AMENHOTEP III AND AMARNA: SOME NEW CONSIDERATIONS

By W. RAYMOND JOHNSON

The monuments of Amenhotep III at Amarna have long perplexed scholars by their ambiguous nature. In the first section of this paper the deification of Amenhotep III is examined through his votive sculpture, which appears after his Year 30 rendered in a new artistic style featuring unusual solar iconography. In the second section a new identification of a statuette group excavated by Petrie at Amarna, UC 004, is proposed, and the criteria for that identification examined. The paper concludes with a discussion of the theological relationship between Amenhotep III and Akhenaten expressed in their art, where Amenhotep III’s later iconography reflects his identification with the sun’s disk and the creator-god Atum-Re, while Akhenaten’s iconography emphasizes his role as Atum’s firstborn, Shu. It is suggested that the two kings ruled together in the ritual roles of Atum and Shu as an integral part of Amenhotep III’s deification programme, and that the senior king was the original focus of his son’s Aten cult.

For many years there has been spirited debate over exactly what role, if any, Akhenaten’s father Amenhotep III played in the Amarna Period. A tidy corpus of material inscribed for Amenhotep III, consisting of diplomatic correspondence, jar sealings, faience and precious jewellery, and sculpture of various types, has been excavated throughout Akhenaten’s city at Amarna from the beginning of work there.¹ These inscriptions and representations of Amenhotep III, often accompanied with the later form of the Aten’s name found only after Akhenaten’s Year 9, suggest that he was a presence at Amarna, although the exact nature of that presence has always been ambiguous.

For those who believe that the two kings ruled consecutively, Amenhotep III’s presence at Amarna is in memory only, perhaps a mark of Akhenaten’s ancestral piety, indicated by additional references to ‘houses’ or ‘chapels’ of Thutmose I, Amenhotep II, and Thutmose IV also found there.² Those who believe that the Amenhotep III material from Amarna is evidence that Akhenaten and his father shared the throne during this time have difficulty explaining away the contradiction of the older king’s well-known piety toward Amun-Re and his son’s notorious antipathy toward that deity. It has been suggested that Amenhotep III must have been weak and ineffectual during his last decade, possibly even in poor health, to allow his son such destructive licence. At first glance a number of Amarna-style sculptures of Amenhotep III from his last years, such as Metropolitan Museum of Art 30.8.74 (pl. IV, 1–2, and see below, pp. 70–1), which show him corpulent and dressed in the gauzy, loose-fitting robes associated with his son, seem to support this view. Artistic representations and other evidence, such as the poor physical condition of the mummy traditionally identified as Amenhotep III, have sug-


² Fairman, in COA III, 200; W. J. Murnane, Ancient Egyptian Coregencies (SAOC 40; Chicago, 1977), 127–9.
gested to some scholars that in his later years an ailing Amenhotep III handed over the affairs of state to his son, whose religious zeal was held in check until the death of the older king. Others hold that later in his reign Amenhotep III essentially abandoned the affairs of state for affairs of the harem, and spent his last decade in indolent, voluptuous retirement, while Akhenaten was allowed to pursue his religious reforms without interference.

Given Amenhotep III’s well-known penchant for grandiose architectural expressions of his piety towards Amun-Re and the other gods of Egypt, the grandest of which, the great Colonnade Hall at Luxor Temple, was still under construction at the time of his death, the idea that he abandoned all that at the end of his reign is too contradictory to be satisfactory and therefore has been widely, and correctly, rejected. This rejection has logically led to the opposite view, that Amenhotep III must have died before Akhenaten ascended the throne of Egypt, or very shortly thereafter. The monuments and inscriptions of Amenhotep III in an Amarna style or context in the consecutive-reign model are then considered post-mortem homages to Akhenaten’s highly-regarded father, heirlooms brought to the new city, or in the case of diplomatic correspondence addressed to Amenhotep III but found at Amarna, archival references.

Current research suggests that the truth might be more complex. Hourig Sourouzian has recently pointed out that the ‘gauzy robes’ of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten, far from being the frivolous attire of voluptuaries, were another iconographic innovation of Amenhotep III associated with the jubilee rites, a modernized heb-sed costume that henceforward replaced the archaic jubilee cloak on all royal statuary, through the Ramesside period and later. Additional new material pertaining to Amenhotep III’s deification while alive, an event which evidence suggests occurred at the culmination of his first jubilee rites, has an equally important bearing on the problem of the initial impetus of Akhenaten’s religious ‘revolution’ and the extraordinary theological relationship of the two kings. By way of an introduction to these matters, the first part of this paper is devoted to a brief overview of the nature of Amenhotep III’s deification and some of the tangible remains that were generated by that theological event.

3C. Aldred, Akhenaten, Pharaoh of Egypt: A New Study (London, 1968), 62–3, 104; Aldred felt that Akhenaten’s fury against Amun might have been unleashed only at the very end of his reign (p. 195).
4E. Bille-De Mot, The Age of Akhenaten (New York, 1966), 37ff.: ‘Prematurely worn out by his excesses, he died at 51, after reigning thirty-eight years’ (p. 38); W. C. Hayes, The Scepter of Egypt, II (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), 280.
6For reviews of the chronological questions posed by the diplomatic correspondence, see W. L. Moran, The Amarna Letters (Baltimore, 1992), xxxiv–ix; D. B. Redford, Akhenaten the Heretic King (Princeton, 1984), 185–203; and Giles, Ikhnaton, 141–202.
Aspects of the deification of Amenhotep III

Reliefs preserved in the temple of Soleb in Nubia which depict Amenhotep III worshiping figures of himself as the god ‘Nebmaatre Lord of Nubia’ indicate that this king experienced living deification, or worship as a god while he was still alive, at some point during his reign of almost 39 years.\(^9\) I have suggested elsewhere that textual and artistic criteria from Amenhotep III’s last decade pinpoint this event to the celebration of his first jubilee in Year 30.\(^10\) In a dated scene commemorating the first jubilee preserved in the Theban tomb of Kheruef, Amenhotep III is depicted in the barque of the sun god, thus identified as the sun god while still alive, a state of being traditionally that of deceased kings as described in the Pyramid Texts.\(^11\) The exceptional nature of the event is underscored in the accompanying text where it is stated that these particular jubilee rites had not been celebrated since ‘the time of the ancestors’, and that the king decreed they be enacted ‘in accordance with writings of old’.\(^12\)

A new rebus writing of his prenomen appears after Amenhotep III’s first jubilee, where a figure of the king himself stands for nb, the feather in his hand represents $m\varphi r$, and the disk on his head (and the name as a whole) spells out $R\upsilon$.\(^13\) A variant of this name occurs on wine-jar stoppers at Malqata and Amarna enclosed within a large sun-disk in the solar barque sailing on the hieroglyph $p\tau$ (‘heaven’), beneath it the hieroglyph $f\mathfrak{th}n$ (‘dazzling’). The whole group spells out ‘Neb-maat-Re is the Dazzling Aten’.\(^14\) A shorter form of this epithet is found on public and private monuments throughout the later part of Amenhotep III’s reign.\(^15\)


\(^10\)Above, nn. 5 and 8.


\(^12\)The Epigraphic Survey, The Tomb of Kheruef: Theban Tomb 192 (OIP 102; Chicago, 1980), 43, pl. 24. This ritual undoubtedly took place on the Birket Habu and its eastern mate across the river.

\(^13\)Johnson, in Berman (ed.), Art of Amenhotep III, 38, drawing 4. The rebus name is usually found without a cartouche, in the manner of that of a deity; see L. Bell, ‘Aspects of the Cult of the Deified Tutankhamun’, in P. Posener-Krieger (ed.), Mélanges Gamal Eddin Mokhtar (BdE 97; Cairo, 1985), I, 42, n. 6. This rebus appears on seal documents, stamped bricks, and wine-jar labels dating to Amenhotep III’s three sed-festivals in Years 30, 34, and 37 from his heb-sed-palace in Western Thebes (present-day Malqata); see Hayes, ‘Inscriptions from the Palace of Amenhotep III’, JNES 10 (1951), 157–83. It also appears on private and royal monuments from Memphis to Aswan, such as the famous biographical inscription found on the block statue of Amenhotep III’s chief steward of Memphis, Amenhotep, in W. M. F. Petrie, Tarkhan I and Memphis V (London, 1913), 32–6, pls. lxxviii–lxxx, and a rock inscription at Aswan mentioning the statue ‘Neb-maat-Re is Re of the Rulers’; A. Varille, ‘L’inscription dorsale du colosse méridional de Memnon’, ASAE 33 (1933), 94.


\(^15\)The epithet ‘the Dazzling Sun-Disk (Aten)’ is first encountered in the Lake Scarab inscription dated to Amenhotep III’s Year 11, as the name of the royal barge. ‘Neb-maat-Re is the Dazzling Aten’ is also found on the front architrave on the west side of his late-second-decade Luxor Temple proper; A. Gayet, Le Temple de Louxor (MMAF 15; Paris, 1894), 15. In the tomb of Neferekhuru (TT 107), the chief steward of Amenhotep III’s palace at Malqata, the palace is referred to as ‘the Palace of the Dazzling Aten’: A. Hermann, ‘Das Grab eines Nachtmin in Unternubien’, MDAIK 6 (1936), 38. Amenhotep is referred to by that name on numerous stelae belonging to other members of the palace staff found at Thebes and Abydos; Hayes, JNES 10, 179, and also in the texts of canopic jars belonging to some of his minor wives: G. Legrain, ‘Fragments de canopes’, ASAE 4 (1903), 145.
Innovations in his titulary, dramatic changes in the style and iconography of his subsequent statue and monument decoration, and the simultaneous appearance of votive sculpture of Amenhotep III in a multitude of divine forms indicate that his living deification was a consequence of his expanded jubilee rites. The accumulating evidence indicates that during his last decade, Amenhotep III was officially considered to be a living manifestation of the creator god Re, particularly in his manifestation as the sun's disk, Aten, and hence was a living embodiment of all the gods of Egypt, their 'living image' on earth.

During the decade leading up to Amenhotep III's first heb-sed, vast quantities of sculpture were commissioned and executed in preparation for that event, in numbers probably not seen since the Middle Kingdom: \(^{16}\) statues of the king and his family; multiple images of all the gods in the likeness of the king; hundreds of lion-headed Sekhmet statues; and kilometres of sculptures of the king in animal form, such as recumbent androsphinxes, criosphinxes, rams, jackals, lions and even falcons, vultures, and serpents, which guarded the broad avenues leading to his numerous temple complexes. \(^{17}\) Inscriptions, style, and iconography indicate that the bulk of this sculpture was prepared before the king's thirtieth year, in preparation for his jubilee; many pieces are inscribed with references to it. Betsy Bryan has suggested that in assembling sets of these statues in his mortuary temple, Luxor Temple, Soleb, and elsewhere, Amenhotep III took on the role of Ptah, creator of the gods as defined in the Memphite Theology, gathering the images of the gods and uniting with them as part of his jubilee celebration/deification. \(^{18}\) Indeed, he was worshipped as the embodiment of Ptah in the 'Temple of Nebmaatre-United-with-Ptah' at Memphis, described in detail in the autobiographical inscription of his High Steward of Memphis, Amenhotep, who was responsible for its construction. \(^{19}\) The conspicuous veneration of the king as a manifestation of specific deities continued into the Ramesside period, particularly during the reign of Ramesses II, who also appears to have initiated this specialized worship at the time of his first jubilee. \(^{20}\) Labib Habachi pointed out years ago that when Ramesses II experienced his own living deification, he was essentially emulating his illustrious ancestor, Amenhotep III. \(^{21}\)

Several series of sculptures commemorating the deified Amenhotep III, datable by their unusual style, were executed after his first jubilee. One of these, a remarkable

---

\(^{16}\) The mortuary complex of Amenemhet III at Hawara was undoubtedly one of the prototypes for Amenhotep III's statuary programme; see PM IV, 100–1 (Labyrinth. Amenemhet III) and Petrie et al., The Labyrinth, Gerzeh and Mazghuneh (London, 1912).

\(^{17}\) For the best overview of the royal statuary production of Amenhotep III's reign, see Bryan, in Bryan and Kozloff, Egypt's Dazzling Sun, 125–228.

\(^{18}\) Ibid., 135–6. A partial, inscribed back support in dark blue faience of a lifesize figure of Amenhotep III as the god Ptah was recovered by the EES at Saqqara, see G. T. Martin, The Tomb of Hetepka (London, 1979), 40 no. 118, pl. 36. For a smaller inscribed votive figure of Amenhotep III as Ptah, also in faience, see H. Schlegl (ed.), Geschenk des Nils: Ägyptische Kunstwerke aus Schweizer Besitz (Basel, 1978), 56–7 cat. 178.


\(^{20}\) See the study by M. Eaton-Krauss, 'Ramesses-Re Who Creates the Gods', in E. Bleiberg et al. (eds), Fragments of a Shattered Visage: The Proceedings of the International Symposium on Ramesses the Great (Monographs of the Institute of Egyptian Art and Archaeology 1; Memphis, 1991), 21, where the role of Ramesses II as the creator-god Re is discussed.

quartzite statue of the king excavated at Luxor Temple in 1989 and now on prominent display in the lower ‘Cachette’ gallery of the Luxor Museum,22 depicts him in the ‘rejuvenation’ or ‘deification’ style of his last decade. Standing on a sledge, with the powerful body of a young man and exaggerated, overlarge eyes that heighten the effect of his new youthfulness, Amenhotep III wears the double crown and an elaborate, pleated kilt festooned with disk-crowned uraei and falcon feathers at the back, all features of the new style and all solar-related. The statue is essentially a representation of the king’s body as solar deity, and is named, ‘Ruler of the Nine Bows, Dazzling Aten’ of all lands, whose Uraeus (iḥt) illuminates the Two Banks’. This statue was set up in Luxor Temple and was undoubtedly the focus of Amenhotep III’s cult there, just as other statues of the deified king in many different forms and scales were set up at this time in all the major cult centres of Egypt, most of them in quartzite, a stone associated with the sun god.23

Chief among these quartzite statues are the well-known Colossi of Memnon, or ‘Ruler of the Rulers’, that still flank the entrance to Amenhotep III’s long-vanished mortuary complex in Western Thebes;24 fragments of a colossal striding statue named ‘Montu of the Rulers’ erected against the south side of the Tenth Pylon at Karnak;25 a series of colossal baboons excavated at Hermopolis which portray Amenhotep III in the guise of the moon-god Thoth;26 two colossal standing sculptures of the god Ptah from Memphis now in the foyer of the Egyptian Museum, Cairo;27 a small head of the king in Cleveland (61.417) with a short, rounded and curled wig, fillet, and missing double crown that associates him with the god Khonsu Neferhotep;28 and one of the most remarkable of all, a slightly over-lifesize seated statue in the Musées royaux d’Art et d’Histoire, Brussels (E. 5188), which depicts the king with the head, wings, and tail feathers of a solar falcon and the body of a man.29 A surprising number of small votive statuettes of Amenhotep III and his family survive: Brooklyn Museum 48.28 is one of the finest, made of ebony, gold, and glass.30 The figure wears an elaborate gilded kilt with falcon-tail sporran, and

22 Luxor M 838; see Mohammed el-Saghir, The Discovery of the Statuary Cachette of Luxor Temple (Mainz, 1991), 21–7, figs. 45–59.

23 The association may have derived from the close proximity of the major quartzite quarries at Gebel Ahmar to the cult centre of Re in Heliopolis.

24 Style and iconography, such as the panther head at the top of the sporran of the southernmost colossus, suggest a late date for their erection; see Sourouzian, ‘La statuaire royale sous Amenophis III dans les grands sites d’Égypte’, in Les Dossiers d’Archéologie, 180 (March 1993): Amenophis III: L’Égypte à son apogée, 10.


26 They were found in pieces at later foundations of Philip Arrhidaeus; see A. J. Spencer, Excavations at El-Ashmunein, II. The Temple Area (London, 1989), pls. 93–4; D. M. Bailey et al., British Museum Expedition to Middle Egypt, Ashmunein (1980) (British Museum Occasional Paper 37; London, 1982), 6–10, pls. 7a–11b, 24a–27c.

27 Cairo JE 38439 and one other, both usurped by Ramesses II. Note that the faces were recut by Ramesses II to reflect his own features; my thanks to Betsy M. Bryan for that observation.

28 Height 17.3 cm, width 17 cm, depth 25.3 cm; Bryan, in Kozloff and Bryan, Egypt’s Dazzling Sun, 159–61.

29 Height 1.99 m. E. 5188 has recently been published in two studies by B. Van Rinsveld, who suggests that although found in the Khonsu Temple at Karnak, the statue was originally set up in Amenhotep III’s mortuary temple: ‘Le dieu-faucon égyptien des Musées Royaux d’Art et d’Histoire’, BMRAH 62 (1991), 15–45; idem, ‘Redating a Monumental Hawk Sculpture in the Musées royaux, Brussels’, KMT 4/1 (Spring 1993), 14–21.

30 The inscription on the plinth mentions Amenhotep III’s jubilee palace at Malkata, and it probably came from there. R. Fazzini et al., Ancient Egyptian Art in the Brooklyn Museum (London, 1989), no. 44; Hayes, JNES 10, 86 n. 75, 178.
originally had an elaborate collar, now missing, probably the shebyu-necklace of gold disks (another iconographic device utilized during his final decade to indicate his uplifted, ‘deified’ status), fastened to a pin still preserved at the back of his neck.\textsuperscript{31} From a similar statuette, the superb head identified on stylistic grounds as Queen Tiye, Berlin 21834, made of yew wood, gold, silver, and glass, ranks among the masterpieces of the genre.\textsuperscript{32} The headless statuette MMA 30.8.74 (pl. IV, 1–2) is another of this type in dark serpentine, where in jubilee/‘Amarna’ attire, his hands clasped before him, Amenhotep III with the djed-pillar on his back is associated with the god Osiris.\textsuperscript{33} British Museum EA 2275 in black steatite\textsuperscript{34} and Berlin 17020 in white limestone,\textsuperscript{35} both headless, each depict Amenhotep III in a long pleated kilt an elaborate sporran grasping a heqa-sceptre in his right hand held vertically against his right shoulder. The wide belts and sporran sashes, the looped sash, the cords tipped with papyrus umbels suspended from the belt, and the panther head at the top of the sporran on the Berlin piece, which represents an archaic form of the sky goddess,\textsuperscript{36} are all iconographic innovations found in the ‘deification’ style of the king’s last decade. The Berlin statuette also holds a long staff, probably originally topped with the ram-head of Amun, now broken away.\textsuperscript{37}

A small diorite head of the king in Chicago, OIM 16687 (pl. V, 1–4), may have come from another of these votive sculptures. Found by Uvo Hölscher in his excavations at Medinet Habu, the uninscribed head exhibits Amenhotep III’s thick neck (lacking a back support), broad face, and wide khepresh-crown. The nose and lips are damaged, but enough remains to indicate that both were small, in contrast to the large, narrow, almond eyes which dominate the face. The eyes have traces of a cosmetic line outlining the upper edge, and the eyebrows are indicated with a characteristic raised plastic line that arches over the eye. Because of its findspot there will always be some question that this head might have been from an ushebti of Amenhotep III since unpublished fragments of others were found elsewhere in the Medinet Habu complex,\textsuperscript{38} but it is equally possible

\textsuperscript{31} From the time of Amenhotep II onwards, the king is often depicted in private tombs enshrined and wearing these accoutrements, to as the god Re, and accompanied by the goddess Hathor. The shebyu-collar, which represented an elevation in status when presented to a private person, here reflected a change in the king’s state of being after his potential death, the result of his assimilation and identification with the sun-disk. See E. Hornung, Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt: The One and the Many, trans. John Baines (Ithaca, New York, 1982), 139; A. Radwan, Die Darstellung des regierenden Königs und seiner Familienangehörigen in den Privat- gräbern der 18. Dynastie (MÄS 21; Berlin, 1969); Wente, in Studies ... Wilson, 83–91. For the shebyu-necklace, see Eaton-Krauss, in Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Egypt’s Golden Age: The Art of Living in the New Kingdom. 1558–1085 B.C. (exh. cat., 1982), 238–9 no. 316.


\textsuperscript{33} Bryan, in Kozloff and Bryan, Egypt’s Dazzling Sun, 204–6; E. Chassinat, ‘Une statuette d’Amenophis III’, BIFAO 7 (1909), 169–72.

\textsuperscript{34} Height 14 cm, inscribed with Amenhotep III’s name; H. R. Hall, ‘Objects of Tut’ankhamun in the British Museum’, JEA 14 (1928), 76–7, pl. 11.

\textsuperscript{35} H. Schäfer, ‘Die Simonsche Holzfigur eines Königs der Amarnazeit’, ZÄS 70 (1934), pl. 3.

\textsuperscript{36} Bryan, in Bryan and Kozloff, Egypt’s Dazzling Sun, 201.


\textsuperscript{38} The ushebtis are perhaps additional evidence that the rewrapping of the royal mummies in the Twenty-first Dynasty occurred at Medinet Habu. For other evidence in the form of inscribed linen docketts, see E. Thomas, The Royal Necropoleis of Thebes (Princeton, 1966), 265 n. 7; C. N. Reeves, Valley of the Kings: The Decline of a Royal Necropolis (London, 1990), 230.
that it is another example of a votive statuette from an earlier house or palace shrine in the vicinity.\textsuperscript{39}

A large percentage of Amenhotep III’s votive statuettes were made of glazed, light-coloured steatite,\textsuperscript{40} such as the headless CG 42084 in Cairo, which is in the same attitude as the British Museum and Berlin statuettes but also features a double shebyu-necklace and a falcon-tail sporran tipped with a panther head and flanked by cobras crowned with sun-disk (one missing).\textsuperscript{41} This piece and others of the same material are often inscribed on the back plinth for Amenhotep III in his mortuary temple; others are dedicated specifically to Amenhotep III’s ‘living image’ (\textit{hnty \textasciitilde mh}) in his mortuary temple, were probably offered to it, and then distributed as votive offerings to temples elsewhere, such as Karnak, where CG 42084 and several others were found at the turn of the century in the Karnak statue cachette.\textsuperscript{42} In function they should perhaps be regarded as the successors to the large glazed steatite commemorative scarabs so popular with Amenhotep III before his Year 30. The statuettes may have served to proclaim the event of his deification while simultaneously being an extension of it.

Although many of the smaller votive statuettes depict Amenhotep III with a thickened waist, a number of them were executed in what can only be described as a naturalistic style, seemingly at odds with the mannered, ‘deification’ style with its exaggerated youthfulness. The Brooklyn ebony statuette and the corpulent serpentine figure in New York, while featuring iconography associated with the deification style, are set apart by the naturalistic rendering of the royal physiognomy and physique. The Brooklyn statuette depicts the king with a full round face, unlined lips, thick neck, double chin, and mature, stocky body with enlarged stomach, while the long, gilded kilt and sporran display elements of the deification iconography: falcon-tail sporran, sashes, and pendant cords tipped with papyrus umbels and lily flowers hanging from the wide belt. The thick-necked, corpulent statuette in serpentine sports an elaborate floral \textit{twah}-collar, associated with Osiris, and often found around the necks of Amenhotep III’s relief figures in his last decade.\textsuperscript{43} These statuettes are readily assumed to be posthumous productions because of their naturalism, usually associated with Akhenaten and Amarna, and their funerary iconography. This assumption should be questioned in the light of our growing understanding of the nature of Amenhotep III’s all-encompassing divinity, which embraced the gods of the dead as well as the living, and whose deification iconography

\textsuperscript{39} The Medinet Habu complex was built over the northern part of the Malqata palace settlement. OIM 16687: height 6.9 cm; width 5.2 cm; depth 5.2 cm. 1929 excavation records indicate that the head was found at Section E/5, the stratum with the ‘small walls’, (‘therefore 21–22nd Dynasty’) with two pots, an alabaster cosmetic vessel, a diorite grinding stone, and an alabaster beaker. My thanks are due to the Oriental Institute Museum for permission to publish OIM 16687 here, and to Emily Teeter for information from the excavation records. A similar head found at Faras in Nubia and now in the Khartoum Museum (Khartoum 5829) is also attributable to Amenhotep III by its style; see J. Karkowski, \textit{Faras, V: The Pharaonic Inscriptions from Faras} (Warsaw, 1981), 139, Appendix II.

\textsuperscript{40} Bryan, in Kozloff and Bryan, \textit{Egypt’s Dazzling Sun}, 193–208.

\textsuperscript{41} Schäfer, ZÄS 70, 6, pl. 8; Bryan, in Kozloff and Bryan, \textit{Egypt’s Dazzling Sun}, 201–2, n. 7.

\textsuperscript{42} ‘He made [it] as his monument for his living image in the temple of [Neb]maatre’, from Cairo JE 38596; Bryan, in Bryan and Kozloff, \textit{Egypt’s Dazzling Sun}, 200–1; also idem, ‘Steatite figures of Amenhotep III: An Example of the Purposes of Minor Arts’, in E. Goring et al. (eds), \textit{Chief of Seers. Studies for Cyril Aldred} (forthcoming).

\textsuperscript{43} For the Osiride association of the teah-collar, see Martha Bell, in S. D’Auria et al. (eds), \textit{Mummies and Magic: The Funerary Arts of Ancient Egypt} (Boston, 1988), 133–4 cat. no. 68, and 139 cat. no. 77.
borrows heavily from funerary iconography.\textsuperscript{44} There are other factors to consider as well, such as the almost total lack for any other Egyptian king of documented examples of votive sculpture of this sort, commissioned during his immediate successor’s reign.\textsuperscript{45} It should also be noted that a growing corpus of naturalistic sculpture of Amenhotep III from Thebes and elsewhere, ranging in scale from diminutive to colossal, firmly dates the inauguration of the style to the end of Amenhotep III’s own reign and not the end of Akhenaten’s reign.\textsuperscript{46}

**Amenhotep III’s monuments at Amarna**

The indirect or circumstantial evidence of Amenhotep III’s presence at Amarna consists of a wide range of monuments of the older king found at that site, including statuary and relief work. Much has been written about this material, so it is not necessary to go into detail here. One of the best examples is the often-discussed lintel scene preserved in the tomb of Huya, the Steward of Queen Tiye, recorded by Norman de Garis Davies at the turn of this century and dated after Akhenaten’s Year 9 by the late form of the Aten’s name.\textsuperscript{47} The lintel is split into halves which depict the two royal families back-to-back: on the left Akhenaten, Nefertiti, and four royal daughters, and on the right Amenhotep III, Tiye, and an enigmatic young princess called Baketaten, whose mother is left unnamed, and who was either their youngest daughter or granddaughter.\textsuperscript{48} Amenhotep III is represented living and is even rendered somewhat larger in scale than Akhenaten’s figure to the left, as is his throne. Amenhotep III and Nefertiti both extend their right hands towards their respective families in a distinctly active manner, a gesture utilized extensively in Amarna art to indicate active communication between different figures. The right hands of Queen Tiye and Baketaten raised in worship have often been interpreted as an indication that Amenhotep III is dead, but the gesture might instead commemorate their reverence for Amenhotep the living, deified king, just as the daughters of Akhenaten and Nefertiti worship their divine parents with fans in the pendant scene. It is significant that Tiye is shown wearing the double plumes and horned disk of Hathor, a detail that underscores her own deification and identification with that goddess in this scene. The jambs of another doorway in the same tomb are inscribed with

\textsuperscript{44}See, for instance, Radwan, ‘Amenophis III., dargestellt und angerufen als Osiris (\textit{ten-nfrw})’, \textit{MDAIK} 29 (1973), 71–6.

\textsuperscript{45}Commissioned anew, as opposed to completing a monument initiated during his predecessor’s reign. A rare example is the Abydene chapel of Ramesses I built for the perpetuation of his father’s cult by Sety I. For a list of votive statuettes of earlier kings, see Bryan, in Bryan and Kozloff, \textit{Egypt’s Dazzling Sun}, 193.

\textsuperscript{46}The present author is preparing a study of this corpus, which includes two larger-than-lifesize grey granodiorite sculptures of the corpulent Amenhotep III in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo (CG 33900 and 33901), excavated at Kom el-Hetan by G. Daressy; a head with naturalistic features that matches the body of CG 33900; a quartzite colossus \textit{in situ} in Amenhotep III’s mortuary precinct north of Kom el-Hetan; and a number of related granite pieces.

\textsuperscript{47}Norman de G. Davies, \textit{The Rock Tombs of El Amarna, III. The Tombs of Huya and Ahmes} (London, 1905), pl. xviii.

\textsuperscript{48}Marc Gabolde (‘Baketaten fille de Kiya?’, \textit{BSEG} 16 (1992), 27–40) has proposed that Baketaten was the daughter of Akhenaten and the disgraced Kiya, and was later ‘adopted’ by Tiye. He cites the fact that Baketaten’s mother’s name is nowhere written, which implies disgrace, and points out that in texts where Kiya’s and her daughter’s names have been erased, the space left for the daughter’s name would fit Baketaten’s name. This is not entirely true; the space allowed for the name of Kiya’s daughter in the examples Gabolde cites is too small, even if one leaves off the female determinative, which is always found with her name elsewhere.
the names of both kings, also in association with the late name of the Aten, with no indication in the inscriptions that Amenhotep III is deceased.\textsuperscript{49} An equally important monument of Amenhotep III from Amarna is the carved stela BM 57399 excavated by the Egypt Exploration Society in the private residence of Panehsy, High Priest of the Aten.\textsuperscript{50} The stela is executed primarily in painted raised relief, and features a portly figure of Amenhotep III seated with Queen Tiye before a large pile of offerings, while the Aten disk above them and its titulary are executed in sunk relief. The king and queen, rendered naturalistically, are represented in a pose of relaxed intimacy. Because the upper body of Tiye is damaged, there are two possible positions for the arms of the royal couple. In the first, the king rests his left arm on the lap of his queen, who caresses it with her left hand and embraces him with her other arm, the fingers of which can be seen on the king's shoulder, just under his chin. The alternative possibility is that they each have their arms around each other's shoulders, their other arms on their respective laps. The stela has been interpreted both as evidence that Amenhotep III was still alive, and possibly even residing at Amarna, and the reverse, that the stela is an \textit{hommage} to the deceased king. One might wonder, however, what a monument of this quality and nature was doing in the private residence of such a high functionary of the Aten cult.

These and other such objects from Amarna are discussed extensively in the studies of Fairman, Aldred, Giles, and others.\textsuperscript{51} But there are uninscribed objects as well pertinent to the problem of Amenhotep III's presence at Amarna. One of these was excavated in the workshop of the sculptor Thutmosis in the South Suburb, the same workshop where the painted bust of Nefertiti now in Berlin was found.\textsuperscript{52} This uninscribed, lifesize plaster head, Berlin 21299, probably cast from a statue, bears no resemblance to the numerous portraits of Akhenaten found at Amarna, yet the short, broad neck, wide face and distinctive features match the British Museum stela and make its identification as another portrait of Amenhotep III certain.\textsuperscript{53} A temple dedicated to Queen Tiye at Amarna called the 'Sunshade of Tiye', featured in the tomb reliefs of her Steward, Huya, was decorated with named, alternating pair statues of Amenhotep III and Tiye and Akhenaten and Tiye, so we know that monumental sculpture of Amenhotep III was to be found at the site.\textsuperscript{54} The plaster head of Amenhotep III may have been cast from one of these statues.

\textsuperscript{49}Davies, \textit{Rock Tombs} III, pl. xxi.

\textsuperscript{50}Height 30 cm; width of cornice 30 cm. The stela was found in fragments in the north and west loggias of house R.44.2; some of the pieces, including the upper left and sections of Tiye's upper body, were not recovered; F. L. Griffith, 'Stela in Honour of Amenophis III and Taya, from Tell El-Amarna', \textit{JEA} 12 (1926), 1–2, pl. i; Bryan, in Bryan and Kozloff, \textit{Egypt's Dazzling Sun}, 213–14. For an excellent colour photograph of the stela, see Bille-De Mot, \textit{The Age of Akhenaten}, 36, pl. 4.

\textsuperscript{51}See above, nn. 1–4, and in addition, Eaton-Krauss, 'Akhenaten versus Akhenaten', \textit{BiOr} 47 (1990), 542–59.

\textsuperscript{52}For this workshop, see R. Krauss, 'Der Bildhauer Thutmose in Amarna', \textit{Jahrbuch preussischer Kulturbesitz} 29 (1983), 119–52.

\textsuperscript{53}B. Fay, \textit{Egyptian Museum Berlin} (Berlin, 1990), 80, cat. 41; Maya Müller, \textit{Die Kunst Amenophis' III. und Echnatons} (Basel, 1988), pl. 11a–b.

\textsuperscript{54}Davies, \textit{Rock Tombs} III, pls. viii–xi; note the details of the statuary in pls. x and xi. Note also pl. xi, where in the back sanctuary two royal couples appear to be ascending a set of stairs leading to the back altar. They cannot be statues, because they are not shown with back supports or plinths as are the other statues in the complex; see new study by Giles, forthcoming.
A small limestone head in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (1933.1207) was found by the EES in the precinct of the Great Temple of the Aten and identified by the excavators as Amenhotep III.55 Examination of the piece, however, has revealed that the broken chin, mouth with distinct naso-labial lines, long neck, and elongated skull shape all point to an identification of the subject as Akhenaten. The broken chin gives the head a rounder appearance than would have been the case when the head was intact, but a bit of surviving upper lip allows a reconstruction of the head’s true shape. Evidence of partly-carved roundels on the khepresh-crown suggest that the limestone head was covered with a thin layer of fine gypsum plaster before the finishing details were added. Stylistically the head belongs to the earlier artistic period at Amarna.

Because it is certain that sculpture in the round of Amenhotep III existed at Amarna, it is also probable that among the thousands of fragments excavated at that site, now in the reserves of museums around the world, there survive unrecognized pieces from his statuary. A small monument that belongs to this category is in the collection of the Petrie Museum, University College London, UC 004 (pl. VI, 1–3).56 This well-known, uninscribed group statuette was excavated by Petrie at Amarna and belongs to the category of votive statuette commonly found in the private house and garden shrines at Amarna, usually depicting Akhenaten and Nefertiti, separately, paired, and sometimes in the company of one or more daughters.57 The preferred material for these statuettes was limestone, sometimes with faience wigs or crowns, although harder stones such as granite and quartzite were also utilized, and the size varied from quite small to almost a metre in height. UC 004 is among the smallest known, only 14.5 cm in preserved height, 8.3 cm in depth, and 11.2 cm wide. The headless group statuette depicts a royal couple accompanied by a diminutive princess and is cut from a single piece of fine limestone. The king and queen hold hands, and the child originally held the right hand of her mother. The three figures stand against a substantial back plinth which stops just below the top of the queen’s broken head and continues slightly higher behind the missing head of the king, where it supported the back of his crown. All three figures stand with their left foot forward in active, striding position. Both king and queen wear sandals, while the princess is barefoot, and the costume of the king consists only of a simple undecorated apron or sporran. The queen wears a tripartite wig and little else; she and the tiny princess give the impression of being nude.

Petrie excavated the triad at Amarna in a sculptor’s workshop which he describes not very precisely as being ‘near the south end of town’. Julia Samson (see below) observes that this workshop was probably the same atelier of Thutmose where additional masterpieces of sculpture, including the plaster head, Berlin 21299, were discovered during later German excavations. Petrie identified the group as ‘Akhenaten, queen, and princess’, and suggested that it was a trial piece, ‘perhaps a sketch for the design of some larger group’.58 Aldred accepted the Akhenaten/Nefertiti identification and proposed in the catalogue of the Brooklyn Museum exhibition of 1973 that the plumpness of the figures was due to the fact that they were unfinished, and would eventually have been

55 Height c. 16 cm. Pendlebury et al., COA III, 17, no. 12, pl. lvii.i. I am very grateful to Helen Whitehouse and the Ashmolean Museum, for permission to examine the piece firsthand.
56 My thanks are due to Barbara Adams and the Petrie Museum for permission to publish UC 004.
57 PM IV, 199–207; Aldred, Akhenaten and Nefertiti (New York, 1973), 47.
58 Tell El Amarna, 30–1, pl. i.1.
carved with pleated garments similar to the closest parallel, Louvre E. 15593 (pl. VII, 1–2) and painted as well.\textsuperscript{59} The Louvre statuette is inscribed in paint with the names of Akhenaten, Nefertiti, and the later names of the Aten in two columns on the back of the plinth, indicating a date of manufacture after Akhenaten’s Year 9.\textsuperscript{60} Because both statuettes display a relaxed physical rendering of the human form noticeably softer than the severe, exaggerated style of Akhenaten’s earlier years, Aldred dated the Louvre group to late in Akhenaten’s reign, and UC 004 to the same time or a little earlier by association. He compared them to a similar statue of Nefertiti alone, also excavated in Thutmosis’ workshop, Berlin 21263, which although considerably larger (40 cm) displays the same later characteristics.\textsuperscript{61} The seemingly nude body with its tell-tale flared sleeve would have been carved with the pleats of a tight-fitting gown had it been finished.

Julia Samson, in her study of Amarna objects in the University College Museum, interprets UC 004 quite differently.\textsuperscript{62} She identifies the statuette as Akhenaten and Nefertiti, but sees in the fleshiness of their figures an indication of an earlier date for the piece. She describes the queen’s figure as the ‘taut upright body of a young woman’ while the king’s is ‘fleshy like his father’s in his later years’. She points out that the queen wears a Theban tripartite wig, with the lappets pendent over the breasts, a wig which Nefertiti consistently wears throughout the Karnak Aten complex, but only in her very earliest representations at Amarna. Samson identifies the small princess as probably Meritaten, the eldest of the royal couple’s six daughters, and suggests that the statuette commemorates the arrival of the royal family at Amarna. Samson’s iconographic analysis makes sense when viewed strictly within the parameters of Akhenaten’s immediate family, but there are some interesting problems. Aldred is correct in associating UC 004 with votive statuettes that are stylistically late. The relaxed nature of the king’s and queen’s bodies displays no hint of the severe distortion of Akhenaten’s earlier style;\textsuperscript{63} rather, the artist has represented two mature adults with the fuller, softer bodies of middle age, in the style of Berlin 21263 which represents an older Nefertiti. How then do we explain the seeming contradiction of iconography and style?

Samson notes two other details of the queen’s figure unique to this statuette, which not only set it apart from other votive statuettes at Amarna, but also provide important iconographic clues to the identity of the person being portrayed. First are the two upward-curving lines at the base of the abdomen, just above the pubic area. Although Samson does not discuss it further, this artistic device is undoubtedly intended to indicate the effects of repeated childbirth on the female body, and thus underscores the maturity of the woman being represented. On other statues, Nefertiti, who bore at least

\textsuperscript{59} Akhenaten and Nefertiti, 63–4, fig. 41.

\textsuperscript{60} Louvre E. 15593 (= E. 22746); height 22.2 cm, width 12.3 cm, depth 9.8 cm; ibid., figs. 39–40; Aldred, Akhenaten, King of Egypt (London, 1988), figs. 20–1; profile view, J. Monnet, L’Égypte (Paris, 1963), 92; for an excellent colour photograph, see J. Leclant et al., L’Empire des Conquérants (Paris, 1979), 175. The statuette is included in this study with the kind permission of the Louvre Museum.

\textsuperscript{61} Aldred, Akhenaten and Nefertiti, 66, fig. 44; K.-H. Priese, Ägyptisches Museum (Museuminsel Berlin) (Mainz am Rhein, 1991), 108–10 no. 66.

\textsuperscript{62} Amarna, City of Akhenaten and Nefertiti: Nefertiti as Pharaoh (Warminster, 1978), 21–2, fig. 5a.

\textsuperscript{63} Compare with Berlin 21835, excavated at Amarna (house N48,15), white calcite, height 12 cm: Fay, Egyptian Museum Berlin, 92 cat. no. 47; and the Karnak colossi of Akhenaten: Aldred, Akhenaten and Nefertiti, 29–31, figs. 9–12.
The figures stand on the south side of each colossus, while those of Amenhophet III's mother stand on the north. The figure of Queen Tiye on the northern colossus is mostly destroyed, but a small section of her right breast preserves the double line.

See the figures of Tiye carved on the side panels of her gilded funerary shrine from KV 55, which originated at Amarna; T. M. Davis, The Tomb of Queen Tiye (London, 1910), pls. xxix, xxxii–iii. See also the representations of the queen in the tomb of her steward Huya at Amarna; Davies, Rock Tombs III, pls. iv, vi, viii, ix, and xvi.

Brooklyn Museum 29.34: height 21.9 cm, width 4.8 cm, depth 4.4 cm (the feet are restored); excavated by the EES in 1923 in House Q44.1, room 8; Aldred, Akhenaten and Nefertiti, 168 cat. no. 96; R. A. Fazzini, Art from the Age of Akhenaten (Brooklyn, 1973), 15, fig. 11.

The stately and relief work of Akhenaten is remarkably consistent in the teardrop stomach detail; for the best compilation, see Aldred, Akhenaten and Nefertiti.


69See n. 33.
hotep III's mortuary temple where the king is rendered with the same distinctive physique. The confusion over the identity of the royal couple of UC 004 has been exacerbated by the missing heads which would have exhibited physiognomies unlike those of Akhenaten and Nefertiti. Fortunately, the bodies contain enough diagnostic information to provide an identification without the heads.

I originally thought that I might have located the missing head of the king in the collection of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. BMFA 11.1506 (pl. VIII, 1–4) is a tiny limestone head of a khepresh-crowned king, 3.75 cm in height. The khepresh-crown is squat, preserves traces of blue paint and gold leaf at the diadem bands, and is supported at the back by a narrow plinth. The face of the king is broad, jowly, and features a 'shadow' eye, only partly carved to provide a platform for a painted eye. The nose has been flattened sometime after the manufacture of the piece, as has the upper lip, but the preserved lower lip is full, and two shallow depressions descend from the corners of the mouth. The king's ears are large with fleshy, pierced lobes, and exhibit remarkable interior detailing for their diminutive size. Finally, the king sports a prominent double chin and a noticeably thick neck. The distinctive features of the Boston head compare well with portrait sculpture and relief work from the last decades of Amenhotep III's reign, including the Amarna material. The profile of the king's head and crown is comparable to its two-dimensional counterpart on the British Museum stela BM 57399, where Amenhotep III's khepresh-crown is also noticeably squatter than Akhenaten's, and his neck is quite thick. The head bears no resemblance at all to the thin-necked, long faces of Akhenaten, even in the late statuettes, such as Cairo JE 43580. The carving style of the Boston piece with its shadow eye and detailing of the crown and uraeus is essentially identical to the Louvre statuette of Akhenaten and Nefertiti and was very possibly produced at the same Amarna workshop.

A comparison of the broken underside of the Boston head with a plaster impression of the neck break of the king on UC 004, kindly provided by Barbara Adams of the Petrie Museum, revealed corresponding break lines that suggested a match between the two pieces. In June 1993 Rita Freed of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts generously sent the Boston head to London for comparison with the body, and it became clear that although the scale of the two pieces is practically identical, the back pillar of the Boston head was too broad by a few millimetres. UC 004 and MFA 11.1506 then, represent fragments of two votive statuettes of Amenhotep III manufactured for veneration at Amarna.

Several conclusions can now be drawn. First, iconographic details linking UC 004 to statuary of Amenhotep III and Tiye suggest that the University College votive statuette represents Amenhotep III, Tiye, and a young princess, in all probability Baketaten, based

71 The identification of Boston MFA 11.1506 as Amenhotep III was first proposed by Edna R. Russmann at the Cleveland Museum of Art Symposium, 'Amenhotep III: Art Historical Analysis', November 20, 1987, in a paper entitled 'Palace and Tomb: The Nature of Eighteenth Dynasty Egyptian Painting'. I am most grateful to her and to Rita E. Freed and the Boston Museum of Fine Arts for permission to publish it here.
72 The 'shadow' eye is often carved, as it is in Boston MFA 11.1506, with a raised bevel that creates the illusion of an eyelid without an actual carved line. The device occurs on Louvre E. 15593 and a khepresh-crowned head of a larger statue of Akhenaten in the Egyptian Museum, Turin, 1398 (limestone; height 10 cm); A. M. Donadoni Roveri, Museo Egizio (Turin, 1991), 19, upper left.
73 Aldred, Akhenaten and Nefertiti, 65, fig. 42; J. Vandier, Manuel d'archéologie égyptienne, III. Les grandes époques: La statuaire (Paris, 1958), pl. 110, no. 1.
on her association with the couple elsewhere at Amarna. As such, UC 004 is essentially a three-dimensional variation of the lintel scene in Huya’s tomb, and received the same veneration at Amarna that statues of Akhenaten and his family received in house and garden shrines devoted to the cult of the royal family. The style of the sculpture is Aldred’s ‘late’ style, exhibiting a relaxed, naturalistic rendering of the ageing bodies of the older royal couple. The small Boston head, MFA 11.1506, belonged to a painted and gilded statuette of Amenhotep III executed in the same style and at approximately the same scale, and may also have been part of a family group. The gilding and superb quality of the carving show that the statuette, despite its size, was an important object of veneration. Similarities of style and workmanship link UC 004 and the Boston head with the inscribed Louvre statuette of Akhenaten and Nefertiti. E. 15593. It is possible that all three pieces were produced in the same workshop, perhaps that of the sculptor Thutmosis, sometime after Akhenaten’s Year 9, although the archaeological evidence indicates that votive statuettes of this sort were produced at various sculpture ateliers across the site. A fragment of a similar, unfinished sculpture group in limestone in the collection of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, 1936.658 (TA 35/563) (pl. VIII, 5), was excavated at Amarna by the EES in the ‘Sculptors’ area’ of the Great Palace. Preserved is Nefertiti’s roughed-out head with distinctive flat-topped crown and the complete width of the back pillar (7 cm across) with the attachment point for another head beside hers. Unlike Louvre E. 15593 and UC 004, Nefertiti’s head is on the right.

The statuette UC 004 raises some other interesting questions, particularly concerning the identification of the tiny princess as Baketaten. The latter is known to us primarily from the tomb of Huya, Steward to Queen Tiye, where she is shown in the company of Amenhotep III and Tiye in the famous lintel scene, and with Tiye alone on several other occasions. A scene in the same tomb shows the overseer of the sculptures of Queen Tiye, Iwta, putting the finishing touches to a small statue of the princess. Baketaten is always shown relatively small in relation to Amenhotep III and Tiye in these scenes, consistently smaller even than Akhenaten and Nefertiti’s eldest daughter Meritaten when they appear in the same scene. Her appearance as a toddler on UC 004, produced at least after Akhenaten’s Year 9, and in the company of both Tiye and Amenhotep III, suggests a number of possibilities. Baketaten must have been born sometime after the beginning of Akhenaten’s reign, after the point when some believe that Amenhotep III had died. Whether Baketaten was their daughter or granddaughter, all three are represented as alive in Huya’s tomb and in the UC 004 statuette nine to twelve years after the beginning of Akhenaten’s reign, and nine to twelve years after Amenhotep III’s supposed death. Amarna art is famous for its sometimes painful truthfulness; it does not make sense that Amenhotep III would be depicted alive, holding hands with the living Queen Tiye and Baketaten, if he were actually dead. There were specific artistic conventions for depicting

---

74 Aldred, Akhenaten and Nefertiti, 58–66. It is even possible that UC 004 is a finished piece, never intended to receive the carved pleats of robe and kilt.

75 Height 7 cm; COA III, 81. I thank Helen Whitehouse for this reference and for permission to include it here. For some additional unfinished pieces of votive sculpture found at Amarna, see R. Anthes, ‘Werkverfahren Ägyptischer Bildhauer’, MDAIK 10 (1941), 86–9, pl. 18 (Berlin 21254; queen or princess, quartzite), pls. 19–20 (Berlin 21238; genuflecting king, limestone).

76 Davies, Rock Tombs III, pl. xviii. A statuette in the Nelson Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City, Missouri, 47.13, height 39.6 cm, is the three-dimensional equivalent of the statuette depicted in Huya’s tomb, minus the gown; Aldred, Akhenaten and Nefertiti, 131 cat. no. 53.
deceased individuals at Amarna: lying on a bier, as the deceased princess Maketaten and another individual are shown in the royal tomb; standing upright in statue form and crowned with a cone of scented fat in a vine- and papyrus-bedecked shrine, as is Maketaten and another individual in the royal tomb; and last, (at least for non-royal nobility) in mummified form crowned with a cone of scented fat. The figures of Amenhotep III from Amarna display none of the characteristics of a deceased individual found elsewhere in Amarna art.

There is now evidence that life-size or larger figures of Amenhotep III were to be found in certain stone Aten temple or palace scenes as well. A late-style limestone block from Amarna reused at Hermopolis, now in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art (1991.240.1) preserves most of the neck and shoulder of a slightly over-lifesize king that has recently been identified as another Amarna representation of Amenhotep III. The lower part of the king’s short curled wig, fillet, and diagonal back streamers from which a sun-disk-crowned cobra rears, protecting the king’s back, remain. Three distinguishing characteristics identify the figure as Amenhotep III. First, the king wears a double shebyu-necklace of gold disk beads which neither Akhenaten nor any other member of his immediate family is ever shown wearing in his Aten complexes, yet which is one of the major iconographic devices utilized by Amenhotep III to indicate his deification. Second, the neck of the king is short and thick, stylistically unlike the slender necks of Akhenaten (or Nefertiti) but comparable to the characteristic thick neck of Amenhotep III. Third, the sunk relief of the king’s body is cut considerably deeper into the stone than any other known sunk-relief figure of Akhenaten or his family, yet this deeper cutting is another hallmark of the sunk-relief carving of Amenhotep III’s last decade, just as his raised-relief carving for this time is unusually high. It seems

77 G. T. Martin, The Royal Tomb at El’-Amarna, II (London, 1989), pls. 58, 61, 63, and 64.
78 Ibid., pls. 25, 68, and 69.
79 Ibid., pl. 25, possibly Queen Tiye.
80 Davies, Rock Tombs III, pl. xxii.
81 MMA 1991.240.1, length 53.7 cm: Dorothea Arnold, BMMA 50/2 (Fall 1992), 7 (ill.); also G. Roeder, Amarna-Reliefs aus Hermopolis, Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Hermopolis-Expedition in Hermopolis 1929–1939, II (Hildesheim, 1969), pl. 185 (PC 94), right half of block; R. Hanke, Amarna-Reliefs aus Hermopolis: Neue Veröffentlichungen und Studien (HÄB 2; Hildesheim, 1978) 216 fig. 4.9, left half of block. I originally thought the block represented a late portrait of Akhenaten who had assumed the deification iconography of his deceased father, but have since been convinced by the arguments of Dorothea Arnold that the relief represents Amenhotep III himself; see Johnson, in Berman (ed.), Art of Amenhotep III, 45–6, drawing 8.
82 This wig is the one worn by Amenhotep III in votive figures where he is associated with the god Khonsu Nefertopol; see Bryan, in Bryan and Kozloff, Egypt’s Dazzling Sun, 159–61, 198–202.
83 I have observed one unpublished Re-Horakhty block from the Tenth Pylon at Karnak where (presumably) Amenhotep IV wears the shebyu-necklace (with undifferentiated beads) in a doorway scene, but he is not attested wearing it on any other monument at Thebes (outside of private tomb scenes), Amarna, or elsewhere, although the necklace does appear on papyrus stands in offering scenes; see Roeder, Amarna-Reliefs aus Hermopolis, pl. 156. 42-VIII A. Another block from Hermopolis, Louvre E. 11519, preserves the middle sections of two princesses (?) playing with (but not wearing) a shebyu-necklace; see Roeder, ibid., pl. 198 (PC 185).
84 Arnold, BMMA 50/2, 7. Cf. figures of Akhenaten wearing the same wig: I. E. S. Edwards, Hieroglyphic Texts from Egyptian Stelae, etc., VIII (British Museum, London, 1939), pl. xxiii, BM 24431; Roeder, Amarna-Reliefs aus Hermopolis, pl. 37. 108-VIII A. For a figure of Nefertiti wearing the wig, see ibid. pl. 172. PC 28 (Brooklyn Museum 60.197.8); J. D. Cooney, Amarna Reliefs from Hermopolis in American Collections (Mainz am Rhein, 1965), 20 no. 12.
85 Dorothea Arnold, personal communication.
86 For the ‘deification’ relief style of Amenhotep III’s fourth decade, see Johnson, AHi VI CIE, 231; idem, in Berman (ed.) Art of Amenhotep III, 35.
extraordinary that the rules governing Amenhotep III's relief carving would be found in scenes featuring him at Amarna, yet this appears to be the case. One can only speculate as to the nature of the scenes that featured the older king, but they were undoubtedly similar to those found in Huya's tomb and on the BM stela. Another Hermopolis block in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (1991.237.85) preserves the deeply carved, sandal-shod feet of a striding king on a ground line and probably also belongs to a figure of Amenhotep III. There is no certainty that the two blocks preserve parts of the same figure, but it should be noted that the feet are not standing on a dais, as one would expect for the representation of a deceased king.

The votive statuette of Amenhotep III in the Petrie Museum and others like it represent a new preoccupation with the divinity of the living royal body separate from the divinity of the king as the sun's disk and other gods, an important aspect of Amenhotep III's deification programme. Based on examples found in situ at Amarna, statuettes of Amenhotep III's and Akhenaten's families were set up there and elsewhere in Egypt by honoured members of the court in palace, house, and garden shrines, and were worshipped as gods in their own right.

Conclusions

The 'circumstantial evidence' of Amenhotep III's presence at Amarna is growing with every passing year and obliges us to reconsider his role in the Amarna episode. The identification and worship of Amenhotep III as the sun's disk must have made a tremendous impression on Akhenaten before he came to the throne. If the two kings ruled consecutively, Akhenaten's devotion to and preoccupation with the sun disk, the Aten, certainly had its origins in the eventful last decade of his father's rule and at the very least should be viewed as an evolving continuation of those momentous events. If the two kings ruled together, then there is now a possible theological motivation or rationale for that state of affairs that is gradually emerging.

Just as Queen Tiye participated in the deification ritual of her husband, became the living manifestation of all of Egypt's goddesses, and was represented thereafter in the tripartite wig and plumed/horned crown of the sun god's consort Hathor in numerous reliefs and statuary, even at Amarna, so might the presence of Shu, the firstborn child of the creator god, have been ritually required in Amenhotep III's deification programme in order to complete his own divine triad. The iconography of Akhenaten's monuments, particularly in the earlier work, stresses the king's role as the god Shu, the embodiment of air, light, sunbeams, and all life. On an early Amarna relief from Brooklyn, 41.82, Nefertiti offers to the Aten a figure of Shu crowned with his distinctive four feathers. 87 A number of the sandstone colossi of Akhenaten found at East Karnak were originally crowned with these same four feathers of Onuris-Shu, 88 while Akhenaten's exaggerated female characteristics in his sculpture and relief work underscore Shu's dual nature at creation as inherently both male and female. Nefertiti shared this role as Tefnut, the female counterpart of Shu. 89

Hermann Te Velde has described how in the Coffin Texts it is Shu’s birth, or separation from his father Atum, that causes them both to come to life and consciousness.\(^90\) Their separation initiates creation itself, and causes Atum to open his eyes, which become the sun and the moon. Because Shu and his father essentially create each other and cannot exist without each other, the deified Amenhotep III in his role of creator god may have required the presence of Shu in the form of his coregent son, Akhenaten, as the means to attain and perpetuate his exalted state. Thus the coregency of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten may have had a theological basis, and was intentionally patterned after the unique relationship of Atum and Shu. The two kings, as dictated by Amenhotep III’s deification programme, would have been separate yet pendant to each other, linked theologically, every day recreating each other, every day recreating creation. The significance of the god Atum to Akhenaten is nowhere more evident than when, in his later fury against Amun and the gods of Thebes, figures of Atum are generally spared.

The style of Amenhotep III’s momentum decoration underwent sweeping changes at the time of his first jubilee in Year 30, from the traditional Thutmoside style to an exaggerated art style which emphasized his new youthfulness and introduced solar-related iconography that communicated his assimilation with the creator god and the sun’s disk. The style of Amenhotep IV/Akhenaten’s monument decoration underwent similar changes at the same time, from a traditional style in his first year or two to an exaggerated art style which emphasized his unique nature as the first born of the creator god, male and female in one.\(^91\) The long coregency model allows the kindred artistic and iconographic innovations of both kings to have occurred simultaneously in order to emphasize their ritual Atum/Shu relationship, while the separation of the two courts was dictated by the nature of that relationship. This model would also suggest that the stimulus for Akhenaten’s divine father, the ‘Living Re-Horakhty/Aten’, was his actual father, the living, deified Amenhotep III, the ‘Dazzling Aten’, the most extraordinary of all of Amenhotep III’s many deified forms.\(^92\)

According to this model, Amenhotep IV/Akhenaten became junior coregent by Amenhotep III’s Year 29 and immediately inaugurated the worship of the senior king in the form of the falcon-headed Re-Horakhty at Karnak prior to and in preparation for Amenhotep’s first jubilee. After his jubilee in Year 30 the newly deified Amenhotep III’s living apotheosis as the sun god was commemorated by the inauguration of the Aten complex at Karnak, with Amenhotep IV acting as high priest, and the representation of the deified king as the rayed orb. Additional Aten temples were set up simultaneously in Heliopolis, Memphis, and elsewhere, and the cult, primarily royal, was simply one among the many traditional cults. Amenhotep IV changed his name to Akhenaten in his Year 5, which coincided with the celebration of Amenhotep III’s second jubilee (also the jubilee of the Aten),\(^93\) and founded Akhetaten, the ‘Horizon of the Aten’, present-day Amarna, at the directive of the Aten himself, to be the primary cult centre of the Aten.

---

\(^90\)‘Schu,’ LÄ V, 735.

\(^91\) Müller, Die Kunst Amenophis’ III und Echnatons, 1-106-112; Aldred, Akhenaten and Nefertiti, 48-57.

\(^92\) Battiscombe Gunn commented long ago on Akhenaten’s divine ‘coregent’ in his ‘Notes on the Aten and His Names’, JEA 9 (1923), 168–70.

alone. Akhenaten and the court moved to the new city by Year 9, coinciding with Amenhotep III’s third jubilee, and it is to this period that most of the monuments of Amenhotep III found at Amarna belong, dated by the later spelling of the Aten’s name. Egypt’s other cults contributed goods to the Aten cult and coexisted peacefully with it until Amenhotep III’s death around Akhenaten’s Year 11. Soon after he assumed sole rule in Year 12, and possibly in reaction to the unexpected death of his father, Akhenaten issued the almost incomprehensible order to hack out every reference to or representation of Amun and the Theban pantheon throughout Egypt, an act that was to damn him to the same fate shortly thereafter.

In summary, Akhenaten’s new solar cult was not only rooted in the deification programme of his father, but was probably the culmination of that deification programme. Amenhotep III’s deification and worship as the sun’s disk supplies a theological rationale for the joint rule of the two kings, a subject long in dispute. In this discussion of sculpture of Amenhotep III from Amarna and elsewhere, some of it long assumed to be that of Akhenaten, I hope the need has been demonstrated to re-examine other such previously excavated material with a critical eye. Circumstantial or not, the indirect evidence of Amenhotep III’s active participation in the Amarna period is accumulating, and providing vital clues to one of ancient Egypt’s most fascinating and complex periods.

---

94 For the certain founding of Akhetaten in Year 5, see Murnane, “The “First Occasion of the Discovery” of Akhetaten’, SAK 14 (1987), 239–41.
95 Aldred, Akhenaten, King of Egypt, 273.
97 As this article was going to press, it was brought to my attention by Christina Karlshausen, Brussels, that a fourth statue of Queen Tiye exists with the double lines under her breasts, Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Egizio, inv. no. 22. This larger-than-lifesize grano-diorite statue was appropriated by Ramesses II who reinscribed it for his mother Tuya, and went so far as to recarve the face. The folds beneath the breasts can only be seen from the sides.
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