An act to remain:

A verbal study of the interaction between east and west in Dendera.

MA Thesis

Jorke Grotenhuis

s0607967

Table of contents

1. Introduction

During the Graeco-Roman period, large-scale construction of temples took place in Egypt. The decorations of the temples seem to display a pattern, based on their exact placement on the wall, and interaction between different scenes. In addition, the text seem to be planned out in advance. This was first remarked by E. Winter[1] in 1968. Since then, this principle has become known as the "grammaire du temple"[2]. This implies that there was some sort of template behind the placement of most of the architectural design and relief decoration. This has been confirmed by texts on papyrus, the so called "book of the temple", which explains in detail how a sanctuary and the surrounding priesthood should be organized.[3]

Although we possess a basic knowledge of the principles guiding the decoration, the full depth of its intricacies is not known. The walls, pillars and doorways follow the same basic design. An image on the bottom, the soubassement; above that one to four registers with scenes or columns of texts; above that a frieze, topped off with another line of inscriptions, the bandeau. Especially the scenes in the registers show interaction between the scenes in the same register. This is visible in the *Randzeilen*, where the same verbal pattern is used throughout the same register.[4] Moreover, the scenes that are on the opposite wall also interact with their opposing scenes, where one side shows the offering of beer, where the opposite side shows an offering of wine.[5]

The challenge now exists in discovering the guiding principles behind it, to discover the details of the temple grammar. Christian Leitz has delved into this issue in his book: *Die Aussenwand des Sanktuars in Dendera, Untersuchungen zur Dekorationssystematik.* In his research, discussed in chapter 2, he discovered that there was an interaction between the east and west side of the temple. I therefore wonder, is this a part of the temple grammar, i.e. applicable for the entire temple and applicable for every temple, or is this only a coincidence on the sanctuary of this specific temple? In this thesis, I explore the oppositions and interactions between the inscriptions on the east and west sides and I will argue that there are significant patterns that link the two sides.

[1] Erich Winter, *Untersuchungen zu den ägyptischen Tempelreliefs der griechisch-römischen zeit,* Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften 98 (Vienna, 1968)
[2] Philippe Derchain, Un manuel de géographie liturgique à Edfu, in Chronique d' Égypte 73 (Bruxelles, 1962) p. 33
[3] Holger Kockelmann, Die "Grammatik des Tempels" in Daniel von Recklinghausen und Martin Andreas Stadler (ed.), *Kult Orte, Mythen, Wissenschaft und Alltag in den Tempeln Ägyptens* (Berlin, 2011) p. 19
[4] Christian Leitz, *Quellentexte zur Ägyptischen Religion I, Die tempelinschriften der griechisch-römischen Zeit,* Münchner Ägyptologische Studien 50 (Berlin, 2009) p. 28-29
[5] Kockelmann (2011) p. 22-23

2. The temples of Dendera

The temples discussed in this thesis are both part of the temple complex of Dendera. The complex is located about twenty-five kilometers below Koptos, four kilometers distant from the Nile on the west bank.[6] The complex is facing north because of the east-west orientation of the Nile.[7] In the Graeco-Roman period the city of Dendera was the metropolis of the sixth Upper Egyptian nome, Tentyris. The settlement was already occupied since the early Dynastic period, as tombs in the necropolis reveal.[8] During the Graeco-Roman period, the city was a cult center for Hathor, by that time assimilated with Isis, and known to the Greek population as Aphrodite.[9]

The temple complex itself consists of the great temple of Hathor, a temple to Isis, a sacred lake, a sanatorium, a Ptolemaic and a Roman birth house and a Christian basilica. The complex is enclosed by a mud-brick enclosure wall.[10] In this enclosure, on the north side is a gateway that resembles a pylon, with a doorway containing reliefs made during the reign of the emperor Domitian and the emperor Trajan.[11] Although this site was being visited and being written about by Jean-François Champollion, Auguste Mariette and many others, it was only in 1930 that Émile Chassinat started the first fully comprehensive publication of the inscriptions of the temple, which was continued by Sylvie Cauville after his death.[12] The digital publication of *Le Temple de Dendera, Tome quinzième*[13] in 2008 finished the publication of the inscriptions of the naos of temple of Hathor in Dendera. Even to this day, a full translation of the entire temple is not available, although Cauville has published the translations for Dendera I-VI, and XIII-XV, as well as the temple of Isis and its gateway[14]

---

6   Günther Hölbl, *Altägypten im Römischen Reich, Der Römische Pharao und seine Tempel, band I, Römische Politik und altägyptische Ideologie von Augustus bis Diocletian, Tempelbau in Oberägypten*, Sonderbände der antiken welt, Zaberns Bildbände zur Archäologie (Mainz am Rhein, 2000) p. 72-73
7   John Baines and Jaromir Malek, *Cultural Atlas of Ancient Egypt*, revised edition (Oxford, 2000) p. 112
8   Baines, Malek (2000) p. 112
9   Hölbl (2000) p. 73
10 Pierre Zignani, *Le temple d'Hathor à Dendara, Relevés et étude architecturale, texte*, Bibliothèque d'Étude 146/1 (Cairo, 2010) p.32
11   Hölbl (2000) p. 74
12 René Preys, *Les complexes de la Demeure du Sistre et du Trône de Rê, Théologie et décoration dans le temple d'Hathor à Dendera,* Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 106 (Leuven, 2002) XXIX-XXX
13 Published on www.dendara.net (2008)
14 Sylvie Cauville, *Dendara I, traduction*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 81 (Leuven, 1998), *Dendara II, traduction*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 88 (Leuven, 1999), *Dendara III, traduction*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 95 (Leuven, 2000), *Dendara I, traduction*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 81 (Leuven, 1998), *Dendara IV, traduction*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 101 (Leuven, 2001), *Dendara V-VI, traduction*, *Les cryptes du temple d'Hathor, vol. I* Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 131 (Leuven, 2004), *Dendara XIII, traduction*, *Le pronaos du temple d'Hathor: Façade et colonnes,* Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 196 (Leuven, 2011), *Dendara XIV, traduction*, *Le pronaos du temple d'Hathor: Parois intérieures,* Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 201 (Leuven, 2011), *Dendara XV, traduction*, *Le pronaos du temple d'Hathor: Plafond et parois extérieures,* Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 213 (Leuven, 2012)

The Hathor temple

The great temple of Hathor was started on July 16, 54 B.C., when the first foundation rites where performed for the naos of the Hathor temple. Based on the date of construction, and the ground plan similar to that of the temple of Horus in Edfu, it is assumed that the construction crew used for the temple of Edfu was relocated to Dendera, without interruption in their work.[15] The first stage of the construction and decoration, the naos, was carried out during the reign of Cleopatra VII, between 51-30 B.C. During this time most of the inside of the naos was decorated. Interestingly, in the crypts under the naos, the cartouches read the names of Ptolemy XII and Cleopatra VII. Inside the naos, however, the cartouches remain empty.[16] It is expected that the cartouches were not inscribed because of the political turmoil in Egypt following the death of Ptolèmy XII.[17] During this period the sanctuary, the "Holy of Holies", was built inside the naos, being a fully detached structure from the naos. On this sanctuary the cartouches are also empty.

Part of the decoration of the south outside wall of the naos were decorated under Ptolemy XV Caesar (Caesarion) and Cleopatra VII. The decoration was not completed during their reign however, and was finished in the name of the emperor Augustus, during which reign the decoration on the east and west outside wall was carried out.[18] Not everything was finished during the reign of the emperor Augustus. On the second and third offering scene of the second and third register the name of the emperor Claudius shows up. Cauville suggest that the reason why this happened was because of an earlier plan which would link the enclosure wall to the temple itself, as seen in Philae. As this plan fell through, scenes had to be added, and were therefore done in the name of the emperor Claudius, as he was the reigning emperor at that moment.[19]

Except for the sanctuary, the naos consists of a room before the sanctuary where the barks where housed, eleven chapels around the sanctuary, and a hall for the Ennead. Of the chapels, seven are dedicated to Hathor, and one to Isis, Sokar-Osiris, Harsomthus and Horus of Edfu each.[20] Under the naos are multiple crypts, used for storage and rites. Remarkable about these is that they are actually decorated, which is not practiced everywhere.[21]

Upon the roof of the naos are six chapels to Osiris, three on the west side, and three on the east

---

[15] Hölbl (2000) p. 75
[16] Hölbl (2000) p. 76
[17] Zignani (2010) p. 38
[18] Hölbl (2000) p. 76
[19] Sylvie Cauville, *Le Temple de Dendara, tome douzième, texte* (Cairo, 2007) p. XI
[20] Hölbl (2000) p. 76
[21] Kockelmann (2011) p. 33-34

side. These chapels were dedicated on December 28, 47 B.C.[22]

The construction and decoration of the late-Ptolemaic structure ended in year 9 of the reign of Augustus, 22-21 B.C. This leads to a construction time, for the naos, of 34 years. But already on August 19, 30 B.C. Hathor took residence in the temple. In the same year that the naos was completed, the construction was started on the fully Roman pronaos. The pronaos consists of a large pillared hall, consisting of 24 Hathor pillars. There is a foundation inscription in Greek, dedicating the building to the emperor Tiberius. Remarkably enough, in the Egyptian inscriptions emperor Tiberius is not mentioned. Instead the emperors Caligula, Claudius and Nero are mentioned.[23] The bare construction of the naos was finished around 32-37 A.D.[24] Most probably during the reign of emperor the Nero, work was started on a stone enclosure wall, which was never completely finished.[25]

The temple of Isis

The temple of Isis is located to the south of the Hathor temple. The original Rammeside construction was not orientated north to south, but east to west. The precursor to the current temple was created during the reign of Nectanebo I. It was expanded during the Ptolemaic period when two halls of pillars on the east side of the sanctuary of Nectanebo I were constructed. The current sanctuary is dated to the Augustan Era. For this construction the sanctuary of Nectanebo I was removed, and a new sanctuary built, on a platform two meters higher than the original construction, so that it was at the same level as the Hathor temple and was now facing north, just as the Hathor temple. Most probably the remodeling of the temple went hand in hand with a change in the function of the temple, becoming a birth temple for Isis.[26]

Culture of the priesthood and legitimacy

The expansive construction of the temples in Egypt during the Ptolemaic period does not happen without reason. Ruling a country requires legitimacy, and for ancient Egypt this was no different. The Persian rulers of Egypt ruled, and were generally disinterested in the territory and the religion. They did not try to win the hearts and minds of the people.[27] The principle changed with the

---

[22] Hölbl (2000) p. 78
[23] Cauville (2007) p. XI
[24] Hölbl (2000) p. 78-79
[25] Hölbl (2000) p. 81
[26] Hölbl (2000) p. 80-83
[27] Stefan Pfeiffer, Herrscherlegitimität und Herrscherkult in den ägyptischen Tempeln griechisch-römischer zeit, in Daniel von Recklinghausen und Martin Andreas Stadler (ed.), *Kult Orte, Mythen, Wissenschaft und Alltag in den Tempeln Ägyptens* (Berlin, 2011)

conquests of Alexander. By being acclaimed as son of a god, and making offerings to the Apis, he showed himself as one who performed the kingly duties, and in this way tried to establish himself as the legitimate ruler of Egypt.[28] This principle was continued by the Ptolemies, who ruled through the local elite. One of the elite groups where the priests. Because gaining legitimacy was in large part connected to following the religious rules, the priesthood became a powerful political force.[29] From the reign of Ptolemy III on, the rulers and the priesthood came together in synods, where the priesthood would confirm the divine status of the ruler, and receive many concessions in return. These would then be published in multiple languages, as seen on the stone of Rosetta.[30]

Another effect of these synods was that it led to the official classification of priests, from those who performed the rites, to those who acted more as a philosopher or scientist, working on religious matters.[31] Fortunately, the rules governing this are known to us. A find from Tebtynis was the so-called 'book of the temple' [32] In this book, the ideal Egyptian temple was laid out, describing the architectural details, and the way the decorations had to be performed.[33] Moreover, the book gives a detailed description of the rules and tasks of the priesthood. This included who could join, what the hierarchical order was, and how their tasks should be organized, based on four divisions of priests during a month. The book describes an ideal situation, and was therefore a product intended to be used all around Egypt.[34] This book is a result of philosophical work, which was performed in the *pr-ꜥnḫ*. The building was usually attached to the library of the temple. In this place text were written, and the decorations and inscriptions of the temple where composed. This is also the place where children were given an education. During the Ptolemaic period this was the place of science.[35] Due to their authority in religion within Egypt, the priesthood held the key to legitimacy, and therefore had political, economic and

---

[28] Pfeiffer (2011) p. 119-120
[29] Daniel von Recklinghausen, Opferbringer und Forscher, Priester in den ägyptischen Tempeln, in Daniel von Recklinghausen und Martin Andreas Stadler (ed.), *Kult Orte, Mythen, Wissenschaft und Alltag in den Tempeln Ägyptens* (Berlin, 2011) p. 98
[30] Recklinghausen (2011) p. 99
[31] Recklinghausen (2011) p. 99
[32] Ola El-Aguizy, The Tebtynis Library, in Ola El-Aguizy, Mohamed Sherif Ali (ed.), *Echoes of Eternity, Studies presented to Gaballa Aly Gaballa*, Philippika, Marburger altertumskundliche Abhandlungen 35 (wiesbaden, 2010) p. 175-176
[33] Joachim Friedrich Quack, Les normes pour le culte d'Osiris. Les indications du Manuel du Temple sur les lieux et les prêtres osiriens, in Laurent Coulon (ed.) *Le culte d'Osiris au Ier millénaire av. J.C. Déciyvertes et travaux récents, Actes de la table ronde internationale tenue à Lyon. Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée (université Lumière-Lyon 2) les 8 et 9 juillet 2005*, Bibliotheque d'étude 153 (Cairo, 2010) p. 23
[34] Joachim Friedrich Quack, Die Götterliste des Buches vom Tempel und die überregionalen Dekorationsprogramme, in Ben Haring, Andrea Klug (ed.) *6. Ägyptologische Tempeltagung, Funktion und Gebrauch altägyptischer Tempelräume, Leiden, 4-7 September 2002,* Königtum, Staat und Gesellschaft Früher Hochkulturen 3,1 (Wiesbaden 2007) p. 213-214
[35] Recklinghausen (2011) p. 107

scientific power during the Ptolemaic period.[36] Even though the priest lived in a society that was becoming more and more influenced by Greek culture, they remained true to their own lore, and hardly any foreign influence is detectable within it.[37] This does not mean that there was no development within the lore, which there was, but that there was no major foreign influence. The views and rituals developed within its own little world, until well into the Roman period.

Furthermore, we have actually found evidence of the thorough planning of the decorations in the temples, as seen in a carbonized bundle of papyrus found in Tanis. The now readable parts of the papyrus show drawings of the design of certain aspects of the temple, and are accompanied by text which describes the common lines shared by the type of offering scene they are bound to. Moreover, it allows for certain local variations. This shows that there was actually a general plan which was followed all over Egypt for Graeco-Roman temple construction.[38] Moreover, this shows that the development of the temple grammar in general was discussed on a national level. Although the local variants show that the different regions had freedom within the constraints of the design, major changes were less likely to be added withouth consent of the combined priesthood, making the philosophical development still tightly controlled by a small group of priests within the country.

This alliance between the king and the priesthood led to the construction of many temples in Egypt. The concessions to the priesthood let to them becoming economic powerhouses, able to finance the construction of the temples. But it was also expected from a good king that he donate to the construction. Thus we see that the most elaborate construction projects taking place in Egypt during this period were sponsored by both priesthood and the king.[39]

When Egypt became incorporated into the Roman World, the emperor Augustus was not restrictive on religion. He acted as a good king, being named a liberator, and performing his duties as a king. He became known as the son of Apollo, making his rule more secure. The changes at this time seem so meaningless that the only visible change is in the name of the king.[40] At first there still circulated various names for the king. This fact is even visible on the eastern and western outside wall of the naos. On the east outside wall, the first scene of all four registers use the name *ḥꜣ rmys*, "the

[36] Recklinghausen (2011) p.114
[37] Olaf Kaper, Vergrieksing, in Harco Willems, Willy Clarysse (ed.), *Keizers aan de Nijl* (Leuven, 1999) p. 127
[38] Joachim Friedrich Quack, Die theoretisch Normierung der Soubassement-Dekoration. Erste Ergebnisse der Arbeit an der karbonisierten Handschrift von Tanis, in Alexa Rickert un Bettina Ventker (ed.) *Altägyptische Enzyklopädien, De Soubassements in den Tempeln der griechisch-römischen Zeit, Soubassementstudien I, band I*, Studien zur spätägyptischen Religion, Band 7 (Wiesbaden, 2014) p. 20-21
[39] Pfeiffer (2011) p. 125
[40] Pfeiffer (2011) p. 135-137

Roman," for the *n(y)-sw.t b(i)t(y)* name. On the rest of the east outer wall, the second register of the south outside wall and the bandeaux of the west outside wall, the name *ꜣwtwgrt*. On the remaining parts of the west wall, the name is *ḥḳꜣ ḥḳꜣ.w*.[41] Then, in 23 B.C., with the death of Ptah Psenamun II, the high priest of Ptah in Memphis, whose function included the theoretical discussion of how the emperor should be addressed, there came an end to the discussion. His death was also the end of the family of high priests in Memphis, and could be considered the reason why after his death the development of the title stagnated.[42] From this point on, we can see a growing disinterest by the Roman emperors in the religion of Egypt. Temple constructions are still performed in their name, but it is not likely that they themselves took part in the rites. Moreover, it is unlikely that some of them even set foot in Egypt. Because of the solidified nature of their nomenclature, it is even hard to make out which work was performed under which emperor in Dendera, and even the rest of Egypt.[43] During the Roman period, the religion kept the legitimacy of the roman emperor as Egyptian ruler intact, but it became mostly a fossilized tradition, rather than that there was any philosophical reasoning behind it.

---

[41] Cauville (2007) p. X-XI
[42] Hölbl (2000) p. 24
[43] Pfeiffer (2011) p. 138

3. The work of Christian Leitz

In his work on Dendera Leitz[44] discusses the ritual scenes on the outside wall of the sanctuary of the temple of Hathor. The scenes each depict an offering scene of the king offering an item to seated or standing gods, which are accompanied by text. There are 48 scenes in total, and these cover the east, west and north walls of the sanctuary. Of the 48 scenes 12 are on the south wall. Leitz considered half of these part of the east wall, and the other six part of the west wall. He suggests that instead of considering these scenes as short independent texts by themselves, one should consider them as a single, unified corpus.[45] His study is limited to the scenes only. The soubassement and the bandeaux inscriptions on the outside wall were disregarded for his study. He does remark that these gave no positive results in comparison to the results of the ritual scenes, and were therefore removed from his study.

The first part of his work is the study of the 48 scenes of the sanctuary and their translation. This is followed by the discussion of the scenes, according to many categories, ranging from epigraphical, the exact use of signs, to the exact verb forms used, as well as many other categories. For the purposes of this thesis, I will only deal with one part of his discussion, which is entitled "Symmetrische Szenenverbindungen"[46]. He states that one of the purposes of his work was to see if the texts on the eastern side, with the added six scenes of the south side, were unrelated to those on the west side, with its added six scenes.[47] As part of his overall studies of the scenes, he wanted to see if there was a noticeable interaction between the east and west side. For if this was true, one could create the principle on which the scenes interact, which could make understanding and translating the scenes easier. Furthermore, one would be able to reconstruct scenes more precisely by comparing them to their opposites.

This part of his research is based on the principle of the symmetrical unity in the architecture of the Graeco-Roman period. This symmetrical unity is based on the existence of two symmetrically opposed parts that are used as an explanation of the cosmos and its phenomena. Just as our present-day science is attempting to describe the cosmos, and all that happens within it, so did the ancient Egyptians. This is reflected in the love the Egyptians had for polar concept building, by creating a unity

---

[44] Christian Leitz, *Die Aussenwand des Sanktuars in Dendera, Untersuchungen zur Dekorationssystematik* (Mainz am Rhein, 2001)
[45] Leitz (2001) p. 3
[46] Leitz (2001) p. 255-291
[47] Leitz (2001) p. 255

by having two oppositions. This is visible in the combination of *nḥḥ* and *ḏ.t* for example.[48]

Leitz[49] wonders if this is visible with the scenes on the temple, for the distance between the opposing parts of the temple can be far removed from each other, which makes it difficult to expect that they were created with a pattern in mind. One has to imagine a team leader going from one scene to the other, just to see if minor details are in balance in both scenes, which can be quite far from one another. The second problem exists in the enormous amount of options that could be considered. Leitz explains that this is so for three reasons. First, the opposition is not based on a lexical argument, like a play on the day and night cycle, by using two verbs that have a slight difference in exact meaning. Second, it is possible to find a word that is the opposite of the other, like silver versus gold. Third, the opposition exists in large elements, such as active versus passive, subject versus object.

Symmetrical connections

The symmetrical connections are discussed by Leitz in five points, which are once again divided in extra subsections. Namely: A) Sprache, B) Kosmos, C) menschliche/göttliche Eigenschaften, D) Kult and E) Sonstiges.[50]For this work I will only focus on his part A "Sprache",[51] the verbal differences (or lack thereof) between the east and west outer wall of the sanctuary of the Hathor temple of Dendera. This consists of twelve parts. Namely: a) Active versus passive, b) Subject versus object, c) Action versus state, d) Start of an action versus end of an action, e) finished action versus continuing one, f) *ḥr* + infinitive versus adverbial sentences and pseudo-participles, g) transitive verbs and intransitive verbs with prepositional object versus verbs that describe the character of the subject, h) simultaneousness versus successive, i) earlier versus later, j) negative tense and expression versus positive tense and expression, k) concrete expression versus poetic or abstract expression, l) general expression versus special expression.

In the first part, a), he observes the opposition between active tense and passive tense. He observes this in one case. In this case on the east wall there is an active tense, whereas on the equal sentence on the west wall a passive tense is used.[52] As there is only one example of this in the twenty-four scenes, the value of this example of being a part of the temple grammar is dubious.

The second section, b) speaks of the opposition between subject and object. In three instances

---

[48] Jan Assmann, Parallelismus membrorum, in Wolfgang Helck und Eberhard Otto (ed.), *Lexikon der Ägyptologie Band IV* (Wiesbaden, 1982) kol. 900-908
[49] Leitz (2001) p. 255
[50] Leitz (2001) p. 257-259
[51] Leitz (2001) p. 257-258
[52] Leitz (2001) p. 283-284

11

on the east wall the god or goddesses are the subject of the verbs used. On the western side the god or goddess is the object of the verbs used, thus, where the east side has the god or goddess as an actor, where on the west wall the god is the recipient of the performed action.[53] The existence of three scenes among the twenty-four makes it more likely that this not a small coincidence, but not enough to consider this a trend.

The third section of the observations of Leitz, c), speak of the interaction between verbs used, namely verbs that imply an act and verbs that imply the characteristic of a state. This means that the subject of the verb on the east side is performing the action, (i.e. the king gives) while on the west side describes the state of the subject, (i.e. the subject being satisfied). This is most clearly visible where the west side uses a stative. This interaction is what Leitz observes the most in the scenes, namely in eighteen scenes of the twenty-four. In these scenes[54] Leitz notices that the verbs on the east side of the wall have an active character, as the subject will perform or is performing an action. On the west side on the other hand, the verbs have the characteristics of a state, describing a state of the subject instead of an action by it. For the remainder of this thesis, I will refer to this as being in a state.[55]

The problem with this point is that the argument in this case is based on a rather large degree of interpretation. Whereas there are cases in which it is clear that we are seeing a stative verb on the west wall versus an active verb on the east wall, in other cases it is more problematic. On the other hand this principle is prevalent across the scenes, making a strong point for the existence of a thought pattern behind it, instead of being a lucky incident. Considering this point, one has to remark that the supposed pattern does not occur throughout the entire text, but is found in one or more instances in the scenes. Although it seems to be a minor difference between the east and west side, the fact that it occurs when the two sides are similar in close to all the other aspects, makes it noteworthy. If the text is similar for the most part, then even a minor difference might be of great importance.

In the fourth section, d), Leitz observers that in two cases[56] the east wall shows the start of an action, which is finished on the west wall. This is visible in the use of the verbs. The fifth section, e), discusses the balance between a single finished action, and a continuing one. This is observed in one case[57]. The use of the verbs in these two points, although not much used, show a point like the third section does. The east wall is more active, and earlier, where the west wall ends the action started on

[53] Leitz (2001) p. 260, 283, 291
[54] Leitz (2001) p. 260-266, 268, 271-272, 275-281, 283-284, 286, 290
[55] The difficulty with the terminology is due to the original description: *"Zustand"*
[56] Leitz (2001) p. 270, 283-284
[57] Leitz (2001) p. 283

the east side, or continues it, making it a state.

In the sixth section, f), Leitz shows one instance[58] of the use of the pseudo-verbal construction *ḥr* + infinitive versus the use of an adverbial sentence and a stative in a similar sequence of the scene. In the seventh section, g), he gives one[59] example of the use of a transitive verb with a prepositional object on the east, where the west uses in the similar sequence a verb that describes the characteristics of the goddess. This suggestion can also be taken as a continuation of section 3. The east shows an active character, and the west a descriptive one, which can be explained to be a form of being a state. The eight section, h), shows one[60] example where the east side has multiple actions that are based in the present and happen simultaneously, where the west has multiple actions in the future, the one following after the other.

The ninth section, i), discusses the interaction between east and west, where the east depicts an earlier time, and the west a later time. This is visible in one occasion where the east speaks of birth and the west about being a mother and a wife. One could consider that this is based as well on the course of the sun, as it rises, or is born in the east, and ends in the west. There are five[61] examples of this. The problem with this section is that it is not clearly reflected verbally, but more based on subject matter and interpretation.

The tenth section, j), shows two[62] examples where the east uses negative tense, and the west positive. In the eleventh section, k) there are six[63] examples where the east uses a concrete expression, like lord of wine, and the west uses a more abstract or poetic image, like the lord of quotes.

In the twelfth section, l), Leitz shows in four[64] scenes that the east side would use a general expression for an item, such as incense, where the west will use specific expressions, such as a specific kind of incense.

Most of the sections above show a few instances of difference between east and west, but they are applicable at most to a quarter of the pairs of scenes. The only difference is with section 3. On the outer wall of the sanctuary of the Hathor temple in Dendera, we tend to find the east wall to be dynamic and active, where the west wall seems to be describing a state. That this applies for three quarters of the pairs of scenes seems to indicate a pattern. Therefore, the main goal of this thesis is to

---

[58] Leitz (2001) p. 284
[59] Leitz (2001) p. 261-262
[60] Leitz (2001) p. 263
[61] Leitz (2001) p. 268-269, 270-271, 275, 280, 283
[62] Leitz (2001) p. 260, 288
[63] Leitz (2001) p. 261, 267-268, 277-278, 279, 282, 291
[64] Leitz (2001) p. 275, 276, 288, 290

compare the case study of Leitz analyzed above to other similar parts of the temple so as to ascertain if we should consider this a pattern that is part of the wider temple grammar, or if this is just an interesting incident that was only applied on this monument.

Methodology

The research of Leitz, discussed above indicates that there is a pattern that may be part of the temple grammar. For this thesis, I wondered if the pattern would also be evident if I expanded the corpus to include all offering scenes within Ptolemaic temples. Because Leitz has only discussed a small part of the temple of Hathor in Dendera, it is hard to say if the pattern he has seen is truly part of the temple grammar. Therefore, in this thesis, I will look at other similar parts of the temple of Hathor, and the temple of Isis in Dendera. Within these other sections of the temple, I will attempt to discover if the pattern also shows up as significantly in these different sections, and see if the principle that the east side is active, where the west side is a state, should be considered a part of the universal rules of the temple grammar. I will use the following terms to denote significance: significant, remarkable and incidental. I consider a pattern significant if in the sub-corpus of scenes the pattern shows up in more than half of the scene pairs, remarkable if it shows up in a quarter or fewer of the scene pairs, and incidental if it only shows up once or twice in the corpus of scene pairs.

This will be done by first discussing the scenes depicted inside the sanctuary of the Hathor temple of Dendera, which were made more or less at the same time as the inscriptions on the outside of the sanctuary. Then, I will discuss the first register on south wall of the outside of the naos of the Hathor temple of Dendera, which was made during the reign of Ptolemy XV Caesar (Caesarion) and Cleopatra VII. Next, I will discuss the second register of the south wall of the naos of the temple of Hathor in Dendera, which was created during the reign of the emperor Augustus. Following this I will discuss part of the decorations of the east and west outside wall of the naos, which are also dated to the emperor Augustan Age. After this I will discuss the inside wall of the sanctuary of the temple of Isis in Dendera, which was decorated during the reign of Augustus as well.

In these sections I will look for repeating differences between the scene pairs discussed. If the differences between the scene pairs show up multiple times, I will look at their statistical significance, and discuss it at the end of each chapter. I will test these results against the findings of Leitz in order to discover if the patterns found follow the same principle of the pattern he found.

As this is mostly a verbal discussion of the scenes, I will read the verb forms as written. Where

it is normal for the *sḏm.n=f* to be read as present tense in the offering scenes of the Graeco-Roman period,[65] I will instead consider it still part of Middle Egyptian. This is because the *n* in the verb form is actually still written. Therefore, I consider it to be thought about, and considered as being past tense.

[65]   Dieter Kurth, *Einführung ins Ptolemäische, Eine Grammatik mit Zeichenliste und Übungsstücken, teil 2* (Hützel, 2008) p. 909

4. Inside the sanctuary of the Hathor temple in Dendera

The temple of Hathor in Dendera was founded on 16 July 54 B.C, by king Ptolemy XII Neos Dionysos Auletus. The sanctuary, which was decorated after his lifetime, bears empty cartouches. That the start of the construction is still being performed under his reign is visible in the crypts, where his name is inscribed next to Cleopatra VII. The scenes in the registers discussed here were most probably made after his death in 51 B.C. The first cartouches that are inscribed again are from Cleopatra VII and Ptolemy XV Caesar (Caesarion). The king was not named in the scenes till that moment.[66]

The inside of the sanctuary exists out of a soubassement, followed by three registers with scenes, bound by a frieze above it. The east and west wall both have four scenes on each register, with an extra per register on the south wall. For the study of these scenes I used Cauville's translation and Chassinats publication.[67] I will discuss the 15 pairs of scenes shortly to show the remarkable differences between the two pairs. For this, I will use abbreviation, like |R1,I|, Register 1, scene pair I. This will apply to the east as well as the west wall. For the lines I shall use |E1|, meaning line 1, east wall.

|R1, I|[68]

In line |E4| *pr m ḥꜣ.t*, gives a perfective active participle, followed in |E6| by a non verbal construction in the *Gegengabe*. In the corresponding passage, |W3| *pẖr,* is a stative, and line |W6| *ḥꜥ.tw* as well. In the *Gegengaben* of the Hathor, east and west, the east acts, where the use of the stative on the west side makes it a state.

In the divine *Randzeile* |E7|, the line is filled with participles, a stative and an infinitive, where |W7| has only one participle, and the rest is descriptive, without verbal clauses. Furthermore, in this *Randzeile* the east has a negative, where the west does not.

|R1, II|[69]

In line |E4-E7| there is no verbal form, except for the standard *di=i*, which can be disregarded. In the corresponding position on the west |W4-W6|, there are verb forms, *sš,* a subjunctive *sḏm=f, ḏbꜣ.tw*, a stative, *iṯ.n=k*, a circumstantial *sḏm.n=f*. In this passage, the east side is non-verbal, where the west is verbal.

[66]   Sylvie Cauville, *Dendara I, traduction,* Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 81 (Leuven, 1998) p. 5
[67]   Émile Chassinat, *Le Temple de Dendara, tome premier* (Cairo, 1934)
[68]   Cauville (1998) p. 66- 69, 92-95 Chassinat (1934) p. 40-41, 58-59
[69]   Cauville (1998) p. 68-69, 94-95 Chassinat (1934) p. 41-42, 59-60

|R1, III|[70]

In line |E2|, *wḏꜣ.n=i* and *snsn.n=i* are both a nominal *sḏm.n=f*, were the similar passage |W2-W3| *swꜣš=i* and *sḳꜣ=i* are both a nominal *sḏm=f*. In this scene, the tense of the east wall is past, and the west wall is present. Also, the divine *Randzeile* |E10| has *pr m ḥꜥ.w=f*, a perfective active participle and *n siꜣ.n.tw snn=s*, which is a negative passive *sḏm.n=f*. On the west |W10| there is *bꜣ.tw*, a stative, *dwꜣ n=s nṯr.w,* a circumstantial *sḏm=f* and *r dwꜣ*, r + infinitive. In this scene, the east is active and negative, where the west wall describes a state and is positive.

|R1, IV|[71]

In this scene pair, the scenes are very similar to each other, with no noteworthy points to remark. On the west there are fewer verbs used, but still follow the same pattern as the east.

|R1, S|[72]

In |E2-E3| there are five verb forms, with an active character, like *ir=s* which is a nominal *sḏm=f* and *r mtr,* a r + infinitive. In |W2-W3| are 11 verb forms, more descriptive nature, *ms.tw*, a stative, *mr ib=ṯ*, a perfective relative *sḏm=f,* and past tense, *rdi.n=ṯ sy*. The east side is more active, where the west is a state. In addition, |E7| has *in=i*, a nominal *sḏm=f* form, where |W7| has *ḥr.tw,* a stative. Furthermore, here the east is more active, where the west is a state.

　　In the *Gegengabe* of Hathor, |E16| *wbn=s* and *ir.t=s* are infinitives where the *Gegengabe* of Isis |W15| has *ẖnm.tw* and *ꜥpr.tw,* two statives. The character of the east wall is here more active, and the west a state. In the divine *Randzeile*, |E22| has *mḥ* and *psḏ*, two imperfective active participles, where | W21| has *pr*, a perfective active participle. Here, on the east it is present time, where the west is past.

|R2, I|[73]

In line |E2|, there is only *mn n=ṯ*, an imperative, where |W1| contains *mn n=ṯ* as well, but also *ḏbꜣ.n=i*, a nominal *sḏm.n=f*. Further more, the divine *Randzeile* |E8| contain no true verbal clauses, bar the *nfr-ḥr* construction. |W7| on the other hand has *bs m gb,* a perfective active participle, and also *iwꜥ.n=s,* a circumstantial *sḏm.n=f*. In this scene pair, the east side uses fewer verbs in general, and the character of

---

70   Cauville (1998) p. 68-71, 94-97 Chassinat (1934) p. 42-43, 60-61
71   Cauville (1998) p. 70-71, 96-99 Chassinat (1934) p. 43-44, 61-62
72   Cauville (1998) p. 72-73, 98-99 Chassinat (1934) p. 44-45, 62-63
73   Cauville (1998) p. 74-75, 100-101 Chassinat (1934) p. 45-46, 63-64

the east side is more present, where the west is past.

|R2, II|[74]

In the title, |E2| consists of *sᶜr=i,* a nominal *sḏm=f,* and *ḥtp=s* and *ḫw=s* are both subjunctive *sḏm=f.* On the west side |W2| consists of *wꜣḏ.tw* and *ḏbꜣ.tw,* both statives. In this scene pair, the east has an active nature, where the west acts as a state.

|R2, III|[75]

In the title on the east side |E2-E3| *snsn wnmy=i, ḥfᶜ iꜣb=i, swꜣs=i* and *sfn=i* are all nominal *sḏm=f,* where the west side |W2-W3| consists of a greeting formula, followed by *mn n=ṯ,* a stative, and *mꜣꜣ=ṯ* a subjunctive *sḏm=f.* Remarkable here is that the east wall is in first person, where the west is in second person.

|R2, IV|[76]

On the east side |E2-E4| consists of *my* and *mk n=k,* two imperatives, followed by *di=k, wnn kꜣ=k, ḫw=k* and *ir=k,* all subjunctive *sḏm=f.* On the west side |W2-W4| there is *mn n=ṯn,* an imperative, followed by *ḫw=f,* a subjunctive. This is followed by *nh.n=f, sḥr.n=ṯn,* both circumstantial *sḏm.n=f* and *iy sꜣ,* a circumstantial *sḏm=f* and *mḥ ib=ṯn,* a subjunctive *sḏm=f.* In this part, the east wall is based in the present to future, where the west is based in the past.

Furthermore, in the text of Hathor, in |E10|, *ᶜn.tw* and *ḥᶜᶜ.tw* are both statives. On the west side |W6| gives *ir.n=i, wḥm.n=i, dr.n=i,* three nominal *sḏm.n=f,* followed by *mḥ, nḥm* and *snḥm,* three imperfective active participles. In this section, the east acts as a state, where the west is active, and also where the east is present, and the west is past.

In Horus versus Harsomthus, |E16| *ḳmꜣ* is a perfective active participle, where |W15| has *ḫw* and *mk,* both an imperfective active participle, making the east past, where the west is present. Following this to Ihy-wer and Harsomthus, |E19-E20| show *ᶜꜣ irw* and *ꜣw-ib mw.t=f,* both nominal *sḏm=f,* and *n rḫ.tw=f,* a negative passive *sḏm=f* and *mꜣꜣ=f,* an infinitive. The corresponding passage on the west side is non-verbal on the other hand. This makes the east side verbal and negative, where the west is non-verbal and positive.

[74] Cauville (1998) p. 74-77, 100-101 Chassinat (1934) p. 46, 64
[75] Cauville (1998) p. 76-77, 102-103 Chassinat (1934) p. 46-47, 65
[76] Cauville (1998) p. 76-79, 102-105 Chassinat (1934) p. 47-48, 65-67

At Hathor versus Hathor, |E23-E24| places Hathor as the acting party, where in |W22| *ꜣw-ib=f* is performed for Hathor, her being in a passive role. This shows the east to be active, where the west reflects a state of Hathor.

|R2, S|[77]

In line |E9-E11| *mḥ, wbn* and *mḥ* are imperfective active participles, where the similar section on the west wall is non-verbal. This makes the east wall verbal versus the west wall non-verbal, and makes the east wall seem active, where the west wall reflects a state.

|R3, I|[78]

In the title |E2| has *sḏfꜣ.tw*, a passive relative *sḏm=f*, and *iꜥb=i*, a nominal *sḏm=f,* where |W2| has *iꜥb.n sy*, a nominal *sḏm.n=f.* This places the east in the present, where the west is the past. Furthermore, in the *Randzeile* of the king, |E3| has *šꜣꜥ* and *wꜣb,* both an imperfective active participle, and *iꜥb=i,* a nominal *sḏm=f.* On the west wall, |W3| has *ḥnꜥ.tw*, a stative and *ttf.n=i*, a nominal *sḏm.n=f.* This places the east in an active character and present tense, where the west is a state and past tense. To complicate things, line |E6| has *ḳmꜣ,* a perfective passive participle, and |E7| *ḫpr*, a perfective active participle. On the west, |W6| is an imperfective active participle. This makes the east past tense, and the west present tense.

|R3, II|[79]

In the title, |E1| *pḫr.n=i,* is a nominal *sḏm.n=f*, where |W1| *swꜥb* is an infinitive. This makes the east side past, where the west is present tense.

|R3, III|[80]

In the royal *Randzeile* |E3| *rmn=i* is a nominal *sḏm=f,* where in |W5| there are *ir.n nt*, a relative *sḏm.n=f*, *bꜣ.n=s* and *bd.n=s* two nominal *sḏm.n=f*. This makes the east wall present tense, where the west is past tense. In the divine *Randzeile*, |E8| has *ib=i ꜣw*, an infinitive, where |W10| has *bꜣ.tw* and *ḏbꜣ.tw* in a corresponding section. Furthermore, in the *Gegengabe*, the east side has a non-verbal sequence, where

[77]   Cauville (1998) p. 78-81, 104-107 Chassinat (1934) p. 48-49, 67-68
[78]   Cauville (1998) p. 80-81, 106-107 Chassinat (1934) p. 49-50, 68
[79]   Cauville (1998) p. 82-83, 106-109 Chassinat (1934) p. 50-51, 68-69
[80]   Cauville (1998) p. 82-83, 108-109 Chassinat (1934) p. 51, 69-70

the west has *ꜥpr,* a stative. This gives the east a slightly more active character, where the west is a state.

|R3, IV|[81]

In the title, |E2-E3| gives the east a descriptive character, with non-verbal clauses and *ḏbꜣ.tw* and *nḏm,* both a stative. In the similar section in the west, |W2-W3| has *in=i,* a nominal *sḏm=f* and *smn=tn, wnm=tn* and *ir ḏ.t=tn,* three subjunctive *sḏm=f.* This makes the east side a state, and the west the active side. Furthermore, the west side has many more verb forms, but it does follow the same pattern as the east side. Thus, although it seems that by sheer amount of verbs the west side is more active, the fact that the patterns the east and west side follow are the same does not change the interaction between the two sides.

|R3, S|[82]

In the title the east side is purely non-verbal and descriptive, where the west follows the same principle, but does have a verb form |W2| *ḏbꜣ.tw,* a stative. Furthermore, with the goddesses, |E6-E8| give *sḥtp, rḏ* as imperfective active participles, and *iwꜣ* and *mꜣꜣ=s* as infinitives. In the corresponding section on the west wall the only verb is |W7| *snsn nṯr.w nṯr.w.t,* which is not an action of the goddess herself. In the divine *Randzeile* |E12| has *snsn=f,* a nominal *sḏm=f,* where |W13| has *ꜣṯp.tw,* a stative. In this scene pair the east side is more active in character, and the stative verb forms on the west side make the west side a state.

Considering the scenes in the sanctuary, one thing stands out. In nine of the fifteen scene pairs, the principle that Leitz noticed on the outside, also happens on the inside.[83] The east wall has more of an active character, where the west wall is a state. This means that the pattern should be considered significant. Moreover, it seems to display a further pattern. On the first register it is the first scene, the third scene and the scene on the south wall, in the second register it is the second scene, the fourth scene, and the scene of the south wall. The third register follows the pattern of the first register again.

There are three scenes on this wall, namely |R2, IV|, |R3, I| and |R3, IV| that complicate this point. Both |R2, IV| and |R3, IV| reverse the principle, making the east side the state and the west side the active wall, which weakens the argument, even more so for |R2, IV| which supports the hypothesis

[81] Cauville (1998) p. 84-85, 108-111 Chassinat (1934) p. 51-53, 70-71
[82] Cauville (1998) p. 86-87, 112-113 Chassinat (1934) p. 53, 71-72
[83] |R1, I|, |R1, III|, |R1, S|, |R2, II|, |R2, IV|, |R2, S|, |R3, I|, |R3, III|, |R3, S|

as well.

Another thing that is happening between the pairs is that one wall is present tense, where the other is past tense. That the east is present happens five times, where it happens four times for the west. For both sides, it seems there is a remarkable pattern. To make it more complicated, |R2, IV| and |R3, I| both appear past and present on both sides. This makes it difficult to consider the past-present interaction between east and west credible as part of the temple grammar.

5. The south outside wall of the naos of the temple of Hathor in Dendera.

The south wall of the naos of the temple of Dendera consists of a soubassement, two registers of scenes, topped by a frieze. The first register consists of two scenes, an east and a west one. The second register consists of five scenes which should be considered part of the east wall, and five scenes that should be considered part of the west wall.

The discussion of the scenes on the south wall of the naos of the temple of Hathor in Dendera will be divided into two sections, because of the slight time difference between the decorations. The first register dates from the reign of Cleopatra VII and Ptolemy XV Caesar (Caesarion), while the second register dates from the reign of the emperor Augustus. The translations for these scenes are provided in appendix A, based on the edition of Cauville.[84] In these translations I follow a slightly different description for the scenes: SE 1 and SW 1 are the scenes of the first register. SE 2-6 and SW 2-6 are the scenes of the second register. I use this new description to ease the comparison. The exact pages and plates in Cauville are supplied with the translations of the scenes.

Register 1 |SE1-SW1|

In the recitation of the queen, |E15| gives *ḥfꜥ.n=i* and *ꜣm.n=i,* both nominal *sḏm.n=f*, followed by *wꜣ.tw,* a stative. On the west side |W15| gives *mn n=ṯ* an imperative, and *ir.n=i,* a nominal *sḏm.n=f,* followed by *di=i*, a circumstantial *sḏm=f*. In this passage, on the east side the queen describes a finished action, while the west describes mostly an action in progress.

In the passage Nechbet and Wadjet, |E16-17| is very verbally active, giving *wnn.n=i, sḥr.n=i, wḏ.n=i* and *ir.n=i,* all nominal *sḏm.n=f,* and *ḥr mḥ* and *ḥr mḥ,* twice a *ḥr* + infinitive. The west side is on the other hand non-verbally descriptive, bar |W16| *ḫrp*, a imperfective active participle. In this section the east side uses more verbal forms, is active and based in the past, where the west wall is mostly non-verbal, and uses present tense.

In the text accompanying the musicians Ihy-wer and Harsomthus, |E19-21| *ḫntš.tw* is a passive *sḏm=f,* followed by *pꜥpꜥ.n=s* a relative *sḏm.n=f, wbn=k*, a nominal *sḏm=f, sḥd.n=k*, a circumstantial *sḏm.n=f, di=sn,* a circumstantial *sḏm=f*. In the corresponding passage |W19-20| has *srḳ, drp, sšm, sr* and *iy*, all imperfective active participles, and *ḳmꜣ*, a perfective active participle. In this passage the east

---

84   Sylvie Cauville, *Le Temple de Dendara, tome douzième, texte* (Cairo, 2007) and Sylvie Cauville, Alain Lecler, Yousreya Hamed, *Le Temple de Dendara, tome douzième, planches* (Cairo, 2007)

side uses *sḏm=f* forms, where the west uses participles.

Continuing with the passage of Hathor and Isis, the eastern section |E26-E33| shows fifteen different verb forms, where |W25-W27| gives only three, *pˤpˤ*, a perfective active participle, *ir-ms.tw,* a passive *sḏm=f* and *ir,* an imperfective active participle. The remainder of the corresponding section of text uses non-verbal descriptive clauses. It seems that in this section the east side has a more active character than the west side, which is by it's descriptive nature a state. Moreover, the east side uses more verb forms in general than the west in this regard.

In the passage of Horus versus Harsomthus, |E38-E41| gives *grg* and *pr,* two perfective active participles, *smꜣ* and *ḫw,* two imperfective active participles. In the corresponding passage |W37-40| are *ḫpr, sštꜣ, ḳmꜣ, sḫpr, iry, ṯs*, and *iy* perfective active participles, followed by *ṯn=f* and *siꜣ=sn*, two circumstantial *sḏm=f, iy n=f psḏ.t* and *ḫpr=sn*, two nominal *sḏm=f*, followed by *šꜣˤ.n=f,* a relative *sḏm.n=f.* Moreover, in the *Gegengabe* |E43| has *sšp=k,* a subjunctive *sḏm=f*, and *rd.t*, an infinitive. On the west side, |W42| has *sḫr.tw,* a stative. This passage has more verbal forms on the west side, showing *sḏm=f* forms, where the east side has only participles. Furthermore, in the *Gegengabe* the east has a more active character, where the west side is a state, based on the use of the stative.

In the passage of Harsomthus and Osiris, |E45-E46| show *km, ḳmꜣ, ḫpr* and *nḥp*, perfective active participles, where |W45-W46| has *wp* and *bˤḥ*, two imperfective active participles. Furthermore, in the *Gegengabe* |E49-E50| has *ḥr sbsb* and *ḥr ḥn*, two times a *ḥr* + infinitive, where |W49| has *m ḥknw*, a m + infinitive and *r bˤḥ,* a r + infinitive. In this passage the east side has a perfective tense, while the west has a present to future tense.

In line |E51-E55| there are eight verb forms, where the same passage has only |W52| *pr*, a perfective active participle. In this section the east side is more active, due to ample verb usage, while the west side has more a descriptive nature, making it a state.

Considering this scene pair, it seems that one could still consider that during the reign of Cleopatra and Ptolemy XV Caesar the east is active in nature and the west has the characteristics of a state. So, for the reign of Cleopatra VII the pattern is still significant. It must be noted that with this scene pair, the difference lies more in the fact that the west side is generally less verbal, which makes it more descriptive, which is by nature more like a state than an action. Furthermore, the east is more likely to be the side which describes finished actions, while the west side is based more in the present. Register 2 |SE2-SW2|

In this scene pair, there is only one thing of note. In the text accompanying the musicians Ihy-wer and Harsomthus, |E6-E7| give *pr,* a perfective active participle, followed by a part of direct speech, *ir.n=i,* a nominal *sḏm.n=f.* On the west side |W7| has *iry,* an imperfective active participle, followed by only non-verbal clauses. In this scene pair, the east is perfective, where the west is present. Furthermore, the east has direct speech, whereas the west side has indirect speech.

Register 2 |SE3-SW3|

In the *Randzeile* of the king |E4| has *in=i*, a nominal *sḏm=f* followed by *ḳmȝ.n ṯnn,* a relative *sḏm.n=f.* On the west side |W4| has *in=i, sˁr=i* and *ḥs=i,* all nominal *sḏm=f* in a narrative construction, one following after the other. In the text accompanying the two goddesses, |E6-E7| *wbn n=s, psḏ n=s*, both an imperfective active participle, describes an action performed by Atoem, where |W8| *mḥ,* an imperfective active participle is performed by the goddess herself. In this scene pair, the east is singular, and considering the goddess, inactive, where the west has a narrative character, with agency of the goddess herself.

Register 2 |SE4-SW4|

In the *Randzeile* of Maat, |E4| has *ḫf.n=i* and *sḳȝ.n=i,* twice nominal *sḏm.n=f.* On the west, |W4| *dwȝ-nṯr=i,* a nominal *sḏm=f* and *sḳȝ.tw=ṯ,* a passive *sḏm=f.* As for Hathor, |E7| has *mḥ,* an imperfective active participle where the west is fully non-verbal and descriptive. The same goes for Ihy-wer versus Harsomthus, where |E11| *ḫpr* is a perfective active participle, where the west is non-verbal and descriptive. In this scene pair, the east side has an active character, where the west is descriptive, and is the east side past tense, where the west is present.

Register 2 |SE5-SW5|

In the *Randzeile* of Ahayt and Touayt |E7| *wbn.tw* is a stative, where the similar sequence |W7| has *sty.n=i,* a nominal *sḏm.n=f.* Also |E7| has *bd.n=k,* a circumstantial *sḏm.n=f*, where the west |W7| has *bd wbn=k,* a circumstantial *sḏm=f.* In the divine *Randzeile* |E11| has *ḳȝ.tw,* a stative, where |W11| has *twȝ p.t,* an imperfective active participle. In this scene pair, the east side acts as a state, where the west is more active. Furthermore, the east side is past tense, where the west is present.

Register 2 |SE6-SE6|

In the lines of Menket versus Renenout, the east side |E2-E6| has seven verb forms, where the west |W2-W6| has only three. Furthermore, on the east side there is *ꜣḥ.tw*, a stative. In this passage the east side has a stative, but has also more verb forms, while the west is more descriptive.

In the text of Shesemou, the east side has |E13| *nḏm id.t=f* and *wꜣḏ šn.w=f,* both nominal *sḏm=f* and *ẖnm.n=f* a circumstantial *sḏm.n=f,* where the corresponding passage |W12-W13| is non-verbal and has *r ḥḵn*, a r + infinitive. For this passage, the east side uses *sḏm=f* forms, where the west does not.

In the text of the musicians Ihy-wab and Harsomthus, |E25| has *ir.n=i,* a nominal *sḏm.n=f,* where |W25| has *ir=i,* a nominal *sḏm=f*. Also, |E27| has *pẖr.tw,* a stative, where |W27| has *ir.t,* an infinitive. In this passage, the east side is past tense, where the west is present. Furthermore, the appearance of the stative makes the east side a state.

In the text of Horus versus Khnoum, |E35| *ir* and *mk* are both imperfective active participles, where |W34| has *ir* and *sẖpr,* both perfective active participles. In this passage, the east side is present tense, where the west is past tense.

Finishing in the divine *Randzeile*, |E36| has *sẖkr.n=k*, a nominal *sḏm.n=f*, and *sgn.n=i,* a circumstantial *sḏm.n=f,* where |W36| has in similar locations *spẖr=k,* a nominal *sḏm=f*, and *snsn ib=i*, a circumstantial *sḏm=f*. This passage makes the east past tense, and the west side present tense.

Considering these pairs of scenes, the principle that the east side is active, and the west a state does no longer apply for most of them. One can make an argument for |SE2-SW2| and |SE4-SW4|, where the non-verbal tendency of the west side seem to make it like a state, but this is also countered by |SE5-SW5| and |SE6-SW6|, which have both stative verb forms on the east side when the west does not. Considering this, it seems that for the south wall, the second register of the naos, the principle does no longer apply for the scene pairs during the reign of the emperor Augustus. For the reign of the emperor Augustus, the perceived pattern of the reign of Cleopatra VII is no longer significant.

One could wonder why this seems to happen during his reign. It is highly unlikely that Augustus was actually able to read what was inscribed on the temple walls, nor could the greatest part of the population of Egypt. On the other hand, he just took control of the country, and needed to be considered legitimate to rule in peace. I would expect that a slightly different group of priests took over in the planning of the decorations and inscriptions. Based on the now Roman rule, one would expect

some changes to leadership and religious views. On the temple walls in general, the difference is hardly visible for an outsider, as the inscriptions stayed Egyptian in style an nature. A major difference is the lack of an empress on the walls.[85] This is true as well for the material used for this thesis, as there is never any mention of any empress. Furthermore, in general the amount of hieroglyphs and words used increased, as one can see in the temple of Philae, where the Randzeilen posses three times more hieroglyphs during the reign of the emperor Augustus and emperor Tiberius, than were used during the reign of the Ptolemys.[86] Remarkably, over time more and more was added to the temple grammar, and now suddenly something has been dropped. As far as we understand the development of the religious inscription on the temple walls, it is unexpected that suddenly something is dropped, while the work would be in progress continually. So, one could assume that this is a shift in religious thought. Because we know that there was a general guid to how the decoration of the temple had to be performed, the change seems more surprising, as suddenly the book had to be made again, to include the new views. Of course, If one adjust the rules to change the naming principles of the kings on the walls, it is more likely that they would also have adjusted some other principles on the walls themselves. As the papyrus of Tanis shows, there was room for local adjustment to parts of the scenes.

Something that does happen for four out of the five pairs is that the east is past tense, where the west is present. This is actually a significant pattern showing up. This is only opposed in the scene pair |SE6-SW6|, which contains arguments for this hypothesis, as well as an argument against it.

Remarkable, this pattern follows point i) of Leitz, where he spoke of an earlier action, versus an later action. But, where his point was made by comparison of subject matter, one can see it reflected in a verbal state: the east side is past tense, the west present tense. Moreover, we seen to be witnessing a change from pairs depicting acts versus the present tense form replaced the principle of action versus state. It is difficult to present an answer as to why this happened, but I would suggest that the priest who preserved a way of life during the Ptolemaic era were forced to accept that these times were gone; instead of focusing on the eternal continuation, the walls started to reflect an active and bygone life.

---

[85] Filip Coppens, René Preys, Traditionele temples in de Grieks-Romeinse periode, in Harco Willems, Willy Clarysse (ed.), Keizers aan de Nijl (Leuven, 1999) p. 113

[86] Joachim Hallof, Beobachtungen zu den Randzeilen in den griechisch-römischen Tempeln Ägyptens, *Altorientalische Forschungen 14* (Berlin, 1987) p. 15-18

6. The eastern and western outer wall of the naos of the temple of Hathor in Dendera.

The east and west outer wall of the naos of the temple of Hathor in Dendera were both decorated during the reign of Augustus. The decoration on the wall consists of a soubassement, followed by four registers, topped by a bandeau inscription and a frieze. The two lower registers are interrupted by a doorway, leading to fewer scenes on the lower two registers. For the number of scenes one runs into a problem. On the east side, there are eighteen scenes on the first register, nineteen on the second, and twenty on the top two registers. On the west side, however, are eighteen scenes on the first and second register, and nineteen on the top two registers. The two sides have an unequal number of scenes. This is due to the doorway. Above the doorway on the eastern side are two scenes, while on the west side there is only one. Furthermore, on the east side, there is a scene before the doorway, a small scene to the *s3-t3*, which does not exist on the west side. Remarkably enough there is a difference between the *n(y)-swt bity* name of Augustus. Constantly it is *3wtwgrtr* on the east side, where it is *ḥk3 ḥk3.w stp n ptḥ* on the west side. As this part of the decoration took place in his between his first and ninth year as ruler of Egypt, the priesthood was still in discussion about the form his royal name should take.[87] I would expect that for this project, they used two different ways to engrave the *n(y)-sw.t b(i)t(y)* name (*3wtwgrt* and *ḥk3 ḥk3.w*), so that they would retain both titles on the project, and not give insult by forgetting one of them.

Due to time constraints, and the fact there is no published translation of these walls, I have only translated about a quarter of the scenes on these walls. These consist of a group of nine pairs of the first register, and nine pairs of the second register. Moreover, because of the unequal number of scenes on these walls, and the fact that the first sets of scenes on the first register are part of the foundation rituals, I have started my translations in the middle of the first register. The translations are based on Cauville's edition[88], and provided in appendix B. For this thesis, I will refer to the codes used in my translations, instead of those of Cauville.

A principle that does show up in this comparison between the east and west side, is that the scenes are not always aligned directly to their opposite on the other wall, as some are related crosswise. This is based on the subject of the ritual scenes. In general I have to remark that even allowing this to happen did at times make it difficult to figure out which scene paired with which scene, for even then it was difficult to combine them based on subject, god or any other qualifier.

---

[87] Hölbl (2000) p. 19-23
[88] Cauville (2007)

Furthermore , I should remark that my use of the phrase non-verbal, most of all for the *Randzeilen* of the second register, does not necessarily mean that there are no verb forms in the section. Rather, it means that the line is non-verbal for the parts that are not part of the standard verbal constructions in the sentences, for example *di=i* for the *Gegengabe*, and the *ḥr* + infinitive construction of the *Randzeilen* of the second register.

Register 1 |E1-W1|

The first difference is in the title, where |E1| has *iy.n=i ḥr=t*, a greeting formula, |W2| has *mn n=t*, an imperative. Moreover, where the following text in the title has four verbal forms on the east side |E2|, |W2| is non-verbal and descriptive. In the section of Hathor, the text outside of the *Gegengabe* |E15-E16| has five verbal forms, where the similar section |W7-W9| is non-verbal. In the section of Harsomthus and Ihy-wer, the *Gegengabe* |E20| has *stp*, an infinitive, where |W15| has *mn.ti*, a stative. In this pair of scenes, the east wall is more verbal versus a non-verbal west side. Finally, the east side has a more active character, versus the west side being a state.

Register 1 |E2-W3|

In the title, the east side |E1| has *msḫ₃ nṯry=s*, a nominal *sḏm=f*, followed by *sḥtp.tw=s*, passive *sḏm=f*. On the west side |W1|, there is only *sḥtp*, an infinitive. In this section, the east uses *sḏm=f* forms, where the west uses infinitive.

In the *Gegengabe* of Hathor |E10| uses *ḥr dw₃* and *ḥr nhm*, both *ḥr* + infinitive, where the west side |W14| has *sḫm*, a stative. For this section, the east is active, where the west is a state.

In the section of Horus and Osiris, |E12| has *pr m ₃ḫ.t* and *pr m ₃st*, both perfective active participles, where the similar section |W16| has *sḫm*, an imperfective active participle. Furthermore, |E14| has *n niwt šw.w*, a negation followed by a stative, where |W17| has *ḥms.w*, a stative without negation. For this section, the east side is past and negative, where the west is present and positive.

Register 1 |E3-W2|

In the *Gegengabe* of Hathor, |E10| has *wḥm=k*, a subjunctive *sḏm=f*, where |W19| has *ḥr dw₃*, a *ḥr* + infinitive and *ḥꜥ.w*, a stative. In the section of Harsomthus, |E12-E14| gives *sḫp*, an imperfective active participle, *ḳm₃*, *pr* and *ḫpr*, three perfective active participles. On the west there is only |W21| *rr.n nbw.t*, a relative *sḏm.n=f*. Furthermore, in the *Gegengabe* the east |E14| has *rwḏ*, a stative, where the

west is non-verbal. For this pair, the east side uses *sḏm=f* forms, where the west uses infinitives. Finally, the east shows participles where the west uses a relative.

Register 1 |E4-W4|

In the *Randzeile* of the king, |E8| uses *ḥry-tp.n=f* and *iṯ.n=f*, two circumstantial *sḏm=f,* where the similar passage |W4| uses *ms*, a perfective active participle. Furthermore, in the *Gegengabe* of Hathor, |E16| has *dmḏ*, a stative, where the west is non-verbal. In the *Gegengabe* of Ihy-wer versus Horus, |E22| has *mn* and *ṯtf.w*, both a stative, where |W18| uses *ḥr wsr*, a *ḥr* + infinitive. In this scene pair, the east side uses *sḏm=f* forms, where the west uses a participle, and the east is a state, where the west is active.

Register 1 |E5-W5|

In the section of Isis, |E5-E7| has three verb forms, *šn itn*, a relative *sḏm=f* and *rdi* and *wꜥ,* both an imperfective active participle, where the corresponding passage on the west side is non-verbal. For the *Gegengabe*, however, the east is non-verbal, where the west |W8| has *m iꜣw* and *m wꜣḥ-tp,* both *m* + infinitive. This contradicts itself, and thus this part of the scene pair has to be disregarded. In the divine *Randzeile*, |E13| has *n pꜥpꜥ.tw=s*, which is a negative passive *sḏm=f*, and *mn.w,* a stative, where the west is non-verbal. For this scene pair, the east side is negative and is like a state, where the west side is non-verbal and positive.

Register 1 |E6-W6|

In the title, |E2-E4| uses *šꜥd.w,* a stative and *sr*, a imperfective active participle, where in the corresponding passage |W2| uses *ṯn* and *sṯḥn*, both an imperative. For the *Randzeile* of the king, the east side |E5| uses *smꜣ.w*, a stative, and four imperfective active participles, where the west side |W5| use *tm*, a negative imperfective active participle, as well as three other imperfective active participles. In the *Gegengabe* of Hathor, |E10| uses *dmḏ*, a stative, where the west side is non-verbal. In the *Gegengabe* of Ihy-wer, the east is now non-verbal, where the west side |W13| uses *m ḥtt* and *ḥr dwꜣ-nṯr*, both infinitives. For this pair, the east side uses participles and a stative where the west uses imperatives, the east uses a stative where the west only uses participles, and the east is positive where the west is negative. Finally, in this case, the east is non-verbal where the west side uses infinitives.

Register 1 |E7-W7|

In this pair, there is one section in the *Randzeile* of the king, |E4|, which uses *sn.n=f,* a nominal *sḏm.n=f,* where the similar passage |W4| uses *ḫfꜥ.tw,* a stative. For this section, the east side is past tense and active, where the west side is present tense and a state

In the section of Isis, the east side |E13| uses *sḫr,* an imperfective active participle, where the corresponding section |W13-W14| uses *ḥsk,* an imperfective active participle and *gnḥ.n=s,* a circumstantial *sḏm.n=f.* In the *Gegengabe,* the east side is non-verbal, where the west side |W15| uses *r šn,* a r + infinitive, followed by *n wn=sn,* a negative *sḏm=f.* For the section of Isis, the east side is in the present tense, where the west side is in the past tense, negating the section in the *Randzeile* of the king. Finally, it shows a case where the east is non-verbal and positive, where the west side is verbal and negative.

Furthermore, the divine *Randzeile* uses on the east |E15| *sk.w,* a stative, where the west |W15| uses *ḫw,* an imperfective active participle. In addition, the east uses *n wnn=f,* a negative *sḏm=f,* where the west uses *ḥꜥ nṯr.w,* a circumstantial *sḏm=f.* This section makes the east a state, where the west is more active, and makes the east negative and the west positive, negating the *Gegengabe* of Isis.

Register 1 |E8-W8|

In the *Gegengabe* of Harsomthus, the east side |E8| has *iri-ms n=k ꜣḫ.t* and *bꜥḥ=k,* both a subjunctive *sḏm=f,* where the west side |W9-W10| uses *npḏ.w* and *stp.w,* both statives. For this scene pair, the east side is active, where the west side is a state.

Register 1 |E9-W9|

In the section of Horus, the east side |E14| uses *šd.n=f,* a circumstantial *sḏm.n=f* and |E15| *n rdi,* a negative infinitive, whereas the west uses |W13-W14| *sḥd* and *ṯḥn,* both an imperfective active participle. In the *Gegengabe,* the east side is non-verbal, where the west side |W15| uses *bkꜣ.tw,* a stative, *ms=s,* a relative *sḏm=f,* and *r dmḏ,* an infinitive. For this pair, the east is in the past tense, negative and for the *Randzeile,* non-verbal. The west side, on the other hand, is in the present tense, positive, and for the *Randzeile* verbal and a state.

Register 2 |E10-W10|

In the title, the east side |E2-E4| has *ḫy.w* and *wꜥb.w,* both statives, followed by *sꜥm=ṯ* and *wšꜥ=ṯ,* two

subjunctive *sḏm=f* and *ꜥb*, an imperfective active participle. On the west side |W1| there is *ir*, an imperfective active participle. In this section, the east side is a state, where the west is active. For the *sw* construction of the *Randzeile* of the king, the east side |E5| uses *bꜥḥ.n=f*, a circumstantial *sḏm.n=f* and *pr.t*, an infinitive, where the west side |W2| uses *iṯ*, an imperfective active participle, and *tḫ.w*, a stative. In the text of Hathor, the east side |E9| has *nn-wn* and *iwty*, two negatives, where the west is positive. Furthermore, in the divine *Randzeile*, the *sw* construction has |E16| *pnḳ.n=s* an circumstantial *sḏm.n=f* on the east side, where the west |W9| has *mn*, an infinitive. For this part of the scene pair, the east is past and negative, whereas the west side is present tense and positive.

Register 2 |E11-W12|
In the title the east |E2-E3| has *pr*, a perfective active participle, *wbs*, an infinitive, *ḳmꜣ.n=k* a nominal *sḏm.n=f* an *ꜣḫꜣḫ*, an imperfective active participle. In the corresponding section |W2| uses *ṯn.w*, a stative. Furthermore, the second similar section of the title has on the east side |E3| *ṯḥn ḥr=k*, a subjunctive *sḏm=f* and *mꜣꜣ=sn*, an infinitive, where the west side |W4| has *šsp n=ṯ* and *rd*, two imperatives. For this section the east side is active while the west is a state, and the east side is suggestive where the west side is commanding.

Register 2 |E12-W11|
In the title, the east side |E2| uses *ir.n=i*, a nominal *sḏm.n=f* and *mḥ*, an imperfective active participle, where the west side |W2| uses *mn n=ṯ*, an imperative, followed by *r sḏ*, an infinitive. For this section the east describes a situation, where the west side gives a command.

Register 2 |E13-W13|
For the section of Isis and Iousas, the east side |E7-E9| has *rr*, a perfective active participle, *di.t*, an infinitive, *rmn*, an imperfective active participle and *n gm*, a negative *sḏm=f*. On the west there is only |W7| *ḥr.tw*, a passive relative *sḏm=f*. For this scene pair, the east is active and negative, where the west is passive and positive.

The following two registers present a bit of a problem. Considering their subject, I would compare them in a crossed pattern. The problem is that scene E14 and W14 both lack a *Randzeile* for the king. Still, based on subject matter, namely pacifying Hathor for |E14| and offering the lotus and

papyrus reed for |W15|, and offering the vineyard for |E15| offering wine for |W14|, I decided to compare them in a crosswise pattern.

Register 2 |E14-W15|

In the title, the east side |E2| has in and *sḏfꜣ*, two imperfective active participles. The west side |W2-W3| has *mn n=k,* an imperative, *wꜣḏ.n=f* and *ḫn.n=f,* two nominal *sḏm.n=f*, followed by *ḫpr=w*, a circumstantial *sḏm=f*. For this section the east side uses participles where the west side *sḏm=f* forms. Furthermore, the east side has the present tense where the west has the past tense.

   In the section of Ihy-wer versus Mout, the east side is positive, where the west side |W11| has *n ḥri=s*, a negative *sḏm=f.* For the divine *Randzeile* the east side is non-verbal, where the west side |W13| has *ḥtp.w* and *dmḏ*, both a stative. For this section the east is positive and non-verbal, while the west is negative and a state.

Register 2 |E15-W14|

In the section of Hathor, the east is non-verbal, where the west |W6| has *pḫr.ti,* as stative. Furthermore, in the *sw* construction of the divine *Randzeile*, |E12| uses *iḫ=sn,* a relative *sḏm=f,* where the west uses *ḳmꜣ*, a perfective active participle. For this pair, the east is non-verbal and has the present tense, where the west side is a state, and has the past tense.

Register 2 |E16-W16|

In the title, the east side |E2-E3| uses *nḏ.n=f* a circumstantial *sḏm.n=f* and *sḫr=f* a subjunctive *sḏm=f*. On the west side |W3| has *n ḥb* and n *dbḥ*, both negative infinitives. In the section of Hathor versus Horus, the east has |E13| *n sn.wy=sy*, a non-verbal negative, where the west side is positive. For this scene pair, the east uses *sḏm=f* forms, where the west uses infinitives.

Register 2 |E17-W17|

In the title, the east side has is non-verbal, where the west side is describing an amulet |W3| *ꜥrḳ.w, ṯn.w, ꜣḫ.w, wr.w* and *mḥ.w,* all a stative. In the section of Harsomthus versus Montou, the east side | E6| has *pr* and *ḫpr,* both perfective active participles, where the west |W9-W10| has *ḥnk* and *ḫw*, imperfective active participles. For the *Randzeile* the east has |E9| *wbn* and *bs*, imperfective active participles, *dr.n=f*, a circumstantial *sḏm.n=f*, and *n rḫ=f,* a negative infinitive. The west in this section is

non-verbal. For this pair of scenes, the east side is non-verbal where the west is a state, the east is past tense and the west present, and the east active where the west is non-verbal.

Register 2 |E18-W18|

In the section of Thoth versus Ihy, in line |E5| the east uses *sphr=i*, a nominal *sḏm=f* where the west uses |W5| *ir*, an imperfective active participle. Due to the damaged state of this scene pair, there was not more that I could claim with any certainty. For this pair, the east side uses a *sḏm=f* form, where the west uses a participle.

Considering the pairs of scenes of the east and west side of the outer wall of the naos, one thing has to be remarked first. There are many things happening between these walls. Although most of the time only appearing once, I was able to make nineteen categories to describe them all.

The interaction between east and west, where the east is active and the west is a state, happened for five scene pairs (|E1-W1|, |E2-W3|, |E7-W7|, |E8-W8|, |E11-W12|), although there were also three pairs that did the exact opposite. (|E3-W2|, |E4-W4|, |E5-W5|). Looking at this, it seems clear that for the reign of Augustus, the pattern perceived during the reign of Cleopatra VII is no longer significant, and could hardly be considered remarkable.

There are also a few interesting patterns showing up, in the sense that we can call them remarkable. For four of the scene pairs, the east side is in the past tense, where the west tense is in the present. This pattern is for this part of the corpus no longer significant, and them being remarkable can be discussed, as the opposite is also true for two pairs of scenes.

In five scene pairs, the east side uses *sdm=f* forms, where the west side uses infinitives or participles. Finally, in five scene pairs, the east side is negative, where the west side is positive. This is countered by two scene pairs that do exactly the opposite.

7. Inside the sanctuary of the Isis temple in Dendera.

The temple of Isis in Dendera is located just south of the temple of Hathor. The temple complex itself was constructed in four stages, under different rulers. Due to the state of the complex beside the temple itself, it is unclear if this should be considered dedicated to Isis, or to some other deity. This is because there are hardly any useful inscriptions on the remnants of the walls surrounding the sanctuary that suggest that the whole complex was dedicated to Isis. Under the king Nectanebo I, the west wall of the first hall with pillars was constructed. The orientation of this part of the temple complex is with its entrance to the east. The second stage of construction was carried out under Ptolemy VI. This part includes the rest of the first hall. During the reign of Ptolemy X, a pronaos and a hypostyle hall were added in front of the first hall, and a peristyle was built around the first hall.[89]

The temple of Isis itself was created during the reign of Augustus. The temple was consecrated around the same time the name of Augustus started to show up on the Hathor temple. The temple was integrated in the earlier structure, but was also reoriented in the process. The end result was that the entrance to the temple proper came to lie to the north. This is a remarkable change in orientation. For the purposes of this thesis, on the other hand, it is very useful, as the sanctuary took on the same orientation of the temple of Hathor. The temple consists of a vestibule, two chapels, the *pr-nw* and *pr-nsr*, and the sanctuary in the middle.

For this thesis, I have looked at the scenes inside the sanctuary, because sadly, the western outer wall of the temple for the most part no longer exists, and the remains do not yield any usable scenes for comparison. The decoration of the sanctuary consists for the west, east and south wall of a soubassement, four registers, topped by a frieze. For the north wall, there is only one register due to the doorway, which is part of the fourth register for the other walls. For the east and west wall, the first register possesses four scenes, the second register one, the third register has four again, and so does the fourth register. The south wall always has two scenes, one of which should be considered part of the east wall, the other of the west wall. The north wall also has two scenes, one east, the other west. For this section I will use the same abbreviations as I used in the sanctuary of Hathor. For these scenes and translation I will refer to Cauville.[90]

Due to heavy damage on the first two scenes of the west side, they are not included in this analysis.

---

[89]   Sylvie Cauville, *Dendara, le temple d'Isis, texte* (Cairo, 2007) p. XVI-XXV
[90]   Sylvie Cauville, *Dendara, le temple d'Isis, texte* (Cairo, 2007), Sylvie Cauville, Alain Lecler, *Dendara, le temple d'Isis, planches* (Cairo, 2007) and Sylvie Cauville, *Dendara, le temple d'Isis, volume I, Traduction,* Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 178 (Leuven 2009)

|R1, III|[91]

In the divine *Randzeile*, the east side is non-verbal, where the west side |W10| has *ir.tw-ms*, a perfective passive participle, *ṯn sy*, an imperfective active participle, and n *pr=s*, a negative *sḏm=f*. For this pair, the east side is non-verbal and positive, where the west side is verbal, and negative.

|R1, IV|[92]

In the divine *Randzeile*, the east side is non-verbal, where the west side |W8| has *ḫpr*, a perfective active participle, *iy n=s mw.t=s* and *nsi=s,* both circumstantial *sḏm=f.* In this scene pair, the east side is non-verbal, whereas the west is verbal.

|R1, S|[93]

In the divine *Randzeile*, the east side is non-verbal, where the west side |W9| has *bs,* an infinitive, *ibꜣ n=s nṯr.w* and *nhm n=s nṯr.w.t*, two nominal *sḏm=f.* It has to be remarked that the actions in the *Randzeile* on the west side are not being performed by the goddess herself. In this scene pair, the east side is non-verbal, where the west side is verbal.

The second register is one scene for the east and west wall, excluding the south. These scenes work a bit differently. Both have a king, but where the east side has four musicians directly in front of a row of eight seated divine figures, the west side has the king facing a divine figure, then three times in a row a seated divine figure facing two divine figures. For this reason, I have compared the musicians with the seated gods who face the other gods, and had to change the order of the west wall around a bit to make the comparison.

|R2|[94]

In the divine *Randzeile*, the east side has |E46| *ḥtp.tw*, a stative, where the west side has |W48| *pꜥpꜥ.tw=s*, a passive *sḏm=f*, *ꜥnḫ n=s itn*, a circumstantial *sḏm=f* and *ir.n=s,* a circumstantial *sḏm.n=f.* In this section, the east side is reflects a state, where the west side is active.

[91]   Cauville (2009) p. 36-39, 66-69 Cauville (2007) p. 87-88, 113-114
[92]   Cauville (2009) p. 38-39, 68-69 Cauville (2007) p. 88, 114-115
[93]   Cauville (2009) p. 40-41, 68-71 Cauville (2007) p. 89, 115-116
[94]   Cauville (2009) p. 40-43, 70-73 Cauville (2007) p. 90-92, 116-118

|R2, S|[95]

In the *Randzeile* of the king, the east side |E2| has *ẖnm.n ẖnmw,* a relative *sḏm.n=f*[96], where the west side |W3| has *ḫꜥ.tw,* a stative. For this section the east side is past tense, where the west side is present tense.

|R3, I|[97]

In the title, |E2| has *r sṯꜣm,* a r + infinitive, where |W1| *gs.tw* is a stative. In the divine *Randzeile,* |E11| has *sḫpr,* a perfective active participle and the *n gm,* a negative *sḏm=f,* where |W11| has *ẖb,* an imperfective active participle. For this pair, the east side is active where the west is a state, and the east side is in the past tense and negative, whereas the west side is in the present tense and positive.

|R3, II|[98]

In the *Randzeile* of Thoth versus Ihy-wer, the east side |E4| has *rdi.n,* a circumstantial *sḏm.n=f,* where the west side |W6| has *mḥ.tw,* a stative. Furthermore, for Hathor versus Isis, the east side is non-verbal, where the west side |W8-W10| has *psḏ,* an imperfective active participle, *wbg.n=s* and *nms.n=s,* two nominal *sḏm.n=f,* and *sn stw.t=s,* a circumstantial *sḏm=f.* In the divine *Randzeile,* the east side |E7| has *ḥꜣy* and *mh,* two imperfective active participles, where the west has |W13| *sḥḏ,* an imperfective active participle and *wpš.n=s,* a circumstantial *sḏm.n=f.* For this pair, the east side is active where the west side is a state. Finally, the east side is non-verbal where the west is verbal.

|R3, III|[99]

In the *Randzeile* of *ḥr-sꜣ-ꜣst* and Ihy-wer, the east side |E5| uses *rr.n nbw.t,* a relative *sḏm.n=f,* where on the west side |W4| there is *ir,* an imperfective active participle. In this pair of scenes, the east side is in the past tense, whereas the west side is in the present.

|R3, IV|[100]

[95] Cauville (2009) p. 44-45, 74-75 Cauville (2007) p. 92-93, 119
[96] Cauville reads *ẖnm n ẖnmw*
[97] Cauville (2009) p. 44-47, 74-77 Cauville (2007) p. 93-94, 120
[98] Cauville (2009) p. 46-47, 76-77 Cauville (2007) p. 94, 121
[99] Cauville (2009) p. 46-47, 76-79 Cauville (2007) p. 95, 121-122
[100] Cauville (2009) p. 48-49, 78-79 Cauville (2007) p. 95-96, 122-123

In the *Randzeile* of Ahayt and Touayt, the east side |E8| has *ḥꜥy.n=f*, a circumstantial *sḏm=f*, where the west side |W8| has *bd=k,* a circumstantial *sḏm=f*. For this pair, the east side has a past tense, where the west side has a present tense.

|R3, S|[101]

This scene pair does not have anything of note to compare, as it follows a similar pattern.

|R4, N|[102]

This scene pair does not have any noteworthy differences, as it follows a similar pattern.

|R4, I|[103]

In the text of Harsomthus versus Horus, the east side |E5| has *dwꜣ.tw*, a passive *sḏm=f*, where the west side |W6-W7| has *ḏꜣ* and *wn,* both imperfective active participle. Furthermore, in the divine *Randzeile*, the east side has |E6| *ḥntš.n=i,* a nominal *sḏm.n=f*, where the west side |W8| has *ip.tw* and *km.tw,* both statives. For this pair, the east side is passive and the west is active. Finally, the east side is active in nature, where the west is a state.

|R4, II|[104]

In the section of Amon versus Ptah, the east side is non-verbal, where the west side |W7-W8| has *ḥtp* and *rḏ.t,* two infinitives. For this pair, the east side is non-verbal, where the west is verbal.

|R4, III|[105]

In the section of Nout versus Nepthys, the east side has |E5-E6| *ms* and *šꜣꜥ,* both perfective active participles, and *pꜥpꜥ,* an infinitive. The west side however is non-verbal. For this pair, the east side is verbal, where the west side is non-verbal.

|R4, IV|[106]

---

[101]   Cauville (2009) p. 48-49, 78-81 Cauville (2007) p. 96-97, 123
[102]   Cauville (2009) p. 50-51, 80-81 Cauville (2007) p. 97-98, 124-125
[103]   Cauville (2009) p. 50-51, 82-83 Cauville (2007) p. 98-99, 125-126
[104]   Cauville (2009) p. 52-53, 82-83 Cauville (2007) p. 99-100, 126
[105]   Cauville (2009) p. 52-53, 82-85 Cauville (2007) p. 100, 126-127
[106]   Cauville (2009) p. 52-55, 84-85 Cauville (2007) p. 101, 127-128

In the title of this pair, the east side |E1-E2| has *pꜣḏ.n=f* and *ẖnm.n=f,* both circumstantial *sḏm.n=f* and *snsn=k*, a subjunctive *sḏm=f*. The west side is non-verbal in the similar section. For this section, the east side uses *sḏm=f* forms, where the west side is non-verbal.

|R4, S|[107]

In the section of Hathor versus Isis, the east side has |E13-E14| *psḏ*, an imperfective active participle, and *dmḏ,* a stative. On the west side |W6-W9| *rd.t*, an infinitive, *wbn n=s itn,* a circumstantial *sḏm=f*, *bẖ.n=s*, a circumstantial *sḏm.n=f* and *smꜣ=s*, a circumstantial *sḏm=f*. For this section, the east side is a state, where the west side is more active in nature.

Considering these sixteen usable scene pairs, the principle that the east is active, where the west is a state, is far from being significant. It does happen in three scenes pairs, |R3, I|, |R3, II| and |R4, I|, but at the same time, in scene pair |R2| and |R4, S| the exact opposite happens. This makes the principle barely remarkable.

As a remarkable pattern, in five scenes the east side is non-verbal, where the west is verbal. This is opposed by two scenes where the opposite happens.

As far as my research goes, although there is a lot that happens between the east and west side, there is no clear significant pattern visible.

---

[107]   Cauville (2009) p. 54-55, 84-87 Cauville (2007) p. 101-102, 128-129

8. Conclusion

This thesis has considered the question if the pattern found by Leitz is a part of the temple grammar. The answer to this questions is yes as much as it is no. If one only looks at the inscriptions made during the same time, the pattern does show up as being a statistical significant pattern in Dendera. However, if one moves to a period beyond that point, the significance of the patterns becomes less apparent, and can only be supported by rather hands-on interpretation, not by clear evidence.

If one considers the section of the reign of Cleopatra VII, the pattern is statistically significant, but only if one considers non-verbal descriptive sections to be a state. Moving on to the reign of the emperor Augustus, the pattern becomes statistically remarkable, but no longer significant. Moreover, the principle can also be observed more often reversed. Thus, although it seems to be a pattern in one time, after that time one could no longer consider it a significant pattern that should be considered a rule. It is remarkable though, that a principle used on an earlier date is suddenly dropped. It is not unlikely that this is due to the new leadership of Egypt, and could show that even hidebound traditionalists like the priests of Egypt were affected by it. As one can see with the royal titulary of the emperor, and its development, the priesthood had some troubles with the new rulers, and how to deal with them. Although it eventually stagnates, the changes in the first few decades of the reign of the emperor Augustus shows that they actively tried to deal with the problem, which could explain the changes in the verb use as well. As the priesthood was changing principles to deal with the changes in leadership, the priesthood was more at liberty to change even more. Furthermore, there seems no clear replacement for the loss of a principle, with different options added, without any becoming truly remarkable, or without its retraction for also showing its opposite.

Due to the nature of this work, being a master thesis, I have not been able to do the research for every case in Dendera, nor outside that city. One still has to see if the pattern is truly significant for the same time period, as I have only researched the naos. More places need to be studied, to see if it is true beyond the sanctuary of Dendera, and if so, if it applies in other places such as Edfu as well.

Furthermore, although I could find no clear statistically significant underlying pattern in the scenes from the reign of Augustus, that does not mean that there is not one. I have only scratched the surface, and deeper research is needed to see if it actually has one.

In conclusion, there is an interaction between the east and west side of temple decoration based

on the verbal interaction, where the east side is active in nature, and where the west side is a state. Depending on the time period of creation, the principle where the east side is active and the west side a state might be considered a major underlying principles to guide the verbal system inside the scenes.

Bibliography

Jan Assmann, Parallelismus membrorum, in Wolfgang Helck und Eberhard Otto (ed.), *Lexikon der Ägyptologie Band IV* (Wiesbaden, 1982) kol. 900-908

John Baines and Jaromir Malek, *Cultural Atlas of Ancient Egypt,* revised edition (Oxford, 2000)

Sylvie Cauville, *Dendara I, traduction*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 81 (Leuven, 1998)

Sylvie Cauville, *Dendara, Le fonds hiéroglyphique au temps de Cleopâtre* (Paris, 2001)

Sylvie Cauville, *Le Temple de Dendara, tome douzième, texte* (Cairo, 2007)

Sylvie Cauville, Alain Lecler, Yousreya Hamed, *Le Temple de Dendara, tome douzième, planches* (Cairo, 2007)

Sylvie Cauville, *Dendara, le temple d'Isis, texte* (Cairo, 2007)

Sylvie Cauville, Alain Lecler, *Dendara, le temple d'Isis, planches* (Cairo, 2007)

Sylvie Cauville, L'Impossible serrement de main ou la pax romana à Dendara, in *Revue d'Égyptologie 58* (Paris, 2007) p. 29-39

Sylvie Cauville, *Dendara, le temple d'Isis, volume I, Traduction,* Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 178 (Leuven 2009)

Sylvie Cauville, *Offerings to the Gods in Egyptian Temples* (Leuven 2012)

Émile Chassinat, *Le Temple de Dendara, tome premier* (Cairo, 1934)

Filip Coppens, René Preys, Traditionele temples in de Grieks-Romeinse periode, in Harco Willems, Willy Clarysse (ed.), *Keizers aan de Nijl* (Leuven, 1999) p. 110-113

Philippe Derchain, Un manuel de géographie liturgique à Edfu, in *Chronique d' Égypte 73* (Bruxelles, 1962) p. 31-65

Ola El-Aguizy, The Tebtynis Library, in Ola El-Aguizy, Mohamed Sherif Ali (ed.), *Echoes of Eternity, Studies presented to Gaballa Aly Gaballa,* Philippika, Marburger altertumskundliche Abhandlungen 35 (Wiesbaden, 2010) p. 175-178

Henri Gauthier, *Dictionnaire des noms géographiques contenus dans les textes hiéroglyphiques, tomes I-VII* (Osnabrück, 1975)

Joachim Hallof, Beobachtungen zu den Randzeilen in den griechisch-römischen Tempeln Ägyptens, *Altorientalische Forschungen 14* (Berlin, 1987) p. 12-20

Günther Hölbl, *Altägypten im Römischen Reich, Der Römische Pharao und seine Tempel, band I, Römische Politik und altägyptische Ideologie von Augustus bis Diocletian, Tempelbau in Oberägypten,* Sonderbände der antiken welt, Zaberns Bildbände zur Archäologie (Mainz am Rhein, 2000)

Olaf Kaper, Vergrieksing, in Harco Willems, Willy Clarysse (ed.), *Keizers aan de Nijl* (Leuven, 1999) p. 126-129

Holger Kockelmann, Die "Grammatik des Tempels" in Daniel von Recklinghausen und Martin Andreas Stadler (ed.), *Kult Orte, Mythen, Wissenschaft und Alltag in den Tempeln Ägyptens* (Berlin, 2011) p. 1645

Dieter Kurth, *Einführung ins Ptolemäische, Eine Grammatik mit Zeichenliste und Übungsstücken, teil 2* (Hützel, 2008)

Christian Leitz, *Die Aussenwand des Sanktuars in Dendera, Untersuchungen zur Dekorationssystematik,* Münchner Ägyptologische Studien 50 (Mainz am Rhein, 2001)

Christian Leitz, *Quellentexte zur Ägyptischen Religion I, Die tempelinschriften der griechischrömischen Zeit* (Berlin, 2009)

Stefan Pfeiffer, Herrscherlegitimität und Herrscherkult in den ägyptischen Tempeln griechischrömischer zeit, in Daniel von Recklinghausen und Martin Andreas Stadler (ed.), *Kult Orte, Mythen, Wissenschaft und Alltag in den Tempeln Ägyptens* (Berlin, 2011) p. 116-141

René Preys, *Les complexes de la Demeure du Sistre et du Trône de Rê, Théologie et décoration dans le temple d'Hathor à Dendera,* Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 106 (Leuven, 2002)

Daniel von Recklinghausen, Opferbringer und Forscher, Priester in den ägyptischen Tempeln, in Daniel von Recklinghausen und Martin Andreas Stadler (ed.), *Kult Orte, Mythen, Wissenschaft und Alltag in den Tempeln Ägyptens* (Berlin, 2011) p. 91-115

Penelope Wilson, *A Ptolemaic Lexikon, A Lexicographical Study of the Texts in the temple of Edfu,* Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 78 (Leuven, 1997)

Joachim Friedrich Quack, Die Götterliste des Buches vom Tempel und die überregionalen Dekorationsprogramme, in Ben Haring, Andrea Klug (ed.) *6. Ägyptologische Tempeltagung, Funktion und Gebrauch altägyptischer Tempelräume, Leiden, 4-7 September 2002,* Königtum, Staat und Gesellschaft Früher Hochkulturen 3,1 (Wiesbaden 2007) p. 213-235

Joachim Friedrich Quack, Les normes pour le culte d'Osiris. Les indications du Manuel du Temple sur les lieux et les prêtres osiriens, in Laurent Coulon (ed.) *Le culte d'Osiris au Ier millénaire av. J.C. Déciyvertes et travaux récents, Actes de la table ronde internationale tenue à Lyon. Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée (université Lumière-Lyon 2) les 8 et 9 juillet 2005*, Bibliotheque d'étude 153 (Cairo, 2010) p. 23-30

Joachim Friedrich Quack, Die theoretisch Normierung der Soubassement-Dekoration. Erste Ergebnisse

der Arbeit an der karbonisierten Handschrift von Tanis, in Alexa Rickert und Bettina Ventker (ed.) *Altägyptische Enzyklopädien, De Soubassements in den Tempeln der griechisch-römischen Zeit, Soubassementstudien I, band 1*, Studien zur spätägyptischen Religion, Band 7 (Wiesbaden, 2014) p. 17-27

Erich Winter, *Untersuchungen zu den ägyptischen Tempelreliefs der griechisch-römischen zeit,* Osterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften 98 (Vienna, 1968)

Pierre Zignani, *Le temple d'Hathor à Dendara, Relevés et étude architecturale, texte,* Bibliothèque d'Étude 146/1 (Cairo, 2010)