

GREAT KARNAK RELIEF<sup>a</sup>

**709.** The campaign of Sheshonk in Palestine in the fifth year of Rehoboam of Judah (1 Kings 14:25), probably about 926 B. C., must have taken place in the latter half of the reign of the founder of the new dynasty. He possessed no monument in Thebes, upon which he might record the achievement until his twenty-first year (about 924 B. C.), when he built the Bubastite gate in the Karnak temple and the first court to which it leads (§§ 701-8). Its wall then received a victorious relief of the conventional character, the inscriptions in which are made up of stereotyped phrases drawn from earlier monuments of the same kind, which are, therefore, too vague, general, and indecisive to furnish any solid basis for a study of Sheshonk's campaign. Had we not the brief reference in the Old Testament to his sack of Jerusalem, we should hardly have been able to surmise that the relief was the memorial of a specific campaign. However, as it is the only monumental record of the campaign<sup>b</sup> which we possess, it has been given in full below.

<sup>a</sup>On the outside of the south wall of the great Karnak temple, between the Bubastite gate and the south wall of the hypostyle, adjoining the reliefs of Ramses II. It is published by Champollion, *Monuments*, 284, 285; Rosellini, *Monumenti Storici*, 148; Lepsius, *Denkmäler*, III, 252, 253, a; Mariette, *Voyage dans la haute Egypte*, II, 42. Besides these, the list alone has been published: Brugsch, *Geographische Inschriften*, II, XXIV; Champollion, *Notices descriptives*, II, 113-19; and a collation by Maspero, *Recueil*, VII, 100, 101. I had also several photographs. The list is rapidly perishing; four names in the seventh row (Nos. 105-8) long ago fell out and are in Berlin; No. 27, Megiddo, has either fallen out or been removed; many names once legible are no longer so. And yet this priceless monument has never been exhaustively copied and published, in such a manner as a classical monument of its character would be. The best of the publications (apart from Mariette's photograph in *Voyage*) is Lepsius'.

<sup>b</sup>There are two other monumental references to the campaign. (1) the record of Syrian tribute at Karnak (§§ 723, 724); (2) the title attached to the name of an official of the time: "[fellow]er of the king on his campaigns in the countries of Retenu" (fragment of coffin from the Ramesseum; Petrie, *Ramesseum*, Pl. XXX a, No. 1; Müller, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, IV, 280-82). There is some question as to the date of the second reference; nor is it the only reference to the Asiatic war of this period, as stated by Müller (*ibid.*, 281).

710. Fortunately for us, the relief is accompanied by a list of the towns and localities plundered by Sheshonk, and as this list is our sole source for determining the limits of his campaign, we must briefly note the extent of territory which it involves. It enables us to control the statement of Amon in the relief (§ 722, l. 19), crediting Sheshonk with having captured Mitanni. No towns so far north can be found on the list. The reference to Mitanni is unquestionably drawn from older inscriptions, and the Egyptian scribes of this period probably knew little more of the vanished Euphrates kingdom than the authors of the Bentresh stela (III, §§ 429 ff.), a little later, knew of the same distant region.

711. The list<sup>a</sup> is introduced as usual by the Nine Bows, and the names which follow are unquestionably arranged in two main groups: first, the towns of Israel, and second, those of Judah. The main line of cleavage is probably somewhere between Nos. 50 and 60 or 65, but that this line is exclusive, or that the groups themselves are exclusive, is by no means certain. Roughly stated, the list devoted between fifty and sixty names to Israel, and about a hundred to Judah. Of the total of seventy-five or so that are preserved, only seventeen can be located with certainty, and two more with probability.<sup>b</sup> Fourteen of these belong to Israel; they are mostly important towns; while the remaining five in Judah are, with one exception, obscure villages. This may be an accident of preservation. The southernmost town captured is Arad, in southern Judah, and the northernmost is possibly Beth Anath, in northern Galilee, which, with Adamah, west of the Sea of Galilee, would stand alone, well north of the group of towns in the Kishon valley, which

---

<sup>a</sup>On its arrangement and extent, see the description of the relief (§ 718).

<sup>b</sup>Of these nineteen, sixteen are found in the Old Testament.

are more likely to mark the limit of Sheshonk's northern advance.

712. Let us now notice the names in the list which may be identified and located.<sup>a</sup> Leaving the Nine Bows, which introduce the list, the following three names (10-12)<sup>b</sup> are mutilated and unrecognizable, the list then proceeds with towns of Israel in the Kishon valley and vicinity: No. 13, Rabbith ( $Rw-b^{\text{c}}$  - $ty = \text{רַבִּיִּת}$ ); No. 14, Taanach ( $T^{\text{c}}$  - $n-k^{\text{c}}$  =  $\text{תַּאנַּח}$ ); No. 15, Shunem ( $\xi^{\text{c}}$  - $n-m^{\text{c}}$  =  $\text{שׁוּנֵם}$ );<sup>c</sup> No. 16, Bethshean ( $B^{\text{c}}$  - $ty$  - $\xi^{\text{c}}$  - $n-r^{\text{c}}$  =  $\text{בֵּית־שֵׁאֵן}$ );<sup>d</sup> No. 17, Rehob ( $Rw-h^{\text{c}}$  - $b^{\text{c}}$  - $^{\text{c}}$  =  $\text{רְחוֹב}$ );<sup>e</sup> No. 18, Hapharaim ( $h^{\text{c}}$  - $pw-rw-m^{\text{c}}$  =  $\text{חַפְרַיִם}$ );<sup>f</sup> No. 22, Machanaim ( $M-h^{\text{c}}$  - $n-m$  =  $\text{מַחֲנַיִם}$ );<sup>g</sup> No. 23, Gibeon ( $k-b^{\text{c}}$  - $^{\text{c}}$  - $n^{\text{c}}$  =  $\text{גִּבְעוֹן}$ );<sup>h</sup> No. 24, Beth-

<sup>a</sup>A number of important names in the list had already been identified by Champollion; many are due to Brugsch (*Geographische Inschriften*, II, 56-71); a study by Maspero *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache*, 1880, 44 ff.), a useful treatment by Müller (*Asien und Europa*, 166-72), and another fuller essay by Maspero, in *Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, 27, 63-122, followed by a discussion by Conder, 123-30). The following numbers all refer to Lepsius, *Denkmäler*; Champollion, *Notices descriptives*, has inserted a lost oval between 41 and 45, omitted two between 48 and 51, omitted one between 59 and 61, and misplaced 65 behind 68. The second and last of these errors were noted by Maspero in collating the original (*Recueil*, VII, 100), but his study (*Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache*, 1880, 44 ff.) employs the hopelessly confused numbering of Champollion, *Notices descriptives*, which makes it difficult to follow. Much could still be done with the list by a thorough Semitist. I have treated only those names calculated to elucidate the list as a whole, or those which can be geographically placed. The customary juggling with Semitic roots, taken from a Hebrew dictionary, may be made to fill many pages, but is, historically, totally valueless.

<sup>b</sup>The identification of two of them, as Gaza and Megiddo, is a guess; the occurrence of Megiddo later (27) shows that we cannot look for it here.

<sup>c</sup>These three all in Issachar.

<sup>d</sup>Manasseh;  $n-r = n$ , as commonly.

<sup>e</sup>Probably not Rehob by the Sea of Galilee; see Müller, *Asien und Europa*, 153.

<sup>f</sup>Issachar. No. 19,  $^{\text{c}}$  - $d-rw-m^{\text{c}}$  - $m$ , that is,  $\text{אֲדָרִים}$ , is perhaps  $\text{אֲדָרִים}$ , Adaroim in Judah. We should then necessarily conclude that the list has mixed the towns of the two kingdoms. No. 20 is lost, and No. 21 ( $\xi^{\text{c}}$  - $w^{\text{c}}$  - $d$ ) is unknown.

<sup>g</sup>East of Jordan, Gad.

<sup>h</sup>Benjamin.

horon ( $B^{\circ} -ty-h-w^{\circ} -rw-n =$  בית הורון);<sup>a</sup> No. 26, Ajalon ( $^{\circ} -yw-rw-n =$  אילון);<sup>b</sup> No. 27, Megiddo ( $M-k-d-yw =$  מגידו).<sup>c</sup>

713. Next follows the much-discussed  $Yw-d-h-m-rw-k$  or ידהמלק (No. 29), which is, of course, not to be rendered "the king or kingdom of Judah."<sup>d</sup> With No. 32,<sup>e</sup>  $^{\circ} -r^{\circ} -n^{\circ}$ , ערן, we are again in the vicinity of southern Carmel; for this place is the Aruna, passed by Thutmose III on his march to Megiddo (II, 425). No. 34,<sup>f</sup>  $d^{\circ} -d-p-t-t-rw$ , דפתאל or צדפתל, was probably a city of central Palestine,<sup>g</sup> while the next recognizable name,<sup>h</sup> No. 38,  $S^{\circ} -yw-k^{\circ}$ , is phonetically exactly equivalent to Socoh (שכיה),<sup>i</sup> and it would carry us into Judah.

<sup>a</sup>Ephraim; No. 25,  $k^{\circ} -d-t-m$ , is unknown.

<sup>b</sup>Dan, but in Israel.

<sup>c</sup>Issachar (though held by Manasseh). No. 28,  $^{\circ} -d-rw =$  אדר (or אדל) agrees phonetically exactly with אדר in Judah (Josh. 15:3; Numb. 34:4), but, again we should have a long leap from Israel into Judah; and Addar is well reproduced in No. 100, certainly in Judah.

<sup>d</sup>The impossibility of this rendering was long ago shown by Brugsch (*Geographische Inschriften*, II, 62, 63). He also proposed rendering  $h$  as the article; so also Müller (*Asien und Europa*, 167; *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, X, 81), who proposed "Hand of the King." The difficulty is that this involves the transliteration of the Semitic article by the Egyptian scribe, whereas in the lists regularly, and in this list everywhere, the article is translated (see Nos. 71, 77, 87, 90, 92, 94, etc.). The location of the place is unknown.

<sup>e</sup>No. 30 is lost; and No. 31,  $H^{\circ} -y^{\circ} -n-m$ , חיים or האנם, is unknown.

<sup>f</sup>No. 33,  $B^{\circ} -rw-m^{\circ} -m$ , בלמם, is unknown.

<sup>g</sup>It is not known from the Old Testament, but it is mentioned in Papyrus Anastasi, I, 22, 5, where it appears to be between northern Israel and Benjamin (see Müller, *Asien und Europa*, 167).

<sup>h</sup>No. 35 is too broken for use; No. 36,  $B^{\circ} -ty-t^{\circ} -rw-m^{\circ} m$  ( $m^{\circ} m = m$  in this list), or בית התלם, "House of the furrow," is unknown. In the collation (*Recueil*, VII, 100, No. 36), the  $ty$  has been overlooked, but it is perfectly clear on the photograph. Hence the long paragraph on the word (*Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, 27, 102, 103) falls away. No. 37,  $K^{\circ} -k^{\circ} -rw-y$ , perhaps a כקר (with ק in the middle for כ?), is unknown.

<sup>i</sup>There are two cities of this name in Judah, one in the valley of Elah toward the Shephelah, and the other in the highlands southwest of Hebron. See the objections of Müller (*Asien und Europa*, 161).

714. The entire next row (40-52) is lost,<sup>a</sup> except the first name, which began with an Abel, "meadow;" and the next row (53-65) is in little better condition. It contains three familiar names, No. 56, <sup>2</sup>*d-m-<sup>2</sup>* or אֲדַמָּא, perhaps Edom;<sup>b</sup> and No. 57, <sup>d</sup>*rw-m<sup>2</sup> m* (read *m*?) or צִוְרִים, "Rocks," which, however, are of slight geographical value; and No. 59, *Y-rw-d<sup>2</sup>-<sup>2</sup>*, Yeraza<sup>c</sup> of the Annals (II, 326, l. 12), in north-western Judah.

715. Nos. 65, 66, *P<sup>2</sup>-<sup>c</sup><sup>2</sup>-m-k<sup>c</sup><sup>2</sup>-y<sup>2</sup>-d<sup>2</sup>*,<sup>d</sup> "The<sup>e</sup> Valley of עִזָּא, or עֵצָא," form the first example of a long series of compound names (each occupying two rings), of which the first member is a well-known Semitic word, like שֶׁבֶלֶת, "Stream" (73 and 75), נֶגֶב, "South-country" (84, 90, 92), and הַקֵּל, "Field" (68, 71, 77, 87, 94, 96, 101, 107). But, unfortunately, these names, while often capable of translation, cannot be geographically located. The most interesting is (Nos. 71, 72) *P<sup>2</sup><sup>e</sup>-h<sup>w</sup>-k<sup>2</sup>-r<sup>w</sup>-<sup>2</sup><sup>2</sup>-b<sup>2</sup>-r<sup>2</sup>-m*, or הַקֵּל<sup>f</sup>

<sup>a</sup>A few fragments in Maspero's collation.

<sup>b</sup>But names of countries do not appear in this list. There was an אֲדַמָּא in Naphtali, and Müller proposes "Edumia-Dôme" in eastern Ephraim (Müller, *Asien und Europa*, 168).

<sup>c</sup>See Müller, *Asien und Europa*, 152, note 1.

<sup>d</sup>There is no *m* at the end according to Maspero's collation (*Recueil*, VII, 100, No. 63, confirmed by photograph); hence there was no basis for the identification with עִזָּמִיָּה in Judah (Müller, *Asien und Europa*, 168). Why it is still read with *m* by Maspero (*Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, 27, 108, 109) in 1892, I do not know.

<sup>e</sup>*P<sup>2</sup>* is the Egyptian article.

<sup>f</sup>Even if this word be Aramaic, it would not militate against the identification of the second part of the name with Abram. But its frequent occurrence in this list, quite justifies Bondi's conclusion that, although not found in the Old Testament, הַקֵּל is an old Canaanite word. The strange ending <sup>2</sup> in which Müller would see the Aramaic status emphaticus, is of no significance here, for it is added to many names in the list, which we know existed in Palestine many centuries before the Aramaizing of the Palestinian dialects began. It is not unlikely that it is a feminine ending (for the undoubted feminine termination ם exists in the list only in those words in which it is still preserved in Hebrew. The ם elsewhere was therefore lost between the time of Thutmose III and Sheshonk I). That the

אברם,<sup>a</sup> which can be nothing else than “*The Field of Abram.*”<sup>b</sup> That the name of the traditional ancestor of the Hebrews should be found among the towns of southern Palestine, while of great interest, is not remarkable. We already have the name of Jacob in the lists of Thutmose III, and probably also that of Joseph. We might, therefore, expect to find the name of Abram, especially at this time, when we know that the traditions of their ancestors were especially cherished and daily current among the Hebrews, and were beginning at last to take permanent form. But the narratives of Genesis are all later than this list of She-shonk; hence this is the earliest mention of Abram’s name in an historical document—his first appearance in history.

716. The remainder of the list, as we have stated, offers very little which can be geographically determined. No. 100, <sup>ו</sup>-ד-ר<sup>ו</sup>-<sup>ו</sup>,<sup>c</sup> is doubtless אֶרֶץ in Judah, while of two

---

ending <sup>ו</sup> is a feminine ending in this list is indicated by the fact that this very word חֶקֶל, while four times written with the ending <sup>ו</sup>, is once written with no ending, and once with *t* and the land-determinative. Such a *t* was at this time, exactly as in modern Arabic, not pronounced, but indicated merely the vowel *ā* or *ē*, the connection between the lost feminine *t* and the word to which it belonged. Finally it should be noticed that the plural of the word in this list is חֶקְלִים (107), which I need hardly state is a Hebrew and not an Aramaic plural. While masculine, it may still belong to a feminine noun like שָׁנָה, pl., שָׁנִים.

<sup>a</sup>This word is explained by Maspero (*Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, 27, 83) as a plural of אֶבֶל, which he gives as “אֶבְלִים.” This equivalence is phonetically perfect, but nevertheless impossible. This plural is given its vowel-points as if it were an existent form, but the plural of אֶבֶל, “meadow,” does not occur. The word is used in Hebrew only as the first member of an annexion in geographical names, e. g., אֶבֶל קָרְמִים, and never occurs in any other combination. This is also its use in all of the other names in which it occurs in our list. Moreover, if this were not so, we must demand for the second number some specific term, name, or epithet.

<sup>b</sup>On showing this identification to Erman, he looked up his own studies on this list, and to his own surprise he found in his manuscript that he had made the same identification in 1888. It was also made independently by Schaefer.

<sup>c</sup>Repeated in No. 117.

Arads (Nos. 108, 110, <sup>c</sup>*-rw-d-<sup>o</sup>*), one must be ערד in the desert of Judah. No. 124 is possibly to be emended to Beth Anoth,<sup>a</sup> and No. 125 is probably Sharuhēn of southern Judah.<sup>b</sup> We look in vain for Jerusalem, which (according to 1 Kings 14:25) was also plundered by Sheshonk. It must have been lost in one of the lacunæ.

Professor Sayce has kindly sent me the following note on the list:

“In the newly recovered portion of the list, Legrain has discovered the name of Jordan (*Yw-r-d-n*), and after *Raphia* and *L-b-a-n* we have <sup>c</sup>*-n-p-rw-n*, עין-פרך (see Gen. 21:19, 21), and finally *H-<sup>o</sup>-m* (as in the list of Thothmes III).” He doubtless refers to readings in the bottom lines, which are not yet published.

717. The historical conclusions to be drawn from the peculiarities in the language and writing of the list seem to me to have been misunderstood. The alleged Aramaisms are very doubtful; but even if they be admitted, their use by the hieroglyphic scribe is so utterly opposed to the usage of Aramaic that they would prove only the personal peculiarity of an Egyptian scribe, slightly acquainted with Aramaic, and absolutely nothing as to the pronunciation of the name of a given town current in Palestine. The conclusion that this list shows that Aramaic had already become the leading language of Syria, therefore, seems to me, to be without basis.

---

<sup>a</sup>BethAnath (Josh. 19:38; Judg. 1:33) is in Naphtali; we may equally well read, with Müller, BethAnoth (Josh. 15:59), which was in Judah (modern Bêt-<sup>c</sup> Anân?).

<sup>b</sup>No. 118, *P<sup>o</sup>-b<sup>o</sup>-y-<sup>o</sup>*, should be compared with the land *B<sup>o</sup>* which Schaefer tells me occurs on Seti I's stela at Tell-esh-Shehab in the Hauran. From the squeeze he read: “*Mut, mistress of B<sup>o</sup>* (*nb't-B<sup>o</sup>*, with *b<sup>o</sup>*-bird and hill-country).” If BethAnath of Naphtali occurs in the second half of the list, a place in the Hauran might also be there.

The arrangement and content of the famous relief and its inscriptions will be found in the following description.

*Scene*

718. The king<sup>a</sup> on the right gathers in his left hand the hair of a group of kneeling Asiatics, who raise their hands appealing for mercy, as he brandishes his war-mace over their heads. On the left, Amon approaches, extending to the Pharaoh a sword, and leading to him by cords five lines of sixty-five captives. Below these are five lines more, containing ninety-one captives, led by the presiding goddess of Thebes. There are thus one hundred and fifty-six captives, each symbolizing a Palestinian town, the name of which is inclosed in a crenelated oval, above which appear the shoulders and head of the captive in each case.<sup>b</sup> Of these names, the fourth and tenth rows have almost entirely perished, involving the loss of thirty-one names; while twelve more, in different places, have also disappeared. Omitting badly mutilated examples, allowing for at least fifteen names which occupy two ovals each, and eliminating the Nine Bows, some seventy-five names of ancient Palestinian cities have here survived.

719. The accompanying inscriptions are the following:

*Over the Kneeling Captives*

Smiting the chiefs of the Nubian Troglodytes, of all inaccessible countries, all the lands of the Fenkhu, the countries — —.

---

<sup>a</sup>This figure has now totally disappeared, as it evidently was only painted and never hewn in relief. From similar scenes we are able to restore the conventional figure of the Pharaoh, as above described.

<sup>b</sup>Compare the similar lists of earlier times; Thutmose III (II, 402, 403); Seti I (III, 113, 114); Ramses III (IV, 130, 131).



*Before the King*

Sheshonk I,<sup>a</sup> king, great in fame, smiting the countries that assail him, achieving with his sword, that the Two Lands may know that he has smitten the chiefs of all countries.

*With Amon*

720. <sup>1</sup>Welcome! my beloved son, Sheshonk,<sup>b</sup> — — mighty in strength. Thou hast smitten the lands and the countries, <sup>2</sup>thou hast crushed the Nubian Troglodytes, [thy] sword was mighty among the Asiatics; they were made fragments every moment. Thy victorious fame — all lands. <sup>3</sup>Thou wentest forth in victory, and thou hast returned in might; <sup>4</sup>thou hast united<sup>c</sup> —; I have <sup>5</sup>—<sup>d</sup> for thee the countries that knew not Egypt, that had begun to invade [thy] boundaries, in order to cut off their heads. <sup>6</sup>Victory is given into thy hands, all lands and all countries are united — —, the fear of thee is as far as the four pillars [of heaven], the terror<sup>e</sup> of thy majesty is among the Nine Bows: thou hast <sup>7</sup>— the hearts of the countries. Thou art Horus over the Two Lands, <sup>8</sup>thou art <sup>9</sup>— against thy enemies, when thou hast smitten the foe. Take thou my victorious sword,<sup>f</sup> thou whose war-mace has smitten the chiefs of the countries.

721. <sup>6</sup>Utterance of Amon-Re. . . . .<sup>g</sup> <sup>7</sup>“My heart is very glad, when I see thy victories, <sup>8-11</sup>my son, Meriamon-Sheshonk, my beloved, who camest forth from me, in order to be my champion. I have seen the excellence of thy plans; which thou hast executed, the — of my temple, which thou hast established [for] me, in Thebes, the great seat to which my heart [inclines]. <sup>12</sup>Thou hast begun to make monuments in Southern Heliopolis, Northern Heliopolis, and every city — — thereof for the <sup>13</sup>sole<sup>1</sup> god of its district. Thou hast made my temple of millions

<sup>a</sup>Threefold titulary.

<sup>b</sup>Some epithets omitted in translation.

<sup>c</sup>Sm > ? Or: “*thou hast explored*” (*wb > ?*).

<sup>d</sup>The *p* before the *s*, given by Lepsius, is probably an accidental fracture or chisel mark (photograph); but it may be the *wsh*-vessel, although *wsh*, “*extended, enlarged*,” does not fit the context.

<sup>e</sup>*Nhm*, “*battle-cry*?”

<sup>f</sup>Referring, of course, to the sword which he is represented as extending to the king.

<sup>g</sup>Titles of the god.

of years, — — of electrum, wherein I —. <sup>13</sup>Thy heart is satisfied over  
[————] ————. Thou hast — <sup>14</sup>more than any king of them all.  
Thou hast smitten every land, my mighty sword was the source of the  
victories which I have given — — — — all the Asiatics <sup>15</sup>(*Mnyw-Stt*).  
Thy fire raged as a flame behind them, it fought against every land,  
which thou didst gather together, which thy majesty gave to it, (being)  
Montu <sup>16</sup>the mighty overwhelming his enemies. Thy war-mace, it  
struck down thy foes, the Asiatics of distant countries; thy serpent-  
crest was mighty among them.”

722. “I made thy boundaries <sup>17</sup>as far as thou desiredst; I made the  
Southerners come in obeisance to thee, and the Northerners to the great-  
ness of thy fame. Thou hast made a great slaughter among them with-  
out number, <sup>18</sup>falling in their valleys, being multitudes, annihilated and  
perishing afterward, like those who have never been born. All the  
countries that came — [—]; <sup>19</sup>thy majesty has destroyed them in the space  
of a moment. I have trampled for thee them that rebelled against thee,  
overthrowing [for] thee the Asiatics of the army of Mitanni (*M-t-n*);  
<sup>20</sup>I have humbled them [—] beneath thy feet. I am thy father, the  
lord of gods, Amon-Re, lord of Thebes, sole leader, whose remnant<sup>a</sup>  
escapes not, that I may cause thy valor to be [remembered] in the  
future<sup>b</sup> through all eternity.”

PRESENTATION OF TRIBUTE<sup>c</sup>

723. This fragmentary inscription in all likelihood accom-  
panied a relief depicting the presentation of tribute to Amon; for it represents Sheshonk addressing Amon, and delivering  
to him the tribute of Syria (*h<sup>3</sup> rw*) and Nubia. The date  
is unfortunately lost, but it is, of course, after the Palestin-  
ian campaign. Sheshonk evidently controlled lower Nubia,

<sup>a</sup>The remnant whom he has not slain.

<sup>b</sup>Text has *m nh* (with the legs); but we must read either *m ht* or *n m ht*, that  
is, “*hereafter*,” or “*for the hereafter*.”

<sup>c</sup>Wall inscription in great temple of Karnak, in a chamber immediately on  
the northwest of the sanctuary (Champollion, “*Cour U*”); published: Champol-  
lion, *Notices descriptives*, II, 142-44; Lepsius, *Denkmaler*, III, 255, *c* (royal name  
only).