Late Period temples have their own specific characteristics, such as large, protective, mudbrick temenos walls, hardstone shrines with complex decorations or long mythological texts, colonnaded entrances, innovations such as the wabet and “mammisi,” and burials of royal family members, including the divine adoratrices, within the temple complexes. Representative examples are the Late Period temples at Tanis, Sais, Mendes, and Hibis.

The New Kingdom was a period of great development of divine temples (dedicated to gods) and "mansions of millions of years" (memorial temples). If the constructions in the Delta (Tell el-Balamun, Pi-Ramesse) have been poorly preserved, those of Upper Egypt, especially at Thebes, display the grandeur typical of New Kingdom Temples. The Karnak complex (Barguet 1962/2006) developed over an extended period in an evolutionary fashion along its two major axes (East-West and North-South), allowing us to grasp its building stages with their various aims and purposes at specific moments in time. In the temples of Ramses III at Karnak and Medinet Habu, we can discern a model that was used regularly in later periods, albeit with a number of modifications.

Unfortunately it is difficult to follow the temple development that occurred from the end of the New Kingdom to the beginning of the Ptolemaic Period, because the scant remaining physical traces on which we base our reconstruction have been much degraded. Such poor preservation is largely a result of the military and economic difficulties that Egypt faced during that span of seven hundred years (Jansen-Winkeln 2006; Kienitz 1953; Kitchen 1996); moreover, important building programs were not embarked upon during certain dynasties when the central authority was particularly weak. The numerous temples in the Delta especially suffered from military activity in antiquity, particularly during the Assyrian invasion and the Second Persian Period.

During the Byzantine Period and later, the number of surviving temples was further diminished. The walls were dismantled, the limestone blocks being taken away to the lime kilns and the granite blocks being reused in the construction of villages, cities, and Byzantine or Islamic-Period monuments, while the mudbrick remains suffered from the activities of the sebakhin and the deteriorating influence of the wet Delta climate. This may explain why the Temple of Hibis in the
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Kharga Oasis, at the edge of the depression, is comparatively so much better preserved. A large number of Late-Period temple sites have been only partially explored. The recent excavations in Tanis, Bubastis, Athribis, Mendes, Sais, Buto, and Tell el-Balamun are beginning to fill in some of the voids in our knowledge.

**Characteristics and Innovations**

Several innovations, which appear to be elements of the transition from the New Kingdom temple to the Ptolemaic, can be discerned in the concept of Late Period temples and surrounding areas. At Tanis, Sais, and Mendes, the royal tombs were built inside the temenos walls (Quack 2006; Stadelmann 1971). Similarly, the funerary chapels of the Divine Adoratrice/God’s Wife of Amun were located within the precinct of Medinet Habu. In the Kushite Period (25th Dynasty) the entrance of the temple was embellished with a colonnade, which foreshadows the kiosk structure featured in many temples dated to the Ptolemaic Period. The temple of Amun at Hibis, dated to the Persian Period (27th Dynasty), has several chapels on the roof, which likewise prefigure roof chapels of the Ptolemaic Period. In Dynasty 30 an intense program to construct enormous mudbrick enclosure walls was inaugurated to protect temples from outside threats. In the same period, but apparent as early as the 26th Dynasty, the number of hardstone naoi (shrines that house the statue of the god) in the temples increases. These shrines are decorated with complex scenes or long mythological texts, such as those from Saft el-Henna. The style of the 26th Dynasty is characterized by a preference for “archaizing” art, to be distinguished from the “archaistic” art of the 30th Dynasty (Arnold 1999: 308 - 309; Bothmer 1960: XXXVII).

**The Third Intermediate Period**

At the end of the 20th Dynasty a division takes place between the Theban king-priests, starting with Herihor, and the new dynasty founded by Smendes, which establishes itself at Tanis. At Karnak, Pinedjem continues the decoration of the Khonsu temple and during his reign restorations took place at Medinet Habu, as attested by the restoration texts. The creation of Tanis—the Egyptian Djanel, capital of the pharaohs of the 21st Dynasty, in the northeastern Delta on the Pelusiac branch of the Nile—is the most striking event of this period (Brissaud 1987, 1998: 19 - 32, Brissaud and Zivie-Coche 1998, 2000; fig. 1). In the northern part of the site, a vast temenos was surrounded by an enormous mudbrick wall, on which stamps of the cartouche of Psusennes I have been found. Psusennes I had constructed there a temple of Amun-Ra “Lord of the Throne of the Two Lands,” of which the foundation deposits have been found, but which has subsequently been remodeled and enlarged to such an extent that it is impossible to say what the original building looked like (fig. 2). The mudbrick enclosure wall also included the area where had been established the tombs of the kings and members of the royal families of both the 21st and 22nd dynasties (Smendes, Psusennes I, Ramses-Ankhfenemut, Underbaumndj, Amenemope, Osorkon I, Siamun, Psusennes II, Osorkon II, Takelot I, Shoshenq II, Hornakht, Takelot II, Shoshenq III). The tombs were polytaphs, containing a number of burials, and after various changes served as royal cachettes (Roulin 1998). This radical innovation was probably instigated by the layout of the site of Tanis itself: a sandy tell in the midst of agricultural land, far removed from the gebel—the mountains that form the natural boundary of the Nile valley, where for centuries the tombs of the pharaohs and the elite were chiseled out. The tradition of royal burial within the temenos walls continued at Sais (Spencer, N. 2006) by the rulers of the 26th Dynasty, whose tombs unfortunately have been plundered, and at Mendes, in the burial chamber of Nephertites I (Redford 2004). The sarcophagus of Nectanebo II, re-used and finally found at Alexandria, may have originally been part of a burial in Memphis.

From its beginning Tanis was conceived of as a northern replica of Thebes, where, in
addition to Amun, Mut and Khonsu were venerated. The Mut temple, south of the precinct of Amun, is definitively dated to the Third Intermediate Period: foundation deposits with the name of Siamun have been discovered at the entrance gate. A temple dedicated to Khonsu may have been built at that time north of the Amun temple, later to be rebuilt during the 30th Dynasty, as demonstrated by the discovery of statues of the god in the form of a baboon, with cartouches of Psusennes I. During the 21st Dynasty, a temple dedicated to Amun of Ipet, discovered as recently as the end of the twentieth century, was built on the southern part of the tell, modeling the one in Luxor. Building activities of the kings of the 21st Dynasty are rarely encountered in other parts of Egypt (Jansen-Winkeln 2007a). The few examples are the temple of Isis at Giza (Zivie-Coche 1991: 45 - 79) and, at Memphis, a chapel with the name of Siamun, dedicated by Ankhefenmut.

During the 22nd Dynasty (Jansen-Winkeln 2007b) Shoshenq I erected a temple to Amun-Ra “Great of Fame, Lord of the Promontory” at el-Hiba/Teudjoi. At Karnak he built the Bubastide gate and a double colonnade along the court in front of the second pylon. On the southern portico an inscription of the “Annals of Osorkon” can be found, which has been dated to years 11 and 12 of Takelot I (Caminos 1958; The Epigraphic Survey 1954). Osorkon II was a prolific builder, of whose constructions we find remains in Upper as well as Lower Egypt. Planning to be buried at Tanis, he considerably enlarged the main temple, where the second and third pylons are attributed to his reign. These gateways, their entrances conspicuously flanked by pairs of obelisks, are impressive even today. Columns from the Old Kingdom, already reused by Ramses II (probably at Pi-Ramesse, the present-day Qantir), were transported to Tanis, where Osorkon II usurped them by inscribing his name.
Moreover, they have been found outside the temple complex of Amun-Ra there, where they had again been reused, perhaps during the 30th Dynasty, in what is now a dilapidated ruin known as the “East Temple” (fig. 3). Shoshenq III added to the temple complex, particularly by building a monumental access gate at the west side, which remained functional for the duration of the temple’s use. In addition, we know that Shoshenq V built a temple, subsequently dismantled. Building stones bearing his name have been found reused in the construction of the sacred lake of the 30th Dynasty.

The temple of Bubastis benefited from important additions by Osorkon II, who had a special connection to the goddess Bastet, “Lady of Bubastis” (Habachi 1957; Tietze 2003): a monumental gate was erected, decorated with sed-festival scenes that present details not attested elsewhere (Naville 1892; Fig. 4).

A practice characteristic of the Third Intermediate Period was to erect “donation stelae,” which guaranteed the temple donations specified upon them. These stelae have very specific formulations and a unique iconography. They are particularly numerous during the 21st and 22nd dynasties and have also been attested for the 26th (Saite) Dynasty, but become increasingly rare after that period. The donation formulae clearly show that private individuals with links to the temple, such as gate-keepers, would receive a plot of land from the king (or from a great chief of the Meshwesh during the Libyan Period) through an intermediary official. The recipient would have the right to work the land in exchange for payment of part of the harvest to the temple (Meeks 1979b). This well-recorded system gives important information on the administrative and economic function of temples at this time.

The period of the Libyan anarchy (Gomaà 1974; Yoyotte 1961) has left scant architectural remains. Best known are the tombs of military and religious dignitaries: in Memphis, the tomb of prince Shoshenq, son of Osorkon II and high priest of Ptah (Badawi 1956); and at Herakleopolis, the tombs of several great chiefs of the Ma (Pérez-Die and Vernus 1992).

The 25th Dynasty
The Kushite kings exercised their power primarily at Thebes, although Memphis was also the object of their attention, as indicated by the “Shabaqo Stone” (Junker 1940), a copy of an ancient mythological text, the cosmological part probably Ramesside (the dating of this important document is still under debate). A further indication of the importance of the northern city was a restoration decree, on a stele of Taharqa, for...
the Memphite temple of “Amun at the head of the gods” (Meeks 1979a). Previously, Piankhy had recorded his offerings in all the temples of the conquered land on his victory stele, found at Gebel Barkal (Grimal 1981).

In the temple of Karnak, Taharqo built a western colonnade in the temple court west of the second pylon, of which only one column is extant today, while of the other columns only the lower parts and remains of the “screen” walls that once connected the columns have been preserved. Three additional colonnades at each of the other cardinal points completed the design. A similar construction was built in front of the temple of Montu in north Karnak and at the entrance of the 18th-Dynasty temple at Medinet Habu (Leclant 1965). The most original monument is the Edifice of Taharqo (Cooney 2000; Parker et al. 1979), built near the sacred lake of Karnak. At present only the subterranean part of the structure is extant, the superstructure having been for the most part destroyed. There is no building that parallels this unique structure; we therefore have no comparison on which to base a reconstruction of the upper part. The underground rooms are dedicated to Amun-Ra, narrowly associated with Osiris. The walls are decorated with the Litany of Ra, a hymn to the ten bos of Amun, and the first known representation of the Mount of Djeme, which was thought to cover the cenotaph of Osiris on the west bank of the Nile at Thebes. The fundamental aspects of the theology of Amun that become manifest during the Late Period are found for the first time on the walls of the Edifice of Taharqo. A restoration text of Montuemhat, governor of Thebes, inscribed in one of the small rooms of the Mut temple (Leclant 1961), relates a temple inventory that took place during the reign of Taharqo as part of a program of repairs executed at that time.

The rulers of the 25th Dynasty also constructed several temples in southern Egypt and northern Sudan, at Tabo, Kawa (Macadam 1949-), and Sanam. These were mostly dedicated to Amun and built on the classical Egyptian model, with the exception of particular details that might reflect relationships with local cults. At the foot of the sacred mountain at Gebel Barkal the cult spaces were transformed or rebuilt.

The style of sculpture and relief is characterized by the search for a certain classicism, of which the paradigms hark back to the Old Kingdom (Memphis) and Middle Kingdom (Thebes). This taste for archaism continued in the succeeding dynasty.

The 26th Dynasty (Saite Period)

During the rule of the pharaohs who hailed from Sais (El-Sayed 1975), the towns of the Delta became the focus of great development. The temples were restored or rebuilt; the local cults blossomed. A good indication of this remarkable apex is the clerical titulary—that is, priestly titles that either were known from earlier texts, or occur in this period for the first time. Their associated functions were often linked to a specific god, worshiped in a specific temple. The Theban region was mostly under the direct influence of the divine adoratrices, whose power had been established since the early Third Intermediate Period. Their names, inscribed on monuments, are given the same status as that of the kings who installed them in office. The office disappeared at the end of the 26th Dynasty (Graefe 1981).

Given the poor preservation of most of the Delta sites, we often have only the temple foundations and certain stone elements remaining, while the temple superstructures have completely disappeared. The temple of Amun at Tell el-Balamun/Sema-Beheqedet was completely renovated under Psammetichus I (Spencer, J. 1996, 1999, 2003). The ongoing excavations at Buto give us a basic idea of the temple of Wadjit, built by Amasis. The same is true for the temples of Sais, although excavations have revealed very few remains in situ (Wilson 2006). At Mendes, Amasis rebuilt the temple of Banebdjed. Of the four monumental monolithic naoi, dedicated to Shu, Geb, Ra, and Osiris—the four bos of Banebdjed—only one is standing today, dominating an open field (De Meulenaere and
MacKay 1976; Lilyquist Soghor 1967). At Tanis the discovery of foundation deposits bearing the name of Apries indicates the period in which the Mut temple was renovated and embellished with a columned court fronting the temple. Similar renovations were carried out in the time of Apries of the temples of Amun and Amun of Ipet. In this period there were also building activities in Imet (Tell Nabasha/Tell Faraun) and Pithom (Tell el-Maskhuta), where Rameside monuments from Tell el-Rataba in the Wadi Tumilat were re-used. In Memphis the building activities concentrated on a restoration of the Serapeum and the construction of the palace of Apries. The many stelae dedicated to the deceased Apis date to this period (Malinine et al. 1968).

The cult of Osiris became increasingly important in the 26th Dynasty—a development that began in the 25th Dynasty, as witnessed by several shrines at Karnak. In the northern section of the temple complex there, several chapels were dedicated to specific forms of Osiris, such as “Osiris Wennefer, Neb Djefau” (Osiris Wennefer, Lord of Nourishment) and “Osiris Hery-ib pa Ished” (Osiris Who Resides in the Persea Tree). The buildings are inscribed with the names of the contemporary ruling pharaohs and divine adoratrices. The latter also erected several chapels in the Montu temple complex in north Karnak, while their funerary chapels were located within the walls of Medinet Habu (Hölscher 1954). To the south, at El-Kab, a temple of Psammetichus I has been brought to light (fig. 5), and several other temples in Upper Egypt were embellished in this period.

Remains of several 26th-Dynasty temples in the oases indicate important cult activities in the Libyan Desert. At Siwa the Egyptian-style temple of Aghurmi was dedicated to the form of Amun popular in the oasis: the god depicted with the head of a ram. This temple was built at the time of Amasis and is the only 26th-Dynasty construction of which more than the foundations remain (Colin 1998; Kuhlmann 1988). The name of Amasis is also found on several chapels in Ain Muftella in the Bahariya Oasis. These chapels were part of a carefully designed decorative program, displaying an elaborate pantheon (Labrique 2004).

Figure 5. View of the temple at El-Kab.

In spite of the fragmentary state of many of the monuments of the 26th Dynasty, the style of decoration displays a high degree of both artistry and epigraphy, with a sophistication that is typical for this period of archaizing workmanship. Many temples are embellished in this period with naos of hard stone, such as granite or greywacke (Roeder 1914). Typical also is the widespread use of Egyptian bekhen stone. Two good examples are the naos of Mefky (Louvre D29), dedicated to a local form of Osiris and dated to the rule of Amasis, and the naos of Baqlieh (Zivie 1975), dedicated to Thoth “who separates the two companions” (Cairo CG70008). The temple courts housed an abundance of statues of priests who lived during the 26th Dynasty, or slightly later, such as Neshor, Wedjähorresne, and Horkhebi (Heise 2007). These statues typically have an autobiographical text inscribed on their back pillar. The inscriptions provide us with a record of the existence of temples for which we have no other evidence and they contain information on temple function and decoration for which we have no other sources (for example, Vernus 1978).

The 27th to 29th Dynasties

In spite of the Greek historians’ traditionally anti-Persian sentiment underscoring the aggressive manipulations of the Achaemenids in Egypt, the kings of the 27th Dynasty (the
First Persian Period) apparently did not pillage or destroy the Egyptian temples, nor did they kill the sacred Apis bull, a sacrilegious crime often attributed to the Persian rulers (Devauclhelle 1995). Little evidence from this period has survived in the Nile Valley or the Delta, apart from stelae found during the excavation of the Suez Canal (Posener 1936).

In contrast, evidence from the Kharga Oasis is extremely well preserved, if not abundant. There, the temple at Hibis remains the only witness to the scope and nature of the building activities during the Late Period, before the start of the Ptolemaic Period. Construction at Hibis may have begun in the 26th Dynasty, but the temple was primarily built during the succeeding (27th) dynasty and decorated mostly by Darius. The temple was completed during the rule of the 30th-Dynasty king Nectanebo II. The construction follows the plan of the traditional Egyptian temple, but underwent a number of modifications (Winlock 1941; fig. 6).

The temple at Hibis was dedicated to Amun, “Lord of Hibis.” It contains, on one side, an adaptation of the Theban theology and, on the other, several rooms dedicated to Osiris. The decorative program encompassed notable peculiarities that have not been found elsewhere. The decorated naos has nine registers on its walls, which contain approximately 700 representations of both gods and of what may perhaps be divine statues. At the head of these representations, the king is shown in each register performing a ritual (Cruz-Urbi 1988: pp. 1-43; Davies 1953: pls. 2-5). Grouped by sepat (geographic-religious entities) they present an overview of the active cults of the time, organized by region (fig. 7). Interestingly, each sepat takes a form of Osiris. In spite of the
brevity, or complete absence, of explanatory texts, the richness of these images, many of which are unique, provides an extraordinary glimpse into the theological developments of the Late Period. By comparing these images with the earlier glosses in the mythological Delta Papyrus (Meeks 2006), or with the later Ptolemaic temple inscriptions, we find a consistent number of cults. Thus the Egyptian pantheon, or at least a large part of it, was brought together on the walls of the cella of the Amun temple at Hibis. The naos was, in effect, conceived of as a microcosmos wherein the gods of Egypt were gathered and the yearly rebirth of Osiris celebrated. This is a very different vision than that provided by Ptolemaic temple-reliefs, wherein the king was portrayed leading a procession of geographic divinities towards the main god of the temple. The latter emphasized the organization of the religious provinces, each _sepat_ being listed with their principal god, their town, and the geographical divisions.

The hypostyle hall of the Hibis temple was also decorated in an unusual fashion. The walls were laid out as an enormous papyrus roll decorated with vignettes and containing a series of hymns to Amun (Davies 1953: pls. 31 - 33; Klotz 2006). Several passages of these hymns are known from earlier texts, such as the “magical” Papyrus Harris and the hymn to the ten _ba_ of Amun from the Edifice of Taharqo at Karnak, which is one of the first examples of a religious hymn reproduced on a wall painting—a common feature in the later Ptolemaic temples.

During the 27th (Persian) Dynasty a mudbrick temple dedicated to Osiris- _iuw_ was built in the southern part of the Kharga Oasis. Excavation of this temple (at the site of Ayn Manawir, near Dush) has yielded numerous bronze statues of the god as well as a large quantity of demotic ostraca (Wuttmann et al. 1996).

The 28th and 29th dynasties have left very few traces, most likely due to prevailing political difficulties. Sparsely scattered inscribed blocks have been found bearing the names of Amyrtaios, Nepherites I, and Psammuthis (Traunecker 1979). Only the building activities of Hakoris are manifest, especially at Karnak, where his name has been found on the decoration of a bark station in front of the Temple of Amun. This ruler also ordered the restoration of the columns of Thutmose III in the small temple of Medinet Habu (Traunecker 1981). Among his dedications we find evidence for a cult, performed every ten days, wherein Amun of Ipet worshipped the primordial gods who rest in the Mount of _Djeme_. We know details of the theology surrounding this cult from Ptolemaic inscriptions in the Theban region. Another rare witness of this period is the sarcophagus of Nepherites I, which was found in the temple precinct of Banebdjed in Mendes, but the structure that once accommodated it is unfortunately in poor condition (Redford 2004).

The 30th Dynasty

Between the difficulties at the end of the 29th Dynasty and the Second Persian Period, which was much more violent than the first, Egypt was relatively calm and prosperous under the 30th-Dynasty rulers, who hailed from Sebennytos (Samanud) in the Delta (Spencer, N. 1999). In consequence, we see a wave of significant building activity throughout the country, frequently started by Nectanebo I and finished by Nectanebo II, the last indigenous pharaoh. Often these constructions served as a point of departure for later Ptolemaic temples, such as the ones at Philae, or the Iseum at Behbet el-Hagggar (Favard-Meeks 1991: 449 - 451). The two kings used their royal prerogatives to establish a cult for their statues during their lifetime, sometimes under protection of the Horus falcon (De Meulenaere 1960). The art of this period is sometimes characterized as “archaizing,” stemming from the search for models in the recent past, mostly those developed during the 26th Dynasty. Also noticeable, however, are original elements, which develop further during the following period. On the architectural front the introduction of the _wabet_ represents an
innovation. This is an open court in the temple building with a small adjacent room for the New Year’s ritual, such as that seen in the Temple of Khnum at Elephantine. We also see the creation of the first “mammisis,” or birth temples, such as those at Dendara and Philae. The number of shrines increases in temples of the 30th Dynasty. The style of reliefs, as well as that of statuary, changes considerably, with more rounded and realistic forms, and the division of the torso in three parts—an element that becomes more pronounced in later periods. Typical also is the use of hard stone, for both statuary and naoi.

In order to defend temples against increasing threats of violence, Nectanebo I initiated an enormous project of building mudbrick enclosure walls around several temple compounds, often to be finished by Nectanebo II. At Tanis, in the area of the Amun temple, a new wall was built, which was much more substantial than the one made by Psusennes. The new wall encompassed the temple of Horus of Mesen and incorporated the main entrance—the gate of Sheshonk III—on the west. The temples of Mendes and Tell el-Balamun were likewise protected with large temenos walls. In the south the enormous enclosure wall of Karnak was built, including a new stone pylon on the west side, which remained unfinished, and monumental gateways at the other cardinal points. These were decorated in the Ptolemaic Period, but the processional route to Luxor, flanked by sphinxes, was enhanced during the 30th Dynasty (Cabrol 2001). Dendara and El-Kab benefited from similar protective building efforts. The mudbrick walls show an innovative technique: the walls were no longer conceived of as one unit, but as a succession of alternating sunken and raised sections, which provide better cohesion of the whole. Moreover, the mudbrick courses are slightly curved, resulting in a wave pattern along the length of the wall (Spencer, J. 1979).

Inside the enclosure walls, massive mudbrick structures were built, known as *shena-wab*, whose function is not well understood and too little discussed. It appears that their role was primarily economic, though they without doubt had links of a religious nature as well (Traunecker 1987).

At Tanis the temple of Amun underwent several alterations during the 30th Dynasty. A colonnade was probably added to the forecourt, re-using columns of the Old Kingdom. Two deep wells also date to this period. The temple of Khons was completely rebuilt, and a sacred lake was excavated nearby, with supporting walls built of re-used blocks from the Third Intermediate or Saite Period. The limestone wall that enclosed the temple of Amun was restored, as it is attested by a foundation deposit of Nectanebo I. The obelisks in front and behind the Temple of Amun were possibly also erected in the 30th Dynasty. A temple dedicated to Horus of Mesen, rebuilt during the Ptolemaic Period, was erected south of the temple of Amun inside the enclosure wall of the 30th Dynasty and was perhaps related to the poorly preserved “East Temple.”

The rulers of the 30th Dynasty were active in Pi-Soped (Saft el-Henna), as can be deduced from naoi of Nectanebo I found there, though we find hardly a trace remaining of an associated temple. The extant naoi feature truly original decoration: one (Cairo CG 70021) bears representations of gods and divine statuary (Naville 1888; Fig. 8); another, thought to be from Ismailia, is inscribed with a mythological text that describes the quarrel between the god Shu and his son Geb (Goyon 1936); and the “naos of the decades” (Louvre D37 and Cairo JE 25774), also dated to Nectanebo I (Habachi and Habachi 1952), is broken into several fragments, others of which may be among the fragments found recently in the bay of Abuqir (von Bomhard 2006). Fragments of a naos of Nectanebo II have been discovered in Bubastis (Spencer, N. 2006).

In Naukratis, a stele of Nectanebo I (Cairo JE 34002) displays epigraphy of high quality and provides detailed information relating to
taxes—including information on “custom” (import) regulations and tax deductions granted to the temple of Neith (Lichtheim 1976). Recently an almost identical stele was discovered in the underwater excavations in the bay of Abuqir, indicating the location of the sunken city of Thonis/Herakleion (Yoyotte 2006). A stele of Nectanebo at Hermopolis/Ashmunein (Cairo JE 72130) indicates the construction there of a temple of the goddess Useret-Nehemtawyt and a temple of Thoth, both of which were protected by a new enclosure wall (Roeder 1954, 1959; Spencer, J. 1989). Though construction of the Temple of Isis, on the island of Philae in Aswan, had begun in the 26th Dynasty, as witnessed by inscribed blocks bearing the name of Amasis, the building was expanded by Nectanebo I. On the island of Elephantine, under Nectanebo II, work started on a new temple of Khnum, which was provided with the new wabet feature (Jenni 1998; Niederberger 1999). The erection of 30th-Dynasty cult structures took place far into the Western (or Libyan) desert, in the Bahariya Oasis, where the name of a certain Wenamun “Great Chief of the Desert” has been found inscribed in the remains (Gallo 2006).

After the devastation that took place during the Second Persian Period, Egypt went through a period of major development that included the reconstruction of existing temples and the creation of new religious structures—an ambitious project that was continued and intensified during the Ptolemaic Period. It should be emphasized that, prior to the Second Persian Period, both the temple design and the cults celebrated within had witnessed profound transformations, such as the creation of the wabet (the open court dedicated to the celebration of the New Year), the addition of chambers for the cult of Osiris, and the creation of the birth house, or mammisi, where the birth of the child-god was celebrated. The latter was a continuation of a development that had begun in the Third Intermediate Period, in which an emphasis on birth replaced that of the royal-divine marriage. Khons-the-Child, son of Amun and Mut, is held in high favor, but most often represented is the child-god Horus, in his various forms as Harpocrates “Horus the Infant”; Harsiese “Horus, Son of Isis”; or Harendotes “Horus, the Avenger of his Father.” His reputation has been linked to the Late-Period popularity of Isis and Osiris, which is manifest in the grand Osirian festivals held in the month of Khoiak to celebrate the rebirth of the deceased god, and in the establishment of an Iseum in several locations, such as Behbet el-Haggar and Philae. At the same time a complex and subtle theology of Amun was developed at Thebes. Amun himself, worshiped in his temples at Karnak and Luxor, honored, in his form of Amun of Ipet, a mortuary cult performed every 10 days for the deceased ancestor gods buried in the Mount of Djeme, located on the west bank, not far from the cemetery area. It is questioned whether the god may have actually visited himself every ten days, or whether “substitution cults” performed the cult in his place (Traunecker 1981).
It should be noted that the last indigenous dynasties saw the start of the development of enormous animal-necropoli, such as the Anubieion at Saqqara (Jeffreys and Smith 1988), where tens of thousands of mummified falcons, ibises, cats, and dogs were deposited, and which reflects a practice—different from that of the sacred-Apis cult—that would become especially popular in the Ptolemaic Period.

Bibliographic Notes

The history of the Late Period is very complex and many points of chronology and succession are still under debate. Yoyotte (1961) and Kitchen (1996, 3rd edition) were pioneers of Late Period scholarship. See also Gomaa (1974). Jansen-Winkeln (2006) is a recent publication with extensive bibliography. We have acquired knowledge of building activities in Egypt during the first millennium BCE thanks to excavation reports of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (e.g., Badawi 1956; Brissaud 1987, 1998; Brissaud and Zivie-Coche 1998, 2000; Hölscher 1939; Naville 1888, 1892; Pérez-Die and Vernus 1992) and to publications of the temple inscriptions (Davies 1953; Parker et al. 1979). For textual evidence of temple furnishings see Meeks (1979b) and Roeder (1954). Recent excavations, many of which are ongoing, offer a better understanding of the evolution and transformation of Late Period sites by providing improved topographic maps and plans (e.g., Redford 2004; Spencer, J. 1989, 1996, 1999, 2003; Spencer, N. 2006). Arnold (1999) has compiled a synthesis that includes the Ptolemaic Period; caution is required when using this publication, however, as several of the plans do not correspond with the visible reality, while others are merely hypothetical. Monographs dedicated to a site and its surroundings (e.g., Vernus 1978; Zivie-Coche 1991; Zivie 1975) are written from the perspective of the Kulttopographie or the géographie religieuse, offering at the same time a diachronic and synchronic overview of the history of Late Period temples and their cults.
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