The Names of the Construction Parts in the Temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari
Question of Erasures of the Feminine Endings
The name in the ancient Egyptian world was of utmost importance. It defined the character of a person or a thing, being often a religious or political statement. The personal name was usually perceived as a regular sentence with all the rules of Egyptian grammar.¹ Royal names, because of their high rank, were a special instance, but the manner of reading appears to be the same.² In this context it could be expected that the reading of the names of temple parts will be treated in the same way, which, however, is not the case.

The temple of Hatshepsut occupies a special place in the research on naming buildings and their parts due to feminine endings used. These endings and their impact on the meanings remained neglected by most researchers.

The first person who made his own suggestion on understanding Egyptian names of buildings parts from the temple of Hatshepsut was E. Otto in his Topographie.³ He treated these names as sentences containing $sDm.f$ forms.

The studies on naming parts of sacral buildings were commenced relatively late in the subject literature. The next scientist who proposed the translation of names of temples, temple gates, etc. was Ch. Nims in his article about Thebes.⁴ He read only two names of the gates from the temple of Hatshepsut and in his translation he did not omit any part of the name of the gate leading to the Lower Chapel of Anubis, but probably because of bad state of preservation, he was unable to read the complete name of the gate to the Complex of the Sun Cult. The translation of K. Sethe indicates that he saw the names of gates as relative clauses.⁵ It can also be noticed that the names of gates were read as $sDm.t(w)$ passive form as well.⁶

The book published by T. Grothoff was devoted to gates names.⁷ The author distinguished five types of these names.⁸ Only two of them (Struktur A and Struktur B) can be observed in connection with the parts of buildings from Hatshepsut’s reign. The structure of both is similar, namely: Struktur A = terminus technicus + cartouche of the king + participial phrase; Struktur B = terminus technicus + cartouche of the king + god’s name + participial phrase. Struktur A concerns the situation where the participial

---

¹ I am especially grateful to dr Mirosław Barwik and prof. Ewa Laskowska-Kuszta) for their helpful advice and suggestions, as well as to Barbara Majchrzak for correcting my English.
⁴ Ch.F. Nims, Places about Thebes, JNES 14, 1955 [= JNES 14], pp. 110–123.
⁵ SetHe, Urk. IV, p. 137.
⁷ T. Grothoff, Die Tornamen der ägyptischen Tempel, Aegyptiaca Monasteriensia I, Aachen 1996 [= Tornamen].
1. Reconstructed original names of the gates in the Temple of Hatshepsut, Deir el-Bahari, from the reign of Hatshepsut.
phrase is an epithet for the king; as for the Struktur B, the participial phrase is linked to the god’s name.\(^9\)

At present scholars seem to use reading systems based mainly on Grothoff’s patterns or, if it is more convenient, they use regular grammar rules.\(^{10}\)

The material from the temple of Hatshepsut, with particularly often represented names of the gates (Fig. 1), gives an opportunity to verify substantially the proper understanding of this type of names in an adequate way.

The question of the relationship between three first nouns appears. It seems that the so-called terminus technicus (first noun) was not usually connected with the name of the king/queen and the latter constituted a part of the proper name. If the name did not contain the name of the king/queen second noun, any genitival structure was visible after terminus technicus.\(^{11}\) This is much more apprehensible in the case of names of the domains, where the proper name was written inside the sign hwt, therefore the genitival structure must be excluded.

The names of the doors of Hatshepsut’s sacral buildings are unique as they contain both the name of the king and the god. These two differ by their grammatical gender, which, consequently, gives a broader context and possibility to understand the grammar structure of the name.

The basic error made by scholars, resulting from the lack of data, was giving the same importance to completely and partially preserved names. Frequently, by omitting some parts of these names, they lost the chance to understand the full idea of the name. A typical example for this overlapping was the name of the granite gate leading from the Upper Courtyard to the Main Sanctuary of Amun (Fig. 1), cited as ‘Jmn htp hr mnn.s,\(^{12}\) which in full transcription runs as follows: sb\(^3\) M\(^{3}\)r-k\(^3\)-R\(^\circ\) ‘Jmn htp.w hr mnn.s. Such an omission has also further consequences. Firstly, it is impossible to compare the complete names of the gates with partially preserved (or partially recorded) ones from other building. Secondly, it may disturb interpretation.

It is possible to recognise three grammar structures which were used in the names of gates and other architectural structures, written on the doors and walls of the temple of Hatshepsut:

1. the name of the god + the nfr hr construction\(^{13}\): sb\(^3\) ropol ‘Jmn qsr mnn – ‘The great gate: Amun [is] holy of monuments’ (gate leading to the Upper Courtyard);

2. stative (or imperfective active participle\(^{14}\)): sb\(^3\) M\(^3\)r-k\(^3\)-R\(^\circ\) ‘Jmn htp(.w) hr mnn.s – Gate: M\(^3\)r-k\(^3\)-R\(^\circ\) Amun [is] satisfied with her monument’ (gate leading to the Bark Hall)

---

\(^9\) Grothoff, Tornamen, Fig. 49 on p. 234.
\(^{11}\) E.g. sb\(^4\) ‘Jmn Ssp(.w) mnn @At-Sps(wt)-Xmnt-‘Jmn (gate leading to the Statuary Room).
\(^{12}\) Grothoff, Tornamen, p. 114.
\(^{13}\) Cf. J.P. Allen, Middle Egyptian. An Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs, Cambridge 2000, p. 61 (6.5).
\(^{14}\) Due to the lack of broader context it seems to be impossible to decide if it is a stative or an imperfective active participle with the name of the god in an honorific transposition.
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and $sb\dot{3} \ 'Jmn \ ssp(.w) \ mnw \ H3t-ssp(wt)-lnmnt- 'Jmn$ – ‘Gate: Amun receives the monument of $H3t-ssp(wt)-lnmnt- 'Jmn$’ (gate leading to the Statuary Room);

3. participial phrase: the rest of the gates names from the temple of Hatshepsut and two names of domains represented on the walls of this temple.

Most errors appeared in the translation of the gates names which contain participial phrase, since these forms were often unnoticed.

An important source of information about the way of interpretation of the discussed names is the name of the gate located in the eastern part of the northern wall of the Upper Courtyard and leading to the Complex of the Sun Cult (Fig. 2). Its full name $sb\dot{3} \ Mn-hpr-R\dot{e} \ dsr \ 3lt \ 'Jmn$ (on the left jamb) / $sb\dot{3} \ M3'r-k3-R\dot{e} \ dsrt \ 3lt \ 'Jmn$ (on the right jamb) was reduced by T. Grothoff to $'Jmn \ dsr-3lt$ and he read it as ‘Amun, der Heilig ist im Horizont’. This name was also translated by Ch. Nims as ‘Amun is holy in the horizon’, and more recently by J. Karkowski as ‘Men-[kheper]-Re / [Maat]-ka-[Re] holy of Amun’s Horizon’. It was disregarded by most scholars, except for J. Karkowski, that this name has two forms, one feminine and one masculine, depending on the jamb which it was placed on. The second form written on the right jamb with feminine $t$ at the end.

---

15 T. Grothoff erroneously marked it as a gate leading from the Vestibule to the Altar Court of the Complex of the Sun Cult, cf. Id., Tornamen, p. 113, Fig. 28.
17 Grothoff, Tornamen, p. 114; the same abbreviation is quoted by E. Arnaudiès-Montélimard, namely: ‘Les noms de deux autres portes de la reine sont composés sans son nom : Jmn dsr mnw et Jmn dsr 3lt’, cf. Ead., CahKarn XII, p. 151.
18 Grothoff, Tornamen, p. 115.
19 Nims, JNES 14, p. 118, Inscription 33.
20 Karkowski, Solar Complex, p. 133.
21 J. Karkowski noticed it but used it in translation only partially, cf. Id., ibid.
(dsrt) is obscure if it is translated as it used to be, with the participial phrase describing Amun. The feminine form is logical if it constitutes an epithet for the name of the queen, and not for Amun. In consequence, Amun’s name must be regarded here as placed in an honorific transposition. This example shows that a new reading pattern must be created: *terminus technicus*: the king/queen (cartouche name) + participial phrase + the name of the god. Thus, the name of the gate leading to the Complex of the Sun Cult can be translated as ‘Gate: Mn-hpr-R’ / M$k_t-k$3-R’ is holy of the horizon of Amun’.

This observation concerns other names of gates as well. In all cases, the names contain queen’s throne name and a participial phrase which is easily visible because of the erasure of the feminine ending made during the proscription of Hatshepsut. The only masculine participial phrase was used in the case of the name of the gate leading to the Offering Chapel of Tuthmosis I (Fig. 1). It should be pointed out, that the inscription was re-carved, and the previous one is illegible. T. Grothoff translated this name as ‘Amun, der den Nordwind gibt’,

This system of reading can also be applied to the names of other architectural constructions – two names of domains appear on the walls of the temple of Hatshepsut:

First of them was depicted on the southern and northern walls of the passage leading to the Statuary Room. The personification of the domain was shown entering the room with the name written on her head inside the sign hwt (Fig. 3). The whole name of the domain can be read as: hwt M$k_t-k$3-R’ gmt 3ht ‘Jmn and translated: ‘Domain: M$k_t-k$3-R’ who finds the horizon of Amun’. The presence of the original feminine ending makes it possible to verify earlier suggestions on the reading of gates names. E. Naville translated it as ‘The house of the horizon of Amon, of Ramaka’ suggesting that it was the name of the Bark Hall. The feminine ending was not noticed or drawn in Naville’s publication. The name was also referred to by F. Pawlicki as +sr-3ht (without translation), and by J. Karkowski as ‘Amun-Who-finds-the-Horizon’.

The name of the other domain was carved on the eastern wall of the Court in the Complex of the Royal Cult. Again, the name written inside the sign Hwt (in this case in fortress-like shape) was placed on the head of the representation of the domain. The full name should be read hwt 3-hpr-k$3-R’ mry ‘Jtm, and translated as ‘Domain: Tuthmosis Ist beloved of Atum’.

---

22 Grothoff, Tornamen, p. 115.
23 E. Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari. Part V. The Upper Court and Sanctuary, EEF 27, London 1906 [=Deir el-Bahari V], pl. 139.
24 Naville, Deir el-Bahari V, p. 10.
25 It has been quoted by T. Grothoff in this erroneous form, cf. Id., Tornamen, p. 467, Dok. 9d).
27 Karkowski, Solar Complex, p. 81.
28 Naville, Deir el-Bahari V, Pl. 128. Dr. O. Białostocka is working now on this particular representation.
The names of the gates at the temple of Hatshepsut refer to the rituals and the theological message of the particular parts of the temple. It is worth to note that the names displayed on both sides of the temple axis remained in close ideological relation to each other. This is visible e.g. in the names of the gates leading to the parts of the Shrines of Hathor and Anubis hidden in the rock, where the names referred to bringing food offerings (Fig. 1). It also seems that the names of the gates situated along one axis expressed continuation of one theological idea. The names from the main axis of the temple are connected with the ritual function of the whole monument, as all of them describe its significance in relation to Amun (Fig. 1), but the names of the gates placed in Hathor Shrine are strictly connected with Hathor cult (Fig. 1).
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