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CHAPTER 2

Economic Implications of the Menkaure Triads

Florence Dunn Friedman
Brown University

Abstract

This article expands on an earlier suggestion that the Menkaure triads served, in part, as economic illustrations of how the king’s Heb-Sed was provisioned. The working hypothesis is that each triad’s stated nome is linked to an (unnamed) economically important town, like Sheikh Said or Giza, which was associated with a real or symbolic Hathor temple whose estates provisioned the King’s Heb-Sed. Two triads are singled out for discussion in this regard: one with the standard for the 15th nome of Upper Egypt, the Hare nome; and the other, its damaged mate, provisionally restored with the White Walls of the 1st nome of Lower Egypt that held Egypt’s capital of Memphis. Hathor in this economic model mediates between the king and state, on the one hand, and the nomes and their resources, on the other. Reality and symbolism come together in this goddess, who, at her son’s valley temple, serves as divine provisioner at the juncture of archaeologically-based reality and symbolic fiction.

1 Introduction

This article builds on several others that dealt with the meaning and function of the Menkaure triads. In the course of researching those articles, I developed what has become the core of my working hypothesis, and which is at the base of

* My thanks to Peter Der Manuelian, Philip J. King Professor of Egyptology, Harvard University, and Thomas Schneider, Professor of Egyptology and Near Eastern Studies, University of British Columbia, for inviting me to speak at the conference, “Towards a New History for the Egyptian Old Kingdom. Perspectives on the Pyramid Age,” held at Harvard University, April 26, 2012, out of which this article grew. Thanks also to Rita E. Freed, John F. Cogan, Jr. and Mary L. Cornille Chair of the Department of Art of the Ancient World; Lawrence M. Berman, Norma Jean Calderwood Senior Curator of Ancient Egyptian, Nubian, and Near Eastern Art; and Denise Doxey, Curator of Ancient Egyptian, Nubian, and Near Eastern Art, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, for helpful access to the triads and fragments. Much appreciation to Michelle Pisa for graphics, JJ Shirley for editorial help, and Michael Fredericks for photography.

1 Friedman, “Triads I,” “Triads II,” and “The Cultic Relationship of the Menkaure Triads.”
For the sake of clarity, and to add new data, I repeat and expand on some of that material now, especially the implications of one proposal: that the triads read as names of ḫwt estates from provincial Hathor temples, real or symbolic.

The triads consist of four intact examples plus two large fragments, presented in two format types (Fig. 2.1). Type 1 shows the king striding at center, flanked by Hathor and a nome personification, and Type 2 shows Hathor seated at center, flanked by the standing king and a nome personification. Type 1 cites the Hathor
FIGURE 2.2 Inscriptions on the base of each intact triad: JE 40678, JE 46499, JE 40679, MFA 09.200.*

(*COURTESY MUSEUM OF FINE ARTS, BOSTON)
cult of Ḥwt-Hr nbt nht m swt. s nbt, “Hathor, Mistress of Sycamore in all her Places” (Fig. 2.2; JE 40678 [omitting “her”], 46499, 40679), and Type 2 cites the separate Hathor cult of Ḥwt-Hr nbt nht, “Hathor, Mistress of Sycamore”4 (Fig. 2.2; MFA 09.200). Of the fragmentary triads, one is Type 1 (Fig. 2.1d), and the other Type 2 (Fig. 2.1f), the latter identified from remains of the center-seated figure of Hathor with traces of the standing king to her left.5 The nomes on the intact triads are UE 4, 7, and 17 for Type 1, and UE 15 for Type 2, while the two fragmentary triads lack nome signs. To “read” the triads as estate names, I used the back slab as the ḫwt hieroglyph without corner box; Hathor’s embrace, handholding and close juxtaposition to the king as the verb, mr, “love”; and the nome sign as the given nome. Based on other Fourth Dynasty estate names, especially Sneferu’s, I suggested a reading of: ḫwt Mn-kꜢw-RꜤ mr Ḥwt-Hr Mn-kꜢw-R’, “The ḫwt estate of Menkaure (called) ‘Hathor loves Menkaure’,” in the given nome.6 What is not stated on the triads, I believe, is the specific town in which the estates lay in the given nomes (like Sheikh Said, e.g., in UE 15); the towns would have been understood. The estates, I suggested, are from Hathor temples in those unnamed towns. The temples and their estates may be fictitious propaganda, or real, or a combination of both.

Besides reading the triads as estate names, I also tried to show how the iconography and attitude of the triads’ figures, plus the inscription on the triads’ bases, detail the benefits accorded Menkaure: his legitimation (expressed through Hathor and the nome personifications’ hand holding or embrace), his provisioning from Upper Egypt (stated in the inscriptions, Fig. 2.2),7 his ability to move simultaneously in multiple directions (signaled by the outward

---

5 Reisner, Mycerinus, 110 (14). Much of the statuary has disappeared, as attested by the abundant shattered pieces of greywacke and calcite alabaster. But I find no evidence of group statuary that combined Menkaure with a deity other than Hathor. An interesting idea from Ćwiek, Relief Decoration, 313, n. 1294, however, suggests that the unprovenanced Hildesheim fragment of a cat deity with missing king (in Seidel, Statuengruppen, 10–12, fig. 4, pl. 2) was part of a calcite alabaster Menkaure triad with Bastet, instead of Hathor.
6 See Friedman, “Triads 1,” 34–36 for full discussion. The naming construction uses Jacquet-Gordon, Les noms des Domaines, 75, 111 A2a; names appear as verbal phrases, like “God x loves the king,” in the late Fourth and early Fifth Dynasty (p. 78).
7 Reisner, Mycerinus, pl. 46. Through the nome personifications (vehicles through which Hathor acts), the inscriptions show the king receiving offerings from UE 4 (JE 40678): ḫt nb(t) jmjt SmꜤw ḏfꜢ nb ḥtpt nbt sk tw hꜢ( j). t( j) m nswt-bjtj dt; from (UE 7) JE 46499: ḫt nb(t) nfrt jmjt( j) ḥtpt nbt jmjt SmꜤw ḫ( j). t( j) m nswt-bjtj dt; from UE 17 (JE 40679): ḫt nb(t) nfrt jmjt( j) ḥtpt nbt jmjt SmꜤw ḫ( j). t( j) m nswt-bjtj dt; and from UE 15 (MFA 09.200): nfrt nb(t) ḥtpt nb(t) ḫ( j) ḥtpt nb jmjt SmꜤw ḫ( j). t( j) m nswt-bjtj dt.
glances of the flanking figures), and, most importantly, his confirmation at the Heb-Sed. The Heb-Sed theme is revealed in Type 2 by the mks held in the king’s left hand (Fig. 2.3a), unlike the “enigmatic object” held by the king in every Type 1 (Fig. 2.3b). Following the pattern of all Type 1s, which show the king holding the same object, the damaged Type 2 (Fig. 2.1f) should follow the intact Type 2, by showing the king with the Heb-Sed mks in his left hand. Legitimation, provisioning, multi-directionality, and Heb-Sed confirmation come to Menkaure through Hathor, with Sed confirmation being the most important. The Heb-Sed, I stressed, is the main theme of the triads, with legitimation, provisioning and multi-directionality being attendant themes to the Sed-Festival, just as they were at Sneferu’s lower temple at the Bent Pyramid and, earlier, at Djoser’s Step Pyramid complex.

The provisioning theme is a prominent feature of the triads and appears in the form of inscriptions with textual variations on the base of each triad (Fig. 2.2). The provisions, I maintained, should be understood as coming from

---

8 Friedman, “Triads II.”
10 Stadelmann, “The heb-sed Temple of Sneferu at Dahshur,” confirms the Sed-Festival purpose of Sneferu’s temple.
11 Friedman, “Triads II,” 105–11. For Khufu Heb-Sed images, see Khaled, Royal Funerary Domains, 98–101. In Friedman, “Triads II,” I missed a provisioning theme for Djoser implicit in some of the pottery and stone vessels from his underground galleries (Lacau and Lauer, Pyramide à Degrés IV and V), some with ink labeled food contents referencing the Heb-Sed (Lacau and Lauer, Pyramide à Degrés v, esp. 96; cf. Lauer, Saqqara, 133; pl. 104 with calcite alabaster vase with Heb-Sed decoration), the ceremony with which “probably all of the ink inscriptions are to be linked” (Regulski, “Ink Inscriptions,” 955, 957).
Hathor, through the vehicle of the nome personifications, who act as her deputies, and before whom the inscriptions appear. The framework for the transfer of goods from the provinces to the king via Hathor was based on real-world economics, since funneling produce from provincial properties (estates or domains) to a king had a long tradition dating back to the beginnings of Egyptian history. With Menkaure, however, I’ve suggested a variation on this theme, namely, that the goods listed on the triads should not be understood as coming directly from Menkaure’s own domains but from domains he really or symbolically set up for his divine mother (and wife), Hathor, whose temple estates he and other kings, in theory, if not in fact, had founded or allied themselves with.

My hypothesis about Menkaure’s interest in provincial Hathor temples would link to a principle seen later in the Royal Annals of the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties, where the crown is presented as responsible for all gods’ temples, caring for them through acts of royal patronage especially in the form of land endowments. Menkaure, I suggest, presents himself as patronizing the temple cults of Hathor in the nomes on the triads, an act that would be understood within a quid pro quo relationship in which he sets up estates for her temples, from which she then provisions his Heb-Sed. In such a propagandistic fiction, the triads would show Hathor feeding her son, her “beloved” (Fig. 2.2), with supplies from her own temple properties, i.e., herself. I now revisit that theory, as well as my reading and understanding of Type 2 triads.

One important point in this analysis is whether these provisions for Hathor’s beloved were for his funerary cult, which is what I originally assumed. Indeed, a king’s need for ongoing provisions in a funerary cult was real, and archaeological remains confirm that well into the Sixth Dynasty goods were offered to Menkaure in the form of four seated alabaster statues—none of which, by the way, has an offering text—in the valley temple’s offering hall behind the open court. But I now believe that the triads’ provisions from Hathor focused not

---

13 Dreyer, Umm el-Qaab I.
14 Bussmann, “Die Provinztempel,” XCI–XCIV, Ch. 7.
15 Wilkinson, Royal Annals, 154.
16 UE 4 (JE 40678): mry ḏt; (UE 7) JE 46499: mry; from UE 17 (JE 40679): mry ḏt; and from UE 15 (MFA 09.200): mry.
18 Discussed in Friedman, “Names of Menkaure,” forthcoming. See Reisner, Mycerinus, 47. Nolan, “The Cult of Menkaure,” 70, finds that the funerary cult seems to have been active even when Menkaure was alive.
on this funerary cult, but on his *Heb-Sed,*\(^{19}\) which is not funerary in nature. Hathor as specifically illustrated through the Type 2 triads is provisioning Menkaure’s *Heb-Sed* from her own *ḥwt* temple estates, a hypothesis with implications, symbolic and maybe real, for the economic workings of the country. The first step is to look at the meaning and usage of *ḥwt,* and how it may relate to my hypothesis.

2  **Ḥwt**

2.1  **Definition of Ḫwt**

*Ḥwt* is a generic term for an enclosed structure,\(^ {20}\) possibly “any large brick enclosure, whatever its purpose.”\(^ {21}\) Based on Old Kingdom sources, Rainer Hannig defines *ḥwt* most notably as a settlement or farm,\(^ {22}\) which, as Patricia Spencer notes, was probably in origin an enclosure with a brick wall around it.\(^ {23}\) Expanding on this notion, and substituting stone for brick, a *ḥwt* could be the house of a king, especially his pyramid temples; or the house of a god, *i.e.,* his or her divine temple.\(^ {24}\) But it is economics that often dominate the

---

\(^{19}\) I appreciate discussing this point with Hana Vymazalová. All conclusions, however, are my own. On the association of Hathor with the *Sed*-Festival, see Selve, “Le Symbole Bat,” who dates the Hathor association back to the Old Kingdom through the Bat sign. Selve shows the Bat sign relates to Hathor from the beginning of its use (p. 91), appearing in the Old Kingdom with private persons from the Residence who participate at the *Heb-Sed* (pp. 94–95). Centuries later, Amenhotep III’s first *Heb-Sed* will include Hathor (LeBlanc, *Sed Festival* I, 48), showing the king enthroned with her (pp. 56–58). Bat, the symbol of Hathor, appears on the Menkaure triad with *UE* 7 (JE 46499).

\(^{20}\) Gardiner sign-list O6, 493 also translates *ḥwt* as the ideogram for “castle,” “mansion,” “temple,” and “tomb.” A defensive notion can also be attached to the enclosure; see Moreno Garcia, “The State and organization,” 317, who identifies *ḥwt* as a tower.

\(^{21}\) Spencer, *The Egyptian Temple,* 23.

\(^{22}\) Hannig, *Wörterbuch* I, 781.

\(^{23}\) Spencer, *The Egyptian Temple,* 23.

\(^{24}\) Hannig, *Wörterbuch* I, 782. In the Sixth Dynasty it could also refer to a tomb (p. 783), another type of “dwelling”; *cf.* n.20, above. A false door inscription, possibly mid-Fifth Dynasty, from the tomb of the Overseer of Menkaure’s pyramid, Li-nefret includes among his titles, *(sš) n ṣḏwt n ḥwt Mn-kꜢw-RꜤ* (Schürmann, *Die Reliefs,* 14, 67, fig. 19, top left, middle column with original text) translated by Schürmann (p. 20) as “(der Schreiber) des Schatzes des Gutes ‘Tempel des Mykerinos’,” that is, “(Scribe) of the Treasury of the estate, ‘The Ḫwt-Temple of Menkaure.’” Hannig, *Wörterbuch* I, 782 translates *ḥwt* as a Menkaure “temple” based on Schürmann, *Die Reliefs,* 14 (but see 20); and elsewhere as a temple of Neferirkare, plus another in his name of Kakai. See also, Spencer, *The Egyptian Temple,*
usage of *ḥwt*, as textual sources clarify its role as an income-producing property that yielded agricultural and other goods for kings\(^{25}\) and gods (or the elite, not discussed here).\(^{26}\) Kings installed *ḥwts* around the country. The economic meaning of *ḥwt* has been explored in detail since the late 1990s, especially by Juan Carlos Moreno Garcia, who shows that *ḥwt* “jouait un rôle fondamental dans l’organisation administrative des provinces ainsi que dans le contrôle de la campagne égyptienne,”\(^{27}\) acting as “une installation de la couronne qui contrôlait des terres, des localités et des travailleurs, et qui était utilisée comme centre d’emmagasinage et de ravitaillement.”\(^{28}\) Storage and provisioning were economic features critical to *ḥwt*, which was one of several types of royal foundations, or domains,\(^{29}\) that also included *njwt*, an economic subdivision, or village, controlled by a *ḥwt*.\(^{30}\) Helen Jacquet-Gordon\(^{31}\) produced the seminal work on this subject, explored more recently by not only Moreno Garcia, but also Hratch Papazian,\(^{32}\) and Mohammed Khaled.\(^{33}\)

### 2.2  Ḥwt at the Sneferu Temple

The architectural and economic meanings of *ḥwt* conflate at Sneferu’s lower (or so-called valley) temple at the Bent Pyramid at Dahshur. The temple itself was identified as a *ḥwt* by the hieroglyph written on quarry blocks destined for

---

24. But Schürmann suggests that Menkaure’s *ḥwt* temple (with pr-determinative) dealt with the financial management of Menkaure’s mortuary cult. If so, a *ḥwt* could thus be a dwelling for the king during or after life, but also possibly an entity that played a role in the economy of his cult. I do not think the Menkaure temple in the Li-nefret inscription, however, necessarily related to the king’s valley or pyramid temples, though it is possible.

25. Provisioning also included the king’s workmen on site. Redding, “The OK Corral,” 4, “calculated that 11 cattle and 37 sheep/goats were slaughtered every day to feed the workers at the Lost City . . .”

26. Moreno Garcia, “Estates (Old Kingdom),” 1. An official could also have estates. For Fourth Dynasty examples, see Strudwick, *Texts*, Metjen (no. 108), Nykaure (no. 111), and Penmeru (no. 112); and Strudwick’s comments on funerary domains (no. 319).

27. Moreno Garcia, Ḥwt et le milieu rural égyptien du IIIe millénaire, 151.


29. Since the Early Dynastic period, sources differentiate “domains,” shown in oval frames, from enclosures known as *ḥwt* estates: Wilkinson, *Early Dynastic Egypt*, 118; see also his summary on royal foundations, pp. 117–25.


32. Papazian, *Domain of Pharaoh*.

33. Khaled, *Royal Funerary Domains*. 
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the temple,34 with the term then echoed by the file of personified ḥwt estates lining part of the interior temple walls35 (Fig. 2.4). Grouped by nome, each ḥwt estate is named atop the head of a female offering bearer, with the estate name determined by njwt, that smaller agricultural unit controlled by the ḥwt.36 The result is a visual nesting of one concept within another: nomes with named ḥwt estates and their village farms that fed the king (an economic concept) nested within the ḥwt-temple itself (an architectural one). But do these ḥwt estates, which theoretically held economic and administrative control over properties throughout the country, reflect reality or fiction? Are they an economic record? The procession on the east and west walls includes so many offering bearers and was, in its entirety (though few LE nomes survive), so neatly symmetrical that the whole tableau may just be a piece of visual propaganda to project the power of the king, a picture that Moreno Garcia sees as ideology trumping reality.37 He is surely right, in part. But just as we might not tilt our understanding of the so-called scenes of daily life in private tombs too steeply toward being pure idealization,38 we might similarly make room for multiple views in assessing the Sneferu estates. For it is still true that during a reign as long as 33 years,39 Sneferu was a prolific builder (as Moreno Garcia notes) and, as attested by the Palermo Stone, appears to have founded ḥwt estates throughout Upper and Lower Egypt (Urk. I, 236: 11), founding in one year 35 ḥwt, or possibly ḥwwt-ꜤꜢt40 (Urk. I, 236: 14).41

34 Fakhry, Sneferu II, Part 1, 14; Spencer, The Egyptian Temple, 24.
36 I missed this point in Friedman, “Triads” I and “Triads II.”
37 Moreno Garcia, Ḥwt et le milieu rural égyptien du IIIe millénaire, 72–73, 96, 104–05, 143.
38 See Swinton, Management of Estates, in which the author argues that scenes of daily life “reflect the actual work of a rural estate” (p. 147). On the pictured domains in private tombs, however, see Moreno Garcia, Ḥwt et le milieu rural égyptien du IIIe millénaire, 72–73, and “L’organisation sociale,” 417 on what he perceives as their unreal nature. I thank Susan Hollis for reference to the last article.
40 The term in Schäfer, Bruchstück, 30, Nr. 3, goes untranslated. On reading the hieroglyph as ḥwwt-ꜤꜢt, “great estate,” see Scalf, “Rereading the 7th Count of Snefru,” esp. 90, and n. 7 with reference to an alternate translation by Málek, In the Shadow of Pyramids, 68, who translates the text as “creating 35 estates with people and 122 cattle-farms.”
41 See Moreno Garcia, Ḥwt et le milieu rural égyptien du IIIe millénaire, 235 for Sneferu’s governmental changes and the Palermo Stone record that Sneferu built ḥwt extensively throughout both Upper and Lower Egypt. I am stressing that perhaps these data are actually relevant to the extensive number of ḥwt on his temple walls.
And while the Annals could exaggerate, some of Sneferu’s ḫwt estates, as Moreno Garica demonstrates, were real. UE 1, which Ahmed Fakhry justly inferred for the top of the west wall of Sneferu’s temple portico,\(^{42}\) had an Aswan estate used by Sneferu, and another founded by him at Elephantine,\(^{43}\) where there had already been a royal estate probably since the Second Dynasty.\(^{44}\) The Annals show that Sneferu, through the founding of multiple ḫwt estates, spread his power throughout the country, surely in large part to tap the provincial resources that were key to provisioning his expansive building needs.\(^{45}\) So even if the number and names of the ḫwt-estates on the walls of his temple are fanciful, his ḫwt procession still alludes, at base, to an economic reality of increasing Fourth Dynasty royal control over those provinces, including, if we can paraphrase from the Menkaure triads’ inscriptions, all their good things,\(^{46}\) i.e., their resources (Fig. 2.2). So the ḫwts on Sneferu’s temple walls are not just a perfectly balanced picture of Upper and Lower Egyptian estates over which

\(^{42}\)  Fakhry, *Sneferu II*, Part 1, 18, Fig. 8; and see Friedman, “Triads I,” Fig. 15. Preserved UE nomes are 9–16, 18, and 22.
\(^{43}\)  Moreno Garcia, *Ḥwt et le milieu rural égyptien du IIIe millénaire*, 152.
\(^{44}\)  Seidlmayer, “Town and State,” 121.
\(^{45}\)  Málek, *Shadow of the Pyramids*, 68.
\(^{46}\)  UE 4 ([JE 40678): ḫt nb(t); UE 7 ([JE 46499): ḫt nb(t) nfr; UE 17 ([JE 40679): ḫt nb(t) nfr; UE 15 ([MFA 09.200): nfr nb(t).
the king as sovereign had complete control. There were, at least in part, real income-producing estates projected into this cosmological ideal of the temple that were clearly part of a real economic network of feeding the king and his projects. Looking at one estate that also appears on the triads expands on this theme.

2.3 **Significance of the ḫwts in UE 15**

One of the surviving Upper Egyptian nomes on the Sneferu temple’s west entrance wall is UE 15, shown with three named ḫwt estates. UE 15 is also the nome on the intact Type 2 Menkaure triad (Fig. 2.1e), which, according to my hypothesis, included an unnamed but understood town in which its named estate lay. Unlike Sneferu’s entire procession, which I believe originally showed a circulation of offerings moving north and south to the king from almost all the nomes, Menkaure’s triads, I think, were never intended to show all nomes. I estimate from the excavated bits and pieces of greywacke at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts that there were perhaps ten or twelve triads in all, and so ten or twelve nomes. If I am right, then the choice of each nome on the triads becomes especially noteworthy, making us look more closely at UE 15, on the intact Type 2.

UE 15 was the Hare, or Hermopolite, nome, containing the two especially important towns of Sheikh Said and Hatnub, either of which could have been the unnamed town for the estate in this Type 2 triad. The Belgians’ recent work in UE 15 strongly suggests the presence of a ḫwt-royal estate at Sheikh Said by Khufu’s reign. In fact, the Sheikh Said ḫwt was probably founded by Khufu, or possibly Sneferu. It was a supplier of calcite alabaster, probably into Menkaure’s reign, and is replete with evidence of industrial stone working. At Sheikh Said, it also looks like Khufu established a royal cult, that is, a cult to himself, which continued into the Fifth Dynasty. Nearby Hatnub also had calcite alabaster quarries, referenced on Early Dynastic inscribed alabaster

---

47 Moreno Garcia, Ḥwt et le milieu rural égyptien du IIIe millénaire, 96, and also 72, 104–05.
48 Fakhry, Sneferu 1, Part 1, 34, and 39, Figs. 15, 16. Their estate names to my knowledge do not connect to known towns.
49 Friedman, “Triads II,” 119. Few LE nomes, however, survive.
vessels deposited in Djoser’s Third Dynasty underground galleries,\(^{55}\) and like Elephantine (UE 1) and Sheikh Said (UE 15), the Hatnub quarries may also have been a royal ḫwt estate dating to Khufu.\(^{56}\) UE 15 was thus rich in assets, with great natural resources, technological expertise and possibly growing intellectual capital even in Menkaure’s day.\(^{57}\) But for reasons noted below, it was Sheikh Said, I believe, that is the specific though unnamed town to be understood in the UE 15 nome of the intact Type 2 triad.

UE 15 was part of Middle Egypt, the area between Asyut and Memphis,\(^{58}\) that, rich with fertile soil,\(^{59}\) attracted the attention of kings in the Fifth Dynasty,\(^{60}\) as it attracted the attention of Khufu in the early Fourth Dynasty; and, as I will suggest, that of Menkaure toward the end of the Fourth Dynasty. Significantly, Middle Egypt was also a region that reveals a Hathor-Heb-Sed connection in Middle Kingdom private tombs that Wente thinks was based on early Fifth Dynasty royal Heb-Sed scenes from Sahure.\(^{61}\) Given the associations of fertility, Hathor and (a bit later) the Heb-Sed, it is noteworthy that the Type 2 triad uses UE 15 in the triad in conjunction with clear Heb-Sed iconography (Figs. 2.1e, 2.3a; 2.5a, 2.6).

The Belgian team connects the estate at Sheikh Said in UE 15 to Giza, the site of not only Menkaure’s, Khafre’s and Khufu’s pyramid complexes but also

---

\(^{55}\) Lacau and Lauer, *Pyramid à Degrés V*, 15 for Hatnub as the origin of numerous vases pre-dating Djoser, also 96.

\(^{56}\) Willems, *et al.*, “Industrial Site,” 325.

\(^{57}\) Besides Sheikh Said and Hatnub, there was also Deir el-Bersha, a town with Old Kingdom burials (de Meyer, “Two cemeteries”) that about 500 years after Menkaure (ca. 2000 BCE) evidenced a level of medical expertise and anatomical understanding (Chapman, “Replicating the Mutilations,” 27–28; Peacock, *et al.*, “Replication of ancient Egyptian osteotomies”) that might suggest a history of accumulated scientific knowledge reaching back centuries. It was even in this nome that Akhenaten would later found Akhetaten (Amarna) in the Eighteenth Dynasty (Berman, “Discovering Deir el-Bersha,” 91. For Middle Kingdom art here, see Freed, “Art of the Middle Kingdom,” esp. 79, 87).

\(^{58}\) Baines and Málek, *Cultural Atlas*, 14, 120.


\(^{60}\) Moreno Garcia, ḫwt et le milieu rural égyptien du 111e millénaire, 240–41; de Meyer, “Two Cemeteries,” 49, mentions Middle Egypt’s connection to a trade route in the Bahariya Oasis.

\(^{61}\) Wente, “Hathor at the Jubilee,” 89: Senbi’s Middle Kingdom private tomb chapel in Meir (UE 14) in Middle Egypt includes Hathor-related ceremonies related to both funerary and Heb-Sed contexts. A dancer addresses Senbi: ‘May you repeat a million sed-festivals while Hathor gladdens you therein.’ Wente also cites an UE 16 Middle Kingdom nomarch’s tomb in a related context. See also, Selve, “Le culte d’Hathor,” 121.
of a large urban settlement in the area at Giza known as Heit el Gurab, dated from mud sealings to Khafre and Menkaure. The excavators find a striking similarity between Sheikh Said and Heit el Gurab based on parallels between bread molds and other pottery, seal impressions, the presence of stone (as opposed to mudbrick) walls with northern orientation, remains of similarly high-quality diets, and botanical and faunal remains. Both sites were “centrally provisioned.” On the basis of these similarities in material culture, the Belgian excavators suggest that the hwt estate of Sheikh Said in UE 15 was modeled on a hwt estate at Giza in LE 1. Since Sheikh Said in UE 15 is analogous to Giza in LE 1, I am suggesting that the two Type 2 triads may also be analogs. As the intact Type 2 (Fig. 2.1e) alludes, I believe, to the unmentioned town of Sheikh Said in UE 15, so the damaged Type 2 (Fig. 2.1f) would allude to Giza in LE 1. If so, the damaged Type 2 can be restored with the nome standard of the White Walls of Memphis for LE 1, the nome in which Giza—and the capital—lay (Fig. 2.5). The two Type 2 triads would thus show that:

Type 2 Triad (MFA 09.200)/ Sheikh Said/UE 15/
parallels
Type 2 triad (MFA 12.1514)/ Giza/LE 1/.

Two known hwt-royal estates, Sheikh Said and Giza, could therefore be suggested as the unnamed towns in the UE 15 and LE 1 Type 2 Menkaure triads.

To take this hypothesis further: Giza has clear Memphite ties to Hathor, with the Memphite (Giza-Sakkara) cult of Ḥwt-Ḥr nbt nht, “Hathor, Mistress of Sycamore” cited on the intact Type 2 triad (Fig. 2.2, MFA 09.200), as opposed to all Type 1s that name her Ḥwt-Ḥr nbt nht m swt.s nbt, “Hathor, Mistress of Sycamore in all her Places,” or, dropping the possessive pronoun, Ḥwt-Ḥr nbt nht m swt nbt, “Hathor, Mistress of Sycamore in all Places,” meaning,

62 Tavares, “Village, town and barracks.” The inscriptional material she cites (p. 270, n. 3) refers to the mud sealings published by Nolan, Mud Sealings.
63 Vereecken, “Old Kingdom bakery.”
68 On Hathor and Memphis, see Allam, Beiträge zum Hathorkult, 3–22.
69 MFA 09.200. Jones, Index 1, 441, nos. 1636, 1637, translates, “Hathor mistress of the nehet-shrine.”
70 JE 46499; JE 40679.
71 JE 40678.
throughout Egypt. Marianne Galvin shows that “Hathor, Mistress of Sycamore” and “Hathor, Mistress of Sycamore in all (her) Places” are two separate but related Hathor cults. Following the pattern that all Type 1s have the same title, the damaged Type 2 should carry the same title as the intact Type 2, namely, “Hathor, Mistress of Sycamore.” Thus the two Type 2 triads in Fig. 2.5 would both include Hathor, Mistress of Sycamore, suggesting that the special Memphite form of the Hathor cult extended to both Sheikh Said in UE 15 and Giza in LE 1 by the late Fourth Dynasty. This would yield:

Type 2 Triad (MFA 09.200) /
Hathor, Mistress of Sycamore / Sheikh Said /
UE 15 /
paralleling

Type 2 triad (MFA 12.1514) /
Hathor, Mistress of Sycamore / Giza / LE 1 /

While Sheikh Said in UE 15 has no proven connection to a Hathor cult as early as the Fourth Dynasty—and while we do not find a Priest(ess) of Hathor, Mistress of Sycamore at Sheikh Said until the Fifth or Sixth Dynasty—Günther Roeder notes that the lack of earlier evidence for Hathor may simply be an accident of preservation, leading me to wonder if the intact Type 2 triad in Fig. 2.5 could be a clue to that as yet-unknown evidence for a Hathor cult in UE 15 in the late Fourth Dynasty. In the next section, I expand on this thought further and link it to the Heb-Sed.

---

72 Galvin, Priestesses of Hathor, 81: “The Priestess of Hathor, Mistress of the Sycamore in all her Places served in all of the sanctuaries dedicated to Hathor as the Mistress of the Sycamore.”

73 Galvin, Priestesses of Hathor, 71–72: “…the titles Priestess of Hathor, Mistress of the Sycamore and Priestess of Hathor, Mistress of the Sycamore in all her Places must be regarded as separate and distinct titles. It should be not assumed that the Priestess of Hathor, Mistress of the Sycamore could fulfill the duties of that title in both of the temples dedicated to Hathor, Mistress of the Sycamore.”

74 Data for Fifth and Sixth Dynasty references are summarized in de Meyer, Old Kingdom Rock Tombs, 42. And see Roeder, Hermopolis, 174–75.

75 Galvin, Priestesses of Hathor, 65 cites a priestess from the Fifth or Sixth Dynasty; I thank Galvin for this reference. De Meyer, “Restoring the Tombs,” 126, cites Baer, however, who dates Meru to the middle of the reign of Pepi II, in Rank and Title, 225, 283 (no. 192). De Meyer, Old Kingdom Rock Tombs, 42 cautions the reader that the “title is very common during the Old Kingdom and does not necessarily imply that a Hathoric cult was located nearby.”

76 Roeder, Hermopolis, 175: “In Bodenfunden ist Hathor, abgesehen von den Erwähnungen in den Gräbern der Gaugrafen bei Schech Said, nicht sicher belegt, vermutlich weil diese aus älterer Zeit nicht erhalten sind.”
3 The UE 15 Menkaure Triad

As discussed in a previous article, the intact Type 2 Menkaure triad with the nome sign for UE 15 has unique features among the intact triads (Fig. 2.6).\(^{77}\) It presents Hathor, not the king, as the focus, with the specific Memphite cult title of “Hathor, Mistress of Sycamore”; and shows her seated, not standing, doubly embracing the king who stands, not strides, while holding the Heb-Sed \(\text{mks}\); and where, for the only time, \(\text{ꜫnḫ}\) (meant for the king) is offered by the only female nome personification with an advanced left leg.\(^{78}\) The use of the \(\text{ꜫnḫ}\) is

---

\(^{77}\) On this unique triad, and especially its use of the \(\text{ankh}\), see Friedman, “Triads 11,” 103–10.

\(^{78}\) Based on the comparable iconography among Type 1s, the fragmentary Type 2 triad, \(\text{MFA 12.514}\), was probably comparable in iconography to Type 2, \(\text{MFA 09.200}\).
significant, causing me now to read the Type 2 triad differently from those of Type 1. For the reading, I still use the back slab as the ḫwt hieroglyph without corner box, but translate Hathor’s embrace as mr-“wish” instead of “love,” and translate the extended ʿnh as “live,” yielding ḫwt Mn-kꜢw-rꜢ mr Ḥwt-Ḥr ʿnh Mn-kꜢw-rꜢ, “The ḫwt-estate of Menkaure (named) ‘Hathor wishes that Menkaure live’, which is in UE 15. I base the reading on the naming construction of an early Fifth Dynasty Sahure domain—though not a ḫwt—transcribed by Khaled as: mr bꜢwy ʿnh SꜢḥw-RꜢ,81 “The two bas wish that Sahure live.”82 While the record of Old Kingdom domain names is far from complete, it is intriguing that Niuserre in the mid-Fifth Dynasty (at his Abusir funerary temple) uses this same construction, but now specifically referencing Hathor in one of his ḫwt estate

---

79 See Friedman, “Triads II,” esp. 110.
80 Jacquet-Gordon, Les noms des Domaines, 76, 111 A2c. And see e.g., Unas, 175, nos. 60 (Bat) and 64 (Hathor); Pepy II, 187, nos. 20 (Khenty-Khekekh), 22 (Ptah), and 192, no. 54 (Hathor).
82 Khaled, Royal Funerary Domains, 191.
names (Fig. 2.7): *ḥwt Ny-wsr-RꜤ mr ḥwt-Hr ṣnh Ny-wsr-RꜤ*, “The ḥwt-estate of Niuserre (named) ‘Hathor wishes that Niuserre live,’” which is followed by the sign for UE 14,83 a nome with a well-known Hathor cult in Cusae,84 and surely the unnamed town to be inferred for UE 14 (paralleling Sheikh Said in UE 15 and Giza in LE 1 in the Menkaure triads). In a somewhat speculative digression, I ask: was Niuserre perhaps citing Menkaure’s Type 2 ḥwt name? Connecting Menkaure to Niuserre may not be accidental. Mark Lehner’s team revealed that it was Niuserre who returned to Giza, after a long absence of royal attention in the Fifth Dynasty, to renovate Menkaure’s valley temple and revive his cult.85 Niuserre, Lehner notes, may have felt a genealogical link to his Fourth Dynasty Giza forebears (Khafre86 and Menkaure) through Khentkaues 1,87 a link that, as John Nolan points out, Niuserre appears to have exploited in order to legitimize his claim to the throne in a time of dynastic instability.88 I am wondering if Menkaure visually embedded estate names in sculptural form in his Type 2 triads that Niuserre later translated into textual renderings of

83 Jacquet-Gordon, *Les noms des Domaines*, 157, no. 25 from Niuserre’s domain procession in his Abusir funerary temple. I cited this estate name in another context in “Triads 1,” 35 where I said it did not use the corner box on the ḥwt sign; there is too much restoration, however, to know this for sure. On verbal phrases that appear in the second half of the Fifth Dynasty, see Jacquet-Gordon, *Les noms des Domaines*, 78.


86 Khafre also used the triad and dyad forms of statuary in his pyramid complex: Friedman, “Triads 1,” 28, citing Krauspe in *Statuen und Statuetten*, nos. 26 (gneiss triad fragment) and 30 (gneiss dyad fragment). Khafre’s valley temple, with its two entrances, calls him mry Bštt ẓnh dt, “Beloved of Bastet, living forever” at the northern entrance, inside of which was probably the extant seated dyad of him with Bastet; and mry ḥwt-Hr [ẓnh dt], “Beloved of Hathor, [living forever]” at the southern entrance (Hölscher, *Das Grabdenkmal des Königs Chephren*, 16–17, figs. 8, 7). Inside the southern entrance was probably a lost dyad of Khafre with Hathor. But see Flentye, “Decorative Programs,” 87–88, with reservations as to whether dyads were ever installed in the niches. These same two approaches, from north and south, Lehner’s team now shows, were used at the Menkaure valley temple. Lehner *et al.*, “Re-examining the Khentkaues Town,” 183: “The two ways are also comparable to the two ways approaching the Khentkaues complex, at the end of its building sequence. . . . The double access bears similarities to the sixth dynasty valley temple of Pepy II.”


his own estates. Niuserre, in fact, could have seen the Type 2 triads, since the statue vandalism at the valley temple seems to have taken place shortly before he returned to Giza to renovate the temple. Another small, but possibly telling, feature appears in this regard.

Niuserre used five other ḫwt names, as restored by Jacquet-Gordon, that employ the same naming construction as found in the Type 2 triad, but these other five ḫwts name gods other than Hathor; I illustrate two of the five in Fig. 2.8a. The arrangement of hieroglyphs in the Hathor ḫwt name (Fig. 2.7) is different from the arrangement in the five non-Hathor ḫwt names. In Niuserre’s non-Hathor names, the mr-sign is to the lower left of the image, but in the Hathor ḫwt name the mr-sign moves to the upper right beside the king’s

---


90 The five, as restored by Jacquet-Gordon, Les noms des Domaines, using III A2c, p. 76, are: 155, nos. 16, 17; 156, no. 18; 157, nos. 23; 24.
name. The Niuserre ḫwt estate name with Hathor is the only one out of the six (five without and one with Hathor) that mirrors in its arrangement of glyphs the arrangement of figures in the Type 2 Menkaure triad (Fig. 2.9). In the Niuserre estate name, the mr-embrace (wish/love) sign juxtaposes Niuserre in the written form of his ḫwt name, just as directly below, the mr-embrace (wish/love) gesture by the figure of Hathor juxtaposes Menkaure in his sculptural form. The other Niuserre glyphs similarly align with the triad’s figures below (see caption to Fig. 2.9). Was Niuserre, who renovated Menkaure’s valley temple, “copying” the ḫwt estate reading of his predecessor, whose Heb-Sed theme had special significance for Niuserre as seen at his Abu Gurab sun temple?

Menkaure’s use of UE 15 on the intact Type 2 triad cites a nome that is geographically adjacent to Niuserre’s UE 14 in his ḫwt name (Fig. 2.7). UE 14 and 15 are, like the site of Tehna (discussed below), part of Middle Egypt, that area of rich arable lands which by the Old Kingdom (e.g., at Tehna), referenced Hathor worship, and by the Middle Kingdom the Heb-Sed. Jacquet-Gordon observes
that the use of a deity’s name in a domain name suggests that deity’s worship there, so my reading of the intact Type 2 triad would further suggest the existence of a cult of “Hathor, Mistress of Sycamore” in UE 15 by Menkaure’s day at the royal estate at Sheikh Said. That the Hathor cult was connected to Menkaure’s Heb-Sed is further suggested in this UE 15 Type 2, since here the king holds the Heb-Sed mks, as Hathor’s double embrace confirms his status to rule through the festival. If I am right, this Type 2 triad might be not only our earliest reference to the Hathor cult in UE 15 and specifically at Sheikh Said, but also an indication of provisioning Menkaure’s Heb-Sed from UE 15 in Middle Egypt—just as the Type 2 fragmentary triad would be a not unexpected indication of provisioning Menkaure’s Heb-Sed from LE 1 in the capital Memphite region—where the “real” Heb-Sed (even if symbolic and post-mortem) would have taken place. In my proposal, the combination of Hathor-King-Heb-Sed provisioning would reach to both UE 15 and LE 1 by the late Fourth Dynasty through the following links:

Type 2 triad (MFA 09.200)/ Hathor, Mistress of Sycamore/Heb-Sed mks/Sheikh Said/UE 15/
parallels
Type 2 triad (MFA 12.1514)/ Hathor, Mistress of Sycamore/Heb-Sed mks/Giza/LE 1/

The UE 15 triad may show that Hathor, in a Middle Egyptian nome, well before the Middle Kingdom, is linked to the king’s Heb-Sed through provisioning. It also shows that while the Sed-Festival could take place (presumably) at the capital (in life or after) under the aegis of “Hathor, Mistress of Sycamore,” it could be provisioned by her ḫwt estates in far-flung nomes.

The nomes and their unmentioned towns with which the triads are associated seem to be those that kings found economically important—just what we see with the small step pyramids of the late Third and early Fourth Dynasties (also non-funerary monuments) that were located near economically important towns in given nomes where Heb-Sed-related cults could be linked to royal domains. This is just what I think is going on with the triads: that the triads linked to nomes with economically important towns (domains) to which the

92 The particular town near which a small step pyramid was located was the overriding reference point for where these little step pyramids were located, the probable goal being to connect royal cult to royal domains, at least in part (Dreyer and Kaiser, “Zu den kleinen Stufenpyramiden Ober- und Mittelägyptens,” 56). See Seidlmayer, “Town and State,”
Heb-Sed was added—but now with the added feature of Hathor. Her temples, real or imagined, near royal domains take center stage and could be used to legitimize royal claims to the produce of those nomes’ towns. In other words, royal economic interest, if we expand on the example of UE 15, could establish a presence in a nome with the imprimatur of Hathor, who through ḫwt names was shown to visibly love the king and support his Heb-Sed, while provisioning that festival forever from her own ḫwt temple estates. But how real or active were such putative temple estates and were they capable of distributing goods beyond their own confines?

4 The Real and the Unreal

The Menkaure triads may provide a glimpse into an unfolding process of slightly decreasing symbolic truth in favor of an increased measure of reality in the late Fourth to Fifth Dynasty. If we go back to Sneferu, a combination of the real and the symbolic appears in the number of Seneferu’s nomes and their estates that provisioned him. But Sneferu’s purpose in exploiting his provincial estates, I am suggesting, concerned more than his funerary cult. The inscription recently found by Rainer Stadelmann shows that the temple was specifically for the king’s Heb-Sed, despite the fact that nothing in the estate names above the offering bearers or in any preserved text on the walls mentions the Heb-Sed—just as nothing in the triads’ text specifically mentions the

122. These points are discussed in Friedman, “The Cultic Relationship of the Menkaure Triads.”
93 Gillam, “Priestesses of Hathor,” 226 notes that “Indeed, it seems obvious that the cult of the royal goddess [i.e., Hathor] followed the ruling elite as it organized the towns of Upper Egypt . . . as centres for the redistribution of goods and services for its benefit.” Cf. Selve, “Rôle et attributions des nomarques,” 85.
94 Stadelmann, “The Heb-Sed Temple of Sneferu at Dahshur.” The importance of the Sed-Festival for Sneferu is underscored by the king’s appearance in the characteristic Heb-Sed cloak at the satellite pyramid of the Bent Pyramid (Aldred, Egyptian Art, 63, fig. 24) and at North Dahshur where Stadelmann records numerous fragments of the king in the cloak (“Die Pyramiden des Snofru,” 233–34, pl. 73).
95 Fakhry, Sneferu II, Part I, 55 for remains of four estate names on fig. 25, which he says could be “from any one of the first twelve nomes of L.E.” Remains of the leftmost estate can be restored as “Sneferu-Heb-Sed,” which Fakhry notes is the same name as an UE 11 estate on the west wall. Above the fragmentary L.E. estates from an unknown nome is a fragment of the king’s raised heel running what is probably the Heb-Sed race (fig. 25).
96 Though iconography on the temple’s pillars and upper temple walls does allude to the Sed-Festival. Fakhry, Sneferu II, Part I, figs. 120, 127 (king standing with mks); fig. 25 (with
Heb-Sed. What I have suggested in previous work also underscored Sneferu’s Heb-Sed theme, for when he symbolically exited south out of his temple in the Heb-Sed, he was flanked on his right by UE 22, which has survived, and probably LE 1 on his left (which Fakhry rightly inferred), orienting him east and in the Memphite and Dashur region—where he would have celebrated his real-life Heb-Sed (Fig. 2.10a–b). The revision from my earlier thinking, however, is that the offerings from his many pictured ḥwt estates were specifically directed to his Heb-Sed, the same principal I propose for Menkaure in his valley temple, where the funerary cult, though clearly operative in the back of his temple through his seated alabaster statues, was not the focus of the offerings inscribed on the triads. Except with Menkaure, I am suggesting the provisions were not understood to be from his own ḥwt estates but really or symbolically from his mother’s. And just as Sneferu’s Heb-Sed should be understood as symbolically enacted in the open court of his temple, so should Menkaure’s. With Sneferu, the king’s ḥwt estates feed his Heb-Sed in a ḥwt; with Menkaure, the ḥwt estates of his mother feed his Heb-Sed in his temple, surely also understood as a ḥwt. And just as ḥwt estates line Sneferu’s temple, so did Menkaure’s ḥwt estates inhabit his ḥwt valley temple—except not as relief, as with Sneferu, but in the form of three dimensional sculptures.

Provisioning the Heb-Sed is not new, and in this regard a trail of ideas I suspect may lead to the Fifth Dynasty sun temples, where at Niuserre’s Heb-Sed, “Die Grosse Festdarstellung” on the inner walls around the solar obelisk show fragments of offerings that are understood as coming from the deity to the king, just as with the triads, offerings come from Hathor to the king at his Heb-Sed. The requirement for food at the Heb-Sed in a monumental context goes back to the Second Dynasty at the so-called “Fort” at Hierakonpolis, where small granite relief fragments, probably from the enclosure’s lintel, included images of Khasekhemwy seated in a kiosk and wearing the Heb-Sed raised foot of king in Heb-Sed run); fgs. 43, 55, 58, 68 (reconstructed as running with mekes). See Friedman, “Triads I” and “Triads II”; LeBlanc, Sed I, esp. 231–37.

97 Tavares, “Village, town and barracks,” 276 on the possibly “shifting capital” of the Old Kingdom.
99 All the triads are relatively small, averaging about 90 cm high, and must have stood on plinths, presumably around the open court of the valley temple.
100 Kees, Das Re-Heiligtum III, pls. 20, 21, 23. My thanks to Susan J. Allen, Research Associate for Egyptian Expedition Archives, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, for obtaining these images for me.
101 From Hierakonpolis, City of the Hawk (http://www.hierakonpolis-online.org/index.php/explore-the-fort [accessed 12/29/12]).
cloak,\textsuperscript{102} as well as engaged in a ceremonial run,\textsuperscript{103} plus fragments of the title \textit{pr ḫrj-wḏb},\textsuperscript{104} a title that Gardiner showed concerned the feeding of the king.\textsuperscript{105} Numerous Old Kingdom titles include the term,\textsuperscript{106} in which \textit{pr} translates as

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure.png}
\caption{Figure 2.10a shows the placement of \textit{uE} 22 and \textit{LE} 1 at the temple entrance relative to the king exiting south out of his temple. Figure 2.10b shows the geographical relationship of these two nomes. After Friedman, “Triads II,” Fig. 20; temple plan after Friedman, “Relief Panels,” Fig. 21, after Fakhry, Sneferu II, Part I, Figs. 1; 119.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{102} Alexanian, “Reliefdekoration,” Taf. 2, Abb. 8 and “Relief Decoration of Khasekhemwy,” 14. \\
\textsuperscript{103} Though the area that would include his hands, and therefore a \textit{Heb-Sed mks}, is missing: Alexanian, “Reliefdekoration,” Taf. 3, Abb. 10 and “Relief Decoration of Khasekhemwy,” 15. There are also standing attendants: Alexanian, “Reliefdekoration,” Taf. 3, Abb. 9. \\
\textsuperscript{104} Alexanian, “Reliefdekoration,” Taf. 3, Abb. 23. Though fragmentary, the title is reliably reconstructed. \\
\textsuperscript{105} Gardiner, “The Mansion of Life,” esp. 84, 88; Hannig, \textit{Wörterbuch} 1, 453: Haus des Speisesites. \\
\textsuperscript{106} Numerous titles that include \textit{pr ḫrj-wḏb} indicate one who is charge of reversion offerings: Jones, \textit{Index} 1, e.g., 286, no. 1036; 212, no. 790; 213, no. 791; 407, no. 1500; 409, no. 1505; 411, no. 1513; 408, no. 1501; see also \textit{Index} 11, 603–06, no. 2212.
“department.” Feeding the king at his Heb-Sed, it appears, was formalized by the end of the Second Dynasty with its own department and a director of reversionary offerings. It was perhaps a symbolic feeding, since we don’t know if Khasekhemwy was celebrating his Heb-Sed at the large enclosure known as the “Fort” in life or in death, or possibly both. But probably even in Khasekhemwy’s time, the real-life economic model of how goods from provincial estates satisfied the needs of the king was being used to fulfill one of the king’s most pressing ritual needs, his Heb-Sed.

5 Hathor and a hwt-ꜤꜢt near Tehna

Outside of the triads, there is no certain reference I am aware of in the Fourth Dynasty of Hathor feeding the king’s Heb-Sed. But at one provincial Old Kingdom temple tied to the state, Hathor is clearly linked to provisioning in the context of a hwt-ꜤꜢt, or Great Estate. The term refers to a larger or more important hwt, and similarly carries architectural and economic meaning, as in an especially important building or structure, or to an expanded economic version of a hwt. Moreno Garcia characterizes it as a provincial palace or royal estate, and shows that, like a hwt, it served as an economic foothold by which the king extended his power into the provinces. As with hwt, hwt-ꜤꜢt was associated with a king or god, appearing in the one extant inscription that shows Menkaure’s real-life involvement with a provincial Hathor temple. The temple is dedicated to a local form of Hathor in Middle Egypt, called “Hathor, Mistress of Rainet, ‘Mouth of the Valley,’” a site about 2 km south of Tehna (“Tihna al-Gabal” on the map in Fig. 2.11). Tehna itself was a hwt-estate, that

107 E.g., Jones, Index I, 212, no. 790; 213, no. 791.
108 R. Friedman, “Fixing the Fort,” notes that “this imposing enclosure may have been built to commemorate the king’s rejuvenation festival or perhaps even the reunification of land under his command and the grand festival when Khasekhem was reborn as Khasekhemwy. Indeed, what could be a better place for such a celebration than the home of the patron god of Egyptian Kingship, Horus of Hierakonpolis. Proof for this theory, however, will be hard to come by, mainly because we are not the first to investigate the monument.” R. Friedman, “Investigating the Fort,” 11–12 leaned more toward in-life use on the basis of pottery remains.
110 Kessler, Historische Topographie, 246; Gardiner, AEO II, 92*. However, Nims, “Catalogue of Things,” 260 earlier located Rainet, on the basis of Ramesside evidence, closer to Sheikh Mubarik, a site Kessler places just south of his own location for Rainet, but over the border south of UE 17 into UE 16 (see Fig. 11 in this article). See also Zibelius, Ägyptische Siedlung, 137. Despite slightly different placements, it is clear that Rainet was
is, an administrative center\textsuperscript{111} set up at the order of the king, where the managers of the nearby Rainet temple and its lands were buried.\textsuperscript{112} Two of the administrators, Khenukai and Nikaiankh I, were appointed by royal decree, a fact that “would appear to indicate a confidence by the crown (Menkaure and Userkaf) in their administrative abilities and suggests a certain seniority within the ranks of royal officials or possibly even royal blood.”\textsuperscript{113} Elite individuals related to the crown worked here. Adding to the significance of the site is the possibility that already in the Old Kingdom Tehna may have had the important harbor it was known to have in later times.\textsuperscript{114} That Rainet, in turn, was a proper locality is suggested by its writing with the village or town determinative (Gardiner sign-list O49), seen in the inscription below,\textsuperscript{115} where, as Dieter Kessler notes, the Hathor temple was probably the reason for the determinative rather than any presumed settlement that accompanied it.\textsuperscript{116}

While Elizabeth Thompson, Director of the Australian Tehna Expedition, places Tehna and Rainet in UE 16, as do many, but not all, others, no nome sign has yet been found in any of the Tehna tomb inscriptions thus far,\textsuperscript{117} and Kessler’s research strongly suggests that Tehna and Rainet, during the Old and Middle Kingdom, were, in fact, in UE 17\textsuperscript{118} (Fig. 2.11). This is a significant point relative to the triads, since the nome standard for UE 17 appears on one Menkaure triad (Fig. 2.1c).\textsuperscript{119} The ḥwt administrative center at Tehna, including Rainet’s Hathor temple and ḥwt-ꜤꜢt, I am suggesting, may be the unnamed town for this triad’s estate.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[112] Thompson, \textit{et al.}, \textit{The Old Kingdom Cemetery at Tehna I}, 15.
\item[113] Thompson, \textit{et al.}, \textit{The Old Kingdom Cemetery at Tehna I}, 16.
\item[114] Gundlach, “Tehne,” 304.
\item[115] The text is best seen in Thompson, \textit{et al.}, \textit{The Old Kingdom Cemetery at Tehna I}, pl. 57, with Rainet shown above the head of the seated Nikaiankh I, determined solely by the village/town determinative (Gardiner sign-list O49).
\item[116] Kessler, \textit{Historische Topographie}, 247. The writing of Rainet in other instances also included the hill country determinative (Gardiner sign-list N25; Thompson, \textit{et al.}, \textit{The Old Kingdom Cemetery at Tehna I}, 21, n. 34, with references), appropriate given the adjacent stretch of hills and cliffs that ran around Rainet and north to Tehna (Gundlach, “Tehne,” 304. See Kessler, \textit{Historische Topographie}, Map 2; and Fig. 11 in this article.)
\item[117] Thompson, \textit{et al.}, \textit{The Old Kingdom Cemetery at Tehna I}, 21, n. 33.
\item[118] Kessler, \textit{Historische Topographie}, 283–85, esp. 284, Map 2.1, thank Dieter Kessler for reconfirming his thoughts on this subject in a personal communication. See also Gundlach, “Tehne,” 304.
\item[119] Earlier, Sneferu’s official, Metjen, was “leader of the nome (spꜢt) and overseer of commissions in UE 17” (\textit{Urk.} 1, 3: 17). On spꜢt as countrysides, see Allen, “Some Aspects,” 10, 17.
\end{footnotes}
The Tehna inscription\textsuperscript{120} that mentions Menkaure belongs to Nikaiankh I and dates from the reign of Userkaf, first king of the Fifth Dynasty, which places it within approximately a decade of Menkaure’s death.\textsuperscript{121} The tomb owner’s titles are revealing:

\textit{jmj-rꜢ pr n ḥwt-ꜤꜢt, jmj-rꜢ njwwt mꜢwt, jmj-rꜢ ḥmw-nṯr n ḥwt-Ḥr nbt RꜢ-Jnt, rḫ/jḫt nswt Nj-k(3.j)-Ꜥnḫ \textup{(Urk. I, 24: 12–13).}}

Steward of the Great Estate,\textsuperscript{122} overseer of the new towns and overseer of the priests of Hathor, Mistress of Ra-Int, royal acquaintance/custodian of the king’s property,\textsuperscript{123} Nikaiankh.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure.png}
\caption{Modified from Kessler, Historische Topographie, Map 2.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{120} Fraser, “Early Tombs at Tehneh,” 127.
\textsuperscript{121} Hornung, et al., “Chronological Table,” 491 gives about 7 years between Menkaure’s death and Userkaf’s accession, Userkaf then having about a 6 year reign. Menkaure ruled about 5 (Hornung, et al., “Chronological Table,” 491) or 6 years (Krauss and Warburton, “Conclusions,” 485).
\textsuperscript{122} Jones, \textit{Index} I, 121, no. 486.
\textsuperscript{123} For \textit{rḫ nswt}, see Jones, \textit{Index} I, 327–28, no. 1206, listed under \textit{iry ḫt nswt}, meaning “one who is concerned with the things of the king” or, among other translations, “custodian of
Thompson shows that Nikaiankh I was part of the elite group of late Fourth to Early Fifth Dynasty nomarchs whose tombs at Tehna represent some of “the earliest burials of provincial officials in the Old Kingdom,” with his “position as ‘Overseer of the new towns’ [being] the senior administrative post held by provincial nomarchs in the Fifth Dynasty.” Moreno Garcia, putting together the administrative and temple titles, describes Nikaiankh’s sphere of influence: “This provincial official and his family succeeded in controlling both the local temple of the goddess Hathor and the royal agricultural centres of the crown in the province...” The picture is one of an impressive interweaving of social, economic, and political power between crown and local elite. Both the ḥwt-ꜤꜢt, which I see as a royal economic installation, and the cult temple of Hathor at Rainet that I am interpreting as a separate entity within it, were under the control of the tomb owner.

Much of Nikaiankh I’s status derives from his tie to the king. His ranking title of rḫ nswt/jry ḫt nswt may be telling in this regard, especially when translated as “custodian of the king’s property,” or, by using ḫt as “cult,” translated by Ron Leprohon as “one connected to the [royal] cult.” Based on readings from the Fifth Dynasty Abusir Papyri, Leprohon asks if the title (though not referencing Nikaiankh specifically) “is more than simply a designation of rank and upward mobility, but is an actual indication of the king’s largess? The title could then broadly be rendered as ‘One connected to the cultic largess of (i.e., from) the king.’” Such a translation would ally Nikaiankh I to the cult activi-

the king’s property.” Numerous references follow for this title.

125 Thompson, “Report.” See also Papazian, Domain of Pharaoh, 54.
126 Moreno Garcia, “State and organization,” 321. The author also notes that while the Fifth Dynasty epigraphic record reveals that “[f]or the first time temples have become an important element of the rural landscape” that the role of temples was probably not insignificant, as demonstrated in this Nikaiankh inscription. Also, Moreno Garcia, “Les temples provinciaux,” 102.
128 It is interesting in this regard to note that “[t]he architectural form of most of the tombs in this cemetery is remarkable being an attempt by the ancient architects to reproduce the stone and brick mastabas of the cemeteries of the capital at Giza and Saqqara.” From Thompson, “Report.” The tombs seem to have been imitating prestigious Memphite forms.
130 Leprohon, “Sixth Dynasty False Door,” 47. I thank Ron Leprohon for discussing this term with me.
ties and generosity of Userkaf. So while Tehna’s cult temple, like other provincial cult temples, may have been deeply rooted in its own locality, it and its managers were probably significant enough in Userkaf’s day—and even in Menkaure’s, but a few years earlier—to merit the state’s rewards and interest.

Kings show interest in provincial temples, in fact, since the Early Dynastic period. Moreno Garcia summarizes some of the current data on the subject from Upper Egypt, including findings from Elephantine (UE 1) where Second and Third Dynasty sealings point to royal intervention in the activities of the local elite through control of a local temple there; and at Gebelein in UE 4 where Fourth Dynasty papyri attest to a state requirement of the people for aid in constructing a temple. Elephantine comes up enough in the archaeological record to the end of the Fourth Dynasty that we would expect a Menkaure triad with UE 1 for one of the triad reconstructions. But the Theban nome with Gebelein (UE 4) does appear on one triad (Fig. 2.1 a), so it is noteworthy that Early Dynastic relief fragments from the temple of Gebelein (UE 4) suggest a Sed-Festival there. Evidence thus points to royal use of provincial monuments at both Hierakonpolis, at the enclosure called the “Fort,” and possibly at Gebelein’s temple, for celebration of Heb-Seds, and in the case of Gebelein, through use of a local temple that was perhaps already, and certainly would be later, dedicated to Hathor. Provincial intervention in the nomes through the medium of local institutions/temples, for reasons economic and ritual—including the Heb-Sed—are suggested or shown from the first dynasties.

Though Menkaure’s interest in Rainet’s ḫwt-ꜤꜢt with its Hathor temple has no known connection to his Heb-Sed, his intervention at Tehna was surely grounded in economics that concerned a range of cult provisioning. Tehna’s location in Middle Egypt, with what may have been a functioning harbor nearby, made it ripe for exploitation; it was a focus for development and control by Fifth Dynasty kings. Menkaure’s involvement at Tehna may be a forerunner to Fifth Dynasty interest and exploitation in Middle Egypt. His reign, in fact, should be seen very much in keeping with the Fifth Dynasty, the period from Menkaure to Userkaf representing in some ways a carry-over of ideas.

131 Bussmann, “Die Provinztempel Ägyptens,” LXXXV–LXXXVII, Ch. I.
135 Moreno Garcia, “Ḥwt et le milieu rural égyptien du IIIe millénaire,” 241, though I am placing Tehna in UE 17, as opposed to Moreno Garcia who places it in UE 16.
136 Stadelmann, “Userkaf,” 531 on a development of ideas from the Fourth to Fifth Dynasty. He remarks that Shepseskaf and Userkaf have so many points in common that it is difficult to suggest a dynastic break between them; even in the construction of their names, the f surely refers in each to Re.
as well as a marked shift in bureaucratic structure;\textsuperscript{137} but a time so brief that, as Nolan’s work on the Pottery Mound mud sealings shows, some scribal officials working under Menkaure were still working under kings in the Fifth Dynasty long after Userkaf, and as late as Niuserre.\textsuperscript{138}

The temple at Rainet’s $hwt\cdot \text{ḥwt}$ acted in an economic capacity, and it did not act alone. It was part of a network of redistribution within its region, revealed when Nikaiankh I, as authorized by Userkaf, says:

\begin{align*}
\text{jr } h\text{ḥt } nb(t) \ 'ḳt.s \ r \ hwt-nṯr \\
\text{jnkJs } w' \ h\text{ḥt } nb(t) \ n \ wdb-rd \ r \ hwt-nṯr \ (\text{Urk. I, 26.12–13}).
\end{align*}

As for anything that will enter into the temple [i.e., of Hathor], it is indeed I who shall act as $w'\text{ḥt}$-priest over all things (“aspects”)\textsuperscript{139} of the reversionary offerings involving the temple.\textsuperscript{140}

Papazian makes a good case for believing that the goods redistributed here did not originate from the temple but rather that the temple received the goods from another source and then redistributed them, in a pattern found later in the Fifth Dynasty where the origin of a temple’s goods were another temple and the royal residence.\textsuperscript{141} Papazian suggests that the reversionary offerings were ritually processed only after resources (qualified here as $ḥt \ nbt$) were directed toward the temple. This would suggest that Hathor’s temple was not the originator of those offerings, but

\begin{itemize}
    \item \textsuperscript{137} Nolan, \textit{Mud Sealings} and “On the Cusp,” 10–11 shows that in the Fifth, as opposed to the Fourth, Dynasty “[t]he real work of governing was done by a growing number of trained officials, who staffed the newly formed government bureaus.”
    \item \textsuperscript{138} Nolan, \textit{Mud Sealings}, 407.
    \item \textsuperscript{139} Papazian, “Temple of Ptah,” 141, n. 21 on $ḥt \ nbt$ as “all aspects.”
    \item \textsuperscript{140} Transliteration and translation basically follow those of Papazian, “Temple of Ptah,” 141.
    \item \textsuperscript{141} Goedicke, “Cult-temple and ‘State,’” 123 also concludes that the temple was dependent in part on the largess of the king.
\end{itemize}
rather that it acted firstly as the recipient of the goods, and subsequently as the ritual reverser of that income, over which Nykaiankh maintained control.\textsuperscript{142}

In this understanding, the role of the Hathor Temple is purely cultic,\textsuperscript{143} that is, as a ritual recipient and reverser. And while one might conclude that the temple and its lands were too small to feed more than the Hathor cult and temple personnel, I am not sure we really know how small or large an operation it was, or whether the temple estates within the \textit{hwt-ꜤꜢt} had enough land to feed any outside its purview. What the inscription and Papazian’s analysis do show, however, is that the temple and the \textit{hwt-ꜤꜢt} in which it functioned were part of a broader economic network of generators, receivers, and redistributors of goods, within which was this one royal estate. And even if the temple there took a largely ceremonial role, that of receiver but not generator of goods (and I do not know that we can say that for sure), that ceremonial role was still significant in Menkaure’s day, because Tehna was sitting on valuable land, with a probable harbor and a local Hathor cult, all of which the crown could exploit. The given is that through connection with such provincial temples the king was staking a claim on their estates for provisioning his own needs.\textsuperscript{144} A picture of a multi-layered territorial, economic, and religious installation at Tehna emerges with roots going back at least to Menkaure’s reign, and perhaps a bit earlier, as discussed below.

6 Menkaure and the \textit{hwt-ꜤꜢt} near Tehna

Earlier in the inscription, Menkaure appears in the context of a rare legal document concerning the transfer of Nikaiankh’s property to his children at his death,\textsuperscript{145} a portion of which is stated as having come from Menkaure. The tomb owner says,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{142} Papazian, “Temple of Ptah,” 142.
\item \textsuperscript{143} Papazian, “Temple of Ptah,” 143.
\item \textsuperscript{144} Gillam, “Priestesses of Hathor,” 226 notes that, “[i]ndeed, it seems obvious that the cult of the royal goddess [Hathor] followed the ruling elite as it organized the towns of Upper Egypt . . . as centres for the redistribution of goods and services for its benefit.”
\item \textsuperscript{145} Manuelian, “An Essay in Document Transmission,” esp. 13.
\end{itemize}
ḥm-nṯr jrw.n.(j) pw m msw qt.(j)  
\[\text{r wꜤb n hwt-hrw}\]  
\[\text{jw jr ḥt stꜢt 2 jn ḥm MN-KꜢW-RꜤ}\]  
\[\text{n ḥmw-nṯr jpn}\]  
\[\text{r wꜤb hrs}\]

These are the priests I made from the children of my funerary estate to do wꜤb-service for Hathor, in light of that fact that 2 arouras of farmland were made by the Incarnation of Menkaure for those priests to do wꜤb-service in exchange for it (Urk. I, 25: 2–6).¹⁴⁶

The tomb owner’s children are ḥm-nṯr priests to whom Menkaure pays 2 arouras of land (1.36 acres),¹⁴⁷ in exchange for their work as wꜤb-priests of Hathor. Menkaure’s small, but not unusual, allotment of 2 arouras¹⁴⁸ of rich fertile land (ḥt) is not to endow an entire Hathor cult, as sometimes suggested;¹⁴⁹ it is rather to pay already existing ḥm-nṯr priests to do, or continue to do, wꜤb service at an already existing Hathor temple.¹⁵⁰ In other words, the 2 arouras were

¹⁴⁶ I thank James P. Allen for his transliteration, translation and clarification of meaning, in personal communication.
¹⁴⁷ Calculated on the basis of Allen, Middle Egyptian, 101 that says 10 arouras = 6.81 acres.
¹⁴⁸ For the range of size in fields, for which 2 arouras is low, see Jacquet-Gordon, Les noms des Domaines, 3.
¹⁴⁹ And as I mistakenly thought in Friedman, “Triads I,” 37.
¹⁵⁰ This text, by the way, confirms the existence of Hathor priests in a provincial temple outside Memphis in the late Fourth Dynasty: Gillam, “Priestesses of Hathor,” 226, n. 163. Gillam also stresses that the duties of these priests are not merely honorific but entail real temple services (pp. 212–13).
fields allotted by the crown for maintenance of an ongoing cult that preceded Menkaure’s allotment—and possibly Menkaure. Concerning the role of wꜤb-priests, Moreno Garcia makes a case, though based mainly on Middle Kingdom papyri, that they were not lowly temple workers, but members of the lower elite in provincial temples who could make a fairly good living, and share in the status of interacting with higher-ups\textsuperscript{151}—as Menkaure’s intervention in the Nikaiankh I inscription may also suggest. Menkaure’s payment to the priests to take on another duty shows how Hathor temple service is being yoked at least by the late Fourth Dynasty to a state-sanctioned economic base in Middle Egypt. The presence of Menkaure here in the late Fourth Dynasty, plus his Hathor-related triads, and especially the UE 17 triad, suggest that something real, in both an economic and religious sense, is going on here. But defining that reality more fully is not easy.

7 New Hypotheses

The distinction between real and symbolic started with my reading of the three intact Type 1 triads as ḫwt-estates called “Hathor loves Menkaure,” each in a different nome. Is this mere rhetoric or would the repeated use of one name for multiple estates be likely? Repetition of the same domain name in a single series is, in fact, known from the Fourth Dynasty,\textsuperscript{152} as seen with Sneferu,\textsuperscript{153} and confirmed from the early Fifth, by Khaled’s recent publication of the funerary domains on Sahure’s causeway—some using the late Fourth-early Fifth Dynasty naming formula that I used for Type 1 triads, namely, “God x loves the king.”\textsuperscript{154} Whether these domains and their provisions are primarily symbolic takes us back to Sneferu’s Heb-Sed temple where I suggested that a blend of real and fictive income-producing estates is presented as supplying his Sed-Festival.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{151} Moreno Garcia, “Les temples provinciaux,” 114–17; Gillam, “Priestesses of Hathor,” 213 for a Sixth Dynasty example of an overseer of Hathor priests and also a wꜤb who performs hands-on service in a Hathor cult at Cusae [UE 14] (Urk. 1, 222: 2).
  \item \textsuperscript{152} See Jacquet-Gordon, Les noms des Domaines, 13 on two or more domains having same name in different parts of the country.
  \item \textsuperscript{153} Fakhry, Sneferu II, Part 1, 55, 58; Jacquet-Gordon, Les noms des Domaines, 13.
  \item \textsuperscript{154} Khaled, Royal Funerary Domains, gives multiple Sahure domain names using the formula of “God x loves the king,” using nṯr (pp. 69, 117 [probably], 123 [probably], 145); Sokar (pp. 79, 122, 168); or Seshat (pp. 120, 158, 173) as gods who love the king. The formula also appears one time each with Re (p. 118), Horus (p. 156), Nemty (p. 171) and Dwaw (p. 178).
\end{itemize}
As noted, when Sneferu exited his temple, symbolically or really, he was headed south according to the compass, but east as well, since he would have UE 22 on his right and (probably) LE 1 on his left (Fig. 2.10a), putting him in the Memphite region for his Heb-Sed celebration (Fig. 2.10b). What recent archaeology reveals is that he would have been moving toward a real harbor connected to the temple. Discovered in 2010 by two German teams, the harbor appears to be huge, running east from Sneferu’s temple, the very direction in which he runs. We have at Sneferu’s Heb-Sed temple, therefore, an interweaving of symbolic and archaeologically-based truth occurring at the lower temple entry point to the pyramid complex. This area has been associated through texts with the mrt and the r3-š. The earliest reference to the mrt relates to Sneferu, though it is recorded later, in a Fifth Dynasty Annals inscription from the reign of Neferirkare. It cites the procession of a statue to Hwt-Hr nht Snfrw mrt (Urk. 1, 247: 15–16), “(a cult place of) ‘Hathor, (Mistress) of the Sycamore’ (in?) the mrt-of Sneferu,” suggesting a cult of the goddess in a Sneferu constructed mrt shrine/temple. Based on the Fifth Dynasty Abusir papyri, Paule Posener-Kriéger shows that the mrt was fundamentally a cult of “Hathor, Mistress of the Sycamore,” allied to feeding the dead king. These two features, that is, the Hathor, Mistress of the Sycamore cults, and the fact that she provisions the king, are repeated in every one of Menkaure’s triads (Fig. 2.2). The Neferirkare text suggests that Sneferu’s mrt temple of Hathor was active (or renewed) in the time of Neferirkare, a king who gave Hathor special cultic focus in his funerary and Sed-related sun temples. It has been posited that each king founded his own mrt temple, leading us to expect one for Menkaure. While no remains of any mrt has been found, its suggested location would be the area of the valley temple, thought to have been the locus for a sacred marriage between the king and Hathor in her role as wife and queen.

156 Posener-Kriéger, Archives II, 618, n. 2.
157 Keeping in mind that the provisions originate from Hathor, not the nome personification, who, like an anthropomorphic hieroglyph, performs the offering on behalf of Hathor, not in her stead.
158 E.g., Posener-Kriéger, Archives I, 107, n. 1.
159 Seidel, Statuengruppen, I, 47; Arnold, Lexikon, 161: inscriptions attest to ten mrts from Sneferu to Pepy II.
160 Old Kingdom evidence, besides Sneferu’s, includes early Fifth Dynasty references to mrts of Userkaf and Sahure. See Helck, “Gartenanlage, -bau.” Sahure’s mrt was connected to both Hathor and Sekhmet.
This point is used by Matthias Seidel in his discussion of the triads to connect Menkaure and Hathor at the king’s valley temple through an assumed presence of a mrt temple there.\footnote{Seidel, \textit{Statuengruppen}, 1, 47.} Given the overlap in economic functions (provisioning) through Hathor (the provisioner) that are implicit in both the mrt and the triads, he may be right.

Posener-Kriéger’s work shows that the mrt was also connected to the rꜢ-š, a place of provisioning\footnote{Posener-Kriéger, \textit{Archives} 11, 618, n. 2.}, described by Lehner as “a place of deliveries, storage and production,”\footnote{Lehner, \textit{Complete Pyramids}, 232.} and by Toby Wilkinson as “an intermediary institution responsible for collecting produce from the royal domains,”\footnote{Wilkinson, \textit{Royal Annals}, 164.} functions Moreno Garcia attributes to hwt. Lehner suggests the rꜢ-š—literally, “entrance to the basin”—might be “the entrance to the valley ensemble, where the valley temple, harbor, canal and pyramid town were located.”\footnote{Lehner, \textit{et al.}, “Re-examining the Khentkaues Town,” 164, 183, 190.} In fact, he and his team seem recently to have found the basin. It appears as a steep drop-off in front of Menkaure’s valley temple, suggesting a real harbor—as they also found for the Khentkaues I complex just to the north of the Menkaure valley temple,\footnote{Lehner, \textit{Complete Pyramids}, 230–32.} giving archaeological support to the suggestion made some years ago that these Giza complexes (like Sneferu’s at the Bent Pyramid) were fronted by harbors in the area known from texts as the rꜢ-š.\footnote{Lehner, \textit{Complete Pyramids}, 230; also Málek, \textit{In the Shadow of the Pyramids}, 79.}

The mrt, rꜢ-š and hwt held shared economic functions that I think get folded into the triads, where Hathor embraces and legitimizes her son/husband (Type 1 and 2), confirming him in the Heb-Sed (Type 2), “marrying” him in the mrt, and provisioning him from her temple hwt\textsubscript{s} (founded in theory by him) in the given nomes (on Type 1 and 2). The economic functions at work are both real and symbolic: the real being the movement of goods into the valley temple to provision the king’s Sed-Festival, and the symbolic being a mediation of these economic functions through the one who makes it all possible—Hathor, the king’s mother/wife who visibly supports him and implicitly offers divine sanction for his claim to economic bases in nomes with income-producing potential. Standing at the juncture of the real and the symbolic, she is the figure uniting the mrt, rꜢ-š and hwt\textsubscript{s}, the divine force driving the country’s economic engine for the creation and transfer of the nomes’ products. While she acts on
a symbolic plane as mother/wife and provisioner, she stands in the triads in a real valley temple, at a real rꜢ-š storage and delivery area, beside a real harbor, where real agricultural and industrial goods arrived for the king from towns like Sheikh Said, Giza and maybe Tehna. Through the vehicle of Menkaure’s triads Hathor shares economic functions with the rꜢ-š and mrt, enabling the influx of “all good things” from a network of her real and symbolic ḫwt estates which provision Menkaure’s most important cult, his Heb-Sed.

Abbreviations

All abbreviations not included in this list follow those used in the Lexikon der Ägyptologie.

ÄA Ägyptologische Abhandlungen


AERAGram Ancient Egypt Research Associates, Newsletter

Ägypten and Levante

ArOr Supp Archiv Orientální Supplementa

AV Archäologische Veröffentlichungen

BSFÉ Bulletin de la Société française d’Égyptologie

B. TAVO Tübinger Atlas des vorderen Orients, Beihefte Reihe B

CRIPEL Cahier de Recherches de l’Institut de Papyrologie et d’Égyptologie de Lille


sign-list Internet-Beiträge zur Ägyptologie und Sudanarchäologie. Studies from the Internet on Egyptology and Sudanarchaeology

JE Journal d’Entrée (Cairo Museum)

JESHO Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient


MFA Museum of Fine Arts, Boston

WA Writings from the Ancient World
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