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Many historical issues surround the late Nineteenth Dynasty after the reign of Merneptah, and one of them is the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II. These two kings ruled over a period in which both Amenmesse and Seti II were competing kings with evidence suggesting that Amenmesse founded a rival kingship during the reign of Seti II and managed to control ancient Nubia and Upper Egypt for at least four years. This dissertation seeks to examine the known monuments and monumental inscriptions belonging to Amenmesse and Seti II in order to answer historical, archaeological, genealogical, and epigraphic questions pertaining to their reigns. Amenmesse, based on the available evidence, was a member of the late Nineteenth Dynasty royal family who challenged the kingship of Seti II, crown prince of Merneptah and the legitimate heir upon Merneptah’s death. One of the suggested historical identities for Amenmesse is of the Nubian Viceroy Messuy, a son of Seti II appointed to the office under Merneptah. This theory suggests that Messuy utilized the resources available to the administrative position of Viceroy of Nubia to launch a rebellion against Seti II. This dissertation seeks to answer the questions surrounding the historical identity of Amenmesse through genealogical examinations of the royal families of Merneptah and Seti II and if the monuments and inscriptions of the Viceroy Messuy reveal family ties to the late Nineteenth Dynasty royal family. A large part of the dissertation includes an analysis and examination of the known monuments and artifacts pertaining to the reigns of
Amenmesse and Seti II to reveal new traces of Amenmesse’s inscriptions from his brief rule that are largely obscured by later usurpations of Seti II. The final analysis suggests that Amenmesse, a member of the royal family, did manage to establish a nearly four year competing reign within the six year reign of Seti II. However, analysis of the available monumental and epigraphic evidence cannot support the suggested identification of Amenmesse with the Viceroy Messuy.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

The ancient Egyptian Nineteenth Dynasty (ca. 1293-1185 B.C.), part of the New Kingdom (ca. 1570-1070 B.C.) elicits a fair amount of mention in modern publications with the available information granting insights into just about every facet of ancient Egypt during this historical period.¹ The beginning of the Nineteenth Dynasty only

comes about due to the royal family of the Eighteenth Dynasty (ca. 1570-1293 B.C.)
having no living male heir to continue the line after the death of Tutankhamun. The
throne passed to two non-royals before the Vizier Paramessu, the future Ramesses I and
founder of the Nineteenth Dynasty royal family, became appointed heir and successor to
the throne.² Ramesses I reigned for two years (ca. 1293-1291 B.C.), and was succeeded
by the nearly twelve year rule of his son Seti I (ca. 1291-1279 B.C.), and the sixty-seven
year rule of Ramesses II (ca. 1279-1212 B.C.), son of Seti I. Ramesses II was succeeded
by his thirteenth son Merneptah, who ruled for about ten years (ca. 1212-1202 B.C.).

²For the transition between the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties, see Jacobus Van Dijk,
“The Amarna Period and the Later New Kingdom (c. 1352-1069 B.C.),” in The Oxford History of
Ancient Egypt, ed. Ian Shaw (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 290-94; Raymond O.
Faulkner, “Egypt: From the Inception of the Nineteenth Dynasty to the Death of Ramesses III,”
In CAH, vol. 2, part 2, History of the Middle East and the Aegean Region c. 1380-1000 B.C., ed.
I. E. S. Edwards et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 217; Morris Bierbrier,
“Elements of Stability and Instability in Ramesside Egypt: The Succession to the Throne,” in
Fragments of a Shattered Visage: The Proceedings of the International Symposium of Ramesses
the Great, ed. Edward Bleiberg and Rita Freed (Memphis Tennessee: Institute of Egyptian Art
and Archaeology, Memphis State University, 1993), 9-10; William J. Murnane, “The Kingship of
the Nineteenth Dynasty: A Study in the Resilience of an Institution,” in Ancient Egyptian
Kingship, ed. by David O’Connor and David P. Silverman (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 185-217;
Edward F. Wente, “Genealogy of the Royal Family,” in An X-Ray Atlas of the Royal Mummies,
After Merneptah’s death, the reigns of the Nineteenth Dynasty kings then become uncertain and sketchy in that collateral and possible competing interests among royal family members of the late Nineteenth Dynasty spelled disaster in the dynastic succession. ³

The problems and uncertainties in the history of the later Nineteenth Dynasty after King Merneptah are that there were two competing claimants in Egypt, at the same time or nearly so, who positioned themselves as king and successor after the death of Merneptah. These two kings are Amenmesse and Seti II (ca. 1203/1202-1197/1193 B.C.), and their monuments serve as the basis for the research conducted in this dissertation.⁴ The exact lineage and reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II presents many questions and uncertainties pertaining to Nineteenth Dynasty History. There are numerous doubts as to the exact identity of their parents as well as the geographic extent of their monuments and reign lengths. It is these questions and uncertainties that this dissertation addresses through a new meticulous examination of the known monuments of Amenmesse and Seti II thereby yielding new insights and newly identified monuments pertaining to their reigns.


Early Historical Accounts of Amenmesse and Seti II

Outside of the existing monumental records for Amenmesse and Seti II, the earliest literature mentioning the reigns of these two kings is in the writings of the ancient Egyptian historian Manetho in his *History of Egypt*, albeit in an indirect way. Manetho’s work is largely lost except for quotations, paraphrases, and an epitome utilized by other ancient historians in following years.⁵ An epitome preserved by Sextus Julius Africanus via Georgius Syncellus’ *Ecloga Chronographica (Chronological Excerpts)* mentions an “Ammenemnes” ruling for five years during the Nineteenth Dynasty, which is very close to the nearly four year reign attributed to Amenmesse by modern Egyptologists and historians.⁶ A further account allegedly from Manetho and preserved by Josephus in *contra Apionem (Against Apion)* 1.98-101 recounts a king Sethos who “appointed his brother Harmais as viceroy of Egypt and gave him all royal power” with the understanding that Harmais was not to become king while Sethos campaigned outside Egypt. Harmais, of course, broke the promise he made with his brother as Harmais “wore a crown and supplanted his brother” leading Sethos to return in order to deal with his brother’s traitorous actions.⁷ Thomas Schneider believes this episode reflects the dynastic struggles between Amenmesse and Seti II during the late Nineteenth Dynasty even though this event and some of the kings involved appears placed towards the end of the Eighteenth Dynasty and beginning of the Nineteenth Dynasty in other ancient sources.

---


⁶Verbrugghe and Wickersham, 129, 143, 199. On the nearly four year reign of Amenmesse, see Wente and Van Siclen, 236, 252, 256.

⁷Quoted translations of Josephus’ *contra Apionem (Against Apion)* taken from Verbrugghe and Wickersham, 159.
using Manetho as their source for ancient Egyptian history. Caution must be stressed in utilizing Josephus’ work as a depiction of ancient Egyptian history as written by Manetho because Josephus gives “citations from a set of altered and distorted excerpts” due to a polemic discourse having erupted over the contributions that the Jews and ancient Egyptians may have had in forming the civilization and culture of ancient Greece. At some time after Manetho’s death, sections of Manetho’s History of Egypt became altered to add to the anti-Jewish polemic that existed during Josephus’ day.

Nineteenth Century Accounts of Amenmesse and Seti II

The next appearance of Amenmesse and Seti II in literature probably comes from the earliest epigraphic expeditions to record the monuments of the ancient Egyptians, especially in the area of ancient Thebes, or modern Luxor. Franco-Tuscan and Prussian Expeditions during the 1820s and 1840s, led by early epigraphers such as Jean-François Champollion and Karl Richard Lepsius, began to note various monuments and inscriptions dating to the late Nineteenth Dynasty belonging to Kings Amenmesse and Seti II. More specifically, in several instances, such as Amenmesse’s tomb in the Valley of the Kings (KV 10) and stelae erected by him at the mortuary temple of Seti I,

---

8Thomas Schneider, “Conjectures about Amenmesse: Historical, Biographical, Chronological,” in Ramesside Studies in Honour of K. A. Kitchen, ed. Steven Snape and Mark Collier (Bolton: Rutherford Press, in press), 104. In Verbrugghe and Wickersham, 142-43, King Amenophis, father of the king Sethos in the episode recounted by Josephus, appears in the epitome preserved by both Africanus and Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea but as the sixteenth king of the Eighteenth Dynasty thereby leading to some confusion over the kings Josephus recounts. Schneider, “Conjectures about Amenmesse,” 104, sees Amenophis/Amenophath/Amenephthes/Amenephthis as listed in Josephus, Africanus, and Eusebius as all the same king that he feels is to be identified as Merneptah of the Nineteenth Dynasty.

9Verbrugghe and Wickersham, 116.

10These monuments are recorded in LD 3: 201c, 202a, 202e 219c; LDT 3: 91-92, 130, 154, 205-206.
Amenmesse’s name had been erased entirely or replaced by that of another king, Siptah.11 These early recordings showing that the names of Amenmesse or Siptah were erased or replaced on many monuments dating to their reigns led to much confusion over the exact sequence of kings after Merneptah’s death. A dynastic struggle between as many as four rulers, Amenmesse, Seti II, Siptah, and Queen Tausert, may have erupted over who had the right to succeed Merneptah.

Emmanuel de Rougé made the first attempts at defining the relationships of the late Nineteenth Dynasty rulers by suggesting that Amenmesse and Siptah were usurpers from a rival branch of Ramesses II’s family who formed an “intercalated” dynasty ruling before Seti II, the legitimate heir, came to the throne.12 August Eisenlohr suggested an alternate arrangement to fit his theories concerning the end of the Nineteenth Dynasty and the beginning of the Twentieth Dynasty in that he felt Amenmesse and then Siptah,

---


12 Gaston Maspero, “King Siphtah and Queen Tausrît,” xiv-xv; Emmanuel de Rougé, Étude sur une stele égyptienne, appartenant a la Bibliotheque Impériale (Paris: Imprimerie impériale, 1858), 185-86.
being father and son, came after Seti II reigned.\textsuperscript{13} Although not all of Eisenlohr’s theories were embraced by the scholarly community of the day, his sequence of kings in succession Merneptah, Seti II, Amenmesse, Siptah, and Queen Tausert became almost standard in other works.\textsuperscript{14} Franz Lauth hypothesized an alternate arrangement, suggesting that Amenmesse ruled after Siptah at the very end of the Nineteenth Dynasty. Lauth also believed that Amenmesse was quite possibly not an immediate member of the late Nineteenth Dynasty royal family but was either a commoner adopted into the family or even born to a daughter of an earlier king not married to a member of the current royal family.\textsuperscript{15} Such a situation would explain the perceived illegitimacy of Amenmesse by later kings in that he was an usurper because his father probably never was a king.

Twentieth-Century Accounts of Amenmesse and Seti II Part 1: The Early 1900s to the 1950s

By the early twentieth century, the sequence of Seti II followed by Amenmesse had become so well-entrenched in the literature that it seemed infallable. Flinders Petrie used

\begin{addendum}
\item\textsuperscript{13}August Eisenlohr, “On the Political Condition of Egypt before the Reign of Ramses III: Probably in Connection with the Establishment of the Jewish religion from the Great Harris Papyrus,” \textit{TSBA} 1 (1872): 375-78.
\end{addendum}
this sequence in his historical reconstruction of the late Nineteenth Dynasty in which Seti II is the father of Amenmesse, Siptah, and Tausert, and these three royal siblings engage in a dynastic fight over who got to rule after Seti II died.\textsuperscript{16} An exception is Gaston Maspero, who reemphasized the old de Rougé sequence of Amenmesse and Siptah as the predecessors of Seti II.\textsuperscript{17} These two alternate chronologies of Maspero and Petrie were reexamined by Walter Emery in the 1930s, and he became convinced that Petrie’s chronology of Seti II followed by Amenmesse fit the monumental evidence best.\textsuperscript{18}

By the 1950s, consensus on late Nineteenth Dynasty history changed again. Ricardo Caminos minutely examined the Amenmesse stelae in the mortuary temple of Seti II and concluded that the sequence of kings was Amenmesse, Siptah, Seti II, but that this “does not signify that they held the throne in sequence.”\textsuperscript{19} Louis-André Christophe confused matters even more by reintroducing Ramesses-Siptah and Merneptah-Siptah into late Nineteenth Dynasty chronology and placing Amenmesse between these two kings named

\textsuperscript{16}William Matthew Flinders Petrie, \textit{A History of Egypt}, vol. 3, \textit{From the XIXth to the XXXth Dynasties} (London: Methuen, 1905), 2-3, 118-33. Petrie’s claim in \textit{History of Egypt}, 3: 121, of Eisenlohr’s claiming that Amenmesse and Siptah are brothers is erroneous as Eisenlohr, 377-78, states that Amenmesse and Siptah are father and son.

\textsuperscript{17}Maspero, “King Siphtah and Queen Tauosrît,” xvii-xx, xxviii-xxix. Maspero also suggested earlier in \textit{History of the Ancient Peoples}, 2: 439, that Amenmesse and Siptah were brothers born to non-reigning sons of Ramesses II who bore the exact same names.

\textsuperscript{18}Walter B. Emery, “The Order of Succession at the Close of the Nineteenth Dynasty,” in \textit{Mélanges Maspero}, vol. 1, part 1, \textit{Orient Ancien} (Cairo: Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1935-38), 353-56. In an earlier work, Henri Gauthier, \textit{Le livre des rois d’Égypte, Recueil de titres et protocoles Royaux, noms propres de roi, reines, princes et princesses, noms de pyramides et de temples solaires, suivi d’un index alphabétique}, vol. 3, \textit{De la XIXe à la XXIVe dynastie} (Caire: Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1914), 127-49, hesitantly placed the order of kings as Amenmesse, Seti II, and then Siptah, but admitted that the precise order of kings was uncertain.

Siptah (Ramesses-Siptah, Amenmesse, Merneptah-Siptah) with Seti II ruling before Ramesses-Siptah. With confusing and somewhat archaic revisions such as these, it is a wonder anyone understood what happened during the late Nineteenth Dynasty.

In contrast to these theories, Wolfgang Helck and Alan Gardiner began to formulate what has become the standardized chronological history of the late Nineteenth Dynasty for many years. According to this theory, Amenmesse usurped the throne directly after the death of King Merneptah, and Seti II, son and legitimate heir of Merneptah, did not rule until after Amenmesse’s reign. Siptah, of which there was only one king named as such, is then placed ruling after Seti II died. Jürgen von Beckerath even made a bolder interpretation by suggesting initially that Amenmesse was a *Gegenkönig*, or “counter-king,” with a parallel reign to that of Siptah, but later suggesting that Amenmesse was *Gegenkönig* during the reign of Seti II. Seeing Amenmesse as a usurping king within or parallel to the reigns of either Seti II or Siptah then became a possibility of explaining

---


how Amenmesse managed to become king being that his claims to the throne probably were not legitimate.23

Twentieth-Century Accounts of Amenmesse and Seti II Part 2: The 1960s and 1970s

By the 1960s and 1970s, considerable new information appeared concerning the late Nineteenth Dynasty, especially the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II, with the research of Cyril Aldred, Labib Habachi, Rolf Krauss, Leonard Lesko, Jacques Vandier, and Frank Yurco.24 Aldred suggested that the perceived illegitimacy of Siptah by the Twentieth Dynasty kings was due to his father not being a legitimate king. To Aldred, this suggested that Siptah’s father was Amenmesse, with Amenmesse having usurped the throne from the legitimate king Seti II.25 Lesko disagreed with Aldred and suggested that Siptah was the son of Seti II and that the sequence of rulers at the end of the Nineteenth Dynasty was Seti II, Siptah, and lastly, Tausert.26 Vandier, much like Aldred and Lesko, decided to look at the complex family relationships of the late Nineteenth Dynasty royal

23Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, 277, suggests that Amenmesse’s reign was “before or within that of Sethos II.” Faulkner, “Egypt: From the Inception of the Nineteenth Dynasty,” 237, takes Amenmesse as “a temporary usurper into the reigns of either Sethos II or Siptah.” David O’Connor, “New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period, 1552-664 B.C.” in *Ancient Egypt: A Social History*, ed. B. G. Trigger et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 223, also sees Amenmesse as an usurper within the reign of Seti II.


26Lesko, “Little More Evidence,” 29-32. Lesko does not explicitly place Amenmesse before or within the reign of Seti II other than to say that since Siptah usurped the stelae of Amenmesse at the mortuary temple of Seti I, it seems to indicate a lack of paternal affiliation between them.
family. He concluded that Amenmesse was not the father of Siptah, but that they were both sons of Seti II born to different queens.²⁷ Amenmesse is placed in Vandier’s reconstruction as an usurper within the reign of Siptah, the legitimate heir after Seti II’s death. Vandier then explains the nomen change from Ramesses-Siptah to Merneptah-Siptah as occurring after Siptah regained the throne from Amenmesse’s temporary reign.²⁸

Perhaps the most revelatory analysis of the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II comes from Rolf Krauss, who published two articles in which he suggested that Amenmesse was a “counter-king” (Gegenkönig) whose reign occurred within that of Seti II.²⁹ In Krauss’ theory, Seti II reigned as king over all of Egypt and Nubia for about a year until Amenmesse forced Seti II out of Upper Egypt and Nubia thereby creating a situation in which there were two competing kings; specifically, Amenmesse ruling over Upper Egypt and Nubia while Seti II ruled Lower Egypt. During or just before his Fifth Year, Seti II managed to defeat or drive Amenmesse out of power thereby reestablishing unified kingship over all of Egypt and Nubia.³⁰ According to Krauss, not only did


²⁸Ibid., 186-89.


Amenmesse’s reign coexist with that of Seti II, but Amenmesse was none other than the Nubian Viceroy Messuy, a son of Seti II who decided to launch a rebellion against his father to claim the throne.\footnote{See later expansions of this theory in Krauss, “Zur Historischen Einordnung Amenmesse,” 27-34; idem, \textit{Sothis- und Monddaten}, 128-31, 141, 207; idem, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse: Nachträge,” \textit{SAK} 24 (1997): 161-84; idem, \textit{Moïse le Pharaon}, trans. by Nathalie Baum (Monaco: Éditions du Rocher, 2000), 114-58. Habachi, “King Amenmesse and Viziers Amenmose and Kha’emtore,” 64-67, reached an alternate conclusion in which he suggests that Amenmesse was the Vizier Amenmose (\textit{Jmn-ms}) who rebelled against Seti II after being removed from office.}

In a contemporaneous 1979 study, Frank Yurco examined the known monuments of Seti II to see if they could reveal traces as to whether they originally belonged to Amenmesse. Yurco worked with Patrick Cardon in examining a series of statues naming Seti II at Karnak Temple in Luxor to see if they might have been usurped from Amenmesse. Cardon was able to match a quartzite head in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (MMA 34.2.2) to one of the six statues at Karnak, and Yurco found that all six statues had been usurped with the traces indicating that these statues originally belonged to Amenmesse.\footnote{Patrick Cardon, “Amenmesse: An Egyptian Royal Head of the Nineteenth Dynasty in the Metropolitan Museum,” \textit{MMJ} (1979): 5-14; Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 15-31.}

Yurco also examined the cartouches contained within the battle reliefs on the exterior west wall of the \textit{Cour de la Cachette} and showed that these scenes dated to the reign of Merneptah and were not original reliefs of Ramesses II as scholars commonly believed. Yurco noticed that the earliest cartouche was that of Merneptah, whose name was then "l’anti-pharaon." Although Beckerath first suggested the \textit{Gegenkönig} theory, Beckerath, \textit{Chronologie des ägyptischen Neuen Reiches}, 36, 70-73, discusses and gives a chronology for Amenmesse either reigning before (Amenmesse 1203-1200/1199 B.C.; Seti II 1200/1199-1194/1193 B.C. or during the reign of Seti II (Seti II 1204-1198 B.C.), but in idem, \textit{Chronologie des Pharaonischen Ägypten}, 104-105, Beckerath merely gives Amenmesse as ruling before Seti II.
erased and replaced by that of Amenmesse. After Amenmesse’s reign came to an end, Seti II, seeking to eliminate all traces of whom he believed to be an illegitimate king, usurped the cartouches featuring Amenmesse’s name for himself rather than to recarve Merneptah’s name in them.33

Twentieth-Century Accounts of Amenmesse and Seti II Part 3: The 1980s to the 1990s

After these groundbreaking studies into the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II, research into the late Nineteenth Dynasty tended to focus on either supporting Krauss’ theory of Amenmesse as “counter-king” within the reign of Seti II or maintaining Amenmesse as having an independent reign between that of Merneptah and Seti II. Habachi maintained that the evidence he examined shows that Amenmesse’s monuments were without doubt normally usurped by Seti II, so he places Amenmesse as ruling before Seti II.34 Likewise, Edward Wente and Charles Van Siclen III placed the reigning sequence of kings as Merneptah, followed by Amenmesse and Seti II in their chronology of the New


Kingdom, which was also adopted by Morris Bierbrier, Kenneth Kitchen, and Anthony Spalinger. Serious criticism of Krauss’ theories appeared in works by Jürgen Osing, along with Manfred Gutgesell and Bettina Schmitz, who pointed out that some of Krauss’ observations were based on misreading textual evidence involving the Viceroy Messuy and an oversimplification of the administrative ostraca from Deir el-Medina.

Although supported by some researchers, like Erik Hornung, Ingeborg Müller, David O’Connor, and Claude Vandersleyen, doubts still remained about the identification of Amenmesse with the Viceroy Messuy and his status as Gegenkönig within the reign of Seti II. Aidan Dodson initially supported Amenmesse as Gegenkönig during the reign of Seti II, Amenmesse’s suggested father, but not his identity as Messuy, in articles


dealing with monuments of Amenmesse and Seti II along with a discussion of the royal queens associated with their reigns. Upon examining the long inaccessible reliefs of Messuy at Amada, Dodson fervently supported the identification of Amenmesse with Messuy because of perceived *uraei* allegedly having been added to images of Messuy at Amada along with theorizing the chronological sequence of Amenmesse’s reign interrupting the construction of Seti II’s tomb. Yurco did not accept Krauss and Dodson’s conclusions and presented his own research concerning the Viceroy Messuy and affirming the traditional sequence of Amenmesse and then Seti II ruling after Merneptah’s death.

**Twenty-First Century Accounts of Amenmesse and Seti II**

Recent research within the past few years has continued new insights into the late Nineteenth Dynasty. Thomas Schneider published an article examining the genealogy of the late Nineteenth Dynasty royal family in which he suggests that Amenmesse was a royal grandchild born to one of Ramesses II’s non-reigning sons. Amenmesse’s status as a potential “King’s Son” is only due to Seti II later marrying Takhat, Amenmesse’s

---


mother and Seti II’s aunt, thereby making Amenmesse Seti II’s stepson-cousin.\textsuperscript{41}

Schneider postulates further on Amenmesse’s genealogy in that he believes the “Tale of Two Brothers” represents in some way the legitimization of the right for collateral royal family members to rule before another family member appointed as heir in a traditional father-son succession. In this manner, Schneider explains how Amenmesse ruled before Seti II by creating a mythology that would allow something perplexing to established procedures on royal father-son succession when the heir apparent was still alive.\textsuperscript{42}

Basis and Purpose of Research

The beginning of the Nineteenth Dynasty is represented best in modern Egyptological and historical research by works focusing on the monuments and reigns of Seti I, Ramesses II, and Merneptah.\textsuperscript{43} The Nineteenth Dynasty after Merneptah has yet to be the subject of an intensive study except a few paragraphs in the \textit{Lexikon der Ägyptologie}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{41}Schneider, “Conjectures about Amenmesse,” 99-105.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
and brief mentions in several histories and genealogical studies of ancient Egypt.\(^{44}\) The purpose of this dissertation is to add to these already established works by focusing on the known monuments and monumental inscriptions belonging to the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II in order to answer questions surrounding the late Nineteenth Dynasty in ancient Egypt. The dissertation will begin with an analysis and discussion of the monuments featuring Prince Seti-Merneptah, the future King Seti II, in his role as crown prince and heir apparent to King Merenptah, his father. Next is an analysis containing the royal family of the late Nineteenth Dynasty focusing on the family genealogy of Merneptah with an examination of the identity of Seti II’s mother and who are the known royal brothers and sisters of Seti II. One of the possible identities of Amenmesse is that he was a brother or half-brother to Seti II. Following this analysis is an examination of the royal family members belonging to the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II. The monuments and information pertaining to the known queens, royal sons, and

royal daughters from the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II will be examined from a historical and genealogical perspective.

The bulk of the dissertation is a detailed analysis of all the currently identified monuments and artifacts belonging to Amenmesse and Seti II in their own respective chapters. The monuments and artifacts featured include; their tombs, statuary, monumental temple inscriptions and constructions, scarabs, and other minor items featuring titulatures belonging to these two kings ranging in geographic sequence from Syria-Palestine, Lower Egypt, Upper Egypt, and into Nubia. Monuments and artifacts of uncertain provenance are found immediately following those found in Nubia in the chapter listings. As part of the analysis dealing with the reigns and monuments of these two kings, discussion of usurped monuments, mainly those of Seti II showing signs of having been usurped from an earlier king, are grouped according to what the usurpations show. If a monument shows definite traces of Amenmesse’s titulary it is included in the chapter dealing with the monuments of Amenmesse. Otherwise, those monuments and artifacts showing unclear or no traces of Amenmesse’s name are discussed in the chapter dealing with Seti II.

The final chapter deals with the monuments and artifacts pertaining to the Nubian Viceroy Messuy. One of the historical identities suggested for Amenmesse is that he was none other than the Viceroy Messuy, so a discussion of all the existing monuments and artifacts pertaining to the Viceroy Messuy is necessary to assess whether he was indeed a member of the royal family and took the regal name of Amenmesse upon becoming king.

Due to the scope of this dissertation, some topics have had to be limited or are entirely outside of the present discussion. Administrative officials from the reigns of Amenmesse
and Seti II are discussed in conjunction with major monuments featuring both the name of the king that these officials served, and the official as well, while monuments and documents merely naming the official have been excluded.\(^4\) The same holds true for the workers at Deir el-Medina as only major monuments containing the names of Amenmesse or Seti II are featured in this dissertation because the lives, careers and graffiti of these workers are covered in-depth in other works.\(^5\) Foreign relations

\(^{45}\) The most notable absence from the administration is the Royal Cupbearer and Chancellor Bay. The majority of Bay’s monuments and inscriptions listed in KRI 4: 285-86, 369-71, RITA 4: 205, 267-70, date to the reign of Siptah, and this period is under study by Kevin L. Johnson at the University of Memphis in a dissertation titled “Transition and Legitimation in Egypt’s Late 19th and Early 20th Dynasties: A Study of the Reigns of Siptah, Tausret, and Sethnakht,” so Bay’s status and his relationship with Siptah and Tausert will not be discussed here. The only two inscriptions possibly from the reign of Seti II are a West Theban Graffito (1700) and an Ostracon (CG 25766) in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo giving little insight into his career between the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II other than giving Bay the titles of “King’s Scribe” (\(s\text{-}s\text{-}\text{nswt}\)) and “Royal Cupbearer/Butler (\(w\text{dwpw}/w\text{b}A\text{-}\text{nswt}\)). In light of the recent confirmation of Bay’s execution during Siptah’s reign by Pierre Grandet, “L’exécution du chancelier Bay: O. IFAO 1864,” BIFAO 100 (2000): 229-45, Callender suggests in “Queen Tausret and the End of Dynasty 19,” 89-92, that CG 25766 may actually be a plea for help by Bay or an associate for Amun-Re to save Bay from his impending execution thereby dating CG 25766 to the reign of Siptah. For more on Bay, see Jaroslav Černý, “A Note on the Chancellor Bay,” ZÄS 93 (1966): 35-39; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 61, 70-84; Andrea Maria Gnirs, Militär und Gesellschaft: ein Beitrag zur Sozialgeschichte des Neuen Reiches, Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte Alttägyptens, vol. 17 (Heidelberg: Heidelberger Orientverlag, 1996), 110, 129-31; Wolfgang Helck, “Bai,” Lexikon der Ägyptologie, 1: 604-605; Thomas Schneider, “Siptah und Beja: Neubeurteilung einer Historischen Konstellation,” ZÄS 130 (2003): 134-46.

pertaining to the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II are not attested in currently available historical records. Also absent are the later rulers of the Nineteenth Dynasty, Tausert and Siptah. Their reigns are entirely outside this study on the monuments of Amenmesse and Seti II and their relations are only discussed genealogically through Tausert being “Great Royal Wife” of Seti II. Through limiting the research in said manner, the objective of this dissertation is to provide a new synthesis of currently available information concerning the monuments and reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II using epigraphic, archaeological, and historical analysis.

47This is not to say that no diplomatic relations or correspondence between ancient Egypt and its neighbors occurred during the reign of Amenmesse and Seti II. It is that archives containing the equivalent of the Amarna Letters for the late Nineteenth Dynasty have yet to be found in Egypt, and archives from other ancient Near Eastern city-states are largely missing any mention of these kings. The only exception is a mention in the Urternu archives at Ugarit of a King Seti, with the available information not specifying if the letter indicates Seti I or Seti II. For more on this mention of a King Seti at Ugarit, see Pierre Bordreuil and Florence Malbran-Labat, “Les Archives de la Maison d’Ourtenou,” CRAIBL 139, no. 2 (1995): 445; Itamar Singer, “A Political History of Ugarit,” in Handbook of Ugaritic Studies, ed. Wilfred G. E. Watson and Nicolas Wyatt (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999), 715 note 373. For the Ugarit Urternu archives, see Marguerite Yon, “La maison d’Ourtenou dans le quartier sud d’Ougarit (fouilles 1994),” CRAIBL 139, no. 2 (1995): 427-43.

48For the end of the Nineteenth Dynasty, see now Callender, “Queen Tausret and the End of Dynasty 19,” 81-104; idem, “The Cripple, the Queen, & the Man from the North,” 48-63; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 70-98; Schneider, “Siptah und Beja,” 134-46. The genealogy of Siptah is now being discussed in Johnson, “Transition and Legitimation in Egypt’s Late 19th and Early 20th Dynasties.”
Chapter 2

The Career of Seti II as Crown Prince of Merneptah

As with any member of the ancient Egyptian royal family, the future Seti II had a role to fulfill amid the administrative duties of the late Nineteenth Dynasty royal family. When compared to previous dynasties, there is a more outward presence for royal children, especially sons, on Nineteenth Dynasty royal monuments when compared to those belonging to the previous Eighteenth Dynasty royal family.\(^1\) However, while there is an overwhelming amount of documentation for royal sons during the first part of the Nineteenth Dynasty under Ramesses II, one encounters nearly the same situation as that of the Eighteenth Dynasty when examining the monuments involving the late Nineteenth Dynasty.\(^2\) The representation of royal family members upon monuments belonging to Merneptah, Amenmesse, and Seti II tends to be very rare. For the purposes of this study, all known representations of Seti-Merneptah, the future Seti II, in his role of crown prince are gathered together in this section along with the varying princely titles he held while he was the intended heir to the throne.

---

\(^1\) Aidan Dodson, “Crown Prince Djhutmose and the Royal Sons of the Eighteenth Dynasty,” *JEA* 76 (1990): 87-96, sums up succinctly the known royal family members of the Eighteenth Dynasty and their appearance, or lack thereof, on Eighteenth Dynasty royal monuments.

\(^2\) For the sons of Ramesses II, see Marjorie M. Fisher, *The Sons of Ramesses II*, vol. 1, *Text and Plates* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001); idem, *The Sons of Ramesses II*, vol. 2, *Catalogue* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001). Murnane, “Kingship of the Nineteenth Dynasty,” 204-207, suggests that the visual presence of numerous royal sons upon Ramesses II’s monuments was a preemptive attempt to ward off any dynastic claimants or challenges to the royal throne being that the Nineteenth Dynasty was founded by a non-royal military family.
1. Titles on Red Limestone Seated Statue of Merneptah from Bubastis (figure 2.1)³

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo (?)⁴

Transliteration of princely titles: jry−pṛt ss nswt Sthy mrj.n-Pth

Translation: “Hereditary noble, royal scribe, Seti-Merneptah.”⁵

Description: Naville describes this as being a fragment of a seated statue belonging to Merneptah with Seti-Merneptah’s titles on the right side. Only a fragment of the throne remains due to the statue being quarried away in antiquity.⁶

³References: PM 4: 30; KRI 4: 49; RITA 4: 37; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 126; Édouard Naville, Bubastis (1887-1889), Egypt Exploration Fund Eighth Memoir (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1891), 45, plate 38D; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 25, 32 note 12; Iskander, 54, 154; Gnirs, 128 note 734; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 66, figure 18; Spalinger, review of Elephantine-Stele des Sethnakht, 277 note 24.

⁴According to PM 4: 30, Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 126, the statue was number 702 in Gaston Maspero, Guide du visiteur au Musée du Caire, 2d ed. (Caire: Imprimerie de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1912), 172-73. However, according to Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 25, and 32 note 12, along with Gaston Maspero, Guide du visiteur au Musée du Caire, 4th ed. (Caire: Imprimerie de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1915), 185, this reference is to CG 1240 as described below.

⁵Compare with RITA 4: 37.

⁶Naville, Bubastis, 45; RITA 4: 37.
Figure 2.1. Titles of Prince Seti-Merneptah on Bubastis statue of Merneptah. Detail of Naville, *Bubastis*, plate 38D.

2. Red Granite Statue of Merneptah from Medinet Madi, Fayum (figure 2.2)\(^7\)

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE 66571

Transliteration of princely titles: \(jry-p^s\)t sš nswt jmy-r mš\(^c\) wr z3-nswt smsw Sthy mrj.n-Pth

Translation: “Hereditary noble, royal scribe, generalissimo, eldest King’s son Seti Merneptah.”

Description: The dorsal pillar of the statue’s left side has an image of Prince Seti Merneptah inscribed with the titulary described above. Seti Merneptah wears the long princely side lock of hair extending down to his shoulders as well as sandals. He wears a long robe extending down to his ankles and tied together with a sash at the waist. Seti-Merneptah’s right hand is raised in a pose of adoration toward the sculpted image of his father Merneptah while his left hand holds a $hq^3$ crook scepter and an ankh sign.

---

8Kitchen, *RITA* 4: 44, and Iskander, 54, prefer the term “generalissimo” for *jmy-r mšś* wr but the more simpler “general” as used by Fisher, 1: 63-64, might be better. Rainer Hannig, *Die Sprache der Pharaonen: Großes Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch-Deutsch (2800-950 v. Chr.),* Marburger ed. (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2006), 61, suggests Generalfeldmarschall. Dr. Suzanne Onstine suggested to this author “supreme commander” during the dissertation defense.

Figure 2.2. Detail of Prince Seti-Merneptah on JE 66571. From Sourouzian, *Monuments du roi Merenptah*, plate 19b, used with permission from the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Abteilung Kairo.
3. Red Granite Statue of Merneptah with Limestone Base from Ashmunein (figure 2.3)\textsuperscript{10}

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE 35126 (statue), JE 35127 (base)

Transliteration of princely titles: \textit{jry-p\textsuperscript{t} hry-tp t\textsuperscript{w}y s\textsuperscript{s} nswt jmy-r m\textsuperscript{s} wr z\textsuperscript{3}-nswt smsw}

\textit{Sthy mrj.n-Pth}

Translation: “Hereditary noble, Chief of the Two Lands, royal scribe, generalissimo, eldest King’s son Seti-Merneptah.”\textsuperscript{11}

Description: On the left side of the statue is a figure of Prince Seti-Merneptah raising his right hand in a pose of adoration toward the leg of King Merneptah.\textsuperscript{12} In his left hand, Seti-Merneptah holds a fan, a princely rank of office.\textsuperscript{13} Seti-Merneptah is depicted wearing the curled side lock of a prince upon his wig and an \textit{uraeus} upon his forehead. His robe extends down well past his ankles and almost touches his sandaled feet.\textsuperscript{14}


\textsuperscript{11}For \textit{hry-tp t\textsuperscript{w}y}, Sourouzian, \textit{Monuments du roi Merenptah}, 118, prefers to link the title with \textit{jry-p\textsuperscript{t}t} thereby being “le prince héréditaire, qui est à la tête du Double Pays” (“Hereditary prince who is at the head of the Two Lands”). Compare with Iskander, 54, who uses “Chief over the Two Lands.” Perhaps also “Head of the Two Lands.”

\textsuperscript{12}Sourouzian, \textit{Monuments du roi Merenptah}, 118, and idem, “Statues of King Merenptah,” 229, describe Seti-Merneptah as touching the statue’s leg.

\textsuperscript{13}Fisher, 1: 132-33.

\textsuperscript{14}Sourouzian, \textit{Monuments du roi Merenptah}, 118, figure 26; idem, “Statues of King Merenptah,” 229; Iskander, 54-55.
Figure 2.3. Detail of Prince Seti-Merneptah on JE 35126. From Sourouzian, *Monuments du roi Merenptah*, plate 22b, used with permission from the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Abteilung Kairo.

4. Red Granite Statue of Merneptah Slaying Prisoner (figure 2.4)$^{15}$

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo CG 1240

Transliteration of princely titles: jry-p’t ḫry-tp tꜣwy ʒȝ-nswt n ḫt.f mrj.f Stḥy mrj.n-Pth mꜣ

Translation: “Hereditary noble, Chief of the Two Lands, King’s son of his body, his beloved, Seti-Merneptah, justified.”

Description: The image of Prince Seti-Merneptah is very heavily damaged with the majority of the body having been destroyed sometime in the past. An oblique line of damage passes upward through the prince’s body with the right arm preserved and the left arm and everything below the upper chest missing. The right hand is raised in a pose of adoration while the now-missing left hand holds a fan against the left shoulder. The curled princely side lock dangles from Prince Seti-Merneptah’s head.

16 For ḫry-tp tꜣwy, see note 11.

17 Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 173 figure 31, and plate 33b; idem, “Statues of King Merenptah,” 244 plate 8.

Figure 2.4. Detail of Prince Seti-Merenptah on CG 1240. From Sourouzian, *Monuments du roi Merenptah*, plate 33b, used with permission from the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Abteilung Kairo.
5. Red Granite Statue of Merneptah from Tanis (figure 2.5)\textsuperscript{19}

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE 37481

Transliteration of princely titles: \textit{jry mry.f fjf.f jry-p*t z’-nswt [Sth]y mrf.n-Pth m3* hrw}

Translation: “His Beloved and Favorite of His Father, Hereditary noble, King’s Son, [Set]i-Merneptah, justified”

Description: The image of Prince Seti-Merneptah holds his right hand in a pose of adoration towards the statue of Merneptah while his left hand holds a fan against his own shoulder. A long uncurled side lock extends from Prince Seti-Merneptah’s wig down to his upper chest, and he wears a long robe that extends down to his sandaled feet. The Seth animal that is part of Prince Seti-Merneptah’s name has been erased.\textsuperscript{20}


\textsuperscript{20}Sourouzian, \textit{Monuments du roi Merenptah}, 83 figure 20b, 84-85; idem, “Statues of King Merenptah,” 230; Chadeauf, 51-52; Iskander, 56. The erasure of the Seth figure fits the pattern of Late Period erasures of the Seth animal and not a malicious attack toward Seti II. For more, see Benoît Lurson, “Israël sous Merenptah ou le sort de l’ennemi dans l’Égypte Ancienne,” in \textit{Étrangers et exclus dans le Monde Biblique: Colloque International à l’Université Catholique de l’Ouest, Angers, les 20 et 21 février 2002} (Angers: Université Catholique de l’ouest, 2003), 57, and discussion concerning number 7 below.
6. Red Granite Statue of Merneptah from Tanis (figure 2.6)\textsuperscript{21}

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE 37483

Transliteration of princely titles: \(jry-p^t\ m\ sty\ Gb\ h\ p\ r\ p\ t\ j\ f\ n\ j\ t\ j\ f\ z\ -\ n\ s\ w\ t\ s\ m\ s\ w\ [(S)h]\ y\ m\ r\ j\ .n\ -P\ t\ h]\ \\

Translation: “Hereditary noble, successor to Geb, Leader of the Two Lands of his father, eldest King’s son [Set]i-Merneptah.”\(^{22}\)

Description: Prince Seti-Merneptah raises his right hand in a pose of adoration, but it has been carved in a manner such that the right arm is nearly vertical so that it almost appears to be resting upon the knee belonging to the statue of Merneptah. The left hand holds a fan that does not rest upon the shoulder but is held forward so the fan rests behind the right hand.\(^{23}\) A long uncurled princely side lock hangs down to the upper chest, but much of the body has disappeared due to a diagonal break through the statue of Merneptah at the knees. From what remains of the dress, Prince Seti-Merneptah appears to be wearing a long robe.\(^{24}\) As evidenced in the previous statue, the Seth sign has been erased from Prince Seti-Merneptah’s name

---

\(^{22}\)For \(jry-p^t\ sty\ Gb\), Sourouzian, *Monuments du roi Merenptah*, 81, suggests the translation “le prince héréditaire, sur le trône de Geb” (“Hereditary prince upon the throne of Geb”). Kitchen suggests the alternative translation “Delegate upon the Throne of Geb” in *RITA* 2: 588 note 3.

\(^{23}\)Sourouzian, *Monuments du roi Merenptah*, 80 figure 19b, 81, and plate 15b; idem, “Statues of King Merenptah,” 230; Chadeaufaud, 52-53; Iskander, 56.

\(^{24}\)Sourouzian, *Monuments du roi Merenptah*, 80 figure 19b, 81, and plate 15b; idem, “Statues of King Merenptah,” 230; Chadeaufaud, 52-53; Iskander, 56.
Figure 2.6. Detail of Prince Seti-Merneptah on JE 37483. From Sourouzian, *Monuments du roi Merenptah*, plate 15c, used with permission from the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Abteilung Kairo.

7. Block of Prince Seti from the Battle Reliefs of Merneptah at Karnak (figure 2.7)\(^{25}\)

Location: Blockyard at Temple of Karnak in Luxor, Egypt

Transliteration of princely titles: \( jry-p't [Sity] zt-nswt n ht.f mry.f \)

Translation: “Hereditary noble, [Seti], King’s son of his body, his beloved.”

Description: The block shows a prince leaning forward in his chariot beneath a sunshade while attending to his team of horses. The prince holds the reins with both hands while also using his right hand to hold a whip. A long side lock without a curl dangles down at a slight angle to the prince’s chest due to the prince leaning forward in the chariot.

Figure 2.7. Block of Prince Seti from the Battle Reliefs of Merneptah at Karnak. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.
Discussion and Comments on Number 7

Probably no other monument evokes more fervent discussions than the battle reliefs belonging to the Cour de la Cachette in Karnak Temple.\textsuperscript{26} A masterful study by Frank Yurco appeared in 1986 that reevaluated these reliefs to be those of Merneptah and his Canaanite military operations rather than belonging to Ramesses II.\textsuperscript{27} A further analysis of these scenes, focusing on the pattern of usurpations of the royal cartouches belonging to these battle reliefs, will appear later in this study (chapter 5 number 69). Much of the debate over these scenes involves a discussion over to whom these reliefs belong and who is depicted in the various battle scenes. The question of identifying various conquered people upon these reliefs as belonging to ancient Israelites is outside the scope of this study.\textsuperscript{28} Certain evidence in these scenes points towards the identification of the

\textsuperscript{26}PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 130-33 (491-95) and plan 14; KRI 2: 164-68; RITA 2: 38-42.

\textsuperscript{27}Yurco, “Merenptah’s Plaestinian Campaign,” 70; idem, “Merenptah’s Canaanite Campaign,” 189-215.

Prince Seti on this block as the future King Seti II in his role as Merneptah’s crown prince thereby identifying these scenes as belonging to Merneptah and not Ramesses II.

One important piece of evidence that weighs in favor of these reliefs belonging to Prince Seti-Merneptah, the future Seti II, and not prince Seti, son of Ramesses II, is that the name \( \text{Sth} \) is almost entirely erased from the block while the title of \( jry-p^f t \) is mostly, if not entirely, intact.\(^{29}\) Most arguments place this erasure of the Seth glyph as typical Late Period erasure of a detestable god in light of Seth’s actions in the death of his brother Osiris.\(^{30}\) If this were true then why go to the effort of erasing the entire name and not just the Seth glyph? Indeed, an examination of similar monuments belonging to Kings Seti I and Seti II shows that the iconoclasm directed at the Seth animal affects just that glyph alone and not any other part of the titulary belonging to either king.\(^{31}\) It hardly seems likely that erasing the Seth glyph would entail erasing the entire name of \( \text{Sth} \) unless the erasure is meant to be an attempt at usurpation or damnatio memoriae. The only malice that could be directed at any prince Seti, including any

\(^{29}\)Brand, “Date of War Scenes,” 64, 70; idem, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 42-44.

\(^{30}\)Lurson, “Israël sous Merenptah,” 57.

\(^{31}\)Brand, “Date of War Scenes,” 64-65, 70; idem, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 43 note 48. See also similar erasures of the Seth glyphs belonging to the nomen of Seti II on the reconstructed Cour de la Cachette inner walls in Le Saout, 216, 219, 221-22, 224-227, and plates 1-3.
attempts at damnatio memoriae, would be that of Amenmesse after his seizure of the throne from the legitimate heir, Seti II.\(^{32}\)

As a counterpoint, one might argue that this pattern of erasure is supported by similar evidence concerning Prince Seti, the son of Ramesses II. Argumentatively, one of the suggestions that these reliefs belong to Ramesses II is that the pattern of damage of Prince Seti’s name on the Cour de la Cachette block matches damage seen in reliefs containing Ramesses II’s Prince Seti.\(^{33}\) Upon further consideration and comparison of the two princes, this theory cannot be supported by the evidence. Ramesses II’s relief present on the west wall of the second court and the north and south sides of the west wall of the Hypostyle Hall at the Ramesseum depicting his Prince Seti have only the Seth glyph erased and never the entire name as found in the Cour de la Cachette block.\(^{34}\)

Similar scenes at Luxor Temple on the First Pylon, the interior and exterior walls of the Ramesses II Court, and the exterior west wall belonging to the Processional Colonnade all show that only the Seth glyph was ever attacked and not the entire princely name.\(^{35}\)

\(^{32}\)Leaving aside for a future section in this work the numerous arguments for or against Amenmesse seizing the throne before Prince Seti-Merneptah’s coronation as King Seti II or even seizing power within the reign of Seti II.

\(^{33}\)Lurson, “Israël sous Merenptah,” 56-57.

\(^{34}\)For the reliefs of Ramesses II’s Prince Seti at the Ramesseum’s Second Court and the Ramesseum Hypostyle Hall, see PM\(^{2}\) 2: 437-38 (13, 19-20) and plans 41-42; KRI 2: 864; RITA 2: 560-61; RITANC 2: 571; Fisher, 1: 109, 168 (plate 30B), 170 (plate 32A), 174 (plate 36A-B); idem, 2: 20-21, 23, 29; Christian Leblanc and Magdi Mohamed Fekri, “Les Enfants de Ramsès II, au Ramesseum,” Memnonia 1 (1990-1991): 95-96.

\(^{35}\)For the reliefs of Ramesses II’s Prince Seti on the First Pylon, the Court of Ramesses II, and the exterior wall of the Processional Colonnade at Luxor Temple, see PM\(^{2}\) 2: 306 (17), 333 (202), 334 (205), and plans 30-31; KRI 2: 141, 171, 348-49, 609; RITA 2: 23, 45, 184-85, 403; RITANC 2: 571; Fisher, 1: 109, 181-82 plates 43B-44A, 194 plates 56A-B, 251 plates 113A-B, and 260-61 plates 122B, 123B; idem, 2: 39-40, 49, 152-53. There is a second scene of Ramesses II’s Prince Seti on the south wall of the Court of Ramesses II, but the scene is so severely damaged to an extent that any indication of whether the Seth glyph is erased remains
Even at Karnak Temple, in processional scenes belonging to Ramesses II on the exterior of the Hypostyle Hall, the Seth glyph is the sole object of erasure and not the entire name.\textsuperscript{36}

These patterns of erasure show that if the scene of Prince Seti from the \textit{Cour de la Cachette} block belongs to Prince Seti, son of Ramesses II, then merely the Seth glyph needed to be erased to fit the pattern of Late Period erasures of the Seth glyph. This is not what is seen when contextualizing the different images of Ramesses II’s Prince Seti. In no other instance does any scene containing Ramesses II’s Prince Seti show a near totality of erasing the royal name.\textsuperscript{37} The only conclusion is that this is indeed the future Seti II in his role as crown prince of Merneptah.

As a final rejoinder for supporting the identification of the \textit{Cour de la Cachette} block as belonging to Prince Seti-Merneptah and not Ramesses II’s Prince Seti, the titles born by the prince on the \textit{Cour de la Cachette} block are \textit{jry-pť z3-nswt n ht.f mrj.f} “Hereditary noble, King’s son of his body, his beloved.” In no instance of wall relief or other artifact does Prince Seti, son of Ramesses II, bear titles other than “King’s son of his body, his beloved” (\textit{zi-nswt n ht.f mrj.f}) or merely “King’s son of his body” (\textit{zi-nswt n ht.f}), and there are no known traces of Ramesses II’s Prince Seti ever having undetermined.

\textsuperscript{36}For this scene at Karnak Temple see PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 58 (174) and plan 10; KRI 2: 145; RITA 2: 25; RITANC 2: 571; Fisher, 1: 109, 263 plate 125A, 265 plate 127A; idem, 2: 153.

\textsuperscript{37}RITANC 2: 74; Yurco, “Merenptah’s Canaanite Campaign,” 201; Brand, “Date of War Scenes,” 64-65, 70; idem, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 45.
been named $jry-p^t$ on any monument be it temple or tomb. Indeed, the interval in
which Ramesses II’s Prince Seti could have been named $jry-p^t$ would have been after
Khaemwaset in Year 53 and before Merneptah received the title sometime in Year 55.
If Ramesses II’s prince Seti indeed possessed the title of $jry-p^t$ then it makes sense
logically to believe that his burial in KV 5 would reflect his new titles as heir apparent.
This is not what is seen in KV 5.

In addition to these titles, Yurco believes that the figure of the prince on this scene
belongs to another prince entirely, being that $jry-p^t$ Sthy belongs to a
figure on a block that stood to the left of this block and $z\text{-}nswt$ $ht.f$ $mrj.f$
belongs to the figure portrayed on this block whose name is now lost. Such a scenario
is certainly feasible, but a far simpler explanation is that the titles $jry-p^t$ and $z\text{-}nswt$ $nt$ $ht.f$ $mrj.f$ belong to the prince portrayed on this block-Prince Seti. Variations abound in

---

38 Fisher, 2: 7-8, 14, 20-21, 23, 29, 39-40, 44, 49, 60, 151-54. In Valley of the King’s tomb KV 5, now identified as the burial place of the royal sons of Ramesses II, canopic jar fragments were found in Chambers 1 and 2 bearing the name of Prince Seti, son of Ramesses II. It is interesting to note that Fisher, 1: 110, points out the fact that Seti’s name in the funerary context found within KV 5 utilizes the writing of Seti without the Seth glyph as $swty$. It is also worth mentioning that nowhere on these fragments does Prince Seti possess the title of $jry-p^t$ but just merely the title of $z\text{-}nswt$ $mrj.f$ (“King’s son, his beloved”). For these fragments, see Kent R. Weeks, *KV 5: A Preliminary Report on the Excavation of the Tomb of the Sons of Rameses II in the Valley of the Kings*, rev. ed., Publications of the Theban Mapping Project 2 (Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 2006), 104-105.


40 In Weeks, *KV 5: A Preliminary Report*, 104-106, canopic jar fragments of Prince Amenherkhepeshef are shown alongside those of Prince Seti. Amenherkhepeshef’s canopic fragments indicate his titles as $smsw$ $\tilde{s}$ $nswt$ $jry-p^t$. Prince Seti’s canopic fragments lack any hierarchical titles other than $z\text{-}nswt$ $mrj.f$, which indicates that he never possessed the title of $jry-p^t$ before his death or that older canopics from an earlier stage of Prince Seti’s career were used.

41 Yurco, “Merenptah’s Canaanite Campaign,” 204. See also similar conclusions in *RITANC* 2: 78; Lurson, “Israël sous Merenptah,” 57; Sourouzian, *Monuments du roi Merenptah*, 14 note 84.
the titulary order of Ramesside princes, especially during the reign of Ramesses II, but the title of *jry-pꜣt* comes first before any other titulary as an indicator of status as crown prince.\(^{42}\) Thus, a third prince need not be created from the arrangement of titles on this block.

One final piece of evidence must be pointed out is that other monuments of Prince Seti-Merneptah are always written with his full name as *Stḥy mrj.n-Ptḥ* and rarely just *Stḥy*. Nevertheless, if one accepts the battle reliefs on the walls of the *Cour de la Cachette* as belonging to the Canaanite campaign of Merneptah then the solution as to why Prince Seti-Merneptah’s name is written in this manner is a simple one. At this early stage in his career Seti-Merneptah had not yet adopted the compound name that he possessed later during Merneptah’s reign and during his own reign as King Seti II.\(^{43}\) Alternatively, it can also be that the peculiarities of carving the reliefs upon the *Cour de la Cachette* may have resulted in not enough space available to carve Seti-Merneptah’s full name and the workers responsible for the work had to shorten Prince Seti-Merneptah’s name in order to get the inscription to fit.\(^{44}\)

---

\(^{42}\) Brand, “Date of War Scenes,” 65-66, 70.

\(^{43}\) Although the majority of monuments pertaining to the historical inscriptions of Merneptah, such as the Israel Stela (CG 34025) and the Amada text, date and describe events of Year 5, Yurco, “Merenptah’s Canaanite Campaign,” 213-14, and idem, “3,200-Year-Old Picture of Israelites Found in Egypt,” 36, suggests that Merneptah’s Canaanite campaign dates to sometime between Years 2-4 of his reign. If so, then Prince Seti-Merneptah’s usage of *Stḥy* in these battle reliefs reflects his status in the years during which this campaign occurred and not necessarily when these reliefs were carved.

\(^{44}\) Thanks to Dr. Peter Brand for suggesting this scenario.
8. Prince Seti-Merneptah on Rock Stela of Panehsy, vizier of Merneptah, at Speos Horemheb at Gebel el-Silsila (figure 2.8)45

Location: in situ

Transliteration of princely titles upper scene: \( jry-p^f t \ hry-tp \ t\wy \ ss \ nswt \ jmy-r \ m\^s \ wr \ z\^t-nswt \ smsw \ n \ ht.f \ mrj.f \ [St\by \ mrj.n-Pth \ m\^s \ hrw \]

Translation: “Hereditary noble, Chief over the two lands, royal scribe, generalissimo, eldest King’s son of his body, his beloved [Seti-Merneptah, justified.”46

Transliteration of princely titles lower scene: \( jry-p^f t \ ss \ nswt \ jmy-r \ m\^s \ wr \ z\^t-nswt \ n \ ht.f \ mrj.f \ [Sthy \ mrj.n-Pth] \)

Translation: “Hereditary noble, royal scribe, generalissimo, King’s son of his body, his beloved, [Seti-Merneptah].”

---


46Compare with *RITA* 4: 71.
Description: On the upper part of the stela, King Merneptah makes a presentation of *maat* to Amun and Ptah while Queen Istnofret II stands behind Merneptah playing sistra.\(^{47}\)

Immediately behind Istnofret II stands Prince Seti-Merneptah raising his right hand in adoration while holding both a fan and a *hq\(^{3}\)* crook scepter in his left hand. Seti-Merneptah wears sandals as well as a long robe that extends down to his ankles. In the lower scene, Merneptah offers a sphinx to Re-Horakhty and Maat while followed by two royal sons. The first son is Prince Seti-Merneptah while the name of the second son is unfortunately lost other than the title *z\(^{2}\)*-*nswt* and his royal image.\(^{48}\) In his right hand, in a reversal of what was depicted in the upper scene, Seti-Merneptah holds a fan and a *hq\(^{3}\)* crook scepter while raising his left hand in adoration. Prince Seti-Merneptah wears a long robe that extends down to his ankles tied at the waist with a sash. He wears sandals as well as having a long side lock extending down to his upper chest and partially hidden by his raised left arm.

\(^{47}\)Iskander, 55, 341; *RITA* 4: 71. For the presentation of *maat*, see Emily Teeter, *The Presentation of Maat: Ritual and Legitimacy in Ancient Egypt*, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations, no. 57 (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1997).

\(^{48}\)KRI 4: 90; *RITA* 4: 72; Iskander, 55, 341. The second prince is discussed in chapter 3.
Figure 2.8. Prince Seti-Merneptah on stela of the Vizier Panehsy. Detail of Rosellini, *Monumenti del culto*, plate 35 number 1.
9. Stela of Vizier Panehsy at West Silsila (figure 2.9)\textsuperscript{49}

Location: \textit{in situ}

Transliteration of princely titles: \textit{jry-pśt tjtjf tswy jmy-r mšc hrp hfnw jrr-rdwj n ntr-nfr}

\textit{z3-nswt n ht.f mrj.f jmy-r mšc wr [Sthy mrj.n-Pth]}

Translation: “Hereditary Noble, curtain of the Two Lands, General (or overseer of millions), Controller of many, Companion to the good god, King’s son of his body, his beloved, generalissimo, [Seti-Merneptah].”\textsuperscript{50}

Description: King Merneptah is depicted offering maat to Amun-Re.\textsuperscript{51} Immediately behind Merneptah is Seti-Merneptah raising his right hand in adoration while holding a fan in his left hand. The prince wears a long robe extending down to his ankles and wears sandals upon his feet.

Discussion and Comments on Number 9

Gauthier believes that this stela belonging to the Vizier Panehsy portrays another son of Merneptah whose name is destroyed except for an \textit{f}.\textsuperscript{52} Kitchen amends this to \textit{n} instead of \textit{f} with the errant \textit{f} being a mistake on the part of Lepsius or the ancient

\textsuperscript{49}References: PM 5: 217; KRI 4: 92; RITA 4: 72-73; LD 3: 200c; LDT 4: 93-96; Champollion, \textit{Monuments}, 2: plate 105; Dodson, \textit{Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy}, 25, 32 note 13; Gauthier, \textit{Livre des rois}, 3: 126; Gnirs, 51 note 89, 87 note 396; 106 note 567, 128 note 734; Iskander, 56, 189, 342; Miller, 86; Rosellini, \textit{Monumenti del culto}, plate 37 number 2; Sourouzian, \textit{Monuments du roi Merenptah}, 198 (d) and note 892.

\textsuperscript{50}LD 3: 200c has \textit{z3-nswt n ht.f mrj.f [ . . . ] nswt jmy-r mšc wr} copied where KRI 4: 92 does not include the \textit{nswt} sign between \textit{mrj.f} and \textit{jmy-r mšc wr}. The only other suggestion is that the missing sign is \textit{sš} making the missing phrase \textit{sš nswt}. Therefore, the reconstructed title suggests \textit{z3-nswt n ht.f mrj.f [sš] nswt jmy-r mšc wr} “King’s son of his body, his beloved, royal [scribe], generalissimo.” In opposition to this is that KRI 4: 92, and Rosellini, \textit{Monumenti del culto}, plate 37 number 2, do not indicate any trace of the \textit{nswt} sign. See also Gnirs, 106 note 567.

\textsuperscript{51}See note 47.

\textsuperscript{52}Gauthier, \textit{Livre des rois}, 3: 126.
Egyptian workers. For that reason, Kitchen restores the missing prince as [Stḥy mrj].n-[Pḥ] “Seti-Merneptah.” Though Kitchen’s conjectural restoration seems likely, could this belong to another son entirely as Gauthier suggests? The titles of the prince match those known to belong to Seti-Merneptah such as “Hereditary noble” (jṛy-pʿt), “King’s son of his body” (z3-nswt n ḫt.f), and “Generalissimo” (jmy-r mšr wr). In contrast to these titles are the unique titles, if not entirely uncommon for late Nineteenth Dynasty royal sons, that appear on this monument such as “Curtain of the Two Lands” (tḥjt ḫwy), “Controller of many” (ḥṛp ḫfmw), and “Companion to the good god” (jṛj-rdwj). Being that the titles on this monument match those known of Prince Seti-Merneptah, the future Seti II, Kitchen’s restoration is supported in that no other royal son belonging to Merneptah is known to have held a higher ranking position in this period with the exception of Prince Seti-Merneptah himself.

53 KRI 4: 92 note 5b. See also Figure 2.9.

54 For tḥjt ḫwy, a title normally referring to the vizier, see Alan Henderson Gardiner, Egyptian Grammar: Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs, 3d ed. rev. (Oxford: Griffith Institute, Oxford University Press, 1994), 494; Raymond O. Faulkner, A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian (Oxford: Griffith Institute, Oxford University Press, 1996), 293; Hannig, 985-86. For jṛj-rdwj, see Faulkner, Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian, 293; Hannig, 97.

55 Unless one believes Merneptah had an elder son also named Merneptah. Evidence concerning this theoretical elder son is discussed in chapter 3 on the late Nineteenth Dynasty royal family of Merneptah.
Figure 2.9. Stela of Vizier Panehsy at West Silsila. Detail of LD 3: 200c.
The next series of monuments, due to their lack of clear provenance and uncertain attribution, are gathered together here.

Unknown Provenance

10. Titles from the Papyrus D’Orbiney\textsuperscript{56}

Location: British Museum, London BM 10183

Transliteration of princely titles:\textsuperscript{57} $t\dot{3}y \ hw \ hr \ wnmj-nswt \ jry-p't \ s$s \ nswt \ jmy-r \ m$s \ wr \ z$3-nswt \ Sthy \ mrj-Pt$h$

Translation:\textsuperscript{58} “Fanbearer on the King’s Right Hand, Hereditary noble, Royal scribe, generalissimo, King’s son Seti-Mer(n)eptah.”\textsuperscript{59}

Discussion and Comments on Number 10

The Papyrus D’Orbiney (BM 10183) contains the ancient Egyptian “Tale of Two Brothers” in which a family feud erupts between Anubis and his younger brother Bata resulting from false accusations of rape made by Anubis’ wife. The story ends with both


\textsuperscript{57}\textit{KRI} 4: 82, indicates that the \textit{n} is missing in \textit{Sthy mrj.n-Pth}. Here the transliteration and translation is from the most complete version on the last line of the recto as the verso is partially incomplete reading $t\dot{3}y \ hw \ hr \ wnmj-nswt \ s$s \ nswt \ jmy-r \ m$s \ wr \ z$3-nswt.$

\textsuperscript{58}Compare with \textit{RITA} 4: 66.

\textsuperscript{59}The title of $t\dot{3}y \ hw \ hr \ wnmj-nswt$ is an administrative military title possessed by Nineteenth Dynasty royal princes. For more see Fisher, 1: 62, 76, 131-32.
Bata eventually becoming king of Egypt through supernatural actions. The “end line” or “appendix” on the recto contains the titles of Prince Seti-Merneptah dating the papyrus to at least the reign of Merneptah due to Prince Seti-Merneptah possessing titles he utilized only as crown prince such as “Fanbearer on the King’s Right Hand” (tℓy h₃ h₄ wnmj-nswt), “Hereditary noble” (jry-τStretch1 69), “Royal scribe” (sS nswt), “generalissimo” (jmy-r mšr wr), and “King’s son” (zj-nswt).

Though filled with elements seemingly from the realm of the supernatural and bordering on mere fantasy, Rolf Krauss and more recently, Thomas Schneider believe that Papyrus D’Orbiney in some way represents a historical truth wrapped in a tale of near fantasy in that it recounts the dynastic struggle between Amenmesse and Seti II. Krauss sees parallels with Bata being appointed Viceroy of Nubia and later “Hereditary noble” (jry-τStretch1 69) and successor by the king as this fits with Krauss’ historical reconstruction of identifying Amenmesse as the Nubian Viceroy Messuy.

Schneider elaborates further on Krauss’ theory by suggesting that the “Tale of Two Brothers” is a mythologizing legitimization created “on behalf of political ideology” to explain Amenmesse’s kingship. Amenmesse, being a collateral member of the late Nineteenth Dynasty royal family, was not in the direct line of succession being that he was a cousin-stepson to Seti II. The expected father-son succession of Merneptah

---

60 See now the in-depth analysis of Hollis, Ancient Egyptian “Tale of Two Brothers.”


63 Schneider, “Innovation in Literature,” 323.
followed by Seti II, his son, is replaced by a more complex father (Merneptah)-son (Seti II)-stepson/cousin (Amenmesse)-stepfather (Seti II) succession.\textsuperscript{64} To explain the irregularities in this succession, the “Tale of Two Brothers” legitimized Amenmesse’s succession in that it creates a situation by which a younger “brother”, which Schneider deems applies to collateral family members, becomes king before his elder brother in a manner supplanting the traditional succession of a king to his eldest son.\textsuperscript{65}

Tempting as Schneider’s theory may be, there are problems in attempting to apply it to the complex events during the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II. If Amenmesse was indeed the Viceroy Messuy, there is no instance of a “King’s Son of Kush,” the nominal title of the Nubian Viceroy, ever being a physical “King’s Son,” or ever possessing the title of \textit{jry-\textit{p}}\textsuperscript{r}, normally the designated crown prince and heir to the throne.\textsuperscript{66} Upon becoming king, Bata appoints his older brother Anubis as \textit{jry-\textit{p}}\textsuperscript{r}, which does not seem reflected through any event during the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II. Seti II was already crown prince of Merneptah, and being that Amenmesse was considered an usurper, it seems unlikely that Amenmesse would reappoint the legitimate heir as his heir because Amenmesse would have focused on creating his own dynastic line and not continuing the line of his rival.\textsuperscript{67}

\textsuperscript{64} Schneider, “Innovation in Literature,” 319-20, 322-26.

\textsuperscript{65}Ibid., 323-25.

\textsuperscript{66}Gutgesell and Schmitz, 134. See also Bettina Schmitz, \textit{Untersuchungen zum Titel s\textsuperscript{3}-nj\textsuperscript{w} “Königsohn,”} Habelts Dissertationsdrucke: Reihe Ägyptologie, no. 2 (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag, 1976), 267-72.

\textsuperscript{67}Amenmesse would have appointed his son, if he had one, as his heir and not the son of the previous king. If one sees Amenmesse as a collateral family member, Amenmesse may have even considered male members from his collateral branch as potential heirs rather than turning to Seti II as heir.
Most importantly, if this tale was created as a political propaganda to give Amenmesse’s reign a mythological legitimacy, why include on it the titles and name of Prince Seti-Merneptah, the very person whose reign Amenmesse intervened or replaced? Another point is that Schneider feels that there are allusions to the identity of Bata that parallels in some way the historical career of Amenmesse when he was the Nubian Viceroy Messuy.68 If these are indeed allusions to the career of Amenmesse as viceroy, then their scope would have been limited to only those persons able to read and understand the parallels between Bata and Amenmesse’s career if true. Furthermore, any attempts at political legitimization would have been lost as Seti II could have simply destroyed all copies of the text upon gaining the throne not to mention the limited generational historicity of the story as propaganda. As the events surrounding Amenmesse’s reign became lost through the years, would anyone in ancient Egypt have preserved enough about the “Tale of Two Brothers” to know that it reflected the struggles between Amenmesse and Seti II? Not enough evidence supports the theory that “The Tale of Two Brothers” reflects the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II.

11. Siliceous Limestone Statue of Prince Seti as a Youthful Horus69
Location: Originally in the Egyptian Museum at Giza, now presumably in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo. RITA 4: 67, gives a number of TR 16/2/25/8 but this is in error.70


70 KRI 2: 900; RITA 2: 587; RITANC 2: 603; Iskander, 56; Fisher, 2: 153, do not give a number for this statue that originally was part of the Egyptian Museum when it was located at Giza.
Transliteration of dorsal pillar: (beginning lost) \([m]\) \(dpt-ntr\) \(sty\) \(Hr\) \(Jwn-mwt.f\) \(sdty-nswt\) \(mry\) \(n\) (rest lost)\(^{71}\)

Translation: “. . . [in?] the god’s barque, successor of Horus, Iunmutef, King’s foster child, beloved of . . .”\(^ {72}\)

Transliteration of princely titles on the statue’s left side: \(z3-nswt\) \(n\) \(ht.f\) \(mrj.f\) \(hnw\) \(tpj\) \(n\) \(jtj.f\) \(StHy\) \(m3\)\(^{5}\) \(hrw\)

Translation: “King’s son of his body, his beloved, first \(hnw\) (?) of his father, Seti, justified.”\(^ {73}\)

Description: The statue is that of a “Young Horus” with a side lock that extends down to the shoulder, and a finger touching the mouth. The left hand holds an \(ankh\) sign while

---

\(^{71}\) Based on description of the inscription provided in Daressy, “Remarques et notes,” (1902): 161; \(KRI\) 2: 900; \(KRI\) 4: 82.

\(^{72}\) Fisher, 2: 153, suggests the translation of “. . .successor of Horus, Iunmutef, beloved royal foster child of . . .” Kitchen suggests in \(KRI\) 4: 82, note 12\(^{a}\) that Daressy’s transcription of the \(\beta\) sign (Gardiner N 17) before \(dpt-ntr\) was a mistaken reading of the preposition \(m\) (Gardiner Aa 15). I have tentatively followed Kitchen’s reconstruction in the translation. Kitchen in \(RITA\) 2: 587, and \(RITA\) 4: 67, suggests \(sdty-nswt\) as meaning “fosterling of the king.”

\(^{73}\) Fisher, 1: 109; idem, 2: 153. Kitchen in \(RITA\) 2: 587, translates \(hnw\) as “officer” while translating it as “commander” in \(RITA\) 4: 67.
straps hanging from the neck suspend a heart amulet upon the chest. No picture or drawing is known.

Discussion and Comments on Number 11

The titulary of this statue, although fragmentary is quite unique among Nineteenth Dynasty royal monuments, and there is a lack of precise conclusions as to exactly who this monument represents. Is this Prince Seti, son of Ramesses II, or is this Prince Seti-Merneptah in some earlier stage of his career when he used a shortened form of his name as Seti? The title of $Hnw\ tpj\ n\ jtj.f$ “First $Hnw$ (?) of his father” is uncommon when compared to other Nineteenth Dynasty military titles. The titles of $z3-nswt\ n\ ht.f\ mrj.f$ “King’s son of his body, his beloved” are quite common among Nineteenth Dynasty princes and could fit either Ramesses II’s Prince Seti or Prince Seti-Merneptah. The titles of $sty\ Hr.Jwn-mwt.f$ “successor of Horus, Iunmutef” suggests a cultic role for either Seti as royal princes regularly fulfilled cultic or priestly roles in ancient Egyptian society.

---

74 Daressy, “Remarques et notes,” (1902): 161, notes the head is broken, and the body is preserved only to the knees.

75 See also previous comments concerning Prince Seti from the Cour de la Cachette block.

76 Kitchen in RITANC 2: 603, points out in Faulkner, Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian, 171, the alternate meaning for $hnw$ to be “military commanders.” An alternate suggestion is that the word might be $hnwtj$ “defender” making the phrase “First Defender of His Father,” which seems indicative of a military title. For $hnwtj$, see Hannig, 576.

77 Indeed, “King’s son of his body, his beloved” occurs among the appearances of Prince Seti, ninth son of Ramesses II, in the battle reliefs of Ramesses II. For these attestations, see KRI 2: 141, 174; RITA 2: 23, 47; Fisher, 2: 151-54.

78 RITANC 2: 603; Fisher, 1: 109. The title of Iunmutef alone indicates that the bearer was fulfilling the functions of a high priest but also fulfilling the role of Horus, son of Osiris, or as...
Problematic is the title of $sdty\-%ntswt$ “King’s foster child” as this indicates that the Seti on this statue is not a biological son of the king; namely, not a “king’s son of his body.”\textsuperscript{79} If $sdty\-%ntswt$ is taken literally to represent a non-royal child taken under royal tutelage and essentially accepted as potential heir to the throne then this conclusion casts doubts on the legitimacy of this Seti, either as son of Ramesses II or Merneptah.\textsuperscript{80} However, Seti is called $z\%ntswt\ n\ ht.f$ “King’s son of his body” elsewhere on the statue and this counteracts the suggestion that this Seti was an adopted son of a king. Furthermore, Prince Meryatum, sixteenth son of Ramesses II, bears the same title of $sdty\-%ntswt$ on the dorsal pillar of a statue located in the Egyptian Museum in Berlin (7347).\textsuperscript{81} It does appear that the title of $sdty\-%ntswt$ is therefore an otherwise rarely attested title to signify a royal son who has not yet risen to the rank of being heir to the throne and is therefore still under the guidance of his father.\textsuperscript{82}

The final question to ask is which Prince Seti is depicted on this statue? Daressy concluded in 1902 that this was a representation of Seti II as a child.\textsuperscript{83} More recently,

\textsuperscript{79}Fisher, 1: 109.

\textsuperscript{80}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{81}K\textit{RI} 2: 907; \textit{RITA} 2: 592; \textit{RITANC} 2: 611. Fisher, 1: 117-18, oddly does not mention this title when discussing Meryatum but does mention it in Meryatum’s catalog where $sdty\-%ntswt$ is translated as “King’s child.” See Fisher, 2: 175, for more.

\textsuperscript{82}Faulkner, \textit{Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian}, 260, gives the meaning of $sdty$ to also mean “child” as well as “foster-child of the king.” Since the Seti on this statue is a $z\%ntswt\ n\ ht.f$, he is a king’s biological son rather than a foster child. For more on $sdty$, see Hannig, 857-58.

\textsuperscript{83}Daressy, “Remarques et notes,” (1902): 161.
Kenneth Kitchen and Marjorie Fisher classify the statue as a representation of Prince Seti, son of Ramesses II, rather than Seti II.\(^{84}\) Nevertheless, both Kitchen and Fisher do admit that the statue could be classified as either Seti. Countering this suggestion is that Prince Seti, son of Ramesses II, bears no attestations of the titles of \(st\ y\ Hr\ Jwn-mwt.f\ sdty-nswt\) on any of his monuments and is not recorded as \(hnw\ tpj\ n\ jtt.f.\)^{85} The final conclusion is that this statue is a representation of Seti II in his role as crown prince.

12. Calcite Column Drum of King’s Son, Seti\(^{86}\)

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo TR 16/2/25/8, JE 36652, SR 13959

Transliteration of princely titles: \(jry-p\^t\ ss\ nswt\ z\^t-nswt\ Sthy\ m\^t\ hrw\)

Translation: “Hereditary noble, royal scribe, King’s son, Seti, justified.”

Description: Prince Seti, facing a seated image of a king, raises his right arm in a pose of adoration while he carries a fan in his left hand. The fan rests against Prince Seti’s left shoulder. The prince wears sandals and a long robe that reaches down to about the ankles. The princely side lock extends from the wig prince Seti wears.\(^{87}\)

---

\(^{84}\)KRI 2: 900; KRI 7: 447; RITA 4: 67; RITANC 2: 603-604; Fisher, 1: 109; idem, 2: 153.

\(^{85}\)For the monuments and titles of Prince Seti, ninth son of Ramesses II, see KRI 2: 141, 145, 171, 174, 915; RITA 2: 23, 25, 45, 47, 596; RITANC 2: 603-604; Fisher, 2: 151-54.

\(^{86}\)References: PM 8, part 5: 804-058-065; KRI 2: 900; RITA 2: 586; RITANC 2: 603-604; Brand, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 45 note 54; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 25, 33 note 16; Fisher, 1: 109-110; idem, 2: 153; Gnirs, 124 note 694.

\(^{87}\)Fisher, 1: 110, 280 plate 142C, idem, 2: 153.
Discussion and Comments on Number 12

This monument falls into the same category as number eleven listed above. The Seti depicted upon this column can be taken as either Prince Seti, son of Ramesses II, or Seti II in his role as crown prince. The title of *jry-pꜣt* is commonplace among royal princes of the Nineteenth Dynasty to indicate that the prince is a high ranking member of the royal family as well as the designated heir to the throne.\(^{88}\) Prince Seti, son of Ramesses II, does not bear the title *jry-pꜣt* on any of his known monuments, which is quite unusual if he eventually became heir to the throne.\(^{89}\) Much in the same category of being named *jry-pꜣt* is the title of *sš nswt* “royal scribe,” which Prince Seti, son of Ramesses II, also never possessed based on his surviving attestations. Seti II, in his role as Prince Seti-Merneptah, did possess these titles in a number of combinations listed previously in this section.\(^{90}\)

As part of the research involved in an analysis of the usurped Karnak and Luxor cartouches of Merneptah, Dr. Peter Brand points out that while contextualizing the known monuments of Prince Seti, son of Ramesses II, the cartouches of the seated king before Prince Seti on this column are now hacked out.\(^{91}\) Kenneth Kitchen found what he takes as traces of Ramesses II’s name within the erased cartouches, but Brand suggests

\(^{88}\)Fisher, 1: 62-63, 110. See also the analysis section in this same section.

\(^{89}\)For these titles, see KRI 2: 141, 145, 171, 174, 915; RITA 2: 23, 25, 45, 47, 596; RITANC 2: 603-604, 617; Fisher, 2: 151-54.

\(^{90}\)For example, see numbers two, three, and eight listed above.

\(^{91}\)Brand, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 45 note 54. I wish to personally thank Dr. Brand for his consultations on this monument while his Merneptah article was under preparation.
that no instance of malicious usurpation or erasure of Ramesses II’s name is known.\textsuperscript{92} The only logical conclusion is that another kings’ name must belong in the battered cartouches, and the only king that fits the pattern of malicious attack directed at his name is that of Merneptah. In the context of the dynastic struggles between Seti II and Amenmesse, erasures and usurpations fit the attacks directed against Merneptah’s monuments in the Theban area during the late Nineteenth Dynasty.\textsuperscript{93}

In association with the erased name on this column is the somewhat brief chronological interval that Prince Seti, son of Ramesses II, had in the hierarchy of becoming heir apparent before Merneptah, the thirteenth son and successor to Ramesses II. This interval occurs between Years 53-55, when Khaemwaset disappears from the record for an unknown reason but before Merneptah’s appointment as crown prince in Year 55 or thereafter.\textsuperscript{94} Based on the tiles attributable to Seti II as crown prince and the lack of similar titles for Prince Seti, son of Ramesses II, this column therefore is possibly a monument of Seti II as crown prince of Merneptah.

\textsuperscript{92}Dr, Peter Brand, personal communication. For the purported Ramesses II traces on this monument, see KRI 2: 900; RITA 2: 586; RITANC 2: 603.

\textsuperscript{93}Brand, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 45 note 54.

\textsuperscript{94}Fisher, 2: 110. For Merneptah as crown prince of Ramesses II, see KRI 2: 902-905; RITA 2: 588-90; RITANC 2: 606-90; Fisher, 1: 114; Gnirs, 84 note 364, 92, 123-24 note 691; Iskander, 31-35; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 16-22.
13. Black Granite Statuette (figure 2.10)\(^{95}\)

Location: British Museum, London BM 68682

Transliteration of princely titles: \([jry-p\textsuperscript{f}t] \textit{hr}y-tp \textit{t\texttwy}s \textit{s}\textotw s\textotw jmy-\textit{r} \textit{m}\textit{s}\textit{s} [wr]\)

Translation: “[Hereditary noble], Chief of the two lands, royal scribe, generalissimo.”\(^{96}\)

Description: The statue is of a Nineteenth Dynasty prince consisting of just the upper portion of a kneeling statue that once grasped a naos or other ritual object.\(^{97}\) The statue lacks the distinctive ritualized dress of a priest, and on its head, a round wig bears a curled side lock that “identifies the wearer as a prince of the royal house.”\(^{98}\)


\(^{96}\)Unfortunately, as pointed out in KRI 7: 220, any trace of titles and name after \(jmy-\textit{r} \textit{m}\textit{s}\textit{s} [wr]\) is lost.

\(^{97}\)Davies, “Putting a Name to the Prince,” 21.

\(^{98}\)Ibid., 22.
Discussion and Comments on BM 68682

Regrettably, the portion of the back pillar that contains the name of this individual is missing. Based on the stylistic features of the prince’s countenance, such as heavy eyelids and curved brows, and the incised hieroglyphs carved upon the back pillar, statue
BM 68682 dates to the Nineteenth Dynasty. The surviving titles of \textit{[jry-p$^r$t]} \textit{hry-tp t$^wy s$ nswt jmy-r ms$ [wr]} fit identifying the statue as that of Prince Seti-Merneptah as he possessed similar titulary as crown prince in examples described previously in this section. On the other hand, these titles also belong to King Merneptah, father of Prince Seti-Merneptah, in his role as crown prince of Ramesses II. Without definite traces of a name on this statue, one hesitates to attribute it definitely to Prince Seti-Merneptah, the future Seti II.

Conclusions

In nine of the representations or attestations of Prince Seti-Merneptah listed in this section (numbers 1-8, 10), excluding those whose attributions are sketchy, Seti-Merneptah bears with regularity the title \textit{jry-p$^r$t}. The title of \textit{jry-p$^r$t} normally indicated that the bearer of this title is a high ranking son within the Nineteenth Dynasty royal family and is the designated heir, or crown prince, to the throne. The next title showing regular occurrence among the princely titles of Seti-Merneptah is that of \textit{s$ nswt}, or “royal scribe” (numbers 1-3, 8, 10). However impressive the title of “royal scribe” might sound, there is a lack of precise evidence indicating whether princes who held this title were actually scribes or designees of mere honorific rank.

In five instances (numbers 2-3, 8-10) Seti-Merneptah bears the military title of \textit{jmy-r ms$ wr} “generalissimo, general, or great leader of the army” and this indicates that the

\footnotesize

99 Davies, “Putting a Name to the Prince,” 21.

100 Ibid., 22; Dodson, \textit{Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy}, 25, 32 note 11; Gnirs, 87 note 392.


102 Fisher, 1: 63, 76.
person bearing the title, itself a high honorific that normally follows $s\$ nswt, is the designated heir to the throne.\textsuperscript{103} More importantly, by bearing the title of $jmy-r m\$r wr$ Seti-Merneptah was the oldest son chosen as heir to the throne, or at least the oldest living son chosen as heir.\textsuperscript{104} Therefore the titles of $jry-p\$t$ and $jmy-r m\$r wr$ indicate that Seti-Merneptah is the eldest son of Merneptah who was designated heir to the throne and would, in theory, become king upon the death of Merneptah.

Seti-Merneptah’s status as eldest son of King Merneptah is further strengthened by attestations of the title of $z\$-nswt smsw “eldest King’s son.” In four instances (numbers 2-3, 6, 8) Seti-Merneptah bears this title that supports the indication that he was the oldest living king’s son who was also crown prince or heir. This does not necessarily mean that any prince who possesses the title $z\$-nswt smsw$ is the first born son of the king but is merely the “oldest living son of the king.”\textsuperscript{105} There could be other sons who were born before Seti-Merneptah, but if he possesses the title of “eldest King’s son” then any older brothers should, in theory, be deceased.\textsuperscript{106}

Of more frequent occurrence among the monuments is Prince Seti-Merneptah bearing the title of either $z\$-nswt $n ht.f$ or merely $z\$-nswt “King’s son of his body/King’s son”

\textsuperscript{103} Fisher, 1: 63-64.

\textsuperscript{104} Ibid., 128.

\textsuperscript{105} Fisher, 1: 99. The title for the first born king’s son is $z\$-nswt $tpy n ht.f“First King’s son of his body.” For more on this title, see Fisher, 1: 64-65.

\textsuperscript{106} Oddly, in the royal family of Ramesses II, Prince Khaemwaset possessed the title of $z\$-nswt smsw$ when his older brother Prince Ramesses was still apparently alive. See Fisher, 1: 78-79, 99, for more.
(numbers 4, 7-10). This title indicates Seti-Merneptah was a legitimate, biological son of Merneptah and not merely an honorific title bestowed by the king.\textsuperscript{107}

The next frequent title is $hry$-$tp$ $t\text{\textw}$ “chief of the two lands” with three occurrences (numbers 3-4, 8). Fisher states that in conjunction with $jry$-$p\text{\textf}$, this titulary seems to indicate that the possessor of $jry$-$p\text{\textf}$ $hry$-$tp$ $t\text{\textw}$ ruled or governed in some manner before succeeding to the throne as king.\textsuperscript{108} As an example of a princely title, $hry$-$tp$ $t\text{\textw}$ is somewhat uncommon, if not out of the ordinary, for a Nineteenth Dynasty prince.\textsuperscript{109} Merneptah, thirteenth son of Ramesses II, possessed the same title as part of his royal career as crown prince of Ramesses II, so this is an instance of Merneptah, as king and father, bestowing upon Prince Seti-Merneptah the same titles and honorific position within the royal family as he himself once possessed.\textsuperscript{110}

With just one instance (number 6), Prince Seti-Merneptah bears the titles of $sty$ $Gb$ $hrp$ $t\text{\textw}$ $n$ $jtj.f$ “successor to Geb, Leader of the Two Lands of his father.”\textsuperscript{111} Again, the rarity of this title makes it quite exceptional among Nineteenth Dynasty princes, let alone those of the late Nineteenth Dynasty.\textsuperscript{112} The same title of $sty$ $Gb$ appears among the titles of Merneptah, so this appears to be another case of Merneptah bestowing upon Prince

\textsuperscript{107}Fisher, 1: 130-31.

\textsuperscript{108}Ibid., 114. See also in this same manner Iskander, 29-30.

\textsuperscript{109}Iskander, 58.


\textsuperscript{111}Or the alternate translation of $sty$ $Gb$ as “Delegate upon the Throne of Geb” in note 14. Fisher, 1: 114, and Iskander, 54, 56, 58, tend to take $sty$ $Gb$ in association with $jry$-$p\text{\textf}$.

\textsuperscript{112}Iskander, 56, 58.
Seti-Merneptah, his son, the same titles Merneptah possessed as crown prince of Ramesses II.\textsuperscript{113} In contrast with styl Gb, the title of \textit{hrp t\textasciitilde{}wy n jtj.f} is indeed so uncommon that it does not occur among the titles of Merneptah and may belong uniquely to Prince Seti-Merneptah.

All these titles show that Prince Seti-Merneptah, the future Seti II, was crown prince and heir apparent to Merneptah. In his role as crown prince, Seti II fulfilled administrative and religious duties as evidenced through these titles bestowed upon him by Merneptah, his father. The position Prince Seti-Merneptah held was the highest position a royal prince could hold in the family hierarchy, as no one other than the crown prince could succeed the king. As such, any challenges to the royal succession, as happened when Amenmesse made a claim to the throne, would have to come from marginalized or collateral members of the royal family who themselves were far from being named heir. A challenge might come from potential full or half-brothers of Seti II, maybe even a son of Seti II himself, and such identities for Amenmesse are explored in chapters 3 and 4.

\textsuperscript{113}Attestations of Merneptah as \textit{sty Gb} include \textit{KRI} 2: 145, 902-903; \textit{RITA} 2: 25, 588; \textit{RITANC} 2: 606-607; Iskander, 19, 21, 31-33; Gnirs, 124-27; Fisher, 2: 162, 165, 169-70.
Chapter 3
The Late Nineteenth Dynasty Royal Family of Merneptah

The historical information surrounding the Late Nineteenth Dynasty royal family falls into a situation similar to that when examining the royal family of Ramesses I and Seti I at the beginning of the Nineteenth Dynasty. There is a definite lack of clear, contextual representation of Nineteenth Dynasty family members that allows their relationships within the royal family to be ascertained without confusion. The royal family at the beginning of the Nineteenth Dynasty seems to only gain prominence during the reigns of succeeding kings.\(^1\) For instance, the best example of a royal member of the Nineteenth Dynasty royal family rising to prominence is that of Queen Tuya, wife of Seti I and mother of Ramesses II.\(^2\) Queen Tuya is almost unknown during the reign of Seti I, but she is given special prominence during the reign of Ramesses II, her son, by having a regal tomb carved for her in the Valley of the Queens and a near 27 foot (8.96 meter) colossal statue erected in her honor in the Ramesseum.\(^3\)

\(^1\)Brand, *Monuments of Seti I*, 343-44; Iskander, 61-64.


With the family of Merneptah, the generational line relating directly to the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II, there is much confusion and speculation as to the genealogical relationships of the brothers, sisters, mothers, and wives, during this period of the later Nineteenth Dynasty. There are a number of royal women sharing the name of Istnofret to whom researchers assign any number of titles and relationships that further confuse any attempts to straighten out the lineage of Merneptah’s family. In this section the members of Merneptah’s royal family will be contextualized to define precisely who was the mother of Prince Seti-Merneptah, the heir apparent, and the royal siblings of Prince Seti-Merneptah in an attempt to understand thoroughly these complex genealogical relationships. The possibility of Amenmesse being a direct descendant of Merneptah’s lineage cannot be discounted when looking at members of the royal family.


5Indeed, there are as many as five women assigned the name Istnofret but not all these women have any direct bearing on the genealogy of Merneptah’s family and those of Amenmesse and Seti II. Iskander, 39, following Eugene Cruz-Uribe, “On the Wife of Merenptah,” GM 24 (1977): 25-26, suggests four Istnofrets but actually gives the name of another royal woman named Istnofret making a totality of five. Leblanc, Nefertari, 141, and Kenneth Kitchen in RITANC 2: 630, suggest only four royal women bearing the name Istnofret.
Queens

1. Great Royal Wife Istnofret II on Grey Granite Statue of Merneptah

Location: Before pylon at Temple of Luxor, Egypt

Transliteration of queenly titles: $hmt\ ns\ wr\ nbt\ t3wy\ Jst\-nfrt\ 3nh.tj\ dT$

Translation of queenly titles: “Great Royal Wife, Lady of the Two Lands, Istnofret, alive forever.”

Description: Queen Istnofret II is shown on the side of an usurped statue of Amenhotep III found during clearance work at Luxor temple in the late 1950s. Istnofret II is clothed in a long diaphanous gown upon her body and wears a vulture headdress topped with two large plumes and Hathor horns. In her left hand, Istnofret II holds a papyrus while her right hand is raised in a pose of adoration.


Actually, the lower half of this statue was found during these excavations with the torso found in earlier work at Luxor. For more, see Muhammad, 245, 261, 276-77, and plates 72a-c, 73a-d, 74. For the identification of this statue as belonging to Amenhotep III, see Arpag Mekhitarian, “Statues d’Aménophis III?” CDE 31, no. 62 (1956): 296-98; Bryan, 142, 148.
2. Istnofret II on Merneptah’s Year 2 Decree at West Silsila (figure 3.1)\(^8\)

Location: *in situ*

Transliteration of queenly titles\(^9\): *hmt-nswt hnwt rsy mhw nbt t\(\bar{b}\)wy Jst-nfrt \(\text{\textit{\text{\textit{\textit{nbt}}}}}\)j

Translation: “King’s Wife, Mistress of the South and North, Lady of the Two Lands, Istnofret, alive.”

Description: At the top of this stela, dating to Year 2 of Merneptah, Merneptah presents *maat* to Amun-Re and Mut.\(^10\) Directly behind Merneptah stands Queen Istnofret II and the Vizier Panehsy (*P\(\bar{n}\)-\(nhsj\)).\(^11\) Istnofret II wears a long diaphanous gown and is barefoot. Upon her forehead is an *uraeus*, and Istnofret II wears an elaborate flat crown topped by a vulture and a large cobra between its outstretched wings. Hanging over her left shoulder is a long sidelock of hair. Istnofret II’s right hand is in a pose of adoration while her left hand holds a sistrum.

---


\(^9\)Instead of transliterating “Mistress of the South and North” as *hnwt rsy mhw*, Iskander, 48, transliterates it as *hnwt \(\text{\textbf{\textit{\textit{\textit{s}}}m\(w\) mhw})* while Dodson and Hilton, 41, transliterate it as *hnwt \(\text{\textbf{\textit{\textit{\textit{s}}}m\(w\) T\(\bar{b}\)}-mhw})* “mistress of Upper and Lower Egypt.” For more on this queenly epithet, see Troy, 195 number D1/4.

\(^10\)PM 5: 212 (39) with map on 209; Thiem, 2: plan 4: *V* II/5. For the presentation of *maat*, see Teeter, *Presentation of Maat*.

Figure 3.1. Istnofret II on Merneptah’s Year 2 Decree at West Silsila. Detail of upper part of Rosellini, *Monumenti storici*, 120 number 1.

3. Istnofret II on South Side Wall of Rock Shrine of Merneptah at West Silsila (figure 3.3)\(^{12}\)

Location: *in situ*

Transliteration of queenly titles: ħmt nswt wrt nbt tꜣwy sḥtp nṯrw ħmt nswt Jst-nfrt

---

Translation: “Great Royal Wife, Lady of the Two Lands, who pacifies the Gods, King’s Wife, Istnofret.”

Description: Queen Istnofret II stands before Taweret, Thoth, and Nut. She wears a long diaphanous gown and is in her bare feet. She wears the vulture crown topped by large plumes and Hathor horns. In both hands, Queen Istnofret holds sistra as she makes an offering to these three gods as indicated by an offering table pilled with offerings.

Figure 3.2. Istnofret II on Rock Shrine of Merneptah at West Silsila. Detail of Champollion, *Monuments*, 2: 103 number 3.
4. Istnofret II on Stela of Panehsy at the Speos of Horemheb at Gebel Silsila (figure 3.3)\textsuperscript{13}

Location: \textit{in situ}

Transliteration of queenly titles: $\textit{hm}\textit{t}-\textit{nswt wrt} \textit{hnwt rsy mhw nbt t\textit{\`w}y Jst-nfrt}$

Translation: “Great Royal Wife, Mistress of the South and North, Lady of the Two Lands, Istnofret.”

Description: On this stela, Merneptah makes a presentation of \textit{maat} to Amun-Re and Ptah. Directly behind him are Queen Istnofret II, Prince Sety-Merneptah, and the Vizier Panehsy.\textsuperscript{14} Istnofret II is clad in a diaphanous gown and wears sandals upon her feet. Upon her head is a flat crown topped by a vulture and a large cobra between its outstretched wings similar to the crown in monument 2 above. In both hands she holds sistra.

\textsuperscript{13}References: PM 5: 210 (17) with map on 209; \textit{KRI} 4: 89; \textit{RITA} 4: 71; Champollion, \textit{Monuments}, 2: plate 121; idem, \textit{ND} 1: 257, 646 (A); \textit{LDT} 4: 85g; Gauthier, \textit{Livre des rois}. 3: 125; Iskander, 50, 55, 189, 341; Miller, 86; Rosellini, \textit{Monumenti del culto}, plate 35 number 1; Ali Radwan, “Eine Inschrift aus Gebel El-Silsila,” \textit{MDAIK} 32 (1976): 187-89; Sourouzian, \textit{Monuments du roi Merenptah}, 198 (b) and plate 37c; Thiem, 1: 83, 89, 115, 116, 122, 248 note 1666, 248-49 note 1668, plate 40a-b; idem, 2: plan 4: \textit{P V/3}.

\textsuperscript{14}For Panehsy, see note 11 above.
Figure 3.3. Isthofret II on stela of Panehsy at the Speos of Horemheb at Gebel Silsila. Upper detail of Rosellini, Monumenti del culto, plate 35 number 1.
5. Statue of Panehsy from Deir el-Medina

Location: Deir el-Medina inventory 201 and 250; SCA inventory 693; Qurna register 1/29. As of 2007, the statue is in Cairo for eventual display at the Museum of Civilization in Fustat.

Description: This statue consists of fragments discovered during excavations in the Temple of Amun and the Ptolemaic enclosure at Deir el-Medina. Panehsy rests his hands on either side of a throne containing sculpted images of a royal couple. The heads of the royal couple are missing, but enough traces remain to indicate that one of the seated couple wore a *nemes* and the other figure was a woman. The titulary of Merneptah on either side of the throne indicates the male seated figure was Merneptah.


Although Iskander, 50, 339, described the location of this statue as currently unknown, see now the current information provided by el-Bialy, “Merenptah, le vizir Panehesy et la Reine,” 151 note 2, along with older Deir el-Medina inventory numbers in PM² 1, part 2: 695; KRI 4: 84; Bruyère, *Rapport sur les fouilles de Deir el Médineh (1935-1940)*, 2: 50, 106-109, and plate 41.

himself, but the female figure is an otherwise unnamed and unidentified queen.\textsuperscript{18} Iskander believes this is Istnofret II, but it might be another queen entirely.\textsuperscript{19}

6. Queen Bintanath II on Red Granite Tanis Statue of Merneptah\textsuperscript{20}

Location: Copenhagen National Museum, Denmark 345 (See discussion and comments below)

Transliteration of queenly titles: \textit{jrt-p\textsuperscript{f}t wrt hswt hnowt t\textsubscript{3}wy tm [ . . . ] hmt-nswt [B\textsubscript{t}nt\textsuperscript{f}n]}\textsuperscript{t}

Translation of queenly titles: “Hereditary Noble, Great of Praises, Lady of the Entire Two Lands, [ . . . ] Royal Wife [Bintanath].”

Discussion and Comments on Number 6

The appearance of this inscription in Kenneth Kitchen’s \textit{Ramesside Inscriptions} series suggests that Bintanath, bearing the primary title of \textit{hmt-nswt “Royal Wife”} in direct relation to Merneptah’s nomen \textit{mrj.n-Pth htp-hr-Mn\textsubscript{f}t}, is another wife of Merneptah.\textsuperscript{21}

Upon further research, Hourig Sourouzian identifies this statue, published by Jean Jacques Rifaud and used as a basis for Kitchen’s collations in \textit{KRI} 4: 46, as the same


\textsuperscript{19}Iskander, 50, 339. Recently, el-Bialy, “Merenptah, le vizir Panehesy et la Reine,” 157-61, suggests that this statue represents a queen who was a daughter of Panehesy. This could be the Istnofret IV suggested by Leblanc, \textit{Nefertari}, 141, 174 note 1, 171-72, 182 note 100, but el-Bialy writes that the lack of a queen’s name or definite affiliation between Panehesy and the unnamed queen on this statue prevents confirmation of such a theory.


\textsuperscript{21}\textit{KRI} 4: 46, and \textit{RITA} 4: 34, based mainly on an examination of Rifaud, plate 125: 20. See also similar conclusion in Chadefaud, 50-51.
Statue in the Copenhagen National Museum in Denmark (345) portraying Queen Istaoffet I, the mother of Merneptah and second wife of Ramesses II. This queen, hereafter identified as Istaoffet I, bears the titles on the Copenhagen National Museum statue (345) of jrt-prt wrt hswt hwt t3wy tm hmt-nswt mwt-nswt Jst-nfrt “Hereditary noble, Great of Praises, Lady of the entire Two Lands, King’s Wife, King’s Mother, Istaoffet.” Based on this reanalysis, this monument cannot represent Bintanath II as a queen of Merneptah but represents his mother Istaoffet I instead.

7. Queen Bintanath II on Black Granite Luxor Statue (figure 3.4)

Location: Luxor Museum Luxor, Egypt 129/Luxor inventory number J.131

Transliteration of queenly titles: z3t-nswt snt-nswt hmt nswt wrt Bint-5nt 5nh.tj

Translation: “King’s Daughter, King’s Sister, Great Royal Wife, Bintanath, alive.”


22 KRI 7: 218-19; Valdemar Schmidt, Østerlanske indskrifter fra den Kongelige Antiksamling (København: Hoffensberg & Trap, 1879), 5-6 and plate 1: 2a-f; Iskander, 42, 44; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 5, 85-87, figures 21a-b, 22, and plate 17; idem, “Statues of King Merenptah,” 231 and plate 6.

23 See the titles in KRI 7: 219; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 85-87, figures 21a-b, 22, and plate 17. For Queen Istaoffet I, wife of Ramesses II and mother of Merneptah, see KRI 2: 854-56; RITA 2: 556-58; RITANC 2: 565-68; Desroches-Noblecourt, “Abou Simbel, Ramses, et Les Dames de la Couronne,” 132; Dodson and Hilton, 166-69, 171; Fisher, 1: 11; Iskander, 40-48; Kitchen, Pharaoh Triumphant, 98, 100; Christian Leblanc, “Istis-Nofret, grande épouse de Ramsès II. La reine, sa famille et Nofretari,” BIFAO 93 (1993): 313-33; idem, Nefertari, 141-83; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 2-4, and plates 1, 2, 3a-c.

Description: Bintanath II wears a long diaphanous gown upon her body and a vulture headdress topped with two large plumes and Hathor horns rests upon her head. In her left hand, Bintanath II holds a papyrus while her right hand is raised in a pose of adoration.

Figure 3.5. Queen Bintanath II from Statue of Merneptah at the Luxor Museum. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.
Discussion and Comments on Number 7

Originally, this granite statue of Merneptah stood in Luxor temple and was uncovered during excavations in the late 1950s as was the statue containing the image of Queen Istnofret II (figure 3.1 above). The statue’s head and lower half were joined together with the torso found in an earlier excavation, and the statue became a centerpiece for the Luxor Museum. The question is just who is the hmt nswt wrt Bint-nt “Great Royal Wife Bintanath” on this statue. Queen Bintanath’s titles indicate that she is z3t-nswt snt-nswt “King’s Daughter and King’s Sister” meaning that on this statue Queen Bintanath is sister to a king and daughter of a king. Since the statue is that of Merneptah, she is his sister, as Merneptah did have an older sister named Bintanath, but not a daughter. That means that her father has to be none other than Ramesses II himself as he was the father of both Merneptah and Bintanath, who later became one of Ramesses II’s wives during his reign. The Bintanath on Luxor Museum 129 is then Merneptah’s older sister and daughter-wife of Ramesses II, her father, and not Merneptah.

25Muhammad, 245, 261, 276-77, and plates 72a-c, 73a-d, 74.

26Romano, Parlasca, and Rogers, 98-99, and figures 75-76.


Analysis of Numbers 1-7

On at least three of the attestations listed above, (numbers 1, 3, 4) Queen Istnofret II bears the title of $hmt\ nswt\ wrt$ “Great Royal Wife” meaning that she is the primary wife of Merneptah.\(^{29}\) Being the “Great Royal Wife” of Merneptah, she had a number of cultic roles to uphold in the royal family as evidenced by her numerous other titles and instances of worshiping the gods in the monuments where she prominently appears. Granted that Istnofret II is secure in her identity as “Great Royal Wife” of Merneptah the question to ponder is just exactly who is she?

None of the monuments featuring Queen Istnofret II state specifically her relation to the earlier Nineteenth Dynasty royal family. Her father is not known and the name of her mother is likewise lost to researchers. On the other hand, there are some royal women from the early Nineteenth Dynasty royal family of Ramesses II that could be the same Istnofret II who became the chief queen of Merneptah. The problem is that there are few indications that these women can be positively identified as being Queen Istnofret II.

One suggestion is that Queen Istnofret II is none other than the sixth daughter of Ramesses II meaning that Merneptah married his sister through Ramesses II’s marriage to his other Great Royal Wife Istnofret I.\(^{30}\) Princess Istnofret, daughter of Ramesses II, is attested on Ramesses II’s monuments at Abu Simbel, Derr, Abydos, Luxor, and a

\(^{29}\) On number 2, the Year 2 decree of Merneptah, Istnofret II is merely $hmt\ nswt$ “King’s Wife,” but this may be an oversight by the ancient Egyptian workers who carved the monument in antiquity.

mention on a papyrus now in Leiden (Papyrus Leiden I 362). Such a definition might seem ideally convenient for positively identifying Queen Istnofret II as the sister of King Merneptah, but this identification cannot be supported by the inscriptions and monuments of Queen Istnofret II. On no monument does Queen Istnofret II ever bear the title of $\text{zit-nswt}$ “King’s Daughter” or $\text{snt-nswt}$ “Kings Sister” to show her familial affiliation to the Nineteenth Dynasty royal family of Ramesses II or to Merneptah. Given the emphasis on the titulary of the daughter-wives of Ramesses II, it is difficult to believe that the marriage between Merneptah and his sister would not become part of the formulaic titulary of Queen Istnofret II if she was indeed his sibling. On the known monuments of Princesses Bintanath, Merytamun, Nebttawy, Henttawy, and Henutmire, all daughter-wives of Ramesses II, their affiliation is normally given as $\text{zit-nswt hmt nswt wrt}$ “Kings Daughter, Great Royal Wife” denoting their relationship to Ramesses II as his daughters and wives during their lives.

31For the monuments bearing Princess Istnofret’s name and image, see KRI 2: 916-923, 926-27; RITA 2: 597-603, 606; RITANC 2: 619-23, 630; Dodson and Hilton, 169, 171. Princess Istnofret normally is the sixth daughter on Ramesses II’s monuments but at Abydos and Luxor she is given as the eighth daughter. This begs one to ponder, is this a mistake by the ancient Egyptian workers or did Princess Istnofret get demoted for bad behavior? For Papyrus Leiden I 362, an inquiry into the health of Princess Istnofret from two palace singers, see KRI 2: 926-27; RITA 2: 606; RITANC 2: 630; Jacobus J. Janssen, “Nine Letters from the Time of Ramses II,” OMRO 41 (1960): 31-47; Kitchen, Pharaoh Triumphant, 111; Edward F. Wente, Letters from Ancient Egypt, Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World, ed. by Burke O. Long, vol. 1 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 33.


33For Bintanath, see note 22 above. For Merytamun, Nebttawy, Henttawy, and Henutmire, see KRI 2: 752-54, 766, 844, 857, 916-923, 924-26; RITA 2: 496-97, 505-506, 550, 558, 597-603, 604-606; RITANC 2: 480-84, 489-90, 549-50, 569-70, 619-23, 626-30; Dodson and Hilton, 169-70, 172; Desroches-Noblecourt, “Abou Simbel, Ramses, et Les Dames de la Couronne,” 130, 134-37; Kitchen, Pharaoh Triumphant, 110-11; Leblanc, Nefertari, 207-256. Henutmire was once considered to be Ramesses II’s sister, whom he later married, but is now identified as another daughter-wife. For more on Henutmire’s identity, see RITANC 2: 549-50, 569-70; Brand,
If Queen Istnofret II is not the sister of Merneptah then another candidate must be considered. Eugene Cruz-Uribe suggests that Queen Istnofret II is none other than the niece of King Merneptah. Namely, she is the daughter of Merneptah’s elder brother Khaemwaset.\(^34\) On the left side of a statue from the Fayum and now in the Castle Sforzesco in Milan, Istnofret, daughter of Khaemwaset, bears the titles of \(\text{n} \text{zt.f} \text{n} \text{ht.f} \text{mrj.f Jst-nfrc} \) “His Daughter of His Body, His Beloved, Istnofret.”\(^35\) Cruz-Uribe suggests that this union between the families of two full brothers was a means of solidifying the lineage of Istnofret I in the royal family of Ramesses II by uniting Prince Merneptah, a high-ranking military commander, and Khaemwaset, a prominent religious leader, and their families in a “political marriage” ensuring “a smooth transition” in the event that either brother became king.\(^36\) Jacobus J. Janssen, and to a lesser extent Cruz-Uribe,

---

\(^{34}\) Cruz-Uribe, “On the Wife of Merenptah,” 24-26; Iskander, 52; Wente, “Genealogy of the Royal Family,” 144. Identifying Istnofret II as Merneptah’s niece might be negated by excavations conducted by the Waseda University of Japan at Saqqara. Excavations near a monument of Prince Khaemwaset, son of Ramesses II, have uncovered a tomb containing a sarcophagus belonging to a woman named Istnofret, possibly the very daughter of Khaemwaset under discussion. On the other hand, preliminary reports note that no inscriptions naming family relationships have been found yet, and the suggestion that this might be the burial of Istnofret, daughter of Khaemwaset and niece of Merneptah, is based purely on the archaeological location of the tomb to the nearby monument of Khaemwaset. For more see Nevine el-Aref, “In the House of Millions of Years,” Al-Ahram Weekly On-line, (5-11 March 2009). <http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2009/937/heritage.htm> [06 May 2009]; Press Release-Tomb and Sarcophagus of Isisnofret Discovered at Saqqara, (March 2009). <http://www.drhawass.com/blog/press-release-tomb-and-sarcophagus-isisnofret-discovered-saqqara> [06 May 2009].

\(^{35}\) KRI 2: 887; RITA 2: 576 (C); RITANC 2: 593-94 (C); Fisher, 1: 105; idem, 2: 104.

suggest that the royal family of Ramesses II was beset by inter-familiar conflicts as these collateral branches of the royal family born to Nefertari, Istnofret, and other wives vied for varying statuses.\textsuperscript{37}

The situation concerning Queen Bintanath II (number 7 above) is as equally puzzling as the identity of Queen Istnofret II. Based on the titles on the statue of \textit{z3t-nswt snt-nswt hmt nswt wrt} “King’s daughter, King’s Sister, Great Royal Wife” one might conclude that Merneptah did indeed marry his older sister to solidify the family relationships of Ramesses II’s many wives and children. On the other hand, Queen Bintanath I, as elder sister of Merneptah and wife of Ramesses II, would have been somewhere in her 60s or 70s at best if she was indeed still alive when her younger brother Merneptah became king.\textsuperscript{38} Such a marriage, well beyond the limits of fertility in that time, would have been merely symbolic if one wishes to identify Queen Bintanath II as Merneptah’s elder sister.

Concurrently, the titles of \textit{z3t-nswt snt-nswt hmt nswt wrt} could be correct in the sense that the titles refer to another Bintanath entirely. Queen Bintanath I appears to have had a daughter with her husband-father Ramesses II. In QV 71, the tomb of Queen Bintanath I, a daughter bearing the titles of \textit{z3t-nswt n htf} “King’s Daughter of His Body” follows Queen Bintanath I on a scene upon the east wall of the sarcophagus chamber with the daughter’s name having never been carved or painted upon the wall for unknown

\textsuperscript{37}Jacobus J. Janssen, “La Reine Nefertari et la succession de Ramsès II par Merenptah,” \textit{CdE} 38 (1963): 30-36; Cruz-Uribe, “On the Wife of Merenptah,” 25, 28. However, Cruz-Uribe takes a more moderate view on such a suggestion by stating that Janssen’s conclusions are highly speculative.

\textsuperscript{38}Antelme, 32-33, suggests an age of 72 while Leblanc, \textit{Nefertari}, 198, suggests 62. Kitchen, \textit{RITANC} 2: 626, believes Queen Bintanath died during the 40s of the reign of Ramesses II, her father-husband.
reasons. A second scene on the west wall of the sarcophagus chamber shows the same unnamed daughter with the title of wsjr z3t-nswt “Osiris, King’s Daughter” adoring Nephthys. In a manner analogous to Queen Istnofret I having a daughter named Istnofret, the unnamed daughter in QV 71 then might be a daughter of Ramesses II named Bintanath. This Princess Bintanath is “King’s Daughter,” as she is the daughter of Ramesses II, but is at the same time the sister-niece of Merneptah being that he is simultaneously brother and uncle to Queen Bintanath I’s daughter. Upon becoming king, Merneptah marries this second Bintanath, his sister-niece, and she gains the title of “King’s Daughter, King’s Sister” upon the Luxor statue as she is daughter of Ramesses II, the previous king, and sister to Merneptah, the current king, who makes her his “Great Royal Wife” in a circumstance similar to how her mother gained similar titles.

The problem with this scenario is that the daughter upon the wall of QV 71 remains eternally unnamed “to our loss.” No other known monument of Queen Bintanath I

---

39 For the scene, see Antelme, 28-29, and plate 3; KRI 2: 923; RITA 2: 603; RITANC 2: 623-24; PM2 1, part 2: 767 (13-14); Leblanc, Nefertari, 196, and 197 figure 55; idem, Ta Set Neferou, plate 184. For QV 71, see PM2 1, part 2: 766-67 (1-15), and plan on 760; Champollion, ND, 1: 400-402; LDT 3: 227; Leblanc, Ta Set Neferou, plates 178-84.

40 Leblanc, Nefertari, 196, and 197 figure 56; idem, Ta Set Neferou, plate 183; PM2 1, part 2: 767 (11-12). The title of z3t-nswt is barely visible in drawings made recently as shown in Leblanc, Nefertari, 197 figure 56, but the scene was relatively undamaged when Richard Lepsius made his copy in LD 3: 172c. In contrast to this interpretation of a second representation of Bintanath’s daughter, Kitchen in RITA 2: 603, RITANC 2: 624, takes this scene as part of a larger scene on the same wall showing Bintanath I worshipping Osiris in her dual role as princess (“King’s Daughter”)and queen (“Lady of the Two Lands”).

41 Desroches-Noblecourt, “Abou Simbel, Ramses, et Les Dames de la Couronne,” 133-34, 140; idem, Ramsès II: La Véritable Histoire, 375 note 32, 415; idem, Ramesses II: An Illustrated Biography, 219-220; Leblanc, Nefertari, 195-97; Antelme, 32-33.

42 RITANC 2: 624. Kitchen theorizes that the daughter’s name was unfamiliar to the scribe responsible for placing the inscriptions upon the wall and skipped placing it upon the wall until some future time. Ironically, that time never came as the tomb was utilized for the burial of Queen Bintanath I and the daughter’s missing name never written.
shows a named daughter that could be a Bintanath II and attempting to give this daughter
the name of Queen Bintanath I, her mother, is beyond the boundaries of reasonable
logic. The most logical conclusion, barring any future discoveries, is that the Queen
Bintanath of the Luxor Museum statue, the only known monument attributable to
Merneptah, is that of Queen Bintanath I, daughter-wife of Ramesses II and sister to
Merneptah thereby making the so-called Queen Bintanath II a phantom created from
untenable assumptions. Concurrently, it remains unknown if this image of Queen
Bintanath is a postumous dedication to her memory or merely to represent her status as
an honored sister and “Great Royal Wife” of Ramesses II by being alive during the reign
of King Merneptah.

Princesses

8. Princess Istnofret from Papyrus Leiden I 350 verso

Location: Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leiden

43Indeed, both Leblanc, *Nefertari*, 196-98, and Antelme, 33, conclude skeptically that
identifying this alleged Queen Bintanath II as the daughter of Queen Bintanath is based on
inconclusive evidence. Note that Troy, 171, identifies Queen Bintanath II as “Daughter of
Merneptah and Isitnofret II” as well as Merneptah’s wife. On the other hand, Troy does not
explain how Bintanath II could be a z3t-nswt “King’s Daughter” of Merneptah while
simultaneously being snt-nswt “King’s Sister” on the same statue.

44Leblanc, *Nefertari*, 198.


46References: *KRI* 2: 807; *RITA* 2: 531; *RITANC* 2: 527; *KRI* 7: 447; Bierbrier, review of
*Ramesside Inscriptions, Historical and Biographical*, 207; Cruz-Uribe, “On the Wife of
Merneptah,” 23-24; Gauthier, *Livre des rois*, 3, 126; Gnirs, 84-85; Iskander, 50-51, 60; Janssen,
*Two Ancient Egyptian Ship’s Logs*, 10, 15, 22, 26, 43; Leblanc, *Nefertari*, 196-98; Miller, 86;
Petrie, *History of Egypt*, 3: 118; Wente, “Genealogy of the Royal Family,” 144. Dodson and
Hilton, 177, 182, refer to her as Isetneferet D. Sometimes this personage is given the
nomenclature of Istnofret III, but in the interest of clarity and the fact that this royal woman never
ruled as queen, she is simply Princess Istnofret here.
Transliteration of royal titles: 47  špst  Jst-nfrt  zît  mrj.n-Pth  šps

Translation of royal titles: “Noblewoman Istnofret, daughter of Merneptah.”

Discussion and Comments on Number 8

Papyrus Leiden I 350 verso documents a ship’s log recounting deliveries of various food, liquid refreshments, and animals during Year 52 of an unnamed king. The only king whose regnal years are long enough to fit that category during the Nineteenth Dynasty is Ramesses II, so the document can positively be placed within his reign. 48 Part of the nominal deliveries of beer and bread mention an Istnofret who is described as the daughter of Merneptah. 49 Later in the log an Istnofret is mentioned again but this time the text describes deliveries of cattle from the herd (pꜣ jdr) belonging to a zêt-nswt  Jst-nfrt “King’s daughter Istnofret.” 50 In his discussion concerning Istnofret in Papyrus Leiden I 350 verso, Janssen believes that the persons mentioned in the ships’ log in column II, 7 and column IV, 20 are the same person. Namely, Janssen believes the title of  zît  mrj.n-Pth “daughter of Merneptah” is a mistake for  hmt  mrj.n-Pth “wife of Merneptah,” as he believes that the attestations of Istnofret mentioned on this document

47 As found in Papyrus Leiden I 350 verso column II, 7. See Janssen, Two Ancient Egyptian Ship’s Logs, 10, 22; KRI 2: 807; RITA 2: 531.

48 Janssen, Two Ancient Egyptian Ship’s Logs, 4; Iskander, 50; RITANC 2: 526.

49 Janssen, Two Ancient Egyptian Ship’s Logs, 10, 22; KRI 2: 807; RITA 2: 531.

are both references to Queen Istnofret II, wife of Merneptah whom he takes to be a daughter of Ramesses II. 51

On the other hand, Janssen’s suppositions are faulty in claiming that the two mentions of an Istnofret both refer to the same person, Queen Istnofret II, wife of Merneptah. Janssen’s rejection of the zjt title as a mere mistake by stating that because Merneptah may have had a daughter possessing the same name as his wife “but as she is not known from elsewhere it is rather improbable,” is rather unconvincing. 52 Eugene Cruz-Uribe points out that the two Istnofrets mentioned in Papyrus Leiden I 350 verso are mentioned seven days apart (2 Peret 25 to 3 Peret 1) and in different circumstances, which indicates that they are entirely two different royal women. 53 Therefore, Janssen’s arguments for the two Istnofrets being the same person on this document are rejected in favor of the document mentioning Princess Istnofret, daughter of Ramesses II, and Princess Istnofret, daughter of Merneptah. 54

Based on this document, at least one daughter of Merneptah exists as part of the royal family of the late Nineteenth Dynasty. Seti-Merneptah, the future Seti II, has been discussed earlier as the heir apparent of Merneptah, but it would be hasty to conclude that the royal family of Merneptah consisted of only one son and daughter. Other monuments bear representations of royal sons belonging to Merneptah, but researchers dispute these

51 Janssen, *Two Ancient Egyptian Ship’s Logs*, 26, believes that this identifies the Istnofret on this document as not only the wife of Merneptah but the sixth daughter of Ramesses II as well. See also Gnirs, 85 note 374.


54 See also in this regard KRI 7: 447; Bierbrier, review of *Ramesside Inscriptions, Historical and Biographical*, 207; Iskander, 50-51, 60; Miller, 86; Wente, “Genealogy of the Royal Family,” 144.
representations as to just who exactly these monuments represent. Some monuments possibly represent phantom elder son(s) of Merneptah who preceded Prince Seti-Merneptah in his role of jry-pꜣt. In this next section, candidates for elder or younger sons of Merneptah are presented with the problems surrounding the evidence for or against their existence.

Princes

9. Prince Khaemwaset II on the Battle Reliefs of Merneptah from the Cour de la Cachette at the Temple of Karnak (figure 3.5)

Location: in situ

Transliteration of princely titles: [z3-nswt] n htf ḫrw-m-w3st m3ꜣ hrw

Translation: “[King’s son] of his body, Khaemwaset, justified.”

---


56References: KRI 2: 165; KRI 4: 82; RITA 2: 39; RITANC 2: 73-74; Brand, “Date of War Scenes,” 66-67, 70-71; idem, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 45; Iskander, 59-60, 325; Yurco, “Merenptah’s Canaanite Campaign,” 205-206; idem, “3,200-Year-Old Picture of Israelites Found in Egypt,” 26, 30, and 37 note 5. See also further references under Battle Reliefs of Merneptah. Dodson and Hilton, 179, 182, refer to him as Khaemwaset D.
Figure 3.5. Prince Khaemwaset II on the Battle Reliefs of Merneptah. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.
Discussion and Comments on Number 9

As with any discussion of the battle reliefs carved upon the west wall of the Cour de la Cachette at Karnak Temple, contentious debate arises over the identity of the king, princes, and persons depicted in these scenes. More specifically, one of the princes upon the wall has a direct bearing to the late Nineteenth Dynasty royal family. One of the princes under discussion is the future Seti II in his role as crown prince, but the other prince is a figure subject to much debate—Prince Khaemwaset II (Figure 20). Frank Yurco, in his analysis of Merneptah’s Canaanite campaign, identifies this figure as a younger son of Merneptah named after Merneptah’s brother Prince Khaemwaset I. By the titles carved next to his figure, Prince Khaemwaset II is definitely a younger brother to Prince Seti-Merneptah because Prince Khaemwaset II bears the title of \([z3-nswt] n \text{ht.f} \) “(King’s Son) of His Body” and does not possess the designation of \(smsw\) “eldest.” If Prince Khaemwaset II was indeed an elder brother to Prince Seti-Merneptah not only would he bear “eldest” as part of his titulary, but he would also possess a further array of titles designating his status as an elder prince. This is not apparent in the case of Prince Khaemwaset II, and therefore, he is a younger brother to Prince Seti-Merneptah.

On the other hand, considerable debate arises concerning the identity of this Prince Khaemwaset. If one attributes these reliefs to King Merneptah, then this Prince Khaemwaset II is a younger son of Merneptah named after the deceased Prince

---

57 An excellent up to date summary of the arguments can be found in Brand, “Date of War Scenes,” 51-84.

58 PM² 2: 132 (491) and plan 14; KRI 2: 165; RITA 2: 39.


60 See the titles of Prince Seti-Merneptah listed in chapter 2.
Khaemwaset I, who would have been this prince’s illustrious uncle. Nonetheless, some researchers wish to identify these scenes as belonging to Ramesses II thus making the prince on the Cour de la Cachette reliefs the well-attested son of Ramesses II named Khaemwaset. The question remains as to which Khaemwaset appears on these reliefs.

For all intents and purposes in this work, the Khaemwaset on these reliefs is Prince Khaemwaset II. Prince Khaemwaset I, the son of Ramesses II, is known more for his priestly roles and status during his father’s administration rather than his role as a high ranking military campaigner. In an analysis of Prince Khaemwaset I’s monuments, Marjorie Fisher states that “no military titles or epithets occur on any of the 150 objects associated with Khaemwaset.” The military reliefs of Ramesses II at Beit el-Wali and the Ramesseum feature the only known instances of Prince Khaemwaset I riding a chariot or participating in armed combat with an enemy. At the Ramesseum, Prince

---


63 Fisher, 1: 103.

64 For the scene of Prince Khaemwaset I at Beit el-Wali on the south wall of the entrance, see PM 7: 23 (6-7) and plan on 22; KRI 2: 198; RITA 2: 61; RITANC 2: 112-13; LD 3: 176a; Champollion, Monuments, plate 71; Fisher, 1: 78, 91-92 and 215-16 plates 77B-78B; idem, 2: 89; Herbert Ricke, George R. Hughes, and Edward F. Wente, The Beit el-Wali Temple of Ramesses II, The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Nubian Expedition, vol. 1 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1967), 10-11, and plates 7-8; Rosellini, Monumenti storici, plates 71-75. For the scene at the Ramesseum on the east wall of the Hypostyle Hall, see PM" 2: 438 (18) and plan 42; KRI 2: 174; RITA 2: 47; RITANC 2: 83; LD 3: 166; Champollion, Monuments,
Khaemwaset I has the titles of \[zi-nswt\ n htf mrj fr Hr-m-w\textperiodcentered st\ “King’s Son of His Body, His Beloved, Khaemwaset,” but his titles differ on the Beit-el-Wali relief. At Beit-el-Wali Khaemwaset is \[zi-nswt\ n htf mrj fr mw ntry pr m k3-nht Hr-m-w\textperiodcentered st m\textperiodcentered hrw\ “King’s Son of His Body, His Beloved, the Divine Semen who came forth from the Mighty Bull, Khaemwaset, justified.”\textsuperscript{65} The Ramesseum titles fit those found upon the \textit{Cour de la Cachette} relief but differ from those found at Beit el-Wali. As Fisher points out, the titles at Beit el-Wali demonstrate special status bestowed upon Khaemwaset as \[mw ntry pr m k3-nht\ “the Divine Semen who came forth from the Mighty Bull” normally “implied acceptance as divine in human society as well as recognition by the god.”\textsuperscript{66} Kitchen dates the Beit el-Wali reliefs to early in the career of King Ramesses II when Prince Khaemwaset was about four years old.\textsuperscript{67} If Prince Khaemwaset, son of Ramesses II, was given this special recognition so early in his royal career, why was this title not included on the \textit{Cour de la Cachette} relief if this scene dates to the reign of Ramesses II? The only answer to this question is that these scenes do not belong to Ramesses II, but to Merneptah, thereby making the Khaemwaset on these reliefs the already identified Prince Khaemwaset II, younger son of Merneptah.

In contrast to this identification, another issue surrounding the identification of Khaemwaset on the \textit{Cour de la Cachette} relief involves a series of usurped cartouches

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{65} \textit{KRI} 2: 174, 198; \textit{RITA} 2: 47, 61; Fisher, 1: 78, 91-92; idem, 2: 89, 98.

\textsuperscript{66} Fisher, 1: 92.

\textsuperscript{67} \textit{RITANC} 2: 600, but earlier in \textit{RITANC} 2: 113, Kitchen gives a range of four years to a maximum of eight as to the age of Prince Khaemwaset I during the events depicted at Beit el-Wali.
upon the walls of the battle relief. These cartouches involve in large part the succession and dynastic struggles surrounding the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II and are discussed further in the section on the monuments of Amenmesse and Seti II. Of significance here are the usurped cartouches over the king and his team of horses in the scene containing Prince Khaemwaset II. 68

The cartouches of the kingly figure attacking an unnamed fort by trampling and slashing its occupants read $b^3 \cdot n \cdot R^e \ mrj \cdot Jmn \ mrj.n \cdot Pth \ \ htp-hr-M3^r t$ beneath those of Seti II $wsr-hprw-R^e \ mrj \cdot Jmn \ Sityh \ mrj.n \cdot Pth$. 69 No trace whatsoever of Ramesses II’s titulary has ever been found beneath those of Merneptah’s in repeated epigraphic examinations of these cartouches. 70 In the same scene, over the chariot team of which Prince Khaemwaset II holds the reigns of, the caption reads $htr \ \ c^3 \ tpj \ n \ \ hm.f \ mrj \ Jmn \ n \ [jhw] \ b^3\cdot [n]-R^e \ [mrj-Jmn]$ “First Great Chariot team of His Majesty, ‘Beloved of Amun’ from the [stable] Ba[en]re [Meryamun]” with Merneptah’s prenomen being replaced by the prenomen of Seti II $wsr-hpr[w]-R^e \ mrj-Jmn$. 71 Again, no instance of Ramesses II’s

---

68 Yurco, “Merneptah’s Canaanite Campaign,” scene 2 on 191 figure 1b, 192 figure 3, 196, 197 figure 10, 198 figure 11, 199 figure 13, 200 figure 14; idem, “3,200-Year-Old Picture of Israelites Found in Egypt,” 30; KRI 2: 165; RITA 2: 39; RITANC 2: 77 scene a

69 For the prenomen and nomen of Merneptah, see Jürgen von Beckerath, Handbuch der Ägyptischen Königsnamen, 2d ed. Münchner Ägyptologische Studien, ed. Günter Burkard and Dieter Kessler, vol. 49 (Mainz: Philip von Zabern, 1999), 156, 158-59; For the prenomen and nomen of Seti II, see Beckerath, Königsnamen, 158-60; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 130-39.


titulary has ever been found in the cartouche above the chariot team, despite Donald
Redford’s claim otherwise, and to do so must be wishful thinking concerning something
that is not there.72

One final comment on the identity of the Prince Khaemwaset upon the Cour de la
Cachette scenes needs to be made. As Kenneth Kitchen points out, the very earliest these
scenes could be carved by Ramesses II on the Cour de la Cachette is sometime after Year
21 of his reign because of the Hittite Peace Treaty of Year 21 being carved upon the wall
before the war reliefs. Kitchen finds it highly unusual, if not impossible, that Ramesses II
should carve battle reliefs upon the walls of the Cour de la Cachette and coincidently
leave some of the wall undecorated, of just the right size, until he needed it in Year 21 to
record the Hittite Peace Treaty.73 Careful examination of the compositional elements of
the Year 21 Peace Treaty stela and how they relate to the battle reliefs upon the same
wall indicates that the Year 21 Treaty came first and the battle scenes came at a later date,
which fits with these battle scenes being carved by Merneptah and not Ramesses II.74

Furthermore, if Ramesses II did carve these scenes after Year 21, then why do the
titles of Khaemwaset not reflect his priestly and cultic status if this is indeed
Khaemwaset, son of Ramesses II? By Year 21 of his father’s reign, Khaemwaset was

72Redford, “Ashkelon Relief at Karnak and the Israel Stela,” 196 note 55 claims that traces of
Ramesses II’s prenomen wsr-Mnt-[R] stp.n-R underlie those of Seti II in the cartouche over the
horses without giving clear proof that these traces exist. He repeats these same claims in “Egypt
and Western Asia in the Late New Kingdom,” 4, but his arguments revolve around Kitchen’s
initial suppositions in “Some New Light on the Asiatic Wars of Ramesses II,” 68 note 9, and KRI
2: 165 note 4ab, 167 note 8a that these scenes belonged to Ramesses II but on purely conjectural
grounds. Yurco, “Merneptah’s Canaanite Campaign and Israel’s Origins,” 28; idem,
“Merneptah’s Wars, the ‘Sea Peoples,’ and Israel’s Origins,” 497, along with Kitchen in RITANC
2: 73-74, and “Victories of Merneptah,” 229, support the identification of these reliefs with
Merneptah as well as skillfully refuting Redford’s claims.

73Kitchen “Victories of Merneptah, and the Nature of Their Record,” 229; RITANC 2: 74.

74Brand, “Date of War Scenes,” 54-56, 68.
heavily involved in priestly roles at Memphis as reflected by his titles of \( sm/sm \, n \, Pth \)

“Sem-Priest/Sem-Priest of Ptah” and \( hrp-\text{snd}(w)t-\text{nb}(t) \) “Controller of all the \( \text{snd}(w)t \) Loin Cloths,” among others.\(^{75}\) None of these titles appear on the scene involving Prince Khaemwaset, and it seems odd that a person so heavily involved in a priestly role would appear at all on a battle scene. Therefore, the conclusion is that these scenes represent Prince Khaemwaset II, younger son of Merneptah and brother of Prince Seti-Merneptah.

10. King’s Son on Rock Stela of Panehsy at Gebel Silsilah (figure 3.6)\(^{76}\)

Location: \textit{in situ}

\footnotetext[75]{Fisher, 1: 103; \textit{RITANC} 2: 601. For the priestly and cultic titles possessed by Khaemwaset, son of Ramesses II, see Fisher, 1: 98-101.}

\footnotetext[76]{References: PM 5: 210 (17); \textit{KRI} 4: 90; \textit{RITA} 4: 67; Champollion, \textit{Monuments}, 2: plate 121; Rosellini, \textit{Monumenti del culto}, plate 35 number 1; Iskander, 55, 189, 341; Sourouzian, \textit{Monuments du roi Merenptah}, 198 and plate 37b; Miller, 86; Thiem, 1: 83, 89, 115, 116, 122, 248 note 1666, 248-49 note 1668, plate 40a-b; idem, 2: plan 4: \textit{P V/3}.}
Discussion and Comments on Number 10

This stela features in the discussion of not only Queen Istnofret II but also in the discussion concerning royal brothers of Prince Seti-Merneptah. The upper part of this stela has been discussed previously in the monuments featuring Queen Istnofret II (number 4 above), but the lower part contains evidence that Merneptah had another son (figure 3.7). On the lower register, King Merneptah offers a sphinx to Re-Harakhty and Maat while two princes and the Vizier Panehsy officiate behind Merneptah. Both princes hold fans and $hq\tilde{s}$ scepters in their right hands while raising their left hands in adoration. Their princely attire is even similar with both of them wearing long robes that extend down to their ankles and tied at the waist with a sash. The two princes wear sandals and long princely side locks extend down to their upper chest. The first prince is Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah, but the identity of the second prince is unknown. The name and titles of the second prince were lost by the time Champollion and Rosellini recorded the monuments at Gebel Silsilah. All that can be reconstructed is that there is enough space to restore the title of $[z\tilde{s}-ns\tilde{w}r]$ showing that this person was indeed a son of Merneptah and a brother to Prince Seti-Merneptah but little else remains. Recent analysis of the stela is hindered by the almost entire loss of the image of the second prince.

---

77PM 5: 210 (17); KRI 4: 89-90; Champollion, *Monuments*, 2: plate 121; Rosellini, *Monumenti del culto*, plate 35 number 1; Thiem, 1: plate 40a-b; idem, 2: plan 4: P V/3.


79KRI 4: 90; Iskander, 55, 189, 341; Miller, 86. In contrast to this identification of a second prince on this monument is Sourouzian, *Monuments du roi Merenptah*, 198 note 888, who identifies this lower register containing Prince Seti-Merneptah followed by a fanbearer (flabellifère). Why Sourouzian identifies this second figure as a mere fanbearer while ignoring the recorded drawings that clearly show that the second figure wore princely attire is unclear.
prince except the lower torso, waist, and upper legs of this second prince with the head, hands, feet, and royal insignia being lost to the elements.

11. Prince Ramessu-Merneptah on Kneeling Grey Granite Teil el-Maskhuta Statue

Location: Currently Unknown

Transliteration of the base left side: *hrp ntrw jw*Gb *hrp jmj-r nst.f sš nswt jmy-r msꜣ wr z3-nswt smsw Rꜣ-ms-sw mrj.n-Pth*

Translation of the base left side: “Director for the Gods, Heir of Geb, Overseer of His Throne, Royal Scribe, Generalissimo, Eldest King’s Son, Ramessu-Merneptah”

Transliteration of the base right side: *jry-pꜣt ḫry-tp tꜣwy mw ntrj pr m Jtmw sš nswt jmy-r mšꜣ wr z3-nswt smsw mrj.n-Pth*

Translation of the base right side: “Hereditary Noble, Chief of the Two Lands, Divine Semen Who Emerged from Atum, Royal Scribe, Generalissimo, Eldest King’s Son, Merneptah”

Transliteration of the back pillar: *[jmy-r mšꜣ] wr z3-nswt smsw mrj.n-Pth*

Translation of the back pillar: “[Generalissimo], Eldest King’s Son, Merneptah”

Transliteration of titles on the left side of the naos: *z3-nswt jry-pꜣt Rꜣ-ms-sw mrj.n-Pth*

Translation of titles on the left side of the naos: “King’s Son, Hereditary Noble, Ramessu-Merneptah”

Transliteration of titles on the top of the naos: *Rꜣ-ms-sw mrj.n-Pth*

Translation of titles on the top of the naos: “Ramessu-Merneptah”

---

Description: This kneeling naophoros statue of Prince Ramessu-Merneptah was discovered in January 1970.\textsuperscript{81} The statue is broken with the legs, waist, lower torso, lower arms, and naos preserved while the head, upper torso, shoulders, and upper arms missing. Preserved in the center of the naos is an image of Atum-Kheperi.\textsuperscript{82}

Discussion and Comments on Number 11

Questions arise as to who exactly this statue represents. Hourig Sourouzian questions whether this statue belongs to Prince Merneptah, son of Ramesses II, or if it belongs to another Merneptah entirely. Sourouzian suggests that it may be an older son of Prince Merneptah who was given the titles of $\text{zj}$-$\text{nswt}$ $\text{smsw}$ “Eldest King’s Son” after Merneptah became king. This son then died at the beginning of Merneptah’s reign leaving behind this statue and the Gebel Silsilah stela as evidence that there were two sons of Merneptah; specifically, Prince Ramessu-Merneptah and his younger brother Prince Seti-Merneptah.\textsuperscript{83} Although such a scenario would help in identifying the princes on the Gebel Silsilah monuments, identifying Prince Ramessu-Merneptah as the deceased elder son of Merneptah makes the issue a little more complex than it should be.

On the left side of the base and the left side and top of the naos, the Prince on this statue is called Ramessu-Merneptah. On the right side of the base and the back pillar he is simply Merneptah.\textsuperscript{84} The titles on this statue match those of Merneptah in his role as

\textsuperscript{81}Bakry, “Recent Discoveries in the Delta,” 1.

\textsuperscript{82}Ibid., plate 1.

\textsuperscript{83}Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 24-25; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 26.

\textsuperscript{84}K\textit{RI} 2: 903; Bakry, “Recent Discoveries in the Delta,” plates 3-4.
crown prince of Ramesses II, so this statue portrays Merneptah in one of his later stages as crown prince through compounding his name with that of Ramesses II, his father.85 Furthermore, a similar naophoros statue to Hapi from Athar el-Nabi, now in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (JE 53679), exists from the reign of Merneptah as king. Although lacking the compound Ramessu-Merneptah name, the statue resembles the Ramessu-Merneptah statue so much that the identity of the Ramessu-Merneptah statue as belonging to the future King Merneptah is easily assured.86

The next monuments have been grouped together under a similar circumstance in that they have been identified under various and sometimes not too clearly defined criteria as belonging to a phantom elder son of Merneptah named Merneptah who would, in theory, be a brother to Prince Seti-Merneptah.87 This spectral alleged elder son of Merneptah over-contextualizes much of the evidence that confuses matters when dealing with the genealogy of the later Nineteenth Dynasty.

85RITANC 2: 607-608; Bakry, “Recent Discoveries in the Delta,” 8; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 22, 26; Fisher, 1: 114-15; idem, 2: 165; Gnirs, 84 note 364, 124 note 691; Iskander, 20. Fisher, 1: 115, points out by compounding his name with that of his father, Ramesses II, Merneptah wished to show that he was mw ntr pr m Jtmw “Divine Semen Who Emerged from Atum,” as he was not only son of the divine Ramesses II but also figuratively the son of the founder of the Nineteenth Dynasty, Ramesses I, being that Ramesses I founded the Nineteenth Dynasty dynastic line much like how Atum founded the divine lineage of the ancient Egyptian gods.

86For the statue from Athar el-Nabi (JE 53679), see KRI 4: 31-32; RITA 4: 28; RITANC 2: 607-608; Bodel Hornemann, Types of Egyptian Statuary, part 3 (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1951-1969), 595; Iskander, 161; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 63-64, and plate 12a-c;

87Yoyotte and López, 14; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 26; Fisher, 1: 111-12, 113, 116; idem, 2: 167-70; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 22-24, 66-67, 93; Spalinger, review of Elephantine-Stele des Sethnakht, 277 note 26. Gnirs, 84 note 364, 85, 87 note 394, 103-104, 123-24 note 691, 125 note 704, 128 notes 733, 735, calls him Merneptah III. Technically, one could refer to this individual as Prince Merneptah II, but Dodson and Hilton, 177-79, 182, tend to call him Merneptah B.
“Elder Son” Prince Merneptah

12. Limestone Relief of Prince Merneptah offering to Shu from Bubastis (figure 3.7)\textsuperscript{88}

Location: Currently unknown

Transliteration of princely titles: hzy mry.f jry-p\textsuperscript{t} hry-tp t\textsuperscript{3}wy s\textsuperscript{s} nswt mry.f z\textsuperscript{3}-nswt mrj.n-PtH mAa xrw

Translation of princely titles: “His Beloved and Favored, Hereditary Noble, Chief of the Two Lands, Royal Scribe, His Beloved, King’s Son, Merneptah, Justified.”

Description: This fragmentary limestone relief shows Prince Merneptah offering incense in his left hand to Shu while raising his right had in praise. A curled princely sidelock dangles down to Merneptah’s upper shoulders, and an uraeus is upon his forehead. Little else of Merneptah’s body remains.

\textsuperscript{88}References: PM 4: 31; KRI 2: 902; RITA 2: 588; RITANC 2: 606; Naville, Bubastis, 43-44, plate 36K; Louis-André Christophe, “La carrière du prince Merenptah et les trois régences ramessides,” ASAE 51 (1951): 342; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 26; Fisher, 1: 116; idem, 2: 168; Gnirs, 87 note 394, 128 notes 733, 735; Iskander, 16, 154; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 24, 66-67; Spalinger, review of Elephantine-Stele des Sethnakht, 277 note 26; Yoyotte and López, 14.
Figure 3.7. Prince Merneptah offering to Shu. From Naville, *Bubastis*, plate 36K.
13. Limestone Relief of Prince Merneptah offering to Amun-Re from Bubastis (figure 3.8)\textsuperscript{89}

Location: Currently unknown

Transliteration of princely titles: $h\tilde{z}y\ m\tilde{r}_{y}.f\ j\tilde{r}_{y}-p\tilde{t}\ h\tilde{r}_{y}-t\ p\ t\tilde{b}w\ y\ s\tilde{s}\ nswt\ jmy-r\ h\tilde{m}t\ jmy-r\ m\tilde{s}\ wr\ z\tilde{s}-nswt\ m\tilde{r}j.n-P\tilde{h}\ m\tilde{s}\ h\tilde{r}w$

Translation of princely titles: “His Beloved and Favored, Hereditary Noble, Chief of the Two Lands, Royal Scribe, Overseer of the Seal, Generalissimo, King’s Son, Merneptah, Justified.”

Description: This limestone relief shows Prince Merneptah offering incense in his left hand to Amun-Re while raising his right hand in praise. A curled princely side lock dangles down to Merneptah’s upper shoulders, and an \textit{uraeus} is upon his forehead. He wears a long ankle length kilt without sandals

Figure 3.8. Prince Merneptah offering to Amun-Re. From Naville, *Bubastis*, plate 36L.
14. Fragmentary Limestone Relief of Prince Merneptah from Bubastis (figure 3.9)\textsuperscript{90}

Location: Currently unknown

Transliteration of princely titles:\textsuperscript{91} [ . . . ] z\textit{i}-\textit{nswt mrj.n-Pth m\textit{t}\textit{f hrw}

Translation of princely titles: “King’s Son, Merneptah, Justified.”

Description: This fragmentary limestone relief probably was similar to numbers 12 and 13 by showing Prince Merneptah making an offering but so little remains of the scene to make a conclusive determination. A curled princely sidelock dangles down to Merneptah’s upper shoulders, and his left arm is raised.


\textsuperscript{91}Kitchen, \textit{KRI} 2: 902, \textit{RITA} 2: 588, \textit{RITANC} 2: 606, restores [\textit{nb t\textit{i}wy}], but the preserved traces are too fragmentary to confidently restore anything before z\textit{i}-\textit{nswt}.
Figure 3.9. Fragmentary relief of Prince Merneptah from Bubastis. From Naville, *Bubastis*, plate 36O.
15. Prince Merneptah offering to Seth on Usurped Black Granite Statue of Sesostris I from Tanis.\(^2\)

Location: Egyptian Museum, Berlin 7265; Egyptian Museum, Cairo CG 384, JE 28825\(^3\)

Transliteration of princely titles: \(hzy\ mry.f\ z3.f\ mry.f\ shtp\ jb\ <nb>:\ f\ n\ ms\ sw\ jry-p\ s\ nswt\ jmy-r\ m\ s\ wr\ z3-nswt\ m\ Pth\ m\ s\ \ hrw\)

Translation of princely titles: “His Beloved and Favored, His Son, His Beloved, Who Please the Heart of His Lord, The One Who Gave Him Birth, Hereditary Noble, Royal Scribe, Generalissimo, King’s Son, Merneptah, Justified.”

Description: This scene, upon the back of an usurped statue of Sesostris I, shows Prince Merneptah offering to Seth. In Merneptah’s right hand he offers incense to Seth while his left hand is in the act of pouring libation over an offering table. Merneptah wears a shirt, long ankle length kilt, and sandals. Upon his head, Merneptah wears a short beard, a long curled princely sidelong that reaches his shoulders, and an \(urateus\) on his forehead.

---

\(^2\)References: PM 4: 18; KRI 2: 905; RITA 2: 590; RITANC 2: 608-609; Christophe, “Carrière du prince Merenptah,” 342; Dodson, \(Rameses II’s\) Poisoned Legacy, 26; Hans Gerhard Evers, \(Staat aus dem Stein: Denkmäler, Geschichte und Bedeutung der ägyptischen Plastik während des Mittleren Reichs\) (München: F. Bruckmann, 1929), vol. 1: 38-41, and plates 36, 41; idem, \(Staat aus dem Stein: Denkmäler, Geschichte und Bedeutung der ägyptischen Plastik während des Mittleren Reichs\), vol. 2, \(Die Vorarbeiten\) (München: F. Bruckmann, 1929), 96-97; Fisher, 1: 116; idem, 2: 168-69; Gnirs, 87 note 394, 128 notes 733, 735; Iskander, 22 note 42, 151; Günther Roeder, ed., \(Ägyptische Inschriften aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin\), vol. 2, \(Inschriften des neuen Reichs\) (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1924), 19-22; Sourouzian, \(Monuments du roi Merenptah\), 23-24, 93, and plate 7b; idem, “Seth fils de Nout et Seth d’Avaris dans la Statuaires royale ramesside,” in \(Timelines: Studies in Honour of Manfred Bietak\), vol. 1, ed. Ernst Czerny et al. (Leuven: Peeters & Department of Oriental Studies, 2006), 352; Spalinger, review of \(Elephantine-Stele des Sethnakht\), 277 note 26; Yoyotte and López, 14.

\(^3\)The lower part of this statue is in Berlin while the torso and head is in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (CG 384, JE 28825). For the torso, see PM 4: 23; KRI 4: 45; Ludwig Borchardt and Aksel Volten, \(Statuen und Statuetten von Königen und Privatleuten im Museum von Kairo, Nr. 1-1294\), vol. 2, \(Text und Tafeln zu Nr. 381-653\) (Berlin: Reichdruckerei, 1925), 3-4, and plate 60; Evers, 1: 38-41, and plate 36; idem, 2: 96-97; Rifaud, plate 125: 1; Sourouzian, \(Monuments du roi Merenptah\), 93; idem, “Seth fils de Nout,” 348 note 78.
16. Prince Merneptah offering to Seth on Usurped Black Granite Statue of Sesostris I from Tanis (figure 3.10)\textsuperscript{94}

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE 37465, SR 634

Transliteration of princely titles on throne: \[jry-p't\ s]ty Gb jwš.f hnty tbw\̄y hry-tp n [srw]
\(rhyt\ sšm\ w jdbwy sš nswt jmy-r mš\ w z3-[nswt] mrj.n-Pth m\̄t hrw\)

Translation of princely titles on throne: “[Hereditary noble], Successor to Geb, His Heir, Foremost of the Two Lands, Chief of the [Nobles] and Common People, Leader of the Two Banks, Royal Scribe, Generalissimo, [King’s] Son, Merneptah, Justified.”

Transliteration of princely titles from scene of Merneptah offering to Seth: \(hzy\ mry.f\)
\(jry-p't\ hry-tp t\̄wy sš nswt jmy-r h\̄mt jmy-r mš\ w z3-nswt mrj.n-Pth m\̄t hrw\)

Translation of princely titles from scene of Merneptah offering to Seth: “His Beloved and Favored, Hereditary Noble, Chief Over the Two Lands, Royal Scribe, Overseer of the Seal, General, King’s Son, Merneptah, Justified.”

Description: On the rear of an usurped statue of Sesostris I, there is a line of titulary belonging to Prince Merneptah and beneath these titles is a scene of Merneptah offering to Seth. The scene is heavily damaged and little remains of the figures of Seth and Merneptah. Merneptah performs the act of pouring libation over an offering table with his right hand while his left hand holds an incense burner. Upon his head, Merneptah

\textsuperscript{94}References: PM 4: 18; KRI 2: 902-903; RITA 2: 588; RITANC 2: 606-607; Christophe, “Carrière du prince Merenptah,” 339-41, 351; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 26; Evers, 1: 38-41, and plates 37-38; idem, 2, 96-97; Fisher, 1: 116, and plates 148B-C; idem, 2: 169-70; Gnirs, 87 note 394, 103 note 548, 104 note 558, 128 notes 733, 735; Georges Goyon, “Trouvaille à Tanis de fragments appartenant à la statue de Sanoustit 1er, no. 634 du Musée du Caire,” ASAE 37 (1937): 81-84, and plates 1-3; Iskander, 21-22, 152; Petrie, Tanis, part 1, 5, plate 1: 4A; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 22-23, 93, and plate 7a; idem, “Seth fils de Nout,” 348; Spalinger, review of Elephantine-Stele des Sethnakht, 277 note 26; Yoyotte and López, 14.
wears a short beard, a long curled princely sidelock that reaches his shoulders, and wears an *uraeus* on his forehead.

Figure 3.10. Prince Merneptah offering to Seth on JE 37465, SR 634. From Goyon, “Trouvaille à Tanis de fragments appartenant à la statue de Sanousrit Ier,” plate 3. Reproduced with permission from the Supreme Council of Antiquities
17. Blue-Glazed Steatite Scarab\textsuperscript{95}

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE 86112

Transliteration of Scarab: \textit{jry-p\textsuperscript{\textcircled{t}} sty Gbb mw ntrj pr m k\textsuperscript{3}-nht t\textsuperscript{\textcircled{t}}w h\textsuperscript{3}swt dm\textsuperscript{d} m hf\textsuperscript{\textcircled{t}}f jpr jb m jr m\textsuperscript{\textcircled{t}}t n jtw.f ntw nbw w\textsuperscript{f} jwjt spw. frw nw h\textsuperscript{3}swt nbt ss nswt jmy-r ms\textsuperscript{\circ} wr z\textsuperscript{\textcircled{t}}-nswt mrj.n-Pth \textit{n}nh \textit{gdt}

Translation of Scarab: “Hereditary Noble, Successor to Geb, Divine Semen Who Came Forth From the Mighty Bull, The Flat Lands and the Foreign Lands Are United in His Fist, Sensible in Doing Maat for His Fathers, All the Gods, One Without His Equal, Leader of the Chiefs of All Foreign Lands, Royal Scribe, Generalissimo, King’s Son, Merneptah, Alive Forever.”

Discussion and Comments on Numbers 12-17

These monuments (numbers 12-17) all belong to a person identified by researchers, such as Jean Yoyotte and Jesús López, Aidan Dodson, Andrea Gnirs, Hourig Sourouzian, and Anthony Spalinger, as Prince Merneptah, the alleged elder son of King Merneptah.\textsuperscript{96} This elder son would have had to die sometime during Merneptah’s reign as Prince Seti-Merneptah, the future Seti II, ultimately possessed the titles and office of not only crown prince but “King’s Eldest Son.” In the scene of Prince Merneptah offering to Amun-Re

\textsuperscript{95}References: K\textit{RI} 2: 902-903; \textit{RITA} 2: 588; \textit{RITANC} 2: 606-607; Christophe, “Carrière du prince Merenptah,” 344-51; Fisher, 1: 115-16, and plate147A; idem, 2: 165; Gnirs, 84 note 364, 123-24 note 691, 125 note 704, 128 note 735; Iskander, 20-21; Sourouzian, \textit{Monuments du roi Merenptah}, 21-22; Yoyotte and López, 14.

\textsuperscript{96}For a summation of the theory, see Yoyotte and López, 14; Dodson, \textit{Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy}, 26; Dodson and Hilton, 177-79, 182; Fisher, 1: 111-13, 116; idem, 2: 167-70; Gnirs, 84 note 364, 85, 87, 103 note 548, 104 note 558, 125 note 704, 128 note 735; Sourouzian, \textit{Monuments du roi Merenptah}, 22-24, 66-67, 93; Spalinger, review of \textit{Elephantine-Stele des Sethnakht}, 277 note 26.
from Bubastis (number 13) and the scene of Prince Merneptah offering to Seth on the Tanis statue (JE 37465, SR 634), this prince has the titles of $jry-p^t \ hry-tp \ t\wy \ ss \ nswt \ jmy-r \ hmt \ jmy-r \ m\$ wr “Hereditary Noble, Chief of the Two Lands, Royal Scribe, Overseer of the Seal, Generalissimo.” On the scene of Prince Merneptah offering to Shu from Bubastis and on the Berlin statue (7265), Merneptah has the titles of $jry-p^t \ hry-tp \ t\wy \ ss \ nswt$ “Hereditary Noble, Chief of the Two Lands, Royal Scribe” followed by $jmy-r \ m\$ wr “Generalissimo.” Yoyotte and López, along with Sourouzian, take the titles $jry-p^t \ hry-tp \ t\wy \ jmy-r \ hmt$ as representative of another prince entirely rather than associating these titles with Merneptah, son of Ramesses II. Because of these different titles, sometimes on the same monument, when compared to titles of Merneptah as crown prince monuments 12-16 must therefore represent a different Prince Merneptah.

As part of the arguments surrounding the statues, Yoyotte and López suggest that a limestone stela in the Louvre (IM.3747/N.412) originally from the Serapeum represents the Prince Merneptah depicted on the Bubastis reliefs and the Berlin and Cairo statues. The titles on this stela read $ss \ nswt \ jry-p^t \ jmy-r \ m\$ wr $z\ynswt \ smsw \ n \ ht.f \ mrj.n-Pth$ “Royal Scribe, Hereditary Noble, Generalissimo, Eldest King’s Son of His Body,

---

97Fisher, 1: 116 and 286 plate 148C; idem, 2: 167-70; Goyon, “Trouvaille à Tanis,” 84; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 22-24, 66-67; idem, “Seth fils de Nout,” 348; Yoyotte and López, 14. Note that the Tanis statue (JE 37465, SR 634) indicates that Prince Merneptah is $jmy-r \ m\$ while on the Bubastis scene he is $jmy-r \ m\$ wr.

98Fisher, 1: 116; idem, 2: 168-69; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 22-24; idem, “Seth fils de Nout,” 348; Yoyotte and López, 14. Note also that only the Berlin statue possesses the title $jmy-r \ m\$ wr.

99Yoyotte and López, 14; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 26; Dodson and Hilton, 177; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 24, 66-67; idem, “Seth fils de Nout,” 348; Spalinger, review of Elephantine-Stele des Sethnakht, 277 note 26.
If these monuments do indeed represent another son of King Merneptah named Merneptah, then this stela would support the theory that this Prince Merneptah was an elder brother to Prince Seti-Merneptah and the original crown prince who died sometime during the reign of King Merneptah in this manner making Prince Seti-Merneptah the new crown prince.\footnote{Sourouzian, \textit{Monuments du roi Merenptah}, 22-24, 66-67.}

Although tempting upon first analysis, such theories involving this phantom elder Prince Merneptah cannot be supported when analyzing the evidence. Yoyotte and López link the steatite scarab (JE 86112; number 17 above) to the monuments belonging to the alleged elder Prince Merneptah. On this scarab are titles held by Prince Merneptah, son of Ramesses II, in his career as crown prince such as \textit{jry-p\textsuperscript{t} sty Gb “Hereditary Noble, Successor to Geb” and sš nswt jmy-r mš\textsuperscript{t} wr “Royal Scribe, Generalissimo.”}\footnote{For Merneptah’s title of \textit{jry-p\textsuperscript{t} sty Gb} see Yoyotte and López, 14; Iskander, 31-34; Fisher, 1: 114; Gnirs, 124-27; Sourouzian, \textit{Monuments du roi Merenptah}, 16-22.}

Sourouzian takes \textit{sty Gb} as one of the titles King Merneptah took as crown prince around Year 55 of Ramesses II’s reign, and it is also attested on an image of Crown Prince Merneptah belonging to a Tanis statue of Ramesses II in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (CG 575), and a block from the exterior south wall of the Hypostyle Hall at the Temple
of Karnak. This designation of Merneptah, son of Ramesses II, as “Successor to Geb” represents “the highest titles borne by a prince preceding accession to the throne.” Merneptah gained this title possibly through being bestowed the office and duties of kingship without actually being crowned king yet. As a means of giving Merneptah a greater role in the duties of kingship, he was named “successor to Geb” as the living king is normally Horus in life and Osiris in death. Since there can be only one Horus, and Ramesses II was still alive at this time, Ramesses II became equated with the god Geb, and Merneptah could take on duties normally associated with the Horus king. Being named “successor to Geb” also ties into the Heliopolitan creation myth in that Osiris, and later Horus, are the successors of Geb in ancient Egyptian mythology and being named “successor to Geb” tied Merneptah directly into this mythology as he would become king after his father died much like how Horus succeeded Osiris.

As for jry-p’t hry-tp tḥwy “Hereditary Noble, Chief of the Two Lands,” these titles are also not unusual when compared to those belonging to King Merneptah as crown prince. Decorated fragments of Crown Prince Merneptah, son of Ramesses II, from Athribis in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (JE 32009) and a statue of Ptah in the Florence Museum

---

103 For the statue of Ramesses II with Crown Prince Merneptah (CG 575) see PM 4: 22; KRI 2: 441; RITA 2: 268-69; RITANC 2: 297; Borchardt and Volten, Statuen und Statuetten, 2: 123-25, and plate 98; Fisher, 1: 113, and 282 plate 144C; idem, 2: 164-65; Gnirs, 84 note 364; 124 note 691; Iskander, 18; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 19-20, and plate 6a. For the Karnak block see PM² 2: 58 (174); KRI 2: 143; RITA 2: 25; RITANC 2: 571; Fisher, 1: plate 125A; idem, 2: 162; Iskander, 19-20; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 22.

104 Iskander, 31.

105 Ibid., 31-34.

106 Thanks to Dr. Mariam Ayad for this suggestion.
(1681) bear the titles $jry\, p^5 \, hry\,-tp\, t\, \dot{\dot{\theta}}\, wy$ upon them.\footnote{For the Athribis fragments in the Egyptian Museum (JE 32009), see PM 4: 66; KRI 2: 903; RITA 2: 589; RITANC 2: 608; Fisher, 1: 112, and 281-82 plates 143B-144A-B; idem, 2: 163-64; Gnirs, 84 note 364; 124 note 691; Iskander, 15; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 19-21, and plate 6b-d. For Florence 1681 (1801), the statue of Ptah, see KRI 2: 904; RITA 2: 590; RITANC 2: 608-609; Christophe, “Carrière du prince Merenptah,” 343-44; Fisher, 1: 111, 114-16; idem, 2: 166-67; Gnirs, 84 note 364; 124 note 691; Iskander, 18; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 18-19, and plates 41-42.} Again, there is nothing really unusual in these titles that necessarily mean that these titles or monuments belong to a different Prince Merneptah other than the well-attested son of Ramesses II.

The only title not known elsewhere is that of $jmy\,-r\, htm\, “\text{Overseer of the Seal}”$ seen on the Bubastis scene of Merneptah offering to Amun-Re and on the usurped statue of Sesostris I in the Egyptian Museum (JE 37465, SR 634). Being that the titles on these monuments match others belonging to Merneptah, son of Ramesses II, the simplest explanation is to assign these titles to Crown Prince Merneptah as well.\footnote{Iskander, 16, 30.}

The one identifier that is puzzling in these monuments is the possession of a uraeus upon the figure of Prince Merneptah.\footnote{Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 24; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 26.} On the Bubastis scenes, the Tanis statues, and the Louvre stela, Prince Merneptah wears an uraeus upon his forehead that indicates the individual became king at one point. Where then does this person shown in numbers 12-16 belong? One possible suggestion is that the uraei represent some aspect of the dynastic quarrel between Amenmesse in and Seti II in their struggles over ancient Egypt.\footnote{Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 26; Dodson and Hilton, 177-79.} Tempting as this theory may be, there is nothing to support drawing this Prince Merneptah into the struggles between Amenmesse and Seti II.
On the Louvre stela (IM.3747/N.412), Prince Merneptah is shown with an *uraeus* upon his forehead and beneath the scene of Prince Merneptah are two other persons named Tjay and Smentawy. Smentawy is not known on any other monument, but Tjay is known as one of King Merneptah’s secretaries. Since Tjay is connected to King Merneptah, he would be connected to the career of Merneptah as crown prince of Ramesses II as well. This means that the Louvre stela (IM.3747/N.412) cannot represent any other Merneptah than the well-attested son of Ramesses II and not an alleged son of Merneptah. The *uraeus* merely reflects Merneptah’s future kingly status after Ramesses II died and likely was added upon Crown Prince Merneptah succeeding his father.

When examining the other known representations of Crown Prince Merneptah with added *uraei*, such as the Louvre stela (IM.3747/N.412), the Athribis fragments, and at the Ramesseum, the reasonable explanation for these *uraei* is that these images were updated to reflect the new status of Crown Prince Merneptah as king. This makes the Tanis statues (CG 575, JE 37465; Berlin 7625) fall into the same category of monuments updating and reflecting Merneptah’s new status as king.

---

111 KRI 2: 377; RITA 2: 207-208; RITANC 2: 231-33; PM² 3: 784; Gnirs, 84 note 364; 124 note 691.

112 Iskander, 17, 371-73. For the monuments of Tjay under King Merneptah, see KRI 4: 107-119; KRI 7: 221-25; RITA 4: 83-91.

113 For the scenes of Merneptah at the Hypostyle Hall of the Ramesseum, updated with his kingly prenomen and uraeus, see PM² 2: 438-39 (19-20), and plan 42; LD 3: 168a-b; Champollion, *Monuments*, 4: plate 336; Leblanc and Fekri, 97-98, and plate 19.
Conclusions

Given the scarcity of monuments naming the royal family of Merneptah and their relations to Prince Seti-Merneptah, one might feel that the task at analyzing the royal family is rather pointless. Quite the opposite opinion results when examining the known monuments and correlating them to royal monuments of the earlier Nineteenth Dynasty. Royal Nineteenth Dynasty queens appeared on monuments featuring their children, either as a group monument featuring the king or on monuments dedicated by their children, often posthumously. For example, Queen Istnofret I is prominently featured on monuments of her children, such as Khaemwaset, Bintanath, and Merneptah, at Aswan, Gebel Silsila, the Serapeum, and statuary in the Louvre (2272), Brussels (E.7500), and the Egyptian Museum, Cairo (JE 25772). Therefore, since Prince Seti-Merneptah appears twice on a monument of Queen Istnofret II from Gebel Silsilah, she is his mother as it would seem odd that a prince would appear on a monument alongside an unrelated queen. In the same manner, the second prince on the monument is likewise another son of Queen Istnofret II albeit one whose name is unfortunately lost. Princess Istnofret, daughter of Merneptah, could also be another child of Queen Istnofret II given the Ramesside tendency to reuse names of living or deceased family members for their children, but there is no evidence of her mother on the known document featuring

---

114 Some monuments feature Khaemwaset, Merneptah, or Bintanath, while others, like the Brussels statue (E.7500) and the fragment in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo (JE 25772) feature children whose names are not preserved. The one unifying factor is that the people on these monuments mentioning Queen Istnofret I are all her children. For these monuments, see PM² 3: 817 (a); PM 5: 210 (22), 249; KRI 2: 375, 384-85, 854-55, 881, 891; RITA 2: 207, 556-558, 572; RITANC 2: 556, 565, 567, 589-90; Fisher, 2: 110-11, 115, 135; Iskander, 10-12, 40-41; Leblanc, “Isis-Nofret,” 314, and plate 3B; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 2-4, and plates 1, 2, 3a.
Princess Istnofret so the identity of her mother is uncertain and may be a different queen entirely.\textsuperscript{115}

Prince Khaemwaset II is a bit more problematic. He could very well be the second son of Queen Istnofret II based on the appearance of a second son on the Gebel Silsilah stela. Unfortunately, the lack of a name on this monument hinders this identification. Also, his mother is never named on the \textit{Cour de la Cachette} relief that identifies him and linking him to Istnofret II is tenacious at best. Another suggestion is that Prince Khaemwaset II is the son of another queen of Merneptah making him a half-brother to Prince Seti-Merneptah. The question is then which queen?

The identification of a second queen is not guaranteed, but one cannot entirely reject the possibility of a second queen of Merneptah either. The so-named Queen Bintanath II is merely a misidentification of Queen Bintanath I, sister of Merneptah and daughter-wife of Ramesses II, who received honors from her brother Merneptah by placing her name and titles upon the Luxor statue (Luxor Museum 129/Luxor inventory number J.131).\textsuperscript{116} The Statue of Panehsy from Deir el-Medina (number 5) may very well contain the image of another queen of Merneptah as it does not specifically name the queen sitting beside him. Queen Takhat, mother of Amenmesse, could fall under this category of another queen of Merneptah, but the evidence linking her to Merneptah is tangential in nature and will be discussed under the section dealing with the families of Amenmesse and Seti II as

\textsuperscript{115}Such as Princesses Istnofret, daughter of Queen Istnofret I, and Prince Khaemwaset II, son of Merneptah, named for his uncle but also a non-royal relative of the early Ramesside family. For the non-royal ancestral Khaemwaset, see Eugene Cruz-Uribe, “The Father of Ramses I: OI 11456,” \textit{JNES} 37 (1978): 237-44.

\textsuperscript{116}Antelme, 33; Iskander, 49; Leblanc, \textit{Nefertari, l’aimée-de-Mout}, 198.
king. From the analysis and conclusion given earlier, a tentative genealogy for the family of Merneptah is given in table 1.

Table 1: Genealogical Reconstruction of Merneptah’s Royal Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Queen(s)</th>
<th>Merneptah</th>
<th>Istnofret II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King’s Daughter Istnofret</td>
<td>Khaemwaset II</td>
<td>Son from Silsilah Stela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seti-Merneptah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The burials of these royal wives and children of Merneptah’s family are equally unknown or unidentified. Unlike Ramesses II, who constructed a series of regal tombs for his queens in the Valley of the Kings and built a royal mausoleum, KV 5, for some of his sons, no known tombs can be associated with any queen, son, or daughter of Merneptah. Nicholas Reeves theorizes that Queen Istnofret II died before Merneptah and may have been buried in KV 8, the tomb of Merneptah, as an ostracon found in the Valley of the Kings (JE 72460) mentions a tomb of an Istnofret somewhere in the

\[117\] Unless one wishes to identify Amenmesse as a son of Merneptah, which in that case would make KV 10 a known tomb belonging to one of Merneptah’s sons. Evidence for or against this association will be presented in chapter 7.
vicinity.\textsuperscript{118} So far, recent French clearance and conservation in KV 8, the tomb of Merneptah, have turned up no indication that Queen Istnofret II was buried there.\textsuperscript{119}

Regardless of where these siblings and wives were buried, the evidence remains that Prince Seti-Merneptah had at least two to three additional brothers who potentially could be Amenmesse in the role of a younger brother or half-brother to Amenmesse.\textsuperscript{120} If Amenmesse fits this category of a younger sibling of Seti II, he could never have been a serious candidate to succeed the throne as none of these brothers of Prince Seti-Merneptah ever possessed the title of $jry-p^t$ or bore the designation of $z^3$-$nswt$ $smsw$ “King’s Eldest Son.” Having not been the eldest son and bestowed the titles, position,


\textsuperscript{119}Much of the recent excavation has concentrated on the annexes behind and to either side of the burial chamber (Ka, Kc, and Jc-d). For this recent work, see Christophe Barbotin and Sylvie Guichard, “La tombe de Merenptah: projects et travaux récents,” \textit{Memnonia} 15 (2004): 153-64; idem, “Fouilles du Louvre dans la tombe de Merenptah 2005-2006,” \textit{Memnonia} 17 (2006): 151-69.

\textsuperscript{120}Two brothers counting Khaemwaset II and the son on the Gebel Silsilah stela (number 10 above). Three brothers if one follows Yurco, Kitchen, Lurson, and Sourouzian suggestions by taking the block of Prince Seti from the \textit{Cour de la Cachette} battle reliefs to represent Prince Seti and another unnamed son plus Khaemwaset II and the Gebel Silsilah stela. For the suggestion that the Prince Seti block portrays two individuals, see \textit{RITANC} 2: 78; Yurco, “Merenptah’s Canaanite Campaign,” 204; Lurson, “Israël sous Merenptah,” 57; Sourouzian, \textit{Monuments du roi Merenptah}, 14 note 84.
and duties associated with the position of crown prince, Amenmesse’s motives for
usurping the throne must remain for a later chapter. Although Amenmesse as a brother or
half-brother to Seti II remains a tantalizing possibility, other identities for Amenmesse
must be considered as well. These other identities will fall under the second part of the
Late Nineteenth Dynasty royal family through an examination of the royal families of
Amenmesse and Seti II.
Chapter 4

The Late Nineteenth Dynasty Royal Families of Amenmesse and Seti II

The information regarding the late Nineteenth Dynasty royal family as it pertains to the royal siblings of Prince Seti-Merneptah, the future Seti II, and his potential mother among the royal women during the reign of Merneptah have been discussed previously. In this section the monuments pertaining to the royal families of Amenmesse and Seti II, their queens, and potential children will be analyzed. The inscriptional evidence concerning the queens and potential children of Amenmesse and Seti II is as varied and incomplete as the information regarding the royal family of Merneptah. Some of the inscriptions have been altered, in the case of Queen Takhat, other inscriptions are intact but the name of the person is erased with no trace left behind to determine the person’s name. To make matters more confusing, a few monuments do not give any hint of who a person’s father is, making the exact lineage of some family members highly debatable. By design, one aspect of late Nineteenth Dynasty royal monuments is left out of this discussion. Specifically, monuments and historical questions dealing with Siptah and Tausert in their respective roles as king, queen-regent, and regnal queen, are not included in this study as these monuments lie outside of the scope of this dissertation and therefore are not included here.¹ Only those monuments relating to Queen Tausert as queen of Seti II are discussed in this dissertation. Furthermore, only monuments and artifacts explicitly

¹These monuments and questions as well as questions surrounding Siptah’s historical identity are being covered in a dissertation under preparation by Kevin L. Johnson at the University of Memphis titled “Transition and Legitimation in Egypt’s Late 19th and Early 20th Dynasties: A Study of the Reigns of Siptah, Tausret, and Sethnakht.”
naming these individuals have been included as quite a number of artifacts, such as jewelry from KV 56 in the Valley of the Kings, are uninscribed.

Queens

Queen (Mother) Takhat²

1. King’s Daughter, King’s Mother, (Altered to Wife) Takhat from Headless Red Quartzite Standard Bearer Statue (figure 4.1)³

Location: Hypostyle Hall, North of Column 70 in the Temple of Karnak

Transliteration of the Queen’s hieroglyphs: z3t-nswt hmt-nswt T3h3t

Translation: King’s Daughter, King’s Wife, Takhat.

²Dodson and Hilton, 183, call her Takhat A.

Discussion and comments of Number 1

This statue is one of at least three statues currently standing within the Hypostyle Hall at Karnak. Although they contain the titulary of Seti II, Frank Yurco’s research shows that these statues were usurped by Seti II from Amenmesse.4 The statues and their usurpations are discussed in the section dealing with the Monuments of Amenmesse, but the figure of Queen Takhat on the side of the statue relates directly to Amenmesse’s

historical identity. On the statue’s left side is a figure of Queen Takhat wearing a
diaphanous gown and a crown topped with a large cobra and a vulture. Takhat’s right
hand is raised in adoration while her left hand holds a lotus blossom.\(^5\) Her titles written
in front of her figure read \(z\, hmt\, T\, T\) “King’s Daughter, King’s Wife, Takhat.”\(^6\) Unlike the usurped cartouches and titulary of Seti II on this statue, Queen
Takhat’s cartouche shows no sign of altering. Conversely, her title of \(z\, hmt\) is unusual in that it contains an extra \(t\) offset to one side of the \(hmt\) grouping instead
of the expected \(\text{hmt}\). The extra \(t\) could be a complement for \(hmt\), but Yurco suggests that
it was part of Takhat’s original titles of \(mwt\) “King’s Mother” as the skewed
writing of \(hmt\) came from altering the original inscription into \(hmt\) present on the
statue today.\(^7\) Yurco’s examination reveals that the area around the original \(mwt\)
grouping has been smoothed down and reinscribed with \(hmt\).\(^8\) Therefore, the original
inscription indicated that Queen Takhat was mother to Amenmesse, since he was the king
who originally inscribed the statue, as well as daughter of a king, but she was also wife of
a king in that Seti II altered the title of “King’s Mother” to “King’s Wife.” Under Seti II,


\(^7\)Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 20.

\(^8\)Ibid. In looking at photos of Takhat’s queenly titles, there appears to be an area roughly
ovoid in shape in the area where the \(hmt\) sign is today. This corresponds to Yurco’s description
of 0.3-0.35 centimeters of erasure, but the traces Yurco gives in his figure 6 on page 19 are not readily discernable.
mwt-nswt T3ḥt (“King’s Mother, Takhat”) became changed into hmt-nswt T3ḥt (“King’s Wife, Takhat”) after his appropriations were finished.9

2. King’s Daughter, Great Royal Wife Takhat on Red Quartzite Standard Bearer Statue (figure 4.2)10

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo CG 1198

Transliteration of the queen’s titles: z3t-nswt hmt-nswt wrt hrmw.s T3ḥt ʿnh.tj

Translation: King’s Daughter, Great Royal Wife, united with her Horus, Takhat, alive.11

---


11 See James P. Allen, Middle Egyptian: An Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 217, for ʿnh.tj. Alternatively, RITA 4: 187, uses the older “may she live.”
Discussion and comments on Number 2

This colossal standard bearer statue of Seti II comes from Jacque de Morgan’s excavations in the Hypostyle Hall during the early 1890s. Now in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (CG 1198), on the left side of the statue is a badly damaged relief figure of Queen Takhat along with her titles. The only parts of Queen Takhat intact is her

---

arm that is outstretched and touching the left leg of Seti II and Takhat’s sandaled foot (figure 4.2). Despite the damage to Takhat’s figure, her titles remain completely intact. Directly in front of the relief figure of the queen, Takhat’s titles read z3t-nswt hmt-nswt wrt hnm Hrs.T3h'rt 3nh.tj “King’s Daughter, Great Royal Wife, united with her Horus, Takhat, alive.”

Anonymous Queen

3. Figure of an Anonymous “Great Royal Wife, Mistress of the South and North” on a Damaged Red Quartzite Standard Bearer Statue (figure 4.3)

Location: Before the Porch of the Second Pylon at the Temple of Karnak

---


Translation of the queen’s titles: \([hm]\text{-}nswt \ wr[t] \ hnw[t] \ rsy \ mhw\)

Translation: Great Royal [Wife], Mistress of the South and North.\(^{15}\)

---

Figure 4.3. An unknown Great Royal Wife, Mistress of the Two Lands from a Karnak Statue. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.

Discussion and Comments on Number 3

Located in front of the Second Pylon at the Temple of Karnak, this statue is another in a series of statues usurped by Seti II from Amenmesse. On the left side of the statue is a

\(^{15}\)Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 23, reconstructs the queen’s titulary from the surviving traces and states her cartouche was so thoroughly erased that there are but a “few meager traces of the cartouche oval.”
slightly damaged sunk relief image of a queen with her titles before her. The queen has her right hand raised in adoration and holds a lotus and an ankh symbol in her left. The queen wears a long knotted robe with a collar, but damage to the statue has destroyed any traces of the queen’s crown.\textsuperscript{16} The queen’s titles, partially damaged by the same damage that affected the queen’s crown, reads \textit{[hm]t-nswt wr[t] hnw[t] rsy mhw [. . .]} “Great Royal [Wife], Mistress of the South and North, [. . .]”.\textsuperscript{17} Because the queen’s name on this statue was so thoroughly erased that not a trace remains today, this indicates that she was Amenmesse’s “Great Royal Wife” and cast into oblivion when Amenmesse met his fate because her claim to Queenship would have only been through Amenmesse’s seizing of the throne.\textsuperscript{18}

Who Amenmesse’s wife was remains problematic due to a lack of clear evidence. Initial theories, based on the presence of a “Great Royal Wife, Mistress of the Two Lands, Baketwerel” in KV 10, the tomb of Amenmesse, suggests that she is the wife of Amenmesse whose name might have been on this statue, but the scenes of Baketwerel in KV 10 are secondary images plastered over original Amenmesse decoration when the tomb was reused in the Twentieth Dynasty for Queen Baketwerel, now identified as the

\textsuperscript{16}Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 21, and 22 figure 10.

\textsuperscript{17}Ibid., 23, reconstructs the queen’s titulary from the surviving traces and states her cartouche was so thoroughly erased that there are but a “few meager traces of the cartouche oval,” and the Queen’s name remains lost to researchers.

\textsuperscript{18}Ibid., 29 note 43, hypothesizes that perhaps Seti II erased the hieroglyphs of Amenmesse’s queen but replaced them in paint and plaster with his queen(s). Such a theory would solve the question as to why the erased cartouche was never recarved, and why there is no name in the cartouche. Namely, the paint weathered away through the years and left behind the blank surface seen today. In contrast to this theory, Yurco also points out there is no keying for applying plaster on the statue.
wife of Ramesses IX. Rolf Krauss takes this queen as an Ethiopian princess in an attempt to link Amenmesse’s life to that of Moses in the Bible, while Vivienne Callender believes the figure is meant to represent Queen Takhat instead. Another suggestion might be that Amenmesse’s wife is the otherwise unattested Taiay found on an ostracon discovered in the Valley of the Kings, of which is covered further in number 5 below.

4. Damaged Figure of a Queen on Usurped Red Quartzite Standard Bearer Statue (figure 4.4)

Location: Before the Porch of the Second Pylon at the Temple of Karnak

---

19 Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 21-24, 26, and 29 note 43, takes the queen on this statue to be Baketwerel, but see now the identification of Queen Baketwerel as wife of Ramesses IX in Dodson, “Takhat’s and Some Other Royal Ladies,” 224-26.


21 References: PM² 2: 38 (137); Adam and el-Shaboury, 49 note 1; Azim and Réveillac, 1: 107, 116, 120-21; idem, 2: 31, photos 4-2/18, 75, 96, 100; Chadeau, 64-65; Legrain, Temples de Karnak, 51 figure 38, 140, 141 figure 91; Pillet, “Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1923-1924),” 74; Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 23-25.
Discussion and comments on Number 4

Only about half, maybe less, of the figure depicting a now nameless queen is preserved on this statue Seti II usurped from Amenmesse. What is preserved of the queen’s figure shows her wearing sandals and a diaphanous robe much like that of Queen Takhat described previously in number 1 above on a statue in the Hypostyle Hall at Karnak. The queen holds a lotus in her left hand, and presumably her right hand would have been raised in adoration, but it is missing along with the remainder of the body and
all titulary.22 Because of the history of this statue as originally belonging to Amenmesse and later usurped by Seti II, the queen probably “was related to the pharaoh whom the statue originally represented.”23 This means that the figure on this statue could be another image of Amenmesse’s wife or of his mother, Queen Takhat, in a manner analogous to the other Amenmesse statues at Karnak, but unless the missing fragments are discovered, her exact identity remains unknown.

Queen Taiay

5. Ostracon of Queen Taiay found during the Amarna Royal Tombs Project in The Valley of the Kings24

Location: Currently unknown

Discussion and comments on Number 5

Excavations conducted during 1998-2000 by the Amarna Royal Tombs Project discovered an ostracon containing the name and titles of a previously unattested queen.25 Initial word of mouth reports made confusing references that the ostracon contained this queen’s name on one side of an ostracon containing the name of Amenmesse, but a more


23Ibid., 25.


complete report, plus a photograph of the ostracon, corrects these misconceptions. This ostracon was discovered during excavations by the Amarna Royal Tomb Project at site 1 located to the north of the tombs of Amenmesse (KV 10) and Ramesses III (KV 11). The inscription reads

\[\text{hmt-nswt \(nb(t)\) \(bwy \ 3jy\ \(\text{\'nh.tj}\)\]}

“King’s Wife, Lady of the Two Lands, Taiay, Alive.”26 This ostracon was found in a deep layer of tomb chippings associated with the late Nineteenth Dynasty, and excavation of these chippings turned up at least three ostraca containing the name of Amenmesse, one containing a prenomen reading

\[\text{mn-mj-R\(^e\) \(stp.n-R\(^e\) \(mrij-Jmn\).}\]

It is unclear if the Queen Taiay ostracon was found in the same stratigraphic level or in context with the Amenmesse ostraca because if the Queen Taiay ostracon did indeed come from the same stratigraphic context she might be the name of Amenmesse’s wife that is erased on the Karnak statue discussed earlier. One factor negating this suggestion is that Amenmesse’s queen on the Karnak statue is a \text{hmt-nswt wrt} “Great Royal Wife” while Queen Taiay is merely a “King’s Wife” denoting her status as “not a queen of the first rank.”28

---

26 Adapted from Reeves, ed., \textit{Newsletter of the Valley of the Kings Foundation}, no. 1 (2002), figure 22; idem, \textit{Bulletin of the Valley of the Kings Foundation}, no. 2 (March 2003), figure 1. The only published photographs so far are a bit unclear as to the \text{\'nh.tj} epithet.

27 Adapted from Reeves, ed., \textit{Newsletter of the Valley of the Kings Foundation}, no. 1 (2002), figure 23.

Queen Tausert

6. Limestone Architrave from Qantir with Seti II

Location: Currently unknown

Discussion and comments on Number 6

Current excavations by the Pelizaeus Museum in Hildesheim at the site of Qantir are revealing new information about the Ramesside capital of Pi-Ramesse during the reign of Seti II. One example of new information emerging from 1997 excavations at Qantir is a fragmentary monument from the reign of Seti II consisting of an architrave discovered in area Q IV at Qantir containing the names of Seti II and Queen Tausert. The Seti II fragment is discussed in the analysis of the monuments of Seti II, but the Tausert fragment will be discussed here. The limestone fragment containing Tausert’s name (Field number 97/0582; Inventory number 1700) is the largest of the two fragments discovered in area Q IV in 1997. The majority of Tausert’s figure is missing except for the upper third of a long plumed crown with some remaining traces of blue, red and yellow paint in what is left of the scene, and the upper part of a cartouche located next to a solar disc with uraei preserves the name $[t]^{3}-ws[rt]$ “[T]ause[rt].” The reconstructed

---


30Pusch, “Vorbericht über die Abschlusskampagne,” 29; idem, “Tausret und Sethos II,” 101-109. For the find location at Qantir, see Pusch, “Tausret und Sethos II,” 104 illustration 6, area Q IV grid i/31.

31Pusch, “Tausret und Sethos II,” 103-105. The cartouche shows the full spelling of Tausert with $wsr$ spelled out using the $wsr$ sign plus $s$ and a now lost $r$. Uncertainty exists if there ever was a $t$ preceding the $\ddot{a}$ sign at the beginning of the cartouche. The right side of the cartouche is
design of the architrave once featured Seti II and Queen Tausret standing behind Seti II while both were worshipping or offering to ancient Egyptian gods. An interesting part of the reconstruction is that the reconstructed scene shows the solar disc with *uraei* above a second cartouche of Tausert. Vivienne Callender points out ancient Egyptian queens normally do not possess twin cartouches unless they are regents, and the solar disc with *uraei* normally indicates the ruler, so the reconstruction given is “unusual”. Since there is no indication Tausert was ever regent with her husband Seti II, another solution is needed. Most likely is that the scene showed the solar disc with *uraei* over Tausert’s titles of hmt nswt wrt “Great Royal Wife” due to closer parallels existing for such an arrangement with queenly monuments.

---

heavily damaged, and the drawings and pictures of the Tausert fragment in Pusch, “Tausret und Sethos II,” 103-104 figures 3 and 5, do not seem to indicate any trace of a *t* but it is possible that it was on the now missing portions of the architrave. For the full writing of *wsr* in Tausert’s name, see Beckerath, *Königsnamen*, 162-63; Gauthier, *Livre des rois*, 3: 146.


33 Callender, “Queen Tausret and the End of Dynasty 19,” 98. Callender rightly criticizes the reconstruction in that the alleged second cartouche is in an area heavily damaged and is not explicitly drawn in Pusch, “Tausret und Sethos II,” 104 figure 4, as a hypothetical reconstruction.

34 Callender, “Queen Tausret and the End of Dynasty 19,” 98 note 95.
7. Gold Cup with Cartouche of Tausert from Tell Basta/Zagazig [Bubastis] (figure 4.5)\textsuperscript{35}

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo CG 53260, JE 39872

Figure 4.5. Tausert Gold Cup CG 53260, JE 39872. From Edgar, “Treasure of Tell Basta,” in \textit{Le Musée égyptien}, 2: plate 44.

Discussion and Comments on Number 7

At the site of Tell Basta, or Bubastis, near Zagazig two buried hoards of gold and silver artifacts were discovered in September and October of 1906. This gold cup or chalice with the cartouche of Tausert was part of the first hoard secretly excavated by workers and largely sold on the antiquities market. Fortunately, this cup was seized before it could be sold and taken abroad. The bowl of the cup is engraved with alternating petals of the blue and white lotus, with the foot decorated to resemble a papyrus. The stem bears a cartouche topped by a plumed sun disc reading $t^3$-wsrt “Tausert.” The hoards probably originate from the temple of Bubastis based on the location of their discovery in the tell, but the exact reasons for their burial remains uncertain. Likewise, the cartouche topped with a plumed solar disc surrounding Tausert’s name does not clearly indicate her status on the cup. Despite claims that some of the artifacts from the Tell Basta hoard bear the name of Seti II, an analysis of the known artifacts by William Kelly Simpson shows that the majority of artifacts bear the

---

36 See accounts of the discovery in Edgar, “Treasure of Tell Basta,” 93-97; Müller and Thiem, 193-94.


38 Callender, “Queen Tausret and the End of Dynasty 19,” 86 note 26, suggests that the hoards may have been stolen from the temple of Bubastis and then buried for safekeeping or else part of a ritual burial of “out-dated and broken items.” Edgar, “Treasure of Tell Basta,” 97, 107, suggests that since part of the hoard contains essentially scrap pieces of silver, it may be part of a “stock-in-hand of a metal-worker.”
name of Tausert strongly suggesting that the items probably date from Tausert’s regency with Siptah or her sole reign at the end of the Nineteenth Dynasty.\(^3^9\)

8. Gold rings with double-plumed cartouches from KV 56 (figure 4.6)\(^4^0\)

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo CG 52264-65, JE 39696

Translation of Name (Both cartouches): \(t\³\-wsrt\)

Translation: Tausert

Discussion and comments on Number 8

Among the many artifacts discovered in KV 56 during Theodore Davis’ excavations during January 1908 in the Valley of the Kings, are two gold rings associated with Tausert. The first ring (CG 52264, JE 39696) contains two cartouches topped with plumed solar discs, and the cartouches contain Tausert’s name (\(t\³\-wsrt\)) with the \(wsrt\)

\(^{39}\)Callender, “Queen Tausret and the End of Dynasty 19,” 99, states that some of the gold and silver vessels found in the Tell Basta hoard “contain the names of Seti II and Tausert.” The gold cup (CG 53260) certainly has Tausert’s name, but none of the other objects from the hoard has the name of Seti II. Simpson, “Vessels with Engraved Designs,” 45 note 95, indicates that much confusion exists due to Alexander Scharff, “Altes und Neues von den Goldschmiedearbeiten der Ägyptischen Abteilung,” Berliner Museen 51 (1930): 115-16, describing a gold vessel in the Egyptian Museum, Berlin (19736) as having the cartouches of Seti II when they are, as Simpson notes, those of Tausert. For the remainder of the Tell Basta hoard in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (CG 52575-76, 53258-59, 53261-63; JE 38720/38710) and fragments in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (MMA 07.228.187; 07.228.212) see PM 4: 34-35; KRI 4: 372-73; RITA 4: 270-71; Desroches-Noblecourt, Ramses le Grand, 288-93, 298-301; Edgar, “Treasure of Tell Basta,” 98-108, and plates 43-55; Müller and Thiem, 193-94; Émile Vernier, Bijoux et orfèvreries, part 2, Nos. 52152-52639, Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire nos. 52001-53855 (Caire: Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1909), 183-84, and plate 18; idem, 4: 414-18, and plates 104-105.

element spelled out as \(\text{\texttt{hr}}\) instead of the expected \(\text{\texttt{r3}}\). The second ring (CG 52265, JE 39696), whose gold is described as being paler than that in the first ring, once again contains cartouches topped by plumed solar discs, but the cartouches merely contain uraei crowned with plumes.\(^{41}\)

Figure 4.6. Tausert gold ring CG 52264, JE 39696. From Vernier, 2: plate 26.

9. Gold rings with lapis and “ceramic” scarabs containing Tausert cartouches from KV 56 (figure 4.7)\(^{42}\)

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo CG 52266-67, JE 39698-99

Transliteration of cartouche\(^{43}\): \(ti\text{-}w3r(t)\)

Translation: Tauser(t)

---

\(^{41}\)PM\(^2\) 1, part 2: 567; KRI 4: 278, RITA 4: 199; Daressy, “Catalogue of the Jewels and Precious Objects of Setuï II and Tauosrît,” 42 numbers 23-24, and plate 11; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 146; Vernier, 2: 97, and plate 26. For KV 56, see further below.


\(^{43}\)Vernier, 2: 98.
Discussion and comments on Number 9

Coming from KV 56 are these two gold rings with lapis and “ceramic” scarabs that contain Tausert’s cartouches. The first ring (CG 52266, JE 39698) is gold with a lapis scarab with Tausert’s name reading t\-\-w\-sr(t). The second ring (CG 52267, JE 39699) is gold with a “ceramic” scab and contains the same spelling of Tausert’s name as the first with the final t omitted.\footnote{PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 567; KRI 4: 278, RITA 4: 199; Daressy, “Catalogue of the Jewels and Precious Objects of Setu\textsuperscript{I} II and Tauosr\textsuperscript{I},” 42 numbers 25-26, and plate 11; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 146; Vernier, 2: 98, and plate 25.}
10. Silver Bracelets naming “Great Royal Wife” Tausert and Seti II from KV 56 (figure 4.8)\textsuperscript{45}

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo CG 52577-78, JE 39688

![Figure 4.8. Silver bracelet CG 52577 of Seti II and Tausert. From Vernier, 2: plate 20.](image)

Discussion and comments on Number 10

These two silver bracelets coming from KV 56 are one of the few artifacts other than the architrave at Qantir from the reign of Seti II that shows him together with his wife,

Queen Tausert. The two plaques on the bracelets contain a scene showing Seti II and Tausert amid papyrus bouquets. Seti II is seated on a throne and holds in his right hand an emblem combining the $HH$ sign with the $dd$ amulet while his left hand holds out a cup for Tausert to fill. Tausert stands before Seti II holding a lotus in her right hand while offering or about to pour liquid from a vase in her left hand. Of interest is that the two bracelets show rather unskilled attempts at writing the names of the royal couple due to several missing signs on the two bracelets. The first bracelet (CG 52577, JE 39688) reads for Tausert’s titulary $Hmt\ nswt\ wr(t)\ (t)\beta-wsr(t)$ “Great Royal Wife (T)auser(t)” and $wsr-hprw-R^e\ mrj-Jmn\ Sth\ mrj.n-P(th)$ “Userkheperure Meryamun, Seti-Mernep(tah)” for Seti II. The second Bracelet (CG 52578, JE 39688) reads $Hmt\ nswt\ wr(t)\ t\beta-wsr\ t$ “Great Royal Wife Tausert” and $wsr-hprw-R^e\ mrj-Jmn\ Sth\ mrj.n-P(th)$ “Userkheperure Meryamun, Seti-Mernep(tah).”

---

46 Andrews, 158; Bongioanni and Croce, 376, 605; Callender, “Ancient and Modern Perceptions of Female Sovereignty,” 60-61; idem, “Queen Tausret and the End of Dynasty 19,” 85-86; idem, “The Cripple, the Queen, & the Man from the North,” 54; Daressy, “Catalogue of the Jewels and Precious Objects of Setuî II and Tauosrît,” 39-40 number 15, and plates 9-10; Vernier, 2: 184-85, and plate 20.


48 Ibid.
11. Gold Earrings/Annules with “ceramic” inlay from KV 56 (figure 4.9)\textsuperscript{49}

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo CG 52331, JE 39677; British Museum, London BM 54459

Figure 4.9. Tausert gold earring CG 52331, JE 39677. From Davis, \textit{Tomb of Siptah; The Monkey Tomb and the Gold Tomb}, plate 11.

Discussion and Comments on Number 11

These two gold earrings with “ceramic” inlays, one in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (CG 52331, JE 39677) and the other in the British Museum in London (BM 54459) both

originate from KV 56.\textsuperscript{50} Their design consists of a cartouche with two feathers containing the name $t^{3}\textnormal{-}wsr(t)$ “Tauser(t).”\textsuperscript{51}

12. Gold Floral Diadem from KV 56\textsuperscript{52}

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo CG 52644, JE 39674

Discussion and comments on Number 12

Among the numerous jewels or parts of jewels found in KV 56 is this gold floral diadem (CG 52644, JE 39674) containing the names of Seti II and Tausert. The diadem consists of a gold band with sixteen attached gold flowers with several of these flowers damaged and had to be straightened out before remounting.\textsuperscript{53} The gold flowers consist of ten petals, four of which contain the prenomen and nomen of Seti II $wsr-hprw-R\textnormal{r} mrj-\ldots$

\textsuperscript{50}The example in Cairo (CG 52331) was discovered in situ within KV 56. The British Museum example (BM 54459) apparently was smuggled out of KV 56 during excavations as the British Museum purchased it in 1919 from Mohammed Mohassib, a Luxor antiquities dealer. For more on BM 54459, see Reeves and Taylor, 119; Russmann, 176; also the British Museum’s online catalog entry by entering “54459” at <http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/museum_no__provenance_search.aspx>.


\textsuperscript{52}References: PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 567; KRI 4: 278, RITA 4: 199; Andrews, 22 illustration 13, 94, 106; Bongioanni and Croce, 373, 605; Daressy, “Catalogue of the Jewels and Precious Objects of Setuî II and Tauosrît,” 35 number 1, and plates 11, 13-14; Müller and Thiem, 197-98, and illustration 417; Émile Vernier, Bijoux et orfèvreries, part 3, Nos. 52640-53171, Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire nos. 52001-53855 (Caire: Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1925), 204, and plate 41.

\textsuperscript{53}Initial reports of the diadem in Daressy, “Catalogue of the Jewels and Precious Objects of Setuî II and Tauosrît,” 35 number 1, and plates 11, 14, describe only fourteen flowers but this is amended in Vernier, 3: 204, to sixteen flowers. For pictures of the reconstructed diadem, see Andrews, 22 illustration 13, 94, 106; Bongioanni and Croce, 373, 605; Daressy, “Catalogue of the Jewels and Precious Objects of Setuî II and Tauosrît,” plate 13; Müller and Thiem, 197-98, and illustration 417; Vernier, 3: plate 41.
Jmn Sthy mrt.n-Pth with Tausert’s name t3-wsrw written on petals opposite those containing the name of Seti II.54

Figure 4.10. Tausert gold floral diadem Cairo CG 52644, JE 39674. From Davis, Tomb of Siphtah; The Monkey Tomb and the Gold Tomb, plate 13 lower image.

54KRI 4: 278, RITA 4: 199; Daressy, “Catalogue of the Jewels and Precious Objects of Setuỉ II and Tauorsît,” 35 number 1; Vernier, 3: 204.
13. Tomb of Queen Tausert, KV 14, in the Valley of the Kings

Location: in situ

Discussion and comments on Number 13

Probably one of the lengthier tombs from the period of the late Nineteenth Dynasty, the Tomb of Queen Tausert, KV 14, has undergone numerous architectural and decorative changes during its long period of construction. The majority of work consists of altering KV 14’s design and decoration from the period of coregency with Siptah to revising the entire decorative scheme during Tausert’s sole rule and final use of the tomb in the Twentieth Dynasty to bury Sethnakht. The majority of KV 14’s architectural and

---


56 For KV 14, see PM2 1, part 2: 528, 527-32 (1-42); KRI 4: 355-56; RITA 4: 256-57; LDT 3: 209-14; Champollion, ND, 1: 448-59; Dodson, After the Pyramids, 108-110; Gardiner, “Tomb of
decorative changes are outside the scope of this dissertation, as they reflect the status of
Tausert during and after the reign of Siptah, and are not discussed in depth here.\(^{57}\)

Of significance to the reign of Seti II are a number of Tausert’s titles within the tomb
as well as the beginning of KV 14’s construction. An ostracon in the Egyptian Museum
in Cairo (JE 72452) describes a visit in “Year 2, 1 Peret 8” to the workers at Deir el
Medina by an administrator or agent (\(\text{rwdw}\)) ordering them to \(\$^3 \! \! \mbox{ p}^3 \! \! \mbox{ h}r \! \! \mbox{ n} \! \! \mbox{ hmt nswt wr[t]}\)
\(t^3\!-\!wsrt\) “begin the tomb of the Great Royal Wife Tausert.”\(^{58}\) Although frequently dated
to the reign of Siptah, Wolfgang Helck, followed by Hartwig Altenmüller, revised the
date of O. JE 72452 to the reign of Seti II due to a graffito at the entrance of KV 14
describing \(hsbt \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \![5]
the intervention of Amenmesse, and that work did not restart until Seti II forced
Amenmesse out of the Theban area. Concurrently, the graffito cited above from Year 1
of Siptah could not have been carved in the entrance of KV 14 unless it had been in
existence for some time negating the theory that construction of KV 14 did not begin
until Year 2 of Siptah.\textsuperscript{60}

Most of Tausert’s titulary represents her status under Seti II, but there is the possibility
that one or more of the titles may have been upgraded to reflect her status under Siptah
and later as sole ruler. For instance, on the lintel above the door leading into room B,
Tausert has the titles $\textit{hmtnswtrwrtnt}\ t\iwy\ \textit{hnwтрs} \ 	extit{mhw} \ “\textit{Great Royal Wife, Lady of}
of the Two Lands, Mistress of the South and North” along with $\textit{hmtnswtrwnbt}\ t\iwy\ \textit{hnwtr}[\textit{rsy}\ \textit{mhw}] \ “\textit{Great Royal Wife, Lady of the Two Lands, Mistress of the}\ [\textit{South and}
North]}” and $\textit{jrt-p\t} \ “\textit{Hereditary Noblewoman}” on the doorjambs leading into room B.\textsuperscript{61}
In room B, the scenes showing Tausert before various gods constantly refer to her as $\textit{hmtnswtrwrtnt}\ t\iwy\ \textit{Great Royal Wife, Lady of the Two Lands},” with the additional
epithets $\textit{hnwtr}\ \textit{rsy}\ \textit{mhw} \ “\textit{Mistress of the South and North}.”\textsuperscript{62} If the first two corridors date
as early as Year 2 of Seti II, there does not appear to be any decoration surviving from

\textsuperscript{60}Altenmüller, “Bemerkungen zu den neu gefundenen Daten,” 147-49, 159; Dodson, “Eternal
Harem,” 40-41.

\textsuperscript{61}PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 527 (1); KRI 4: 356; RITA 4: 257; LDT 3: 209; Champollion, \textit{ND}, 1: 448;
Lefèbure, 2: 123-25; Weeks, “KV 14-Tausert & Setnakht: Gate B.” The writing of $nt\ iwy$ on
the lintel without a $t$ might be due to a lack of space, as it is written correctly on the doorjambs,
but it might be intentional to reflect Tausert’s status as sole ruler after the death of Siptah.
Likewise, Tausert’s use of $\textit{jrt-p\t}$, may also be an indication of her status as coregent with Siptah
as she is not attested with that titles on any known monument dating from the reign of her
husband, Seti II. Troy, 134-35, 196 D2/1, suggests that $\textit{jrt-p\t}$ reflects a queen’s status as
mediator over Egypt because ancient Egyptian queens were priestesses and daughters of kings
thereby giving them a greater role in maintaining order.

\textsuperscript{62}PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 527-29 (2-3); KRI 4: 355-56; RITA 4: 256-57; LD 3: 201a-b; LDT 3: 209-210;
Champollion, \textit{ND}, 1: 450; Lefèbure, 2: 123-25; Weeks, “KV 14-Tausert & Setnakht: Corridor B.”
As with the titulary on the entrance, sometimes the $t$ in $nt\ iwy$ is not written.
this time period of KV 14’s construction unless the titles alone date from Year 2 of Seti II. Much of the decoration in these first two corridors features scenes of Tausert and Siptah before ancient Egyptian gods, which later had Siptah’s titles replaced by Seti II’s and later still Tausert’s figures replaced by that of Sethnakht. These complicated revisions of titulary convinced earlier researchers that Siptah was married to Tausert, but this has long been proven false.63

14. Scarab formerly in the MacGregor Collection (figure 4.11)64
Location: Former Reverend William McGregor Collection, Currently Unknown
Transliteration: hmt-nswt t3-wsrt
Translation: Kings Wife, Tausert

---

63The evidence rejecting Tausert as Siptah’s queen is best found in Gardiner, “Only One King Siptah,” 12-22, followed by Beckerath, “Queen Twosre as Guardian of Siptah,” 70-74. For the patterns of erasures in KV 14, see KRI 4: 355-56, RITA 4: 256-57, and the literature cited in note 49 above.

Discussion and Comments on Number 14

Among the varied collection once belonging to the Reverend William MacGregor is a scarab of uncertain composition featuring the name and titulary of Tausert. The scarab reads $\text{hmtnswt t3-wsrt}$ “King’s Wife, Tausert.”\textsuperscript{65} Although Kenneth Kitchen classifies this scarab as belonging to the period of regency with Siptah, it could just as easily belong to the reign of Seti II as there is nothing to specifically link it to Siptah’s reign.\textsuperscript{66}


\textsuperscript{66}KRI 4: 278, 356; RITA 4: 199, 257.
15. Steatite Scarab (figure 4.12)$^{67}$

Location: Petrie Museum University College, London UC 12841

Transliteration: $hm\text{-}nswt\ t\bar{s}-wrrt$

Translation: Kings Wife, Tausert

![Scarab UC 12841](image)

Figure 4.12. Tausert scarab UC 12841. From Petrie, *Scarabs and Cylinders with Names*, plate 44 number 19.7:3

Discussion and Comments on Number 15

In the collection of the Petrie Museum at the University College in London is a steatite scarab (UC 12841) of unknown provenance with the name and titles of Tausert reading

$hm\text{-}nswt\ t\bar{s}-wrrt$ “King’s Wife, Tausert.”$^{68}$

---

$^{67}$References: *KRI* 4: 278, 356; *RITA* 4: 199, 257; William Matthew Flinders Petrie, *Scarabs and Cylinders with Names, Illustrated by the Egyptian Collection in University College, London*, British School of Archaeology in Egypt and Egyptian Research Account Twenty-First Year, 1915, no. 29 (London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt, Constable, 1917), plate 44 number 19.7:3.

$^{68}$*KRI* 4: 278, 356; *RITA* 4: 199, 257; Petrie, *Scarabs and Cylinders with Names*, plate 44 number 19.7:3.
16. Faience Plaque or Amulet (figure 4.13)\textsuperscript{69}

Location: British Museum, London BM 14788\textsuperscript{70}

Figure 4.13. Tausert faience plaque BM 14788. Image © Trustees of the British Museum.


\textsuperscript{70}Purchased from S. Wilson in 1854. See also the British Museum’s online catalog entry by entering “14788” at \url{http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/museum_no__provenance_search.aspx}. 
Discussion and Comments on Number 16

This faience plaque or amulet is in the British Museum in London (BM 14788). It is often described as being a piece of “scale armor” probably representing part of a divine corset.\footnote{KRI 4: 278, 356; RITA 4: 199, 257. See also the British Museum’s online catalog entry by entering “14788” at <http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/museum_no__provenance_search.aspx>.} A plumed cartouche on BM 14788 contains only the name of Tausert ($t\overline{3}$-$wsr$) written out fully with the later part written as $\overline{\text{w}r\text{t}}$\footnote{KRI 4: 278, 356; RITA 4: 199, 257; Hall, Catalogue of Egyptian scarabs, 229 number 2276.}.

Royal Daughters of Seti II


Discussion and Comments on Number 17

The only evidence of the royal children of Seti II, besides the enigmatic Prince Seti-Merneptah discussed below, is from an inscription mentioning the burial of Qedemerut ($qd$-$mrwt$) found in the Assasif Tomb of Khnumemhab (TT 26).ootnote{PM$^2$ 1, part 1: 43 (3); KRI 3: 373; KRI 4: 271; Eigner, 170 note 348; Kampp, 1: 212-13.} Qedemerut is...
described as being “The Great (One) of the House (Majordomo)” ($\text{	extit{3 n pr}}$) of the $\text{msw}$

$\text{nswt n Sthy mrj.n-Pth}$ “King’s Daughters of Seti-Merneptah.”  These daughters, if not a
collective term for all Seti II’s children, remain unknown as the only evidence for them,
along with Qedemerut, is this mention on TT 26.$^{76}$

Royal Sons of Seti II

18. Prince Seti-Merneptah from Triple Shrine of Seti II at Karnak (figures 4.14-16)$^{77}$

Discussion and comments on Number 18

Unlike royal children at the beginning of the Nineteenth Dynasty, the royal children of
Seti II are almost phantoms in that they are rarely attested on the monuments of their

$^{75}$PM$^2$ 1, part 1: 43 (3); KRI 4: 271; RITA 4: 194; Helck, “Zwei Thebanische Urkunden,” 86. The phrase $\text{msw ns w}$ normally is a collective term to indicate the king’s children, or perhaps the
king’s relatives as suggested to this author by Dr. Peter Brand and Jennifer Butterworth, but here
it is written with a seated woman determinative (Gardiner B1) instead of the expected child sign
(Gardiner A17) thereby strongly suggesting only the king’s daughters applies in this inscription
as suggested by Hannig, 383. See also comments on the collective nature of $\text{msw ns w}$ in Malte

$^{76}$Helck, “Zwei Thebanische Urkunden,” 86-87.

$^{77}$References: PM$^2$ 2: 25-26 (29, 32, 36-37), and plan 9 [3]; KRI 4: 255, 257-59; RITA 4: 180,
182-85; Harold Hayden Nelson, Key Plans Showing Locations of Theban Temple Decorations,
The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Publications vol. 56 (Chicago: The University of
Chicago Press, 1941), KA 4-5, 23-24, 49-50; Azim and Réveillac, 1: 109-110; idem, 2: 18 photo
4-2/29; Paul Barguet, Le Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak: Essai d’Exégèse, Publications de l’Institut
Français d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire Recherches d’archéologie, de philologie, et d’histoire,
vol. 21 (Caire: l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1962), 51-52; Elizabeth Blyth, “Some
Thoughts on Seti II: ‘the good-looking young pharaoh,’” in Studies on Ancient Egypt in Honour
of H. S. Smith, ed. Anthony Leahy and William J. Tait (London: Egypt Exploration Society,
1999), 40-42; Champollion, ND, 2: 2, 7; Henri Chevrier and Étienne Drioton, Le temple reposoir
de Séti II. à Karnak (Caire: Imprimerie Nationale, 1940), 26-29, 36-37, 39, 45-46, 56, and plates
7-8, 10-11; Callender, “Queen Tausret and the End of Dynasty 19,” 85; Dodson, Rameses II’s
Poisoned Legacy, 45, 63; Dodson and Hilton, 183; Legrain, Temples de Karnak, 75-83; Gnirs,
128-29, Miller, 99; Schneider, “Siptah und Beja,” 141-46; Vandier, “Ramsès-Siptah,” 185;
Wente, “Genealogy of the Royal Family,” 146-47. Dodson and Hilton, 176, 183, refer to this
prince as Sety-Merneptah B.
father except perhaps maybe one or two that are reliably dated to Seti II’s reign. Prince Seti-Merneptah, eldest son of Seti II, is no exception. His image only exists on Seti II’s Triple Barque Shrine for Mut, Amun-Re, and Khonsu in the forecourt of the Temple of Karnak. His titles resemble those of Seti II, his father, when Seti II was crown prince under Merneptah and are once again, only attested in the Triple Barque Shrine at Karnak.

Figure 4.14. Detail of Prince Seti-Merneptah from the Chapel of Mut east wall. Photo courtesy of Kevin Johnson.

78 For the Triple Shrine of Seti II, see PM² 2: 25-27 (25-40) and plans 7, 9 [3]; Nelson, KA 1-9, 12-24, 26-50, 55-71, 75-91; Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 51-52; Blyth, “Some
Inside the Chapel of Mut, the base of the east wall contains a dedication of Seti II where Prince Seti-Merneptah is described as $jry-p^t\ hry-tp\ t3wy\ jrtj\ nswn\ [n\nwj]\ hjtj\ h3tj-\ r\ b3\ dr.f\ hrp\ wr\ nw\ T3-mrj\ shrr\ [b3]\wy\ [n]\ nb.sn\ [. . . jry-p^t\ z3-nswnl\ smsw\ Sthy\ mrj.n-Pth\ m^t\ hrw\ [m]\ pr\ [Jmn]\ “Hereditary Noble, Chief over the Two Lands, Eyes of the King of Upper Egypt and [Ears] of the King of Lower Egypt, Count of the Entire Land, Great Leader of Tameri (Egypt), Who pacifies the Land for Their Lord [. . .Hereditary Noble], Eldest [King’s Son], Seti-Merneptah, Justified, [in] the Domain [of Amun].” The same east wall contains a scene depicting Seti II and Prince Seti-Merneptah offering to the barque of Mut (figure 4.13), and Prince Seti-Merneptah has the titles of $jry-p^t\ z3-nswnl\ smsw\ [Sth]\y\ [mrj.n-Pth]\ m^t\ hrw\ [m\ pr]\ Jmn\ “Hereditary Noble, Eldest King’s Son, [Set]i-[Merneptah], Justified, [in the Domain of] Amun.”

Thoughts on Seti II,” 40-42; Chevrier and Drioton, Temple reposoir de Séti II. à Karnak; Gnirs, 128-29; Legrain, Temples de Karnak, 75-83.

PM$^2$ 2: 25-26 (29), and plan 9 [3]; KRI 4: 257; RITA 4: 182-83; Nelson, KA 4-5; Chevrier and Drioton, 36-37, 39, and plate 11; Gnirs, 129 note 736. The lower part of the figure of Prince Seti-Merneptah is mostly missing today except for one foot. Wente, “Genealogy of the Royal Family,” 146, KRI 4: 257 notes 8**-a, 15*-16*, and Gnirs, 129, state that these titles are cut over those of Chancellor Bay after information provided by Frank Yurco, whose observations were never fully published.
The next depiction of Prince Seti-Merneptah is on the west wall of the central chapel of Amun-Re where an erased figure and Seti II offers to the Barque of Amun-Re, but the texts on this wall pertaining to the figure are largely erased as well (figure 4.14). The last chapel of Khonsu contains a dedicatory text and a scene of the prince similar to that in the chapel of Mut. At the base of the east wall, a dedication text reads $jry-p^3t\ m\ [\ .\.\ ]$

$Gb\ t^3jt\ n\ t^3\ r\ \ d^r.f\ z3-nswt\ smsw\ [Sth]\ y\ mrj.n-Pth\ m^3\ hrw\ m\ pr\ nb.f\ [Jmn]$ “Hereditary

---

80PM2 2: 26 (32); KRI 4: 255; RITA 4: 180; Nelson, KA 23-24; Chevrier and Drioton, 26-29, and plate 10.
Noble, in [. . .] Geb, Vizier of the Entire Land, Eldest King’s Son, [Set]i-[Merneptah], Justified, in the Domain of His Lord, [Amon].” The west wall depicts Seti II and Prince Seti-Merneptah offering to the barque of Khonsu, and the prince is identified in the text over the figures of Seti II and Prince Seti-Merneptah (figure 4.15) as \( jry-p^t \cdot . . \ nb.f \ jy.n \ kA[f] \ mrr \ Hr.f \ jy-p^t \ z3-nswt \ smsw \ StHy \ mrj.n-Pth \ m3^c \ hrw \) “Hereditary Noble. . .His Lord, (One) Effective for [His] Ka, Beloved of His Horus, Hereditary Noble, Eldest King’s Son, Seti-Merneptah, Justified” and before the prince himself as \( jry-p^t \ z3-nswt \ smsw \ [StHy]y \ mrj.n-Pth \ m3^c \ hrw \) “Hereditary Noble, Eldest King’s Son, [Set]i-Merneptah, Justified.”

---

81PM2 2: 26 (36-37), and plan 9 [3]; KRI 4: 258-59; RITA 4: 184-85; Nelson, KA 30-32; 49-50; Chevrier and Drioton, 45-46, 56, and plates 7-8; Gnirs, 129 notes 736, 742. Gnirs, 129 note 742, chooses to restore \( jry-p^t m \ [sty] Gb \) “Hereditary Noble [Successor] to Geb.” Wente, “Genealogy of the Royal Family,” 146, KRI 4: 258 note 11\(^a\), 259 notes 11\(^a-a\), 12\(^a-a\), Gnirs, 129, state that these titles are over those of Chancellor Bay.
In looking at these scenes containing Prince Seti-Merneptah, son of Seti II, it is evident that Prince Seti-Merneptah, being “Eldest King’s Son” (z3-nswt smsw) was the designated heir or crown prince because of his designation of *jry-pꜣt*, which is normally
the an indicator of the heir apparent within the Nineteenth Dynasty royal family. The titles “Vizier of the Entire Land,” (tjt/n r dr.f), and “Chief over the Two Lands, Eyes of the King of Upper Egypt and [Ears] of the King of Lower Egypt, Count of the Entire Land, Great Leader of Tameri (Egypt)” (hry-tp t3wy jrtj nswt [nwyj] hjtj h mówi t3 r dr.f hrp wr nw T3-mrj) have almost no parallels among royal sons of the Nineteenth Dynasty and are a bit unusual. It is possible that these are the remains of earlier inscriptions and titulary mentioned by Yurco as belonging to Chancellor Bay that were incorporated into the inscriptions of Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah when the Triple Shrine was redecorated to incorporate Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah into the decorative scheme. Alternatively, these titles of Prince Seti-Merneptah are laudatory in that they were intended to boost the prince’s status as heir and potential coregent being that Prince Seti-Merneptah was jry-p5t and eldest son. In so doing this would label Prince Seti-Merneptah as the heir apparent as well as grooming him for his intended role as Seti II’s colleague.

---


83However, the title “Chief of the Two Lands” (hry-tp t3wy) is an attested, if uncommon, title from the Nineteenth Dynasty royal family. See Fisher, 1: 114; Iskander, 29-30, 58.

84Wente, “Genealogy of the Royal Family,” 146; KRI 4: 257 notes 8a-a, 15a-16a, 258 note 11a-b, 259 notes 11a-a, 12a-a, Gnirs, 129.

85Thanks to Dr. Peter Brand for suggesting this aspect.
19. Burial in Tomb KV 56 in the Valley of the Kings\textsuperscript{86}

Discussion and Comments on Number 19

Discovered in January 1908 during Theodore Davis’s excavations in the Valley of the Kings, KV 56 is a tomb containing one irregularly shaped room reached by a shaft.\textsuperscript{87}

The tomb was filled full of flood debris, and appears to have been excavated rather quickly as a reexamination of KV 56 in 1999-2000 and 2002 by the Amarna Royal Tomb Project discovered that KV 56 still contained objects left behind when Davis finished his


\textsuperscript{87}For KV 56, see PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 567; Aldred, “Valley Tomb no. 56 at Thebes,” 176-78; Altenmüller, “Bemerkungen zu den Königsgräbern,” 60-61; Daressy, “Catalogue of the Jewels and Precious Objects of Setuî II and Tauosrît,” 35-46; Davis, 2-4, 30-32; Reeves, \textit{Valley of the Kings}, 131-33, 136-37; idem, ed., \textit{Newsletter of the Valley of the Kings Foundation}, no. 1 (2002); Reeves and Wilkinson, 153; Romer, \textit{Valley of the Kings}, 220-21; Thomas, \textit{Royal Necropoleis of Thebes}, 156, 165-66; Weeks, “KV 56-Unknown,” in \textit{Atlas of the Valley of the Kings}; idem, ed., \textit{Atlas of the Valley of the Kings}, sheet 66. Reeves, “On Some Queen’s Tombs of the Eighteenth Dynasty,” 72, suggests that the irregular shape to KV 56’s single room is due to the fact that it originally was to have a pillar in the center of the room, a design Reeves links to a feature he believes is indicative of Eighteenth dynasty queen’s tombs.
work. Many of the items Davis found within KV 56 consisted of gold jewelry such as an enormous pair of gold earrings inscribed with the prenomen and nomen of Seti II $\text{wsr-hprw-R}^r \text{ mrj-Jmn Sityh mrj.n-Pth}$ (CG 52397-98, JE 39675), uninscribed rings, bracelets, earrings, and ornaments of varying shapes and sizes in stone, gold, and electrum. A few items appear to be heirlooms passed down within the royal family as a ring (CG 52262, JE 39694) and a few calcite vases (JE 39713-18) bore the titles of Ramesses II. As mentioned previously, several of the objects contained the names of Seti II and Tausert, so the initial assumption was that KV 56 was in some way a cache or reburial of

---

88The only publication of this reexamination of KV 56 and its discoveries in Reeves, “On Some Queen’s Tombs of the Eighteenth Dynasty,” 72, note 47; idem, ed., Newsletter of the Valley of the Kings Foundation, no. 1 (2002), figure 35; idem, Bulletin of the Valley of the Kings Foundation, no. 1 (December 2002), figure 5, all indicate that the Amarna Royal Tombs Project found a plaque with Seti II’s name similar to sixteen plaques found by Davis with Seti II’s prenomen and nomen $\text{wsr-hprw-R}^r \text{ mrj-Jmn Sityh mrj.n-Pth}$ and now in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (CG 52684, JE 39701), three gold pendants matching a necklace in Cairo attributed to Queen Tausert (CG 52679-81, JE 39679), along with fragments of faience, gold leaf, a mask of Hathor (perhaps similar to CG 52697, JE 39684), and a golden mandrake ornament. For the sixteen plaques of Seti II, the Queen Tausert necklace, and other gold Hathor heads from KV 56, see PM$^2$ 1, part 2: 567; KRI 4: 278, RITA 4: 199; Andrews, 98, 145; Daressy, “Catalogue of the Jewels and Precious Objects of Setuî II and Tauosrît,” 37-38 number 6b-c, 39 number 11, 43, and plates 14, 16-17, 19-20; Vernier, 3: 225-28, 232, and plates 54G, 55, 56C.

89For the gold earrings of Seti II (CG 52397-98, JE 39675), see PM$^2$ 1, part 2: 567; KRI 4: 278, RITA 4: 199; Andrews, 112-13, and illustration 93; Bongioanni and Croce, 375, 605; Daressy, “Catalogue of the Jewels and Precious Objects of Setuî II and Tauosrît,” 35-36 number 2, and plates 7-8; Rita E. Freed, Ramesses the Great: His Life and World (Memphis, Tennessee: City of Memphis, 1987), 151 catalog number 19; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 138; Müller and Thiem, 197-98, and illustration 416; Saleh and Sourouzian, 232-33 number 223; Vernier, 2: 137-38, and plate 28. For the varying rings, bracelets, and amuletic objects (CG 52263, 52399, 52400-02, 52580-81, 52583-85, 52640, 52675-78, 52682-83, 52685-87, 52690-91, 52694-96, 52698-99, 52700, 52706-07; JE 39676, 39678-83, 39685-87, 39689-92, 39695, 39700, 39702, 39706-10), see Andrews, 115-16, 147, 166-67; Daressy, “Catalogue of the Jewels and Precious Objects of Setuî II and Tauosrît,” 36 number 3, 37-38 numbers 5, 6a, 7-10, 39 numbers 12-14, 40 numbers 16-18, 41 numbers 19, 22, 42 number 27, 43 number 29, 44 numbers 33-37, and plates 11, 14-18; Vernier, 2: 97, 139-40, 186-87, 201, and plates 19-20, 25-26, 29; idem, 3: 201, 224-25, 227-33, 237, and plates 54, 56, 57.

90PM$^2$ 1, part 2: 567; Andrews, 116; Daressy, “Catalogue of the Jewels and Precious Objects of Setuî II and Tauosrît,” 41 number 21, 45-46, and plates 11, 21-22; Vernier, 2: 96, and plate 26. A few of the vases under the entry JE 39713-18 are described in PM$^2$ 1, part 2: 567, and Maspero, Guide du visiteur au Musée du Caire, 4th ed., 380, as belonging to Seti II.
Queen Tausert after her tomb was taken over for the burial of Sethnakht in the Twentieth Dynasty. Nevertheless, some of the artifacts discovered within KV 56 suggested something other than a cache or reburial of Queen Tausert. Cyril Aldred, in a reexamination of KV 56, comments that much of the jewelry found in KV 56 is suited more towards being worn by a child than an adult, and that the silver sandal (CG 52710, JE 39705) and silver gloves or hands (CG 52708-09, JE 39704) found within KV 56 are definitely child sized. Aldred notes that Davis describes a stratum in KV 56 “about a half-inch thick of broken gold leaf and stucco, covering an area some four square feet” along with scattered blue-glazed curls and the fact that much of the jewelry from KV 56 was discovered near this feature strongly suggests that Davis discovered the much decayed remains of a coffin largely destroyed by flooding. This reanalysis suggests that KV 56 is a burial of a young child belonging to Seti II and Tausert based on the number of objects featuring their names and that much, but not all, of the jewelry in KV 56 is more suited to a child’s physique than that of an adult. The

---

91 Altenmüller, “Bemerkungen zu den Königsgräbern,” 60-61; Davis, 32; Gardiner, “Only One King Siptah and Twosre Not His Wife,” 20. Not mentioned in the Seti II and Tausert materials earlier is a gold ring with cloisonné inlays (CG 52261, JE 39693) bearing the prenomen of Seti II wsr-hprw-Rm n-PtH on the outside and his prenomen Sthjy mrj-n-PtH on the outside. For CG 52261, JE 39693, see Andrews, 167; Daressy, “Catalogue of the Jewels and Precious Objects of Setuî II and Tauosrît,” 41 number 20, and plate 11; Vernier, 2: 95-96, and plate 26.

92 Aldred, “Valley Tomb no. 56,” 177-78. For the silver sandal and hands, see Daressy, “Catalogue of the Jewels and Precious Objects of Setuî II and Tauosrît,” 43 number 31, 44 number 32, and plates 12, 21; Vernier, 3: 238.

93 Davis, 32; Aldred, “Valley Tomb no. 56,” 177.

94 For instance, see two gold rings in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (CG 52690-91, JE 39700) that Daressy, “Catalogue of the Jewels and Precious Objects of Setuî II and Tauosrît,” 42 number 27, and plate 17, describes as being a child’s ring due to its small size. See also Vernier, 3: 230, and plate 54E, F.
larger objects would then be burial gifts given by the grieving parents, Seti II and Tausert, to their dead child.

On the other hand, which child of Seti II and Tausert was buried in KV 56? Aldred suggests that a “young girl not more than four years old,” otherwise a daughter of Seti II and Tausert, died and was the person for whom the jewelry and other goods found in KV 56 was made. This would tie in with the daughters of Seti II mentioned in TT 26, but Aldred’s theory is not the only possibility. In a more recent article, Thomas Schneider suggests that the individual buried in KV 56 is none other than Prince Seti-Merneptah himself. Schneider suggests that Prince Seti-Merneptah was born late in Year 6 of Seti II or maybe into Year 1 of Siptah, possibly with Tausert as the child’s mother based on the material from KV 56. Prince Seti-Merneptah then lived into Year 4 of Siptah before his death sometime around 1 Akhet 10 and burial in KV 56 on 4 Akhet 22. The evidence supporting either conclusion is not as clear as might be hoped, as the only named objects are those featuring Seti II, Tausert, or Ramesses II. Any object containing the name of the young child buried in KV 56 has been destroyed by flooding, stolen by ancient and modern tomb robbers, or inadvertently destroyed during excavation.

95 Aldred, “Valley Tomb no. 56 at Thebes,” 178.


97 Aldred, “Valley Tomb no. 56,” 176-77, makes note of Davis, 3-4, where he describes how finding much of KV 56 filled with hardened mud from flooding, it was decided to use water to
Prince Ramesses-Siptah/Siptah (son of Merneptah, Amenmesse, or Seti II)

The following attestations of Prince Ramesses-Siptah are problematic in that his father is not explicitly named, yet on a statue from the Staatliche Sammlung Ägyptischer Kunst in Munich (Glyptothek 122) an erased figure might be his father or his tutor, depending on who exactly that erased figure was.98

20. Quartzite Statue of Prince Ramesses-Siptah99

Location: Louvre, Paris E25413

Discussion and Comments on Number 20

In the Egyptian collection of the Louvre is a block statue purchased in 1956 (E25413) portraying Prince Ramesses-Siptah in the guise of a scribe with a princely sidelock, and the sacred animal of Thoth upon his head. The exact provenance is unknown, but Hermopolis or Ashmunein has been suggested as its original location due to symbols and dissolve the mud and free much of the artifacts from it. By using such a technique, an undetermined amount of organic materials was lost, probably including remains of the young person buried there.

98 In light of Kevin Johnson’s ongoing research into the genealogy and historical identity of Siptah, in-depth discussion of Munich Glyptothek 122 has been limited or redacted in this chapter by request.

figures of Thoth, Shepsy and Nehmetaway upon the statue. On the front of this statue, inscriptions to the right and between two figures of the gods Shepsy (Śpsj) and Nehmetaway (Nḥmt-ꜣwꜣy but written as Nḥmt-jnyt) describe Prince Ramesses-Siptah as z3-nswt Rã-ms-s z3-Pth m3ꜣ hrw “King’s Son, Ramesses-Siptah, Justified” along with a similar inscription on the right shoulder. The back pillar calls him z3-nswt n htf Rã-ms-s z3-Pth [m3ꜣ hrw] “King’s Son of His Body, Ramesses-Siptah, [Justified].”

21. Limestone Relief of Ramesses-Siptah with His Mother, Suteriroy

Location: Louvre, Paris E26901

Discussion and Comments on Number 21

Along with the block statue of Ramesses-Siptah, this limestone relief suggested as coming from Qantir and obtained by the Louvre in 1970 (E26901) depicts Prince

---


101 KRI 2: 908; RITA 2: 592; RITANC 2: 613-14; Fisher, 1: 118-19, idem, 2: 181; Vandier, “Ramsés-Siptah,” 169-71; idem, “Nouvelles acquisitions,” 100. For Shepsy (Śpsj) and Nehmetaway (Nḥmt-ꜣwꜣy) on Louvre E25413, see Parlebas, 227-32.

102 Ibid.

Ramesses Siptah. However, this relief also depicts prince Ramesses-Siptah’s mother. Carved in sunk relief and slightly damaged, this relief shows Prince Ramesses-Siptah labeled as $z\text{-}nswt R^5$-$ms$-$s$ $z\text{-}Pth$ “King’s Son, Ramesses-Siptah” with both his hands raised in a pose of worship being followed by his mother, who holds a sistrum in her right hand while her left hand is raised in worship. Her titles read $mwt.f$ $hmt$-$nswt$ $sw$-$tr$-$jry$ “His Mother, King’s Wife Suteriroy.”

Conclusions

From the usurped statue of Amenmesse in the Hypostyle Hall at the Temple of Karnak, Queen Takhat was the mother of Amenmesse whose title of “King’s Mother”

104 Desroches-Noblecourt, “Nouvelles acquisitions,” 21; Vandier, “Ramsés-Siptah,” 171; idem, “Nouvelles acquisitions,” 100-102. Yoyotte, “Un souvenir du ‘pharaon’ Taousert,” 468-69, mentions seeing Louvre E26901 for sale in Cairo and suggests Qantir as its provenance. On the other hand, Yoyotte does not specify if that is what he was told by those selling the relief, or if he concluded this by other means.

was altered to “King’s Wife” upon usurpation of the statue by Seti II. On CG 1198, Takhat has the titles of “King’s Daughter, Great Royal Wife,” which adds to the evidence that Queen Takhat was the chief wife of a previous king, either Ramesses II or Merneptah, or a currently reigning king like Seti II or Amenmesse. Amenmesse can be excluded as husband of Queen Takhat because why would Seti II usurp the Karnak statuary of Amenmesse only to leave the name and titles of Amenmesse’s queen intact and not replace them with that of Queen Tausert, wife of Seti II? Unless one wishes to believe that Seti II married Amenmesse’s queen, any queen of Amenmesse’s would have been deemed an usurper as well because any potential queen(s) of Amenmesse gained their position through Amenmesse’s usurping the throne. The evidence that the anonymous queen on an Amenmesse statue before the Second Pylon (number 3 above) had her name erased after Seti II usurped the statue shows that erasure was dealt out to Amenmesse’s wife as well. That leaves Takhat as wife of Ramesses II, Merneptah, or Seti II.

That Takhat had the title of “King’s Daughter” on both the Karnak statue and CG 1198 shows she was a direct member of the royal family through her father being a king but which king was he? On an ostracon in the Louvre, Paris (666) dated to Year 53 of Ramesses II, a “King’s Daughter Takhat” (z3t-nswt T3ḥfrt) is recorded along with other

---


royal princesses. If O. Louvre 666 does not, as Kitchen suggests, represent an inspection of these royal women’s tombs or perhaps a family mausoleum in the manner of KV 5, then Takhat was a daughter of Ramesses II who may have become queen through marriage to a later Nineteenth Dynasty king. Conversely, it could just as easily be the case that Takhat is an otherwise unattested daughter of Merneptah named after a royal relative as very little is known about the royal family of Merneptah.

Assuming Takhat was Amenmesse’s mother, this leaves the possible candidates for his father as Ramesses II, Merneptah, or Seti II as Takhat had been a “Great Royal Wife” to one of these kings based on the titles present on CG 1198. One suggestion discussed by William Miller, Anthony Spalinger, Edward Wente, and Frank Yurco, is that Ramesses II married his daughter Takhat, making her one of Ramesses II’s daughter-wives, thereby making Amenmesse a son of Ramesses II (table 2).


110 See discussion in chapter 3 on the royal family of Merneptah. Alternatively, Faulkner, “Egypt: From the Inception of the Nineteenth Dynasty,” 237, and Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 43, suggest that Takhat could also be a granddaughter of Ramesses II.

Table 2. Genealogy of Amenmesse as Son of Ramesses II via Miller, Spalinger, Wente, and Yurco

![Genealogy Diagram]

Through such a genealogical relationship, this makes Amenmesse’s claims and seizure of the throne a bit strained, as Amenmesse would have been a collateral member of Ramesses II’s royal family, and he would have had years to wait before even gaining the position of crown prince if he even lived that long. Perhaps these collateral and possibly marginalized younger royal sons of Ramesses II began to look discontentedly at their chances of ever becoming king as their older full or half-brothers had better chances in succeeding Ramesses II, their father. Possibly seeing a chance at becoming king after the death of Merneptah, Amenmesse would then have seized the throne on the basis that he was a son of Ramesses II and had a right to rule based on this affiliation even though Merneptah already had an heir, Prince Seti-Merneptah, the future Seti II.\textsuperscript{112}

One factor against making Amenmesse a son of Ramesses II is that CG 1198 resembles more closely in its features and costume statues of Merneptah than those of

\textsuperscript{112}Miller, 96; Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 30-31. Note that Spalinger, review of Elephantine-Stele des Sethnakht, 277-78, points out that being a collateral son of Ramesses II may have indeed made Amenmesse royalty, it “could in no way have enabled him to claim the throne of Egypt” and that any “justification of Amenmesse to the throne of Egypt was extremely weak” when based on any affiliation with Ramesses II.
Seti II or Ramesses II. Amenmesse as a son of Merneptah is feasible through making him a son of Queen Takhat, daughter of Ramesses II and otherwise unattested as “Great Royal Wife” of Merneptah (table 3).

Table 3. Genealogy of Amenmesse as son of Merneptah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Istnofret I</th>
<th>Ramesses II</th>
<th>Unknown Queen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Istnofret II</td>
<td>Merneptah</td>
<td>Takhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Seti-Merneptah (Seti II)</td>
<td>Amenmesse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Merneptah had additional sons other than Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah, such as Prince Khaemwaset from the battle reliefs of Merneptah at Karnak and an additional anonymous son from a stela at Gebel Silsila, along with probably more whose names have not been preserved. Yurco objects to Merneptah as Amenmesse’s father because he cannot fathom why Amenmesse “would turn against his father’s memory” as evidenced by the erasures of titulary on Merneptah’s monuments such as the battle reliefs.

---


114 If so, then Queen Takhat does not have the title *snt nswt* “King’s Sister” as part of her titulary unless it was left off CG 1198 for some reason or that such a title was not as important as being “Great Royal Wife.”

115 See discussions in chapter 3.
on the *Cour de la Cachette*.\textsuperscript{116} Again, possibly Amenmesse was upset at being a royal son whose chances at succeeding his father was becoming remote due to an elder brother or half-brother appointed crown prince, such as Seti II.

A final choice for Amenmesse’s father is Seti II. If Amenmesse claims Takhat is his mother from the Hypostyle Hall statuary then Amenmesse is the son of Seti II through Takhat, Seti II’s “Great Royal Wife” and daughter of Ramesses II or Merneptah (table 4).\textsuperscript{117} The inscriptions on CG 1198 have been erased and reinscribed, with the final version of inscriptions being those of Seti II, but the titulary of Queen Takhat remains unchanged. According to Aidan Dodson, this reflects Takhat’s status as “Great Royal Wife” under Seti II since he theorizes that the statue reflects Amenmesse usurping the statue from his father, Seti II, and then Seti II usurping the statue from Amenmesse, his son.\textsuperscript{118} It is uncertain if the erasures on CG 1198 can support the inscribing of three names in Dodson’s theory (Seti II-Amenmesse-Seti II), so such a conclusion is highly speculative.

\textsuperscript{116}Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 28-29 note 36.


\textsuperscript{118}Dodson, “Takhats and Some Other Royal Ladies,” 225-26; idem, *Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy*, 43-44.
Even if one supports the theory that Amenmesse was a son of Seti II, such a conclusion need not be based on direct biological ties between Seti II and Amenmesse. In a more recent theory by Thomas Schneider, Amenmesse could be a royal cousin of Seti II born to a marriage between a son of Ramesses II and the future Queen Takhat. After Takhat’s first husband died, she later married Seti II, and this would then make Amenmesse Seti II’s younger cousin and stepson, and make Amenmesse a grandson of Ramesses II.\textsuperscript{119} Despite making Queen Takhat Amenmesse’s mother and Seti II’s queen, this does not mean that that this Takhat is the same person buried in KV 10 bearing the titles *mwt nfr mwt nswt wrt* “God’s Mother, Great King’s Mother.” The Takhat in KV 10

\textsuperscript{119}Schneider, “Conjectures about Amenmesse,” 100; idem, “Innovation in Literature on Behalf of Politics,” 319-24. In Schneider’s reinterpretation, Queen Takhat would be Seti II’s aunt via a marriage to a brother or half-brother of Merneptah, Seti II’s father and, if indeed a daughter of Ramesses II, sister or half-sister to the proposed son of Ramesses II who was her first husband. Schneider does not explicitly say, but it is possible that the first husband of Queen Takhat was one of the twelve crown princes who predeceased Crown Prince Merneptah, or he could be one of Ramesses II sons who never reached the rank of crown prince.

---

Table 4. Expanded Genealogy of the Family of Seti II with Amenmesse as son of Seti II

\begin{itemize}
  \item Istdnofret I
  \item Istdnofret II
  \item Tausert
  \item Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah
  \item Daughter(s) mentioned in TT 26
  \item Amenmesse
  \item Ramesses II
  \item Unknown Queen
  \item Merneptah
  \item Seti II
  \item Takhat
\end{itemize}
is most likely a royal woman, lacking queenly titles, of the Twentieth Dynasty who was the mother of Ramesses IX.\textsuperscript{120}

The association of the KV 10 Takhat with another Queen named Baketwerel in KV 10 as well led to the initial conclusion that \textit{hmt-nswt wrt nbt t\textsuperscript{3}wy} “Great King’s Wife, Lady of the Two Lands” Baketwerel from KV 10 was Amenmesse’s wife based on the similarities between Baketwerel’s titles in KV 10 and the titles on the usurped Amenmesse statue (number 3) discussed above.\textsuperscript{121} With a reanalysis of the decoration within KV 10, Queen Baketwerel, as portrayed on the walls within KV 10, cannot have been Amenmesse’s queen as it seems highly unlikely that she would have been given a burial given that her status as queen was due to Amenmesse’s seizing the throne and becoming king through a questionable act. Queen Baketwerel is now to be identified as

\textsuperscript{120}Dodson and Hilton, 191, 194, call her Takhat B. For more on “God’s Mother, Great King’s Mother” Takhat, see comments in chapter 5 concerning KV 10 plus PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 518 (4-5), and plan on 510; \textit{LD} 3: 202f; \textit{LDT} 3: 205; \textit{KRI} 4: 200; \textit{RITA} 4: 143-45; Callender, “Queen Tausret and the End of Dynasty 19,” 84; Dodson, “Takhats and Some Other Royal Ladies,” 224-26; Gauthier, \textit{Livre des rois}, 3: 129-30; Lefebure, \textit{Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes}, 2: 84-85, and plate 55; Otto Schaden and Earl Ertman, “The Tomb of Amenmesse (KV 10): The First Season,” \textit{ASAE} 73 (1998): 134-36; Troy, 171 number 19.14. A fragment of a possible canopic jar bearing the name of Takhat found by Howard Carter during excavations between the tomb of Ramesses IX (KV 6) and KV 55 during his Winter 1920-Spring 1921 season likely belongs to the Takhat of the Twentieth Dynasty. For more, see PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 588; Reeves, \textit{Valley of the Kings}, 104, 113, 329.

\textsuperscript{121}Dodson and Hilton, 191-92, refer to her as Baketwernel A. For more on Baketwerel in KV 10, see PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 518 (6-8), and plan on 510; \textit{LD} 3: 202g; \textit{LDT} 3: 205-206; \textit{KRI} 4: 201; \textit{RITA} 4: 143-45; Aldred, “Parentage of King Siptah,” 46; Faulkner, “Egypt: From the Inception of the Nineteenth Dynasty,” 237; Gauthier, \textit{Livre des rois}, 3: 130; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 168-69; Lefebure, \textit{Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes}, 2: 84-85, and plates 56-57; Miller, 98; Spalinger, review of \textit{Elephantine-Stele des Sethnakht}, 278; Troy, 171 number 19.16; Vandier, “Ramsès-Siptah,” 185; Wente, “Genealogy of the Royal Family,” 146; Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 23, 30. In KV 10, sometimes Baketwerel is called \textit{hmt-nswt} “King’s Wife” rather than “Great King’s Wife” and sometimes “Lady of the Two Lands” is written \textit{nb t\textsuperscript{3}wy} with the \textit{t} omitted.
the wife of Ramesses IX, mother to Ramesses X, and grandmother to the sister-wife of Ramesses XI also named Baketwerel.  

If Takhat is indeed a “Great Royal Wife” of Seti II, then he had two different queens who had the title of “Great Royal Wife” because Queen Tausert, Seti II’s other wife, also utilized this same title. Queen Takhat may have been the first “Great Royal Wife” and died early at the beginning of Seti II’s reign as Tausert held the title “Great Royal Wife” at least by Year 2, 1 Peret 8 according to O. JE 72452. Tausert’s background remains mysterious, as none of her titulary addresses her as “King’s Daughter” or “King’s Sister,” but she could very well be a high-ranking granddaughter or great-granddaughter of Ramesses II or even a cousin from a collateral branch of the royal family.


123 KRI 4: 404; RITA 4: 289; Altenmüller, “Bemerkungen zu den neu gefundenen Daten,” 158-59; idem, “Tomb of Tausert and Setnakht,” 228; Callender, “Queen Tausret and the End of Dynasty 19,” 84-85; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 43-46; Gardiner, “Tomb of Queen Twosre,” 43 note 3; Thomas, Royal Necropoleis of Thebes, 115. Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 46, creates a scenario in which the rapidly deteriorating situation of Amenmesse threatening Seti II, his father, in the Theban area forced Seti II to marry Tausert in order to essentially strengthen his own kingship with a new “Great Royal Wife” that was not the mother of the usurper Amenmesse.

124 Buttles, 158-61, and Petrie, History of Egypt, 3: 128, refer to Tausert in the old outdated “heiress” theory as a “King’s Daughter” but of Seti II. Troy, 171 numbers 19.14-19.15, refers to her as a possible daughter-wife of Seti II but with much hesitation. Tausert might still be a “King’s Daughter” through her use of the title jrt-pr’t, but usage of this title might be more indicative of Queen Tausert’s coregency with Siptah than reflecting her status as a royal daughter. An anonymous female mummy in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo (Unknown Woman D; CG 61082) discovered resting in the wooden coffin lid of Sethnakht (CG 61039, JE 34565) at the second royal mummy cache within KV 35, the tomb of Amenhotep II, and has been speculatively identified as Tausert, but as yet no definite proof confirming this identification. For Unknown Woman D, see Salima Ikram and Aidan Dodson, The Mummy in Ancient Egypt: Equipping the Dead for Eternity (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1998), 326-27; Robert B Partridge, Faces of Pharaohs: Royal Mummies and Coffins from Ancient Thebes (London: Rubicon Press, 1994), 164-67; Grafton Elliot Smith, The Royal Mummies, Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire nos. 61051-61100 (Caire: Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1912),
Of the royal children of Seti II, nothing else is known of the royal daughters referred to in the TT 26 graffito unless one wants to accept Aldred’s interpretation that the KV 56 burial represents the tomb of one of these daughters. The excavated artifacts from KV 56 are ambiguous enough to support the burial of either a son or a daughter, with Queen Tausert as the mother of this deceased child since the majority of artifacts from KV 56 name her. Of the sons, there are two choices fraught with problems. One son is the previously mentioned Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah from the Triple Barque Shrine of Seti II at Karnak. Based on his titulary, he was the eldest son of Seti II as well as the son who would in theory become Seti III, the next king upon Seti II’s death. On the other hand, something happened to these plans as Ramesses-Siptah succeeded Seti II as king and became involved with Chancellor Bay and Tausert over control of the throne.

One possible explanation, suggested by Edward Wente, is that the historicity of Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah, son of Seti II, is questionable being that the figures of Crown Prince Seri-Merneptah were carved over images of Chancellor Bay to suppress his memory after his fall from power in an event Wente places after Seti II’s reign. Such a suggestion would make Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah a phantom, a fictional son invented for an act of political expediency and suppression. There is nothing to indicate that this


125Aldred, “Valley Tomb no. 56 at Thebes,” 176-78.


127Wente, “Genealogy of the Royal Family,” 146-47. In contrast, Miller, 99, takes Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah as a real son of Seti II whose figures were added during the sole reign of Queen Tausert to suppress the memory of Chancellor Bay.
Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah was a mere invention for the propagandistic purpose of eliminating a political rival, so he had to have been a real son of Seti II.\textsuperscript{128}

Another theory is that Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah was a son of Seti II but died before his father.\textsuperscript{129} Cyril Aldred and Elizabeth Blythe believe that some of the texts that precede Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah’s titles at the Triple Barque Shrine at Karnak suggest the possibility that he may have died before Seti II.\textsuperscript{130} Inside the chapels dedicated to Mut and Khonsu, the titulary of Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah is preceded by $dj.wj\ m\ hsw\ nt\ hr\ nswt\ n$ “Given by Favor from the King to” and another phrase in the chapel of Khonsu is $n\ k3\ n$ “For the Ka of” Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah.\textsuperscript{131} These phrases, plus the use of $m3\5\ hrw$, appear to indicate that Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah died before his father and was being honored in the Triple Barque Shrine that was dedicated to his memory so that the $ka$ of the now-deceased Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah could partake in the daily offerings at the Triple Barque Shrine.\textsuperscript{132}

In opposition to this suggestion is that neither of these phrases necessarily mean that Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah was dead when these scenes were carved upon the walls of the Triple Barque Shrine but that the crown prince was being honored by Seti II as part of his role as potential heir. In direct opposition to $m3\5\ hrw$ as an indicator of being

\textsuperscript{128}Dodson, \textit{Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy}, 63.

\textsuperscript{129}Aldred, “Parentage of King Siptah,” 47; Blyth, 42; Faulkner, “Egypt: From the Inception of the Nineteenth Dynasty,” 237; Vandier, “Ramsès-Siptah,” 176, 185, 187.

\textsuperscript{130}Aldred, “Parentage of King Siptah,” 47; Blyth, 42.

\textsuperscript{131}PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 25-26 (29, 36-37), and plan 9 [3]; KRI 4: 257-59; RITA 4: 182, 184-85; Nelson, KA 4-5, 30-32; 49-50; Chevrier and Drioton, 39, 46, 56, and plates 7-8, 11.

\textsuperscript{132}Blyth, 42. Gardiner, “Only One King Siptah and Twosre Not His Wife,” 18, mentions that the Triple Barque Shrine was “dedicated as a reward” to Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah but not necessarily that it was a mortuary offering.
deceased, Ramesses II is attested in a room in his Abydos temple, as well as the temple of Seti I at Abydos, as ms $\text{hrw}$ meaning that he can speak no falsehoods before the gods.\footnote{Fisher, 1: 66; William J. Murnane, Ancient Egyptian Coregencies, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, no. 40 (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1977), 271. For the Ramesses II temple, see PM 6: 36 (31-32); KRI 2: 542-44. For Ramesses II, in his role as crown prince, having ms $\text{hrw}$ in the Gallery of the Kings in the temple of Seti I at Abydos, see PM 6: 25 (229-30); KRI 1: 177; Brand, Monuments of Seti I, 162, 318, and figure 81.}

Furthermore, both Merneptah, son of Ramesses II, and Seti II, in their roles as crown prince, bear the epithet as well and they certainly lived to become the next king upon the death of Ramesses II and Merneptah.\footnote{Merneptah has the epithet ms $\text{hrw}$ as crown prince on a diorite statue of Ptah in the Egyptian Museum in Berlin (7553), a granite block (JE 32009), a red granite statue of Ramesses II (CG 575), part of a limestone statue (CG 750, JE 28038), and an usurped statue of Sesostris I (JE 37465, SR 634), all in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo, and a plinth in the Museo Archaeologio in Florence (1681[1801]). For attestations of ms $\text{hrw}$ for Seti II as crown prince see numbers 4-5, 8 in chapter 2. For the attestations of ms $\text{hrw}$ on the monuments of Merneptah as crown prince, see further KRI 2: 441-15, 496-97, 902-905; RITA 2: 268-69, 316, 588-90; RITANC 2: 606-610; Fisher, 1: 116, and 281-82 plates 143B-144, 285-86 plates 147B-D-148; idem, 2: 163-70; Gnirs, 84 note 364, 92, 123-27; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 5, 18-23, and plates 6a-d, 7a, 41-42.} The use of ms $\text{hrw}$ in many cases can be used in a “generic or prospective sense” not necessarily meaning that the individual bearing such an epithet is dead when the inscription was carved.\footnote{Fisher, 1: 116. See also the discussion in Murnane, Ancient Egyptian Coregencies, 267-72.} The role of a crown prince and heir in the Nineteenth Dynasty was to reinforce the stability of the throne through the act of succession transferring power from father to son thereby making portrayals of the crown prince a powerful piece of royal propaganda.\footnote{Thanks to Dr. Peter Brand for this suggestion.} A deceased crown prince might be memorialized, but if the crown prince is indeed dead then that would show weakness in the succession in that there would not be the transfer of power from father to a specific son. It would be far easier to transfer the title of crown prince to another son to reinforce the royal propaganda than to use a deceased crown prince.
In contrast to theories involving in some way Prince Seti-Merneptah’s death caused by Amenmesse or his associates in an act of political murder, the fact that the scenes of Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah replace those believed to be Chancellor Bay suggest that the late birth of the crown prince may have necessitated a change in the sociopolitical propaganda of the Late Nineteenth Dynasty royal family.\textsuperscript{137} As outlined by Schneider, the birth of Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah late in the reign of Seti II necessitated a change in the Triple Barque Shrine’s decoration featuring Chancellor Bay since the newly born crown prince needed to be portrayed alongside his father. At Seti II’s death, the relatively young age of Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah necessitated the intervention of Chancellor Bay to put Ramesses-Siptah, whom Schneider takes to be a son of Merneptah and a half-brother to Seti II, on the throne. Any hopes for Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah to gain the throne ended with his death during Year 4 of Siptah.\textsuperscript{138}

This necessitates the royal status and possible identity of Siptah with Prince Ramesses-Siptah as Siptah ultimately became king due to the death or the young age of Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah if he was indeed born late in Seti II’s Year 6. None of the representations of Prince Ramesses-Siptah specifically name his father, other than to label him a “King’s Son,” and considerable debate exists in the literature over Prince Ramesses-Siptah being a son of Ramesses II, Merneptah, Amenmesse, or Seti II, and his

\textsuperscript{137}Dodson, \textit{Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy}, 45, 63, suggests a somewhat more elaborate explanation involving Crown-Prince Seti-Merneptah being killed during Amenmesse’s rebellion because Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah would be an obvious rival in the path of Amenmesse’s kingship being next in line for the throne.

\textsuperscript{138}Schneider, “Siptah und Beja,” 141-46. Even though Schneider’s theory is just that, it remains an intriguing theory to explain the existence of Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah, rather than to make him a mere phantom or to die by Amenmesse’s actions.
identity with the future King Siptah.\textsuperscript{139} One factor not made readily apparent in available literature so far is that if Prince Ramesses-Siptah is the same Ramesses-Siptah who succeeded Seti II, none of his titulary was upgraded on any known monument of Prince Ramesses-Siptah to reflect his new status as king. There is nothing to indicate that Prince Ramesses-Siptah was a son of Seti II or to definitely link him with the future King Ramesses-Siptah other than the similarities in name.\textsuperscript{140} Furthermore, there is nothing to definitely link Siptah to Amenmesse except suggestions by Aldred and Dodson that an erased figure on a statue in the Staatliche Sammlung Ägyptischer Kunst in Munich (Glyptothek 122) is Amenmesse.\textsuperscript{141} The Twentieth Dynasty kings did conveniently omit any mention of Amenmesse and Siptah when it came to public displays of legitimate


\textsuperscript{140}Lesko, “A Little More Evidence,” 31-32, takes Prince Ramesses-Siptah and the future King Siptah to be the same person he believes is a son of Seti II. In contrast, Spalinger, review of \textit{Elephantine-Stele des Sethnakht}, 272, 278-79, points out even though Prince Ramesses-Siptah and King Ramesses-Siptah bore the same name, this does not automatically make them the same person. Reginald Engelbach, “A List of the Royal Names on the Objects in the ‘King Fouad I Gift’ Collection with Some Remarks on Its Arrangement,” \textit{ASAE} 41 (1942): 219, 226, notes a scarab in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (JE 74630) described as containing the names of Seti II and Siptah, but this cannot be used as evidence of affiliation between these two kings based on the only known published information.

kings as in the Min-Kamutef reliefs at Medinet Habu. Any perceived illegitimacy of Amenmesse and Siptah by the Twentieth Dynasty could be due to these kings being either father and son or perhaps half-brothers of the last two legitimate rulers, Merneptah and Seti II.

---


143 Wente, “Genealogy of the Royal Family,” 147. Spalinger, review of *Elephantine-Stele des Sethnakht*, 279-80, rejects the non-appearance of Amenmesse and Siptah on the Min-Kamutef reliefs at Medinet Habu as necessarily meaning that Amenmesse and Siptah were related at all. The apparent suppression of Siptah as a legitimate king might be due to King’s Wife Suteriroy being the mother of Siptah. If she was a Canaanite queen of lesser rank, Siptah would have only been part Egyptian and possibly not considered legitimate for this reason along with his association with Chancellor Bay. For more on this theory, see Dodson, *Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy*, 72-74; Schneider, “Siptah und Beja,” 134-41. For Siptah as a son of Merneptah, see Fisher, 1: 118; Schneider, “Siptah und Beja,” 142-43; Spalinger, review of *Elephantine-Stele des Sethnakht*, 279-80; Vandier, “Ramsés-Siptah,” 172-75; Wente, “Genealogy of the Royal Family,” 147; Yoyotte, “Un souvenir du ‘pharaon’ Taousert,” 468-69.
Chapter 5

The Royal Monuments of Amenmesse

It is necessary for any examination of questions surrounding the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II to begin with their monuments, such as statues, stelae, temple decorations and inscriptions, tombs, scarabs, and other artifacts. What makes a study of the monuments belonging to these two kings so challenging is that a majority of the monuments feature usurpations and palimpsest inscriptions belonging to the legitimate heir Seti II. Ultimately, many of the monuments of Seti II feature clear erasures and usurpations of titles from an earlier king, but there are very few, if any, identifiable traces of Amenmesse’s name on them. ¹ In fact, progress into Amenmesse’s succession, reign, and monuments is “charted inadvertently in ambiguous texts or upon the remains of chisel-clawed statues stored in museum basements.”² Because of the heavy concentration of Amenmesse’s monuments belonging mostly in Upper Egypt and Nubia, some researchers like Rolf Krauss believe that the known monuments of Amenmesse reflect his status as Gegenkönig, or “counter-king,” ruling over Upper Egypt and Nubia while Seti II ruled from Lower Egypt.³ This interesting feature to the monuments of Amenmesse may just

¹KRI 4: 194.
²Romer, Ancient Lives, 57.
be a feature of preservation, but it remains an interesting fact to consider. In this chapter
the royal monuments containing clear traces or unaltered examples of Amenmesse’s
titulary will be examined in geographic sequence from outside Egypt then ranging from
Lower Egypt to Upper Egypt and then into Nubia. Monuments without a clear
provenance will be grouped at the end of this chapter. Those monuments featuring
usurpations by Seti II, but no clear traces of Amenmesse’s names, are in the chapter
containing Seti II’s monuments
Outside Egypt

1. Naos Sistrum from Hathor Temple at Timna, Israel

Location: Part of the collection of the Museum Haaretz Tel Aviv, Israel

Transliteration: $mn\text{-}[mj]\text{-}R^c$ or $mn\text{-}[mA\text{a}t]\text{-}R^c$

Discussion and Comments on Number 1

This naos, or “shrine-topped,” sistrum discovered during excavations in 1969 at the Hathor Temple located at the copper mines in Timna, Israel, is one of the most perplexing monuments in the discussions concerning the monuments of Amenmesse and

---


Seti II. The sistrum, depending on how one wishes to read the prenomen upon it, reads as either the prenomen of Amenmesse \( mn-\{mj\}-R^e \) or that of Seti I \( mn-\{mAat\}-R^e \). The sistrum consists of two pieces in a rectangular pylon-shape “with a cavetto cornice and torus molding on all four faces” and black paint used for the inscription contained within a cartouche on top. Initial reports of the discovery mention that the sistrum dated to the reign of Seti I because the surviving prenomen written in black paint \( mn \) and \( R^e \) fit the prenomen of Seti I. However, this identification soon changed as more detailed reports and publications appeared on the Hathor Temple at Timna.

With some doubts as to the reading of the cartouche as \( mn-\{mAat\}-R^e \), Benno Rothenberg and Alan Schulman, two members of the team working on the excavations of the Hathor Temple at Timna, began suggesting that the cartouche on the sistrum belonged to another king entirely. This king became Amenmesse with the restoration of the prenomen on the sistrum as \( mn-\{mj\}-R^e \) in the catalog of Egyptian artifacts found during the excavation. 

---


7Schulman, “Catalogue of the Egyptian Finds,” 118 number 19, figure 28:1, and plate 119:1. The sistrum was found in locus 101 and given field numbers 241/1 and 225/1. See also Mumford, “International Relations,” 1347 table 5.10.

8Giveon, “Egyptian Inscriptions,” 50; Rothenberg, Were These King Solomon’s Mines, 163-64, 164 figure 48, and plates 82-83.

excavations of the Hathor Temple at Timna. Not only did the sistrum suddenly become identified with Amenmesse’s reign but additional votive objects from Timna became associated with Amenmesse as well. A faience jar stand bore traces in black ink of a title and nomen reconstructed as nb ti[w] [Jmn]-ms-[s], and a faience sherd has a cartouche written over the sign for gold reading [mn-mj-Rc] stp.n-Rc [Jmn]-ms-[s(w)]. A final sherd of green glass gives the tantalizing remains of a cartouche reading [mn-mj-Rc] stp.n-Rc [Jmn]-ms-[s(w)]. Obviously, these objects would support any arguments that Amenmesse was not merely a Theban usurper within the reign of Seti II but ruled over all of Egypt in a capacity to send expeditions to the copper mines and the Hathor Temple at Timna.

The problem with associating these artifacts to the reign of Amenmesse is that they would be an anomaly within the context of Syria-Palestinian archaeology being that they would be the only Amenmesse objects to be found outside Egypt. Raphael Giveon points out that identifying the sistrum as belonging to Amenmesse seems almost impossible as Amenmesse’s name has never been discovered at the Hathor Temple at Serabit el-Khadim in the Sinai, and there would be no rationale for finding Amenmesse’s name at


11For the jar stand, found in locus 107 and bearing the field number 279/1, see Schulman, “Catalogue of the Egyptian Finds,” 127 number 97, figure 31:4; Mumford, “International Relations,” 1370 table 5.19. For the faience sherd, found in loci 106, 109, and given field numbers 339/2 and 323, see Schulman, “Catalogue of the Egyptian Finds,” 128 number 104, figure 40:6, and plate 122:12; Mumford, “International Relations,” 1371 table 5.20.

12Schulman, “Catalogue of the Egyptian Finds,” 136 number 180, and figure 39:3; Mumford, “International Relations,” 1380 table 5.22. The glass was given field number 313 and came from locus 103.
Timna if it was never found at Sinai to begin with. Furthermore, many of the titles could be equally read and restored as those of any of the Ramesside kings with Re in their titles. In fact, Schulman suggests that the faience sherd and glass fragment might just be those of Ramesses II, whose prenomen and nomen \([wsr\text{-}m\hat{r}t\text{-}R\hat{r}] \ stp\text{-}n\text{-}R\hat{r} [R\hat{r}]-ms-[sw]\), fits the preserved traces. Most likely, the sistrum does belong to Seti I, as his name is about the earliest known Egyptian king found at Timna on this sistrum and a faience bracelet discovered in 1984. Based on the lack of known Amenmesse objects outside of Egypt, it seems very unlikely that Amenmesse had a presence at all outside of Egypt thereby lending weight to the theory that Amenmesse’s rule did not extend beyond the boundaries of Upper Egypt and Nubia.

---

13 Giveon, “Amenmesse in Canaan,” 28. In contrast to the lack of Amenmesse objects from these sites, objects with Seti II’s titles are known from Timna and Serabit el-Khadim. See comments in chapter 6 concerning the royal monuments of Seti II.


15 For the faience Seti I bracelet discovered in locus 107 and bearing the prenomen and nomen of Seti I \(mn\text{-}m\hat{r}t\text{-}[R\hat{r}] \ Sty-[mr]n-[Pth]\), see Schulman, “Catalogue of the Egyptian Finds,” 125 number 83a, 145, figure 31:7, and plate 125:3; Mumford, “International Relations,” 1355 table 5.12, 1392-93; Pinch, 61-62, 273. It is very interesting to note that in Rothenberg, “Timna’,” 1482-83, 1485, Seti I is mentioned not only as the founder of the Hathor Temple at Timna, but Amenmesse’s name is conspicuously absent from the list of objects found there. Mumford, “Egypt’s New Kingdom Levantine Empire,” 166, 183 note 93, 184 note 96, concludes that this sistrum could “also possibly, albeit less likely” belong to Amenmesse with the most likely owner being Seti I.

16 An almost similar and parallel conclusion is to be found in Mumford, “International Relations,” 315, 329.
Lower Egypt

2. Faience Vase from Cemetery C at Riqqa (figure 5.1)17

Location: Petrie Museum University College, London UC 16064

Transliteration of prenomen and nomen titles:18 nb t³wy mn-mj-R³ stp.n-R³ nb ḫw Jmn-R³-ms-s ḥq³t-W³st

Translation: Lord of the Two Lands, Menmire Setepenre, Lord of Appearances, Amenremesse, Ruler of Thebes

---


18Dodson, “King Amenmesse at Riqqa,” 153 note 7, points out that one fragment containing the upper third or so of the prenomen is missing but the missing fragment was present when discovered and photographed in the excavation report so the inclusion of the missing portion is confirmed beyond doubt. For the excavation photo see Engelbach et al., Riqqeh and Memphis VI, plate 51 number 1. For Amenmesse’s prenomen and nomen, see Beckerath, Königsnamen, 158-59; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 127-29; Kitchen, “Titularies of the Ramesside Kings,” 134-35.
Discussion and Comments on Number 2

This faience vase (figure 5.1) containing the titles of Amenmesse was discovered during the 1914 excavations at Riqqa Cemetery C, but at the time it was identified as belonging to “Ramessu XII,” now identified as Ramesses XI. Kenneth Kitchen points out in a 1987 article that the long held identification by Reginald Engelbach of this vase

---

belonging to Ramesses XI could no longer be upheld as the vase clearly contained Amenmesse’s prenomen and nomen \( mn-mj-R^c \ stp.n-R^c \ Jmn-R^c-ms-s \ hq\?-W^3st. \)\(^{20}\) Kitchen also notes that Riqqa is south of ancient Memphis, and the possibility that the vase was manufactured there rather than in “far distant Thebes” is an intriguing conclusion.\(^{21}\) In contrast, this piece does not support or strengthen the argument that Amenmesse ruled over Upper and Lower Egypt independently of Seti II because, as Kitchen elegantly writes, “one swallow does not make a summer.”\(^{22}\) The vase could have been long buried before whatever fate ended or overthrew Amenmesse’s reign, or the vase ended its days as a piece of utilitarian ware in an area not too concerned with the polemics of ancient Egyptian kingship and succession.\(^{23}\)

Middle Egypt

3. Slate Palette Fragment from Hermopolis\(^{24}\)

Location: Currently Unknown

---

\(^{20}\)Kitchen, “Amenmesses in Northern Egypt,” 23. This vase later appeared in KRI 7: 204.

\(^{21}\)Ibid., 24.

\(^{22}\)Ibid.

\(^{23}\)Dodson, “King Amenmesse at Riqqa,” 154 note 10.

Discussion and Comments on Number 3

In his 1977 article on the historical question and identity of Amenmesse, Rolf Krauss identifies a fragment of a slate palette found during German excavations at Hermopolis, or modern Ashmunein, as belonging to Amenmesse.25 The palette (excavation number 317/V) was found during excavation near the Middle Kingdom Temple at Ashmunein and initially identified as belonging to Tuthmosis IV based on the preserved fragmentary line of text reading \( t\overline{hwy} \, nswt \, bjtj \, nb \, t\overline{hwy} \) and a cartouche preserving part of a prenomen consisting of \( mn \) and \( R^e \), which the excavators took to be the prenomen \( mn-[hprw]-R^e \) of Tuthmosis IV.26

The identification of the prenomen on this palette fragment as Tuthmosis IV was not without some discussion, as Thutmosis III \( (mn-[hpr]-R^e) \) and Seti I \( (mn-[M\dot{a}t]-R^e) \) could also have been the king who originally dedicated this piece as a votive offering to Thoth, but based on archaeological evidence at the time, Thutmosis IV was chosen as the most likely candidate.27 Krauss, however, points out that the fragmentary \( t\overline{hwy} \) as found is the last part of a Horus name, and neither Tuthmosis III nor Thutmosis IV had this element in their Horus names. In spite of both Tuthmosis III and Thutmosis IV as not being the


26Roeder, *Hermopolis 1929-1939*, 69, 83, 308; Roeder, et al., “Bericht über die Ausgrabungen der deutschen Hermopolis-Expedition 1935,” 40, and plate 12d. In Roeder, et al., “Bericht über die Ausgrabungen der deutschen Hermopolis-Expedition 1935,” plate 12d, a second even more fragmentary line of text is directly opposite the line just described, but all that is preserved is the lower part of \([nb] \, t\overline{hwy}\) and approximately a third of the \( R^e \) sign, so the palette originally had two similar parallel lines of text.

kings who carved this palette, both Seti I and Amenmesse did possess $t\beta wy$ in their Horus names, so the debate centers on if the palette belongs to either of these two kings.\textsuperscript{28}

On the palette, if the Horus name is indeed that of Seti I, the name is reconstructed as $[Hr\ k3\ nht\ hfrj-m\-W\ 3st\ s'nh]-t\beta wy$. Amenmesse’s Horus name on the palette, if indeed his, $[Hr\ k3\ nht\ mfrj-M\ 3t\ smn]-t\beta wy$. Krauss argues epigraphically that the traces in the prenomen fit Amenmesse’s name more so than that of Seti I, so he concludes that the palette fragment belongs to Amenmesse and identifies it as such.\textsuperscript{29} The arguments are unconvincing and the palette could be that of Seti I since nothing else belonging to Amenmesse ever turned up during excavations at Hermopolis.

Upper Egypt

4. Stela from Kom es-Sultan at Abydos (figure 5.2)\textsuperscript{30}

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE 8774

\textsuperscript{28}Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 158-59. For the Horus names of Thutmosis III and Thutmosis IV, see Beckerath, \textit{Königsnamen}, 136-41.

\textsuperscript{29}Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 159.

Discussion and Comments on Number 4

This stela shows a procession of female dancers and musicians performing while an upper register features priests carrying a portable boat shrine containing a cartouche with what appears to be a variant writing of Amenmesse’s nomen without using the seated Amun sign (figure 5.2).31 The only association with Amenmesse on the entire stela is the

31Mariette, Abydos, 2: plate 52; idem, Catalogue général des monuments d’Abydos, 417-18 number 1127; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 129; KRI 2: 550; RITA 2: 357; RITANC 2: 380; Petrie, History of Egypt, 3: 127.
cartouche contained on the monument and even that has been called into question as a corrupt or misread text. Rolf Krauss questions this association and speculates that Amenmesse probably did not establish a mortuary cult at Abydos. For that reason, he concludes that this stela must belong to another king entirely with Krauss identifying this monument as belonging to Ramesses III. ³² Kitchen likewise believes this cartouche is a corrupt writing of another king, but he takes the cartouche as that of Ramesses II with the mry part of his titulary having been omitted for some reason.³³ Dodson believes that neither Krauss nor Kitchen’s objections necessarily “exclude this stela as possible evidence for a posthumous cult of Amenmesse” based mainly on a possible affiliation between Amenmesse and Siptah as father and son.³⁴

³²Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 157, but Mariette, Abydos, 2: 55, describes this stela as belonging to Ramesses III as well. Krauss points out in Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 163 number 26A, the similarities between this cartouche and another cartouche of Ramesses III on a graffito at Sehel that assures this identification. A similar conclusion rejecting this monument as belonging to Amenmesse was reached independently by Labib Habachi, “King Amenmesse and Viziers Amenmose and Khâ’emtore,” 61.

³³KRI 2: 550; RITA 2: 357; RITANC 2: 380. Kitchen takes this cartouche to read Rc-ms-s (mrj)-Jmn. Concurrently, Mariette, Catalogue général des monuments d’Abydos, 416-18, changed identification of this stela from one belonging to Ramesses III to one from the reign of Ramesses II.

³⁴Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 119-20 note 23. For Amenmesse as the possible father of Siptah, see now Johnson, “Transition and Legitimation in Egypt’s Late 19th and Early 20th Dynasties.”
East Bank of Ancient Thebes: Temple of Karnak

5. Head from a Red Quartzite Statue Wearing a *Khepresh* Crown (figure 5.3)\(^ {35} \)

Location: Metropolitan Museum of Art MMA 34.2.2

---

Figure 5.3. Head of Amenmesse in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (MMA 34.2.2). Photo courtesy of Jane Hill.
6. Headless Red Quartzite Standard Bearer Statue (figure 5.4)\textsuperscript{36}

Location: Hypostyle Hall, North of Column 71, Temple of Karnak in Luxor, Egypt (Neck Break Matches MMA 34.2.2 above)

Figure 5.4. Usurped standard bearer statue inside the Hypostyle Hall at Karnak Temple to which MMA 34.2.2 matches. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.
Discussion and Comments on Numbers 5-6

Numbers five and six (figures 5.3-4) are to be recognized as two parts of the same statue. The body of the standard bearer statue, showing the king barefoot and wearing a long skirt, was discovered in the Temple of Karnak during Georges Legrain’s 1913 excavations within the Hypostyle Hall while the head disappeared into the antiquities underground before appearing for sale in 1930.37 Howard Carter, using a Paris antiquities dealer by the name of Eustache de Lorey as an intermediary, helped the Metropolitan Museum of Art begin negotiations to purchase the head, but the final sale was not reached until 1934 for a price of £7,000, or $2,000 according to 1934 exchange rates.38 Entering the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art (MMA 34.2.2), the statue head was erroneously identified as Ramesses II for many years, if not believed as an outright forgery.39 In a 1979 study, Patrick Cardon matched the Metropolitan Museum’s head to the Hypostyle Hall statue (figure 5.4) by joining a cast of the neck of the statue in the Temple of Karnak with the head in the Metropolitan Museum. Although


38James, *Howard Carter*, 449-50; Betty Schneider, personal communication 2003; Winlock, “Recent Purchases of Egyptian Sculpture,” 181, 186. The author would like to thank Betty Schneider for sharing her notes on the Metropolitan Museum’s accession card taken while she was researching at the museum’s Watson Library.

missing a fragment of the back pillar, the head and neck joined perfectly.\textsuperscript{40} It is most unusual in that standard bearer statues wearing the \textit{khepresh} are exceedingly rare in the Eighteenth or Nineteenth Dynasties.\textsuperscript{41} Indeed, the only other Nineteenth Dynasty standard bearer statue wearing the \textit{khepresh} is one of Ramesses II at Mit Rahinh.\textsuperscript{42} Therefore, Cardon suggests that Amenmesse choose his depiction wearing the \textit{khepresh} on this standard bearer statue as an attempt to link himself to an illustrious ancestor, in this case Ramesses II, and give Amenmesse some legitimacy to his rule since he was essentially usurping the throne from Seti II, the legitimate ruler.\textsuperscript{43} Added to this linkage of Amenmesse copying earlier kings is that Amenmesse choose to have carved on either side of the \textit{khepresh}’s brow band two uraei wearing the White Crown of Upper Egypt and the Red Crown of Lower Egypt. A \textit{khepresh} such as the one on the Amenmesse head from the Metropolitan Museum of Art is unique in that it portrays features from earlier

\textsuperscript{40} Cardon, 8-9.

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid. As Cardon points out, the only Eighteenth Dynasty standard bearer statues wearing the \textit{khepresh} are in the British Museum (BM 37639) and the Egyptian Museum, Cairo (CG 42095, JE 37032). For illustrations, see Vandier, \textit{Manuel d’Archéologie Égyptienne}, 3: plates 119-20. For more on the Blue Crown in the New Kingdom, see Hardwick, “Iconography of the Blue Crown,” 117-41. For standard bearer statues, see Marianne Eaton-Krauss, “Concerning Standard-Bearing Statues,” \textit{SAK} 4 (1976): 69-73; Chadefaud, \textit{Statues porte-enseignes de l’Égypte ancienne (1580 1085 av. J.C.)}.

\textsuperscript{42} This statue was discovered in 1940 while digging a well at Hod el-Wissada near Mit Rahinh. For an account of its discovery and description, see Mustafa el-Amir, “A Statue of Ramesses II,” \textit{ASAE} 42 (1943): 359-63; PM\textsuperscript{4} 3, part 2: 863. For the statue’s inscriptions and a translation, see \textit{KRI} 2: 496; \textit{RITA} 2: 315-16.

\textsuperscript{43} Cardon, 14.
statues while at the same time individualizing the details of the crown in an attempt at defining the royal style of the reign.\textsuperscript{44}

Although the titulary of this statue belongs to Seti II, the hieroglyphs have been recut from those of another king.\textsuperscript{45} The belt and sporran have been heavily altered so that some of the sporran pleats or stripes are erased near the inscription.\textsuperscript{46} The surface of the back pillar is very irregular and shows panning down its center. There are a few traces of stray lines belonging to the original inscription, but not enough to reconstruct the original titulary at present.\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{44}Cardon, 12-13. The only other khepresh to feature uraei carved wearing the White and Red Crowns on either side of the brow band is the head (TR 27/5/67/1, SR 15541) from a dyad statue of Ramesses II and a goddess from Tanis but now rejoined to the dyad as displayed in front of the Egyptian Museum in Cairo. The uraeus wearing the White Crown is on the statue’s right while the uraeus wearing the Red Crown is on the left, much like on the Amenmesse head from the Metropolitan Museum of Art (MMA 34.2.2). In contrast, the head of Amenmesse features two uraei on either side, making a total of four, while the Ramesses II head just has a single uraeus on each side. For more on these brow band uraei and the Ramesses II head from Tanis, see Cardon, 10-13; Petrie, \textit{Tanis}, 1: 25, and plate 14:2; Mohamed Saleh, “Varia from the Egyptian Museum,” in \textit{Stationen: Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte Ägyptens: Rainer Stadelmann gewidmet}, ed. Heike Guksch and Daniel Polz (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1998), 353-56.

\textsuperscript{45}For the Seti II inscriptions, see Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 17, figure 2; \textit{KRI} 4: 261; \textit{RITA} 4: 186.

\textsuperscript{46}Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 17-18; Dr. Peter Brand, personal communication 2004.

\textsuperscript{47}Ibid.
7. Headless Red Quartzite Standard Bearer Statue (figure 5.5)48

Location: Hypostyle Hall, North of Column 70, Temple of Karnak Luxor, Egypt

Transliteration of Amenmesse’s titles on back pillar: 

\[mn-mj-R|zj-R\] \([W\text{3st mry}] Jmn-R\] \(nswt \ ntr[w] \ [nb \ pt \ dj \ 'nh]\]

Translation: “[Menmi]re, . . . Son of Re, Amenremesse, Ruler of [Thebes, beloved of] Amun-Re, King of the God[s], [Lord of Heaven, given life]”49

Transliteration of Seti II inscription over Amenmesse’s on the back pillar50

\(\text{Hr k}\z nht \ Mrj-R\] \(nswt \ hq>j \ mj-R\] \(nb \ t\wj \ wsr-hprw-R\] \(Mrj-Jmn \ zj-R\] \(nb \ h\w\) [\text{StHy}]

\(Mrj.n-PtH \ dj \ 'nh\)

Translation: Horus, Mighty Bull, beloved of Re, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Ruler like Re, Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheperure Meryamun, Son of Re, Lord of Appearances51, [Seti] Merenptah, given life.

---


51Here the author uses \(nb \ h\w\) after Allen, 66. Alternatively, “Lord of Crowns,” as in RITA 4: 185.
Figure 5.5. Standard Bearer statue of Seti II originally inscribed for Amenmesse inside the Hypostyle Hall at Karnak Temple. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.
Discussion and Comments on Number 7

This second standard bearer statue is much like the first in that it shows the king barefoot but wearing a short skirt with pleats instead of the long skirt worn on the previous statue (figure 5.5). Unlike the previous standard bearer statue, this statue has sculpted in sunk relief on the statue’s left side an image of Queen Takhat. This second standard bearer statue probably wore a khepresh, but regrettably, the head has not been found to date in any museum holdings or in storage. The base shows a few quarry marks but no obvious signs of usurpation unless the base was not inscribed to begin with or entirely recut. The belt cartouche reading wsr-hprw-Rˁ mrj-Jmn “Userkheperure Meryamun” has been definitely recarved, as the patterned wavy belt is shaved away on the top left and right of the cartouche and the belt’s surface is lower than the surrounding area.

The back pillar of this statue yields stronger evidence for usurpation from Amenmesse as well as preserves some traces of his original decoration. When Yurco examined these statues in 1974-1977, he noticed traces of the original inscription on the back pillar as well as an overall recutting to the back pillar’s surface. According to his reconstruction, what traces of the original inscription that remain discernable are a Rˁ in the Horus titulary Hr k3 nht mrj-Rˁ on the upper par of the back pillar, z3-Rˁ beneath nb

---

52 For Queen Takhat, see chapter 4 dealing with the families of Amenmesse and Seti II.
53 Cardon, 13 note 21. According to Maspero, Rapport du Service des Antiquités pour l’année 1913, 5; quoted in Chadefaud, 59. Legrain discovered this statue during excavations along the southern wall of the Hypostyle Hall. The statue’s fisted right hand was found in storage at Karnak during restoration work in 1955 according to Adam and el-Shaboury, 49.
54 Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 20; Dr. Peter Brand, personal communication 2004.
The strongest traces are a preserved Amun from Amenmesse’s nomen beneath the hprw element of Seti II’s prenomen, and the signs for Amun-Re beneath those of zâ-Râ. Unlike the final version cut by Seti II, Amenmesse’s original inscription appears to have faced right, and not left as in Seti II’s version, and was carved using “slightly larger hieroglyphs than those of Seti II’s inscription.”

8. Titulary on Colonnade of Tuthmosis I doorway/Wadjyt Hall Southeast Gate (figures 5.6-7)


Translation: “Men[mi]re [Step]enre Mery[amun], Amenremesse, Ruler of [Thebes].”

56 Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 18-19, and figure 6. Yurco suggests the trace of the Re sign is part of Amenmesse’s prenomen of mn-mj-Rê. For a comparison, see Beckerath, Königsnamen, 158-59.

57 Ibid., 19, and figure 5.


59 The transliteration given is of the cartouches on the north and south walls, which yield the most traces of Amenmesse’s name. See Loeben, “Porte sud-est de la sale-ouadjyt,” 213, 215-17 figures 1-3, 221 plate 4a-b. Habachi, “King Amenmesse and Viziers Amenmose and Kha’entore,” 61, and plate 12, comments on these same cartouches but erroneously identifies the name as that of Ramesses III.
Discussion and Comments on Number 8

On the southeast gate leading to the Wadjyt Hall of the Temple of Karnak, are two lines of vertical titulary carved before scenes of a statue of Amenhotep III on a sledge. Although the prenomen and nomen, \textit{wsr-hprw-Rc mrj-Jmn Sthy mrj.n-Pth}, are those of Seti II, these cartouches have been usurped from Amenmesse as traces of his prenomen and nomen appear beneath those of Seti II. Both cartouches exhibit a common characteristic found when examining usurped cartouches pertaining to the monuments of Amenmesse and Seti II. The prenomen and nomen cartouches lie in a smoothed depression indicating that the original stone surface has been cut back to allow the name of Seti II to be inscribed. Unlike raised relief, which merely has to be cut or shaved from the wall, these cartouches are carved in sunken relief requiring much effort by the ancient Egyptian workers responsible for erasing these cartouches. Since these cartouches were in sunken relief, the entire projecting stone surrounding the sunken glyphs had to be removed prior to commencing the next step in the process. Once the workers finished with this step, the cartouches were polished with a sandstone buffer leaving the smoothed depressions behind for the carving of Seti II’s prenomen and nomen.

\textsuperscript{60}PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 81 (212c-d) and plan 10; Nelson, KC 36a-b; Loeben, “Porte sud-est de la sale-ouadjet,” 207-223.

\textsuperscript{61}For the prenomen and nomen of Amenmesse, see Beckerath, \textit{Königsnamen}, 158-59; Gauthier, \textit{Livre des rois}, 3: 127-29. For the prenomen and nomen of Seti II, see Beckerath, \textit{Königsnamen}, 158-60; Gauthier, \textit{Livre des rois}, 3: 130-39.

\textsuperscript{62}Brand, “Date of War Scenes,” 16; idem, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 12.
On the north wall, a fragmentary line of text reads *mw ntry pr m ḫṛ f nswt bj tj wsr-hprw-Rc mrj-Jmn zī-Rc [Sth]y mrj.n-Pth dj ’nh mj [Rc] dt* “Divine Semen Who Came Forth from His Body, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Userkheperure Meryamun, [Set]i-Merneptah, Given Life, Like [Re], Forever.” 63 Both the prenomen and nomen

63PM 2: 81 (212c); Nelson, KC 36b. Loeben, “Porte sud-est de la sale-ouadjyt,” 213, plausibly reconstructs the beginning of the text as [’nh ntr nfr zī-Jmn] “[Live the Good God, Son of Amun]” after an almost identical text found on a stela at the mortuary temple of Seti I at Qurna. For the text from the stela, see KRI 4: 197; RITA 4: 141; Caminos, “Two Stelae in the Kurnah Temple of Sethos I,” 27.
cartouches that contain Seti II’s name have been deeply cut back and smoothed down leaving a noticeable dip or bowl in the cartouche (figure 5.6A-B). The earlier cartouche containing Amenmesse’s prenomen was smaller than the final cartouche containing Seti II’s prenomen, and the bottom left part of the original Amenmesse cartouche is seen extending into the n of Jmn. Traces of a R sign exists beneath and extending from the wsr sign into the second R sign that makes up Seti II’s prenomen of wsr-hprw-R. Beneath the mrj and mn signs in the lower part of the prenomen, another R sign can be seen thereby allowing the reconstruction of Amenmesse’s prenomen as [mn-mj]-R [stp.n]-R “[Menmi]re [Setepen]re” (figure 5.6A).64

Because of the recutting and enlarging of the cartouche to suit Seti II’s prenomen, the z-R signs were recut as well. The original sign for R in z-R as it pertained to Amenmesse’s titulary is bisected by the new enlarged cartouche for Seti II. Below this, the nomen cartouche contains traces of Jmn-R-ms beneath the signs for [Sth]y and mrj while only q remains from hq between the Pt and h in Pth (figure 5.6B).65

On the south wall a line of text reads qf m n nswt nb nswt bjtj wsr-hprw-R mrj-Jmn z-R [St]y mrj-n-Pth dj “Electrum of Every King, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Userkheperure Meryamun, [Set]i-Merneptah, Given Life, Like Re, Forever.”66

---

64Loeben, “Porte sud-est de la sale-ouadjyt,” 217 figure 3, 221 plate 4a.

65Ibid. Habachi, “King Amenmesse and Viziers Amenmose and Kha’emtore,” 61, reconstructs Amenmesse’s nomen here as Jmn-ms-s [mrj]-R hq-[W3st] “Amenmesse, [Mery]re, Ruler of Thebes.” A variant nomen for Amenmesse such as this is attested in Beckerath, Königsnamen, 158-59 E 2, and Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 127, but there does not appear to be any traces in the nomen cartouche to support such a reconstruction. Note also the usual damage directed at the Seth sign.

66PM2 2: 81 (212d); Nelson, KC 36a. Loeben, “Porte sud-est de la sale-ouadjyt,” 213, reconstructs the missing beginning as “[nh nfr nfr dw n nbw] “[Live the Good God, Mountain of Gold].”
The nomen on the south wall shows no visible traces of Amenmesse’s nomen, unlike the situation found on the north wall, but the prenomen shows more traces of Amenmesse’s name than the corresponding cartouche on the north wall (figure 5.7). Beneath the signs for *wsr-hprw-Rc* are traces of *mn-mj-Rc* from Amenmesse’s prenomen. Directly within the cutting for the *mrj* in Seti II’s *mrj-Jmn* is a trace of the original *mrj* in Amenmesse’s name.67 At the bottom of the prenomen cartouche, the *Rc* sign lies beneath the *mn* board of *Jmn*, the top ridges of the *n* in Amenmesse’s *stp.n-Rc* are seen above the *n* belonging to *Jmn*, and perhaps a trace of the *stp* sign belongs in a horizontal stroke near the *mn* sign (figure 5.8).68

---


68 Ibid. On the other hand, this author wishes to interject that the faint trace Loeben assigns to the *stp* sign of *stp.n-Rc* in this cartouche is just too faint to reliably ascertain.
Figure 5.7. Usurped Cartouche of Amenmesse at PM² 2: 81 (212d), Nelson, KC 36a. Photo courtesy Dr. Peter Brand.

The prenomen cartouche on the south wall yields an unique orthography in that the \( mn \) and \( mj \) signs of the first part of the prenomen are carved offset to another sign that is not preserved. Normally, Amenmesse’s prenomen would be \( mn-mj-R^{c} \) with the signs
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in the space left in the prenomen is than of the god Amun either fully written out as \textit{Jmn} or written using the symbol for the god himself \textsuperscript{70} (Gardiner C12). The prenomen on the south wall is then reconstructed as \textit{mn-mj-R\textsuperscript{c} [stp].n-R\textsuperscript{c} mrj-[Jmn]} “Menmire [Step]enre Mery[amun].\textsuperscript{71}

9. Karnak Temple “Between Pylon Six and Central Court” South Court Gateway showing a King offering flowers and \textit{maat} to Amun and Amun-Kamutef (figure 5.8)\textsuperscript{72}

Location: \textit{in situ}

Transliteration of prenomen and nomen of lower scene: \textit{[mn-mj]-R\textsuperscript{c} [stp.n-R\textsuperscript{c}] [Jmn]-R\textsuperscript{c}-[ms-s hq\textsuperscript{3}]-W\textsuperscript{3}st]}

Translation: [Menmi]re [Setepenre] [Amen]re[messe, Ruler of Thebes]

\textsuperscript{70}Loeben, “Porte sud-est de la sale-ouadjyt,” 213.

\textsuperscript{71}For this variant of Amenmesse’s prenomen, see Beckerath, \textit{Königsnamen}, 158-59 T 2; Gauthier, \textit{Livre des rois}, 3: 127-28.

\textsuperscript{72}PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: plan 12 [1]. References: PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 95 (271), and plan 12 [1], court 7; Nelson, KD 32-33; Barguet, \textit{Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak}, 131-33; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 156.
Figure 5.8. Erased cartouches containing traces of Amenmesse’s prenomen and nomen at PM² 2: 95 (271) lower register. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.

Discussion and comments on Number 9

This scene is interesting in that it has escaped overt notice by most researchers commenting on the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II. Most observations concentrate on
the scenes surrounding the Seti II gateway as they contain usurped cartouches but no clear traces of Amenmesse’s name. While taking pictures of the Seti II gateway in 2008, Dr. Peter Brand noticed this scene and brought it to the attention of this author. The upper register of this scene shows a king leaning forward while offering flowers to Amun-Kamutef. Approximately a third of the scene is missing, as only the lower part of [Jmn-KA]-mwt.f remains along with a smoothed area where the king’s titles once were. This smoothed area once contained the king’s titulary, prenomen, and nomen, but they were erased completely and never recarved.

The lower register (figure 5.8), although the cartouches were likewise erased but not the titles, do contain traces of Amenmesse’s prenomen and nomen thereby indicating he originally carved this scene and the one above it along with the nearby scenes on the Seti II gateway by association. This lower scene shows a king wearing the Khepresh, or Blue Crown, offering maat to a figure of Amun-Re. The kingly titles read nswt bjtj jr ht nb tìwy [Prenomen] zj-Rc n ht.f nb hfw [Nomen] “King of Upper and Lower Egypt, who performs the rituals, Lord of the Two Lands, [Prenomen], Son of Re of His Body, Lord of Appearances, [Nomen].” The cartouches have been nearly completely erased and smoothed down except for traces of the Rc signs in Amenmesse’s prenomen and nomen and are reconstructed as [mn-mj]-Rc [stp.n-Rc] [Jmn]-Rc-[ms-s hqj]-W3sr.

---

73Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 156, and Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Re à Karnak, 131-33, comment, in general, on the Seti II material at PM2 2: 95 (272-73) but not this scene specifically. See also comments on the Seti II gateway below.

74PM2 2: 95 (271); Nelson, KD 32.

75PM2 2: 95 (271); Nelson, KD 33. Most instances involving Seti II usurping scenes from Amenmesse involve erasing the cartouches and recarving them but not erasing much of the formulaic titles such as nswt bjtj, nb tìwy, nb hfw, and so on. The only differences are when the Horus or other kingly names and titles differ between the two kings and were altered.
10. South Court “Between Pylon Six and Central Court” gateway (“Seti II Gateway”) containing cartouche above image of a king offering to Amun-Re, cartouche above king offering to Amun-Re and Amunet, and cartouche behind a king offering to a god (figures 5.9-11).

Location: in situ

Transliteration of prenomen: [mn-mj]-R$^\circ$ [stp.n-R$^\circ$]

Translation: [Menmi]re [Setepenre]

Discussion and Comments on Number 10

These scenes (figures 5.9-11) belong to what has normally been identified as a gateway belonging to the reign of Seti II, but the complex history of this gateway dates back to the Eighteenth Dynasty and the reign of Thutmose III with the final form being achieved in the Nineteenth Dynasty under Amenmesse and Seti II. Thutmosis III built the first gateway by reusing a granite doorway from Hatshepsut’s Chapel Rouge as a means of separating the South Court of the Sixth Pylon from the court of the Sixth Pylon. This Thutmosid gateway was then completely rebuilt in the Ramesside period with the final cartouches carved on its walls being those of Seti II. Even though the cartouches

---


77PM$^2$ 2: 95 (270a-f); Burgos and Larché, 2: 119-20, 127, 133-34; Azim and Réveillac, 1: 197-98. Also note that blocks from the annals of Tuthmosis III were reused in the foundations of the Ramesside gateway as described in Guillaume Charloux, “Sondage dans la cour sud du VI$^\circ$ pylône,” *Cahiers de Karnak* 12, part 1 (2007): 230-31; Emmanuel Lanoë, “Fouilles à l’est du VI$^\circ$ pylône: l’avant-cour sud et le passage axial,” *Cahiers de Karnak* 12, part 1 (2007): 379.
on this monumental gateway are those of Seti II, these cartouches have been usurped from another king. In almost every instance, the cartouches of Seti II bear the characteristic sign of an earlier cartouche in sunken relief having been erased, and then the cartouche smoothed down for recarving the titles of Seti II.\textsuperscript{78} No researcher has ever commented on any traces of Amenmesse’s name remaining on this gateway, but based on the pattern of reworked cartouches, Seti II usurped them from an earlier king who can only be Amenmesse. Although Seti II’s erasures were very thorough, and the effects of time and environment have damaged some cartouches further, there remain three traces of Amenmesse’s titulary on three scenes unnoticed until now.\textsuperscript{79}

\textsuperscript{78}See comments concerning the inscription at the Wadjyt Hall Southeast Gate and note 74.

\textsuperscript{79}The Seti II gateway has been in rather poor condition for years with Georges LeGrain having to take immediate steps to prevent its collapse in 1898-1899. A total consolidation and rebuilding of the gateway since 2003 by the Centre Franco-Égyptien des Temples de Karnak has recently finished preserving the gateway from a somewhat perilous condition. For LeGrain’s work, see Azim and Réveillac, 1: 19, 197-201; idem, 2: 113-16 plates 4-4/82-94. For recent work in the area, see Burgos and Larché, 2: 127-37, 231; Charloux, “Sondage dans la cour sud du VIᵉ pylône,” 227-46; Guillaume Charloux, Jean-François Jet, and Emmanuel Lanœ, “Nouveaux vestiges des sanctuaries du Moyen Empire à Karnak. Les fouilles récentes des cours du VIᵉ pylône,” \textit{BSFE}, no. 160 (Juin 2004): 26-46; Lanoë, “Fouilles à l’est du VIᵉ pylône: l’avant-cour sud et le passage axial,” 373-89.
The first scene containing the trace of Amenmesse’s titulary is on the upper left register surrounding the gateway. The scene shows a king offering four *mrt* chests to Amun-Re and Khonsu, and a few of the blocks from the upper part of this scene are unfortunately missing.\(^8^0\) The cartouches before the king are about half preserved and read *wsr-hprw-[R*] *mrj-Jmn [Sth]* *mrj.n-Pth* “Userkheperu[re] Meryamun, [Seti]-Merneptah” (figure 5.9). In examining the nomen, there are traces of Amenmesse’s nomen preserved beneath that of Seti II. Directly behind the preserved trace of the Seth sign in Seti II’s nomen, one can see the traces of the double reed leaf \(\ddot{y}\). In front of and

\(^{80}\)PM\(^2\) 2: 95 (272); Nelson, KD 2. The lower left register at PM\(^2\) 2: 95 (272), Nelson, KD 3, shows a king offering lettuces to Amun-Re, but the cartouche shows no traces of Amenmesse’s name.
just behind the first reed leaf are two vertical lines that are the remains of the \textit{ms} sign of Amenmesse’s nomen left after Seti II’s attempts to erase and recarve the cartouche. In between the \textit{pt} and \textit{h} of \textit{Pth} is preserved the \textit{q} that makes up the second part of Amenmesse’s nomen of \textit{hq3-W3st} (figure 5.9). Therefore, the preserved traces of Amenmesse’s nomen in this scene are reconstructed as \textit{[Jmn]-ms-[s] hq3-[W3st]}.

The second scene containing traces of Amenmesse’s titulary is located on the lower right register surrounding the gateway, and it shows a king offering to Amun-Re and Amunet.\textsuperscript{81} Above the figure of the king is a line of text reading \textit{nb t\textit{wy} wsr-hprw-R^\textit{c}} [\textit{stp.n-R^t}] \textit{nb h\textit{w} [St\textit{th}y mrj].n}-P[t]h “Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheperure [Setepenre], Lord of Appearances, [Set]i-Mer[n]ep[t]ah”(figure 5.10).\textsuperscript{82}

\textsuperscript{81}PM$^2$ 2: 95 (273); Nelson, KD 35. I would like to thank Dr. Peter Brand for pointing this cartouche out to me. The upper right register at PM$^2$ 2: 95 (273), Nelson, KD 34, shows a king leading four calves to the Theban Triad, but not enough of the cartouches are preserved to determine if any traces of Amenmesse’s names remain other than to reconstruct the final cartouches to read as those of Seti II [\textit{wsr-hprw-R^c mrj}-Jmn [\textit{St\textit{th}y mrj}.n-Pth].

\textsuperscript{82}The damage to the Seth glyph is intentional, part of an established pattern of erasing Seth’s image in the Late Period, but the damaged or missing parts of the prenomen, \textit{[stp.n-R^t]}, and nomen, \textit{mrj}.n-P[t]h, are the result of environmental damage, especially with the evident salt damage on the bottom of both cartouches.
Figure 5.10. Cartouche of Amenmesse usurped by Seti II at PM² 2: 95 (273) (Lower Register). Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.

Although poorly preserved in their current state, the cartouche containing the prenomen of Seti II contains a trace of the prenomen of Amenmesse. Between the wsr and $R^e$ signs in Seti II’s prenomen cartouche, a trace remains of an earlier $R^e$ sign belonging to Amenmesse’s prenomen of $[mn-mf]-R^e [stp.n-R^e]$ “[Menmi]re [Setepenre]” thereby making this scene and its inscriptions original works of Amenmesse later usurped by Seti II.
The final scene (figure 5.11) is located on the gateway lintel facing the Thutmosid vestibule located behind the Sixth Pylon and consists of a double scene of a king offering to various gods. The right half of the lintel has a king offering to Amun-Re, and a heavily damaged scene consisting of the upper half of a kingly figure offering ointment to a now missing divine figure.83 Directly behind the partially preserved figure of the king a vertical line of text reads *nswt bjtj nb tīwy wsr-hprw-Rc mṛj-Jmn z3-Rc nb h₅w [Stḥḥy mṛj.n-[Pt]ḥ “King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheperure Meryamun, Son of Re, Lord of Appearances, [Seti]-Merne[pta]ḥ.” The prenomen cartouche in this scene is very similar to the cartouche on the opposite side in that the prenomen of Seti II shows a trace of Amenmesse’s prenomen beneath it. Extending from the *wsr and continuing into the *Rc of *wsr-hprw-Rc, a small trace of an earlier *Rc sign appears to be the only trace left of Amenmesse’s prenomen reconstructed as *[mn-ḥ]-Rc [stp.n-Rc] “[Menmi]re [Setepenre].”

83PM² 2: 95 (270a-b); Nelson, KD 1.
Figure 5.11. Cartouche containing trace of Amenmesse’s prenomen on the lintel described at PM² 2: 95 (270a-b). Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.
11. Karnak Temple “Between Pylon Six and Central Court” South Court Doorjamb (figures 5.12-13)\textsuperscript{84}

Location: \textit{in situ}

Transliteration: \textit{[mn]-mj-[R\textsuperscript{r}] [stp.n]-R\textsuperscript{c} Jmn-ms-s [hq\j{3}-W\textsubscript{3}st]}

Translation: [Menmire Setepen]re Amenmesse, [Ruler of Thebes]

Discussion and Comments on Number 11

This decorated doorjamb (figure 5.12) belongs in the category of usurped texts of Amenmesse not previously noticed or commented upon similar to the scenes discussed previously. The doorjamb is part of a Ramesside doorway cut through a Thutmosid wall, and it links the south court of the Sixth Pylon to the south court of the Fifth Pylon.\textsuperscript{85} The doorjamb is damaged with the top and left third bearing the most damage and some, but not all, of the inscription missing. The doorjamb, although currently showing the prenomen and nomen of Seti II, shows traces of Amenmesse’s prenomen and nomen underlying that of Seti II. On the left column of the doorjamb, the majority of the preserved prenomen and titulary reads \textit{[nsw]t bj tj nb ts\textsubscript{wy} wsr-hprw-R\textsuperscript{c} mrj-[Jm] n [mr]y Jmn-R\textsuperscript{c} nb nswt ts\textsubscript{wj} “King of [Upper] and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheperure Meryamun, Beloved of [Am]un-Re, Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands.”}

\textsuperscript{84}PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: plan 12 [1]; Nelson, KD 4. References: PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 95 (269), and plan 12 [1], court 7; Nelson, KD 4; Burgos and Larchè, 2: 221, 226-227, 231, 346.

\textsuperscript{85}Burgos and Larchè, 2: 221, 226-27, 231, 346.
Figure 5.12. General view of the doorjamb at PM² 2: 95 (269) showing titulary and titles of Seti II. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.

A closer examination of the prenomen of Seti II on the left column (figure 5.13), although missing the outer edge of the cartouche and the reed leaf of Jmn, reveals traces
of Amenmesse’s prenomen. At the right edge of the mrj sign in the prenomen, a very rounded trace of a sign can be seen, which does not seem to fit nominal examples of writing mrj in other examples of Seti II’s prenomen on nearby walls. It is the right shape for being a remnant of mj in Amenmesse’s prenomen of mn-mj-Rc. Beneath the mn of Amun-Re is an unmistakable trace of a circle that is part of the second element of Amenmesse’s prenomen stp.n-Rc. By utilizing these traces, Amenmesse’s prenomen is then reconstructed as [mn]-mj-[Rc] [stp.n]-Rc.

Figure 5.13. Cartouche at PM² 2: 95 (269) showing Seti II’s prenomen and nomen over those of Amenmesse. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.
The right column of text (figure 5.13) reads $z^3-Rc nb h^5w [Sth]y mrj.n-Pth mry Jmn-Rc nswt ntrw "Son of Re, Lord of Appearances, [Set]j-Merneptah, Beloved of Amun-Re, King of the Gods." Once again, examination of the nomen of Seti II shows that traces of Amenmesse’s nomen lies beneath that of Seti II. Within the mrj sign, and just beneath the Seth sign, appears about the lower third of a seated figure, most likely a seated god. Beneath the double reed leaf $y$ is a vertical stroke from another earlier sign as well. Above and below the $n$ sign are two horizontal signs, partially erased but still clear, that closely match the doorbolt $s/z$ (Gardiner O 34). If these two horizontal signs are taken to be two doorbolts, then the vertical sign beneath the $y$ sign is the remains of $ms$ and the seated god was once Amun thereby yielding the reading $Jmn-ms-s$. Taking this conclusion into account, the nomen of Amenmesse on this doorjamb once read $Jmn-ms-s [hq3-W3st]$. 

12. Usurped Colossi at the Entrance to the Chamber of Kings, Akhmenu Temple of the Temple of Karnak (figure 5.14-15)$^{86}$

Location: in situ

Transliteration of nomen titles: $[Jmn]-Rc-[ms-s hq3-W3st]$

Translation: [Amen]re[messe, Ruler of Thebes]

Discussion and Comments on Number 12

These two colossal Osiride statues (figure 5.14), one complete and the other consisting of mostly the feet and lower legs, originally belonged to Thutmose III before being usurped by Amenmesse and Seti II.\(^87\) Barguet first identified these statues as original Eighteenth Dynasty constructions usurped first by who he believed to be Seti II.\(^88\) While examining these statues, Frank Yurco noticed that there were actually two usurpations to these Osiride colossi. The first was Amenmesse usurping the statues from Thutmose III, and the second was Seti II usurping them from Amenmesse.\(^89\) Yurco postulates that these two usurpations were to take claim for work done in the Akhmenu Temple by these two Nineteenth Dynasty kings. Namely, Amenmesse usurps these Thutmosid colossi to claim credit for enlarging the entrance to the Akhmenu Temple, and then Seti II usurping these statues from Amenmesse to suppress Amenmesse’s name and constructions.\(^90\)

In examining the cartouches on these two statues, it is evident that the entire prenomen and nomen has been cut back to a considerable depth in an attempt at erasing the titles of a previous king. Yurco reconstructs the prenomen and nomen on these statues as

\(^{87}\)The statue at PM\(^2\) 2: 112 (343c); Nelson, KF 3, is intact except for the erased cartouches and damage to its face. All that remains of the other statue at PM\(^2\) 2: 112 (343d); Nelson, KF 4, are its feet and about the lower third of its legs.


\(^{90}\)Ibid. Laboury, 151, sees this usurpation as a means of Seti II linking his name to enlargements to the processional way of the barque of Amun-Re; but Laboury does not consider the possibility put forth by Carlotti, 1: 240-41, that Seti II merely usurped the work of Amenmesse, who was the king who originally began these enlargements and first usurped the Thutmosid colossi.
originally Amenmesse’s “perhaps in plaster and paint” and then Seti II’s titles in paint.\textsuperscript{91} An examination of these two statues reveals that if Seti II did indeed write his name over that of Amenmesse in paint, it is missing or not as discernable today.\textsuperscript{92} However, there is a trace on the partially preserved statue of Amenmesse’s nomen (figure 5.15).\textsuperscript{93} Examining the cartouche reveals the clear trace of a $R^e$ sign allowing the reconstruction of Amenmesse’s nomen on this statue as $[Jmn]-R^e-[ms-s\ hq3-W\ast]$.\textsuperscript{94}

\textsuperscript{91}Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 26. In tandem with this observation is Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 158, who states the northern colossus at PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 112 (343c); Nelson, KF 3, has Seti II’s name written in blue paint. See also Carlotti, 1: 41, 240.

\textsuperscript{92}Champollion, ND, 2: 159, does record a prenomen cartouche $wsr-hprw-R^e\ mrj.(n)-Jmn$ on one of the statues.

\textsuperscript{93}The statue located at PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 112 (343d); Nelson, KF 4.

\textsuperscript{94}The cartouche is that of Amenmesse’s nomen because above the cartouche are traces of the title $[nb]\ h^5w$ “[Lord] of Appearances” with the $h^5w$ sign being clearly discernable. The title of $nb\ h^5w$ always precedes Amenmesse’s nomen allowing for the reconstruction of the cartouche and title as $[nb]\ h^5w\ [Jmn]-R^e-[ms-s\ hq3-W\ast]$. 
Figure 5.15. General view of usurped colossi at entrance to Akhmenu Temple Chamber of Kings. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.
Figure 5.16. Nomen cartouche at PM² 2: 112 (343d) featuring traces of Amenmesse’s name. Photo courtesy of Robert Griffin.
13. Inner Vestibule, Room 3 of the Akhmenu Temple At the Temple of Karnak: Scenes of Amenmesse making offerings and text.  

Location: *in situ*

Transliteration of prenomen titles: \([mn-mj]-Ra [stp.n-Ra]\)

Translation: [Menmi]re [Setepenre]

Discussion and Comments on Number 13

On the walls of the Inner Vestibule of Room 3 belonging to the Akhmenu Temple of the Temple of Karnak, two scenes depict a procession of divine barques of the Theban Triad being carried by a procession of priests and fanbearers and then the resulting offering being made by a king to the barques as they rest upon stands. A further scene on the west wall of this vestibule shows a king presenting a table of offerings to a seated god. Of interest to the reign of Amenmesse is the scene on the east wall showing a king offering to the barque of Amun-Re resting on a stand. Directly above the barque of Amun-Re are roughly seven columns of text featuring an address by Amun-Re to the king making the offering. At the beginning of the third column, there is a cartouche

---


KRI 4: 194; RITA 4: 139; Barguet, *Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak*, 168-69. The entire cartouche is erased except for the \(\hat{R}^e\) sign at the top of the prenomen.

PM² 2: 112 (348-49); Nelson, KF 140-41, 143-44; Carlotti, 1: 50.

PM² 2: 112 (347); Nelson, KF 147-48; Carlotti, 1: 48-50. From current photographs of the scene, the figures of the king and seated god are preserved from about the waist down.

PM² 2: 112 (349), and plan 13 [2]; Nelson, KF 143; KRI 4: 194; RITA 4: 139; Barguet, *Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak*, 168-69. The description of this scene in PM² 2: 112 (348), is in error as Barguet, *Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak*, 168-69, clearly points out that the text in question
containing a $R^e$ disc with the remainder of the signs having been clearly erased but never reinscribed. Thus, the original cartouche on the wall read \([mn-mj]-R^e\ [stp.n-R^e]\), which is the prenomen of Amenmesse. Other surviving cartouches upon the adjoining south and east walls show the titulary of Seti II, but these cartouches are clearly palimpsest as the cartouches show signs of erasures. Basted on these erasures by Seti II, the original decoration upon the wall dates to Amenmesse’s reign with Seti II erasing the cartouches and inscribing his name after Amenmesse’s downfall.

14. Headless Kneeling Red Quartzite Offering Bearer Statue (figure 5.16)

Location: Festival Hall of Thutmosis III’s Akhmenu Temple at the Temple of Karnak

Transliteration of the left side of the base: \(mn-mj-R^e\ [stp.]n-[R^e]\ \(mry\ Jmn-R^e\ \dj\ \^n\nh\)

Translation: Menmire [Setepe]n[re], Beloved of Amun-Re, Given Life

is on the east wall above the bark of Amun. Although much destroyed today, the scene in question has been confirmed by examination of recent photographs of this wall.


102 Barguet, *Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak*, 178 note 4, first proposed that this was an original statue of Amenmesse. Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 26 figure 15, records traces of \(mn-mj-R^e\) and the \(n\) of \(stp.n-R^e\), which is part of Amenmesse’s prenomen. The author examined this statue in 2001 and found it hard to discern these traces. Likewise, photographs taken in 2004 are equally unclear as to collating these traces.

225
Transliteration of the right side of the base: \(^{103}\) [\(dnh.w\).f nb \(h^5w\) [\(Jmn\)-\(R\textsuperscript{c}\)-\(ms-s\) \(hq^3\)-\(W\textsuperscript{3st}Jmn-R\textsuperscript{c}\) [\(mrj\) \(nswt\) \(ntrw\)]

Translation: His [wings?], Lord of Appearances, [Amen][re][messe], Ruler of [Thebes], [beloved of] Amun-Re King of the Gods.\(^{104}\)

Back Pillar inscription transliteration: [\(wsr-hprw-R\textsuperscript{c}\) mrj-Jmn [\(z^3-R\textsuperscript{c}\) Sthy] mrj.n-Pth mry \(Jmn-R\textsuperscript{c}\) \(nswt\) \(ntrw\)]

Translation: [Userkheperure] Meryamun, [Son of Re Seti] Merneptah, Beloved of Amun-Re, King of the Gods.\(^{105}\)

\(^{103}\)Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 26, interprets the trace of a sign before \(nb\ \(h^5w\) to be a falcon’s wing thereby yielding \(dnh.w\). Regrettably, the loss of much of the front makes it impossible to recreate what the original inscription was.

\(^{104}\)Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 26 figure 15, records traces of the \(R\textsuperscript{c}\) and \(hq^3\) of Amenmesse’s nomen. The author examined this statue in 2001 and found it hard to discern these traces. Photographs taken in 2004 are equally unclear as to collating these traces.

\(^{105}\)Ibid., 26 figure 15 records there is a large gap between \(mrj-Jmn\) and \(mrj.n-Pth\). A slight trace of the bottom of the \(Sth\) sign is discernable on photographs, so one can sensibly restore \(z^3-R\textsuperscript{c}\) \(Sthy\) between the two groups.
Discussion and Comments on Number 14

This kneeling red quartzite offering bearer statue is located near the sanctuaries of the Heret-ib, or the Festival Hall of Thutmosis III’s Akhmenu Temple (figure 5.16). The head and arms are missing, but enough traces remain to conclude that the stature

---

originally wore a *nemes* headdress and held an offering table.\textsuperscript{107} The back pillar, bearing the fragmentary prenomen and nomen of Seti II, was usurped from an earlier king as the inscriptions show a dip along their surface.\textsuperscript{108} As Yurco observes, along the sides of the base the prenomen on the right side, never reinscribed by Seti II, reads $mn-mj-R^r [stp.] n-[R^r]$ “Menmire [Setepe]n[re]” and the nomen along the left side, again never reinscribed, reads $[Jmn]-R^r-[ms-s] hq3-[W3st]$ “[Amen]re[messe], Ruler of [Thebes].”\textsuperscript{109} Why Seti II choose to erase and inscribe the back pillar but leave the right and left sides erased and uninscribed is puzzling unless these erased cartouches on the base were plastered over and Seti II’s titulary merely painted on. As Yurco concludes, this statue can be thought of as a matched pair with a similar statue in the Hypostyle Hall at Karnak in that he believes both originally stood within the Festival Hall of the Akhmenu Temple at Karnak.\textsuperscript{110} Both statues again show signs of recutting, but this statue is marred by heavier damage to crucial portions of the inscriptions.


\textsuperscript{108}Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 25.

\textsuperscript{109}Ibid., 26.

\textsuperscript{110}Ibid. For the Hypostyle Hall statue, see the description in chapter 6 concerning the monuments of Seti II.

Location: \textit{in situ}

Transliteration of prenomen and nomen titles: \textit{mn-[mj]-R$^*$ [stp.n]-R$^*$ [Jmn]-R$^*$-[ms-s hq3-W$^*$t]}

Translation: \textit{Men[m]re [Setepen]re, [Amen]re[messe, Ruler of Thebes]}

Discussion and Comments on Number 15

On the north wall of the Solar Shrine of the Akhmenu Temple at Karnak, traces of three registers show a king before Amun and the Theban Triad while the base of this wall features the jubilating (\textit{hnw}) Souls of Pe and Nekhen kneeling before cartouches.\footnote{PM$^2$ 2: 123 (423); KRI 4: 194; RITA 4: 139; Nelson, KF 430-34; Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 203-204.}

Much of the decoration in this room is assigned to Ramesses III, with some additions by Ramesses IV, but according to Barguet, the cartouches before the Souls of Pe and Nekhen have been usurped by Ramesses III from an earlier king, most likely...
The most compelling evidence that these scenes originally dated to Amenmesse’s reign is on the doorway leading to the shrine itself. The doorway to the shrine is at the end of a stairway leading from the Akhmenu Temple and features decorated jams and a lintel on the inner part of the shrine. The north, or left as one faces out of the shrine, wall of the doorway has a cartouche of Ramesses III that contains traces of Amenmesse’s prenomen and nomen beneath it, namely, 

\[ mn-[mj]-R^e [stp.n]-R^e [Jmn]-R^e-[ms-s hq3-W3st]. \]

In addition to this cartouche, more evidence on the lintel of the doorway provides further traces that Amenmesse decorated the majority of the Solar Shrine and not Ramesses III. On the lintel of the shrine’s doorway, the Horus name \[ mrj-M3t smn-t3wy \] surrounds Ramesses III’s prenomen on either side. This Horus name is not that of Ramesses III but is the Horus name of Amenmesse attested on monuments in the Theban area such as twin stelae at the mortuary temple of

---


114 PM² 2: 123 (421); Nelson, KF 425-26.

115 Barguet, *Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak*, 204; Christophe, “Note à propos du rapport de M. Chevrier,” 257. Note that PM² 2: 123 (423), KRI 4: 194, and RITA 4: 139 all assign this Ramesses III cartouche containing Amenmesse’s name to the scenes of the jubilating souls of Pe and Nekhen while Barguet places the cartouche on the north wall next to the door. Likewise, Christophe describes this cartouche but mentions no trace of Amenmesse’s name.
Seti I. There has been no apparent attempt to erase the Horus name of Amenmesse but merely to erase Amenmesse’s prenomen and replace it with that belonging to Ramesses III. The sequence of decoration in the solar shrine is then attested as Amenmesse decorating the chamber, and Ramesses III ultimately carving his cartouches over those of Amenmesse but leaving some elements of Amenmesse’s titulary discernable, such as the Horus name above the doorway. Although the final name appearing upon the walls of the Solar Shrine are those of Ramesses III and IV, this does not discount the possibility that Seti II originally erased the cartouches of Amenmesse in the Solar Shrine with the intent of carving his name there but left the task unfinished by the end of his reign.

16. Bandeau Texts, East Temple of Amun-Re Harakhty at the Temple of Karnak (figures 5.17-18)

Location: in situ

Transliteration of titles: ḫr k3-nḥt mrj-M3’ı s[mn-t3wy]

Or, ḫr k3-nḥt [mrj-M3’ı] smn-[t3wy]

Translation: “Horus, Mighty Bull, [Beloved of Maat], Establishing the [Two Lands]”

---

116Christophe, “Note à propos du rapport de M. Chevrier,” 257; Champollion, ND, 2: 174. For mrj-M3’ı smn-t3wy as the Horus name of Amenmesse, see Beckerath, Königsnamen, 158-59 (H 1-3 with variants); Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 128. Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 167 number 45B, does note this instance of Ramesses III having his Horus name written as mrj-M3’ı smn-t3wy, but he does not point out as Christophe does the odd instance of this being the only attested use of this Horus name for Ramesses III. For Ramesses III’s different Horus names, see Beckerath, Königsnamen, 164-67 (H 1-17); Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 156-73; Kitchen, “Titularies of the Ramesside Kings,” 137. For the twin stelae of Amenmesse, see PM² 2: 409 (14-15); LD 3: 201c; LDT 3: 91-92; KRI 4: 195-97; RITA 4: 139-40; Caminos, “Two Stelae in the Kurnah Temple of Sethos I,” 17-29, and plates A-B, and further comments and references below.

117Carlotti, 1: 245-46.

Discussion and Comments on Number 16

These bandeau inscriptions (figures 5.17-18) are further indicators of Seti II usurping original decoration of Amenmesse, and they consist of lengthy lines of formulaic titulary beneath scenes of Ramesses II before gods. \(^{119}\) Much like other usurped monuments of

Amenmesse, Seti II erased Amenmesse’s names but tried to leave as many of the
formulaic titles intact to probably cut down on the amount of work required to recut these
scenes.\textsuperscript{120} On the base of the left wall, examination of the bandeau text reveals that the
beginning Horus name $Hr\ k3>nht$ is original and not erased, but Seti II’s Horus name of
$mry-R^c$ and the following titulary of $nswt\ bjtj\ nb\ t\ddot{w}y$ and Seti II’s prenomen $[wsr]-hpwrw-$
$R^c\ mrj-Jmn$ all lie within a distinctive smoothed out depression indicating that this part of
the bandeau inscription is recarved (figure 5.17). Paul Barguet, in his research at Karnak
Temple, indicates that he believes this Seti II bandeau text was written over that of
Amenmesse and reconstructed the original Amenmesse bandeau text as that of his Horus
name $Hr\ k3>nht\ mrj-M35t\ s[mn-t\ddot{w}y]$ “Horus, Mighty Bull, Beloved of Maat, Establishing the [Two Lands].”\textsuperscript{121}

A closer inspection of this bandeau text shows no trace of Amenmesse’s Horus name
or his prenomen in the area of Seti II’s usurpations. The only trace of a previous
inscription is a vertical line directly behind and extending into the bee sign in $nswt\ bjtj$
that might be part of $smn-t\ddot{w}y$ or just a stray line.\textsuperscript{122} While this might not be definite
proof of Amenmesse’s Horus name, inspection of the other bandeau inscription across
the entry passageway reveals better traces of Amenmesse’s titulary.\textsuperscript{123}

\textsuperscript{120}See note 75.

\textsuperscript{121}Barguet, \textit{Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak}, 229, note 2; \textit{PM}\textsuperscript{2} 2: 211 (31), and plan 18; \textit{KRI} 4: 195; \textit{RITA} 4: 139; Nelson, \textit{KI} 160-61; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 154.

\textsuperscript{122}Barguet, \textit{Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak}, 229, note 2; \textit{KRI} 4: 195; \textit{RITA} 4: 139.

\textsuperscript{123}PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 211 (30); Nelson, \textit{KI} 166-69.
The bandeau text on the right wall reveals that much like the left wall, the surface with the Horus name titles remains original but that the Horus name itself, titulary, and prenomen of Seti II, *mry-R*² *nswt bjtj nb t3wy wsr-hprw-R*² *mrj-Jmn*, all lie within the characteristic smoothed depression of having been usurped from an earlier inscription. Closer inspection of the *nswt bjtj* grouping, gives a better representation of what Barguet describes (figure 5.18). Beneath the bee sign and extending up into at least the bee’s feet is the bottom third of the papyrus scroll (Gardiner Y 1) written vertically. Extending from just above the bee’s wings, and traveling down through the bee’s abdomen is the trace of a long curved sign that is the pestle and mortar sign (Gardiner U 32) together reading that makes up part of Amenmesse’s Horus name of *smn-bwy*. Barguet probably examined both bandeau texts, noticed the vertical line on the left text and saw the traces beneath the right text and created a composite Amenmesse Horus name that is now suggested as.

---


125 For example, PM² 2: 211 (31); KRI 4: 195; RITA 4: 139; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 154, all follow Barguet’s reconstruction and attribute the traces of Amenmesse’s Horus name to the left wall when the traces on the right wall fit better. Coincidently, Gauthier, *Livre des rois*, 3: 128 6B, records an attestation of Amenmesse’s Horus name at Karnak similar to that found on the bandeau text in question. Unfortunately, he notes that the exact provenance at Karnak is undetermined.
17. Seventh Pylon doorway at the Temple of Karnak: king receives *heb-sed* (figure 5.19-21)\textsuperscript{126}

Location: *in situ*

Transliteration: \([mn-mf]-R^e \ [stp.n-R^e] [Jmn-ms-s \ hq^j-W^st]\

Translation: \([Menmi]re \ [Setepenre] \ [Amenmesse, Ruler of Thebes]\

Figure 5.19. Seti II receives *heb-sed* from Amun-Re from the west wall of the Seventh Pylon Doorway. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.
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Discussion and Comments on Number 17

On the west wall of the Seventh Pylon doorway at the Temple of Karnak, scenes portray Thutmose III being led to Amun-Re by Horus and Thoth and then the act of Amun-Re embracing Thutmose III. Beneath this is a scene of a seated Amun-Re bestowing heb-sed to a kneeling Seti II with Mut standing behind Seti II, and Khonsu standing behind Amun-Re (figure 5.19). Directly behind this heb-sed scene are two statue niches with the titulary of Thutmose III above and on either side of the niches. Between these niches are the Horus name, prenomen, and nomen of Seti II (figure 5.21) with an additional prenomen of Seti II to the left of the second niche. A closer examination of this wall reveals traces of usurpation by Seti II of the cartouches belonging to the heb-sed scene as well as to the cartouches flanked by the Thutmose III niches.

---

127PM² 2: 169 (498d) and plan 14; Nelson, KG 82-84; Barguet, Le Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 270-71; Legrain, “Rapport sur les travaux exécutés à Karnak,” 278 [B-D]. See also Chicago Oriental Institute photos 6222-23.

128Legrain, “Rapport sur les travaux exécutés à Karnak,” 278 [B-D]; Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 270-71 note 1; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 156. PM² 2: 169 (498d), claims the titles between the niches are those of Merneptah, but the cartouches are clearly those of Seti II. Most commentary has been on the heb-sed scene but these cartouches between the niches seem to have escaped discussion until now.
These scenes proved problematic for the eventual usurpation and recarving by Seti II in that they were carved in granite, a hard stone not easily reworked without effort.\textsuperscript{129} Because of the hard nature of granite, any attempts at usurping a granite relief is characterized by “deep pitting of the surface, achieved by pecking at the relief.”\textsuperscript{130} The original cartouches were chipped or pecked away with some effort, and then the surface smoothed or carved down leaving behind a new area for Seti II’s titles. Even though Seti II commenced this effort at erasing Amenmesse’s titles, his workers left behind enough traces to show that the scene and associated cartouches were not originally Seti II’s but those of Amenmesse.

\textsuperscript{129}The stone on this part of the Seventh Pylon was identified as granite by Legrain, “Rapport sur les travaux exécutés à Karnak,” 278.

On the *heb-sed* scene featuring a king kneeling before Amun-Re and Khonsu, the cartouches above the kneeling king figure reads *wsr-hprw-RꜢ mrj-Jmn Sthy mrj.n-Pth* “Userkheperure Meryamun Seti-Merneptah,” but an examination of the cartouches reveals that the entire cartouche has been recut and recarved for Seti II (figure 5.21). The top register line is missing in the area of the cartouches indicating that the cartouches had to be chipped away in order to recut them, and in the process, Seti II’s workmen found it necessary to remove the register line to adequately erase the top of the cartouche. Further indications of this chipping and erasure can be seen by the cartouche containing Seti II’s prenomen. To the right of the cartouche bearing the prenomen *wsr-hprw-RꜢ mrj-Jmn*, is a line of titulary reading *nb tꜢwj nb ḫw* “Lord of the Two Lands, Lord of Appearances.” A
very large gouge cuts through the vertical register line separating Seti II’s prenomen from this titulary and is a trace left from the chipping of the original Amenmesse cartouche from the granite surface.

Figure 5.21. Cartouches of Seti II located on the Seventh Pylon Doorway. Photo courtesy of Kevin Johnson.
Despite their best efforts, Seti II’s workers could not remove all traces of Amenmesse’s name or were merely careless in their work as a trace of Amenmesse’s prenomen still exists on the Seventh Pylon. The large cartouches of Seti II between the niches of Thutmosis III (figure 5.21) features a seated figure of Amun-Re holding the signs of life and dominion (śnḥ and wšs) to the Horus figure belonging to the Hḥ kꜣ-nḥt mrj-Rc Horus name of Seti II. Careful examination of the Horus name reveals a dip in the surface just below the kꜣ-nḥt signs, indicating that the surface has been chipped and smoothed down for the insertion of Seti II’s Horus name. However, there is no trace of Amenmesse’s Horus name to be found, and the remainder of the text beyond Seti II’s mrj-Rc is missing.

Behind the Horus name of Seti II are his prenomen and nomen lying within two cartouches topped by solar plumes. The cartouches read wsr-hprw-Rc mrj-Jmn Sṭḥy mrj.n-Pḥ [dj śnḥ mj] Rc “Userkheperure Meryamun Seti-Merneptah, given life, like Re.”131 Within the prenomen cartouche a larger solar disc lies beneath the smaller solar disc of wsr-hprw-Rc (figure 5.21). With this trace of Amenmesse’s prenomen, the original cartouche once read [mn-mj]-Rc [stp.n-Rc] and indicates that the heb-sed scene and the cartouches on the west wall of the Seventh Pylon doorway once belonged to Amenmesse.

131 Although the wall below the cartouches is very damaged today, Oriental Institute photo 6223 shows that traces of the signs comprising dj śnḥ mj Rc existed when the photo was taken. Examination of photos taken of this scene in December-January 2009 reveals that the Rc sign of mj Rc still exists beneath Seti II’s nomen allowing the reconstruction given.
18. Grey Granite Block Statue of the High Priest of Amun Roma-Roy from the Cour de la Cachette Karnak (figure 5.22)\textsuperscript{132}

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo CG 42186, JE 36648

Discussion and Comments on Number 18

Discovered during Legrain’s 1904 excavations in the Cour de la Cachette, this grey granite block statue now in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (CG 42186, JE 36648)
represents the High Priest of Amun (*hm-ntr tpj n Jmn*) Roma-Roy. It was one of three statues of Roma-Roy found during Legrain’s excavations in the *Cour de la Cachette*, but these other two statues either do not contain any cartouches of the king(s) Roma-Roy served under (CG 42185, JE 36989) or date to the reign of Merneptah (JE 37874). On CG 42186, all cartouches on the statue appear erased except for the prenomen of Ramesses II (*wsr-M\u00e9t-R\u00e9 stp.n-R\u00e9*) on the right side. However, during an examination of this statue in the 1970s, Frank Yurco and Rolf Krauss detected previously

---


unrecognized traces of Amenmesse’s name in a cartouche on the left side of the statue.

The cartouche is badly battered, but reads leading to the reading of nb hibre Jmn-

[ms-s hq3-W3st] "Lord of Appearances, Amen[messe Ruler of Thebes]."136

19. Calcite Statue of Amun and Amunet usurped by Amenmesse from the Cour de la Cachette137

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE 37528

Discussion and Comments on Number 19

Among the more recent cataloging projects at the Egyptian Museum in Cairo is an inventory of all statues discovered by Georges Legrain in the Cour de la Cachette at the Temple of Karnak. This calcite statue usurped by Amenmesse (JE 37528) has somehow escaped mention in the literature associated with the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II until its recent online publication. The statue, which mainly consists of the lower part of a seated group statue, portrays Amun and Amunet, his consort, and has Amenmesse’s cartouches upon it reading mn-mj-Rê stp.n-Rê mrj-Jmn Jmn-Rê-ms-s hq3-W3st “Menmire

136KRI 4: 208-209; RITA 4: 150-51; Iskander, 382; Frood, 48-50; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 155, 158; Lefebvre, Inscriptions concernant les grands prêtres d’Amon, 20-23; Legrain, Statues et statuettes, 2: 53, and plate 48; Schulz, 1: 280-81, 2: plate 67c-d. The only publication of this new reading is in Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 155, 158, who relays his reading made with Frank Yurco along with information provided by Lanny Bell. Lefebvre, Inscriptions concernant les grands prêtres d’Amon, 26-27, suggests the erased cartouches on this statue to be those of Siptah based on traces he allegedly saw on an erased cartouche on the left shoulder. Kitchen in RITA 4: 150-51, decides to restore the name of Amenmesse in all the erased cartouches but only conjecturally in brackets.

Setepenre Meryamun, Amenmesse, Ruler of Thebes." JE 37528 is described as being usurped by Amenmesse, but it is unclear if any traces survive from the earlier king’s name.

West Bank of Ancient Thebes

20. Stelae at Seti I Mortuary Temple at Qurna (figures 5.23-24)

Location: in situ

138 Coulon and Jambon, “CK 939: Group Statue of Amun and Amunet.” JE 37528 is also described as having the numbers “K 43 (sic) et N 306” associated with it.

139 Ibid. Also unclear is if Amenmesse’s cartouches contain the usual titles before his cartouches such as nswt bjtj, nb t3wy, z3-Rc and so on.

Figure 5.23. Southern stela of Amenmesse in the mortuary temple of Seti I about December 2008-January 2009. Photo courtesy of Betty Schneider.
Figure 5.24. Northern stela of Amenmesse in the mortuary temple of Seti I about December 2008-January 2009. Photo courtesy of Betty Schneider.
Discussion and Comments on Number 20

On the west bank of the Nile in ancient Thebes, Amenmesse carved two stelae upon the portico of the mortuary temple of Seti I at Qurna that are located on either side of the main entry from the portico into the hypostyle hall of Seti I’s mortuary temple.\footnote{PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 409 (14-15) and plan 40 [1]; Nelson, Kurnah 21, 33; KRI 4: 195-97; RITA 4: 139-41; Caminos, “Two Stelae,” 17; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 154, 158.} The left, or southern, stela (figure 5.23) is very badly damaged today, and the only known epigraphic records of it were made by Richard Caminos and Kenneth Kitchen long after the text on the stela began to disappear. The stela shows a king wearing a \textit{khepresh} crown offering \textit{maat} to Amun-Re, Mut, Khonsu, and another King who could be Seti I or Ramesses II due to a preserved \textit{Ra} sign at the top of the damaged cartouche above the king.\footnote{PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 409 (14) and plan 40 [1]; Nelson, Kurnah 21; KRI 4: 195-96; RITA 4: 139-40; Caminos, “Two Stelae,” 17-23 and plate A.} The right, or northern, stela (figure 5.24) in about the same state of perseveration today as the left stela shows a king, again wearing the \textit{khepresh}, receiving the \textit{khepesh} sword (\textit{hp\text{"}{\textsh}}) from Amun-Re, who is followed by Queen Ahmose-Nefertari, Seti I, and Ramesses II.\footnote{PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 409 (15); Nelson, Kurnah 33; LD 3: 201c; LDT 3: 91-92; KRI 4: 196-97; RITA 4: 140-41; Caminos, “Two Stelae,” 24-28, and plate B; Gauthier, \textit{Livre des rois}, 3: 128; Petrie and Walker, \textit{Qurneh}, 13, and plate 45; Schulman, “Take for Yourself the Sword,” 276, and 290 figure 13.}

These stelae have been described as having “no artistic merit whatsoever” and bearing formulaic religious rhetoric “of the dullest sort possible.”\footnote{Caminos, “Two Stelae,” 17.} Despite these criticisms, these two stelae relate to the reign of Amenmesse and the late Nineteenth Dynasty as his titles were carved upon the stelae before they were recut by at least two other kings, one
being Siptah. On the left stela (figure 5.23), two frame lines border the central portion of the stela containing the main text and the scene of the king offering maat. Amenmesse’s Horus name *mrj-M3\textsuperscript{t} smn-t3wy* is intact in the left frame line while it is largely lost due to damage to the sandstone surface on the right.\(^{145}\) Following the Horus names on the left and right frame lines are the prenomen and nomen of Amenmesse. On the left frame line, the preserved traces of Amenmesse’s prenomen \([mn-mj]-R^c stp[n]-R^c\) are recut for Siptah’s prenomen \(3h-n-R^c stp.n-R^c\) by erasing the \(mn\) and \(mj\) signs and carving Siptah’s \(3h\) and \(n\) signs onto plaster, which has fallen out since Siptah’s reign.\(^{146}\) The following nomen on the left frame line reads \(Jmn-R^c-ms-[s hq\textsuperscript{3}-W\textit{ist}]\) and does show signs of erasure but all traces of presumably Siptah’s nomen are lost.\(^{147}\)

The right frame line of the left stela presents something of an oddity. The preserved traces of the prenomen read \([mn-mj-R^c]-stp.n-R^c\) but were replaced at a later date by \(mn\) and \(M3\textsuperscript{t}\) signs suggesting a nomen reading \(mn-M3\textsuperscript{t}-[R^c]\), which is the prenomen of Seti I, while the nomen following this prenomen reads \([Jmn]\)-\(R^c-[ms-s hq\textsuperscript{3}]-W\textit{ist}].\(^{148}\)

\(^{145}\) *KRI* 4: 195; *RITA* 4: 139; Caminos, “Two Stelae,” 20, and plate A.

\(^{146}\) *KRI* 4: 195, 345; *RITA* 4: 139, 249; Caminos, “Two Stelae,” 20, and plate A. In contrast to Caminos, Kitchen in *KRI* 4: 195, suggests restoring the additional element *mrj-Jmn* to Amenmesse’s prenomen on both frame lines making the prenomen read \([mn-mj]-R^c stp[n]-R^c [mrj-Jmn]\). Cartouche reconstructed using Caminos, “Two Stelae,” 20, and plates A-B.

\(^{148}\) *KRI* 4: 195 note 9\textsuperscript{a}; Caminos, “Two Stelae,” 21, and plate A. Caminos records no traces of Siptah’s prenomen or nomen here, but does not discount that Siptah’s nomen could have been carved into plaster placed over Amenmesse’s nomen that later fell off.
The main text of the left stela shows further signs of erasures at least twice indicating two kings decided to usurp this stela from Amenmesse. One of those kings is Siptah, and the name of the other king is undetermined due to damage and indistinct traces of the titulary belonging to the second king. Over the king offering maat, Siptah carved his $\text{ lh}$ and $n$ signs over the erased $mn$ and $mj$ signs of Amenmesse’s prenomen much like the prenomen on the frame lines. Further in the main body of the text, Amenmesse’s cartouches show signs of usurpation, but still retain clear traces of his name to show that his name was the first name in the cartouches before being usurped by Siptah. In every instance of Siptah’s usurpations in the main text, Siptah altered Amenmesse’s prenomen to reuse the $\text{stp.n-Rc}$ elements and replace the first part with $\text{ lh-n-Rc}$. The one exception to this is about line seven of the main text where a preserved cartouche reads $\text{Jmn-Rc-ms-s hq3-W3st}$. The signs in this cartouche near the bottom of the stela shows no signs of recurring or usurpation and is therefore one of the few original Amenmesse cartouches to escape usurpation on the left stela.

On the right stela (figure 5.24), Amenmesse’s Horus name $\text{mrj-M3t smn-t3wy}$ has been replaced by two different Horus names, one being Siptah’s Horus name and the other a bit puzzling. On the left frame of the right stela, Siptah carved his Horus name $\text{wr-phtj-mj-Jmn}$ after erasing Amenmesse’s Horus name, and

---

149 Caminos, “Two Stelae,” 21-22. All that remains of the second usurpation are the traces of the titles “Lord [of the Two Lands]” ($\text{nb [t3wy]}$) and “Lord [of Appearances]” ($\text{nb [h3w]}$) before the prenomen and nomen with all other signs having been lost when the plaster they were cut into fell off.

150 Ibid., 22-23.

151 Ibid., 23; KRI 4: 196.
at a later date, Amenmesse’s prenomen that follows the Horus name on the left frame line was altered to \( mn-M\tilde{s}t-R\), the prenomen of Seti I, but the nomen, even though erased, still bears clear traces of Amenmesse’s name.\(^{152}\) The Horus name on the right frame line was equally altered to \( nb-h\tilde{3}bw-sd-mj-\text{Tttnn} \) with the following nomen altered to suit Siptah.\(^{153}\) This change of Horus names presents a unique problem as to whom exactly these Horus names on the second stela belong to.

The Horus name \( nb-h\tilde{3}bw-sd-mj-\text{Tttnn} \) on the right frame line of the right stela was definitely cut over Amenmesse’s Horus name, suggesting that this might be another Horus name for Amenmesse, yet his normal Horus name is preserved on the first line of the main text as \( mrj-M\tilde{s}t snn-[t\tilde{w}y] \). One suggestion is that the Horus name of \( nb-h\tilde{3}bw-sd-mj-\text{Tttnn} \) might be a change in titulary late in Amenmesse’s reign, and this appears in older sources as occurring at the Temple of Karnak in untraceable contexts.\(^{154}\) A better suggestion is that this is an otherwise unattested Horus name of Siptah, and this fits in with his pattern of usurpations on these stelae from Amenmesse. The problem with this is that this same Horus name is also

---


\(^{153}\) KRI 4: 196, 345; RITA 4: 140-41, 249; Caminos, “Two Stelae,” 24-25, and plate B.

\(^{154}\) Caminos, “Two Stelae,” 24. Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 128, and E. A. Wallis Budge, The Book of the Kings of Egypt, vol 1, Dynasties I-XIX (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1908), 190, place \( nb-h\tilde{3}bw-sd-mj-\text{Tttnn} \) as a Horus name of Amenmesse but merely give the Temple of Karnak as the provenance. Nevertheless, attributing this Horus name to the Temple of Karnak may be in error as Budge, Book of the Kings of Egypt, 1: 190, gives LD 3: 201 as the source for Amenmesse possessing the Horus name \( nb-h\tilde{3}bw-sd-mj-\text{Tttnn} \), and that Lepsius’ reference is to the Seti I temple at Qurna not the Temple of Karnak.
attested as a Horus name for Ramesses III on a door fragment from the eastern fortified
gate at Medinet Habu.\textsuperscript{155} The only conclusion is that \textit{nb-h³bw-sd-mj-T³tnn} is not a
variant Horus name of Amenmesse, as any evidence for him having this Horus name is
probably non-existent, but rather belongs to Siptah, or more appropriately, Ramesses III
who would be the second usurping king on this stela but whose name was not preserved.

Concerning the name of Seti I that replaces that of Siptah and Amenmesse in a few of
the cartouches, Flinders Petrie thought that it was an attempt by Amenmesse to change
his prenomen to that of Seti I in “a bad play on words.”\textsuperscript{156} A far simpler explanation is
that these cartouches were purposely done in the Twentieth Dynasty, perhaps by
Ramesses III, to either suppress the names of Amenmesse or Siptah, considered by the
Twentieth Dynasty Kings to be illegitimate, or an attempt to honor the memory of Seti I
by carving his prenomen over those considered to be usurpers or illegitimate kings.\textsuperscript{157}

The remainder of the main text on the right stela presents similar evidence of Siptah
usurping the prenomen and nomen of Amenmesse except on the right stela Siptah’s
nomen of \textit{mrj(n)-PtH z³-PtH} over the figure of the king receiving the

\textsuperscript{155}Kitchen suggests \textit{nb-h³bw-sd-mj-T³tnn} as a variant Horus name for Siptah in \textit{KRI} 4: 345,
\textit{RITA} 4: 249. For this variant Horus name as that of Ramesses III, see Beckerath, Köngsnamen,
164-65 H9; Uvo Hölscher, \textit{The Excavation of Medinet Habu}, vol. 3, \textit{The Mortuary Temple of
Oriental Institute Publications, vol. 54 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1941), plate
35B. Uvo Hölscher, \textit{The Excavations of Medinet Habu}, vol. 4, \textit{The Mortuary Temple of Ramses
III}, part 2, trans. by Elizabeth B. Hauser. The University of Chicago Oriental Institute
Publications, vol. 55 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951), 8 note 20, amends the
discovery of this piece as inside the Twenty-Second Dynasty tomb of Horsièse at Medinet Habu.
For the tomb of Horsièse, see PM\textsuperscript{2}1, part 2: 772; Uvo Hölscher, \textit{The Excavations of Medinet

\textsuperscript{156}Petrie, \textit{History of Egypt}, 3: 126.

\textsuperscript{157}Caminos, “Two Stelae,” 26.
hpš is better preserved than any corresponding nomen cartouche on the left stela. The remainder of the main text resembles the religious rhetoric of the left stela in strengthening Amenmesse’s prestige in the eyes of the gods and the people, but one line of text became disassociated from its religious significance and interpreted as a historical inscription pertaining to the late Nineteenth Dynasty royal family.

On lines five and six of the main text on the right stela, it states that Amenmesse, the king who first erected and inscribed the stela, was raised by Isis in Akhbit “to be ruler of all that the sun-disc encircles.” Because of this statement and the association of Siptah with this stela, early research into the history of the late Nineteenth Dynasty took this statement to mean Amenmesse and Siptah formed a rival branch of the royal family who came from Akhbit in the Delta. Although enticing at the time, such rhetorical statements should not be taken as literal history as Akhbit is linked to accounts of the god Horus as a youth in the marshes of the Egyptian Delta. Such parallelism is in keeping with the tradition of ancient Egyptian kings associating with the god Horus while they ruled and need not be taken as the literal hometown of Amenmesse and Siptah.

---

158 KRI 4: 196, 345; RITA 4: 141, 249; Caminos, “Two Stelae,” 26-27, and plate B.

159 KRI 4: 197; RITA 4: 141; Caminos, “Two Stelae,” 27.

160 Eisenlohr, 377-78; Maspero, History of the Ancient Peoples, 2: 439 note 4; idem, “King Siptah and Queen Tauosrit,” xiv-xv; de Rougé, Étude sur une stele égyptienne, 186-87; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 75.

161 Maspero, History of the Ancient Peoples, 2: 439 note 4, 254 note 2; idem, “King Siptah and Queen Tauosrit,” xvii-xviii.
21. Limestone stela base near the Ramesseum

Location: Currently Unknown

Discussion and Comments on Number 21

In 1888, George Daressy published this fragmentary stela base once located “200 meters behind Ramesseum.” It was last seen and commented on by Georg Möller during excavations carried out in Western Thebes by the Berlin Museum in 1911 and 1913, and its current whereabouts today is unknown. Three fragmentary lines of text as recorded by Daressy contain rhetorical comparisons evoking Montu, Ptah and Sekhmet in the name of Amenmesse whose name was preserved intact as

\[ mn-mj-R^e \ stp.n-R^e \ Jmn-ms-s \ hq3-W\textit{st}. \]

Of interest is that Amenmesse evidently usurped this stela because Daressy states that the preserved cartouches of Amenmesse show signs of being cut over those of another king whose name was not recorded or the visible traces were not enough to be able to reconstruct the

---


164 Anthes, “Deutschen Grabungen auf der Westseite von Theben ,” 22; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 154. Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse: Nachträge,” 180, states that Möller recorded this stela in his Grabungstagebuch on 11 February 1911, and based on Möller's notes there had been some damage to the text in the intervening years since Daressy’s publication in 1888.

165 KRI 4: 197; RITA 4: 141-42.
original name in the cartouches.\textsuperscript{166} This stela might have been usurped by Amenmesse for erection in his mortuary temple somewhere in Western Thebes, but there is currently no known site on the West Bank of Thebes identified as a mortuary temple belonging to Amenmesse.\textsuperscript{167} Thus, while this stela of Amenmesse was usurped, it remains unclear as to who this stela originally belonged to, where it was erected, and its current whereabouts.

That Amenmesse may have begun a mortuary temple is suggested by a graffito (number 321) in Western Thebes referring to a \textit{hwt} (?)-\textit{mn-mj-R\textsuperscript{\textdegree} stp.n-R\textsuperscript{\textdegree} n\texttt{h-dj-s}}\textsuperscript{168} “Mansion (?) of Menmire Setepenre, LPH” with no mention of where such a temple might be located. Wolfgang Helck suggests Amenmesse’s mortuary temple is the [\textit{hwt nt hhw}] \textit{m rnp t n nswt bj[tj...[m pr J]mn hr jmnt W3st “[Mansion of Millions] of Years of King of Upper and Lower Egypt...[in the Estate of A]mun in the West of Thebes” mentioned on the Bilgai Endowment Stela in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (JE 43341).\textsuperscript{169} Although tempting to restore Amenmesse’s names in the erased cartouches on


this monument, the mention of the Steward (jmy-\(r\) \(pr\)) \(\text{Paibes},\) known from jar inscriptions from Siptah’s mortuary temple, and the erasure of the name of a \([t^3jrt-p^5t]\) \(\cap t n t^3\ nb\) “[the] Great [‘Princess’] of the Entire Land” points to this stela being a monument dating to the time of the reigns of Siptah and Tausert, which lies beyond the scope of this current study.\(^{170}\)

22. Cartouches on Osiride pillar base at the Ramesseum (figures 5.25-26)\(^{171}\)

Location: \(\text{in situ}\)

Discussion and Comments on Number 22

Of all the known monuments belonging to Amenmesse in the Theban area, this inscription differs from inscriptions where his prenomen and nomen were erased before recarving. This Amenmesse inscription on the base of one of the Osiride pillars at the Ramesseum, the mortuary temple of Ramesses II, has been usurped by a later king but

\(^{170}\)Davies, \(\text{Egyptian Historical Inscriptions of the Nineteenth Dynasty},\) 342. Helck, “Datierung des Papyrus Greg,” 211-12, bases his arguments on the premise that Tausert was not a member of the royal family, hence she could not be a \(jrt-p^5t\), but Takhat, mother of Amenmesse, could use this title given her genealogy as a possible daughter of Ramesses II. The problem with this suggestion is that the name of Takhat was never erased, just any mention of her being the mother of Amenmesse. For Paibes, see Wolfgang Helck, “Zur Geschichte der 19. und 20. Dynastie,” 49; \(\text{KRI}\) 4: 343, 368; \(\text{RITA}\) 4: 247, 267.

not by mere erasure (figures 5.25-26). Amenmesse’s prenomen and nomen cartouches were plastered over before carving the names of a later Ramesside king over them.\textsuperscript{172}

Figure 5.25. Usurped prenomen of Amenmesse at the Ramesseum. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.

On the north-west portico of the second court of the Ramesseum, Amenmesse carved his name over the cartouches of an inscription of Merneptah on the west face of an Osiride Pillar. The text reads

\[
\text{nswt hjtj nb t3wy mn-mj-R\textsuperscript{c} stp.n-R\textsuperscript{c} mrj-Jmn z3-R\textsuperscript{c} nb h5w Jmn-R\textsuperscript{c}-ms-s hqj-W3st [mry] Jmn-R\textsuperscript{c} nb nstw [t3wj]} \quad \text{“King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands, Menmire Setepenre Meryamun, Son of Re, Amenremesse, Ruler of Thebes, [Beloved of] Amun-He, Lord of the Thrones [of the Two Lands].”}
\]

Much later, during the Twentieth Dynasty, a later Ramesside ruler came along and plastered over Amenmesse’s prenomen (figure 5.25) and nomen (figure 5.26).

---


174*KRI* 4: 197; *RITA* 4: 142; *LD* 3: 219c; *LDT* 3: 130; Brand, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 33-34; Gauthier, *Livre des rois*, 3: 128; Helek, *Ritualdarstellungen des Ramesseums*, 79; Leblanc et al., 45, 67 number J20a. In this case, Amenmesse usurped only the prenomen and nomen of Merneptah, \(b3-n-R\textsuperscript{c} mrj-Jmn mrj.n-Pth htp-\textit{hr-M\textsuperscript{2}t}\), by plastering over the cartouches and then carving his titles over them.
much in the same manner as Amenmesse had done so to Merneptah’s name. The later Ramesside king carved $R^5$-ms-s mrj-Jmn over the newly applied plaster in the nomen, and Jmn and $R^5$ in the prenomen, but the plaster has fallen out of the prenomen leaving behind the palimpsests of Merneptah and Amenmesse.175

23. Doorway Dedications on Small Thutmosid Temple at Medinet Habu (figure 5.27)176

Location: in situ

Figure 5.27. Medinet Habu Small Temple doorway dedication corresponding to PM$^2$ 2: 466 (38a); Nelson, MHB 212; LD 3: 202a. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.

175KRI 4: 197 note 11 suggests that the third name in the nomen is that of Ramesses IV, and the preserved traces do fit his nomen unless the final name was a later attempt to change the offending nomen to that of Ramesses II who also shared the same elements in one of his variant names. The prenomen is reconstructed, if indeed that of Ramesses IV, plausibly as $[wsr-M^3t]-R^5$ [stp.n]-Jmn or $[hq3-M^3t]-R^5$ [stp.n]-Jmn. Leblanc et al., 45, 47, 210, does not reconstruct the traces of the third nomen as $R^5$-ms-s mrj-Jmn but takes mrj-Jmn to be part of Amenmesse’s full nomen of Jmn-ms-s hq3-Wist mrj-Jmn. This cannot be supported by the collations of Kitchen in KRI 4: 197, and Richard Lepsius in LD 3: 219c, and LDT 3: 130.

Discussion and Comments on Number 23

Of all the known monuments and inscriptions belonging to Amenmesse, this inscription on the small Thutmosid temple at Medinet Habu can be considered one of the few spared from total erasure or recarving by Seti II or a later king. The Amenmesse inscription on the south door jam is beneath restoration inscriptions of Horemheb and Seti I and reads

\[
\text{nswt bjtj nb t\textasciitilde{\text{\textasciicircum}}wy mn-mj-R^\text{e} stp.n-R^\text{e} mrj-Jmn z\textasciitilde{\text{\textasciicircum}}-R^\text{e} Jmn-ms-s hq\textasciitilde{\text{\textasciicircum}}-W^\text{3st mrj-R^{e} dj }^\mathcal{N}nh \text{“King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands, MenmIRE}
\]

Setepenre Meryamun, Son of Re, Amenmesse, Ruler of Thebes, Meryamun, Given Life (figure 5.27).\textsuperscript{177} The text on the north jamb is virtually identical except for a mistake in carving the \textit{mrj} sign for the \textit{mn} sign in the prenomen, and the omission of the \textit{mrj} sign in the nomen resulting in the variant \textit{Jmn-R^e-ms-s hq\textasciitilde{\text{\textasciicircum}}-W^3st}.\textsuperscript{178} It can only be surmised that these two doorway inscriptions went unnoticed during the suppression of Amenmesse’s name during the reign of Seti II and later kings thereby allowing his inscriptions at the Thutmosid temple to survive into the present.

\textsuperscript{177}PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 466 (38a); Nelson, MHB 212; LD 3: 202a; KRI 4: 197; RITA 4: 142; Gauthier, \textit{Livre des rois}, 3: 127; Hölscher, \textit{Excavation of Medinet Habu}, 2: 19, and plates 13, 20B; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 154. McClain, 192-93, suggests that although these Amemnesse inscriptions are not restoration inscriptions in the strictest sense, these brief titles and cartouches might suggest an attempt to at least begin a renewal of the Thutmosid temple. Hölscher, \textit{Excavation of Medinet Habu}, 2: 19 note 19, suggests that Amenmesse may have taken a role in restoring the Thutmosid decorations erased during the reign of Akhenaten.

\textsuperscript{178}PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 466-67 (38b); Nelson, MHB 213; LDT 3: 154; KRI 4: 197; RITA 4: 142; de Rougé, \textit{Inscriptions hiéroglyphiques copiées en Égypte}, plate 148.
24. Cartouche at Roman Portico before First Pylon of Thutmosid Temple at Medinet Habu

Location: in situ

Discussion and Comments on Number 24

Not much information is available concerning this cartouche of Amenmesse, which itself is in a secondary context. The cartouche is described as belonging to a block “built-in” the Roman Portico before the First Pylon of the Thutmosid Temple at Medinet Habu. Sources are unclear if it is a prenomen or nomen on the block, and if the block is part of a larger construction from somewhere else on the West Bank of Thebes or a reused block from perhaps the Thutmosid Temple.

26. Theban Relief of Vizier Khaemtjtry Usurped by Vizier Preemheb

Location: Oriental Institute, Chicago OI 10816; See also Turin N. 50246 (Suppl. 6136) below

Transliteration: \[mn]-m[j]-Ra
\[stp.n-Ra\]
\[mrj-Jmn\]
overcut by \[wsr-hprw-R\]

\(^{179}\)References: PM² 2: 462 (7) and plan 44; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 154.

\(^{180}\)Ibid.

Discussion and Comments on Number 26

In the collection of the Oriental Institute at the University of Chicago (OI 10816) is part of a stela or perhaps a tomb scene purchased in Cairo during 1920 but recorded as coming from Thebes showing the upper torso of a bald-headed vizier with his fan tucked under his left arm as he raises both hands in adoration. The upper part of the scene preserves just the sandaled feet of a figure, possibly a king or the vizier once again, before a pedestal containing a divine image. The preserved inscription includes a royal cartouche reading \textit{wsr-hprw-R$^\text{c}$ [stp.n-R$^\text{c}$] mrj-Jmn}, which is the full prenomen of Seti II, but it has been written in an erased cartouche containing traces of \textit{[mn]-m[j]-R$^\text{c}$ [stp.n-R$^\text{c}$] mrj-Jmn} that happens to be Amenmesse’s full prenomen. This shows that the vizier who is portrayed on this monument served under Amenmesse, but the cartouche was changed to that of Seti II upon his restoration.

What is most interesting is that the vizier this piece originally was made for was disgraced due to his association with Amenmesse and the reestablishment of Seti II upon the throne. The titles of the vizier read \textit{t$\text{\`y}$ hw hr wnmj-nswt jmj-r nwt t$j$tj p$3$-R$^\text{c}$-m$hb$ m$3$ hrw} “Fanbearer on the King’s Right, City Governor, Vizier, Preemheb, Justified.” Preemheb is a vizier associated with the later part of Seti II’s reign, but his name has been cut into plaster, now fallen away, placed over an earlier name. The earlier name was

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{183} \textit{KRI} 4: 206 note 11$^a$, claims that \textit{[mn]-m[j]-R$^\text{c}$} was reworked into \textit{wsr-hprw-R$^\text{c}$} and the final part of the titulary \textit{[stp.n-R$^\text{c}$] mrj-Jmn} was left intact as these parts of the prenomen were shared by both Amenmesse and Seti II. Aidan Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 48 note 50, claims the cartouche was “deeply, and roughly, hacked out” before inscribing Seti II’s titles.
  \item \textbf{184} \textit{KRI} 4: 206 note 13$^{a-a}$, 281; \textit{RITA} 4: 148-49; Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 47, 48 note 50; idem, \textit{Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy}, 54-55, 62; Habachi, “King Amenmesse and
\end{itemize}
}
that of a person named ḫˁ-m-t-trj “Khaemtjtry” bearing the same titles of tꜣy hw ḫr wnmj-
nswt jmj-r nwt tꜣtj. Khaemtjtry, previously attested as the Viceroy of Nubia, evidently became promoted to vizier from the office of viceroy under the reign of Amenmesse and then became dismissed from the position upon Seti II gaining or regaining control of the throne. Such a scenario would explain the erasures and usurpations of monuments belonging to Khaemtjtry especially usurpation of relief OI 10816 by the Vizier Preemheb under Seti II.

---

185 Černý, review of Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reiches, 142, claims that Preemheb’s name is overcut by that of Khaemtjtry, but Habachi, “King Amenmesse and Viziers Amenmose and Kha’emtore,” 64, clearly establishes Khaemtjtry as the person whose name was on the block first as his signs “fit with the style of the remaining inscription” while Preemheb’s inscription is “crudely carved, being done over an earlier inscription.” For Preemheb, see entry concerning his Wadi Hammamat inscriptions in chapter 6 dealing with the Monuments of Seti II.

186 Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 54-55, 62; Habachi, “King Amenmesse and Viziers Amenmose and Kha’emtore,” 64-65, 66-67. A third Khaemtjtry is described as a sš mš “Army Scribe,” and sš nfrw n nb tβwy “Scribe of Recruits of the Lord of the Two Lands” on a stela in the British Museum (BM 139) from the reign of Merneptah, but it is unclear if this is Viceroy and later Vizier Khaemtjtry in an earlier stage of his career. For more on Army Scribe Khaemtjtry, see KRI 4; 124-25; RITA 4; 94-95; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 29; Iskander, 378-79. For Khaemtjtry as viceroy, see Habachi, “King Amenmesse and Viziers Amenmose and Kha’emtore,” 59-60, 64-67; idem, “Königsohn von Kusch,” in Lexikon der Ägyptologie, vol. 3, Horhekenu-Megeb, ed. Wolfgang Helck and Wolfhart Westendorf (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1980), 634; idem, “Viceroyts of Kush during the New Kingdom,” in Sixteen Studies on Lower Nubia (Caire: Imprimerie de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1981), 165-66; Spalinger, review of Elephantine-Stele des Sethnakht, 273-76, and further comments in chapter 6 dealing with the Monuments of Seti II.
26. Usurped Deir el-Medina relief (see also OI 10816 above)\textsuperscript{187}

Location: Egyptian Museum, Turin N. 50246 (Suppl. 6136)

Discussion and Comments on Number 26

In the Egyptian Museum of Turin, a fragmentary relief shows the lower part of a kneeling figure worshipping several broken lines of text.\textsuperscript{188} The name in the preserved cartouches is that of Seti II, but clear traces of Amenmesse’s Nebty name, and his prenomen and nomen exist beneath the usurpations of Seti II. On the first line of the relief, Seti II carved \textit{nht hpš} “Strong of Arm” over Amenmesse’s Nebty name of \textit{[nbty] wr-bj3wt-m-Jptswt} “[Two Ladies], Great of Marvels in Karnak” creating a new variant Nebty name for Seti II \textit{nht-hpš-m-Jptswt} “Strong of Arm in Karnak.”\textsuperscript{189} On the third line, the prenomen is lost, but the usurped nomen cartouche preserves traces of \textit{[Jmn-m]s-s [hq3-W2st]} “[Amenmesse, Ruler of Thebes]” beneath \textit{Sthy mrj.n-Pth} “Seti


\textsuperscript{188}KRI 4: 198; RITA 4: 142-43; Aidan Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 121 note 33, 125 note 52; idem, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 47 note 47; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 154; Tosi and Roccati, 202-203, 355. PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 714, describes this relief as “Sethos II with goddess, censing before Amun-Re and [Ptah],” which appears to be a description of an entirely different relief as there is no trace of Amun-Re or Ptah on this fragment.

\textsuperscript{189}KRI 4: 198; RITA 4: 142; Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 125 note 52; Tosi and Roccati, 203, 355. Kitchen, in KRI 4: 198, RITA 4: 142, restores the Horus name of Amenmesse here as \textit{[Hrw k3 nht mrj-Mf3t smn-t3wy]} “[Horus, Mighty Bull, Beloved of Maat, Who establishes the Two Lands].”
Merneptah.” The very last preserved line again has the prenomen and nomen of Seti II

\[ wsr-hprw-R\] \[ mrj-Jmn Sthy mrj.n-Pth \] carved over that of Amenmesse with only

Amenmesse’s nomen \[ Jmn \] -ms-s \[ HoA-WAst \] being fully preserved.\(^{191}\)

The exact location where this fragmentary relief was discovered is uncertain other than the publication of this piece states that it came from Ernesto Schiaparelli’s 1905 excavations at Deir el-Medina.\(^{192}\) Aidan Dodson suggests that it might be part of Amenmesse’s constructions at the Oratory of Ptah and Meretseger on the path from Deir el-Medina to the Valley of the Queens since Schiaparelli did work in this area but definitive evidence to link this relief to the oratory is lacking.\(^{193}\) Frank Yurco suggests that his analysis of Turin N. 50246 (Suppl. 6136), shows it matches a relief fragment of

\(^{190}\)KRI 4: 198; RITA 4: 142; Tosi and Roccati, 203, 355. On this relief, Amenmesse’s nomen is written here in an unusual variant with \( hq\text{-}W3st \) placed between the \( ms \) sign and the double door bolt \( s/z \) as found on a shrine at Amarah West. See further comments in the description for that monument.

\(^{191}\)Ibid. For this final prenomen, Tosi and Roccati, 203, record no traces of Amenmesse’s prenomen but record a \( mrj \) sign and a trace of a seated god sign that appears to be Amun, which would be a unique writing of Seti II’s prenomen epithet using the Amun sign and not the usual \( Jmn \) grouping. Alternatively, Kitchen in RITA 4: 142 suggests that this prenomen preserves a trace of Amenmesse’s \( stp.n-R^c \) as he reconstructs the prenomen as \([mn-mj-R^c \ mrj-Jmn]\) \( stp.n-R^c \) but not in KRI 4: 198. The drawing of the text and published photograph of the relief in Tosi and Roccati, 203, 355, is clear in that the prenomen on the last line preserves traces of \( mrj-Jmn \) and not \( stp.n-R^c \). The preserved Amenmesse nomen here is much like the nomen described above in that \( hq\text{-}W3st \) is placed in between the \( ms \) sign and the double door bolt \( s/z \).


\(^{193}\)Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 125 note 52. For the Oratory of Ptah, see PM\(^1\) 1, part 2: 706-709; Bernard Bruyère, Mert Seger à Deir el Médineh, Mémoires publiés par les membres de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire, vol. 58 (Caire: Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1930), 5-48; Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 120-25.
the Vizier Khaemtjtry usurped by the Vizier Preemheb that is now in the Oriental Institute in Chicago (OI 10816). If Turin N. 50246 (Suppl. 6136) did indeed come from Ernesto Schiaparelli’s excavations at Deir el-Medina in 1905, then there is a strong possibility that relief OI 10816 came from there as well. The question as to if the monument these reliefs came from is a tomb or stela remains uncertain.

27. Chapel G Oratory of Ptah King, Vizier, and Workman before Gods (figure 5.28)

Location: *in situ*

Figure 5.28. Chapel G at the Oratory of Ptah. From Bruyère, *Mert Seger*, plate 7. Used with permission of the Institute Français d’Archéologie Orientale.

---

194 Yurco, “Was Amenmesse the Viceroy of Kush, Messuwy?” 56, repeated by Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 47 note 47, based on Yurco’s observations, but no further information as to how this identification was made ever appeared.

Discussion and Comments on Number 27

On the path between Deir el-Medina and the Valley of the Queens lies the Oratory of Ptah and Meretseger consisting of a series of rock cut chapels, numbered A-G, containing relief and stelae dedicated to various gods. Chapel G contains a badly damaged scene showing several gods before a king, a vizier, and a workman from Deir el-Medina (figure 5.28). On the left hand side of the scene stands Isis offering to Osiris, then Isis, Min-Kamutef, Horus, son of Isis, Re-Harakhty, Ptah, and Amun-Re. Directly in front of Amun Re stands the damaged figures of a king followed by the “City Governor and Vizier (jmj-r nwt t3ty) Amenmose (Jmn-ms) and “The Chief Workman in the Place of Truth, and Superintendent of Works,” (3-n-jst m st-m3t jmj-r k3t) whose name is lost. It is highly debatable if the “Chief Workman in the Place of Truth” portrayed here is

196PM² 1, part 2: 706-709.


198KRI 4: 198; RITA 4: 143; Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 122-23. Even though the Vizier’s name is lost, Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 122, points out a single J is preserved from the Jmn grouping in the Vizier Amenmose’s name allowing for the restoration. Aiding this restoration is that an offering table with Vizier Amenmose’s name was found in a pit dug in Chapel G. Kitchen in RITA 4: 143, restores additional titles of “[(?)]Hereditary Noble and Count (?)]” (jry-p’t h3ty-) before those of “City Governor and Vizier,” but the recorded traces in Bruyère, Mert Seger, plate 7 are too indistinct. For more on Vizier Amenmose see KRI 4: 204-206; RITA 4: 147-48; Černý, review of Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reiches, 143; Habachi, “King Amenmesse and Viziers Amenmose and Kha’emtore,” 57-67; Helck, Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reichs, 326-27, 459.
either Hay IV, or Neferhotep the Younger, two of the known bearers of this title from this
time period, because traces of any name for the chief workman are definitely lacking on
the monument.¹⁹⁹

Equally of interest are the cartouches surrounding the figure of the king. The king is
shown standing before Amun-Re, and directly over the staff Amun-Re holds are two
cartouches. The formulaic titles nswt hjtj nb ḫwy nb ḫw are intact, but the prenomen and
nomen are erased except for a single R sign in the prenomen.²⁰⁰ The remaining Re sign
can only be the remains of Amenmesse’s prenomen [mn-mj]-Ṛ, as he is the only king
whose titles and image would warrant erasures. An alternate suggestion might be that
these cartouches originally contained Seti II’s titles [wsr-hprw]-Ṛ before erasure and
reuse by Amenmesse, as he could reuse the Re element in his titulary, but the Vizier
Amenmose has been linked to Amenmesse’s reign exclusively and negates this
suggestion.²⁰¹

---

¹⁹⁹ For Hay IV and Neferhotep the Younger, sometimes described as Neferhotep II, see Davies, 
Who’s Who at Deir el-Medina, 19-21, 31-34. For the title and office of “a-n-jst m st-mṣt”, literally
“Great One of the Gang in the Place of Truth,” see Černý, Community of Workmen at Thebes, 44,
121-32.

²⁰⁰ KRI 4: 198; Bruyère, Mert Seger, 46-47, and plate 7.

²⁰¹ For Amenmose, see KRI 4: 204-206; RITA 4: 147-48; Habachi, “King Amenmesse and
Viziers Amenmose and Kha’emtore,” 57-67.
28. Tomb KV10 in the Valley of the Kings (figures 5.29-30)\textsuperscript{202}

Location: \textit{in situ}

Discussion and Comments on Number 28

The tomb of Amenmesse, KV 10, in the Valley of the Kings is perhaps the largest surviving monument from Amenmesse’s reign next to the gateway at the Sixth Pylon of the Temple of Karnak.\textsuperscript{203} During his brief reign of nearly four years, Amenmesse constructed a tomb at least half the length compared to those belonging to his immediate predecessors in the Nineteenth Dynasty Ramesses II and Merneptah. What is even more commendable is that the tomb was very nearly completely decorated from entrance to chamber F before work finished with the end of Amenmesse’s reign, and this decoration includes carving raised and sunk relief on the walls along with painting and plastering of the walls and ceiling.\textsuperscript{204} KV 10 is located in the central part of the Valley of the Kings


\textsuperscript{203}For a plan of KV 10 see PM\textsuperscript{1} 1, part 2: 510, now superseded by Weeks, ed., \textit{Atlas of the Valley of the Kings}, sheet 24-25; idem, “KV 10-Amenmeses,” in \textit{Atlas of the Valley of the Kings}.

\textsuperscript{204}Schaden and Ertman, 145.
with the Twentieth Dynasty tomb of King Ramesses III, KV 11, directly adjacent to KV 10 on the west and the Nineteenth Dynasty tombs of Ramesses I and Seti I, KV 16 and KV 17, directly up the wadi to the east.\textsuperscript{205} The location of KV 10 may show some affinity to the founders of the Nineteenth Dynasty as not only is KV 10 located directly west of the tombs of Ramesses I and Seti I, but the tombs of Ramesses II and Merneptah, KV 7 and KV 8, are located to the north of KV 10. The location of KV 10 in relation to KV 7 and KV 8 may be more than fortuitous as Amenmesse may have been trying to indicate genealogical ties to his immediate predecessors Ramesses II and Merneptah through Amenmesse being the son or grandson of either of these two kings.\textsuperscript{206}

Archaeologically, KV 10 has only received somewhat limited investigations by the earliest explorers in the Valley of the Kings. Richard Pococke seems to be the first to note and map KV 10 during his visit to the valley in 1737-1738, and it received mention by Napoleon’s scholars as part of the \textit{Description de l’Égypte}. After these brief notices, KV 10 was investigated and explored in the 1820s and 1840s by James Burton, John

\textsuperscript{205}For the location of KV 10 in the center of the Valley of the Kings see PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: plan 2; Weeks, ed., \textit{Atlas of the Valley of the Kings}, sheet 3. Interestingly enough, the workers building KV 11, originally the tomb of Sethnakht before Ramesses III claimed it for himself, misjudged the distance between KV 10 and KV 11 resulting in room D of KV 11 colliding with unfinished room Fa of KV 10. The workers building KV 11 then changed the axis of the tomb in order to prevent further collisions with KV 10. For more on this collision see Dodson, \textit{After the Pyramids}, 116-17; Ertman, 40; Reeves and Wilkinson, 150-51, 159; Romer, \textit{Ancient Lives}, 85-86; Schaden, “Amenmesse Project Report,” 1-9; Schaden and Ertman, 118; Thomas, \textit{Royal Necropoleis of Thebes}, 110-11; Weeks, ed., \textit{Atlas of the Valley of the Kings}, sheet 24 (KV 10), sheet 26 (KV 11); idem, “KV 10-Amenmeses: Side Chamber Fa”; idem, “KV 11-Rameses III: Corridor D1a.” in \textit{Atlas of the Valley of the Kings} (January 2008). <http://www.thebanmappingproject.com/atlas/index_kv.asp> [21 May 2008].

Gardner Wilkinson, Robert Hay, and Richard Lepsius. About the only detailed epigraphic description of the tomb, besides the brief accounts of the researchers previously mentioned, is an investigation made by Eugène Lefèbure in 1883. Lefèbure attempted recording all visible relief in KV 10, which was not fully cleared when he began recording, and he could not penetrate into the tomb past room F. His “rough and ready” drawings, although seemingly crude by modern epigraphic standards and criticized endlessly by other researchers, is about the only record available of some scenes in KV 10 as a flood near the beginning of the Twentieth Century filled KV 10 further with debris thereby making access to the tomb nearly impossible and destroying much of what Lefèbure recorded. The last known record of any archaeological clearance, albeit a partial one at that, was in 1907 when Edward Ayrton briefly worked in room B to level some of the flood debris to allow the installation of another dining table because KV 10 was used as a place to eat lunch while visiting the Valley of the Kings.

---

207PM² 1, part 2: 517; Ertman, 38; Reeves and Wilkinson, 52-55, 61-63, 66, 150; Weeks, “KV 10-Amenmeses.”

208His work in KV 10 appeared in Lefèbure, Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes, 2: 81-86, and plates 55-57.

209Reeves and Wilkinson, 68. The most critical comments concerning Lefèbure’s work are in Romer, Valley of the Kings, 154, who describes Lefèbure as “utterly dedicated” to his work, but his “quick and often careless” epigraphy reflected “poor technique and lack of interest shown in any of the qualities of the relief” prevalent during his time. Ertman, 43, and Schaden and Ertman, 137, make note that Lefèbure evidently recorded the figures and text of the scenes he found in the tomb at different times or even from memory as some details were missing from his drawings when excavation within KV 10 in the 1990s allowed unhindered access to the tomb and the remaining decoration. Schaden, “KV-10: Amenmesse 2000,” 136, estimates that the decoration Lefèbure recorded was destroyed sometime in the interval 1885-1900 based on an analysis of flood deposited sand within KV 10.

210Reeves, Valley of the Kings, 104, 308, 334, 339; Reeves and Wilkinson, 150. However, Schaden and Ertman, 121, note in their investigations of KV 10 in 1992-1993, Ayrton cleared only the upper part of room B and removed enough of the remaining debris into room C “to form a roughly flat surface to serve as a work and storage space.” An archival photograph showing the
Full archaeological clearance of KV 10 began in 1992 under the direction of Otto J. Schaden as part of the Amenmesse Project, and work in KV 10 has revealed many interesting epigraphical, archaeological, and architectural details that pertain to Amenmesse’s reign and help clarify some long standing questions relating to KV 10 regarding its use and possible reuse.211

eating arrangements within KV 10, possibly after Ayrton’s brief 1907 clearance, is in Jan Morris, The Spectacle of Empire: Style, Effect, and the Pax Britannica (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1982), 227. Even though Ayrton made mention of his brief excavations, further evidence came to light in the 1990s that earlier explorers conducted some archaeological excavations in room F by probing and shifting the flood debris around in the back, or south, part of the room, around some of the pillars, and into room G. For more on these previously unknown excavations within KV 10, see Schaden, “Amenmesse Project Report,” 1; idem, “KV-10: Amenmesse 2000,” 132-33, 136; Schaden and Ertman, 136-37.

Currently, KV 10 is completely excavated except the stairs leading from room F to room G in the tomb. Its near complete clearance reveals several interesting architectural details linking KV 10 chronologically to previous Nineteenth Dynasty royal tombs built prior to KV 10. KV 10 resembles architecturally KV 8, the tomb of Merneptah, with the appearance of the decreased slope of KV 10’s passages and chambers evoking similar elements found in KV 7, the tomb of Ramesses II. To Eric Hornung, this is a concept called “extension of the existing” in which each ancient Egyptian king built upon the tomb design of his predecessors in the Valley of the Kings to create a new, unique tomb that was an amalgamation of old and new architectural design and construction but went beyond that which existed before.

Such concepts extended not only to royal tomb architecture and construction, but to wall decoration as well. KV 10 closely resembles KV 8 in that the entrance lintel, door jambs and the scene immediately inside the entrance in room B were carved in raised relief and the remaining walls of the tomb were carved in sunk relief. Decoratively, KV 10 follows existing ancient Egyptian concepts in the New Kingdom when it came to royal tomb decoration as the ancient Egyptian kings became Osiris in death, but hoped for rebirth much like the sun god Re did in his eternal cyclical voyage through the sky and the underworld. Re entered the underworld at dusk in his solar barque, traveled through its endless regions to rejoin his physical body so that he might be reborn again at

---

212 Dodson, After the Pyramids, 106-108; Reeves and Wilkinson, 150-51; Schaden, “Amenmesse Project Report,” 2; Schaden and Ertman, 145; Weeks, “KV 10-Amenmeses.”


214 Ertman, 40; Schaden and Ertman, 120-22; Thomas, Royal Necropoleis of Thebes, 110; Weeks, “KV 10-Amenmeses.”
dawn to begin the process anew.\textsuperscript{215} Each ancient Egyptian king then hoped to join in this nocturnal voyage of Re through the underworld because even though the king became Osiris at death, Osiris needs Re in order to achieve resurrection. As Eric Hornung describes the process, both Re and Osiris achieve resurrection through fusing with one another because each god needs the requisite force of the other as a catalyst to make the act of resurrection happen.\textsuperscript{216} Therefore, Amenmesse hoped to achieve this resurrection by carving the details of Re’s nocturnal voyage through the ancient Egyptian underworld upon the walls of KV 10 so that he might participate in this act and become like Re and Osiris.

Continuing with the theme of “extension of the existing” when it comes to royal Nineteenth Dynasty tomb design, a sloped staircase descends down to the entrance of KV 10. Labeled A on plans, this staircase features a ramp in the center with stairs on either side that is often referred to as a sarcophagus slide as it probably facilitated moving heavy objects, like sarcophagi, into the tomb.\textsuperscript{217} This entrance stair was part of what the ancient Egyptians called a “God’s Passage” (\textit{st\textasciitilde ntr}) referring to the path the king and Re take in the underworld, or in this case, the sloping entry stairs are “The God’s Passage of the Way of Shu” (\textit{p\textasciitilde st\textasciitilde ntr n w\textasciitilde t S\textasciitilde w}) because the tomb entry was literally upon the open

\textsuperscript{215}For a summation of Re’s voyage through the ancient Egyptian underworld as described by the ancient Egyptian religious texts found on royal tombs, see Eric Hornung, \textit{The Ancient Egyptian Books of the Afterlife}, trans. by David Lorton (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1999).

\textsuperscript{216}Hornung, \textit{Ancient Egyptian Books of the Afterlife}, 140-42; idem, \textit{Valley of the Kings}, 87-94.

\textsuperscript{217}Schaden, “Some Observations on the Tomb of Amenmesse (KV 10),” 245; Schaden and Ertman, 118-19; Thomas, \textit{Royal Necropoleis of Thebes}, 107; Weeks, “KV 10-Amenmeses: Entryway A.” Although found on Nineteenth Dynasty tombs beginning with KV 7, the tomb of Ramesses II, Reeves and Wilkinson, 118-19 mention that this divided stairway first appears in Akhenaten’s tomb (TA 26) at Amarna.
Raised relief on the entrance lintel portrays the traditional motifs of the goddesses Isis and Nephthys worshipping a solar disc featuring the sun god Re in his nocturnal ram and morning beetle forms. The outside jambs feature the names and titles of Amenmesse, also in raised relief, while the inner door jambs contain the motifs of the goddess Maat kneeling over lilies, the heraldic plants of Upper Egypt, on the left and papyrus plants on the right (figure 5.29), representing the heraldic plants of Lower Egypt, in an symbolic east to west, and vice versa, arrangement of the tomb axis representative of the journey Re takes during both day and night. At some time after Amenmesse’s

---

218 Jaroslav Černý, *The Valley of the Kings: Fragments d’un Manuscrit Inachevé*, Bibliothèque d’Étude, vol. 60 (Cairo: Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire, 1973), 27; Demarée, “Royal Riddles,” 16 figure 1; Thomas, *Royal Necropoleis of Thebes*, 277-78. Hannig, 850, gives a full rendition of pꜣ sꜣ-nṯr ḏḏ jn (n pꜣ-Rꜣ) nj hr n wꜣt Šw “The First God’s Passage (of Re), which is upon the Way of Shu.”


Richard H. Wilkinson, “Symbolic Orientation and Alignment in New Kingdom Royal Tombs,” in *Valley of the Sun Kings: New Explorations in the Tombs of the Pharaohs*, ed. Richard H. Wilkinson (Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Egyptian Expedition, 1995), 76-77, and idem, “Symbolic Location and Alignment in New Kingdom Royal Tombs and Their Decoration,” 83-84, points out that this arrangement of the lily plants on the left and the papyrus plants on the right in the Nineteenth Dynasty symbolizes a south to north orientation as these plants would be in their symbolic geographic orientations even though in actuality this would be the east and west walls of KV 10. He further expands this symbolic orientation by pointing out the tomb axis in the Nineteenth Dynasty has the entrance being symbolically east and the burial chamber symbolically west indicative of the cyclical path of Re in an orientation he refers to as the beta alignment type. For more on this tomb orientation, see Wilkinson, “Symbolic Location and Alignment in New Kingdom Royal Tombs and Their Decoration,” 79-86; idem, “The Motif of the Path of the Sun in Ramesside Royal Tombs: An Outline of Recent Research,” *JSSEA* 25 (1995): 78-84; idem, “Symbolic Orientation and Alignment in New Kingdom Royal Tombs,” 74-81. Teeter, 41 note 52, believes the image of the goddess Maat is to reinforce her association with the god Re, her father. As Thomas, *Royal Necropoleis of Thebes*, 107, and Weeks, “KV 7-Rameses II,” point out, the motifs on the entrance lintel and jambs of KV 10 actually begin earlier with KV 7, the tomb of Ramesses II, and are standard among Nineteenth Dynasty tombs after Ramesses II.
reign, someone removed this raised relief of both text and figures of the gods leaving behind a “ghostly outline” of the original scenes.221

Figure 5.29. The goddess Maat on KV 10 doorjamb. From LD 3: 202e.

Continuing into KV 10 is room B, “The Second God’s Passage” (p3 stβ-ntr 2nw), where on the left was once carved a scene showing Amenmesse before Re-Harakhty

221Dodson, After the Valley of the Kings, 106.
presenting him with life, stability, and dominion (figure 5.30) followed by another scene portraying the frontispiece of the Litany of Re showing a solar disc containing Khepri and the ram headed nocturnal form of Re vanquishing the denizens of the underworld darkness.\textsuperscript{222} The relief style changes in room B with Amenmesse before Re-Harakhty and the frontispiece to the Litany of Re carved in raised relief and the following lines of text of the Litany of Re and all other decoration afterwards being in sunk relief.\textsuperscript{223}

Decoratively, the scene of Amenmesse before Re-Harakhty closely resembles that found in KV 8, the tomb of Merneptah. The scene, carved in raised relief that is now mostly shaved from the wall, was most likely carved by the same workers that had built KV 8 as the traces of Amenmesse’s pleated clothing shows “no decrease in artistic quality from the reliefs of earlier kings of the Nineteenth Dynasty.”\textsuperscript{224} Much like the similar scene in KV 8, Amenmesse wore an elaborate atef crown but much of the wall where Amenmesse’s head is was damaged at some time in the past leaving behind just a trace of the atef.\textsuperscript{225}

\textsuperscript{222}For “The Second God’s Passage” and its variant attestations, see Černý, \textit{Valley of the Kings}, 28; Demarée, “Royal Riddles,” 16 figure 1. For the Litany of Re, see Eric Hornung, \textit{Das Buch der Anbetung des Re im Westen (Sonnenlitanei), Nach den Versionen des Neuen Reiches}, 2 vols. Aegyptiaca Helvetica 2-3 (Genève: Éditions de Belles Lettres, 1975-1977); idem, \textit{Ancient Egyptian Books of the Afterlife}, 136-47.

\textsuperscript{223}PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 518 (2-3); KRI 4: 200; RITA 4: 144; Dodson, \textit{After the Pyramids}, 106-108; Ertman, 40; Lefèbure, \textit{Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes} 2: 83; Reeves and Wilkinson, 150-51; Schaden and Ertman, 122-25; Thomas, \textit{Royal Necropoleis of Thebes}, 110-11; Weeks, “KV 10-Amenmeses: Corridor B.”

\textsuperscript{224}Ertman, 40.

\textsuperscript{225}Compare the drawing of the scene in KV 10 from Schaden and Ertman, 123, to pictures of a similar scene from KV 8 in Hornung, \textit{Valley of the Kings}, 95 plates 56-57, and 99 plate 67.
Eric Hornung suggests that Seti II desecrated the memory of Amenmesse through ordering KV 10’s decoration and text removed to deny Amenmesse his desired existence.
in the ancient Egyptian underworld. Even though the relief and text was removed from the walls of rooms A and B in KV 10, it appears a mostly half-hearted effort went into the task of removing Amenmesse’s decoration if the goal was to indeed attack Amenmesse’s name. On the western thickness of the room B doorjambs there still are “virtually untouched” cartouches, which one would not normally expect to find in a damnatio memoriae. The ceiling of room B preserves traces of decoration indicating that it contained vultures flying inwards into the tomb along with Amenmesse’s cartouches, and these traces appear undamaged. Added to these anomalies are several columns of the Litany of Re in sunk relief on the left wall of room B with the text continuing on the right with more traces of Amenmesse’s cartouches. Further back in room B, just before the doorway leading into room C, is a prenomen and two nomen cartouches of Amenmesse bearing clearly readable signs of

\[
\begin{align*}
mm-mj-[R^e] & \text{ stp.n-R^e mrj-[Jmn]} \\
Jmn-R^e-mn-s & \text{ hq}^3-W3st
\end{align*}
\]

with the second nomen cartouche reading \[
\begin{align*}
\text{nswt-[bjtj]} & \text{ [Jmn-R^e-ms]-s hq}^3-W3st.
\end{align*}
\]

---


227 Schaden and Ertman, 122; *KRI* 4: 200; *RITA* 4: 144.

228 Wilkinson, “Motif of the Path of the Sun in Ramesside Royal Tombs,” 79, points out that in Nineteenth Dynasty tombs these vultures fly into the tomb to reinforce the motif of the king and Re’s descent into the underworld.

229 *KRI* 4: 200; *RITA* 4: 144; Lefèbure, *Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes*, 2: 83; Schaden and Ertman, 125; Weeks, “KV 10-Amemneses: Corridor B.” Thanks also to Dr. Otto Schaden, personal email communication 20 November 2010, for his clarification concerning the jambs.

230 Schaden and Ertman, 122, and 124 figure 4.
Continuing into room C, “The Third God’s Passage” \((p\ddagger\; st\ddagger\; nfr\; 3nw)\), more scattered traces of Amenmesse’s decoration occurs upon the walls. On the inner jambs, a prenomen cartouche on the left, battered by flooding but not erasure, still reads \(Jmn-R^n ms-[s]\; hq3-W\ddagger st\). Also evident on the thickness of both jambs to room C are two scenes of Amenmesse before Hathor, which may show ancient signs of recutting.\(^{231}\) Further into the corridor are two “trapezoidal” niches on each wall containing further traces of the Litany of Re as well as representations of the seventy-five eastern and western forms of Re referred to in the Litany.\(^{232}\) These niches were called “The Sanctuaries in which the Gods of the East and West Repose” possibly due to ritual statues resting in the niches but more likely, according to Eric Hornung, named because of the eastern and western forms of Re carved in these niches.\(^{233}\)

In room D, “The Fourth’s God’s Passage” \((p\ddagger\; st\ddagger\; nfr\; 4nw)\) the left wall contains traces of the fourth hour of the Amduat and the right wall contains the fifth hour in an arrangement first seen in KV 8 that is counter to the arrangement seen in royal tombs at the beginning of the Nineteenth Dynasty.\(^{234}\) The forth and fifth hours of the Amduat represents the land of Rosetau that Sokaris, god of the Memphis necropolis, rules.

\(^{231}\) Schaden and Ertman, 130, and plate 5; Weeks, “KV 10-Amenmeses: Gate C.”

\(^{232}\) Lefèbure, \textit{Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes}, 2: 83-84; Schaden, “Amenmesse Project Report,” 2; Schaden and Ertman, 129; Weeks, “KV 10-Amenmeses: Corridor C.”

\(^{233}\) Eric Hornung, \textit{The Tomb of Pharaoh Seti I/Das Grab Sethos’ I} (Zürich: Artemis, 1991), 15, and 16-17 figures 5-6. According to ČernÝ, \textit{Valley of the Kings}, 28, and Hannig, 644, the niches are \(n3-\text{h}m\w n\ddagger \; htp\; n\ddagger-\text{nfr}\w j\ddagger bt\; jm.w\) and \(n3-\text{h}m\w n\ddagger \; htp\; n\ddagger-\text{nfr}\w jmnt\; jm.w\). See also Demarée, “Royal Riddles,” 16 figure 1.

\(^{234}\) Weeks, “KV 10-Amenmeses: Corridor D.” In KV 17 and KV 7, the tombs of Seti I and Ramesses II, the fourth hour of the Amduat is normally on the right wall of room D and the fifth hour on the left. For more, see PM², part 2: 506 (7-8), 508 (9-10), 536 (9-10); Kent R. Weeks, “KV 17-Sety I: Corridor D,” in \textit{Atlas of the Valley of the Kings} (January 2008) <http://www.thebanmappingproject.com/atlas/index_kv.asp> [21 May 2008]; idem, “KV 7-Rameses II: Corridor D.”; idem, “KV 8-Merenptah: Corridor D.”
Rosetau is a chaotic sandy crossroads where there is not enough water for Re to sail in his solar barque, so Re’s solar barque transforms into a fiery serpent to slither across the region. The fourth and fifth hours symbolically represent the need for Re to rest, or reenergize, in the netherworld as these hours are marked by the primeval darkness that Re’s light fails to brighten due to his weakening energy. The plastered ceiling in room D further portrays the landscape of the ancient Egyptian underworld through its decoration consisting of “white stars on a dark blue background,” found in other Nineteenth Dynasty tombs.

The architecture of room D expands upon that found in KV 8, the tomb of Merneptah. The two small rectangular niches raised above the floor at the end of room D in KV 8 became lowered closer to the floor in KV 10. These small niches were known as “Doorkeeper’s Rooms” (‘t frj-ỉ3) and are about one meter high and one meter wide making these niches big enough to hold a small guardian statue of a king or god used in the burial. When compared to the slope of the same room in KV 17, KV 7, and KV 8,}

---


237 Schaden and Ertman, 133. The stars on this dark blue background can be white or yellow as in KV 8. See as an example Weeks, “KV 8-Merneptah: Corridor D.”

238 Černý, *Valley of the Kings*, 28; Demarée, “Royal Riddles,” 16 figure 1; Hannig, 136; Schaden, “Amenmesse Project Report,” 4; Weeks, “KV 10-Amenmeses: Corridor D.” Upon inspection in 2001, these niches appeared to hold an average sized person if they squatted down and tucked their knees into their chest.
room D is for the first time in the Valley of the Kings completely level rather than a sloping passage as found in the tombs mentioned. Interesting enough, the first 1.5 meters of floor in room D was cut away and then filled in with rough stones and plaster. This could be one of two events encountered while workers were building KV 10. One possibility is that the workers encountered a patch of bad rock while excavating room G and decided to cut the rock away and then fill in the excavation with stones and plaster. The second possibility is that room D began construction as a sloping corridor like that seen in KV 7, KV 8, and KV 17, but the decision was made to make room D totally level instead. In the process of conversion from a sloping corridor to a level one, the floor then was filled in to cover over the earlier construction.

Beyond room D is room E or “The Hall of Waiting/Hindering” (tΔ wsht jsq). Room E is often referred to in literature as “The Well Chamber” because a deep shaft was normally dug into the floor as either a means of catching water that might flow into the tomb, deterring tomb robbers from penetrating into the deeper parts of the tomb, or perhaps served as a ritual representation of Rosetau, the realm of Sokaris, as seen in the fourth and fifth hours of the Amduat. In contrast to other early Nineteenth Dynasty

---

239 Weeks, “KV 10-Amenmeses: Corridor D.”


241 Černý, Valley of the Kings, 28, prefers “Hall of Waiting” as he feels that the king’s mummy waited here as part of the funerary ritual before being taken to the burial chamber. On the other hand, Thomas, Royal Necropoleis of Thebes, 278, and idem, “The ‘Well’ in King’s Tombs of Biban el-Molûk,” JEA 64 (1978): 81-82, prefers “Hall of Hindering” as this room essentially hindered or stayed progress further into to tomb.

242 According to Friedrich Abitz, Die Religiöse Bedeutung der Sogenannten Grabräberschächte in den Ägyptischen Königsgräbern der 18. Bis 20. Dynastie, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen, ed. Wolfgang Helck and Eberhard Otto, vol. 26 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1974) the shaft or well in room E has special significance in royal tombs as room D, immediately before room E, has the fourth and fifth hours of the Amduat carved upon its walls. Being that
tombs, the well was never excavated in KV 10, but the decoration of the room commenced as normally found in Nineteenth Dynasty royal tombs.\textsuperscript{243} Traces of Amenmesse’s titulary appears on the doorjambs leading into room E, and high on the right wall are fragmentary titles of Amenmesse with the cartouches reading $\text{mn-mj-}[R^c]$ $\text{stp.n-R^c}$ $\text{mrj-[Jmn]}$ $\text{[Jmn-R^c]}$-$\text{ms-s}$ $\text{HoA-WAst}$. The decoration in room E presumably followed that of KV 8 featuring the sons of Horus, Isis, Nephthys, Anubis, and Thoth but little more than the lower parts of the original scenes remain today.\textsuperscript{244} Despite their careful attention to the decorative scheme in room E, the ancient Egyptian workers miscalculated when cutting room E as it deviates from the center axis of the tomb and as a result, room E and the rooms after it in KV 10 begin to bend to the west due to these miscalculations.\textsuperscript{245}

these hours deal with the realm of Rosetau, the shaft in room E then becomes the physical representation of Rosetau that serves as an obstacle that the king and Re must overcome to achieve resurrection. In this same manner, see Thomas, “The ‘Well’ in King’s Tombs,” 80-83; Claude Vandersleyen, “Le sens symbolique des puits funéraires dans l’Égypte ancienne,” \textit{CdE} 50 (1975): 151-57.

\textsuperscript{243}Salima Ikram, “Nile Currents,” \textit{Kmt} 6, no. 3 (Fall 1995): 6-7; idem, “Nile Currents,” \textit{Kmt} 6, no. 4 (Winter 1995-1996): 8. The well shaft may have been carved only on the day of the king’s funeral after the lower rooms of the tomb were sealed off.

\textsuperscript{244}Schaden, “Amenmesse Project Report,” 3; Schaden and Ertman, 134-35, 134 figure 11; Weeks, “KV 10-Amenmeses: Chamber E.” In 2001, the author examined this room and found that the lower parts of Amenmesse’s original sunk relief scenes remained discernable consisting of feet, legs, and lower torsos. A few arms and possibly hands could be discerned with difficulty. For a comparison with similar scenes in KV 8 featuring the sons of Horus, Osiris, Anubis, Khery-Baqef, Isis, Nephthys, Serqet, Neit, and Thoth, see PM$^\text{2}$ 1, part 2: 508 (12-13); Weeks, “KV 8-Merenptah: Well Chamber E.”

\textsuperscript{245}This is best seen in Weeks, ed., \textit{Atlas of the Valley of the Kings}, sheet 24-25. A similar deviation from the tomb axis appears in room C, which bends to the west briefly, but this deviation was corrected back to the east in the construction of room D only to have the tomb axis deviate yet again in room E. A possible suggestion for these deviations from the tomb axis might be simple miscalculations or, better yet, careless work as Amenmesse may have been trying to finish his tomb in a rapid amount of time.
Directly after the “Well Chamber” comes room F “The Chariot Hall” ($t\, ws\dot h\, mr\dot kbt$) consisting of four pillars flanking a staircase with a sarcophagus slide leading to the lower parts of the tomb. Adjacent to room F was normally another pillared room Fa “Another Hall of Repelling Rebels” ($kt\, ws\dot h\, dr\, sbf$), but in KV 10 room Fa was barely begun before work ended in KV 10 except for the initial phase of roughly carving at least two pillars from the rock. The entrance jambs of room F feature Amenmesse’s names, and the walls of the room were once decorated with the fifth hour on the left and the sixth hour on the right of the Book of Gates dealing with measuring out a lifetime of existence and abundant fields to the justified dead, the capture of Apophis, a threatening serpent that tries to impede Re’s journey, and the passage of Re’s physical body deeper into the underworld carried by gods “Hidden of Arm.” The wall decoration culminated on the rear wall of chamber F with traces of a scene showing Amenmesse offering to Osiris and a standing female goddess, either Hathor or Isis, based on correlations with other Nineteenth Dynasty Royal Tombs. The pillars in room F of KV 10 are severely

---

246 Schaden, “Some Observations on the Tomb of Amenmesse (KV 10),” 248-50; Schaden and Ertman, 136-44; Weeks, “KV 10-Amenmeses: Pillared Chamber F.”; idem, “KV 10-Amenmeses: Side Chamber Fa.” According to Černý, Valley of the Kings, 29, and Thomas, Royal Necropoleis of Thebes, 278-79, “The Chariot Hall” probably served as the storage place in the royal tomb for the king’s chariots. Černý, Valley of the Kings, 29, also believes that “Another Hall of Repelling Rebels” was named because of scenes showing the punishment of Re’s enemies upon the walls of this room.


248 Schaden and Ertman, 141; Weeks, “KV 10-Amenmeses: Pillared Chamber F.” Compare with KV 17 where the king is led by Horus to a seated Osiris and standing Hathor to KV 8 and KV 15 where twin figures of the king offer to an enshrined Osiris. As room F is still unexcavated in KV 7, it is unknown if the tomb of Ramesses II is the transition from showing the king being led before Osiris to offering to him. For more, see PM 2, part 2: 506, 509 (17), 533 (17), 537 (16); Weeks, “KV 17-Sety I: Pillared Chamber F.”; idem, “KV 7-Rameses II: Pillared Chamber
damaged from flooding because the room was filled nearly to the ceiling with flood debris. In fact, during excavation several of the pillars had to be partially or totally rebuilt with newly cut limestone blocks. Some traces of decoration survive on these shattered pillars such as Amenmesse’s titles on the top of the inner faces of the pillars where flood debris did not reach as high. One such example shows Amenmesse’s nomen $Jmn-R^3-ms-s \overset{\circ}{hq}j-W^3st$ encircled by a cobra with a solar disc upon its head. The only definite decorated pillar faces to survive are on pillar 3 (Schaden pillar D) where a figure of Ptah stands on the front, or north, face of the pillar and on the left, or east, face of the same pillar contains traces of a standing figure, perhaps Osiris, with an offering stand.


According to Schaden and Ertman, 140-42 (pillar B), and 142 figure 13; Thomas, *Royal Necropoleis of Thebes*, 111; Weeks, “KV 10-Amenmeses: Pillared Chamber F (pillar 2).” During excavation of this pillar in 2000, this cartouche was placed aside and the shattered remains of the pillar removed, but not yet rebuilt. For more on this, see Schaden, “KV-10: Amenmesse 2000,” 132-33, and plates 2-3.

In a comparison with pillars in room F as found in other Nineteenth Dynasty royal tombs, Ptah is normally found on a pillar with Osiris, Anubis, Horus, Re-Harakhuty, or a figure of the king himself. Unfortunately, the published traces do not indicate exactly what
The remaining rooms in KV 10, rooms G and H, were the “First of the Opening” (tpḥ n wpt) and “The Other Second God’s Passage” (ḥpḥḥ ṣḥḥ-nḥḥ r-mḥḥ ḫ 2) that normally contained scenes of the Opening of the Mouth ritual as found in KV 17, KV 7, and KV 8. As discovered during archaeological excavations in the 1990s, rooms G and H were badly damaged by the floods that poured into KV 10 over the years, and it appears that rooms G and H were never decorated, at least for Amenmesse. The tomb ends with room H only being half excavated before work stopped, and it is uncertain if this is where work stopped when Amenmesse’s reign ended or perhaps if rooms G and H are entirely new constructions during a later phase of reuse of KV 10.

What makes the archaeological and chronological history of KV 10 so complex is that the original decoration in KV 10 was either totally removed, as at the entrance, or at best, haphazardly attacked if the case was to indeed erase Amenmesse’s existence in the afterlife. In many instances Amenmesse’s name was overlooked and shows no traces of erasure but does show signs of damage from the repeated flooding in KV 10. If damnation was the intended goal by Seti II, only Amenmesse’s name and figures needed

god is on the left face of this pillar. For a comparison, see PM² 1, part 2: 504, 509 (A, C), 528, 533 (A-D), 538 (A-D); Weeks, “KV 17-Sety I: Pillared Chamber F.”; idem, “KV 7-Rameses II: Pillared Chamber F.”; idem, “KV 8-Merenptah: Pillared Chamber F.”; idem, “KV 15-Sety II: Pillared Chamber F.”

Černý, Valley of the Kings, 31-32, and Demarée, “Royal Riddles,” 17 figure 2, have an alternate interpretation for this room as the “first (god’s passage) of the wp.t (zenith)” possibly because this room represents the apex of the sun’s nocturnal journey. For the Opening of the Mouth ritual in the tombs of Seti I, Ramesses II, and Merneptah, see PM² 1, part 2: 506 (11-14), 539-40 (23-28); Weeks, “KV 17-Sety I: Corridor G, Corridor H.”; idem, “KV 7-Rameses II: Corridor G, Corridor H.”; idem, “KV 8-Merenptah: Corridor G.”


When asked by this author in 2001, Otto Schaden suggested that rooms G and H may have been carved at a later date than the initial construction begun by Amenmesse as the proportions of G and H are off from those found in rooms B-F.
to be attacked and attacking the figures of the gods within KV 10 would not be needed unless Seti II had a vendetta against the gods depicted in KV 10. Concurrently, the removal of decoration in KV 10 would fit the criteria of reuse and adapting KV 10 for members of the royal family. In this case, two queens whose decorative scheme for their burial would not match that of Amenmesse’s, so the tomb decoration had to be removed or covered over for the new occupants.  

This reuse of KV 10 was for the burial of two royal women long assumed to be related to Amenmesse; namely, the “God’s Mother, Great King’s Mother” (mwt-nfr mwt-nswt wrt) Takhat and “Great Royal Wife, Lady of the Two Lands” (hmt-nswt wrt nbt-twy) Baketwerel, but they are now to be identified as the mother of Ramesses IX and the queen of Ramesses IX respectively.

Room E, originally decorated for Amenmesse was redecorated for the burial of “God’s Mother, Great King’s Mother” Takhat by plastering over the original Amenmesse decoration and either painting or carving and then painting entirely new scenes on the walls. The left wall contained [Ptah]-Sokar-Osiris on the front wall near the entrance into room E, then a scene showing Takhat offering to Atum, Horus, and Isis, with Anubis on the rear wall next to the entrance into room F. The right wall again contained Osiris on the front wall, then Takhat offering to Re-Harakhty and Anubis, Takhat offering nw jars, and then a figure of Horus-Iwnmutef on the rear wall. Much of this decoration was

---


256KRI 4: 200-201; RITA 4: 144-45; Dodson, “Takhats and Some Other Royal Ladies,” 224-25. For Takhat, mother of Ramesses IX, and Queen Baketwerel, wife of Ramesses IX, of the Twentieth Dynasty, see chapter 4 notes 120-22.

later destroyed in the floods that entered into KV 10 between 1885 and 1900 that washed this later plaster from the wall and exposed the earlier traces of Amenmesse’s decoration.\textsuperscript{258} Despite flooding destroying much of the Takhat decoration, a few traces survive such as Takhat’s painted cartouche on the rear wall, text of Isis on the left wall, and parts of Takhat’s titles of \textit{wsjr mwt-n\textsuperscript{t}r} on the right wall.\textsuperscript{259}

Room F was extensively redecorated for Queen Baketwerel with the pillars and the right and left walls featuring scenes from the Book of the Dead spell 17 showing Baketwerel in the presence of Anubis jackals, the sons of Horus, Serqet, and Mehit-weret.\textsuperscript{260} The rear wall showed a scene on the left of Queen Baketwerel offering to Osiris and Isis and another scene on the right showing the queen offering to Anubis and Hathor. Between these scenes on the rear wall was a scene of Anubis and Horus leading Queen Baketwerel before Isis and Osiris.\textsuperscript{261} These scenes were incised in fresh plaster applied over Amenmesse’s original decoration as evidenced by Queen Baketwerel’s decoration of pillar 3 (Schaden pillar D). Lefébure recorded painted figures of Hapy and Qebehsenuef on the front, or north, part of pillar 3 incised in plaster applied over that of the original Amenmesse decoration consisting of the god Ptah as the Ptah figure was

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{259}Schaden, “Amenmesse Project Report,” 2-3; Schaden and Ertman, 134-35.

\textsuperscript{260}PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 518 (6-7); KRI 4: 201; \textit{RITA} 4: 145; Lefébure, \textit{Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes}, 2: 85, and plate 56; Thomas, \textit{Royal Necropoleis of Thebes}, 111; Weeks, “KV 10-Amenmeses: Pillared Chamber F.”

\textsuperscript{261}PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 518 (8); LD 3: 202g; KRI 4: 201; \textit{RITA} 4: 145; Lefébure, \textit{Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes}, 2: 85, and plate 56; Thomas, \textit{Royal Necropoleis of Thebes}, 111; Weeks, “KV 10-Amenmeses: Pillared Chamber F.”
\end{footnotesize}
intact when room F was excavated in the 1990s. Likewise the traces of the fifth and sixth hours of the Book of Gates appear to have been merely plastered over in the course of redecorating the tomb for Queen Baketwerel as an undamaged “very Ramesside face” from one of the inhabitants of the Book of Gates still remains visible today. Much like the decoration in room E for Takhat, the Baketwerel decoration was largely destroyed except for a few traces found during excavation and a solitary image of Baketwerel still on the wall from the scene of Baketwerel being led by Anubis and Horus to Osiris and Isis.

The final component of the reuse of KV 10 was only discovered through excavating the lower rooms of KV 10. When rooms G and H were excavated, canopic jar fragments, faience curls, and parts of a human skeleton turned up along with several pieces of a sarcophagus lid and other burial goods such as animal bones from food offerings.

---

262 Lefébure, Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes, 2: plate 57; Schaden, “KV-10: Amenmesse 2000,” 133-36, and plates 4-8, 11; Weeks, “KV 10-Amenmeses: Pillared Chamber F.” The Ptah figure on pillar 3 (Schaden pillar D) was damaged when the pillar fragmented due to flooding, but it was not defaced indicating that the figure was intact and merely plastered over when room F was reused for Queen Baketwerel. Parts of Queen Baketwerel’s plaster decoration were found in the flood debris surrounding this pillar when it was finally excavated.

263 Thanks to Earl Ertman for showing this author the “Ramesside face” in 2001. For the Book of Gates, see Hornung, Ancient Egyptian Books of the Afterlife, 55-77; idem, Tomb of Pharaoh Seti I/Das Grab Sethos’ I, 122-32.

264 This surviving image of Queen Baketwerel is described rather poignantly in Ertman, 43-45; Schaden and Ertman, 137-40.

Upon further clearance and excavations, the material belonged to a Queen Takhat that had the titles of “King’s Daughter” (zḥt-nswt) on the canopic fragments and “Great Royal Wife” (ḥmt-nswt wrt) or merely “King’s Wife” (ḥmt-nswt) on the sarcophagus fragments. The faience curls, numbering well over 240 pieces found throughout KV 10, and not merely in the lower chambers, evidently belonged to a coffin or coffins belonging to the burial of Takhat. The human remains, consisting of a damaged skull and part of a mandible, were found directly on the floor of room H and belong to a female between the ages of 18-25 years at death. Due to the association of this skull and mandible to the Takhat material found in this part of KV 10, this most likely is all that remains of Queen Takhat after her burial was pillaged by tomb robbers.

As to the question that Amenmesse ever utilized KV 10 for his burial, the most logical conclusion is he was never buried in KV 10. No burial goods have ever been found in

Brock, “The Sarcophagus Lid of Queen Takhat,” 99; Schaden, “KV-10: Amenmesse 2000,” 130-31. The sarcophagus was usurped from a Queen Anketemheb (ḫngt-m-ḥb) who also possessed the title “Mistress of the Palace” (ḥnwt ḥṭ) and may be an otherwise obscure daughter of Ramesses II. Fore more on this Anketemheb, see Brock, “The Sarcophagus Lid of Queen Takhat,” 97-102; Ikram, “Nile Currents,” Kmt 11, no. 3 (Fall 2000): 7; Schaden, “KV-10: Amenmesse 2000,” 131.


Ikram, “Nile Currents,” Kmt 10, no. 3 (Fall 1999): 7; idem, “Nile Currents,” Kmt 11, no. 3 (Fall 2000): 7; Schaden, “KV-10: Amenmesse 2000,” 129-30, and plate 1. Schaden, “KV-10: Amenmesse 2000,” 130, points out that a skeletal human hand was found directly on the floor of room E during excavations and the estimated age of the person these bones belonged to matches the age estimate of the skull and mandible, so this is probably more remains of Queen Takhat.
KV 10 bearing the name of Amenmesse, and the overall unfinished nature of room Fa shows that work stopped in the tomb as soon as Amenmesse’s reign ended or Seti II gained control over the Theban region. The tomb was decorated from entrance A to pillared hall F with both raised and sunk relief, and the walls received their final layer of plaster and paint before work stopped. It now appears that any attempt at damnation by Seti II towards Amenmesse in KV 10 was done in an uncoordinated manner because examples of Amenmesse’s titulary are still evident on the walls of KV 10 and show signs of flood damage and not deliberate erasure. At a later time the decoration in KV 10, whether it was Amenmesse’s titulary or images of the gods were chiseled from the walls or covered over in plaster for the reuse of the tomb to bury Queens Takhat and Baketwerel in the Twentieth Dynasty.

29. Fragment of Sarcophagus (?) of Amenmesse found in the Tomb of Seti II, KV15

Location: Currently Unknown

Discussion and Comments on Number 29

Although excavations within KV 10 have not turned up any evidence for Amenmesse’s burial, Lefébure discovered a fragment at the entrance of KV 15, the tomb of Seti II, that might be a piece from Amenmesse’s sarcophagus. The white limestone

269However, see comments concerning a possible reuse of Amenmesse material in the tomb of Seti II in number 28 below. Rooms G and H may belong to the period of work stoppage when Amenmesse’s reign ended, as room H was only half completed, but rooms G and H have the added detail of being converted or possibly added for the burial of Queen Takhat as the proportions of these chambers do not quite match the others in KV 10. See also note 251 above.

fragment bore incised signs in blue, except a cartouche containing Amenmesse’s
prenomen [mn]-mj- Rc stp[n]-Rc on what appears to be the upper surface, where yellow
was used instead.271 Based on the horizontal and vertical nature of the inscriptions
present on this fragment, Lefèbure concluded that this was not a wall fragment but
belonged to a sarcophagus of Amenmesse. Exactly what happened to this piece is
unknown, as Lefèbure was the only person to mention such a fragment in the tomb of
Seti II, and it has not been described or turned up in any museum collection since his
description.272

If this fragment does belong to a sarcophagus of Amenmesse, it would be quite
interesting as it might help prove that Amenmesse did receive a burial in KV 10 but only
to have it disinterred by Seti II upon gaining control of the throne. In this scenario,
reusable burial goods of Amenmesse, such as sarcophagi, were transferred from KV 10 to
KV 15 for reuse by Seti II in his burial and perhaps this fragment came from a piece not
reinscribed in time for Seti II’s burial.273 Unfortunately, the loss of this piece presents
more questions than answers because it is not known if Lefèbure correctly identified this
fragment as coming from a sarcophagus or not.274

271PM2 1, part 2: 578; KRI 4: 202; RITA 4: 145; Lefèbure, Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes, 2:
154-55; Thomas, Royal Necropoleis of Thebes, 111.

272Lefèbure, Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes, 2: 154-55; Thomas, Royal Necropoleis of Thebes,
111.

273In this manner, see Bojana Mojsov, “A Royal Sarcophagus Reattributed,” BES 11
University, 1992), 191-99, who theorizes that the sarcophagus of Ramesses III in the Louvre,
Paris (D1; base) and the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge (E.1.1823; lid) originally belonged to
Amenmesse and was appropriated from his tomb in the Twentieth Dynasty. The arguments are
not too convincing as Aidan Dodson, “Was the Sarcophagus of Ramesses III Begun for Sethos
II?” 198, points out the inscriptions of Ramesses III on the lid are original and not usurped.

274Thomas, Royal Necropoleis of Thebes, 111.
Armant

30. Text on Thutmose III Pylon at Armant\textsuperscript{275}

Location: \textit{in situ}

Discussion and Comments on Number 30

On the east part of the Thutmose III Pylon at the temple of Armant, there is an inscription on the south face belonging to Amenmesse that has been usurped by Seti II, but the inscription originally belonged to Merneptah before its usurpation by Amenmesse.\textsuperscript{276} The east part of the Thutmose III pylon features six lines of text, the first three being an earlier inscription of Ramesses II. The next two lines, four and five, date to the end of the Nineteenth Dynasty as they feature the nomen and prenomen of Merneptah, Amenmesse, and Seti II.\textsuperscript{277} The beginning of the usurped Amenmesse inscription has been damaged by blocks inserted at a later time, probably in the Ptolemaic or Roman periods, but the surviving inscription reads [\textit{nswt bjtj nb} \textit{t3wy mn-mj-Rc stp.n-Rc [mrj-Jmn] z3-Rc Jmn-Rc-ms-s hq3-W3st mry MnJ(w) nb JwnJ “[King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the] Two Lands, Menmire Setepenre [Meryamun], Son of Re, Amenremesse, Ruler of Thebes, Beloved of Month(u), Lord of Armant.”\textsuperscript{278} The


\textsuperscript{276}PM 5: 157; \textit{KRI} 4: 202; \textit{RITA} 4: 146; Mond and Myers, 1: 162-63; idem, 2: plates 7, 87.

\textsuperscript{277}Mond and Myers, 1: 162. For the earlier inscription of Ramesses II, see \textit{KRI} 2: 712; \textit{RITA} 2: 468-69; \textit{RITANC} 2: 460-61.

\textsuperscript{278}\textit{KRI} 4: 202; \textit{RITA} 4: 146; Mond and Myers, 1: 162-63; idem, 2: plate 87.
inscription itself dates to the reign of Merneptah, but Amenmesse plastered over Merneptah’s prenomen and nomen before carving his name in the cartouches. Seti II came along after Amenmesse’s reign and carved his prenomen and nomen over Amenmesse’s thereby resulting in a triple palimpsest. To further consolidate his claim to the inscription on the pylon, Seti II carved an identical inscription beneath line containing the usurped Merneptah and Amenmesse cartouches.  

Tôd

31. Eighteenth Dynasty Kiosk at the Temple of Tôd (figure 5.31)

Location: in situ

---

279 Mond and Myers, 1: 162-63; idem, 2: plate 87. The line of text that is an original inscription of Seti II reads [nswt bjįt nb tšwy] wsr-hprw-Rš stp.n-Rš zš-Rš [Šty] mjt.n-Pṭḥ mry Mnt(w) nb Jwnj.

Discussion and Comments on Number 31

These inscriptions at Tod are on the base of the east and west pillars located at the southern entrance of the Thutmosis III bark shrine dedicated to the god Monthu (figure 5.31). These inscriptions are unlike the normal usurped inscriptions of Amenmesse.
found at Thebes in which the cartouches were erased first before inscribing them with new titles. The inscriptions at Tod are much like the inscription found at the Ramesseum in Thebes in that the cartouches were plastered over first and then a new prenomen and nomen carved into the plaster. Over time, the plaster has fallen away leaving the prenomen and nomen of the usurping king, namely that of Ramesses III, surcharged over the still readable prenomen and nomen of Amenmesse. At the southern entrance to the shrine, the south face of the east pillar reads \textit{nswt} \textit{htj nb t3wy mn-mj-R\textsuperscript{c} stp.n-[R\textsuperscript{c}] mrj-Jmn} “King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands, Menmire Setepen[re] Meryamun,” with Amenmesse’s prenomen later surcharged by the prenomen of Ramesses III \textit{wsr-Ms\textsuperscript{t}-R\textsuperscript{c} mrj-Jmn} “Usermaatre Meryamun” (figure 5.31).\textsuperscript{282} The south face of the west pillar reads \textit{z3-R\textsuperscript{c} nb h5w Jmn-Rc-ms-s hq3-Wist} “Son of Re, Lord of Appearances, Amenremesse, Ruler of Thebes” that was surcharged, again at a later date, by the nomen of Ramesses III \textit{Rc-ms-s hq3-Jwnw} “Ramesses, Ruler of Heliopolis” (figure 5.31).\textsuperscript{283} Seti II may have overlooked this inscription of Amenmesse being that it is on the lower part of the pillars at the southern entrance to the shrine, but Ramesses III made certain that the offending prenomen and nomen of Amenmesse was covered in plaster and then inscribed anew for him.

\textsuperscript{282}KRI 4: 202; \textit{RITA} 4: 145; \textit{KRI} 5: 339; Barguet, “Tôd. Rapport de Fouilles,” 97-98; Adam and Pierrat-Bonnefois, 70, 75, 126, and 71 figure 5.

\textsuperscript{283}Ibid.
Tell Edfu

32. Faience Jar from Tell Edfu

Location: National Museum Warsaw, Poland 138872

Discussion and Comments on Number 32

For years these five sherd fragments from a faience jar discovered during the 1937 Polish-French excavations at Tell Edfu remained in the National Museum in Warsaw, Poland (138872) without much interest by researchers. The excavators during the 1937 season initially identified the fragments as belonging to Ramesses III and published the fragments as such in the excavation report. By 2000, this identification had changed from the sherds belonging to Ramesses III to belonging to Amenmesse. Joanna Aksamit reexamined these fragments, and in reconstructing the design of the pot, Aksamit noticed the cartouche visible on one of the fragments read Jmn-Rc-ms-s hq3-Wjst “Amenremesse, Ruler of Thebes,” which is the nomen of Amenmesse not Ramesses III. In decoration and style, the reconstructed faience vase contains a lotus flower around the bottom of the vase, and lotus petals and mandrakes around the upper neck of the vessel. Amenmesse’s cartouche originally faced left, and it is uncertain from the preserved fragments if his


Bruyère et al., 133, and plate 40. Aksamit, 29 note 1, points out that the original excavations discovered eight pot sherds when compared to what is present today in the National Museum. This is easily explained in that joins were found among a few of the sherds thereby reducing the number of sherds from eight to five.

Aksamit, 29-30.
prenomen adjoined the nomen in a “back to back” arrangement. In style and shape, the Tell Edfu faience vase resembles somewhat the vase found at Riqqeh now in the Petrie Museum (UC 16064) in that both contained a lotus flower on the base, but in contrast, the Riqqeh vase has its cartouches encircled by flowers.

Regrettably, the exact context in which these Amenmesse jar sherds were found is unclear. The Amenmesse sherds were found in an excavation trench somewhere in the center of Tell Edfu, but the exact stratigraphic context was not recorded or is now lost. It would be interesting to know what context the Amenmesse sherds were found in, as tantalizing evidence suggests a large Ramesside pylon existed at Tell Edfu, and perhaps the Amenmesse vase had something to do with Late Nineteenth Dynasty constructions at the site.

287 Aksamit, 30, and 30 notes 3 and 5. Strangely, Photo 1 and 2 in Aksamit, 30-31, shows the signs in the cartouche facing right while Aksamit describes them facing left. The signs face left in Figure 1 on Aksamit, 30, so the photos must have gotten reversed somewhere before final publication.

288 Ibid., 30.

289 Ibid., 32.

290 Ibid., 31-33.
Nubia

33. Usurped Text on Colossus Buttress at Abu Simbel

Location: in situ

Figure 5.32. General view of colossus at Abu Simbel showing buttress under arm. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.

Discussion and Comments on Number 33

This Amenmesse inscription at the Great Temple of Ramesses II at Abu Simbel is found upon small blocks placed beneath the arm of the colossus adjacent to the entrance of the temple. During the later half of the Nineteenth Dynasty, this colossal statue of Ramesses II had become damaged, which resulted in repairs being carried out by stones being placed beneath the statue’s right arm in an attempt to shore it up. As preserved today, however, the Horus name and cartouches carved upon the blocks under the right arm are those of Seti II and reads

\[ Hr\ k3\ nht\ mrj-R^e\ ntr-nfr\ wsr-hprw-R^e\ mrj-Jmn\ z{i}-R^e\ S'hy\ mrj.n-Pth \]

“Horus, Mighty Bull, beloved of Re, The Good God, Userkheperure Meryamun, Son of Re, Seti Merneptah.”

Obviously, Seti II usurped the cartouches from an earlier king, but which king?

Kenneth Kitchen suggests that the blocks were originally repairs made by Ramesses II

---

292 PM 7: 100 (26); el-Achirie et al., 9 number D. 10, and plates 12, 26a-c; Barsanti and Maspero, 143; Habachi, “King Amenmesse and Viziers Amenmose and Kha’emtore,” 62.

making the Horus name and the prenomen and nomen cartouches his.\textsuperscript{294} What is puzzling about this suggestion is that Seti II never showed any animosity directed at Ramesses II through usurpation of his monuments but only usurped a monument if Amenmesse’s name was on it or the monument had been previously erased as in the case of the Cour de la Cachette reliefs. In fact, the inscription is that of Amenmesse, and the preserved traces read by Labib Habachi reads

\[
\text{Hr k3 nḥmt smn-tḥwy nṯr-nfr mn-}
\text{mj-Rꜣ stp.n-Rꜣ zꜣ-Rꜣ Jmn-ms-s mrj-Rꜣ “Horus, Mighty Bull, Who establishes the Two}
\text{Lands, The Good God, Menmire Setepenre, Son of Re, Amenmesse, beloved of Re.”}\textsuperscript{295}
\]

\textsuperscript{294}KRI 2: 753; RITA 2: 497; RITANC 2: 480-81; KRI 4: 275; RITA 4: 197. A theory also backed by el-Achirie et al., 9, and Desroches-Noblecourt and Gerster, 27, but see also the discussion for and against this identification in Hein, 34 note 148.

\textsuperscript{295}Habachi, “King Amenmesse and Viziers Amenmose and Kha’emtore,” 62 figure 3b; Hein, 34-35, 143; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmon (2. Teil),” 155; idem, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse: Nachträge,” 171; Beckerath, “Reihenfolge der Letzten Könige der 19. Dynastie,” 247, 251. It is interesting to note that the Horus name and the nomen of Amenmesse as found at Abu Simbel features two uncommon variants. First, \textit{mry-Mꜣꜣt} is missing from the Horus name, and second, the normal epithet \textit{ḥqꜣ-Wꜣꜣt} is not written in the nomen but \textit{mrj-Rꜣ} instead. Barsanti and Maspero, 141, also suggest that other repairs at the entrance into the Hypostyle Hall of Abu Simbel date to the reign of Seti II, so that would mean that these suggested repairs also might be originally those of Amenmesse.
34. Rock Stela of Mery at Abu Simbel number 22 (figure 5.33) 296

Location: in situ

Discussion and Comments on Number 34

To the south of the Temple of Ramesses II at Abu Simbel is a rock stela “set within a rectangular frame representing a doorway” dedicated by the jdnw (n) W3w3(t) mry “Deputy of Wawat, Mery.” 297 The stela (figure 5.33) shows a king wearing the White Crown, labeled as Seti II, smiting a Nubian prisoner with a mace while Amun-Re offers a khepesh (hpš) sword to the king. 298 The cartouches along the top and side frame lines are all those of Seti II with his prenomen and nomen reading wsrs-hprw-Rc mrj-Inn Shty mrj.n-Pth but they have been usurped from Amenmesse as the cartouches show clear signs of having been erased and then smoothed down, leaving behind a bowl-shaped


298PM 7: 118 (22); KRI 4: 207; RITA 4: 149-50; LD 3: 204e; LDT 5: 167; Champollion, ND, 1: 78; Habachi, “King Amenmesse and Viziers Amenmose and Kha’emtore,” 62-64 figure 4; Gnirs, 8-9 note 63; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 155; Myśliwiec, 120-21; Schulman, Ceremonial Execution and Public Rewards, 37-39, and figure 19; idem, “Take for Yourself the Sword,” 271-72, and figure 2.
depression, but there are still traces of Amenmesse’s prenomen reading

\[
[ mn-mj ] - R^\circ \text{ stp.n-R}^\circ \ [ mrj-Jmn ]
\]

under the prenomen of Seti II

\[
wsr-[ hprw ] - R^\circ \ mrj-Jmn
\]

along the top frame line.\(^{299}\) On the left jamb, the nomen of Seti II

\[
[ Sth ] y \ mrj.n-Pth
\]

may contain traces of

\[
[ h ] q [ j - W 3 st ]
\]

making the nomen here \( [ Jmn-ms-s \ h ] q [ j - W 3 st ] \) “[Amenmesse], Ruler [of Thebes],” unless the traces are something else.\(^{300}\)

\(^{299}\)厨房 in \textit{KRI} 4: 207; \textit{RITA} 4: 149-50. Habachi, “King Amenmesse and Viziers Amenmose and Kha’emtore,” 62-64, also mentions the erased cartouches along the top of the stela, but records no traces of Amenmesse’s name in his figure 4. Schulman, \textit{Ceremonial Execution and Public Rewards}, 38 note 98, claims Habachi collated these traces, but there is no indication of this in Habachi’s drawing unless the missing areas in his cartouches are supposed to represent traces of Amenmesse’s name.

\(^{300}\)Kitchen in \textit{KRI} 4: 207, \textit{RITA} 4: 149-50, makes this hesitant restoration.
The greatest evidence that this stela of Mery was erected during Amenmesse’s reign is that the Horus name of $mrj-M3't\ smn-t3wy$ in the opening lines of the main text of the stela is that of Amenmesse and not Seti II. When the stela was usurped for Seti II, the cartouches were altered but Seti II’s agents overlooked the Horus
name of Amenmesse.\textsuperscript{301} In the same section of the stelae, possible traces of Amenmesse’s prenomen [\textit{mn-mf}]-\textit{R} \textsuperscript{e} \textit{[stp.n]}-\textit{R} \textsuperscript{e} lie under Seti II’s prenomen \textit{wsr-hprw-R} \textsuperscript{e} \textit{mrj-Jmn}.\textsuperscript{302}

Deputy of Wawat Mery is known from rock graffiti from Abu Simbel and Nag Abidis where he has the titles of \textit{sš pr-ḥdj jmj-r mšr n nb t\̣wy m T3-stj mry jdnw n \textit{W3wš(t)}}

“Scribe of the Treasury, General of the Army of the Lord of the Two Lands in Taseti (Nubia), Mery, Deputy of Wawat.”\textsuperscript{303} Deputy Mery is also known from excavations at the site of Aniba, especially clearance of his tomb (SA 7) in the necropolis there. The University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology contains several artifacts found during clearance of tomb SA 7 at Aniba such as two doorjambs (E. 11356; E. 11359), a tomb stela (E. 11367) over eighty ushabtis (E. 11067A-I), an offering table (E. 11361), along with amulets (E. 11064-65), scarabs (E. 11001, E. 11063), glass figures of Imsety and Hapy (E. 11066A-B) and some pottery (E. 11350, E. 11221).\textsuperscript{304} The


\textsuperscript{302}\textit{KRI} 4: 207; \textit{RITA} 4: 149-50, but with much uncertainty.

\textsuperscript{303}PM 7: 118 (21); \textit{KRI} 4: 282; \textit{RITA} 4: 202; \textit{LDT} 5: 167; Champollion, \textit{ND}, 1: 78; Gnirs, 8-9 note 63; Žába, Hintze, and Verner, 146-47. The graffito at Nag Abidis reads simply \textit{jdnw mry “The Deputy Mery.” For the Nag Abidis graffito, see \textit{KRI} 7: 247; Žába, Hintze, and Verner, 146-47 number 123, and figures 228-29.

\textsuperscript{304}For these items, see \textit{KRI} 4: 282-85; \textit{RITA} 4: 202-204; George Steindorff, \textit{Aniba}, vol. 2, \textit{Text} (Glückstadt: J. J. Augustin, 1937), 57-58 (E. 11356; E. 11359), 62-68 and plate 0 (E. 11367; E. 11361), 81 (E. 11067A-I); 91, 97 (E. 11064-65), 103, 109 (E. 11001, E. 11063), 125 (E. 11066A-B), 128-29 (E. 11350, E. 11221); idem, \textit{Aniba}, vol. 2, \textit{Tafeln} (Glückstadt: J. J. Augustin, 1937), plates 34 number 2, 4 (E. 11356; E. 11359), 38a (E. 11367), 35 number 2 (E. 11361), 51 number 18 (E. 11065), 55 number 57 (E. 11001), 66 numbers 25-26 (E. 11066A-B). For tomb SA 7 at Aniba and its tomb chapel, see PM 7: 78-79; \textit{KRI} 4: 282, 285; \textit{RITA} 4: 202-205; Steindorff, \textit{Aniba}, 2: 212-15, and figure 38, plate 27a-b. For a more recent analysis of the ushabtis of Mery (E. 11067A-I), see Stacie Lynn Olson, “New Kingdom Funerary Figures in Context: An Analysis
inscriptions on the doorjambs, tomb stela, and offering table all give Mery the additional title of *jmj-r pr-hd n nb t3wy m T3-stj* “Overseer of the Treasury of the Lord of the Two Lands in Taseti (Nubia).”

“Deputy of Wawat, General of the Army, and Overseer of the Treasury of the Lord of the Two Lands in Taseti” Mery, based on the insessional evidence, evidently served his office under Amenmesse and Seti II. The Abu Simbel stela (number 22) originally had the name of Amenmesse on it before Amenmesse’s cartouches were mostly erased and replaced with those of Seti II. It is uncertain when exactly Mery died, as no kingly objects are associated with his tomb at Aniba. Nonetheless, none of the recovered objects coming from Mery’s tomb at Aniba (SA 7) shows any sign of erasure leading to the conclusion that Mery might have survived the Amenmesse and Seti II conflict and spared from any sort of *damnatio memoriae* direct at Amenmesse’s supporters.

35. Buhen Stela 1611 and Amulet 1696

Location: Amulet 1696 currently in the collection of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford 1964.591. Location of Stela 1611 currently unknown.

---

305 *KRI* 4: 282-85; *RITA* 4: 202-204.


Discussion and Comments on Number 35

Of all the known monuments of Amenmesse, these artifacts from the Egypt Exploration Society’s excavations at Buhen do not at first appear at anything revelatory. The blue glass ring or amulet (Buhen catalog number 1696; excavation number K10-37) was found at the South Temple at Buhen during excavations in 1963-1964, and the inscription reads $\text{mn-mj-Ra stp.n-Ra mrj-Jmn Jmn-Ra-ms-s hq3-W3st.}$

The stela (Buhen catalog number 1611; excavation number K11-7 bis) was discovered at the South Temple of Buhen during the same season as the glass amulet, but it is a true rarity in that it is the only royal monument of Amenmesse to yield a year date from his reign. Stela 1611 is in very poor condition, with the majority of text being preserved on the right hand side of the stela. At the top of the stela, enough is preserved to determine that a king is in the act of making an offering to a deity whose name is not preserved. The preserved cartouches, what is left of them, contain the titulary of Seti II, but these cartouches have been usurped from Amenmesse as they show clear signs of erasure.

Although the excavation team attributed Stela 1611 to Seti II, it features the unmistakable Horus and Nebty titulary of Amenmesse on the upper part of the stela. On the first line the Horus and Nebty name reads $[Hr] k3 nht mrj-Ms3t smn-t3wy nbty wr-

---

308 KRI 4: 203; RITA 4: 146; Hein, 44, 143; Smith et al., 197, 213-14, and plate 55.


310 KRI 4: 202; RITA 4: 146; Smith et al., 130-31, 213, and plates 30:1, 76:1.

311 KRI 4: 202; RITA 4: 146.
[ḥrswt-m-Jptswt] “[Horus], Mighty Bull, Beloved of Maat, Who establishes the Two Lands, Two Ladies, Great [of Marvels in Karnak].”

As for the date line, it reads ḫsbt I 2 ḫbd “Year 1, Second Month of. . . .” with the text being too damaged and destroyed to reveal the season or day. At least the preserved date line does give clear proof that Amenmesse erected this stela at Buhen in his first year of rule, and it stood there before Seti II established or reestablished his rule at Buhen and had the stela reinscribed. The prenomen and nomen cartouches were recarved with Seti II’s titulary but with the Horus and Nebty names left surprisingly intact. Either it was deemed more important to recarve the cartouches rather than both the cartouches and the Horus and Nebty names, or Seti II’s reign came to an end before the stela could be completely reworked.

36. Shrine and Buttresses in the Hypostyle Hall of the Temple of Amarah West

Location: Believed in situ

312 KRI 4: 202; RITA 4: 146; Smith et al., 130-31, 213, and plates 30:1, 76:1.

313 Ibid.; Hein, 44, 143.


315 Herbert W. Fairman, “Preliminary Report on the Excavations at Amarah West, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, 1947-8,” JEA 34 (December 1948): 3, indicates that the temple was backfilled during the 1947-1948 season at Amarah West in order to preserve the site from the elements, so the shrine presumably lies buried still in the Hypostyle Hall.
Discussion and Comments on Number 36

The Amenmesse shrine in the Temple of Amarah West marks the furthest point south that any monument belonging to Amenmesse has ever been found to date. The shrine is located in the Hypostyle Hall of the Temple of Ramesses II at Amarah West. Herbert W. Fairman discovered the shrine during the Egypt Exploration Society’s 1938-1939 excavation season in the temple. On the left side of the shrine, the text reads

\[ \text{twt} \ n \ Jmn-[R^c]-ms-s \ hq3-W^s \ dj [\text{[nh]}] \]

"Statue of Amen[re]messe, Ruler of Thebes, Given [Life]." The other part of the inscription is lost except for preserved traces of \( mj \ R^c \) “Like Re.” According to published accounts of the excavation, the inscriptions on this shrine were never erased or usurped. Rather, they were plastered over in the Twentieth Dynasty by Siese, Viceroy of

---


317 Fairman, “Preliminary Report on the Excavations at Amârah West, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, 1938-9,” 141; Spencer et al., 41, and plates 40c, 41c.

318 KRI 4: 203; RITA 4: 146; Hein, 55. Amenmese’s nomen is written here in an unusual variant with \( hq3-W^s \) placed in between the \( ms \) sign and the double door bolt \( s/z \). In Spencer et al., plate 41c, the only known photograph of the front of the shrine shows additional text flanking the opening for the statue that is not referenced in KRI 4: 203. Due to the indistinct nature of the photograph, it is unknown if the text is that of Amenmese or another king entirely.
Nubia under Ramesses VI, and Wentawat, Viceroy of Nubia under Ramesses IX, along with Usermaatrenakht, Deputy of Kush, during the reign of Ramesses IX.\textsuperscript{319}

Erecting a statue shrine was not the only construction activity dating to the reign of Amenmesse at Amarah West. In the Hypostyle Hall, buttresses were added along the eastern part of the south wall in an attempt to shore up the ceiling, which was evidently in a state of near collapse by end of the Nineteenth Dynasty. The buttresses bear the cartouches of Amenmesse, but were plastered over or recut by Ramesses III much like other instances were Ramesses III usurped or suppressed Amenmesse’s name.\textsuperscript{320}

The following monuments and objects, bearing Amenmesse’s name, lack clear provenance or their provenance is sketchy at best. A few of these objects, especially the scarabs, may actually belong to other kings entirely.

\textsuperscript{319}PM 7: 161 (35); Fairman, “Preliminary Report on the Excavations at ḫAmārah West, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, 1938-9,” 141, 143; Patricia Spencer et al., 41, and plates 40c, 41c. For Siese, Viceroy of Nubia under Ramesses VI, see Habachi, “Königsohn von Kusch,” 635. For Wentawat, Viceroy of Nubia under Ramesses IX, along with Usermaatrenakht, see KRI 6: 525-27; Habachi, “Königsohn von Kusch,” 635.

\textsuperscript{320}Fairman, “Preliminary Report on the Excavations at ḫAmārah West, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, 1938-9,” 142; Hein, 55, 143; Spencer et al., 40-41, and plates 37c-d, 40b. One of the buttresses is indicated at PM 7: 161 (28).
Unknown Provenance

37. Usurped Limestone Statue Base

Location: Liverpool City Museum M13510 (Destroyed by Luftwaffe Bombing during World War II)

Discussion and Comments on Number 37

Of all the monuments belonging to Amenmesse, this statue base in Liverpool could have answered questions as to if Amenmesse was indeed a Gegenkönig to Seti II, but its destruction due to a Luftwaffe air raid during World War II limits researchers to rely on accounts published before 1941. The statue base entered the collections of Joseph Sams and Joseph Mayer before its donation to the Liverpool Museum in 1867. Exactly where in Egypt the statue originated is not too clear as surviving museum records do not explicitly state a provenance, but Luxor Temple has been suggested as a possible origin.

---


322 For descriptions of M13510 before its destruction in 1941, see Emery, “Order of Succession,” 353-56; Gatty, 52; Petrie, History of Egypt, 3: 127; Sams, plate 9. Although destroyed, museum records do survive for this piece but sadly no photographs. For more see Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 124-28; Davies, “Statue Base NMGM M13510.”
for the base. From surviving records the statue base was inscribed along the left and right sides with Amenmesse’s Horus name \( mrj-Mb^t \) and Nebty name \( smn-t\betawj \) followed by Amenmesse’s prenomen and nomen \( mn-mj-R^c \) \( stp.n-R^c \) \( Jmn-ms-s \) \( hq\beta-\ Wist \) on the rear of the base. On the top of the base, a surviving line of text reads \( nTr-nfr \) \( nb \) \( t\betawy \) \( nb \) \( jr \) \( ht \) \( mn-mj-R^c \) \( stp.n-R^c \) \( z\beta-R^c \) \( Jmn-ms-s \) \( hq\beta-\ Wist \) “The Good God, Lord of the Two Lands, Lord who Performs the Rituals, Menmire Setepenre, Son of Re, Amenmesse, Ruler of Thebes.” Although the final name on this now destroyed statue base was Amenmesse that does not mean this statue base was originally his, and the original owner of this piece is a matter of contention.

Flinders Petrie first published that Liverpool M13510 belonged originally to Seti II, as he considered the inscription across the top of the base to have been originally inscribed for Seti II before its usurpation by Amenmesse. Walter Emery, perhaps the last to examine the statue before its destruction in 1941, states likewise that the inscriptions on

---

323 Davies, “Statue Base NMGM M13510.” Both PM² 2: 337, and Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 125-26, state that James Burton’s manuscripts in The British Museum give the Temple of Luxor as the base’s original location.

324 KRI 4: 203; KRI 7: 235-36; RITA 4: 146-47; Caminos, “Two Stelae in the Kurnah Temple of Sethos I,” 28-29; Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 26 figure 7. See also picture posted online with the museum record at Davies, “Statue Base NMGM M13510.” The prenomen on the right side is erased with no indication of any signs present in surviving records.

325 KRI 4: 203; KRI 7: 236; RITA 4: 146; Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 26 figure 7.

the statue base originally belonged to Seti II “but little remains of this original inscription beyond one or two faint traces on the cartouches,” and he took the inscription on the top $nfr-ntr
tw y nb jr
t$ to be an unaltered inscription of Seti II meaning the entire base was recut by Amenmesse except for this one preserved line of text.\footnote{Emery, “Order of Succession,” 355. Although Emery does not explicitly state that he examined the statue base for his article, Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 127 note 64, points out that Emery’s measurements of the base differ from those in the Liverpool Museum’s records suggesting Emery did make at least a minimal brief examination.} Further complicating the issue of if Amenmesse usurped this statue base from Seti II are the surviving museum records written by Percy Newberry and Thomas Eric Peet. Newberry recorded that the traces on the statue base indicates Amenmesse usurped it from Merneptah, but at a later date not specified, Peet amended this entry in museum records to say that Amenmesse usurped the base from Seti II.\footnote{Caminos, “Two Stelae in the Kurnah Temple of Sethos I,” 28.} Even more puzzling is that the traces Peet recorded as surviving from the original Seti II nomen and prenomen seem not to fit him at all.

It is certain that the cartouches on Liverpool M13510 were usurped by Amenmesse from an earlier king, but was it Merneptah or Seti II? Peet’s observations and amendments to the museum records state that the prenomen and nomen on the top of the statue base contained Amenmesse’s name over those of Seti II. Of the nomen, Peet recorded $mrj$ and $PtH$ beneath $Jmn-ms-s hq3-W3st$, but the prenomen reveals not the expected $wsr-hprw-R^c stp.n-R^c$ or $wsr-hprw-R^c mrj-Jmn$ of Seti II but something else entirely. According to Peet’s observations, he saw two seated human or anthropomorphic
figures facing one another followed by two short vertical strokes. The first seated figure seems to have a curled beard and the other figure has a tall plumed crown, so an obvious conclusion is that these are figures of two gods with the figure wearing the tall plumed crown being Amun-Re. If so, Seti II never had a prenomen such as this, but Merneptah’s prenomen fits these traces as his prenomen of $b3-n\cdot R\cdot mrj-Jmn$ was written in the manner found with the figures of Amun and Re facing one another with Liverpool M13510 reading $\text{[graphic]}$ or $\text{[graphic]}$. This means that the statue base was an original monument of Merneptah that was later usurped by Amenmesse. If true, the nomen would be $\text{[graphic]}$ $mrj[n]-Pth$ $[hpt-hr-M3\cdot I]$ with a very “unique orthography” not readily attested on surviving monuments of Merneptah.

On the other hand, Seti II need not be dismissed entirely as the original owner of Liverpool M13510, and there is a possibility that the prenomen is indeed his. If Seti II’s prenomen on this statue was $wsr-hprw-R\cdot mrj-Jmn$, Seti II could have had an unusual variant prenomen where the Amun and Re elements were written not with their expected sun disc or $Jmn$ grouping but as $\text{[graphic]}$ with the glyph figures of these gods. The only issue with this suggestion is that Seti II is not known to have ever written his prenomen using the seated figures of these gods as

---


330 KRI 4: 203 note 11; KRI 7: 236; Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 128 and 128 note 75. For the writing of this prenomen of Merneptah, see Beckerath, Königsnamen, 158-59 T1-T2.

331 Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 128. See also KRI 4: 203 note 11; KRI 7: 236 for this reconstruction.
reconstructed here. Another possibility is that Liverpool M13510 bore traces of a triple usurpation; namely, the statue base being an original monument of Merneptah, usurped by Seti II, and then by Amenmesse. The problem with this suggestion is that Seti II never usurped a monument belonging to Merneptah, his father, unless Amenmesse did so first, and the usurpations Seti II carried out were merely directed at Amenmesse and not Merneptah specifically.

This is what makes the loss of Liverpool M13510 regrettable as the questions raised by the museum records are at odds with the observations made by those who saw the statue base before its destruction in 1941. If the original name was Seti II, then it fits the suggestion of Amenmesse as a *Gegenkönig* within the reign of Seti II, but if the original name was Merneptah then Amenmesse ruled independently before Seti II.

38. *Heb-sed* Relief

Location: Liverpool City Museum M13827 (Destroyed by Luftwaffe Bombing during World War II)

---

332 Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 128. A similar nomen for Seti II written with the *Ptḥ* before the Seth element occurs at Armant and at the Eight Pylon at the Temple of Karnak, but these are the only known occurrences of Seti II having his nomen written as such. See Beckerath, *Königsnamen*, 160-61 E1.

333 Ibid.

334 For instance, see comments concerning the *Cour de la Cachette* reliefs in chapter 6 on the Monuments of Seti II and the figure of Prince Seti-Merneptah in chapter 2.

Transliteration: \textit{mn-mj-R} \textit{stp.n-R} \textit{Jmn-ms-s \textit{hqj}-W3st}

Translation “Menmire Setepenre, Amenmesse, Ruler of Thebes”

Discussion and Comments on Number 38

Much like the statue base discussed previously, this relief fragment entered the Liverpool Museum in 1867 as part of the Egyptian collection of Joseph Mayer. Tragically, for modern researchers, the piece was destroyed during World War II when the museum was bombed during a \textit{Luftwaffe} air raid but a picture and museum records concerning the relief survive.\textsuperscript{336} Overall, the scene resembles the usurped scene on the Sixth Pylon of the Temple of Karnak in that it showed Amun-Re presenting \textit{heb-sed} to Amenmesse. The raised relief figure of Amun-Re is preserved from about the chest upwards, and only the hand and wrist of Amenmesse survived. That the king being presented \textit{heb-sed} is indeed Amenmesse is conformed by his intact prenomen and nomen in the center of the relief. The sunk relief inscription reads \textit{[nb] t\textit{bwy mn-mj-R} stp.n-R} \textit{[nb] h\textit{w Jmn-ms-s \textit{hqj}-W3st} “[Lord] of the Two Lands, Menmire Setepenre, [Lord] of Appearances, Amenmesse, Ruler of Thebes.”}\textsuperscript{337} The exact provenance of this now destroyed relief is unknown, but Aidan Dodson suggests that it may have come from Amenmesse’s constructions at Chapels E or G at the Oratory of Ptah on the path between Deir el-Medina and the Valley of the Queens. Several usurped or erased fragmentary stelae and relief belong to these chapels, and their construction and decorations date to at

\textsuperscript{336}Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 119 note 20, 124 notes 46, 49, and plate 10; Davies, “Fragment of a Scene NMGM M13827.”

\textsuperscript{337}KRI 4: 203-204; RITA 4: 147.
least the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II making this relief coming from the Oratory of Ptah a strong possibility.  

39. Usurped Limestone Stela fragment in Kent from Deir el-Bahri area

Location: Denys Bower Collection Chiddingstone Castle, Kent 42 (Former Rustafjaell Collection)

Discussion and Comments on Number 39

The Denys Bower Collection at Chiddingstone Castle in Kent contains a fragment of a limestone stela belonging to Seti II (inventory number 42) that shows signs of being usurped from Amenmesse. The exact original provenance of the piece is unknown, as the earliest description of this fragment in the collection of Robert de Rustafjaell labels it as allegedly coming from the Temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahri in Western

---

338Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 123-35. See also the relief from Chapel G at the Oratory of Ptah, number 23 above, and the usurped stela from Chapel E in the Monuments of Seti II.


340PM 8, part 4: 803-044-675.
Rustafjaell sold this stela fragment at auction in 1906, and it later ended up in the collection of Denys Bower where it currently resides.

The stela, as preserved today at Chiddingstone Castle, consists of a fragment of the top lunette of the stela showing the winged sun disc. Based on the preserved text, Amun-Re would have stood on the left side of the stela addressing the King, who stood on the right, with the phrase \([dj.n(j) n.k] \) \(\text{dj.n.(j) n.k} \) \(\text{n} \) \(\text{aHaw} \) \(\text{n} \) \(\text{Ra} \) \(\text{rnpwt} \) \(\text{n Jtmw} \) “[(I) have given to you] the lifetime of Re and the [years of Atum].” The cartouches read \(\text{nb t3wy wsr-hprw-R} \) \(\text{nry-Jmn nb h5w} \) \(\text{Sth} \) \(\text{y mry.n-Pth} \) “Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheperure Meryamun, Lord of Appearances, [Set]i-Merneptah.” These two cartouches show signs of erasure in that both cartouches have been heavily gouged and smoothed in an attempt to remove any traces of the original names. Dodson points out that the bottom half of the nomen sheared off diagonally when it was being erased and the new nomen of Seti II was cut partially in a plaster filling used to repair this damage. Despite these erasures and

---

341 PM² 2: 377. Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 115-16 assigns it a Theban provenance based on an analysis of the “golden-brown” color of the limestone similar to that found in Western Thebes.

342 See auction of 19-21 December 1906 in Catalogue of the Collection of Egyptian Antiquities formed in Egypt by R. de Rustafjaell, 6 number 61, and plate 9 number 8. Available records are unclear as to when the stela fragment ended up in Bower’s collection because Bower was born in 1905, so he did not purchase the piece when it first appeared at auction in 1906. What evidence is presented in literature suggests that the stela fragment was bought between the years 1918-1939 and immediately post 1945 when Bower bought the majority of his collection. For more see Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 115; Phillips and Dodson, 51-54; Jaromir Malek et al., “The Robert de Rustafjaell (also known as Col. Prince Roman Orbeliani) Collection,” in Working Files of the Topographical Bibliography, 15-16 August 2009 <http://www.griffith.ox.ac.uk/gri/3rustaf.html> [11 December 2009].

343 Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 116-17, and plate 8. See also the picture in Phillips and Dodson, 55.

friable damages, a \( n \) from the original name survives beneath the \( mry \) in the prenomen \( \text{wsr-hprw-R}^c \text{ mry-Jmn} \). Because of its offset position, Dodson reconstructs the original prenomen as that of Amenmesse reading \( [\text{mn-mj-R}^c \text{ stp}].n-[R^c \text{ mrj-Jmn}] \) or \( [\text{mn-mj-R}^c \text{ stp}].n-[R^c] \) with the \( mj \) sign being written without the reed leaf complement.\(^{345}\)

Exactly where this piece came from is still uncertain. Dodson suggests that the piece came from Chapel E or G at the Oratory of Ptah near Deir el-Medina. There are a number of suitable locations at either chapel that the piece could have come from, but nothing definite.\(^{346}\)

40. Sandstone Block Statue of a Steward and Royal Scribe\(^{347}\)

Location: Ägyptologische Sammlung Universität Heidelberg, Heidelberg 275

Discussion and Comments on Number 40

In the Ägyptologische Sammlung of the Universität Heidelberg is a severely damaged and battered block statue (number 275) of a royal official from the time of Amenmesse. Purchased in 1913 from A. Ismallun in Cairo, probably a third, maybe less, of the upper part of the block statue remains. Unfortunately, the name of the official is lost but his

\(^{345}\)Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 117-19, and 119 figure 3b-c.

\(^{346}\)Ibid., 120-25; Phillips and Dodson, 55; PM 8, part 4: 803-044-675.

\(^{347}\)References: PM 8, part 2: 609 (801-643-300); Erika Feucht, ed., \textit{Vom Nil zum Neckar: Kunstschätze Ägyptens aus pharaonischer und koptischer Zeit an der Universität Heidelberg} (Berlin: Springer, 1986), 78-79 no.207; Schulz, 1: 155, idem, 2: plate 33a-d.
preserved titles are *jmj-r pr* “Steward or Majordomo” and *šš-nswt* “King’s Scribe.”

Two cartouches, the lower parts of which are missing, located below the right and left arms show that the king this official served must have been considered illegitimate as the remaining parts of the cartouches are heavily and deliberately erased. That means the king whose name was originally in these cartouches must have been Amenmesse and were erased upon Amenmesse’s removal.

41. Granite Statue Fragment with a Golden Horus Name

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo TR 30/8/64/4

Discussion and Comments on Number 41

Described as coming from the Garden City suburb in Cairo, this fragment of a granite statue in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (TR 30/8/64/4) contains information suggesting that it contains part of Amenmesse’s titulary that previously has been poorly preserved. The exact provenance of the statue is unknown as it appears that it was “part of a private collection or a dealer’s stock seized by the Service des Antiquités.” The statue fragment is little more than a pleated kilt with a sporran bordered by ribbons and two

---

348PM 8, part 2: 609 (801-643-300); Feucht, 78-79; Schulz, 1: 155-56; idem, 2: plate 33a-d.

349PM 8, part 2: 609 (801-643-300); Schulz, 1: 155-56; 2: plate 33a-d. Feucht, 79, notes that on the left shoulder is a cartouche reading *Sḥy (mrj.n)-Pth*. In published photographs of this statue, there does not appear to be anything visible in the cartouches unless Feucht means that there is an additional cartouche on top of the left shoulder. If this is so, then the nameless official served both Amenmesse and Seti II, but lack of an overhead photograph of this statue makes confirming Feucht’s reading difficult.


351Ibid., 255-56, 259.
cobras. A line of text running down the center reads

\[ Hr \ nbw \ ^3\ hps \ s^3 \ Wst \ n \ ms \ sw \ nswt \ hjtj \ nb \ t\wy \ “Golden \ Horus, \ Great \ of \ Strength, \ Who \ makes \ Thebes \ Great \ for \ the \ One \ Who \ Bore \ Him, \ King \ of \ Upper \ and \ Lower \ Egypt, \ Lord \ of \ the \ Two \ Lands.” \]

Tom Hardwick theorizes in his publication of TR 30/8/64/4 that this Golden Horus name is that of Amenmesse based on the traces of a fragmentary Golden Horus name from two stelae of Amenmesse at the mortuary temple of Seti I at Qurna. Since no other Ramesside king appears to have utilized a Golden Horus name such as this, Hardwick suggests that this new Golden Horus name on TR 30/8/64/4 is that of Amenmesse. On the other hand, problematic is that the statue fragment preserves no other titulary that can be attributed to Amenmesse’s known examples thereby making linking this Golden Horus name to Amenmesse theoretical for now.

---


353 Ibid., 259; For discussions of Amenmesse’s fragmentary Golden Horus name, see Beckerath, Königsnamen, 158-59 G; Caminos, “Two Stelae in the Kurnah Temple of Sethos I,” 22, 27, and 18-19 plates A-B; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 128; Kitchen, “Titularies of the Ramesside Kings,” 134 note 5; Schneider, “Conjectures about Amenmesse,” 100 note 6; idem, “Innovation in Literature on Behalf of Politics,” 325.


355 The author wishes to personally thank Tom Hardwick for his discussions concluding his observations on TR 30/8/64/4.
42. Granodiorite Statue Head Wearing a *Khepresh* Crown\textsuperscript{356}

**Location:** Walters Art Museum, Baltimore 22.107

**Discussions and Comments on Number 42**

In the Walters Art Museum in Baltimore is a granodiorite statue head (22.107) wearing the *Khepresh*, or Blue Crown, purchased by Henry Walters in 1923 and described as originally coming from Upper Egypt. The nose and part of the uraeus is broken off or damaged along with parts of the mouth, ears, and eyebrows.\textsuperscript{357} The most recent Porter and Moss volume identifies the statue head as “probably Amenmesse” but gives no further information as to how this conclusion was reached.\textsuperscript{358} Identifications of Walters Art Museum 22.107 range from Late New Kingdom to George Steindorff’s conclusion that the head was from the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty due to its similarities to


\textsuperscript{357}Walters Art Gallery, *Handbook of the Collection*, 16; Steindorff, *Catalogue of the Egyptian Sculpture*, 48 [139], and plate 20. The Walters Art Museum’s entry “Head of a Statue of Amenhotep III,” describes the piece as coming from “Thebes (present-day Luxor, Egypt) (?).”

\textsuperscript{358}PM 8, part 1: 84 (800-730-150).
depictions of Kushite King Taharqa. In Edna Russman’s analysis of Twenty-Fifth Dynasty royal art, this statue head “could not possibly be Kushite” as “the Blue Crown, the depression around the mouth, the neck creases are not found on any Dynasty XXV sculpture.” The Walters Art Museum agrees with Russman’s analysis as they describe the statue head as belonging to Eighteenth Dynasty King Amenhotep III and later recarved by Ramesses II in the Nineteenth Dynasty.361

43. Blue Glass Scarab (figure 5.34)362
Location: Petrie Museum University College, London UC 12831

Transliteration: Jmn-*s (s) hq3-W1st

Translation: Amenmes(se) Ruler of Thebes

359Walters Art Gallery, Handbook of the Collection, 16; Steindorff, Catalogue of the Egyptian Sculpture, 48 [139].

360Russmann, Representation of the King, 56 [37].

361“Head of a Statue of Amenhotep III.”


363Additional scarabs bearing Amenmesse’s name are in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (JE 74608-74609), but it is uncertain if these two scarabs bear prenomen, nomen, or both. For more, see Engelbach, “A List of the Royal Names on the Objects in the ‘King Fouad I Gift’ Collection,” 226.
Discussion and Comments on Number 43

This scarab (figure 5.43) was first described in the works of Flinders Petrie as part of the holdings of The University College, London originating from the excavations and activities of Petrie himself.\textsuperscript{364} It is a blue glass scarab bearing the name of Jmn-ms-(s) hq3-W3st “Amenmes(se) Ruler of Thebes.”\textsuperscript{365} Despite Petrie’s publication of the scarab, it is unknown if he found it while excavating or merely purchased it from an antiquities dealer.\textsuperscript{366}

\textsuperscript{364}Petrie, \textit{Scarabs and Cylinders with Names}, plate 44 number 19.5; idem, \textit{History of Egypt}, 3: 126-27.


\textsuperscript{366}The author wishes to thank Rupinder Padda and Ivor Pridden of the Petrie Museum University College, London for their assistance in checking museum records concerning this piece.
44. Blue Faience Ring (figure 5.35)\textsuperscript{367}

Location: British Museum, London BM 17939

Transliteration: $[Jmn]$-ms-$hq\dot{3}$-\textit{W\textit{3}st}

[Amen]messe, Ruler of Thebes

Discussion and Comments on Number 44

This faience ring (figure 5.35), purchased in 1882 from The Reverend Greville John Chester, is believed to have come from the Theban area and contains the preserved nomen of what appears to be Amenmesse $[Jmn]$-ms-$hq\dot{3}$-\textit{W\textit{3}st}.\textsuperscript{368} Although the restoration of Amun is feasible, there exists the possibility that the first element is Re making this a cartouche of Ramesses II as he sometimes used the “Ruler of Thebes”


epithet. Negating this suggestion is that Ramesses II only used this epithet with his prenomen $wsr-M\beta^{\text{t}}t-R^\text{c}$.\textsuperscript{369}

45. Steatite Scarab (figure 5.36)\textsuperscript{370}

Location: British Museum, London BM 46238

Transliteration: $Jmn-ms-sw\ mry Jmn-R^\text{c}$

Translation: Amenmessu, Beloved of Amun-Re(?)$^{371}$

---

\textsuperscript{369}Beckerath, \textit{Königsnamen}, 154-55 T6; Kitchen, “Titularies of the Ramesside Kings,” 135, notes that the phrase $hq^{3}-W\text{ist}$ does not necessarily mean that Amenmesse was a “Theban/Nubian rival” of Seti II due to its use by Ramesses II and kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty.

\textsuperscript{370}References: Hall, \textit{Catalogue of Egyptian scarabs}, 228, number 2272; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 156

\textsuperscript{371}Hall, \textit{Catalogue of Egyptian scarabs}, 228 number 2272, drops the Re and translates as “Amenmessu, beloved of Amun.”
Discussion and Comments on Number 45

The exact provenance of this steatite scarab is unknown as it entered the collections of the British Museum via a purchase in 1907 from the Reverend Chauncey Murch. If indeed a scarab belonging to Amenmesse, this example presents a variant writing of Amenmesse’s name written using the sw plant instead of the expected door bolt s. As written, the scarab reads Jmn-ms-sw mry Jmn-R “Amenmessu, Beloved of Amun-Re,” which as written is an uncommon grouping of signs for Amenmesse (figure 5.36). However, Rolf Krauss points out that these signs can be read R-ms-sw mry-Jmn hq “Ramessu Meryamun, Ruler,” which fits the nomen of Ramesses II more than Amenmesse.

46. Blue Composition Scarab (figure 5.37) Location: British Museum, London BM 28363

Transliteration: Jmn-ms-(s) MAat or Jmn-ms-(s) (hq)-MAa

Translation: Amenmes(se), Maat or Amenmes(se) (Ruler of) Maat

---

372 See also the British Museum’s online catalog entry by entering “46238” at <http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/museum_no__provenance_search.aspx>.

373 Ibid.


Figure 5.37. Blue composition scarab BM 28363. Detail of Hall, *Catalogue of Egyptian Scarabs in the British Museum* 228, number 2273.

Description and comments

Much like the previous scarab from the British Museum, this scarab possibly presents another unusual variant of Amenmesse’s name. The signs read *Jmn-ms-(s) Mꜣt*, which is not too unusual for Amenmesse despite the added Maat sign.\(^{376}\) If one wishes to presume that the Maat sign is a shortened writing for *ḥqꜣ-Mꜣt* because there was not enough space on the scarab, the scarab reads *Jmn-ms-(s) (ḥqꜣ)-Mꜣt* “Amenmesse, Ruler of Maat,” which is not attested as an epithet for Amenmesse anywhere.\(^{377}\)

As an alternate suggestion to reading the scarab as *Jmn-ms-(s) Mꜣt*, the Maat sign could be a miscarving of the reed leaf making the intended meaning *Jmn-msy*, which is

---


\(^{377}\) Although not attested, see comments for BM 29241 below.
attested on just one other known scarab from the Palin collection (number 2). The only problem with this suggestion is that there are not enough known attestations of scarabs bearing these signs to make a definite conclusion possible.

47. Steatite Scarab (figure 5.38)

Location: British Museum, London BM 29241

Transliteration: Jmn-ms-s ḥq3-M3ʾt mrj-Jmn, but more likely (Rʾ)-ms-s ḥq3-M3ʾt mrj-Jmn

Translation: Amenmesse, Ruler of Maat, Beloved of Amun or (Ra)messes, Ruler of Maat, Beloved of Amun

Figure 5.38. Steatite scarab BM 29241. Detail of Newberry, Scarabs, plate 35:24

---


Discussion and Comments on Number 47

This steatite scarab entered the collections of the British Museum in 1897 as another purchase from the Reverend Chauncey Murch. Upon first glance, the scarab reads $Jmn\text{-}ms\text{-}s\ hq\text{³}\text{-}M\text{³}\text{t}\ mrj\text{-}Jmn$ “Amenmesse, Ruler of Maat, Beloved of Amun,” which is an “unusual type” of scarab to belong to Amenmesse with the epithet of “Ruler of Maat” in the nomen (figure 5.38). In fact, the epithet “Ruler of Maat” belongs to the nomen of another Ramesside ruler entirely—Ramesses IV. Percy Newberry examined this scarab as part of his research into ancient Egyptian scarabs, and he concluded that the scarab did not belong to Amenmesse but to Ramesses IV with the reading $(Ra)\text{-}ms\text{-}s\ hq\text{³}\text{-}M\text{³}\text{t}\ mrj\text{-}Jmn$ “(Ra)messe, Ruler of Maat, Beloved of Amun.”

48. Bronze Ring in Würzburg with Amenmesse’s prenomen

Location: A. Kiseleff Collection in the Martin von Wagner Museum Universität Würzburg K 1059

---

380 See also the British Museum’s online catalog entry by entering “29241” at <http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/museum_no__provenance_search.aspx>.

381 Hall, Catalogue of Egyptian scarabs, 228; Matouk, 1: 113 number 658.

382 Newberry, Scarabs, 184, and plate 35:24. Newberry notes this may be a scarab of Ramesses IV as he possessed the title “Ruler of Maat.” For Amenmesse to have this similar epithet is unusual, if not uncommon, because nowhere else does Amenmesse possess this particular epithet despite the reservations raised in Hall, Catalogue of Egyptian scarabs, 228, over Newberry’s conclusion. Kitchen in KRI 6: 64, and Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 156, associate this scarab with Ramesses IV as well. For the titles of Ramesses IV, see Kitchen, “Titularies of the Ramesside Kings,” 137-38; Beckerath, Königsnamen, 166-68, especially nomen variants E1 and E5.

Transliteration of prenomen titles: mn-mj-Rṣ stp.n-Rṣ mrj ḫmn
Translation: “Menmire Setepenre Meryamun”

Discussion and Comments on Number 48

Little is known about this bronze signet or seal ring in the A. Kiseleff Collection of the Martin von Wagner Museum at the Universität Würzburg (K 1059). The bronze ring bears the prenomen of Amenmesse mn-mj-Rṣ stp.n-Rṣ mrj ḫmn “Menmire Setepenre Meryamun,” and its exact provenance is unknown. Since it is a signet ring, it might be tempting to suggest it belonged to a high official in Amenmesse’s reign, such as a vizier, but without further context and provenance it is almost impossible to determine if the ring saw use or was a ritual dedication in a tomb or temple.

Conclusion

When examined from a geographical context, the one feature that stands out in all of Amenmesse’s monuments is that there is nothing to indicate that Amenmesse had any established presence in Syria-Palestine, or the Sinai, or even anything showing that Amenmesse had dominion over Lower Egypt except for the Riqqeh vase. Overwhelmingly, the royal monuments of Amenmesse do point towards the fact that they are indeed chiefly centered in Upper Egypt and Nubia and tend to support the theory that Amenmesse, as king, held power in Upper Egypt alone. One might object to such a

384Koschel, 77.
385Ibid., 78.
386See comments concerning the Riqqeh vase at number 2 above. The Timna sistrum at number 1 is probably not that of Amenmesse but belongs rightfully to Seti I.
statement, but it is hard to deny that given the importance placed on sending expeditions to the Sinai and to Syria-Palestine by previous reigns that nothing has been found to show that Amenmesse asserted his kingly authority in a way that left an impression on the archaeological and historical record of the region. This is not to say that Amenmesse showed no interest in these regions at all. Indeed, he may well have sent expeditions to the Sinai or Syria-Palestine, but where is the proof? Even with the attention paid to Amenmesse’s monuments in Upper Egypt and Nubia by Seti II and Ramesses III, traces were left behind of Amenmesse’s name indicating his presence in those regions. It is hard to see Seti II totally erasing any evidence that Amenmesse sent an expedition to Sinai or into Syria-Palestine unless there was nothing to erase to begin with. This definite lack of evidence for Amenmesse outside Egypt strongly supports the theory that Amenmesse probably did not control all of Egypt, and he was a rival counter-ruler to Seti II, the legitimate king.

As the iconic Gegenkönig, Amenmesse’s monuments show an increasing attempt at legitimizing his rule. Amenmesse, in an act of political realism, felt that he had a right to interfere in the royal succession even though this act of interrupting an established heir, Seti II, most likely would be questioned and tantamount to a chaotic force threatening maat.387 To counter these perceptions, Amenmesse had to immediately establish his claim as the legitimate ruler in the eyes of the gods and the ancient Egyptian people.

It is not surprising to notice that most of the monuments left behind by Amenmesse are those in temples where the act of legitimizing his power would be the most important in the eyes of the ancient Egyptian gods. There also would be the added benefit of

387Spalinger, review of Die Elephantine-Stele des Sethnakht, 277-78.
perhaps increasing his status and legitimacy if he could be included in the daily temple rituals to the gods, so Amenmesse did as much as he could to try emphasizing his connection to the temple rituals.

At Karnak, Amenmesse erected four standard bearer statues in the Hypostyle Hall along the north-south axis of the Hypostyle Hall as this would allow Amenmesse ritual participation in the temple ceremonies through placing his statues along the route that the barque of Amun-Re and other gods would take as they were carried through Karnak Temple.\(^{388}\) To further establish his legitimacy and participation in the temple ritual, Amenmesse concentrated his work on the southeast gate of the Wadjyt Hall, and he inscribed his name on the polygonal columns in the south court of the Fifth Pylon, enlarging the southern doorway of this same court, and possibly usurping the colossi in the same court.\(^{389}\) In the area of the Sixth Pylon, Amenmesse constructed a doorway linking the south court of the Fifth Pylon to the south court of the Sixth Pylon, and rebuilt a Thutmosid gateway linking the south court of the Sixth Pylon to the court of the Sixth Pylon.\(^{390}\) In the Akhmenu Temple, Amenmesse usurped the Osiride colossi at the


\(^{389}\) PM\(^2\) 2: 81 (212c-d), and plan 10 court 4; Nelson, KC 36a-b; Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 114 notes 1-2. Carlotti, 1: 19, 240-41, points out that Seti II and Ramesses III inscribed their names in this area of the Fifth Pylon over that of an earlier king, most likely Amenmesse, as he was the only king whose name was constantly usurped in this area of Karnak by Seti II and Ramesses III.

\(^{390}\) PM\(^2\) 2: 95 (269, 270a-b, 271-73) and plan 12 [1]; Nelson, KD 1-4, 34-35, 153; Burgos and Larché, 2: 221, 226-27, 231, 346.
entrance to the temple, enlarged the Inner Vestibule of Room 3, and erected two kneeling offering bearer statues near the Festival Hall of Thutmosis III’s Akhmenu Temple.\textsuperscript{391}

Amenmesse carried out these constructions to link his name to the processional route for the barque of Amun-Re through the Temple of Karnak to the Akhmenu Temple.\textsuperscript{392} In doing this, Amenmesse hoped to link his name to the procession and ritual of Amun-Re and therefore legitimize his rule in the eyes of the ancient Egyptian gods. In many other monuments of Amenmesse, this common theme of linkage and legitimization becomes readily apparent as Amenmesse tried to link his rule to that of prior kings. For example, carving two stelae at the mortuary temple of Seti I, inscribing his name at the Ramesseum and the Thutmosid barque shrine at Tod, repairing the colossi of Ramesses II at Abu Simbel, and even the location of KV 10, to name a few, were all attempts by Amenmesse to increase his royal prestige through a series of constrictions that linked his name to illustrious ancestors and at the same time, served to legitimized his rule.

Seti II did not have to legitimize his rule, as that had already been done through Merneptah appointing him the heir apparent, but Seti II had to deal with the interloping rule of Amenmesse, whose monuments served to fulfill the concept of causing his name to live as long as they continued to exist. Seti II then had to take steps to usurp or erase Amenmesse’s name wherever found, but as pointed out previously in this section, in some instances the task was less than thorough or overlooked due to the end of Seti II’s


reign. In marked contrast to the royal monuments of Amenmesse, Seti II’s monuments exist over a far wider range than Amenmesse’s and serve as evidence to the status of Amenmesse within the dynasty.
Chapter 6
The Monuments of Seti II as King

In this section, the monuments concerning Seti II as king of Egypt are collected and listed geographically from outside Egypt in Syria-Palestine and continuing geographically from Lower to Upper Egypt and ancient Nubia. In comparison with the monuments of Amenmesse, the obvious fact stands out that there are more monuments for Seti II as king than known monuments for Amenmesse. Nonetheless, many of Seti II’s monuments feature definite usurpations of titulary and cartouches from another king, most likely Amenmesse. ¹ For matters of convenience, only monuments featuring the name of Seti II are discussed here, as these monuments are original works of Seti II during his reign as king, or they feature usurpations by Seti II from Amenmesse or indirectly Merneptah, in the case of the battle relief on the walls of the Cour de la Cachette at the Temple of Karnak. Very few, if any, of these monuments contain traces of Amenmesse’s names; however, the pattern of erasures definitely follows the pattern witnessed on the surviving monuments of Amenmesse that bear traces of his name but were ultimately usurped from Amenmesse by Seti II. ² One contrast with the monuments of Amenmesse is that Seti II’s monuments range across the entirety of Upper and Lower Egypt, as well as Syria-Palestine, which goes as long way in supporting Seti II as the legitimate successor to Merneptah.


²See comments regarding these monuments in chapter 5 dealing with the monuments of Amenmesse.
Outside Egypt

Tell el-Farah South

1. Jar Fragments and Scarab from Tell el-Farah South (figures 6.1-2)\(^3\)

Location: Jar fragments in the collection of the Israel Department of Antiquities and Museums I.9834\(^4\); Scarab in the collection of the British Museum, London\(^5\)

Jar Fragments Transliteration: \([wsr-hprw-R\text{\(\text{e}\)}]} stp.n-R\text{\(\text{e}\)} mrj-[Jmn] [Sthy] mrj.n-P\text{\(\text{h}\)}\]

Jar Fragments Translation: [Userkheperure] Setepenre Mery[amun] [Sety] Merneptah

Scarab Transliteration\(^6\): \(stp.n-R\text{\(\text{e}\)} Sthy mrj.n-P\text{\(\text{h}\)}\]

Scarab Translation: Setepenre Seti-Merneptah

---


\(^4\)Dothan, *Philistines and Their Material Culture*, 31 plate 1.


\(^6\)Both Macdonald, Starkey, and Harding, 24, and Giveon, *Egyptian Scarabs from Western Asia*, 28-29 number 21, suggest reading this as *Sthy mrj.n-P\text{\(\text{h}\)} stp.n-R\text{\(\text{e}\)}* “Seti-Merneptah Setepenre.”
Discussion and Comments on Number 1

These fragments belonging to a large jar of Seti II (figure 6.1) discovered during 1930 excavations at Tell el-Farah South in a courtyard of an Egyptian governor’s residency
and consist of Seti II’s prenomen and nomen $\text{[wsr-hprw-R] stp.n-R}^e \text{ mrj-[Jmn] [St}hy]\text{]

$\text{mrj.n-Pth}$ flanked by the emblematic notched palm branch $\text{rnpt}$ signs symbolizing “100,000s of years,” or what the ancient Egyptians considered an eternity of rule and existence (figure 6.1). The scarab (figure 6.2) was found in tomb 934 at Tell el-Farah South among over a hundred scarabs tossed into the center of the tomb after it was robbed. Depending on how one reads the scarab, it bears part of the prenomen and full nomen of Seti II $\text{stp.n-R}^e \text{ St}hy \text{ mrj.n-Pth}$, or the nomen with an epithet $\text{St}hy \text{ mrj.n-Pth stp.n-R}^e$, which is not attested elsewhere.

---

7PM 7: 370; KRI 4: 242; RITA 4: 169; Dothan, Philistines and Their Material Culture, 28, 31; Giveon, Egyptian Scarabs from Western Asia, 28-29 number 21; Macdonald, Starkey, and Harding, 28-29, and plates 61:1, 64:74 (excavation number YX 36410); Mumford, “International Relations,” 317, 1963, 1965; Yisraeli, 442. For Tell el Farah, see in general Yisraeli, 441-44.

8Macdonald, Starkey, and Harding, 24, and plate 52:130; Mumford, “International Relations,” 1965. For tomb 934, see Macdonald, Starkey, and Harding, 24-25, and plates 51-53, 59.

9See note 6 above.
2. Steatite Scarab from Tell Masos (Khirbet el-Mashash; figure 6.3)\textsuperscript{10}

Location: Currently unknown

---

Discussion and Comments on Number 2

This steatite scarab (figure 6.3) from Tell Masos (Khirbet el-Mashash) is a little unusual in that it features a monogram or rebus interpreted as Seti II’s prenomen $wsr$-$hprw$-$R^c$ that has raised some debate over the reading of the motifs present on the scarab and whose name is written.\textsuperscript{11} The scarab (Figure 3) shows an ancient Egyptian king wearing a $khepresh$, or Blue Crown, smiting a captive while a much smaller figure stands behind the king in adoration.\textsuperscript{12} In front of the king is a somewhat flattened sun disk and a $hpr$ beetle. Raphael Giveon takes the king smiting the prisoner to be a monogram for $wsr$ making the name on the scarab $wsr$-$hpr(w)$-$R^c$ “Userkheper(u)re,” which is the normal first element of Seti II’s prenomen minus the plural strokes after the beetle.\textsuperscript{13}

The smiting scene is a common element on scarabs found throughout Syria-Palestine and Egypt, but the problem with many of them are that few feature enough signs to determine if a king is named upon them or the text is corrupt.\textsuperscript{14} Those that do feature a

\textsuperscript{11}Both Giveon and Kempinski, 104, and Dothan, Philistines and Their Material Culture, 86 note 340, cite identifications of the king on this scarab as ranging from Ramesses II to Ramesses X, but see Brandi’s criticisms below. For an overall description of Tell Masos (Khirbet el-Mashash), see Fritz and Kempinski, 1: 1-6; Kempinski, 986-89.

\textsuperscript{12}Fritz and Kempinski, 2: 214-15, and plate 107. An almost identical scarab was found in tomb 227 by Flinders Petrie during excavations at Tell el-Farah South in 1928 and 1929 but lacking any inscriptions. See William Matthew Flinders Petrie and Olga Tufnell, Beth-Pelet I (Tell Fara), British School of Archaeology in Egypt, no. 48 (London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt, Bernard Quaritch, 1930), 11-13, and plates 31: 319, 68.

\textsuperscript{13}Raphael Giveon, “A Monogram Scarab from Tel Masos,” Tel Aviv 1 (1974): 75; Giveon and Kempinski, 102-103.

\textsuperscript{14}Brandl, 371. For similar smiting scenes, see L.77-30 in Raphael Giveon and Trude Kertesz, Egyptian Scarabs and Seals from Acco from the Collection of the Israel Department of Antiquities and Museums (Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1986), 26 number 86, that shows a king smiting a figure but the only element present is a possible $R^c$ sign. Further examples of these smiting scarabs are found in Giveon, Egyptian Scarabs from Western Asia, 32-33 number 32 (L.641 from Tell el-Farah); Erik Hornung and Elisabeth Staehelin, eds., Skarabäen und andere Siegelamulette aus Basler Sammlungen, Ägyptische Denkmäler in der Schweiz, vol.
smiting scene as a monogram for \textit{wsr} and feature a name are very rare. One regional example comes from Tell el-Farah (South) and shows the smiting scene with a $R^e$ and $M^3t$ sign making a monogram of \textit{wsr-M^3t-R^e}, which is the prenomen of Ramesses II.\textsuperscript{15} In Egypt, two steatite scarabs from Gurob in the Petrie Museum (UC 12670-71) feature a smiting scene containing a $M^3t$ sign and $R^e$, either as a solar disc or a winged falcon wearing a solar disc, and again, are monograms for \textit{wsr-M^3t-R^e}.\textsuperscript{16} Given that Ramesses II used this monogram for his name on a number of scarabs it is likely that this shortened writing of a king’s prenomen continued throughout the Nineteenth Dynasty.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[15] Giveon, “Monogram Scarab from Tel Masos,” 76; Giveon and Kempinski, 103. According to Rowe, 160 number 670, the scarab from Tell el-Farah (I.9771, now in the collection of the Israel Department of Antiquities and Museums) is “probably mentioned” in the publication of finds from tomb 960 at Tell el-Farah but no mention of the scarab could be found in Macdonald, Starkey, and Harding, 25-26, and plate 92.
\item[16] Giveon, “Monogram Scarab from Tel Masos,” 76; Giveon and Kempinski, 103, except that UCL 12671 is not mentioned. For UCL 12670-71, see Petrie, \textit{Scarabs and Cylinders with Names}, 27-28, and plate 40 numbers 19.3:24-25. A second steatite scarab mentioned by Giveon in the Petrie Museum (UC 12668) is an entirely different scene with a king before Re-Harakhty holding a \textit{wsr} staff and a $M^3t$ sign over the two thereby making the prenomen \textit{wsr-M^3t-R^e}. For UC 12668, see Petrie, \textit{Scarabs and Cylinders with Names}, 27-28, and plate 40 number 19.3:22.
\end{footnotes}
In criticism of Giveon’s interpretation is that of Baruch Brandl who suggests that the king named on this scarab is not Seti II at all. Brandl believes that when reading a scarab, one must consider the sequence of hieroglyphs as written. He suggests that a king’s titulary was written in the center of the scarab first, and then if additional space was needed to finish the name, any additional signs appear in the front with the signs always “keeping their original order” and that they “must also appear consecutively.” Brandl, using these criteria, interprets the Tell Masos scarab as the prenomen of Ramesses X $hpr-[M\textsuperscript{3}t]-R^c$.\textsuperscript{17}

Chronologically, this scarab from Tell Masos presents more problems in that it was not found in any stratigraphic context at the site. The scarab was part of a surface find in area A at Tell Masos and cannot be associated with any loci or strata uncovered during excavations there in the early 1970s.\textsuperscript{19} The context of the scarab is unknown, but it does at least establish a presence for Seti II material in the immediate area and might represent the furthest north that Seti II objects have been found to date.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{17}Brandl, 382.

\textsuperscript{18}Ibid., 383-84, 405. For the prenomen of Ramesses X, see Beckerath, Königsnamen, 174-75 T1-2; Kitchen, “Titularies of the Ramesside Kings,” 139.

\textsuperscript{19}Fritz and Kempinski, 2: 214; Dothan, Philistines and Their Material Culture, 86; Kempinski, 988; Oren, “‘Governor's Residencies’ in Canaan,” 48.

\textsuperscript{20}Mumford, “International Relations,” 329, but see comments for the Tell Beit Mirsim scarab below.
3. Steatite Scarab from Tell Beit Mirsim

Location: Currently unknown

Discussion and Comments on Number 3

This steatite scarab was found during William F. Albright’s excavations at Tell Beit Mirsim during the first three seasons of work at the site (1926, 1928, and 1930). The scarab comes from Late Bronze Age Stratum C-2 and shows a king wearing a khepresh smiting a figure and there is a wsr staff behind the king and a beetle above the figure grasped by the king. In keeping with the similarities on the monogram scarab from Tell Masos, this scarab would then read \( wsr-hpr(w)-(R^e) \) the prenomen of Seti II. If this scarab is indeed that of Seti II, it would represent the northernmost point that Seti II material has been found in Syria-Palestine, and gives a good archaeological context for

---


21 Albright, 51-52; Mumford, “International Relations,” 2401, 2406, and Table 13.2. For Tell Beit Mirsim, see Albright and Greenberg, 177-80.

22 Albright, 51-52; Mumford, “International Relations between Egypt, Sinai, and Syria-Palestine,” 2401-02, 2405-06.

23 Giveon and Kempinski, 105, and 105 note 19, but Albright, 52, identifies this scarab as a corrupt writing of \( wsr-Mf^e-t-R^e \) the prenomen of Ramesses II. Mumford, “International Relations,” 2406, dates the scarab as Ramesside. On the Tell Beit Mirsim scarab, \( wsr \) is written out instead of the smiting figure of the king standing for \( wsr \) as on the Tell Masos scarab. The only question is was the \( R^e \) sign omitted due to a lack of space or is the figure of the king supposed to represent the missing \( R^e \) because the king is the “son of Re?” Giveon and Kempinski, 105 note 19, gives no further insight. Brandl, 382-83, identifies this scarab as that of Seti II as well but with the \( R^e \) in Seti II’s prenomen omitted.
Seti II’s status in the area as Stratum C-2 represents the last occupation level before the Sea Peoples came into the area during the early years of the ancient Egyptian Twentieth Dynasty.\textsuperscript{25}

4. Menat Counterpoise Fragment from the Hathor Temple at Timna\textsuperscript{26}

Location: Part of the collection of the Museum Haaretz Tel Aviv, Israel\textsuperscript{27}

Transliteration: $[\text{wsr}]-hpr(w)-[R^\text{a}]$ $[\text{mrj-J}]mn$ or $[\text{wsr}]-hprw-[R^\text{a}]$ $[\text{stp.n}]-R^\text{c}$ after KRI 4: 242; Schulman, “Catalogue of the Egyptian Finds,” in \textit{Egyptian Mining Temple at Timna}, 119

Discussion and Comments on Number 4

This fragment from a faience menat counterpoise was discovered during 1969 excavations at the Hathor Temple at Timna, Israel.\textsuperscript{28} In its fragmentary state, only a few signs are preserved from this votive offering to Hathor. The preserved signs are a

\textsuperscript{25}Two further scarabs from Syria-Palestine are known; one from Tell Taannek and another formerly part of the Moshe Dayan collection now in the collection of the Israel Museum, Jerusalem. Not much is known about the scarab from Tell Taannek, as it is a surface find, and no known provenance for the former Dayan scarab. For more, see Giveon, “Monogram Scarab from Tel Masos,” 76; idem, \textit{Egyptian Scarabs from Western Asia}, 28 number 21; Giveon and Kempinski, 104. For the transition from Late Bronze Stratum C-2 into Iron Age Stratum B at Tell Beit Mirsim, dating to the Sea Peoples period, see Albright, 37-61; Mumford, “International Relations,” 2401-02, 2405-18.


\textsuperscript{27}Pinch, 66.

\textsuperscript{28}Ibid., 66, 271; Rothenberg, \textit{Were These King Solomon’s Mines}, 163; idem, \textit{The Egyptian Mining Temple at Timna}, 83; Schulman, “Catalogue of the Egyptian Finds,” 119. The menat counterpoise was found in locus 112 and given field number 115/1. See also Mumford, “International Relations,” 1355 table 5.13.
definite hpr beetle and what looks like about a third of a mn sign making this menat counterpoise fragment containing the prenomen of Seti II with its variant mrj-Jmn epithet reconstructed as [wšrt]-hpr(w)-[Rc] [mrj-J]mn “[User]kheper(u)[re] [Merya]mun. In contrast to this reading is that of Kenneth Kitchen and Alan Schulman who take the mn sign to be the plural strokes of the hpr beetle and the solar disc Rc sign, which would then make the preserved prenomen still that of Seti II but featuring his more common prenomen [wšrt]-hprw-[Rc stp.n]-Rc “[User]kheperu[re Setepen]re.”\(^\text{29}\) Another Timna fragment from a faience amulet preserves a fragmentary Sthw mrj[n]-PtH, but it is most likely that of Seti I, not Seti II, as the nomen cartouche is written more like Seti I with the PtH signs preceding the Seth element of the nomen.\(^\text{30}\)

In contrast to the alleged Naos Sistrum from Timna, now most likely that of Seti I, the presence of this Seti II fragment gives further proof that Amenmesse did not have a presence outside of Egypt. That Seti II was able to send and make offerings at the Hathor Temple at Timna shows that he was deemed the legitimate king of Egypt and was able to prevent Amenmesse from doing so to legitimize his rule.\(^\text{31}\)


\(^{30}\)The faience amulet was found in loci 101-102 and was given field number 208/1. Rothenberg, Were These King Solomon's Mines, 163, and 164 figure 48:1, identifies it as Seti I while Mumford, “International Relations,” 1330, 1364 table 5.15, classifies the amulet as either Seti I or II. Despite the arguments in Schulman, “Catalogue of the Egyptian Finds,” 139 number 195, 310, and figure 47:8, the nomen of this fragment fits the nomen of Seti I more than Seti II as the PtH elements clearly precede the Sthw and mrj signs as commonly found in the nomen of Seti I.

\(^{31}\)See comments concerning the Naos Sistrum from Timna in chapter 5 concerning the monuments of Amenmesse. Although the Seti II menat counterpoise fragment does not give any weight to the possibility of Seti II ruling from Lower Egypt for a period of time, it does show that Amenmesse did not send an expedition to Timna, thereby indicating the possibility that he was prevented from doing so.
Discussion and Comments on Number 5

At the site of Serabit el-Khadim in the Sinai, the ancient Egyptians sent numerous expeditions to the area that were involved in turquoise mining. During the expeditions, they erected a temple to Hathor dating to the Twelfth Dynasty and into the New Kingdom. On the south half of the Temple of Hathor pylon at Serabit el-Khadim,
Thutmose III carved a scene showing himself, Overseer of the Treasury Sennefer, and Chief [Steward] Kanunu worshipping and offering to Hathor. Some time during the Nineteenth Dynasty, Seti II added his prenomen and nomen \([wsr-hprw-R^c stp].n-[R^c] mrj-Jmn \text{Sth}[y] \ mrj.(n)-Pth\) “[Userkheperure Setep]en[re] Meryamun, Set[i]-Mer(ne)ptah.”

On the lower part of the pylon, additional scenes and text were added, possibly dating to the reign of Seti II, but this is uncertain due to the loss or destruction of the pylon by 1935. The text shows a figure offering to a goddess, possibly Hathor, and three fragmentary lines of text of which the first two read \(z\-nswt \ jmj\-r \ [m\,\bar{s}\,\varepsilon]\) wr \(wsr \ R^c\)

“King’s Son, Generalissimo, Userre(?).” The last line of text reads \(nswt \ bj\,fj \ [h\,q\,\bar{s} \] \ pdt \ 9 \ nb \ t\,\bar{w}y\) “King of Upper and Lower Egypt, [Ruler] of the Nine Bows, Lord of the Two Lands” followed by a trace of a cartouche ring, unfortunately with no preserved text.

---


35PM 7: 351 (194, 269), and map on 348; KRI 4: 242; RITA 4: 169; Černý, ed., 158-59 (194), 185 (269); Gardiner and Peet, plate 63; Mumford, “International Relations,” 1022, 1028 table 4.49, 1128-29 table 4.85; Petrie and Currelly, 80; Pinch, 51; Weill, 196-98 (86), 201 (90). Černý, ed., 158 (194), suggests that Kanunu’s title was \([j\,mj\,-r \ pr \ wr \ n \ nswt\) which Allen, 273 note 21, suggests a literal translation of \(j\,mj\,-r \ pr \ wr\) as “Great Overseer of the House” or “Chief Steward.”

36KRI 4: 242 note 16; Černý, ed., 158-59 (194), 185 (269); Mumford, “International Relations,” 1128-29 table 4.85.

37KRI 4: 242 note 16; suggests that \(wsr \ R^c\) might be a misreading for \(S\,th\,y\). On the other hand, this could be Seti II’s prenomen \(wsr-[hprw]-R^c\) but see comments as follows.

38Kitchen in KRI 4: 242, RITA 4: 169, suggests the missing group of signs before \(pdt \ 9\) was \(h\,q\,\bar{s}\) with the seated king determinative, but Černý, ed., 158 (194), 185 (269), suggests an alternate restoration of \([s\,gr] \ pdt \ 9\) “smiting the Nine Bows.” Another suggestion is \([d\,r] \ pdt \ 9\) “subduing/repulsing the Nine Bows” given that a common element of Seti II’s Nebty Name was
If these three lines of text do date to the time of Seti II, then the “King’s Son, Generalissimo” (zā-nswt jmj-r [mšr] wr) would have to be none other than Seti II as his prenomen fits the preserved traces on the pylon wsr-[ḥprw]-Rc “User[kheperu]re.” However, Seti II always used what eventually became his nomen Stḥy mrj.n-Pth when he possessed the titles of zā-nswt jmj-r mšr wr in his role as crown prince and heir apparent of King Merneptah, his father.39 A better solution would be that wsr Rc is a misreading of Stḥy as suggested by Kenneth Kitchen thereby making the person named on the pylon Seti-[Merneptah] (Stḥy [mrj.n-Pth]), a rarely attested son of Seti II.40 Alternatively, another suggestion is that the name is wsr-Rc “Userre” making this another son of Seti II if this inscription is to be associated with the reign of Seti II.41

6. Vase and Bowl Fragments from Temple of Hathor Serabit el-Khadim, Sinai (figures 6.5-6)42

Location: Some fragments in British Museum, London BM 13193, 13197, 13242, 4178343


39See attestations of this title in chapter 2 on the pre-royal career of Seti II.

40KRI 4: 242 note 16b. For more on Prince Seti-Merneptah, son of Seti II, see chapter 4 on the royal families of Amenmesse and Seti II.

41Gnirs, 87, makes a similar suggestion, but if so, this son is unattested except this now missing pylon at Serabit el-Khadim.

42References: PM 7: 364; KRI 4: 243; RITA 4: 169-70; Černý, ed., 185 (268); Mumford, “International Relations,” 1128-1130, and 1130 table 4.86; Pinch, 309-310; Petrie and Currelly, 140-41, 149, and figures 146:12, 147:5; Weill, 221 (135-36).

43The British Museum’s online catalog entry for BM 13193, 13197, 13242, and 41783, accessible by entering “13193, 13197, 13242, 41783” at <http://www.britishmuseum.org/>
Transliteration Petrie and Currelly, *Researches in Sinai*, figure 146:12: $nb$-$t³wy$ $wsr$-$ḥprw$-$R^c$ $stp$-$n$-$Ra$ $nb$ $ḥ³w$ $Sthy$ $mrj$-$n$-$Pt[t]$ $[mrj]$ $Hwt$-$Hr$ $ḥnwt$ $mfk³t$

Translation: Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheperure Setep[en]re, Lord of Appearances, Sety Merne[p]ah, [beloved of] Hathor, Mistress of Turquoise.\(^{44}\)

Transliteration Petrie and Currelly, *Researches in Sinai*, figure 147:5: $nb$-$t³wy$ $wsr$-$ḥprw$-$R^c$ $stp$-$n$-$R^c$ $nb$ $ḥ³w$ $Sthy$ $mrj$-$n$-$[Pth]$

Translation: Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheperure Step[enre], Lord of Appearances, Sety Merne[ptah].

Transliteration of KRI 4: 243a-b (BM 13197, 13242): $nb$-$t³wy$ $wsr$-$ḥprw$-$R^c$ $stp$-$n$-$R^c$ $Sthy$ $mrj$-$[n$-$Pth]$; KRI 4: 243c (BM 13193): $[Sthy$ $mrj$-$n$-$P[t]$]

Translation KRI 4: 243a-b\(^{45}\): Lord of the Two Lands Userkheperure Setepenre, Sety Mer[neptah]; KRI 4: 243c: [Sety Merne]p[t]ah

\(^{44}\)Pinch, 49, 273, suggests translating $Hwt$-$Hr$ $ḥnwt$ $mfk³t$ as “Hathor, Mistress of Mefkat” due to the varied meaning for $mfk³t$ as either turquoise, copper ore, or any blue-green mineral in general.

\(^{45}\)Mumford, “International Relations,” 1129 table 4.86, notes that the two fragments in KRI 4: 243a-b (BM 13197, 13242), and Weill, 221 (135), join together.
Discussion and Comments on Number 6

These pottery fragments from Serabit el-Khadim all came from Charles K. MacDonald’s excavations in the 1840s and Flinders Petrie’s excavations in 1904-1905 at the Temple of Hathor and represent part of the nearly thirty-two votive objects.
discovered at Serabit el-Khadim (figures 6.4-6.5).\textsuperscript{46} The total fragments come from at least eight vases and bowls, provided some fragments are not joins with other known fragments as with BM 13197 and BM 13242.\textsuperscript{47} Most feature fragmentary lines of titulary plus prenomen and nomen (BM 13197, 13242, 13193, 41783), but the better preserved pieces feature full titulary plus a dedication to Hathor “Mistress of Turquoise.”\textsuperscript{48}

7. Faience Vessel Fragment from Temple of Hathor Serabit el-Khadim, Sinai\textsuperscript{49}

Location: Musées Royaux d’Art et d’Historie, Brussels MR E2175

MR E2175 transliteration: \textit{nb-t\textthreebond{3}wy wsr-hprw-R\textsuperscript{e} stp.n-R\textsuperscript{e} z3-R\textsuperscript{e}}

Translation: Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheperure Setepenre, Son of Re\textsuperscript{50}

Discussion and Comments on Number 7

Very little information is available on this fragment in the collection of the Musées Royaux in Brussels, Belgium (MR E2175) other than that it is an inscribed faience vessel


\textsuperscript{47}Petrie and Currelly, 149, and Černý, ed., 185 (268), list a total of twenty-eight objects, but Mumford, “International Relations,” 1128, lists thirty-two. Pottery fragment totals based on Petrie and Currelly, 140-41, 149, and Mumford, “International Relations,” 1128-29 table 4.86.

\textsuperscript{48}For instance, see Petrie and Currelly, 140-41, and figures 146:12, 147:5. Whether either of these fragments can be associated with BM 41783 is unknown at present.

\textsuperscript{49}References: PM 7: 364; Černý, ed., 185 (268); Mumford, “International Relations,” 1128-29, 1133 table 4.86; Pinch, 307; Louis Speleers, \textit{Recueil des inscriptions égyptiennes des Musées Royaux du Cinquantenaire à Bruxelles} (Bruxelles: Vanderpoorten, 1923), 99 (401).

\textsuperscript{50}Based on Mumford, “International Relations,” 1133 table 4.86, and Speleers, 99 (401).
fragment coming from the Hathor Temple at Serabit el-Khadim. The inscription from MR E2175 consists of little but one element of titulary and the prenomen of Seti II reading *nb-t3wy wsr-hprw-R ē stp.n-R ē z3-R ē “Lord of the Two Lands Userkheperure Setepenre, Son of Re.” An additional fragment reported as having the name of Seti II upon it (MR E2012) actually is a bracelet fragment containing the name of Ramesses V *wsr-Māt-R ē shpr.n-R ē.*

8. Vase and Bracelet Fragments from Temple of Hathor Serabit el-Khadim, Sinai

Location: Bristol City Museum and Art Gallery, Bristol H3242, H3251

Vase Fragment H3242 Transliteration: *Sth[y] mrj.n-Pth*

Translation: “Set[i]-Merneptah”

Bracelet Fragments H3251 Transliteration: *z3-R ē Sthy mrj.(n)-Pth [mrj] Hwt-Hr hnwt mfkAt*

Translation: “Son of Re, Seti-Merneptah, [beloved of] Hathor, Mistress of Turquoise”

---

51PM 7: 364; Černý, ed., 185 (268); Pinch, 307; Mumford, “International Relations,” 1128-29, 1133 table 4.86.

52Mumford, “International Relations,” 1133 table 4.86; Speleers, 99 (401).

53PM 7: 364, identifies MR E2012 as belonging to Seti II, but Speleers, 99 (402), and Černý, ed., 192 (289), refute this. For this bracelet fragment, see Petrie and Currelly, 143, 149, and figure 149:12, 20.


55Thanks to Amber Druce, Documentation Assistant of Ethnography and Foreign Archaeology, at the Bristol City Museum and Art Gallery for answering inquiries concerning these pieces and providing pictures for consultation.
Discussion and Comments on Number 8

These fragments from the Temple of Hathor at Serabit el-Khadim, now in the collection of the Bristol City Museum and Art Gallery, have received very little, if any, mention in the literature dealing with the votive artifacts from Sinai. The only publications known are brief mentions in Porter and Moss and the catalog to the collections of the Bristol Museum. Vase fragment H3242 is a piece of glazed yellow-green cylindrical pottery with part of the outer surface preserved containing a nomen cartouche of Seti II $\text{Sth[y]} \ mrj.n-Pth$ painted in a dark brown followed by what appears to be a $\text{nb}$ sign. Bracelet fragment H3251 is actually two separate fragments of the same glazed bracelet that fit together. The bracelet fragments are blue-green to pale brown-green in color, and have an inscription painted in dark brown signs reading $\text{zî-Rc } \text{Sthy}$ $\text{mrj.(n)-Pth } [\text{mrj}] \text{ Hwt-Hr } \text{hnwt } \text{mfk[t]}$ “Son of Re, Seti-Merneptah, [beloved of] Hathor, Lady of Turquoise.”

---

56PM 7: 364; Grinsell, 53. Presumably H3242 and H3251 are included in the totals of objects listed in Petrie and Currelly, 149, but neither object appears to have been cited in Černý, ed., 185 (268), or Mumford, “International Relations,” 1128-33.

57Amber Druce, personal e-mail communication 4 March 2009.

58Ibid. The differences in color on H3251 are probably due to the glaze wearing off or discoloration over time. Note that the $n$ in $\text{mrj.n-Pth}$ is omitted in the writing, a feature seen on two fragmentary faience bracelets in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (E3323-24) and the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto (906.15.51, B.3128). Bracelet fragments H3251 probably are to be found in the listing of seventeen bracelets and bangles found by Flinders Petrie at Serabit el-Khadim in Petrie and Currelly, 143-44, 149; Mumford, “International Relations,” 1128, 1132 table 4.86.
Discussion and Comments on Number 9

This “lower part of a stem and the disc” belonging to a counterpoise of a menat necklace is about the only menat necklace votive discovered at Serabit el-Khadim to date.


60The British Museum’s online catalog entry for BM 41835, accessible by entering “41835” at <http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/museum_no__provenance_search.aspx> describes it as the “lower part of a blue-glazed menat-amulet, inscribed with the name of Sety II,” which does fit the object under description somewhat, but no references are given to link BM 41835 to the literature cited here.
(figure 6.6). The preserved line of text reads \( wsr-hprw-[R^r] \) \( stp.n-R^r \) “Userkheperu[re] Setepenre” over the sign for gold.

10. Faience Bracelet Fragments from Temple of Hathor Serabit el-Khadim, Sinai

Location: Ashmolean Museum, Oxford E3323-24; Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto 906.16.51 (B.3128) (figure 6.7)

Transliteration: \( nb-t^3wy \) \( wsr-hprw-R^r \) \( stp.n-R^r \) \( z^3-R^r \) \( Sthy \) \( mrj.(n)-Pth \) \( [mry] \) \( Hwt-Hr \) \( hnw\) \( mfk\) \( [r] \)

Translation: Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheperure Setepenre, Son of Re, Seti-Mer(ne)ptah, [beloved of] Hathor, Mistress of Turquoise

---


\(^{64}\) Perhaps add here BM 13193, 13197, and 13242 if the suggestion by Pinch, 272, that these are all bracelet fragments is correct. An additional votive bracelet or bangle fragment, BM 41801, might also be placed here, but it has a fragmentary prenomen that the British Museum online catalog identifies as ranging from Ramesses II to Ramesses VII, including Seti II as a possibility.

\(^{65}\) According to Mumford, “International Relations,” 1132 table 4.86, the Royal Ontario Museum example (906.16.51, B.3128) reads \( Sthy \) \( mrj.(n)-Pth \) \( [mry] \) \( Hwt-Hr \) “Seti-Mer(ne)ptah [beloved of] Hathor.” The author wishes to thank Gayle Gibson of the Royal Ontario Museum, and Dr. Susanne Onstine for their assistance in providing a photograph to allow confirmation of Mumford’s reading.
Discussion and Comments on Number 10

These fragmentary faience bracelet fragments are like the bracelet fragments in the Bristol City Museum and Art Gallery (H3251) in that they were all votive objects dedicated to Hathor at Serabit el-Khadim by Seti II. The four fragments in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (E3323-24; figure 6.7) belong to the same faience bracelet, and the text upon the bracelet reads \( nb-t\bar{3}wy\ wsr\-hprw\-R\bar{e}\ stp\-n\-R\bar{e}\ zt\-R\bar{e}\ St\bar{h}y\ mrf\-(n)\-P\bar{h}\ [mry]\ Hwt-Hr\ hnwt\ mfk\par t \) “Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheperure Setepenre, Son of Re, Seti-Mer(ne)ptah, [beloved of] Hathor, Mistress of Turquoise,” which is very similar to the dedication to Hathor as on the Bristol City Museum and Art Gallery bracelet fragments.\(^6^6\) The fragment preserved in the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto (906.16.51, 

\(^6^6\)KRI 4: 243; RITA 4: 169; Černý, ed., 185 (268); Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 138; Mumford, “International Relations,” 1132 table 4.86; Pinch, 273; Petrie and Currelly, 143-44, and figure 149:7; PM 7: 364, identifies the bracelet illustrated in Petrie and Currelly, figure 149:7, with Ashmolean Museum example E3323, but Mumford, “International Relations,” 1132 table 4.86, tends to suggest that E3323 is a different bracelet entirely.
B.3128) contain a more fragmentary text reading Sthy mrj\(n\)-Pth [mry] Hwt-Hr “Seti-
Mer(ne)ptah [beloved of] Hathor.”

11. Faience Sistrum Handle from Temple of Hathor Serabit el-Khadim, Sinai (figure
6.8)\(^68\)

Location: Bolton Museum, Bolton 1905.68.47\(^69\)

Transliteration: nb h\(^5\)w Sthy mrj.n-Pth mr[y] Hwt-Hr h\(nwt\) mfk\(3\)t

Translation: Lord of Appearances, Sety Merneptah, beloved of Hathor, Mistress of
Turquoise

\(^67\)Mumford, “International Relations,” 1132 table 4.86; Pinch, 273. According to Pinch, 273,
and prior examples such as Ashmolean E3323 and Bristol H3251, the full epithet following
Hathor would presumably have read Hwt-Hr [h\(nwt\) mfk\(3\)t] but nothing else is preserved on Royal
Ontario Museum 906.16.51 (B.3128).

\(^68\)References: PM 7: 364; KRI 4: 243; RITA 4: 169; Černý, ed., 185 (268); Mumford,
“International Relations,” 1128-29, 1132 table 4.86; Pinch, 145-46; Petrie and Currelly, 147, and
figure 151:19.

\(^69\)The author wishes to thank Tom Hardwick, Curator for Egyptian Art and Archaeology at the
Bolton Museum and Art Gallery for his assistance in providing the museum number for the
sistrum handle and confirming that it is the same example as illustrated in Petrie and Currelly,
an additional sistrum fragment in the British Museum (BM 41838) as coming from Serabit el-
Khadim, but the British Museum’s online database labels BM 41838 as coming from Deir el-
Bahri. See also the British Museum’s online catalog entry by entering “41838” at
<http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/museum_no__provena-
nce_search.aspx>.
Discussion and Comments on Number 11

In the collection of the Bolton Museum is a faience sistrum handle (1905.68.47) that is one of three fragmentary sistra discovered during Flinders Petrie’s 1904-1905 excavations in the Temple of Hathor at Serabit el-Khadim, Sinai. The inscription, although very faint today due to salt upon the piece caused by paraffin wax, reads *nb hꜷw Sḥḥy mṛj.n-Pṯḥ mṛ[y] Ḥwt-Ḥr ḫwṭ mtk₇t “Lord of Appearances, Sety Merneptah, beloved of Hathor, Mistress of Turquoise.” Nonetheless, upon looking at recent photographs of Bolton Museum 1905.68.47, it appears that no earlier accounts of this piece noted that

---

70PM 7: 364; Černý, ed., 185 (268); Mumford, “International Relations,” 1128-29, 1132 table 4.86; Pinch, 145-46; Petrie and Currelly, 147, 149, and figure 151:19.

71KRI 4: 243; RITA 4: 169. Tom Hardwick, personal email communication 3 March and 31 March 2009, describes the current state of the piece due to a salt “bloom.” Černý, ed., 185 (268), Mumford, “International Relations,” 1132 table 4.86, and Pinch, 145, have *nb tḥwy “Lord of the Two Lands” instead of *nb hꜷw “Lord of Appearances” before Sḥḥy mṛj.n-Pṯḥ, but the plural strokes for *hꜷw can be seen in the photograph in Petrie and Currelly, figure 151:19.
both sides of the sistrum handle were inscribed. Regrettably, the salting caused by the paraffin wax has rendered the other side of the handle illegible other than faint traces of what looks like a possible nb sign and a wsr sign.  

12. Jar/Vase Stands from Temple of Hathor Serabit el-Khadim, Sinai  

Location: British Museum, London BM 41775; Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto 906.16.34 (B.3111)

Discussion and Comments on Number 12

Of the nearly thirty-two votive objects bearing Seti II’s name at the Temple of Hathor at Serabit el-Khadim, a few ring stands, for placing jars or vases upon, were found bearing Seti II’s name, but confusing the matter somewhat is Petrie’s description of them as being either ring stands or “large armlets.” Petrie describes one of these ring stands as having a Hathor head with two guardian cats on either side of the head. The other ring stand linked to Serabit el-Khadim is in the British Museum in London (BM 41775).

---

72 Photos 1905.68.47a-b provided by Tom Hardwick, personal e-mail communication 31 March 2009. In looking at photo 1905.68.47a, the traces might fit a reconstruction nb [t₃wy] wsr-[ḥprw-R], but the traces are too faint to suggest anything definite.


74 Petrie and Currelly, 146. Mumford, “International Relations,” 1128-29, and 1131 table 4.86, cites a total of three ring stands.

75 Petrie and Currelly, 145-46 number 16; Mumford, “International Relations,” 1131 table 4.86; Pinch, 189.
It is composed of three joined fragments of a ring stand with a green glaze with the prenomen and nomen of Seti II and the name of Hathor.\textsuperscript{76}

The second ring stand comes from the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto (906.16.34; B.3111) and is a white faience ring-stand with the name $wsr$-$hprw$-$R^e$ $stp.n$-$R^e$ written in black. It was initially identified by Gregory Mumford as that of Horemheb, but amended later to belonging to Seti II.\textsuperscript{77}

Comments on objects from Temple of Hathor at Serabit el-Khadin (numbers 5-12)

In examining these nearly thirty-two objects from the Temple of Hathor at Serabit el-Khadin, a varied amount of materials came from Flinders Petrie’s excavations there ranging from vase and jar fragments, sistra fragments, ring stands, faience bracelets, and a solitary menat fragment.\textsuperscript{78} Given the effects of the environment in the Sinai, there could have been more votive objects dedicated than just the thirty-two known examples preserved in museum collections across the world. What is even more evident is that Seti II votives at the Temple of Hathor at Serabit el-Khadin, although few in number, far

\textsuperscript{76}Mumford, “International Relations,” 1131 table 4.86; Pinch 189, 307. See also the British Museum’s online catalog entry by entering “41775” at &lt;http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/museum_no__provenance_search.aspx&gt;. Although not specifically stated in the British Museum’s online catalog entry, the inscription on BM 41775 is probably a standard dedication to Hathor as on other objects described previously and can be reconstructed as $wsr$-$hprw$-$R^e$ $stp.n$-$R^e$ $Sthy$ $mrj.n$-$Pth$ $[mry]$ $Hwtr-Hr$ $[hnwt$ $mfk3t]$ “Userkheperure Setepenre, Seti-Merneptah, [beloved of] Hathor [Mistress of Turquoise].

\textsuperscript{77}Mumford, “Egypt’s New Kingdom Levantine Empire and Serabit El-khadim,” 159-203, but amended to Seti II in idem, “Correction Regarding ‘A Newly Attested Votive Offering of Horemheb,’” 159-62. Part of the problem in identifying this ring-stand pointed out by Mumford, “Correction Regarding ‘A Newly Attested Votive Offering of Horemheb,’” 159-62, results from a misidentification on the original museum index card and unsuccessful attempts to examine the object in question.

\textsuperscript{78}Petrie and Currelly, 149; Mumford, “International Relations,” 1128, 1129-1133 table 4.86; idem, “Egypt’s New Kingdom Levantine Empire and Serabit El-khadim,” 160, 164, 184 note 97, 188, 191, 200-203.
outnumber any known votives for Amenmesse there, which is a grand sum of zero.\textsuperscript{79} Again, as with the contrast between Seti II and Amenmesse material from Timna, it appears that Amenmesse was prevented from sending expeditions to Serabit el-Khadim based on the dominance of Seti II votive material at the Hathor Temple. Even if Amenmesse did send an expedition there, Seti II made certain than whatever traces Amenmesse left behind did not survive to become part of the archaeological and historical record of Serabit el-Khadim.

13. Scarab from Deir el-Balah\textsuperscript{80}

Location: Currently Unknown

Discussion and Comments on Number 13

During excavation carried out by the Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and the Israel Exploration Society at the site of Deir el-Balah, initial reports made claims that a scarab of Seti II was found in the Late Bronze Age.

\textsuperscript{79} Mumford, “International Relations,” 315, 329, 1128; idem, “Egypt’s New Kingdom Levantine Empire and Serabit El-khadim,” 183 note 93, 184 notes 97-98.

necropolis situated at Deir el-Balah. These reports may have been a bit hasty as the official reports made by Trude Dothan and Raphael Giveon of materials found during the 1972 excavation season at Deir el-Balah made mention of a scarab of “Seth I (?)” but nothing about a scarab of Seti II or any later Nineteenth Dynasty ruler. By 1982, Dothan clarified the initial findings to say that the scarab contained the prenomen of Seti I (mn-M3t-Rṣ) and not that of Seti II (wsr-hprw-Rṣ).83


82 Dothan, “Anthropoid Clay Coffins from a Late Bronze Age Cemetery,” 138. Mumford, “International Relations,” 1734 table 7.63, points out that the analysis of ancient Egyptian objects from the 1972 season at Deir el-Balah in Giveon, “Egyptian Finger Rings and Seals from South of Gaza,” 67, makes no mention of a Seti I scarab indicating that Giveon possibly did not see the scarab before finishing his article.

83 Dothan, Philistines and Their Material Culture, 279; Mumford, “International Relations,” 1627, 1734 table 7.63. In conjunction with this is that the official publication of some of the burials in Trude Dothan, Excavations at the Cemetery of Deir el-Balah, QEDEM: Monographs of The Institute of Archaeology, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 10 (Jerusalem: The Institute of Archaeology, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1979), makes no mention of Seti II in any of the Egyptian material found.
14. Vessel from North East Sinai Fort at Haruba (Site A.269)\textsuperscript{84}

Location: Currently Unknown.

Transliteration: $nb\ t\{wy\} [wshr-hprw-R^e\ stp].n-\{R^e\ mrj-Jmn\} nb [h^e\wn] SiThy \{mrj.n-[Pth}\]

Translation: “Lord of the [Two] Land[s] [Userkheperure Setep]en[re Meryamun], Lord of [Appearances] Seti-Merne[ptah]\textsuperscript{85}

Discussion and Comments on Number 14

During 1979-1982 excavations conducted at Haruba by the Archaeology Division of the Ben Gurion University of the Negev, excavators discovered an ancient Egyptian fort (site A-289) as well as an administrative center and encampment (sites A-345, A-343)


\textsuperscript{85}Transliteration and translation based on drawing of reconstructed cartouche from discovered fragments in Goldwasser, “Egyptian Store-Jar from Haruvit,” 34, and KRI 7: 245.
dating to the New Kingdom.\textsuperscript{86} While excavating the north-east corner of the ancient
Egyptian fort at Haruba (site A-289), the excavators found a brick platform presumably
for supporting a flight of stairs leading to the top of the fortified wall. A room adjoining
this brick platform contained a mostly intact ancient Egyptian pithos set into a pit and
fragments from another with both vessels decorated with ancient Egyptian cartouches.\textsuperscript{87}
The cartouches on the fragmentary pithos resemble those found on the Seti II jar
fragments at Tell el-Farah (South), and these Haruba fort fragments read

\begin{verbatim}

\textit{nb t\textsuperscript{3}w} [\textit{wsr-hprw-R\textsuperscript{c} stp}].n-[\textit{R\textsuperscript{c} mrj-Jmn}] nb [\textit{h\textsuperscript{c}w} \textit{Sthy mrj.n-[Pth]} “Lord of the [Two] Land[s] [Userkheperure Setep]en[re Meryamun], Lord of [Appearances] Seti-
Merne[ptah].”\textsuperscript{88} In a more recent revision of the findings, Eliezer Oren now notes that
the cartouches on the intact pithos and the fragmentary pithos at Haruba are those of Seti
II thereby dating both vessels to his reign.\textsuperscript{89}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{86}Oren, “Egyptian New Kingdom Sites in North-Eastern Sinai,” 26-33; idem, “‘Governor’s
Residencies’ in Canaan,” 47-48; idem, “‘Ways of Horus’ in North Sinai,” 84-107; idem,
“Northern Sinai,” 1390-91; idem, “Establishment of Egyptian Imperial Administration,” 281-83,

\textsuperscript{87}Oren, “Governor’s Residencies’ in Canaan,” 47-48; idem, “‘Ways of Horus’ in North
Sinai,” 92; idem, “Northern Sinai,” 1390. Both Mumford, “International Relations between
Egypt, Sinai, and Syria-Palestine,” 643 table 3.87, and Oren, “‘Ways of Horus’ in North Sinai,”
92, describe the non-fragmentary pithos as having its top broken off.

\textsuperscript{88}KRI 7: 245; Goldwasser, “Egyptian Store-Jar from Haruvit,” 34; idem, “Hieratic Inscriptions
from Tel Sera\textsuperscript{a},” 84; Mumford, “International Relations,” 643 table 3.87; Oren, “‘Ways of Horus’
in North Sinai,” 92-93, and 90 plate F, 91 figure 7.

\textsuperscript{89}Oren, “Northern Sinai,” 1390; Mumford, “International Relations,” 642-43, and table 3.87.
Conversely, earlier descriptions of the Seti II material in Goldwasser, “Egyptian Store-Jar from
Haruvit,” 34; idem, “Hieratic Inscriptions from Tel Sera\textsuperscript{a},” 84; Oren, “‘Governor's Residencies’
in Canaan,” 47-48; idem, “‘Ways of Horus’ in North Sinai,” 92-93, and 90 plate F, 91 figure 7,
tend to focus on only what seems to be the Seti II pithos fragments and not the mostly intact one.
The only published photograph of the intact pithos in Oren, “Egyptian New Kingdom Sites,” 30,
Lower Egypt

15. Bronze sword from Buto (Tell el-Farain)\textsuperscript{90}

Location: Egyptian Museum, Berlin 20305

Transliteration: \textit{wsr-hprw-Ra\ mrij-Jmn Sthyt mrij.n-Pth}

Translation: Userkheperure Meryamun, Seti-Merneptah\textsuperscript{91}

Discussion and Comments on Number 15

This bronze sword from the Egyptian Museum in Berlin (20305) originally came from Buto (Tell el-Farain) in the Egyptian Delta, and it not the usual sickle-shaped \textit{khepsh} (\textit{hpš}) sword as normally found in Egypt. Rather, this straight sword is a weapon “designed primarily for cutting and slashing” introduced during the Late Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{92}

This Seti II sword is believed to be the earliest known example of its type, and it is does not seem to show any cartouches upon it, but Mumford, “International Relations,” 643 table 3.87, seems to suggest that the published fragments belong to the pithos with the missing top, and the fragments from the other Seti II pithos remain unpublished.


\textsuperscript{91}Burchardt, 61 figure 2, seems to indicate intentional or environmental damage to the Seth sign in the prenomen as Burchardt’s drawing shows [\textit{Sthyt} mrij.n-Pth, and the available photograph in Burchardt’s plate 5 does show a badly corroded sword. However, \textit{KRI} 4: 243, and Roeder, ed., \textit{Ägyptische Inschriften aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin}, 2: 311, show no damage at all in their collations.

\textsuperscript{92}Hasel, \textit{Domination and Resistance}, 104. For the sword coming from Buto (Tell el-Farain), see PM 4: 45; Burchardt, 61-62.
inscribed with the prenomen and nomen of Seti II \( wsrhprw-R^e \ mrj-Jmn Sihy mrj.n-Pth \) with each nomen being topped by a double-plumed solar disc.\(^93\)

Tanis and Qantir

16. Tanis Block originally from Pi-Ramesse (Qantir) (figure 6.9)\(^94\)

Location: Currently Unknown

Figure 6.9. Block of Seti II from Tanis. Detail of Petrie, *Tanis*, 2: plate 7:141.

Discussion and Comments on Number 16

Amongst the architectural elements from temples, palaces, and other structures coming from the Ramesside capital city of Pi-Ramesse (Qantir) that the Twenty-First Dynasty kings utilized at their capital of Tanis (San el-Hagar) were materials dating to


the reign of Seti II. This fragmentary block of unspecified composition at Tanis, first described by Flinders Petrie in 1886, is one such item originating from a Seti II structure at Pi-Ramesse. It is uncertain according to Petrie’s sole published report if this is part of a gateway, wall, or even an inscription added to an earlier monument.95 A fragmentary inscription at the top of the block, originally two lines, has a preserved nomen reading Stīh mṛj.n-Pṭḥ dj ʿnh “Seti-Merneptah, given life.”96 Beneath these lines of text was a scene showing Seti II before Atum but nothing is preserved of the original figures of Seti II and Atum except the upper part, maybe a third, of a dual crown. Before Atum’s name are two fragmentary cartouches of Seti II the prenomen reading nb t3wy wsr-hpr[w]-Rc “Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheper[u]re” and the nomen reading nb ḫw Stīh [mṛj.n-Pṭḥ] dj ʿnh mj Rc “Lord of Appearances, Seti-[Merneptah], given life like Re.”97

17. Tanis Granite Column Drum originally from Pi-Ramesse (Qantir)98

Location: Believed in situ

Transliteration: wsr-hprw-Rc mṛj-[Jmn] Stīh [mṛj.n-Pṭḥ]

95Petrie, Tanis, 2: 11. The block could be limestone or granite, as other blocks found by Petrie are described as such, but Petrie never specifically describes what type of rock this block is carved from.

96Kitchen suggests in KRI 4: 243, RITA 4: 170, that the upper inscription might be a bandeau text. He also takes the trace of a n and ḫ before the nomen to read [Pt]ḥ n Stīh mṛj.n-Pṭḥ dj ʿnh “[Pt]ah of Seti-Merneptah, given life.”

97KRI 4: 243, RITA 4: 170; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 136; Petrie, Tanis, 2: 11, 29, plate 7: 141. The nomen in the lower cartouche can be restored Stīh [mṛj.n-Pṭḥ] based on the preserved nomen in the upper line of text. However, it is uncertain if the lower prenomen had the normal stp.n-Rc or mṛj-Jmn variant as nothing else is preserved.

Translation: Userkheperure Mery[amun] Seti-[Merneptah]

Discussion and Comments on Number 17

As with the Tanis block of Seti II described previously, this granite column drum came from a palace or temple at Pi-Ramesse and ended up being used in a construction at the sacred lake of Tanis. Little else is preserved other than the upper part of the prenomen and nomen \( wsr-hprw-R^e \) mrj-[Jmn] \( Sthy [mrj.n-Pth] \). Even though the column drum is only partially preserved, Pierre Montet noted that Seti II’s cartouches were carved over an earlier inscription. He notes traces of the earlier inscription between the cartouches and some traces under Seti II’s nomen, but evidently not enough of the earlier inscription could be interpreted to show what it originally was.

18. Qantir Moulds

Location: Currently Unknown

Transliteration: \( wsr-hprw-R^e \) stp.n-R^e and \( wsr-hpr(w)-R^e \) stp.n-R^e mrj-Jmn

Translation: Userkheperure Setepenre and Userkheper(u)re Setepenre Meryamun

\(^{99}KRI\ 4: 244; \ RITA\ 4: 170. \ Montet, 39, restores the prenomen as \( wsr-hprw-R^e \ [stp.n-R^e] \), but as pointed out in \( KRI\ 4: 244, \) there is a definite trace of the \( mrj \) sign visible on the photograph in Montet, plate 44:11.

\(^{100}\)Montet, 39.

\(^{101}\)References: PM 4: 9-10; KRI 4: 244; \( RITA\ 4: 170; \) Labib Habachi et al., \( Tell\ el-Dab’a\ I: \ Tell\ el-Dab’a\ and\ Qantir,\ the\ Sites\ and\ its\ Connection\ with\ Avaris\ and\ Piramesse, \) Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Denkschriften der Gesamtakademia, vol. 23 (Wien: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2001), 51-52; Mahmud Hamza, “Excavations of the Department of Antiquities at Qantir (Faqûs district) season, May 21st-July 7th, 1928,” \( A\ SAE\ 30\ (1930):\ 58,\ 60,\ 61 \) figure 15:12, and plate 4c; William C. Hayes, \( Glazed\ Tiles\ from\ a\ Palace\ of\ Ramesses\ II\ at\ Kantir,\ \) The Metropolitan Museum of Art Papers, no. 3 (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1937; reprint, [New York]: Arno Press, 1973), 6-7.
Discussion and Comments on Number 18

These two moulds for the production of objects featuring Seti II’s prenomen are amongst the first discoveries of his presence at the site of Pi-Ramesse, or modern Qantir, and come from what is described as the remains of a “faience and glazing workshop.” These Seti II moulds discovered during excavations in 1928 resemble similar moulds found at the site during German excavations at Qantir since the 1980s. These moulds feature the prenomen of Seti II \( wsr-hprw-R^a \) \( stp.n-R^a \) with another featuring the normal prenomen of \( wsr-hpr(w)-R^a \) \( stp.n-R^a \) and an additional sign of what appears to be a \( M^3t \) with an extra \( t \). Mahmud Hamza, the excavator who discovered the moulds during the 1928 season at Qantir, thought that this mould was that of Ramesses X, but his prenomen usually reads \( hpr-M^3t-R^a \) \( stp.n-R^a \). Kenneth Kitchen suggests that the writing of the final element is a garbled \( mrj-Jmn \) making the full prenomen \( wsr-hpr(w)-R^a \) \( stp.n-R^a \) \( mrj-Jmn \).

---

102Hamza, “Excavations of the Department of Antiquities at Qantir,” 41-42, 45, 53. See also PM 4: 9-10; Hayes, Glazed Tiles, 6-7; Labib Habachi et al., Tell el-Dab’a I: Tell el-Dab’a and Qantir, 51-52.

103Pusch, “Tausret und Sethos II,” 101-102, and see further comments below.

104KRI 4: 244; RITA 4: 170; Hamza, “Excavations of the Department of Antiquities at Qantir,” 61 figure 15:12, and plate 4c.

105Hamza, “Excavations of the Department of Antiquities at Qantir,” 60-62.

106KRI 4: 244 note 4."
19. Faience Moulds and Limestone Architrave from Qantir

Location: Currently Unknown

Discussion and Comments on Number 19

Ongoing German excavations by the Pelizaeus Museum in Hildesheim at the site of Qantir have revealed a sizeable detail of how the city of Pi-Ramesse looked during the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties. In particular, new information is emerging of the occupation of Pi-Ramesse during the later half of the Nineteenth Dynasty, especially during the reign of Seti II. A series of moulds turned up during excavations at Qantir, and these thirty-five moulds were all for the production of faience objects featuring Seti II’s prenomen, nomen, or both elements of his name. The shape of these faience moulds range from oval, rectangular, to cartouche shaped and those featuring Seti II’s prenomen have the standard elements of $wsr\cdot hpr\cdot R^\circ stp\cdot n\cdot R^\circ$ or $wsr\cdot hpr\cdot R^\circ mrj\cdot Jmn$, but three examples (Field numbers 92/0650, 97/0183, 98/1062) have the variant spelling of $wsr\cdot hpr\cdot (w)\cdot R^\circ mrj\cdot n\cdot Jmn$. The faience moulds featuring Seti II’s nomen all feature the standard $S\theta y \; mrj\cdot n\cdot P\theta h$, but Edgar Pusch, leader of the Pelizaeus Museum excavations at

\[108\] Pusch, “Vorbericht über die Abschlusskampagne,” 29; idem, “Tausret und Sethos II,” 101-102, and 103 illustration 1. One of the moulds (92/0847) found so far to feature Seti II’s prenomen and nomen also contains the variant spelling $wsr\cdot hpr\cdot w\cdot R^\circ mrj\cdot n\cdot Jmn$. Moulds similar to these found at Qantir, one coming from Memphis and the other of unknown provenance, are in the collection of the Ägyptologische Sammlung, University of Heidelberg (Inventory numbers 206, 2041) reading $wsr\cdot hpr\cdot (R^\circ) mrj\cdot Jmn$ and $(wsr)\cdot hpr\cdot (w)\cdot (R^\circ) mrj\cdot Jm(n)$. For more see Feucht, ed., 161, number 410a-b.
Qantir, expresses some hesitation in identifying these nomen moulds as belonging entirely to Seti II as some of these could belong to Seti I.\textsuperscript{109}

Adding further to the presence of Seti II at Pi-Ramesse is a fragmentary architrave discovered in 1997 from a doorway of Seti II belonging to one of the Ramesside Period buildings there. The limestone architrave, as preserved, is two fragments (Field numbers 97/0584, 97/0582; Inventory numbers 1699-1700) that originally featured Seti II and Queen Tausret worshipping or offering to one or more ancient Egyptian gods whose identities are not known due to their names not being preserved on the available fragments.\textsuperscript{110} The fragment with Seti II’s name (Field number 97/0584; Inventory number 1699) came from area Q IV at Qantir just outside one of the southern walls of the horse stables of Pi-Ramesse.\textsuperscript{111} The preserved inscription on the Seti II fragment is little more than part of the prenomen and nomen of Seti II, with traces of blue and red paint upon the stone, reading $[nb] \ t\text{awy} \ wsr-hprw-R^c \ mrj-Jm[n] \ nb \ h^w \ St\text{hy} \ mrj.n-[P\text{th}]$ “[Lord] of the Two Lands, Userkheperure Meryamu[n], Lord of Appearances, Seti-Merne[ptah].”\textsuperscript{112}

\textsuperscript{109}Pusch, “Tausret und Sethos II,” 101.

\textsuperscript{110}Pusch, “Vorbericht über die Abschlusskampagne,” 29; idem, “Tausret und Sethos II,” 101-107; Callender, “Queen Tausret and the End of Dynasty 19,” 86, 97-98.

\textsuperscript{111}See a reconstruction of the architrave in Pusch, “Tausret und Sethos II,” 104 illustration 4. For the find location at Qantir, see Pusch, “Tausret und Sethos II,” 104 illustration 6, area Q IV grid i/31. The Tausert fragment is commented upon in chapter 4 dealing with the royal families of Amenmesse and Seti II.

\textsuperscript{112}Pusch, “Tausret und Sethos II,” 101-103. Pusch reconstructs the nomen on this fragment as $St\text{hy} \ mrj.n-[Pr]h$, and shows a trace of what could be the upper part of the rounded loop of the $h$ on 103 illustration 2, but this trace is not discernable on the published photograph on 105 illustration 5.
20. Limestone Doorway of Deputy and Chief Craftsman Huy from Qantir

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE 58705

Discussion and Comments on Number 20

This doorway, consisting of two decorated doorjambs and a lintel, originally came from a house at Pi-Ramesse, or the modern site of Qantir. It was confiscated by the Antiquities Service in October 1930 after its discovery on a farm at Ezbet Kosti Sawa and a subsequent attempt to sell it on the antiquities market. After its seizure, it was turned over to the Egyptian Museum in Cairo where it resides today (JE 58705). The lintel has in its center cartouches topped by solar plumes and resting on the gold sign containing the prenomen and nomen of Seti II

\[\text{wsr-hprw-} \text{R}^c \text{ stp.} \text{n-R}^c \text{ mrj-} \text{Jmn Sthy mrj.} \text{n-Pth}\]

flanked on either side by Seti II’s variant Horus name of \[\text{k3 nht mk Kmt}\]. On either side of Seti II’s name is a figure of a kneeling worshipping figure in front of text identifying him as \text{jdnw} and \text{jmj-r}


\[\text{\footnotesize 114 Gauthier, “Une tombe de la XIXe dynastie à Qantir,” 115-28, and plate 32; Habachi et al., Tell el-Dab’a I: Tell el-Dab’a and Qantir, 31-32, 39, 41, 53-54, 56, 61, 67, 113, 198-99, and plate 25. Gauthier, “Une tombe de la XIXe dynastie à Qantir,” 115, mistakenly identifies JE 58705 as a tomb doorway and glosses over the circumstances of its acquisition detailed in Habachi et al., Tell el-Dab’a I: Tell el-Dab’a and Qantir, 31-32, 53-54, 198.}\]
hmty wty $pr$ Mntw “Deputy and Overseer of the Workshop, Huy, of the Temple of Monthu.”¹¹⁵

The right doorjamb contains a long $htp$-$dj$-$nswt$ formula of Seti II offering to Ptah, Sekhmet, and Seth alternating with his prenomen and nomen

\[ wsr$-$hrpw$-$R³ stp$-$n$-$R³ mrj$-$Jmn Sth$y$ mrj$-$n$-$Pth. \]

Huy is again named on the right jamb as $jmj$$-r$ $hmty$ $n$ $nb$ $t³wy$ “Overseer of the Workshop of the Lord of the Two Lands,” and $jmj$$-r$ $hmty$ $wr$ “Great Overseer of the Workshop,” all “of the Temple of Monthu.”¹¹⁶ On the left jamb, Seti II gives a $htp$-$dj$-$nswt$ to Amun-Re, Mut, and Khonsu, using the same prenomen and nomen as on the right jamb, and Huy bears the titles on the left jamb of $jdnw$ “Deputy” and $jmj$$-r$ $hmty$ $n$ $nb$ $t³wy$ “Great Overseer of the Workshop of the Lord of the Two Lands.”¹¹⁷

Other than his titles that Huy was a “Deputy and Great Overseer of the Workshop of the Lord of the Two Lands,” which is his penultimate title, Huy was attached to the temple of Monthu as a functionary with his roles as indicated by his previously mentioned titles. This doorway came from his house, number four, at the site of Qantir.

¹¹⁵KRI 4: 294-95; RITA 4: 213; Gauthier, “Une tombe de la XIXe dynastie à Qantir,” 116-17; Habachi et al., Tell el-Dab‘a I: Tell el-Dab‘a and Qantir, 198; Spieser, 208, 306. Translation given is an amagalmation of the righ and left titulary.

¹¹⁶KRI 4: 295; RITA 4: 213; Gauthier, “Une tombe de la XIXe dynastie à Qantir,” 119; Habachi et al., Tell el-Dab‘a I: Tell el-Dab‘a and Qantir, 199; Spieser, 208, 306; Sourouzian, “Seth fils de Nout,” 352.

¹¹⁷KRI 4: 295; RITA 4: 213-14; Gauthier, “Une tombe de la XIXe dynastie à Qantir,” 118-19; Habachi et al., Tell el-Dab‘a I: Tell el-Dab‘a and Qantir, 199; Spieser, 208, 306.
which means that Huy had enough status to be allowed residence at Pi-Ramesse, but no other monuments are known concerning Huy.118

21. Titulary on Black Granite Obelisk of Ramesses II from Athribis (Tell Atrib)119

Location: Egyptian Museum, Berlin 12800

Discussion and Comments on Number 21

This black granite obelisk, now in the Egyptian Museum in Berlin (12800), was being used as threshold for a house in Cairo but is “probably from Tell Atrib,” or Athribis in Lower Egypt.120 The original provenance of Berlin 12800 as coming from Tell Atrib is supported by the reference on the obelisk to Sekhmet and Isis “residing in the Athribis Province” along with Horus Khenty-Khenty (Hr-Ḥntj-ḥty) being mentioned on the quartzite socle to this obelisk in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo.121 The obelisk has the

---

118 See the known details of Huy and his house in Habachi et al., *Tell el-Dab’a I: Tell el-Dab’a and Qantir*, 31-32, 39, 41, 53-54, 56, 61, 67, 113, 198-99.


120 PM 4: 70, mentions that this obelisk might be an original Middle Kingdom monument. Sourouzian, *Monuments du roi Merenptah*, 72, states the obelisk is preserved to a height of about 320 cm.

121 KRI 4: 244-45; RITA 4: 171. On this obelisk Athribis, capital of the Tenth Lower Egyptian Nome, is not written as Hwt-t3-hrj-jb but as Km-wr “Kem-wer” in reference to “The Great Black One,” or the local god of Athribis. For more on Kem-wer, see Baines and Mâlek, 171; Hannig, 1196, 1272. For the spellings of Hwt-t3-hrj-jb and Km-wr, see Hannig, 1171, 1196. Baines and Mâlek, 171, mention Horus-Khenty-Khenty, or Horus Khentekhtai, as another local god of Athribis. For the quartzite socle in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (JE 72147, TR 11/11/20/20
titulary of Ramesses II preserved upon two sides, and Merneptah, son of Ramesses II, carved his names upon it after becoming king himself. After becoming king, Seti II carved his full Horus, Neby
\[\text{nht-hpš dr-pdt-9} \text{ “Strong of Arm, Subduing the Nine Bows,” Golden Horus}\]

“Great of Dread in all Lands,” prenomen and nomen upon all four sides of Berlin 12800 with the normal defacement of the Seth sign occurring after Seti II’s reign.\(^{122}\) An attestation of one variant Horus name is found on Berlin 12800 with
\[\text{k3 nht wr-pḥtj} \text{ “Mighty Bull, Great of Strength,” instead of} \text{k3 nht mry-R} \text{ “Mighty Bull, Beloved of Re.” The nomen reads} \text{Sthy mry.n-Pḥ} \text{ but is written here as}\]
with Seth and Ptah facing each other.\(^{123}\)

22. Inscription on Fragmentary Black Granite Obelisk of Ramesses II from Athribis\(^{124}\)

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo TR 25/11/18/5

---

\(^{122}\) KRI 4: 244-45, and 244 notes 7\(^{a}\), 9\(^{a}\), 12\(^{a}\); KRI 7: 434; RITA 4: 170-71; Roeder, ed., Ägyptische Inschriften aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin, 2: 28-34, Vernus, Athribis, 40; For the earlier inscriptions of Ramesses II and Merneptah, see KRI 2: 465-67; RITA 2: 287; RITANC 2: 323-24; KRI 4: 49; RITA 4: 37; Iskander, 155; Roeder, ed., Ägyptische Inschriften aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin, 2: 28-34; Schott, “Zwei Obeliskensockel aus Athribis,” 192-96; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 72.

\(^{123}\) KRI 4: 244-45; RITA 4: 170-71; Roeder, ed., Ägyptische Inschriften aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin 2: 28-33.

Discussion and Comments on Number 22

Similar to the previous Ramesses II obelisk in Berlin (12800), this fragment of a black granite obelisk was found in El-Fustat, or Old Cairo, and now is in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (TR 25/11/18/5). Originally, the obelisk had Ramesses II’s prenomen and nomen flanked on either side by marginal inscriptions of Seti II, but only two lines of the Ramesses II titulary are preserved today. The Seti II inscriptions, preserved on three sides of the obelisk fragment as found, consist of mostly damaged prenomen and nomen written similar to Berlin 12800. The original provenance of Athribis is supported by two lines of damaged text that mention Seti II is [mry] $Hr-H[n tj-h ty]$ “[Beloved] of Horus Khe[nty-Khenty].”

---


127KRI 4: 245; RITA 4: 171; Daressy, “Antiquités trouvées à Fostat,” 276; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 73; Vernus, Athribis, 41. See also note 119 for Horus-Khenty-Khenty, or Horus Khentekhtai.
23. Kneeling Sandstone Statue and Ceramic Tiles from Tell el-Yahudia

Location: Statue in Egyptian Museum, Cairo CG 1239; One tile former Duke of Northumberland Collection Alnwick Castle, other tile in the Egyptian Museum, Berlin

Discussion and Comments on Number 23

Among the varied material excavated and published during Édouard Naville’s work at Tell el-Yahudia in Lower Egypt is a kneeling statue of Seti II grasping a shrine or naos. Now in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo (CG 1239), only half of the statue is preserved as most of the upper body, including the arms and hands, along with the upper part of the shrine was missing when discovered. The right side of the base has Seti II’s Horus name mry-Mṣḥt followed by wsr-hprw-Rˁ mrj-Jmn [Sthy] mrj.n-Pth while the left side has only the nomen Sthy mrj.n-Pth preserved.

References: PM 4: 58; KRI 4: 245; RITA 4: 171-72; Samuel Birch, Catalogue of the Collection of Egyptian Antiquities at Alnwick Castle (London: R. Clay, Sons, and Taylor, 1880), 78 number 530; Borchardt and Volten, 4: 124-25; Naville and Griffith, 10 note 1; Roeder, ed., Ägyptische Inschriften aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin, 2: 334; Sourouzian, “Seth fils de Nout,” 352. Naville and Griffith, 10 note 1, states the statue is limestone, but the official publication of CG 1239 in Borchardt and Volten, 4: 124, states the statue is sandstone.

Naville in Naville and Griffith, 10 note 1, states in a postscript dated April 1889 that CG 1239 was actually found after his 1887 excavations ended.

Borchardt and Volten, 4: 125.

KRI 4: 245; RITA 4: 172; Borchardt and Volten, 4: 125. An interesting feature of this statue is that the Seth sign has been hacked from the nomen on the right and back of the base but is intact in the nomen cartouche on the left side of the base.
Since the inscriptions on CG 1239 refer to Seti II as $p\dot{\dagger}$ m\textit{rwt} n Jtmw “The Beloved of Atum,” the badly preserved shrine originally must have contained a figure of Atum.\textsuperscript{132}

Less information is available concerning the tile of Seti II coming from Tell el-Yahudia formerly in the Duke of Northumberland Collection at Alnwick Castle. The tile is described as coming from a palace or temple at Tell el-Yahudia and is white in color bearing the nomen of Seti II [Sth]y $mrj.n$-Pth.\textsuperscript{133} A similar fragmentary faience tile from Tell el-Yahudia is part of the collection of the Egyptian Museum in Berlin (7940) and contains the prenomen of Seti II $wsr$-$hpwr$-$Ra$ $mrj-Jmn$, but no other information is available as to the circumstances of its discovery.\textsuperscript{134}

\textsuperscript{132}KRI 4: 245; \textit{RITA} 4: 172; Borchardt and Volten, 4: 124; Sourouzian, “Seth fils de Nout,” 352.

\textsuperscript{133}Birch, 78 number 530. For other objects described as coming from the same structure at Tell el-Yahudia, see PM 4: 56-57; William Matthew Flinders Petrie and J. Garrow Duncan, \textit{Hyksos and Israelite Cities}, double vol. British School of Archaeology in Egypt and Egyptian Research Account, Twelfth Year, 1906 (London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt, Bernard Quaritch, 1906), 8, 17, and plates 16-16A.

\textsuperscript{134}Roeder, ed., \textit{Ägyptische Inschriften aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin}, 2: 334.
24. Granite Statue from Cairo\textsuperscript{135}

Location: Museo Archaeologio, Florence 7667

Discussion and Comments on Number 24

Originally coming from the Cairo area, this statue of Ramesses II, now in the Museo Archaeologio in Florence (7667), has the titles of Seti II carved upon the back pillar.\textsuperscript{136} As preserved, the inscription reads $nswt\ bij\ nb\ t\by\ wsr-hprw-R\mrj-Jmn\ z-\by\ nb\ \by\ w\ Stly\ mrj.n-Pth$ “King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheperure Meryamun, Son of Re, Lord of Appearances, Seti-Merneptah.”\textsuperscript{137}

25. Pink Granite Block from Heliopolis (Matariya)\textsuperscript{138}

Location: Currently Unknown

Discussion and Comments on Number 25

Although excavations at the ancient Egyptian site of $Jwnw$, or Heliopolis, have occurred over a number of years commenced throughout the years, much of site remains buried under the modern Cairo suburbs of Matariya and Ain Shams or the nearby site of

\textsuperscript{135}References: PM 4: 70; KRI 4: 276; RITA 4: 198; Astorre Pellegrini, “Glanures,” RecTrav 20 (1898): 99.

\textsuperscript{136}PM 4: 70.

\textsuperscript{137}KRI 4: 276; RITA 4: 198; Pellegrini, 99.

\textsuperscript{138}References: PM 4: 64; KRI 4: 246; RITA 4: 172; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 136; Gaston Maspero “Notes sur quelques points de grammaire et d’histoire,” ZÄS 19 (1881): 116.
Tell Hisn.139 This pink granite block comes from one of the now destroyed temples at the site of Heliopolis and has a fragmentary inscription stating Seti II is [mry] Rˁ-Hr-ḥtj “[Beloved of] Re-Horakhty.” A very unusual form of the prenomen of Seti II preserved on this block is nswt bjtj nb tḥwy wsr-ḥprw-Rˁ mrj-Stḥ “King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheperure Meryseth.” 140 Unless “Beloved of Seth” is a mistaken writing for Meryamun, this prenomen epithet is so far not attested anywhere else.

26. Three Red Granite Columns from Heliopolis (Matariya) or Memphis141
Location: Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (No number)142

Discussion and Comments on Number 26

These three red granite columns were originally found in Alexandria being used as construction material in a fort there. In 1869, engineer Anton Lucovich removed these columns to Vienna in celebration of a Middle Eastern trip of Austro-Hungarian Emperor


140KRI 4: 246; RITA 4: 172; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 136; Maspero, “Notes sur quelques points de grammaire et d’histoire,” 116.

141References: PM 4: 5; KRI 4: 246; RITA 4: 172; LDT 1: 217; Ernst von Bergmann, “Inschriftliche Denkmäler der Sammlung ägyptischer Alterthümer des österr. Kaiserhauses,” RecTrav 7 (1886): 177-78; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 136; Iskander, 172; Sourouzian,

Franz Joseph I, and the three columns were reused as architectural supports in two rooms of the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna. The columns are original monuments of Thutmosis IV, and later had the prenomen and nomen of Merneptah added to them. The greater numbers of inscriptions, however, are the Horus name $k\dot{i}\ n\dot{h}t\ w\dot{r}-p\dot{h}tj$, Nebty $n\dot{h}t-hp\dot{s}\ d\dot{r}-p\dot{d}t-9$, Golden Horus $\dagger-n\dot{r}w-m-t\dot{3}w-nbw$, prenomen, $\text{\(\includegraphics[width=0.1\textwidth]{seth.png}\)}$ and nomen of Seti II. Much like Berlin 12800, these columns in the Kunsthistorisches Museum preserve the nomen $\text{\(\includegraphics[width=0.2\textwidth]{ptah.png}\)}$ $S\dot{h}y\ m\dot{r}.n-P\dot{t}h$ written using the signs for Ptah and Seth. The original provenance is unclear, as these three columns come from somewhere else other than Alexandria, but a location of Heliopolis or ancient Memphis seems possible.

---

143 Randl, “18th Dynasty columns KhM,”; PM 4: 5; Bergmann, 177.

144 PM 4: 5; KRI 4: 52; RITA 4: 40; LDT 1: 217; Bergmann, 177-78; Iskander, 172; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 49.

145 KRI 4: 246; RITA 4: 172; LDT 1: 217; Bergmann, 177-78.

146 Kitchen in KRI 4: 52, suggests “Alexandria from Heliopolis or Memphis?” but later amends this to Heliopolis alone in KRI 4: 246.
27. Glazed Inlay Tile and Limestone Text Fragment from Heliopolis (Matariya) (figure 6.10-11)\textsuperscript{147}

Location: Tile in Kelvingrove Art Gallery and Museum, Glasgow Museums, Glasgow 10.e.1912; Text Fragment in Burrell Collection, Glasgow Museums, Glasgow 9.ap.1912\textsuperscript{148}

Figure 6.10. Seti II tile fragment in the Kelvingrove Art Gallery and Museum 10.e.1912. Adapted from Petrie and Mackay, \textit{Heliopolis, Kafr Ammar and Shurafa}, plate 8:5.

\textsuperscript{147}References: PM 4: 61; KRI 4: 246; \textit{RITA} 4: 172; William Matthew Flinders Petrie and Ernest Mackay, \textit{Heliopolis, Kafr Ammar, and Shurafa}, British School of Archaeology in Egypt and Egyptian Research Account Eighteenth Year, 1912, no. 24 (London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt, Bernard Quaritch, 1915), 7, and plate 8:5, 10

\textsuperscript{148}Thanks to Simon R. Eccles, Senior Curator (The Burrell Collection) Ancient Civilizations, of the Glasgow Museums for answering inquiries about these pieces.
Discussion and Comments on Number 27

During Flinders Petrie’s 1911-1912 excavation seasons at the site of Heliopolis, two objects pertaining to the reign of Seti II were found (figures 6.11-12) except that their precise find spots are unrecorded.\(^{149}\) One object (figure 6.13) is a piece of “inlaid glazed tile,” which a little over half the original length is preserved, and has Seti II’s prenomen and part of his nomen preserved \textit{wsr-hprw-R\textsuperscript{c} mrj-Jmn Sthy [mrj.n-Pth]}\(^{150}\). The second object (figure 6.14) is an inscribed limestone fragment erroneously identified in the excavation report as containing the first element of the prenomen belonging to

---

\(^{149}\)Petrie and Mackay, 7, merely list these Seti II objects under “Later Remains: Small Objects” with no indication of where they were found.

\(^{150}\)KRI 4: 246; RITA 4: 172; Petrie and Mackay, plate 8:5. Simon R. Eccles, personal email communication 21 August 2009, mentions that a black granite fragment in the Glasgow Museums collections (10.f.1912) initially described as having the prenomen of Seti II contains the prenomen of Seti I instead.
Twenty-Second Dynasty King Shoshenq III (\textit{wsr-M\textsuperscript{3}t-R\textsuperscript{c}}) but it contains what appears to be the prenomen of Seti II reading $[\textit{nsw}]t \textit{bjtj wsr-hpr[w]-R\textsuperscript{c}}$.\textsuperscript{151} Alternatively, this limestone fragment is linked to Shoshenq I (\textit{hd-hpr-R\textsuperscript{c}}), or Shoshenq IV (\textit{wsr-M\textsuperscript{3}t-R\textsuperscript{c}}) with a recent examination of this piece suggesting an identification of the prenomen as $\textit{\epsilon\textsuperscript{3}-hpr-R\textsuperscript{c}}$ of Shoshenq V.\textsuperscript{152}

28. Limestone Statue from Heliopolis (Matariya) (figure 6.13)\textsuperscript{153}

Location: Open Air Museum at Matariya, Egypt

\textsuperscript{151}Petrie and Mackay, 7, plate 8:10; \textit{KRI} 4: 246 note 10\textsuperscript{a}; \textit{RITA} 4: 172.

\textsuperscript{152}Simon R. Eccles, personal email communication 21 August 2009, suggests that the prenomen on the limestone fragment is that of Shoshenq V reading $\textit{\epsilon\textsuperscript{3}-hpr-R\textsuperscript{c}}$ “Aakheperre” but “the second sign is not clear.”

Discussion and Comments on Number 28

Excavations during the late 1980s and early 1990s by the Egyptian Antiquities Organization, now the Supreme Council of Antiquities, near a canal at Matariya discovered a fragmentary statue of Seti II that was eventually restored from the recovered
fragments and placed on display in the Open Air Museum at the site.\textsuperscript{154} The Seti II statue is a kneeling offering bearer statue showing Seti II kneeling and holding an offering table (figure 6.13). Parts of the statue’s upper chest, shoulder, and head are eroded away but enough remains preserved to show that Seti II wore a Nemes headdress topped with a Khepri beetle.\textsuperscript{155} While the inscription on the right side of the base is missing, the left side is intact and reads with some variant titles $k3$ $nht$ $mk$-$Kmt$ $nswt$ $bjtj$ $jw^\nu$ $dshr$ $nb$ $t3wy$ $[wsr]$-$hprw$-$R^\nu$ $stp$-$n$-$R^\nu$ $z3$-$R^\nu$ $nb$ $hf$-$w$ $Sth$-$y$ $mrj$-$n$-$Pth$ $mrj$ $R^\nu$-$Hr$-$3htj$ “Mighty Bull, Protector of Egypt, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Who Inherits the Red Crown, Lord of the Two Lands, [User]kheperure Setepenre, Son of Re, Lord of Appearances, Seti-Merneptah, Beloved of Re Horakhty.”\textsuperscript{156} The statue is an original monument of Seti II, as none of the inscriptions show apparent any signs of usurpation, and as Ahmed el-Sawi discusses in his article, the statue is also a monument originally erected at Heliopolis. This conclusion is supported on the back pillar where the inscription describes Seti II as $ndtj$ $Jwnw$ “Protector of Heliopolis,” and on the top of the offering table where the inscription refers to Seti II as $mrj$ $Jtmw$ $nb$ $Jwnw$ “Beloved of Atum, Lord of Heliopolis” and $mrj$ $\dot{S}w$ $z3$-$R^\nu$ $ntr$-$3$ “Beloved of Shu, Son of Re, The Great God.”\textsuperscript{157}

\textsuperscript{154}Abd el-Gelil, Shaker, and Raue, 137; el-Sawi, 338.

\textsuperscript{155}el-Sawi, 338, and plates 55a-c, 56a-d.

\textsuperscript{156}Ibid., 338, and 339 figure 1f-i. Note that el-Sawi omits $jw^\nu$ $dshr$ in the translation given on 338.

\textsuperscript{157}el-Sawi, 340, and 339 figure 1j-k.
29. Wooden Fragment with Horus Name found in vicinity of Sacred Animal Tomb Complexes at Saqqara\textsuperscript{158}

Location: British Museum, London BM 68173

Discussion and Comments on Number 29

Walter Emery discovered this fragment from a wooden shrine, box, or foundation deposit during the Egypt Exploration Society’s 1966-1967 excavations near the sacred animal tomb complexes at Saqqara, and the Egypt Exploration Society later donated this fragment to the British Museum in London (BM 68173).\textsuperscript{159} BM 68173 contains the first part of a Horus name $k^3\text{nht}\ 3\text{nht}[w]$, which initial reports on the object reconstructed into what was believed to be a Horus name of Seti II $k^3\text{nht}\ 3\text{nht}[w\ m\ t\text{bw}\ nbw]$ “Mighty Bull, Great of Victories in All Lands.”\textsuperscript{160} However, Seti II only had a Golden Horus name of $3\text{nhtw}\ m\ t\text{bw}\ nbw$ and never a Horus name with these titles, so the wooden fragment must belong to another king whose Horus name begins with $k^3\text{nht}\ 3\text{nhtw}$.

\textsuperscript{158} References: PM\textsuperscript{2} 3, part 2: 824, and map 69; Geoffrey Thorndike Martin, The Tomb of Hetepka and Other Reliefs and Inscriptions from the Sacred Animal Necropolis North Saqqâra 1964-1973, Texts from Excavations Fourth Memoir, Excavations at North Saqqâra Documentary Series 2 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1979), 41 number 125, and plate 37.

\textsuperscript{159} PM\textsuperscript{2} 3, part 2: 824, and map 69; Martin, Tomb of Hetepka, 41 number 125. The British Museum’s online catalog entry of “68173” at<http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/museum_no__provenance_search.aspx> labels the wooden fragment as a “foundation-deposit/box (?).”

\textsuperscript{160} PM\textsuperscript{2} 3, part 2: 824; Martin, Tomb of Hetepka, 41 number 125, and plate 37 number 125.
The king BM 68173 belongs to is Ramesses VI of the Twentieth Dynasty whose Horus name of $k\mathring{3} nht \, ^{\mathring{3}}-\mathring{hypw} \, s'nh-t\beta wy$ “Mighty Bull, Great of Victories, Making the Two Lands to Live” fits the traces present on the fragment.  

30. Quartzite Columns in the Hypostyle Hall of the Temple of Ptah at Memphis (West Hall of Ramesses II) 

Location: Believed in situ

Discussion and Comments on Number 30

In the ruins of the Ramesses II’s Hypostyle Hall, or West Hall, of the Temple of Ptah at Memphis, some quartzite column fragments have the prenomen and nomen of Seti II upon them. The cartouches read $wsr-hpr\mathring{w}-R\mathring{ep} \, mrj-Jmn \, Sth(y) \, mrj.n-PtH \, Jmn$ “Userkheperure Meryamun, Set(i)-Merneptah Amun.”  

\[161\] KRI 7: 359, and the British Museum’s online catalog entry of “68173” at <http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/museum_no__provenance_search.aspx> identify BM 68173 as belonging to Ramesses VI. Strangely, Martin, Tomb of Hetepka, 41 number 125, suggests that BM 68173 could belong to Ramesses VI by suggesting a reconstructed titulary of $k\mathring{3} nht \, ^{\mathring{3}} nht \, [s'nh-t\beta wy]$, but his overall conclusion was to label this piece as “fragment with Horus name of Seti II.” For the Horus name of Ramesses VI, see Beckerath, Königsnamen, 170-71 H1-2; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 197-200; Kitchen, “Titularies of the Ramesside Kings,” 138.


\[163\] PM\textsuperscript{2} 3, part 2: 833; KRI 4: 246; RITA 4: 172-73; Daressy, “Le temple de Mit Rahineh,” 30-31 number 7; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 135. KRI 4: 246, indicates the Amun figure might be a mistake, on part of Daressy or te ancient Egyptian workers, so perhaps the Ptah figure was meant to be here.

\[164\] KRI 4: 246; Daressy, “Temple de Mit Rahineh,” 31; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 135. Kitchen in RITA 4: 173, suggests a translation of the last part of the nomen as “beloved of Ptah &
31. Inscriptions on Pillar Bases and Sanctuary Walls at Temple of Ramesses II at Ptah Enclosure, Memphis

Location: *in situ*

Discussion and Comments on Number 31

This small temple built by Ramesses II and dedicated to Ptah, Ptah-Tatenen, and two other deities was discovered during Cairo University excavations led by Ahmad Badawi in the early 1940s. Further excavations in 1955 and 1956 by the University of Pennsylvania in the area established the archaeological history of the temple as part of a functioning temple complex in ancient Memphis. The temple consists of a pylon, pillared portico, pillared hall, and three chapels adjoining the colossal enclosure wall of Ptah at Memphis. Of interest to the reign of Seti II is that his titulary was carved on

Amun (?)” unless it is, as he suggests in KRI 4: 246, some mistake in part by an ancient Egyptian scribe or worker.


the pillar bases in the pillared hall and the lower walls of the temple sanctuary. Concurrent with Seti II’s inscriptions on the pillars and the sanctuary walls is what seems to be a minor rebuilding of the temple through the addition of a portico, raising of the entrance door sill of the pillared hall, and raising of the entrance floor of the northernmost chapel. It is not known if these alterations are minor restorations or additions by Seti II, but his titles indicate that the temple was in use until at least the end of his reign as no other titulary from any Nineteenth or Twentieth Dynasty king appears anywhere in the temple. Based on these observations, Seti II’s titles are original inscriptions from his reign, but it cannot be surmised if they originate from the beginning or end of his reign.

32. Block with Name of Seti II over Siptah at the Temple of Ptah, Memphis (figure 6.14)

Location: Currently Unknown

---


Description and Comments on Number 32

This block was first described by Flinders Petrie after his 1913 excavation season in Memphis digging in and around the Temple of Ptah. An unusual discovery on this block is that the prenomen of Siptah has been carved over with the wsr and hprw signs in an attempt to transform the prenomen cartouche into that of Seti II. As preserved, the original inscription on the block reads nswt bj tj nb t3wy 3h-n-R c stp.n-R c “King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands, Akhenre Setepenre,” and Siptah’s prenomen was later altered to that of Seti II wsr-hprw-R c stp.n-R c “Userkheperure Setepenre.”

The question unanswered so far is that was this recarving an attempt to honor the name of Seti II posthumously or was it an attempt to suppress the name of Siptah by

---

171Engelbach et al., 33. Regrettably, no exact find spot is given.
carving the name of Seti II over Siptah’s name? Flinders Petrie, in a belief common
during the early part of the 1900s, wrote that this was evidence that “Siptah preceded
Sety II” in an old order of succession now outdated.173 Another suggestion is that Siptah
may have been linking his reign to that of Seti II by carving Seti II’s prenomen over his
because if Siptah associated himself with his immediate predecessor that may have given
him the stability and legitimacy he needed to rule.174

In contrast, if Siptah was seen as an illegitimate king, his name may have been
suppressed on this block by carving the prenomen of Seti II over Siptah’s prenomen in an
attempt to erase his reign. Countering this suggestion is that there does not appear to be
any erasure of Siptah’s prenomen šh-n-Rc to allow the carving of Seti II’s wsr-hprw-Rc
over it. It is also unclear if plaster was ever placed over Siptah’s prenomen, and what the
only available photograph shows looks like wsr and hprw carved directly over šh and n.

33. Limestone Column fragment from Memphis with Seti II and Siptah’s name175
Location: Bristol City Museum and Art Gallery, Bristol H647176

173Engelbach et al., 33. In contrast, Gardiner, “Only One King Siptah and Twosre Not His
Wife,” 16, points out this block was taken by many to show Siptah preceded Seti II except that
Seti II was dead when Siptah erected this block and therefore Seti II’s name is a postumous
addition after Siptah died. For a summary of the old arguments on late Nineteenth Dynasty
succession, see Emery, “Order of Succession,” 353-56.

174See now the arguments on the genealogy of Siptah in Johnson, “Transition and Legitimation
in Egypt’s Late 19th and Early 20th Dynasties.”

175References: PM 3, part 2: 872; Grinsell, 53.

176The author wishes to thank Bristol City Museum and Art Gallery staff members Sue Giles,
Curator of Ethnography and Foreign Archaeology, and Amber Druce, Documentation Assistant
of Ethnography and Foreign Archaeology, for answering inquiries concerning this piece.
Coming from Flinders Petrie’s excavations at ancient Memphis, this limestone column fragment ended up in the collection of the Bristol City Museum and Art Gallery (H647). What proves to be so interesting about this column fragment is that it is described as having the names of Seti II and Siptah upon it, which might prove an affiliation between these two kings. In looking at photographs of Bristol H647, the actual fragment does not fit the description given for it, and warrants a more in-depth analysis than can be found in the available literature.177

The column fragment has the prenomen cartouche $\text{wsr-hprw-R}^\varepsilon \text{ stp.n-}$ $R^\varepsilon$ topped by what appears to be the lower part of a plumed solar disc while the nomen cartouche is very fragmentary, as the column fragment is mostly broken away on this section, but there are traces of the $n$, $p$, and $t$ signs of $[mrj].n-Pt[h]$ making the reconstructed nomen $[\text{Sty} \text{ mrj}].n-Pt[h]$.178

Obviously, the prenomen cartouche is original as the fist part of the prenomen, $\text{wsr-hprw-R}^\varepsilon$, shows no signs of altering into the known prenomen variants of Siptah $\text{shfj.n-R}^\varepsilon$ or $\text{3h-n-R}^\varepsilon$ that are normally written with the epithet $\text{stp.n-R}^\varepsilon$.179 If the prenomen shows no signs of altering then the nomen cartouche might

---

177PM² 3, part 2: 872; Grinsell, 53.
178Special thanks to Amber Druce for providing a reference photograph of H647, and Yoshifumi Yasuoka, Doctorial Candidate at the Institute of Egyptology, Vienna University and The Institute of Architectural History, Vienna University of Technology for providing detailed photographs and notes taken during research on column fragments from Petrie’s excavations at Memphis.
179For these variant prenomen of Siptah, see Beckerath, Königsnamen, 160-63 T2-4; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 141-44; Kitchen, “Titularies of the Ramesside Kings,” 136.
have been changed into $R^c$-ms-$s$ $z^3$-$Pth$ or $mrj.n$-$Pth$

$z^3$-$Pth$ by reusing the $Pth$ element of Seti II’s nomen. In contrast to this suggestion is that the upper part of the nomen is damaged and covered in mud with little else being discernable to fit any scenario of Siptah reusing the nomen cartouche.\textsuperscript{180}

A final suggestion to the question as to whether the names of Seti II and Siptah are found together on this column is that Siptah’s name might be written on the column’s opposite side. The problem with this suggestion is that Bristol H647 has been “encased in plaster for many years,” and thus prevents any examination of any possible inscription on the opposite side.\textsuperscript{181} A possible solution to this would be that the published sources examined or made reference to Bristol H647 before encasing in the plaster, but why would the column fragment be encased in plaster on all sides, in this manner preventing access to the inscription, if the other side had an inscription? On the other hand, if there is no inscription on the other side, it would not be an issue to encase the column fragment in plaster for ease of storage or display. It appears very doubtful, unless the opposite side of H647 becomes available for detailed examination, that there is a Siptah inscription anywhere on the column fragment and that the original description of H647 is in error.\textsuperscript{182}

\textsuperscript{180}Yoshifumi Yasuoka, personal email communication 06 March 2009, observes “a left half of the first flowering reed ‘i’ for the name Seti” in the top left half of the nomen. This is not discernable in photographs available, so this is not added in the reconstructed transliteration. For Siptah’s nomen, see Beckerath, \textit{Königsnamen}, 160-63 E1-7; Gauthier, \textit{Livre des rois}, 3: 141-45; Kitchen, “Titularies of the Ramesside Kings,” 136.

\textsuperscript{181}Amber Druce, personal email communication 02 March 2009.

\textsuperscript{182}Yoshifumi Yasuoka, personal email communication 06 March 2009, notes that due to H647 being encased in plaster on “all the sides but the front surface” it “appears unlikely” that the opposite surface has any inscriptions and this author agrees with his conclusion.
34. Block with names of Siptah and Seti II from Memphis

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE 30174

Discussion and Comments on Number 34

Much in the same manner as number 31, this block comes from the area of ancient Memphis and features the names of Siptah and Seti II superimposed upon one another. The only published sources on this block differ on exactly whose name was written first. Porter and Moss and a journal from 1892, the time when the block entered the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (JE 30174), describes this block as having the name of Seti II altered to the prenomen of Siptah. Kenneth Kitchen seems to indicate that the block features the prenomen of Siptah altered to that of Seti II in a manner very similar to the block Petrie found. In looking at the published text though, some signs seem to have been left out or are damaged. Block JE 30174 reads

\[
\text{\textit{nswt bjtj nb t\textit{\textw}} 3\textit{h}-n-R^c \textit{stp.n-R^c z3-R^c nb }\textit{h}^\textit{w} \text{ “King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands, Akhenre Setepenre, Son of Re, Lord of Appearances” with the remainder of signs being lost. Cut over the } 3\textit{h}-n-R^c \text{ element of the nomen is what Kitchen reads as }\textit{wsr} \text{ and }\textit{Jmn} \text{ signs making the new prenomen }\textit{. The altered prenomen resembles some sort of garbled variant of Ramesses II’s prenomen, but the intended result may have been to write the full prenomen of Seti II.}
\]

\[\textit{\textw} \text{ “unklare Usurpierung.”}\]

\[\textit{\textw} \text{ “Inventaire des Objects ou Monuments Entrés dans les Collections du Musée de Ghyzeh Pendant l’Année 1892,” BIE 3d series, no. 3 (1892): 283.}\]

\[\textit{\textw} \text{ PM2 3, part 2: 872; “Inventaire des Objects ou Monuments Entrés,” 283.}\]
wsr-(hprw)-R stp.n-R (mrf)-Jmn “User(kheperu)re Setepenre (Mery)amun, which fits the traces better.\textsuperscript{186}

35. Red Granite Statue of a Baboon protecting a King from Memphis\textsuperscript{187}

Location: Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna ÄS 5782

Discussion and Comments on Number 35

This statue portrays a baboon standing on its hind legs with its hands raised in adoration while a small figure of a king wearing a nemes stands before the baboon.\textsuperscript{188}

The statue entered the collections of the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna (ÄS 5782) in 1878 and is given a provenance of coming from ancient Memphis.\textsuperscript{189} Normally, the common description of this statue identifies it as “probably Seti II,” but little else is given to expand this identification further.\textsuperscript{190} Based on “the style posture, and costume of the royal figure,” an identification of Kunsthistorisches Museum ÄS 5782 as belonging to the

\textsuperscript{186}KRI 4: 349; RITA 4: 252.


\textsuperscript{188}Demel, illustration 23; Michałowski, Art of Ancient Egypt, illustration 359; Reinisch, 243; Seipel and Grewenig, 165; Vandier, Manuel d’Archéologie Égyptienne, 3: 645, and plate 130:4.

\textsuperscript{189}PM\textsuperscript{2} 3, part 2: 864; Monika Randl, “Statue of a Baboon with a Royal Figure KhM 5782,” in The Global Egyptian Museum, (15 April 1999) <http://www.globalegyptianmuseum.org/record.aspx?id=5117> [30 July 2008].

\textsuperscript{190}PM\textsuperscript{2} 3, part 2: 864.
reign of Amenhotep III, not Seti II, “is likely.” One possible means of why earlier accounts of Kunsthistorisches Museum ÄS 5782 identified it as Seti II is that the statue of a king has a royal name on it chest, which may have been that of Seti II. The name on the kingly figure may have been applied secondarily over the name of the original owner of the statue, but the illegibility of the name due to natural erosion makes reading it today difficult.

36. Lintel Fragment of the Vizier Hori from Memphis

Location: University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia M. 12909

Discussion and Comments on Number 36

In the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology in Philadelphia is a fragmentary lintel (M. 12909) discovered in Memphis belonging to the Vizier Hori and featuring Seti II’s name. The Seti II inscription, on what would be the center of the lintel and partially damaged at its beginning, reads

191Randl, “Statue of a Baboon with a Royal Figure.” See also the description in Seipel and Grewenig, 164-65, where ÄS 5782 is dated to the reign of Amenhotep III.

192Randl, “Statue of a Baboon with a Royal Figure.”


194Location given as such in KRI 7: 247, but attempts to locate the object among the University of Pennsylvania’s collections have proven unsuccessful so far. Jennifer Houser Wegner, person email communication 12 February 2010, communicated to this author that this piece might be part of the Coxe Expedition’s finds from 1919, but “never accessioned” due to the lintel having been given to the Egyptian government per the division of finds at the end of the excavation season.
“Horus, Mighty Bull [. . .] Lord of Appearances, Userkheperure Setepenre Meryamun.”\textsuperscript{195} The inscription of Hori gives him the titles of $\text{jr}\text{y-p}\text{t}[\text{b}\text{y}\text{ w}\text{h}]\text{ wn}\text{m} \text{n}\text{nswt}\text{ tj}\text{tj}\text{ jmj-r}\text{ njwt}\text{ b}\text{t}\text{y}$ “Hereditary Noble, [Fanbearer on the] King’s Right Hand, Great Vizier, Overseer of the City, and Vizier.”\textsuperscript{196} Vizier Hori is known from a number of monuments from the reign of Seti II into the reign of Siptah and Tausert, and if his genealogical ties are correct, Vizier Hori was the great-grandson of Ramesses II through his father, High Priest of Ptah Hori, who himself was a son of Khaemwaset, son of Ramesses II.\textsuperscript{197}

37. Block Statue of “Greatest of the Directors of Craftsmen,”\textsuperscript{198} High Priest of Osiris and Sem-Priest of Ptah at Memphis Iyiroy with Naos of Ptah-Sokari\textsuperscript{199}

Location: Louvre, Paris A71 [N72]

\textsuperscript{195}KRI 7: 247. The Horus name of Seti II is damaged and it cannot be discerned if it was written as \textit{wr-p}\text{tj} “Great of Strength,” or \textit{mr}\text{y-R}\text{e} “Beloved of Re.”

\textsuperscript{196}KRI 7: 247.


\textsuperscript{198}PM\textsuperscript{2} 3, part 2: 704.

Discussion and Comments on Number 37

This statue of *sm n Pth* and *hm-ntr tpj Wsjr* “Sem-Priest of Ptah and High Priest of Osiris” Iyiroy in the Louvre in Paris (A71 [N72]) probably dates to the reign of Tausert as king and sole ruler after Siptah’s death in that her nomen of *t3-Wsrt stpt.n-Mwt* appears on the statue’s left shoulder. However, on the right shoulder Seti II’s nomen *Sthy mrj.n-Pth* is written as well.²⁰⁰ Aidan Dodson suggests that this was a deliberate act by Tausert to circumvent the problematic issue of having shared power with Siptah, the previous king, and link her reign directly to that of her deceased husband, Seti II.²⁰¹ On the other hand, it may be that *Sem* and High Priest Iyiroy’s career in the priesthood spanned the reigns of Seti II, Siptah, and Tausert, and the cartouches are merely Iyiroy’s way of commemorating the reigns of the kings he first and last served under, especially if Iyiroy prepared for his eventual death sometime during the reign of Tausert.²⁰²


²⁰¹Dodson, *Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy*, 86.

²⁰²Relief from Iyiroy’s tomb was discovered during 1955-1956 excavations by the University of Pennsylvania at Memphis. Although the relief was found reused in a later tomb, it does show that Iyiroy had a tomb in the area. For this relief, see PM² 3, part 2: 704, 845; KRI 4: 380-81; RITA 4: 276-77; Rudolf Anthes, “Memphis (Mit Rahineh) in 1956,” *PUMB* 21, no. 2 (June 1957): 12-13, 28-33, figures 8-11; Rudolf Anthes et al., “The Catalogue of Finds,” in *Mit Rahineh 1956*, by Rudolf Anthes (Philadelphia: The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, 1965), 79-85, and figures 7, 8, plates 27a, 28a-b, 29a; Jean Leclant, “Fouilles et travaux en Égypte, 1955-1957,” *Orientalia*, n.s., 27 (1958): 83, and plate 3. Iyiroy may have not died during the reign of Tausert if he is the same Iyiroy on a fragmentary doorway from Qantir in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo (TR 30/1/35/1a-e) bearing the cartouches of Ramesses III and mentioned on two stelae of Hori, his son. For more on these monuments, see KRI 5: 425, 426-27; Habachi, “Khâtâ’na-Qantîr,” 455, 489, 493-95, and plate 26; Labib Habachi and Paul Ghalioungui, “The ‘House of Life’ of Bubastis,” *CdE* 46, no. 91 (1971): 81-67; Habachi et al., *Tell el-Dab’a I: Tell el-Dab’a and Qantir*, 30-31, 39, 54, 63, 113-14, 199-201, and plate 26.
Middle Egypt

38. Fragmentary Kneeling Sandstone Statue from Atfih

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo

Discussion and Comments on Number 38

This kneeling sandstone statue of Seti II holding a naos or shrine was discovered beneath the foundations of a building to the south-east of Atfih in April of 1902. Much of the beginning titulary on the right and left sides of the base is missing except enough is preserved on both sides to show that it began with the Horus name of Seti II and then followed by on the right:

\[
\text{nswt bj tj wsrt-hprw-Rc} \\
\text{stp.n-Rc (mrj-Jmn) z?-Rc Sthy mrj.n-Pth mrj Jimw dj 5nh mj Rc “King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Userkheperure Setepenre (Meryamun), Son of Re, Seti-Merneptah, Beloved of Atum, Given Life, like Re.”} \]

The nomen of Seti II is preserved on the back pillar, and the naos has an image of the local goddess Isis-Hathor. Based on this dedication of the

---


\(^{204}\)Naguib, 214, describes this statue fragment as being taken to the Egyptian Museum in Cairo, but no number is given.

\(^{205}\)Ibid.; PM 4: 76.

\(^{206}\)KRI 4: 247; RITA 4: 173; Naguib, 213. The only traces preserved of the opening titulary are 5nh Hr k3 nht on the left and 5nh Hr [k3 nht] on the right. Naguib, 213, publishes the prenomen on the right side of the base as wsrt-Mrj-hprw-Rc stp.n-Rc that Kitchen in KRI 4: 247 note 3, takes to be a mistake for mrj-Jmn, as suggested in the translation, but he does not specify if this is a mistake on Naguib’s part or the ancient Egyptians.
naos image to Isis-Hathor, the statue probably originally stood in a now-destroyed temple or shrine at Atfih.  

39. Steatite Plaque from Gurob (Kom Medinet Ghurab) (figure 6.15)

Location: Ashmolean Museum, Oxford 1890.1017

Figure 6.15. Steatite Plaque 1890.1017 from the Ashmolean Museum. From Petrie, *Illahun, Kahun and Gurob 1889-90*, plate 19:23.

40. Red Feldspar Plaque from Gurob (Kom Medinet Ghurab) (figure 6.16)

Location: Petrie Museum University College, London UC 12848

Transliteration: *wsr-hprw-Rc stp.n-Rc*

---

207 Naguib, 213-14; PM 4: 76; KRI 4: 247 note 2b.


209 Thanks to Helen Whitehouse, Curator of the Egyptian Collections at the Ashmolean Museum for providing the museum number for this piece.


211 Thanks to Rupinder Padda of the Petrie Museum University College, London for assistance in checking museum records concerning this piece.
Discussion and Comments on Numbers 39-40

These objects (Ashmolean 1890.1017; UC 12848) come from Flinders Petrie’s excavations at the site of Gurob (Kom Medinet Ghurab) near el-Lahun. Ashmolean 1890.1017 (figure 6.15) is a black steatite tray or basin discovered along with pottery and jewelry dating to the reign of Seti II among various caches of objects buried beneath the floors of residences at Gurob. Three sides of Ashmolean 1890.1017 are decorated with figures such as a giant Kheper beetle, the god Ptah, and a smiting scene with an additional figure of a person standing before a chair. The fourth side contains the prenomen and nomen of Seti II written as $wsr\text{-}hprw-R^e\ stp\text{-}(n)\text{-}R^e\ Sth(y)\ mrj\text{-}(n)\text{-}Pth$

“Userkheperure Setep(en)re, Beloved of Amun and Ptah.”

---


213Giveon and Kempinski, 104-105; Petrie, Illahun, Kahun and Gurob 1889-90, 18, and plate 19:23. Kitchen in KRI 4: 247, and RITA 4: 173 reconstructs the titulary to read $wsr\text{-}hprw-R^e\ stp\text{-}(R^e)\ mrj\ Jmn\ Pth$ “Userkheperure Setepen(re), Beloved of Amun and Ptah.” This does not match the published drawing of the piece in Petrie, Illahun, Kahun and Gurob 1889-90, plate
Red Feldspar Plaque UC 12848 (Figure 6.16), perhaps from a ring, comes from Gurob, but the exact circumstances concerning its discovery is unclear as Flinders Petrie only mentions UC 12848 in a later publication and not in his excavation report concerning the Seti II material from Gurob.\textsuperscript{214} UC 12848 contains the prenomen of Seti II and reads \textit{wsr-hprw-R}\textsuperscript{t} \textit{stp.n-R}\textsuperscript{t}.\textsuperscript{215}

41. Cartouches on Rock Shrine of Merneptah at El-Babein close to El-Surariyeh (Siririya) (figure 6.17)\textsuperscript{216}

\textbf{Location: \textit{in situ}}

\textbf{Discussion and Comments on Number 41}

At el-Babein, Merneptah built a rock-cut chapel to the goddess Hathor “Lady of Akhwy” (\textit{Hwt-hrw nbt 'hwj}) on the east bank of the Nile.\textsuperscript{217} Seti II limited his work at el-Babein to adding his cartouches on a bandeau beneath a scene involving Merneptah, his

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{214}Petrie, \textit{Scarabs and Cylinders with Names}, plate 44 19.8:4.
\item\textsuperscript{215}KRI 4: 277; RITA 4: 198.
\item\textsuperscript{217}PM 4: 126-27 (1-6) and plan on 120; LD 3: 198a-e; LDT 2: 47-48; KRI 4: 56-58; RITA 4: 44-46; Iskander, 173; Sourouzian, “Chapelle rupestre de Merenptah,” 207-233 and plates 48-59; idem, \textit{Monuments du roi Merenptah}, 111-115, and plates 20-21.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
father. On the left wall beneath a scene of Merneptah and a queen worshipping a god, presumably Harsaphes (Hrj-š.f) based on the concluding line of text, and a goddess, Seti II cut two cartouches containing his prenomen of wsr-hprw-Rc stp.n-Rc mrj-Jmn, followed by a fragmentary cartouche that could be the nomen of either Merneptah or Seti II.

218 Sourouzian, “Chapelle rupestre de Merenptah,” 215, writes that the titulary of Merneptah was originally below these scenes but was removed and replaced with that of Seti II.

219 PM 4: 127 (4); LD 3: 198c; LDT 2: 48; KRI 4: 247; RITA 4: 173; Sourouzian, “Chapelle rupestre de Merenptah,” 211-12, 215. The third cartouche has a Ptḥ sign followed by a another seated anthropomorphic god facing the Ptah figure that the drawing in LD 3: 198c does not record the second god’s head. Following these two signs in the third cartouche is a trace of what looks like a wsr. Kitchen in KRI 4: 247, and RITA 4: 173, interprets the second seated god as the Sḥ sign, and the wsr a reed leaf making this third cartouche the nomen of Seti II Sḥy [mrj.n]-Ptḥ but if the second seated figure is that of the goddess Maat, then it is the nomen of Merneptah [mrj.n]-Ptḥ [ḥtp-hr]-Mḥt.
Figure 6.17. Cartouches on Rock Shrine of Merneptah at El-Babein. Detail of LD 3: 198c.
42. Doorway Scenes on Pylon at Hermopolis (el-Ashmunein) (figures 6.18-19)\textsuperscript{220}

Location: \textit{in situ}

Discussion and Comments on Number 42

During excavations at Hermopolis in April 1901, monuments dating to the Late Nineteenth Dynasty were uncovered including a colossal red granite statue of Merneptah usurped from Ramesses II, and the pylon of a Nineteenth Dynasty temple decorated by Seti II.\textsuperscript{221} The pylon was part of a temple to Amun-Re at Hermopolis dating to the reigns of Ramesses II and Merneptah based on the colossal statue and inscriptions found in the temple, but the scenes on the pylon doorway (figures 6.18-19) date to the reign of Seti II except for titulary before kneeling Hapi figures on the lower outer thickness of the doorway dating to the reign of Siptah and Tausert.\textsuperscript{222}


\textsuperscript{221}Chabân, 211-23; Roeder, \textit{Hermopolis}, 65-66. For the statue of Ramesses II usurped by Merneptah (JE 35126), containing a figure of Prince Seti-Merneptah, see number 3 in the chapter dealing with the pre-royal career of Seti II.

\textsuperscript{222}Roeder, \textit{Hermopolis}, 65-68, 88-89, 297-98; Iskander, 174; Sourouzian, \textit{Monuments du roi Merenptah}, 117-22. For the inscriptions of Merenptah at Hermopolis, see \textit{KRI} 4: 59; \textit{RITA} 4: 47-48; Günther Roeder, “Zwei hieroglyphische Inschriften aus Hermopolis (Ober-Ägypten),” \textit{ASAE} 52 (1954): 319-57, and plates 2-6. For the Siptah and Tausert texts, see \textit{KRI} 4: 344, 353; \textit{RITA} 4: 248-49, 255; Lesko, “A Little More Evidence,” 29-32. The only thing linking Ramesses II to the Temple of Amun-Re at Hermopolis is the colossal statue (JE 35126) usurped by Merneptah as Lesko, “A Little More Evidence,” 29, points out Roeder’s belief that Ramesses II founded the temple is a mistaken reading of Tausert’s prenomen \textit{z3t-Rc mnjt-jmn} and nomen \textit{t3-wsr stpt.n-Mwt} on the pylon as that of Ramesses II \textit{w3t-Mrt-Rc stp.n-Rc}.
Figure 6.18. North wall of doorway at Hermopolis. From Roeder, *Hermopolis 1929-1939*, plate 65. Used with permission from Gebrüder Gerstenberg, GmbH & Co. KG.
Figure 6.19. South Wall of doorway at Hermopolis. From Roeder, *Hermopolis 1929-1939*, plate 64. Used with permission from Gebrüder Gerstenberg, GmbH & Co. KG.
On the northern pylon (figure 6.18) the outer thickness of the doorway has scenes of Seti II receiving life or before Thoth, Thoth of Ramesses II (\textit{Dhwjt n R^\text{c}-ms-sw mrt-Jmn}), Horus, and Ptah. The main part of the doorway has Seti II wearing a combined Blue and Atef Crown topped with a solar disc while offering incense along with papyrus and lotus blossoms to Amun-Re. Above the scene of Amun-Re and Seti II a line of titulary gives the prenomen and nomen of Seti II except that Seti II’s prenomen is written as a rebus using a seated figure of Re holding a \textit{wsr} staff and a standing figure of Amun to spell out \textit{wsr-hprw-R^\text{c} stp.n-R^\text{c} mrj-Jmn} while a standard line of Seti II’s prenomen and nomen is beneath the scene of Seti II and Amun-Re.\textsuperscript{223} On the inner thickness, the Horus, Nebty, Golden Horus, prenomen and nomen of Seti II appear. The Horus name is \textit{k\text{3} nht mk-Kmt} while the Nebty is \textit{shm-hpš dr-pdt-9} “Powerful of Arm, Subduing the Nine Bows.” the Golden Horus name is damaged but can be reconstructed from the traces as \textit{[Aa-nrw-m]-tA[w]-nb[w]} “[Great of Fear in] All Land[s]” based on a corresponding text from the southern pylon.\textsuperscript{224}

The southern pylon is similar to the northern pylon in that it has scenes of Seti II receiving life from Thoth, Shepsy (\textit{Śpsj jm Hmnw}), Re-Horakhty, and Amun-Re (figure 6.19). The main scene is similar to the one on the northern pylon in that a line of Seti II’s prenomen and nomen border the top of the main scene and a single line of titulary featuring Seti II’s prenomen and nomen flanks the bottom. On the southern pylon, the main part of the doorway features Seti II wearing a combined Red and Atef Crown


offering *maat* to Thoth. On the inner thickness is a line of titulary featuring the Horus, Nebty, Golden Horus, prenomen, and nomen of Seti II as featured on the northern pylon.

43. Rock Cartouches at Gebel Abu Foda

Location: *in situ*

Transliteration: *wsr-hprw-Rc [mrf]-Jmn Sthy mrj.n-Pth*

Discussion and Comments on Number 43

These two vertical rock cartouches consist of merely the prenomen and nomen of Seti II *wsr-hprw-Rc [mrf]-Jmn Sthy mrj.n-Pth* over the sign for gold albeit carved on a colossal scale of nearly eight feet in height. However, the exact location of these cartouches is still uncertain as the location reported upon by Arthur Weigall and Georges Legrain does not apparently contain any cartouches of Seti II. According to Legrain’s account in 1897, the Seti II cartouches are about 500 meters (1,639 feet) from the site of Darb el Kharaib, sometimes referred to as Wadi Sheikh.

---


227KRI 4: 250; RITA 4: 176; Gauthier, *Livre des rois*, 3: 135; Weigall, “Miscellaneous Notes,” 171, gives the overall dimensions as eight feet high (2.4 meters) and four feet wide (1.2 meters).
Kharachy, and 30 meters (100 feet) from the Nile at Deir el Amir Tadros. Weigall described these cartouches as being carved on rocks on the east bank of the Nile north of Deir el-Amir Tadros and just opposite Beni Qurria on the west bank.

In a 1979 study of the sources for ancient Egyptian stone, Dietrich and Rosemarie Klemm noted that the cartouches of Seti II were not where Legrain described them between Darb el Kharaiib and Deir el Amir Tadros. They surmise that there is a possibility that the cartouches are covered by modern debris, as Weigall was the last to see them in 1909, but another scenario is possible. That is, what if the location of these cartouches was an error made by Weigall and Legrain?

During the 2004 season of the Middle Egypt Quarries Project, Eugene Cruz-Uribe visited the ancient Egyptian quarries at Sheikh Atiyat located south of the village and quarries at Maabda. Upon the rocks there he states that there is “a rather large sunk relief cartouche” of Seti II that was dimensionally similar to the cartouches described by Weigall in 1909. Cruz-Uribe theorizes that the

---

228 Legrain, “Notes archéologiques prises au Gebel Abou Fodah,” 5, and map on 3. For Darb el Kharaiib (Wadi Sheikh Kharachy) and Deir el Amir Tadros see Cruz-Uribe, “Middle Egypt Quarries Project 2004 Field Season,” 9-12; Klemm and Klemm, Stones & Quarries in Ancient Egypt, 104, and 78 figure 107.

229 PM 4: 241; Weigall, “Miscellaneous Notes,” 171, also describes standing near the cartouches on the east bank of the Nile and seeing on the west bank “the village of Beni Sheugeir to the south and that of Kom es Shebit to the north.” Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 135, merely describes the cartouches as north of Manfalout.

230 Klemm and Klemm, “Herkunftbestimmung altägyptischen Steinmaterials,” 130; Cruz-Uribe, “Middle Egypt Quarries Project 2004 Field Season,” 8. Klemm and Klemm, Stones & Quarries in Ancient Egypt, 104, give an alternate suggestion that the cartouche may have been destroyed by blasting work done in Legrain’s time.

231 Cruz-Uribe, “Middle Egypt Quarries Project 2004 Field Season,” 8, notes that the cartouches are 3.2 meters (10.5 feet) high and 2.2 meters (7.2 feet) wide, similar, but not exactly, to Weigall’s measurements of 2.4 meters (eight feet) in height and 1.2 meters (four feet) in width.
cartouches at Sheikh Atiyat are those described by Legrain and Weigall as he found, as did Dietrich and Rosemarie Klemm, no traces of any Seti II cartouches at Deir el Amir Tadros.232 One problem with this suggestion is that there is about a seven to eight kilometer (4.4 to 5 miles) difference between where Legrain and Weigall described the Seti II cartouche and where Cruz-Uribe discovered them. They could be entirely different cartouches, but definite answers to if the Sheikh Atiyat Seti II cartouches are indeed those described at Deir el Amir Tadros are not forthcoming due to a lack of clear topography of the region.233

Cruz-Uribe also notes an unfinished stela directly beneath the rock cut cartouches that would have been nearly 5.1 meters (16.7 feet) tall if finished, but the ancient Egyptian workers completed little more than preliminary work on the top and left side before abandoning the stela. Cruz-Uribe indicates in “Middle Egypt Quarries Project 2004 Field Season,” 7, that the drawing of the cartouches on page 8 shows only the Seth sign as being damaged. In looking at photos 13-14 on 23-24 it appears the double reed leaf is slightly damaged as indicated here.


233Eugene Cruz-Uribe, personal email communication, 29 September 2009, refers to the problems encountered while carrying out his research in 2004. Local contacts often gave different names for places visited during the expedition thereby making it hard to pin down exact locations sometimes. Despite these difficulties, Cruz-Uribe states that the location of Tadros was assured because “all agreed where Tadros was and the cartouches are not there,” after visiting Tadros himself. He does state the possibility that some locations may have changed names in the interval of 1909-2004 as “maybe there was a 2nd ‘Tadros’ which the locals call now Sheikh Atiyat.” Special thanks to Eugene Cruz-Uribe for his assistance and correspondance concerning the Seti II cartouches. Similar cartouches of Seti II are also located three kilometers from quarries at Deir el-Gebrawi if they are not the same cartouches described by Eugene Cruz-Uribe. See Klemm and Klemm, *Stones & Quarries in Ancient Egypt*, 110, and 107 figure 153; Dieter Kurth and Ursula Rößler-Köhler, eds., *Zur Archäologie des 12. oberägyptischen Gaues: Bericht über Zwei Surveys der Jahre 1980 und 1981*, Göttinger Orientforschungen IV. Reihe Ägypten, ed. Friedrich Junge and Wolfhart Westendorf, vol. 16 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1987), 71, and 71 figure 17.
Upper Egypt

44. Granite Statue of Priest of Osiris and High Priest of Isis Wenennefer\textsuperscript{234}

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo CG 766, JE 25097

Discussion and Comments on Number 44

This upper part of a statue (CG 766, JE 25097) belonging to $hm$-$ntr$ $\text{n} $ $Wsjr$ $wnn$-[nfr]

“Priest of Osiris Wenenefer” is indicated as coming from Abydos in 1881. CG 766 and the appointment of Wenennefer dates to the reign of Seti II in that Seti II’s prenomen of $wsr-hprw-R^c$ $stp.n-R^c$ appears on a cartouche on the head of CG 766.\textsuperscript{235} Wenennefer is known from two stelae in the Louvre in Paris (C98, C219) that do not specifically name a king, but do give his other known title of $hm$-$ntr$ $tpj$ $n$ $Jst$ “High Priest of Isis.”\textsuperscript{236}


\textsuperscript{235}PM 5: 94; KRI 4: 296; RITA 4: 214; Borchardt and Volten, 3: 80, and plate 141.

\textsuperscript{236}For Louvre C98, C219, see PM 5: 99; KRI 4: 296-97; KRI 7: 449; RITA 4: 214-16; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 62; Paul Pierret, Recueil d’inscriptions inédites du Musée Égyptien du Louvre, part 2 (Paris: Franck, 1874-1878), 54, 65-66.
45. Block at Dishna

Location: Believed in situ

Discussion and Comments on Number 45

In April 1910, Louis Massignon discovered this block bearing the names of Seti II in the entry of a tomb belonging to Sheik Jalal ad Dashnawi located west of the village of Dishna.\textsuperscript{238} The preserved text consists of the Golden Horus and prenomen of Seti II

\[
\text{A-nxtw-m-tAw-nbw nswt bjtj wsr-xprw-R\textsuperscript{c} mrj-Jmn} \text{ “Great of Victories in All Lands, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Userkheperure Meryamun.”}\textsuperscript{239}
\]

Exactly where the block originates from is unknown, as nothing on the block specifically describes its original context, and Massignon notes that the tomb of Sheik Jalal ad Dashnawi was a recent construction but exactly how and for what purpose the Seti II block became used in the tomb was undetermined.\textsuperscript{240}


\textsuperscript{238}PM 5: 122; Massignon, 87-88.

\textsuperscript{239}\textit{KRI} 4: 250; \textit{RITA} 4: 176; Gauthier, \textit{Livre des rois}, 3: 134; Massignon, 88. Massignon, 88, also records that the cartouche of Seti II is written three times on the visible parts of the block.

\textsuperscript{240}Massignon, 88.
46. Inscriptions at Wadi Hammamat of Vizier and Chief of Works Preemhab of Year 5

Location: in situ

Discussion and Comments on Number 46

As part of the process of obtaining stone for carving and constructing monuments, the ancient Egyptians sent expeditions into various desert quarry sites to obtain needed stone. One such site is the Wadi Hammamat where mines existed for stones such as greywacke, siltstone, and *bekhen* (*bḫn*), or green breccia. The overseers of these expeditions normally left various graffiti behind stating their titles, and the kings that they were obtaining the stones for in order to construct monuments. The reign of Seti II is no exception when it comes to stone quarry graffiti except that only a few examples are known from the end of Seti II’s reign at Wadi Hammamat.

---


The majority of graffiti at the Wadi Hammamat dating from Seti II’s reign come from an expedition dating from Year 5 led by the Vizier Preemheb. The most prominent of these shows the Vizier Preemheb following Seti II as he offers nw jars to Min, Horus, and Isis. Seti II’s cartouches read \(\text{wsr-hprw-[Ra]} \text{mrj-Jmn} [Sth]y \text{mrj.n-Pth} \text{dj} 5\text{nḫ mj R}}^{c} “\text{Userkheperu[re] Meryamun, [Seti]-Merneptah, Given Life, Like Re,” while Preemheb has the titles of \(\text{jry-pt smr w côty jmj-r nwt t3j p3-Rc-m-ḥb m3-ḥrw “Hereditary Noble, Sole Courtier, City Governor, Vizier, Preemheb, True of Voice”} \) and was given the task of obtaining bekhen stone.

Another similar graffito, lacking a year date, shows Seti II with cartouches reading \(\text{wsr-hprw-Rc mrj-Jmn} [Sth]y \text{mrj.n-Pth} \) offering nw jars to Min, Horus, and Isis. Beneath this scene is a figure of a kneeling, worshipping Preemheb with the expanded titles of \(\text{jry-pt ḫ3tj-rc z3h t3jtj r3-nḥn ḫm-ntr M3t jmj-r ḫmw-ntr n ntrw nbw jmj-r nwt t3jt n ṣm cô t3-mḥw “Hereditary Noble, Count, Great Vizier, Mouth of Nekhen (Hierakonpolis), Priest of Maat, Overseer of the Priests of All the Gods, City Governor, and Vizier of Upper and Lower Egypt.”} \)

Two additional graffiti exist for Vizier Preemheb showing a similar figure worshipping the cartouches of Seti II, but they are likewise undated.


\[244\] KRI 4: 281; RITA 4: 201; Goyon, Nouvelles inscriptions rupestres du Wadi Hammamat, 109 number 95, and plate 32; Helck, Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reichs, 327, 460; Hikade, “Expeditions to the Wadi Hammamat,” 156, 165 number 5; Peden, Graffiti of Pharaonic Egypt, 109.

\[245\] KRI 4: 281; RITA 4: 201; Černý, review of Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reiches, 143; Goyon, Nouvelles inscriptions rupestres du Wadi Hammamat, 109 number 95, and plate 32; Helck, Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reichs, 327, 460; Hikade, “Expeditions to the Wadi Hammamat,” 156, 165 number 5; Myśliwiec, 120-21; Peden, Graffiti of Pharaonic Egypt, 109.

\[246\] PM 7: 333; KRI 4: 280; RITA 4: 201; Couyat and Montet, 111-12 number 239, and plate 45; Helck, Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reichs, 327, 460; Hikade, “Expeditions to the Wadi Hammamat,” 156, 166 number 7; Myśliwiec, 120-21; Peden, Graffiti of Pharaonic Egypt,
With only one year date, the first inscription definitely dates to Year 5 towards the end of Seti II’s reign. The other inscriptions of Vizier Preemheb, although undated, probably date to Year 5 as well along with other inscriptions at Wadi Hammamat of expedition members.\(^{248}\) What is revealing about these graffiti is that unless the undated examples mentioning Seti II were made during earlier expeditions, all these graffiti made by workers and Preemheb date to Year 5 of Seti II, which is relatively late in his reign. The fact that there are no inscriptions from Years 1-4 might support the intervening reign of Amenmesse causing interference in the process of obtaining stone for the legitimate king Seti II. Also revealing is that there are currently no known graffiti from the area naming an expedition sent by Amenmesse for stone unless Seti II ordered the destruction of such graffiti.

109 note 303. For z3b tjtjt, literally “Dignitary (He) of the Curtain,” see Allen, 429, 438. The suggestion in Hannig, 1016, of “Großwesir” is adopted here.

\(^{247}\)PM 7: 333; KRI 4: 280; RITA 4: 200-201; Černý, review of Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reiches, 143; Couyat and Montet, 49 number 46, 114-15 number 246, and plate 14; Hikade, “Expeditions to the Wadi Hammamat,” 156, 165-66 numbers 6, 8; Peden, Graffiti of Pharaonic Egypt, 109 note 303; Spieser, 90, 110, 221, 315.

\(^{248}\)PM 7: 333; KRI 4: 279-80; RITA 4: 200; Couyat and Montet, 86 number 129, 107 number 221, 115 number 247a; Goyon, Nouvelles inscriptions rupestres du Wadi Hammamat, 110-11 numbers 96, 99, and plates 31-32; Hikade, “Expeditions to the Wadi Hammamat,” 156, 165-66 numbers 9-16; Peden, Graffiti of Pharaonic Egypt, 109 note 303. Complicating matters is besides the impressive titulary associated with the vizier, Preemheb is also called merely hrj-klt “Chief of Works” on other graffiti. Hikade, “Expeditions to the Wadi Hammamat,” 156, believes that “Chief of Works” Preemheb is a different person than the Vizier Preemheb while Kitchen in KRI 4: 279-81, RITA 4: 200-201, takes them to be the same person.
47. Sandstone Block Fragment from Medamud

Location: Medamud Blockyard

Transliteration: \([\text{wsr}] - \text{hprw-}[\text{R}^\text{r}] \text{ stp.n-}\text{R}^\text{c}\)

48. Sandstone Column Drum in South Kiosk pavement of Temple of Monthu at Medamud

Location: Medamud Blockyard

Transliteration: \([\text{nb}] \; \text{h}^\text{r} w \; \text{Sthy mrj} \text{.n-P} \text{t}\)\text{h}

Discussion and Comments on Numbers 47-48

This block and fragment of a column date from French excavations at Medamud in the late 1920s and early 1930s.\(^{251}\) The sandstone column fragment (inventory number 2457) was found reused in the pavement of the South Kiosk of the Greco-Roman temple of Monthu at Medamud. The preserved text consists of the nomen of Seti II \([\text{nb}] \; \text{h}^\text{r} w \; \text{Sthy mrj-}[\text{P}] \text{t} \text{h} \) “Lord of Appearances, “Seti-Mer(ne)[p]tah.”\(^{252}\) The fragment from a sandstone block (inventory number 6189) was

\(^{249}\)References: PM 5: 144; \(\text{KRI} 4: 250; \text{RITA} 4: 176; \)Fernand Bisson de la Roque, \textit{Rapport sur les fouilles de Médamoud (1931 et 1932)}, Fouilles de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire vol. 9, part 3 (Caire: Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1933), 58-59.

\(^{250}\)References: PM 5: 140, 144, and plan on 138; \(\text{KRI} 4: 250; \text{RITA} 4: 176; \)Fernand Bisson de la Roque, \textit{Rapport sur les fouilles de Médamoud (1926)}, Fouilles de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire vol. 4, part 1 (Caire: Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1927), 71, figure 41.

\(^{251}\)Brand, \textit{Monuments of Seti I}, 191, mentions blocks of Seti I, also discovered at Medamud, as coming from Thebes, so the Seti II material may have originated there as well.

\(^{252}\)PM 5: 140, 144, and plan on 138; \(\text{KRI} 4: 250; \text{RITA} 4: 176; \)Bisson de la Roque, \textit{Rapport sur les fouilles de Médamoud (1926)}, 71. \(\)Kitchen in \(\text{KRI} 4: 250, \)adds an additional element of \(\it{ift}\)
found during excavations near the Gateway of Tiberius and preserves part of the
prenomen of Seti II

\[\text{[wsr]} - hpr[w-R^c] stp.n-R^c z^\prime[{-R^c}]\]

“[User]kheper[ure] Setepenre, Son [of Re].”

East Bank of Luxor (Ancient Thebes)

49. Red Sandstone Seti II Statue Base at Chapel on the Avenue of Sphinxes at Temple of
Monthu, Karnak

Location: Currently Unknown

Discussion and Comments on Number 49

During the 1949-1951 seasons of l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale at
Karnak, excavations discovered a small chapel located on the avenue of sphinxes before
the Ptolemaic Propylon of the Temple of Monthu at Karnak. Inside this chapel were a
number of fragmentary statues, and one of these was the base and feet of a red sandstone
statue of Seti II. Based on the available remains, the statue was originally a standard

\(^{(Gardiner D 17)}\) “image” following the nomen that he translates in \textit{RITA} 4: 176, as
“\((??)[living] image [of . . .].\)” The available photograph in Bisson de la Roque, \textit{Rapport sur les
fouilles de Médamoud (1926)}, 71 figure 41, is unclear as to what the sign is.

\(^{253}\text{PM 5: 144; KRI 4: 250; RITA 4: 176. Bisson de la Roque, \textit{Rapport sur les fouilles de Médamoud (1931 et 1932)}, 59, mistakenly identifies this fragment as possibly belonging to Ramesses X.}\)

\(^{254}\text{References: PM}^2 2: 2 (3) and plan 2; Chadefaud, 62; Clément Robichon, Paul Barguet, and
vol. 25 (Caire: Imprimerie de l’Institut français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1954), 46-47, 161-62,
français du Caire vol. 25 (Caire: Imprimerie de l’Institut français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1954),
plates 45-48, 147.\)
bearer statue that faced south towards the Temple of Monthu with the left foot striding forth and holding a standard against the left side of the body.  

The only available photographs show that the front of the base had Seti II’s Horus name of \( k3 \ nht \ mrj-R^c \) on either side of his prenomen \( wsr-hprw-R^c \ mrj-Jmn \) and nomen \( Sthy \ mrj.n-Pth \). The prenomen and nomen on the front of the base are topped by the usual plumed solar disc and the cartouches, along with the Horus name, rest on the sign for gold. Alongside the statue’s right side is a barely visible line of text reading \( nswt \ bjtj \ wsr-hprw-R^c \ mrj-Jmn \) with a trace of what looks like \( z\dot{i}-R^c \) barely visible in the photographs following the prenomen on the right side.  

The only publication to date notes that the inscription on the statue’s right side is usurped based on signs of erasure on that side as well as traces of the earlier inscription on the rear of the base, but no indications are given what these earlier traces might be.  

Behind the remains of the standard on the statue’s left side is a trace of \( dl \) sign, and directly behind the remains of the standard is a cartouche originally followed by \( \sim nh.tj \) carved over with \( \sim nh-wd3-snb \). Based on the preserved traces within the cartouche and the traces of \( \sim nh.tj \), it is believed that the statue also had an image of Queen Takhat, a royal wife attested to on usurped statues of Seti II.

255PM^2 2: 2 (3) and plan 2; Robichon, Barguet, and Leclant, 1: 46-47, 161-62, figures 79, 81; idem, 2: plates 45-48, 147; Chadefaud, 62.

256Robichon, Barguet, and Leclant, 2: plate 147.


258Ibid., 162; Chadefaud, 62. See the Karnak statues in the section following and Queen Takhat in chapter 4.
50. Red Sandstone Obelisk at the Quay of Amun at Karnak Temple\(^{259}\)

**Location:** *in situ*

**Discussion and Comments on Number 50**

Originally, there were two obelisks standing on either side of the quay or tribune leading to the avenue of sphinxes before the First Pylon at Karnak Temple, but excavations carried out by Georges Legrain in 1895-1896 only managed to recover one obelisk.\(^{260}\) Today, the southern obelisk remains *in situ* on the quay and contains on its four faces the Horus mrj-R\(^{\circ}\), Nebty \(\text{mk-Kmt} \text{ w}f-h\text{3swt}\)

“Protector of Egypt, Subduing Foreign Lands,” Golden Horus \(\text{C}j-m\text{htw-m-t3w-nbw}\)

prenomen \(\text{w}sr-hprw-R\(^{\circ}\) mrj-Jmn\), and nomen \(\text{Sthy mrj.n-Pth}\) of Seti II with further prenomen and nomen around the base topped by solar plumes and resting on the sign for

---


\(^{260}\)PM\(^2\) 2: 21-22 (2-3) and plan 7; Legrain, *Temples de Karnak*, 6-7, 16, 20, 24; Azim and Réveillac, 1: 90-91, 100-101, idem, 2: 2 photos 4-1/5, 4-1/7, 9 photos 4-1/40-44, 10 photo 4-1/46. For work carried out in the same area in 1969 and 1970, see Lauffray, “Abords occidentaux du premier pylône,” 77-144.
gold. An interesting feature of its instillation is that the parapet of the quay masks the inscriptions on the south and east sides of the obelisk’s base. This suggests that the original obelisks were placed in an arrangement that exposed all four sides of their bases, and at a later date, the quay was modified or rebuilt to include the parapet that blocks the southern obelisk’s base on two sides.

51. Red Sandstone Stela on Avenue of Sphinxes at Karnak Temple (figure 6.20)

Location: *in situ*

Discussion and Comments on Number 51

On the same avenue of sphinxes before the First Pylon of the Temple of Karnak, Legrain’s excavations revealed that Seti II erected a double sided stela showing Amun-Re being offered jars and incense by Seti II (figure 6.20). Beneath this offering scene are five sets of cartouches topped by solar plumes reading *wsr-hprw-Rā mrj-Jmn Sīty mrj.n-Pth*. Below the cartouches is a lengthy religious dedicatory text discussing that Seti II “has made as a monument for his father, Amun-Re” (*jr.n.f m mnw n jīj.f Jmn-Rā*) and the

---


264PM^2^ 2: 22 (6) and plan 7; Daressy, “Remarques et notes,” 30; Legrain, *Temples de Karnak*, 24.
reciprocal actions taken on Seti II’s behalf by Amun-Re.\textsuperscript{265} On both edges are preserved the Nebty, Golden Horus, prenomen, and nomen of Seti II.

Figure 6.20. Stela on Sphinx Avenue at Temple of Karnak. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.

\textsuperscript{265}KRI 4: 251; RITA 4: 176-77; Daressy, “Remarques et notes,” 30-31.
52. Triple Shrine in Karnak Temple Forecourt (figure 6.21)\textsuperscript{266}

Location: \textit{in situ}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image}
\caption{General view of Seti II Triple Shrine in Karnak Temple forecourt. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.}
\end{figure}

Discussion and Comments on Number 52

The Triple Shrine of Seti II (figure 6.21) is located in the forecourt of the Temple of Karnak directly adjacent to the First Pylon and features three barque chapels dedicated to Mut, Amun-Re, and Khonsu, which served as a way-station for the divine barques of these three gods during temple festivities. Napoleon’s expedition noted the Triple Shrine buried under debris in 1799, but the earliest known excavations of the shrine were in 1818 with Jean-Jacques Rifaud, who discovered two colossal quartzite statues of Seti II before the shine. By 1888, the shrine was reported blocked and buried by debris, thereby preventing access, so Georges Legrain began excavations in February 1897 that lasted up until June 1913 when the monument was finally fully cleared. According to Legrain and Barguet, the Triple Shrine is chiefly sandstone, with quartzite used in construction of the doorways and foundations.

On the outside of the Triple Shrine, there is a dedication text by Seti II just below the cornice and scenes of Mut and Khonsu giving life to Seti II, and Seti II offering maa to

267PM² 2: 25-27 (25-40) and plans 7, 9 [3]; Nelson, KA 1-9, 12-24, 26-50, 55-71, 75-91; Blyth, 41; Chevrier and Driotton, 1-2; Legrain, Temples de Karnak, 75. As Charles F. Nims points out in “Places about Thebes,” 115-16, 122 figure 1: 15a-b, the name for this Triple Shrine is unfortunately damaged, with a crucial word being unreadable, but the preserved traces read rnu [.s] nfr [. . .] mn [w3h]t [Sthy] mryn-n-Pth m pr Jmn “[Its] beautiful name is ‘[x] is the Way [Station] of [Seti]-Merneptah in the House of Amun.’” For more on this name, or lack thereof, see KRI 4: 253; RITA 4: 179; Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 51; Legrain, Temples de Karnak, 77; Nims, “Places about Thebes,” 115-16, 122 figure 1: 15a-b.

268Legrain, Temples de Karnak, 75; Azim and Réveillac, 1: 109. For the statues, see the subsequent entries following.

269Ibid. Although fully cleared, publication of the Triple Shrine did not appear until 1940 with Chevrier and Driotton’s Le temple reposoir de Séti II. à Karnak.

270Legrain, Temples de Karnak, 76; Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 51; Chevrier and Driotton, 2.
Amun-Re and Khonsu.271 Facing the Triple Shrine, the west, or left, chapel is that of Mut and contains scenes of Seti II making offerings to Amun-Re, Mut, and Khonsu, and Seti II and Prince Seti-Merneptah offering to the bark of Mut.272 The rear wall of this chapel contains Seti II offering to Mut and two niches featuring Iunmutef priests offering to an image of Seti II.273

In the center is the chapel of Amun-Re, and its walls show Seti II entering the chapel on the west and east walls and then scenes of Seti II and Prince Seti-Merneptah offering to the bark of Amun-Re, Seti II offering to Amun-Re, Mut, and Khonsu, and offering to Amun-Re, Amunet, and Ptah.274 The rear wall has two scenes of Seti II offering to Amun-Re and Khonsu in one and Amun-Re and Mut in the other. Beneath these offering scenes are three niches each showing Iunmutef priests on the side walls offering to a statue of Seti II on the rear wall reinforcing the suggestion that the chapel of Amun-Re served also as a chapel for the royal ka embodied in statues of the king.275

The last chapel is dedicated to Khonsu and has scenes of Seti II offering to Amun-Re, Mut, Seti II and Prince Seti-Merneptah offering to the bark of Khonsu, and further scenes

---

271PM 2: 25-26 (25-27), and plan 9 [3]; Nelson, KA 55, 57-58; KRI 4: 252; RITA 4: 177-78; Chevrier and Drioton, 6-8, and plate 2.

272PM 2: 25-26 (28-29); Nelson, KA 2, 4-5; KRI 4: 257-58; RITA 4: 182-83; Chevrier and Drioton, 34-39, and plate 11; Legrain, *Temples de Karnak*, 80-81; Myśliwiec, 120-21, and plate 122 figure 269. For the otherwise unattested Prince Seti-Merneptah, see chapter 4 dealing with the royal families of Amenmesse and Seti II.

273PM 2:  26 (30); Nelson, KA 6-7, 8a, 9a-c; Chevrier and Drioton, 39-41, and plates 5, 11; Legrain, *Les Temples de Karnak*, 80.

274PM 2: 26 (31a-f, 32-33); Nelson, KA 12-16, 23-24, 56; KRI 4: 252-57; RITA 4: 177-82; Chevrier and Drioton, 6-7, 20-29, and plates 2, 6, 9-10.

275Blyth, 41. For these scenes, see PM 2: 26 (34); Nelson, KA 17-19, 20-22a-c; KRI 4: 255-57; RITA 4: 181-82; Barguet, *Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak*, 52; Chevrier and Drioton, 29-34, and plates 5, 9, 10; Legrain, *Temples de Karnak*, 77-78.
showing Seti II offering to Khonsu, Mut, Ptah, Amun-Re, and Amunet. Unlike the chapels of Mut and Amun-Re, the chapel of Khonsu has five niches total on the east, or right, and north, or rear, walls. The niches on the east wall have Seti II on each side wall offering to Khonsu and Thoth on the rear wall while the niches on the north wall have a double scene over them of Seti II offering to Khonsu while the niches feature Seti II offering to Khonsu.

The exterior of the east and north walls of the Triple Shrine feature further offering scenes of Seti II offering to various gods. On the exterior east wall, scenes show Seti II offering to different pairings of Amun-Re and Amunet, Hathor, Amun-Re and Mut, Khonsu, Amun-Re and Khonsu, Thoth, Horus, and Amun Kamutef. The exterior north wall shows at least ten scenes, some regrettably damaged, of Seti II offering to Amun-Kamutef, Amun-Re, Re-Harakhty-Atum, Monthu, Ptah, Thenent, Mut, and Amunet.

An interesting feature relating to Seti II reign is that parts of the Triple Shrine remained unfinished by the end of Seti II’s reign and successive reigns as well. The sandstone blocks on the exterior and the interior west, or left, wall of the chapel of Mut

---

276PM² 2: 26 (35-37); Nelson, KA 26-28, 49-50, 30-41; KRI 4: 258-60; RITA 4: 183-85; Chevrier and Drioton, 42-56, and plates 6-8; Legrain, Temples de Karnak, 81-82; Myśliwiec, 120-21, and plate 122 figure 267. For an analysis of the scenes showing Seti II offering to Ptah, Amunet, Amun-Re, Khonsu, Mut, and Amun-Re on the upper east wall of the chapel of Khonsu (Nelson, KA 36-41) see Lurson, “L’étude du décor des temples pharaoniques,” 237-55.

277PM² 2: 26 (37-38); Nelson, KA 42-44a-c, 45-46, 47-48a-c; KRI 4: 260; RITA 4: 185; Chevrier and Drioton, 49-58, and plates 5, 7-8; Legrain, Temples de Karnak, 82-83.

278PM² 2: 26-27 (39); Nelson, KA 60-71; Chevrier and Drioton, 9-13, and plate 3; Legrain, Temples de Karnak, 83. As indicated in PM² 2: 26-27 (39), the lower register on the exterior east wall (Nelson, KA 66-71) is damaged but Legrain, Temples de Karnak, 83, records that it showed scenes of Seti II offering to Amun-Kamutef, Khonsu, Thoth, Amun-Re, Amun-Re and Khonsu, and Mut.

279PM² 2: 26-27 (40-41); Nelson, KA 75-91; Chevrier and Drioton, 13-20, and plate 4; Legrain, Temples de Karnak, 83.
remain undressed and still are in the roughened state the stones left the quarries with due to reconstruction dating to when the First Pylon was built along with work on the First Court Portico.\textsuperscript{280} Work on the hard stone comprising the doorjambs of the chapel of Amun-Re stopped with the scenes and text being only partially carved or not carved at all. Likewise, the door jambs of the chapels of Mut and Khonsu were smoothed down in preparation for carving, but the intended scenes and text never initiated.\textsuperscript{281} This unfinished state of the Triple Shrine’s doorjambs could mean two possible scenarios occurred. One scenario is that work on the shrine began in the first year or two of Seti II’s reign then work was interrupted by Amenmesse’s seizure of power in the Theban area only to have work resume once Seti II regained power towards the end of his reign. The second suggested event is that Seti II began construction on the Triple Shrine late in his reign, possibly his fifth and into his sixth year, and work progressed at a steady pace until Seti II’s death in his Year Six when work stopped.

In looking at these two possible explanations as to the unfinished nature of the Triple Shrine doorjambs, the most likely scenario is that Seti II began work on the Triple Shrine late in his reign and that work ceased upon the death of Seti II and the beginning of Siptah’s reign. If Seti II begun the Triple Shrine during his first two years, only to have the reign of Amenmesse intervene, then Amenmesse would most likely have resumed work on the shrine and usurped what decoration existed for Seti II at this early stage of construction. If so, then the cartouches should exhibit the characteristic signs of erasure, maybe even a triple palimpsest (Seti II to Amenmesse then to Seti II), but in every instance, the cartouches of Seti II are original. As a parallel theory, one might then

\textsuperscript{280}Legrain, Temples de Karnak, 76; Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 51 note 7.

\textsuperscript{281}Ibid.
suppose the Triple Shrine was an original monument of Amenmesse taken over by Seti II, but the originality of the cartouches as being those of Seti II again negates this suggestion.\textsuperscript{282} Therefore, the Triple Shrine indicates that Seti II began this monument late in his reign and construction had not finished by the time of his death in Year Six thereby leaving the door jambs unfinished.

53. Lintel of Seti II from Triple Shrine area\textsuperscript{283}

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE 6295

Discussion and Comments on Number 53

Nothing else is known of this lintel coming from the area of Seti II’s Triple Shrine other than it shows a double scene featuring a kneeling Seti II offering wine to Amun-Re and is now in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (JE 6295).\textsuperscript{284} Presumably, it is some architectural element from an entirely different Seti II monument as there is nothing to specifically link it to the Triple Shrine other than its discovery near the Triple Shrine.

\textsuperscript{282}As pointed out in KRI 4: 252 note 8\textsuperscript{a}, there are the usual erasures throughout the Triple Shrine of the Seth sign in the nomen \textit{Sihy mrj.n-Pth}, but the cartouches of Seti II are original. The only erasures are those observed by Frank Yurco of the name and titles of Bay, a royal functionary, replaced by the name and titles of Prince Seti-Merneptah, a son of Seti II. For more, see KRI 4: 257 notes 8\textsuperscript{a}, 12\textsuperscript{a}, 15\textsuperscript{a}-16\textsuperscript{a}, 258 note 11\textsuperscript{a-b}, 259 notes 11\textsuperscript{a}\textsuperscript{a-a}, 12\textsuperscript{a-a}, \textit{RITA} 4: 182-85; Wente, “Genealogy of the Royal Family,” 147.

\textsuperscript{283}Reference: PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 27.

\textsuperscript{284}PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 27.
54. Quartzite Statue with Standard (figure 6.22)\textsuperscript{285}

Location: Louvre, Paris A 24; Crown in Egyptian Museum, Cairo TR 16/2/21/7, SR 197

Discussion and Comments on Number 54

One of two colossal statues discovered by Jean-Jacques Rifaud before the Triple Shrine of Seti II in 1818, this statue was removed from the Temple of Karnak soon after its discovery and ended up as part of the Egyptian collection of the Louvre (A 24) in 1827 after being purchased in Rome (figure 6.22).\textsuperscript{286} These two statues originally stood on bases to the right and left of the Triple Shrine’s central chapel of Amun-Re, and a recent analysis of the text orientation on Louvre A 24 and its companion in the Egyptian Museum, Turin (1383) shows that Louvre A 24 was on the left and Turin 1383 on the right.\textsuperscript{287}


\textsuperscript{286}PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 291; Azim and Réveillac, 1: 109; Barbotin, 100; Chadeaub, 56.

\textsuperscript{287}Barbotin, 101-102.
Louvre A 24 is a colossal quartzite standard bearer statue featuring the names and titles of Seti II. The statue strides with its left leg forward and holds a standard in its left
arm against the shoulder while the right hand holds a mekes symbol. At some time in the past, parts of the statue were restored in plaster, such as the nose, beard, crown and the small god on the upper part of the standard, but these plaster restorations were removed in a new restoration carried out in 1997. One interesting feature of this statue is that the crown was missing from the statue when it left Egypt and entered into the Louvre. When compared with Turin 1383, Louvre A 24 originally wore a combined red and atef crown upon its head with the atef crown attached to the base of the red crown with a circular tenon. Upon its arrival at the Louvre, the statue had a plaster white crown affixed to the head as the atef component was left behind in Egypt and restorers thought the statue originally wore a double crown. The atef crown belonging to Louvre A 24 sometime later entered into the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (TR 16/2/21/7, SR 197), and after Hourig Sourouzian noted the atef crown’s existence, the plaster double crown was removed during the 1997 restoration.

Louvre A 24’s standard has Seti II’s Horus name mry-Rc, the Nebty name being the variant mk-Kmt wḍ-hıswt “Protector of Egypt, Subduing Foreign Lands,” prenomen wsr-hprw-Rc mrj-Jmn, and nomen [Sthy] mrj.n-Pth. The statue’s belt and kilt feature some uncommon variants in titles, as the belt features Seti II’s nomen reading

\[ \text{Sthy mrj.n-Pth mrj-mj-Rc} \] “Seti-Merneptah Merymire” and the kilt

---

288 Barbotin, 101; Chadefaud, 56; Vandier, “Ramsés-Siptah,” 182.

289 Barbotin, 100. For pictures of Louvre A 24 before the second restoration in 1997, see Berman and Letellier, 71; von Bissing, Denkmäler ägyptischer Sculptur, plate 54; Vandier, Manuel d’Archéologie Égyptienne, 3: 636, and plate 128 number 5; idem, “Ramsés-Siptah,” 182 figure 3; Yoyotte, Treasures of the Pharaohs, 148-49.

290 Barbotin, 100, 102; Sourouzian, “Seth fils de Nout,” 352 note 100.

291 Barbotin, 102; Sourouzian, “Conservation of Statuary,” 411, 413.
reads \textit{nb t\textsuperscript{3}wy jrw spw n jtf.f R\textsuperscript{c} wsr-hprw-R\textsuperscript{c} mrj-Jmn} “Lord of the Two Lands, Who makes Deeds for His Father, Re, Userkheperure Meryamun.”\textsuperscript{292} The back pillar and front of the base has the prenomen \textit{[wsr]-hprw-R\textsuperscript{c} mrj-Jmn} and nomen \textit{[StHy] mrj.n-Pth} with Seti II being “beloved of” Amun-Re. The sides of the base have the prenomen and nomen \textit{wsr-hprw-R\textsuperscript{c} mrj-Jmn [StHy] mrj.n-Pth}, but as the text continues onto the rear of the statue, it reads \textit{mry dj 5nh} “Beloved of, Given Life”\textsuperscript{293} Christophe Barbotin suggests that the missing element, usually the name of a god, is to be found on the top of the standard that the statue carries in its left arm. Although damaged, Barbotin proposes that the standard once had an image of Seth or even Amun-Re upon it signifying the fact that Seti II would be protected by the image of that god as well as being beloved of either Seth or Amun-Re at the top of the standard.\textsuperscript{294}

As to the originality of the monument, all the inscriptions show no signs of usurpation except the usual erasures of the Seth sign part of the Late Period hostility directed at the image of Seth.\textsuperscript{295} The few preserved Seth signs are on the back pillar, as Barbotin notes, 

\textsuperscript{292}Barbotin, 101, 143 inscriptions 3-4. Kitchen in \textit{KRI} 4: 267, \textit{RITA} 4: 191, translates \textit{jrw spw n jtf.f R} as “who performs <bene>factions for his father Re.” Barbotin, 101, and 102 note 1, 143, translates this as “who acts on behalf of/who carries out the opportunities for his father Re.”

\textsuperscript{293}\textit{KRI} 4: 267-68; \textit{RITA} 4: 190-91; Barbotin, 101, 144-45; Sourouzian, “Seth fils de Nout,” 352.

\textsuperscript{294}Barbotin, 101-102. Barbotin points out that exactly which god Seti II was beloved of is problematic, as the predominant god named in the inscriptions is Amun-Re, but Turin 1383 names Seth as well. The standard on Turin 1383 is likewise damaged, making a final conclusion difficult.

\textsuperscript{295}Ibid.; Chadeauf, 56, 176 note 36. Cardon, 14 note 28, points out concerning the inscriptions on Louvre A 24 and Turin 1383 that Frank Yurco, who examined these statues as part of an investigation into usurped statues of Amenmesse and Seti II, “confirms that they are all original of the time of Sety II.” An earlier conclusion that these statues are Seti II originals is in Vandier, “Ramsés-Siptah,” 182 note 3.
probably because access to the back pillar was limited by the statue’s placement against the Triple Shrine.\textsuperscript{296}

55. Quartzite Statue with Standard (figure 6.23)\textsuperscript{297}

Location: Egyptian Museum, Turin 1383

Discussion and Comments on Number 55

This Seti II statue in the Egyptian Museum in Turin (1383; figure 6.23) is an almost identical statue with Louvre A 24. Like Louvre A 24, Turin 1383 was discovered by Jean-Jacques Rifaud in front of the Triple Shrine of Seti II in 1818, and ended up as part of the collection of Bernardino Drovetti, French consul to Egypt, before it was sold in 1824 to the Egyptian Museum in Turin.\textsuperscript{298} Turin 1383, unlike Louvre A24, is in a better state of preservation, as it left Egypt with its crown intact, and it originally stood on the

\textsuperscript{296}Barbotin, 102; Sourouzian, “Seth fils de Nout,” 352.


\textsuperscript{298}PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 292; Azim and Réveillac, 1: 109; Chadeauf, 56-57; Curto, “Il torinese colosso di Osimandia,” 24; idem, L’antico Egitto, 155-56; Donadoni Roveri, Dal museo al museo, 137; Fabretti, Rossi, and Lanzone, 2: 107; Farina, 36; Museo egizio di Torino, 132.
base to the right of the doorway into the Triple Shrine’s chapel to Amun-Re. The statue strides forth with its left leg and holds a standard in its left arm against the body while the right hand clenches a seal with Seti II’s prenomen \textit{wsr-hprw-Rc mrj-Jmn}.\footnote{Barbotin, 101-102.}

The inscriptions on Turin 1383 allow for some restorations of missing text on Louvre A 24 as Turin 1383 is in a better state of preservation. The back pillar has the Horus name \textit{mry-Rc}, the Nebty name \textit{mk-Kmt w\textit{f}-h\textit{swt}} as on Louvre A 24, prenomen \textit{wsr-hprw-Rc mrj-Jmn}, and nomen \textit{Sthy mrj.n-Pth} along with “Beloved of Amen-Re.” The standard also has the Horus name, Nebty, prenomen, and nomen as the back pillar, but Seti II is described here as \textit{mry-Sthy \textit{phtj mry Rc dj \textit{nh dt}} “Beloved of Seth, Great of Strength, Beloved of Re, Given Life Forever.”\footnote{Curto, \textit{L’antico Egitto}, 155-56; Donadoni, “Image and Form,” 117-18, 168-70, and plate 184; Donadoni Roveri, \textit{Dal museo al museo}, 138-39; Farina, 36; Museo egizio di Torino, 82-87. Concerning the shape in the clenched hands of statues, see Henry G. Fischer, “An Elusive Shape within the Fisted Hands of Egyptian Statues,” \textit{MMJ} 10 (1975): 9-21.} The front of the base has the prenomen and nomen of Seti II, along with Amun-Re being the god Seti II is beloved of, but part of the nomen is missing due to a niche having been cut into the base at an undetermined time. Both the left and right sides of the base have the prenomen and nomen of Seti II along with \textit{dd w\textit{ss}} on the right half of the base and \textit{mry dj \textit{nh}} on the right and left sides.\footnote{KRI 4: 268; \textit{RITA} 4: 191; Chadeaufad, 57, 176 note 37; Gauthier, \textit{Livre des rois}, 3: 136; Sharpe, 2: 43 illustrations 5-6, 8-11; Sourouzian, “Seth fils de Nout,” 352.} Similar to the inscription found on Louvre A 24, Barbotin suggests that the missing element in \textit{mry dj \textit{nh}} is found on the top of the standard that the statue carries, but in this case, the standard on Turin 1383 is damaged as well. Using an analogy with

\footnote{Ibid.}
Figure 6.23. Seti II Statue with standard Turin 1383. Photo courtesy of Dr. Francesco Tiraditti.
Louvre A 24, the standard probably had an image of Seth, Amun-Re, or Re upon it due to the fact that these three gods are mentioned in the mry formula upon Turin 1383.\textsuperscript{303}

As to the original ownership of Turin 1383, all the inscriptions point to the statue being an original monument of Seti II. Turin 1383 shows no signs of usurpation except for erasures of the Seth sign as found on Louvre A 24.\textsuperscript{304}

56. Titles and Figures on Red Granite Statues of Ramesses II\textsuperscript{305}

Location: Before the Second Pylon of the Temple of Karnak Luxor, Egypt

Discussion and Comments on Number 56

Standing in front of the Second Pylon of the Temple of Luxor, these two colossal red granite statues of Ramesses II feature the titles and portrait of Seti II.\textsuperscript{306} These statues actually date earlier than the reign of Ramesses II in that the features and iconography closely resembles Thutmosid statues such as those belonging to Thutmosis III and Hatshepsut. During the reign of Ramesses II, the statues were usurped with the titles of

\textsuperscript{303}Barbotin, 101-102; Chadeaufd, 56, 58; Sourouzian, “Seth fils de Nout,” 352.

\textsuperscript{304}Ibid.; Cardon, 14 note 28; Vandier, “Ramsés-Siptah,” 182 note 3.

\textsuperscript{305}References: PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 37-38 (134, 136), and plans 7, 9 [4]; Nelson, KA 145, 153; KRI 2: 554-55; LDT 3: 12; Champollion, ND, 2: 23-24; Laboury, 319-23; Legrain, Temples de Karnak, 139-40; Hourig Sourouzian “Les Colosses du II\textsuperscript{e} pylône du temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, remplois ramessides de la XVIII\textsuperscript{e} dynastie,” Cahiers de Karnak 10 (1995): 505-543.

\textsuperscript{306}PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 37 (134, 136), and plans 7, 9 [4]; Nelson, KA 145, 153.
Ramesses II along with his adding images of his daughters Bintanath and Merytamun to the sides of the statues.  

After Ramesses II usurped these two statues, Seti II decorated them with his figure and titulary. On the southern statue, Seti II carved his prenomen and nomen $\text{wsr-}hprw-R\text{র}$ $\text{mrj-Jmn Sthy mrj.n-Pth}$ on the west, or left, side of the socle along with his Horus name except that the Horus name is damaged except for $k3\ nht$. On the east, or right, side of the statue in the negative space supporting the legs is a sunken relief image of a king holding a $hq3$ scepter. In front of this kingly figure is a damaged line of text with only a few preserved scattered signs, which allows a possible restoration of $z\text{³-}R\text{র nb [}}h\wedge{\text{w}}\text{], but the cartouche is too badly damaged to allow any definite reconstruction. Based on a similar image on the northern statue, the figure is most likely Seti II as the two figures are carved in the same area on both statues.

The northern statue is more damaged than the southern statue, with the lower legs, socle, and pedestal in situ and numerous fragments from the body stored to the north of their original position. The right side of the socle features similar inscriptions as found on the southern statue, but they are so eroded when compared to the southern statue that little of the prenomen or nomen are discernable. On the west, or right, side of this statue


308PM² 2: 37-38 (136); Nelson, KA 153; Legrain, *Temples de Karnak*, 139; Sourouzian, “Colosses du IIᵉ pylône,” 509 figure 2b, 512, and plate 4b; Laboury, 320. Sourouzian comments that the Seti II inscriptions appear abraded by erosion rather than through erasure.


310Ibid., 508.

311PM² 2: 37 (134); Nelson, KA 145; KRI 2: 555; Sourouzian, “Colosses du IIᵉ pylône,” 514, 520 figure 9, and plates 8-9.
in the negative space supporting the legs is an image of a king holding an ankh sign, but unlike the similar image on the southern statue, this figure has an intact prenomen of Seti II before it reading \textit{nswt} \textit{bjj} \textit{wsr-ḥprw-R} \textit{mrj-Jmn} “King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Userkheperure Meryamun.”^312

One feature of these two statues pointed out by Hourig Sourouzian is that they have apparently been moved from their original position in front of the Second Pylon of the Temple of Karnak. On the rear of the socle of both statues, Ramesses II placed images of Nekhbet and Wadjet, the goddesses of Upper and Lower Egypt, over their respective heraldic plants of the lotus and papyrus.^313 Because of this feature, Sourouzian proposes that the statues originally stood facing west under Ramesses II as this would orient the lotus and papyrus images on the rear of the socle to their respective geographical locations of north and south. As found today, these two colossal statues are oriented facing each other, meaning that they have been turned from a western orientation to a north-south orientation.^314

According to Sourouzian, Seti II is presumed to be the king who turned these statues to face one another as he realized that the lotus and papyrus no longer faced their geographic locations once the statues no longer faced west. On the socles of the northern and southern statues, Seti II placed the papyrus on the far left and the lotus on the far

---


^313Sourouzian, “Colosses du II° pylône,” 510, 511 figure 4, 518 figure 8, 519, and plates 5, 6b.

^314Ibid., 523-24, 525 figure 10. On the other hand, Laboury, 319, 322, suggests that these statues were placed by Thutmosis III before the western pylon of the “cour des fêtes” belonging to Thutmosis II and later moved to their current position before the Second Pylon. For the “cour des fêtes” of Thutmosis II, see Luc Gabolde, “La ‘Cour de Fêtes’ de Thoutmosis II à Karnak, \textit{Cahiers de Karnak} 9 (1993): 1-100.
right to geographically orient these plants now that the statues faced each other and not to
the west as under Ramesses II. Sourouzian proposes further that the reorientation of
these statues to face one another was part of an effort by Seti II to reorient statuary along
the processional route through the Temple of Karnak as he wanted to increase and
emphasize his constructions before the Second Pylon.

57. Usurped Red Quartzite Standard Bearer Statue (figure 6.24)
Location: Before the Porch of the Second Pylon at the Temple of Karnak Luxor, Egypt

Discussion and Comments on Number 57

This quartzite statue (figure 6.24) currently stands besides the northern colossal red
granite statue of Ramesses II discussed previously and faces to the south. Only about
half of the statue is preserved from the base and sandaled feet up to about the waist level.
In the negative space on the left side of the statue behind the striding foot of the king, is a
sunk relief figure of a queen holding an ankh and a lotus in her left hand, but the name of

---

315 Sourouzian, “Colosses du IIe pylône,” 509 figure 2b, 512, 517 figure 7a, 519, 523-24, 525
figure 10, and plates 4b, 7a.


317 References: PM² 2: 38 (137); Adam and el-Shabouery, 49 note 1; Chadeauf, 63-64;
Lauffray, Karnak d’Égypte, 100-101 illustration 78, 105 illustration 81, Legrain, Temples de
Karnak, 51 figure 38, 140; Maurice Pillet, “Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1923-1924),”

318 Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 21; Chadeauf, 63. Although the statue is not indicated,
it is in the general area of PM² 2: 37 (134-35), Nelson, KA 145, and a photograph showing its
position can be seen in Sourouzian, “Les Colosses du IIe pylône,” plate 1a.

441
Figure 6.24. Standard bearer statue near the porch of the Second Pylon. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.

This queen was carved away in antiquity.\textsuperscript{319} The base and the back pillar of this statue feature Seti II’s prenomen and nomen \textit{wsr-hprw-R\textsuperscript{c} mrj-Jmn Sthy mrj.n-Pth}.\textsuperscript{320} The standard contains Seti II’s Horus, Nebty, and Golden Horus names reading \textit{[Hr k\textsuperscript{3} nht

\textsuperscript{319}Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 21-23; Chadeauf, 63. See further analysis of this queen in chapter 4 dealing with the families of Amenmesse and Seti II.

\textsuperscript{320}For these inscriptions, see Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 23 figure 11. Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 22-23, also notes that the left side of the base is blank. Either it was never carved to begin with or left blank after usurpation.
mrj-R⁵ nbtj mk-Kmt w⁵f-[ḥ³s]w[t bjk nbw ḫ³-nḥtw-m-t³w-nbw nsw]t [ḥtj]nb t³wj wsr-[ḥprw-R⁵]mrj-[Jmn] “[Horus, Mighty Bull, beloved of Re; Two Ladies, Protector of Egypt,] subduing [foreign land]s; [Gold Falcon, Great of Victories in all lands; King of Upper and Lower Egypt], Lord of the Two Lands User[kheperure] Mery[amun]”.³²¹ The belt reads simply Stḥy mrj.n-Pth mrj-Jmn “Sety-Merneptah Meryamun.”

The original location of this statue, as well as its discovery, is a bit unclear. Yurco’s supposition is that this statue was discovered during Legrain’s excavations in the Forecourt and the Second Pylon at Karnak as Legrain mentions finding a fragment of a red quartzite statue of Seti II (“grès siliceux rouge”) near the southern colossal statue of Ramesses II.³²² However, Legrain’s work in 1896-1897 uncovered two statues in the general area between the Colonnade of Taharqa and the two colossi of Ramesses II, and the descriptions fit the second quartzite statue of Seti II found before the southern colossus of Ramesses II.³²³ These two statues were placed beside Taharqa’s column on

---

³²¹There is the slightest trace of ṣ and w signs from Seti II’s Two Ladies name nbtj mk-Kmt w⁵f-h³.swt on the standard when examining photographs taken of it in 2004. Regrettably, parts of the standard appear to have flaked off from when Yurco studied it. Accordingly, the Ḥṛw ḳš nḥt mrj-R⁵ nbtj mk-Kmt titulary was on the now missing upper part of the statue. The only remaining traces are a t probably belonging to nswt ḥtj, the majority of nb t³wj, and wsr and mrj from wsr-[ḥprw-R⁵]mrj-Jmn. The full titulary can be plausibly restored as indicated.

³²²Yurco, “Ammenesse: Six Statues,”21; Legrain, Temples de Karnak, 140. For views of the Forecourt and Second Pylon of the Temple of Karnak before Legrain’s excavations, see Azim and Réveillac, 1: 106-107, 118-119, 121; idem, 2: 14-15 photos 4-2/12, 4-2/18, 16 photo 4-2/22, 33-34 photos 4-2/84-86, 38 4-2/100.

³²³Azim and Réveillac, 1: 107, 116, 120-21; idem, 2: 15, 31, 34, 37, 38 photos 4-2/18, 75, 87, 96, 100.
the south side of the court before the Second Pylon and eventually were moved further east to the positions they occupy today.324

Yurco’s examination indicates that this statue is to be placed in the category of an original monument of Amenmesse albeit usurped by Seti II. The inscriptions on the back pillar and the prenomen cartouche on the base’s front shows noticeable dips along their surfaces indicating usurpation but no traces of the original inscription are discernable. Yurco indicates that the rough surface surrounding many of the inscriptions of Seti II as well as the sometimes “sloppy cutting of the signs” is highly suggestive that Seti II usurped this statue from Amenmesse.325

Even though this statue stands before the Second Pylon, this may not be its original location, at least when Amenmesse first erected this statue. During Maurice Pillet’s 1923-1924 excavations at Karnak, he found a quartzite base and fragments from another in the Hypostyle Hall that he concluded belonged to statues of Seti II placed along the north-south axis of the hall.326 Yurco believes that since this standard bearer statue resembles two already in the Hypostyle Hall, the original location for the Seti II statue near the northern colossus of Ramesses II is in the Hypostyle Hall on the northern side of columns three and four.327

---

324Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 23; Azim and Réveillac, 1: 107. For photos showing the original location of these statues beside Taharqa’s column, see Legrain, Temples de Karnak, 51 figure 38, 141 figure 91; For Taharqa’s column, see PM² 2: 25 (24); Nelson, KA 123-26.


58. Heavily Damaged Usurped Red Quartzite Standard Bearer Statue (figure 6.25) \(^{328}\)

Location: Before the Porch of the Second Pylon of the Temple of Karnak Luxor, Egypt

Figure 6.25. Heavily damaged standard bearer statue before the porch of the Second Pylon. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.

\(^{328}\)References: PM\(^2\) 2: 38 (137); Adam and el-Shaboury, 49 note 1; Azim and Réveillae, 1: 107, 116, 120-21; idem, 2: 31, photos 4-2/18, 75, 96, 100; Chadefaud, 64; Legrain, Temples de Karnak, 51 figure 38, 140, 141 figure 91; Pillet, “Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1923-1924),” 74; Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues at Karnak,” 22-24.
Discussion and Comments on Number 58

This severely damaged standard bearer statue (figure 6.25) stands before the southern colossus of Ramesses II and faces north.\textsuperscript{329} The statue consists of little more than a third, or less, of the base and part of the back pillar. On the right side of the statue is part of a sandaled foot of a king, and the left side has the lower part of a queenly figure holding a lotus.\textsuperscript{330} The preserved inscription on the back pillar reads \textit{[nsw]\textit{t} [bjtj] \textit{wsr-hprw-R\textsuperscript{c} mrj-Jmn z\textsuperscript{3} R\textsuperscript{c} Sthy mrj.n-Pth dj \textit{\textasciitilde}nh “[King of Upper and Lower Egypt,] Userkheperure Meryamun, Son of Re, Sety Merneptah, given life.”}\textsuperscript{331} What little is preserved of the base inscription is just a trace of \textit{mj R\textsuperscript{c}}.\textsuperscript{332}

As with the statue of Seti II near the northern colossus of Ramesses II, this statue comes from Legrain’s work in 1896-1897 between the Colonnade of Taharqa and the two colossi of Ramesses II as photographs taken at the time show it erected near Taharqa’s

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{329}PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 38 (137); Nelson, KA 153; Yurco, “Amenmesse Six Statues,” 23; Chadefaud, 64. For a photograph of the statue’s current location, see Sourouzian, “Les Colosses du II\textsuperscript{e} pylône,” plate 1a.
\item \textsuperscript{330}Yurco, “Amenmesse Six Statues,” 20-21; Chadefaud, 64.
\item \textsuperscript{331}Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 24. The first \textit{t} of \textit{nswt bjtj} is readily discernable in photographs of the back pillar.
\item \textsuperscript{332}Ibid., 24 figure 12. Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 24 figures 12-13, shows a large fragment of the base in his drawing and collation, but the base fragment reading \textit{\textasciitilde}nh nfr nfr z\textsuperscript{3} Jmn nswt bjtj nb t\textasciitilde}wj wsr-hprw-R\textsuperscript{c} mrj-Jmn[n] “Live, the Good God, Son of Amun, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands “Userkheperure Meryamu[n]” was erroneously identified as belonging to this southern statue of Seti II due to its placement with this statue and actually belongs to a different Seti II statue in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (CG 1198). Sourouzian, “Conservation of Statuary,” 410, writes that this block was removed from its location Yurco saw it in during his study and taken to the Egyptian Museum for rejoining to CG 1198.
\end{itemize}
column. At a later date this statue was moved east from Taharqa’s column to its current placement before the southern colossus of Ramesses II.

Along with the standard bearer statue of Seti II to the north, this statue shows signs of having been usurped from another king, most likely Amenmesse. Yurco’s examination reveals that the preserved prenomen and nomen of Seti II on the back pillar of this statue shows signs of erasure and recutting but nothing from Amenmesse’s original inscriptions. This southern statue of Seti II also was not in its original location when found and probably is the second statue that Yurco proposes Amenmesse placed to the north of columns three and four in the Hypostyle Hall.

59. Usurped Kneeling Red Quartzite Offering Bearer Statue (figure 6.26)

Location: Near Column Four in the Hypostyle Hall of the Temple of Karnak Luxor Egypt

Discussion and Comments on Number 59

Now standing north of column four in the Hypostyle Hall, this quartzite offering bearer statue of Seti II represents the king kneeling while holding an offering table (figure 6.30). Much of the head, offering table, hands, parts of the base and its associated inscriptions are missing, but given that this statue shows traces of a nemes headdress, it probably resembled a similar kneeling offering bearer statue of Ramesses II from Abydos.

Azim and Réveillac, 1: 107, 116, 120-21; idem, 2: 15, 31, 34, 37, 38 photos 4-2/18, 75, 96, 100; esp. 38 photo 4-2/100 which shows it near Ramesses II statue; Legrain, Temples de Karnak, 51 figure 38, 140, 141 figure 91.


Figure 6.26. Kneeling offering bearer statue in the Hypostyle Hall at Karnak Temple. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.

now in the British Museum (BM 584 [96]). The back pillar contains Seti II’s prenomen and nomen \([\text{wsr-hprw-R}^{c} \text{ mrj-Jmn}] n \text{ Sthy mrj.n-Pth} [\text{Userkheperure Meryamu}n, Seti-Merneptah while the front of the offering table has only the prenomen \(\text{wsr-hprw-R}^{c} \text{ mrj-Jmn}\). The base, parts of which are missing, has Seti II’s prenomen

---

336 For BM 584 [96], see Budge, *Guide to the Egyptian Collections*, 241; idem, *Guide to the Egyptian Galleries (Sculpture)*, 161; idem, *Egyptian Sculptures in the British Museum*, 17, and plate 32; Budge and Hall, 366; Sourouzian, “Statues et representations de statues royals sous Séthi I,” 250 note 47, and plate 49e.

337 Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 21 figure 8, and *KRI* 4: 261. Note the upper part of the back pillar is missing, and entirely restored in *KRI* 4: 261.
and nomen \textit{wsr-hprw-R^c mrj-Jmn Shty mrj.n-Pth}.\textsuperscript{338} Pillet found this statue during his 1923-1924 excavations between the southern enclosure wall of the Temple of Karnak and the temple of Taharqa located to the north of the sacred lake. Since he found two quartzite bases during earlier work in the Hypostyle Hall, Pillet concluded that this statue originally stood on one of these bases, so he placed it in the Hypostyle Hall.\textsuperscript{339}

In 1955, Shehata Adam and Farid el-Shaboury noticed salts attacking the Amenmesse/Seti II statues in the Hypostyle Hall, and they were forced to take measures to prevent further damage. New bases were provided for these statues, and it is interesting to note that Pillet did not place the kneeling statue of Seti II on one of the quartzite bases he discovered. Photographs taken of the statues during the restoration in 1955-1956 show the kneeling offering bearer statue resting directly on the floor of the Hypostyle Hall and not a quartzite base.\textsuperscript{340} In fact, Yurco suggests through his studies of these statues that the kneeling offering bearer statue Pillet found does not belong in the Hypostyle Hall but is the missing companion statue to a kneeling offering bearer statue near the \textit{Heret-ib}, or Festival Hall, sanctuaries of Thutmosis III’s Akhmenu Temple.\textsuperscript{341}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{338}\textit{KRI} 4: 261; \textit{RITA} 4: 185. Yurco’s drawings of this statue in “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 21 figure 8, shows that only the ‘\textit{nh Hr} and Seti II’s prenomen and nomen are present on the base. According to observations made by Dr. Peter Brand for this author, about one-third of the left and right sides of the base are missing at present with modern filler replacing the lost parts. The restorations given for the entire base in \textit{KRI} 4: 261, and \textit{RITA} 4: 185, might fill the gap between ‘\textit{nh Hrw} and \textit{[wsr]-hprw-R^c}, but they must be considered highly speculative.
\item \textsuperscript{339}Pillet, “Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1923-1924),” 72-74; Yurco, “Amenmesse Six Statues,” 15.
\item \textsuperscript{340}Adam and el-Shaboury, 49-50, and plate 16; Yurco, “Amenmesse Six Statues,” 15.
\item \textsuperscript{341}Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 15, 25-26. For the statue in the Akhmenu, see PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 110 (341), and plan 12 [2]; Barguet, \textit{Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak}, 178 note 4; Carlotti, 1: 69-70; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 156.
\end{itemize}
Paul Barguet first theorized that this kneeling statue of Seti II was usurped from Amenmesse, and research carried out by Frank Yurco in the 1970s backed up Barguet’s conclusions. Although this kneeling offering bearer statue in the Hypostyle Hall yields very few, if any, traces of Amenmesse’s name, it does have clear indications of usurpation. On the back pillar is a very faint trace of what could be a mr sign along with signs of panning down of the stone’s surface and an overall rough quality to the stone indicative of erasing an earlier text for carving the prenomen and nomen of Seti II. The base is very rough on the right and shows signs of erasure of an earlier prenomen and nomen inscription, but damage incurred through the years to the base makes it difficult to make any positive identification of the earlier text.

---


344 Pillet, “Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1923-1924),” 73, indicates that the statue was not in the best of perseveration when discovered in the mid 1920s. By 1955, moisture and salts precipitated to such an extent that urgent measures were taken to preserve the inscriptions upon the statue. See Adam and el-Shaboury, 49-50, and plates 16-17.
Discussion and Comments on Number 60

The façade of the northern doorway leading into the Hypostyle Hall at the Temple of Karnak underwent many changes to its decoration under the reigns of Seti I, Ramesses II, and succeeding kings. Seti II was no exception to adding to this doorway, but his work was limited to adding marginal inscriptions beneath scenes on the lower east and west jambs of the doorway. On the exterior east jamb beneath a scene showing a king offering to Amun-Re and Sekhmet, Seti II carved a marginal inscription reading \( \text{nswt bjtj nb t\^wy wsr-hprw-R}^c [mrj-Jmn] z\^3-R}^c Sth[y] mrj.n-Pth dj \^nh “King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheperure[Meryamun], Son of Re, Set[i]-Merneptah, Given Life.” \)

On the west jamb, a king offers to Amun-Re and Ptah and the second marginal inscription reads \( \text{nswt bjtj nb t\^wy wsr-hprw-R}^c mrj-Jmn z\^3-R}^c Sthy mrj.n-Pth dj \^nh dd wis mj R}^c “King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheperure Meryamun, Son of Re, Seti-Merneptah, Given Life, Stability, and Dominion, like Re.” \)

References: PM² 2: 49 (162d-e) and plan 10; Nelson, KB 280, KH 11-12; Brand, Monuments of Seti I, 202-205; Legrain, Temples de Karnak, 204; The Epigraphic Survey, The Battle Reliefs of King Sety I, Reliefs and Inscriptions at Karnak, vol. 4, The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Publications, vol. 107 (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1986), 66-72, and plate 19, left and right.

See a discussion of the changes and altering of the decoration under Seti I and Ramesses II in Brand, Monuments of Seti I, 202-205; Epigraphic Survey, Battle Reliefs of King Sety I, 66-72.

Epigraphic Survey, Battle Reliefs of King Sety I, 67, 70, and plate 19, left.

Ibid., 69, 71, and plate 19, right.
Unlike many of the Seti II texts at Karnak, which show unmistakable signs of having been usurped from an earlier king, these marginal inscriptions, especially the cartouches, appear to be entirely original works of Seti II.349

61. Usurped Red Quartzite Standard Bearer Statue (figure 6.27)350

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo CG 1198

Discussion and Comments on Number 61

Another statue once found in the Hypostyle Hall is a standard bearer statue of Seti II that is in the Cairo Museum (CG 1198; figure 6.27) but is generally not included in discussions that group the Karnak statues in the center of the Hypostyle Hall together as a whole.351 Jacques de Morgan discovered CG 1198 buried under pylon debris within the Hypostyle Hall, and this can be narrowed down to the debris from the Second Pylon that collapsed into the western end of the Hypostyle Hall.352 The discovery of CG 1198 under

349Epigraphic Survey, *Battle Reliefs of King Sety I*, 67-68, 72 note e.


351For instance, the conclusion reached in Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 16, where he discusses the possible location of CG 1198 but does not include it in his detailed analysis of the Amenmesse/Seti II statues until the very end.

this debris from the Second Pylon in the western part of the Hypostyle Hall indicates that
this may be the original location of CG 1198, but it could also have been moved to the
western part of the Hypostyle Hall from another location by Seti II or a later king.

Figure 6.27. CG 1198 in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter
Brand.
CG 1198 contains Seti II’s nomen on the belt and his prenomen and nomen \textit{wsr-hprw-R\textsuperscript{c} mrj-Jmn Sthy mrj.n-Pth} on the sporran/kilt.\textsuperscript{353} The statue bears two standards on which are inscribed Seti II’s Horus, Nebty, Golden Horus, prenomen, and nomen reading \textit{Hr k3 nht mrj-R\textsuperscript{c} nbjtj mk-Kmt w\textsuperscript{f}j-h\textsuperscript{3}swt bj\textkern0.5kern3j nbw \textit{53-nhtw-m-t3w-nbw nswt bj\textkern0.5kern3j nb t3wj wsr-hprw-R\textsuperscript{c} mrj-Jmn z3-R\textsuperscript{c} nb h\textsuperscript{5}w Sthy mrj.n-Pth mrwt mj Jmn dj \textit{\textbf{5nH dt}} “Horus, Mighty Bull, beloved of Re; Two Ladies, Protector of Egypt, subduing foreign lands; Gold Falcon, Great of Victories in all lands; King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheperure Meryamun, Son of Re, Lord of Appearances, Seti Merneptah, loved like Re, given life for eternity.”\textsuperscript{354} The front of the base contains a very damaged cartouche reading \textit{[wsr-hpr]}\textsuperscript{w-[R\textsuperscript{c}] mrj-J[mn]} while the inscription along the front and right sides of the base reads \textit{5nH nth ntr nfr z3-Jmn nswt bj\textkern0.5kern3j nb t3wj wsr-hprw-R\textsuperscript{c} mrj-Jmn z3-R\textsuperscript{c} nb h\textsuperscript{5}w Sthy mrj.n-Pth dj 5nH “Live, the Good God, Son of Amun, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheperure Meryamun, Son of Re, Lord of Appearances, Seti Merneptah, given life.”\textsuperscript{355} The left

\textsuperscript{353}Borchardt and Volten, 4: 98; \textit{KRI} 4: 261.

\textsuperscript{354}\textit{KRI} 4: 261; \textit{RITA} 4: 186-87; Borchardt and Volten, 4: 97-99. The translation given is an amalgamation of the left and right standards as the preservation of the titulary differs on each.

\textsuperscript{355}The front of the base was missing when Borchardt and Volten, 4: 98; \textit{KRI} 4: 262; and Hornemann, 1: plate 195, made their observations of CG 1198. The missing right portion of the base stood before the Second Pylon of the Temple of Karnak in front of a damaged standard bearer statue of Seti II (number 58 above) leading Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 24 figures 12-13, to erroneously identify the CG 1198 base fragment as belonging to this statue. Sourouzian, “Conservation of Statuary,” 410, managed to receive permission to remove the missing base fragment and rejoin it to CG 1198 in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo. The left side of the base, of which part is still missing, reads \textit{z3-R\textsuperscript{c} nb h\textsuperscript{5}w Sthy mrj.n-Pth df 5nH “Son of Re, Lord of Appearances, Seti Merneptah, given life.”}
side of the back pillar contains Seti II’s prenomen and nomen while the right has his Horus, Nebty, prenomen and nomen written. 356

CG 1198 has been the central focus of numerous debates as to which king first carved and inscribed the statue and whether it had been usurped. Alan Gardiner briefly made an indication that the inscriptions of Seti II on CG 1198 were not original. 357 Although Yurco concludes the inscriptions along CG 1198’s base show no signs of usurpation, he mistakenly grouped the missing fragment from the base’s right side with another statue of Seti II in front of the Second Pylon, and this missing base fragment shows signs of usurpation. Damage to the cartouche on the front of the base renders any traces of an earlier inscription unreadable except for the prenomen of Seti II [wrs-hpr]w-[Rˁ] mrr-J[mn] carved there. 358 On the right side of the base, the prenomen of Seti II shows a deepening of the cartouche indicating the prenomen is usurped from an earlier inscription, or the earlier inscription was erased and not recarved until the reign of Seti II, and the overall rough surface of the base suggests the scenario that Seti II recarved the base. Further signs of erasure of CG 1198 from an earlier king are that the Seti II titulary inscriptions on the back pillar, sporran/kilt, and belt show either erasures of surrounding decoration or a “noticeable dip” on their surfaces meaning that the inscriptions at these locations on the statue are not original. 359

356 KRI 4: 262; RITA 4: 187; Borchardt and Volten, 4: 98.

357 Gardiner, “Only One King Siptah and Twosre Not His Wife,” 17, quoting notes from an examination of CG 1198 given to him by William Edgerton.


359 Ibid., 28; Borchardt and Volten, 4: 99, states that the back pillar was not visible at the time CG 1198 was examined for their publication, so Yurco must have managed to make a brief
Examinations of CG 1198 show no readily visible traces of any earlier usurped inscriptions, unless the erasure was extremely through to obliterate any evidence of an earlier inscription. \(^{360}\) However, the front and right side of CG 1198’s base reveals an earlier inscription not erased but reused by Seti II. The base reads \(\text{"Live, The Good God, Son of Amun," which is a similar epithet already attributed to Amenmesse through his stelae at the Qurna temple of Seti I. Although Yurco feels } nfr\)

\(\text{nfr } z\text{-Jmn \ parallels Amenmesse’s nomen, this probably is a standardized titulary that need not belong exclusively to Amenmesse but possibly to another king.}^{361}\)

CG 1198 then is a statue in which Seti II became the final king to place his name upon it, but that does not necessarily mean he deliberately usurped it. Parallels exist between the features and costume, such as the wig, indicating that CG 1198 belongs to an earlier king other than Seti II. Hourig Sourouzian notes similarities in the style of wig that is pointed on the sides, extends down to the collarbone, as well as covers the ears as found on CG 1198 and a statue of Merneptah, originally from Pi-Ramesse, in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (JE 37481). \(^{362}\) Similarly, Patrick Cardon and Yitzhak Margowsky

\(^{360}\)Dr. Peter Brand, personal communication 2004.

\(^{361}\)Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues,” 25. For the Amenmesse inscription in the mortuary temple of Seti I, see PM² 2: 409 (15), and plan 40 [1]; Nelson, Kurnah 33; LD 3: 201c; LD² 3: 91-92; KRI 4: 197; RITA 4: 141; Caminos, “Two Stelae in the Kurnah Temple of Sethos I,” 27, and 19 plate B; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 128; Schulman, “Take for Yourself the Sword,” 276, and 290 figure 13.

\(^{362}\)Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 89. The statue of Merneptah (JE 37481) was found at Tanis but its original location was undoubtedly Pi-Ramesse, For JE 37481, see PM 4: 20; KRI 7: 220; Chadeifa, 51-52; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 25, 32 note 12; Eaton-Krauss, “Seti-Merenptah als Kronprinz Merenptahs,” 17-18, 21, figure 1; Iskander, 56, 151; Petrie, Tanis, 2: 28-29, and plate 7, plan 106 inscription 137; Sourouzian, Monuments du roi
noted certain features of CG 1198 indicating that it was “more likely to be the work of Merenptah” than Seti II or Ramesses II. 363 If CG 1198 is an original work of Merneptah’s reign, then what did lead Seti II to carve his name upon it?

As seen on the Merneptah battle reliefs on the Cour de la Cachette, Merneptah’s cartouches were erased and then replaced by that of Seti II, but Seti II was not the originator of these erasures. As already noted by Yurco, Merneptah’s cartouches were erased by Amenmesse, and then the erased cartouches replaced with the prenomen and nomen of Seti II. In no instance did Seti II ever maliciously usurp the monuments of Merneptah, his father, unless Amenmesse did so first. 364 Therefore, this statue possibly shows signs of Amenmesse first erasing the texts of Merneptah on CG 1198, but not inscribing his titles upon the statue. After Amenmesse’s reign, Seti II then carved his titles upon the erased areas making him the final king to utilize CG 1198.

As a rejoinder, Aidan Dodson suggests CG 1198 shows a triple usurpation but not in the manner of Merneptah erased by Amenmesse and then CG 1198 taken over by Seti II. Dodson suggests CG 1198 is an original statue dating to Seti II’s reign that Amenmesse usurped from Seti II and that Seti II usurped CG 1198 back from Amenmesse upon the conclusion of Amenmesse’s reign. 365 As intriguing as this suggestion is, the pattern of erasures on CG 1198 might not support an erasure and recarving done twice unless Amenmesse’s texts were rather shallow.


364 Ibid. For the pattern of erasures on the Merneptah battle reliefs, see Yurco, “Merenptah’s Canaanite Campaign,” 189-215.

365 Dodson, “Takhats and Some Other Royal Ladies,” 226.
62. Inscriptions on Doorway of Pylon Four at Karnak Temple (figure 6.28)\textsuperscript{366}

Location: \textit{in situ}

Figure 6.28. Seti II inscription on the Fourth Pylon at PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 78-79 (202c-d). Photos courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.

Discussion and Comments on Number 62

At the Fourth Pylon of the Temple of Karnak, Seti II carved his titulary consisting of his Horus, Nebty, Golden Horus, prenomen and nomen on the north and south sides of the entrance to the pylon and mainly his prenomen and nomen on the west (figure 6.28).\textsuperscript{367} Barguet mentions that the prenomen and nomen of Seti II \textit{wsr-hprw-R\textsuperscript{e} mrj-Jmn [Sih\textit{y} mrj.n-Pth\textit{h}}, located on the entrance to the Fourth Pylon between an inscription of


\textsuperscript{367}PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 78-79 (202a-d) and plan 10; Nelson, KC 23m-j, 113a-i; KRI 4: 262; \textit{RITA} 4: 187; Barguet, \textit{Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak}, 90-91, 97-98, and plates 11, 13a; Champollion, \textit{ND}, 2: 131; Leclant, “Inscriptions ‘éthiopiennes’ sur la porte du IVe pylône,” 102, 115 figure 4.
Tuthmosis IV and cartouches of Ramesses III, are carved over the prenomen and nomen of Amenmesse. In examining the cartouches closely, it becomes apparent that the cartouches on the west side of the entrance are very rough and show signs of chisel marks where the cartouches were recut for Seti II. As to traces of Amenmesse’s name, the erasures were so thorough as to totally obliterate his prenomen and nomen except for one instance where a possible ms sign from [Jmn]-ms-[s] occurs and that trace is very faint.

Additional traces of Seti II’s activities are described as being part of a scene showing “Seti II (?) receiving life from Amun” and a Seti II text on the rear of the Fourth Pylon. The scene of Seti II and Amun is questionable, even in Porter and Moss, but the text on the rear of the Fourth Pylon, which Barguet describes as a renewal inscription, is that of Seti I as the prenomen and nomen clearly read as mn-M3’5-R5 Sthy mrj.n-Pth.

63. Court between Pylons Five and Six at Karnak Quartzite Lintel of Seti II and Amun-Re (figure 6.29)

Location: in situ

---

368 Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 90 note 3.

369 PM² 2: 79 (202d).

370 PM² 2: 79 (202j, l); Nelson, KC 27, 118-19.

371 Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 98; Brand, Monuments of Seti I, 66.

372 References: PM² 2: 87 (233) and plan 10; Nelson, KC 55; Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 114 note 2; Burgos and Larché, 2: 298; Carlotti, 1: 19, 240-41.
Discussion and Comments on Number 63

In the Thutmosid court between the Fifth and Sixth Pylons at the Temple of Karnak is a doorway containing a quartzite lintel decorated with scenes of Seti II before Amun-Re (figure 6.29). The lintel shows a double scene of a kneeling Seti II offering $nw$ jars to a seated Amun-Re who gives life, stability, and dominion to Seti II. Although part of the jambs belonging to this doorway feature text and images of Tuthmosis III, a hereto unrecognized feature of the west jamb is that it features part of a fragmentary inscription of Seti II. Badly fragmented, what is preserved reads $nswt$ $bjtj$ $nb$ $t\hat{3}wy$ $wsr-hprw-R\hat{c}$ $mrj-[J]mn$ $z\hat{3}-R\hat{c}$ $nb$ $h\hat{5}w$ then a large loss followed by $dj$ $\hat{c}nh$ $mj$ $R\hat{c}$ $[d]t$ “King of Upper and

---

373PM² 2: 87 (233) and plan 10; Nelson, KC 55.

374PM² 2: 87 (233); Nelson, KC 58. Although the Seti II inscription is not described in detail, Seti II’s overall work in this area is mentioned in Carlotti, 1: 19, 240-41; For the Tuthmosis III inscription, see Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 113.
Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheperure Mery[a]mun, Son of Re, Lord of Appearances . . . Given Life, Like Re, for Eternity.”

The quartzite lintel, bearing the prenomen and nomen of Seti II is not an original work of Seti II in that every cartouche on it has been usurped from another king. The cartouches show the characteristic deep bowl shaped depressions indicating that Seti II had these cartouches recut from an earlier king. Another feature indicating that Seti II modified this lintel is that the lintel does not match the doorjambs of this doorway and does not appear to be an original part of this doorway to begin with as it is too large for the jambs. In fact, this quartzite lintel comes from a doorway linking the south court of the Fifth Pylon to the south court of the Sixth Pylon as Barguet noted that the fragmentary quartzite doorjambs located here matched the usurped quartzite lintel of Seti II in the court between the Fifth and Sixth Pylons. The inscriptions on this doorway have preserved traces of Amenmesse’s titulary beneath those of Seti II, so it is very likely that this lintel originally topped the Ramesside doorway linking the south courts of the Fifth and Sixth Pylons. As part of Seti II’s overall campaign to suppress the name of Amenmesse at the Temple of Karnak, Seti II erased Amenmesse’s name on the doorway linking the courts of the Fifth and Sixth Pylons not only as an attempt to erase

375 Conjecturally, the lower part of the doorjamb following Seti II’s prenomen might have read z3-Rc nb h5w [Sth₂mrj n-Pth] dj 5nh mj Rc [d]t “Son of Re, Lord of Appearances, [Seti-Merneptah], Given Life, Like Re, for Eternity.” There is the slightest trace below nb h5w that could be the upper part of the nomen cartouche, but there also is an additional amount of space that additional titulary might fill between the proposed restored nomen and dj 5nh.

376 Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 114 note 2; Carlotti, 1: 19, 240-41; Burgos and Larché, 2: 221, 226-27, 231, 298, 346.

377 PM² 2: 95 (269); Nelson, KD 4. The quartzite jambs belonging to the doorway linking the south courts of the Fifth and Sixth Pylons are still in situ as evidenced by a photo in Burgos and Larché, 2: 221, taken during excavation and restorations in the area. See also further comments in the section on the Monuments of Amenmesse, number 11.
Amenmesse’s name and memory, but also to increase Seti II’s building activities in the area of the Fifth and Sixth Pylon, as either Amenmesse or Seti II enlarged many of the doorways along what would be the processional route to the Akhmenu Temple.\footnote{Carlotti, 1: 19, 240-41, mentions that many of the inscriptions in the area between the Fifth and Sixth Pylons featuring the name of Seti II are usurped from Amenmesse. Therefore, it would seem that many of the enlarged doorways, but not all, leading to the Akhmenu were the work of Amenmesse. It is not clear if Seti II decided to rebuild the doorway linking the south court of the Fifth Pylon to the south court of the Sixth Pylon by removing the quartzite lintel and placing it on the doorway in the court between the Fifth and Sixth Pylons or if the lintel was placed here after Seti II’s reign.}

64. Entrance of the Sixth Pylon at the Temple of Karnak Seti II offers to Theban Triad (figure 6.30)\footnote{References: PM$^2$ 2: 89 (239c) and plan 10; Nelson, KD 149; Champollion, ND, 2: 138-39; Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 116; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 156; Schwaller de Lubicz, Les temples de Karnak, 2: 130-31; Pierre Lacau, “L’or dans l’architecture égyptienne,” ASAE 53 (1956): 235-36.}

Location: \textit{in situ}
Discussion and Comments on Number 64

In the entrance of the Sixth Pylon, a severely damaged scene located at the base of the north wall shows Seti II kneeling and offering *maat* to Amun-Re, Mut, and Khonsu. On either side of this scene are double plumed cartouches containing the prenomen and nomen of Seti II *wsr-*\textit{hprw-R̄} *mrj-Jmn Sthy mrj.n-Pth*. According to Barguet, Seti II’s name in this scene is carved over an earlier king’s name, but he does not explicitly say

\[^{380}\text{PM}^2 2: 89 (239c)\text{ and plan 10; Nelson, }\textit{KD}\text{ 149; Champollion, }\textit{ND}\text{, 2: 138-39; Barguet, }\textit{Temple d’Amon-Řē à Karnak}\text{, 116; Krauss, }\text{”Untersuchungen zu König Amenemesse (2. Teil),”}\text{ 156; Schwaller de Lubicz, }\textit{Les temples de Karnak}\text{, 2: 130-31; Lacau, ”L’or dans l’architecture égyptienne,”}\text{ 235-36.}\]
that king is Amenmesse.\textsuperscript{381} If Amenmesse did carve this scene on the Sixth Pylon, then the actions of Seti II and nature have totally obscured any traces of an earlier name.

65. Renewal Inscription on West Face of the South Exterior Wall adjoining the Sixth Pylon (figure 6.31)\textsuperscript{382}

Location: \textit{in situ}

Discussion and Comments on Number 65

The West Face of the South Exterior Wall adjoining the Sixth Pylon contains a very long restoration inscription belong to Seti II.\textsuperscript{383} The inscription reads

\begin{verbatim}
[nTr-nfr] wr mnn pr jt.f Jmn qm3 nfrw.f s53 pr.f smnh sh-nTr.f m k3wt mnh nt nhh
nswt bhjt jtt Jmn nb t3wy wsr-hprw-R\(\textsuperscript{c}\) mrj-Jmn nswt nht jrtw mnwy 533 bj3j shrw.f
nb hpr.sn hr-c mj.j nb ntrw shd.n.f Wst m mnh wrw n nswt jr n.j.f z3-R\(\textsuperscript{c}\) n hjt(f) mrj.f
nb hjw [Stf]y mrj.n-Pth mry Jmn-R\(\textsuperscript{c}\) nb nswt t3wy dj nhh “[The Good God], Great of
Monuments in the House of His Father, Amun, Who Created His Beauty, Who Made
Great His House and Made Useful His God’s Shrine as a Beneficent Work of Eternity,
King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Image of Amun, Lord of the Two Lands,
Userkheperure Meryamun. Victorious King, Efficient in Deeds, Abundant of Many
Marvels, All His Plans Happen Immediately, Like Those of His Father, The Lord of
the Gods. He brightened Thebes with Great Monuments, No King has done what he
has done, Son of Re, of His Body, His Beloved, Lord of Appearances, [Set]i-
Merneptah beloved of Amun-Re, Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands, Given
Life.”\textsuperscript{384}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{381}Barguet, \textit{Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak}, 116.

\textsuperscript{382}References: PM\(\textsuperscript{2}\) 2: 88 (237), and plan 10; Nelson, KC 60; KRI 4: 262-63; RITA 4: 187; Barguet, \textit{Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak}, 118; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 156; McClain, 194-95.

\textsuperscript{383}PM\(\textsuperscript{2}\) 2: 88 (237) and plan 10; Nelson, KC 60.

\textsuperscript{384}KRI 4: 262-63; Translation after RITA 4: 187, and McClain, 194-95.
Figure 6.31. Detail of prenomen and nomen on the west face of the south exterior wall adjoining the Sixth Pylon. Photos courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand and Kevin Johnson.

Although the prenomen and nomen cartouches currently contain Seti II’s name, they clearly have been usurped from an earlier king (figure 6.31). The cartouches show a characteristic bowl-shaped depression indicative of the cartouche being erased and smoothed down before carving Seti II’s name in them. An inspection of these cartouches reveals no traces of the earlier name in them, but the name in these cartouches originally was probably that of Amenmesse. Amenmesse cut a doorway through the south exterior

---

wall of the Sixth Pylon linking the South Court of the Sixth Pylon to the South Court of the Fifth Pylon but damaging Thutmosid constructions by doing so. To take credit for building the doorway, Amenmesse carved this restoration inscription on the west exterior wall adjoining the Sixth Pylon immediately adjacent to his new doorway. During his erasures of Amenmesse’s name, Seti II had Amenmesse’s prenomen and nomen erased and replaced with his.

66. Renewal Inscriptions of Seti II in the Vestibule of the Granite Sanctuary of Philip Arrhidaeus (figure 6.32)

Location: in situ

---

386 Burgos and Larché, 2: 221, 226-27, 231, 346.

387 In the south court of the Fifth Pylon at PM² 2: 87, plan 10 court 4 (“South Pillared Court”), and Nelson, KC “Court of Thutmose III,” there is a toppled Osiride colossus inscribed with the name of Seti II wsr-hprw-Rˁ mrj-Jmn Sthy mrj.n-Pth. Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 114-15, and Carlotti, 1: 19, 240-41, point out that Seti II and Ramesses III usurped the constructions of a king in the area of the Fifth Pylon other than Thutmose III. Based on the pattern of Seti II usurpations at Karnak, there is a strong possibility than Amenmesse’s name was once on this Osiride statue. The author wishes to thank Dr. Peter Brand for bringing this statue to his attention.

388 References: PM² 2: 89-90 (240-45), and plan 12 [1]; Nelson, KD 151-52, 160-61, 179; LD 3: 30b, 1-33; Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 117 note 5, 119 note 4; Brugsch, Recueil de monuments égyptiens, plates 43-44; Champollion, Monuments, plate 303; idem, ND 2: 139; Jéquier, L’architecture et la décoration dans l’ancienne Égypte 3: plate 2; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenemesse (2. Teil),” 156; McClain, 194-95; Myśliwiec, 120-21; Rosellini, Monumenti storici, plate 122 [1]; Schwaller de Lubicz, Les temples de Karnak, 2: plate 140.
Discussion and Comments on Number 66

In the vestibule of the Granite Sanctuary of Philip Arrhidaeus, replacing an earlier barque shrine of Thutmose III behind the Sixth Pylon, Seti II inscribed a series of bandeau inscriptions on the lower wall detailing his renewal activities in the area of the Sixth Pylon. These inscriptions consist of mostly long lines of Seti II’s titulary and dedications to Amun-Re, but a close inspection reveals that these inscriptions are usurped
from an earlier king, probably Amenmesse. In contrast to the nominal method of erasing Amenmesse’s prenomen and nomen while leaving connecting titles intact, Seti II choose to have the entire line of text erased here including the Horus name, titles, prenomen and nomen (figure 6.32). The only parts of the wall left intact are those containing the name and epithets of Amun-Re, and one can detect a characteristic lip where the preceding inscription was cut back by Seti II. Regrettably, the erasures are so through that no trace can be detected of Amenmesse’s name.

67. Room 15 North of Granite Sanctuary Seti II giving libation to gods and Ahmose-Nefertari

Location: in situ

Discussion and Comments on Number 67

On the north-east doorjamb of storeroom 15 located north of the Granite Sanctuary at The Temple of Karnak, a scene shows a king adoring and making offerings to Amun-Re and Queen Ahmose-Nefertari. Alfred Wiedemann described the cartouches of the king

---


392PM² 2: 103 (308) and plan 11; Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 148-51, 209-210 note 1; Brand, Monuments of Seti I, 66; Caminos, “Two Stelae in the Kurnah Temple of Sethos I,” 29; Loeben, “Amon à la place d’Aménophis I,” 233-34, and 241-43 plates 1-3; Wiedemann, Ägyptische Geschichte, 2: 484.
in this scene as those of Seti II over the name of Amenmesse.\footnote{Wiedemann, \textit{Ägyptische Geschichte}, 2: 484; Gauthier, \textit{Livre des rois}, 3: 128; note 2; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 156; Petrie, \textit{History of Egypt}, 3: 125. In opposition to this is that Caminos, “Two Stelae in the Kurnah Temple of Sethos I,” 29, states that he could not find this scene when using Wiedemann’s description. Charles F. Nims, review of \textit{Ägyptologische Studen}, by O. Firchow, ed., \textit{BiOr} 14 (1957): 137, amends Wiedemann’s description to the Wadjyt Doorway at PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 81 (212c-d), Nelson, KC 36a-b, but there is not a scene at this location showing a king before Amun-Re and Ahmose-Nefertari.} Porter and Moss, following Paul Barguet, describe the cartouches as Seti II usurping Ramesses II.\footnote{Barguet, \textit{Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak}, 209-210 note 1; PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 103 (308).} The discrepancy between these two descriptions can be explained if there was a trace of \textit{stp.n-R\textsuperscript{c}} beneath Seti II’s name as both Ramesses II and Amenmesse used that element in their prenomen; namely, \textit{wsr-M\textsuperscript{r}\textit{f}-R\textsuperscript{c} stp.n-R\textsuperscript{c}} for Ramesses II and \textit{mn-mj-R\textsuperscript{c} stp.n-R\textsuperscript{c}} for Amenmesse, leading one to conclude that the cartouche was originally that of Amenmesse.

In actuality, this doorway contains the nomen cartouche of Seti I \textit{Sthy mrj.n-Pth} usurped by Ramesses II as his nomen of \textit{R\textsuperscript{c}-ms-sw mrj-Jmn} is cut over that of Seti I. Christian Loeben points out that Barguet mistakenly took the cartouche upon the doorway as that of Seti II, when it is clearly written as that of Seti I with the \textit{Pth} element preceding that of \textit{Sthy}.\footnote{Loeben, “Amon à la place d’Aménophis I,” 235-36; Brand, \textit{Monuments of Seti I}, 66. Loeben, “Amon à la place d’Aménophis I,” 236 note 15, also points out that Seti I consistently wrote his nomen with the \textit{Pth} element before the \textit{Sthy} element in Karnak. For more on the attested variant spellings of Seti I’s nomen, \textit{Sthy mrj.n-Pth} and \textit{Sthy mrj.n-Jmn}, see Christian E. Loeben, “Annexe I. A propos de la graphie du nom de Séthi I à Karnak,” \textit{Cahiers de Karnak} 8 (1982-1985): 225-28.} The quality and style of relief, mixing raised relief for Ahmose-Nefertari and sunk relief for that of the king and Amun-Re, also clearly date this
doorway to the early Nineteenth Dynasty reigns of Seti I and Ramesses II and not the later Nineteenth Dynasty reign of Amenmesse and Seti II.  

68. Renewal Text on Sokar Complex Doorjamb

Location: in situ

Discussion and Comments on Number 68

On the lower part of the doorjamb separating rooms twenty-six and twenty-seven at the Sokar Complex of the Akhmenu Temple at the Temple of Karnak, a restoration inscription reading [s]mAwy-mnw jr.n Sthy mrj.n-Pth n jt.f.Jm[n-R©] “[Re]newal of monuments made by Seti-Merneptah for his father Amu[n-Re].” This restoration inscription is normally linked to the reign of Seti II, but the problem with this suggestion is that the nomen here is written in the manner of Seti I’s nomen with the Pth grouping written before Sthy. According to Christian Loeben, Seti II wrote his

---


398 PM² 2: 118 (385a), and plans 11, 12 [2], 13 [2]; Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 191-92; Grallert, 2: 621 number S1/Rv023. Transliteration and translation based on KRI 4: 263; RITA 4: 188; Grallert, 1: 318 number S1/Rv023; McClain, 148.

399 Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 192; KRI 4: 263 note 55a. Compare also the nomen of both Seti I and Seti II in Beckerath, Königsnamen, 150-51 E1-2 (Seti I), 160-61 E3-9, 11 (Seti II).
nomen as resembling that of Seti I on only one attested occurrence at Karnak from the exterior of the Eighth Pylon. Joseph McClain suggests that since “neither king left any other text” in the area of the Akhmenu’s Sokar Complex “that Seti I is as reasonable an identification as Seti II for the king in question here.” Based on the rarity of examples at Karnak of Seti II writing his nomen like Seti I, this restoration inscription cannot be positively linked to the reign of Seti II and must be seriously considered as that of Seti I.

---

400 Loeben, “Amon à la place d’Aménophis I,” 236; Beckerath, Königsnamen, 160-61 E1. The cartouche is at PM² 2: 177 (527c-d), and is commented on further below. Two similar examples come from the pylon of the Temple of Armant and chapel E at the Oratory of Ptah. For Armant, see Mond and Myers, 1: 162-63; idem, 2: plate 87, and for chapel E at the Oratory of Ptah, see comments in this chapter.

401 McClain, 148 note 156.

402 Kitchen in RITA 4: 188, translates the nomen as “Sethos (I or II) Merneptah,” while McClain, 148, 194, ultimately takes the restoration inscription as either that of Seti I or Seti II. Grallert, 2: 621 number S1/Rv023, describes the restoration inscription rather hesitantly as “Sethos I?” Loeben, “Annexe I. A propos de la graphie du nom de Séthi I,” 225, most assuredly identifies this as a restoration inscription of Seti I.
69. Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah Battle Reliefs on the outer wall of the Cour de la Cachette

Location: in situ; some fallen scenes in various Karnak blockyards

Discussion and Comments on Number 69

Probably no other topic raises as much discussion in the literature surrounding the late Nineteenth Dynasty than the battle reliefs on the outer west wall of the Cour de la Cachette of Karnak Temple. Much of the arguments revolve around identifying these reliefs as originally those of Ramesses II or Merneptah and trying to locate ancient Israelites on the walls if one takes these reliefs as a pictorial representation of the defeated people from Merneptah’s Israel Stela. The debate over identifying ancient


404For views supporting identifying these scenes as belonging to Merneptah, first championed by Frank Yurco, see Yurco, “Merenptah’s Plaestinian Campaign,” 70; idem, “Merenptah’s Canaanite Campaign,” 189-215; idem, “3,200-Year-Old Picture of Israelites Found in Egypt,” 20-38; idem, “Frank J. Yurco’s Response,” 61; idem, “Merenptah’s Canaanite Campaign and Israel’s Origins,” 27-55; idem, “Merenptah’s Wars, the ‘Sea Peoples,’ and Israel’s Origins,” 498-99; RITANC 2: 72-78; Brand, “Chronology of the South Wall of the Hypostyle Hall,”; idem, “Date of War Scenes,” 51-84; idem, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 29-48; Hasel, Domination and
Israelites on these scenes is beyond the current study as are the numerous arguments as to who these reliefs belong to. For all intents and purposes, these reliefs date securely to the reign of Merneptah and the focus of arguments here concerns the pattern of usurped cartouches on the exterior west wall of the Cour de la Cachette.405

The cartouches in these battle reliefs belonging to Merneptah show signs of usurpations in that the names in these cartouches are those of Seti II, but the cartouche surface has the bowl-shaped depression indicative of the surface having been cut back for recarving. Yurco’s analysis suggest that the majority of cartouches were expertly erased to contain no traces of an earlier name other than that of Seti II, but he did identify at least four scenes or scattered blocks that contain signs of Merneptah usurped by Amenmesse and Amenmesse later usurped by Seti II.406 Although Yurco’s reconstruction of the usurpations makes sense chronologically, there is little in situ evidence to support his conclusion.

In scene two of the Merneptah battle relief showing Merneptah attacking an unnamed Canaanite city, possibly Gezer, Yurco claims the cartouches behind the king contain three

---

405PM2 2: 132 (491, 493-94); Nelson, KO 52, 54-56, 57, 59-60. For the most current summation over whether these scenes belong to Ramesses II or Merneptah, see the succinct and sobering points raised in Brand, “Date of War Scenes,” 51-84; idem, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah at Karnak and Luxor,” 29-48.

names. The first name is Merneptah’s prenomen and nomen $b\dot{\dot{a}}-n-R^e$ $mrj-Jmn$ $mrj.n$-$Pth$

\textit{Baanre Meryamun, Merneptah Hotephirmaat}” overcut by Amenmesse’s
name that only the smallest trace is preserved as $[Jmn-ms-s] hq\dot{a}]-W^st]\] “[Amenmesse,]
Ruler of [Thebes].” Seti II then erased Amenmesse’s name and carved his prenomen and
nomen $wsr$-$hprw-R^e$ $mrj$-$Jmn$ $Sth\ y$ $mrj.n$-$Pth$ “Userkheperure Meryamun, Seti
Merneptah” over that of Merneptah.\textsuperscript{407} In this same scene there is Prince Khaemwaset
holding the reigns of Merneptah’s chariot team, and the prenomen cartouche over the
horses Yurco believes shows three names. Again, Yurco reconstructs the prenomen as
that of Merneptah $b\dot{\dot{a}}-[n]-R^e$ $[mrj-Jmn]$ cut over by Amenmesse’s prenomen $mn-mj-R^e$

$[stp.n-R^e mrj-Jmn]$ and lastly by Seti II $wsr$-$hprw-R^e$ $[mrj]-[Jmn]$.$\textsuperscript{408}$

The second instance of usurped cartouches is in scene five showing Merneptah
binding Shasu prisoners before leading them back to Egypt. The cartouches over the
king, very severely damaged by gouges, Yurco interprets to contain Merneptah’s
prenomen and nomen $[b\dot{\dot{a}}-n]-R^e$ $[mrj-Jmn]$ $[mrj.n]$-$Pth$ $htp$-$[hr-M^\dot{a}t]$ then Amenmesse’s,
but with only the nomen $[Jmn]$-$ms-[s]$ $[hq\dot{a}]-W^st]$ plausibly reconstructed, and the final
name in sequence being Seti II’s prenomen and nomen $[wsr$-$hprw-R^e mrj-Jmn]$ $Sth\ y$
$[mrj.n-Pth].\textsuperscript{409}$

\textsuperscript{407}Yurco, “Merneptah’s Canaanite Campaign,” 191 figure 1a-b, 192 figure 2; 197-98 figures

10-11; idem, “3,200-Year-Old Picture of Israelites Found in Egypt,” 25; Heinz, 294 I.2. In
contrast, see now the new collation of this cartouche in Brand, “Usurped Cartouches of
Merneptah,” 21 figure 2, and further comments below.

\textsuperscript{408}Yurco, “Merneptah’s Canaanite Campaign,” 191 figure 1a-b, 199, 200 figure 14; Heinz,
294 I.2.

\textsuperscript{409}Yurco, “Merneptah’s Canaanite Campaign,” 191 figure 1a-b, 194 figure 6; 201-202 figures
15-16; Heinz, 295 I.3.
The final cartouches in Yurco’s evidence of usurpations are two loose blocks from a battle in scene four and from the presentation of captives to Amun-Re in scene eight.\(^{410}\) The block from scene four shows Merneptah wearing the *khepresh* and holding a bow with the cartouches in front of him containing his prenomen and nomen $b\delta-[n]-R^e\ [mrj]-Jmn\ [mrj].n-Pth\ htp-hr-M\delta^t$ overcut by Seti II’s names $wsr\-hpr[w]-R^e\ mrj\-Jmn\ Sthy\ mrj.n-Pth$. The block from the presentation scene contains just the prenomen of Merneptah $b\delta-[n]-R^e\ [mrj]-Jmn$ overcut by $wsr\-hprw-R^e\ mrj\-Jmn$, the prenomen of Seti II.\(^{411}\)

Yurco’s reconstruction of these cartouches would then seem to indicate that Amenmesse had a direct hand in not only intervening before the reign of Seti II but that he mounted an intensive campaign of erasing and carving Merneptah’s name for his own. Regrettably, “no reliable trace of Amenmesse has ever been found” on the exterior west wall of the *Cour de la Cachette* despite Yurco’s affirmations.\(^{412}\) Yurco’s traces of what he believed to be Amenmesse’s name become phantoms upon the walls of Karnak Temple in that several collations of what appears at best to be stray lines and half circles in Yurco’s drawings detected no traces of Amenmesse’s name but did confirm the sequence of Merneptah’s name being the earliest and Seti II’s being the latest name in

\(^{410}\)Yurco, “Merenptah’s Canaanite Campaign,” 191 figure 1a-b, 193 figure 5, 195 figure 9; Heinz, 295 I.5, 296 I.6; Le Saout, 231, 232 4c, and plates 4 (4b), 9 (4c).

\(^{411}\)Yurco, “Merenptah’s Canaanite Campaign,” 195 figure 9; 202-203 figures 17-18, 203-204 figures 19-20; Le Saout, 231, 232 4c, and plates 4 (4b), 9 (4c). See also the new collation of the cartouche from scene eight in Brand, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 38 figure 15, where the prenomen of Merneptah reads $[b\delta-n]-R^e\ [mrj]-Jmn$ in the new collation.

these cartouches. For some unknown reason, Amenmesse erased all the cartouches on the exterior west wall and possibly the interior west wall as well, but he never carved his name in the erased cartouches unless Amenmesse’s name was merely painted in the erased cartouches. Later, Seti II, upon the ending of Amenmesse’s reign or control over Thebes, placed his names in the erased cartouches resulting in the wall as it currently appears.

70. East (Inner) Face of the West Wall of the Cour de la Cachette at Karnak: Scenes of Seti II with Deities (Court 1 North of Seventh Pylon)

Location: in situ; some fallen scenes in various Karnak blockyards

---

413 Brand, “Chronology of the South Wall of the Hypostyle Hall,”; idem, “Date of War Scenes,” 60-64, 67-68; idem, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 29-38, 46-48; Murnane et al., 103-104. Iskander, 317-18, admits to the sequence of names being Merneptah and Seti II, but still believes these scenes are Ramesses II’s even though no trace of Ramesses II’s name exists in any of these cartouches.

414 Brand, “Date of War Scenes,” 60-62, 67-68, and idem, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 29-38, 46-47, refutes Yurco, “Merneptah’s Canaanite Campaign,” 197, and idem, “3,200-Year-Old Picture of Israelites Found in Egypt,” 24-25, and the hypothesis that Amenmesse’s titles were largely cut into plaster placed over Merneptah’s partially erased and keyed cartouches and that Seti II had to merely strip away Amenmesse’s plaster, add a bit of fresh plaster, and carve his own name in order to effectively erase Amenmesse’s titles from the wall. In no case is there any trace of plaster in other than small quantities to indicate that Amenmesse carved his name into these erased cartouches of Merneptah. Alternatively, Amenmesse could have painted his name in the erased cartouches, of which there are no traces of today, and painting his name may have been easier to erase if Amenmesse did indeed use this method. For the relief on the inner west wall, see comments in the following section.

415 References: PM² 2: 132 (490), and plan 14; Nelson, KG 52-64; LDT 3: 43; Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 275-76; Champollion, ND, 2: 194; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 133; Georges Legrain, “La litanie de Ouasit,” ASAE 15 (1915): 276-77; Le Saout, 214-28, and plates 1-3 (1a-b, 3a-c).
Discussion and Comments on Number 70

In contrast with the Merneptah battle relief on the outer west wall of the *Cour de la Cachette*, the inner face of the west wall features ritualized scenes showing a king, named as Seti II in the cartouches, before various deities. Much like the outer west wall of the *Cour de la Cachette*, the inner face of the west wall has lost many blocks over the years that are in various magazines and store yards at Karnak or remain lost resulting in many scenes being reconstructed on paper.\(^{416}\) The basic arrangement of the scenes on the wall features two registers, with the uppermost register largely missing, but traces indicate it consists of, in order from left to right, a king offering unguent to Amun-Re followed by the Ennead of fourteen gods, a king offering maat to Mut, Amun-Re, and Khonsu, two scenes showing a king before various deities, and two more scenes featuring the king receiving heb-sed from the gods and kneeling on a Persea tree before Amun-Re and Mut.\(^{417}\) The lower register, again from left to right but mostly reconstructed from blocks elsewhere at Karnak, shows a king being purified, offering bread to Amun-Re, before Mut and Amun-Re, offering a *nmst* vase to Amun-Re, two scenes before Amun-Re, the king between Thoth and Amun-Re, and a scene showing the king receiving *heb-sed* from Amun-Re.\(^{418}\) The remaining scenes *in situ* upon the wall shows a king before Amun-Re and before Waset, receiving *heb-sed* from Amun-Re and Mut, offering *maat* to Amun-Re, offering four *mrt* chests to Amun-Re and Isis, offering four calves to Amun-Re and

\(^{416}\)Le Saout, 214-28, and plates 1-3 (1a-b, 3a-c).

\(^{417}\)PM\(^2\) 2: 132 (490), and plan 14; Nelson, KG 52-57. Much of the upper register preserves only the feet belonging to the king and gods in the scenes, making identification of these gods difficult, and the southern, or left, part of the wall only exists due to the photographic reconstructions in Le Saout, 214-19, and plates 1-3 (1a-b, 3a, c).

\(^{418}\)Nelson, KG 51; Le Saout, 219-24, 227-28, and plates 1-3 (1a-b, 3a, c).
Khonsu, running with a bull before Amun-Re-Kamutef and Amunet, and a scene showing a king being led by Atum and another god, before Hathor, Amun-Re and Mut.\textsuperscript{419}

Even though Seti II’s name is upon the inner face of the west wall of the \textit{Cour de la Cachette}, he was not the king who originally carved these scenes upon the wall. In every instance where Seti II’s titulary is found, the characteristic bowl-shaped depressions are evident where the original cartouches were cut back in the process of erasing the original name.\textsuperscript{420} The question is then whose name was originally in these cartouches? An analysis of similar scenes in the \textit{Cour de la Cachette} sheds some light on the issues.

In a manner analogous to the battle scenes on the outer west wall of the \textit{Cour de la Cachette}, a logical conclusion is that these ritual scenes originally date to the reign of Merneptah, were erased under Amenmesse, and then Seti II carved his names in the erased cartouches upon reestablishing control over Thebes. Le Saout adds another king to the sequence by suggesting the entire decoration on the inner and outer faces of the west wall belong to Ramesses II, who was then usurped by Merneptah, Amenmesse, and Seti II.\textsuperscript{421} In contrast to this is that “to date, no trace of any name prior to Seti II’s has been discovered in this series of ritual scenes” on the inner west wall, and no name earlier than Merneptah’s has been discovered on the outer west wall.\textsuperscript{422} However, on the inner

\begin{footnotes}
\item[419]PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 132 (490); Nelson, KG 58-64; Barguet, \textit{Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak}, 275-76; Brand, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 36 figure 13.
\item[420]Brand, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 33-34, 36-37 figures 13-14, 46-47; idem, “Date of War Scenes,” 60-64, 66-67, 69, 84 figure 30; Le Saout, 214-24, 227-28, and plates 1-3 (1a-b, 3a, c).
\item[421]Le Saout, 214-15, 229, followed by Sourouzian, \textit{Monuments du roi Merenptah}, 143, 150, tends to identify these scenes as Ramesses II merely on grounds that these scenes are so characteristic of other scenes of Ramesses II that they must be his.
\end{footnotes}
face of the east wall of the *Cour de la Cachette*, there are scenes with the cartouches of Merneptah and at least one of the scenes bears notice of the possible sequence of usurpations for the west wall.

The inner face of the east wall of the *Cour de la Cachette*, is decorated with not only the Great Historical Inscription of Merneptah, but the Victory Hymn, and triumphal scenes showing Merneptah slaying prisoners before Amun-Re.\textsuperscript{423} The cartouches in these scenes and inscriptions, located on the southern end of the inner face of the east wall of the *Cour de la Cachette*, all contain intact examples of Merneptah’s titulary except for one example. On the northern end of the same wall there is a scene of a king kneeling between the paws of a criosphinx. The king holds a $hq\beta$ scepter in his left hand, wears a princely sidelock, and the cartouches before the king reads $b\beta-n-R\epsilon$ mrj-Jmn mrj.n-Pth $\hat{h}tp-hy-Mt\beta$t, which is the name of Merneptah.\textsuperscript{424} In looking at the cartouche, however, one notices that although the cartouche is readable it has been hacked in preparation for erasure and possible usurpation except that the work never progressed past what is on the wall today. Brand suggests that this is an example of an incomplete *damnatio memoriae* directed at Merneptah by Amenmesse in the Theban area, and the


evidence from the inner and outer west wall of the Cour de la Cachette certainly suggests Amenmesse did have an agenda against Merneptah.425

Nonetheless, damnation does not need to be the only explanation for the erased cartouches on the inner western wall and the hacked cartouches in front of the crouspinx on the inner eastern wall of the Cour de la Cachette. Amenmesse could have erased these cartouches with the intention of placing his name in them, and for whatever reason left the work unfinished before the end of his reign. This accounts for the incomplete erasure of the crouspinx as Amenmesse’s workers erased the cartouches on the inner and outer faces of the west wall of the Cour de la Cachette and started work on the northern end of the east wall before Amenmesse fell from power, died, or ordered his workers elsewhere. Seti II then merely used these largely erased cartouches to further his status by having his name placed in them.426

On final thought on these ritualized scenes from the inner west wall. They might just be original works of Amenmesse.427 The erasures of these cartouches on the inner west wall are “too shallow to allow for one than royal name prior to Seti II.”428 No discernable traces of Merneptah’s name has been found to date on these scenes, and it could equally be that Amenmesse originally carved these scenes on the inner west wall and that Seti II effectively erased all traces of Amenmesse’s name during his work of

425Brand, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 33-34; idem, “Date of War Scenes,” 61-62. Sourouzian, Monuments du roi Merenptah, 149, believes this is an instance of Merneptah usurping Ramesses II.


428Brand, “Date of War Scenes,” 85 figure 30.
erasing Amenmesse’s name at Karnak. Granted, the counter argument is also that
Merneptah’s name was erased, but the cartouches never inscribed, by Amenmesse and
Seti II then carved his name in the erased cartouches after Amenmesse’s reign ended.
Either scenario is possible in that the only name in the cartouches today is Seti II’s and all
traces of an earlier name are no longer existant.

71. East (Inner) Face of the West Wall of the Cour de la Cachette at Karnak: Seti II
Decree (Reconstructed)\(^{429}\)

Location: In storage at Karnak

Discussion and Comments on Number 71

This now largely destroyed stela containing a royal decree consists mostly of scattered
blocks in various storerooms at Karnak, but it was once carved on the inner west wall of
the Cour de la Cachette at Karnak Temple.\(^ {430}\) A number of large lacunae and missing
blocks create gaps in the reconstructed stela, but the basic layout is Seti II offering to a
seated Amun-Re, while Mut, Khonsu, and Waset stand behind Amun-Re. Beneath this
top scene are at least eighteen lines of rhetorical text describing how the king issued a

\(^{429}\)References: PM\(^2\) 2: 180, 136, 297; KRI 4: 263-66; RITA 4: 188-89; Barguet, Temple
d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 255 note 2; 276-87; G. A. Gaballa and K. A. Kitchen, “Ramesside Varia
I,” CdE 43, no. 86 (1968): 269-70, and figure 5; Wolfgang Helck, “Ramessidische Inschriften aus
II,” 82-87; idem, “Nachlese zu ramessidischen Inschriften,” ZÄS 83 (1958):145-46; Le Saout,
224-26, and plate 3 (3b).

\(^{430}\)Published accounts of the fragments appear in PM\(^2\) 2: 180, 136, 297; KRI 4: 263-66;
Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 255 note 2; 276-87; Gaballa and Kitchen, 269-70, and
figure 5; Helck, “Ramessidische Inschriften aus Karnak,” 37-39, and figure 1; idem, “Zwei
Thebanische Urkunden aus der Zeit Sethos II,” 82-87; idem, “Nachlese zu ramessidischen
Inschriften,” 145-46; Le Saout, 224-26, and plate 3 (3b).
decree to the various god’s fathers, *wab* priests, lector priests, and other temple functionaries and acolytes that anyone caught accepting or demanding “bribes” will be dismissed and demoted to “field-laborer” perhaps with legal repercussions as well.\footnote{KRI 4: 263-66; RITA 4: 188-89.}

Even though the name appearing in the cartouches is Seti II’s, his name has been carved over that of an earlier king.\footnote{Le Saout, 224-25.} On the preserved frame lines of the stela there once existed on either side long lines of titulary featuring the prenomen and nomen of a king. The left frame line is too fragmented but the right frame contains a partially preserved nomen [\textit{Stḥ]y mrj.n-Pth} of Seti II showing the characteristic deep depression that indicates erasure and usurpation of the cartouche.\footnote{Ibid., plate 3 (3b).} There does not seem to be any preserved traces of the earlier king who carved this stela, and possibility is that this is an earlier monument erected by Merneptah based on the similarities between the erased cartouches on this stela and on the inner and outer west wall of the \textit{Cour de la Cachette}.

72. Court of the Eighth Pylon Interior Face of the Exterior West Wall\footnote{References: PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: plan 14; Nelson, plate 8 figure 1, plate 14 figure 3; Le Saout, 246-48, and plate 9 (8a-b).}

Location: In storage at Karnak

Discussion and Comments on Number 72

These scenes belonging to Seti II are in a manner of preservation similar to the royal stela described earlier in that none of these scenes remain \textit{in situ} on the exterior west wall
of the court of the Eighth Pylon. These scenes only exist through scattered fragmentary blocks in storage at Karnak, and were only noticed during Le Saout’s research during the mid 1970s.\footnote{Le Saout, 246-47, and plate 9 (8a-b). Although these scenes are not indicated, a general overview of the area can be found in PM$^2$ 2: plan 14; Nelson, plate 8 figure 1, plate 14 figure 3.} What known fragments suggest is that there were a series of ritual scenes, probably in two registers, carved along the interior west wall of the court of the Eight Pylon. Of these only two sections of wall can be reliably reconstructed and based on the surviving fragments, the scenes were left unfinished.\footnote{Le Saout, 246, seems to indicate that the cartouches are not usurped, so that means that these scenes are Seti II originals. What is not certain is if these scenes are unfinished due to Seti II’s death in his Year 6 or unfinished due an intervening reign of Amenmesse and never completed after Amenmesse’s downfall.}

The first reconstructed scene is of Seti II offering to Amun-Re, Mut, and Khonsu seated on a dais.\footnote{Ibid., 246, and plate 9 (8a).} The next scene Le Saout suggests comes from the northern half of the interior west wall where it joins the Seventh Pylon. The upper register shows Seti II offering to various gods, of which Amun-Re can be identified from preserved traces while the lower register once featured dedication ans presumably scenes of Amun-Kamutef and Amunet.\footnote{Ibid., 247-48, and plate 9 (8b).}
73. Seti II offers to Amun-Re and Inscriptions of High Priest Roma-Roy Eighth Pylon

East Face (figure 6.33)\textsuperscript{439}

Location: \textit{in situ}

Figure 6.33. East face of the Eighth Pylon showing inscription of Roma-Roy. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.

Discussion and Comments on Number 73

The eastern portion of the Eighth Pylon contains a staircase leading to the roof of the pylon. Featured around the doorway giving access to the staircase are several inscriptions and scenes of various priests of the late Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties, most notably High Priest of Amun (ḥm-ntr tpj n Jmn, literally “First God’s Servant of Amun”) Roma-Roy and Ramessenasnakeh.440 Directly relevant to the reign of Seti II is a scene directly over the doorway and the inscriptions of High Priest Roma-Roy (figure 6.33). The scene over the doorway shows Seti II offering to a seated Amun-Re, and the titles describe Seti II as ‘nh ntr-nfr zi-Jmn nb t³wy wsr-ḥprw-Rˁ stp.n-Rˁ nb ḫw Sth ṣmrj.n-Pḥ “Live, The Good God, Son of Amun, Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheperure Setepenre, Lord of Appearances, Seti-Merneptah.”441

Beneath this scene of Seti II offering to Amun-Re are stairs that give access to the roof of the Eighth Pylon, and the lintel over these stairs shows Roma-Roy worshipping a king’s erased prenomen and nomen. Epithets on either side of the cartouches give praise to Amun-Re and Horus for honors bestowed to the ka of Roma-Roy, while an inscription at the bottom of the lintel confirms that Roma-Roy was responsible for decorating the

440PM² 2: 177 (527a-d) and plan 14; Nelson, KL 70-71, 73-75; LD 3: 237a-c. For the scenes involving Roma-Roy, high priest from the later half of the reign of Ramesses II through the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II, see PM² 2: 177 (527c-d); Gnirs, 129, 168-69, 203 note 106; Nelson, KL 73-75; LD 3: 237c; KRI 4: 210, 266, 287-89; RITA 4: 151-52, 189-90, 206-208; Frood, 54-59; Iskander, 382; Lefebvre, Histoire des grands prêtres d’Amon de Karnak, 139-55; idem, Inscriptions concernant les grands prêtres d’Amon, 26-41. For the scenes involving Ramessenasnakeh, high priest during the reign of Ramesses IV, see PM² 2: 177 (527a); Nelson, KL 70-71; LD 3: 237a-b; KRI 6: 87-88; Lefebvre, Histoire des grands prêtres d’Amon, 264-66.

441PM² 2: 177 (527c-d) and plan 14; Nelson, KL 73; LD 3: 237c; KRI 4: 266; RITA 4: 189-90; Frood, 54; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 134; Gnirs, 129, 168-69, 203 note 106. The nomen of Seti II on this doorway is written with the mrj and Pḥ elements preceeding Sth. As pointed out by Loeben, “Amon à la place d’Aménophis I,” 236, this is about the only occurrence at Karnak of Seti II writing his name in a manner analogous to that of Seti I.
lintel as it reads  \textit{jr \textasciitilde{ } hr\textasciitilde{ } sb\textasciitilde{ } n \textasciitilde{ } hm.f \textasciitilde{ } hm-ntr \textasciitilde{ } tpj \textasciitilde{ } n \textasciitilde{ } Jmn \textasciitilde{ } rm\textasciitilde{ } m3\textasciitilde{ } \textasciitilde{ } hrw} “Made under the hand of (one) taught by His Majesty, The High Priest of Amun, Roma, Justified.”

On either side of the door are likewise decorated jambs containing a \textit{htp-dj-nswt} formula as Roma-Roy asks for benefactions from the gods from his loyal service while listing his titles, besides “High Priest of Amun” (\textit{hm-ntr \textasciitilde{ } tpj \textasciitilde{ } n \textasciitilde{ } Jmn}), such as “Hereditary Noble and Count” (\textit{jrj-p\textasciitilde{ } h\textasciitilde{ } ty\textasciitilde{ }-c}), “Overseer of the Priests of All Gods” (\textit{jmy-r \textasciitilde{ } hmw-ntr \textasciitilde{ } n \textasciitilde{ } ntrw \textasciitilde{ } nbw}), “God’s Father” (\textit{jt-ntr}), “Third Priest of Amun” (\textit{hm-ntr \textasciitilde{ } 3nw \textasciitilde{ } n \textasciitilde{ } Jmn}), “Second Priest of Amun” (\textit{hm-ntr \textasciitilde{ } 2nw \textasciitilde{ } n \textasciitilde{ } Jmn}), “Overseer of the Treasury and Granary of Amun” (\textit{jmy-r \textasciitilde{ } pr-hdq \textasciitilde{ } n \textasciitilde{ } Jmn}, \textit{jmy-r \textasciitilde{ } snwt \textasciitilde{ } n \textasciitilde{ } Jmn}). In the same manner as the cartouches over the doorway, the cartouches on the left and right jamb are erased.

To the right of this doorway is a long biographical inscription of Roma-Roy with his son, Second High Priest Bakenkhonsu (\textit{bik-n-hnsw}), standing behind a figure of his father in which Roma-Roy praises and asks for benefactions from Amun-Re but also mentioning that he repaired the \textit{w\textasciitilde{ } bt} “which is in the [estate] of [Amun]”.

---

\textsuperscript{442}PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 177 (527c-d) and plan 14; Nelson, KL 74; LD 3: 237c; Breasted, \textit{Ancient Records of Egypt}, 3: 269 note c; Iskander, 382. Compare translation with KRI 4: 210; RITA 4: 151-52; Frood, 54; Lefebvre, \textit{Inscriptions concernant les grands prêtres d’Amon}, 26-30. Roma-Roy refers to himself in these scenes as Roma (\textit{rm\textasciitilde{ }}) and Roy (\textit{ry}), hence the conventional hyphenation of his name.

\textsuperscript{443}KRI 4: 210; RITA 4: 151-52; Frood, 55-56; Lefebvre, \textit{Inscriptions concernant les grands prêtres d’Amon}, 26-30. The titles listed are amalgamations of those on the left and right jambs. For more on Roma-Roy’s titles, see Gnirs, 168-69, 203 note 106; Iskander, 380-87; Lefebvre, \textit{Histoire des grands prêtres d’Amon}, 257-59.

\textsuperscript{444}According to KRI 4: 210, and Frood, 55, the left jamb preserves \textit{k\textasciitilde{ } nswt \textasciitilde{ } nb \textasciitilde{ } t\textasciitilde{ } twy} “The Royal Ka of the Lord of the Two Lands” before the erased cartouche, presumably a prenomen, but the same spot on the right jamb is missing an estimated five groups.

\textsuperscript{445}PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 177 (527b); Nelson, KL 75; KRI 4: 288; RITA 4: 207; Frood, 55, 58. See also Breasted, \textit{Ancient Records of Egypt}, 3: 264-69; Grallert, 1: 329-31, 341-43 number Pr/19D/Bio014; idem, 2: 692 number Pr/19D/Bio014; Iskander, 383; Lefebvre, \textit{Inscriptions concernant les grands prêtres d’Amon}, 32-39; McClain, 197-98.
Roma-Roy’s many prayers and wishes to Amun-Re is ḫw.j.k z.k mṛj.k nb tꜣwy [wsr-hpr]w-Rṣ stp.n-Rṣ m ṣnh dd wṣs [r ḏt] “May you protect your son, your beloved, Lord of the Two Lands, [Userkheper]ure Setepenre, in life, stability and dominion [for eternity].”

From this dedication, it appeared that Roma-Roy’s tenure as High Priest of Amun continued into part of Seti II’s reign, but the erased cartouches warrants another question of whose name was originally in them.

Iskander suggests that the erased cartouches on the lintel and the doorjamb are those of Ramesses II, based mostly on faulty assumptions between these erased cartouches and erased cartouches on a block statue of Roma-Roy in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (CG 42186, JE 36648, Legrain number K 40).

Kitchen, rather boldly, restores Amenmesse’s prenomen and nomen as [Menmire Setepenre, Amenmesse, Ruler of Thebes] in the erased cartouches on the lintel and the left and right jambs in RITA 4 but not in his previous RI 4.

The problem in doing so is that there is no trace of any recognizable name in the areas where the prenomen and nomen should be. Richard Caminos examined these scenes in the 1950s hoping to find an answer to the questions surrounding late Nineteenth Dynasty royal succession, but he found these cartouches “upon examination to be scraped off beyond recognition.” Therefore, these cartouches might be indeed those of Amenmesse or those of Merneptah. Given the pattern of erased

---


447 Iskander, 382. Lefebure, Inscriptions concernant les grands prêtres d’Amon, 26-27, suggests them to be those of Siptah in the belief that Amenmesse and Siptah preceded Seti II. For CG 42186, see comments in chapter 5.

448 RITA 4: 151-52.

cartouches on the *Cour de la Cachette*, these erased cartouches could belong to either Merneptah or Amenmesse and were never reinscribed by Seti II for reasons unknown. The cartouche of Seti II in Roma-Roy’s biographical inscription shows no apparent malicious attempts at erasure, and the missing signs are probably due to weathering of the wall surface.450

High Priest of Amun Roma-Roy theoretically served both Amenmesse and Seti II. Leaving aside any questions concerning Amenmesse as an usurping counter-ruler for the moment, as high priest, it would seem that he inevitably got involved in the succession crisis at the end of the Nineteenth Dynasty with repercussions for his immediate family.451 On the Eighth Pylon, one of the wishes Roma-Roy makes is that his son, Bakenkhonsu, succeed as the next High Priest of Amun as Roma-Roy states $\text{zj m st}(j)$ $j\text{jt} m^{\text{zj}} f w^{\text{zj}} r n h h$ “My son in (my) seat, my office in his possession, one [son] after another, for eternity.”452 Apparently, Bakenkhonsu did not succeed Roma-Roy as another High Priest of Amun named Mahuhy is known from the reign of Seti II, and two other high priests, Hori (IV) and Minmose, are known from the reigns of Siptah and

---

450In contrast to this observation is Vandersleyen, *L’Égypte et la Vallée du Nil*, 2: 580, who calls Roma-Roy “une prudence hypocrite” because he interprets Roma-Roy as having replaced the first element *mn-mj-R* of Amenmesse’s prenomen in this cartouche with *wsr-hprw-R* of Seti II. Kitchen in *KRI* 4: 288, notes no signs of the cartouche having any traces of Amenmesse’s name, and Lefebvre, *Histoire des grands prêtres d’Amon*, 147, states that the cartouche received damage judged to be relatively recent when he examined it, but Lefebvre could read the upper part of the cartouche as *wsr-hprw-R* without noting any earlier inscription.

451Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 143-44, and Vandersleyen, *L’Égypte et la Vallée du Nil*, 2: 580, make light that Roma-Roy may have lost his position as High Priest of Amun to Mahuhy for embracing and supporting the reign of Amenmesse too closely. If so, then why were Roma-Roy’s names not erased on his monuments? The erased cartouches on CG 42186 and the Eighth Pylon could indeed be those of Amenmesse, but if so, Roma-Roy’s name on these monuments is intact.

452*KRI* 4: 288; *RITA* 4: 207; Bierbrier, *Late New Kingdom in Egypt*, 5, 16-17; Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, 3: 268; Frood, 57.
Tausert thereby frustrating Roma-Roy’s wishes that his son take over his office as the next high priest upon Roma-Roy’s death.\textsuperscript{453} Furthermore, the image and titles of Bakenkhonsu are defaced on the Eighth Pylon suggesting that he faced some persecution in the aftermath of Amenmesse’s reign.\textsuperscript{454}

74. Faience plaques from the Ninth Pylon\textsuperscript{455}

Location: One example Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE 47296\textsuperscript{456}

Discussion and Comments on Number 74

Seti II placed in the thickness of the doorjambs belonging to the Ninth Pylon a series of faience plaques having his prenomen and nomen. Maurice Pillet described one such

\textsuperscript{453}Bierbrier, \textit{Late New Kingdom in Egypt}, 16-17; Gnirs, 146-47; Lefebvre, \textit{Histoire des grands prêtres d’Amon}, 154-56; Dodson, \textit{Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy}, 62. Roma-Roy could have easily survived Amenmesse’s reign and lived into the restoration of Seti II’s rule in the Theban area only to die in office as there is nothing to indicate he was removed from office, and his name was not erased from his monuments as indicated in note 449. For more on Mahuhy, see comments under the stela in the Karnak fowl yard. For High Priest Hori (IV) and Minmose, see KRI 4: 377-78; RITA 4: 278-75; Dodson, \textit{Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy}, 79; Lefebvre, \textit{Histoire des grands prêtres d’Amon}, 156-57, 260.

\textsuperscript{454}Dodson, \textit{Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy}, 62. In contrast to this suggestion is that the images of High Priest Ramessesnakht also shows signs of hacking about the face in a manner similar to that of Bakenkhonsu, son of Roma-Roy, so the damage to the face may be later damage directed at pagan images in Christian and Islamic times. A different type of damage, according to KRI 4: 289 note 11, is the deliberate erasure of \textit{z.t.f} and \textit{b3k-n-hns} \textit{m3r wr} in his father’s biographical inscription on the Eighth Pylon. The names of Ramessesnakht and Roma-Roy on the Eighth Pylon are intact, so Bakenkhonsu’s name seems to have been singled out for erasure.

\textsuperscript{455}References: PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 181 (540f) and plan 15; Maurice Pillet, “Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1921-1922),” \textit{ASAE} 22 (1922): 252-54, and figures 5-6. The same piece is described and illustrated in Eugene Cruz-Uribe, “\textit{Sth ‘t phty ‘Seth, God of Power and Might,}’” \textit{JARCE} 45 (2009): 213, and 213 figure 7, photograph 4.

\textsuperscript{456}Number given in Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 138 note 28, but not in the description given in Pillet, “Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1921-1922),” 252.
plaque discovered in his 1921-1922 excavations at Karnak.\textsuperscript{457} The front of the plaque is essentially a cartouche topped by a plumed solar disc, and the cartouche has the full prenomen and nomen of Seti II as \\
\\n\textit{wsr-hprw-R$^s$ mrj-Jmn} \\
\\n\textit{Sthy mrj.n-Pth} written using a greenish black color for the faience inlay. The back of the plaque, white in color, still had traces of the plaster used to affix it to the jamb, but it also had the \textit{mj} and Seth \textit{signs} carved upon it.\textsuperscript{458}

\textsuperscript{457}Pillet, “Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1921-1922),” 252-55.

\textsuperscript{458}After Pillet, “Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1921-1922),” 252-53 and 253 figures 5-6. Cruz-UrIBE, “Seth, God of Power and Might,” 213, was unable to examine the rear of the plaque but his photograph 4 matches Pillet “Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1921-1922),” 253 figure 5. A somewhat similar plaque blue on white in color reading \textit{wsr-hprw-R$^s$ mrj-Jmn Sthy mrj.n-Pth}, lacking any inscriptions on the reverse, is located in the British Museum in London (BM 67970). Unfortunately, BM 67970 has no provenance as it was purchased in 1973 from R. Symes. For BM 67970, see Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 138 note 28; Richard B. Parkinson et al., \textit{Cracking Codes: The Rosetta Stone and Decipherment} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 109; A. J. Spencer and Louise Schofield, “Faience in the Ancient Mediterranean World,” in \textit{Pottery in the Making: World Ceramic Traditions}, ed. Ian Freestone and David R. M. Gaimster (London: British Museum Press, 1997), 106. An additional example in the British Museum (BM 12857) labeled as coming from Karnak features the prenomen of Seti II in a plumed cartouche reading \textit{wsr-hprw-R$^s$ mrj-Jmn} with the additional element \textit{Sthy (?)}, but the only other available details are that it was bought from the Reverend Greville John Chester in 1881 and not excavated. For more on BM 12857, see the British Museum’s online catalog entry by entering “12857” at <http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/museum_no__provenance_search.aspx>. 
75. Heb-sed Temple of Amenhotep II

Location: Courtyard between the Ninth and Tenth Pylons at the Temple of Karnak, Luxor, Egypt

Discussion and Comments on Number 75

This temple of Amenhotep II is located in the courtyard between the Ninth and Tenth Pylons at the Temple of Karnak. It has been conjecturally suggested that part of the construction, or at least the renewal, of this monument belongs to the activity of Seti II because of his name appearing upon the walls and pillars of the temple. In none of the excavation or epigraphic reports is the name of Seti II mentioned, but the names of Amenhotep II and Seti I appear on the walls more frequently. In fact, “there are no texts of Seti II” upon the walls of the temple of Amenhotep II with the possible exception

References:


460 PM² 2: 185-86 (562-77) and plan 15; Nelson, KG 211-21, 223-59, KG Pillars 14-47, 52, 65-68; Gilbert, 233-36; Lauffray, Karnak d’Égypte, 140-44.

461 PM² 2: 185; Barguet, Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak, 18; Lauffray, Karnak d’Égypte, 143; McClain, 195.

462 The Heb-sed temple of Amenhotep II was first excavated and restored in the early 1920s. For reports on these excavations see Pillet, “Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1922),” 99-138; idem, “Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1923-1924),” 53-88. Van Siclen, 75, dates this monument as an original construction of Amenhotep II with changes and restorations being made in the reigns of Horemheb and Seti I.
of some reliefs on the north chapel wall “perhaps stylistically later than the surviving name of Seti I.”\textsuperscript{463} Therefore, this structure is not a monument pertaining to the reign of Seti II.

76. Tenth Pylon Temple of Karnak Sphinx on South Face and Avenue of Crio-Sphinxes\textsuperscript{464}

Location: \textit{in situ}

Discussion and Comments on Number 76

South of the Tenth Pylon of the Temple of Karnak, Seti II left a few scattered inscriptions mainly on a few sphinxes dating to the reign of Horemheb. Directly beside the remains of a colossal statue of Amenhotep III, a badly damaged sphinx rests on a base, and the front of the base is inscribed with the cartouches of Seti II.\textsuperscript{465}

Further down from the Tenth Pylon is an avenue of Crio-Sphinxes linking the Tenth Pylon to the Temple of Mut. Jean François Champollion recorded a few cartouches

\textsuperscript{463}Van Siclen, 87. These scenes mentioned by Van Siclen are at Nelson, KG 244-47; Van Siclen, 89 (44-48). McClain, 195, suggests that the Amenhotep II temple was restored by Seti II “without commemorative inscriptions,” which seems unlikely. Seti II, if he went to the trouble of restoring the Amenhotep II temple, would indeed want to place his name on the temple especially since Seti II placed so much effort into attempting to suppress Amenmesse’s existence through usurpations or new inscriptions.


\textsuperscript{465}PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 190 (588); Nelson, KO 76 (not indicated but general area); Chevrier, “Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak 1949-1950,” 436; Schwaller de Lubicz, \textit{Les temples de Karnak}, 2: plate 420.
carved on the bases of these Crio-Sphinxes reading \textit{wsr-hprw-R\textsuperscript{r} mrj-Jmn Sthy mrj.n-Pth}.\textsuperscript{466} However, the majority of these sphinxes bear the name of Horemheb, so Seti II merely carved his name on another king’s work.

77. Scene on Pylon at the Temple of Mut\textsuperscript{467}

Location: \textit{in situ}

Discussion and Comments on Number 77

On the west entrance wall of the pylon of the Temple of Mut at Karnak, Seti II carved a scene and a dedicatory inscription.\textsuperscript{468} The scene shows a divine barque with offerings before it and inscribed on a stand or altar is the prenomen and nomen of Seti II \textit{wsr-hprw-R\textsuperscript{r} mrj-Jmn Sthy mrj.n-Pth}. Beneath this scene is a dedicatory inscription stating \textit{k3 nht mrj-R\textsuperscript{r} nsw[t] hbtj […] wsr-hpr[w-R\textsuperscript{r}] mrj-Jmn jr.n.f m mnw.f n Mwt nbt pt qd.n.f pr.s m m\textsuperscript{3}wt m k3t mnh n nhh Hnsw . . .} “Mighty Bull, Beloved of Re, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, […] Userkheper[ure] Meryamun. He made his monument for Mut,


\textsuperscript{467}References: \textit{PM\textsuperscript{2}} 2: 256-57 (4n) and plan 25; Nelson, K Mut 32-32; \textit{KRI} 4: 266-67; \textit{RITA} 4: 190; \textit{LD} 1: 83x; \textit{LDT} 3: 76; Margaret Benson, Janet Gourlay, and Percy E. Newberry, \textit{The Temple of Mut in Asher: An Account of the Excavation of the Temple and of the Religious Representations and Objects Found Therein, as Illustrating the History of Egypt and the Main Religious Ideas of the Egyptians} (London: Murray, 1899), 30, and plate 4; McClain, 194

\textsuperscript{468}PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 256-57 (4n) and plan 25; Nelson, K Mut 32-32. Called “Pylon [II]” in \textit{KRI} 4: 266.
Lady of Heaven; he built her house anew as a beneficent work for eternity; Khonsu. .

469 The inscription seems to indicate that the pylon, or at least part of it as a renewal, was built during the reign of Seti II.470 Further work by Seti II at the Temple of Mut includes the statue described below and perhaps future work at the site will turn up more evidence of Seti II’s reign.

78. Seated Sandstone Statue (figure 6.34)471
Location: British Museum, London BM 26

Discussion and Comments on Number 78

This seated sandstone statue of Seti II (BM 26) comes originally from the Temple of Mut where Giovanni Belzoni discovered this statue and six Sekhmet statues in 1816. The statue became part of the collection of the British Council Henry Salt who later sold the statue to the British Museum in 1823.472 BM 26 shows a seated Seti II holding a shrine in his lap surmounted with a ram’s head, a symbol of the god Amun-Re. Normally, a

469 _KRI_ 4: 266-67; _RITA_ 4: 190; _LD_ 1: 83x; _LDT_ 3: 76; Benson, Gourlay, and Newberry, 30 and plate 4. The missing signs between _nsw[r] bjtj […] wsr-lgpr[w-Rc_]_ are not restored here as Kitchen hesitantly restores the missing signs as [Lord of the Two Lands?] in _RITA_ 4: 190.


471 References: _PM_ 2: 288; _KRI_ 4: 267; _RITA_ 4: 190; Bissing, _Denkmäler ägyptischer Sculptur_, plate 55; Blyth, 39; Gauthier, _Livre des rois_, 3: 137; T. G. H. James, ed., _Hieroglyphic Texts from Egyptian Stelae, etc. in the British Museum_, part 9 (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1970), 14-15, and plate 9; Russman, _Eternal Egypt_, 178-79; Strudwick, 224-25.

472 Strudwick, 224; T. G. H. James, ed., 14-15; Russmann, _Eternal Egypt_, 178-79.
king is shown in the act of kneeling in order to present similar shrines to the intended god, so it is unusual to have a king seated and merely holding the shrine in his lap.473

Figure 6.34. Seated Sandstone Statue British Museum BM 26. Picture © Trustees of the British Museum

The text on the back pillar proclaims $ntr-nfr \ tnr \ hr \ hpš.f^{3} \ phty \ mj \ Mnt(w) \ nb \ W3st$

$nswt \ hjtj \ wsr-hprw-R^{c} \ mrj-Jmn \ z^{3}-R^{c} \ [Sth]\ y \ mrj.n-Pth \ dj \ nnh$ “The Good God, Powerful

with His Strong Arm, Great of Strength like Month(u), Lord of Thebes, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Userkheperure Meryamun, Son of Re, [Set]i-Merneptah, Given Life." On the shoulders are Seti II’s prenomen and nomen, $wsr$-$\text{hprw}$-$R^\circ$ mrj-$Jmn$ [St$h$y mrj.$n$-$Pth$], and they are also to be found on the front of the statue’s base. On the right side of the base is a text reading $k\delta$ $nht$ mrj-$R^\circ$ nswt $bjtj$ $wsr$-$\text{hprw}$-$R^\circ$ mrj-$Jmn$ $z^i$-$R^\circ$ [St$h$y mrj.$n$-$Pth$ mry Pth-$Skr$-$Wsjr$ dj $\text{`nh}$ mj $R^\circ$ “Mighty Bull, Beloved of Re, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Userkheperure Meryamun, Son of Re, [Set]i-Merneptah, Beloved of Ptah-Sokar-Osiris, Given Life like Re.” The same titles are repeated on the left half except Seti II is “Beloved of Osiris, Foremost of the West” ($Wsjr$ $\text{`ntj}$-$jmnt$).475

The statue is often described in terms of its workmanship, such as fine details in the costume and wig and well-detailed anatomy, the hieroglyphs leave much to be desired due to their “awkwardness” in carving.476 Dodson suggests that the rough and awkward carving of hieroglyphs on BM 26 is due to the statue originally being made for Amenmesse, and the titles being subsequently erased and reinscribed by Seti II.477 In contrast to this theory, there is no evidence that Amenmesse ever carved his name upon BM 26 and the only signs of malicious damage are erasures directed at the Seth sign as is common on Seti II’s monuments.478


475$KRI$ 4: 267; $RITA$ 4: 190; James, ed., 14-15, and plate 9. Strudwick, 224, James, ed., 15, and Russmann, Eternal Egypt, 179, prefer the alternate translation of $Wsjr$ $\text{`ntj}$-$jmnt$ as “Osiris-Khentamenti.”

476Strudwick, 224. A view also shared by Blyth, 39; Russmann, Eternal Egypt, 178-79. James, ed., 15, expresses the opinion that they are “incised with very moderate skill.”

477Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 52.

478$KRI$ 4: 267; James, ed., 15, and plate 9; Russmann, Eternal Egypt, 178-79.
79. Seated Statue with pleated robe from the Karnak Cachette

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE 37347; Legrain number K 298

Discussion and Comments on Number 79

The initial description in the only available reference suggests that this seated statue from the *Cour de la Cachette* was in appearance very similar to the statue in the British Museum (BM 26). Conversely, information made available in November 2009 from the Karnak Cachette Database Project indicates that JE 37347 is not a statue of Seti II at all but is that of Siptah carved sometime after his year three because of his use of the Merneptah-Siptah nomen upon the statue.

80. Stela and Block from Royal Storehouse and Fowl Yard at Karnak

Location: Currently Unknown

References:


480 Coulon and Jambon, “CK 715: Seated Statue of Merenptah-Siptah. Cairo JE 37347.”

481 *PM*² 2: 142.

482 Coulon and Jambon, “CK 715: Seated Statue of Merenptah-Siptah. Cairo JE 37347.”

Discussion and Comments on Number 80

Directly adjacent to the sacred lake at the Temple of Karnak is what is described as a royal storehouse and a fowl yard for the birds presented as offerings to the gods during rituals at the temple. During Henri Chevrier’s 1935-1936 excavations near the sacred lake, he discovered a stela of Seti II with an additional text at the bottom of the stela featuring High Priest of Amun Mahuhy (mꜣ-Rḥw-ḥy). The top of the stela has the prenomen and nomen of Seti II wsr-hprw-Rḥ mrj-Jmn [Ṣḥḥ]y mrj.n-Pḥ above a scene of Seti II standing before an offering table. To the left of the offering table are a seated Amun-Re, and a standing Mut and Khonsu. The following text beneath this offering scene features long lines of Seti II’s titulary containing his Horus, Nebty, Golden Horus, prenomen and nomen along with numerous laudatory comparisons of the king with the gods. The last few lines recount that Seti II jr.n.f m mnw.f n jṯj.f Jmn-Rḥ nswt-nṯrw. . mhwn m mḏwt “He made as his monument for his father, Amun-Re, King of the Gods. . a fowl house anew” that Seti II stocked with a number of ancient Egyptian birds to raise for future offerings.

At the very bottom of the stela is a scene that is only preserved about a third or less showing a kneeling man with his hands raised in adoration before seven lines of text. The majority of the text is missing, but the preserved lines recount praise for Mut,

---

484PM² 2: 222, and plan 20; Ricke, 129.

485PM² 2: 222 (8), and plan 20 [1]; Chevrier, “Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1935-1936),” 140, and plate 2; Gnirs, 146-47; Ricke, 124.

486KRI 4: 290; RITA 4: 208; Chevrier, “Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1935-1936),” 140, and plate 2; Ricke, 125 figure 1. As expected, all instances of the Seth sign are defaced on this stela.

487KRI 4: 290; RITA 4: 208-209; Ricke, 126-27.
Asheru, Shu, Khonsu, by \( \text{hm-nt\textit{r} tpj n Jmn} \) [ . . . ] \( m^5-h\textit{w-hy} m^5 h\textit{rw} \) “The High Priest of Amun [ . . . ] Mahuhy, Justified.”\(^{488}\) Mahuhy is known further from a kneeling statue from the Karnak Cachette (CG 42157, JE 36810), an offering bearer statue from Luxor (JE 36810), an inscription from the chapel of Merneptah at El-Babein near El-Surariyeh (Siririya), and a stela of Seti II from West Silsila.\(^ {489}\) Since his titles on these monuments reflect his status as High Priest of Amun (\( \text{hm-nt\textit{r} tpj n Jmn} \)), Mahuhy was the replacement for Bakenkhonsu, son of Roma-Roy, even though Roma-Roy had hoped for son to replace him. Most likely, Bakenkhonsu became too closely aligned with the Amenmesse faction and therefore paid the price for his support by being denied his father’s position.\(^ {490}\)

As for the block allegedly found in the vicinity of the fowl yard featuring the name of Seti II, the only available source mentions a block of Ramesses II and Psamtik I without any explicit indication of a block of Seti II.\(^ {491}\) Given that the stela talks about \( m \text{m}^3 w t \) when it comes to the fowl house, Seti II would logically have rebuilt an earlier structure.

\(^{488}\) KRI 4: 290-91; RITA 4: 208-209; Ricke, 126-27.


\(^{491}\) Mariette, \textit{Karnak}, 1: 11.
dating to the time of Ramesses II, based on the block containing his name in the area, but little more is available to date of Seti II construction other than his stela.\textsuperscript{492}

81. Exterior of Khonsu Chapel Triple Barque Shrine and Inner Pylon Face Temple of Luxor\textsuperscript{493}

Location: \textit{in situ}

Discussion and Comments on Number 81

On the exterior of the Khonsu Chapel belonging to the Triple Barque Shrine of Hatshepsut and Ramesses II in the Ramesside courtyard of Luxor Temple, an inscription of Seti II has mostly been overlooked by scholars until William Murnane and Kenneth Kitchen made mention of the inscription in two separate studies.\textsuperscript{494} The inscription, located beneath a scene of a king offering flowers to Khonsu, reads \textit{nswt mrytj mj Jm[n]} \textit{ phtj mj Mntw hrtj} [\textit{ib Wst}] \textit{nswt [bttj hqt mj R}] \textit{wsr-[hprw]w-R mjmnj Jm[n]} “King greatly beloved like Amun, Great in Strength like Monthu, resident of [Thebes], King of Upper and [Lower] Egypt, [Ruler like Re], User[heperu]re Meryamu[n].\textsuperscript{495} It is not certain if

\textsuperscript{492}Ricke, 130; Mariette, \textit{Karnak}, 1: 11. PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 222, appears to have mistaken the comments in Ricke, 130, to mean that there was a block of Seti II present, but Mariette, \textit{Karnak}, 1: 11, does not mention a block of Seti II.


\textsuperscript{494}KRI 4: 268; Murnane, “Earlier Reign of Ramesses II,” 160. KRI 4: 268, locates the inscription at roughly PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 310 (46) and plan 28 [4]. On the other hand, this inscription is mentioned in Abd el-Razik, 68, and plate 28b.

\textsuperscript{495}KRI 4: 268; \textit{RITA} 4: 192. Abd el-Razik, plate 28b, only includes the opening \textit{nswt mrytj mj Jm[n]} \textit{ phtj mj Mntw} and much of the inscription is not as discernable in Abd el-Razik’s plate.
the scene of a king offering flowers to Khonsu goes with this inscription or not, as
damaged bandeau texts of Ramesses III and another king lies below the Seti II inscription
along with an inscription dated to Ramesses II’s Year 3 that continues onto the first pylon
of the Temple of Luxor.496

82. Quartzite Statue Base from Luxor Temple497

Location: Currently Unknown

Discussion and Comments on Number 82

Labib Habachi discovered this quartzite statue base of Seti II during excavations to the
east of Luxor Temple in 1937.498 The inscription on the top of the base gives the statue’s
name reading twt n Stby mrj.n-Pth wrt h3b-sdw mj jt.f Jmn “Statue of Seti-Merneptah,
Great of Sed Festivals like His Father, Amun.”499 On the front is Seti II’s prenomen and
nomen wsr-hprw-R† mrj-Jmn [Stby] mrj.n-Pth surrounded by rnpt signs and proclaiming
the king is beloved by Amun-Re and Mut. The right and left sides of the base contains

The collation in Murnane, “Earlier Reign of Ramesses II,” 160 figure 4, compares with that in
KRI 4: 268.

496PM2 2: 310 (46); KRI 2: 345-47; KRI 5: 290; Abd el-Razik, 68-69, and plate 28b; Murnane,
“Earlier Reign of Ramesses II,” 160. KRI 6: 47, records the third bandeau text is Ramesses IV
later usurped by Ramesses VI.

497References: PM2 2: 337; KRI 4: 268-69; KRI 7: 448; RITA 4: 192; Labib Habachi,
“Clearance of the Area to the East of Luxor Temple and Discovery of Some Objects,” ASAE 51
(1951); 453-55, and figures 2-4.

498PM2 2: 337; Habachi, “Clearance of the Area to the East of Luxor Temple,” 453-55. and
plate 1 G.

499KRI 4: 268; KRI 7: 448; RITA 4: 192; Habachi, “Clearance of the Area to the East of Luxor
Temple,” 453, and figure 2.
Seti II’s Horus name *mrj-R* and his prenomen and nomen *wsr-hprw-R* *mrj-Jmn [Sth]* *mrj.n-Pth.*

In his analysis of the finds from his excavations at Luxor Temple, Habachi theorizes that this statue base and the statue it once held originally came from Karnak Temple and was moved to Luxor Temple because of a lack of monuments from Luxor bearing Seti II’s name. This is not reason enough for rejecting Luxor Temple as the original location of this now missing statue and its base as there are Seti II inscriptions at Luxor temple to warrant that Seti II ordered work at Luxor Temple but on a small scale basis.

83. Usurped Bandeaux Inscriptions in Ramesside Forecourt of the Temple of Luxor

Location: *in situ*

---


502 On these inscriptions, see further comments below. Habachi, “Clearance of the Area to the East of Luxor Temple,” 455 note 1, mentions these inscriptions but seems not to consider them of enough importance.

84. Inscriptions on the Entry, Scenes, and Columns in the Colonnade Hall of the Temple of Luxor\textsuperscript{504}

Location: \textit{in situ}

85. Bandeau Texts in Solar Court and Vestibule of Amenhotep III (Interior East Wall of Vestibule, South Wall East Side of Vestibule, Interior East Wall of Court, Interior North Wall East Half, Interior West Wall of Vestibule, Interior South and North Walls West half; Kitchen Texts 1-7)\textsuperscript{505}

Location: \textit{in situ}

Discussion and Comments on Numbers 83-85

Besides the Temple of Karnak, the only other monument on the east bank to feature inscriptional evidence of Late Nineteenth Dynasty Kings is the Temple of Luxor. Many inscriptions, mostly bandeau texts in sunken relief, show signs of erasure and recarving for another king while others were never recarved. These inscriptions follow the pattern seen on the west wall of the \textit{Cour de la Cachette} in that the titulary was erased and not

\textsuperscript{504}References: PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 312-316 (72c, 77-81, 82-86) and plan 31; Nelson, LC 3-6, 18-24, 32-40; Abd el-Razik, plate 28a; Brand, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 38-42; Georges Daressy, “Le voyage d’inspection de M. Grébaut en 1889,” \textit{ASAE} 26 (1926): 8; Epigraphic Survey, \textit{Reliefs and Inscriptions at Luxor Temple}, 2: xix, 14-18, 24-27, 30-35, 45-47, and plates 154-59, 172-73, 178, 194-95, 224B.

recarved or that Seti II carved his name anew over the erasures.\footnote{Brand, “Date of War Scenes,” 62-63.} The areas subject to intentional, malicious attack are those where Merneptah carved bandeau texts or his prenomen and nomen, as on the pillars of the Colonnade Hall of the Temple of Luxor.\footnote{Most of these erasures are published in KRI 4: 269-71; RITA 4: 192-94; Epigraphic Survey, Reliefs and Inscriptions at Luxor Temple, 2: xix, 6-8, 14-18, 24-27, 30-35, 45-47, 52-56, and plates 143, 154-59, 172-73, 178, 194-200, 204, 224B; Brand, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 38-42.}

In the Ramesside forecourt of the Temple of Luxor, the interior east, west, and southern walls once contained bandeau texts of Merneptah on their lower sections that were largely erased and have escaped study and publication until recently.\footnote{These inscriptions are located roughly at PM² 2: 307-309 (27-31); Nelson, LA 16-31, 44-52, 54-55; 66-81. The reliefs on the southern wall have been published by the Epigraphic Survey as part of the façade of the Colonnade Hall, but the only other study of the traces on the east and west walls of the Ramesside Forecourt is Brand, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 38-39, and figure 16.} The inscriptions on the south wall of the Ramesside Forecourt, more properly part of the façade of the Colonnade Hall, were erased on the lower eastern and western sides of the entry façade into the Colonnade Hall.\footnote{PM² 2: 307 (27, 31); Abd el-Razik, plate 28a; Brand, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 39; Epigraphic Survey, Reliefs and Inscriptions at Luxor Temple, 2: 6-7, and plates 130, 138, 143A-B, 155.} The erasure of the original bandeau text of Merneptah was not complete, as parts of the inscription appear to have been saved for reuse. The opening titles of ꞏnb ḫr k3 nḥt on the eastern and western sides of the façade were not erased, but the titulary and cartouches after this opening phrase were. The faint
but unmistakable traces of Merneptah’s prenomen and nomen $b\gamma-[n]-R^\kappa mrj-[Jmn] mrj.n-Pth htp-hr-M3\kappa t$ on the western part of the façade shows that these inscriptions belong to him.\textsuperscript{510}

Inside the Colonnade Hall, Merneptah carved bandeau texts along the eastern and western interior wall, carved his cartouches on the columns of the hall, and possibly redecorated the entrance of the Colonnade Hall with new ritual scenes.\textsuperscript{511} Merneptah’s bandeau texts were largely replaced by texts of Ramesses IV, but the inscriptions of Merneptah remain discernable enough to allow for adequate reconstruction of their original appearance.\textsuperscript{512} One thing that should be pointed out is that Merneptah, in redecorating the entrance of the Colonnade Hall, covered over ritual scenes of Ramesses II with new blocks.\textsuperscript{513} If, as some argue, Merneptah usurped the reliefs on the west wall of the Cour de la Cachette from Ramesses II, his father, why did Merneptah not usurp the scenes here? It would have been easier to usurp these scenes than to erect new masonry. The fact that Merneptah carefully covered over these scenes shows that he bore no maliciousness toward his father, Ramesses II, and he wanted to preserve these scenes albeit under new blocks that Merneptah could redecorate and claim as his own.

\textsuperscript{510}Brand, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 39-41, and figures 17-21; Epigraphic Survey, Reliefs and Inscriptions at Luxor Temple, 2: 6-7, and plates 130, 138, 143A-B, 155. The cartouches on the eastern part reads $b\gamma-[n]-R^\kappa [mrj-[Jmn] mrj.n-Pth htp-hr-M3\kappa t$

\textsuperscript{511}PM² 2: 312-316 (72c, 77-81, 82-86), and plan 31; Nelson, LC 3-6, 18-24, 32-40; Brand, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 39-42; Daressy, “Voyage d’inspection de M. Grébaut en 1889,” 8; Epigraphic Survey, Reliefs and Inscriptions at Luxor Temple, 2: xix, 14-18, 24-27, 30-35, 45-47, and plates 154-59, 172-73, 178, 194-95, 224B.

\textsuperscript{512}Epigraphic Survey, Reliefs and Inscriptions at Luxor Temple, 2: 24-27, and plates 172-73. For the Ramesses VI inscriptions, see also KRI 6: 47-48.

\textsuperscript{513}Epigraphic Survey, Reliefs and Inscriptions at Luxor Temple, 2: 14-18, and plates 154-59; Brand, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 39, 42.
The final inscriptions belonging to Merneptah are more bandeau texts in the Solar Court of Amenhotep III located on the interior east and west walls of the vestibule, the eastern part of the interior southern wall, the interior east wall of the court, the eastern part of the interior north wall of the court, the interior western wall of the vestibule, the western part of the interior south wall, and the western part in the interior north wall.\textsuperscript{514} Many of these inscriptions were erased and cut over by new bandeau inscriptions of Seti II, but in one instance the plaster used to smooth the wall surface after erasure has fallen away revealing part of Merneptah’s Nebty name $h\check{j}-mj-P\check{h}-m-hn[w-h\textit{fnw}]$.\textsuperscript{515}

As mentioned, the pattern of inscriptions indicates that Merneptah carved a series of bandeau texts throughout the Temple of Luxor along with his cartouches on the pillars of the Colonnade Hall. These inscriptions were erased, some replaced by bandeau texts of Seti II, others not replaced but parts of the inscription preserved, such as $\check{m}n\check{h} \textit{Hrw} k3 \textit{nht}$, for potential reuse of the wall surface.\textsuperscript{516} The Epigraphic Survey concluded in every instance that Seti II was the guilty party in erasing Merneptah’s inscriptions at Luxor Temple, but an adequate explanation is never given as to why Seti II never reinscribed all the erased bandeau texts. In fact, the publication of these inscriptions suggests that “rather than to posit more than one period of erasure for the Merneptah bandeau texts” it

\textsuperscript{514}PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 317-18, 334 (92-98, 102, 101a-c, 207-209); and plans 31-32; Nelson, LC 76-79; 80-83, 84-87, 90-93, 97-100, 105-111, LD (31-46) 46, 56, LG 61-62; \textit{KRI} 4: 269-71; \textit{RITA} 4: 192-94; Brand, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 42, 44 figure 25

\textsuperscript{515}\textit{KRI} 4: 269 note 11\textsuperscript{a}; \textit{RITA} 4: 192. Although Kitchen in \textit{KRI} 4: 269, claims these texts are unpublished, his texts 1 and 5 in \textit{KRI} 4: 269, 271, and \textit{RITA} 4: 192, 193-94, appear in Gayet, 37-38.

\textsuperscript{516}This technique is seen at the Temple of Karnak where texts of Amenmesse and possibly those of Merneptah were erased, but only the offending Horus, Nebty, and Golden Horus names along with the prenomen and nomen as attempts were made to reuse neutral parts of titulary. According to Gayet, 41, Seti II also left behind inscriptions on the side walls in the Portico or Hypostyle Hall (PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 318, and plan 32; Nelson, D), but it is uncertain if these are original or usurped.
was far simpler to just blame everything on Seti II. Contrary to this opinion is that William Murnane, one of the epigraphers on staff with the Epigraphic Survey during their work at Luxor, concluded that the erasures of Merneptah’s inscriptions at Luxor Temple were those of Amenmesse, not Seti II. This fits the patterning mentioned earlier from Karnak Temple. Amenmesse erased as many instances of Merneptah’s name and bandeau text as he could have been planning, as on the façade of the Colonnade Hall, to reuse some neutral elements for his use. Due to the ending of his reign or some other matter, Amenmesse never finished this work other than the erasures of Merneptah’s inscriptions. Seti II then utilized the opportunity to carve new bandeau texts in the Solar Court of Amenhotep III and on the columns of the Colonnade Hall, but left many of the other erased inscriptions alone.

86. Sandstone Stela reused in Roman Period

Location: One fragment in Egyptian Museum, Cairo TR 26/2/25/1

517 Epigraphic Survey, Reliefs and Inscriptions at Luxor Temple, 2: 6. Brand, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 42, points out that their conclusions fall into the category of concluding that that the erasures are “a ‘typical’ case of Ramesside usurpation on the part of Seti II.”


519 For the columns in the Colonnade Hall with Seti II’s name replacing the erased name of Merneptah, see Epigraphic Survey, Reliefs and Inscriptions at Luxor Temple, 2: 30-35, 45-46, and plates 178-79, 194; Brand, “Usurped Cartouches of Merneptah,” 42, 43 figures 23-24.

Discussion and Comments on Number 86

In the Forecourt, or Solar Court, of the Temple of Luxor built by Amenhotep III, many monuments were utilized by the Roman garrison that lived in and around Luxor Temple when Egypt became part of the Roman Empire. One such monument reused in Roman era constructions at Luxor Temple is a fragmentary stela part of which still remains at Luxor, and the other known fragment resides in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (TR 26/2/25/1). Porter and Moss describe it as a “stela of Sethos II (including decree with sanctions),” while Daressy describes it as a stela of Seti I, not Seti II. Even more puzzling is that in the published accounts of both the Cairo and Luxor fragments; no royal cartouche is present to indicate who exactly this stela belongs to. At best, G. A. Gaballa suggests that the style of the hieroglyphs indicates that the stela is of a Ramesside date, and the exact king who erected this stela must remain unknown until more fragments turn up at a later date.

521 PM2 2: 317 (99); Nelson, LD 100; Gaballa, “Three Acephalous Stelae,” 124-25, and plates 23, 23A.


87. Sandstone Column Drums of Seti II from Pavement of the First Antechamber of Temple of Luxor.\textsuperscript{524}  
Location: Currently Unknown  

Discussion and Comments on Number 87  

During the early 1950s, excavations in the First Antechamber of the Temple of Luxor revealed that the floor, dating to the Roman period, was largely built of reused blocks and fragments from other areas of Luxor Temple, some from the Ethiopian Twenty-Fifth Dynasty. At least a few of these reused blocks were sandstone column drums featuring the name of Seti II carved upon them in sunk relief.\textsuperscript{525} Other than the initial brief accounts of their discovery, no other information is known about these reused column drums.

West Bank of Luxor (Western Thebes)  

88. Usurped Figure in Second Court of the Ramesseum.\textsuperscript{526}  
Location: \textit{in situ}  


\textsuperscript{526}References: PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 435 column E, and plan 42 column E; Nelson, R pillar 23; \textit{KRI} 4: 271; \textit{RITA} 4: 194; Helck, \textit{Ritualdarstellungen Ramesseums}, 75.
Discussion and Comments on Number 88

In the Second Court of the Ramesseum, Wolfgang Helck first made notice that part of a Ramesses II inscription next to one of the Osiride pillars was usurped by Seti II. The original inscription, located to the left of the Osiride pillar, reads

\[
kA\ nxt\ mrj\-\Maat\ nTr\ nfr\ zA-Ra\ ms-sw\ mrj\-Jmn\ mrj\ Jtmw\ nb\ Jp[t]-swt\ “Mighty\ Bull,\ Beloved\ of\ Maat,\ The\ Good\ God,\ Son\ of\ Re,\ Ramessu\ Meryamun,\ beloved\ of\ Atum,\ Lord\ of\ Karnak.” \textsuperscript{527}\]

At some point during his reign, Seti II carved over Ramesses II’s inscription thereby changing the inscription to read

\[
kA\ nht\ mrj-M\ nTr\ nfr\ zA-R\ ms-sw\ mrj-Jmn\ mrj\ Jtmw\ nb\ Jp[t]-swt\ “Mighty\ Bull,\ Beloved\ of\ Maat,\ The\ Good\ God,\ Son\ of\ Re,\ Ramessu\ Meryamun,\ beloved\ of\ Atum,\ Lord\ of\ Karnak.” \textsuperscript{527}\]

This pillar just happens to be the same one with the Merneptah inscription usurped by Amenmesse that was later usurped by a later Ramesside king. Why Seti II decided to carve his name next to the Osiride figure over an inscription of Ramesses II and not over the Amenmesse inscription on the west side of the same pillar is puzzling.\textsuperscript{529}

\textsuperscript{527}Helck, \textit{Ritualdarstellungen des Ramesseums}, 75. Not noted or included in Leblanc et al., 160-74, and plate 67.

\textsuperscript{528}Helck, \textit{Ritualdarstellungen des Ramesseums}, 75; KRI 4: 271; RITA 4: 194. Seti II’s prenomen here utilizes the Seth animal (Gardiner E20) alone without the double reed leaf y as normally written.

\textsuperscript{529}See comments concerning the Amenmesse inscription in the chapter 5 dealing with the monuments of Amenmesse.
89. Faience Tile Fragments from Ramesseum\textsuperscript{530}

Location: One example Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE 40426\textsuperscript{531}

90. Two Plaques from Ramesseum\textsuperscript{532}

Location: Currently Unknown

91. Tile fragments from Medinet Habu\textsuperscript{533}

Location: Currently Unknown

92. Jar Fragments from Tausert Mortuary Temple\textsuperscript{534}

Location: Two fragments in Petrie Museum University College, London UC 30039-40

Discussion and Comments on Numbers 89-92

One monument that remains a tantalizing mystery in the area of ancient Thebes is the site of Seti II’s mortuary temple. This was where Seti II’s mortuary cult would have

\textsuperscript{530}References: PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 443; James Edward Quibell et al., The Ramesseum and The Tomb of Ptah-hetep, Egyptian Research Account Second Year, 1896, no. 2 (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1898), 9, 17, and plate 18.

\textsuperscript{531}Pillet, “Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1922),” 253, describes JE 40426 as being discovered in 1908. See also Dodson, “The Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 138 note 28.

\textsuperscript{532}Reference; Mohamed el-Bialy, “Les enseignements du cavalier de déblais nord du Ramesseum,” Memnonia 6 (1995): 76, and plate 10B.


\textsuperscript{534}References: PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 447 and plan 33; William Matthew Flinders Petrie, Six Temples at Thebes 1896 (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1897), 15, 29, and plate 19 numbers 3-4.
thrived in perpetuating his name through daily offerings and rituals. The reason for the mystery is that there is no direct evidence that such a structure existed on the West Bank except for tangential evidence discovered in excavations.535

In 1896 excavations to the north and south of the Ramesseum, James Quibell discovered at least four tiles, or plaques, inscribed with Seti II’s titulary. Quibell described these tiles as having blue signs on a white background, and at least one having a blue background with incised signs. The only available drawing of one of these tiles shows a prenomen topped by a plumed solar disc reading wsr-hpr[w-Ra].536 Similar tile fragments turned up at Medinet Habu during excavations in the 1930s, but these fragments contained a nomen cartouche reading [Sth y mrl].n-Pth.537 More recently, 1993 excavations carried out with the intent of removing the debris mounds surrounding the Ramesseum discovered two more fragments with blue signs on a white background reading wsr-hprw-Rf mrl-Jmn and wsr-hprw-Rf [mrl]-Jm[n].538 The earlier name fragments discovered by Quibell, along with some “models of headless oxen” similar to those found in foundation deposits, made Flinders Petrie suggest that Seti II’s mortuary temple was somewhere in the vicinity of the Ramesseum.539 The two fragments found at

535Haring, Divine Households, 423.
536PM² 2: 443; Quibell et al., 9, and plate 18; Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 138 note 28. These fragments are similar to JE 47296 and BM 67970 described in Number 69 above.
537PM² 2: 527; Hölscher, Excavations of Medinet Habu, 4, part 2: 44-45, and plate 36t; Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 138 note 28. According to the picture in Hölscher, Excavations of Medinet Habu, 4, part 2: plate 36t, the second fragment reads [Sth y mrl].n-[Pth] with only the n and a seated Ptah figure being preserved.
538el-Bialy, “Enseignements du cavalier de déblais,” 76, and plate 10B.
539Quibell et al., 9. For similar foundation deposits from the mortuary temples of Tausert and Siptah, see Petrie, Six Temples at Thebes, 13-17, and plates 16-18.
Medinet Habu also suggest that the area from the Ramesseum to Medinet Habu would cover any site where Seti II might locate his mortuary temple as suggested by the discoveries of these fragments.

Preserved inscriptions from the reign of Seti II also hint at a location somewhere on the west bank for a mortuary temple of Seti II. A fragmentary papyrus found at Gurob (Gurob F line 1,2) mentions, along with cattle deliveries and branding at Miwer, in passing the $hwt\ nt\ [hhw\ n\ rnpt\ nswt\ hbj\ wsr-hprw-R^S\ stp.n-R^S]\ mrj-Jmn\ [hr]\ jmnt\ [W3s]\ t

“Mansion of [Millions of Years (of) the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Userkheperure Setepenre] Meryamun [in] the west of [Wase]t (Thebes).”\textsuperscript{540} The same temple is mentioned in Papyrus Anastasi IV 7.1 concerning wine deliveries from the vineyards belonging to the $hwt\ nt\ hhw\ n\ rnpt\ n\ nswt\ hbj\ wsr-hprw-R^S\ stp.n-R^S\ mrj-Jmn\ c\nh-d\b-s\ m pr\ Jmn

“Mansion of Millions of Years of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Userkheperure Setepenre Meryamun, LPH, in the House of Amun.”\textsuperscript{541} Wine jar fragments from the mortuary temple of Tausert (UC 30039-40), unfortunately, do not come from “The Mansion of Million of Years of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Userkheperure Setepenre Meryamun” but come from the $\k\m w\ n\ pr\ Sth\y\ mrj.n.-Pth\ m\ pr\ Jmn

“Vineyard of the Temple of Seti-Merneptah in the House of Amun,” which might be

\textsuperscript{540}Alan Henderson Gardiner, \textit{Ramesside Administrative Documents} (Oxford: Griffith Institute, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford University Press, 1948; reprint, Oxford: Griffith Institute, Ashmolean Museum, 1995), x, 18, and 18a note 9\a-b, but note Gardiner’s restorations “in spite of some difficulties in the traces” present; Blyth, 41.

a different temple altogether, and that vineyards created by Seti II during his reign were used by his successors.542

Even with this tantalizing inscriptionsal and archaeological evidence suggesting Seti II had a mortuary temple, there is a strong indication that it was mostly unfinished or even usurped by one of his successors. If Seti II ruled independently without the intervening reign of Amenmesse, then the design of Seti II’s mortuary temple should resemble that of Merneptah or those belonging to Siptah and Tausert.543 On the other hand, if Amenmesse’s reign occurred within that of Seti II, Seti II may have not had time to build

---

542PM2 2: 447 and plan 33; KRI 4: 354; RITA 4: 256; Petrie, Six Temples at Thebes, 15, 29, and plate 19 numbers 3-4; Blyth, 41. Additional fragmentary inscriptions from the mortuary temples of Siptah and the Ramesseum refer to wine from the kꜣm n pr ṣḥy mrr.j n-Prh n pr ḫmn “Vineyard of the Temple of Seti-Merneptah in the House of Amun,” but in this context such a reference does not necessarily refer to a mortuary temple as the inscription merely calls the temple a pr and not a ḫwt ni ḫhw n rnpt. For these inscriptions, see KRI 4: 346-47; RITA 4: 250; Petrie, Six Temples at Thebes, 29, and plate 19 number 5; Wilhelm Spiegelberg, “Bemerkungen zu den hieratischen Amphoreninschriften des Ramesseums,” ZÄS 58 (1923): 27, 30; Wilhelm Spiegelberg, ed., Hieratic Ostraka & Papyri found by J. E. Quibell in the Ramesseum, 1895-6, Egyptian Research Account, 1898 (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1898), 19-199 number 139.

anything but the barest of foundations before Amenmesse took over, and may not have had time to actually finish his mortuary temple upon regaining control in the Theban area. In reality, the site of Seti II’s mortuary temple may have even been taken over by one of his successors, and the remnants either incorporated into or lie buried beneath ruins on the west bank.544

93. Burial of Royal “Governoress” mentioned in Tomb of Khnumemhab, Assasif (TT 26)545

Location: in situ

544One suspect as to taking over Seti II’s mortuary temple might be Queen Tausert, wife of Seti II, but reports from the new excavations of Tausert’s mortuary temple by The University of Arizona Egyptian Expedition indicates that the temple was farther along in construction than previously thought but nothing has turned up so far to indicate that Seti II had anything to do with the site. For more, see Richard H. Wilkinson, “The Tausert Temple Project: 2004 and 2005 Seasons,” Ostracon 16, no 2 (Summer 2005): 7-1; idem, “The Tausert Temple Project: An Additional Feature Discovered in the 2005 Season,” Ostracon 17, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 9; idem, “The Tausert Temple Project: 2006 Season,” Ostracon 17, no. 2 (Fall 2006): 9-12; idem, “The Tausert Temple Project: 2007 Season,” Ostracon 18, no. 1 (Summer 2007): 3-10; idem, “The Tausert Temple Project: 2008 Season,” Ostracon 19, no. 1 (Fall 2008): 3-8; idem, “The Tausert Temple Project: 2009 Season,” Ostracon 20 (Fall 2009): 3-13; idem, “The Tausert Temple Project: Report for the 2009-10 Season,” Ostracon 21 (Fall 2010): 3-11. Another suspect would be Siptah, but the foundation deposits of his temple in Petrie, Six Temples at Thebes, 16-17, and plates 17-18, clearly feature his name or that of Chancellor Bay, and no work apparently has been conducted at the site since Petrie’s excavations in 1896. See also in this manner Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 138 note 27; Weinstein, 235-37, 241-43, 266-68, 290.

Discussion and Comments on Number 93

A dated inscription pertaining to the reign of Seti II can be found in the Tomb of Khnumemhab, Treasurer of the Ramesseum, (TT 26) in the Assasif. The message is on a doorjamb leading into the transverse hall of the tomb and reads $\text{hsbt } 3 \text{ iht } 14 \text{ sw } n \text{ mnj } \text{ pr } qd-mrw } m\text{ hrw } n \text{ n3 } msw \text{ nswt } n } \text{ Stby } \text{ mrj } n-Pth \text{ m pt nj } hr } \text{ sm } “\text{Year 5, 3 Akhet 14, Day of Burial of the ‘Great (One) of the House’ (Majordomo) Qedemerut, True of Voice, of the King’s Daughters of Seti-Merneptah, in the house, who was in the following.”} 547 The year date is rather close to the end of Seti II’s reign, but it is uncertain if the inscription means $\text{pr } Qedemerut$ was buried in Khnumemhab’s tomb as a descendant, an usurpation of TT 26, or if it is a graffito jotted down to record Qedemerut’s burial nearby. Furthermore, nothing else is known about $\text{pr } Qedemerut$ or the royal daughters of Seti II she was in charge of other than this inscription.

94. Chapel E at the Oratory of Ptah King receives Heb-Sed from Amun-Re and Ptah (Usurped from Amenmesse and later usurped by Sethnakht) (figure 6.35) 548

Location: in situ

546PM$^2$ 1, part 1: 43 (3); KRI 3: 373; KRI 4: 271; Eigner, 170 note 348; Gnirs, 185; Kampp, 1: 212-13.

547PM$^2$ 1, part 1: 43 (3); KRI 4: 271; RITA 4: 194; Gnirs, 185 note 1238; Helck, “Zwei Thebanische Urkunden aus der Zeit Sethos II,” 86. KRI 4: 271 note 14, mentions that Helck, “Zwei Thebanische Urkunden aus der Zeit Sethos II,” 86, transcribes the day as “Day 14,” but he translates it as “Day 22” in text.

Discussion and Comments on Number 94

Located between Deir el-Medina and the Valley of the Queens is the Oratory of Ptah and Meretseger, which consists of seven rock cut chapels numbered A-G.\textsuperscript{549} Chapel G features erased texts pertaining to the reign of Amenmesse, but the nearby chapel E contains a stela with Seti II’s name upon it.\textsuperscript{550} The upper part of the stela (figure 6.35) shows a king receiving *heb-sed* from Amun-Re and Ptah while Hathor and Mut stand behind the king. The lower part, now apparently lost due to the effects of nature, shows a king being suckled by a cow-horned goddess while another scene shows a king standing or being led by a god and goddess.\textsuperscript{551}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 706-709; Bruyère, *Mert Seger*, 11-52.
\item For chapel G, see the discussion in chapter 5 on Amenmesse’s monuments.
\item PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 708; KRI 5: 5; LD 3: 204d; LDT 3: 224-25; Bruyère, *Mert Seger*, 39-40, and plate 6; Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 120; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (1. Teil),” 170, 183; Tosi and Roccati, 29-30; Leblanc, *Ta Set Neferou*, plates 32B, 33. Lepsius in LD 3: 204d, and LDT 3: 225, records that the bottom part of the stela was destroyed when he recorded it, but Bruyère, *Mert Seger*, 39-40, and plate 6, managed to record enough traces to publish the bottom part of the stela in 1930. Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 121, and plate 9, indicates that the rock has sheared off diagonally from the figure of Ptah resulting in a loss of the bottom third or so of the figures in upper scene with the lower scene “lost or illegible” to Dodson by the late 1980s and early 1990s.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Figure 6.35. Chapel E Oratory of Ptah. From Bruyère, _Mert Seger_, plate 6. Used with permission of the Institute Français d’Archéologie Orientale.
The cartouches in the upper scene are a bit of an oddity in that they contain the names of Seti II and Sethnakht. The prenomen reads \( \text{wsr-} h w-R^e \text{ stp.}n-R^e \text{ mrj-}R^e \) “Userkhaure Setepenre Meryamun,” which is the prenomen of Sethnakht, while the nomen reads as that of Seti II \( \text{Sthy mrj.}n-Pth \) albeit written in a manner similar to that of Seti I.\(^{552}\) According to Dodson’s observations, both cartouches show signs of usurpation in that their surface is sunken below the level of the surrounding stone and inscriptions. The original owner of this stela could only be Amenmesse in that the suggested pattern of cartouche erasure fits similar activities carried out by Seti II against Amenmesse, but that there are no traces of Amenmesse’s name left in the cartouches as preserved today.\(^{553}\)

95. Unfinished Limestone Stela from Chapel D Oratory of Ptah\(^{554}\)
Location: Egyptian Museum, Turin N.50089 (Sup. 6145)

Discussion and Comments on Number 95

This fragment of an unfinished stela, discovered in chapel D during Schiaparelli’s 1905 excavations, shows a king standing with Mut and Khonsu behind him as he offers


\(^{553}\)Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 120-21.

\(^{554}\)References: PM\(^2\) 1, part 2: 707-708; KRI 4: 273; RITA 4: 195; Bruyère, Mert Seger, 39, 283; Tosi and Roccati, 125-26, 301.
maat to Amun-Re and possibly Ptah (figure 6.40). Although Porter and Moss describe the king in this scene as Sethnakht, the preserved cartouches read as

\[\text{[wsr-hprw-Ra] mry-Jmn Sthy mr[.n-Pt|h}\]

“[Userkheperure] Meryamun, Seti-Mer[nepta]h,” which are the cartouches of Seti II not Sethnakht. Because the stela is unfinished, there is a strong possibility that it was carved towards the end of Seti II’s reign and left unfinished at his death in his sixth year of rule. Its unfinished state can possibly be connected to the activities in nearby chapels E and G with Seti II erasing Amenmesse name from relief and stelae present in these areas of the Oratory of Ptah. Amenmesse’s names were erased wherever found, work begun on the stela from chapel D, but the majority of work unfinished by the time Seti II died.

---

555PM² 1, part 2: 707-708; KRI 4: 273; Bruyère, Mert Seger, 39, 283; Tosi and Roccati, 125-26, 301. Tosi and Roccati, 125, suggest Ptah as the fourth god in the scene, but there does not appear to be any traces of his figure in the plate on 301 as there is a break just behind the figure of Amun-Re. The description given for Turin N. 50246 (Suppl. 6136) in PM² 1, part 2: 714, fits Turin N.50089 (Suppl. 6145) as described here better indicating there was some confusion between the two pieces. For chapel D from the oratory of Ptah, see PM² 1, part 2: 707-708; LD 3: 206d; LDT 3: 224-25; Bruyère, Mert Seger, 37-39, and plate 5.

556KRI 4: 273; RITA 4: 195; Tosi and Roccati, 125-26. Tosi and Roccavi, 126, followed by KRI 4: 273 and note 10⁵⁵, have the prenomen as [wsr-hprw-Ra] mry-Sth “[Userkheperure] Meryseth,” which they amend to the transliteration given above. PM² 1, part 2: 707-708, evidently confused N.50089 (Suppl. 6145) with another in the Egyptian Museum in Turin also found in chapel D (N.50092; Suppl. 6146) that does feature Sethnakht’s name. For Turin N.50092 (Sup. 6146), see KRI 5: 4; Bruyère, Mert Seger, 39, 283; Tosi and Roccati, 127-28, 302.
96. Tomb KV 15 in the Valley of the Kings (figure 6.36)\textsuperscript{557}

Location: \textit{in situ}

Discussion and Comments on Number 96

The tomb of Seti II in the Valley of the Kings, numbered KV 15 in modern plans of the valley, is situated up an adjoining southwestern branch of the main valley next to the possible tomb of Thutmose I (KV 38), which makes KV 15 far from the centrally located earlier Nineteenth Dynasty Ramesside tombs of Ramesses I, Seti I, Ramesses II, and Merneptah.\textsuperscript{558} The earliest modern scholar to explore KV 15 was Richard Pococke followed by Napoleon’s scholars, James Burton, Champollion, John Gardner Wilkinson, and Richard Lepsius.\textsuperscript{559} Although described and partially recorded by Champollion, Lepsius, and Eugène Lefèbure, the only known archaeological excavation was carried out by Howard Carter in 1903-1904 with no indication of any discoveries made in the brief


\textsuperscript{558}PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 532-33 (1-19). For a plan of KV 15 see PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 528, again superseded by Weeks, ed., \textit{Atlas of the Valley of the Kings}, sheet 32; idem, “KV 15-Sety II,” in \textit{Atlas of the Valley of the Kings} (January 2008). <http://www.thebanmappingproject.com/atlas/index_kv.asp> [21 May 2008]. For the location of KV 15 in comparison with other tombs in the vicinity, see PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: plan 2; Weeks, ed., \textit{Atlas of the Valley of the Kings}, sheet 3.

\textsuperscript{559}PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 532; Reeves and Wilkinson, 152; Thomas, \textit{Royal Necropoleis of Thebes}, 111; Weeks, “KV 15-Sety II.”
account of work, and Carter later utilized KV 15 as a conservation laboratory during his clearance of Tutankhamun’s tomb (KV 63) from 1922-1932.\(^{560}\)

Architecturally, KV 15 differs from earlier Nineteenth Dynasty tombs, such as that of Merneptah (KV 8), and the tomb most similar to KV 15 is that the tomb of Amenmesse (KV 10). Although incorporating design elements initiated by Ramesses II in his tomb (KV 7) and resembling somewhat the basic tomb plan of Merneptah, the slope of KV 15’s corridors is very shallow, even nearly completely level, when compared with that of KV 8 and KV 15’s immediate contemporary KV 10. Unlike earlier Nineteenth Dynasty royal tombs in the Valley of the Kings, the entrance of KV 15 is carved directly in a cliff face and not into the rock floor of the valley meaning that there are no sloped stairs leading to the tomb entrance since KV 15’s entrance is nearly level.\(^{561}\) The reason for this particular feature is unknown, as KV 10 has a more traditional sloped entry stair leading to its entrance, but KV 10 and KV 15 share one feature in common in that both

---

\(^{560}\)Howard Carter and Arthur C. Mace, The Tomb of Tut-Ankh-Amen: Discovered by the Late Earl of Carnarvon and Howard Carter (London: Cassell, 1923), vol. 1: 128-29; James, Howard Carter: The Path to Tutankhamun, 82, 273; Hornung, Valley of the Kings, 18-19; Romer, Valley of the Kings, 185, 260. Howard Carter, “Report of Work Done in Upper Egypt (1903-1904),” ASAE 6 (1905): 119, mentions no discoveries in KV 15 except stating that he completely cleared the tomb and placed an iron gate over the entrance. Thomas, Royal Necropoleis of Thebes, 112, suggests that Carter discovered during his clearance the anonymous mummy once housed in a box in KV 15 that Reeves, Valley of the Kings, 104, believes is an “intrusive” Third Intermediate Period Mummy. This mummy has since been removed for testing under the theory that it might be a missing royal mummy. For the earlier descriptions of KV 15, see LD 3: 203b, 204a-c; LDT 3: 214-15; Champollion, ND, 1: 459-63; Lefèbure, Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes, 2: 146-56.

\(^{561}\)Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 133; Thomas, Royal Necropoleis of Thebes, 111-12; Weeks, “KV 15-Sety II.” Although one might think that the entrance of KV 8, the tomb of Merneptah, did not have a sloped staircase, the entrance of KV 8 is now covered by a modern staircase obscuring the original stairs. See Catharine H. Roehrig, “Gates to the Underworld: The Appearance of Wooden Doors in the Royal Tombs in the Valley of the Kings,” in Valley of the Sun Kings: New Explorations in the Tombs of the Pharaohs, ed. Richard H. Wilkinson (Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Egyptian Expedition, 1995), 101, 106 note 34; Weeks, “KV 8-Merenptah: Entryway A.”
have abbreviated, unfinished plans with the room or corridor beyond the “The Chariot Hall” (room F) being utilized as a roughly prepared burial chamber.562

In keeping with the concept of “extension of the existing” when it comes to royal tomb design, KV 15 deviates by having the unusual feature of being carved directly in a cliff face and not in the floor of the Valley of the Kings. It also has a unique feature of having two “projecting rubble-built side walls” at the entrance that were covered in the same plaster used inside the tomb.”563 The exterior of the entrance, or “The God’s Passage of the Way of Shu,” does continue the decorative scheme established by Ramesses II by depicting on the entrance lintel the goddesses Isis and Nephthys worshipping the nocturnal ram and morning beetle forms of Re in a solar disc while the outside jambs feature the names and titles of Seti II and the inner doorjambs contain the motifs of the goddess Maat kneeling over lilies and papyrus plants as found in earlier Nineteenth Dynasty royal tombs.564 Of interest in the decorative scheme is that the cartouches at the entrance have been altered, maybe even erased and reinscribed, with different variants of the same name, namely, that of Seti II.565 The cartouches originally were Seti II’s prenomen and nomen wsr-hprw-Rā mry-Jmn Sīḥy mṛj(n)-Ptḥ with Jmn in

562Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 133; idem, After the Pyramids, 104-105; Reeves, Valley of the Kings, 103; Reeves and Wilkinson, 150-53; Thomas, Royal Necropoleis of Thebes, 112; Weeks, “KV 15-Sety II.”

563Weeks, “KV 15-Sety II: Entryway A.” Recent flood control and landscaping work at the entrance of KV 15 have largely obscured this feature. For “extension of the existing,” see comments under KV 10 in chapter 5.

564PM² 1, part 2: 532 (1); KRI 4: 272; RITA 4: 194; Champollion, ND, 1: 459-60; Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 132 figure 1, 133; Lefèbure, Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes, 2: 146-47; Reeves and Wilkinson, 152; Teeter, 41 note 52; Thomas, Royal Necropoleis of Thebes, 112; Weeks, “KV 15-Sety II: Gate B.”

the prenomen written solely with a seated Amun figure \( \text{mrj} \) with a double reed leaf, and the nomen featuring a seated Ptah determinative \( \text{mrj} \) in the writing \( \text{mrj}\text{-(n)-Pth} \).

These signs were recut or erased and replaced by \( \text{wsr-hprw-R\text{e} mrj-Jmn Sthy mrj.n-Pth} \), written as \( \text{in which the double reed leaf and seated Amun in the prenomen were dropped, a seated Osiris figure replacing the Seth in Sthy, and the Ptah determinative in the nomen dropped altogether.}^{566}

In room B, or “The Second God’s Passage,” the decoration resembles KV 8 as well as KV 10 where on the left is a scene in raised relief showing Seti II before Re-Harakhty presenting him with life, stability, and dominion. On the other hand, instead of the expected scene from the frontispiece of the Litany of Re following this scene, the wall contains a scene in sunken relief showing Seti II offering \( \text{nwd} \) jars to Nefertem followed by the expected Litany of Re and its columns of texts (figure 6.36).^{567} On the right wall, instead of the texts of the Litany of Re, two scenes in sunken relief were added of Seti II offering to Re-Harakhty and Sokar followed by the expected lines of Litany texts.\(^{568}

Decoration in room B then deviates from completely carved columns of text belonging to

---

\(^{566}\text{KRI 4: 272; RITA 4: 194; LDT 3: 214; Champollion, ND, 1: 459-60; Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 133-34, 134 figure 2; Lefèbure, Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes, 2: 146-47.}

\(^{567}\text{As compared to scenes in the earlier Nineteenth Dynasty tombs of Seti I (KV 17), Ramesses II (KV 7), Merneptah (KV 8), and Amenmesse (KV 10). See PM\text{\textsuperscript{2}} 1, part 2: 535 (2), 505 (2), 507 (3), 518 (2); Reeves and Wilkinson, 135-43, 146-51; Weeks, “KV 17-Sety I: Corridor B.”; idem, “KV 7-Rameses II: Corridor B.”; idem, “KV 8-Merenptah: Corridor B.”; idem, “KV 10-Amenmesse: Corridor B.”; Thomas, Royal Necropoleis of Thebes, 110-12.}

\(^{568}\text{PM\text{\textsuperscript{2}} 1, part 2: 532 (2-3); KRI 4: 272; RITA 4: 194-95; LD 3: 203b, 204a-c; LDT 3: 214-15; Champollion, ND, 1: 459-60; Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 132 figure 1, 133-35; Lefèbure, Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes, 2: 147-48; Myśliwiec, 120-21, and plate 122 figures 268, 270; Teeter, 41 note 49; Thomas, Royal Necropoleis of Thebes, 112; Weeks, “KV 15-Sety II: Corridor B.”}
the Litany of Re on the left wall while the right wall only has half of its texts completely
carved with the remainder consisting of just red ink outlines because the text never
received final corrections and carving.\textsuperscript{569}

Room C, “The Third God’s Passage,” continues more deviation from the expected
Nineteenth Dynasty royal tomb decoration along with providing more examples of work
largely unfinished. On the left wall is a scene of Seti II offering Maat to Re-Harakhty
followed by portions of the Litany of Re and the second hour of the Amduat. The right
wall shows Seti II offering incense to Sokar, more extracts of the Litany and the third
hour of the Amduat. The ceiling contains a depiction of the ram-headed \textit{ba} of Re flanked
by Isis and Nephthys as kites.\textsuperscript{570} Room D, “The Fourth’s God’s Passage,” contains the
expected fourth hour of the Amduat on the left followed by the fifth hour on the right as
found in KV 8 and KV 10 along with two “Doorkeeper’s Rooms” on the lower part of the
walls at the end of the room. As with room C, room D has most of its decoration only
sketched out in red ink with minor carving done with some of the royal figures in room C
but once again, largely unfinished.\textsuperscript{571}

\textsuperscript{569}Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 135; idem, \textit{After the Pyramids}, 104.
A picture illustrating this is in Hornung, \textit{Valley of the Kings}, 44. Hornung, \textit{Valley of the Kings},
41, also points out the norm was for scenes to be initially sketched in red, and receive final
corrections in black before carving. In KV 15, the initial and final corrections were both in red.

\textsuperscript{570}PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 532 (4-6); Champollion, \textit{ND}, 1: 459-60; Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the
Tomb of Sethos II,” 132 figure 1, 135; Lefèbure, \textit{Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes} 2: 148-49; Reeves
and Wilkinson, 152-53; Teeter, 41 note 49; Thomas, \textit{Royal Necropoleis of Thebes}, 112; Weeks,
“KV 15-Sety II: Corridor C.” For an image coming from the third hour of the Amduat in KV 15,
both sketched and corrected in red, see Hornung, \textit{Valley of the Kings}, 50 plate 16.

\textsuperscript{571}PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 533 (7-9); Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 132 figure
1, 135; idem, \textit{After the Pyramids}, 104; Lefèbure, \textit{Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes}, 2: 149-50; Reeves
and Wilkinson, 152-53; Thomas, \textit{Royal Necropoleis of Thebes}, 112; Weeks, “KV 15-Sety II:
Corridor D.”
The largest deviation from the expected wall decoration comes in room E, “The Hall of Waiting/Hindering” or “The Well Room.” The normal Nineteenth Dynasty royal tomb scenes would have featured Seti II offering and standing before a number of protective deities, such as the four sons of Horus, Isis, and Anubis. The walls in room E contain painted, not carved, scenes of funerary statuary similar to examples of gilt wood statuary.
found in the tomb of Tutankhamun.\textsuperscript{572} Examples of these statues might have been placed in this room during the burial of Seti II, or the depictions of these statues on the walls of room E served as substitutes for the actual statues that were never buried with Seti II.\textsuperscript{573}

Inside room F, “The Chariot Hall,” the decoration is in “poor quality” painted sunken relief different than the sunken relief seen in the transition from raised to sunken relief in room B near the entrance of KV 15.\textsuperscript{574} The decorative scheme of room F does resemble that found in earlier Nineteenth Dynasty royal tombs such as KV 8 and traces known from KV 10. Room F has four pillars on either side of a slope leading to the burial chamber, and each pillar is decorated with images of Seti II and ancient Egyptian gods such as Anubis, Horus-Iunmutef, Ptah, Geb, Re-Harakhty, Ptah-Osiris, Horus, Nefertem, and Shu. The left wall has the fifth hour of the Book of Gates while the right wall has the sixth hour, and the rear wall of the room has a double scene of Seti II offering \textit{maat} and wine to an enshrined Osiris.\textsuperscript{575}

What would have been one of the rooms containing the Opening of the Mouth scenes was only partially carved from the rock before it had to be hastily adapted into a burial


\textsuperscript{573}Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 135-36; idem, \textit{Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy}, 39; Thomas, \textit{Royal Necropoleis of Thebes}, 112.

\textsuperscript{574}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{575}PM\textsuperscript{2} 1, part 2: 533 (12-17, pillars A-D); Champollion, \textit{ND}, 1: 462; Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 132 figure 1, 136; idem, \textit{After the Pyramids}, 104; Lefèbure, \textit{Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes} 2: 151-52; Reeves and Wilkinson, 152-53; Teeter, 41-42; Thomas, \textit{Royal Necropoleis of Thebes}, 112; Weeks, “KV 15-Sety II: Pillared Chamber F.”
chamber with the reality of Seti II’s death. The walls were left in a very rough state and covered in scenes that were merely painted on plaster applied onto the unfinished walls. The decoration consists of an extract taken from the sixth hour of the Book of Gates along with Jackals, and deities representing those who follow Re and Osiris. On the ceiling, a winged Nut stretches the near entire length of the corridor. Seti II had prepared a rectangular red granite sarcophagus containing a lid decorated with a mummiform image of himself on the outside and an image of Nut on the underside. The box and the head of Seti II from the lid of the sarcophagus have disappeared long ago, and all that remains today is the broken lid resting on modern supports. Long ago robbed of all its burial goods, the only item to survive from the burial of Seti II, other than the sarcophagus lid, is his mummified remains now in the Egyptian Museum in

576 For an ostracon described as coming from a private collection and perhaps recording work in KV 15 at this stage, see Demarée, “Royal Riddles,” 9-18.

577 PM² 1, part 2: 533 (18-19); Abitz, Statuetten in Schreinen, 19-25, 81-83; Champollion, ND, 1: 462-63; Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 132 figure 1, 136; idem, After the Pyramids, 104-105; idem, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 39, 64-65; Lefèbure, Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes 2: 152-53; Reeves, Valley of the Kings, 103; Reeves and Wilkinson, 152-53; Thomas, Royal Necropoleis of Thebes, 112; Weeks, “KV 15-Sety II: Burial Chamber J.”

578 PM² 1, part 2: 533; KRI 4: 273; RITA 4: 195; Champollion, ND, 1: 463; Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 136; idem, After the Pyramids, 105; idem, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 65; Lefèbure, Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes, 2: 53; Reeves, Valley of the Kings, 103; Reeves and Wilkinson, 152-53; Thomas, Royal Necropoleis of Thebes, 112; Weeks, “KV 15-Sety II: Burial Chamber J.” Dodson, “Was the Sarcophagus of Ramesses III Begun for Sethos II?” 196-98, followed by Ikram and Dodson, 263-64, believe that Seti II intended to have three red granite sarcophagi made to house his mummy in a manner similar to the arrangement seen in Merneptah’s tomb KV 8. Being that time and the unfinished nature of the burial chamber in KV 15 did not allow this plan to be followed, Seti II was only buried in what was the innermost sarcophagus of a possible three and that one of these other suggested unused sarcophagi was later used for the tomb of Twentieth Dynasty king Ramesses III (KV 11), of which the base is now in the Louvre, Paris (D1) and the lid in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge (E.1.1823). Although tempting, one wonders why, according to Dodson’s theory, that the sarcophagus was left presumably uninscribed, and Siptah, Tausert, and Sethnakht failed to utilize this sarcophagus for their own burials to only be used nearly a decade later by Ramesses III. Note that Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 136 note 24, points out that the red granite face in the Louvre in Paris (E6205) is that of Nut from the underside of the lid in KV 15 and not that of the mummiform image of Seti II from the outside.
Broken and battered by tomb robbers, the mummy of Seti II was rewrapped and cached with other royal mummies in the tomb of Amenhotep II (KV 35) where Victor Loret discovered it in 1898.

The tomb of Seti II shows several inconsistencies in royal tomb decoration and architecture that, at first, initially can be explained by the death of Seti II in his sixth year of rule. Seti II died, and the workers have to prepare the tomb for burial and finish up what decoration is deemed most important in the period between the announcement of death, the seventy day period of mummification and preparation of Seti II’s body, and the

---

579 Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 136 note 23, notes that two fragmentary faience ushabtis in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (MMA 10.130.1074A-B) attributed to Seti II by Hayes, Scepter of Egypt, 2: 362, contain only the nomen Seti-Merneptah and “there seems to be nothing to distinguish them” from known examples of Seti I therefore they could indeed belong to Seti I. Grafton Elliot Smith, “Report on the Unrolling of the Mummies of the Kings Siptah, Seti II, Ramses IV, Ramses V, and Ramses VI in the Cairo Museum,” BIE 5th series, no. 1 (1907/1908): 54-61, and idem, Royal Mummies, 73-81, records that while unwrapping the mummy of Seti II, he discovered some shirts and other fragmentary garments probably from the burial of Seti II along with some wadjet amulets, scarabs, beads, and sphinxes mounted on strings placed around Seti II’s legs that were overlooked when the tomb was robbed. Overall descriptions of the mummy of Seti II can be found in Smith, Royal Mummies, 73-81, and plates 64-66; Partridge, 161-64; James E. Harris and Kent R. Weeks, X-Raying the Pharaohs (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1973), 158-59; Ikram and Dodson, 326; Reeves, Valley of the Kings, 205, 211, 247-48; Thomas, Royal Necropoleis of Thebes, 242. Recent research, drawing upon a suggestion by Smith, Royal Mummies, 79-80, that due to the mummy of Seti II having different craniofacial features than Ramesses II, Merneptah, and Siptah, some researchers believe the mummy of Seti II is actually a missing member of the Thutmosid royal family, such as Thutmose II. For details, see James E. Harris and Fawzia Hussien, “The Identification of the Eighteenth Dynasty Royal Mummies: A Biological Perspective,” International Journal of Osteoarchaeology 1 (1991): 235-39; Partridge, 163; Edward F. Wente, “Who was Who among the Royal Mummies,” The Oriental Institute News and Notes, no. 144 (Winter 1995), 30 July 1997 [Last Update] <http://oi.chicago.edu/research/pubs/nn/win95_wente.html> [30 August 1997]; Edward F. Wente and James E. Harris, “Royal Mummies of the Eighteenth Dynasty: A Biologic and Egyptological Approach,” in After Tut'ankhamūn: Research and Excavation in the Royal Necropolis at Thebes, ed. C. Nicholas Reeves (London: Kegan Paul, 1992), 2-20.

580 For an account of the discovery of KV 35, see Victor Loret, “Le tombeau d’Aménophis II et la cachette royal de Biban el-Molouk,” BIE 3d series, no. 9 (1898): 98-112. More recent accounts and interpretations include Ikram and Dodson, 84; Harris and Weeks, 112-13; Reeves, Valley of the Kings, 192-99, 220-224; Thomas, Royal Necropoleis of Thebes, 77-78.
arrival of the royal funerary procession in Thebes from presumably Pi-Ramesse. 581

Contrary to this scenario is that this fails to adequately explain why there is such a vivid transition from finished raised and sunk relief at the entrance and room B to a large part of the decoration in rooms C and D remaining mere sketches, and the lesser quality of work further into the tomb. Certainly the hasty nature of adapting what would have been room G into a burial chamber fits the criteria of Seti II having died unexpectedly and preparing the tomb for his burial as soon as possible. The unfinished nature of Seti II’s tomb hints at something more complex than merely the king’s death but revolves around the political machinations of individuals during the late Nineteenth Dynasty.

Another unusual feature to the somewhat haphazard finishing, if one can call it that, of KV 15 is many of the Seti II cartouches at the entrance of KV 15 and beginning of room B shows signs of erasure and recutting. 582 These cartouches were never usurped by replacing Seti II’s name with another king but merely replastered and recarved in some cases such as the cartouches in front of the kneeling Maat figures on the doorjambs at the entrance of the tomb. Aidan Dodson makes note of a unique four playing piece mn sign utilized in many of what he feels are restorations of the cartouches at the entrance of the tomb. This “four spike” design differs from the more conventional mn signs as found elsewhere in KV 15 suggesting that a different worker or team was responsible for

---

581 Dodson, *Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy*, 64-65. Hornung, *Valley of the Kings*, 40, also describes the tomb as if work suddenly stopped upon the death of the king.

these restorations than work carried out elsewhere in the tomb and adds to the odd nature of KV 15.\(^{583}\)

If Seti II had six full years to finish KV 15, then the decoration would have been more complete in the manner of fully plastered, carved, and painted sunk relief scenes in the manner of KV 8, the tomb of Merneptah. KV 15 shows a haphazard mixture of finished and unfinished scenes suggestive of an interruption of work at crucial moments of construction. Amenmesse had nearly four years to work on KV 10 and his tomb shows finished carved and painted decoration up to the point where work stopped with the end of his reign.\(^{584}\) If Seti II did indeed have six uninterrupted years, construction and decoration would have still been far more in advance than what is seen in the tomb today. Even Siptah, the successor of Seti II, managed to have a tomb, KV 47, which was almost completely finished with carved and painted decoration up to his burial chamber in the near seven years of his reign.\(^{585}\) The work inside KV 15 strongly suggests a period of work stoppage and then resumption of work after some time had passed.

\(^{583}\)Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 135, 137-38, 141-42. Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 137, that the conventional mn signs as found within KV 15 have five playing pieces but his drawing on 135 indicated six.


\(^{585}\)For many years, it was believed that KV 47 was largely unfinished with only the outer rooms B-F completed but recent excavation and conservation by a team from the University of Basel discovered scenes from the sixth and seventh hours of the Amduat in lower room J1 thereby indicating that the tomb was more complete decoratively than believed. However, the burial chamber was only half complete by Siptah’s death and later flooding did damage or destroy much of the lower rooms. For this recent work, see Jenni and Mauric-Barberio, 14-16, 18-19, 23; “MISR: Mission Siptah Ramses X.: Das Grab des Königs Siptah (KV 47),” in MISR: Mission Siptah-Ramses X (4 January 2010). <http://aegyptologie.unibas.ch/17824/> [18 January 2010]; Kent Weeks, “KV47-Siptah: Corridor J1,” in Atlas of the Valley of the Kings (January 2008). <http://www.thebanmappingproject.com/atlas/index_kv.asp> [21 May 2008].
The question is then what interrupted work in KV 15 and why were the decorations at the entrance of KV 15 erased? One theory by Hartwig Altenmüller suggests Seti II was never buried in KV 15 but buried by Queen Tausert, his wife, in her tomb KV 14 in an intended double burial for Seti II and herself. In this scenario, KV 15 was left unfinished due to Queen Tausert burying Seti II in KV 14, and Seti II was later removed from KV 14 by Sethnakht when he usurped the tomb from Tausert and reburied Seti II in KV 15 with the unfinished nature of KV 15 being explained by Sethnakht hurriedly finishing it for Seti II’s reburial. Part of Altenmüller’s arguments rests on a previously obscured graffito (number 551) over the entrance of KV 14 recording \textit{hsbt 1 3 prt 11 sw n zm3 (t3) n wrRpr[w]-Rc [mrj-Jmn]} “Year 1, 3 Peret 11, Day of burial of Userkheper[u]re [Meryamun].” Although Altenmüller’s theory is tempting, nothing in the graffito explicitly states Seti II was buried in KV 14 but most likely that a scribe or official recorded the burial of Seti II in the first year of Seti II’s successor, Siptah, and that the most likely place such a burial occurred was in KV 15.

Although other candidates, such as Siptah and Bay, have been suggested as alternate candidates for the erasures and restorations in KV 15, the only likely scenario is that the

---


588 As pointed out by Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 139; idem, \textit{Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy}, 65, work continued in KV 14 during the reigns of Siptah and Tausert, so would Seti II have really been buried in a tomb in which construction continued for at least another eight years? Highly unlikely.
erasures in KV 15 are the actions of Amenmesse. Taking Amenmesse’s reign as intervening in the middle of Seti II’s reign, the pattern of work in KV 15 becomes suggestive of a deliberate attack on the name of Seti II. Towards the end of Seti II’s first year of rule, decorative work in KV 15 had reached the end of room B with much of the decoration nearly finished. Seti II is forced out of the Theban area by Amenmesse, and Amenmesse attacks Seti II’s name by erasing the cartouches in KV 15 but not replacing them with his own. Upon regaining control of the Theban area in Year 5, Seti II begins restoring KV 15, as well as suppressing Amenmesse’s name, but the sudden death of Seti II in Year 6 resulted in the current state of decoration.

97. Year 2 Stela at Speos of Horemheb West Silsila (figure 6.37)
Location: in situ

589 Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 140-42; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (1. Teil),” 182-85; idem, Moïse le Pharaon, 128-30. Any suggestion of Bay’s activities in the period after Siptah’s rule are now negated by Grandet, “L’exécution du chancelier Bay,” 229-45, describing an ostracon reporting the execution of Bay in Year 5 of Siptah. Siptah seems to have shown no malicious intent towards Seti II, so he cannot be considered a candidate either. See Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 139; Wente, “Genealogy of the Royal Family,” 147.

590 Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 140, briefly suggests that the reason for the cartouche erasures in KV 15 is that Amennesse may have had an intent to usurp KV 15 for himself before deciding to construct KV 10 instead. Since KV 10 resembles the decoration and layout of KV 8 and KV 7 more than KV 15 does, Amennesse may have wanted to show an affiliation towards Merneptah and Ramesses II by building his tomb closer to theirs architecturally and geographically rather than to use KV 15, which deviated somewhat from the plans of KV 8 and KV 7.

591 Dodson, “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 140-42.

Discussion and Comments on Number 97

On a doorway of the Speos of Horemheb at West Silsila, Seti II carved a now much damaged stela that has never been entirely published except for a “provisional copy” in Kitchen’s *Ramesside Inscriptions* (figure 6.37). The stela is bordered on the top by frame lines bearing a $htp$-$dj$-$nswt$ formula for A[mun-Re] and Mut, while the side frame lines are either heavily damaged or missing except for a few scattered signs. At the top of the stela was once a figure of Seti II and other figures, now lost, standing before Amun-Re, Mut, and Khonsu with cartouches over the king’s figure reading $wsr$-$hprw$-$R^c mry$-$Jmn$ Sthy $mrj.n$-$Pth$.594


Krauss believes that the missing figures, at least one of them Seti II, before Amun-Re, Mut, and Khonsu were erased as part of Amenmesse’s campaign against Seti II’s monuments when he seized power in Upper Egypt.\textsuperscript{595} This might explain the now missing figures in the upper scene, but why merely erase the figure of Seti II and others

\textsuperscript{595}Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (1. Teil),” 183.
while leaving the cartouches of Seti II intact? Perhaps the missing figures are an incomplete attempt at usurping the monument for Amenmesse by erasing the figure of Seti II, but Amenmesse’s agents left the task uncompleted due to unknown reasons. On the other hand, the damage may be totally unrelated to the dispute between Amenmesse and Seti II and may belong to another period entirely.

The main part of the text is the most important in that it features one of the few monumental year dates of Seti II but the text itself is marred by damage and erosion resulting in several large lacunae. The opening line of the body of the stela reads *hsbt 2 4 prt* “Year 2, 4 Peret” followed by presumably Seti II’s Horus, Nebty, and Golden Horus names followed by his prenomen and nomen *wsr-hprw-Rˁ mry-Jmn [StH]y mjr.n-Pth.*

The remaining text, again marred by large lacunae, is normal laudatory epithets of Seti II, the gods, and the state of Egypt. At the bottom of the stela is a kneeling worshipping figure facing into the Speos of Horemheb, and he is described as *sš nswt jmy-r mšt wr n nb tʻwy mʻ-hw-hy mʻ hrw* “King’s Scribe, Generalissimo of the Lord of the Two Lands, Mahuhly, Justified.” This same person is mentioned earlier in the main text but given the titles of *sš nswt mʻ-hw-[hy pʻ jmy-r] pʻ mšt* “King’s Scribe Mahu[hy, the General of] the Army.”

Mahuhy is the same person later elevated to the rank of High Priest of Amun to replace Roma-Roy after his tenure ended as a scene within the Speos of Horemheb shows

---

596 *KRI* 4: 274; *KRI* 7: 246; *RITA* 4: 196; *LDT* 4: 85i; Champollion, *ND*, 1: 258 text D. Kitchen, *RITA* 4: 196, amends his provisional copy in *KRI* 7: 246 to the date reading 4 prt < I> meaning the day was originally omitted from the inscription. In looking at photographs of this stela, it does not appear that there was ever an attempt to carve the day but the line looks to read *hsbt 2 4 prt hr hm (n)* “Year 2, 4 Peret, during the incarnation (of),” then followed by Seti II’s titulary.

597 *KRI* 7: 246; *RITA* 4: 196; Gnirs, 146-47.
Mahuhy adoring and having the titles of $jry-p^t \ h^t y^-^c \ jmy-r \ hmw-ntr \ n \ ntrw \ nbw \ (n) \ W^st \ hmn-ntr \ tpj \ n \ Jmn \ m \ Jpt-swt$ “Hereditary Noble and Count, Overseer of the Priests of all Gods in Waset (Thebes), High Priest of Amun in Karnak.”

Although this text is undated, it has to date from sometime close to the end of Seti II’s reign if Mahuhy was not yet High Priest of Amun in Year 2 but most likely in Year 5 or 6 of Seti II’s reign.

98. Sehel Graffito (figure 6.38)

Location: in situ

Discussion and Comments on Number 98

At Sehel, a rock graffito shows two individuals worshiping a figure of the goddess Anuqet ($n[qt]$) evoked by a $htp-dj-nswt$ formula (figure 6.38). The names of these figures are lost except for their titles of $wpwj (?)$ and $s\& [nswt]$ “Envoy (?) and [Royal] Scribe,” or at least the title of one of these figures, and over their heads is the prenomen and nomen of Seti II reading $wsr-hprw-R^c \ stp.n-R^c \ Sthy \ mrj.n-Pth \ dj \ 5nh \ dt$ “Userkheperure Setepenre, Given Life for Eternity.”

References:

PM 5: 212 (41); KRI 4: 292; RITA 4: 210; Gnilrs, 146-47; Lefebvre, Histoire des grands prêtres d’Amon, 260-61; Legein, “Notes d’inspection,” 137 figure 2; Thiem, 1: 67 note 299, 83 note 425, 84, 90, 243 note 1650, 244, and plate 52b; idem, 2: plan 4: VII/2.

For more on Mahuhy, see comments under the stela from the fowl-yard at Karnak above and Gnilrs, 146-47, Lefebvre, Histoire des grands prêtres d’Amon, 154-56, 259-60.

References: PM 5: 252; KRI 4: 274; RITA 4: 196; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 133; Jacques de Morgan et al., Catalogue des monuments et inscriptions de l’Égypte antique: ouvrage publié sous les auspices de S. A. Abbas II. Helmi, khédive d’Égypte, par la direction générale du Service des Antiquités, Première série, Haute Égypte, vol. 1, De la Frontière de Nebie a Kom Ombos (Vienne: Adolphe Holzhausen, 1894), 95 number 146.

PM 5: 252; KRI 4: 274; RITA 4: 196; Gauthier, Le livre des rois d’Égypte, 3: 133; de Morgan et al., 1: 95 number 146.
99. Graffito at the Island of Bigeh at Aswan (Above Messuy Graffito)\textsuperscript{602}

Location: \textit{in situ}

Discussion and Comments on Number 99

On Bigeh Island at Aswan, a graffito of Seti II is “carved on large granite boulders piled by natural forces toward the south end of the northern hill on Biga” just behind the

The Seti II graffito is on the topmost boulder next to a granite outcropping in the area where the graffito is located. Earlier accounts of the cartouche gave a description of a solar plumed cartouche resting on the sign for gold and reading of \( wsr-hprw-R^e \ stp.n-R^e \), but this reading has to be questioned due to an examination made of the graffito in the 1990s. William Murnane examined this cartouche in early April 1995 and noted a much different reading to the Seti II cartouche. The cartouche, now badly eroded, rests on the sign of gold and reads \([wsr-hpr]\ w-R^e [mrj-J] mn “Userkheper]ure [Merya]mun.”

Nubia

100. Forecourt Blocks at Temple of Isis at Debod (Dâbôd)

Location: Currently Unknown; Temple given to Spain 1968 and now in Parque de Rosales Madrid, Spain

\(^{603}\) Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse: Nachträge,” 178, quoting a letter sent to him by William J. Murnane after an inspection of the graffito in April 1995; PM 5: 256 (9B). For the general area where this graffito is located, although not explicitly mentioned, see Weigall, Report on the Antiquities of Lower Nubia, 35.

\(^{604}\) LDT 4: 175, followed by KRI 4: 274, RITA 4: 196, and Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 133, who appear to have not examined the cartouche directly. Champollion, ND, 1: 614, took the cartouche to be that of Ramesses II \( wsr-Mf\t R^e \ stp.n-R^e \).


Discussion and Comments on Number 100

Although the Temple of Isis at Debod dates primarily to the Meroitic and Greco-Roman periods in ancient Egyptian history, some inscriptions pertaining to Seti II were found on blocks at the site. Very little information is available on the first block other than the published accounts of this block by Karl Lepsius and another by Günther Roeder. In the forecourt of the Temple of Isis at Dâbôd, Lepsius describes a reused block containing the cartouches of Seti II albeit in a very fragmented state reading

\[\text{[wsr-hprw-R}^e\text{mrj]-Jmn [Sthy] mrj.(n)-Pth}.\]

During the summer of 1961, a Polish expedition taking part in the effort to excavate the site of Debd due to the rising waters from the Aswan High Dam discovered another block of Seti II (excavation number AD 2/61) as a surface find in the center of excavation sector I located north of the first pylon. This block contains two badly weathered cartouches of Seti II featuring his prenomen and nomen

\[\text{wsr-hprw-R}^e\text{ [mrj-Jmn] Sthy mrj.n-[Pth]}\]

that, based on the surviving traces, were surrounded on either side by cobras wearing the solar disc. The fact that the first block was reused in the Roman forecourt

---

607 PM 7: 4; LDT 5: 3; Roeder, Debod bis Bab Kalabsche, 1: 4-5; Hein, 5, 144. Based on the traces given in LDT 5: 3, the n may not have been written in mrj.n-Pth.


609 Marciniak, 7, and plates 4 number 8, 5 numbers 9-10. There is some uncertainty if mrj.n in the nomen was written as reconstructed by Marciniak, 7, as given here or had \(\text{[mrj.n]}\) (Gardiner N 36) instead. The photographs in Marciniak, plates 4-5 are not clear enough to give a decisive answer.
along with the surface find of the second block is a prime indication that both come from
another structure of Seti II in the area, whose location and purpose remains unknown.610

101. Seti II name over Ramesses II at Temple of Beit el-Wali611

Location: *in situ*

Discussion and Comments on Number 101

Although decorated primarily by Ramesses II, the temple of Beit el-Wali does contain
one minor inscription relating to the reign of Seti II. On the north wall of the forecourt,
behind scenes showing Ramesses II engaged in attacking Libyan and Asiatic enemies,
there is a scene showing Ramesses II enthroned in a kiosk receiving Asiatic captives
presented by Prince Amenhirwenemef, Ramesses II’s eldest son, while various official
give praise and adoration to the king.612 Behind Ramesses II is an table containing
offerings of ostrich eggs and feathers that has been altered to contain two cartouches with
the prenomen and nomen of Ramesses II, Seti II, and Ramesses IV. The cartouche of

Seti II reads \[ ws_r-hprw-R^* stp.n-R^* [Sth]y \]

610Marciniak, 8, suggests that the Seti II block discovered in 1961 indicates that Seti II may
have built an earlier temple or structure at Debod that was torn down, and the blocks reused to
build the later temple on the site. For a similar premise of an earlier New Kingdom temple at

611References: PM 7: 23-24 (9); LDT 5: 14; KRI 2: 197; RITA 2: 61; RITANC 2: 112; Hein, 8,
144; Gaston Maspero, “Notes de voyage,” *ASAE* 10 (1910): 6-7; Herbert Ricke, George R.
Hughes, and Edward F. Wente, *The Beit el-Wali Temple of Ramesses II*, The University of
Chicago Oriental Institute Nubian Expedition, vol. 1 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press,
1967), 34-38, and plates 15, 47B; Günther Roeder, *Der Felsentempel von Bet el-Wali*, Les
Temples immergés de la Nubie (Caire: Imprimerie de l’Institut français d’Archéologie Orientale,
1938), 20, and plate 24.

612PM 7: 23-24 (8-9); KRI 2: 197; RITA 2: 61; RITANC 2: 112; Roeder, *Felsentempel von Bet
el-Wali*, 20, and plates 23-24; Ricke, Hughes, and Wente, 16-17, and plate 15.
[mtr].n-[Pth], with a large portion of the nomen missing due to a loss of stone on this section of the wall.\textsuperscript{613}

According to an analysis of the cartouches by Edward F. Wente, the sequence of usurpations is not the expected sequence of Ramesses II usurped by Seti II and then by Ramesses IV. Rather, the sequence is Seti II usurped by Ramesses IV, and then Ramesses IV being usurped by another Ramesside king, probably Ramesses VI, who decided to carve Ramesses II’s name over Ramesses IV.\textsuperscript{614} Therefore, under this scenario, Seti II was the king who first carved his prenomen and nomen onto the offering of ostrich eggs and feathers, and later had his work usurped by Ramesses IV and VI.

102. Amada Temple Stela Year 2 (figure 6.39)\textsuperscript{615}
Location: Currently Unknown

Discussion and Comments on Number 102

This fragmentary stela at The Temple of Amada is another of the few monumental inscriptions of Seti II bearing a year date for his reign. Composed of three fragments, the stela was discovered during clearance of the temple in 1909 by Alexandre Barsanti.\textsuperscript{616}

\textsuperscript{613}LDT 5: 14; KRI 2: 197; RITA 2: 61; RITANC 2: 112; Hein, 8; Maspero, “Notes de voyage,” 6-7; Ricke, Hughes, and Wente, 34-38, and plate 47B; Roeder, Felsentempel von Bet el-Wali, 20, and plate 24.

\textsuperscript{614}Ricke, Hughes, and Wente, 37-38; Hein, 8; KRI 2: 197, note 16c-a-a.


\textsuperscript{616}PM 7: 73; Gauthier, Temple d’Amada, 195. For an account of the 1909 clearance at the Temple of Amada, see Alexandre Barsanti, “Les Temple d’Amada: Le temple d’Aménôthès II,”
The text itself is in extremely poor condition, and only five lines are preserved on the fragments. The beginning bears the date of *hsbt* 2 “Year 2” and a long lacuna follows that presumably would have contained Seti II’s Horus and Nebty names.\(^{617}\) The next discernable line is Seti II’s Golden Horus name of \(\text{aA-nxtw-m-tAw-}[nb]\) “Great in

Victories in [All] Lands” followed by his prenomen \(\text{Sthyn trj.} n\text{-Pth}\), which is repeated on the fifth and last preserved line of the stela along with Seti II’s full prenomen \(\text{[wsr]-hprw-}\)

---

\(^{617}\) *KRI* 4: 274; *RITA* 4: 197; Gauthier, *Temple d’Amada*, 195-96, and plate 42B; Hein, 23, 143.
The remainder of the text seems to indicate the normal laudatory epithets directed at the king by proclaiming “announcements of numerous and abundant jubilees” but little else is preserved. The repair work on this colossus was begun by Amenmesse and usurped by Seti II. See further comments in chapter 5 concerning the monuments of Amenmesse.

---

618 KRI 4: 274; RITA 4: 197; Gauthier, Temple d’Amada, 195-96, and plate 42B; Hein, 23, 143. It is unclear if the n in mrj[n]-Pth was left out or part of the damaged double reed leaf y in Sthy. Gauthier, Temple d’Amada, 196, takes it to have been left out while Kitchen, KRI 4: 274, believes it to have been written below the double reed leaf y.

619 KRI 4: 274; RITA 4: 197.


621 PM 7: 100 (26); el-Achirie et al., 1, part 1: 9 number D. 10, and plates 12, 26a-c; Barsanti and Maspero, 143; Habachi, “King Amenmesse and Viziers Amenmose and Kha’emtore,” 62. The repair work on this colossus was begun by Amenmesse and usurped by Seti II. See further comments in chapter 5 concerning the monuments of Amenmesse.
prenomen and nomen \textit{wsr-hprw-R$^c$ mrj-Jmn Sthy mrj.(n)-Pth}.\textsuperscript{622} At some time after the reign of Ramesses II, the walls on either side of the doorway, especially the northern wall, became damaged and repairs carried out with large sandstone blocks. Barsanti suggests that these repairs date to the reign of Seti II linking his cartouche to the work on the adjacent wall as well as the colossus just outside the entrance.\textsuperscript{623} Regardless of who repaired the entrance walls, Seti II continued his activities further inside the temple.

Just inside the entrance to the Inner Pillared Hall on the thickness of the left doorjamb, Seti II carved another inscription bearing another crucial monumental year date for his reign.\textsuperscript{624} The scene above what is labeled an oracle text shows a king offering to the barque shrine of Amun-[Re] being carries by priests, and the badly damaged cartouches above the king read \textit{wsr-[hprw]-R$^c$ [stp].n-[R$^c$] [mrj-Jmn] Sthy [mrj.n]-P[th]}.\textsuperscript{625} The text itself, equally damaged as the cartouches before the king, begins with the Horus \textit{mrj-R$^c$} and Nebty names of Seti II, then followed by Seti II’s full prenomen \textit{wsr-hprw-R$^c$ stp.n-R$^c$ mrj-}.

\textsuperscript{622}Černý and Donadoni, E10c; el-Achirie et al., 1, part 1: plate 102 E10; Desroches-Noblecourt and Gerster, 30; Hein, 35, 143. PM 7: 101 (30-32), gives the general area but does not indicate the cartouche.

\textsuperscript{623}Desroches-Noblecourt and Gerster, 28, 30; Barsanti and Maspero, 141; Hein, 35, 143. Alternatively, this repair could be Amenmesse’s work later usurped by Seti II, but there is no indication that the cartouche of Seti II was usurped from Amenmesse,

\textsuperscript{624}PM 7: 108-109 (92); LD 3: 189a; LDT 5: 148; el-Achirie et al., \textit{Le Grand Temple d’Abou Simbel}, 1, part 1: plate 108 G14; Černý and Edel, G14; Hein, 35, 143.

\textsuperscript{625}KRI 4: 275; RITA 4: 197. These reading are by no means definite as Kitchen shows some reservations in his reconstruction, and Lepsius, LDT 5: 148, thought this scene and inscription dated to the reign of Ramesses II.
A large part of the text is lost, but the fourth line begins with the crucial date of hsbt 1 2 ḫt 25 “Year 1, 2 Akhet 25” and appears to mention some wonder that the deified Ramesses II did as the very last line calls him ṟsr-M3śt-Rṣstp.n-Rṣp3 nṯr ṣ₃ “Usermaatre, the Great God.”

Exactly what the deified Ramesses II did is unknown, as crucial lines of the text remain lost revealing what was revealed or done for Seti II. All that can be determined is that in “Year 1, 2 Akhet 25” Seti II either visited or sent representatives to Abu Simbel, and he ordered this text to be carved upon the left thickness of the Inner Pillared Hall.

104. Cartouches and Architectural Elements from the Fortress and South Temple at Buhem

Location: South Temple now at the Sudan National Museum/National Museum of Sudan, Khartoum; other elements currently unknown

---

626 KRI 4: 275; RITA 4: 197. The Nebty name here can be either nḥt-ḥpš dr-pdt-9 or sḥm-ḥpš dr-pdt-9, but the preserved traces are inconclusive per KRI 4: 275.

627 LD 3: 189a; KRI 4: 275; RITA 4: 197; Černý and Edel, G14. According to KRI 4: 275 notes 8a, 9b, 10a, and Černý and Edel, G14, parts of what Lepsius recorded are now missing.


Discussion and Comments on Number 104

On the outer doorjambs of the Thutmosid South Temple at Buhen, Seti II carved his titles beneath scenes and inscriptions belonging to Thutmose III. On the southern jamb the inscription reads \( nb \ t\beta[w] \ wsr-hprw-Rc \ mrj-Jmn \ dj \ "nb \ mh \ Rc \ “Lord of the [Two] Land[s], Userkheperure Meryamun, Given Life like Re.” \)

The northern jamb reads \( z\beta \ Rc \ nb \ h^6w \ Sthy \ [mrj].n-Pth \ mj \ Rc \ “Son of Re, Lord of Appearances, Seti-[Mer]neptah, like Re.” \) Along with carving his titles on the doorjambs, Seti II may have been the king who widened the doorway through cutting back its inner face, but it could have been equally the work of Merneptah, as Ricardo Caminos suggests.

Also coming from the South Temple, are a sandstone lintel and doorjamb (ST 5, 8) discovered reused in a secondary context. The lintel (ST 8) contains an inscription reading \( nfr \ nfr \ wsr-hprw-Rc \ mrj-Jmn \ z\beta-Rc \ Sthy \ mrj.n-[Pth] \ mry \ Jmn-Rc \ nb \ nswt \ t\beta[wy] \ “The Good God, Userkheperure Meryamun, Son of Re, Seti-Merne[ptah], beloved of Amun-Re, Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands.” \)

The doorjamb fragment (ST 5) reads \( z\beta-Rc \ n \ htf \ mrj.f \ nb \ h^6w \ Sthy \ mrj.n-Pth \ [mrj] \ Hr \ [nb \ Bhn] \ “Son of Re, of His Body, His Beloved, Lord of Appearances, Seti-Merneptah, [Beloved of] Horus [Lord of Buhen].” \) This doorjamb fragment could be that of Seti I instead, as the nomen is written

\[ \text{References:} \]

630PM 7: 133 (1-2); Caminos, New-Kingdom Temples of Buhen, 1: 13-15; Randall-MacIver and Woolley, 1: 19.

631Caminos, New-Kingdom Temples of Buhen, 1: 14, and plate 14: 1. Randall-MacIver and Woolley, 1: 19, erroneously have \([nswt \ htj] \ wsr-hprw-Rc \ mrj-J[mn] \ dj \ "nh.\)


633Ibid., 1: 13.

634Smith et al., 155; Hein, 44, 144. The epithet of Amun-Re here is indeed \( nb \ nswt \ t\beta[wy] \ “Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands” \) as checked against Smith et al., plate 76 number 3, and not the translation given as “Lord of Thebes.”
with the \( Pth \) element preceding the \( Sthy \) element.\(^{635}\) A second sandstone doorjamb (Buhen catalog number 1651; excavation number K10-59) coming from excavations in the forecourt colonnade of the South Temple contains just the prenomen of Seti II reading \( wsr-hprw-R^c\ mry-Jmn \ mry \ Jmn \ dj \ 5njh \ ) “Userkheperure Meryamun, Beloved of Amun, Given Life.”\(^{636}\)

The remaining architectural elements, mostly fragmentary lintels, doorjambs, and blocks, come from the Fortress of Buhen and not the South Temple as described previously. They feature his prenomen and nomen, either \( wsr-hprw-R^c\ mry-Jmn \ Sthy \ mrj.n-Pth \) or \( wsr-hprw-R^c\ stp.n-R^c\ Sthy \ mrj.n-Pth \) in one instance, or sometimes just his prenomen.\(^{637}\)

105. Stela 1745 of Viceroy of Nubia Khaemtjtry from Buhen\(^{638}\)

Location: Currently Unknown

\(^{635}\)Smith et al., 155, and plate 43 number 2; Hein, 44, 144.

\(^{636}\)Smith et al., 134, 213, and plates 33 number 1, 76 number 3; Hein, 44, 143.

\(^{637}\)See Smith et al., 95, 115, 117, 120, 196, 213, and plate 11 number 2, 22 number 5, 24 number 3, 26 number 3, 55, for Buhen catalog numbers 369 (excavation number J7-48) reading \( wsr-hpr[w]-R^c\ [Sthy] [mrj.n-Pth] \), 1400 (excavation number H9-35) with just the first part of the prenomen \( wsr-hpr[w]-R^c\ ) preserved, 1426 (excavation number H9-60) reading \( wsr-hprw-R^c\ stp.n-R^c\ Sthy \ mrj.n-Pth \), 1498 (excavation number I9-3) reading \( [wsr]-hprw-R^c\ mrj-Jmn \ Sthy \ mrj.n-Pth \), 1538 (excavation number J9-12) reading \( [wsr-hprw-R^c]\ mry-Jmn [Sthy] mrj[n]-Pth \). See also Hein, 43, 143.

\(^{638}\)References: KRI 4: 282; RITA 4: 202; Dodson, Ramesses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 30; Habachi, “King Amenmesse and Viziers Amenmose and Kha’emtore,” 64-65; Hein, 44, 143; Iskander, 363-64; Smith et al., 150-51, and plate 41 number 3; Spalinger, review of Elephantine-Stele des Setthnakh, 275-76.
Discussion and Comments on Number 105

During the Egypt Exploration Society’s 1963-1964 season at Buhen, excavations in the South Temple forecourt discovered a badly fragmented stela (Buhen catalog 1745; excavation number K10-63). The top of the stela shows a king wearing the red crown offering nw jars to “Horus Lord of Buhen” (Ḥr nb Bhn), and the bottom shows a kneeling official of which only the arm appears readily visible in the only available drawing. The battered inscription before the king reads nswt bjtj nb t3wy [wsr-hprw]-Rˁ [mry-Jmn] “King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands, [Userkheperure] [Meryamun], while the inscription before the largely missing official reads jr.n z3-nswt n Kš jmj-r h3swt nbw Hathor-[m-t-trj] “Made by the King’s Son of Kush, the Overseer of Gold Countries, Kha[emtjtry].”

Viceroy Khaemtjtry is known from other monuments at Buhen, especially the inner south jamb of the main doorway and the western face of pilaster five at the South Temple, as well as two sandstone doorjamb fragments (Buhen catalog 442, 1187; excavation numbers J7-121, J8-37) from the town and fort at Buhen. However, Khaemtjtry worships the prenomen and nomen of Merneptah in the South Temple. On Stela 1745 the preserved prenomen shows a trace of a solar disc on the available drawing,

---

639Smith et al., 150-51 and plate 41 number 3.

640Ibid., KRI 4: 282; RITA 4: 202; Hein, 44, 143; Iskander, 363-64.

641PM 7: 133 (4W), 134 (5W); KRI 4: 97; RITA 4: 76-77; Caminos, New-Kingdom Temples of Buhen, 1: 16-17, 25, and plates 16, 26-28; Iskander, 363-64; Randall-MacIver and Woolley, 1: 22-25; idem, 2: plate 11; Smith et al., 96, 112, and plates 12 number 6, 21 number 3; Spieser, 110-11, 186, 291. An additional sandstone lintel described in Smith et al., 117, plate 24 number 3 (Buhen catalog 1498; excavation number 19-3), and Spieser, 193, 297, shows a kneeling viceroy holding a fan in his right hand while worshipping the cartouches of Seti II [w3r]-hprw-Rˁ mry-Jmn Ṣty mhjr.n-Pht. The name of the viceroy is totally destroyed and it is uncertain if this lintel depicts Khaemtjtry, Preemheb, or another viceroy entirely.
but H. S. Smith noted traces of further signs he took as those of Seti II’s prenomen $wsr$-$hprw$-$R^c$ [mry-Jmn]. Therefore, it appears that Viceroy Khaemtjtry served not only under Merneptah but into the reign of Seti II if the traces on Stela 1745 are indeed those of Seti II.  

An alternate scenario is that the name of Seti II on Stela 1745 may be an usurpation of the stela by Seti II from Amenmesse or the stela may preserve traces of Amenmesse’s prenomen of [mn-mj]-$R^c$. Labib Habachi, along with Anthony Spalinger, suggest that the name of Seti II is carved over that of Amenmesse, as it appears Viceroy Khaemtjtry became involved in the post-Amenmesse restorations and damnations carried out by Seti II in that Khaemtjtry’s name was almost completely erased from his monuments at Buhen.  

A fragmentary relief in the Oriental Institute Museum in Chicago (OI 10816) contains a cartouche of Amenmesse usurped by Seti II but more interestingly the name of a $t\!t\!y$ $h w h r$ $w n m n$ $n s w t$ jm$-r$ $n j w t$ $t\!t\!y$ $H^c$-$m$-$t$-$t r j$ “Fanbearer on the King’s Right Hand, Overseer of the City, and Vizier, Khaemtjtry” was usurped by a Preemheb who bore the same titles. Viceroy Khaemtjtry evidently became promoted to vizier under the reign

642Smith et al., 150-51 note 1. A picture of Stela 1745 is not provided in the publication of finds at Buhen, so Smith’s restorations are given in brackets. Habachi, “King Amenmesse and Viziers Amenmose and Kha’emtore,” 64-65, give a less tentative restoration of $wsr$-$[hprw]$-$R^c$ based on data given to him by Smith and Caminos.

643Smith et al., 151 note 3; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 30.


of Amenmesse and then became dismissed from the position upon Seti II gaining control of the throne. Such a scenario would explain the erasures directed in Buhen at Khaemtjtry, and the usurpation of his relief by Vizier Preemheb.646

For lack of a better classification, the following objects are all grouped as provenance unknown. That is, the original location of these objects is uncertain, unclear, or they appear in museum collections without their origin being on record.

Provenance Unknown

106. Limestone Pillar Fragment647

Location: Ägyptologische Sammlung, University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg Inventory number 12

Discussion and Comments on Number 106

A fragmentary limestone pillar in the Egyptian Museum of the University of Heidelberg (Inventory number 12) contains a line of text mentioning Seti II. The pillar was purchased in 1912 at Abusir, but it is uncertain if the original location was indeed

---

646Dodson, *Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy*, 54-55, 62; Habachi, “King Amenmesse and Viziers Amenmose and Kha’emtore,” 64-65, 66-67. A third Khaemtjtry is described as a sš mš “Army Scribe,” and sš nfrw n nb tīwy “Scribe of Recruits of the Lord of the Two Lands” on a stela in the British Museum (BM 139) from the reign of Merneptah, but it is unclear if this is Viceroy and later Vizier Khaemtjtry in an earlier stage of his career. For more on Army Scribe Khaemtjtry, see KRI 4: 124-25; RITA 4: 94-95; Dodson, *Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy*, 29; Iskander, 378-79.

Abusir or somewhere else. The preserved text reads ntr nfr k3w n Kmt nswt hjtj nb t3wy wsr-hprw-Rc mjr-Jmn z3-Rc “The Good God, Food of Egypt, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands, Userkheperure Meryamun, Son of Re.”

107. Quartzite Statue Base
Location: Described as for sale in Paris 1993; Currently Unknown

Discussion and Comments on Number 107

The exact history of this quartzite statue base of Seti II is unknown. In 1993, it was described as circulating amongst antiquities dealers in Paris presumably from a private collection. The front part of the base is missing along with parts of the preserved texts, but the inscriptions on the right and left sides clearly shows that it is an original work of Seti II. The left side of the base preserves Seti II’s Golden Horus name ć3-nrw-m-t3w-nbw “Great of Fear in All Lands,” followed by nsit hjtj wsr-hprw-Rc stp.n-Rc z3-Rc [Sih]y mjr.n-Pth shtp jb n Jtmw “King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Userkheperure Setepenre, Son of Re, [Set]i-Merneptah, who pleases the heart of Amun.” The right side has part of the Horus name of Seti II, [k3 nht wr]-phtj “[Mighty Bull, Great] of


651PM 8, part 1: 70 (800-665-500); Cabrol, 31.

652Cabrol, 32-33; PM 8, part 1: 70 (800-665-500)
Strength,” then the Nebty name of \( nht-hps \ dr-pdt-9 \) “Strong of Arm, Subduing the Nine Bows,” then followed by \( nswt \ bj\( ty \ wsr-hprw-R^c \ stp.n-R^c \ z\( t-R^c \ [Sth]y \ mrj.n-P\( th \) again.\(^653\)

Agnès Cabrol believes that the dimensions of the base suggests that it was intended to hold a sphinx and that because Seti II is described as \( shtp \ jb \ n \ Jtmw \) “who pleases the heart of Atum” the statue originally came from Heliopolis.\(^654\)

108. Usurped Limestone Relief in Brooklyn\(^655\)

Location: Brooklyn Museum 86.226.25 (formerly L 68.10.2)\(^656\)

Discussion and Comments on Number 108

The Brooklyn Museum has as part of its ancient Egyptian collection a limestone stela that once belonged to Ernst Erickson and is now a permanent part of the collection (86.226.25; formerly L 68.10.2). Brooklyn 86.226.25 is a fragmentary stela showing a seated Amun-Re, followed by a standing Queen Ahmose-Nefertari and part of a figure of her son, King Amenhotep I both in their deified forms. These three figures face to the

\(^653\)Cabrol, 32-33.

\(^654\)Ibid., 33-35.


\(^656\)Thanks to Mary Gow, Assistant Librarian at the Wilbur Library of Egyptology, and Edward Bleiberg, Curator of the Egyptian, Classical, and Ancient Middle Eastern Art at the Brooklyn Museum, for their assistance concerning this piece.
right, and a figure of a king would have been before them facing left but the stela is broken leaving behind just the offering address of the king. Based on a fragmentary line of text beneath the figures of Amun-Re, Ahmose-Nefertari, and Amenhotep I, this stela is most likely a private stela erected by a contemporary of the king whose figure is missing along with the worshiping figure of the stela owner.

The cartouches on Brooklyn 86.226.25 are very heavily gouged and battered so much that the royal name was deemed nearly unreadable. What signs exist today in the cartouches read as \textit{wsr-}[hpr]w-\textit{R}^\textit{r} [\textit{mrj}-\textit{Jmn}] [\textit{Sth}]\textit{y mrj. n-Pth}, the prenomen and nomen of Seti II. Due to their battered state, Rolf Krauss once suggested that these cartouches were erased by Amenmesse when he took over the Theban area as proof that Amenmesse is to be seen as a \textit{Gegenkönig} within the reign of Seti II. These battered cartouches actually show the opposite in that they show a somewhat sloppy job of erasing the original name and inscribing Seti II’s name within the erased cartouches. The normal pattern of erasures involving the name of Seti II is that the original name was chiseled away and the interior smoothed down to prepare the cartouche for Seti II’s name. For whatever reason, the cartouches were never smoothed down after hacking out the original name.

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
\item Fazzini, “Some Egyptian Reliefs in Brooklyn,” 54-55; Fazzini and Bianchi, 115-16; Gitton, 46 number 21. For the background of the Ernest Erickson Egyptian collection, see Fazzini and Bianchi, 97-132.
\item Fazzini, “Some Egyptian Reliefs in Brooklyn,” 55; Fazzini and Bianchi, 116. However, see Fazzini, “Some Egyptian Reliefs in Brooklyn,” 55 note 46, for a suggestion that this stela may be a royal stela instead of a private stela.
\item In examining a photograph provided by Edward Bleiberg, Curator of the Egyptian, Classical, and Ancient Middle Eastern Art at the Brooklyn Museum, the \textit{hpr} sign was not visible in \textit{wsr-hprw-R}^\textit{r} but the plural strokes are, hence the suggested transliteration. What looks like the \textit{mrj} in \textit{mrj-Jmn} looks to be there, but barely, so the reconstructed reading [\textit{mrj-Jmn}]. All but the Seth sign appears visible in the photograph as well.
\item Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (1. Teil),” 186.
\end{itemize}}
name, and the prenomen and nomen of Seti II were carved in the rough surfaces within the cartouches.\textsuperscript{661} Since the majority of Seti II usurpations are of Amenmesse monuments, the only king whose name could have originally been in these cartouches is Amenmesse himself, but the erasures were so thorough that no trace of Amenmesse’s titles are to be seen anywhere in the cartouches.\textsuperscript{662}

As to the provenance of this piece, the records state that the dealer claimed the piece came from “Kama” a misunderstanding of either Karnak or Qurna, a village in Western Thebes.\textsuperscript{663} Richard Fazzini and Robert Bianchi point out that the deified Ahmose-Nefertari and Amenhotep I were subject of many cult stelae at Deir el-Medina, but that they were also subject of worship at temples near the modern village of Qurna such as the mortuary temple of Seti I. Based on these criteria, they suggest that Brooklyn 86.226.25 did indeed come from the area of Qurna. Aidan Dodson, however, believes that the stela fragment comes from chapel E at the Oratory of Ptah. The method of decoration, raised relief figures and sunk relief text closely resembles fragmentary remains of other scenes from the Oratory of Ptah with Amenmesse’s name on them, and it is conceivable that the ancient Egyptian artist(s) who worked at the Oratory of Ptah also did work at other locations in Western Thebes.\textsuperscript{664} On the contrary, there is nothing definite to support

\textsuperscript{661}Fazzini and Bianchi, 116; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 143 note 42.

\textsuperscript{662}Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 143 note 42; Dodson, “Amenmesse in Kent, Liverpool, and Thebes,” 124 note 47. Fazzini and Bianchi, 116, suggest that the original name was Ramesses II based on stylistic considerations of the figures of Amun-Re, Ahmose-Nefertari, and Amenhotep I, but there are no instances, if any, of Seti II usurping Ramesses II.

\textsuperscript{663}Fazzini, “Some Egyptian Reliefs in Brooklyn,” 55 note 44; Fazzini and Bianchi, 116.

\textsuperscript{664}Thanks to Dr. Peter Brand for making this suggestion.
Dodson’s suggestion other than the fact that the village of Qurna is not far from the Oratory of Ptah and conceivably a modern villager could have gone to the Oratory, removed Brooklyn 86.226.25 and later sold it to an antiquities dealer.  

109. Sandstone Stela of Seti II before Amun

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo TR 21/6/24/14

Discussion and Comments on Number 109

Little information is available about this unpublished stela in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo (TR 21/6/24/14) except the briefest mention in the newer Porter and Moss series where it is described as the “upper part of a round-topped stela” showing “Sethos II in adoration before Amun.”

110. Limestone Block with cartouche of Seti II

Location: Petrie Museum University College, London UC 14383

---


667 Ibid.


669 Another block might be in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (JE 85584) as referenced in Engelbach, “A List of the Royal Names on the Objects in the ‘King Fouad I Gift’ Collection,” 221, 226. Engelbach merely describes it as “objects from foundation and other deposits,” and the piece seems unpublished other than this brief mention. Based on the description, it might not even be a foundation block.
Discussion and Comments on Number 110

This limestone block in the Petrie Museum in London (UC 14383) is vaguely mentioned in the available literature.\textsuperscript{670} UC 14383 has a $nb$ and a $t$ sign preserved at the top followed by the nomen $Sth\text{ }mrj.n$-$Pth$.\textsuperscript{671} Identified as belonging to Seti II, the nomen cartouche of UC14383 is written like that of Seti I with the $Pth$ element written first followed by the $Sth\text{ }$and $mrj.n$ elements, which is not noted in the literature, so there is a possibility that this is either a rare variant of Seti II’s nomen, or the block is that of Seti I.\textsuperscript{672} This limestone block closely resembles similar blocks in the Petrie Museum (UC14375-77) found covering foundation deposits at the mortuary temples of Siptah and Tausert, but the provenance and excavation details of this block is unknown.\textsuperscript{673}

\textsuperscript{670}PM 8, part 5: 804-049-600; Stewart, 1: 9.

\textsuperscript{671}Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, “Museum Number-UC14383.”

\textsuperscript{672}Stewart, 1: 9; PM 8, part 5: 804-049-600. In looking at the titulary of Seti I in Beckerath, \textit{Königsnamen}, 150-51 E2, the nomen on UC 14383 matches that of Seti I found on a pillar (number 8) at the Speos Artemidos at Beni Hasan. For this inscription, see KRI 1: 43; RITA 1: 36; RITANC 1: 47; Brand, \textit{Monuments of Seti I}, 54-56.

\textsuperscript{673}The author wishes to thank Rupinder Padda and Ivor Pridden of the Petrie Museum University College, London for their assistance in checking museum records concerning UC 14383. For similar foundation stones of Siptah (UC 14375), Bay (UC 14376), and Tausert (UC 14377), see PM 2: 429, 447; Stewart, 1: 6-7, and plate 4 number 2, 5, 8; Petrie, \textit{Six Temples at Thebes}, 14-17, and plate 17 numbers 2, 11-12; Weinstein, 233, 235-38, 241-44, 266-270, 290. PM 8, part 5: 804-049-599, indicates that UC 14382 is a sandstone block with the nomen of Merneptah and PM 8, part 5: 804-049-601, indicates that UC 14384 is a sandstone block with the cartouche of Thutmose IV. Charles Van Siclen III, “Tuthmosid Varia [VIII-IX],” \textit{VA} 7 (1991): 159-60, believes UC 14384 comes from the mortuary temple of Thutmose IV, and this suggests that these blocks in the Petrie Museum might be from Petrie’s 1896 excavations at the mortuary temples of these kings in Western Thebes. However, they could likely be from somewhere else entirely.
111. Scarabs with Prenomen \textit{wsr-hpr(w)-R\textsuperscript{r} stp.n-R\textsuperscript{r}} or \textit{wsr-hprw-R\textsuperscript{r} stp.n-R\textsuperscript{r}} (figures 6.40A-B)\textsuperscript{674}

Locations: Petrie Museum University College, London UC 12846-47, 12849, 12851-62; British Museum, London BM 4116, 24205, 24206, 30621, 32346, 32430, 32452, 38563, 38724, 38739, 38779, 39826, 40842, 41972, 41993, 42370, 42449, 42748, 49771; Egyptian Museum, Cairo CG 36284-85\textsuperscript{675}; Former Fouad S. Matouk collection, 693 (M.V.8), 700-702 (M.V.9-11), 698 (M.VI.6), 697 (M.VI.8), 694 (M.VII.4) now in Bibel+Orient Museum University of Freiburg, Switzerland\textsuperscript{676}

\textsuperscript{674}References KRI 4: 276; RITA 4: 198; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 137; Hall, Catalogue of Egyptian scarabs, 229-30, numbers 2279-94; Matouk, Corpus du scarabée égyptien, 1: 114 (numbers 693-94, 696-98, 700-702), 195 (numbers 661, 663-664, 218 (numbers 693-94, 697-98, 700-702); Percy Edward Newberry, Scarab-Shaped Seals, Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire nos. 36001-37521 (London: Archibald Constable, 1907), 72, and plate 5; idem, Scarabs, 183 and plate 36:4; Petrie, Historical Scarabs, plate 19 numbers 1623-32; idem, Scarabs and Cylinders with Names, plate 44 numbers 19.8:8-18. BM 30621 has additional element \textit{mrj-R\textsuperscript{r}}. See also the British Museum’s online catalog entry by entering “30621” at <http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/museum_no__provenance_search.aspx>.

\textsuperscript{675}According to Engelbach, “A List of the Royal Names on the Objects in the ‘King Fouad I Gift’ Collection,” 226, additional Seti II scarabs in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo are found under the numbers JE 74610-74629, but it is unknown if they feature prenomen, nomen, or both.

\textsuperscript{676}Not described are variant scarabs with additional epithets such as \textit{wsr-hpr(w)-R\textsuperscript{r} stp.n-R\textsuperscript{r}} (\textit{Jmn}) (BM 24204), \textit{wsr-hpr(w)-R\textsuperscript{r} hq3-Wist nb-t\textasciitilde{im}} (BM 26621), \textit{wsr-hprw-R\textsuperscript{r} M\textsuperscript{r}t} (BM 42634), \textit{wsr-hpr(w)-R\textsuperscript{r} stp.(n-R\textsuperscript{r}) nb-M\textsuperscript{r}t} (BM 37865). Further scarabs in the British Museum (BM 38722, 38732, 37759) are said to contain the names of Seti II, but this is probably in error as these scarabs are given a date to the reign of Twenty-First Dynasty King Siamun. For more on these scarabs, see Hall, Catalogue of Egyptian scarabs, 230 numbers 2296-98, 231 number 2300, 239 number 2390, 240 numbers 2392, 2396.
Discussion and Comments on Number 111

These scarabs, mostly in steatite ranging from white to brown and green, fit into a category of having Seti II’s prenomen written as $wsr-xpr(w)-Ra stp.n-R^c$, without the plural strokes, or $wsr-hprw-R^c stp.n-R^c$.\(^{677}\) One scarab, BM 30621 has the additional element of $wsr-hprw-R^c stp.n-R^c mrj-R^c$.

---

\(^{677}\)KRI 4: 276; RITA 4: 198; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 137; Hall, Catalogue of Egyptian scarabs, 229-30, numbers 2279-94; Matouk, Corpus du scarabée égyptien, 1: 114 (numbers 693-94, 696-98, 700-702), 195 (numbers 661, 663-664), 218 (numbers 693-94, 697-98, 700-702); Newberry, Scarab-Shaped Seals, 72, and plate 5; idem, Scarabs, 183 and plate 36:4; Petrie, Historical Scarabs, plate 19 numbers 1623-32; idem, Scarabs and Cylinders with Names, plate 44 numbers 19.8:8-18.
112. Scarab with Nomen Swty mrj.n-Pth, Sthy mrj.n-Pth, or Sthy mrj.(n)-Pth.\textsuperscript{678}

Location: Former Duke of Northumberland Collection Alnwick Castle;\textsuperscript{679} Petrie Museum University College, London UC 12617-18, 12647A; British Museum, London BM 30599, 39111

Discussion and Comments on Number 112

A steatite scarab once part of the Duke of Northumberland Collection at Alnwick Castle contains a nomen reading Swty mrj.n-Pth.\textsuperscript{680} Although attributed to Seti II, it may just be that of Seti I as the prenomen is written \begin{footnotesize} \[
\text{PtH}
\end{footnotesize} \text{Swty} \begin{footnotesize} \[
\text{PtH}
\end{footnotesize} \text{mrj.} \text{with the Pth before the Swty element in a manner highly reminiscent of the way Seti I wrote his name. Backing up this conclusion is a different description by Samuel Birch of the same scarab except that he describes it as double sided. Birch’s description of one side matches the cartouche Swty mrj.n-Pth while the other side reads Sthy mrj.n-Pth \begin{footnotesize} \[
\text{PtH}
\end{footnotesize} \text{mrj.} \text{with the seated Osiris figure replacing the Seth animal.} \textsuperscript{681} Again, the Pth element is written before the Sth element making this a probable scarab of Seti I.

The other scarabs in this group, made of faience and steatite in blue and green, in the collection of the Petrie Museum University College, London (UC 12617-18, UC

\textsuperscript{678}References: KRI 4: 276; RITA 4: 198; Birch, 143 number 1067; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 138; Hall, Catalogue of Egyptian scarabs, 201 number 2006-2007; Matouk, Corpus du scarabée égyptien, 1: 114 number 665, 195 number 665; Newberry, Scarabs, 183 and plate 36: 4.

\textsuperscript{679}KRI 4: 276; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 138; Newberry, Scarabs, 183.

\textsuperscript{680}KRI 4: 276; RITA 4: 198; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 138; Matouk, Corpus du scarabée égyptien, 1: 114 number 665, 195 number 665; Newberry, Scarabs, 183 and plate 36: 4.

\textsuperscript{681}Birch, 143 number 1067, if his drawing is interpreted correctly here, who refers to this particular scarab as “of doubtful authenticity.”
12647A) and the British Museum in London (BM 30599, 39111), feature the nomen of Seti II written with the Seth animal and read \( \text{Sthy mrj.n-Pt} \) (UC 12617-18; BM 30599) and \( \text{Sthy mrj(n)-Pt} \) (BM 39111). Hall classifies BM 30599 and BM 39111 as scarabs of Seti I. Certainly, the nomen \( \text{Sthy mrj.n-Pt} \) written on BM 39111 matches that of Seti I with the \( \text{Pt} \) element written before the \( \text{Sthy} \), but BM 30599 shows the nomen written exactly as the nomen of Seti II, so BM 30599 must be reclassified as a scarab of Seti II.

113. Steatite, Carnelian, and Faience Scarabs with Prenomen Variant \( \text{wsr-hpr(w)-R} \text{ mrj-Jmn} \) or \( \text{wsr-hprw-R} \text{ mrj-Jmn} \)

Location: Petrie Museum University College, London UC 12845, 12869, 71881; British Museum, London BM 32400; Louvre, Paris E 6292; Museo Archaeologio, Florence 1096; Former Fouad S. Matouk collection 696 (M.V.12) now in Bibel+Orient Museum University of Freiburg, Switzerland

---


Petrie, *Historical Scarabs*, plate 19 numbers 1634-35, gives E 6292 for his number 1635 but no reference for his 1634.

Florence 1096 described as carnelian in Guidotti, Andrenucci, and Fiorani, “Scarabeo con nome reale SAT 1096.”
Discussion and Comments on Numbers 113

All these scarabs in green or buff faience, carnelian, or steatite bear the variant prenomen $wsr-hpr(w)-R^e\ mrj-\ Jmn$ or $wsr-hprw-R^e\ mrj-\ Jmn$.\(^{686}\)

114. Faience Scarabs with Prenomen $wsr-hpr(w)-R^e\ mrj-\ Jmn$ or $wsr-hprw-R^e\ mrj-\ Jmn$ and Nomen $Sth\ mrj.n-Pth$\(^{687}\)

Location: Petrie Museum University College, London UC 12874-76; British Museum, London BM 42213; University of Glasgow Hunterian Museum, Glasgow GLAHM D.1920.52; Former Fouad S. Matouk collection 691 (M.V.1), 690 (M.V.2/3) now in Bibel+Orient Museum University of Freiburg, Switzerland\(^{688}\)

Discussion and Comments on Number 114

These faience scarabs in the British Museum (BM 42213), the Petrie Museum (UC 12874-76), the Hunterian Museum of the University of Glasgow (GLAHM D.1920.52) and the Bibel+Orient Museum at the University of Freiburg contain the full prenomen


\(^{688}\)Not described is a variant scarab with prenomen and nomen variants $(wsr)-hpr(w)-R^e\ Sth(y)\ nb-(t\ wy)$ (BM 16994). See Hall, *Catalogue of Egyptian scarabs*, 231, number 2299.
and nomen of Seti II \( \text{hsr-hpr(w)-Ra} \text{mrj-Jmn Sthy mrj.n-Pth} \) and \( \text{hsr-hprw-R} \text{ mrj-Jmn Sthy mrj.n-Pth} \) (Matouk 690-91). An additional detail is that the prenomen and nomen cartouches feature plumed solar discs.\(^{689}\)

115. Scarab with Prenomen \( \text{hsr-hprw-R} \text{ (mrj)-(J)mn} \) over King in a Chariot shooting at a Captive (figure 6.41)\(^{690}\)

Location: Currently Unknown

6.41. Scarab with prenomen \( \text{hsr-hprw-R} \text{ (mrj)-(J)mn} \) over king in a chariot shooting at a captive. From Newberry, Scarabs, plate 36:7

Discussion and Comments on Number 115

This interesting scarab was described by Percy Newberry in his publication on scarabs after being seen in an antiquities dealer’s shop in Luxor. It shows a king in a chariot

\(^{689}\)KRI 4: 276; RITA 4: 198; Gauthier, Le livre des rois d’Egypt, 3: 138; Hall, Catalogue of Egyptian scarabs, 229, number 2277; Matouk, Corpus du scarabée égyptien, 1: 113 numbers 690-91, 195 number 659; 218 numbers 690-91; Newberry, Scarabs, 183 and plate 36:3; Petrie, Scarabs and Cylinders with Names, plate 45 number 19.8: 28-30.

\(^{690}\)References: KRI 4: 276; RITA 4: 198; Newberry, Scarabs, 183, and plate 36:7; Matouk, Corpus du scarabée égyptien, 1, 114 number 666, 195 number 666; idem, Corpus du scarabée égyptien, 2: 191 number 1675.
aiming his bow at a captive or enemy, and the signs over the king reads $wsr-hprw-R^e (mrj)-(J)mn$. Scarabs showing the motif of a king in a chariot, either aiming his bow or merely in the chariot, occur throughout ancient Egypt and Syria-Palestine but are not as common as other motifs found in collections worldwide.692

116. Buff Steatite Scarab with Prenomen $wsr-hpr(w)-R^e stp(.n)-R^e$ and Nomen $Sthy mrj.n-Pth$693

Location: Petrie Museum University College, London UC 12873

Discussion and Comments on Number 116

This single buff steatite scarab is part of the collection of the Petrie Museum in London (UC 12873). It is slightly damaged with a chip out of one corner, and the prenomen and nomen are $wsr-hpr(w)-R^e stp(.n)-R^e Sthy mrj.n-Pth$ “Userkheper(u)re Step(en)re, Seti-Merneptah.” Here again the nomen is written in a manner analogous to the nomen of Seti I.

691 KRI 4: 276; RITA 4: 198; Newberry, Scarabs, 183, and plate 36:7; Matouk, Corpus du scarabée égyptien, 1: 114 number 666, 195 number 666; idem, Corpus du scarabée égyptien, 2: 191 number 1675.

692 Matouk, Corpus du scarabée égyptien, 1: 114 number 666. For scarabs showing the king in a chariot, see Matouk, Corpus du scarabée égyptien, 2: 359-60 numbers 1659-78, 403 numbers 1708-1717; Dothan, Excavations at the Cemetery of Deir el-Balah, 44-45, showing a seal of Ramesses II.

693 References: KRI 4: 276; RITA 4: 198; Petrie, Scarabs and Cylinders with Names, plate 45 number 19.8:27.

117. Double sided Plaques with prenomen and nomen (figure 6.42)

Location: Petrie Museum University College, London UC 12871-72; British Museum, London BM 24188; Former Fouad S. Matouk collection 692 (M.V.7) now in Bibel+Orient Museum University of Freiburg, Switzerland

Transliteration UC 12871-72 and BM 24188: \textit{wsr-hprw-R^e mrj-Jmn Sthy mrj.n-Pth}

Transliteration Matouk 692 (M.V.7) \textit{wsr-hprw-R^e stp.n-R^e mrj-Jmn Sthy mrj.n-Pth}

Figure 6.42. Seti II plaques UC 12871-72. Detail of Petrie, \textit{Scarabs and Cylinders with Names}, plate 45 number 19.8:25-26.

Description and Comments on Number 117

These rectangular and cartouche shaped plaques feature the prenomen and nomen of Seti II written upon them. The examples from the Petrie Museum (UC 12871-72) are rectangular plaques in green faience and show the prenomen of Seti II \textit{wsr-hprw-R^e mrj-Jmn} “Userkheperure Meryamun” on one side and his nomen \textit{Sthy mrj.n-Pth} “Seti-

\begin{itemize}
\item Matouk, \textit{Corpus du scarabée égyptien}, 1: 114 number 660, 195 number 660.
\end{itemize}
Merneptah” on the reverse. The British Museum plaque (BM 24188) differs only in that it has Sthy mrj.n-Pth inscribed on both sides of the plaque. The plaque from the former Matouk Collection (692; M.V.7) is a cartouche shaped plaque made from white steatite and contains the full prenomen of Seti II wsr-hprw-R² stp.n-R² mrj-Jmn “Userkheperure Setepenre Meryamun” on one side and the normal nomen Sthy mrj.n-Pth on the reverse.

118. Faience Sphinx with Prenomen and Nomen (figure 6.43)
Location: Petrie Museum University College, London UC 12870
Transliteration: wsr-hprw-R² stp.n-R² Sthy mrj.n-Pth

References: KRI 4: 276; RITA 4: 198; Petrie, Scarabs and Cylinders with Names, plate 45 number 19.8:25-26. The author also thanks Rupinder Padda and Ivor Pridden of the Petrie Museum for their assistance in checking museum records concerning UC 12871-72. Petrie, Historical Scarabs, plate 19 number 1637, and Gauthier, Le livre des rois d’Egypt, 3: 138, record a plaque very similar to UC 12871-72 as coming from the Rijksmuseum in Leiden (652), but no additional information was made available.

Hall, Catalogue of Egyptian scarabs, 229 number 2278.

Matouk, Corpus du scarabée égyptien, 1: 114 number 692, 195 number 660. The photo of the plaque in Matouk, Corpus du scarabée égyptien, 1: 218 number 692, only illustrates the side of the plaque with the full prenomen wsr-hprw-R² stp.n-R² mrj-Jmn.

References: KRI 4: 276; RITA 4: 198; Petrie, Scarabs and Cylinders with Names, plate 45 number 19.8:24.
Discussion and Comments on Number 118

In the collection of the Petrie Museum at the University College in London is a small faience sphinx belonging to Seti II (UC 12870). On the underside of the sphinx is written the prenomen and nomen of Seti II $wsr\cdot hprw\cdot R^e \ stp.\ n\cdot R^e \ Sthy \ mrj.\ n\cdot Pth$.\footnote{KRI 4: 276; RITA 4: 198; Petrie, Scarabs and Cylinders with Names, plate 45 number 19.8:24}

119. Wood Furniture Fragment (figure 6.44)$^{\footnote{References: KRI 4: 277; RITA 4: 198; Petrie, Scarabs and Cylinders with Names, plate 44 19.8:19.}}$

Location: Petrie Museum University College, London UC 12864

Transliteration: $wsr\cdot hprw\cdot R^e \ mrj\cdot Jmn$
Discussion and Comments on Number 119

UC 12864 in the Petrie Museum at the University College in London is a piece from some type of ancient Egyptian furniture or a decorative element for a temple or palace as evidenced by the tenons at the top and bottom of the piece. 703 Made of wood and showing traces of blue paint, UC 12864 is cartouche shaped and topped by a plumed solar disc with the cartouche having the prenomen \textit{wsr-ḥprw-Ra} \textit{mj-jmn}, which is the prenomen of Seti II. 704


\footnote{Ibid.}
120. Faience Plaques\textsuperscript{705}

Location: Egyptian Museum, Turin 6388; Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leiden AD6; Petrie Museum University College, London UC 12878A; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston MFA 03.1566

Discussion and Comments on Number 120

In the collections of the Egyptian Museum in Turin (6388), the Rijksmuseum in Leiden (AD6), and the Petrie Museum at University College in London (UC 12878A), and the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston (MFA 03.1566) are several blue faience plaques bearing either the prenomen and nomen $wsr$-$hprw$-$Ra$ $mrj$-$Jmn$ $mrj.n$-$PtH$ of Seti II (Turin 6388; Rijksmuseum van Oudheden AD6) or just his nomen $Sthy$ $mrj.n$-$PtH$ (UC12878A) often topped with solar plumes.\textsuperscript{706} These plaques strongly resemble those found or used in foundation deposits,


\textsuperscript{706}For Turin 6388, see KRI 4: 277; RITA 4: 198; Gauthier, Livre des rois, 3: 137; Petrie, History of Egypt, 3: 124, and figure 47. For Rijksmuseum van Oudheden AD6 see Maes, “Tegel met namen von Seti II RMO AD6.” UC 12878A is a bit faded when compared to the other two plaques. See Petrie, Buttons and Design Scarabs, plate 25 number 19.8.33. Weinstein, 266, states that MFA 03.1566 is of green faience and resembles the plaque in Turin and Leiden but is unpublished so far.
such as those found at the mortuary temples of Siptah and Tausert, but for what ultimate use these plaques were intended for is unknown.\textsuperscript{707}

121. Single Sided Faience Plaques or Tiles\textsuperscript{708}

Location: Petrie Museum University College, London UC 12865-68; British Museum, London BM 12857, 12930, 29214-15, 54821, 65432, 67970; Fitzwilliam Museum University of Cambridge, Cambridge E.93a-d.1937\textsuperscript{709}; Musées Royaux d’Art et d’Histoire, Brussels MR E.6172B, E.6393\textsuperscript{710}

Transliteration: \textit{wsr-hprw-Rc mrj-Jmn Sthy mrj.n-Pth}

\textsuperscript{707}For the foundation deposit materials from the mortuary temples of Siptah and Tausert, some in the Petrie Museum (UC 29234a-d, 29236A-C, 29239a-o, 29382a-b, 29383, 29393l, 29384, 29387a-d, 29388), see PM\textsuperscript{2} 2: 429, 447; Petrie, \textit{Six Temples at Thebes}, 13-17, and plates 16-18; Weinstein, 233, 235-38, 241-44, 266-270, 290.


\textsuperscript{709}Part of the Ricketts and Shannon Collection at the Fitzwilliam Museum, these fragmentary tiles contain the cartouches of Seti II with example E.93d.1937 having Ptah on the back. No further information is available. See the Fitzwilliam Museum’s online catalog entry by entering “Seti” at <http://www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/opac/search/search.html>.

\textsuperscript{710}Also add here or in the previous entry the examples cited by Dodson., “Decorative Phases of the Tomb of Sethos II,” 138 note 28, listed as coming from the Nationalmuseet in Copenhagen, The Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, in Leiden (RMO G571), and Metropolitan Museum of Art (MMA 10.130.1677-81). Dodson cites an addition example in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (JE 40426), but Pillet, “Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1921-1922),” 253, describes it as a cartouche of Seti I found in February 1893 at Mit Rahineh.
Discussion and Comments on Number 121

Theses faience plaques are all single sided featuring Seti II’s prenomen and nomen written in white on a blue to violet background. UC 12867 is a faience plaque broken into at least three pieces and later repaired. It probably would have been topped with a solar disc and plumes, but these appear to have not been recovered. UC 12867 contains the prenomen and nomen of Seti II \( \text{wsr-hprw-R} \ mrj-Jmn \)

---

\(^{711}\)Petrie, Scarabs and Cylinders with Names, plate 44, refers to them as “white in violet” with an additional comment as “faded.”
The other examples in the Petrie Museum are not as complete as UC 12867. UC 12865 is the upper third or less of a plaque topped by a plumed solar disc and preserves the signs \(\text{wsr-}hpr[w]-R^\circ\) while UC 12866 lacks the plumed solar disc, having been broken off some time in the past, and has the first part of Seti II’s prenomen \(\text{wsr-}hprw-R^\circ\). UC 12869 is the bottom half of a cartouche reading \([\text{Sthy}]\ \text{mrj.n-Pth}\) and differs slightly from UC 12867 in that UC 12869 uses the standing Ptah determinative.

The faience plaques or tiles in the British Museum (BM 12857, 12930, 29214-15, 54821, 65432, 67970), some complete and some fragmentary, are cartouche-shaped topped by a plumed solar disc with either the prenomen or both the prenomen and nomen written in the cartouche mostly blue on white in color. Most of these examples remain unpublished or unclearly described.

The faience examples in the Musées Royaux d’Art et d’Historie in Brussels (MR E.6172B, E.6393) are white with a bluish-grey background and resemble UC 12865 described above in that they contain intact solar plumes. MR E.6172B contains about

---

712KRI 4: 277; RITA 4: 198; Petrie, Scarabs and Cylinders with Names, plate 44 number 19.8:22.

713Petrie, Scarabs and Cylinders with Names, plate 44 19.8:20-21.

714Ibid., plate 44 19.8:23. Examples even more fragmentary than these can be found under UC29466 reading \(\text{mrj-Jmn}\), UC 34535 reading \(\text{wsr-hprw-R^\circ \ mrj-Jmn}\), and UC 34536 reading probably \(\text{wsr-hprw-[}R^\circ \ mrj-Jmn]\ Sth[y \ mrj.n-Pth]\).

715BM 67970 is about the only known example published in Parkinson et al., 109; Spencer and Schofield, 106. See also comments on BM 67970 and 12857 above concerning the faience plaques at the Ninth Pylon. For BM 12930, 29214-15, 54821, and 65432, see British Museum’s online catalog entries by entering “12930, 29214, 29215, 54821, 65432” at <http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/museum_no__provenance_search.aspx>.
half of a nomen reading *Sthy mrj[n-Pth]*, with the Seth sign gouged out but readable, and MR E.6393 reads *[wsr]-hprw-R* mrj-*Jmn* with damage causing the user sign to split away.716

Discussion and Comments on Numbers 111-21

The numerous collections of these scarabs, plaques, tiles, and other assorted artifacts stand out against the rare examples of such items bearing Amenemesse’s name. Unfortunately, many of these artifacts lack a clear provenance, which makes it almost impossible at reconstructing assemblages of similar items from known sites in Egypt.

Conclusions

Of all the one hundred twenty-two known monuments and other artifacts of Seti II categorized in this section, twenty-seven feature Seti II’s name on monuments belonging to another king. Not all these twenty-seven examples bear malicious intent, as most cases are simply Seti II adding his name to an earlier king’s monument like those of Ramesses II, Merneptah, or Thutmose IV (numbers 21, 22, 26, 101).717 Some examples are postumous as in the cases of Seti II’s name over Siptah (numbers 32, 34). By and large numerous examples of Seti II’s monuments feature his name and titulary over erased titles and names of an earlier king (numbers 49, 57-63, 65-66, 69-71, 73, 83-85, 88, 94). One of these erasures involves a line of text at the Ramesseum (number 88), but the majority of these erasures involve in some manner the reign of Amenmesse. Although

716A. De Caluwe, “Royal Cartouche KMKG-MRAH E.6172B.”; idem, “Royal Cartouche KMKG-MRAH E.6393.”

717It is not certain who the Tanis column, number 17, belonged to originally as not enough detail is given in Montet’s account.
Seti II has been unfairly blamed for erasing the cartouches and titulary of Merneptah, his father, on the walls of the Cour de la Cachette at the Temple of Karnak and at the Temple of Luxor (numbers 69-71, 83-85) Seti II merely inscribed his name on wall surfaces already erased by Amenmesse.

The question is then, how to see Amenmesse in relation to Seti II when it comes to monuments? As the legitimate king and successor of Merneptah, Seti II would have more surviving monuments than that of Amenmesse, who was considered the usurper. The numerous examples of the monuments of Seti II given in this section attest to that. Nonetheless, the state of KV 15, the tomb of Seti II, shows that there was more to Seti II’s reign than normally thought. If Seti II had six interrupted years of rule, then his tomb would be in a more complete state when he died in his sixth year of rule. The unusual pattern of erasures, restorations, and unfinished decoration through KV 15 suggests that something interrupted work for a period of time like the intervention of Amenmesse, an interloping king, during the reign of Seti II.

Many of Amenmesse’s monuments discussed previously feature his titles and cartouches usurped by Seti II. As the legitimate king, Seti II was tasked with these immense issues upon regaining power. Seti II not only had to erase Amenmesse’s name whenever he could find it, but he had to essentially restore the instances at Karnak and Luxor where Amenmesse apparently erased Merneptah’s name but did not carve his own (numbers 69-71, 83-85). Not only did Seti II have to attempt to suppress Amenmesse’s name wherever he could find it, but Seti II had to resume interrupted work like that in
KV 15 in the Valley of the Kings. The fact that KV 15 was hastily finished and several examples of Amenmesse’s name were haphazardly erased or not at all shows that Seti II simply ran out of time before he could accomplish these tasks.
Chapter 7

The Viceroy of Kush Messuy and the Historical Identity of Amenmesse

The description and analysis of the monuments of Amenmesse and Seti II in the preceding sections have focused on their inscriptions and the patterns of usurpations and erasures on each monument. It has become apparent that although there are a number of instances where Amenmesse’s name and titulary is intact, more examples exist to show that Seti II erased Amenmesse’s name wherever he could and carved his name and, in some cases new titulary, over the areas once containing Amenmesse’s name. An even greater question is just exactly who was Amenmesse was historically? How is he to be identified within the genealogical and historical background of the late Nineteenth Dynasty? Glimpses into Amenmesse’s background have appeared previously in this work in analyses of Takhat, Amenmesse’s mother, and other members of the late Nineteenth Dynasty royal family. This following section will address the issues surrounding the historical identity of Amenmesse himself as it pertains to late Nineteenth Dynasty history.

One of the major issues surrounding the historical identity of Amenmesse comes from Rolf Krauss’ investigations into the chronology, genealogy, and historical questions surrounding the Nineteenth Dynasty during the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II. One of his theories is that Amenmesse was none other than the Viceroy of Kush Messuy. In Krauss’ scenario, Messuy was a genuine “King’s Son” appointed “King’s Son of Kush.” That is, Messuy was a royal son and member of the royal family who was appointed Viceroy of Nubia and for undetermined reasons decided to seize the throne from Seti II,
the legitimate king.¹ In the early 1990s, the Messuy was Amenmesse theory received another positive suggestion with the claim that images of the Viceroy Messuy at the Temple of Amada contained uraei added to their brows after they had been initially carved. This suggests that Messuy became king during or after his service as viceroy, and the uraei were added to reflect Messuy’s new updated status upon being crowned as Amenmesse.² In the following section, the monuments belonging to Viceroy Messuy will be presented along with a discussion of any evidence that they might prove that Messuy ruled as Amenmesse.

1. Graffito at Aswan on the Road to Philae (figure 7.1)³

Location: Believed in situ

---


²Krauss, Moïse le Pharaon, 139-40; Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 41-48.

Discussion and Comments on Number 1

Described as being located upon the road leading from Aswan to Philae, among many inscriptions in this area, this rock graffito depicts the Viceroy of Nubia Messuy standing before Merneptah (figure 7.1). Merneptah is seated in a royal chariot pulled by a team of horses and faces backwards towards Messuy with an outstretched right arm. Messuy stands before Merneptah and is holding a fan in both hands towards Merneptah. The

---

4PM 5: 247; Reisner, “Viceroys of Ethiopia,” 47 no. 15a; Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 47; idem, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 30; Dodson and Hilton, 182; Gauthier, “Les ‘fils royaux de Kouch,’” 214; Habachi, “Graffiti and Work of the Viceroys of Kush,” 33 number 34; idem, “Graffiti in the Area of the First Cataract,” 186, 188; idem, “Königsohn von Kusch,” 634; idem, “Viceroys of Kush during the New Kingdom,” 165; Iskander, 362; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 132-33; idem, Moïse le Pharaon, 145-46; de Morgan et al., 1: 18 number 87; Peden, Graffiti of Pharaonic Egypt, 110-11 note 310; Petrie,
inscription above and behind the figure of Messuy reads z3-nswt n Kš jmj-r h3swt rsw tly hw hr wnmj-nswt sš nswt ms-sw-y m3r hrw “King’s Son of Kush, Overseer of the Southern Foreign Lands, Fanbearer on the King’s Right Hand, Royal Scribe, Messuy, Justified.” Beneath the scene is an additional line of text reading z3-nswt n Kš tly hw hr wnmj-nswt sš nswt ms-sw-y m3r hrw “King’s Son of Kush, Fanbearer on the King’s Right Hand, Royal Scribe, Messuy, Justified.”

Sameh Iskander, following Labib Habachi, suggests that this rock graffito commemorates a campaign launched against a rebellion in Nubia recounted in Merneptah’s Year 5 text recorded in the Temples of Amada, Amarah West, Wadi es-Sebua, and Aksha (Serra West) due to the fact that Merneptah is depicted in his “war chariot.” Iskander expands his suggestion further to suggest that Messuy led the ancient Egyptian army in some manner due to his suggestion that Messuy possessed the title “Overseer of the Army of the Viceroy,” and Anthony Spalinger’s suggestion, followed by Kenneth Kitchen and A. J. Peden, is that Merneptah did not personally lead the ancient Egyptian Army against the Nubian rebellion.

Tempting as this suggestion

---

Season in Egypt, 8, and plate 2 number 70. Although frequently discussed, the only known published picture of the entire scene is in de Morgan et al., Catalogue des monuments, 1: 18 number 87, as most accounts only reproduce the texts.

5KRI 4: 94; RITA 4: 74; LD 3: 200f; Reisner, “Viceroyos of Ethiopia,” 47 no. 15a; Dodson and Hilton, 182; Habachi, “Graffiti and Work of the Viceroyos of Kush,” 33 no. 34; Krauss, Moïse le Pharaon, 145-46; Iskander, 360, 362; de Morgan et al., 1: 18 number 87; Petrie, Season in Egypt, 8, and plate 2 number 70.

6Iskander, 363; Habachi, “Graffiti and Work of the Viceroyos of Kush,” 33 number 34. Anthony J. Spalinger, Aspects of the Military Documents of the Ancient Egyptians, Yale Near Eastern Researches 9 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), 8-9, 12-14, 20-21, 32, 238, suggests that because of the occurrence of the stereotypical jw.tw phrase in the Year 5 texts that the king did not specifically take part in the action described and could have left the campaign up to subordinates. What was most important, according to Spalinger, was to establish the action in space and time and then show that the king still maintained order through vanquishing his enemies albeit in an indirect way. Kenneth A. Kitchen, “Historical Observations on Ramesside Nubia,” in Ägypten und Kusch, ed. Erika Endesfelder et al. (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1977), 222, and Peden, Graffiti of Pharaonic Egypt, 115, both say that Messuy “more likely” suppressed
may be, there is nothing to suggest that this graffito is linked specifically to Merneptah’s campaign against Nubia as recounted in his Year 5 inscriptions or that Messuy participated in such a campaign on behalf of Merneptah. Additionally, the alleged title of “Overseer of the Army of the Viceroy,” actually belongs to another person and not to Messuy.7

2. Graffito at the Island of Bigeh at Aswan8

Location: in situ

Discussion and Comments on Number 2

Behind the Greco-Roman temple on the island of Bigeh at Aswan, a graffito of Messuy is “carved on large granite boulders piled by natural forces toward the south end of the northern hill.”9 The inscription reads simply [symbol image]

the Nubian rebellion. For the Year 5 inscription at the Temple of Amada see the following under the Temple of Amada.

7See doorjamb from Aniba tomb SA 36 below.


9Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse: Nachträge,” 178; PM 5: 256 (9B). For the general area where this graffito is located, although not explicitly mentioned, see Weigall, Report on the Antiquities of Lower Nubia, 35.
ns\textit{wt} n K\textit{s} ms-sw-y “King’s son of Kush, Messuy” with no additional titles.\textsuperscript{10}

Considerable speculation about this graffito existed for many years due to the fact that it had been associated with a nearby cartouche of Seti II suggesting that Messuy was also viceroy into the reign of Seti II. Indeed, it might be said that Messuy’s graffito was in essence “offering to” the cartouche of Seti II.\textsuperscript{11} In contrast to this suggestion is that a fresh examination by William Murnane in 1995 shows that there is no connection between the Messuy graffito and the Seti II cartouche. The Seti II cartouche is carved on a rock above that of Messuy and that the two cartouches “are not contemporary” because the rocks and inscriptions of these two graffiti face different directions and that Messuy would have carved Seti II’s name on the boulder containing his inscription if he indeed wanted to show a connection to the reign of Seti II.\textsuperscript{12}


\textsuperscript{12}Ibid. See also comments in chapter 6 on the monuments of Seti II.
3. Messuy scene from the Inner Doorway of the Beit el-Wali Temple of Ramesses II
(figure 7.2)\textsuperscript{13}

Location: \textit{in situ}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure7.2.jpg}
\caption{Scene of the Viceroy Messuy from Beit el-Wali. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{13}References: PM 7: 25 (22) and plan on 22; \textit{KRI} 4: 94; \textit{RITA} 4: 75; \textit{LD} 3: 176g; Champollion, \textit{Monuments}, 74; Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 47; idem, \textit{Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy}, 30; Gauthier, “Les ‘fils royaux de Kouch,’” 213-14; Habachi, “Königsohn von Kusch,” 634; idem, “Viceroy of Kush during the New Kingdom,” 165; Iskander, 360-61; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 132-33; Peden, \textit{Graffiti of Pharaonic Egypt}, 115 note 343; Reisner, “Viceroy of Ethiopia,” 47 number 15b; Roeder, \textit{Felsentempel von Bet el-Wali}, 52-53 [236-38], 166-67 [548], and plate 21b; Ricke, Hughes, and Wente, 23, and plate 21; Sharpe, 2: 59.
Description and comments

Located on the central doorway leading into the vestibule of the Temple of Beit el-Wali dating to the beginning of the reign of Ramesses II, an image of Viceroy Messuy is on the left thickness that shows him kneeling and holding a fan and a piece of cloth in his left hand. Around his forehead is a headband or fillet with a knotted tassel on the back of his head (figure 7.2). The inscription before, above, and behind Messuy reads $z\dot{s}-nswt n K\dot{s} t\ddot{y} hw hq\dddot{z} hr wnmj-nswt 'g\ddot{z} [s]w hr wnmj.f s\dddot{s} nswt ms-sw-y stp n t\dddot{3} smr “King's Son of Kush, Fan and Scepter Bearer on the King’s Right Hand, Who Positions Himself on His Right, Royal Scribe, Messuy, Chosen of the South.”

4. Faience Ushabti of Messuy from Tomb Number Five at Wadi es-Sebua

Location: Currently Unknown

---

14PM 7: 25 (22) and plan on 22; LD 3: 176g; Champollion, Monuments, 74; Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 47; idem, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 30; Gauthier, “Les ‘fils royaux de Kouch,’” 214; Habachi, “Königsohn von Kusch,” 634; idem, “Viceroy of Kush during the New Kingdom,” 165; Iskander, 360-361; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 133-34; Peden, Graffiti of Pharaonic Egypt, 115 note 343; Reisner, “Viceroy of Ethiopia,” 47 number 15b; Roeder, Felsentempel von Bet el-Wali, 52-53 [236-38], 166-67 [548], and plate 21b; Ricke, Hughes, and Wente, 23, and plate 21; Sharpe, 2: 59. Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 133-34, along with Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 44 note 21, suggest that this tasseled headband might be a Messuy trait, but other viceroys such as Viceroy Heqanakht and Huy II from the reign of Ramesses II are shown wearing similar headbands, so the feature need not be uniquely that of Messuy. For depictions of Viceroy Heqanakht and Huy II, see Spieser, 189, 222-23, 293, 317; Habachi, “Graffiti and Work of the Viceroy of Kush,” 29-30 (26, 27b) and plate 8.

15KRI 4: 94; RITA 4: 75; Ricke, Hughes, and Wente, 23. RITA 4: 75 suggests the alternate translation of “Who Stationed Him at His Right (Hand)” for ’g\ddot{z} [s]w hr wnmj.f.

Discussion and Comments on Number 4

This ushabti of Messuy was discovered during excavations in the tombs surrounding Wadi es-Sebua from 1929 to 1931 by the Egyptian Antiquities Service. In debris cleared from above the court of tomb five, excavators discovered a single faience ushabti reading

\[ \text{zh} \text{h} \text{d} \text{Wsjr zt-nswt n Kš jmj-r} \]

\[ \text{hšwt rsw ms-sw-y} \text{ “The Sehedj, The Osiris, King’s Son of Kush, Overseer of the Southern Foreign Lands, Messuy.”} \]

The exact context of this ushabti is unknown, as it was found outside tomb five and not inside the tomb. Messuy burial goods were found in a greater context at Aniba, so it has been suggested that this might be a second tomb for Messuy, or an ushabti donated to a subordinate of the viceroy buried at Wadi es-Sebua.18


4. Scenes of Messuy Worshipping Titles of Merneptah on Outer Doorjambs of the Temple of Amada (figures 7.3-4)  

Location: in situ

Figure 7.3. Figure of Messuy from Temple of Amada left outer jamb. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.

Discussion and Comments on Number 4

On the outer door jambs of the Eighteenth Dynasty Temple of Amada, there are two scenes of the Viceroy Messuy worshiping the cartouches of Merneptah carved beneath scenes of Amenhotep II and Thutmosis III being embraced by Re-Harakhty. On the right and left jambs, Messuy is shown kneeling and holding a ḫqa scepter and fan in one hand.\(^{20}\)

\(^{20}\)PM 7: 67 (1-2) and plan on 66; el-Achiery, Barguet, and Dewachter, Temple d’Amada, 1: plate 2, (A2,4), plate 4 (2, 4); Barguet and Dewachter, Temple d’Amada, 2: 3-4, 16 note 5 (B2, 4), plate 3 numbers 3-4 (B2, 4), and plate 100 numbers 169-70; Barguet, Youssef, and Dewachter, Temple d’Amada, 3: 1-2 (B2, 4), and plate 1 Porte B2,4; Aly, Hamid, and Dewachter, Temple d’Amada, 4: B1-4; 14-15; Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 41-48; idem, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 30, 41-43; Gauthier, Temple d’Amada, 181-83, and plate 40a; Habachi, “Königsohn von Kusch,” in Lexikon der Ägyptologie, 3: 634; idem, “Viceroy of Kush during the New Kingdom,” 165; Iskander, “Reign of Merenptah,” 361; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 132-33; idem, Moïse le Pharaon, 139-40; Peden, Graffiti of Pharaonic Egypt, 115 note 343; Reinsner, “Viceroy of Ethiopia,” 47 number 15d; Spieser, 30, 91, 110, 185, 290 (9A-B); Weigall, Report on the Antiquities of Lower Nubia, 104; Yurco, “Was Amenmesse the Viceroy of Kush, Messuwy?” 50-55.

Figure 7.4. Figure of Messuy from Temple of Amada right outer jamb. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.
hand while the other hand worships Merneptah’s prenomen on the left and his nomen on
the right (figures 7.3-7.4). Messuy’s inscription on the left jamb reads $jn\ kr\ z\text{-}nswt\ n\ Kš\ ms-[sw]-y\ [m3]\ hrw$ “By the Ka of the King’s Son of Kush, Mes[Su]y, [Justified]”
while the right jamb reads $jn\ kr\ z\text{-}nswt\ n\ Kš\ ms-sw-y\ m3\ hrw$ “By the Ka of the King’s Son of Kush, Messuy, Justified.”$^{21}$

Even though there are claims that the condition of the inscriptions containing
Messuy’s name reflects some malicious attempt to erase it, the condition of the
inscription today reflects the actions of erosion and not humans.$^{22}$ Ricardo Caminos
observed that Messuy’s name “has certainly not been the subject of malicious damage” in
his other attestations at Amada, and Aidan Dodson reached a similar conclusion years
later in that the damaged portions resulted from the fracturing and abrading of the edges
of the blocks that the scenes are carved upon.$^{23}$ This natural erosion of the rock surface
gives rise to another question concerning Messuy’s status.

In a 1997 study, Aidan Dodson published an article based on a suggestion by Frank
Yurco that the images of the Viceroy Messuy be examined in light of Yurco’s initial
suspicion that Messuy’s scenes on the outer doorjambs had uraei added to them.$^{24}$

---

$^{21}$RI 4: 94-95; RITA 4: 75; el-Achiery, Barguet, and Dewachter, Temple d’Amada, 1: plate 2
(A2,4), plate 4 (2, 4); Barguet and Dewachter, Temple d’Amada, 2: 3-4, 16 note 5 (B2, 4), plate 3
numbers 3-4 (B2, 4), and plate 100 numbers 169-70; Barguet, Youssef, and Dewachter, Temple
d’Amada, 3: 1-2 (B2, 4), and plate 1 Porte B2,4; Aly, Abdel-Hamid, and Dewachter, Temple
d’Amada, 4: B1-4; 14-15.

$^{22}$Claims for deliberate damage include James Henry Breasted, “Oriental Exploration Fund of
the University of Chicago, First Preliminary Report of the Egyptian Expedition,” AJSL 23, no. 1
(October 1906): 46; Barguet and Dewachter, Temple d’Amada, 2: 3-4, 16 note 5.

$^{23}$Caminos, New-Kingdom Temples of Buhen, 1: 17 note 4; Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and
Amenmesse,” 44.

$^{24}$Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 44; Yurco, “Was Amenmesse the Viceroy of
Kush, Messuwy?” 51-52.
Dodson’s examination suggests that the scenes on the left and right doorjambs at the entrance of the Temple of Amada had *uraei* added to their brows strengthening Krauss’ suggestion that Messuy became Amenmesse upon being crowned or self-crowned as king. The scenes were essentially updated to reflect Messuy’s new kingly status as Amenmesse much in the manner *uraei* were added to images of Horemheb, Merneptah, and the Ramesside princes at Medinet Habu upon their ascension to the throne.\(^{25}\) At first glance, Dodson’s suggestion seems to be correct, but the images probably reflect something that ties into the weathered condition of the sandstone rocks.

In a rejoinder to Dodson’s study, Frank Yurco pointed out the often deceptive nature of Nubian sandstone exposed to the peculiarities of natural erosion and weathering. The peculiarity of extremely friable sandstone combined with harsh sunlight often leads researchers to misread and misinterpret carved surfaces.\(^{26}\) The assumed human actions towards Messuy’s name on the doorjambs are proof of what natural erosion and extremely friable and weathered sandstone surfaces can lead researchers to an erroneous interpretation as explained earlier. Likewise, the presumed *uraei* on Messuy’s figures upon the outer doorjambs at the Temple of Amada fall into the same category. The alleged *uraeus* on the left jamb is “not cleanly cut with tools” and is masked by “deep gashes” and heavily eroded strata in the sandstone surface.\(^{27}\) The *uraeus* on the right jamb also shows what Yurco concludes is a “collection of gashes and badly eroded strata lines, plus dubious vertical traces, formed of jagged lines, with hardly a trace of carved


\(^{26}\)Yurco, “Was Amenmesse the Viceroy of Kush, Messuwy?” 50-51.

\(^{27}\)Ibid., 52 (described as “right” jamb).
edge line” applicable to both alleged uraei on the figures of Messuy. Yurco therefore sees these uraei as phantom images created by gashes and reflecting “incidental strata erosion in the highly friable sandstone.”

As one last rejoinder, it is somewhat odd that no earlier epigraphic expedition took notice of these alleged uraei added to the figures of Messuy. Breasted and Gauthier made epigraphic collations at the Temple of Amada for their publications and certainly made no note of anything unusual concerning Messuy’s figures on the doorjambs. A full multivolume epigraphic publication of the Temple of Amada that was made during the Nubian rescue records “nothing unusual” and notes no uraei on the figures of Messuy. Further negating these alleged uraei is the fact that no other known figure of Messuy at Amada or anywhere else shows signs of added uraei as well.

---

28 Yurco, “Was Amenmesse the Viceroy of Kush, Messuwy?” 52.

29 Ibid., 54.


32 Yurco, “Was Amenmesse the Viceroy of Kush, Messuwy?” 52-53. Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 42, and idem, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 41-42, suggests that the “inconspicuous and inaccessible positions” of Messuy’s other scenes at Amada would not have been worthy of updating to reflect Messuy’s new status as king because they were not in a place of prominence as the Messuy’s scenes at the entrance.
8. Viceroy before Year 5 Inscription of Merneptah at the Temple of Amada (figure 7.5)\textsuperscript{33}

Location: \textit{in situ}

Figure 7.5. Image of a Viceroy before Merneptah’s Year 5 inscription. Photo courtesy of Dr. Peter Brand.

Discussion and Comments on Number 8

On the left thickness of the entrance leading into the Hypostyle Hall of the Temple of Amada, is the Year 5 inscription recounting Merneptah’s victories against the Libyans and Nubian rebels.\(^{34}\) Kneeling before the inscription, now somewhat masked by modern cement in the joints, is a male figure raising his right hand in worship while holding a fan in his left hand (figure 7.5).\(^{35}\) The descriptive text in front of and below the figure, whose name is completely erased, reads \(jn\ k.sm\ x t\ z.t{-nswt\ n\ [K\$]\ t\by\ hw\ hq\ 3\ hr\ wnmj{-nswt\ \s\\ s\ nswt\ […]\) “By the Ka of the King’s Son of [Kush], Fan and Scepter Bearer on the King’s Right Hand, Royal Scribe, […]”\(^{36}\) The erased name of this viceroy raises much debate over exactly who this figure portrays.

The majority of sources attribute this figure and text as belonging to the Viceroy Messuy even though the name is erased.\(^{37}\) James Breasted associated this inscription with the other inscriptions of Messuy on the exterior of the Temple of Amada because he thought those inscriptions showed signs of malicious damage and since the viceroy’s

\(^{34}\)For the Year 5 inscription and the lesser preserved parallels at Amarah West, Wadi es-Sebua, Aksha (Serra West), see KRI 4: 1-2, 33-37; RITA 4: 1-2, 29; Iskander, 131-39, 329-35; Černý, Temple d’Amada, 5: Inscription of Merneptah 1-3, and plates 4-6 bis, 8-11; Youssef, “Merenptah’s Fourth Year Text at Amada,” 273-80.

\(^{35}\)PM 7: 67 (5) and plan on 66; el-Achiery, Barguet, and Dewachter, Temple d’Amada, 1: plate 4 (8a-b); Barguet and Dewachter, Temple d’Amada, 2: plate 6; Aly, Abdel-Hamid, and Dewachter, Temple d’Amada, 4: B8; Černý, Temple d’Amada, 5: I-III, Inscription of Merneptah 1, and plates 2, 4, 8; Gauthier, Le temple d’Amada, 186-87, and plate 41.

\(^{36}\)KRI 4: 1, 37, 96; RITA 4: 1, 76; Černý, Temple d’Amada, 5: Inscription of Merneptah 1, and plates 2, 4, 8; Iskander, 132.

name was erased on the left thickness it must belong to Messuy.38 A similar conclusion was suggested by Jaroslav Černý during epigraphic work at Amada in the 1960s, and Kitchen restores the erased name as containing a trace reading \( ms-[sw-y?] \).39 In opposition to this suggestion is that Habachi and Ricardo Caminos both suggest that the erased name at Amada is not Messuy’s but that of the Viceroy Khaemtjtry. In just about every known instance of Viceroy Khaemtjtry’s name at the Temple of Buhen, his name has been erased in a manner similar to the inscription at the Temple of Amada.40 Therefore, there are two possibilities. Either this figure and inscription belong to the Viceroy Khaemtjtry, and his name was erased similar to how his name was erased at Buhen, as Habachi and Caminos suggest, or this belongs to Messuy as Černý reconstructed. The one fact negating Černý’s suggestion that the inscription belongs to Messuy is that Caminos observed that Messuy’s name “has certainly not been the subject of malicious damage” in his other attestations at Amada.41 Since the only other Viceroy dating to the reign of Merneptah is Khaemtjtry, whose name was definitely erased, there is a strong possibility this inscription belongs to him.

38Breasted, “Oriental Exploration Fund of the University of Chicago, First Preliminary Report,” 46, but note Gauthier, Temple d’Amada, 186-87, who recounts that it is impossible to say which viceroy this is.

39KRI 4: 1; Černý, Temple d’Amada, 5: I-III, Inscription of Merneptah 1. The brackets and question mark are added by the author. An interesting feature is that Černý, Temple d’Amada, 5: Inscription of Merneptah 1, says the name is erased and gives no reconstruction while Kitchen in RITA 4: 1, drops the trace \( ms \) sign entirely. See also Kitchen’s revised collation in KRI 4: 37 and 37 note 14a-a where he is less certain of his earlier reconstructions in KRI 4: 1.

40Habachi, “Königsohn von Kusch,” 634; idem, “Viceroy of Kush during the New Kingdom,” 165-66; Caminos, New-Kingdom Temples of Buhen, 1: 17 note 4; Peden, Graffiti of Pharaonic Egypt, 115. For the scenes at Buhen containing Viceroy Khaemtjtry’s erased name, see Caminos, New-Kingdom Temples of Buhen, 1: 16-17, 25, and plates 16, 26-28; Spieser, 110-11, 186, 291.

5. Inscription and Scene of Messuy Worshipping Re-Harakhty on Architrave 16 on Amada Temple (PM 7 South Doorway)\(^\text{42}\)

**Location:** *in situ*

Discussion and Comments on Number 5

Inscribed on Architrave 16 on the exterior of the south wall and directly adjacent to a doorway at the Temple of Amada is a scene and inscription of Messuy. The scene shows Messuy kneeling and holding a fan in his right hand as he worships an before an enthroned Re-Harakhty.\(^\text{43}\) The three lines of inscription behind Messuy refer to him as \(z^3-nswt \text{ n K}\text{s} \ t^3 y \ h\text{r q}i \ hr \ wnmj-nswt \text{ ms-sw-y m}\text{s} r \ hrw \ stp \ n t^3 \ sm\text{r} \) “King’s son of Kush, Fan and Scepter Bearer on the King’s Right Hand, Messuy, Justified, Chosen of the South.” The remainder of the inscription is a standardized encomium where Messuy praises Re-Harakhty on behalf of future viceroys and for the favors that Messuy currently


receives. It is not the standardized portion of this text that is debatable but an epithet amended to Messuy’s titulary at the beginning.

On the second line immediately following *stp n tˁ smr* “Chosen of the South” is a line interpreted by Krauss and Dodson as *zꜣ-nswt n ḫ.t.f* “Son of the King Himself.” This would mean that Messuy was a son of the reigning king, which Krauss suggests would be either Merneptah or Seti II depending on whose reign this graffito was carved. For this reason, using this interpretation of *zꜣ-nswt n ḫ.t.f*, Krauss and Dodson suggest Messuy was indeed a “King’s Son” appointed as Viceroy of Nubia. Although tempting, what is on the architrave differs from this interpretation.

The phrase in question, if taken to mean *zꜣ-nswt n ḫ.t.f* actually reads *zꜣ n n nswt ḫ.t.f*. There are two *n* signs written after the alleged *zꜣ* sign, and if one of the *n* signs is regarded as a mistake on part of the ancient Egyptian worker, the phrase is *zꜣ n nswt ḫ.t.f* “Son of the King Himself.” This is quite unusual in that there is no instance of the phrase *zꜣ-nswt* “King’s Son” being ever written in such a manner. If Krauss’ interpretation of *zꜣ-nswt n ḫ.t.f* is in error could there be another suggestion?

---

44 KRI 4: 95; RITA 4: 75; el-Achiery, Barguet, and Dewachter, *Temple d’Amada*, 1: plate 2 (T1), plate 21 (T1); Barguet and Dewachter, *Temple d’Amada*, 2: 3-4, and plate 103 numbers 175-76; Barguet, Youssef, and Dewachter, *Temple d’Amada*, 3: 57 (T1) and plate 1 (T1); Aly, Abdel-Hamid, and Dewachter, *Temple d’Amada*, 4: T1, 14-15; Gauthier, *Le temple d’Amada*, 191-92; Iskander, 360, 362.


46 KRI 4: 95; Barguet and Dewachter, *Temple d’Amada*, 2: 3-4, and plate 103 numbers 175-76; Barguet, Youssef, and Dewachter, *Temple d’Amada*, 3: 57 (T1) and plate 1 (T1); Aly, Abdel-Hamid, and Dewachter, *Temple d’Amada*, 4: T1, 14-15; Yurco, “Was Amenmesse the Viceroy of Kush, Messuwy?” 55.

47 See the objections to *zꜣ-nswt n ḫ.t.f* by Gutgesell and Schmitz, 131-32; Osing, 271 note 61. Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 140 note 31, tries to retrofit *zꜣ-nswt n*
Kitchen notes that the supposed z3 bird (Gardiner G 39), as inscribed upon the architrave, is “slimmer than s3” and questions reading it as such. 48 Looking at the epigraphic collations and photographs of the inscription done during the Nubian rescue shows a sign unlike a duck and more like a goose, or maybe an ibis. This then makes the Messuy inscription to read gm (Gardiner G 28), b3 (Gardiner G 29), 3h (Gardiner G 25; or variant G 26*/G 26A ) or tn (Gardiner G 41) n nswt and not z3 n nswt. 49 The most likely suggestion is that the sign is 3h making the phrase 3h n nswt ds.f “Effective for the King Himself.” 50 Parallels exist of similar titulary existing for Eighteenth Dynasty Viceroy Nehy and Usersetet reading 3h n nb t3wy and other parallels reading 3h n nb.f. 51

48KRI 4: 95 note 8a.

49 KRI 4: 95 note 8a. For G26A, see Hannig, 1347. Gauthier, Temple d’Amada, 191-92, records the sign as (Gardiner G 26), the ibis on a standard.

50 Gutgesell and Schmitz, 131-32; Osing, 271 note 61. Kitchen in RITA 4: 75, translates the phrase as “(to) whom His Majesty himself gave recognition.”

51 See references in Gutgesell and Schmitz, 133.
6. Column Graffito at Temple of Amada (el-Achiery, Barguet and Dewachter Column 4; PM 7 column 10)\textsuperscript{52}

Location: \textit{in situ}

Description and Comments on Number 6

This small graffito represents the only other attestation of Messuy at Amada and is located “on the exterior of the lower part of the capital of Column IV” on the southern wall of the temple.\textsuperscript{53} It shows a kneeling outstretched figure facing right, of which about half the body is preserved followed by a line of text reading \[ n k\hat{\beta} n z\hat{\beta} nswt n K\hat{\varepsilon} msSw-y m\hat{\imath} \hat{\varepsilon} hrw \] “[For the Ka] of the King’s Son of Kush, Messuy, Justified.”\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{52}References: PM 7: 69 (General Location as graffiti is not described) and plan on 66; KRI 4: 95; \textit{RITA} 4: 75; el-Achiery, Barguet, and Dewachter, \textit{Temple d’Amada}, 1: plate 2 (T2), plate 21 (T2); Barguet and Dewachter, \textit{Temple d’Amada}, 2: 3-4, and plate 104 numbers 177-78; Barguet, Youssef, and Dewachter, \textit{Temple d’Amada}, 3: 57 (T2) and plate 1 (T2); Aly, Abdel-Hamid, and Dewachter, \textit{Temple d’Amada}, 4: T2, 14-15; Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 41-48; idem, \textit{Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy}, 30, 41-42; Habachi, “Königsohn von Kusch,” 634; idem, “Viceroy of Kush during the New Kingdom,” 165; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 132-33; idem, \textit{Moïse le Pharaon}, 123-24; Peden, \textit{Graffiti of Pharaonic Egypt}, 115 note 343; Yurco, “Was Amenmesse the Viceroy of Kush, Messuwy?” 52-54.

\textsuperscript{53}Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 42.

7. Red Sandstone Offering Stand of Messuy from Amada

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE 40282

Discussion and Comments on Number 7

James Breasted uncovered this offering stand, often described as a “pyramidion” in earlier literature, during his 1906 epigraphic work at the Temple of Amada. Now in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (JE 40282), the front of the offering stand contains an wish for Re-Harakhty reading \(dj.f hzw(t) n k3 n z3-nswt ms-sw-y m3 f hrw\) “May You Grant Blessings to the Ka of the King’s Son of Kush, Messuy, Justified.” The back inscription on the offering stand contains a \(Htp-dj[-nswt]\) formula to Re-Harakhty so that \(dj.f h^5 w q^j n k3 n z3-nswt n K\^s ms-sw-y m3 f hrw\) “May He Give a Long Lifetime for the Ka of the King’s Son of Kush, Messuy, Justified.” Rolf Krauss believes that Messuy’s name shows deliberate damage on this offering stand that it strengthens his theory Amenmesse was Messuy and that the damage can be considered a damnato memoriae meted out


Front and back are described here after KRI 4: 95; RITA 4: 75. Gauthier, Temple d’Amada, 195, only describes and hesitantly collates the back portion as he thought in Gauthier, “Les ‘fils royaux de Kouch,’” 214, that the offering stand could not positively be attributed to Messuy. RITA 4: 75, only gives a partial translation of “May he grant favor to the Viceroy” for the front inscription.
against Messuy’s memory after his reign as Amenmesse ended. Nevertheless, Kitchen’s collations of the offering stand in KRI 4: 95 records that Messuy’s name on the rear appears abraded but readable, and the name on the front is completely intact.

8. Messuy Sandstone Pillar Fragment from Temple of Horus of Miam at Aniba (figure 7.8) 

Location: Currently Unknown

Discussion and Comments on Number 8

Aniba, or ancient Miam (Mj’m/M’m), was a very important administrative center for the ancient Egyptians as it served as the administrative center for ancient Wawat. A number of inscriptions and artifacts of Messuy exist from Aniba, but this pillar fragment from the temple of Horus at Amada seems to escape most literature dealing with Nubian viceroys or Messuy’s term in office. Based on the only published photograph, only about a third of the pillar exists and once contained a lengthy inscription of a king of which only the dj’nh epithet survives. The Messuy inscription reads jr.n šš nswt pr-hdj hsb nbw n Kš ms-sw-y nfr mš’h hrw “Made by the Royal Scribe of the Treasury and

---

58 Krauss, Moïse le Pharaon, 124.
59 References: PM 7: 81; George Steindorff, Aniba, 2: 21 and plate 7 number 6.
60 For the now submerged site of Aniba, see Olson, 116-26; PM 7: 75-81.
61 Mentioned and discussed only in PM 7: 81; Steindorff, Aniba, 2: 21, and plate 7 number 6.
Counter of the Gold of Kush, Messuy, Blessed and Justified.” It is possible, being that Messuy is not a “King’s Son of Kush” but a “Counter of the Gold of Kush,” this represents an earlier stage of Messuy’s career before he became viceroy, but this is uncertain.

9. Faience Plaque of Messuy from Aniba Tomb SA 23

Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE 41832

Discussion and Comments on Number 9

During excavations in the New Kingdom cemetery SA at Aniba by the Eckley B. Coxe Junior Expedition and Georg Steindorff, a tomb was uncovered featuring a small faience plaque of Messuy now in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (JE 41832). On one side Messuy is shown worshipping the cartouches of Merneptah, and on the other side,


Reisner, “Viceroy of Ethiopia,” 86 no. 17, and Gauthier, “Les ‘fils royaux de Kouch,’” 233, records the similar title of sš hsb nbw n zšt-nswt “Counting-Scribe of the Gold of Kush” as belonging to Harnefer, subordinate of Viceroy of Kush Huy from the reign of Tutankhamun, so sš nswt pr-hḏ wb3 nbw n Kš may just represent Messuy in an earlier stage of his career.


PM 7: 80; Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 47; idem, *Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy*, 30; Gauthier, *Le livre des rois d’Egypt*, 3: 118 note 1; Iskander, 360-61; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 132, 134; Olson, 166 note 122; Reisner, “Viceroy of Ethiopia,” 47 no. 15g; Steindorff, *Aniba*, 2: 101, 225, and plate 54 number 32. Other than these expeditions in the early 1910s and 1930s, the only other expedition to work at Aniba was by the University of Cairo in the early 1960s just before Aniba was flooded by Lake Nasser. For a brief archaeological history of Aniba, see Olson, 120-26.
the inscription reads \( z\overline{3}-ns\overline{w}t \) \( n \) \( \mathcal{K}s \) \( jmj-r \) \( h\overline{3}swt \) \( rsw \) \( ms-sw-y \) \( m\overline{3}^5 \) \( hrw \) “King’s Son of Kush, Overseer of Southern Foreign Lands, Messuy, Justified.”\(^{66}\) Other than the Messuy plaque, tomb SA 23 contained some pottery, a boat amulet, a bronze cylinder, and some pottery fragments.\(^{67}\) Stacie Olson points out that even though the only inscribed object from SA 23 is the Messuy plaque, the bronze cylinder might represent the remains of a “staff fitting” and therefore indicative that SA 23 contained a status burial of a high ranking person.\(^{68}\)

10. Sandstone Door Jamb from Aniba Tomb SA 36 with Name of Messuy\(^ {69}\)

**Location:** University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia E. 11362

**Discussion and Comments on Number 10**

This sandstone doorjamb from tomb SA 36 at Aniba and currently in the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology in Philadelphia (E. 11362) contains the name of Messuy in conjunction with one of his subordinates. The doorjamb reads \( n \) \( k\overline{3} \) \( n \) \( jmj-r \) \( m\overline{s}^5 \) \( n \) \( z\overline{3}-ns\overline{w}t \) \( n \) \( \mathcal{K}s \) \( ms-sw-y \) \( mry \) […] \( nb \) \( jm\overline{3}h \) “For the Ka of the

\(^{66}\) *KRI* 4: 96; *RITA* 4: 76; Steindorff, *Aniba*, 2: 101, 225 and plate 54 number 32.

\(^{67}\) For tomb SA 36, see Steindorff, *Aniba*, 2: 94, 150, 225. The bronze cylinder is in the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (E. 11120), along with one of the pottery fragments (E. 11348).

\(^{68}\) Olson, 166 note 122.

\(^{69}\) References: PM 7: 80; *KRI* 4: 96; *RITA* 4: 76; Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 47; idem, *Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy*, 30; Gnirs, 8-9 note 63; Iskander, 360, 362; Steindorff, *Aniba*, 2: 58, 238-39, and plate 34 number 6.
‘Overseer of the Army’ (General) of the King’s Son of Kush, Messuy, Mery, […]

An initial misreading of this doorjamb mistakenly attributed the title \( \text{jmj-r} \ m\text{s}\) to Messuy, but the inscriptions clearly show that the dedication is to the Ka of the \( \text{jmj-r} \ m\text{s}\) of the \( \text{z}\text{-nswt n K}\text{s m}\text{w-y} \). \(^{71}\)

11. Tomb S 90 at Aniba \(^{72}\)

Location: \( \text{in situ} \); now submerged under Lake Nasser

12. Sixteen Ushabtis from Aniba Tomb S 90 \(^{73}\)

Location: Ägyptisches Museum-Georg Steindorff-Universität Leipzig, Leipzig 6102, 6112, 7472, 7511, 7534, 7549, 7554, 7565, 7610-12, 7634, 7647-48 \(^{74}\)

\(^{70}\)PM 7: 80; KRI 4: 96; RITA 4: 76; Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 47; idem, \( \text{Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy} \), 30; Gnirs, 8-9 note 63; Iskander, 360, 362; Steindorff, \( \text{Aniba} \), 2: 58, 238-39, and plate 34 number 6. Note that Steindorff, \( \text{Aniba} \), 2: 58, restores the missing part of the inscription as \( n \text{k}\text{z n jmj-r m}\text{s}\text{ }n \text{z}\text{-nswt n K}\text{s m}\text{w-y m}\text{r}\text{y [nb.f]} n\text{b jmj}\text{h} \) “For the Ka of the ‘Overseer of the Army’ (General) of the King’s Son of Kush, Messuy, Beloved of [His Lord], Possessor of Honor,” with the name of the individual missing. Kitchen in KRI 4: 96, RITA 4: 76, takes \( \text{m}\text{r}\text{y} \) to be a personal name that Gnirs, 8-9 note 63, takes to be the same Mery discussed in chapter 5.

\(^{71}\)See by mistake PM 7: 80; Iskander, 360, 362.

\(^{72}\)References: Steindorff, \( \text{Aniba} \), 2: 79, 198, and plan on figure 32; Dodson, \( \text{Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy} \), 30; Olson, 163-67.

\(^{73}\)References: Steindorff, \( \text{Aniba} \), 2: 79, 198, and plate 44 numbers 9-12; Aubert and Aubert, 124-25; Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 47; idem, \( \text{Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy} \), 30; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 132, 134-35; Olson, 156-57, 163-67; Yurco, “Was Amenmesse the Viceroy of Kush, Messuw?,” 55.

\(^{74}\)Olson, 127; Irene Shirun, personal email communication 24 March 2010. Last minute personal email communication from Dr. Dietrich Raue, 10 November 2010, curator at the Ägyptisches Museum-Georg Steindorff of the Universität Leipzig provided the inventory numbers given for the ushabtis and the surviving artifacts from tomb S 90 at Leipzig.
Discussion and Comments on Numbers 11-12

In excavations carried out by Georg Steindorff at Aniba, he discovered a tomb possibly belonging to the Nubian Viceroy Messuy. In cemetery S, tomb S 90 contained a shaft leading to a large irregularly shaped chamber with two side rooms opening off it to the northwest. Among the artifacts inside the tomb, Steindorff recovered two sarcophagi (one in Leipzig 9481), one being completely smashed, beads (Leipzig 7456), carnelian earrings, a hair pin, bronze tweezers (one example Leipzig 2186), a head-rest, and sixteen ushabtis. Four of these ushabtis had no inscriptions (Leipzig 6102, 7472, 7634, 7647), but the remaining twelve have the inscription of the title $\text{zA-nswt n Kš ms-sw-y}$ “King’s Son of Kush Messuy” upon them (Leipzig 6112, 7511, 7534, 7549, 7554, 7565, 7610-12, 7648).

Considerable debate exists as to what this tomb represents. Based on the burial goods, and the fact that two sarcophagi indicates a burial of at least two people occurred in tomb S 90 at Aniba, the most logical conclusion would be that S 90 belongs to and once contained the burial of Viceroy Messuy. In contrast to this suggestion is that according to Stacie Olson, tomb S 90 contained a relatively low status burial and could belong to a subordinate of Messuy. In this case the ushabtis are donations given by Messuy to the

---

75Steindorff, *Aniba*, 2: 72-73, 79, 92-93, 96, 112-14, 120-21, 123, 129-31, 198, and plate 39c, plate 44 numbers 9-12, plate 58c, plate 63 number 2, and S 90 on figure 32; Aubert and Aubert, 124-25; Olson, 166. Raue, personal email communication 10 November 2010, indicated that some pottery recovered by Steindorff in S 90 still exists at Leipzig (2789, 6467) but others (163) are lost due to the museum being bombed during World War II. The status of the remaining two ushabtis

76Steindorff, *Aniba*, 2: 79, 198, and plate 44 numbers 9-12; Aubert and Aubert, 124-25; Olson, 163-64. From the published photographs of four of the S 90 ushabtis in Steindorff, *Aniba*, 2: plate 44 numbers 9-12, it appears that two ushabtis have the $\text{sHd Wsjr}$ title but the other two are indistinct or the inscription is lost. Raue, personal email communication 10 November 2010, did not indicate the status of the remaining two ushabtis from tomb S 90.

77Frank Yurco, “Was Amenmesse the Viceroy of Kush, Messuwy?” 53, 56; Olson, 165.
tomb owner of S 90 even though there are no inscriptions on these ushabtis indicating Messuy is donating them to someone. Another suggestion is that S 90 might be a cenotaph in that the Viceroy of Nubia were normally buried in Egypt and that tomb S 90 would represent Messuy’s symbolic burial in Wawat.\textsuperscript{78} If this is true, why apparently stock the tomb with burial goods consisting of only a few ushabtis and presumably empty sarcophagi? The excavated remains strongly suggest that S 90 contained a burial, and the burial could only be that of Messuy based on the name associated with the objects.

13. Offering Basin of Messuy from Gebel Agg (Toshka East North)\textsuperscript{79}

Location: Currently Unknown

Discussion and Comments on Number 13

During joint epigraphic and archaeological work during the Nubian rescue in the early 1960s, a joint team from Yale University and the University of Pennsylvania discovered thirteen sandstone fragments while working on a Eighteenth Dynasty rock shrine dedicated to Senwosret III, Reshep, and Horus, Lord of Miam.\textsuperscript{80} Most of these fragments came from a stela identified as being dedicated to Senwosret III ($h\textsuperscript{3}j-k\textsuperscript{3}w-R\textsuperscript{6}$), but six of these fragments came from an offering stand belonging to Messuy. The preserved

\textsuperscript{78}Olson, 163-67; Steindorff, \textit{Aniba}, 2: 198. Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 47 note 40, takes the alternate view that even though these ushabtis bear Messuy’s name, it does not necessarily mean he died as a viceroy.


\textsuperscript{80}PM 7: 94; Simpson, \textit{Heka-Nefer}, 36-44.

603
inscription is very fragmentary, and much abraded, but gives an $htp-dj-nswt$ to Amun Re (fragment GA 2) and describes the $\text{šmsw...m}[s-s]\text{w-y} “The Follower...Me[ss]uy.”^{81}$ Also inscribed on these fragments is a badly weathered cartouche hesitantly suggested as $mn-[M\text{št-Rt}]$, but even this reading is very much in doubt in the published drawing.^{82}

14. Aksha (Serra West) Pylon Right Door Thickness^{83}

Location: Currently Unknown; presumed lost^{84}

Discussion and Comments on Number 14

At the temple of Aksha (Serra West), there was once a scene on the right door thickness of the pylon showing Messuy worshiping the cartouches of Merneptah. The

---

^{81}Simpson, *Heka-Nefer*, 41, 42 figure 35, and plate 21b fragments GA 1, GA 5.

^{82} Ibid., 42 figure 35, 43, and plate 21b fragments GA 4 A-B.


^{84}According to Friedrich Hinkel, “Report on the Dismantling and Removal of Endangered Monuments in Sudanese Nubia, 1962-1963,” *Kush* 12 (1964): 114, 116, only parts of the Aksha temple were moved to Khartoum for reassembly during the 1960s, and of those parts removed, only the western wall of the forecourt and about two meters of the northern wall wall were saved. Jean Vercoutter, “Preliminary Report of the Excavations at Aksha by the Franco-Argentine Archaeological Expedition, 1961,” *Kush* 10 (1962): 112-14, makes no mention of the Messuy inscription during excavations at Aksha in 1961 and notes that much of the temple, as well as its inscriptions, were in a poor state of preservation when uncovered during the excavation season.
inscription merely names the titles of Messuy j(n) zš-nswt n Kš tšy ḫw ḫr ḫr wnmj-nswt ms-sw-[y mš]-hrw] “By the King’s Son of Kush, Fan and Scepter Bearer on the King’s Right Hand, Messu[y, Justified].”

15. Damaged Sandstone Lintel or Stela 1668 from Buhen

Location: Currently Unknown

Discussion and Comments on Number 15

During Egypt Exploration Society excavations at Buhen in 1963-1964, this sandstone fragment from a lintel or stela (Buhen catalog 1668; excavation number K10-61A) was discovered in the forecourt of the South Temple. Two lines of text and what might be part of the skirt of a kneeling official suggests that this fragment might show a viceroy kneeling and worshipping the king’s cartouches. The readable parts of the fragmentary inscription contain Kš jmjr and stp n, which do suggest that a viceroy is involved. In Harry S. Smith’s analysis of this fragment, he believes that the restored epithet stp n belonged to is stp n [tš smf] “Chosen of [the Southland]” that is an epithet belonging to

---

85PM 7: 127 (3); KRI 4: 96; RITA 4: 76; LDT 5: 188; Fuscaldo, “Aksha (Serra West),” 13 (plate 1, fig. 1a-b); idem, “Some More on Aksha,” 12; Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 47; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 30; Habachi, “Königsohn von Kusch,” 634; idem, “Viceroys of Kush during the New Kingdom,”165; Iskander, 362; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 132, 135; idem, Moïse le Pharaon, 123; Reisner, “Viceroys of Ethiopia,” 47 number 15f. LDT 5: 188, has Messuy’s name recorded as ms-[sw-y].

86References: Spalinger, review of Elephantine-Stele des Sethnakht, 275-76; Smith et al., 134-35, 213, and plate 33, number 3.

87Emery, Smith, and Millard, 221.

88Smith et al., 134, and plate 33 number 3 (top fragment).
the Viceroy Messuy who utilized \(stp n t\beta \, sm\) at Beit el-Wali.\(^{89}\) The suggested restoration of the inscription would then be \([n \, k3 \, n \, z3-\, nswt \, n] \, K3 \, jmj-r \, [h3swt \, rsw \, ss \, nswt \, t\gamma \, hw \, hr \, \, \, wnmj-\, nswt \, ms-\, sw-\, y \, m3\varepsilon \, hrw] \, stp \, n \, [t\beta \, sm]\) “[For the Ka of the King’s Son of] Kush, Overseer [of the Southern Foreign Lands, Royal Scribe, Fanbearer on the King’s Right Hand, Messuy, Justified.] Chosen of [the Southland].”\(^{90}\) Although a plausible reconstruction, there is no definite trace of Messuy’s name on the fragment and many of the suggested reconstructions do not appear on the fragment at all.

Conclusions

Of all the known monuments belonging to the Viceroy of Kush Messuy, the only monuments to suggest the possibility that he became king are those at Amada. Only the doorjambs at the entrance show the remotest possibility that they might contain uraei, but the heavily weathered surfaces of the sandstone blocks are deceptive. One wonders if Messuy did indeed become Amenmesse, why none of his other figures were upgraded with uraei to reflect his new kingly status at Amada, Aniba, Aswan, Beit el-Wali, and Aksha?\(^{91}\) Furthermore, if Messuy and Amenmesse are the same, why were Messuy’s

\(^{89}\)Smith et al., 134, and plate 33 number 3. Kitchen in *RITA* 4: 76, suggests an emended translation of \(stp \, n \, t\beta \, sm\) as “Chosen One of the Southland (Upper Egypt).”

\(^{90}\)Smith et al., 134.

\(^{91}\)Yurco, “Was Amenmesse the Viceroy of Kush, Messuywy?” 52-54. Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 42, 46, and idem, *Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy*, 41-42, tries to explain the lack of uraei at Amada by noting the scenes of Messuy on the south wall were inaccessible and not prominent enough to warrant uraei. However, if the figure of a viceroy before the Year 5 inscription of Merneptah on the left thickness of the entrance is Messuy, it shows no signs of any alleged uraeus. The position of this scene is very prominent, so it should have at least had a uraeus added to it if one follows Dodson’s reasoning. Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 46, tries to explain absence of any uraeus on this figure due to damage or the fact that the scene would be hidden by the doors of the temple, but his explanations are unconvincing.
scenes and titles not expunged from the record? Seti II did attempt to erase the memory of Amenmesse wherever he could by erasing and carving anew over Amenmesse’s titulary. It is odd that if one takes Amenmesse and Messuy to be the same person, why was Messuy’s name was not erased or replaced by someone closer in loyalty to Seti II? In contrast, if Messuy and Amenmesse are not the same, then there was no reason to attack Messuy’s name.

To strengthen his claim, part of Krauss’ arguments revolves around the orthography of certain elements in the names of Amenmesse and Messuy. Besides the Amun element, the second part of Amenmesse’s name is written or for ms-s. Messuy’s name is normally written as or for ms-sw-y. Sign S 29 following F 31 is to be read as a complement to sign F31 meaning that both signs together stand for msj. Krauss suggests the second in Amenmesse’s name is to be understood as sw based on sign S 29 representing sw instead of the expected sign M 23. Krauss then takes Amenmesse’s name as Jmn-ms-sw and because of the shared and ms-sw orthography in Amenmesse and Messuy’s names, as this is one of his suggestions that Messuy and Amenmesse are one and the same. Although a

---

92 Sometimes the quail chick (G 43) is not written. Yurco, “Was Amenmesse the Viceroy of Kush, Messuwy?” 49-56, uses a different transliteration of Messuy’s name as ms-sw-wy “Messuwy” than used here.

tempting explanation, the ancient Egyptians nearly always represented \( sw \) with the sedge sign M23 and never with the \( s \) (S29).94

Part of Krauss’ arguments over the writing of Amenmesse and Messuy’s names has a small measure of plausibility in that Papyrus Salt 124 in the British Museum (BM 10025) represents a historical overview of the reign of Amenmesse but in a manner glossing over matters politically objectionable to the Seti II administration, such as the name of Amenmesse.95 The majority of Papyrus Salt 124 is a complaint probably dating from the reign of Siptah by a Deir el-Medina worker named Amennakht concerning the proclivities of Chief Workman Paneb ranging from rape, theft, bribery, attempted assault, and threats.96 One of the complaints directed toward Paneb was that Chief Workman

---

94 James Allen, personal communication 13 November 2009.


96 According to Černý, “Papyrus Salt 124,” 244, 251-57, Davies, Egyptian Historical Inscriptions of the Nineteenth Dynasty, 343, 354, and Théodoridès, “Dénonciation de malversations,” 74-77, Papyrus Salt has to date sometime from the very end of the Nineteenth Dynasty to at least the beginning of the Twentieth Dynasty based on the persons mentioned in the complaint. That Paneb is accused of violating the burial of Seti II places Papyrus Salt 124 directly after the reign of Seti II into the reigns of Siptah and Tausert at least. KRI 4: 408-414, and RITA 4: 291-94 places Papyrus Salt 124 into the reign of Siptah as well. Janssen, Village Varia, 106, points out that Papyrus Salt 124 lacks a year date and does not indicate a chronological sequence of when the events took place except in Janssen’s view “the evil deeds were spread over several years.” For the infamous Paneb, see Bierbrier, Late New Kingdom in
Neferhotep the Younger, Amennakht’s brother, had complained to the Vizier Amenmose about death threats made against him by Paneb. Vizier Amenmose punished Paneb for these threats, and Paneb went to Mesy (msy), and Mesy dismissed Vizier Amenmose because Paneb made claims that Vizier Amenmose had him beaten.⁹⁷ Because of the dismissal of Vizier Amenmose, the only person who had the power and authority to dismiss a vizier was the king himself.⁹⁸ Mesy is written as msy and is thought in some manner to represent a politically expedient way of writing the name of Amenmesse as the use of the Z 6 determinative is telling in that the sign normally indicates an enemy.⁹⁹ Accordingly, Krauss takes Mesy (msy) to be the “short”

---

⁹⁷KRI 4: 412; RITA 4: 293; Allam, 1: 283; Černý, “Papyrus Salt 124,” 245-46, and plate 44; idem, “Die Ramessiden,” 278-79; idem, Community of Workmen, 301-305; Davies, Egyptian Historical Inscriptions of the Nineteenth Dynasty, 348-51; Faulkner, “Egypt: From the Inception of the Nineteenth Dynasty,” 237; Habachi, “King Amenmesse and Viziers Amenmose and Kha’entore,” 65; Janssen, Village Varia, 100; Krauss, Moïse le Pharaon, 137; McDowell, Village Life in Ancient Egypt, 192; Romer, Ancient Lives, 64-65; Schneider, “Conjectures about Amenmesse,” 99; Spalinger, review of Elephantine-Stele des Sethnakht, 275; Théodoridès, 50; Vandersleyen, Égypte et la Vallée du Nil, 2: 579; Vernus, 74-75.


("kurzform") version of Messuy (ms-sw-y), and he takes both msy and ms-sw-y to be short forms of Amenmesse’s name Jmn-ms-sw.\textsuperscript{100}

Mesy is a very intriguing solution for identifying Amenmesse and Messuy as the same person, in the manner of Krauss’ theory, but not without criticism. Faulkner once made a critical comment that msy does not necessarily stand for Amenmesse, but the name might be a general nickname for the king and not a reference to any specific king’s name.\textsuperscript{101} Despite his reservations, Černý noticed an important aspect to how msy was described in Papyrus Salt 124. Besides using the Z 6 determinative as described above, Mesy “is written, without cartouche and any title or determinative.”\textsuperscript{102} If Mesy is to be identified with Amenmesse, then the lack of royal titularies on Papyrus Salt 124 would be an expedient way of referring to Amenmesse without giving him the respect afforded to a king. By purposely leaving out royal titles, the scribe writing Papyrus Salt 124 referred to Amenmesse in a disrespectful way using a diminutive name, Mesy, and the enemy determinative because he was not a legitimate king.\textsuperscript{103}


\textsuperscript{101}Faulkner, “Egypt: From the Inception of the Nineteenth Dynasty,” 237.

\textsuperscript{102}Černý, “Papyrus Salt 124,” 255.

\textsuperscript{103}Théodoridès, 23; Allam, 1: 285 note 48; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (1. Teil),” 186.
Accepting an identification of Mesy being a diminutive way of referring to Amenmesse might strengthen Krauss’ theories concerning Messuy and Amenmesse, except caution needs to be used when making assumptions concerning similarities in ancient Egyptian names. Labib Habachi points out that kings who found new dynastic or illegitimate royal lines “usually have important careers before starting their reign” and can be paralleled with the careers of the Vizier Amenemhet, the future Amenemhet I, Horemheb, and Smendes. In all these cases, the careers of these individuals can be traced during their eventual rise to kingship, as they continually used their non-royal name during their private careers as well as king, but “not one single monument of Amenmesse before he became king” is known according to Habachi’s analysis. Habachi then suggests that the career of Amenmesse is to be seen in the Vizier Amenmose dismissed by Mesy because the writing of Vizier Amenmose’s name Jmn-ms as , , and  is more similar to that of Amenmesse. Unfortunately, Habachi’s theory is negated somewhat by the appearance of the Vizier Amenmose on a monument of Amenmesse from the Oratory of Ptah at Deir el-Medina.

104 Habachi, “King Amenmesse and Viziers Amenmose and Kha’emtore,” 65-66. Also add to these mentions Ay, Herihor before he assumed kingly titles and epithets, as well as the future Ramesses I.


107 See chapter 5 number 27.
In a recent study following in the same manner of Habachi’s study, Thomas Schneider also looks at tracing the name Amenmesse through known examples in an attempt to rectify Krauss’ suggestions that Messuy and Amenmesse are the same person. Schneider notes that the name Amenmesse appears “restricted in Egyptian onomastics” to King Amenmesse himself, which he feels is quite unusual, if names specifying divine creation, “Amun has created him,” were utilized wholly by royals in ancient Egypt. In searching for Amenmesse’s pre-royal career, Schneider remarks on Louvre Ostracon N 2261 concerning a person that he feels is Amenmesse. The ostracon mentions a number of royal officials dating to Year 53 of Ramesses II involved with either escorting a royal prince or inspecting his burial. One of these officials involved in this activity is described as "The Controller (or Inspector) . . . Amenmesse."  

---

108 Schneider, “Conjectures about Amenmesse,” 101. For the restricted use of the name “Amun (or Re) has created him,” see Römer, 76 note 16.


110 After Koenig, 110; Schneider, “Conjectures about Amenmesse,” 101-102. Part of the uncertainty over the events described on Louvre N 2261 deals with the names of Princes Sety and Sethhirkhopshef mentioned here. Kitchen in RITA 2: 596-97, RITANC 2: 617, as well as Helck, Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reichs, 409-10, 415, both believe that Louvre N 2261 describes an inspection of the burials of Princes Sety and Sethhirkhopshef, sons of Ramesses II, by the officials mentioned. In opposition to this theory is Fisher, 1: 59; Farouk Gomaà, Chaemwese, Sohn Ramses’ II. und Hohenpriester von Memphis, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen, ed. Wolfgang Helck und Eberhard Otto, vol. 27 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1973), 8, 15-16; Miller, 70-71; Schneider, “Conjectures about Amenmesse,” 102, who all note that this Prince Sety is probably not the son of Queen Nefertari but is described as ms n nfrt-jry n zl-nswt jry-p’t Sth-hr-hps.f n n3 ms w nswt hm.f “Born to Nefertari and the King’s Son and Hereditary Noble, Sethhirkhopshef, of the Royal Children of His Majesty.” As Fisher, 1: 59, Miller, 70-71, and Gomaà, 8, 15-16, all point out, Nefertari is not given any indication of her rank as queen if Queen Nefertari, mother of Prince Sety, is the woman described on this ostracon. Due to the lack of
Schneider suggests that this rwd Amenmessu “might be a palace official serving in the royal harem” making Amenmessu a royal grandson of Ramesses II because royal grandsons could bear a name specifying divine creation, and he theorizes that it is feasible that administrative positions “were assigned to royal princes or a king’s grandsons.”\(^{111}\) After all, a mere grandson of an ancient Egyptian king would not be expected to pose a threat to the royal succession when there would be numerous sons of the reigning king to bear the title of crown prince until one of them became king at last.

In addition to Schneider’s identification of an Amenmessu on O. Louvre N 2261, as possibly being King Amenmesse at an earlier stage of his career, he then seeks to tie the Amenmessu on Louvre N 2261 with the Messuy/Amenmesse theory Krauss advocates by explaining that Amenmesse was an official, possibly of the royal harem, under Ramesses II, then appointed Nubian Viceroy under Merneptah, and eventually an usurping king and rebel during the reign of Seti II.\(^{112}\) Schneider does not give an explanation about why Amenmessu would alter his name from Jmn-ms-sw to Messuy (ms-sw-y), dropping the Amen element, and then to Amenmesse (Jmn-ms-s). If Schneider’s suggestion that only a member of the royal family could bear the name of divine creation, such as “Amun has created him,” why would Amenmesse unnecessarily alter his name to become a Nubian Viceroy? Would he not try to associate himself with the Nineteenth Dynasty royal family

queenly titles. Nefertari is the wife of Prince Sethhirkhopshef, son of Ramesses II, and not the well-known Queen Nefertari.

\(^{111}\)Schneider, “Conjectures about Amenmesse,” 102.

\(^{112}\)Schneider, “Conjectures about Amenmesse,” 101-102; idem, “Innovation in Literature on Behalf of Politics,” 323.
by continuing to use the same name, Amenmessu, he held office under as *rwd?* Krauss and Schneider’s suggestions are not totally convincing.

Another factor against Krauss’ claim that Amenmesse and Messuy are the same is the fact that no “King’s Son of Kush” was a true “King’s Son.” The position of Viceroy of Nubia was a position always given to someone other than a member of the royal family, specifically, someone with an administrative or military career. The appointment to the administrative position of Viceroy of Nubia was an “ideological function as a ‘King’s Son’ in political importance” and that the title never designated anything else but a role that a high official fulfilled as part of overseeing and maintaining order in Nubia. If a royal son was appointed as “King’s Son of Kush” there would have to be the additional epithet *n ḫt.f* “of His Body” to *z3-nswt n Kš* to designate blood kinship with the king. If, according to Krauss, Messuy was a biological “King’s Son” of Seti II appointed “King’s Son of Kush” why did he not enhance his position through expanding his titles to include the epithet “of His Body” to enhance the position of “King’s Son of Kush” by showing that he was a genuine “King’s Son of His Body” and not the bearer of a mere


114Fischer, 1: 130. For the role and duties of the Nubian Viceroy, see Habachi, “Administration of Nubia during the New Kingdom,” 65-68; Säve-Söderbergh, “Historical and Cultural Background,” 6-7.

115Fischer, 1: 130. See also Schmitz, *Untersuchungen zum Titel s3-njšwt*, 65-79, where the title “King’s Son of His Body” designates a biological son of the king.
ideological title with no normal ties to the royal family? Furthermore, if Messuy was a biological son of Seti II, why did he not enhance his position, not only through the use of the $n\;ht.f$ epithet, through use of other titles associated with Nineteenth Dynasty princes, especially military or cultic titles. Biological sons of a king were “ideologically more important than officials” and a “King’s Son” appointed “King’s Son of Kush,” as Krauss suggests Messuy was, would most definitely enhance his titulary to reflect he was more than a mere official.

Alternatively, if Messuy was not a true biological “King’s Son,” and one still wishes to identify him with Amenmesse, then Messuy would fit the role of a non-royal pretender to the throne. In addition to the non-royal officeholders of “King’s Son of Kush,” the alleged Messuy epithet $z\z n\;nswt\;n\;ds.f\;n$ “Son of the King Himself” actually reads $z\z n\;nswt\;ds.f$ and is probably a misreading or miswriting of $3h\;n\;nswt\;ds.f$. Taken as a whole, Messuy cannot be definitively identified as the future king Amenmesse.

---

116Fisher, 1: 63-64 comments that the penultimate rank a Nineteenth Dynasty royal son might hold is $jmj-r\;mS\;wr$ “Generalissimo” that was normally held by the heir apparent. If Messuy was a son of Seti II, he was not the crown prince as that position fell to Prince Seti-Merneptah from the Triple Barque Shrine reliefs. However, there would not be any reason for Messuy not to hold the ranks of $jmj-r\;mS$ “General,” $jmj-r\;ssmt$ “Overseer of Horses,” $hry\;pdt$ “Troop Commander,” $ts\;pdt$ “Troop Captain,” $ktn\;tpy\;n\;hm.f$ “First Charioteer of His Majesty” held, for example, by Pehriwenemef and Montuhirhkopshet, sons of Ramesses II or the cultic title $Jwn-mwt,f$ “Iunmutf” for example. See examples and further discussion in Fisher, 1: 76-77, 86-87, 98-99, 107, 109, 115, 117-18, 125-30.

117Fisher, 1: 124.

118As suggested in Gutgesell and Schmitz, 139-41, but this is based on the assumption that the Takhat buried in KV 10 is indeed Amenmesse’s mother. Gutgesell and Schmitz argue that the Takhat in KV 10 lacks royal titles indicating her status as wife of a king, so therefore, the Takhat in KV 10 must have been non-royal thereby making Amenmesse/Messuy not a member of the royal family but merely an administrative elite who seized the throne. Recent work in KV 10 has shown that the Takhat in KV 10 is more likely the mother of Ramesses IX.
Again, the question is raised, if Messuy is not Amenmesse in the position of Viceroy of Kush, who then was he? Despite Krauss, Dodson, and Schneider’s suppositions, not much information is available on Messuy’s known monuments to indicate his family or background. Based on the doorjamb from the Temple of Horus at Aniba, Messuy probably held the position of \( s\h nswt\ pr-\text{hd}\ hsb\ nbw\ n\ K\h s \) “Royal Scribe of the Treasury and Counter of the Gold of Kush,” along with being described as a “Follower” on the offering basin from Gebel Agg (Toshka East North). This would probably be late in the reign of Ramesses II, as Messuy becomes appointed Viceroy of Nubia under Merneptah, since the majority of Messuy’s monuments have Merneptah’s name upon them. Merneptah’s reign marks the known end of Messuy when it comes to monumental sources as there is nothing to link Messuy to any king other than Merneptah to indicate that Messuy continued to serve his administrative position into the reign of Seti II as Krauss alleges. The excavation of tom S 90 at Aniba seems to indicate that the tomb was stocked and utilized for the burial of Messuy as the remains of two anthropoid sarcophagi and several ushabtis attest.

\[\text{References}\]

119 Schmitz, *Untersuchungen zum Titel s3-njšwt*, 271. This would not be too uncommon as Schmitz lists on 267-72 other Nubian Viceroys of which little is known.

120 Dodson, *Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy*, 30, but see his revised hypothesis in note 123.

121 Though see the reservations expressed by Habachi, “Graffiti and Work of the Viceroys of Kush,” 13; idem, “Administration of Nubia during the New Kingdom,” 66; idem, “Miscellanea on Viceroys of Kush and their Assistants Buried in Dra’ Abu El-Naga’, South,” *JARCE* 13 (1976): 113; Olsen, 163-66, and Säve-Söderbergh, “Historical and Cultural Background,” 6, 9, who believe that Nubian Viceroys were buried in Egypt, probably at Thebes, and not Nubia. Olsen, 165-66, suggests that Aniba tomb S 90 might be a cenotaph built by Messuy where he spent the majority of his career as viceroy, but this does not seem plausible because why would Messuy go to the expense of building a tomb and outfit it with burial goods only to use it as a cenotaph? He would then have to go through another expense to build his other tomb in Egypt, and it is hard to see anyone other than a king doing something elaborate and labor intensive such as this.
Given that the identification of Amenmesse with Viceroy is far from certain, a look at who Amenmesse was is warranted. Since Amenmesse claims on an altered inscription from one of the Karnak Hypostyle Hall statues that Queen Takhat was his mother, and Takhat is described as a $z3t\text{-}nswt\ hmt\text{-}nswt$ “King’s Daughter, King’s Wife,” Amenmesse is a member of the late Nineteenth Dynasty royal family and not a non-royal pretender.\footnote{PM2 2: 51-52, and plan 10; KRI 4: 260; RITA 4: 185-86; Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues at Karnak,” 20 and figure 6.}

Who his father was is a more complex issue. Krauss followed by Dodson would in their hypotheses identify Amenmesse as a son of Seti II and Queen Takhat, appointed by Merneptah as Viceroy of Nubia under his non-kingly name Messuy.\footnote{Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 136-41; idem, Moïse le Pharaon, 146-52; Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 41, 47-48; idem, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 41-46. Dodson and Krauss differ as to when exactly Messuy served as viceroy as Krauss believes Messuy became viceroy towards the end of Merneptah’s reign and into that of Seti II while Dodson sees Messuy being removed from office and replaced by Khaemtjtry, whose name was later erased on many of his monuments. For a summation of the sides on this matter, see Dodson, “Messuy, Amada, and Amenmesse,” 47-48; idem, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 30, 41-46; Krauss, Moïse le Pharaon, 152-54. Callender, “Queen Tausret and the End of Dynasty 19,” 83, also takes Amenmesse as a possible son of Seti II but without identifying him as the Viceroy Messuy.}

Yurco sees Amenmesse as either a son of Ramesses II or more likely Merneptah through marriage to Queen Takhat. If Merneptah is Amenmesse’s father, this then makes Amenmesse a half-brother to Seti II because Queen Takhat is therefore another queen of Merneptah.\footnote{Yurco, “Amenmesse: Six Statues at Karnak,” 28-31; Spalinger, review of Die Elephantine-Stele des Sethnakht, 277-78; Wente, “Genealogy of the Royal Family,” 146, also favor Amenmesse being a son of Ramesses II. In this manner, Ramesses II being Amenmesse’s father would make Amenmesse in some way Seti II’s uncle.}

Another more recent suggestion is that Amenmesse is a grandson of Ramesses II, cousin of Seti II, and later stepson of Seti II. In this scenario, suggested by Thomas Schneider, Amenmesse is the son of Takhat and one of the many sons of Ramesses II possibly, but not assuredly, even one of the twelve sons appointed as crown prince before
Merneptah.\textsuperscript{125} Seti II later marries Takhat, making her Queen, and Amenmesse, the younger cousin of Seti II, then became a stepson of King Seti II.\textsuperscript{126}

Amenmesse’s historical identity is that he certainly is a member of the royal family via his claim that Queen Takhat was his mother. Paternity can be linked to Amenmesse being son of Queen Takhat and Kings Merneptah or Seti II depending on who was Queen Takhat’s husband. More recently, Krauss enlarged his theory of Amenmesse/Messuy as son of Seti II and Takhat to include Amenmesse/Messuy as the archetype of Moses. Contrasting parallelisms between the life of Moses and the orthography his name in ancient Egyptian, essentially \textit{ms-s}, with those of Amenmesse/Messuy, as Krauss sees it, Amenmesse/Messuy becomes the historical figure that biblical compilers based Moses upon to create strong socio-religious bonds. In this fashion, the historicity of Moses is totally fictional being that Krauss sees Moses as a non-existent literary character whose

\textsuperscript{125}Schneider, “Conjectures about Amenmesse,” 100; idem, “Innovation in Literature on Behalf of Politics,” 319-20, 322-24. Schneider, “Innovation in Literature on Behalf of Politics,” 319, 323-24, does not explicitly state that Amenmesse’s father was one of the sons of Ramesses II appointed crown prince and seems to indicate via his figures 1 and 2 on 320, 324, that the alleged father of Amenmesse was just a minor prince, but Schneider’s statement on 319 that Merneptah becoming king essentially deprived “the families of his elder brothers of the hope of kingship that they must have cherished for many years” indicates that one of Merenptah’s deceased elder brothers, who held the position of crown prince, has to be the father of Amenmesse in Schneider’s theory. In opposition to this factor as possible motive for Amenmesse’s action in seizing the throne is that Dodson, \textit{Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy}, 29, points out that the right of succession passed from a Ramesside crown prince upon his death to the next eldest brother and not to the male children of the recently deceased crown prince.

\textsuperscript{126}Schneider, “Conjectures about Amenmesse,” 100; idem, “Innovation in Literature on Behalf of Politics,” 319-20, 322-24.
life story was stolen from Amenmesse.\textsuperscript{127} However fascinating this theory might be for atheistic biblical deconstructionists, any attempt to prove or disprove the historicity or reality of Moses and the Bible lie outside the scope of this work.

Chapter 8

Conclusion

The Building Programs of Amenmesse and Seti II

Through the previous chapters, the monuments of Amenmesse and Seti II reveal interesting patterns surrounding the building programs that these two kings undertook. Amenmesse, in his view, saw himself as a legitimate king and the rightful successor to Merneptah. He had to reflect this through his monuments because his statues, monumental inscriptions, and other artifacts needed to propagandize Amenmesse’s kingship. Amenmesse also had to reinforce the royal ideology of the king performing actions for the gods, as symbolically he was a “Son of Re.” The majority of Amenmesse’s monuments reflect reinforcement of his propaganda that he was a legitimate ruler in that these monuments consist of inscriptions, scenes, and statuary placed in major temples, such as Karnak, Armant, and Amara West, that served as Amenmesse’s link to legitimizing his rule through performing benefactions for the gods. At the same time, Amenmesse did bear some animosity toward the previous reign of Merneptah evidenced by his erasure of Merneptah’s inscriptions in and around the Cour de la Cachette at Karnak and bandeaux inscriptions at Luxor.\(^1\) Amenmesse probably intended to reuse these inscriptions for himself through recarving, but the end of his reign brought these planned constructions to an end.

Largely absent from the monumental record is extensive evidence for Amenmesse attacking or erasing Seti II’s name on monuments dating from the first two years of Seti II. Seti II’s tomb in the Valley of the Kings, KV 15, shows a distinctive pattern of his

\(^1\)Chapter 6 numbers 69-71, 83-85.
name being erased and then restored along with the wall decoration being unfinished or barely begun in some parts of the tomb.² Besides this pattern of erased and restored inscriptions within KV 15, Krauss gives five monuments he feels shows evidence of Amenmesse erasing Seti II’s name. Of these, the inscriptions of Roma-Roy on the east face of the Eighth Pylon at Karnak are inconclusive due to no trace being left on the erased and non-restored inscriptions, so they could equally be those of Merneptah, Amenmesse, or Seti II.³ A stela at the Oratory of Ptah near Deir el-Medina and another fragmentary stela in the Brooklyn Museum (86.226.25) are instances of Amenmesse’s name being erased and then replaced by Seti II after Amenmesse’s downfall.⁴

Of the remaining monuments Krauss lists, the Year 2 stela in the Speos of Horemheb at Gebel Silsila and a green faience plaque from Memphis in the Egyptian Museum in Berlin (4546) do show erasures but nothing definitive. The scenes of Seti II and possibly his son(s) worshipping the Theban Triad appear to be erased, but it is uncertain when exactly this happened or if this can be attributed to Amenmesse’s actions at all due to the fact that Seti II’s name is still intact on the stela.⁵ The faience plaque does have what would be the erased prenomen of a king but the intact nomen reads $\text{Sthy}$.

²See in detail chapter 6 number 96.

³Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (1. Teil),” 183. See chapter 6 number 73.

⁴Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (1. Teil),” 183. Krauss later amended his conclusion on Brooklyn Museum 86.226.25 in “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (2. Teil),” 143 note 42, to Seti II usurping this stela from another king, probably Amenmesse. For these monuments, see Chapter 6 numbers 94, 108.

⁵See chapter 6 number 97.
mrj.n-Pth, written in a manner similar to Seti I, so the plaque is probably his. The lack of monuments from the early half of Seti II’s reign showing usurpations by Amenmesse is most likely due to the situation of Seti II re-usurping these monuments upon retaking the Theban area.

In contrast with the monuments belonging to Amenmesse, Seti II was the legitimate heir of Merneptah and for all intents and purposes the next king. He would not have to legitimize his kingship, but then he had to deal with Amenmesse’s intervening kingship and reign. Many of Seti II’s monuments follow traditional royal ideology through his statues and inscriptions at Karnak, Luxor, Memphis, and Abu Simbel, to name a few. Seti II, however, had to deal with Amenmesse as the mere presence of his name upon temples, statues, and tomb walls could not be tolerated as they served to legitimize Amenmesse’s kingship. Seti II began a program of erasures, usurpations, and new inscriptions wherever he could find Amenmesse’s name or the actions of Amenmesse’s agents against Merneptah. Many of the Seti II inscriptions at Karnak and Luxor reveal the characteristic bowl-shaped depressions indicating that an earlier text was erased before the final name of Seti II was carved in these depressions. In some cases, the erasures were not as thorough leaving behind traces of Amenmesse’s titulary, and in instances of erasures involving Merneptah’s name, Seti II had his name carved instead rather than restoring his father’s name. If Amenmesse erected a statue, Seti II merely had the offending inscriptions erased and replaced with his own rather than to totally


7For example, see Chapter 6 numbers 17, 26, 49, 56-59, 61-63, 65-66, 69, 70-71, 83-85, 88, 94, 108.

8Chapter 5 numbers 6-8, 10-12, 15, 16, 20, 22, 24, 26,-27, 30-32, 34-39.
destroy a reusable statue. Although there is a tendency to gravitate towards the extreme by attributing the majority of statues bearing the name of Seti II as Amenmesse originals, unless there are clear traces of Amenmesse’s name upon them, they are definitely those of Seti II.

Chronological Considerations

In looking at the monuments of Amenmesse and Seti II, one historical question that has been debated over the years is how exactly do the reigns of these two kings fit into the chronology of the Nineteenth Dynasty, and do the monuments belonging to these kings reflect the known lengths of their reigns? One theory suggested by Krauss is that the reign of Amenmesse is to be interpreted as one parallel to that of Seti II making Amenmesse a parallel king within the reign of Seti II. Part of his chief arguments is that a definite gap in regnal years exists between Seti II’s second and fifth year of rule that can correspond only to the time when Amenmesse was in control over Upper Egypt. Such a suggestion would then explain evident gaps in the available chronological data but such an explanation is more complex than intended.

---

9 Especially chapter 5 numbers 6-7, 12, 14, 37; chapter 6 numbers 49, 56-59, 61.

10 See Dodson, *Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy*, 52, 57, 63, who takes BM 26, Turin 1383, and Louvre A 24 as all originally belonging to Amenmesse and later usurped by Seti II.

The Accession Date of Seti II

Problems exist in that the accession dates for Amenmesse and Seti II are largely imprecise and uncertain based on essentially best suggestions and speculations from the available data, once again much of it incomplete. For instance, the accession date of Seti II is a good example for ascertaining chronological problems related to the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II. Seti II came to the throne upon the death of his father Merneptah, whose reign length varies from ten to fifteen years, with Helck suggesting an even longer reign of nineteen years. The highest known dates for Merneptah appear to be in his Year 10 with a range of 2 Akhet 7, 13 to 4 Akhet 7 being attested on two inundation graffiti from Thebes and on Papyrus Sallier I (BM 10185) in the British Museum, London. On an ostracon in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (MMA

\[12\]Janssen, *Village Varia*, 100, 152.

\[13\]For a history and summary of the regnal length of Merneptah, see Iskander, 198-245; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (1. Teil),” 187-95. Wolfgang Helck’s belief of a longer nineteen year reign for Merneptah in *Materialien zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, vol. 4, *Eigentum und Besitz an verschiedenen Dingen des täglichen Lebens, Kapitel P-AH*, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klass, Jahrgang 1963, no. 3 (Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur; Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1963), 536-38/732-34, is largely based on trying to link Manetho’s account, as cited in Josephus, *contra Apionem* (Against Apion), 1.97, of a nineteen year reign to Merneptah with known ostraca from the Ramesseum, but Iskander, 205, and Wente and Van Siclen, 236, point out that the hieratic dockets referencing a Year 19 are more likely those of Ramesses II or Ramesses II in that they do not specifically name a king. For the alleged nineteen years of rule for Merneptah in Manetho via Josephus, see Beckerath, *Chronologie des ägyptischen Neuen Reiches*, 54-61, 70; idem, *Chronologie des Pharaonischen*, 104, 127-28, 223; Verbrugghe and Wickersham, 159, 199.

14.6.217), labeled as coming from Theodore Davis’ excavations in the Valley of the Kings, the death of Merneptah is announced by the scribe Paser who announced \( ws\-hprw-R\chi \ tps.n-R\chi \ \epsilon\eta \ m \ hq3 \) “Userkheperure Setepenre has arisen as ruler.”

Regrettably, the date is only partially preserved with a reconstructed reading of “[Year 1, . . . P]eret 16.” Krauss, along with Janssen, notes that there would have been an interval, taking into account if Merneptah died in Pi-Ramesse, between Merneptah’s death and the news being delivered by Paser that Merneptah died and Seti II was now king.

Since the exact month on O. MMA 14.6.217 is unknown, a number of intervals have been suggested to precisely date Seti II’s accession as king. The most common suggestion is that Seti II’s accession date ranges from “late 1 Peret to early 3 Peret” taking into account the time involved in travel from Pi-Ramesse to Thebes with the news of Merneptah’s death, and Seti II’s next known regnal dates are Year 1, 3 Peret 23 to 3 Shemu 13, up to Year 1, 2 Akhet 10-13 from ostraca in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo.

---


\( ^{17} \) Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (1. Teil),” 169; Janssen, Village Varia, 152. Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (1. Teil),” 169, reconstructs the lost date as [3 P]eret 16 based on the interval from Merneptah’s death in Pi-Ramesse and the time it took an ancient Egyptian ship to sail from Pi-Ramesse to Thebes. If Merneptah died in Thebes, then the interval would only be the time it took for Paser to travel from Thebes on the east bank over to Deir el-Medina on the west bank.
(O. CG 25509, 25560), which recount a visit by Seti II to Thebes.\textsuperscript{18} Using the same data, Kitchen gives an accession of “1 or 2 Peret 25,” Krauss suggests a more precise interval of 2 Peret 29 to 3 Peret 3, while Beckerath would extend the interval to 3 Peret 6. Robert Demarée believes the accession date of Seti II was 2 Peret 29, but gives no data to ascertain how exactly that date was reached.\textsuperscript{19}

By taking O. CG 25509 as belonging to Seti II’s Year 1, 3 Peret 23, Krauss’s supposition that the missing date from O. MMA 14.6.217 is [3] Peret 16 seems possible, but the more likely interval is that of 1 Peret to 3 Peret as suggested by Helck and

\textsuperscript{18} Janssen, Village Varia, 101. See also Helck, “Zur Geschichte der 19. und 20. Dynastie,” 41-42; idem, “Bemerkungen zu den Thronbesteigungsdaten im Neuen Reich,” 123; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenмесse (1. Teil),” 176-77; Wente and Van Siclen, 235, 257. For O. CG 25509, 25560, see KRI 4: 299-302; KRI 8: 74; RITA 4: 217-19; Černý, Ostraca hiératiques, vol. 1, Texte et Transcriptions, Catalogue general des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire Nos. 25501-25832 (Caire: Imprimerie de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1935) 4, 23, 6’, 45’; idem, Ostraca hiératiques, vol. 2, Planches. Catalogue general des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire Nos. 25501-25832 (Caire: Imprimerie de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1935), plates 4-5, 29. In opposition to O. CG 25509 coming from Year 1 of Seti II is Koen Donker Van Heel, “Clusters of Individual Handwritings and the Duplication of Information in the Administrative Documents from Deir el-Medina,” in Writing in a Workmen’s Village: Scribal Practice in Ramesside Deir el-Medina, by Koen Donker Van Heel and Ben J. J. Haring (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2003), 61-64, who suggests that O. CG 25509 dates from the end of Seti II’s Year 6 and Year 1 of Siptah due to overlapping dates on O. CG 25509 and another ostracon, O. CG 25515. Van Heel interprets this data to mean that the scribe responsible for these documents used O. CG 25515 as a draft for writing O. CG 25509 in an attempt to produce a more formal record of events from this time period. Although Van Heel may be correct in this manner, O. CG 25509 and 25515 merely state that on “Year 1, 3 Peret 23” there was a visit, presumably by official(s), but damage to the ostraca prevents confirmation of Van Heel’s theory. For O. CG 25515, see note 13 below.

The problem in determining Seti II’s accession date is that the exact date of Merneptah’s death is not precisely known, with the best available evidence suggesting Merneptah died sometime after Year 10, 4 Akhet 7. The uncertainty of Merneptah’s death means that only an interval can be suggested as to when Seti II came to the throne, unless more precise data comes to light at a later date.

Regnal Years and Length of Seti II’s Reign

Monumentally, attestations to Seti II’s regnal years are confirmed with Year 1 and Year 2 appearing at Abu Simbel, the Speos of Horemheb at West Silsila, Amada, and the next known monumentally attested regnal year is the Preemhab inscription at Wadi Hammamat of Year 5. The currently known administrative documents pertaining to the early reign of Seti II, mainly ostraca from Thebes as mentioned previously, also support the attestations of Years 1 and 2, with another large gap in the available records until Year 5. Seti II’s reign ended during his Year 6, upon the announcement of his death in

---


21 As evidenced on Papyrus Sallier I (BM 10185). Hornung, “New Kingdom,” 212, states that the highest year date for Merneptah is “Year 9, 4 Shemu [10+x],” on O. Gardiner 197, now O. Ashmolean Museum 197, but Hornung is probably referring to the highest completed year of Merneptah, as Caminos, Late-Egyptian Miscellanies, 303, points out that the eulogy of Merneptah found on Papyrus Sallier I clearly links the papyrus to his reign. For O. Ashmolean Museum 197, see KRI 4: 159; KRI 8: 74; RITA 4: 119; Černý, Community of Workmen at Thebes, 331; Wente and Van Siclen, 256.

22 Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (1. Teil),” 176-77; Wente and Van Siclen, 257. For these monuments, see chapter 6 numbers 46, 97, 102-103.

23 Beckerath, Chronologie des ägyptischen Neuen Reiches, 71; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (1. Teil),” 176-77; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 40; Vandersleyen, Égypte et la Vallée du Nil, 2: 579; Wente and Van Siclen, 257. These documents include O.
Year 6, 4 Peret 19, as mentioned on an ostracon in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (CG 25515, JE 47928, with additional fragments JE 50340e-d) and an estimated total length of about five years and eleven months to six full years as king.24

Amenmesse’s Accession Date and Regnal Years

This gap between Seti II’s Year 2 and Year 5 is baffling in that one would not normally expect a short reign to be missing any attested regnal years in both administrative and monumental dates especially in what is essentially the middle of a six year reign. Even the equally short nearly seven year reign of Siptah has all of his regnal

MMA 14.6.217, O. CG 25509, 25560, with Year 1 dates, Papyrus Sallier I-III (British Museum, London BM 10185, 10182, 10181), Papyrus Anastasi IV (BM 10249), and an administrative papyrus from Gurob in the Petrie Museum, London (UC 32784) dating to Years 1-2. Years 5-6 are documented on O. CG 25511-12, 25515-17, 25538, 25541-43, 25556, For more on these documents, see previous references in notes 5, 8, plus KRI 4: 298-328; KRI 7: 249-50; RITA 4: 216-36; Černý, Ostraca hiératiques, 1: 5-8, 16-18, 21-22, 8'-14', 34', 36'-40', 44'; idem, Ostraca hiératiques, 2: plates 6, 8-9, 25, 28; Gardiner, Ramesside Administrative Documents, ix-x, 14-17; idem, Late-Egyptian Miscellanies, xiv-xv, 34-34a, 40-40a, 41-41a; Caminos, Late-Egyptian Miscellanies, 125, 153, 329; Francis Llewellyn Griffith, The Petrie Papyri: Hieratic Papyri from Kahun and Gurob ( Principally of the Middle Kingdom), vol. 1, Text (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1898), 94-98; idem, The Petrie Papyri: Hieratic Papyri from Kahun and Gurob ( Principally of the Middle Kingdom), vol. 2, Plates (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1898), plates 39-40.

24Krauss, “Zur Historischen Einordnung Amenmesse,” 27, has five years and ten months, while Beckerath, Chronologie des ägyptischen Neuen Reiches, 71, idem, Chronologie des Pharaonischen, 105, Morris Bierbrier, “Genealogy and Chronology,” in Ancient Egyptian Chronology, ed. Erik Hornung, Rolf Krauss, and David A. Warburton (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 42, and Wente and Van Sielen, 235, round up to a full six years of rule. Although O. CG 25515 records on Year 6, 1 Peret 19 that Nakhtmin, the chief of the Medjay, announced to the workers at Deir el-Medina that Seti II had died, Janssen, Village Varia, 153-54, points out that the time involved between Seti II’s burial during Year 1, 3 Peret 11 of Siptah, the seventy days of preparation for burial, and the distances involved in communicating between Pi-Ramesse and Thebes means that Seti II had to die a bit earlier than the day the workers received news of Seti II’s death. Janssen calculates this date as occurring during Seti II’s Year 6, 4 Akhet. In contrast, Schneider, “Siptah und Beja,” 146, and Helek, “Begräbnis Pharaos,” 270 note 12, suggest Seti II died during Seti II’s Year 6, 1 Peret 1-2, but note Janssen’s objections cited above as to factoring in time and distances involved. For the last known attestations of Seti II in Year 6, see O. CG 25515-16 in KRI 4: 327-28, 382; RITA 4: 236, 278; Černý, Ostraca hiératiques, 1: 7-8, 11’-14’; idem, Ostraca hiératiques, 2: plates 8-9; Georges Daressy, “Ramsès-Si-Ptah,” RecTrav 34 (1912): 39-52; McDowell, Village Life in Ancient Egypt, 205-206.
years accounted for on existing monuments and documents.\textsuperscript{25} Such a chronological gap might be explained by poor recordkeeping and preservation, but for two whole years?\textsuperscript{26} Krauss’ suggestion of Amenmesse’s reign interrupting Seti II’s reign at this point might be valid, unlike his identification of Messuy with Amenmesse.

According to Krauss’ hypothesis, Amenmesse began his reign within the first five months of Seti II’s Year 1 when Amenmesse proclaimed himself king between 1 Shemu


\textsuperscript{26}As a rejoinder, KRI 8: 70; Beckerath, \textit{Chronologie des ägyptischen Neuen Reiches}, 40; idem, \textit{Chronologie des Pharaos}, 118; Brand, \textit{Monuments of Seti I}, 307; Helck, “Zur Chronologiediskussion über das Neue Reich,” 63-64; Hornung, “New Kingdom,” 211, point out there are no attested documents or monuments from Year 10 of Seti I, which must be a matter of preservation rather than something unexplainable as Years 1-9, 11 appear on numerous monuments and administrative documents. An old theory by John D. Schmidt, \textit{Ramesses II: A Chronological Structure for His Reign}, Johns Hopkins Near Eastern Studies (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), 174-80, suggesting that missing years in Ramesses II reign are explained by a rebellion cannot be supported in light that all years from Ramesses II’s reign can be accounted for. See now KRI 8: 70-73; Hornung, “New Kingdom,” 211.
Helck, followed by Kitchen, Beckerath, Wente and Van Siclen, and Demarée settle for the more precise accession date of 3 Shemu 18. The suggested date of 3 Shemu 18 comes from an ostracon from the Valley of the Kings (CG 25784) in which the change in year from Year 3 to Year 4 of an unknown king is noted as happening on 3 Shemu 18. Since this accession date did not belong to either Merneptah or Seti II, this led Helck to suggest it belonging to Amenmesse as he was the only Nineteenth Dynasty king who lacked a known accession date at the time.

Unfortunately, the only known monumental date of Amenmesse is the usurped stela from Buhen (1611) of Year 1, and the remaining dated documents from his reign are administrative ostraca written by the Deir el-Medina workers dating to Year 3 and Year 4. Even so, the known late Nineteenth Dynasty ostraca are problematic in proving Amenmesse’s reign as occurring within that of Seti II.

---


29 Helck, “Zur Geschichte der 19. und 20. Dynastie,” 43; idem, “Bemerkungen zu den Thronbesteigungsdaten im Neuen Reich,” 121-23. The change in dates is noted on O. CG 25783 where Year 3, 3 Shemu 17, is followed by Year 4, 3 Shemu 18 on O. CG 25784. Van Heel, “Clusters of Individual Handwritings,” 49, suggests that the list of absent workers on 3 Shemu 18 due to illness might have been because of too much celebrating the night before “Amenmesse’s accession anniversary.” For O. CG 25783-84, see note 20.

30 See chapter 5 number 35 for the Buhen stela. Van Heel, “Clusters of Individual Handwritings,” 49, 51, records that the known ostraca from Amenmesse’s Year 3 and 4 (O. CG 25779-80, 25782-84) all come from Howard Carter’s Spring 1922 excavations in the Valley of the Kings where they were found “wrapped in a mat and placed on a shelf” in the remains of a worker’s hut east of KV 47, the tomb of Siptah. For O. CG 25779-80, 25782-84, see KRI 4: 211-16, 220-28; RITA 4: 152-54, 156-60; Černý, Ostraca hiératiques, 1: 86-87, 98-109; idem, Ostraca hiératiques, 2: plates 101-105; Helck, “Zur Geschichte der 19. und 20. Dynastie,” 43;
Part of the problem is that many of these administrative documents coming from the workers at Deir el-Medina lack a king’s name or sometimes even a year date to place them adequately in late Nineteenth Dynasty chronology resulting in many theoretical attributions of ostraca to Merneptah, Amenmesse, or Seti II. Jacobus Jansen urges caution in arbitrary attributing “an undated text to a specific reign” and argues that presenting these undated ostraca as “the definitive truth” of evidence pertaining to Amenmesse or Seti II’s reign shows a lack of careful analysis and methodology.

According to Jansen’s research, O. CG 25779-80, 25782-84 all belong to Year 3 and Year 4 of Amenmesse through a careful analysis of the list of workers and dates present on these ostraca. He believes that Amenmesse considered himself the legitimate heir of Merneptah, rather than Seti II, and Amenmesse then dated his regnal years from the death


31For example, see ostraca bearing Year 1 dates and lacking a king’s name on O. DeM 177, O. DeM 675, Year 2 on O. DeM 209, O. Varille 26, and O. Brunner (now O. Tübingen 1855), in KRI 4: 216-20; KRI 7: 236-40; RITA 4: 154-56. Kitchen gravitates from identifying these ostraca as belonging to the reigns of either Merneptah or Amenmesse in KRI 4: 216-20, KRI 7: 236-40, RITA 4: 154-56, to including Ramesses II in the suggested attributions in KRI 8: 70, 73-74. In contrast, Janssen, “Two Personalities,” 112, 125 notes 25-26, attributes O. DeM 209 and O. Varille 26 to the reigns of “Amenmesse and/or Seti II.” Additionally, see varied attributions of these ostraca as belonging to the Nineteenth Dynasty in general or specifically the reign of Amenmesse through searching by ostraca number at Robert J. Demarée et al., Index to the Deir el-Medina Database (1 November 2009) <http://www.wcpwawet.nl/dmd/indexes.htm> [23 August 2010]. For O. Brunner (O. Tübingen 1855), see KRI 7: 249-50, 414-15; Wolfgang Helck, “Eine Zahlungssquittung,” ZÄS 111 (1984): 6-10; Ben J. J. Haring, “Hieratic Varia,” JEA 90 (2004): 219.

32Janssen, Village Varia, 99. For these undated ostraca, purportedly coming from the reign of Amenmesse or Seti II, see KRI 4: 228-38, 328-35; KRI 7: 240-44, 250; RITA 4: 161-66, 236-41.
of Merneptah resulting in a parallel kingship. The lack of known dates before Year 3 for Amenmesse is explained by Amenmesse not gaining control over the Theban area until about Year 3 of Seti II and then Amenmesse controlling Thebes from Seti II’s Year 3 and possibly into Year 5. This suggests that Amenmesse merely absorbed Seti II’s Year 3 and Year 4 into his own regnal years as he created his own parallel reign to that of Seti II.

One issue that has always caused puzzlement is that if Amenmesse is to be seen as ruling independently before the reign of Seti II, why did the legitimate heir, Seti II, allow this to happen? Seti II was the chosen heir of Merneptah as attested through Seti II’s various titles as crown prince of Merneptah. Seti II, as crown prince, was not going to stand idly by and allow his throne to be taken from him without issuing a protest or gathering the court together to stop Amenmesse, who was an usurper. Concurrently, it would be hard to see Seti II patiently waiting for nearly four years until Amenmesse died without launching his own bid to gain the throne. If Seti II did directly follow Merneptah

---


34 Janssen, Village Varia, 101-102. See also similar earlier studies in Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (1. Teil),” 162-81; idem, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse: Nachträge,” 162-69. Ousing, 257-69, argues in his analysis of the same material for an independent reign of Amenmesse before that of Seti II.

35 See discussion of these titles in chapter 2.

36 Janssen, Village Varia, 100 note 19, says that Amenmesse “was not quite without any ties to the royal family” a statement with which this author agrees.
then having his reign interrupted due to Amenmesse appointing himself king would explain the gap in the monumental and administrative records concerning Seti II’s Year 3 and Year 4.37

Amenmesse’s Kingship and the Rebellion Theory

Creating a parallel kingship, such as the one suggested for Amenmesse, is not without difficulty and would have to be a forceful one thereby leading Krauss to suggest that Amenmesse essentially began his kingship in Nubia through launching a rebellion against Seti II, the legitimate king. Summarizing Krauss’ main points, Amenmesse launched his rebellion within the first five months of Seti II’s reign, managed to extend and consolidate his rule to Thebes by his Year 3, and maintained control over Upper Egypt and Nubia into Year 4, which happens to be the last known currently attested year date for Amenmesse.38 An event, such as a rebellion launched by a collateral or marginalized member of the royal family, would be an interrupting factor in the administrative records as well as the lives of the Deir el-Medina workers.

37Kitchen, “Amenmesses in Northern Egypt,” 23-25; idem “Basics of Egyptian Chronology in Relation to the Bronze Age,” 37-55; idem, “Supplementary Notes on ‘Basics of Egyptian Chronology,’” 155, once supported an independent reign for Amenmesse, but he has softened his stance in idem, “Historical Chronology of Ancient Egypt,” 4; idem, “Regnal and Genealogical Data of Ancient Egypt,” 42; idem, “Egyptian and Related Chronologies,” 167-69, to include Amenmesse’s reign as possibly within that of Seti II.

Evidence for Amenmesse’s Rebellion

Nonetheless, a rebellion would not be directly mentioned in the administrative records as such an event would probably reflect badly upon the late Nineteenth Dynasty royal family. What exists in the currently available documents from the late Nineteenth Dynasty hints that something disruptive did indeed happen during the period covering the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II. Most of these references, admittedly few in number, refer to p3 ḫrw “the enemy” or p3 ḫrw/ḥrwyw “the hostilities.”39 Janssen points out that three of these accounts, O. Nash 1, O. Nash 2, and O. JE 72465, recount court cases “probably” dating to Year 6 of Seti II, mention a time ḥr-s3 p3 ḫrw(y)w “after the hostilities” (O. Nash 1-2) or that p3 ḫrw “the enemy came” (O. JE 72465).40 Another ostracon in the Musées Royaux d’Art et d’Historie in Brussels (E 6311) concerning an inventory of possessions states pAy.f [jt] ḫr mwt p3 ḫrw(yw) “his [father] died (in) the hostilities” and a Deir el-Medina ostracon (O. DeM 319) describes a listing of burial goods with a reference to a time when p3 ḫrw jy “the enemy came.”41 The final


attestation of $p^3\ hrw$ “the enemy” comes from Papyrus Salt 124 (BM 10055) with Amennakht’s complaints against Paneb taking the position of chief workman that Amennakht felt was rightfully his. Amennakht stated that $p^3\ hrw\ hr\ hdb\ nfr-htp$ “the enemy killed Neferhotep (the Younger),” the brother of Amennakht, thereby allowing Paneb to bribe Vizier Preemheb in order to gain the position of chief workman over Amennakht.42

These occurrences of $p^3\ hrw$ “the enemy” or $p^3\ hrw/hrwx$ “the hostilities” refer back to events Janssen notes occurring “in the near past” involving situations that the Deir el-Medina workers found themselves involved in if the scattered attestations refer to when Amenmesse gained control, possibly through force, over the Theban area.43 The Deir el-Medina workers would have found it confusing to have worked on a tomb (KV 15) for one king, Seti II, only to have another king come along, namely Amenmesse, and order work to begin on a second tomb (KV 10). Not only did the workers have to work on two royal tombs during essentially the same regnal period, one for Seti II and another for Amenmesse, but they then had to resume work for Seti II when he regained control over the Theban area as well as erase or destroy much of their work within KV 10.

---

42KRI 4: 408; RITA 4: 292; Allam, 1: 281; Černý, “Papyrus Salt 124,” 244, 247, and plate 42; idem, “Contribution of the Study of Unofficial and Private Documents,” 39; idem, “Die Ramessiden,” 278-79; idem, Community of Workmen, 289-90, 301; Davies, Egyptian Historical Inscriptions of the Nineteenth Dynasty, 344-45; Faulkner, “Egypt: From the Inception of the Nineteenth Dynasty,” 237; Janssen, Village Varia, 100, 102; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (1. Teil),” 184; idem, Moïse le Pharaon, 135; McDowell, Village Life in Ancient Egypt, 191; Romer, Ancient Lives, 65; Spalinger, review of Elephantine-Stele des Sethnakht, 274; Théodoridès, 38; Vernus, 74-75.

43Janssen, Village Varia, 102.
Although some attempt has been made by Helck, Osing, and Spalinger to attribute references to $p\dot{3} \text{hrwy}$ “the enemy” to Libyan or Bedouin raids into the Theban area or rival local workers, an examination of surviving rosters suggests something more complex is involved than referring to mere raids by nomads.\textsuperscript{44} In instances where Libyans or Bedouins are mentioned on surviving documents from the Theban area, mostly those dating from the Twentieth Dynasty, they are clearly called $Rbw$ “Rebu/Libu,” $M\dot{sw}s$ “Meshwesh,” or $\dot{h}\text{styw}$ “desert people.”\textsuperscript{45} In the Nineteenth Dynasty examples cited previously it appears that since the enemy are not mentioned specifically as Libu, Meshwesh, or $\dot{h}\text{styw}$, then a group of non-foreign people who were enemies of the Seti II administration are mentioned. That can only be the supporters and administration of Amenmesse.

Janssen, followed by Mark Collier, examined the known ostraca listing work rosters from a period covering Year 3 and Year 4 of Amenmesse (O. CG 25779-80, 25782-84) and Year 5 and 6 of Seti II into the early part of Siptah’s reign (O. CG 25512, 25516, 25517, 25519, 25521; O. DeM 611).\textsuperscript{46} Comparisons between these two groups of ostraca


\textsuperscript{46}Janssen, Village Varia, 102-103; Collier, 1. For these ostraca, see notes 13 and 20 above plus KRI 4: 313-15; 320-21, 386-89, 390-92, 395, 397-402; RITA 4: 225-26, 228-29, 279-83, 285,
revealed there was a drastic change in the workforce between Year 4 of Amenmesse and Year 5 and Year 6 belonging to Seti II. The most obvious difference is the replacement of Neferhotep the Younger as chief workman by Paneb, as outlined in Papyrus Salt 124, but at least eleven workers and a scribe have seemingly vanished from the roster and replaced by fourteen new workers. Disappearance of this many members of the Deir el-Medina workforce suggests that they were forcefully removed and replaced by new workers as a result of the dynastic struggles between Amenmesse and Seti II. In effect, Janssen sees this as a “purge” either by Amenmesse towards the end of his reign or by Seti II upon regaining control over the area.

The reasons for this suggested “purge” can be explained in two ways. If these workers were removed by Amenmesse, they may have been judged as too loyal to the previous Seti II administration or even tried to sabotage work on the royal tomb and therefore dismissed or killed. If Seti II is to be seen as the king who removed these workers, then they may have collaborated with the usurper Amenmesse too closely and therefore punished accordingly. There is an ostracon in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (CG 25556), dating from Year 5 of Seti II in which Chief Workman Hay stands accused

---

286-88; Černý, _Ostraca hiératiques_, 1: 5-6, 7-11, 9*-10*, 14*-15*, 18*-19*, 22*-25*; idem, _Ostraca hiératiques_, 2: plates 6, 10, 13, 15-16; Collier, 25-41.

47 Janssen, _Village Varia_, 102-104; Collier, 5-8, 18-19. Černý, “Papyrus Salt 124,” 247, and Bierbrier, _Late New Kingdom in Egypt_, 22, theorize that Paneb killed Neferhotep the Younger in order to get his position. If so, why did Amennakht not say so in Papyrus Salt 124 instead of stating “the enemy” killed him. Later, Černý, _Community of Workmen_, 289-90, revised his opinion to state that Amenmesse was to blame. See also the discussion in Davies, _Who’s Who at Deir el-Medina_, 33-34.

48 Janssen, _Village Varia_, 104, followed by Collier, 8.
of w3 r Sthv “cursing against Seti II.”49 Such a case recorded on O. CG 25556 demonstrates that cursing the reigning king was not taken lightly, in light of the previous struggle with Amenmesse, but Seti II probably was not the king who removed the fourteen workers. Amennakht said that “the enemy” killed his brother, and a legitimate king, such as Seti II, would never be referred to in an official complaint as the enemy but an usurper such as Amenmesse would.50

It seems likely that based on these accounts of “the enemy” and “the hostilities” along with the removal of the fourteen Deir el-Medina workers that the dynastic struggle between Amenmesse and Seti II was not a peaceful one. It is unfortunate that in Janssen’s words “only a vague echo of the events” from the currently available documents suggest how the dispute between Amenmesse and Seti II affected Egypt during this period.51 The struggle between Amenmesse and Seti II over the throne has been referred to as “hostilities” by Janssen, a “war” (Krieg) by Krauss, a “civil war” (Bürgerkrieg) or “civil strife” by Allam, Théodoridès, and Haring, a civil war launched by a “rebellious son” according to Vandersleyen, and even a revision by Krauss into a true coup d’État.52 The conclusion of this struggle was the ending of Amenmesse’s reign

---


50Incidentally, Hay’s accusers recanted their charges that he cursed Setii, and they were punished for making a false accusation in what McDowell thinks was a warning instead of “100 severe stick blows.” See McDowell, Jurisdiction in the Workmen’s Community, 175, 251.

51Janssen, Village Varia, 104.

52Ibid., 102; Krauss, “Untersuchungen zu König Amenmesse (1. Teil),” 170, 184-87; idem, Moïse le Pharaon, 155-58; Allam, 1: 56 note 6, 70 note 4, 115 note 4, 215 note 2, 219 note 10,
after a length of nearly four years, disruption in the lives of the Deir el-Medina workers, a
purge of some of the work ranks resulting in death for a few members, and Seti II
regaining the throne in Thebes for a brief period of time before his death in Year 6. It is
uncertain if Amenmesse was killed during Seti II’s attempts to regain control, or if
Amenmesse fled to safety leaving his desire to be king as well as his monuments behind
for Seti II to usurp or destroy.53

The reasons behind Amenmesse deciding to appoint himself king and supplant Seti II
in Upper Egypt and Nubia are still unknown. No known records exist with the kind of
propagandistic statements from Amenmesse defining why he decided to replace Seti II as
king and create his own parallel reign. Krauss believes that one reason for Amenmesse’s
revolt is that the status of Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah as heir apparent may have played
some role in deciding Amenmesse’s choice.54 Dodson thinks that the suggested
replacement of Viceroy Messuy, later King Amenmesse via Krauss, in Year 7 or Year 8
of Merneptah with Khaemtjtry created a situation in which the animosity felt by Messuy
at being dismissed from the position of viceroy led him to launch his rebellion against his
own family.55 Enticing as these theories may be for explaining the root of the struggle

284 note 4; Haring, “Libyans in the Late Twentieth Dynasty,” 80; Théodoridès, 75 note 305;

give Amenmesse a reign of three years and eight months to just three years. Beckerath,
Chronologie des ägyptischen Neuen Reiches, 71, and idem, Chronologie des Pharaonischen, 105,
calculates Amenmesse’s reign from three to four years. Krauss, Moïse le Pharaon, 158,
imaginatively speculates Amenmesse may have been defeated during an attack against Seti II in
Pi-Ramesse and retreated back into Nubia where he eventually died or his defeat caused him to
flee Egypt with his supporters into the Sinai.


55Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 30, 44-45. Dodson’s arguments revolve around a
“top-level purge” (Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 30) by Merneptah in that a few officials appear
between Amenmesse and Seti II, there is nothing concrete to suggest that there is any factual basis to prove them and Amenmesse’s motives remain mysterious.

Conclusion

The monuments of Amenmesse and Seti II reveal a problematic period in ancient Egyptian history. The struggle between Amenmesse and Seti II over the throne became a corrosion that contributed to the end of the Nineteenth Dynasty royal family. Seti II dealt with a rebellious member of the late Nineteenth Dynasty royal family who interfered with the royal act of succession and was a chaotic influence that disturbed the order of maat. Seti II restored order to the chaos that Amenmesse brought to Egypt and even made plans for Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah to be his eventual heir, but Seti II’s plans never came to fruition. Seti II died, and so did Crown Prince Seti-Merneptah, leaving the throne to Siptah, of whose parentage is still questionable, and eventually Queen Tausert. After Queen Tausert, the Twentieth Dynasty rulers were quick to gloss over the problems of the late Nineteenth Dynasty by conveniently skipping any mention
to have been replaced during these years of Merneptah’s reign. Negating this theory is Iskander, 336-413, who notes nothing unusual concerning a suggested purge of the administrative ranks. It is very likely that any changes in administrative positions during Merneptah’s reign are attributive to deaths. Furthermore, if Messuy harbored a grudge against Merneptah, his grandfather, why not launch the rebellion soon after being dismissed instead of waiting nearly three years to launch it during the reign of Seti II?


57For Siptah and Tausert, see the more recent Callender, “Queen Tausret and the End of Dynasty 19,” 81-104; idem, “The Cripple, the Queen, & the Man from the North,” 48-63; Dodson, Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy, 70-98; Schneider, “Siptah und Beja,” 134-46; Johnson, “Transition and Legitimation in Egypt’s Late 19th and Early 20th Dynasties.”
of them and considering Seti II the last legitimate king in their eyes.\textsuperscript{58} The complex and sometimes confusing patterns of usurpations on many monuments dating to the reigns of Amenmesse and Seti II has led to many different reconstructions of late Nineteenth Dynasty history. Amenmesse will always be described as the usurping king who caused problems in late Nineteenth Dynasty royal succession. He probably believed that he was the legitimate successor of Merneptah, politically and probably through blood, and he took the steps he felt he needed to take to make his kingship a political reality. Seti II knew he was the legitimate heir to Merneptah, and he took steps to reinforce that fact by attempting to remove Amenmesse’s name, as well as his memory, from all his monuments through a \textit{damnatio memoriae}. Seti II was unsuccessful in doing this, as traces of Amenmesse’s name are still able to be read today, and the genealogies and reigns of these two kings continue to be the topic of historical discussion and debate.

\textsuperscript{58}Dodson, \textit{Rameses II’s Poisoned Legacy}, 90, states that Sethnakht, first king of the Twentieth Dynasty was “probably a descendant of Rameses II” based on the usage of Seth in his nomen similar to that of Seti I and Seti II. Bierbrier, “Elements of Stability and Instability,”\textsuperscript{13}, and Wente, “Genealogy of the Royal Family,” 148-49, make the interesting observation that there is nothing to positively link the genealogies of the late Nineteenth Dynasty royal family to that of the early Twentieth Dynasty of Sethnakht and his son, Ramesses III. Bierbrier, “Elements of Stability and Instability,” \textsuperscript{13}, further mentions that if Sethnakht was a collateral descendant of Ramesses II or even by chance, Merneptah or Seti II, he or Ramesses III would make light of this fact in some manner. Since neither king propagandizes family ties to the late Nineteenth Dynasty, the Twentieth Dynasty may reflect the origins of the Nineteenth Dynasty in that both came from the military administration.
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