Amenmesse: Six Statues at Karnak

FRANK J. YURCO

The royal Ramesseide head in The Metropolitan Museum of Art (no. 34.2.2) has been shown by Patrick Cardon to belong to one of three related statues in the Hypostyle Hall in the temple of Karnak.1 Of these, Maurice Pillet published a short note about the statue now situated north of column four, representing the king kneeling and holding an offering table.2 He found this statue in excavations near the girdle wall of the Thutmose part of the temple, near Taharqa’s edifice, north of the Sacred Lake at Karnak. It was moved to a location inside the Hypostyle Hall following Pillet’s suggestion that it originally belonged to a group that included the two standing statues located north of columns seventy and seventy-one in the south half of the hall. Pillet had proposed that the north-south axis of the hall was lined originally with a set of reddish quartzite statues, similar to the surviving three.3 Shehata Adam and Farid el-Shaboury, in their description of the restoration of these statues, stated that their original location was uncertain.4 Pillet, however, had discovered additional evidence in support of his proposal,5 and indeed, the photograph that Adam and el-Shaboury took before the restoration shows the statue north of column seventy-one—the one that matches the Metropolitan Museum’s head—still standing on what appears to be its original base.6 Pillet’s proposal regarding the grouping and location of the statues therefore seems the more reliable.7

All three statues were usurped, that is, appropriated and surcharged with respect to their inscriptions, by Sety II from an earlier pharaoh. Three other red quartzite statues at Karnak were similarly usurped. At present, two of these stand before the porch of the Second Pylon at Karnak, on the north and south sides respectively of the main processional axis of the temple.8 The third now stands in the Festival Hall of Thutmose III, just west of the entrance to the sanctuary of the hall.9 The six statues were carved in a reddish quartzite of uniform texture and

A list of abbreviations is given at the end of this article.

1. P-M II, pp. 51–52. This group excludes Cairo statue CG 1198, which came from a different part of the Hypostyle Hall; see below and notes 13–18.
2. Pillet, ASAE 24, pp. 73–74; Barguet, Temple (Cairo, 1962), pl. viii.
3. Pillet, ASAE 24, p. 74.
5. Pillet, ASAE 24, p. 74; he mentions finding a third base (besides those under the statues in the southern half of the hall), and fragments of the same reddish quartzite of which the statues are fashioned at another emplacement along the north-south axis of the hall.
6. Adam and el-Shaboury, ASAE 56, pl. xvi (incorrectly captioned “after restoration”).
7. I doubt, however, the accuracy of the location of the kneeling statue in the Hypostyle Hall. Another virtually identical statue of reddish quartzite survives in the Festival Hall of Thutmose III, just before the sanctuary (P-M II, p. 110, no. 341); it too was usurped by Sety II (Barguet, Temple, p. 178, n. 4), and is of the same scale. It also held an offering table, now almost totally broken away. In fact, the two statues form a complementary pair. As Pillet found the kneeling statue outside the Hypostyle Hall in a secondary context, I would suggest that it belongs with the statue in the Festival Hall, the pair probably flanking the sanctuary entrance.
8. P-M II, p. 38, no. 137; Legrain, Temples, p. 140 (although both Porter-Moss and Legrain mention only one statue, there are in fact fragments of two; see Pillet, ASAE 24, p. 74, and Adam and el-Shaboury, ASAE 56, p. 50, n. 1).
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quality, and are roughly of the same scale (slightly over life-size); their usurpation by Sety II is indicated by their back-pillar inscriptions which are secondary, carved over erased original texts. I would propose, therefore, that all six statues were erected and inscribed originally by one and the same pharaoh, probably at key points along the processional routes of the temple of Amun-Re at Karnak.

A number of historical studies by various scholars have mentioned the statues, but they have yet to be published adequately; and for this reason the inscriptions of all six will be presented and discussed here.

Vandier, contesting a verbal reference given by Edgerton to Gardiner, suggested that the Karnak statues with Sety II’s name had not been usurped. His main argument focused on another statue bearing inscriptions of Sety II, now in the Cairo Museum but originally from Karnak, namely Cairo CG 1198. This statue is usually grouped with the three from the Hypostyle Hall, in spite of the fact that the red quartzite of which it is carved is of a somewhat darker shade, and the scale is approximately twice life-size, markedly larger than the others. The queen on its left side is sculpted, whereas queens on three of the six statues are carved in sunk relief. Moreover, it is clear from a remark made by de Morgan about the discovery of this statue in the season of 1892–93 that it does not belong with the three statues in the Hypostyle Hall; apparently it was found in the hall, but under the debris of a pylon. Lacking any more definite statement concerning its findspot, I would surmise that de Morgan’s reference means under the debris of the Second Pylon; it was in fact found in a ruinous state, partially collapsed into the west end of the Hypostyle Hall. The Cairo statue should not, therefore, be classed with the three statues in the central part of the hall. Since its texts have already been published by Borchardt, it will not be included with the group of six that are our concern here; I will, however, comment below on the question of the usurpation of its texts.

The copies of the texts from the six Karnak statues presented in this study are based upon photographs and controlled hand copies made over the years 1974–77 in Egypt, when I was a member of the Epigraphic Survey of the Oriental Institute. Rubbings of usurped texts were made in order to confirm the earlier traces. In addition, the usurped texts were measured in order to establish how much material had been removed in the erasure of the original inscriptions; where traces of these had survived, the measurements also helped to determine to what depth they had been carved. This procedure proved useful for differentiating between the original and the palimpsest versions.

STATUE NO. 1

Reddish quartzite standing statue of a king, with usurping texts of Sety II, located at present in the southeast quadrant of the Hypostyle Hall north of column seventy-one, facing west. The king is represented wearing a long pleated skirt, holding a standard, broken at the top, against his left shoulder. The statue’s head is broken off, but head no. 34.2.2 from The Metropolitan Museum of Art matches the break. The statue’s overall dimensions, minus the head, are: 197.7 × 43.5 (max.) × 60 cm.

10. All the inscriptions on the six statues are incised. To obliterate an incised text, two techniques are possible: either it is plastered over, making a blank surface for the surcharging text; or it is scraped away, lowering the level of the stone. The second technique was used to usurp the six statues under discussion.
12. Vandier, RdE 23, pp. 181–182; Gardiner’s reference based upon Edgerton is found in JEA 44, p. 17.
15. Contrary to the statement in Gaston Maspero, Guide du visiteur au Musée du Caire, 4th ed. (Cairo, 1915) p. 169 (top), which describes it as carved in red granite.
17. Legrain, Temples, p. 128, fig. 79; and p. 133, fig. 85.
19. I wish to express sincerest thanks to the directors of the Epigraphic Survey during my years with the expedition, Kent R. Weeks, and Charles C. Van Siclen III, for permitting me to use the expedition’s equipment. Special thanks are owed to Patrick Cardon whose photographs have been used in this study.
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The fact that this statue was usurped was recognized by Barguet. Inspection of the inscriptions in the course of copying them confirmed this; the back-pillar inscription had been erased and recarved along its whole length to a depth of 0.5 to 0.7 cm. (Figure 1); no traces of the earlier inscription survived. The front of the base did not reveal the characteristic dip in level of a usurped text. Either the text of Sety II is original here, inscribed onto a blank surface when he usurped the statue, or the entire base was cut back and reinscribed anew. The inscriptions on the right and left sides of the base may be secondary. The surface on both sides is very rough; on the left side, a dip in the level of the surface to a depth of 0.4–0.5 cm. may suggest that original texts were erased from here. The cartouche on the belt, minus the characteristic tie, seems to have been erased and reinscribed

FIGURE 1
Statue no. 1, detail of back-pillar showing erasure of the original inscription. Karnak, Temple of Amun, Hypostyle Hall (photo: Cardon)

FIGURE 2
Statue no. 1, inscriptions (drawing: Yurco)
for Sety II. The sporran text likewise is secondary; the lines showing the pleats of the sporran have been erased, suggesting that the whole surface has been lowered. With the text on the standard, recutting is more difficult to determine as a curved surface is involved. The titulary now visible is entirely that of Sety II (cf. Gauthier, LdR III, p. 138, no. xvii—the titulary, which is not usurped, is from Karnak, from the stela between the sphinxes on the north side of the dromos to the quay). If the standard was usurped, it was only by cutting back the entire surface. It is possible also that the standard was not inscribed originally and that Sety II's titulary was added to a blank surface. (For the inscriptions on the statue, see Figure 2.)

In Adam and el-Shaboury's photograph of the statue prior to restoration (pl. xvib), the statue, which possesses a high base (42.1 cm.), is shown standing on a second block of almost the same height. One reason for this building up of the base was perhaps to equalize the total height of the statue with that of statue no. 2. Minus their heads, the present height of the statues (including bases) is: no. 1, 197.7 cm.; no. 2, 258.4 cm. A parallel raising of the base of a statue may be seen at Luxor, in the First Court, where colossus no. 60 (P-M II, p. 312, nos. 60, 61) has a built-up base that serves to make it the same total height as colossus no. 61.

**STATUE NO. 2**

Reddish quartzite standing statue of a king (Figure 3), bearing the secondary texts of Sety II; it is located in the southwest quadrant of the Hypostyle Hall, north of column seventy, facing east. The king is represented wearing a short pleated kilt with sporran, holding a standard, the top of which is broken away, against his left shoulder; the statue's head is broken off and missing. Behind the advancing left leg of the king, the figure and titles of Queen Takhat (Tjw.t) are carved in sunk relief (Figure 4). She appears wearing a long diaphanous robe and a flat-top crown, surmounted by a Mut-vulture with wings outspread and a large uraeus-type cobra before it. In addition to the standard uraeus on her brow, she also wears a short wig with a sidelock falling over her left shoulder. In her left hand she holds a lotus flower. Her present inscription identifies her as a "king's daughter (and) king's wife.” The statue's overall dimensions are: 258.4 × 67.5 × 95 cm.
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Barguet recognized that this statue was usurped, but the alteration of the queen's second title has not been noted previously. When examined closely, the back-pillar was found to have been erased over its entire inscribed surface, to a depth of 0.5–0.8 cm.; some traces of the original version survive at a depth of

**FIGURE 3**

Statue no. 2. Karnak, Temple of Amun, Hypostyle Hall (photo: Cardon)
0.7–1.0 cm. (Figure 5). The sun-disk of “Son of Re,” of the nomen, of the group “Amun-Re,” and a possible sun-disk near the top of the text, perhaps from the original prenomen, are the deepest of the traces. The original text faced right (south); it was 16 cm. in width, whereas Sety II’s text is only 14 cm. wide. The original titulary had slightly larger hieroglyphs than those of Sety II’s inscription, and the traces suggest that it contained fewer elements. A suggested reconstruction of the original text is included among the inscriptions (Figure 6).

The circular trace beneath Mry-RC of Sety II’s titulary may belong to Amenmesse’s prenomen [Mn-m]-Rc-stp-n-Rc. Starting with the traces below nb-t3.wy,
the original text is preserved more extensively; $s3-R^2$ and a nomen may be read; the nomen is Amenmesse's in a variant form (see Gauthier, *LdR* III, p. 128, no. 19a). It takes up about three groups of signs. Below the original nomen, clear traces of 'Imn-R', $ns\upsilon t\ ntr.w$ and somewhat scantier traces of $nb\ pt\ mry$, $d\dot{i}^2\ 'nh$ are preserved (see Figure 5). Regarding Sety II's nomen, it is of interest to note that only on the backpillar has the Seth-hieroglyph of his nomen been mutilated.

The front of the base shows no clear evidence of recutting; Sety II's texts may have been added to an originally uninscribed surface, or alternately, the entire front of the base may have been cut back, so that none of the usual signs of usurpation would be present. The right and left sides of the base show an uneven surface; they may have been cut back and completely reinscribed, or Sety II's inscriptions may have been added to a previously unused surface.

The belt cartouche, minus the customary tie, seems to have been recut, as shown by its lowered surface. It has been reinscribed with Sety II's prenomen. The surface of the inscription on the sporran shows a dip throughout, about 0.2 cm., suggesting that it was erased and reinscribed.

As on statue no. 1, erasure of the standard that the king holds would be difficult to detect because of the curving surface, but again the entire titulary is that of Sety II and not Amenmesse's; if usurped, it has been recut over its entire surface.

As for the queen's text (Figures 4, 6), of the title $mws.t\ nsw.t\ (\hat{\beta}\ \overset{\alpha}{\delta})$ the Mut-vulture was altered to $hm.t\ (\mathbb{N})$. The surface around this group reveals about 0.3–0.35 cm. of erasure. In the altered version of the title, the final $\alpha$ may serve as a complement for $\hat{\beta}$. It belongs to the original version, however, as indicated by its skewed position relative to the secondary group $\mathbb{N}$.

**Statue No. 3**

Reddish quartzite kneeling statue of a king (Figure 7), inscribed at present with usurping texts of Sety II, located in the northeast quadrant of the Hypostyle Hall, north of column four (not its original location), facing west. The king is represented wearing a short pleated kilt, holding an offering table. His head is broken off and missing, but that he was shown wearing the *nemes*-headcloth is certain from the traces of the striped ends still remaining on the shoulders. The statue's overall dimensions are: $139.7 \times 49.2$ (max.) $\times 98.5$ cm. It resembles statue no. 6 (Figure 14) so closely that the two may be regarded as a pair.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**
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Michalowski, *Karnak*, pl. 21

Pillet, *ASAE* 24, pp. 73–74 (provenience given)

P-M II, p. 52
That the statue had been usurped was recognized by Barguet; reexamination of it confirmed his findings. The entire text on the back-pillar has been erased to a depth of 0.5 cm. and reinscribed for Sety II. The surface of the text area is also quite rough, another indicator of usurpation. No traces of the original inscriptions were found under Sety II’s texts (Figure 8).

Only the beginning, standard portion of the royal titulary is preserved on the front of the base, and this shows no evidence of having been altered. From the preserved traces, it appears that the titulary was continued along the two sides. All that remains, however, on each are the prenomen, nomen, and connecting titles. On the right side, the entire original text has been erased to a depth of 0.6–0.7 cm.; the rough surface also indicates that the existing texts are usurped; the secondary version contains the names of Sety II.

No traces of the original texts are preserved. The cartouche on the table support reveals no traces of erasure; possibly it was added to a surface previously uninscribed.

STATUE NO. 4

Reddish quartzite standing statue of a king (Figure 9), with secondary texts of Sety II superimposed over erased inscriptions of the original king, now located before the porch of the Second Pylon, on the north side, facing south toward the processional axis of the temple. The statue, which is broken off at the waist, represents the king in a long pleated skirt with a sporran; unlike statues nos. 1–3, he is wearing sandals. Originally he was shown holding a standard against his left shoulder, but this is now broken away almost completely. The figure and titles of a queen are carved in sunk relief behind the king’s left leg (Figure 10). She wears a long garment knotted just below her right breast and a broad collar. In her left hand she holds an ‘nb-sign and a lotus flower. Damage to the statue has obliterated her crown, except for a uraeus at the brow. Her titles are those of a chief royal wife, but her name has been expunged utterly; originally there was a cartouche just below her right, extended arm, but only a trace of the oval remains. The statue’s overall dimensions are: 141 (max. preserved) × 59.5 × 102.8 cm.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
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Scholars have hitherto not recognized that this statue was usurped. When examined closely, the central column of inscription on the back-pillar was found to have been erased to a depth of 0.5 cm.; however, no traces of the original inscription are preserved. The surface of the cartouche on the front of
the base revealed a dip of 0.5 cm., and so it too has been erased. Sety II’s prenomen was inscribed here secondarily, but no traces of the original text were found. On the right side of the base, Sety II’s text appears to be original; the entire surface here is very uneven, and may have been cut back completely for the secondary inscription, or left blank to begin with. The inferior quality of the workmanship visible in the carving of the hieroglyphs, by contrast with the details of the king’s costume which are certainly representative of the original workmanship, likewise indicates that Sety II’s texts are secondary. In this regard, note especially the skewed position and shape of the nb-sign of nb-t3.wy, and the overall sloppy cutting of the signs of Sety II’s nomen. The left side of the statue seems not to have been inscribed at all.

The cartouche on the belt, minus the customary tie, has probably been erased and reinscribed. No inscriptions or decoration, aside from the leopard head and the cobras, remain on the sporran, but the surface is rough, suggesting that a text situated between the leopard head and the cobras has been expunged. From the overall roughness of the sporran surface, it may be surmised that the conventional representation of the pleating has also been erased.

The standard is too fragmentary to render an estimate of recutting possible, but the extant traces suggest that the present titulary is entirely that of Sety II.
It too is probably secondary, and either the entire surface has been erased or else it was not inscribed originally.

The queen's name, originally inscribed in a cartouche below her right, extended arm, has been erased thoroughly, leaving but a few meager traces of the cartouche oval. The surface here reveals a dip of 0.28–0.3 cm.; the remainder of the queen's texts, consisting of her titles, was not touched; the depth of the hieroglyphs is 0.3 cm., and as the cartouche was probably cut to the same depth, it is understandable that no traces of her name survive. A reconstruction of her titles is included in Figure 11. The texts suggest that she was the chief queen of the king whom

the statue represented originally. In accordance with the historical interpretation offered below, I would identify her as Bakt-en-werel, wife of Amenmesse (see Gauthier, <i>Ldr</i> III, p. 130, no. xiii).

The location of this statue is alluded to by Pillet and mentioned briefly by Legrain; the latter is quoted by Porter-Moss. Of its location, Legrain states that it was reerected near the place where it had been excavated. That his reference concerns statue no. 4 is fairly certain, for he mentions only one fragment, whereas statue no. 5 is broken into two pieces. So the provenience of statue no. 4 is clearly from the area between the porch of the second pylon and Taharqa's colonnade, and statue no. 5 was probably found there also, as is suggested by Pillet's allusion and Legrain's photograph. Is this the original spot where the statues were erected? I believe not. The area of the court where Legrain reerected statue no. 4 has been subject to much alteration, and the fact that the left side of the base has not been inscribed, either by Amenmesse or by Sety II, may suggest that it was not erected originally where Legrain's photograph shows it, or for that matter in the court at all. Perhaps Sety II moved the two statues (nos. 4 and 5) from inside the Hypostyle Hall in conjunction with his work on the Triple Shrine and the quay; but subsequent extensive rearrangement of the area under the Bubastides and Taharqa makes it difficult, if not impossible, to state precisely where Sety II may have relocated them. Note that in modern times, both statues have been moved from beside Taharqa's columns to their present location (see J. Leclant, "<i>Fouilles et travaux en Egypte, 1957–1960</i>," <i>Orientalia</i> n.s. 30 [1961] pl. xxviii, fig. 14).

**STATUE NO. 5**

Reddish quartzite standing statue of a king with usurping texts of Sety II, now located before the porch of the Second Pylon, on the south side, facing the processional axis of the temple. Like no. 4, this statue is broken off above the waist; the surviving portion consists of two pieces; and the whole front of the figure is missing. The king was probably represented wearing a long pleated garment with a sporran, similar to that worn by statue no. 4; the nature
of the break in front suggests the form of the garment. The figure of a woman holding a lotus flower in her left hand is carved in sunk relief behind the king's left leg (Figure 12). Her name and titles, as well as her upper body, are broken away completely. Overall measurements of the statue: 131.2 × 61 × 67 cm. (maximum preserved; a certain amount of the statue is missing from the broken area, as suggested by the gap in the inscription on the right side).
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None of the cited publications recognized that this statue had been usurped (for the inscriptions, see Figure 13). Examination revealed that the column of text on the back-pillar, containing the royal titulary, had been erased to a depth of 0.4–0.6 cm. and reinscribed for Sety II. No traces of the original inscription were found. On the front of the base, the surface around the vertical cartouche is too badly damaged to permit assessment of recutting; but since the back-pillar texts of Sety II are secondary, the same should be true of this cartouche. The other texts on the front of the base are conventional; they could be adapted for either king and would not have been subject to recutting. The text from the front of the base carries over onto the right side; the area around the cartouche for Sety II on this side seems to have been erased to a depth of 0.75 cm. at the deepest point, making the cartouche a secondary one. Accordingly, the part of

FIGURE 12
Statue no. 5, left side, remains of the figure of a royal lady. Karnak, First Court (photo: Cardon)

FIGURE 13
Statue no. 5, inscriptions (drawing: Yurco)
the text reading nfr nfr s3 'Imn nsw.t bity nb t3.wy is part of the original inscription. The epithet nfr nfr s3 'Imn for Amenmesse is known from elsewhere (see Ricardo Caminos, “Two Stelae in the Kurnah Temple of Sethos I,” in O. Firchow, ed., Ägyptologische Studien [Berlin, 1955] p. 19, for example), and it would be particularly suitable for him, considering his nomen. The left side of the base is now uninscribed; as is the case with the left side of the base of statue no. 4, it may not have been inscribed in either version. The front of the base is too damaged to estimate whether a text matching the one on the right side of the base existed on the left as well. Since it is the left side of the base, facing west, that is uninscribed, while the side facing the porch is inscribed (and seems to have been inscribed also in the original version), again the possibility arises that this statue, like its complement, no. 4, was not placed in the court originally. Perhaps it and statue no. 4 were located, rather, along the transverse axis of the Hypostyle Hall. Pillet indeed found a foundation block for a third statue along the north side of the transverse axis in a position which would have paralleled that of the two statues north of columns seventy and seventy-one.

Since the front of the statue is missing, the belt and sporran with their inscriptions have not survived; nor have the inscriptions accompanying the figure of the woman on the left side of the statue. Her upper body and head have also vanished with the break, so that neither her identity nor her titles can be established, although it is very likely that she was related to the pharaoh whom the statue originally represented.

STATUE NO. 6

Reddish quartzite kneeling statue of a king (Figure 14), with palimpsest cartouches of Sety II. The king is depicted wearing a short pleated kilt. Although his head is missing, traces of striped lappets on the shoulders show that he wore the nemes-headcloth as well as a broad collar. The arms are broken off, but a trace of stone on the king's lap suggests that he held an offering table similar to that of statue no. 3. The overall measurements of the statue are: 115.8 × 46.5 × 74.5 cm. (all maximum preserved). In scale, pose, and dress, this statue is virtually a duplicate of statue no. 3 (Figure 7).

FIGURE 14
Statue no. 6. Karnak, Festival Hall of Thutmose III (photo: Cardon)
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The fact that this statue had been usurped was recognized by Barguet, who proposed that it originally represented Amenmesse. Detailed inspection of the texts on the statue (made jointly with William J. Mannane in April 1977) confirmed Barguet's suggestion. The cartouches, but not the connecting titles, on the back-pillar were subject to erasure and recutting by Sety II; they show a dip to a maximum of 0.7 cm.; no traces of the earlier king's names survive.

On both right and left sides of the base, again the
cartouches but not the connecting titles were erased; in this case, however, they were not reinscribed. The surfaces of the cartouches dip to 0.4–0.45 cm.; as the other, unaltered parts of the inscriptions were carved 0.5–0.65 cm. in depth, traces of the original cartouches were preserved despite the erasure. Reconstructions are included in Figure 15.


As noted above, the scale, pose, and dress of this statue closely parallel those of statue no. 3. Since the latter was found in a secondary context (Pillet, *ASAE* 24, pp. 73–74), it should perhaps be paired with statue no. 6 and relocated inside the Festival Hall of Thutmose III, flanking the doorway into the sanctuary. There is evidence that a Ramesside pharaoh—most probably Amenmesse—enlarged the entrance and vestibule to the Festival Hall. Barguet (*Temple*, pp. 158, 168) had realized this, but suggested that Sety II was the king responsible. He noticed, however, that certain scenes inside the vestibule had been usurped by Sety II from Amenmesse (ibid., p. 169, n. 2), and personal inspection of the cartouches in question, in April 1977, confirmed his observation. Further, the two Osiride colossi that flank the entrance to the Festival Hall, and that Barguet (ibid., p. 158) stated were usurped by Sety II from Thutmose III, were in fact usurped by Sety II from Amenmesse. Again, personal inspection of these colossi on several occasions and under differing light conditions during 1975–77 revealed traces of Amenmesse’s nomen only, beneath Sety II’s painted version. The cartouches had been erased to a considerable depth, however, and it is probable that a double usurpation is involved here: Amenmesse from Thutmose III initially (probably to take credit for his alterations to the entrance), and then Sety II, in paint, from Amenmesse. At least some of the erasure visible in the cartouches was an attempt by Sety II’s agents to destroy the traces of Amenmesse’s name; the depth of the erasure averages 1.0 to 1.4 cm. inside the cartouches, but the unaltered portions of the text outside the cartouches average only 1.0 cm. in depth, while the surviving traces of Amenmesse’s name within the cartouche lie at a depth of 1.3 cm. (measured from the surface to the base of the cut). Thus the evidence suggests that Sety II removed more material from the cartouches than would have been required to erase only Thutmose III’s names, and accordingly that the cartouches had already been usurped once, by Amenmesse, perhaps in plaster and paint. It seems clear, therefore, that Amenmesse executed the alterations to the entrance and vestibule of the Festival Hall, and he may also have placed a pair of statues, nos. 3 and 6, to flank the entrance into the sanctuary.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The preserved traces of the original inscriptions on statues nos. 2 and 6 indicate that these two were dedicated originally by Amenmesse and usurped later by
Sety II. As the six statues form a closely related group—in the material of which they are fashioned, in scale, and especially in their usurpation by Sety II—I would propose that they were all dedicated originally by Amenmesse. The head in the Metropolitan Museum that matches statue no. 1 would then depict Amenmesse's features; it is unique in this respect, for no other sculpted heads of this pharaoh are known at present.\(^\text{20}\) The Museum's head displays details which are not exactly paralleled in the features of any other late Nineteenth Dynasty king.\(^\text{21}\) The proposed identification should help to resolve doubts about the identity of the head, and even those about its authenticity that have arisen because of some of its unique stylistic elements.

With Amenmesse established as the king who originally dedicated these statues, the related question of their use and original location arises. As stated earlier, nos. 1 and 2 seem to be positioned in their original locations, along the north-south transverse axis of the Hypostyle Hall.\(^\text{22}\) There is other evidence that the transverse axis was a focal point for statues. Barguet, on the basis of inscriptions on the adjacent columns, proposed that Ramesses II had erected statues at the point where the main and transverse axis of the hall intersect.\(^\text{23}\) I have also suggested, using as a point of departure Pillet's evidence that four of the quartzite statues were situated along the transverse axis,\(^\text{24}\) that nos. 4 and 5 formed a pair and were originally located inside the Hypostyle Hall. Several additional points of evidence may be marshalled to support this proposal, and also its corollary, that nos. 1, 2, 4, and 5 form a distinct subgroup. Although there can be no doubt that Sety II usurped the statues, most of his inscriptions on the bases of nos. 1, 2, and 4 appear to be original, that is, not carved over an area that had been erased, but probably onto a surface previously left blank. For a usurping king to increase the number of inscriptions on an appropriated monument is a well-attested phenomenon.\(^\text{25}\) The four statues also present a certain unity as a subgroup: all are standing figures, with standards held against the left shoulder, and their bases show a relatively narrow range of variation in height and width.\(^\text{26}\) Statue no. 1, resting originally upon a built-up base, was a special case. It probably was carved from an undersize block of stone and another block was inserted beneath the socle so that it would be equal in height to statue no. 2.

From these observations, it appears that statues nos. 1, 2, 4, and 5 formed a subgroup located inside the Hypostyle Hall, positioned north of columns seventy and seventy-one on the south side, and north of columns three and four on the north side. Accordingly, statue no. 3, now occupying the spot north of column four, should probably be located with statue no. 6, inside the Festival Hall of Thutmose III.\(^\text{27}\)

Why did Amenmesse erect four statues at this particular location on the transverse axis? First, the axis must have been a processional route through the hall, along with the main axis. This is indicated by the fact that Ramesses II, when he added his large horizontal cartouches to the columns of his father in the north half of the hall, had them oriented in such a manner that anyone walking down the transverse axis would be confronted squarely by them. Second, this was the logical route to the temple of Ptah, located north of the Hypostyle Hall. Another reason perhaps lies in the observation made by Barguet that Ramesses II

\(^{20}\) Heads of the other five statues in this group have not been found. Certain reliefs at Karnak, originally decorated by Amenmesse and usurped by Sety II, may depict Amenmesse's features. Unfortunately, all the heads of the king represented in these reliefs are badly damaged or are missing completely.

\(^{21}\) Hayes, Scepter, II, pp. 341–342 and fig. 216, expressed reservations about identifying the head as Ramesses II (in spite of earlier claims, i.e., Hoyningen-Huene and Steindorff, p. 179, and pls. on pp. 134 and 137). More recently, my two colleagues in New York, Cardon and Yitzhak Margowsky, both expressed serious reservations about dating the head to the reign of Ramesses II because it displays too many stylistic features peculiar to the late Nineteenth Dynasty.

\(^{22}\) The evidence presented by Pillet, ASAE 24, pp. 73–74, supports this point.

\(^{23}\) Barguet, Temple, p. 77, n. 2. 

\(^{24}\) Pillet, ASAE 24, pp. 73–74.

\(^{25}\) For example, in a number of statues that Ramesses II and Merenptah appropriated from Amenhotep III; one of these is discussed by Mekhitarian, CdE 31, pp. 297–298, and fig. 28 on p. 297.

\(^{26}\) No. 1, 42.1 cm.; no. 2, 32 cm.; no. 4, 33.5 cm.; and no. 5, 30 cm.

\(^{27}\) No. 1, 60 cm.; no. 2, 68 cm.; no. 4, 59.5 cm.; and no. 5, 61 cm.

\(^{28}\) The measurements suggest that they are a pair: base height: no. 3, 27.5 cm.; no. 6, 21.2 cm.; base width: no. 3, 49.1 cm.; no. 6, 44.6 cm. (estimated); width of back-pillar: no. 3, 23.4 cm.; no. 6, 25.0 cm. Note also that both show clear evidence of having portrayed the king wearing the nemes-headcloth; and that of the six, both definitely had texts of Amenmesse carved on their bases that were usurped by Sety II.
had erected statues at the intersection of the transverse and main axis of the hall.\textsuperscript{29} In view of Amenmesse’s relationship to the royal family through his mother, Takhat, a daughter of Ramesses II, it seems quite consistent that he should erect his own statues in proximity to those of his illustrious ancestor. Such a stress upon his ancestry would likewise help clarify the reasons for the strong stylistic resemblance of the head of statue no. 1 to the work of Ramesses II.\textsuperscript{30}

Queen Takhat’s presence on statue no. 2 provides additional evidence for assigning this statue to Amenmesse originally. Her title originally read “king’s daughter (and) king’s mother” and in the element “king’s mother” it parallels the title of Amenmesse’s mother, Takhat, as it is written beside her representation in his tomb (Valley of the Kings, no. 10).\textsuperscript{31} Her appearance on statue no. 2, in conjunction with these titles, presents the first certain evidence that Amenmesse’s mother was a royal princess. Gardiner’s suggestion that Amenmesse was of royal ancestry is thereby vindicated.\textsuperscript{32} Further, much of the doubt that has persisted about the identification of the Queen Takhat who is represented on Cairo statue CG 1198 with Queen Takhat, the mother of Amenmesse, is removed.\textsuperscript{33}

In spite of Vandier’s claim to the contrary, CG 1198 shows clear traces of usurpation.\textsuperscript{34} The back-pillar, sporran, and belt all have unequivocal signs of alteration of the inscriptions. The back-pillar reveals a noticeable dip along its entire preserved height, suggesting that a complete titulary has been erased and replaced with that of Sety II. The lines indicating the pleats of the sporran, adjacent to the column of inscription that runs down its center, have also been partially erased, probably in the process of removing the original text; likewise, the cartouche oval on the belt reveals a lower surface than the surrounding area. The inscriptions along the sides of the back-pillar are carved onto a rough surface that may have resulted from the erasure of an earlier inscription. The texts on the base of the statue show no clear evidence of erasure, but the base may not have been inscribed originally, or the entire surface may have been removed and inscribed anew (in fact, the surface of the sides of the base has a rough finish, in keeping with this possibility). As for the standards that the king holds in both arms, their surfaces are curved, and to establish the recutting of an entire inscription on such a surface is not possible. Nonetheless, the evidence from the back-pillar, sporran, and belt cannot be refuted, so that the opinion of Gardiner, based upon Edgerton’s notes, is fully vindicated.\textsuperscript{35} Consequently, it is proposed that Cairo statue CG 1198 was dedicated originally by either Ramesses II or Merenptah.\textsuperscript{36} Repeated examinations of its texts have disclosed no traces of the original inscriptions; Ramesses II, although there are plenty of Sety II usurping from Amenmesse. To Lanny Bell, however, I owe the suggestion that Amenmesse might have usurped the statue from Ramesses II because of the figure on it of his mother Queen Takhat. If the original dedicator was Merenptah, Sety II’s father, Sety II did not usurp material from him except where Amenmesse had first usurped or erased his name. Thus Sety II could well be the secondary usurper of the statue but Takhat’s presence on it adds a complication. This would make Merenptah Amenmesse’s father, and would mean that Amenmesse, whose frequent erasure or usurpation of Merenptah’s name I have discovered in my research, turned against his father’s memory. (Ramesses II had usurped some of the works of his father Sety I, but on a limited scale, both in extent and geographical distribution, and not from hostility toward him.) The statue cannot be an original work of Amenmesse because Queen Takhat is depicted with the title of king’s wife and not king’s mother, and inspection of her inscription reveals no trace of alteration. The queen might be more easily regarded as Merenptah’s second principal wife (his first, Isis-nofret, having perhaps predeceased him) than as a chief wife of Ramesses II, who it seems was outlived by his last-known chief wife, his daughter Bint-Anath (see Cruz-Uribe, GM 24, pp. 30–31). Stylistically, according to Cardon and Margowsky, Cairo CG 1198 is also more likely to be the

\textsuperscript{29} Barguet, \textit{Temple}, p. 77, n. 2.

\textsuperscript{30} For comments on this point see Cardon, “An Egyptian Royal Head.” Such stylistic imitation may explain why for so long it was suspected that this head might portray the features of Ramesses II. See also ibid., fig. 7, a granite statue of Ramesses II from Mit-Rahineh (Memphis), for a graphic illustration of the resemblance of this head and statue type to the work of Ramesses II.

\textsuperscript{31} Gauthier, \textit{LdR} III, p. 129, no. xii.

\textsuperscript{32} Gardiner, \textit{JEA} 44, p. 17.


\textsuperscript{34} Vandier, \textit{RdE} 23, p. 182. This statue was examined on several occasions between 1974 and 1979 by myself alone and in the company of my colleagues, James F. Romano, William Murnane, and Rolfe Krauss.

\textsuperscript{35} Gardiner, \textit{JEA} 44, p. 17.

\textsuperscript{36} Sety II could have been the first usurper of Cairo CG 1198 or the second, following Amenmesse, in either case. Positive identification of the original dedicator is hedged with difficulties. If he was Ramesses II, no certain parallels exist for Sety II’s usurpation of a monument directly from him; nor are any examples known to me of Amenmesse usurping material from
Sety II's agents executed their work well in this instance.

With the evidence of the Karnak statue no. 2, the objections to identifying the Queen Takhat of Cairo CG 1198 with Amenmesse's mother are minimized. In reply to von Beckerath's objection, Takhat is not called “king's mother” on Cairo CG 1198 because this statue was dedicated originally by either Ramesses II or Merenptah, and Takhat would not have acquired the title until Amenmesse's accession. It can be concluded with a high degree of certainty that Queen Takhat of Karnak statue no. 2, of Cairo CG 1198, and of the Valley of the Kings tomb no. 10 is one and the same woman—Amenmesse's mother—and daughter almost certainly of Ramesses II, and either his chief wife, or Merenptah's.

The identity of the queen on the Karnak statue no. 4 must be considered at this point. Her titles describe her as “king's great wife, mistress of the Two Lands.” If the statue originally represented Amenmesse, as has been proposed above, then the queen was probably Bakt-en-werel, who is attested as Amenmesse's chief wife in the Valley of the Kings tomb no. 10. It is not surprising that on the statue her name should be erased when Sety II usurped the piece, for her only claim to the royal family may have been through Amenmesse. What is puzzling, however, is that Sety II did not substitute his own chief queen's name in the erased cartouches.

A final question in regard to the queens concerns the status of Takhat. On both the Karnak statue no. 2 and on Cairo CG 1198, her name was left untouched when Sety II appropriated the statues. That his agents were not unaware of her is suggested by the fact that on the Karnak statue they took the time and effort to alter her title from “king's mother” to “king's wife.” Why was the name of the mother of a pharaoh who had usurped the throne spared when the king against whom the usurpation was aimed appropriated the statue? An answer is perhaps to be found in the status indicated by her titles. Both the Karnak statue no. 2 and Cairo CG 1198 show that she was a king's daughter, and her father can be only Ramesses II, or much less likely, Merenptah. She had also been at some point the chief queen of a fully legitimate pharaoh, again either Ramesses II or Merenptah. It is therefore quite possible that Amenmesse used his relationship to her and through her to Ramesses II in order to claim the throne, but that she took no active part in his attempt. If so, Sety II would have had no special motivation to eradicate her memory, as he had with Amenmesse: rather, he may have been moved to respect her because she was a princess and queen of the legitimate royal line and association with her might therefore strengthen his own hold on the throne, a hold that Amenmesse's effort had rendered rather shaky. This explanation of Takhat's position can only remain a theory, but it is one that suits all the points of evidence presented by her figures and inscriptions and by what befell them.

work of Merenptah than Ramesses II. In short, Cairo CG 1198 probably represents Amenmesse's father, but provides no decisive evidence as to whether he was Ramesses II or Merenptah.

37. von Beckerath, JEA 48, p. 70, n. 9.

38. As indicated above (note 36), there is no evidence that Queen Takhat's name or titles were altered on Cairo CG 1198. Nor is it likely that her figure and inscriptions were added secondarily to the statue. Her figure is sculpted in the round, from the same block of stone as the king's. Moreover, the anticipatory use of the title “king's mother” has been challenged convincingly by Vandier, RdE 23, p. 185 and n. 9, and more recently by E. Wente, “Thutmose III's Accession and the Beginning of the New Kingdom,” Journal of Near Eastern Studies 34 (1975) p. 270, with n. 41. Even this last possible exception must now be excluded; see M. Gitton and J. Leclant, “Gottsegemahlin” in W. Helck and E. Otto, eds., Lexikon der Ägyptologie (Wiesbaden, 1976) II, fasc. 6, col. 807, n. 25.

39. The limited space in the scene in tomb no. 10 (C. R. Lepsius, Denkmale aus Aegypten und Aethiopien... [Berlin, 1849-59] III, p. 202f) may explain why Takhat has only the titles “The Osiris, god's mother (and) king's mother.” In her son's tomb, these titles would have the greatest relevance.

40. W. Spiegelberg, “Ostraca hiératiques du Louvre,” Recueil de Travaux 16 (1894) pp. 65-67. An outside possibility is that Takhat, like the son of Prince Sethkerkhepeshef and Nofretari on the companion ostracon (Louvre no. 2261), was a grandchild of Ramesses II who had been inducted into the ranks of the king's children.

41. Gauthier, LdR III, p. 129, no. XII.

42. Of the few inscriptions that survive with her name, none describes her as king's daughter or king's sister, although in Amenmesse's tomb (Lepsius, Denkmale, III, p. 202f), she is shown wearing the sidelock.

43. Unless it was inscribed only in plaster and paint which have since fallen out. There is, however, no evidence of this, such as scoring of the surface to improve the hold of the plaster. Note also that the erased cartouches on statue no. 6 seem not to have been reinscribed.

44. As indicated by her titles on Cairo CG 1198. Amenmesse and all subsequent kings are excluded.
How then are we to interpret such a possible association of Takhat with Sety II in view of Tawosret's role as his chief queen? First, Takhat was not necessarily related to Sety II as his "great wife"; on the Cairo statue, CG 1198, that title pertained to her relationship with its original owner, not Sety II. More to the point, on the Karnak statue no. 2, where Sety II's agents changed her title, they altered it to "king's wife," and not "king's great wife." Secondly, her age, as it may be estimated, may have minimized her threat to Queen Tawosret. An ostraco in the Louvre, no. 666, on which she appears as a princess, may be dated securely to year 53 of Ramesses II (1226 B.C.).

This would make her at least twenty-seven years old in Sety II's first year of rule and in fact she was probably closer to forty-five. She was Amenmesse's mother, and it is unlikely that Amenmesse was a minor when he tried to usurp the throne. As daughter and queen of one of the earlier pharaohs whose legitimacy was not in dispute, her importance would have been great enough to warrant respect from Sety II. If, as has been suggested, she was a daughter of Ramesses II, Sety II would have been able to claim a closer line of descent from him through association with Takhat.

The implication that Amenmesse was of royal ancestry, derived from the evidence presented in this study, helps to clarify the reasons for the stress that he placed upon his relationship to Ramesses II and Sety I (Figure 16). Amenmesse was in a position to observation of Van Siclen III, my own inspection of the two statues in Luxor in 1976–77 suggests that both were usurped from Amenhotep III and not Ramesses II; see also Mekhitarian, Cde 31, pp. 247–248 with fig. 28 on p. 337). So Bint-Anath's representation is definitely contemporary with the usurpation of the statue by Merenptah, and she was still alive at the time, as indicated by the epithet appended after her cartouche. On the statue, her figure and titles were carved onto what had been an uninscribed and undecorated surface.

49. It is expressed clearly in two stelae that he dedicated in the Gurnah temple of Sety I; see Caminos, "Two Stelae in the Kurnah Temple," Ägyptologische Studien, pp. 17–20. The relationship is expressed also through Amenmesse's titulary, which will be discussed at length in my doctoral dissertation, "The Nineteenth Dynasty after Ramesses II," for the University of Chicago, Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations.
claim a more direct maternal line of descent from Ramesses II than could be claimed by Sety II. The latter was Ramesses II's grandson on his father's side, but only a great-grandson on his mother's side, assuming that she was Isis-nofret, the chief queen of Merenptah. Consequently, the resemblance of the Museum's head to the work of Ramesses II can be explained as still another manner in which Amen-messe stressed his relationship to Ramesses II, by imitating the style characteristic of Ramesses II's reign. Patrick Cardon's discovery of the join between the head and the body of statue no. 1 assumes great importance, not only for the art history of the late Nineteenth Dynasty, but also because it increases our understanding of the often confusing history of this politically troubled era.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank William J. Murnane, who during the years we spent together in Luxor accompanied me on numerous occasions while I was gathering evidence from these statues, as well as Edward F. Wente, George Hughes, and Lanny Bell, who all provided valuable advice and commentary. After the paper was completed, I gained access to Edgerton's notes, alluded to above, and it was gratifying to discover that his findings were in agreement with mine, although both had been arrived at independently. Despite the fact that I never studied under him, much of his knowledge of epigraphy was passed on to me by the Epigraphic Survey through his colleagues, George Hughes, Charles F. Nims, Edward F. Wente, and my own colleague, Dr. Murnane. So this study owes much to all those named but especially, in memoriam, to William F. Edgerton.

ABBREVIATIONS


ASAE—Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Egypte (Cairo)

Barguet, Temple—P. Barguet, Le Temple d'Amon-Ré à Karnak (Cairo, 1962)

CdE—Chronique d'Egypte (Brussels)


Gardiner, JEA 44—A. H. Gardiner, "Only One King Siptah and Twosre Not His Wife," JEA 44 (1958)

Gauthier, LdR III—H. Gauthier, Livre des Rois d'Egypte, III, Mémoires d'Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 19 (Cairo, 1914)

GM—Göttinger Miscellen (Göttingen)

Hayes, Scepter II—W. C. Hayes, The Scepter of Egypt (MMA, New York, 1959) II

Hoyningen-Huene and Steindorff—Hoyningen-Huene and Steindorff, G., Egypt (New York, 1943)

JEA—Journal of Egyptian Archaeology (London)

Legrain, Temples—G. Legrain, Les Temples de Karnak (Brussels, 1929)

Mekhitarian, CdE 31—A. Mekhitarian, "Enquêtes: Statues d'Amenophis III?" CdE 31 (1956)


Pillet, ASAE 24—M. Pillet, "Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak, 1923–24," ASAE 24 (1924)


RdE—Revue d'Égyptologie (Paris)

