

appears the *htp-di-nswt* formula to Anubis, to the Great God, and later also to Osiris (Fifth Dynasty) asking for a funerary offering *pri-ḥrw*, a burial, and walking on the roads on which walk the venerables in heaven. No date criterion can be derived from the arrangement of the inscriptions on the sarcophagus before the end of the Old Kingdom. Most important are the lists of offerings inscribed during the Sixth Dynasty on the internal east side, the list of the seven sacred oils at the north end, and the representation of granaries at the south end. It is noteworthy that the lids of two sarcophagi ('Ankhma' ḥor, Ikhekhi) from the beginning of the Sixth Dynasty at Saqqara are inscribed with a peculiar invocation to the various categories of artisans and officials of the necropolis asking that they secure the lid to its "mother" coffin.

The second half of the book consists of appendixes: Royal Sarcophagi (pp. 103-108), Stone Sarcophagi of Royal Relatives and Private People (pp. 109-150), and Wooden Sarcophagi (pp. 151-174). There is no need to emphasize the usefulness of this catalog of all Old Kingdom sarcophagi numbering 156 items (to which should be added now the newly discovered sarcophagus of Sekhemkhet), giving for each its location, provenance, material, measures, data, bibliography, and a clear description and translation of inscriptions.

An indispensable reference work doubling with a beautiful textbook on the archaeology and history of Egyptian art.

ALEXANDER M. BADAWY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
AT LOS ANGELES

Der Harmachistempel des Khephren in Giseh. HERBERT RICKE. *Ägyptische Quellen zum Plan.* SIEGFRIED SCHOTT. Beiträge zur ägyptischen Bauforschung und Altertumskunde. Heft 10. XIV, 79 pp., frontispiece, 17 pls., 20 figs., 4 plans. Wiesbaden: FRANZ STEINER. 1970.

Once again have Dr. Ricke and the late Professor S. Schott collaborated to investigate the architecture of an Egyptian temple and its thematic religious significance. The temple built in front of the great sphinx at Giza—a landmark as well known as the pyramids—was not finally cleared except in 1935-1938, from the sand dunes that kept rolling over the high bedrock cliff. Its ascription to Harmachis 'Hor in the horizon' as the god worshiped and to the pharaoh Khephren as its builder is first proved by the great stela relating the clearing of encroaching sand by Thutmose IV. No trace of a cult or title of priest was found prior to this, a fact that corroborates the unfinished process of the building.

The temple was built on a lower terrace cut for that

purpose below the front of the terrace of the sphinx, perhaps on the site of an earlier shrine with a drainage system. Close affinities with the valley temple of Khephren adjoining it south appear in the construction (bedrock core lined with pink granite) and plan (same alignments east and west, similar east facades with double winding entrance passageways). The internal plan, however, is similar to Khephren's upper funerary temple, combining a pillared court also 58 cubits long flanked by two rows of piers as in the upper court with a stepped pillared portico as in the upper vestibule, but here duplicated east and west of the court. Even the outer width of 88 cubits is the same for both structures. The temple is symmetrical along an east-west axis 7.5 meters south of that of the sphinx. No passage between both could be traced but it is suggested that an altar stood in the north part of the court in the axis of the sphinx.

As the structure was already finished with its granite lining an aisle with six pillars was added on the north and south small sides of the court, an addition which could only find its justification in a thematic modification of the ritual. Ten colossal seated statues stood as the twelve ones in the upper temple in front of the piers. The two statues in the middle of the west row were larger. As in the funerary temple monolithic pillars were brought from the north side and their bottom was engaged into small channels connected to the sockets all varying in depth to adjust to the varying heights of the pillars. From a clever investigation of the measures of corner pillars it was deduced that the clear height above the alabaster floor was eight cubits, as in the deep hall of Khephren's valley temple, probably allowing a ceiling height of ten cubits.

Ricke's study of the architecture and his surmises are corroborated by Schott's contribution "Egyptian Sources to the Plan of the Sphinx Temple" (pp. 47-79), a survey of cult and representations from the time of the pyramids to the mortuary temples of the New Kingdom. The east-west axis of the two stepped niches—obviously implying a cult of the sun and a correlation with the sphinx and Khephren—was allied to a north-south axis marked by the direction of the court and further emphasized by the addition of the two pillared aisles north and south. The authors surmise that the two rows of six piers each flanking the court corresponded symmetrically to the twelve months while the four groups of six pillars each behind the piers corresponded to the hours of the ritual by day and by night. The two niches shut with double doors facing the two entrances supposedly contained a statue of Neith and of Hathor on the comparative evidence derived from the solar temple of Userkaf, and the titles 'priestess of Hathor in the House of Khephren' and 'priestess of Neith in the House of Khephren' found on two false-doors from the tomb of Thethy at Giza (Fourth Dynasty, B.M.). The

'House of Khephren' would be the original name of the sphinx temple. This would not be a mere coincidence for the ritual performed in the temple of the sphinx represented to Khephren and his successors of the Fourth Dynasty a solar cult akin to that performed in the solar temples in connotation with the mortuary temples of the Fifth Dynasty.

In the absence of any scrap of evidence other than the architecture and comparative arguments derived from sources sometimes quite remote in time and ideology the theoretical interpretation presented by the authors should almost entirely be credited as their own. The book makes therefore a very stimulating reading and is perfect as to publication standards. It is to be hoped that Dr. Rieke will be able to continue the series despite the cryptic implication conveyed by the monogram appearing for the first time in this volume and showing a builder bending in two to lay down his burden harnessed on a yoke.

ALEXANDER M. BADAWY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
AT LOS ANGELES

Basilikale Anlagen in der ägyptischen Baukunst des Neuen Reiches. By GERHARD HAENY. Beiträge zur ägyptischen Bauforschung und Altertumskunde, Heft 9. XI, 112 pp., 2 pls., 31 figs. Wiesbaden: FRANZ STEINER. 1970.

This is a dissertation presented to the faculty of architecture at the University of Karlsruhe by Haeny, the assistant of Dr. H. Rieke. The topic is not new but it is treated on a comprehensive plan. The author sets as primary criteria for a basilica that it should have one or three naves flanked by lower aisles, though he considers the clerestory windows as secondary elements, agreeing in this with Vitruvius (*De Architectura*, Lib. V, i, 4-10). Egyptian basilican structures appear between the mid-Eighteenth to the mid-Twentieth dynasties at Karnak in the so-called Festival Hall of Thutmose III, the great hypostyle hall, the front hypostyle of Khonsu, and on the western bank of Thebes in the mortuary temples of Ramses II and Ramses III.

The so-called Festival Hall of Thutmose III (pp. 6-17) is for the first time interpreted as a copy of a peristyle court with pillars surrounding a taller tent on tent-pole columns. This ingenious interpretation explains the chamfered architrave of the pillared ambulatory projecting within the hall, its interspacing and type differing from that of the tent-pole columns, and its continuous course round the four sides of the hall. A similar chamfered architrave projects within the court in the Re^caltar court of Hatshepsut at Qurna, Ptah temple at Karnak, and the temple at Amada. The new architectonic interpretation disposes of the current

one describing the hall as a hebsed hall in favor of a ceremonial storeroom built to house the booty belonging to Amun as an acknowledgement of thanks by Thutmose III. Other basilican halls of the Eighteenth Dynasty existed in the mortuary temple of Hatshepsut and the temple of Thutmose III at Deir el Bahari—the latter temple seemingly combining also a central hall and a surrounding ambulatory as that at Karnak (p. 18).

In the so-called 'unfinished basilica of Luxor' (pp. 19-28) (the hall with two rows of papyriform columns built by Amenhotep III in front of his temple of Amun at Luxor) Haeny would see the last way-station marking the arrival of the procession of Amun, Mut and Khonsu reunited in the great hall of Karnak to the temple at Luxor, on the feast of Ipet. A similar entrance hall was built by the same Amenhotep III in front of the temple at Soleb.

Of the basilican projects of the Nineteenth Dynasty the great hypostyle hall at Karnak deserves the lion's share (pp. 29-61). Inscriptions on its architraves describe its function as the place of Appearance of Amun, Mut and Khonsu, and place of meeting of their barks to receive the tribute of nations, then go in procession to Luxor. The inscriptions specify that this way-station stood in front of Ipet-swt (Amun's temple proper). Haeny examines the arguments concerning the story of the construction and concludes that the court between Pylon III and Pylon II was transformed into a hypostyle hall by Horemheb and completed and decorated by Ramses I and Seti I. This chronology does not subscribe to the earlier suggestion whereby the central papyriform colonnade was built before the aisles. The strictly architectonic interpretation of the choice of taller papyriform columns for the nave to conform to the height of the gateway of the pylon (p. 54) does not take into account the symbolism that underlies the concept of the Egyptian cult temple as recognized by H. H. Nelson and other Egyptologists. While the papyriform columns of the nave at Karnak are not aligned with the smaller columns of the aisles, thus betraying the two components first devised in the so-called Festival Hall of Thutmose III, all the columns in the basilican hypostyle of the Ramesside temples are aligned to achieve unity.

The author is certainly justified in substituting Egyptian elements to a former restoration of the tent built by Ptolemy II for the feast of his parents and Dionysos, after Athenaios' description (pp. 76-77). Yet he does not refer to the facades copying tents in the funerary complex of Djoser at Saqqara. The existence of what Vitruvius specifies as 'Egyptian *oecus*' comparable to a basilica is too readily doubted by Haeny because of lacking evidence (pp. 78-79). I would add that the monuments investigated are exclusively temples though there is no doubt that palaces in Thebes such as those of Amenhotep III at Malqata had basilican halls. Such a hall bordered