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PREFACE

The present series of *varia* is more disparate than its predecessor, *Egyptian Studies* I, and in a further sense; for, although all but one of the articles that comprise it (14/4) are unpublished, a few of them were written as long ago as 1978, and most of the others were written in the 1980’s. Thus the adjective “nova” may seem a trifle misleading. While an effort has been made to keep all the articles up to date, some will undoubtedly show their age.

This series of articles also offers fewer reunings of dispersed inscriptions than its predecessor, although the one that is offered (7/2) is of considerably greater historical importance. And another chapter (1) deals with a scarcely less interesting situation, where inscriptions formerly attributed to a single individual have conversely been re-assigned to two persons, one of whom was evidently named for the other. But the chief difference in the present compilation is the much more extensive series of discussions concerning palaeography, which account for a third of the text. I have not, however, included further examples of palaeographic variants in the terminal list of addenda to Volume I.

Among the several persons who have had a part in this enterprise, I must thank my former assistants Janet Thorpe and Veronica Hamilton, who typed the manuscripts and helped in many other ways, as well as Gertrude Magnus and my wife. I am particularly indebted to Adela Oppenheim for preparing the list of abbreviations, and above all to James Allen, who has computerized the numerous hieroglyphic quotations, including a great many forms that are not to be found in the standard fonts. The final appearance of the book owes much to his skill and patience. As before, I have also received assistance from colleagues in many other institutions, to whom acknowledgment will be made in the following pages. Perhaps, however, I should here make special mention of Jean Leclant, who, on more than one occasion, has enabled me to secure information that otherwise seemed unobtainable.

The firm that produced the earlier volumes in this series is, alas, no more, and what was readily accomplished by letterpress now poses a formidable challenge to the manipulators of cold type. That is so much the case that I very much doubt whether the original format could have been reproduced by computer without the ability of Peter Der Manuelian, who has stepped in where others had failed. He has not only solved every problem, but, thanks to his Egyptological training, has provided proofs that have been remarkably free of errors. In addition to all this, he has also volunteered to assemble the index. Needless to say, he too deserves many thanks, both from myself and from my readers.

This volume, like its predecessors, has been financed by a fund established by the late Lila Acheson Wallace, and so too the research on which it is based.
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<td><em>Kush. Journal of the Sudan Antiquities Service</em>, Khartoum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacau, <em>Sarcophages</em></td>
<td>See CG + number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lange–Schäfer, <em>Grab- und Denksteine</em></td>
<td>See CG + number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay et al., Bahrain and Hemamieh</td>
<td>Ernest Mackay, L. Harding, F. Petrie. <em>Bahrain and Hemamieh</em> (BSA). London 1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDAIK</td>
<td>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo, Mainz a.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Museum of Fine Arts, Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIFAO</td>
<td>Mémoires publiés par les membres de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie orientale, Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIO</td>
<td>Mitteilungen des Instituts fur Orientforschung, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMA</td>
<td>The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMJ</td>
<td>Metropolitan Museum Journal, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Möller, Hieratische Paläographie</td>
<td>Georg Möller, <em>Hieratische Paläographie I (Alt- und Mittel-Hieratisch), II (Neuhieratisch).</em> Leipzig 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moret and Abou-Ghazi, Denkmäler des A.R. III</td>
<td>See CG and number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Morgan, Catalogue des</td>
<td>J. de Morgan et al., Catalogue des monuments et inscriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monumets</td>
<td>de l'egypte antique. Haute Egipte, Vol. I, De la Frontiere de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nubie a Kom Ombos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nianchchnum</td>
<td>Chnumhotep (AV 21).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moussa and Junge, Two</td>
<td>A.M. Moussa and F. Junge, Two Tombs of Craftsmen (AV 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tombs of Craftsmen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray, Index</td>
<td>M.A. Murray, Index of Names and Titles of the Old Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(BSA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray, Saqqara Mastabas</td>
<td>M.A. Murray, Saqqara Mastabas I. London 1905; M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murray and K. Sethe, Saqqara Mastabas II (ERA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naville, Xith Dyn. Temple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIP</td>
<td>Oriental Institute Publications, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMRO</td>
<td>Oudheidkundige Mededelingen uit het Rijksmuseum van</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oudheden te Leiden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientalia</td>
<td>Orientalia: Commentarii Periodici Pontificii Institutii Bibliici,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nova Series, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>von Ahmed Fakhry (AV 28).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paget and Pirie, Ptah-hotep</td>
<td>R.F.E. Paget and A.A. Pirie, The Tomb of Ptah-hotep (with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quibell, The Ramesseum) (ERA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrie, Athribis</td>
<td>W.M.F. Petrie, Athribis (BSA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrie, Dendereh</td>
<td>W.M.F. Petrie et al., Dendereh 1898 and Extra Plates (EEF).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrie, Deshasheh</td>
<td>W.M.F. Petrie, Deshasheh 1897 (EEF).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSBA</td>
<td><em>Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology</em>, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RdE</td>
<td><em>Revue d’Égyptologie</em>, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rec. trav.</em></td>
<td><em>Recueil de travaux relatifs a la philologie et à l’archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes</em>, Paris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABBREVIATIONS

Reisner-Smith, Hist. Giza Ncr. II

SAE
Service des Antiquités de l’Égypte, Cairo

SAK
Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur, Hamburg

Saleh, Three Old Kingdom Tombs at Thebes
Mohamed Saleh, Three Old Kingdom Tombs at Thebes (AV). Mainz 1979

Siut
See Griffith

Schenkel, Frühm. Studien
W. Schenkel, Frühmittelägyptische Studien. Bonn 1962

Simpson, Kawab, Khafkhufu I and II

Simpson, Qar and Idu

Simpson, Terrace of the Great God

Simpson, Western Cemetery

Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte, Vienna

Smith, HESPOK

Spiegelberg-Pörtner, Aegyptische Grabsteine
W. Spiegelberg and B. Pörtner, Aegyptische Grabsteine und Denksteine aus suddeutschen Sammlungen I: Karlsruhe, Mülhausen, Strassburg, Stuttgart. Strasbourg 1902

Stewart, Egyptian Stelae II

Tombeau de Ti

Tylor, Renni
J.J. Tylor, Wall Drawings and Monuments of El Kab. The Tomb of Renni. London 1900

Tylor and Griffith, Paheri
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vandersleyen, Das Alte Ägypten</td>
<td>C. Vandersleyen, Das Alte Ägypten (Propyläen Kunstgeschichte 15). Berlin 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verner, Ptahshepses</td>
<td>The Excavations of the Czechoslovak Institute of Egyptology at Abusir–I. The Mastaba of Ptahshepses: Reliefs I/1. Prague 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernier, Bijoux et orfevreries</td>
<td>See CG + number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward, Index</td>
<td>W.A. Ward, Index of Egyptian Administrative and Religious Titles of the Middle Kingdom. Beirut 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild, Ti II and III</td>
<td>See Tombeau de Ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wörterbuch</td>
<td>See Wb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WZKM</td>
<td>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZÄS</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde, Leipzig and Berlin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. A Later Tomb Chapel in the Mastaba of Ḥnty-kꜣ

While the mastaba of Ḥnty-kꜣ at Saqqara is securely dated to the early years of Pepy I’s reign, there is less certainty about the date of a secondary burial belonging to another Ḥnty-kꜣ,¹ a burial that is situated below Room III. T.G.H. James observes that the pair of false doors in this room (Fig. 1),² both of which bear the name in question as well as the nickname ḫḥꜣ, list several titles that are not attributed to the vizier elsewhere in his tomb. This fact leads him to consider whether Room III might be a subordinate chapel belonging to the person buried beneath it. He abandons that possibility, however, in favor of the conclusion that the chapel, one of two rooms annexed from a neighboring tomb, was equipped with false doors after the rest of the tomb was constructed and that their inscriptions list titles that the vizier acquired after the remainder of his mastaba had been completed.³

It is certainly true that the false doors are later, for as James likewise points out, the titles refer to the pyramid cult of Pepy I as well as that of Teti, and the only other titles of the vizier referring to Pepy’s pyramid occur in the inscriptions of the main entrance of the mastaba.⁴ But the false doors were evidently not made by the same hand that executed the inscriptions of the entrance. In the entrance, as elsewhere, the vizier uses the old phrase pri n.f hrw in the offering formulae, while the false doors have the newer formulation pri-hrw n NN.⁵ Furthermore the inscriptions of the entrance show ☐ as the determinative of qrs,⁶ rather than ☐, which appears in the false doors of Room III and in the burial chamber beneath them.

To consider this question more closely, it will be helpful to compare the titles of each false door, with an asterisk (*) placed before those that are not given the vizier elsewhere:⁷

\[
\begin{align*}
78 & \text{ (a) } \begin{array}{c}
\text{(b) } & \begin{array}{c}
\text{(c) } & \begin{array}{c}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
79 & \text{ (a) } \begin{array}{c}
\text{(b) } & \begin{array}{c}
\text{* (c) } & \begin{array}{c}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

¹ James and Apted, Khentika, pl. 40.
² Ibd., from pl. 13.
³ Ibd., p. 15.
⁴ Ibd., pl. 7.
⁵ For the old formulation see Barta, Ofsverformel, pp. 9, 16 (Bitte 2).
⁶ There are also rather similar forms elsewhere on the exterior (James and Apted, Khentika, pls. 5 [B 4. 14], 6 [C 4. D 5]) and in the burial chamber (pl. 39), while within the mastaba the form is the more usual ☐ (pls. 19 [E 1], 29).
⁷ Here and in what follows the reference numbers applied to inscriptions are those used by James, but the lettered references for the titles are my own.
One is at once struck by two points. In the first place, there is a much greater proportion of dissimilar titles in the second list. Secondly, the titles of the second list are, for the most part, of lesser importance; note, in particular, that 78 has the higher rank of hnty-t (a), while both have the more modest rank of smr-wt (78 c, 79 a), and that 78 has hry-bht hry-tp while 79 has only hry hbt (b in each case). Furthermore two of the dissimilar titles of 78, namely hpr-nsty (f) and hpr hts km (g) occur in the titularies of two viziers in neighboring mastabas, Mrw-w(i.)-kt(i.) and Ttw,8 while the third, zš mdšt ntr, occurs not only in the last two cases, but also in the titulary of the vizier Kt(i.)-gm n(i.), whose mastaba is also near at hand.9 Thus it is not at all surprising that the Vizier Hnty-kt should likewise possess them. On the other hand, several of the titles of 79 are definitely below the level that would normally be expected of a vizier. While the Vizier Hnty-kt is himself imy-r pr nswt “overseer of the king’s domain,” the lesser title sbjt pr-nswt (c) is held by one of his retainers (Ib, inscription no. 111), as are imy-r sšr (e: Fdnw,10 no. 77) and sbjt qbt (g: [Z]tw),11 no. 112; Ib, no. 123). Furthermore titles c, g and probably i constitute virtually the entire titulary on a late Old Kingdom false door of poor workmanship from the same area.12 The title zš n st (i) is applied, without mention of a specific funerary cult, to a retain in Room III (Bq[i], no. 86).

It is true that hry-sšt n pr dwt (i) is a title of some importance—one that might, in fact, be claimed by a vizier.13 But imy-r sšr is probably related to it,14 and a vizier would less prob-

---

8 Firth and Gunn, *Teti Pyramid Cemeteries*, pp. 132 (16), 153 (53); 153 (41, 42).
9 *Ibid.*, pp. 132 (12), 153 (14), 153 (45). I am sure that the reading is thus, as James suspected ([op. cit., p. 11 (11), and not zš qbt ntr. It is often claimed by the higher level of lector priest.
10 Not to be read *dbhw* here or in inscription no. 71 (where it belongs to the man behind the prisoner); for this name, meaning “The Fourth” cf. PNI, 143 (16); Ann Macy Roth, *Egyptian Phyles in the Old Kingdom* (Chicago 1991), p. 70, has also made this correction but less felicitously suggests that the title may be imy-r pr rather than imy-r sšr. The latter title occurs very frequently in this context: e.g., Davies, *Ptaḥ-khep*, pls. 5, 25, 26, 32.
11 For the reading cf. PNI, 298 (17).
14 Cf. Blackman, *JEA* 5 (1918), 148–65, and especially p. 152, where the *mt* of no. 16 should be emended to “šipet cloth” (for which see *ARCE* 2 [1963], 25). The fact that sšr is written out lends a certain emphasis to the title, but does not necessarily indicate its importance; an attendant of Tš, for example, is $\text{[ ]}$ $\text{[ ]}$ (Wild, TT II, pl. 126). Cf. also Paget and Pirie, *Ptaḥ-khep*, pl. 38, and Junker, *Giza* II, fig. 28 and p. 194 (where the final $\text{[ ]}$ is, probably wrongly, assigned to the name following, to be read H$\text{[ ]}$).
ably have claimed that title. Otherwise this comparison leaves \textit{hry sḥu n mdw-nfr} (I) which is appropriate to any lector priest; \textit{wrh 200} (k), which does not seem to be a very lofty title;\footnote{See Junker, \textit{Gīa VI}, p. 15 and VII, fig. 8; other examples: CG 1455, 1551, 1634. While this title is held by two nomarchs (CG 1455 and Davies, \textit{Deir el Gebelai} II, pl. 10), \textit{ḥmt} alone (or preceded by \textit{ḥ}) is known for two retainers of Th-tjpr (or Iq-Tjpr) in the tomb of Mrw-\textit{sw(i)-l.} (Daressy, \textit{Mea}, 562, 567).} and \textit{imy-r Ḫmtḥ} (h) “overseer of the treasury.” Probably the last is to be interpreted thus rather than \textit{imy-r Ḫmtnw} “overseer of sealers,” since the final \textit{w} is hardly ever added to \textit{ḥ} and \textit{ḥmt} in Old Kingdom tomb chapels.\footnote{The only exceptions I have noted are: \textit{ḥsw} Wild, \textit{TI II}, pl. 126; \textit{ḥmtw} Blackman and Apted, \textit{MeA V}, pl. 31.} In the Middle Kingdom both alternatives are attested, and the overseer of sealers is written \textit{ḥ-s-[h] or, more rarely, Ḫmtw.}\footnote{Ward, \textit{Index}, no. 307, to which Turin 1447 (wrongly included with no. 364 with reference to Klebs, \textit{Reliefs und Malerien des Mittleren Reiches} [Heidelberg 1922], fig. 14, should be added; this has both variants.} The present case is remarkable, for it is thus far the only evidence of this kind for “overseer of the treasury” from the Old Kingdom, and there is scarcely any additional evidence of it
prior to the reunification of U.E. Names 1–10 by the Theban King Whrngh In-it.f in the Eleventh Dynasty. One of the inscriptions added to the facade of the Sixth Dynasty nomarch Tnwt at Qasr es-Sayad, made by an imy-r hmtm, may possibly be a little earlier than the Upper Egyptian reunification. As has been noted by Helck, the title is an exceedingly important one in the period of the Theban rulers, when it refers to the personal treasury of the king, but there were also overseers of the treasury who were in the service of nomarchs as well as other officials. At Saqqara, for example, an overseer of the treasury is among the offering bearers in the early Twelfth Dynasty tomb of Hby, a high ranking official, but neither a nomarch nor a vizier. In another case of the same period, an overseer of the treasury brings offerings to an official who has no other title than imy-r pr “steward,” and the offering bearers who follow him have very modest titles indeed.

In the case under consideration it is probable that the title is similarly of minor importance, for it is mentioned only once, whereas—as we shall see presently—the more commonplace title “oversee of linen” (e) occurs three times. Evidently “oversee of the treasury” did not acquire its elevated status, as a position relating to the king’s personal revenues, until the Theban monarchy of the Eleventh Dynasty, and even thereafter it evidently varied considerably in importance, depending on the individual to whom it referred. This reference is not made explicit in the title itself, although there are at least two exceptions: a single occurrence of imy-r hmtm m t r drj “oversee of the treasury in the entire land,” (the well-known Hby, official of Nb-hpt-R Mentuhotep) and imy-r hmtm Tr-w “oversee of the treasury of the Thinite Nome.”

Two further points may be made concerning the titles of false door 79. They include all three of those that occur in the burial chamber below, namely a, d (without jth) and e. And the titles of two loose blocks (XIII, XIV) which James says “belong almost certainly to the north wall of Room III,” likewise show several titles of the same false door: a, d, e, k. Another title on one of these blocks ends with [ ] , and probably refers to a pyramid cult, as in the vizier’s title, 78 j, k. Yet another is unknown elsewhere in the mastaba, or from any other source: [ ] “inspector of priests of the k-house of the tomb (? жд)."

---

18 Clère and Vandier, TPPI, § 20.
19 LD II, 114 (e); cf. Torgny Sæve-Söderbergh, The Old Kingdom Cemetery at Hamra Dom (El-Qasr wa es-Sayad) (Stockholm 1994), pl. 13 (1); this and his inscription II are certainly later than the Old Kingdom (see next note), and not so early as is maintained on p. 39. The title also appears (in the form _office) on a headrest that is thought to antedate the Middle Kingdom: Berlin 1309 (PM III, 517; Ag. Inschr. I, p. 135). But that seems doubtful.
20 Note  for , in imy-r and  fibrations” for the latter see Fischer, Dendera, pp. 196–97, and the Chatsworth stela, MDAIK 4 (1933), 185.
22 Ibid.
23 Firth and Gunn, Tei Pyramids Crystalizes, p. 284.
24 CG 20561 and Louvain C167 (Gayet, Sltes de la Xlle Dynastie [Paris 1886], pl. 55), the same individuals in both cases. In another example of this kind the owner of the stela is of higher rank: CG 20473.
26 Petrie, Abydos I, pl. 60 (2); for the interpretation see Fischer, Titles, pp. 9 (no. 305a), 65 (no. 853).
27 James and Apted, Kenetics, p. 34, referring to pl. 43.
28 Only traces of the first sign are preserved, and its interpretation is not certain, nor is that of the second; this can hardly refer to the tomb of Hny-kf since no non-royal person, no matter how revered, would have h-ntr priests (JARCE 4 [1965], 52). Might it designate the sun-temple of Menkauser at Abusir, ḫst-R?
It may also be observed that the Ḥnty-ši/Ihḥš of these blocks has a shoulder-length wig that is not striated, as it is in the reliefs of the vizier, but shows the horizontal rows of overlapping locks that were originally confined to the shorter type of wig, and were only applied to the shoulder-length wig at the end of the reign of Teti and later.\textsuperscript{29} A still later feature appears in the reliefs of the south wall of Room III (James’ pl. 14): the chair in which the deceased is seated shows the side rail enclosed by the rounded tops of the leonine legs, and only two legs are visible. In the reliefs of the vizier the bottom of the rail runs straight across the tops of the legs, and the front profile of each leg is reduplicated. The different rendering of the top of the legs in Room III is evidently attested as early as the reign of Pepy I, but only rarely before the reign of Pepy II.\textsuperscript{30}

Yet another late feature is to be noted in the burial chamber, where the lids of ointment jars show a seal with the upturned ends of a cord on either side. The upturned ends of the cord are likewise added to the seals of chests and bolts of cloth in a Sixth Dynasty burial chamber at Meir, doubtless dating to the reign of Pepy II,\textsuperscript{31} as well as on the ointment jars of most of Jéquier’s Tombeaux de particulières contemporains de Pépi II, most of which are later than the reign of that king.\textsuperscript{32} This feature evidently was applied later to the seals of jars than to those of chests and bolts of cloth.\textsuperscript{33}

The presence of the title “overseer of the treasure” raises the question whether the reliefs of Room III may be even as late as the Middle Kingdom. As far as I can detect, there is nothing that confirms that possibility. The treatment of the wig is exactly what one would expect at the end of the Old Kingdom;\textsuperscript{34} so too the false doors,\textsuperscript{35} the details of the burial chamber, and the style and palaeography throughout the burial chamber and the room above.\textsuperscript{36}

One inscription in Room III has not yet been examined. It is the vertical column, no. 80, between the pair of false doors (Fig. 2). From its orientation (←) it is evidently associated with false door 78, the adjacent jams of which show the same orientation, and it contains titles j, b, h, c, and f of that false door as well as \textsuperscript{37} “hereditary prince,” which

\textsuperscript{29} Cf. JARCE 1 (1962), 17, n. 80, referring to Izi of Edfu; for further examples see Simpson, \textit{Qar and Idu}, figs. 18 (b), 20, 23, 24, 25, 30, 32, 42; Blackman, \textit{Meir IV}, pls. 9, 16; Blackman and Apted, \textit{Meir V}, pl. 46.

\textsuperscript{30} See Fischer, \textit{Capitole Nome}, p. 54. n. 1; \textit{Dendera}, p. 198 and n. 784. Besides the early example from the tomb of Ḳḥw (Giza 2381), there is a second example from Akhmim (Kanawati, \textit{El-Hawawish VI}, fig. 22 [a]) which may be equally early.

\textsuperscript{31} Blackman, \textit{Meir IV}, pl. 19.

\textsuperscript{32} The question of dating is discussed in a forthcoming article for \textit{Hommages à Jean-Philippe Lauer}.

\textsuperscript{33} I know of only two examples that are earlier than the end of the Sixth Dynasty: Petrie, \textit{Death and the New Life}, pl. 49 (where the ends of the tie are scarcely disengaged from the lid) and Junker, \textit{Giza VIII}, fig. 44. Several examples are known from Akhmim, but these seem later: cf. Kanawati, \textit{El-Hawawish I}, figs. 17, 21; II, 4, 24; VII, figs. 8, 10, 14.

\textsuperscript{34} As compared with that of Ḥs-šdt, PM III, p. 615, which in turn resembles that of Ḥny (Firth and Gunn, \textit{Teti Pyramid Cemeteries}, pl. 39).

\textsuperscript{35} In particular, note that the recessed areas flanking the offering scene are the same height as the panel on which this scene is represented, unlike the false doors shown \textit{ibid.}, pls. 64, 67–75, 83, where the recesses are of lesser height, or are omitted altogether. It seems improbable that the late false door of this type, shown in James and Apted, \textit{Khemiska}, pl. 42(243), belongs to the vizier’s eldest son, as is concluded on p. 14; furthermore it lacks the son’s recurrent title of “lector priest.”

\textsuperscript{36} The treatment of the tops of the legs, as described (with references in note 30 above), is found in the tomb of Ḥs-šdt but not that of Ḥny.
occurs elsewhere in the inscriptions of the vizier.

From the foregoing considerations, one may draw the following conclusions: first, that the reliefs and inscriptions of Room III were made at a later date than those elsewhere, inside and outside of the mastaba, and were made for the burial beneath them, belonging to a man who bore the same name and nickname as the vizier, but who was of lesser rank and status. There is no indication that he was a descendant; more probably he belonged to a later generation of the vizier’s funerary personnel, and may have been given the vizier’s name for that reason, like the son of a funerary priest in the service of the vizier Mhetw.\textsuperscript{37} In any case he did not merely usurp part of the vizier’s mastaba, but set up a false door for the vizier beside his own, so that both would receive the offerings that were made to him or perhaps, less charitably, to increase his own chances of receiving offerings. It is also probable that the Hnty-ki of Room III contrived to introduce himself in the procession of offering bearers that advance towards the vizier’s own false door, in Room VII, for this name has replaced another, and was therefore inserted at a later date (no. 115).\textsuperscript{38} Four of the five names added to the offering bearers in Room III are different from those attached to the vizier’s attendants, and all of them likewise seem to represent a later generation, for two have been inserted into other scenes among the vizier’s reliefs.\textsuperscript{39}

However the relationship of the greater and lesser Hnty-ki is to be explained, it is certain that titles 26–33 and 51 are to be removed from the titulary of the vizier, as presented on pp. 9–10 of the publication in question, and should be assigned to the vizier’s later homonym.

\textsuperscript{37} JARCE 4 (1965), 51.

\textsuperscript{38} The replacement of \(\text{by } \) is odd. Perhaps \(\text{imy-r sunt fr 7n was intended, but could not be completed because space was lacking. At any rate the erased title is one that the later Hnty-ki does not claim.}

\textsuperscript{39} The name \(\text{Boq(\text{ti}) is inserted in the scene on pl. 9 (42), that of } \text{abi on pl. 28 (167). A funerary priest (hm-k) again has the name Hnty-ki, but is evidently not the same individual as the one named on pl. 21 (115). Note further that there are many such additions in the scenes of the vizier, whereas many of the offering bearers of the later Hnty-ki are unidentified, with islands of raised surface between them, which were intended for names that were never added. To make up for this deficiency, three of the names have been repeated beside more than one figure.
2. Names and Titles on an Old Kingdom False Door

Gunther Vittmann (GM 42 [1981], 79) has proposed to recognize an otherwise unknown term for “butcher” on a false door from Mariette’s excavations at Saqqara, now in the Copenhagen National Museum (Pls. 1–2).¹ This had already been listed in Margaret Murray’s Index of Names and Titles of the Old Kingdom as 𓊐𓎋 (pl. 26, following the copy of Mariette), but Vittmann more accurately transcribes it as 𓊐𓎋 and takes the third sign to represent the butcher’s whetstone, reversed (and, it should be noted, reversed on both outer jambs of the false door, facing both right and left) in the labels of two pairs of offering bearers. He connects the supposed title with Fairman’s Ptolemaic evidence for nfrt “throat, gullet,” which is evidently of ancient origin,² and thus reads nfrtj “who has to do with the throat” (in slaughtering).

Apart from the lack of other evidence for such a designation referring to butchers, the names of the four offering bearers present a very serious obstacle to Vittmann’s suggestion, since all of them are of a pattern that would ordinarily lead one to expect the preceding signs to designate a divinity. Ranke, to be sure, does not make that assumption. Following Murray, he reads one of the names as Shm-ȝnh (PNI, 319 [10]) and another as Nj-kw (PNI, 180 [18]), citing the Copenhagen false door as the sole evidence in both cases. A third name is read Irt (PNI, 40 [26]) for which there is again no further evidence from the Old Kingdom, although some examples are cited for the Heracleopolitan Period and later. The fourth name, ending with hʳэфф, is completely overlooked by Murray and Ranke, presumably because the inscription is incomplete. But the traces that precede it strongly suggest that the initial group of signs is again 𓊐𓎋.

Inasmuch as there is abundant evidence for Old Kingdom names such as Shm-ȝnh-Pth, Ny-kw-Pth, Irt-Pth and Pth-hᵗeff,³ it must be considered whether 𓊐 may not belong to the name of a divinity, namely Nfrtm, with the sign for tm correctly oriented. Although there is some evidence that Old Kingdom theophoric names may occasionally have been abbreviated by omitting the name of the god,⁴ it seems improbably coincidental that this sort of abbreviation should have occurred in all four cases. It is also, to be sure, curious that all four

¹ Copenhagen 5129, first published in Mariette, Mas- tabas, pp. 270–71 (reversed). For other references see PM III, 456.
² Cf. Fischer, Calligraphy²–³, p. 54 (F 35).
³ PNI, 319 (11), 180 (20); II, 265 (30); I, 265 (13).
⁴ Junker, Glas IX, p. 105. Most of these cases involve k, and many of them can be interpreted differently, as pointed out below, pp. 65–66.
offering bearers should have theophoric names referring to \( \text{Nfrtm} \), a god who is little known from Old Kingdom personal names apart from these examples. But the name \( \text{Ny-\(nh\)-Nfrtm} \) is attested from a fragment of late Old Kingdom relief in Strasbourg (Pl. 3a).5 Furthermore at least three Old Kingdom examples have been cited for the personal name \( \text{Ny-\(nh\)-Nfrtm} \), presumably referring to the divinity in question.7 And in at least one of these cases the form of \( \text{tm} \) is comparable to the clearest example of the same sign on the Copenhagen false door (at the extreme left):

\[
(\rightarrow) \equiv \equiv (\text{Junker, Giza VIII, fig. 6}) \equiv \equiv (\text{Copenhagen false door})
\]

Even more comparable examples of \( \equiv \equiv \) for \( \text{tm} \) are to be found in hieratic8 and hieroglyphic9 texts of the same period. At the opposite side of the false door the main part of the sign is slightly different (\( \equiv \equiv \)), but this part is rather too thick and rectangular to suit the whetstone; it is much more like \( \equiv \equiv \).

For the recurrence of one and the same divinity in a series of otherwise diverse theophoric names one may compare a series of three offering bearers named \( \text{Dw.ti-Snfrw, Snfrw-h-\(r\)-}\) and \( \text{Snfrw-h-\(b\)-}\) on the false door of the King’s son \( \text{Ks.(i)-nfr} \), BM 1324.10 In this case the frequent allusion to \( \text{Snfrw} \) may not seem surprising since \( \text{Ks.(i)-nfr} \) was the son of that king and was in charge of his father’s funerary cult at Dahshur. But a closer analogy may be seen in a fragment of relief from Saqqara, apparently dating to the very end of the Old Kingdom (Pl. 3b).11 This shows a row of offering bearers, at least four of whom bear theophoric names referring to Khnum: \( \text{Bnk-\(hnmu\), Htp-\(hnmu\), Irt-\(hnmu\) and Htp-\(hnmu\).} \)12 And it may be noted that, on the Copenhagen false door itself, no fewer than eight of the twelve men who flank the offering scene have theophoric names compounded with that of Ptah, to say nothing of the owner himself (Pl. 1). There is accordingly every reason to conclude that the title of the supposed butchers actually belongs to their names, which are to be read \( \text{Shtm-\(nh\)-Nfrtm, Ny-kw-Nfrtm, Irt-Nfrtm and [Nfrtm-h-\(r\)-\(f\).} \)

As it happens, the same false door in Copenhagen has given rise to another problem, which, in this case, concerns a title. It is quoted as \( \text{Htp-\(hnmu\) [or Htnmu]} \) by Kees, who con-

5 No. 2541A. I am indebt to Jacques Parlebas for permitting me to publish my own photograph. The name is preceded by the titles \( \text{mty n št} \) “regulator of a phyle,” \( \text{imyt šfr} \) “oversee of linen,” and \( \text{smr šf n št} \) “companion, scribe of a phyle.”

6 PNI, 200 (24); II, 370, where Ranke notes that Junker’s example is now published in his Giza VIII, fig. 6. This name is also known from the Middle Kingdom, when the name \( \text{Nfrtm-\(ma\)-\(f\) is also attested (PNI, 200 [27]) as well as two examples of Zn-Nfrtm (Ahmed Moussa, JEA 70 [1984], 51, fig. 1 [a] and Habachi, Heqafa, p. 75, fig. 11) to be added to those of later date (PNI, 390, [101]).}

7 For the use of the names of gods as personal names in the Sixth Dynasty see PNI II, 234.

8 Posener-Krieger and de Cenival, Abu Sir Papyri, Pal. pl. 12 (U 15).

9 Ukh I, 164 (10); Edel, MIO 1 (1953), 328 (A, 1).

10 T.C.H. James, Hieroglyphic Texts 1, pl. 10.

11 Medelhavsmuseet, Stockholm, MM 11415. The width is 28 cm at the baseline. I saw this among photographs stored at Saqqara in 1956. For the photograph used here, and permission to publish it, I am indebted to Dr. Bengt Peterson.

12 Cf. Bsk-n-\(Pth\) (PNI, 91 [6], citing CG 1731, which is probably as early as the Sixth Dynasty), and Ukh I, 113 (6), which is early in the reign of Pepy II.

13 No name of this pattern is known to me. This may be the oldest recorded example of \( \text{hsp} \) (Wb. III, 30), which is not otherwise attested before the Middle Kingdom. The meaning would be “Khnum is hidden,” possibly to be read \( \text{Hnmw-hsp(x)} \).

14 Cf. PNI, 39 (27).

15 Cf. PNI, 276 (6); II, 389.
siders it to be a variant writing of the well-known title “Priest of Horus-Anubis Who Presides over the House of the Retinue,” suggesting that $\text{ UserProfile }$ is therefore to be read $\text{ UserProfile }$. His reasoning is followed by Reinsner and Smith, in reference to an occurrence of $\text{ UserProfile }$ on a Fifth Dynasty seal impression from Giza, and the same interpretation of this occurrence is in turn adopted by Kaplon, without reference to Kees. Helck isolates $\text{ UserProfile }$ $\text{ UserProfile }$ $\text{ UserProfile }$ in the present example, leaving the last word unexplained, and Werner Kaiser likewise quotes it as $\text{ UserProfile }$, stating that Bissing and Kees regard this as possibly giving the phonetic reading of the standard. He also observes, like them, that $\text{ UserProfile }$ is not to be confused with the standard $\text{ UserProfile }$, and rightly favors Junker’s explanation of the former as a seal.

If $\text{ UserProfile }$ were the reading of the seal-standard, one would expect it to precede the standard on the Copenhagen false door, not follow it. And there is distinctly more space between the standard and $\text{ UserProfile }$ than between the latter and $\text{ UserProfile }$. It is therefore much more reasonable to suppose that $\text{ UserProfile }$ represents a separate title, with the sign $\text{ UserProfile }$ inadvertently omitted, and that $\text{ UserProfile }$ $\text{ UserProfile }$ $\text{ UserProfile }$ is written normally, trailing off to the right at the end of the column as does the title $\text{ UserProfile }$ $\text{ UserProfile }$ $\text{ UserProfile }$ on the adjacent jamb. As for the reading of the seal-standard, it may well be simply $\text{ UserProfile }$. At any rate the reading $\text{ UserProfile }$ should be abandoned.

---

16 For the interpretation see Fischer, Titles, p. 20, no. 923a; and for other examples see Unk. I, 231 (1 = Cairo J 15048); Wild, Ti III, pls. 183–85; Daressy, Men, p. 569 (false door of Mr-Th); CG 1484 (Mariette, Mastabas, p. 307, with $\text{ UserProfile }$ miscopied as $\text{ UserProfile }$); Petrie and Murray, Seven Memphite Tomb Chapels, pl. 15 (Mariette, op. cit., p. 512); Hassan, Giza I, pp. 4, 6, 9, 19, 34 (R-wr: the first example written $\text{ UserProfile }$ $\text{ UserProfile }$ $\text{ UserProfile }$, where w/\text{w}, if correctly copied, may refer to the epithet $\text{ UserProfile }$, i.e. “solely preceding over”); ibid., II, p. 107 and fig. 119B (Ke(i)-n-mnfr), p. 186 and fig. 214 (Wp-m-nfr). For Middle Kingdom examples see Ward, Index, no. 900; Fischer, loc. cit. Ogden (Varia Egyptiaca § [1987], 271) is probably right in taking Horus-Anubis as a single divinity, despite CG 1484, which evidently regards them as two.

17 Bissing and Kees, Re-Heiligtum III (Berlin 1928), p. 25 f. This is quoted identically by von Bissing and Kees in Untersuchungen zu den Reliefs aus dem Re-Heiligtum des Rauthes I (Abh. der Bayerischen Akad. der Wiss., Ph.-Hist. Kl. 32/1, Munich, 1922), p. 11, n. 83, where no interpretation is attempted.

18 Reinsner-Smith, Hist. Giza Nec. II, pp. 51–52 and fig. 53.

19 Kaplony, Rollsiegel II, p. 149 and pl. 52 (8).

20 Beamtenstitel, p. 49, and Index, p. 145.


22 ASAE 49 (1949), 209.

23 Attested by (1) CG 1907; (2) W.V. Davies et al., Sakkara Tomb I, pl. 28 (= ASAE 43 [1943], 500, fig. 67); (3) ibid., pl. 32 (7); (4) Jéquier, Oudjebel, fig. 28 (= ASAE 26 [1926], 54); (5) Mariette, Mastabas, p. 179 (= MMA 08.201.1). Probably another example is to be recognized in Bissing and Kees, Re-Heiligtum III pl. 19 (316), although the rounded end of the incomplete emblem does not seem to represent either end of a seal. It is true that the fifth example in the foregoing list has an even more indeterminate form ($\text{ UserProfile }$), but this must be distinguished from $\text{ UserProfile }$ (Daw) which occurs elsewhere in the same titulary and is the only alternative that is known from Old Kingdom titles. It should be noted that the present example and no. (1) bear a feather, and that all the examples except the present one place the seal itself in front—doubtless because it was felt that it should precede the loop. The present example of $\text{ UserProfile }$, on the other hand, follows the usual orientation of normally vertical signs that are presented horizontally with the top foremost (Fischer, Egyptian Studies II, pp. 121–22).
Plate 2. Details of Copenhagen 5129
Plate 3a. Strasbourg 2541A
*Courtesy of the University*

Plate 3b. Medelhavsmuseet, Stockholm, MM 11415
*Courtesy of the Museum*
3. A Late Old Kingdom Overseer of the Two Treasuries

The stela Berlin 7779 (Pl. 4 and Fig. 1) is unusual in so many ways that it deserves more attention than the copies provided by Heinrich Brugsch, *Thesaurus Inscriptionum Aegyptiacarum*, pp. 1484–86, and in the museum’s *Aegyptische Inschriften* I, p. 120. It is there dated to the period between the Old and Middle Kingdom, while others have suggested that it is as late as the Eleventh Dynasty.¹ This question will be considered in the following pages together with the provenance, which is said by Brugsch to be “aus Memphis” on the word of a Cairo antiquities dealer, although a conclusive answer can be offered in neither case.

To begin with, it will be useful to give a systematic description and translation, to which some comments may be appended. The format evidently derives from that of Old Kingdom architraves in which the tomb owner, standing at the left, is confronted by a row of figures on a smaller scale, with one or more lines of text above them.² The area occupied by the principal figure, along with a text containing the funerary formula, and his name and titles, will be designated as A (Fig. 2). The funerary formule are presented in A 1 and A 3, each followed by titles and the name (A 2, A 4). But A 4 may also be taken as a continuation of A 2. This arrangement is unexpected, but the presentation of the titles is even more singular, because the principal title is repeated twice and another, subordinate to it, five times. There can be no doubt that the repetition is intentional, creating a rhythmic pattern, and is not simply a means of filling space. Furthermore it seems highly likely that the repetition of the first title is implied before each repetition of the second. As it happens, a much earlier overseer of the treasury, probably dating to the mid-Fourth Dynasty, similarly repeats his principal title on a group of blocks from his tomb; this case is discussed below, in Excursus I.

Thus far the inscription may accordingly be translated as follows: A (1) An offering which the king gives, and Anubis, Who is Upon His Mountain, Who is in the Place of

---

¹ Edith Varga and Steffen Wenig, *Aegyptische Kunst: Sonderausstellung der Agyptischen Abteilung der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin* (Budapest 1963), p. 8, no. 42, dated “11. Dynastie(?),” and assigned to the Middle Kingdom. The length is 63 cm, the height 47 cm. Vandier, in his *Manuel d’Archéologie* II, p. 461, fig. 290, illustrates the stela on a small scale and very indistinctly, among other stelae of the late Heracleopolitan Period and Dyn. XI; it is also mentioned on p. 465. In FM III, p. 732, the stela is said to be

² Fischer, *Dendera*, p. 219 (VII); from Giza (1–5); Abydos (6); Edfu (7); Naqada (8). Also examples from Saqqara (*JASA* 4 [1965], 49 ff. and pl. 29); Dendera (ibid., pp. 62–63 and figs. 14 [c], 16, pls. 5, 12 c), Gizeh (ibid., fig. 35, pls. 21–23), and Akhmim (Ann McFarlane, *GM* 100 [1987], 71).
Embalmimg, Lord of the Sacred Land, that he be buried in the necropolis, (2) The Chamberlain of the King and Overseer of the Two Treasuries, Judiciary 'd-pr Official and Overseer of Two Treasuries, (3) Under-supervisor of the Treasury and Overseer of Scribes of the Two Treasuries, (The Overseer of Two Treasuries), Under-supervisor of the Treasury and Overseer of Scribes of the Two Workshops, (The Overseer of the Two Treasuries), Under-supervisor of the Treasury and Overseer of Scribes of the Two Chambers of the King’s Regalia, (The Overseer of the Two Treasuries), Under-supervisor of the Treasury and Overseer of Scribes of the Two Houses of Gold, (Spss-Pth) (3) An Offering which the King gives, that funerary offerings go forth to him who is revered with Osiris and with the Great God: (4) (The Overseer of the Two Treasuries), Under-supervisor of the Treasury Who Takes Stock of the Production of Upper and Lower Egypt and All Foreign Lands, One Revered with Ptah-Sokaris, Spss-Pth.
The owner is depicted with the conventional attributes of advanced age: he is wigless and wears a long kilt, the edge of which is held with an open hand, while the other hand holds a staff; his torso is paunchy, with sagging breast. The manner in which the rearward arm is "folded over" to touch the border of his long kilt is characteristic of this type of representation and is most frequently encountered at the Memphite cemeteries in the late Old Kingdom, but is also known from Sixth Dynasty examples at Meir, Quseir el-Amarna, and Akhmim. It occurs on a very small scale at the bottom of two false doors from Saqqara, dating to the end of the Heracleopolitan Period, but in one case the old man holds a scepter as well as a staff, and in the other he lacks a staff, both hands being empty. At Meir it reappears in one of the Twelfth Dynasty tombs, combined with similar differences in attitude as well as clothing, but does not seem to have been used elsewhere during the Hera...
cleopolitan Period or the Middle Kingdom, although there are a few still later occurrences. The broad collar is found fairly often in Old Kingdom examples, the pair of bracelets less often. The apparent presence of a beard is illusory; it is not to be expected, and from a close examination of the original by K.-H. Priese, it has proven to be an accidental chip in the stone. This representation is nonetheless unusual in that the figure leans slightly forward; in other words, old age is more definitely suggested than in other cases. Brugsch copied above the staff, i.e., a repetition of the title hry tp [nsw], but this must have been in paint, for there is no trace of it today. Perhaps it was a later addition. A small figure facing the owner, likewise wigless and beardless, but wearing a short kilt, offers incense, using a censer of Old Kingdom style. His name (A 5) is Šm-ḫfr.

Area B shows (1) a figure similar to the owner, though with heavier torso, again beardless, and lacking collar and bracelets; he is: the Scribe rnh-swt-[NN]. All the signs retain rightward orientation, whereas the inscriptions pertaining to all the other minor figures are reversed, as would be expected. Beneath him (2) is a woman, who, in view of her prééminence position, may be the owner’s wife. In accordance with the style of the late Old Kingdom, she has close-cropped hair or a short wig, like the men behind her. Her skirt is the

10 Schäfer, loc. cit., indicates that it continued down to the Middle Kingdom, but he gives no references, and may have had only the Meir examples in mind. For later examples see BMMA 21 (Dec. 1926), 6, fig. 2 (Theban tomb 131, temp. Tutmosis III); BMMA 29 (Dec. 1928), 24, fig. 88 (Dyn. XXVI). In his Manuel d’Archéologie II, p. 485, Vandier describes the present case as an infelicitous innovation; in vol. IV, p. 16, he mentions an earlier example, but curiously describes it as representing a physical deformity, which it certainly is not.

11 Barsanti, loc. cit.; Capart, op. cit., pls. 78–79; James and Apted, Khentika, pl. 7; El-Khouli and Kanawati, Qasr El-Amarna, pl. 36; Blackman, Meir IV, pl. 6; V, pl. 5; CG 1586; Simpson, Qur and Idu, fig. 21; Western Cemetery, Pt. 1, fig. 16; W.V. Davies et al., Saqqara Tombs I, pl. 24; H. Schäfer, Priestergräber (Leipzig 1908), pp. 9, 11. The last examples, relatively late, are unusual in that the hair is divided, divided into rows of rectangular or circular locks.

12 Brackets (more usually one only) appear on some of the earlier representations of long-kilted portly men, JNES 18 (1959), figs. 8, 10, pp. 243, 246. A single bracelet also is found in Blackman, Meir IV, pl. 6; Schäfer, Von ägyptischer Kunst, pl. 14 (2); Simpson, loc. cit. (also two bracelets); Qur and Idu, fig. 34 (two bracelets); El-Khouli and Kanawati, loc. cit. (two bracelets).

13 Cf., however, the architrave of Mnt from Akhmim, Cairo CG 1586, where three figures of this type become more erect as they progress (reading from right to left).

14 For meaningless additions of this kind see MMJ 9 (1974). 9.

15 For the specific motif, showing a diminutive figure of a man censing in this manner before the owner, cf. Junker, Giza VI, fig. 82; VII, figs. 48a, 51, 55; James and Apted, Khentika, pl. 21; Firth and Gunn, Teti Pyramid Cemeteries, pl. 77; ASAÉ 17 (1917), 134 (Qr of Edfu). The closest parallel for the present group is Blackman-Apted, Meir V, pl. 5. This motif evidently became very infrequent after the Old Kingdom, although a later example is to be found in Oising et al., Denkmäler, pl. 58, and an even later one in Newberry and Griffith, Burseh I, pl. 15; for the form of the censer cf. Blackman, ZAS 50 (1912), 66–68. A Theban Dyn. XI example (Blackman, JEA 17 [1931], pl. 8) is less comparable; the small figure kneels above the offering table, and (like the example in Blackman and Apted, Meir V) he does not use a lid, but adds a piece of incense.

16 Cf. the variation of this type of figure in Simpson, Qur and Idu, fig. 21 (D2, E2, F2).

17 In some cases elsewhere a fillet is added: e.g., Simpson, Qur and Idu, figs. 24, 25 (but not 26, 30), 39, 41; Jéquier, Oudéités, figs. 3, 6, 8, 26, 28, 37 (but not 9, 10, 39, 33). At Dendera short hair generally appears on the Dyn. VI–VIII stelae (as grouped in Fischer, Dendera, p. 187) as opposed to those of later date, which show the long lappeted wig. This change of fashion seems generally applicable elsewhere in Dyns. IX–XI, so far as non-royal women are concerned, although short hair is worn by women in two tombs at Akhmim which seem to be later than Dyn. VIII (Kanawati, El-Hawawis I, figs. 8, 13; II, figs. 4, 18, 23, 25, but not 14); for the date cf. Brovarski, in Mélange du musée de l’Égypte Moscou (Cairo 1957), 134 f. It also appears on a few false doors at Saqqara which are equally late: Firth and Gunn, Teti Pyramid Cemeteries, pls. 68, 70 (1); Quibell, Excavations at Saqqara (1905–06), pl. 16 (right); ibid., (1906–07), pl. 10 (1).
usual close-fitting kind, with wide shoulder straps that are partly covered by a broad collar, and (as in many representations of the late Old Kingdom) the straps do not meet at the center.\(^{18}\) One hand raises a lotus blossom to her nose,\(^{19}\) while the other hangs empty at her side. Her title and name are: The King's Acquaintance, \(f.w.f.n.(i).t.\)\(^{1}\) Behind her are ranged a series of five standing men, all wigless and identically clad in a broad collar and short projecting kilt, and all carrying a staff and scepter. The lesser height of the last three may possibly be significant, but is more probably unintentional, for there are a number of other cases where a series of figures tends to be diminished from left to right.\(^{20}\) The arrangement of the hieroglyphs above them is also rather careless, leaving an increasing amount of space above the heads. This negligence is in variance with the elaboration presentation of the owner's titles. The five are identified as (3) The Inspector of Custodians of Property of the Treasury,\(^{21}\) the Revered Ipi;\(^{15}\) (4) The Inspector of Scribes of the Treasury,\(^{9}\) the Revered Ṣpss-Pth; (5) The Inspector of Custodians of Property of the Treasury, the Revered Qnr;\(^{6}\) (6) The Inspector of Custodians of Property of the Treasury, the Revered Ḥwi;\(^{3}\) (7) The Functionary of tenant-landholdings,\(^{5}\) Ipi.

**COMMENTS**

(a) Note that the title \(imy-r\ f.r\ pry-hq\) normally follows \(hry-t\ p\ nswt\) and \(z\ h\ q-l\ mr\) (Klaus Baer, \textit{Rank and Title in the Old Kingdom} [Chicago 1960], pp. 186 [33/3], 187 [36/3]). Hence the pairing that is indicated in the translation. It may also be noted that \(z\ h\ q-l\ mr\) follows \(hry-t\ p\ nswt\), as is again to be expected (\textit{ibid.}, p. 186 [33/18]).

(b) \(Wb.\) i, 75 (6), is certainly right in regarding \(imy-hlt\) as “Untervorstehers,” and I doubt that it ever means “assistant” in Old Kingdom titles (as Junker sometimes interprets it in his \textit{Giza series}). Thus \(\begin{array}{c} \text{J} \text{H} \text{S} \text{K} \text{H} \text{G} \\ \text{J} \text{H} \text{S} \text{K} \text{H} \text{G} \end{array}\) (Fisher, \textit{Giza}, pl. 44 [1]) is evidently “under-supervisor of directors of the army,”\(^{21}\) and not as Rowe translates, “aide (of) the commander of the army”\(^{16}\) (\textit{ibid.}, p. 136); the same man, on his wife’s stela is simply \(\begin{array}{c} \text{J} \text{H} \text{S} \text{K} \text{H} \text{G} \\ \text{J} \text{H} \text{S} \text{K} \text{H} \text{G} \end{array}\) (\textit{ibid.}, pl. 44 [2]) “King’s acquaintance and under-supervisor,” while another man, on the drum lintel of his offering niche, has no other title but \(imy-hlt\) (\textit{ibid.}, p. 139). These occurrences of \(imy-hlt\) can hardly refer to a simple “helper” in either case, or to a hereditary successor, as

---

18 E.g., Junker, \textit{Giza} V, fig. 23; Simpson, \textit{Qar and Idu}, figs. 25, 41; Blackman, \textit{Meir IV}, pl. 9; Davies, \textit{Deir el Gebrawi I}, pls. 3, 5, 7, 12; II, pls. 6, 8, 9, 12.

19 Similarly, standing (and seated) women often hold a long-stemmed lotus in reliefs of the late Sixth Dynasty at Saqqara (e.g., Kanawati et al., \textit{Excavations at Saqqara I}, pl. 35; Fischer, \textit{MMJ} 11 [1976], 20, fig. 12) and in the provinces (Blackman, \textit{Meir IV}, pl. 5; Petrie, \textit{Denderah}, pl. 7; Petrie, \textit{Athribis}, pl. 10; Davies, \textit{Deir el Gebrawi I}, pl. 3; CG 1576 [Abydos]), although there are a few later examples (e.g., Dunham, \textit{Naga-ed-Der Stela}, no. 53); the example shown in \textit{MMJ} 11 (1976), 16-17, may well be as early as Dyn. VIII (see \textit{Ancient Egypt} in the \textit{MMJ} [New York 1977], p. 154 [to p. 170]).

20 E.g., Junker, \textit{Giza} V, figs. 21, 22; Hassan, \textit{Giza II}, fig. 88; Abu-Bakr, \textit{Giza}, fig. 39; Simpson, \textit{Qar and Idu}, fig. 22 (a); Jéquier, \textit{Pyrs. des reines}, fig. 33; Mackay et al., \textit{Hemamieh}, pl. 10 (in other cases the height is irregular); Saleh, \textit{Three Old Kingdom Tombs at Thebes}, pl. 14. The reduction in height is more marked in some of the later examples: Junker, \textit{Giza} IX, fig. 37; Jéquier, \textit{Pyrs. des reines}, fig. 33; Edel in \textit{Form und Mass: Festschrift für Gerhard Fecht} (Wiesbaden 1987), p. 130 (= de Morgan, \textit{Catalogue des monuments}, p. 145 [g] and cf. [e, h] and 144 [a]). The early Old Kingdom chapels at Medum often place the smallest figures first, regardless of orientation: Petrie, \textit{Medum}, pls. 14, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24. In a few cases diminishing height indicates a difference in age; see BES 9 (1987/88), 16 and n. 6.

21 Cf. \(\begin{array}{c} \text{J} \text{H} \text{S} \text{K} \text{H} \text{G} \\ \text{J} \text{H} \text{S} \text{K} \text{H} \text{G} \end{array}\) (Abu Bakr, \textit{Giza}, p. 35), \(\begin{array}{c} \text{J} \text{H} \text{S} \text{K} \text{H} \text{G} \\ \text{J} \text{H} \text{S} \text{K} \text{H} \text{G} \end{array}\) (LD II, 97a), \(\begin{array}{c} \text{J} \text{H} \text{S} \text{K} \text{H} \text{G} \\ \text{J} \text{H} \text{S} \text{K} \text{H} \text{G} \end{array}\) (with additions, Mariette, \textit{Mastabas}, p. 229 f.).
Rosemarie Drenkhahn argues. Another title which Junker translates “Unterhausverwalter” (Giza XI, p. 219) is written  in his fig. 85), which looks like a scribal error; perhaps to be read . The examples of isolated are interesting, however, since it seems doubtful that examples of isolated “overseer” and “inspector” are attested in Old Kingdom titularies. Thus may be somewhat different in nature, although the examples where it is isolated are admittedly rare. For the position of the below the rank of cf. Helck, Beamtentitel, p. 107, referring to Junker, Giza VI, 209. Another indication is the sequence from greater to lesser in “inspectors of funerary priests, under-supervisors of funerary priests, funerary priests.” In the present case is clearly subordinate to and it is interesting that a repetition of the lesser title suffices to echo the combination of both. This seems to imply that the superior title did not supplant the other one, but that they were held concomitantly and had a somewhat different function. Furthermore one is struck by the prominence that is given in some other titles such as that of Kf.(i)-pr-R in the University of Pennsylvania Museum, Philadelphia (Mariette, Mastabas, p. 278), the false door of Kf.(i)-dbh.m.(i) (Hassan, Giza V, fig. 67) and that of (Louvre C 164; Ziegler, Catalogue des stèles, p. 83).

(c) “Scribes of the treasury” are fairly well attested, as well as a “shd “inspector” of them, but this, to my knowledge, is the sole mention of an overseer of such scribes, apart from the Sixth Dynasty false door of the Overseer of the Two Treasuries in the Louvre (C 164), who is “overseer of scribes of the two treasuries.”

22 Handwerker, pp. 81–85.
24 Goyon, Nouvelles inscriptions, indicates that an example is to be found in a titulary that ends with (no. 27; index, pp. 176–77), but this is evidently to be read as a single title: . And the of von Bissing, Gem-ni-kai I, p. 20 (42) is incomplete, as seen from pl. 20. Murray, Index, pl. 41 (center) gives several examples of isolated but none is beyond doubt. In two other cases (Petrie, Deshashem, pls. 7, 12) the context is incomplete; in another (LD II, 53 [x]) the signs are damaged. In LD II, 115 (l) read  (cf. Couyat-Montet, Hammâmâit, no. 107, l. 19), and in LD II, 117 (m) read  (for which cf. Murray’s pl. 38 [center]) and  (for which cf. her pl. 41 [right]). Malek gives two other references (PM IIIa, 246, 758). One (Hassan, Giza VI/5, p. 40 and pl. 19 [8]) is , to be read . for shd see Murray, Titles, pls. 41–42, and Ogden Goebel, Two Aspects of the Royal Palace in the Egyptian Old Kingdom, Columbia University Ph.D dissertation, 1962, pp. 85, 589 ff. In the other case (von Bissing, Bulletin van de Vereniging tot Bevordering der Kennis van de Antieke Beschaving 9/3 [Dec. 1934], 4, fig. 1) there is a lacuna before , which probably contained the rest of the title.

25 Von Bissing, Gem-ni-kai II, pl. 32 and p. 19 (177); Murray, Saqqara Mastabas I, pl. 12; Petrie and Murray, Seven Memphite Tomb Chapels, pl. 14. Lacking the terminal . (CG 1418), 406 (CG 1498); Ub I, 11 (CG 1432). On the other hand the sequence of is given (MO 7 [1960], 490 and pl. 1) is unexpected. It might be considered whether the first of these titles is to be linked with the preceding one as “overseer of commissions of police.”

26 Cf. Mariette, Mastabas, p. 754, where a son is , while his father is.

27 Murray, Saqqara Mastabas I, pl. 7; Petrie and Murray, loc. cit.; Hassan, Guya I, figs. 133, 135; III, fig. 84; VI/3, fig. 40; CG 1689.

28 Petrie and Murray, loc. cit. Sometimes the official in question is an overseer of the treasury (Excursus III below and Mariette, Mastabas, p. 278) or under-supervisor (Hassan, Guya V, figs. 67, 70). In other cases he is the son of such an overseer (H. Petrie and M. Murray, loc. cit.; Hassan, Guya III, fig. 114) or an attendant (Davies, Paahhotep, pls. 32–33). See also Junker, Gza X, fig. 53; Hassan, Giza I, figs. 134, 136, 142; Louvre C 250, 251 (Ziegler, Catalogue des stèles, nos. 12 and 11, the former evidently later than the Old Kingdom).

29 Ibid., no. 10.
(d) The uses of wrbt, referring to the place of embalming and more generally to “workshop” are discussed by Junker,\(^{30}\) and by Rosemarie Drenkhahn.\(^{31}\) Drenkhahn quotes titles referring to hmrwt “craftsmen” in this connection,\(^{32}\) as well as carpenters,\(^{33}\) a painter (zj) and a sculptor (z1), to which may be added “inspector of stonemasons of the king’s workshop,”\(^{34}\) and “ overseer of builders of the workshop.”\(^{35}\) There is no doubt about the meaning of zj in the example she cites, since the individual in question is represented in the act of painting a statue,\(^{36}\) but that meaning is difficult to apply in the present context, where there is a parallel series of scribal titles. Furthermore, there is explicit evidence that the production of craftsmen was recorded by scribes,\(^{37}\) and such records would have enabled ḫps-Pḥw to “take stock of the production.” No other overseers of “scribes of the workshop” seem to be attested, although another zj wrbt, who may or may not have been a painter, is known from two monuments,\(^{38}\) and another overseer of the two treasuries (Louvre C 164, comment b above) has the title zj wrbt “scribe of the two workshops.”

(e) The phrase izwry ḫkw rt nswt is easily recognized despite the anomalous form of ḫkwrt, which resembles ḫr. The word order is indicated by the frequent title imr-izwry ḫkwrt nswt/ imy-r izwry ḫkw rt nswt.\(^{39}\) Presumably the last element is honorifically transposed in the present case as in several examples of the aforementioned title, written  in 40 or  in 41. This title is often preceded by imy-r wrbt. The overseer of scribes does not seem to be otherwise associated with the king’s regalia, although there are at least two examples of  “scribe of the king’s regalia.”\(^{42}\) There is also an odd example of  “inspector of scribes of the treasury and of the king’s regalia,” for which see Excursus III below.


\(^{31}\) Handwerker, pp. 147–48.

\(^{32}\) For “inspector of craftsmen of the workshop” see the reference to Junger, Gis IX, which should be p. 172 and fig. 78; this also occurs on an unpublished offering slab of ṣḥ-br-hm from Reinsen’s G 2011.

\(^{33}\) Paget and Pirie, Paḥ-ḥetep, pl. 35; see also Macmullah, Idout, pl. 12, overlooked on p. 21.

\(^{34}\) LD II, 34 (c): cf.  ṣḥ-br-hm: Eva Martin-Pardey, CAA Hildesheim 1, 82, which she mistakenly translates “Untervisor der ṣḥ-br-hm der Nekropole” (p. 75). Also (Oriental Institute, Chicago, 19618), which is abbreviated ṣḥ-br on a second statue of the same person (10621) Nyk-r ṣḥ-br.

\(^{35}\) Kees, WZKM 54 (1957), 93, fig. 2.

\(^{36}\) See now Badawy, Ṣḥ-ḥetep-Paḥ, fig. 32; here designated ṣḥ-br “scribe of the southern wrbt,” but also, in fig. 45, ṣḥ-br “scribe of the southern wrbt.”

\(^{37}\) Davies, Deir el Gebrawi I, pl. 13, cols. at right.

\(^{38}\) CG 1316, 1353; he is also  ḫkw rt nswt (cf. n. 42).

\(^{39}\) For the first variant see Murray, Saqqara Mastabas I, pls. 4–6; James and Apted, Khentika, pl. 21; CG 1323, 1467; for the second see Firth and Gunn, Teti Pyramid Cemeteries, pp. 106 (15), 136 (81); Hassan, Gis 1A, p. 15; CG 1490; Excavations at Saqqara III, fig. 17 b; W.V. Davies et al., Saqqara Tombs I, pls. 9, 10.

\(^{40}\) Firth and Gunn, Teti Pyramid Cemeteries, pp. 111 (5), 123, 154 (54); Hassan, Gis 1A, p. 7 (and pl. 5); III, figs. 114, 115; Jéquier, Monument funéraire de Pèpi II, III, fig. 63.

\(^{41}\) Strudwick, JEA 71 (1985), 45 and pl. 3 (2).

\(^{42}\) CG 272, 1316, 1353 (the last two belonging to the same individual; cf. n. 38 above). I believe another example is to be seen in  ṣḥ-br Fakhry, Sept tombeaux, fig. 6, p. 13. Also  ṣḥ-br (Hassan, Gis V, figs. 67, 79 and 223),  ṣḥ-br (Mariette, Mastabas, p. 279), “scribe of royal linen of the king’s regalia.” Helck’s characterization of the izwry ḫkw rt nswt as the source of oil (Beamtenstitel, p. 65, followed by Drenkhahn, Handwerker, p. 149) is somewhat misleading. The inscriptions he cites only refer to ṣḥ-br izwry (Urk. I, 177 [10], 178 [6]) and izwry is not restricted to oil any more than pr-ḥd is to clothing (ibid., 177 [9], 178 [5]).
(f) No scribes of the two houses of gold are attested, but the “two houses of gold” are commonly associated with imy-r wr bt in the title imy-r pry nbt 43 See also a reference to the workplace and (? of?) the two houses of gold in Excursus III.

(g) The name is transcribed in accordance with the views expressed in pp. 61–66 below. It is similarly transcribed by Ranke, PNI, 326 (19); see also Murray, Index, pl. 6; Junker, Giza VII, fig. 49; IX, figs. 33, 88; Hassan, Giza II, figs. 7, 9, 35; VI.3, p. 98, fig. 119. Beyond the Memphite cemeteries it is also known from Meir (Blackman, Meir IV, pl. 9) and Abydos (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, SS 76: 66 3); also Couyat-Montet, Hammâmaât, no. 85. It does not seem to have been used after the Old Kingdom until it was revived in the Late Period.

(h) For this formulation, replacing the older pnt n.f hru, see p. 1 above.

(i) The term ‘wy “production” is known from Sixth Dynasty inscriptions at Deir el Gebrawi and Meir, discussed in Warrei 13 (1976), 11–13. The same term evidently appears in a Twelfth (?) Dynasty epithet: the production of the nomes of southern Upper Egypt (Hn-Nbn) 46 which were to be assessed(?).” 47 If so, this is much like the present case, which extends, however, to all of Egypt and to the foreign lands. A further parallel for this epithet is to be found on a late Sixth Dynasty statue in (western) Berlin, where “wy is used in the more general sense of “qualification”; the inscription is discussed in Excursus II. Yet

---

43 In addition to the first five examples of imy-r pry nbt in Murray, Index, pl. 21, see Hassan, Excavations at Saqqara I, p. 12 (8); Giza III, fig. 114; W. V. Davies et al., Saqqara Tomba I, p. 6; Firth and Gunn, Teti Pyramid Cemeteries, pp. 106 (16) and 107 (32); 138 (16); pp. 132 (34) and 133 (35), where the title in question is replaced by (twice copied thus, twice =- =-)

44 Petrie, Abydos I, pl. 54, mistided to the Sixth Dynasty on p. 27, and by Janssen, Egyptische Autobiografie 1, pp. 6, 9, 15, 94, 114. Even if there may be doubt about the form of (twice copied thus, twice =-), the writing of wy as (not attested until the Ninth Dynasty (Fischer, Dendera, p. 154, from Petrie, Denderah, pl. 10) even later (Schenkel, Frühe Studien, § 7)). To judge from Janssen’s other evidence (op. cit., pp. 147–48), the epithet m hbt (the) is not attested before Dyn. XII. E. Brovarski has independently discussed this inscription and concludes (Dissertation, p. 470) that it can be no later than Dyn. X since a hby-tp “of the Thinite Nome” would not be expected after it had been brought under the control of Thebes.

45 The sign for “nomen” is undetailed, as it also is beneath the Thinite emblem at the end of the same inscription.

46 For this term see WB III, 372 (13–16), where the present example is cited, dated Dyn. XI. For a Dyn. VIII “overseer(?) of the nomes of Hn-Nbn” see Edward Terrace, Egyptian Paintings of the Middle Kingdom (New York, 1968), pl. 46; Carolyn N. Peck, Some Decorated Tombs of the First Intermediate Period at Naga el-Der (Brown University Ph.D. dissertation, 1958), pp. 13–14 and pl. II. The term hny similarly refers to Upper Egypt in an early Dyn. IV titulary (Junker, ZAS 75 [1939], 68). A Tenth Dynasty writing much like the one from Abydos is hny (Sest III, 28). The “seven nomes of hny” are attested in Dyn. XI (Gabra, MAIK 32 [1976], 48, fig. 2 [4] and pl. 14). And since Gaspe (BIFAO 81 [1988], 94) has more recently published a Twelfth Dynasty inscription in Wadi Hammamat (reign of Osiris), which refers (line 13) to (written in the same way as “Thebes (in) Hn-Nbn and the Thinite Nome (in) the Head of Upper Egypt.” This suggests a smaller delimitation for the term in question, within the larger confines of TP-Sḫm, for which see p. 86 (c, g) below. Most of the references for Hn-Nbn are also given by Gomâa, Besiedlung, p. 340, and by E. Brovarski, Dissertation, pp. 297–301.

47 The problem is that ḫpt seems to agree with ḫpt rather than with ‘wy as would be expected; cf. ḫpt.i ḫpt nb.ti ḫpt “I assessed everything that was to be assessed” (Urk I, 106 [7–8]). A scribal error? Brovarski, in a series of additions and corrections to his Dissertation (Dec. 1990), has independently proposed the same restoration, based on Settgast’s publication of Berlin (West) 1/85 (Excursus II below).
another example of the same term occurs in the title of a “keeper of produce” (or “production”) for a Fifth Dynasty sun temple and pyramid, discussed in Excursus IV. And finally, in the chapel of Ṣu₂istles(i) at Giza, probably dating to the Fifth Dynasty, a damaged inscription mentions 𓊥𓊟𓊞 which again seems to refer to the “production of Lower and Upper Egypt.”

The preceding signs, recorded as 𓊨𓊣𓊧𓊱, can hardly be anything but 𓊡𓊥𓊧𓊱, i.e., “he who supervises the production.” In this case “production” refers to “handiwork, crafts,” for the same individual was “one who presides over the ornaments of the dancers of the Great House” and “keeper of the diadem in the place (storeroom?) of the king.”

One might also compare the epithet of a Sixth Dynasty expedition leader named Titi:

𓊥𓊲𓊥𓊣𓊠𓊢𓊧𓊡 “one who brings back the produce of the southern and northern lands for the king.” As an official concerned with expeditions, Titi was based at the trade center of Aswan, where he made his tomb, whereas Ṣpss-Ptḥ, as the assessor of such revenue, must have lived at a center where all the production of Egypt and the foreign lands was ultimately accumulated.

(j) PNI, 320 (17); Murray, Index, pl. 13–14; Junker, Giza XII, p. 163. Apparently not known later than the Old Kingdom.

(k) It would be natural to assume that zi and the sign after it constitute a title, and I was initially inclined to regard the second sign as a variant of the sign for cloth, a peculiar form

48 Hassan, Giza VI/3, fig. 190.

49 The only alternative is “singers of Lower and Upper Egypt,” which seems unlikely. His “singer” is occasionally written as 𓊨𓊠, Posener-Krieger, Archives, p. 605; Hassan, Giza I, p. 67 and pl. 44 (1); Junker, Giza VII, fig. 15; Reisner, Hist. Giza Necr. I, pl. 65 b (top); Mariette, Mastabas, pp. 395, 396 († Cairo CG 1528); also fem. ‑ibid.; pp. 395, 396 († CG 1420, 1431, 1461), 398 († CG 1451).

50 Phono realistically recopied in the text, p. 191, as 𓊠𓊱. The first two signs are more usually written 𓊨𓊠, but 𓊠 is study written as 𓊠; the name of Cairo CG 1707 is written rather than 𓊠, as Borchardt has transcribed it in Denkmäler der Alten Reichshe, II, p. 147. And 𓊡 has conversebly been written as 𓊡; the name transcribed as 𓊡𓊡 by Mariette, Mastabas, p. 309, and Borchardt, op. cit. I, p. 180 (CG 184 g), is actually 𓊡𓊡.

51 For 𓊥𓊥 meaning “see to,” “superse” cf. Hassan, Giza IV, fig. 118 (3, 4), in the phrase mu kh, which also occurs as a title; cf. Mourad Z. Allam, ASAÉ 71 (1987), 1–3. Also “it (the making of the tomb) was done in the presence of the king himself at the opening of the pillared hall 𓊥𓊥𓊱𓊡𓊠, while his majesty supervised the daily requirements thereof every day” (Boston MFA 21.3081: Reisner, Hist. Giza Necr. I, pl. 65 b). Similarly 𓊥𓊡𓊡𓊠𓊡 𓊡𓊡 𓊠 “(the work) that was done on them (a pair of false doors) in the stp-w was supervised throughout the day” (Urk I, 99 [1]; for stp-w see Goetel, JARCE 23 (1985), 89).


53 Urk I, 141 (11), where the last words are corrected from my own copy; moreover the preceding title is not 𓊨𓊠, as Sethy suggests, but 𓊠𓊠. In Urk I, 140 (17), the southern and northern lands are specified as Punt and Byblos. For hst “products” (of a place) Faulkner, Concise Dictionary, p. 195, cites Urk I, 123(17).

54 This meaning is evident from the juxtaposition of “Upper and Lower Egypt.” It is true that hst may simply mean “upland” as opposed to the Nile Valley (Wb. III, 234 [7]); also Moussa and Altemmüller, Nianehnum, fig. 15, showing hst as the nearby habitat of fruit trees; cf. Roquet in Mélanges Vercoutter (Paris 1983), pp. 295 ff.). But hst nbt probably always refers to “every foreign land” or “all foreign lands” (Wb. III, 234 [10]); cf. the Old Kingdom title ḫn w 𓊥𓊡, which was held by at least two Old Kingdom officials (Petrie and Murray, Seven Memphite Tomb Chapels, pl. 2, and Reisner, Hist. Giza Necr. I, figs. 257, 263), both of whom were concerned with expeditions abroad.
somewhat resembling the sack at the end of the name Qfr in B (5), which in turn may be compared with in Jéquier, *Monument funéraire de Pepi II III*, fig. 22. But the two forms are not really the same, and I know of no other Old Kingdom “scribe of linen”; the closest comparison is (or the like) “scribe of royal linen.” While making the drawing shown in Figure 1, I became convinced, however, that the doubtful sign represents an animal facing right, along with the other signs, and bearing a flagellum on its back. Figure 3 shows the external outline of this, and beside it a freehand drawing of the interior,

![Hieroglyph in B (1)](image)

made from the original by K.-H. Priese; the surface of the stone is too friable to permit a rubbing. But the identity of the animal is perplexing. It does not seem to be a crocodile on a shrine since the foreleg is not indicated. Furthermore there does not appear to be any evidence for before the Twelfth Dynasty, and it is not known to be surmounted by a flagellum. The head is rather more like that of a bird than a crocodile, and the entire sign conceivably represents a , based on a clumsy hieratic version which was not understood by the scribe who laid out the inscription. This hieroglyph in fact occurs in Old Kingdom writings of the name Ny-‘nh-Nḥbt. A more remote possibility is which occurs as the

---

55 For this variant of Old Kingdom see Junker, *Giza IX*, p. 229.
56 The phrase (Junker, *Giza V*, fig. 10), which has been taken as a title meaning “Schreiber für die Linien” (ibid., pp. 50, 199), is actually a caption: “writing down the (amount of) linen.” An Eleventh Dynasty “scribe of linen” is known from a fragment from Dendera: (University of Pennsylvania Museum, Philadelphia, 29-66-6728). Otherwise this title does not seem to be known in the Middle Kingdom either. In both periods the only titles concerning “linen” as such involve “overseers” and “keepers” (Junker, *Giza IX*, pp. 228–29; Ward, *Index*, nos. 360, 544).
57 Mariette, *Mastabas*, p. 279; also on the same false door, as seen from the original, Univ. Mus., Philadelphia, E 15729: “scribe of the king’s linen and (scribe) of phylactery.” Other scribes of royal linen: Hassan, *Giza V*, figs. 67, 70 and p. 223; VI/3, fig. 188.
58 But cf. , a graffito of uncertain date in Davies, *Sheikh Said*, pl. 29.
59 Unless the flagellum is actually a harpoon; cf. two other cases, dating to the Heracleopolitan Period and the Middle Kingdom, where a lance or arrow protrudes from the back of the crocodile of the Denderite nome emblem: *WZKM* 57 (1961), 59 f.
60 Ranke, *PFI*, 171 (15), citing Turin Inv. 1868 and Cairo CG 1682, to which may be added CG 1700, belonging to the latter. I cannot confirm the presence of the flagellum in the last two cases, but it appears in the Turin example (Corto, *Gli Scavi Italiani*, pl. 28b) and again in Bologna B 1901 (Fischer, *Egyptian Studies*, I, p. 5). In this case and Turin Inv. 1868 it is placed upon , as would be expected, but apparently not in the case of the Cairo examples (belonging to one person). The form is also known from Eleventh Dynasty names at Saqqara: Nḥbt-m-3.5 and her nurse (mwt) Ny-ḥbt (Cairo J 55618, for which cf. Abdalla, *JEA* 78 (1992), 100); cf. also (Firth and Gunn, *Teti Pyramid Cemeteries*, p. 57).
A Late Old Kingdom Overseer of the Two Treasuries

Determinative of \( \text{mnh} \) in the tomb of \( \text{Min} \) and in the Pyramid Texts, and which could represent the god of Letopolis as an independent ideogram in the present case. The overall shape of the sign speaks against this alternative, however, and it may be doubted whether the god would be identified by the ideogram alone. One might also compare on an Old Kingdom block from Giza showing a wine-pressing scene; but this is only recorded from a sketch, and the context of the scene is incomplete and uncertain. In any case the name is evidently to be read \( \text{nh-swt-NN} \), showing a retrograde sequence that is well known in theophoric names of the Old Kingdom. Although no parallel is forthcoming, the suggested interpretation is certainly more plausible than \( \text{Swt-nh} \), as the name has been read previously. The closest comparisons are (ibid., 332 [151]), while the names of several royal pyramids likewise come to mind, dating from the late Fifth to early Twelfth Dynasty.

(i) This is evidently the masc. name \( \text{Taw.f-n.(i)} \), with the addition of the fem. ending (i.), for which other evidence may be cited in Old Kingdom names. It is remarkable that the feminine version has not become \( \text{Taw.s-n.(i)} \), as in the Middle Kingdom (PN1, 15 [4]). The writing of \( \text{mnh} \) is particularly characteristic of the Old Kingdom, although Middle Kingdom examples are occasionally attested.

(m) The title \( \text{sdh yryw-hft pr-hdj} \) is attested by only a few other occurrences.

(n) Rank, PN1, 22 (15, where the first writing should be \( \text{mnh} \)); II, p. 339; Junker, Giza II, fig. 29; Capart, Rue de tombeaux, pl. 34; James and Apter, Khentika, pl. 9 (57); Hassan, Excavations at Saqqa II, p. 41; Simpson, Western Cemetery I, pl. 14; Verner, Ptahshepses, no. 141; Posener-Krieger, Archives II, p. 648. In the provinces: Petrie, Deshasheh, pl. 6; Edel, Felsengraber der Qubbet el Hawa II/1/2 [Wiesbaden 1970], pp. 32–33.

Dynasty, dating to SahuRe and Neuserre. The same determinative occurs after St (Weigall, ASSAE 11 [1911], 171). Also in a tomb chapel of the early Fifth Dynasty: Junker, Giza II, fig. 34. p. 189.

The Pyramid Texts of Menene and Pepy II often add the same determinative to another designation of the same god, \( \text{mnh wr} \) of Tyner (PN1, 1211 M, N; 1670a M, N; 1864b N; 2015c N; 2086c N).

Simpson, Kahun, Khafrahu I and II, p. 34 and fig. 62 (263-253). In two other cases an erect falcon likewise bears the flagellum: \( \text{mnh wr} \) in imnt “western” (Sales, Three Old Kingdom Tombs at Thebes, pl. 4); \( \text{mnh wr} \) (El-Khouli and Kanawati, El Hammamiya, pl. 52) the latter evidently representing the titons (for which see Edel, ZAS 102 [1975], 24–27).


Roeder, Avg. Inschr. II, p. 518; Rank, PN1, 298 (24). The name \( \text{Sakt-nwr} \) (PN1, 341 [10], 428 [16]) is not really comparable; it is analogous to \( \text{Sakt} \) (PN1, 298 [23]), but \( \text{Sakt-nwr} \) is not attested.

Conveniently listed by Helck, in LAV, cols. 5–6.
(o) The arrangement of signs in the preceding and following titularies suggests the sequence is |

\[ \text{[sequence]} \] (cf. comment m). But despite this consideration, the reading is probably \textit{shd ñw pr-hd}, which is well known from Giza and Saqqara.71

(p) Ranken, \textit{PNI}, 333 (9); II, p. 391; Murray, \textit{Index}, pl. 14. The final sign is often \[ \text{[sign]} \] (bag with a handle), but also \[ \text{[sign]} \], as in \textit{Meeruka I}, pl. 83, Macramallah, \textit{Idout}, pl. 12; Simpson, \textit{Qar and Idou}, figs. 36, 39, 41, as compared to \[ \text{[sign]} \], figs. 15–32. In the latter form it is also known from Edfu (Darey, \textit{ASAE} 17 [1917], 131, 134, 135), Abydos (CG 1575) and Dendera (Fischer, \textit{Dendera}, pl. 10 b), and written \[ \text{[sign]} \] at Aswan (de Morgan, \textit{Catalogue des monuments}, I, p. 198). At least two occurrences may be later than the Old Kingdom, both from Akhmim: CG 1669 (with det. \[ \text{[det]} \]; Kanawati, \textit{El-Hawawish VI}, fig. 29a) and \textit{ibid.}, pls. 14–16 (det. \[ \text{[det]} \]).

(q) \textit{PNI}, 267 (12); Murray, \textit{Index}, pl. 11. This form of the name (with final \[ \text{[sign]} \] rather than \[ \text{[sign]} \]) is more common in the Old Kingdom than later, but continues in use down to the Middle Kingdom. It is known at Meir (Blackman, \textit{Meir IV}, pls. 9, 15), at Aswan (de Morgan, \textit{Catalogue des monuments}, I, pp. 148, 158) and at Abydos (CG 1431, 1578) as well as at the Memphite cemeteries (Hassan, \textit{Giza II}, fig. 94; Drioton, \textit{ASAE} 43 [1943], 502 f.).

(r) Although \textit{imy-st-r} is well known as an Old Kingdom term for “functionary,”72 it rarely occurs in titles of that period, and then only in two examples of \[ \text{[sequence]} \].73 A later example (probably late Dyn. XI) occurs in the tomb of the Overseer of U.E. 21–22 \textit{Ip}, at El-Saff, near Atfih, written \[ \text{[sequence]} \].74 In view of the fact that \[ \text{[sequence]} \] follows in all three cases, it seems likely that it is not a separate title; possibly it represents \textit{hnt-w-s} “plantations” or “holdings” rather than \textit{ntyw-s}, which is usually translated “tenant landholders.” In the present instance the replacement of \textit{r} by “\textit{ny}” might possibly be a meaningless assimilation from the “\textit{ny}” of the tomb owner’s epithet in \textit{A(4)}. But this is not necessarily the case since the related term \[ \text{[sequence]} \] provides earlier evidence for “\textit{ny}”, as is pointed out on p. 181 below.

To sum up the preceding comments, all of the personal names are well known from Memphite tombs of the Old Kingdom except \[ \text{[name]} \], which is evidently a feminine form of \textit{Tuf-f-n.i}, as it is written in that period (comment l), and \[ \text{[name]} \], not otherwise attested, but which apparently shows a retrograde sequence that is applied to Old Kingdom theophoric names. \textit{Hw} is attested later than the Old Kingdom, although less frequently, and \textit{Qr} still less frequently. Only \textit{Ip} is equally well known in both the Old and Middle Kingdom. Neither \textit{Spss-Pth} nor \textit{Ssm-ñfr} seem to have been current after the Old Kingdom came to an end. Furthermore none of the names suggests a provenance other than the Memphite cemeteries, although one or another of them makes an occasional appearance in the Upper
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73 Bissing, \textit{Gem-s-n-k1}, p. 19 (17) and pl. 10; II, p. 19 (175); for the latter cf. also p. 16 (100); \textit{Meiruka II}, pl. 120 (2).

Egyptian provinces. The same is true of the divinities that are invoked: Anubis, in the offering formula, and, after the epithet “revered with,” Osiris, The Great God, and Ptah-Sokaris.

The titles of Ṣpss-Ptḥ essentially conform, in sequence and in content, to those of the Old Kingdom except for certain details, which do not necessarily indicate a later date, since they are not known elsewhere. These titles are:

1. hry-tp nsut
2. ṣ-d-mr z3b
3. imy-r ṣrw-hdq
4. imy-ḥt pr-hdq
5. imy-r zṣw ṣrw-hdq
6. imy-r zṣw wḥtby
7. imy-r zṣw izwy ḫkt nsut
8. imy-r zṣw ṣrw nbw

All but one of the four scribal titles are new in some respect—no. 6 because, while scribes thus designated are known, they are not otherwise known to have an overseer; no. 7 because, in addition to this point, the only scribes thus designated are simply zṣ ḫkt-nsut; no. 8 because neither scribes of this kind nor overseers of such scribes are attested, although the title imy-r ṣrw nbw is frequently claimed by other “overseers of the two treasuries,” as are imy-r wḥtby and imy-r izwy-ḥkt. Thus it is the scribal emphasis of these titles that is noteworthy, and that emphasis is borne out by the terminal epithet “who takes stock of the production of Upper and Lower Egypt and all the foreign lands.”

Most of the titles of the subordinate figures are equally familiar from the Old Kingdom, although there are slight differences in the last of them:

1. Ṣḥt nsut (f.)
2. šḥ ṣrw ḫt pr-hdq
3. šḥ ṣrw pr-hdq
4. šḥ ṣrw ḫt pr-hdq
5. šḥ ṣrw ḫt pr ḫt
6. šḥ ṣrw ḫt ḫt-š

Here one misses pr ṣ in no. 6, and ṣwḥ, instead of ṣ is somewhat unusual. It seems doubtful that the omission of a reference to the palace indicates a provincial source later than the Old Kingdom, since titles (1) and (7) of Ṣpss-Ptḥ do refer to the king, and since his entire titulary, from “overseer of the two treasuries” downward, necessarily refers to the central administration. It is true that the title “overseer of the two treasuries” is to be found in the titularies of some high-ranking provincial officials, all of whom are nomarchs or overseers of Upper Egypt, and one a vizier. But the treasury titles, like most of the personal names, are more frequently and completely attested at the Memphite cemeteries, and there is no indication of a provincial connection among the titles listed here. The feminine title Ṣḥt

75 Davies, Deir el Gebrawī II, pl. 9: Kanawatāt, El-Hawawish
III, fig. 8; Blackman and Apted, Meir V, pp. 16 ff. The last is the vizier.
**A Late Old Kingdom Overseer of the Two Treasuries**

nsat is rarely attested in the Memphite cemeteries or in the provinces after the Old Kingdom, although a few examples may be cited.\(^{76}\)

Other orthographic peculiarities must now be examined, as well as those of palaeographic interest. Some of these are probably to be ascribed to carelessness: the sign in place of (comment e), the problematic sign (comment k), and the omission of the final of imnhw in B 3, 4, 6 (not uncommon in the Old Kingdom). The reduplication of in imy-st 'way (comment r) is probably not to be included among these lapses. But the abnormal forms of , and must be considered more seriously.

The sign ——, with two pellets below the land-sign instead of three, is known from a great many inscriptions that are later than the Old Kingdom, at Dendera and elsewhere;\(^{77}\) but it also occurs in late Fifth Dynasty hieratic at Abusir\(^{78}\) and in Sixth Dynasty inscriptions at Abydos,\(^{79}\) Deir el Gebrawi,\(^{80}\) and Sheikh Said,\(^{81}\) as well as at Giza, where, in most cases, the pellets look like grains.\(^{82}\) Sixth Dynasty examples are known from Saqqara,\(^{83}\) as well as some Eighth Dynasty examples in the pyramid texts of Ibi.\(^{84}\)

In the sign // the reduplication of the attachment at the top anticipates the Middle Kingdom form //, but it appears in Sixth Dynasty tombs at Deir el Gebrawi\(^{85}\) and Sheikh Said,\(^{86}\) and there are several Old Kingdom examples at Giza,\(^{87}\) one as early as the Fourth Dynasty.\(^{88}\) I have found fewer examples from Saqqara that are definitely as early as the Old Kingdom,\(^{89}\) although some occur in the Pyramid Texts of Unis;\(^{90}\) at this cemetery the old form // normally persists as late as the Twelfth Dynasty.\(^{91}\)

The form of ——, with a splayed top, is only rarely encountered in inscriptions from Saqqara dating to the end of the Sixth Dynasty or slightly later.\(^{92}\) It also occurs on a small

---


\(^{77}\) At Dendera Mrb and Sn-djw-t have this feature in contrast to their predecessors, while the later Mnt and pTuti resume the normal form; for their sequence see Fischer, *Dendera*, p. 187. For Theban examples see Clère and Vandier, *TPPI*, §§ 13, 14, 16 (fragment), 17, 20, 22, 23, 24, etc.

\(^{78}\) Posener-Kriéger and de Cenival, *Abu Sir Papyri*, Pal. pl. 7 [16].

\(^{79}\) Throughout the autobiography of Wn the Elder, *Uah*, I, 102–104.

\(^{80}\) Davies, *Deir el Gebrawi* II, pls. 11, 12.


\(^{82}\) Junker, *Giza* VIII, figs. 41, 43 (both ---), 66, 70; Hassan, *Giza VI*, 3, fig. 9; Simpson, *Western Cemetery*, Pt. I, figs. 2, 5 (also ---). These three grains are also attested: e.g., Junker, *Giza IX*, fig. 44.

\(^{83}\) CG 1434, 1482 (also --- in both cases), Kanawati et al., *Excavations at Saqqara I*, pl. 29; Jéquier, *Oudjebet*, fig. 37; *Pyr. des reines*, pl. 7 (34), 8 (534), 30 (767–68); *Pyramide d’Abydos* (Cairo 1935), pl. 29 (c).

\(^{84}\) Jéquier, *Pyramide d’Abydos*, pls. 5 (cols. 100–62), 11 (col. 526), 12 (cols. 608, 634), 13 (col. 779), 16 (Z); but also ---, pl. 14 (col. 725).

\(^{85}\) Davies, *Deir el Gebrawi* I, pl. 18 (less clearly in pl. 14).

\(^{86}\) Davies, *Sheikh Said*, pl. 28.

\(^{87}\) Junker, *Giza VII*, figs. 108, VIII, figs. 59, 66, 70; IX, fig. 30; Simpson, *Qar and Idu*, figs. 66, 93 (once thus, twice with the normal form); Simpson, *Western Cemetery*, Pt. I, fig. 41; Badawy, *Tombs of Iset etc.*, (Berkeley 1976), fig. 19 (and pl. 18).

\(^{88}\) W.S. Smith, *JEA* 29 (1933), pl. 23.

\(^{89}\) CG 1436; W.V. Davies et al., *Saqqara Tombs I*, pl. 26 (right outer jamb).


\(^{91}\) Firth and Gunn, *Teti Pyramid Cemeteries*, pl. 83.

\(^{92}\) Cairo CG 53016; Jéquier, *Oudjebet*, fig. 37; *Tombeaux de particuliers*, figs. 97, 98; W.V. Davies et al., *Saqqara Tombs I*, pl. 4; Kanawati et al., *Excavations at Saqqara I*, pl. 12; *MMF* 11 (1976), 172, fig. 12 (esp. left outer jamb). Also James, *Hieroglyphic Texts*, pl. 56 (3), of unknown provenance.
architrave from Abydos\textsuperscript{53} and on a series of inscriptions from Naga ed-Deir, belonging to the same period.\textsuperscript{94} The style of the Naga ed-Deir inscriptions is quite distinctive, however, and cannot be associated with the one under discussion. The present case also shows, in B 3–6, a progressive evolution towards \textsuperscript{47}, which becomes most clear in B 5–6. This “semi-reversal” is encountered throughout the Old Kingdom and, to a lesser extent, somewhat later; it is discussed more fully on pp. 194–201 below.

The sign \textsuperscript{3} is an infrequent variant of the form \textsuperscript{1}. The latter is known from Sixth Dynasty inscriptions at the Memphite cemeteries\textsuperscript{95} and at those of the Upper Egyptian provinces.\textsuperscript{96} The variant with two projections in front occurs on Sixth Dynasty stelae from Edfu,\textsuperscript{97} and Naqada;\textsuperscript{98} there are also somewhat later examples from Balat,\textsuperscript{99} Dendera,\textsuperscript{100} Naga ed-Deir\textsuperscript{101} and Thebes.\textsuperscript{102} I have not found any evidence of it at the Memphite cemeteries except for two or three examples from Saqqara that are no earlier than the end of the Heraclean Period (reign of Merykare),\textsuperscript{103} and another, at Memphis itself, that is at least equally late.\textsuperscript{104} Some Twelfth Dynasty examples\textsuperscript{105} are a little different: \textsuperscript{2}.

One might also consider the form of \(\), which is less angular than usual and has a more pronounced indication of the shoulder, but there is evidence for both these features in late Old Kingdom inscriptions.\textsuperscript{106} A few of the other signs are somewhat clumsily executed in the small jar (W24) with lugs (Oising et al., \textit{Denkmäler}, pls. 58–59), discussed in \textit{ZAS} 109 (1973), 20 (comment M).

\textsuperscript{53} CG 1591.

\textsuperscript{94} Dunham, \textit{Naga ed-Deir Stelae}, nos. 20, 65; Lutz, \textit{Stèles}, nos. 42, 45; CG 1607; also the tomb described by Sayce, \textit{Rec. trav.} 13 (1890), 64 (for which cf. Fischer, \textit{Dendera}, p. 94–94).

\textsuperscript{95} Giza: Junker, \textit{Giza VIII}, figs. 59, 62, 74; Simpson, \textit{Qar and Idu}, fig. 33; \textit{Unk. I}, 260 (11); \textit{MIO} 7 (1960), 303. Saqqara: Firth and Gunn, \textit{Teti Pyramid Cemeteries}, pl. 58 (1, left), 65 (5–8); AASAE 40 (1941), p. 681; fig. 72; Hassan, \textit{Excavations at Saqqara III}, figs. 53, 34; W.V. Davies et al., \textit{Saqqara Tombs I}, pl. 11.

\textsuperscript{96} Blackman and Apted, \textit{Mem. V}, pl. 21; also on the architraves of Qar of Edfu (Unk. I, 253 [3], as well as [11], which should be corrected). Davies, \textit{Deir et Gebeläti II}, pl. 11 has \textsuperscript{4}.


\textsuperscript{98} Fischer, \textit{Copitate Nome}, pl. 4; here the orientation of the top of the sign was wrongly reversed and corrected.

\textsuperscript{99} Oising et al., \textit{Denkmäler}, pls. 53, 56, 58. The dating of the epigraphic material is discussed by Leprohon, \textit{FSEA} 16 (1964), 50–56. A few of his late criteria are known from Dyn. VI: for the raised border of the offering table see now Cherpion, \textit{Manuscrits et hypothèses d'ancien Empire} (Brussels 1989), p. 50 (fig. 35); for covered bowls see i.a. Blackman, \textit{Mem. IV}, pl. 21 (there are also many examples from Saqqara); for the different determinatives of Qaris and Khentamentiu see CG 1574. On the other hand, yet another criterion of later date may be added, namely the
the captions of the last five subordinate figures (B 3–7), and notably 𓊆, in which the tip of the shaft does not appear above the macehead; similar examples may be found in late Old Kingdom inscriptions, however. The same is true of the shrine beneath Anubis (𓊆𓊏) in the initial funerary formula, the sides of which slope inward toward the bottom. Finally it should be noted that the dominant rightward orientation of the hieroglyphs has been retained in the first of the subordinate figures in area B, and that a semi-cursive — (𓊆) appears in the name of this figure.

Among the features that conform to Old Kingdom usage, as compared to later preferences, one may note the determinative 𓊅 in ἰμω (rather than 𓊅 or the like) the determinatives 𓊅 (in this sequence) after ḫr-nnfr,110 the form IColor rather than IColor,111 and written fully (rather than 𓊅, or the like),112 and the ligatured group 𓊆, which is common in the Sixth Dynasty, but becomes less frequent after the Old Kingdom, when the two signs are usually at least slightly separated.113 Older tradition is also followed in the phrase qrs.tw.f ḫr-nnfr rather than qrs.tw.f nnfr etc.; the addition of nnfr begins to appear in late Sixth Dynasty inscriptions, and becomes customary after the Old Kingdom.114 This evidence carries much less weight, to be sure, than the peculiarities that have been enumerated, since most of it could occur at a later date. Even if Sixth Dynasty parallels can be found for these peculiarities, they are sufficiently numerous to indicate that the stela is relatively late—quite probably as late as the Eighth Dynasty. That late a date is also suggested by the rather slowly style of the hieroglyphs and the lesser figures. So too the size of a stela, which is very modest for an official of such importance, although it may have supplemented a false door.

The format and composition of the stela must particularly be taken into consideration. Although it is clearly related to architraves from Giza and the provinces, showing the owner approached by members of his family or offering bearers, its height is abnormally great in relation to the length, resembling the proportions of late Old Kingdom stelae from Upper

---

107 E.g., Simpson, Western Cemetery, figs. 16, 20, 32, Fischer, JAOS 3 (1964), pl. 15.
108 Cf. James and Apted, Khentika, pls. 7 (12), 20 (a–b); Simpson, op. cit., figs. 16, 17, 24; Simpson, Qar and Idu, figs. 26, 28, 32; Kanawati et al., Excavations at Saqqara I, pl. 12; Davies, Deir el Gebrisi, pls. 8, 12 (the latter variable).
109 For the occasional survival of the older form in the provinces see Schenkel, Frühm. Studien, § 11 (b, c); not surprisingly it sometimes survived as late as the Middle Kingdom at Saqqara: Firth and Gunn, Teti Pyramid Cemeteries, pls. 82, 83.
110 Hassan, Giza VI/3, fig. 207; Paget and Pirie, Ptahhotep, pl. 39; Davies, Ptahhotep II, pl. 29; Herta Mohr, Mastaba of Hetep-her-akhot (Leiden 1943), p. 33; Capart, Rue de tombeaux, pl. 11; Badawy, Tombs of Ii, etc., fig. 19. The sequence of 𓊅 is reversed on a late false door, with 𓊅 among the determinatives at the bottom of the jambs, CG 57200; for this determinative see Caminos and Fischer, Epigraphy and Palaeprography, p. 39, n. 41. The same group is again reversed after ḫy in CG 1572, which may be even later.
111 See Schenkel, Frühm. Studien, § 16 (b, d), 18 (d); even though he has subsequently found Sixth Dynasty evidence for this form (Festschrift Elmar Edel [Bamberg 1979], pp. 85–86), it certainly was not common until after the Old Kingdom. In the Eleventh Dynasty (by the reign of Nḫt-pr-nfr-Iníuf) the yending, or no ending at all, became prevalent. Schenkel, Frühm. Studien, § 16 (d), rightly regards an early Dyn. XII example of ḫy as an archaizing feature in CG 42005.
112 Fischer, Dendera, p. 131 and n. 578; Egyptian Studies I, p. 52.
113 ZAS 100 (1973), 18 (A).
114 See Barta, Opferformelle, Bitte 4, pp. 27, 39, 47, where nfr is given for the first time after Dyn. VIII. But Sixth Dynasty occurrences are known from Simpson, Qar and Idu, fig. 35; Davies, Skeikh Said, pl. 23, and the uppermost architrave of Qr of Edfu (Unk. I, 245 [11]).
Egypt. One might, however, consider this case as an amalgamation of two architraves, like an example from the Coptite Nome in which an upper architrave adds two horizontal lines that extend the full length of the lower one, or a more elongated example from the Thinite Nome, of somewhat later date.

Since no stela of comparable format has yet been discovered at Memphis or the Memphis cemeteries, it must be considered whether the provenance might not in fact be Upper Egyptian. That possibility is also suggested by the early appearance of $\frac{2}{3}$ in that region, as well as the rather clumsy style of the figures and inscriptions. But the southern provinces provide no evidence of officials who were solely preoccupied with the treasury—even at Abydos, which was the center of royal power in Upper Egypt in the late Old Kingdom. Furthermore the reference to taking stock of “the production of Upper and Lower Egypt and all foreign lands” clearly points to the royal residence, and this indication is reinforced by the lack of any specific provincial associations in the names, titles or offering formulae.

If the provenance is Memphis, the question of dating becomes more difficult, for Old Kingdom traditions persisted longer at the Memphis Cemeteries. Many of the titles are, in fact, known from the Middle Kingdom, but that late a date is difficult to accept in view of the purely Old Kingdom repertory of personal names, and—to a lesser extent—the style, the iconography (especially the figure of the owner, the short hair of the woman and the detail of censing), the orthography and phrasing. All things considered, I believe the date is more probably the end of the Old Kingdom, i.e., the Eighth Dynasty, although a slightly later date, in the Heracleopolitan Period, cannot be excluded.

Excursus I: Metropolitan Museum 04.2.4–6

Nigel Strudwick, JEA 71 (1985), 45–51, has already published and discussed these blocks (Pl. 5) and rightly notes that the present arrangement, with block 5 at the upper left is impossible because its height is 5.7 cm less than the block next to it (6). He might have added that it cannot belong to the uppermost course of stones, as does 6, because there is not the same amount of space above the signs.

It does not seem impossible, however, to suggest an alternative arrangement. Although, as Strudwick says, “an unknown number of blocks is lost,” the sequence of the remaining blocks is probably correct. Block 6 belongs to the uppermost register of the scene at the right, and to the beginning of the inscription, while blocks 4 and 5 belong to the left edge. Block 5 probably goes above 4 rather than below it, since the left margin and vertical divid-
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115 Fischer, Coptite Nome, no. 8.
116 Louvre C 300 (BES 9 [1987/88], 15 and figs. 1–2; pp. 21–22).
117 In Ward’s Index the owner’s title 1 = no. 1226; 3 = 1267; 4 = no. 430 (one example); for 5 cf. no. 1382 (as n fr hsd); for 7 cf. no. 45 (imy-p izwy n hbrt nswt); for 8 cf. no. 191 (imy-p prwy nsw). The last of the titles of the subordi-
ing line coincide exactly if arranged thus, but do not do so if 5 is placed below. Furthermore the second alternative would produce a gratuitous recurrence of the principal title between the mention of Cheops and Redjedef, for there is every reason to believe that the latter ruler succeeded the former. The lack of space between the hieroglyphs on these two blocks might be explained by some loss along the edge of one or both, and/or the plaster between them. In this case 5 and 4 must be placed at least one course lower than 6 for the reasons stated initially. Taking into account the minimum that is to be restored below 6, the original height of the inscription comes to at least 90 cm if block 6 is not moved still higher. This is an exceptionally large proportion of text if one supposes that it belonged to a large representation of the tomb owner which was placed below it, even assuming that he was seated. The small figures on the right obviously address the owner and it is therefore likely that he was, in fact, shown in this location, with his name before him. But the character and size of the titulary are so unusual that we cannot be sure that such a figure was present. Possibly the attendants advance towards a false door beyond the inscription.

In any case the sequence of the blocks is evidently 6–5–4, so that we may translate: (1) The Overseer of the Treasury and ... of/for Sneferu; ..., Scribe of Royal Decrees, ... Overseer of the Chamber [of the King’s Regalia,] \textsuperscript{120} (3) ..., [Overseer of the Treasury] for Cheops; ..., (4) [The Overseer of the Treasury for] Redjedef; the Overseer of the Treasury for [Chephren]. If blocks 5 and 4 were spread apart, one or more titles would have to be introduced before the names of the first three kings, but it is clear that the title “overseer of the treasury,” in the last column, immediately preceded a royal name, presumably Chephren. It is also evident that Cheops’ name was preceded by more titles than in the case of any of the other rulers, a fact that would accord with the considerable length of his reign, as compared with that of his successor, and would suggest that the career of the anonymous overseer of the treasury occupied a lesser portion of Sneferu’s long reign, and did not continue far into the reign of Chephren. The point of this unique presentation of the titulary is certainly to boast of a long tenure of office—35 years under Cheops and Redjedef, perhaps half a dozen years under Sneferu and a few under Chephren, representing a total of about 45 years of active duty in the same important position.

Although the repetition of a similar title is known from the considerably later monument discussed in the preceding article, I am not aware of any parallel for a chronological succession of royal names in a titulary to make the point that the official in question served these kings. The closest analogy, dating to the early Fifth Dynasty, is a case where the epithet \textit{imnh \textit{hr “revered with” is repeated before each of six consecutive rulers, from Redjedef to Sahure,\textsuperscript{121} while in another case a son of Chephren repeats the same epithet before the name of that king and four successors.\textsuperscript{122} In inscriptions of the later Old Kingdom we hear of officials who exercised various offices under a succession of kings,\textsuperscript{123} but as far as titular-

\textsuperscript{119} Seated: LD II, 10, 22, 25. Standing: \textit{ibid.}, 19–21, 32, 46; Simpson, \textit{Kaaah, Khafkhufu I and II}, fig. 33.
\textsuperscript{120} Cf. p. 19 (e) and n. 39. For the title in its present form see Fischer, \textit{Egyptian Studies I}, p. 90, fig. 3 (5); also: Petrie and Murray, \textit{Seven Memphite Tomb Chapels}, pl. 14 (where the end of the title is to be read $\frac{3}{4}$).
\textsuperscript{121} Gauthier, \textit{ASAE} 25 (1925), 180.
\textsuperscript{122} Hassan, \textit{Gia IV}, fig. 64.
\textsuperscript{123} E.g., \textit{Urk. I}, 98 (12, 15), 142 (9–11), 254 (1–3).
ies are concerned, those that name kings are nearly always associated with funerary cults. A rare exception is (𓊕𓊩𓊕𓊙𓊩), which is evidently to be read wn-ḥrp(w)-ḥmrw m Wnis, indicating, as in the present case, that the high priest of Ptah held office in the reign of that king.124

The caption applied to the first of the three small figures at the upper right is also unusual; he is called ʿs.f ḏt “his ‘son of the funerary estate,'”125 a term that must mean much the same thing as the more familiar sn ḏt “brother of the funerary estate.”126 With this example one may compare a Fifth Dynasty false door on which the wife of the tomb owner is identified as (𓊭𓊡𓊩𓊨) “his wife, the ‘daughter of the funerary estate.’”127 The same term is doubtless to be recognized in the captions of a wife who is identified as (𓊩𓊫𓊩𓊩) “his daughter and his funerary priest(ess);”128 although the reference to the funerary estate is missing, it is clearly implied by the second designation. In addition, two series of attendants labelled msrw mw ḏt “his children of the funerary estate” are assigned to the tomb owner and his son, respectively, in a Fifth Dynasty tomb chapel,129 while another chapel of the same date shows an attendant who is (𓊭𓊩𓊩) “his ‘child of the funerary estate.’”130 Junker, in discussing this, compares the caption (𓊩𓊩𓊩) in the chapel of Whm-št.i at Hildesheim, which he takes to mean “(seine) Stiftungskinder und-brüder,” but is, I think, more probably “his children and snw-ḏt.”131

The “son of the funerary estate” is further identified as “the judicial scribe ḫnt” and he is followed by a scribe whose name is correctly interpreted by Strudwick as N-kəsmm-kš.(i).132 It is not attested elsewhere, but the meaning “My kš is not opposed” is almost synonymous with the well known Old Kingdom name Nn-hfr-kš.(i) “my kš has no opponent.”133 The scribe Pḥ-ḥrt (or Ḥḥt-Pḥḥ) brings up the rear.

The style of the figures and hieroglyphs is decidedly mediocre, given the presumed dating to the reign of Chephren. That date is borne out, however, by the wigs of the first two attendants, in which the uppermost tier of overlapping locks is larger than the rest, and differentiated by a series of striations radiating from the crown.134 Although the palaeographic evidence does not provide further support for this early a date, it does not speak against it.135

---

124 Ukt I, 81, for which see also JARCE 3 (1964), 123, n. 1.
125 Not “his son, for whom (he) has provided,” as Strudwick translates, op. cit., p. 46. For a further example of a ʿs.f ḏt see Stewart, Egyptian Stela II, pl. 37 (4).
126 Cf., among more recent discussions, Y.M. Harpur, JEA 67 (1981), 28 f., 30–34. See also Cairo CG 1417.
127 Mariette, Mastabas, p. 188.
128 Curto, Gli Sacri Italiani, fig. 32 and pl. 25. For msrw ḏt see also Ukt I, 25 (2): “These are the priests whom I have designated as msrw ḏt to do wḥ-service for Hathor.” Here they are actually the children of the tomb owner.
129 Junker, Isis II, fig. 28.
130 Ibid., p. 195. This example is shown in Kayser, Ushamka, p. 32.
131 Strudwick, loc. cit. I have independently come to the same conclusion, which provides an Old Kingdom example of kšm “obstruct,” otherwise attested from the Middle Kingdom and later, and likewise provides the earliest evidence for passive sdm.f.
132 PNI, 168 (21).
133 JNES 18 (1959), 238–39 and fig. 4. This is particularly telling because it is applied to figures of such small scale; cf. Simpson, op. cit., figs. 30–32.
134 The sign 𓊩 is discussed by Strudwick, op. cit., pp. 48–51. The sign 𓊩 has already been compared with other forms in ZAS 93 (1966), 58, fig. 3 and n. 6, where it may be seen that it resembles another Fourth Dynasty example (fig. 3 v).
Excursus II: Berlin-Charlottenburg Inv.-Nr. 1/85

The Old Kingdom statue mentioned on p. 20, comment i, has been illustrated by Jürgen Settgast, but without clear views of the inscriptions or a complete translation of them. He has kindly supplied the photographs shown in Plate 6, and his permission to reproduce them. The base gives the owner’s name Htp-n.(i),

a followed by the rather unusual presence of the determinative $\hat{n}^{b}$ and preceded by the archaic title $\hat{n}^{c}$. The proper right side is covered with four columns of inscriptions: (1) The King’s Chamberlain, Staff of the Commoners, Pillar of the Knm, Priest of Mt, Htp-n.(i), (2) $\hat{n}^{d}$, One Who Takes Stock of the Production of the Deserts, Marshlands and Heaven (3) Commander of the King’s Scribes, Who Takes Stock of Troops of Men and Cattle in the Two Houses (4) $\hat{n}^{e}$, Overseer of the King’s Repast, Who Takes Stock of the Production of the Deserts, Marshlands, and Heaven, Htp-n.(i). The proper left side has five horizontal lines of inscription, reversed (→) as usual: (1) Beloved of his father, (2) whom his mother praised (3) Htp-n.(i), Commander of the King’s Scribes, Htp-n.(i), (4) Revered with the King, Htp-n.(i).

COMMENTS (a) For the name see not only PNI, 258 (12) but Vol. II, p. 380. It is probably an abbreviated version of a name such as Htp-n.(i)-Pth (PNI, 258 [14]).

(b) See MMFI 8 (1973), 7.

(c) Discussed by Godron, RdE 8 (1951), 91-98, who reads the name of the divinity as Ht on the basis of archaic seals. The meaning of the sign $\sim$ is unclear; it also precedes the name of Anubis (CG 1385 and Davies, Sheikh Said, pl. 28; cf. Godron, op. cit., 91 and n. 3), as well as $\sim$ “god” (CG 1482).

(d) The first three titles occur repeatedly in Old Kingdom titles, always in this sequence and often followed by hmn–tr Mrt, as here. For the second and third titles, which evidently pertain to judicial functions, see Helck, Beamtenstitel, p. 74.

(e) Evidently an empty epithet, in which $\sim$ cannot be understood as “handiwork,” or “production” but in a more general sense such as “produce.” It is analogous to imy-r ht nht ddt pt qm $\tilde{t}$ “overseer of everything that heaven gives and earth creates,” which is known from the late Old Kingdom (Fischer, Titles, p. 7 [289d]). In the present case the term for “heaven” (Wb. V, 30) is unusual; the Old Kingdom evidence for it seems to be confined to the Pyramid Texts. This epithet is comparable to an Old Kingdom title in which $\sim$ is written rather differently, but may be recognized by the very similar context if taken as a continuation of the title that precedes it: $\sim$ (Z.Y. Saad, Royal Excavations at Saqqara and Helwan [1941-1945] [Cairo 1947], p. 58 and pl. 19 = Barsanti, ASAE 1 [1900], fig. 10 on p. 156 [reversed rubbing] and Urk. I, 193 [11-12]). The other titles of the official are also concerned with provisioning as well as the supervision of clothing ($\hat{d}t$). This pair of titles is therefore to be translated “overseer of all the king’s repasts, which heaven gives and earth creates, overseer of the produce of all the deserts (sci. “game”).” The use of the sign $\sim$ for $\sim$ is discussed below, in Chapter 14, section 2.

(f) This title is associated with 𓊈𓊊 and in most cases is written 𓊈𓊊 (CG 1426–1430; Lutz, Eg. Tomb Steles, pl. 1; Junker, Giza I, pl. 23; Mariette, Mastabas, p. 303; Simpson, Western Cemetery, fig. 47). In these cases Junker (Giza I, 150) suggests that it has much the same sense as “overseer,” and Helck, Beamtenstitel, p. 75, is of the same opinion. The same association occurs on an alabaster disk from Byblos (Montet, Kêmi I [1928], 84), but here it takes the form; 𓊈𓊊, as in the present case, and this also occurs without the other title elsewhere (CG 1490; Urk. I, 253 [6]; Hassan, Excavations at Saqqara III, fig. 17 b; Brovarski, Colloques internationaux du CNRS 595; L’Egyptologie en 1979 II [Paris 1981], 119). It seems doubtful, however, that the meaning is changed by the rearrangement.

(g) The combination of troops of men and cattle is curious. In the Old Kingdom the title 𓊊𓊊 is regularly applied to the “overseer of the herd,” while z3 ts3 “scribe of troops” is applied to people.137 The addition of “in the Two Houses” is applied to many Old Kingdom titles.

(h) For this and other titles referring to the king’s repast, see the comment (e) above, and Dorman, Hommages à Jean Leclant (Cairo 1994) I, pp. 458–62. To his references for Trnk-Pth may be added: Moussa and Junge, Two Tombs of Craftsmen, illustr. 4; also Tr.n-k3-Pth, ibid., pls. 6, 10, 12. For the reading 𓊊 (t3w-r), see p. 182 below, n. 62.

(i) For ḫsw see Edel, Altäg. Gramm. I, § 699 j, citing ASAE 40 (1940), 681; also II, Nachträge, p. 77. The more usual phrasing is mrj (n) n-it.f, ḫsw (n) mwt.f (Edel, MDAIK 13 [1944], 44–45). A parallel for the present example is to be found on a late Old Kingdom provincial stela that is illustrated in the Sotheby Parke Bernet Catalogue, New York, May 16, 1980, no. 306.

Settgast rightly points out that the statue cannot be earlier than the late Sixth Dynasty, and notes, in this connection, the unusually disparate arrangement of the inscriptions, which are in vertical columns on one side and horizontal lines on the other. The signs and orthography are generally normal, and the reversal of 𓊊 in both inscriptions is not particularly exceptional.138 On the other hand, the spacing is not well planned; the horizontal lines become progressively more crowded, and the vertical columns are poorly aligned; the third sign 𓊊 is omitted in the last of them, and the owner’s name is clumsily fitted in at the bottom of col. 3 instead of being repeated at the very end. Apart from the normal sequence of the initial titles of the first column, the sequence and repetition of the others seems arbitrary. Like the initial titles, “overseer of the king’s repast” is known from the late Old Kingdom139 but the combination of 𓊊 and 𓊊 is an archaic borrowing, while the epithets beginning with ḫr “who takes stock,” are novel and unexpected—particularly in respect to the strange use of ḫr to designate, apparently, flesh, fish and fowl.

137 Scribes: e. g., Hassan, Giza II, p. 99 and pl. 29 (3); Hassan, Excavations at Saqqara III, fig. 21, p. 37; Firth and Gunn, Teti Pyramid Cemeteries, p. 211; CG 1689, 1690; Berlin Inv. Nr. 20065 (ZAS 93 [1966], 67); Hodjash and Berlev, Egyptian Reliefs, no. 18; CG 17002.
138 Fischer, Egyptian Studies II, § 38, and Lāv, col. 189. For 𓊊 (→) see Petrie, Medum, pl. 17. Blackman and Apted, Mér V, pl. 4; for 𓊊 (←) see ibid., pls. 16, 19, 41. Both 𓊊 (→) and 𓊊 (←) are to be found in Junker, Giza IX, fig. 36.
139 And there is at least one Twelfth Dynasty example: Fischer, Titles, no. 33a.
This limestone false door was in the private collection of a Sir Richard Cook when Margaret Murray published it in *Ancient Egypt* (1917), pp. 62–64. In her judgment the pitted surface of the right inner jamb was never inscribed. But a few more signs could be seen at the top of the right outer jamb, and these have been restored in my copy, made from a photograph kindly supplied by Dr. Ann Rosalie David, along with her permission to reproduce it. In the meantime she has also extended the same favor to Nigel Strudwick (*RdE* 38 [1987], 139 ff.), but my drawing (Fig. 4) may nonetheless be useful, and my interpretation of the inscriptions differs from his in some particulars:

Above the owner: The Scribe of Royal Documents of the Palace in (?) the Workshop of (? and ?) the Two Houses of Gold, \( ^{a} \) *Ny-kw-Pth.*

Below the offering table: A thousand of bread, a thousand of beer.

Above and behind the figure censing: It is his brother of the funerary estate \( ^{b} \) who acted for him when he was buried in the goodly west among those who are revered.

Before the same figure: *Pth-hr.f.*

Crossbar: An offering which the king gives, and Anubis, Who Presides over the Divine Booth, that \( ^{c} \) che \( ^{d} \) may be buried in the cemetery, one revered with the great god.

Left outer jamb: \( ^{5} \) *Ny-kw*-Pth. \( ^{c} \) The Inspector of Scribes of the Treasury and of the King’s Regalia, \( ^{d} \) [Ny-kw]-Pth.

Right outer jamb: Great of \( ^{e} \) bar, \( ^{5} \) Overseer of the Treasury, Who Seals the Best of the King’s Food.

Left inner jamb: Under-supervisor of the Treasury, Priest of (King) Sahure, Priest of Re in (the sun temple of Userka) *Nhn-R*, \( ^{w} \) w-priest of the King, *Ny-kw-Pth.*

Right inner jamb: uninscribed.

**COMMENTS** (a) It is just possible that the last part of this title should be emended to  \( ^{b} \) \( ^{c} \), which would yield three titles that are known from other sources: Scribe of royal documents of the palace, Overseer of the Workshop, and (of) the two houses of gold. \( ^{140} \) But at least one other title similarly specifies the nature of royal documents of the palace: \( ^{b} \) \( ^{c} \) \( ^{d} \) \( ^{e} \) \( ^{f} \) \( ^{g} \) \( ^{h} \) \( ^{i} \) “overseer of the registry of royal documents of the palace for serfs and for fields.” \( ^{141} \) It therefore seems more judicious to take the present title at face value.

(b) For other cases where the *sn/snt dl* claims to have provided the burial see Hassan, *Giza II*, fig. 226; Fischer, *MO* 7 (1960), p. 301, fig. 2.

(c) The location of the name is unusual, and the cutting of the remaining signs has not been completed here or at the bottom of the column; in both cases they may have been supplied in paint, as also the incomplete inscriptions on the right jambs.

\( ^{140} \) For the last two titles see p. 20 above (comment f and note 43).

Fig. 4. False door of Pth-hr'f, Manchester 10780
(d) An unusual compound title, but scribes of the king's treasure are attested elsewhere; cf. p. 19 above (comment e and note 41).

(e) Only after restoring this title did I see that Grdelhoff had already recognized it in Murray's photograph: ASAE 42 (1943), 46; cf. Helck, Beamtentitel, p. 62, n. 27. In the meantime it has been discussed at greater length by David Silverman in For His Ka: Essays Offered in Memory of Klaus Baer (Chicago 1994), pp. 245-54. He suggests, on the basis of iconographic evidence, that the determinative of bzt may represent a clothes-bag, but in both the the two examples he cites, the head of the bag is certainly bovine rather than feline. Nor can I see, as he does, that variations of scale and proportions significantly distinguish this sign from the other contexts in which it appears. A more promising clue is to be found in the use of the sign as the determinative of (Pyr. 324), in the epithet zl 'ishw "fiery of burning." In later texts the determinative is replaced by . Possibly there is a connection between the brilliance of gold ornaments and the brilliant coat of the leopard. Its use in bzt can hardly be derived from 'Kopfschmuck," i.e., "diadem," or the like (Wb. I, 1 [11]) since here functions as a phonetic borrowing from "power" (ibid., 2 [3, 4]), both words occurring in the Pyramid Texts); this also takes the form , which never occurs in the title. And the title is at least once written (Hassan, Giza III, fig. 107), where only the context shows that the second sign is to be read bzt rather than bi "leopard," or "leopard skin." For the form of the title cf. wr idt "great of incense" (Wb. I, 152 [12]), wr sñw "great of Upper Egyptian grain" (Fischer, Dendera, p. 94, n. 423), wr ḫw "great of leather" (Brovarski, JNES 32 [1973], 455); in all these cases wr is evidently the equivalent of wr m "great in," i.e., "abounding in." If I am right in suggesting that the determinative of bzt conveys brilliance, as it evidently does in the case of zl, the meaning of wr bzt would be "abounding in brilliant objects" (of silver and gold). In the name of an estate (Jacquet-Gordon, Domaines, p. 249) bzt may well have the same meaning; cf. "The Regalia of Pepy" (ibid., p. 198).

(f) For this and comparable titles see Fischer, Coptite Nome, p. 127, to which add Curto, Gli Scavi Italiani, fig. 30 and p. 69. The sign probably refers to , "King of Lower Egypt," rather than "honey" even though this element precedes dfsw in only one out of four cases.

Excursus IV: British Museum 65953

In the second edition of Hieroglyphic Texts I, pl. 22 (3), T.G.H. James shows a double offering slab (Pl. 7) inscribed for a certain Ny-imut. A single long title, which begins

---


143 For the coloring of (yellow, with black spots) see Smith, HESPOK, p. 376 (Fg).

144 He has kindly supplied the photograph used here.

145 The second sign resembles , rather than , but James' reading is undoubtedly correct; cf. Ny-imut-Pth, PN1, 171 (2, 3), of which the present name may be an abbreviated form.
on the right edge and continues along the lower one, is much more difficult to interpret, particularly since the last sign is damaged, and it is evidently crucial for the meaning. Figure 5 shows this and the preceding signs, traced from the stone itself. The sense of 𓊩 is fairly clear, however; it can hardly be understood otherwise than ird *w*y “keeper of (manufactured) production” or “of (agricultural) produce.”146 Conceivably the last sign might represent a variant of 𓊫 like 𓊪, and despite the omission of 𓊩, this could refer to “jewelers,” lit. “stringers (of necklaces).”147 But the form of the conjectural 𓊫 is indistinct, nor is it reversed, as it is in the same sign in the parallel line at the top. And on the other hand, the reversal of the arrow would be quite unexpected. In the face of these difficulties, it seems hazardous to accept the translation of this part of the title as “keeper of the production of jewelers,” tempting as this may be. The only alternative that comes to mind is to restore a nome emblem, mounted upon a standard, and the only nome emblem that satisfactorily fits the available space is 𓊩, referring to Lower Egyptian Nome 2, immediately north of that of Memphis, on the western edge of the Delta.148 If this is so, the sign appears to have fused with the standard beneath it, as in some other cases.149 The meaning of the entire title would then be: “Keeper of produce/production of the Letopolite Nome (for) Re in (the Sun Temple) Ṣgp-ib-(R), (and for the Pyramid) Mn-swt-Nyusrr.”

146 For other titles beginning with ird see ZAIS 105 (1978), 54–55.
147 The form and use of the sign are discussed below, in Chapter 14, section 5.
148 See Helck, Die altägyptischen Gauen (Wiesbaden 1974), 151. The reading of the emblem may be Ṣk-pḥḥ, for which see my Egyptian Studies 1, pp. 122, 147.
149 It rests directly upon the standard in the inscription of Mpn (Goedicke, MDAIK 21 [1966], pl. 3). Other such examples occur in the funerary temple of Userkaf (as seen in the notes of William Stevenson Smith), and Davies, Psusennes II, pl. 15; cf. also Borchart, Denkmäler des A.R. I, pl. 21 (CG 1419).
Plate 6. Berlin-Charlottenburg 1/85

Courtesy of the Museum
Plate 7. British Museum 65953
   Courtesy of the Museum
4. On the Reading of Some Old Kingdom Titles

1. *R-Nḥn*

On a Twelfth Dynasty coffin from Meir in the Metropolitan Museum, belonging to the Overseer Of Treasurers *Whḥttp* son of *Hpw* (𓊪𓊝𓊩𓊕𓊩𓊝), a pair of *wˁjmt*-eyes occupies the usual position on the area reserved for a "false door," behind which the face was turned to receive offerings and other benefits from the outside world (Pl. 8). The present case, however, adds a most unusual feature; the signs (𓊨) have been placed at the very bottom of this area so that the first of them supplies a mouth to supplement the pair of eyes. Even more complete examples of hieroglyphic "faces" are known from the late New Kingdom (Fig. 1), but in these cases the mouth is formed by a bowl (𓊫𓊨) in a configuration that may perhaps be read *ptr(w) nfr(w) nb* "behold all beauty."⁴

The Middle Kingdom example is evidently more literal in that the sign (𓊫) actually represents a mouth, but it is more difficult to explain why (𓊨) should have been added, beyond the fact that these two signs had long been associated in the juridical title *r-Nḥn* "mouth of Nekhen." I think, however, that the addition of *Nḥn* probably provides a graphic pun, *r n Nḥn* "mouth of an utterance" or "mouth for utterance."⁵ One may compare the *Schriftspielereien* of other coffins of the same period that are discussed by Borchardt,⁶ as well as further emblematic uses of hieroglyphs on a contemporaneous stela and coffin, which I have discussed elsewhere.⁷ There is no question, in any case, that the first sign is intended to provide a mouth, and this point is of some importance because, while the title in question is

---

² Evidently a variant writing of (𓊠𓊝𓊩) (PNI, p. 238 [14]) in which (𓊠) is replaced by (𓊨), as in the later writing of the name of *Kbḥt-Rˁ Menutuhotep*.
³ From G. Brunton and R. Engelbach, *Gardô* (London 1937), pl. 30 (53); another example in Chas. Nicholson, *Aegyptiaca* (London 1891), pl. 8. There are also some cases where (𓊨) appears between the eyes of concubine figures, but without an indication of the mouth; B. Brunére, *Rapport sur les fouilles de Deir el-Médîneh* (1934–1935) (Cairo 1939), pl. 45. Also on the collar of an anthropoid coffin, MMA 86.1.2 (Hayes, *Scepter* II, fig. 265), and on a bronze votive plaque: Naville, *Xth Dynasty Temple III*, pl. 24 (5).
⁴ The *wˁjmt*-eyes and *nfr* may go back to Middle Kingdom devices such as the one discussed by A. Blackman in *JEÂ 21* (1935), p. 2.
⁵ This term for "utterance" is known from the Middle Kingdom onward: Wb. III, 289; Faulkner, *Concise Dictionary*, p. 192.
⁶ *ZAS* 35 (1897), 116–17. He points out that the signs (𓊯) and (𓊨) are emphasized, by color and detail, in the inscriptions on the front and on the head end.
⁷ *MMJ* 5 (1972), 19–20 and fig. 27, and *MMJ* 11 (1976), 125–26 and fig. 1.
interpreted as “mouth of Nekhen” by the Wörterbuch, most Egyptologists have preferred to read it یر-نفح “keeper of Nekhen.”

The Wörterbuch’s interpretation is supported by other Middle Kingdom occurrences of the title, which include یر-نفح but not writings in which the initial element is either ٔ or ٔٔ, as would at least occasionally be expected for writings of یر in that period. Conversely, while یر occasionally appears in Old Kingdom titles as a writing of یر, and scarcely ever as یر it was frequently applied to یر rather than یر in Middle Kingdom titles such as, for example, in ٔ ٔ for یر-ٔ ٔ “overseer.” Thus the Middle Kingdom writing یر can hardly be read otherwise than یر-نفح. The writing یر is attested from the Middle Kingdom, but, as Gardiner has pointed out, this is a survival of the old, and quite distinct, title ٔ (or ٔٔ) نفح, which is sometimes written ٔٔ ٔ ٔ. Since these remarks were written, Detlef Franke, following Gardiner, has presented much the same arguments for the reading, which the coffin of ٍٍٍ ٍ so clearly confirms.

8 Wb. II, p. 390 (5) (probably based on Gardiner’s conclusion in ZAS 42 [1905], 133, that یر-نفح “mouth of Nekhen,” is to be accepted as a provisional reading). Gunn, in Firth and Gunn, Teti Pyramid Cemeteries, pp. 274, 281, also translates “Mouth of Nekhen,” while ٔ ٔ (see below) is translated “Mouth of every Butije,” without a query. T.G.H. James likewise transliterates the first of these titles as ٔ نفح in Corpus of Hieroglyphic Inscriptions, p. 188. Gardiner, Grammar, p. 575. s.v. نفح, remains undecided: “ٔ نفح mouth of (or یر attached to) Nekhen.”

9 So, for example, K. Sethe in Murray, Sagarra Mastabas II, p. 12; Helck, Beamtentitel, p. 145, s.v. یر نفح; Fischer, MIO 7 (1960), p. 304, reading یر نفح (but یر نفح in MIO 13 [1978], 7; EEA 65 [1979], 42); Faulkner, Concise Dictionary, p. 209, s.v. ٔٔ, “s. warden of Nekhen” (but contradicted on p. 145, s.v. “mouth”); G.T. Martin, Private-Name Seals, p. 184, s.v. ٔ ٔ ٔ نفح; J.L. de Cenival, BdE 27 (1975), 66; Paule Poenner-Krieger, Archives, p. 660, s.v. ٔ ٔ ٔ نفح; P. de Bourg, Milanges Maspero 1/4, p. 14; Dimitri Meeks, Année Lexicographique II (Paris 1981), 78, 3291.

10 Many examples in the index of Lange-Schäfer, Grab- und Denksteine des Mittleren Reiches III, pp. 50–52. ٔٔ is also attested as a writing of یر in the Old Kingdom, albeit only rarely: MMJ 10 (1975), p. 20.


12 Edel, ZAS 81 (1956), 9, quotes an Old Kingdom example of ٔٔ as a writing of the title یر, but not in the context of a formal titulary. Compare the writings of یر-ٔ staves, discussed in MMJ 13 (1978), 6–7. Franke (SAK 11 [1984], p. 210, n. 5) also cites ٔٔٔ (Goyon, Nouvelles Inscriptions, no. 61, line 5, dating to Sesotris I), but this is more probably ٔٔ ٔ ٔ.

13 Schenkel, Früh. Studien, 87.

14 Newberry, Bmi Hasan I, pls. 13–44; commented upon by Gardiner, ZAS 42 (1905), 122, who observes that “in their respective usages ٔٔ and ٔ ٔ never interchange.” Kaplony, Inschriften, p. 449, errs in transliterating an archaic example as ٔ نفح. The sign ٔ ٔ does not have this value before the Heracleopolitan Period (ZAS 105 [1978], 55, n. 70).

15 SAK 11 (1984), 210–11. The present discussion was originally scheduled for MMJ 14 (1979), as noted in MMJ 13 (1978), 7, n. 12.
2. ZHY-NTR

A similar interpretation must be applied to the old title 𓀐, which the Wörterbuch rightly interprets as r P nb “mouth of every Butite,” and which, in the Middle Kingdom, was sometimes written 𓀐.\textsuperscript{16}

It is, to be sure, theoretically possible that 𓀐 represents a reinterpretation of the Old Kingdom titles with old *iry Nḥn only secondarily read (or misread) as r-Nḥn.\textsuperscript{17} Against that alternative is the fact that titles beginning with iry normally refer to keepers of things, and not of places or people.\textsuperscript{18} Virtually the only exception to this pattern is the old title 𓀐, which is difficult to explain otherwise than as iry-přt, referring to “the patricians.”\textsuperscript{19}

2. ZHY-NTR

The group 𓀐 (var. 𓀐) appears in a very few Old Kingdom inscriptions and in a limited number of contexts (Fig. 2)\textsuperscript{20} as well as on some inscriptions of earlier date. Peter Kaplon (Kleine Beiträge zu den Inschriften der ägyptischen Frühzeit [Wiesbaden 1966], pp. 51–52) interprets some of the titles in question as an alias of Anubis (Fig. 2 2–4) and possibly [5]) and others as a designation of a funerary officiant, derived from the same alias (Fig. 2 [4a–c] and possibly [5]). Here as in his Inschriften der ägyptischen Frühzeit (pp. 369, 1058), he reads hry-sšt\textsuperscript{21} and dispenses with any explanation, doubtless because he considers it self-evident that this reading is supported by the Middle Kingdom titles where hry-sšt is certainly to be recognized in 𓀐 and 𓀐. It is by no means certain, however, that such a connection exists. There is much more reason to regard the Middle Kingdom writing of hry-sšt simply as one of the several ingenious substitutions that are used in contemporaneous inscriptions, dating to the beginning of the Twelfth Dynasty, e.g., 𓀐 for hry-tf and 𓀐 for imy-r.\textsuperscript{22} The application of the new phonetic value of 𓀐 is probably based on nothing more than a graphic allusion to this writing of Anubis, which goes back to offering formulæ of the Sixth

\textsuperscript{16} Wh. II, p. 390 (4). Junker adopts the same reading, Giza XII, p. 171, s.v. r Pt nb nb.w, as does Gunn (note 8 above). But Helck transliterates iry Pt nb nb.w (Beaumiers, p. 144). Selim Hassan inconsistently transliterates this title as r Pt nb (or r Pt nb nb.w) in Giza X, p. 74, but nonetheless interprets the other title as sḥt by Nḥn, p. 90.

\textsuperscript{17} As suggested by W. Helck in Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reichs, p. 57.

\textsuperscript{18} See ZAS 105 (1978), pp. 54–55. For the Middle Kingdom cf. Ward, Index, nos. 4495–556.

\textsuperscript{19} For the fullest discussion, see Gardiner, Onomastica I, pp. 16–17. See also Franke, SAK 11 (1984), 211, who categorically endorses the accepted reading.

\textsuperscript{20} (1a, twice) Cairo CG 1417; (1b) Cairo CG 1385; (1c) Cairo CG 1385 and Firth and Gunn, Teti Pyramid Cemeteries, p. 169(2); (2a) Cairo CG 1417; (2b) Cairo CG 1384 (father of same person); (3a) Cairo CG 1564; (3b) Junker, Giza IX, figs. 74–75; (3c) ibid., figs. 72–73, 76; (3d) ibid., fig. 73; (4) Cairo CG 13048 (Urk. I, p. 231 [8]); (5) Leipzig 2897 and Berlin 15302–3 (W.S. Smith, AFA 46 [1942], 518 [fig. 7], 521 [fig. 9]).

\textsuperscript{21} The same reading had already been advanced for an archaic example by Scharff in Studies in Honour of F.L. Griffith (Oxford 1952) p. 348; and this is repeated by Hassan, Giza V, p. 89.

\textsuperscript{22} All three of these writings seem to have been created in the reign of Sesostris I. For 𓀐 cf. Schenkel, Frühm. Studien, §7 (d); equally early examples of this are to be found at Aswan (Urk. VII, pp. 5 [10], 6 [4, 10], 7 [9]), Asyut (p. 58 [18]) and in the reign of Sesostris II at Beni Hasan (p. 37 [8]). For contemporaneous examples of 𓀐, which occurs only at Beni Hasan, see below, Chap. 14/4. Contemporaneous examples of 𓀐 and 𓀐 as hry-sšt appear at all three cemeteries: Aswan (Urk. VII, p. 1 [16]), Beni Hasan (p. 22 [9]; and from the reign of Sesostris II, Urk. VII, pp. 37 [7], 38 [8]), Asyut (p. 65 [6]).
Fig. 2. Old Kingdom titles mentioning Anubis
(rearranged from columnar inscriptions, except 3c, 3d)
Dynasty.\textsuperscript{23} As for the use of \textit{hry-sts} as an alias of Anubis, this does not seem to be attested any earlier than the Roman Period, and only rarely at that late a date.\textsuperscript{24} The alias may be based on the previous use of \textit{hry} as a sportive writing, but it seems unlikely that the sportive writing is, conversely, based on the prior use of \textit{hry-sts} as a divine epithet, for which we have no evidence.

Whatever reading is adopted, it is in any case clear that Fig. 2 (2a, b) cannot be combined with \textit{hry-sts}, which follows it in CG 1417, since this phrase does not follow in CG 1564, which belongs to the father of the same individual. It is therefore quite impossible to interpret the title as Kaplony does: \textit{hry-sts} Hry-sts \textit{sr-iw}n\textit{w} “Geheimrat des Geheimrats (= Anubis), des Fürsten von Tumut.”\textsuperscript{25} It should also be noted that, in both cases, \textit{r} is decidedly bent forward, so that \textit{smsw} “elder” is indicated rather than \textit{sr} (\textit{f}).\textsuperscript{26} And with \textit{sr} eliminated, there is no reason to interpret \textit{nsw} as a transposed reference to \textit{iw}n\textit{w} “Heliopolis.”\textsuperscript{27}

If the reading \textit{hry-sts} is precluded for CG 1417, the same is true of Fig. 2 (3c), which is followed by \textit{wt} “embalmer” and \textit{hry-sts}. In this connection it should be noted that there is no other Old Kingdom evidence for \textit{hry-sts} name of god, with the god’s name honorifically transposed.\textsuperscript{28} But if \textit{hry} and \textit{hry-sts} are not combined, then the first element is a separate title and can hardly have the same reading as the second.

A final objection to the reading \textit{hry-sts} (although it is scarcely needed) is the fact that \textit{hry} are repeatedly written side by side in Fig. 2 (3c), so that Anubis is no longer “over” \textit{hry} the shrine. Here the hieroglyphs are arranged in a horizontal line, whereas in all the other cases the arrangement is columnar, and the shrine is necessarily placed beneath. But in Fig. 2 (2b) the shrine is omitted.

The correct solution, I think, is to read the group just as it appears, i.e., \textit{zhy-nfr \textit{Inpw}}. Additional support for this reading is to be found in the Pyramid Texts, where \textit{Diw} are mentioned (Pyr. 750 d).\textsuperscript{29} The title \textit{Diw} is attributed to a lector priest in the Sun Temple of Neuserre,\textsuperscript{30} and reappears as \textit{Diw} in one of the Sixth Dynasty tombs located at Qasr

\textsuperscript{23} For examples of this date see Fischer, \textit{Dendera}, p. 84 (14).

\textsuperscript{24} The Belegstellen for \textit{Diw}, p. 298 (22), include two references, \textit{Rituel de l’embaumement} (new edition by S. Sauneron [Cairo 1952], p. 11 [101], and Papyrus Rhind I (pp. 11, 12). Sauneron (p. xii) dates the first to about 500 B.C., while the second is even later, 9 B.C.

\textsuperscript{25} Kaplony, \textit{Inscriptions}, p. 628.

\textsuperscript{26} Fischer, \textit{Egyptian Studies I}, pp. 81–83.

\textsuperscript{27} Assuming that Kaplony’s reading is prompted by the Heliopolitan \textit{hwt-r} (\textit{Wh}, p. 189 [8-g]).

\textsuperscript{28} One might possibly see an exception in \textit{hry-nfr n nfr}, “he who is privy to the secret(s) of his god” (examples in CG 1485, Mariette, \textit{Masabas}, pp. 130, 211, 295, 326, 357, etc.). But here \textit{nfr} refers to the king, as also in epithets such as \textit{nh nh nfr}, “who belongs to the heart of his god,” see \textit{JNES} 18 (1959), p. 268. It is only on monuments of much later date that we find titles such as \textit{nh nh nfr} “he who is privy to the secrets of Pah” (CG 667).

\textsuperscript{29} The version of Merenre is thus, while that of Teti has \textit{Diw}; Sethe (\textit{Übersetzung und Kommentar}, III, p. 391) notes that this is to be read as \textit{Diw} in Pyr. 26 b (N), “das allgemeine Personendeterminativ der Pyr.,” and he identifies \textit{nh nfr} as the structure over which Anubis presides. The composite sign \textit{Diw} quite frequently replaces \textit{nh} in the epithet of Anubis \textit{nh nh nfr}, and especially at Giza: Junker, \textit{Giza II}, fig. 18; III, fig. 27; VI, figs. 28, 58, 72, etc.

\textsuperscript{30} Bissing, \textit{Re-Heiligtum II}, pl. 23 (56b). Another Old Kingdom example, written \textit{Diw} is given by Stewart, \textit{Egyptian Stele II}, pl. 7 (1), but his copy is mistaken; after re-examining the fragment in question, I am quite certain that the supposed \textit{Diw} (broken at the top) is \textit{nh}, so that the title is actually the familiar \textit{nfr} nfr. The same error is made by Lauer, \textit{ASA} 55 (1958), p. 212, where \textit{Diw} is restored in another inscription.
es-Sayyad. In the Middle Kingdom it reappears in various forms: ḫḥ bàn, ḫḥ nḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ, which are not to be confused with Middle Egyptian ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ, "councillor" or the like, i.e., "belonging to the council." While none of these parallels is identical to the case at hand, there being no mention of Anubis, one of them, at Meir, appears in the context of funerary rituals, as is also true of the Sixth Dynasty example at Qasr es-Sayyad, and in the same context it is replaced by ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ, which is patterned on one of the common epithets of this god "who presides over the divine booth." Thus, as Blackman has perceived, the meaning is not "counselor of the god," but "one who belongs to the divine booth;" one might translate it less literally as "Anubite."

Applying this conclusion to the various examples shown in Figure 2, we may interpret the first of them as ḫḥ nḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ, "he who belongs to the divine booth of Anubis." In the second title the reading is (a) ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ, and (b) ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ, perhaps "senior pillar of Anubis."

The third title (3a) confirms the fact that Anubis is himself called ḫḥ nḥ ḫḥ; it is "ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ-priest of Anubis, He of the Divine Booth." Since the possessor of this priestly title is also "ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ-priest of Wḏt," title 3 b, c cannot well be understood as Junker translates it: "Der Priester der Gotteshalle des Anubis in Aphroditopolis." The parallel indicates that it is "ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ-priest of Anubis, He of the Divine Booth, and of Wḏt."

31 Torgny Säve-Söderbergh, The Old Kingdom Cemetery at Hama Dom (El-Qsar wa es-Sayyad) (Stockholm 1994); the inscription in which this occurs (pl. 20) is not "giving a libation to the temple," as stated on p. 46, but "the giving of a libation (by) the ḫḥ nḥ ḫḥ. A reference to ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ-temple" does occur in another caption below this, but the form of ḫḥ is different, as is the context.

32 Blackman, Meir III, pl. 23 and p. 32 (cf. n. 37 below).

33 J.E. Quibell, Excavations at Saqqara (1903-1907) (Cairo 1908), pl. 7 (3); this is probably the earliest of the Middle Kingdom examples quoted here, but it is not necessarily earlier than the Twelfth Dynasty. The official in question is also a wḥ n ḫḥ-great wḥ-priest."

34 Engelbach and Gunn, Harageh, p. 26, note 11, and pls. 71, 74 (3).

35 Berlin Pap. 10009; Borchardt, ZÄS 37 (1899), p. 98. This reference is cited by Gunn (see preceding note) as well as another ḫḥ nḥ ḫḥ in F.L. Griffith, Hieratic Papyri from Kahun and Gurob (London, 1898), pl. 21 (25). Two of the preceding references have also been cited by Grdselof, ASAE 51 (1951), 139-40, and others by Ward, Index, no. 1322, where ḫḥ nḥ ḫḥ is translated as "counsellor[66c] of a God."

36 WB. III, p. 466 (7-9); ḫḥ nḥ ḫḥ is not given. G.E. Faulkner, Concise Dictionary, p. 257, citing Gardiner, Notes on the Story of Sinuhe (Paris 1910), p. 34, l. 5. A connection between these titles might appear to be suggested by ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ in Griffith, Inscriptions of Sūt, pls. 16 and 19. Gunn (note 33 above) evidently reads this as ḫḥ nḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ, but Janssen more plausibly reads ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ (Egyptische Autobiografie, p. 135, III T 1; II, p. 173, and there translated "een raadgever dien zijn god liefhad."

37 Anomalous writing of ḫḥ is probably to be recognized in the phrase ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ - "I was a great councilor, whom [his] lord loved" (Petrie, Abydos I, pl. 54, a Middle Kingdom inscription mistated to Dyn. VI). Broukorski has independently made the same observation in his Dissertation, p. 474 (c).

38 Blackman, Meir III, pl. 21 and p. 28. It may be added that the priestly officiant of the Graeco-Roman temples of Dendera and Edfu included ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ (WB. III, p. 455 [12]), var. ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ (M. Alliot, Le Coile d'Horus à Edfou I [Cairo 1949], p. 183); here there does not seem to be any specific connection with Anubis despite the similarity to the epithet of that god.

39 See notes 32 and 37 above; the other translation is offered by Gunn (note 34).

40 Janssen, Egyptische Autobiografie II, p. 174 (E), takes the second element separately as "zul van den ouderdom" or "van den grijsaard;" but "pillar of old age" is not otherwise known before the Middle Kingdom. Other epithets mentioning ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ are discussed here and in JAOs 26 (1966), 107; ZÄS 90 (1963), 39-40. A closer analogy is perhaps to be seen in personal names such as ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ (Petrie, p. 17 [15]); ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ (Hassan, Gītā VI, pl. 3, fig. 26, p. 33): "pillar of Min," ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ("pillar of (mīy) ḫḥ), "pillar of Re," although these names might mean "my support is Min," etc.
in 3d may be accidental, although perhaps it was considered sufficient to refer to Anubis by his epithet alone. It is also possible, but I think less likely, that this example combines Fig. 2 (1) and *hm-ntr* Wdjt.

Title 4 is apparently *hpr *Is.t Infw *shy-ntr* “director of the troop(?)” of Anubis, He of the Divine Booth,” and 5 is “st-priest of the temple of Anubis, He of the Divine Booth, Presiding over the Sacred Land.”

It will be noticed that is often unaccompanied by in these titles, raising the possibility that, in such cases, zhy is the correct reading, rather than zhy-ntr. The absence of is, in fact, much less common in funerary formulae invoking Anubis *hnty zhr-ntr*. There is nonetheless little doubt that alone is to be read zhr-ntr, as may be seen from writings such as (Pyr. 2100 c N) and . The use of in titles may be explained by the fact that it is written thus in archaic examples of . On the other hand, is not necessarily to be considered as an epithet in all cases where it appears beneath the figure of Anubis. It seems unlikely, for example, that it represents an epithet in , in which Anubis normally appears as : “*hm-ntr*-priest of Horus-Anubis who presides over the house of the retinue.” The same may be true of Fig. 2 (2a). And the group is obviously the precursor of , which became a common writing of Anubis from the Sixth Dynasty onward, as mentioned earlier.

This discussion does not take account of several cases where the group in question occurs in Old Kingdom seal impressions that are incompletely preserved. The tabulation equally necessarily omits the supposed title , which Kaplon quotes from Cairo statue CG 62, and which actually represents an incorrect transcription of the personal name .

41 Given the context, it is difficult to believe that this is to be isolated as the rather modest title “overseer of the troop(s),” for which see Junker, *Gisa* III, p. 179; IX, p. 47.
43 This approximates one of the alternative interpretations of Kaplon in *Inschriften*, note 1811, save for his transcription of *hry-sıʿt* (= Anubis). In *Kleine Beihrige zu den Inschriften der ägyptischen Frühizeit*, p. 51, he evidently prefers his other alternative: “*hry sīt* dessen, der im Friedhof wohnt (*hnty-t-ıʿr* Anubis) im (?) Tempel.”
44 See Junker, *Gisa* II, p. 116, who points to examples on the sarcophagus of *Mnuh-b*y*f (Cairo) 4885a; *EA* 19 (1953), pls. 21-24. But Old Kingdom examples of *hry* normally show the sign within (as in the case of Cairo CG 1495, 1587, 1788); in the case of J 4885b this and other signs show no internal detail whatever.
45 The same writing also occurs in the epithet of Anubis *hnty zhr-ntr* LD II, pl. 18; Junker, *Gisa* IX, fig. 117, p. 257.
48 Petrie and Murray, *Seven Memphite Tomb Chapels*, pl. 15.
49 For the normal writing see p. 9 above.
50 Borchart, *Grab.* *Net-ur-em*, p. 132; Reisner-Smith, *Hist. Gisa* *Ner* II, figs. 50 (34-12-8) and 57, the latter perhaps to be read *shf* *wtw* Infw “inspector of embalmers of Anubis,” and *swt* is thus perhaps to be restored in an incomplete First Dynasty seal impression (Emery, *Great Tombs of the First Dynasty III* [London 1938], pl. 82 [43]). Kaplon (Inschriften, p. 368) takes this as *shf* *Infw*, as also on the stela of *Sbj*f; but the latter is probably *hpr *Is.t Infw*; see note 42 above.
51 *Kleine Beihrige*, p. 58. Correctly transcribed by Ranke, *PNI*, p. 263 (10), as seen from the statue itself in Cairo.
3. The reading of 𓊪 in titles

In my *Coptic Nomina*, pp. 126–29, I concluded that, although there is ample evidence for sḏwt “sceil” in the Old Kingdom, the determinative, when present, is consistently 𓊪, and that this determinative was evidently not replaced by 𓊰 until the Middle Kingdom. Furthermore, while there is not a great deal of evidence for phonetic writings of 𓊪 and 𓊰 in Old Kingdom titles, which are interchangeable, all of that evidence consistently shows 𓊪 as a phonetic complement to these signs, indicating 𓊬 or 𓊬. Despite these indications, I still hesitated to abandon the prevailing preference for the reading of 𓊪 as sḏwt/sḏwt in most titles, since it seems unwise, in such cases, to replace a standard reading, however doubtful, by another that cannot be proven conclusively. In this particular instance, however, I now believe that my conservatism was misplaced.

Had I pressed my inquiry more earnestly, I should have realized that there is at least one late Middle Kingdom writing of the most recurrent title 𓊪 which clearly betrays the root 𓊬; 𓊪 can hardly be read in any other way than 𓊬 Bity, or, more precisely 𓊬 “treasurer of the King of Lower Egypt.” There is further phonetic evidence for the word 𓊬 “treasure” on which this title is based; the Old Kingdom title 𓊪 is at least once written 𓊤 𓊱 𓊪 𓊦 𓊬 𓊬 𓊬 in the Middle Kingdom, i.e., 𓊬, lit. “keeper of what is sealed,” and an Old Kingdom caption to an offering scene mentions 𓊪 𓊬 𓊪 𓊬 𓊬 “treasure (or “that which is sealed”) containing festival scent.”

In addition there is ample evidence, in Old Kingdom inscriptions, for humber “treasurers” whose title is usually written 𓊪 but also 𓊪, 𓊪, 𓊪, pl. 𓊪, 𓊪, 𓊬, 𓊬 “treasure of the god,” as has long been advocated by Yoyotte and Sauverson.

The terms 𓊬 and 𓊬 are doubtless also to be recognized in titles referring to 𓊪 “the treasure of the god,” overseer of sealbearers” and the phrase 𓊪 (var. 𓊪), which occurs in the following of titles:

55 To explain the odd writing of 𓊪 that I discussed in *Egyptian Studies* I, p. 56, one must therefore fall back on the first alternative, i.e., that it derives from a deformation of hieratic. By the same token I absolve Detlef Franke from this particular objection to his own predilection for the reading of 𓊪 as 𓊬 (GM 83 [1984], 114). On the hand I cannot agree with Wolfgang Booc’s reinterpretation (Sieg und Siegeln im Alten Ägypten [Sankt Augustin 1982], pp. 105–106) of the evidence I presented in my *Coptic Nomina*; the use of 𓊪 and 𓊪 in P.G. 1523 does not indicate a difference in the reading of these two signs, but is to be explained as a case of graphic dissimilation, for which see Sethe, *Die Altegyptischen Pyramidentexte IV*, § 151; Dritoan, *ASA* 49 (1949), 57–68; also van de Walle in *Ägyptologische Studien* (Hermann Grapow Festschrift; Berlin 1955), pp. 366–78.
3. THE READING OF  in Titles

1. ꜝ🏙️

2.  

3. (a) ꜝ🏙️
(b) ꜝ🏙️  
(c) ꜝ🌆

4.  

5.  

6. (a) ꜝ🏙️
(b) ꜝ🏙️
(c) ꜝ🌆

7.  

8. (a) ꜝ🏙️
(b) ꜝ🌆

9. (a) ꜝ🌆
(b) ꜝ🌆

10. ꜝ🌆

The distinction between title 1 and ꜝ🏙️ is indicated by title 3(c), which shows that ꜝキング once again contains the stem 里的; probably the difference of terms reflects a difference of meaning, and the absence of  rivals in the first case may also be significant, although this is likewise absent in titles 3(b), 5, 6(c), 9(b) and 10. Title 3(c) also indicates that 里的 is feminine, as does title 6(b). And the examples assembled here further show that the preceding word is 里 or 里; it does not seem likely that the phonetic complement rivals would be included in some cases—2, 3(b), 4, 6(b), 9(b), 10—and that a feminine ending would not appear just as frequently if this ending existed. Thus the reading seems to be 里 (or 里) 里的 "containing what is sealed." The occasional absence of rivals shows that it is not to be

61 Firth and Gunn, *Teti Pyramid Cemeteries*, p. 153 (8); Gunn, Notebooks XIV,61 (false door of Titi, Saqqara).
62 For another example, on an alabaster headrest at Durham University, see J.G. Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, 1st ed. (London 1842), p. 214; here ꜝ is accompanied by  rivals, and this detail has been verified from the original.
63 Fakhry, *Sei tombeaux*, fig. 7, p. 15.
64 Murray, *Saqqara Mastabas*, p. 266 (here, as in a few other cases, the critical group is written ꜝ rivals, but this arrangement is doubtless purely calligraphic).
66 Capart, *Rue de tombeaux*, pl. 11. On pl. 9 the writing is apparently ꜝ rivals, the sign  rivals is partly obscured by a round accretion, as I have been able to see from a clearer print of the photograph (archive of the Fondation Egyptologique Reine Elisabeth [Brussels], Cat. No. 1371).
69 Urb. I, p. 282 (3); Hassan, *Giza V*, p. 62; Gunn, Notebooks (Griffith Institute, Oxford) XIV,62.
70 Gunn, Notebooks XV,12 (lintel of Titi, Saqqara).
71 Gunn, Notebooks XIV,62 (false door of 里, Saqqara).
72 Both (a) and (b): Hodjash and Berlev, *Egyptian Reliefs*, p. 41.
73 Cairo CG 101, 208, 1515.
76 Contra Helck, *Beamtentitel*, pp. 71–72, who does not mention title 3(c). Also contra Booch, *Siegel*, p. 121, who ignores this example despite the mention of it in my *Coptic Nome*, p. 127, n. 3. My previous discussion also provides examples of rivals written both as ꜝ rivals and ꜝ rivals.
77 For the use of masculine rivals compare the term rivals, which, as I have suggested in ZAS 105 (1978), 55–56, may refer to "authorizations" and which is similarly linked to rivals "royal decrees."
read, but it appears so frequently that its inclusion is probably meaningful. The Wörterbuch
supposes the meaning to be something like “versiegelte Akten,” which suits the generic
determinative as well as the scribal titles 6–9. But in the Coptos Decrees79 hry htm is on the
same basis as pr ṣw nswt, pr hryw wdb and pr mḏw t “the house of royal decrees, the house of
those in charge of reversion offerings and the house of documents.” The passage in question
refers to the iz “bureau” of each, and the inscriptions of a somewhat earlier official in-
clude a series of titles that parallel this association;80 he is imy-r izy “overseer of the two
bureaus” of the hry-htmt, the pr mḏw t and pr hry(w) wdb, as well as the ḫtjm “serfs” (who
also appear in titles 2 and 5).81 Perhaps, then, hry htm is best translated “registry,” as
Goedicke has suggested.82 The various titles would then mean (1) “overseer of the registry;
(2) “overseer of the registry of royal decrees of the Great House for serfs and for fields;”83
(3) “overseer of the two bureaus of the registry;” (4) “overseer of the two bureaus of the reg-
istry of royal decrees;” (5) “overseer of the two bureaus of the registry of serfs;” (6) “overseer
of scribes of the registry;” (7) “overseer of scribes of the registry of royal decrees;” (8) “ins-
pector of scribes of the registry of royal decrees;” (9) “inspector of scribes of the registry;
(10) “scribe of the registry.”

78 WB. III. p. 396 (6).
79 Usk. I, pp. 281 (8) and 284 (15).
80 Mariette, Mastabas, p. 290.
81 Compare also Murray, Saqqara Mastabas I, pl. 4, where
title 3 (a) is followed by imy-r izy mṛt “overseer of the two
bureaus of serfs.”
82 Hans Goedicke, Königliche Dokumente, pp. 87, 166
(the latter in reference to Usk. I, p. 296 [15]): “Registrierung
der gesiegelten Dokumente.”
83 Less probably “overseer of the registry of royal
decrees and of the Great House, etc.”
5. Some Theoporic Names of the Old Kingdom

The interpretation and transcription of Old Kingdom names are not infrequently obscured by one or the other of two factors, or both: honorific transposition and irregularity in the sequence of signs.¹ Honorific transposition was applied with greater consistency in the Old Kingdom than in later periods, but there are, as Ranke notes, a certain number of exceptions,² and he has exploited some of them to explain the pattern of their transposed counterparts; their usefulness for this purpose has not, however, been exhausted. To cope with the second factor one must beware of isolated cases and must attempt to gather a sufficient number of examples to eliminate the possibility of a meaningless orthographic anomaly. This study accordingly emphasizes the quantitative aspect of the Old Kingdom evidence.

1. *Ny-mšt-R*

The importance of the aforementioned points is well illustrated by Westendorf's discussion of the pattern *Ny-mšt-R* which he takes to be *Ny-Rt-mšt*.³ Very little of the Old Kingdom evidence for names of this pattern particularly favors this alternative, although it is not precluded by normal writings such as 𓊫 𓊫 𓊫. Moreover Westendorf correctly points out that the feminine examples of the well-known name that is invariably written 𓊫 𓊫 cannot be read *Nyš-nb-Hθhr* "A possessor of life is Hathor;" he fails, however, to see that it can be understood as *Nyš-nb-Hθhr* "Life belongs to Hathor," in which the element *ny* is invariable,⁴ conforming to the pattern of 𓊫 𓊫 𓊫 𓊫 𓊫 𓊫 𓊫 𓊫 "Ny-sy-nswt, "She belongs to the king."⁵ The alternative reading that he proposes cannot be proven by the various eccentric writings he has tabulated in favor of the sequence *ny* + NN, for the position of the initial — is

² PNII, 13, note 4; delete, however, 𓊫 𓊫, for which see his p. 347; correcting PN1, 64 (15).
³ Wolfhart Westendorf, *MIO* 7 (1960), 316–29. His views are rejected by Edel in *Abh. Gymn. II*, p. LXVII, Nachträge to § 366, and *GM* 2 (1972), 16–17, but Westendorf has subsequently presented further evidence in *SAK* 11 (1984), 381–97; Gilula, without citing Westendorf, agrees with his position (*ReE* 20 [1968], 59 and n. 4); for the first of his examples see notes 51–52 below, and for the second see note 17.
⁴ This objection also excludes Barta's interpretation of *Ny-mšt-R* as "Der zur Weltordnung des Re gehörige" (*GM* 85 [1985], 10).
⁵ PN1, 177 (23).
frequently more ambiguous than he indicates. To begin with those from the Old Kingdom and earlier, one finds the following (numbered according to the list in SAK 11 [1974], 386–87):

(1) \( \text{Writes as } \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{ (earlier } \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{)} \)

(4) \( \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{ is } \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \)

(5) \( \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{ is } \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \)

(8) \( \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{ is } \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \)

(11) \( \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{ is } \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \)

In another of Westendorf's Old Kingdom examples (no. 10) the initial — does not belong to the name, which is \( \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{ Kit.(i)-wd-\text{Nnh}(i).i} \) “My ki is one who commands that I live.”\(^1\) A second name, which is thought to be \( \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{ less certainly indicating *Ny-Rc-wsr,} \) is actually \( \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{ Sihu-Rc.} \)\(^2\) The reading of his no. 6, written sign-by-sign in a column

(\( \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{ a} \)), remains uncertain.\(^3\) In a third name, not considered by him, the sequence of signs in \( \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{ is influenced by the exigencies of available space.} \)\(^4\) It is more difficult to explain \( \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{ Kit.(i)-Nbw,} \) which is not cited either, but \( \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{ may well have been considered a more pleasing arrangement than } \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}}, \) since it occurs twice,\(^5\) and occurs twice again in \( \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{ Ny-k(i)-Nbw,} \)\(^6\) In the case of \( \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{,}\)\(^7\) his no. 12, the first two or more signs may have been interchanged, since \( \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{ is written thus on the same false door, and } \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{ is usual in other names;} \)\(^8\) moreover, a similar interchange is attested in the name \( \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{.}\)\(^9\)

---

6 Gardiner, Peet and Charny, Sinai I, pl. 1 (a); in Vol. II, p. 54, read *nhd-i-it-i*, with a query. For the earlier example see Kaplony, Inschriften III, pl. 96 (177). Another example like this one has more recently been published by El Khoulie and Kanawati, El-Hammamia, Pl. 70:

Here the prominence given to \( \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \) has displaced —, as in (1), where the smallness of — has had the same effect.

7 J.-Ph. Lauer and P. Lacau, La Pyramide à degrés V (Cairo 1965), no. 49. Perhaps *nhd-(i)-Ntr(i).

8 Junker, Giza III, fig. 16.

9 Blackman, Met IV, pl. 9; probably to be read Htp-n.(i)-Hmms, for which see n. 44 below.

10 Cf. PVI, 171 (6). For the case in question see Wm. S. Smith, AJA 46 (1942), p. 512 (fig. 3). This name is also dealt with by Edel, GM 2 (1972), 11 and n. 1.

11 PNI, 295 (19). This is actually the same as PNI, 339 (8); the preceding name belongs to the offering formula.

12 P. Kaplony, Rollenspieler II, pl. 75 (32). Kaplony reads the Horus name and Golden Horus name correctly, but needlessly restores hmr-ntr after the first and misreads the name in the cartouche. The golden Horus name oddly forms the top of the cartouche beneath and the name Sahure is separated from it by a horizontal line, which is not to be read as —. Thus all three names belong to the same king. The owner’s title is also misread; it is not z-h(yr)-t but hry-hykh “assistant of the director of the dining pavilion.”

13 Junker, Giza IX, p. 39 and fig. 13. Junker suggests Ph-n-kau, comparing \( \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{ (Giza III, fig. 43).} \)

14 O. Koefoed-Petersen, Catalogue des bas-reliefs et peintures égyptiennes (Copenhagen 1956), pl. 25, no. 10.

15 Brooklyn Museum 49.215; see MMF 8 (1973), 12, fig. 9. An identical writing of this name appears on the detachable limestone base of a statue, formerly belonging to Ernst Kofler at Lucerne.

16 PNI, 192 (6), II, 368, from Boston MFA 27.1313; also \( \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{ PNI, 430 (4)}, \) from an offering basin on the market, Berlin. This is probably the same name, to be read in reversed sequence, although it may possibly be read on the pattern of Kit.(i)-ny NN, to be discussed presently.

17 PNI, 180 (28); the same example is miscopied on p. 430 (12). A displaced — also seems to occur in the name beside it: \( \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}} \text{ is probably to be read Hrnts.n (ibid., 244 (1)) rather than Ny-nbht, for which see ibid., 178 (4), for in that case one might expect ny-nbht to be written } \overline{\unitfrac{\text{N} \text{N}}{\text{N} \text{N}}}. \)

18 PNI, 64 (10); 273 (10); 340 (1); 417 (17); II, 266 (1); 305 (17).

19 PM III, p. 56 (Giza 1171).
For the displacement of — one may compare names in which $\overline{\|}$ is written $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{20} or $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{21} and $\overline{\|}$ is written $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{22} or $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{23}. This comparison suggests that theophoric names of the type that is under discussion should even more frequently show — at the end rather than at the beginning, since the sequence then becomes retrograde, i.e., NN-x-ny instead of Ny-x-NN, and a retrograde sequence likewise appears in some other tripartite theophoric names of the Old Kingdom.\textsuperscript{24} There are, in fact, a greater number of examples of this kind:

(1) $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{25} Ny-\(\text{nh}\)-\(\text{mig}t\)

(2) $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{26} Ny-\(\text{nh}\)-\(\text{Pth}\)

(3) $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{27} Ny-\(\text{nh}\)-\(\text{Nbt}\)

(4) $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{28} Ny-\(\text{nh}\)-\(\text{nsut}\)

(5) $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{29} Ny-\(\text{nh}\)-\(\text{Rt}\)

(6) $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{30} Ny-\(\text{nh}\)-\(\text{Hbr}\)

(7) $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{31} Ny-\(\text{nh}\)-\(\text{Hnmu}\)

(8) $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{32} Ny-hpt-Pth

(9) $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{33} Ny-hpt-Rt

(10) $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{34} Ny-hwt-\(\text{nsut}\)

(11) $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{35} Ny-\(\text{swt}\)-\(\text{Pth}\)

(12) $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{36} Ny-\(\text{sp}\)-\(\text{Pth}\)

(13) $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{37} Ny-\(\text{nt}\)-\(\text{Rt}\)

(14) $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{38} Ny-\(\text{nt}\)-\(\text{Hr}\)

(15) $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{39} Ny-\(\text{ksw}\)-\(\text{Ni}\)

\textsuperscript{20} Junker, Giza VI, fig. 104; VII, figs. 47, 48; V, 95 a; CG 1590.

\textsuperscript{21} Cf. also $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{21} S\(\text{nh}\)-\(\text{nh}\)-\(\text{Hbr}\) (Hassan, Giza VI, p. 155).

\textsuperscript{22} Cf. also $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{22} S\(\text{nh}\)-\(\text{nh}\)-\(\text{Hbr}\) (Hassan, Giza VI, p. 155).

\textsuperscript{23} Edel, Aligt. Gramm. I, § 100.

\textsuperscript{24} Cf. also $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{23} S\(\text{nh}\)-\(\text{nh}\)-\(\text{Hbr}\) (Hassan, Giza VI, p. 155).

\textsuperscript{25} Wm. S. Smith, AFA 49 (1942), 513, 514, fig. 4; cf. Christiane Ziegler, Catalogue des stèles, no. 17 (p. 117).

\textsuperscript{26} PNI, 64 (22). For the normal writing see ibid., 171 (11).

\textsuperscript{27} Curto, Gli Scavi italiani, pl. 28 (b). Cairo CG 1682 and 1700 (belonging to the same person) show the normal form; also Fischer, Egyptian Studies I, p. 5, fig. 4.

\textsuperscript{28} PNI, 244 (3), for which see PM III, pp. 694–96; also Mâele, SAK 8 (1980), 204. Cf. $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{28} (Reiser’s G 243), records of MFA, Boston; also PM III, p. 247; $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{29} — Posener-Krieger and de Cenival, Abu Sir Papyri, pl. 65 (35).

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., pl. 72 c; ten other examples are all written normally.

\textsuperscript{30} Hassan, Giza III, fig. 222 (also the normal writing); Junker, Giza X, fig. 49. For the normal writing see also PNI, 171 (18).

\textsuperscript{31} Paget and Pirie, Ptah-khepet, pl. 12 (top); Hassan, Giza VI/5, p. 47 (not illustrated); Blackman, Meir IV, pl. 12 (also normal on pls. 8, 9, 12); Moussa and Altenmüller, Nianchnum, fig. 4 (= pl. 3 b) and pl. 90 (and 92). The normal form predominates in this tomb chapel and elsewhere; see PNI, 171 (21, 22).

\textsuperscript{32} Abu-Bakr, Giza, figs. 94, 95 A, C.

\textsuperscript{33} Mereruka I, pl. 82.

\textsuperscript{34} PNI, 422 (22). Another example occurs on the false door of $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{34} (PM III, 179, miscopied), excavated by Abu-Bakr at Giza: $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{34}. For this name see Edel, ZAS 85 (1960), 80–81. A similar name, $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{34} — is to be found in Posener-Krieger and de Cenival, Abu Sir Papyri, pl. 11 (1); cf. Posener-Krieger, Archives I, Tableau V. For the normal sequence in a name of this pattern see JARCE 90 (1993), 5–6.

\textsuperscript{35} Hassan, Giza II, fig. 204, noted in PNI, 295 (27). Leipzig 2557 has the sequence $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{35} (PM III, 173 [11], for which see Klebs, Reliefs des alt. Reiches [Heidelberg 1915], p. 130, fig. 102).

\textsuperscript{36} Moussa, SAK 16 (1983), 276 and pl. 8. Cf. $\overline{\|}$\textsuperscript{36} (Moussa and Altenmüller, Nianchnum, p. 32 [26]); PNI, 180 [17]; Simpson, Western Cemetery, fig. 44.

\textsuperscript{37} BM 1603 (James, Hieroglyphic Texts I, pl. 41 [11], CF. PNI, 180 [17]; Simpson, Western Cemetery, fig. 44).

\textsuperscript{38} BM 1603 (James, Hieroglyphic Texts I, pl. 41 [11], CF. PNI, 180 [17]; Simpson, Western Cemetery, fig. 44).

\textsuperscript{39} BM 1603 (James, Hieroglyphic Texts I, pl. 41 [11], CF. PNI, 180 [17]; Simpson, Western Cemetery, fig. 44).

\textsuperscript{40} PNI, 423 (5).
The terminal position of — also appears in some names of Old Kingdom estates, and notably:

\[ (16) \equiv \_{\text{Ny-}} \text{nyrt-Ty} \]

\[ (17) \equiv \_{\text{Ny-}} \text{ks(i).Ty} \]

Both names are consistently written in this form, the only variable element being the transposed name of the owner.

One might be tempted to read the first seven examples as ‘nh-n(i).NN’, but, as the appended documentation shows, there is ample evidence for the reading given here. On the other hand I have omitted names such as — because the weight of evidence conversely favors Htp-n(i).NN rather than Ny-htp-NN. While the inclusion of nos. 13 and 14 seems warranted by other examples of Ny-ks(i).NN, Ranke is probably right in reading K(i)-ny nbty/nsnwt “My ki is one who belongs to the king,” since these two names, while not very common, always show — at the end; the first is known from at least seven sources, the second from at least three. The same pattern may occur in K(i)-ny nb.f “My ki is one who belongs to its lord,” (although it is possible that the sign — belongs to nb); also in K(i)-ny-lt.f “My ki belongs to his father.” This pattern would also explain the apparent transposition of ki in —, which need not be read Ny-nh-ks(i), but is more probably K(i)-ny-nh.

---

40 Jacquet-Gordon, Domains, p. 359; see also pp. 339, 422-24, and cf. Ny-nyrt-Mnw (Edwards, British Museum Quarterly 16 [1951], 16 and pl. 7); Ny-nyrt-nswt PNI, 294 (17). Cf. p. 64 below, n. 147.
41 Jacquet-Gordon, loc. cit.; see also pp. 131, 136, 166, 226, 541; cf. nos. 12 and 13 in the foregoing list.
42 So Ranke, PNI, 64 (42). The writings of similar pattern are all to be eliminated: PNI, 64 (21) is discarded in Vol. II, 347, and this is listed correctly in Vol. I, 65 (2). Vol. II, 271 (6, 7) should be read Ny-nh-NN; cf. PNI, 171 (9, 10, 13, 14), 422 (16), II, 294 (2) or, in the case of PNI, II, 271 (7), nh-NN (cf. PNI, 66 [19], 417 [7, 8], II, 270 [23, 24], 271 [3, 24]).
43 See notes 25-31 above.
44 Thus — (Abu-Bakr, Giza, figs. 8, 10) is Htp-n(i)-Hnmw (or H) as shown by the more frequent writing — in the same tomb chapel (ibid., figs. 10, 11, 13, 14). The same two writings of the name occur, once each, in Paget and Pirie, Paḫet-heper, pls. 37, 38. This is correctly interpreted by Ranke in PNI, 258 (13), but PNI, 175 (5) should be read identically. The name — is probably to be restored thus in Hassan, Giza VII, fig. 69. Htp-n(i)-Ph is also well attested: PNI, 258 (14); P. Lacau and J.-Ph. Lauer, Pyramide à degrés V (Cairo 1999), no. 65; Murray, Saggara Mastabas I, pl. 29; Fitzwilliam SS 77 (Mâle, BSEG 6 [1982], 53-54); Posener-Krieger and de Genval, Abu Sir Papyri, pl. 68 (d 1, 6). In the index of names given by Posener-Krieger, Archivs II, p. 658, the name Ny-htp-Pth is read on pl. 68 (d 2, 5), but this is by no means certain, and a second example (pl. 97 c) is clearly Htp-Pth. The name — (pl. 74 A] is read Ny-htp-wr, but may be Htp-n(i)-wr. An example of — (Blackman, Mer IV, pl. 9, read Khenemhotpe on p. 32) may similarly be Htp-n(i)-Hnmw.
45 Notes 37-38 above.
46 PNI, 180 (12, 13); Abu-Bakr, Giza, fig. 95 A; B; Hassan, Giza VI/3, p. 99 and pl. 35 c; Junker, Giza XI, fig. 17, p. 148; Co 57192. The reading K(i)-ny nbty is advocated in PNI, 340 (8); cf. PNI, 366 (referring to I, 180 (1)).
47 Reisner, Hist. Giza Necr. I, figs. 269, 270; Junker, Giza II, figs. 15, 18, 22, 24 (but —, figs. 18, 19); III, figs. 20, 21, 24 (but —, fig. 22). The reading k(i).ny-nswt is advocated in PNI, 340 (9).
49 Ibid., n. 5; also attested by Louvre E 11161 and 25408 (Christiane Ziegler, Catalogue des stèles, nos. 46, 47).
50 As proposed by Ranke, PNI, 172 (7); II, 208, n. 9 (although he admits the possibility of ki(i)-ny-nb); on p. 214), and by Edel, Altägypt. Gramm. I, § 99. This would be the only case in which ki is transposed in a personal name. The other exception cited by Ranke is likewise invalid: PNI, 341 (6); the initial — is — (Junker, Giza VI, fig. 386). The apparent transposition of the last two elements...
The only way to reconcile an example such as $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ (Westendorf’s no. 11) and $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ (my no. 1, from the same source) is to conclude that — has been moved up in the first case and moved down in the second; in other words, it properly belongs midway between the other two elements in the name.

In contrast to all the examples considered thus far, the remaining Old Kingdom name which Westendorf has put forward in defense of his interpretation, $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ (his no. 9), is abundantly attested and almost invariable. Even though it is readily read $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$-$\text{\textcopyright}$-$\text{\textcopyright}$, it does not mean “Zu meinem Ka gehörig ist das Leben,” however, since ‘nh is a divinity, as Junker has pointed out. The correct interpretation is therefore “My $k$ is attached to ‘nh.” This case is particularly significant because it is one of the theophoric names in which honorifics does not occur, and therefore offers conclusive evidence for the pattern $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$. Nor is it the only example of its kind. The name $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ clearly shows the same pattern, $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$, referring to an individual named $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$.

Westendorf has also, in defense of his interpretation of these names, taken up Ranke’s suggestion that the name $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ may have derived from $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$, with which it is linked, in which case the latter should be read $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$. Nor is Westendorf deterred by the fact that the same nickname is also linked with $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ and $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$. Since he takes these two names to be abbreviations of a hypothetical $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$, which he reads $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$. The only evidence for this prototype (my no. 12) precludes this reading. It was certainly uncommon, whereas $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ occurs frequently—so frequently57 that it can hardly be regarded as an abbreviation, but is a name of different pattern, in which $\text{\textcopyright}$ is a verb rather than a noun. This difference is clearly demonstrated by $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ and $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$, which are consistently distinguished from one another in the rock tombs at Meir.58

As will be indicated presently, in section 3, the first is probably to be read ‘nh-Ppy and it should not in any case be regarded as an abbreviation of the second. The same is true of $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$, which may be an abbreviation of $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$, but probably not of $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$. The argument for $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ as the origin of $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ is actually weakened by the two cases where $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ is associated with other names, and of $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ (Hassan, Giza VI/3, fig. 40), instead of the more usual writing $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ (PNL 40 [22]) exemplifies the retrograde sequence mentioned by Edel, Altägypt. Gramm. I, § 100. It is true that the title $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ consistently shows transposition in the few cases where the signs are separated; in addition to the example of $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ quoted by Edel (Abu-Bakr, Giza, fig. 38) one may compare $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ (twice, Mariette, Mastabas, p. 70), $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ (Cairo CG 1384), $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ (Boeser, Beschr. aeg. Samml. I, Atlas, pl. 17; O. Kofoed-Petersen, Catalogue des bas-reliefs, p. 69 and pl. 14) and both $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ and $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ (Fisher, Giza, pl. 51 [51]). All these cases are doubtless explained by the apparent precedence of $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ in the normal composite writing of the title as $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$.

51 PNL 180 (10); written $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ in Posener-Krieger and de Cenival, Abu Sir Papiri, pl. 77 (B), but normal in pl. 22 (B). Cf. $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$, pls. 45 (A), 75 (Q).

52 Junker, “Der Lebendige;” this name is dealt with on p. 178.

53 So Ranke PNI, 172 (5); see also E. Edel, Hieroglyphische Inschriften des Alten Reiches (Opladen, 1981), fig. 20; on p. 422 Ranke (PNL) compares $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$, but this is a Middle Kingdom name $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$ $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$, $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$, L.P.H., as may be seen from Anthes, Habicht, 6a.

54 For which see PNI, 320 (11).

55 SAK 11 (1984), 389, referring to PNI, 128.

56 Referring to PNI, 26 (15, where it should be noted that the first example is also combined with $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$). For another example of the first combination see PM III, p. 626 and two more in the auction catalogues of Sotheby’s, New York, June 8, 1984, no. 50, and The Breit- bart Collection, June 20, 1990.

57 PNL 1, 326 (19); Murray, Index, pl. 6.

58 $\text{\textcopyright}{\text{\textcopyright}}$; Blackman, Meir IV, passim; Blackman and Apted, Meir V, (chap. A 1). ‘nh-Ppy: ibid., (A 2).
by two more cases where it is linked with $\text{Mr-Pth} \cdot \text{nh-Mrtr}$ and $\text{Hn} \cdot \text{Hn}$.\textsuperscript{59}

If the Old Kingdom evidence against the pattern $\text{Ny-NN-x}$ may seem to have been presented with excessive minuteness, that is because the sparse evidence from the Middle Kingdom would otherwise favor it. One of Westendorf’s examples is to be eliminated; $\text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr}$ (his no. 2) is probably $\text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr}$.\textsuperscript{60} This leaves two examples:

$\text{(3) } \text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr}$\textsuperscript{61}

$\text{(7) } \text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr}$, $\text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr}$\textsuperscript{62}

There are two other sources for no. 3, one of which is part of the name $\text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr}$.\textsuperscript{63} And there is another source for no. 7, written $\text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr}$, the monument on which this occurs is in such close proximity to the other that both doubtless came from the same workshop. The three occurrences of no. 3 are more difficult to explain, however. They are particularly striking because names of this type were very much less frequently used in the Middle Kingdom. In the absence of further evidence it seems hazardous, moreover, to assume that the Middle Kingdom interpretation of such names differed from that of the Old Kingdom, although that conclusion is difficult to avoid so far as these particular cases are concerned.

2. \text{Thy-hw} and \text{Thy-n}

Ranke has quoted the Old Kingdom name $\text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr}$ to demonstrate that theophoric names of this pattern are to be read $\text{NN-sdm} \cdot \text{f} \cdot \text{f}$ rather than $\text{sdm} \cdot \text{f} \cdot \text{f} \cdot \text{f}$.\textsuperscript{65} An additional example is provided by $\text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr}$, \text{Thy-hw}, since, as will be emphasized presently, the name of the god \text{Thy}, like the godly epithet \text{Nfr}, is not transposed.\textsuperscript{66} This piece of evidence speaks against Brunner’s suggestion that the pattern $\text{NN-sdm} \cdot \text{f} \cdot \text{f}$ was only used when NN was not, strictly speaking, the name of the god; and that, when it was truly the name of the god, the pattern was $\text{sdm} \cdot \text{f} \cdot \text{f}$.\textsuperscript{67} There is, in fact, no evidence whatever for such a distinction between these two categories of theophoric names.

In view of the lack of honorific transposition in Old Kingdom names mentioning \text{Thy}, it is also clear that $\text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr}$, which is known from at least five sources,\textsuperscript{68} cannot be interpreted as $\text{Ny-sw-Thy}$, as proposed by Ranke\textsuperscript{69} and Edel,\textsuperscript{70} since this would normally be written like

\begin{footnotesize}
59 PM III, pp. 91 and 569.
61 PVI, 180 (20); for the example in question see Bos-\text{ticco}, \textit{Stele I}, no. 38.
62 PVI, 171 (19) and p. xxiv, referring to Cairo J 55618, for which see Abdalla, \textit{JEA} 77 (1992), 48.
63 For the latter see \textit{Jéquier, Monument funéraire de Peki II, III}, p. 31, fig. 11; for the other see BM 534, \textit{Hieroglyphic Texts II}, pl. 14 (but note that the same individual is twice $\text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr}$, BM 560, \textit{ibid.}, pl. 35).
64 Quibell, \textit{Excavations at Saqqara 1905–1906}, pl. 17 (6).
65 \textit{JAOS} 70 (1950) p. 66.
66 Cited \textit{ibid.}, p. 65, but not to this effect. \textit{Cf. PVI}, p. 267 (4).
67 Another name that similarly fails to transpose \text{Thy} $\text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr} \cdot \text{Dr}$, (PVI, 421 [10] = Hassan, \textit{Gib II}, figs. 33–35).
68 ZAS 102 (1975) p. 95.
69 PVI, 258 and PVI, 44 (26); besides Ranke’s two sources (Cairo CG 1489, Hammamat inscr. 151) further examples may be found in ASME 37 (1937), 110, and in Engelbach and Gunn, \textit{Harageh}, pls. 8 (6), 77 (9).
70 PVI, 344, referring to Vol. I, p. 44 (26).
71 Edel, \textit{Allg. Gramm. II}, p. LXVIII (to § 357).
\end{footnotesize}
3. The avoidance of the old perfective in theophoric names

Since it is certain that the old perfective occurred in theophoric names as late as the New Kingdom and even after—notably in the royal name Amenophis (cuneiform Amanhaipi)\(^{75}\)—it is only reasonable to assume that this form must have been even more prevalent in such names during the Old Kingdom. Thus, unless there is specific evidence to the contrary, a name such as [image] is generally read Phb-htp rather than Htp-Pth.\(^{79}\) The Old Kingdom evidence to the contrary is so abundant, however, that it seems useful to re-examine the question.\(^{80}\) To begin with, there are Old Kingdom names referring to the god Ihy and the goddess Mrt, both of which fail to show honorific transposition. These names uniformly employ the predicative participle in place of the expected old perfective form:

\begin{align*}
\text{Mn-Ihy} \quad & 81 \\
\text{Nfr-Ihy} \quad & 82 \\
\text{Q-Ihy} \quad & 83 \\
\text{Nfr-Mrt} \quad & 84 \\
\text{Nht-Mrt} \quad & 85 \\
\text{Htp-Mrt} \quad & 86 \\
\text{Qt-Mrt} \quad & 87
\end{align*}

\(^{72}\) Firth and Gunn, Teft Pyramid Cemeteries, p. 52 and p. 114.
\(^{74}\) PNI, 277 (15).
\(^{75}\) To be distinguished from iw-n.f.t.f, iw-n.f-mut.t.f, for which see p. 69 below and n. 206.
\(^{76}\) PNI, 283 (5), not explained.
\(^{77}\) PNI, 289 (23).
\(^{78}\) See Ranke, PNI, p. 13, where it is also noted that the cuneiform and Greek transcriptions likewise provide evidence for Htp-Ims (Hatipumun, Epemounis).
\(^{79}\) This is generally the policy of Ranke; for Phb-htp see PNI, 141 (5). In PNI, 61, he concedes that this reading is not certainly preferable to Htp-Pth. Here he mentions the occasional addition of an ending -w, which is not, however, as clear an indication of the old perfective as he supposes; Edel (Aläög. Gramm. I, § 573) observes that names such as [image], may well represent ḫnḫw-Pth and ḫpy-Mn, as it clearly does in [image] ḫpy-Mn, where -w is the intensive ending added to a participle.
\(^{80}\) Some of this evidence is considered by Ranke in PNI, pp. 13, 71, and by Junker, Giza IX, p. 237, but its extent and implications are not fully realized.
\(^{81}\) PNI, 150 (4); Murray, Saqqara Mastabas I, pls. 50–51 (referring to the same individual).
\(^{82}\) PNI, 195 (12); also Abu-Bakr, Giza, figs. 27, 28, 30; Junker, Giza VI, fig. 56; Moussa and Nassar, SAK 7 (1979), 156.
\(^{83}\) PNI, 332 (9); also p. XXIX (cf. Fischer, Egyptian Studies I, p. 47).
\(^{84}\) PNI, 196 (17).
\(^{85}\) PNI, 424 (20).
\(^{86}\) Junker, Giza VI, fig. 13 (cf. PNI, 258 (9) M.K.).
Some Theophoric Names of the Old Kingdom

One name referring to M rt is "nh mf " which here the theophoric element seems, exceptionally, to be transposed (Hf-M rt); for there is no feminine ending after "nh", as would be expected if the form were old perfections. Some other cases of this kind, involving feminine divinities, will be examined later.

The same pattern is attested by a number of other theophoric names of the Old Kingdom, all of which likewise fail to show honorific transposition:

\[\text{nh}-Nby 89\]
\[\text{wr-Hfpy} 91\]
\[\text{nfr-nqt} 92\]
\[\text{nfr-Inpu-nb-Zh-ntr} 93\]
\[\text{nh-Bs} 95\]
\[\text{Htp-Zpt} 97\]
\[\text{Htp-Nfr} 98\]
\[\text{Htp-R} 99\]
\[\text{Htp-Unmu} 100\]
\[\text{Htp-Unmu(?)} 101\]
\[\text{Htp-Qisy} 102\]

In a few of these examples the theophoric element is an epitaph of a kind that customarily retains its syntactical position, and is not transposed: Nby “The Ombite” (Seth), Nfr “The Beautiful One” (Hathor?), Qisy “The Cusite” (Ukh. Zpt is more difficult to explain, but it evidently refers to a divine entity or possibly to a “divinized” individual (for which see pp. 69–71 below). In the remaining cases the theophoric element would ordinarily show honorific transposition: "nqt “Anukis,” Inpu “Anubis,” Htp “Bi, Ni “Neith,” Nh “Gold”

88 PNI, 265 (6).
89 PNI, 3 (9). This has been verified from a copy by Newberry in the Griffith Institute. I do not know of any other clear evidence for nm. Ranke’s PNI, p. 181 ([5]) is written nm, and the final t may belong to mrt Innu. The name nm (PNI II, 311 (12)) may be Zs-Samit. While nm is regarded as a feminine epitaph, designating Hathor, it would not, in the Old Kingdom, have received a feminine ending. The only alternative is to read nm “Ombite” (Wb II, p. 242 (6)).
90 Hassan, Gia IV, fig. 152.
91 BM 5259: T.G.H. James, Hieroglyph Texts², pl. 15. Another apparently Old Kingdom name mentioning Hfpy is to be found in Blackman and Apte, Beit V, p. 48: dh(1)-Hfpy; this should be added to the Middle Kingdom examples of Ranke, PNI, 406 (16), where Hfpy is sometimes honorifically transposed, sometimes not. For Wr-Hfpy cf. the New Kingdom names Hfpy-y, Hfpy-w (PNI, 234 [8, 9]), but here the meaning is probably “a great Nile;” cf. PNI II, pp. 375–76.
92 PNI, 298 (18) and M. Alliot, Rapport sur les fouilles de Tell El-Dih (1933) (Cairo 1935), p. 25.
93 Engelbach, Riqeg and Memphis VI, pl. 67 (Koepef-Petersen, Stades, no. 18).
94 Cairo CG 17002 (Charles Kuenzler, Objecbes [Cairo 1932], p. 7 and pl. 3).
95 PNI II, 308 (24).
96 PNI, 258 (19); Junker, Gia IX, p. 145; Hodjash and Berlev, Egyptian Reliefs, p. 24.
97 PNI, 259 (7); the reference to Junker is Gia II, fig. 22.
98 PNI, 258 (20); Hassan, Gia II, fig. 26; also probably LD II, pl. 109.
99 Junker, Gia VI, fig. 76.
100 PNI, 426 (27).
101 Junker, Gia IX, fig. 107 and p. 238, where the divinity is taken as feminine Hmwt, possibly, however, the final belongs to hpf. Or it may feminize the entire name; cf. p. 25 above, n. 68.
102 Curto, Gli Scavi Italiani, fig. 13 and pl. 13.
(Hathor), $R^c$ “Re,” $Hmnw$ “Khnum.” To this group we may also add $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow Htp$-$\text{nb} (i)^{104}$ The apparently similar $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 105$ may, on the other hand, be interpreted in a quite different way, either as “content of $k^s$” or possibly as the abbreviation of a longer name such as $Htp$-$\text{hr}$-$\text{R}^{106}$ and so too probably $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 107$ These possibilities will be given further attention presently.

The most likely case I know of in which the old perfective may occur in this group of theophoric names is $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow Nb (i)$-$\text{im},^{108}$ but even here $\text{nb} (i)$ may be honorifically transposed; see Excursus II.

Other indications are provided by theophoric names of the same period, usually belonging to women, in which the divinity is a goddess. In such cases one would expect the other element to display a feminine ending if the form were old perfective.^{109} The old perfective has, in fact, sometimes been recognized in examples as $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 110$, $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 111$, $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 112$ and $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 113$ but none of these cases is by any means conclusive. Both $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}}$ and $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}}$ occur fairly frequently as writings of $Htp$; examples may be found in personal names^{114} such as $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 115$, $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 116$, $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 117$, $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 118$, $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 119$, $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 120$ and $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 121$ as well as in writings of $Htp$-$hr$-$\text{s}$ $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 122$, $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 123$. If $Htp$ is less frequently written $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}}$ or $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}}$, that is because the last two signs are in any case more rarely arranged vertically, but examples may nonetheless be found in $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 124$, $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 125$ (quoted earlier), and $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}}$.^{125} Furthermore the writing $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}}$ more usually follows the name of a divinity in this group of names: $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 126$, $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 127$, $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 128$, $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 129$, $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 130$, $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 131$, $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}} \rightarrow 132$.

104 PVl, 258 (16); Fischer, Capite Nome, nos. 2, 3 (and 36, post-Old Kingdom). Also BM 4659 (A.W. Shorter and I.E.S. Edwards, A Handbook to the Egyptian Mummies and Coffins [London 1938], pp. 23–24), where the name was subsequently revised to $\frac{\sqrt{\text{i}}}{\text{b}}$, with honorific transposition.

105 PVl, 259 (19).

106 So Junker, Giza IX, p. 105.

107 PVl, 257 (27). A very clear example of such an abbreviation is $Nfr$-$htp$, PVl, 198 (14), which is a contraction of $Nfr$-$htp$-$NN$ (PVl, 198 [16–18], 425 [29]; PVl, 298 [29]).

108 From the unpublished false door of Smw, excavated by Abu Bakr at Giza. This name can hardly be interpreted as $\text{nb}$-$\text{imt}$ ($\text{nb}$-$\text{im}$) “possessor of graciousness;” not only is the feminine $\rightarrow$ missing, but there is no evidence that this phrase was used as an epithet until some time after the Old Kingdom (cf. Janssen, Ägyptische Autobiographien, p. 140).

109 Junker, Giza II, p. 188, points out, in this connection, that a feminine name often lacks $\rightarrow$ if this element appears elsewhere nearby, but his examples (ibid., p. 165) show that this situation occurs chiefly after $\text{swn}$, in which the phonetic complement $\rightarrow$ is optional.

110 Hassan, Giza VI/3, fig. 119.

111 Junker, Giza I, fig. 51; also a false door in the Metropolitan Museum, MMA 68.13: Notable Acquisitions 1965–1975, p. 72.

112 PVl, 192 (1).

113 PVl, 75 (9) (= Junker, Giza II, fig. 18).

114 Some of the evidence has already been cited by Lapp, Opferformel, § 11, nn. 6, 7. The same writing sometimes appears in the offering formula $\text{htp}$-$\text{di}$-$\text{nsw}$ (ibid., § 12).

115 For the first writing see Petrie, Medium, pl. 13, 15; Junker, Giza II, fig. 19, and Hans Kayser, Ueberka, p. 33; for the second see Hassan, Giza I, fig. 169, and Junker, Giza IX, fig. 75.

116 Junker, Giza II, fig. 29.

117 Junker, Giza IX, fig. 72.

118 Blackman, Met IV, pl. 9.

119 Fisher, Giza, pl. 54.

120 Martin, Hetepka, pl. 14.

121 Petrie, Medium, pl. 14.

122 Drioton, ASAE 43 (1943), 492.

123 Mariette, Mastabas, pp. 90–91.

124 Ibid.

125 Martin, Hetepka, pl. 14.

126 PVII, 308 (22), 348 (to l. 75 [9]); Simpson, Western Cemetery, fig. 17.

127 PVl, 258 (19); Hassan, Giza IV, figs. 81, 82; VI/3, fig. 129; Simpson, op. cit., fig. 36.

128 PVl, 190 (2); II, 367.

129 PVl, 258 (23).

130 PVl, 259 (4).

131 PVl, 259 (15).

132 PVII, 259 (18); reference to Junker: Giza II, fig. 28.
the reading is clearly Htp-Wdw, Htp-Mnw, Htp-Nbt, Htp-Hthr, Htp-Hqt, Htp-ht, Htp-Zth and Htp-Sst. I have not found a single Old Kingdom case in which this type of theophoric name shows a clearer feminine form such as 135

Edel has noted, in his discussion of Old Kingdom personal names from Aswan, that Tomb 35 shows a woman named 136 , immediately followed by another named 137; the second case indicates that the first does not contain the old perfective htp, or it would have certainly been written like the second. He concludes that it is to be interpreted as Htp-Zth + the diminutive ending -1.34

In addition, the feminine ending of the old perfective is similarly missing in 135

quoted earlier, 138 and these are accordingly to be read "-Hthr, n-Nbtw, n-Hth, Wr-Hth, Nfr-Hth, Hf-Mrt, Shm-Hth, Spss-Hth, and Nqmn-Sst. There are, to be sure, some examples which are apparently comparable, and which do show a feminine ending: 143 and 144, and and 145, but they are so few that one suspects that the ending applies to the entire name as a mechanical addition, as in the case of 146 . Quite possibly, however, the last two are Nfrt-Hth147 and Spst-Nbtw.148 In three other cases of this kind, 149 and 150 and 151 the second element clearly precedes the name of the goddess. The first of them is probably to be read Hzyt-Nbtw “She who is praised of Gold,” which is comparable to masculine examples such as 152 and by feminine 153 where the masculine name of the god precludes the old perfective. The other names are probably Dwst-Nbtw, Dwst-Hth “She who worships Gold/Hathor,”

133 And even this writing is not quite conclusive; see Ranke, PN II, 5 and note g; also Lapp, Oderformul, § 11 (1). 134 E. Edel, Feldgräber der Quebst al Haoua bei Assuan II/17, p. 52. 135 PN II, 58 (1); II, p. 347: Junker, Gisa IX, p. 144. 136 PN II, 190 (14); the reference to Junker is Gisa VII, fig. 108. 137 PN I, 65 (24); II, p. 347, and Junker, Gisa IX, fig. 59. 138 PN I, 417 (26), and Junker, Gisa VI, fig. 70. 139 PN I, 198 (22). 140 PN II, 319 (16). 141 PN II, 326 (22), and Hassan, Gisa IX, fig. 20. 142 PN II, 301 (31). 143 PN I, 235 (10). 144 PN I, 235 (14). 145 PN I, 327 (9). 146 PN I, 195 (17); cf. Junker, “Der Lebendige,” p. 180. See also Fischer, Egyptian Women of the Old Kingdom (New York 1969), pp. 47–48, n. 150, and p. 23 above.

147 In the Heracleopolitan Period and Middle Kingdom the female retinue of Hathor received epithets such as nfrt htrwt ("most beautiful of ornaments") and nfrt "the beautiful ones" JASOS 76 (1956), pp. 166–167 and 108, note 52. One may also compare 148 (PN I, 65 [6]; II, p. 347) and 149 (PN I, 202 [141]), but the latter is clearly Nfrt-nwt, as Ranke suggests in PN II, p. 370, where he quotes a masculine example from Hassan, Gisa II, p. 91 and pl. 27; some of the feminine examples are written 150 (also to be found in PN II, p. 204 [17]) and 151 (Leipzig 3557). It does not seem likely that 152 is to be interpreted in the same way, however, since the other nfrt names of the O.K. all apply to the king (PN I, 202 [20–22], 203 [21]), with the exception of 153 (PN I, 202 [12]; II, p. 370) which may mean "a beauty (is born) to her father." For Nfrt-nfr see also note 165 below.

148 This is, in fact, Ranke’s interpretation (PN I, 327 [6]): “die Haremsdame des nb.ty (d.i. des Königs).” 149 PN I, 191 (26); also an offering basin in Cairo: T 19/6/46/1 (PM III’, p. 293). 150 PN I, 332 (22). 151 PN I, 398 (22). 152 PN I, 355 (3). 153 PN II, 308 (3). Analogous epithets came into use after the Old Kingdom: 154 “praised of Hathor” (Cerny, JEA 47 (1961) p. 7, lines 15–16); 155 “praised of Heqet” (Newberry, Beni Hassan II, pl. 15). The Old Kingdom example quoted by Allam, Beiträge zum Hathorkult, p. 21 (from Macramallah, Idiot, pl. 16) may be defective, to be read [t] nb.f “who does what Hathor praises,” since ir nb.f, etc. is well known in this period (Janssen, Ägyptische Autobiographie I, p. 47 [140–46]).
echoing a familiar epithet of the Old Kingdom priestesses of Hathor: *dwrt Hthr or dwrt Hthr rnb* "who worships Hathor every day."\(^{154}\) Some problems are presented by other names containing *k3i* and *dww* (which are discussed in the following excursus), but they do not affect the question at issue here. Finally there is the feminine name \[\overset{\text{3. The Avoidance of the Old Perfective}}{\text{65}}\]

which is certainly to be read *Nfr-sqmt*. It is less certain, however, whether *sqmt* is the old perfective ("Nfr is heard") or whether it is a participle ("Nfrt is a listener"). And in the latter case *Nfrt* need not refer to a divinity, for the meaning may also be "A good one is one who listens," or the like.

It is true that the old perfective is well attested in Old Kingdom names containing the element *k3i*, which is not subject to honorific transposition.\(^{156}\) But there is, in fact, so much evidence for the old perfective in these cases, compared to the demonstrated rarity of its use in theophoric names, that one immediately suspects the validity of the parallel. While \[\overset{\text{3. The Avoidance of the Old Perfective}}{\text{65}}\] represents *K(i).nfr"My k3i is good" (old perfective), \[\overset{\text{3. The Avoidance of the Old Perfective}}{\text{65}}\] is not *Nfr-k3(i)* with the same meaning, but *Nfr-k3i*, which is probably to be interpreted as "one who is beautiful of k3i,"\(^{159}\) as is shown by its apparent feminine counterpart \[\overset{\text{3. The Avoidance of the Old Perfective}}{\text{65}}\] *Nfrt-k3i*.\(^{160}\) The same pattern is attested by \[\overset{\text{3. The Avoidance of the Old Perfective}}{\text{65}}\] *K(i).usr* and (m.) \[\overset{\text{3. The Avoidance of the Old Perfective}}{\text{65}}\] *Wsr-k3i*\(^{162}\) (f.) \[\overset{\text{3. The Avoidance of the Old Perfective}}{\text{65}}\] *Wsr-k3*i.\(^{163}\) Although it is difficult to find other sets of the three variations that are as complete as these, additional evidence can be cited for comparisons such as *K(i).nfr* and *Nfr-k3i*,\(^{164}\) or for comparisons such as *Nfrt-k3i* and *Nfr-k3i*.\(^{165}\) The interpretation of these names is also borne out by \[\overset{\text{3. The Avoidance of the Old Perfective}}{\text{65}}\] *K(i).nt*\(^{166}\) "My k3i is foremost" and (m.) \[\overset{\text{3. The Avoidance of the Old Perfective}}{\text{65}}\] *Hnty-k3i*\(^{167}\) (f.) \[\overset{\text{3. The Avoidance of the Old Perfective}}{\text{65}}\] *Hnty-k3*i.\(^{168}\) "One who is preeminent of k3i," where the verbal element is replaced by a preposition and its masculine and feminine nisba forms. It remains possible, as Junker has pointed out,\(^{169}\) that masculine forms such as *Nfr-k3i* and *Wsr-k3i* may be abbreviations of longer names like *K(i).nrb* (PNI, 338 [25]) and (f.) *nfr-k3(i)* (next note).

\(^{154}\) See Allam, op. cit., pp. 20–21, but note that his epithet "welche das Gold (i.e., Hathor) preis" is actually a personal name, one of those that are under consideration.

\(^{155}\) Two occurrences: PNI, 203 (4); II, p. 370.

\(^{156}\) See Ranke, PNI II, 14, 208, and note 50 above.

\(^{157}\) PNI, 340 (10) and Junker, Giza VII, figs. 31, 33b.

\(^{158}\) PNI, p. 200 (16). The form \[\overset{\text{3. The Avoidance of the Old Perfective}}{\text{65}}\] (200 [18]) probably does not indicate, as Junker argues (Giza IX, p. 105), the first pers. suffix, since \[\overset{\text{3. The Avoidance of the Old Perfective}}{\text{65}}\] may simply be a terminal ending; cf. PNI II, p. 133, where this is cited.

\(^{159}\) So Gunn, in Firth and Gunn, *Teti Pyramid Cemeteries*, p. 130, continuation of note 3.

\(^{160}\) PNI, 203 (4); Junker’s example is Giza V, p. 132. Cf. also *Nfrt-k3i*, PNI, p. 203 (6) and ASAE 40 (1941) p. 679.

\(^{161}\) PNI, 339 (5).

\(^{162}\) PNI, 86 (12).

\(^{163}\) PNI, 86 (14) and Hassan, Giza IX, figs. 15–17. Cf. also *Wsr-k3i*: James, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Inscriptions*, no. 48.

\(^{164}\) *K(i).wn3* (PNI, 339 [31]), *Whm-k3i* (PNI, 83 [23]); *K(i).mn3* (PNI, 340 [2]; Junker, Giza I, fig. 63; Martin Hetepka, pl. 16 [17]), *Mn-k3i* (PNI, 150 [19]). Cf. also *K(i).nrb* (PNI, 338 [25]) and (f.) *nfr-k3(i)* (next note).

\(^{165}\) Wiëck (PNI, 74 [12]); Wiëck (PNI, 74 [13]); Wh-k3i (PNI, 81 [26]); Junker, Giza II, fig. 9; VI, fig. 109; VII, p. 72; Wh-k3i (PNI, 82 [19]); *Spš-k3i* (Hassan, Giza VI, 3, fig. 41; and cf. *Spš-k3i*, PNI, 327 [1]; Junker, Giza III, fig. 28); *Spš-k3i* (PNI, p. 327 [7, 9]; Junker, Giza VIII, fig. 6). These forms may be supplemented by some for which we do not yet have a masculine equivalent: \[\overset{\text{3. The Avoidance of the Old Perfective}}{\text{65}}\] (PNI, 68 [18]); \[\overset{\text{3. The Avoidance of the Old Perfective}}{\text{65}}\] (PNI, 425 [29]); \[\overset{\text{3. The Avoidance of the Old Perfective}}{\text{65}}\] (PNI, 239 [4]; Junker, Giza II, fig. 28). It does not seem possible to regard the feminine forms as mere "feminizations" of the masculine name, for in this case the *nw* would not follow the first element but would come at the end. Junker, "Der Lebendige," p. 180, evidently recognizes such a case in \[\overset{\text{3. The Avoidance of the Old Perfective}}{\text{65}}\] (PNI, 65 [6]) but Ranke is probably right in suggesting (PNI, p. 347) that the meaning is "die mit schönem Leben."

\(^{166}\) PNI, 340 (19); Junker, Giza VI, fig. 11.

\(^{167}\) PNI, 773 (6).

\(^{168}\) PNI, 773 (13).

\(^{169}\) Junker, Giza IX, pp. 105–106.
Some Theophoric Names of the Old Kingdom

But even if this were the case, the transcription of would still be Nfr-ksi rather than Nfr-kis(i). In contrast to the theophoric names, the ksi-names do not seem ever to have used the latter form in place of the old perfective.

One is therefore left with the conclusion that there is extraordinarily little evidence for the old perfective in Old Kingdom theophoric names of two kinds, each of which should be expected to reveal its presence: namely those in which honorific transposition is inoperative and those in which the name of the divinity is feminine. To judge from this evidence, it was used infrequently. Thus, whenever we have to make a choice between Nfr-NN and NN-nfr, or between Htp-NN and NN-htp, we are more likely to be right if we adhere to the first alternative.

The same conclusion is probably applicable to theophoric names containing verbs of motion, although the evidence for such names is relatively sparse. At least two examples may be quoted in which the old perfective is definitely excluded: Ti-Nffr and Tut-n.Pth, but probably not Phr-nfr since this name does not seem to be theophoric. I know of no Old Kingdom evidence, however, that demonstrates the contrary.

---

170 PNI, 86 (14), var. Wsr-kms.
171 PNI, 109 (7). For Nfr in another theophoric name see above, p. 62 and notes 98, 103.
172 PNI, 138 (19). Here the old perfective is excluded by the use of the sdm. form tut.
173 PNI, 136 (5). Not to be read Phr-Nfr, as Ranke does; the writing is from ASAE 15 (1915) 227; and, as may be seen from Blackman, Meir IV, pl. 14, this may be read as follows, Tut. Thus it is no different from the writing of the same name on the plate following. The meaning of the name is discussed in Studies in Honor of William Kelly Simpson (Boston 1996), forthcoming.
Excursus I: *hzi* and *dwš*

The Old Kingdom theophoric names containing *hzi* and *dwš* show some curious similarities, given the fact that these verbs involve a quite different relationship between man and the gods: *hzi* refers to praise, in the sense of commendation of someone, by the gods; *dwš* to praise, in the sense of worship by someone, of the gods. Hence names of the type *Dwš-NN*, *Dwšt-NN* and *Hzi-NN*, *Hzišt-NN* evidently mean “He/she who worships NN” and “He/she who is praised of NN,” as noted earlier. In addition to these forms there are several that pose problems:

\[
\begin{align*}
&Dwš & (1) & \text{[diagram]} & (3 \text{ exs.})^{174} \\
& & (2) & \text{[diagram]} & 175 \\
& & (3) & \text{[diagram]} & (2 \text{ exs., estates})^{176} \\
& & (4) & a) \text{[diagram]} & b) \text{[diagram]} 177 b \\
& & (5) & \text{[diagram]} & (\text{m.})^{179} \\
&Hzi & (6) & \text{[diagram]} & (1 \text{ ex. m., 2f.})^{180} \\
& & (7) & \text{[diagram]} & (\text{estate})^{181} \\
& & (8) & \text{[diagram]} & (2 \text{ exs., m. and f.})^{182} \\
& & (9) & \text{[diagram]} & (1 \text{ ex.})^{183} \\
& & (10) & \text{[diagram]} & (\text{m.})^{184}
\end{align*}
\]

It is tempting to explain most of these two series of problematic names as *Ny-dwš-NN* (nos. 1–3) “Worship belongs to NN” and *Ny-hzi-NN* (nos. 7–9) “Praise belongs to NN,” although the meaning of *hzi* becomes rather forced; *dwš* would be worship that NN receives, whereas *hzi* would be praise that NN possesses in order to dispense it. In any case this interpretation is excluded by the fact that the sign — is placed at the end without exception; it were correct, one should expect — to precede *dwš* and *hzi* in some of the examples—and indeed in most of them.\(^{186}\) The same is true of a closely related masculine name which is known from three sources—one as \[\text{[diagram]},\] where the position of — is ambiguous,\(^{187}\) once, more clearly, as \[\text{[diagram]},\] \(^{188}\) and once (in hieratic) as \[\text{[diagram]},\] \(^{189}\) and (A) is highly doubtful.

\(^{174}\) PNI, 398 (17), and II, p. 400, citing Mariette, *Masstasbs*, pp. 94–95 (Cairo CG 1511); ibid., pp. 445–46 (same person); Reisner G 5110, G 7530.
\(^{175}\) PNI, 398 (18), citing LD II, 82 (a).
\(^{178}\) PNI, 398 (16), citing Berlin 1108 (E. 2).
\(^{179}\) PNI, 392 (23), citing BM 1324 (–James, *Hieroglyphic Texts I*, pl. 10).
\(^{180}\) PNI, 254 (23), citing Mariette, *Masstasbs*, p. 269 (m); Berlin 7969 (f); Cairo CG 1466 (f).
\(^{182}\) PNI, 426 (22), II, 308 (4), citing Borchhardt, *Grabd. Neuer-Re*, pp. 74, 82 (same man); also Moussa and Altenmüller, *Nianchchnum*, p. 35 (51) and fig. 11.
\(^{183}\) Posener-Krieger and de Cenival, *Abu Sir Papyri*, pl. 65 (25, 42); the example of \[\text{[diagram]},\] on pl. 45 is highly doubtful.
\(^{184}\) Hassan, *Giza VI/3*, fig. 144. The expected form \[\text{[diagram]},\] is also attested (PNI, 254 [14]).
\(^{185}\) Nos. 3, 4 a, and 7 are understood thus by Helen Jacquet-Gordon, *Domains*, p. 465; so also Paul Posener-Krieger, *Archives II*, p. 652, in respect to no. 9.
\(^{186}\) As in \[\text{[diagram]},\] Ny-hzišt-Pth (masc.): PNI, 173 (6).
\(^{187}\) Steindorff, in Hölscher, *Das Grabdenkmal des Königs Chephren* (Leipzig 1912), fig. 166. Not recorded by Ranke, but in PM III, p. 292, it is read Niaptah.
\(^{188}\) Louvre E 25508 (Ziegler, *Catalogue des stèles*, pp. 32, 128 [read lounepth]; 143); in this example \[\text{[diagram]},\] seems to have replaced a mistaken \[\text{[diagram]},\].
\(^{189}\) Thus in Posener-Krieger and de Cenival, *Abu Sir Papyri*, pl. 64 (A). In *Archives II*, p. 690, Posener-Krieger omits the terminal —, but it is evidently present as well as \[\text{[diagram]},\]. As she notes on p. 648, the name Inšt-Pth is also known (PNI, 6 [9]).
Ranke initially thought that nos. 1–3 contained an imperative: *Dw·w-n.(i)-NN* “Pray NN for me!,”¹⁹⁰ while no. 4 would be an abbreviation of the same: *Dw·w-n.(i)* “Pray for me.” This interpretation was abandoned in the second volume of *Personennamen* in favor of *Dw·w-n-NN* “worshiper of NN.”¹⁹¹ He recognizes, however, that no. 4 does not suit this interpretation.¹⁹² Furthermore the location of — again presents a difficulty, although it is not quite so serious as the one that has just been mentioned: at least one or two examples of nos. 1–3 might be expected to show the “graphic transposition of the indirect genitive.”¹⁹³ It therefore seems safer to return to Ranke’s earlier solution, even though there is little further evidence of the imperative in Old Kingdom names.¹⁹⁴ If the feminine ending of no. 5 is not an error, this name might be explained as *dw·w-ti-Snfrw* “Sneferu is worshiped” or “May Sneferu be worshiped.”

The series containing the verb *ḥṣt* is even more perplexing. If nos. 7–9 are not *Njy-ḥṣt-NN*, the only reasonable alternative is the relative form: *Ḥṣt-n-NN* “One whom NN has praised.”¹⁹⁵ with the masculine equivalent represented by no. 6. But the gender of these forms is odd at variance with that of the persons to whom it is applied. The apparently masculine form of no. 6 is known for two women and one man, while the apparently feminine form (nos. 8–9) is conversely known for two men and one woman. No. 7 is excluded from the comparison because it is the name of an estate. The problem cannot be explained away as scribal error, for if one compares examples of the relative form in names containing the verb *ḥwī* “protect,” there is hardly a single instance in which the feminine ending is inappropriately appended or omitted, and this despite the fact that these names are of much more frequent occurrence.¹⁹⁶ An isolated occurrence of *ḥr·w* (PN II, 248 16) refers to a man, suggests that the two masculine examples of nos. 8 and 9 might possibly be read *Njy-ḥṣt-NN*. But this does not explain the two cases where no. 6 is applied to women. The incorrect omission of the feminine ending is more understandable, to be sure, than its occurrence in masculine names, but this omission occurs only rarely in other names.¹⁹⁸

¹⁹⁰ PN II, 368 (17, 18).
¹⁹¹ PN II, p. 400 (referring to I, 398 [12 and 17–20]).
¹⁹² Ibid. (referring to PN I, 398 [17]).
¹⁹⁴ PN II, p. 40, gives no examples, but one is to be found in *Mi·n·i-ḥ(š)ḥ “come to me Sobek* (Münzen und Medaillen A.G. Basel Auktion 49 [June 27, 1974], no. 19). And perhaps also in *ḥr·w* “bring counsel” (PN I, 415 [4]); *ḥr·w·n·i “give me my heart” (PN II, 295 [29]), rather than *Njy-ḥw·i-hm*.
¹⁹⁵ Cf. PN I, 254 (23) and II, p. 378.
¹⁹⁶ PN I, 266 (18–25), 267 (1); II, 309 (28–29), 310 (1); for feminine examples see PN I, 267 (21–22, 25) (the last two in Junker, *Giza VI*, pl. 16a and Simpson, *Western Cemetery*, fig. 31); PN II, 427 (7); also Moussa and Altenmüller, *Nianchknym*, p. 55 and pl. 72; Drioton and Lauer, ASAE 55 (1958), 234 and pl. VI (b).
¹⁹⁷ PN I, 173 (c), referring to LB II, 53 (a).
¹⁹⁸ Ranke (PN II, p. 3 and n. 7) cites three Old Kingdom examples that lack the feminine ending: *Njy-ḥw·i-hm (PN I, 215 [19]), and Blackman and Apted, *Mef°r*, pl. 12); *Nfr (PN I, 194 [11]); Wfr (PN I, 85 [6]). Note also fem. *ḥr·w·n·i “give me my heart” (CG 1592; the masc. form is common: PN I, 254 [28]) and fem. *ḥr·w·n·i (PN I, 421 [14]. II, 403, and p. 70 below). More surprising is fem. *ḥr·w·n·i (PN I, 17 [6], where masc. examples are also given); this may be an abbreviation of *Njy-ḥw·i-hm, for which again see p. 70 below.
Excursus II: Some exceptional transpositions

In PN II, p. 15, Ranke argues that 𓊊𓊌 and 𓊊𓊌 do not show honorific transposition of the word “father,” but are to be read 𓊊𓊌 “nh-n(i)/n.f.” But, as he himself notes on p. 347 of the same volume, the first of these names is a misreading of the other, and the two references are identical. In the same place he also observes that this name is written 𓊊𓊌 on a stela of the Heracleopolitan Period from Naga ed-Deir. It is therefore highly probable that is indeed transposed in the other case, which is accordingly to be read “nh-n.f-it.f.”

In the same discussion Ranke notes that the feminine name 𓊊𓊌 does show honorific transposition of the same element in Mrty-št.s, but points out that the transposition is more understandable in this case since, in this variant of the usual writing 𓊊𓊌, the woman in question is a “king’s daughter”; she is actually his granddaughter, through her mother, but there nonetheless a motivation for according the word “father/ancestor” special respect. This is less clearly true of the second occurrence of the same variant, where the preceding title is only 𓊊𓊌, but the woman’s mother is again a “king’s daughter.” No such connection can be seen, however, in another case, not noted in PN, where a woman is 𓊊𓊌. This corresponds to Middle Kingdom 𓊊𓊌 and is to be read “tw-n.s-št.s her father belongs to her.” Perhaps one should conclude that the transposition of originated in situations where it referred to the king, but was secondarily applied in some cases where it did not.

The word “nb” is seldom transposed in names of the Old Kingdom. One exceptional example has already been noted, and another occurs in 𓊊𓊌 which is probably to be understood as “nh-n.f-nb(i),” “my lord lives for him,” on the pattern of “Anubis lives for him.” Yet another may be found in 𓊊𓊌 Ny-Ks(i)-nbt(i) “My k3 belongs to my mistess.”

Given the paucity of evidence that can be firmly dated to the Old Kingdom, it is difficult to say to what extent honorific transposition was applied to names of theophoric pattern that refer neither to a king nor a divinity, but involve the so-called deification of a non-royal person. To the best of my knowledge, there are scarcely more than five indisputable cases...
of this kind that can be dated to the Old Kingdom. The earliest is 𓊀𓊁𓊂 𓊆𓊂<sup>211</sup> Nḥ-rnḫ-Tl, clearly
dating to the Fourth Dynasty.<sup>211</sup> A second reference to Tl occurs in 𓊀𓊁<sup>212</sup> Nḥ-kfr(i)-Tl, of later date, perhaps the beginning of the Sixth Dynasty.<sup>212</sup> The third case, which belongs to the early Fifth Dynasty, is 𓊀<sup>213</sup> Mṛy(t)-If<sup>213</sup> “Beloved of If.” The fourth case,
dating to the Sixth Dynasty, belongs to a woman called Mṛy(t)-If<sup>214</sup> “Beloved of If.” The name Mṛy is well known from other sources,<sup>215</sup> and it is probably to be recognized in another feminine name: 𓊀<sup>216</sup>, reading Nḥ-rnḫ-If rather than ḫ.<sup>216</sup> It seems more than coincidental that these two names come from tomb chapels that are very nearly adjacent. The fifth case, probably dating to the very end of the Sixth Dynasty, is Nb(i)-Nḥrw, where honorific transposition is applied to the mention of the vizier Mḥrw, whose tomb chapel was again nearby: “Mḥrw is my lord.”<sup>217</sup> The same veneration of an individual is perhaps to be seen in 𓊀<sup>218</sup> and 𓊀<sup>219</sup> Mr-ṣy Th/i/Tl, but Th/i may possibly be the god ḫy, and Tl may conceivably refer to the king of that name; in the second case the absence of honorific transposition would be irregular, however, in the name of the king, and even more so the absence of a cartouche. Yet another possibility is ḫ, which may be read Di-su<sup>220</sup> (rather than Snb-d<sup>220</sup>). It may be added that the names of funerary estates often refer to their non-royal owners, and that, in such cases, the owner’s name is again transposed; two examples have been quoted earlier (p. 58).

Some other possibilities must be discarded. Ranke’s Ṣn for, as he says, but Ṣn as Junker reads it: “He is pure.” And the name ḫ<sup>221</sup> 𓊀<sup>221</sup> Kbfr(i)-m-Nḥrw, which might conceivably be interpreted as Kbfr(i)-m-Nḥrw, is equally certainly Nḥrw-km “Nḥrw the black” as Abu Bakr takes it,<sup>222</sup> despite the fact that one would expect ḫm to be written ḫm, as it is in other cases.<sup>223</sup> There is, however, at least one further possibility that is more difficult to eliminate. It is the label Ṣn<sup>224</sup> , which occurs in a scene from the tomb of Snb, showing men paddling a series of three boats.<sup>224</sup> The label is one of four

---

<sup>211</sup> PM III<sup>2</sup>, pp. 741–42. Not in PN.<br>212 Sotheby Parke Bernet Inc., New York, Sales Catalogue, Egyptian, Classical, and Near Eastern Antiquities, June 10–11, 1985, no. 35; Ghalioungui, MDAIK 40 (1984), 31–32 and pl. 10.<br>213 See above, note 53.<br>214 PNI, 421 (14); II, 403, referring to Hassan, Gīs II, fig. 210.<br>215 PNI, 424 (22). Also Hassan, Gīs VI/3, fig. 220.<br>216 PNI, 414 (19); II, 402, referring to Hassan, Gīs II, fig. 193. Not, apparently, related to Irm. ḫwr<sub>1</sub> (p. 23 above, comment I).<br>217 Wilson, JNES 13 (1954), 244. For the identification of Mḥrw see also JARCE 4 (1955), 51.<br>218 Hassan, Gīs II, figs. 33, 35.<br>219 PNI, 291 (4).<br>220 Ranke, PNI, 313 (22), and p. XXIX, who assumes that the second transliteration is correct; similarly Junker, Gīs II, p. 167, who reads Snb-d<sub>1</sub>-su, without discussion. For the common name Snb see PNI, 312 (15); II, 587.<br>221 PNI, 417 (22), correcting the reference to Junker, Gīs II, p. 167.<br>222 Abu Bark, Gīs, fig. 54, p. 77; in n. 1 Abu Bakr notes that the epithet distinguishes two sons who have the same name. For the hypothetical reading one might compare ḫm of PNI, p. 339 (21), but this name is apparently to be deleted; it does not appear in the final index of names in Junker, Gīs XII.<br>223 PNI, p. 11; all the references given in Ranke’s nn. 21 are so written (the last should be PNI, 149 [200]).<br>224 Junker, Gīs V, fig. 16, discussed on p. 66.
designations, the other three of which are apparently place-names, perhaps referring to the destination or provenance of the boats. The fourth label can hardly be explained in the same way, if only because the boat in question is already designated, and so the additional designation may name the first boatman. Junker hesitantly suggests reading $\text{Z-n-htp-kt}$, referring to a divinity named $\text{Htp-kt}$, which is also known as a personal name in the Old Kingdom. As he also observes, however, one would expect $\text{Z-n}$ to be written $\overline{\text{Z-n}}$; it is normally so written in names of the Old Kingdom including another name from the same tomb (added at a later date).

Excursus III: Two names mentioning Horus

To the best of my knowledge only two examples of the name $\overline{\text{Z-n}}$ have come to light. Ranke read one of them as $\text{hr-nt}$ (with a query), but subsequently wondered if it might be feminine, comparing the other example, which he had read as $\text{ni.t-ht.(u.w)}$. This reading cannot be correct, however, since both occurrences are masculine. The confusion is probably due to the epithet $\overline{\text{ni.t}}$ which precedes the first example; this is not $\text{mry.t.f}$ “his beloved,” but $\text{mry.t.f} “beloved of his father.” The individual in question is the son of a king, presumably Redjedef, and it is to him that the epithet refers. The correct reading is probably $\text{Ny-it.(i)-Hr}$ “my father belongs to Horus,” which may be compared to $\text{Ny-su-Hr} “he belongs to Horus.”

The second name is not recorded by Ranke. It occurs repeatedly beneath each item in a fragmentary list of offerings at Vienna, thus: $\overline{\text{z-n}}$. The first sign is to be understood as the preposition “to,” and the remainder is to be read $\text{Hr-h(u.w).f}$. The closest parallel is $\overline{\text{mry.t.f}}$ which occurs in precisely the same context, repeatedly following — at the bottom of a list of offerings. The meaning is “Horus smites” and “My $\text{kt}$ smites,” or “Horus/my $\text{kt}$

---

225 Cf. $\overline{\text{mry.t.f}}$, known from the Middle Kingdom as an epithet of Osiris (Blackman and Apted, Mein VI, pl. 14 and p. 18, n. 2).
226 PNI, 259 (19); II, p. 380.
227 As pointed out in EEA 60 (1974), 248. In a later volume, Giza XI, p. 240, Junker produces an example that fails to show $\overline{\text{Z-n}}$, which he reads $\text{Z-n-h(k)}$; cf. Junker, “Der Lebendige,” p. 171. This is more probably to be read $\text{Ny-n-h-Mn} (\text{PNI, p. 171 (12)})$, and the entry in PNI, 251 (23) should accordingly be deleted. So too — $\overline{\text{mry.t.f}}$ (Junker, Giza IX, fig. 59), which is $\text{Mf-Mn}$ (PNI, 152 [5]); cf. Orientalia 60 (1991), 295–97.
228 See PM III, p. 3, where the name is read Harnit.
229 PNI, 240 (6), II, 378.
230 Mereruka II, pl. 167.
231 For the writing of “father” cf. $\overline{\text{mry.t.f}}$ quoted on p. 69 above, with note 205. Possibly, however, this word is $\text{fr} “master,” as in $\overline{\text{fr}}$, Hassan, Giza V, figs. 113, 119–35, more usually written $\overline{\text{fr}}$ or the like (PNI, 49 [46]).
232 Simpson, Qar and Idu, fig. 27.
233 W. Wreszinski, Aegyptische Inschriften aus dem K.K. Hofmuseum in Wien (Leipzig 1906), pp. 1–2. For the name see also PNI, 340 (15) and II, 392.
234 Junker, Giza VI, fig. 33. Cf. CG 1485 and Petrie and Murray, Seem Phnom Tomb Chapel, pl. 17, for which see also Mâlek in BSEG 6 (1982), p. 62; here the name, preceded by — again follows each item in the list, as also in Wild, Ti III, pls. 157, 158, and P. de Bourget, Mélanges Maspero IV (MIFAO 66 [1961]), 11 and pls. 1–5. For later examples, where the repeated name is introduced by the epithet “Osiris,” see ZAS 90 (1963), 37, n. 2.
is one who smites," on the pattern of the priestly title zi mrj "loving son." In the present case the signs are curiously framed by the other four signs, and it is doubtless for the sake of this arrangement that h(wil) is written so briefly. The same writing is, however, attested on a statue of  from Saqqara, and a false door at Abu Roash.

---

235 See p. 157 below.
236 *PNI* 340 (15): Cairo CG 268.
237 F. Bisson de la Roque, *Abou-Roach* (Cairo 1924), p. 58 and pl. 33. Elsewhere in the text the name is mistakenly transcribed as  and this error is repeated by Ranke, *PNI*, 256 (26) and PM III, p. 5.
6. On the Interpretation of Names of Pyramids

While there seems to be a well-established consensus as to how the names of Old Kingdom pyramids are to be read and interpreted, this matter—like the reading of many personal names of the Old Kingdom—cannot be taken for granted. At least one challenge to the accepted reading was offered almost thirty years ago by John Bennett,¹ but it has not, to my knowledge, been conclusively endorsed² or refuted.³ Bennett argues that since the names of kings were sometimes omitted from the names of their pyramids, it follows that an example such as ḫnh ⲥ Ⲝ means “Pepy I’s pyramid, the enduring and beautiful.” In other words, mn-nfr represents a pair of masculine participles and not, as customarily thought, the old periphrastic (“Pepy’s Abides and Is Beautiful”). A further argument that Bennett might have brought forward in support of his idea is the fact that the reference to the king may employ either the nomen or prenomen: thus the example that has just been cited may take the form ḫnh ⲥ Ⲝ.⁴

The omission of the royal name might, however, be explained with equal plausibility as an abbreviation. Egyptian personal names at all periods were frequently reduced to hypocoristica,⁵ and toponyms were similarly curtailed, one of the most striking examples being ḫnh-tȝm-n prkn-r “The Mansion Kheperkare (Justified)-is-Powerful,” which was soon shortened to ḫnh-tȝm and finally ḫn(t), the modern Hu.⁶ This case is particularly apt because the abbreviation took place by the Thirteenth Dynasty, if not earlier, and the only valid examples that Bennett cites for pyramid names are those mentioned in the Middle Kingdom tale of Sinuhe. Mn-nfr “Memphis,” which he also cites, is not known to have been used until the Middle Kingdom,⁷ although it was applied to the pyramid somewhat earlier,⁸ which is probably to be compared with the equally puzzling name ḫnn ḫnh ⲥ Ⲝ (Usk I, p. 209 [15]; compare PNI, 44 [25] and II, 223, n. 12, 344). The last sign may be an abbreviated writing of ṭw “breath” although ṭw does not seem to be attested otherwise in personal names at so early a date: “Mn-nfr is my breath,” “Thy is the breath of Mryr,” Goedicke, Königliche Dokumente, p. 58 (8) suggests ḫnh in the second case, but has not taken account of the first one. Cf. also the names ḫnh-Py m Mn-nfr (PNI, 63 [20]) and ḫnh i m Mn-nfr (déquier, Tombeaux des particuliers, p. 112 [miscopied] and pl. 15), where Mn-nfr is again written ḫnh ⲥ Ⲝ, and in the second case it is honorifically transposed.
ON THE INTERPRETATION OF NAMES OF PYRAMIDS

and his remaining example, the supposed name Hor is simply another term for the pyramid and its temple. Nor can any greater significance be attached to the second consideration, the variable use of the royal nomen or prenomen, for this is likewise paralleled by personal names; compare, for example, the name whose name is also written or whose name is also written. In both these cases, the name of the king was, of course, an integral part of the name of the official, although it is difficult to say whether both variations of the royal name were used when the personal names were spoken.

The last point is equally true of the mention of pyramids in personal names. Such cases are very rare but at least one of them is worth quoting in this connection. The name is explained by Ranke as “nh-pdp-m-nn-nfr “König Phipps lebt in Memphis.” In view of the fact that mn-nfr would necessarily, in the Old Kingdom, refer to the pyramid rather than the city Memphis, this interpretation would favor Bennett’s theory—or, in any case, would not speak against it. It seems more probable, however, that this name follows the pattern of var. = “nh-m-tnnt “Life (or “nh.i “my life”) is in the Tnnt-shrine,” with the name of the pyramid replacing Tnnt. At the very end of the Old Kingdom, probably dating to the Eighth Dynasty, another personal name is oddly written however the form of is to be interpreted, this second example even more certainly indicates that the royal name belongs to the name of the pyramid. So also does “my ki is (or “is in”) Hr-nfr-Mmr.r.”

The best comparative evidence, of course, is to be found among other Old Kingdom names of temples and funerary estates. Bennett cites a single example of a temple designated which he interprets as “Sahuré’s building (where) the wrt-crown appears in splendour.” This is more probably to be translated “The Wrt-crown of Sahure Appears,” and it is in any case certain that the names of royal funerary estates quite often include the name of the king; the most common examples follow the pattern Mr-NN (god)-nh-NN (king), “The God NN Desires that King NN Live,” and Snh-NN (god)-NN (king), “The God NN Causes King NN to Live.” One might, to be sure, read the king’s name twice in such cases (“The Estate of King, NN named ‘The God NN Causes King NN to Live’”), but that possibility does not affect the question under consideration. In many cases these estate names are differentiated only by the names of the rulers, so that the royal name is a distinctive and essential element. The same is true of estates such as Ws-Wnis, Ws-Sahr; Nfr-Wnis, Nfr-Rfr, Nfr-Hufu; Hr-[Nfr)i]r, Hr-Hufu, and all three of these

10 Ust I, pp. 251–55; the variant with Ph occurs on the upper architrave; compare Daressy, AAPE 17 (1917), p. 156.
11 Blackman and Apted, Meir V, pls. 5–40. The variant with Mrr occurs on pl. 6. Similarly “nh-nz-Pdp” (Pétre, Abydos II, pls. 19, 21) and “nh-nz-Mrr” (CG 1451, etc.).
12 See n. 8 above.
14 PNI, 132 (5).
15 Cairo CG 1717.
16 Citing Ust I, 38.
18 Ibid., pp. 460, 465–66, 469.
repeated patterns occur in the names of pyramids—those of Chephren (\(\text{wr} \)), Isepi (\(\text{nfr} \)) and Sneferu (\(\text{hfr} \)). Furthermore some similar patterns are repeated in the Twelfth Dynasty, when \(\text{hfr} \) is likewise applied, for example, to Sesostiris I, and \(\text{shm} \) is applied to Sesostiris II.

Theophoric personal names provide further examples of \(\text{Wr-NN}, \text{Nfr-NN} \) and \(\text{Hfr-NN} \), and this class of evidence likewise includes parallels for the pyramid-name \(\text{Hfr-bw-Sihwr} \), including \(\text{Hfr-bw-Pth}, \text{Hfr-bw-Hwthr} \) and \(\text{Hfr-bw-Zkr} \). In the latter case it is apparent that the royal name must come at the end, and the same is apparently true of the pyramid names that have generally been transcribed as \(\text{Ppj-mn-nfr}, \text{Ppj-mn-nfr} \) and the like. These probably do not contain two old perfective forms, but rather consist of a verb + noun, the latter genitively linked with the name of the king. For this pattern one may also compare the personal name \(\text{Mn-\(\text{f} \)-\(\text{nfr} \)-irfr} \) “The Nourishment of Neferirkare Abides,” or “May the nourishment of Neferirkare Abide.” Thus it seems preferable to read \(\text{Mn-\(\text{nfr} \)-\(\text{Ppy} \)} \) “The Beauty” of Pepy Abides” and \(\text{Mn-\(\text{nh} \)-\(\text{Ppy} \)} \) “The Life of Pepy Abides.” For \(\text{Mn-\(\text{nfr} \)-\(\text{Ppy} \)} \) one may compare the name of a temple in an inscription of Pepy II: \(\text{Wfr-\(\text{nfr} \)-\(\text{Rt} \)} \) “Great is the Beauty of Re.” And in the case of \(\text{Mn-\(\text{nh} \)-\(\text{Ppy} \)} \) it should be noted how much more appropriately life is attributed to the king than to his pyramid; it is true that the coffin is designated as \(\text{nb} \) “possessor of life,” but this phrase does not refer to its own longevity, but rather to the life that it encloses. It seems unlikely that, in the Old Kingdom, a building would itself be said to live or to be “abiding of life.”

These last cases raise yet another objection to Bennett’s theory, and specifically his explanation of \(\text{mn} \) “abiding of life as a pair of masculine participles. Although the usual term for pyramid, \(\text{mr} \), is in fact masculine, it was, in the Old Kingdom, personified as a female, and in one case an official of that period refers to the pyramid of his king as \(\text{hmwt} \) “my mistress.”

The feminine role is probably explained by the fact that the pyramid complex was regarded as a city, as in the Dahshur decree, concerning the two pyramids of Sneferu, which consistently refers to the pyramids as \(\text{r} \) “these two (pyramid) cities.” One might compare the masculine word \(\text{nb} \) “gold,” which, as an epithet of the goddess Hathor, is followed by feminine forms in personal names such as Old Kingdom \(\text{Nbw-hntt} \), Middle Kingdom \(\text{Nbw-\(\text{hp} \)-\(\text{hbt} \), Nbw-\(\text{h} \)-\(\text{s} \), Nbw-\(\text{hr} \)-\(\text{s} \). Thus if the name of a pyramid consisted of nothing but one or two participles, as Bennett assumes, one might well expect them to be feminine, and some further evidence for that conclusion is forthcoming from the Middle Kingdom, as will be seen presently.

---

\(^{19}\) Wd-\(\text{dgh} \) (PNII, 80 [14]); Wfr-Hhr (PNII, 274 [20]); \(\text{Nfr-Mrt} \) (PNII, 196 [17]); \(\text{Nfr-\(\text{hhd} \)} \) (PNII, 198 [22]); \(\text{Nfr-\(\text{ng} \)} \) (PNII, 298 [15]); \(\text{Hfr-Inpw} \) (PNII, 203 [10]).

\(^{20}\) PNI, 203 (12–14).

\(^{21}\) For this and other estate names of the same pattern see Jacques-Gordon, Domains, p. 492.

\(^{22}\) For \(\text{nfr} \) as a substantive, see W. II, p. 258 (11–17).

\(^{23}\) Cairo CG 1747.

\(^{24}\) W. I, 106 (15), and see also W. I, p. 199 (14), where late examples are cited.

\(^{25}\) W. I, 106 (17), 107 (6); I follow Gardiner’s explanation (JE 41 [1955] p. 121) as opposed to that of Goedicke in WZKM 56 (1966) pp. 52–54.

\(^{26}\) W. I, 210 (2, 7, 17), 211 (6, 14), etc.

\(^{27}\) PNI, 192 (5, 13), 191 (23). Further evidence is provided by a psalm in Blackman, Met IV, pl. 9: “\(\text{Nbw-hr-s.} \) Gold appears in the great portal: ‘Thy (lit.) power is exalted,’ says Horus.”
Bennett’s explanation of the pyramid names mentioning a plurality of sut “places” is, I must admit, very plausible, but its plausibility is outweighed by the arguments that have just been adduced. Instead of a pyramid that is “most enduring of places,” one must therefore prefer the traditional translation “The places of Merenre abide” or “May the places of Merenre abide.” This may be compared with the personal name 𓊪𓊧𓊳𓊦𓊢𓊣, which Junker convincingly explains as Mn-sut-ît.i-nsut “The places of my father, the king, abide.”

In such cases the “places” are probably to be regarded as the several points within the pyramid complex where offerings were made, but may possibly refer to the entire system of funerary estates which supplied the pyramid cult.

A particularly interesting occurrence of sut is to be found in a title dating to the end of the Eleventh Dynasty, which is claimed by a governor of the Heracleopolitan Nome at El Saff: 𓊪𓊧𓊳𓊦𓊢𓊣. As in other titles in which a hm-nfr priest is associated with a pyramid, this must refer to a specific funerary cult, and the cult is apparently that of Merykare, for his pyramid is elsewhere designated as 𓊬𓊧𓊨𓊢𓊣, again omitting the initial element 𓊪. The geographical and chronological context evidently sufficed to identify even so undistinctive an abbreviation as “the places.”

In other cases one is faced with the more difficult choice of Nfr-Izzi and Wr-R‘fr.f, as quoted above, or Izzi-nfr(w) and R‘fr.f-fatr(w). A comparison of theophoric names suggests that the second alternative, employing the old perfective, was not so popular as is generally assumed, and was particularly unlikely to be used in the case of an adjectival verb. While the choice cannot be conclusively resolved in any specific case, the first alternative has, in general, a greater chance of being correct.

Some of the Middle Kingdom pyramid names differ significantly from the patterns established in the Old Kingdom, and notably 𓊫𓊧𓊨𓊢𓊣. This is evidently “The Places of the Appearances of Amenemhet (I)” as initially suggested by Mace. The name 𓊫𓊨𓊦𓊢𓊣 is also unusual; hnmt looks like a feminine participle, “She Who Encompasses the Places of Khakheperre,” and this case points out the absence of the ending 𓊬 in the Old Kingdom names. Such an ending is not, however, to be recognized in Bennett’s listing of 𓊫𓊧𓊨𓊢𓊣 for the pyramid of Mentuhotep II, which should be corrected to 𓊫𓊧𓊨𓊢𓊣 “Glorious are the places of Nebhepetre,” later abbreviated to 𓊫𓊧𓊨𓊢𓊣.

---

28 Junker, Gita V, p. 188.
29 For the association of št with provisioning see A. Varille, Mélanges Maspero I, pp. 557–58; Fischer, ÆDE 24 (1972) p. 70, note 2.
30 Fischer, The Tomb of ëb at El Saff, p. 26 (21) and pl. G.
31 J. Mâlek, in Hommages à Jean Leclant (Cairo 1994) IV, p. 205. The context is missing, but the title at El Saff speaks against Mâlek’s assumption that sst refers to more than one pyramid.
32 See Chapter 5, section 3.
33 Cf. Edel, Alltäg. Gramm., § 362 bb, who cites the case of Pry. 638 c to show that the old perfective is at least theoretically possible. But in this exceptional case the old per-
fective is used to ring a change on the expected use of participle + noun, and this is done to create the chiastic ABBA pattern that has been favored by stylists down through the ages: ‘i rd.k, rd.k w‘t “great is thy foot; thy foot is large.”
34 On foundation deposit plaques from Lisht (MMA 22.1.1015–1017); cf. those in Dieter Arnold, Pyramid of Snefru (New York 1988), fig. 37, p. 91.
35 BMMA (Nov. 1921) p. 17. So too Helck, LÂ V, col. 6.
36 Petrie, Memphis I, pl. 5.
37 H.R. Hall in Naville, Xth Dynasty Temple I, p. 10; also Cairo CG 20088.
As for the pyramid of Amenemhet I, which is the point of departure for Bennett’s discussion, this fully conforms to Old Kingdom tradition. It is written on a Twelfth Dynasty stela, but the abbreviation of it in Sinuhe (R5) is and this supports the interpretation of as a substantive and argues against Bennett’s translation “The high and Beautiful,” and against the traditional translation “Amenemhet is High and Beautiful.” The correct interpretation is surely “Exalted is the Beauty of Amenemhet.” While the Wörterbuch offers no equally early evidence for qi meaning “exalted” or “great,” one may compare the Old Kingdom personal name “Her Power is Great,” and “Great is the Might of Re,” the latter perhaps dating to the Eighth Dynasty. Finally there is the unusual name ; here again it does not seem necessary to assume that it is the pyramid that beholds, or, as Bennett puts it, “overlooks” the Two Lands. If the name is translated “Sesostris Beholds the Two Lands,” we may understand this as an allusion to the pair of ugdit-eyes that were carved on pyramidia of the Middle Kingdom and that, like the eyes on the coffin and offering niche, enabled the deceased to maintain contact with the external world. The pyramidion of Sesostris I has not survived, but that of Amenemhet III shows the ugdit-eyes, as does that of Khendjer, dating to the following dynasty.

To sum up, I think Bennett’s interpretation of pyramid names is definitely to be rejected in favor of the traditional interpretation, although the latter should be modified in one significant respect: names such as and are not to be read Mryrw-nmn(w)-nfr(w) and lmnhmt-qi(w)-nfr(w), but Mn-nfr(w)-Mryrw and Q-nfr(w)-lmnhmt.

---

38 Louvre C 2: Simpson, Terrace of the Great God, pl. 44.
39 Wb. V, p. 2 (13).
40 PNI, p. 439, referring to PNI, 332 (10).
41 PNI, 332 (18), and correct the reference to Dunham’s no. 68. This and the preceding case exemplify the usefulness of onomastic evidence for lexicographical purposes. Presumably the same meaning of qi is to be recognized in names such as (PNI, 319 [281]) “Ptah is exalted,” “Maat is exalted,” and “Horus is exalted,” both cited on p. 61 above. See also the passage quoted above in note 27.
42 Cairo J 35135: Dieter Arnold, Der Pyramidenbezirk des Königs Amenemhet III (Mainz 1987), p. 38. The eyes head a group of signs that are flanked by the king’s names, to be understood as pr NN nfrw Re “NN regards the beauty of Re.”
43 G. Jéquier, Deux pyramides du Moyen Empire (Cairo 1933), pl. 6 and fig. 17, p. 21.
7. Provincial Inscriptions of the Heracleopolitan Period

1. Stelae from Naqada

In addition to a stela in the Brooklyn Museum which Richard Fazzini has correctly attributed to Naqada,¹ there are two other monuments that might be added to the corpus I have assembled for this cemetery, the first with a reasonable degree of certainty, the second less so, owing to its ruinous condition.

The stela shown in Figure 1 has already been published by Sergio Donadoni,² and my drawing is made from his photograph. It is hardly necessary to repeat his description and comments in entirety, but a few observations may be added. First, the stela formerly belonged to the collection of Georges Michailidis in Cairo. Secondly, the name of the owner is definitely Dg and not Dmg or a variant of Dng, as has been considered possible. And finally it should be noted that a line of text begins above the head of the deceased, terminating before the face of the woman who accompanies him: [ŋ[ní]m |ₖ |ₖ |ₖ |ₖ] “his wife, his beloved, Nnḥ.” Her name is known from the same period at Naga ed-Deir,³ while at Naqada there is a masculine occurrence of the virtually identical [ₖ][ₖ].⁴

Inasmuch as the masculine name Dg (var. Dgi) is well known from contemporaneous stelae from Naqada,⁵ it must be considered whether the present example may have the same provenance—especially since the two writings of Dgi show somewhat similar geometric stylizations of the ear-determinative: [ŋ[ní]m, [ŋ[ní]m]. Although the stela displays only one of the more salient palaeographic features of Naqada—a reversal of [ŋ[ní]m] that is not confined to that site⁶—the provenance seems confirmed by the style and format, and most particu-

¹ Accession no. 69.74.1, in Miscellanea Wilbouriana 1 (1972), p. 40 and fig. 6. The name of the owner, “nh-[n.]-[l.] is evidently the same as the “nh-[n.]-[l.]-l. in Fischer, Captiste Nome, no. 26. This provides another example of a feminine determinative like ²ₖ as in nos. 99, and more particularly no. 35, which likewise shows a long wig. Note also that a Sixth Dynasty fragment from Naqada is published in Hommages à Jean Leclant (Cairo 1994) 1, pp. 181–88.
³ Dunham, Naga-ed-Dér Stelae, no. 63; cf. Ranke, PNI, 205 (26), and II, 370.
⁴ Fischer, Captiste Nome, no. 38.
⁵ Ibid., no. 36; Dgi, nos. 18, 26. This name, when followed by the ear, does not seem to be attested elsewhere before the Middle Kingdom: see Ranke, PNI, 396 (3–4); II, 490.
⁶ Ibid., p. 55; cf. JAOS 76 (1956), 101, nn. 8–10; BiOr 36 (1979), 32 (g). Note also the divine determinative ³ with projecting arms, as in the case of the feminine determinative ² in the Eighth Dynasty Coptos Decrees, and at Naqada and elsewhere: Fischer, Dendros, p. 82 and n. 347.
larly by the group of offerings, including a jar filled with lotus blossoms, one of which has an odd protuberance below the central bud. It occurs on one of the stelae previously identified as having come from Naqada. In this other case the comparable jar may or may not have had a ringstand, for the bottom is missing, but it is attested on another Naqada stela. At first sight it is not clear whether the detail between the shoulder straps of the woman resembles that which is frequent at Naqada, but the apparent resemblance is due to a break in the surface, as shown in the figure. As in the case of two other Naqada stelae, the seam of her skirt is parted between the legs.

The more distinctive of the owner’s two titles is most peculiar. Donadoni hazards the suggestion that it may represent smsw hpyt “seniore del portale,” but without great conviction. The older writing of this title is 𓊁𓊀𓊁, the last sign sometimes taking the form 𓊁; in the Middle Kingdom it was at least once replaced by 𓊁 (𓊁𓊁), but the word

7 Fischer, Coptite Nome, no. 29.
8 Ibid., no. 26.
9 Ibid., fig. 5, p. 52.
10 Ibid., nos. 25, 32.
11 Wb. Belegetellen II, 476 (11), cites CG 23; to this may be added the examples given on p. 229 below, and n. 418.
12 CG 20017, illustrated in Simpson, Terrace of the Great God, pl. 20 (where the CG nos. are transposed).
in question was not determined by a domed structure until the Graeco-Roman Period,\(^{13}\) and the detail at the top can hardly represent a dome in any case. It is true, however, that in most of the early titles where smsw precedes another element, that element represents a structure of some kind.\(^{14}\) In addition to the aforementioned smsw, there are smsw (var. smsw) and smsw (written smsw in the late Old Kingdom and the Heracleopolitan Period.\(^{15}\) To these may be added smsw (t) “elder of the chamber,” in which the two elements have been transposed for aesthetic reasons.\(^{16}\) In the present case the enigmatic sign may be the result of a correction, the title smsw pr “eldest of the domain,” having replaced smsw whrt “eldest of the dockyard.” As shown in Figure 2a, this would account for nearly all of the space within the rectangular portion; the remaining area at the center would have been so vestigial and isolated that it was readily lost along with the plaster filling of the erased signs. The reverse of this sequence of replacement (Figure 2b) is less likely, in view of the fact that there is evidently no room for a in the assumed writing of whrt; if this had been the replacement, it would have been easier to erase the stroke of a, and to have placed a or a above it. But the change to smsw pr would more understandably have required a to be moved higher, with the addition of the stroke that generally appears in this title; two such examples have already been attested at Naqada.\(^{17}\) If the sign in question is not to be explained as a palimpsest revision, it is difficult to see how it can be regarded as a structure of any sort, much less one that is known from titles of the period.

---

\(^{13}\) Wb, Belgestellen II, 476 (6, 7).

\(^{14}\) The sole exception is smsw, “elder of the fowlers,” which is known from two examples, both dating to the Fifth Dynasty: Hassan, Giza II, fig. 240, and Moussa and Altenmüller, Niankhchem, p. 95, pl. 30a, fig. 12. The supervisor of fowlers (or fishermen) is more usually a: Junker, Giza XI, fig. 91; Wild, Ti II, pl. 123; Bissing, Gem-nis-kai II, pl. 8; Blackman, Mer IV, pl. 8; V, pl. 50; Davies, Sheikh Said, pl. 12; Badawy, Nykhtep-Ptah, figs. 33–36; Moussa and Altenmüller, Op. cit., p. 95 and fig. 12. Also a; ibid., pp. 96–97 and fig. 12; LD II, 105 (b); Moussa and Junge, Two Tombs of Craftsmen, pl. 13. In none of these cases is the title followed by a personal name.

\(^{15}\) For examples see Murray, Index, pl. 41, but note that a and a are actually a (for the second cf. CG 1516, belonging to the same person). And for the writings of smsw whrt see also Fischer, Dendera, p. 212; a late Old Kindom example of the later writing of this is attested by a provincial stela illustrated in the sales catalogue of Drouot Richelieu, Paris: Archéologie: Egyptienne et Gréco-Romaine, Dec. 1, 1993, p. 15 (111).

\(^{16}\) See Wb, I, 127 (9), where the Old and Middle Kingdom writings may be compared.

\(^{17}\) Fischer, Captive Nome, nos. 19, 20. The only examples I know of that omit the stroke are: Abu Bakr, Giza, fig. 11; LD II, 74; H. Kayser, Uhenka, p. 33, and perhaps Blackman, Mer IV, pl. 9.
A clearer example of a contemporary smsw whrt is known, however, from a stela which I previously thought of including with the Naqada material, but omitted because the indications for the provenance seemed inadequate (Pl. 9 and Fig. 3). The figures are almost entirely obliterated, as is much of the inscription, but one can see that the dress of the woman is again parted at the bottom. The surviving traces may be translated as follows: (1) An offering that [the king] gives, and Anubis Who is Upon his [Mountain, Lord of the Sacred Land] (2) that funerary offerings be invoked for the Sole Companion, the Eldest of the Dockyard\(^a\) [Mfl\(?\)]\(^b\), (3) [who says]; c “I made a boat for the Hereditary Prince and Overseer of Priests (4) NN\(d\) .... He [praised\(^c\)] me (5) [for it] ... in the northern Head of Upper Egypt.\(^f\) (6) I came back from there in peace.\(^g\) I was one beloved of his father (7) one praised of his mother, whom [his] broth[ers] loved.”

---

\(^a\) Turin Suppl. 1292, measuring 23 x 32.5 cm. The drawing is based on a copy made from the original and from photographs provided by Ernesto Scamuzzi and Silvio Curto. The stela is among the 1,392 antiquities that Schiaparelli acquired in Egypt during the winter of 1900–1901.
2. Words and weapons at Thebes

As Edel has already suspected, the fragmentary inscription known as Florence 7595 is more intact than Bostico realised when he published it. Moreover it virtually completes the upper part of a stela in Strasbourg, which is of considerable historical interest because it mentions an In-it.£ who held the title “Great Overlord of Upper Egypt” (Fig. 4). The stela belongs to a subordinate of the same name, whose name is evidently repeated at the end of the fragment in Florence. He and his wife are represented in deep but rather flat

---

19 ZAS 85 (1960), 83.
20 Bostico, Stele 1, p. 31, fig 26.
21 Collection de l’Université 945; Spiegelberg-Pörtner, Ägyptische Grabsteine I, pl. 11 (18); Clère-Vandier, TPPI.
relief within a recessed area that is well-defined, whereas the incised inscription, above and
to the right of this area, lacks a vertical border on either side.\textsuperscript{22} It is the lack of such a border
that has previously made it difficult to determine how much was missing at the right edge
of the lower fragment.

Both fragments show that the owner holds a bow, but on the fragment in Florence it may
be seen that the same hand also holds a sheaf of arrows.\textsuperscript{23} The initial titles of the great over-

\textsuperscript{22} So also many other Dyn. XI stelae of somewhat later
date: e.g., Cairo CG 20007, 20505, 20512, 20514; BM 614
(Blackman, JEA 17 [1931], pl. 8); MMA 13.182.3 (Hayes,
Scepter I, fig. 90); Gardiner, JEA 4 (1917), pl. 8.

\textsuperscript{23} Stelae from Gebelein generally show the bow and
arrows together, but held with both hands (Kuak 1961),
57, 60 and pls. 11–13). Here and elsewhere the bow is also
carried in one hand, the arrows in another: for Gebelein
see BM 1671 (Polotusk, JEA 16 [1930], pl. 29, where the
son holds the weapons) and a fragment from the
Rustafjaell Collection (Sotheby Catalogue, Dec. 19–21,
1906, pl. 9 [51]); for Naqada see Fischer, Copite Nome, nos.
16, 27, 36–41, as well as 30, 31; also the Theban stela MMA
20.2.29 (Hayes, Scepter I, p. 280 and fig. 183). MMA
26.3.316 (ibid., p. 330). BM 647 (n. 25 below) is so similar
to MMA 20.2.29 that it too probably comes from Thebes.
Dendera has yielded only a single stela with the same motif
(a fragment, University of Pennsylvania Museum, Philadel-
phia, 2966-800), as has Abydos (H.W. Müller, MDAIK 4
[1937], 187). The motif is scarcely known from Twelfth
Dynasty stelae; the only one known to me is Berlin 22820
(ibid., pl. 33 [1] and Anthes, ZAS 65 [1930], 108 ff.); this
late a date is indicated by for ḫw, and instead of
ḥm; the provenance is said to be Qamula, in the Copite
Nome, and it might be regarded as a survival of earlier tra-
dition, although the weapons are well suited to the owner’s
functions.
2. Words and Weapons at Thebes

lord are completed by the lower fragment at precisely the right point, and in line 4 the two fragments both show traces of the sign ꜣ. The lack of detail in the wigs and clothing of the man and wife corresponds to the style of the hieroglyphs, and notably ○ (for ⫝̸) and 𓊍. The shoulder-straps of the wife seem to show a peculiarity mentioned earlier, which is known not only from Thebes, the presumed provenance of the stela, but from other sites throughout the southernmost nomes, to judge from the inner contour of the strap that is visible. The form of the man’s kilt is uncertain; the sheaf of arrows hardly leaves sufficient room for the projecting kilt of traditional form. If the arrows did not overlap the kilt, it must have been the close-fitting šndt, which occurs on a few other stelae of this period, including one belonging to another general. For the same reason I doubt that the other hand held a scepter or an axe.

Brief as it is, the autobiographical text is not without problems, and it is ironic that these problems arise most particularly from the union of the two fragments. They will be examined in the comments appended to the following translation, which accepts the text as it is, without emendation: (1) An offering that the king gives, and Osiris, Lord of Busiris, that funerary offerings go forth to the Chancellor of the King of Lower Egypt, the Sole Companion, the Overseer of Foreign Mercenaries, the Overseer of the Army In-it.f, who says: I went downstream and upstream on a mission for the Hereditary Prince, Count, Great Overlord of Upper Egypt In-it.f to the place to which the chief of Upper and Lower Egypt (were going). (5) Every chief, having arrived there, then rejoiced on meeting me, because I was good of speech. I am one who is outspoken [7] and is efficient of counsel, commanding of voice on the day of assembling, who declares a statement. (8) [being self-collected on the day of ] conference, the revered In-it.f.

Comments: (a) For this title see Lanny Bell, Interpreters and Egyptianized Nubians (University of Pennsylvania dissertation, 1976).
(b) “I went downstream and upstream” is difficult to reconcile with a single destination unless it means a round trip. From the following dynasty there is, in fact, evidence that śm and itw, “going” and “coming,” were used in this fashion; a Twelfth Dynasty inscription at one of the turquoise mines of Sinai speaks of śm iy nb r st tn “every going and coming to this place.” (Gardiner, Peet and Černý, Sinai, pl. 17 [53] and p. 80). And if “upstream” were literally taken to mean a trip south of Thebes, this mission would be rather different from one made downstream. The nomes that lay upstream must already have come under control of

84 Fischer, Coptic Nome, pp. 52–53 and fig. 52.
85 There is little to add to the evidence presented in Kush 9 (1961), 67, n. 52. For Boston MFA 04.1851 see E. Bronevetsky, Studies in Honor of George R. Hughes (Chicago 1976), 37–41 and fig. 11; he thinks this may come from Gebelein, but concedes (n. 36) that the paleographic features favor Thebes. BM 647 is most accurately presented by James, Hieroglyphic Texts, pl. 35 (21) and Florence 7588, from Gebelein, is illustrated by Bosticco, Stele 1, no. 12. Yet another example from Gebelein is to be recognized in the fragment from the Rustafaell Collection (note 23 above). There is also a fragmentary example in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, no. 1248, of unknown provenance.
the Great Overlord of Upper Egypt since he presumably assumed this title after his Theban-Coptite coalition had broken the resistance of U.E. Nomess 1–3, which had hitherto prevailed under the leadership of ‘nhty.fy of Mo‘alla.27

(c) Not simply “nomarch of Thebes,” as Bell says (ibid., n. 1036), following Clère-Vandier (n. 21 above) and not “Great Overlord of the King,” as Eric Doret translates in The Narrative Verbal System (Geneva 1986), p. 146 (ex. 253). The title “Great Overlord of the King” is indeed attested twice at Aswan (Fischer, Dendera, p. 69, n. 279) but there the word in question is written ↓ ↓. In another example of “Great Overlord of Upper Egypt,” probably referring to the same person (ibid., pl. 29), Șm.w shows the normal form: ↓. For further examples where it is written ↓ see comment g below.

(d) As the text stands, this is clearly a singular, since nb “every” would otherwise be added.

(e) I know of no parallel for this use of nb nty... iry, as distinguished from the usual nb nty... im, for which see Edel, Altäg. Gramm., § 1062, and Gardiner, Grammar, § 200 (2).

(f) Ḥqr is perhaps the most malleable of administrative terms. In the late Old Kingdom and the Heracleopolitan Period it designated the “rulers of the Oasis” at Balat,28 recalling an Eleventh Dynasty reference to ↓ ↓ ↓ “the chiefs who ruled over the desert” (Clère-Vandier TPI, § 20 A, 6). And it is frequently applied to the rulers of Nubian lands in Old Kingdom texts.29 In the present case, however, I believe it refers to nomarchs, as it clearly does in the inscriptions of the nearly contemporaneous nhty.fy (Vandier, Mo‘alla, III, 3; IV, 20; XVI, 11), and the same meaning is probably to be applied to this term in inscriptions from the region of Gebelein, in the Theban Nome (Poltosky, JEA 16 [1930], 195 [101]), Černý, JEA 47 [1961], 7 [2–3]). In all these cases the determinative is similarly ↓ ↓. Cf. also Fischer, Coptite Nome, p. 67, where Ḥqr evidently refers to the three overseers of priests whom the deceased served, but they too probably acted as nomarchs (ibid., p. 60). Ḥqr is also known to have designated nomarchs in titularies of much earlier date, in Dyns. III–IV (Fischer, Dendera, pp. 11–12).

(g) The sign ↓ in mḥwt is certain, for the two fragments show traces of the front and rear end of the sign, as seen from the original in Florence; for the piece in Strasbourg cf. Clère-Vandier, TPI, § 21. The reading of Șm.w is equally certain, with ↓ represented by ↓ as in Turin Suppl. 1292, discussed previously; also Clère-Vandier, TPI, pp. 12 (top left), 15, Fischer, Coptite Nome, nos. 27, 39; see also ibid., p. 41 and n. 9; and for Old Kingdom examples: Murray, Saqqara Mastabas I, pl. 9; Blackman and Apted, Meir V, pl. 14. For the phrase cf. ↓ in Vandier, Mo‘alla, p. 186 (II, B, 2). Vandier translates “le Sud et le Nord, ce pays tout entier,” and plausibly recognizes the same combination of

27 For the Theban–Coptite coalition see Vandier, Mo‘alla, p. 198 (II, 6, 3). For the extent of nhty.fy’s domain see p. 242 (VI, a, 3–4).
29 Urk I, 109 (1), 125 (8), 126 (15), 127 (7), 133 (13), 134 (6, 10). Also in Old Kingdom Exegetical texts: Oting, DAI 29 (1973), 112; 32 (1976), 135.
“Upper Egypt” and “North” in IV, 12, p. 225(k). Probably the same interpretation is to be accepted in the present case (rather than “northern Upper Egypt”), although the inscription in Figure 2 seems to apply mḥty “northern” to the “Head of the South,” a smaller portion of Upper Egypt.

(h) I take ḫ(my) in entirety to represent spry (old perfective). For the use of the old perfective in a preliminary circumstantial clause, without any kind of introduction, cf. ḫ(my) ḫ(my) ḫ(my) ḫ(my) ḫ(my) ḫ(my) ḫ(my) ḫ(my) “having gone on a mission of this my lord, I did what he desired” (Gardiner, JEA 4 [1917], pl. 9 [6]). Edel (ZÄS 85 [1960], 83) takes spry to be a perfective relative form “(as for) every chief whom I reached.” His interpretation is theoretically possible, and one might even consider the preceding ḫ(my) as a proleptic ḫ(my), resulting from a scribal error—either haplography (to be read twice, as ḫ(my) and ḫ(my)) or the omission of ḫ(my) after ḫ(my) ḫ(my), ḫ(my) Hawes has suggested to me that the phrase in question might also be translated “(and/or) to which every chief had arrived.” But neither of these alternatives is likely unless one assumes that the omission of ḫ(my) after ḫ(my) is another scribal error, and one that is less comprehensible. The idea of a single destination, and a single meeting, also suits the epithets in lines 7–8, referring to “the day of assembling” and “[the day of] conference.” For the writing of spr cf. ḫ(my) (Urk. I, 130 [16]), ḫ(my) (Pyr. 1188c [N]) and the derived noun ḫ(my) “haven” (Fischer, Dendera, p. 140); the sign derives from in writings of spr “ribs” (Hassan, Giza VI/2, 354 [list 44] 356 [list 109T]), and the boat replaces the generic determinative ḫ(my) to indicate arrival by water.

(i) ḫ(my)n. ḫ(my)n. + old perfective. For the omission of the suffix ending see Edel, ZÄS 84 (1959), 31 (84).


(k) Cf. ḫ(my) ḫ(my) ḫ(my) ḫ(my) ḫ(my) ḫ(my) “who is open of mouth on the day of speech, possessor of a (strong) arm on the day of fighting” (CG 1690, from Mesheikh, in the Thinite Nome).

(l) The second sign might be either ḫ(my) or ḫ(my); cf. ḫ(my) ḫ(my) (Sitt III, 4; Montet, Kēmi 3 [1930], 91). But ḫ(my) seems too short for the available space, and ḫ(my) therefore seems more likely. For the latter phrase see Janssen, Ägyptische Autobiografie I, pp. 20–23.


(n) Dmdnyt is unusual, but the meaning is unmistakable; cf. Bosticc. This clearly refers to the meeting mentioned in lines 2–5.

(o) Cf. ḫ(my) ḫ(my) ḫ(my) ḫ(my) ḫ(my) “who declares a statement in its (proper) time” (Couyat-Montet, Hammamāt, no. 114 [6–7]), which is strangely reminiscent of the more common epithet ḫ(my) ḫ(my) ḫ(my) ḫ(my) ḫ(my) “who finds a phrase when it is lacking” (Janssen, op. cit., p. 114). There is insufficient room for ḫ(my)n in the present case.

(p) For this epithet, which is clearly connected with the phrase just quoted, see ibid., p. 94 f.

(q) I initially took this word to be ḫ(my) ḫ(my) ḫ(my) ḫ(my) ḫ(my) “orders,” but the form of ḫ(my) is odd; it does not seem altogether suitable for ḫ(my) either, but this sign shows some other variations of the same
kind in the late Heracleopolitan Period and Twelfth Dynasty; see p. 103 below. For the entire phrase cf. (Anthes, Hatnub, Gr. 20 [5]).

(r) The use of the name-determinative $\text{የ}$ is rather unusual at the end of the Heracleopolitan Period in situations where the name is adjacent to a large-scale representation of the individual in question (cf. Fischer, Captite Nome, pp. 124–25), but two further Theban examples are to be found in Hayes, Scepter I, figs. 91, 183; for the second of these cf. Fischer, Dendera, p. 131, n. 576.

Thus the entire autobiography appears to be centered upon a single event, a meeting of the nomarchs of Upper Egypt and the North, to which the deceased general was sent to represent his master, the chief Overlord of Upper Egypt In-it.f, elsewhere known as In-it.f ˁn (“the Elder”). While his opening words, “I went downstream and upstream,” probably mean no more than that he made a round-trip to his destination, it is possible that he began this journey by collecting representatives of the three nomes south of Thebes that had already come under Theban domination. There can, in any case, be little doubt that Thebes has rightly been taken to be the provenance of the stela, and that it comes from the cemetery of Dra-abu’l-Naga.30

It remains uncertain where the supposed meeting took place, other than the fact that it was some distance away. If it had been located at Heracleopolis, one might perhaps expect a reference to the “House of Khety,” as is found in slightly later inscriptions dating to the reign of Wkh-ˁnh In-it.f.31 This nonetheless seems probable if “Upper Egypt and the North” embraces the whole of Egypt, and is not to be interpreted as “northern Upper Egypt.” In the second case Abydos would be the most likely alternative, since it probably retained, well into the Heracleopolitan Period, some of the importance it had acquired as the administrative center of Upper Egypt during the Old Kingdom.32

The weapon carried by the emissary may seem at variance with the purely diplomatic nature of this mission, but it echoes a contemporaneous epithet that has been quoted earlier: “one who opens his mouth on the day of speech, a possessor of a (strong) arm on the day of fighting.” One suspects, moreover, that his master was employing diplomacy in the north at the same time that he was subduing his immediate neighbors by military force.

Even in the reign of Wkh-ˁnh, who pushed his conquests as far as the ten southernmost nomes, the use of persuasion, or legal argument, seems not to have been abandoned, for a fragmentary inscription of his time speaks of petitioners who evidently made some claim or complaint against his adversary, the aforementioned “House of Khety.”33 As in other periods of pharaonic history, words seem to have been given as much weight as weapons, even if weapons, in this case, had the final word.

30 So PM I/2, p. 595 f.
31 JEA 61 (1975), 55–57, and Glère-Vandier, TPPF, § 18 (5). Another Eleventh Dynasty text refers to $\text{你要}$ “the domains of the Northerners” (Gardiner, JEA 4 [1917], 35, and pl. 9 [line 3]).
32 Fischer, Dendera, p. 201 f.
33 JEA 61 (1975), 55–57.
Plate 9. Turin Suppl. 1292

*Courtesy Museo Egizio*
8. Egyptian Doors, Inside and Out

Ancient Egyptian doors were usually made of wood and consisted of a number of vertical planks that were secured and reinforced by a series of half-rounded battens.¹ Projections at the upper and lower corners, adjacent to the jamb, enabled the door to pivot inward; and, as might be expected, the battens were on the inside, so that they were completely out of sight when the door was fully opened (Fig. 1).² But in the case of the naos, the small structure that housed the statue of a deceased person or a divinity, there was no space for the doors to open inward, so that the usual situation was reversed. Here the bolts that locked the doors were understandably located on the outside instead of inside, as they were in houses. It is less easy, however, to understand why the battens should be also placed on the outside in such cases. This arrangement is illustrated by a wooden naos of the Middle Kingdom that comes from a chamber east of the pyramid of Sesostris I at Lisht (Pl. 11a)³ and that contained the fetish of Anubis, the patron god of the necropolis and of embalming. The same arrangement is attested by the left-hand door of an ebony shrine from Hatshepsut’s funerary temple at Deir el Bahri, inscribed for Amenophis II (Pl. 11b).⁴ The inside of the door displays reliefs of the king ministering to the god Amun, whose statue was placed within; these reliefs were revealed when the doors were opened, and in that position they show the king facing inward, the god outward, as would be expected.

The evidence from the Old Kingdom, although less direct, leaves little doubt that battens were similarly located on the outside of the doors belonging to naos of that period. A pair of miniature dummy naoi of the late Old Kingdom, from Saqqara (Fig. 2)⁵ show bolts on the doors; battens are omitted, but in view of the crudeness of these models, the omission may not be significant. Clearer evidence is to be found in the tomb chapel of Htp-hr-ḥnṯy in Leiden, in which a shrine for the statue of the deceased shows the bolt and battens when

¹ For examples of the Old Kingdom see Moḥammad Zāki Nour, Zahi Iskander, Mohammad Salah Osman, and Ahmād Youssef Moustafa, The Cheops Boats I (Cairo 1960), p. 9 and pls. 14, 40(A), 47, 48, 52. An Eleventh Dynasty example, MMA 21.3.174, is shown in situ by Winlock, BMMA 18 (Dec. 1923, part II), fig. 5, p. 15, and more clearly in Hayes, Septur I, fig. 165, p. 257. For details of construction see also Otto Koenigsberger, Die Konstruktion der ägyptischen Tür (Glückstadt 1926).

² Attested by many examples in Winlock, Models of Daily Life, D (pl. 59); E (pl. 60); F (pls. 20, 62); G (pls. 22, 64); H (pls. 25, 66); J (pls. 28, 29, 68); N (pls. 39, 70); O (pls. 39, 72, 84). Except for the models of the portico (A, B, pls. 10, 57), these doors are single-salved and usually open inward towards the right (as in the case of the Eleventh Dynasty example mentioned in the preceding note), much more rarely towards the left. The figure shows the doors of the granary (F), pl. 63.

³ MMA 14.3.18. Height 58.7 cm, width 31.5 cm, diameter 22.5 cm. Initially published by Lythgoe in BMMA 10 (Feb. 1915, Supplement), pp. 12–19 and figs. 12, 13, 16, 17.

⁴ Cairo CG 70001: Günther Roeder, Naos (Leipzig 1914), pl. 3; Naville, Deir el Bahari II, pp. 1–4 and pl. 29.

⁵ Jéquier, Tombeaux de particuliers, p. 76, fig. 84.
the doors are closed, and omits the battens when the doors are open (Pl. 12). Another clue is provided by the mastaba of Mrr-wi-kti, where a naos was built into the rear wall of the pillared court (Pl. 13a). The doors have vanished, but their existence is clearly indicated by holes in the outer corners of the limestone threshold, where copper sockets have been removed. And the doors were certainly made of wood, with battened reinforcement, for the left and right walls of the interior are painted with horizontal yellow bands, which also appear on the rabbeted front edge of each. These bands imitate the channels that were sometimes carved on the walls of the entrance passage, against which the doors were opened, and into which the battens fitted. An example of such channels is known from Old Kingdom tomb chapels at Giza (Fig. 3). Although the stylized representations of channels might be taken to imply that the battens were on the back of the missing doors, that is not necessarily the case since the battened side of the doors would not have turned inward against them. A further clue to the resolution of this question is provided by one of the two

---

6 Boeser, Beschr. eng. Sämmig. I, Atlas, pl. 9. The same distinction may be seen in Moussa and Altenmüller, Nienchitzum, pls. 6-12, showing the battens on the closed doors of shrines; pls. 16, 17, 19 (a) show the doors open, without battens. The battens are similarly omitted in other tomb chapels where the doors of such shrines are open.

7 Mennenga, pls. 123, 125 (A), 147, 148 (the last in color).

8 LD Text I, p. 45, where it is noted that this feature also occurs in the chapel of RIf-t-ntr (G 75443); also LD, Ergänzungsbnd, pl. 8.

9 In the case of the New Kingdom naos (note 4 above) a banded pattern appears on the exterior walls (Roeder's pl. 2), but this arrangement was, of course, impossible when the naos was imbedded in a wall.
false doors of the same individual (Fig. 4). This shows, within the central niche, the two leaves of a double-valved door, complete with pivots, battens, and a pair of bolts. Since false doors of the same period frequently contain a standing or emergent statue, one might reasonably interpret the bolted doors as the doors of a naos. Still further evidence may be seen in the cavetto cornice, which now began to appear at the top of the false door, and, even more conclusively, in the torus molding that accompanied it, and extended down each side of the ensemble of niches. For the torus molding is not primarily associated with doorways; it frames an entire wall or façade—in this particular case, the façade of a naos. And that conclusion suggests that the missing doors of Mrr-wi-ki.i's naos similarly displayed battens on the outside.

The bolted and battened niche of Mrr-wi-ki.i's false door is one of the earliest examples of a tradition that continues sporadically throughout the Sixth Dynasty and down to the beginning of the Middle Kingdom, although the detail is more usually limited to a verti-

---

10 Mereruka, pl. 107.
11 Examples in Smith, HESPOK, pl. 57 (a-c); Murray, Sakkara Mastaba I, pl. 19 (Cairo CG 57190); James, Hieroglyphic Texts I, pl. 4 (1); Cairo CG 1447.
12 For these naotopic features compare Alexander Badawy, ASAE 48 (1948), p. 236. Regardless of whether these features specifically derive from the shrine of Anubis, as he maintains, it is in any case certain that they likewise appear in early naoi such as those shown by him on p. 242 (figs. 14 and 15). Since this paper was written the character of the false door as a shrine has also been emphasized by Silvia Wiebach, Die ägyptische Scheintür (Hamburg 1981), p. 141, and much of the evidence for bolts and battens is covered in pp. 154–58, without, however, coming to the conclusions made here.
13 The battens are shown on a false door in Davies, Deir el Gebräu II, pl. 11, dating to Pepy II, and another example is at least this early: Cairo CG 1425. CG 1442 is Heracleopolitan Period (see Fischer, Copite Nome, pp. 40–41); two other examples (Firth and Gunn, Tei Pyramid Cemeteries, pl. 67 [2], 69) are of the same date, or only slightly earlier, and yet another example (H.W. Müller, MDAIK 4 [1935], p. 187, fig. 11) is Eleventh Dynasty.
cal median line and the two bolts.\textsuperscript{14} Vandier has also been struck by the orientation of these details, but concludes that it is meaningless because: “L’art égyptien s’est toujours complu à rendre visibles ceux des éléments d’un ensemble qui auraient dû rester cachés.”\textsuperscript{15} In support of his view one might also cite several cases where the hieroglyph $\rightarrow$, representing a door, shows battens (Fig. 5).\textsuperscript{16} This detail is usually omitted in Old Kingdom hieroglyphs, however.\textsuperscript{17} Moreover, it must be acknowledged that there are some earlier examples of dummy doors in which the orientation of bolts and battens is clearly significant. The southern tomb of the Step Pyramid contains a series of doorlike niches, each containing a representation of King Djoser in relief, and around the corner from these, in a corridor parallel to the first and west of it, are three niches containing the backs of these doors and designated as such by battens in relief.\textsuperscript{18} And from the Fifth Dynasty, in or near the reign of Neuserre,\textsuperscript{19} there is a series of four dummy doors in the tomb chapel of S\textsuperscript{2}m-nfr II

\textsuperscript{14} Bolts are attested by Cairo CG 1401, 1404, 1407, 1439, 1459, 1499, 1574, 1576, 1617, etc. Also Davies, \textit{Deir el Gebra\textsc{u}} II, pl. 11. There are also several cases where a vertical line appears, but not the pair of bolts, as, for example, in Wild, \textit{Ti III} pls. 182–85.

\textsuperscript{15} Vandier, \textit{Manuel d’archéologie} II, p. 412.

\textsuperscript{16} Fig. 5a is from Petrie, \textit{Royal Tomb I}, pl. 18 (4). This also occurs on the famous palette of Narmer. Fig. 5b is Thirteenth Dynasty: J. de Morgan, \textit{Fouilles à Dashour, mars–juin}, 1894 (Vienna 1895), p. 102, fig. 241 (shown here; p. 111, fig. 213). A very late Old Kingdom example is to be found in Labib Habachi’s \textit{Obelisks of Egypt} (New York 1977), p. 40, fig. 16. See also the Dyn. XIX example illustrated by Koenigberger, \textit{Die Konstruktion der ägyptischenTür}, p. 15, fig. 12.

\textsuperscript{17} See in particular \textit{Men\textsuperscript{2}ru\textsuperscript{2}}, pl. 30 (10, and the door on which the carpenters are working) and Bissing, \textit{Re-Heiligtum}, Beiblatt A, and pls. 4, 5, etc. An Old Kingdom example with battens appears in Hassan, \textit{Excavations at Saqqara} III, pl. 30, but this is roughly painted in black pigment and may be subject to the tendency, particularly noticeable in semi-cursive inscriptions, towards stereotyped inner detail, as described in Caminos and Fischer, \textit{Epigraphy and Palaeography}, pp. 40–42. Compare also the hieratic forms in Möller, \textit{Hieratische Paläographie} I, p. 34 (964). A much clearer hieroglyphic example with battens is to be found in Dunham and Simpson, \textit{Mery\textsuperscript{3}nkh}, fig. 4. Further hieroglyphic examples with battens might also be cited from later periods.

\textsuperscript{18} C.M. Firth and J.E. Quibell, \textit{Excavations at Saqqara: The Step Pyramid} (Cairo 1935), pl. 45 (3); Lauer, \textit{ASAE} 54 (1956–1957), p. 106 and pl. 4.

\textsuperscript{19} See Klaus Baer, \textit{Rank and Title in the Old Kingdom}, pp. 131–32 [477].
Fig. 4. False door in mastaba of Mrr-aššu. Drawing by S.R. Shepherd
They represent the pivots, battens, and bolts in such depth and detail that it seems hardly possible that these features were intended merely to characterize them as doors—the more so since, in the center of the same wall, flanked by two of the battened doors on either side of it, was a fifth door that was quite plain except for a vertical groove at the center; this is evidently viewed from the front, and opened in the reverse direction. Apparently the principal idea of these dummy doors is to provide entry to the tomb chapel for the deceased from each of four serdabs located behind them. The fifth door may have been designed for the return, or it may have enhanced the possibility of access by providing at least one case where the bolt was on the other side. These examples, combined with the later examples of nais with external battens, strongly reinforce the probability that the bolts and battens in the central niches of false doors are more significant than Vandier supposes, and that they do not merely enhance the characterization of any door, but specifically characterize the niche as a naos.

Here it may be noted that false doors are also represented in Sixth Dynasty burial chambers, where the doors within the central niche are again bolted. If these doors intentionally show the inner side, then sarcophagi and coffins of later date, displaying a false door on the exterior, should show the door’s outer face. That is, in fact, true of the earliest and most elaborately decorated sarcophagi that have the detail in question, namely those belonging to the female retinue of the Eleventh Dynasty King Nb-hpt-Rʿ Mentuhotep, and one of them, in addition, shows a battened door on the inside, directly behind the other (Pl. 14). It is true that a certain number of coffins do not conform to this pattern, but I know of only one case where bolts are mechanically repeated on both the interior and exterior and none where battens are so repeated. Thus one need not conclude that such details are merely intended to characterize the door without specific reference to the inner side of it.

---

90 Junker, Giza III, fig. 34 following p. 190.
91 Blackman, Mem IV, pl. 19; James and Apted, Khentikho, pl. 40; Borchhardt, Denkmäler des Alten Reiches II, p. 46 (Cairo CG 1572); Jéquier, Tombes de particuliers, pl. 3, 6, 11, 12, 16.
92 For the sarcophagus of ṑꜣšȝt see H.E. Winlock, Excavations at Deir el Bahri 1911-1931 (New York 1942), pl. 8 (outside), 10 (inside). The same views may be found in BMMA 16 (Nov. 1921, part II), figs. 19, p. 43, and 22, p. 47. The outsides of two others similarly show the outsides of the door: Naville, Xth Dynasty Temple I, pls. 19 (A-B), 20, 23.
93 A bolted and battened door evidently appears on the exterior of a coffin that antedates the end of the Old Kingdom: Petrie, Deshaish, pl. 27, and several examples of external bolts are illustrated in Lacau, Sarcophages, CG 28115 (pl. 6); 28038 (pl. 8); 28061 (pl. 10); 28036 (pl. 13); 28029 (pl. 15); 28030 (pl. 16). On the other hand, one example (28085) has bolts on the door inside, none on the door outside, as may be seen from pls. 11 and 24.

Dr. W. Raymond Johnson has made, on my behalf, a tally of examples in the photographic archives of the University
It remains to be considered why the battens of the doors of naoi should be so oddly externalized. The fact that they opened outward rather than inward does not, to my mind, seem sufficient to explain this feature, for it would have been technically feasible to accommodate the battens internally either by making them slightly shorter or by cutting a series of notches along the rabbeted inner jambs. In turning the doors so conspicuously inside the Egyptians evidently wished to emphasize a reversed point of view: these doors were not primarily a means of access to the naos, but rather a means of access from the naos to the temple or chapel within which it was placed. As noted earlier, some of the false doors show an emergent figure that not only suggests the analogy of the shrine, but also indicates that the false door was designed to admit the deceased to the offering place within the tomb chapel. The idea of emergence is also emphasized by a scene in one of the Twelfth Dynasty tomb chapels at Beni Hasan (Fig. 6), where a naos containing a statue of the deceased is dragged to the local temple. One group of men cries "Open the two doors of heaven that the god may come forth!" and the response is "The god is coming! Rejoice!" In a parallel text the divinity, who is not present, is "Gold," i.e., the goddess Hathor, and the response is "Behold, Gold has come forth!" It is true that

Fig. 6. Twelfth Dynasty scene at Beni Hasan. After Newberry

of Chicago's Oriental Institute, including post-Old Kingdom coffins in Boston, Chicago, London (supplemented by data from T.G.H. James) and Cairo (the latter including 3 of those mentioned above); 2 of these show battens on doors within the coffin, usually accompanied by bolts, and 8 others show bolts on doors outside, and only 6 others show bolts in this location. In one case (British Museum 30842) bolts appear both inside and outside. Thus, of these 40 examples, 30 show the inner face of the door on the inside and 10 show the inner face on the outside.

Another possibility is to eliminate the battens altogether, in which case each leaf might consist of a panel reinforced by an outer frame; a Dyn. XXVI example is shown by Roeder, Naos, pl. 44 (a). Compare also the small shrines of Tutankhamun), as shown in Carter, Tut-ankh-Amen III, pl. 11, and the Dyn. XIX example in Ernesto Scamuzzi, Egyptian Art in Turin, (New York 1962), pl. 77, where the frames are imitated by a painted black band.

Newberry, Beni Hasan I, pl. 29.

Davies, Antefker, pl. 29. In an Eleventh Dynasty scene (my Plate 14) the "scribe of the god's book, beloved of his mistress In-It-tf" reads a rather similar litany to the deceased: "Open the two doors of heaven that the god may come forth! "Propitiate Hathor! Say what she loves every day! Open the two doors for the Mistress of the Two Lands!" Here, as in the preceding texts, the imperatives might theoretically be translated as infinitives: "propitiating Hathor," "saying what she loves," "opening the doors." For a clear transcript of the hieal text see Clère and Vandier, TPPI, § 27 (§ 3).
the doors of the shrine are attributed to heaven, as also in the New Kingdom. But they are, in effect, the back door of the temple; the naos is vestibular, the threshold between heaven and earth, and it is not the priest who crosses this threshold but the god who does so. The priest, as “he who opens the doors of heaven,” acts as the doorkeeper who admits the god to his earthly abode. And in a very real sense, by reversing the doors of the naos, its occupant is summoned forth.

27 See the scene and text from Karnak illustrated by Nelson in JNES 8 (1949), fig. 3 (D), p. 205, and Jaroslav Černý, JEA 34 (1948), p. 120, who comments on the later use of the term ‘nau-ft meaning “shrine,” and Edward Brovarski, Orientalia 46 (1977), pp. 107–15, who points out that the doors of the purification booth (‘ibn) likewise seem to have been considered as “doors of heaven” in the Old Kingdom.

28 Wh. I, p. 311 (5).
Plate 12. Levenger chapel of Hapy-trsity, after Boekeer
Plate 13b. Dummy doors in tomb of Sin-eref II, after Junker

Plate 13c. Shrine of Men-arkay, after Strelkovski
Plate 14a. Exterior of sarcophagus, Cairo J 47267
MMA field photograph

Plate 14b. Interior of same sarcophagus
9. Sacerdotal Titles and Epithets of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Dynasties

I HAVE HAD OCCASION, more than once, to comment on the curious use of forms resembling Ⱑ in place of Ⱑ in hieroglyphic texts of the Heracleopolitan Period and the Middle Kingdom, a substitution that evidently derives from hieratic forms such as ⲝ.¹ In the meantime another Twelfth Dynasty example has come to my attention, and one that is so interesting in its own right that it deserves to be pointed out. It occurs at the beginning of a long title that precedes the name of a certain Hmwy, on a stela in the Cairo Museum, CG 20138: Ⱑ Ⱌ Ⱌ Ⱌ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ.² There can be no doubt that the first two words are to be interpreted as Ⱑ Ⱌ Ⱌ Ⱌ Ⱑ. For the form of Ⱌ one may compare Ⱑ Ⱌ in Clère-Vandier, TPPI, § 15, line 6, and Ⱑ in Newbery, Beni Hasan II, pl. 26, line 151, and probably also Ⱌ in Newbery, Beni Hasan II, pl. 19.³

Once again the source is probably hieratic, where forms such as Ⱌ were in use in the Middle Kingdom and earlier.⁴ Thus the title may be translated “warrior who defends Wepwawet” or “warrior and defender of Wepwawet.” The second possibility is favored by a passage from the well-known stela of Ti-ḥpr-nfrṯ, Berlin 1204, where the deceased says Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ.⁵ “I made the procession of Wepwawet, when he proceeds to defend his father.”⁶ Here Wepwawet takes on the role of Horus as defender of Osiris.⁷ This suggests that, in Hmwy’s title, the relation of Wepwawet to ndḥḥ is subjective rather than objective genitive; in other words Hmwy might be a fighter and defender who is in the

¹ Fischer, Coptite Nome, p. 72; Fischer, Egyptian Studies II, p. 145 (g), where it should be noted that the reference to University of Pennsylvania Museum stela 29-66-603 should be 29-66-603. Cf. also the semi-cursive forms Ⱑ and Ⱑ in Newbery, Beni Hasan II, pl. 19.

² Lange-Schäfer, Grab- und Denksteine I, p. 161; III, p. 77 (among the titles the reading of which could not be established); IV, pl. 12. A rather similar example of this is apparently to be interpreted as the title “warrior” in CG 20315; also Ⱑ in CG 20246.

³ Most recently published in C. Vandersleyen, Das Alte Agypten, pl. 24 and p. 267. The passage in question is an epithet Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ (J. Wolfgang Schenkel, Memphis-Heracleopolis-Theben (Wiesbaden 1965), p. 189, note 2, reads ḫpr-ḥr “Ausspruch,” but ndḥḥ seems much likelier and more apt: “I was excellent of counsel in the council of Thinis.”

⁴ Jéquier, Tombeaux des particuliers, fig. 130 (top left).

⁵ Möller, Hieratische Paläographie I, no. 587.

⁶ Most conveniently consulted in K. Sethe, Ägyptische Denkmäler (2nd ed., Leipzig 1928), p. 71 (12); for further bibliography see PM V, p. 97. Also, in connection with the meaning of ndḥḥ, Griffiths, JEA 37 (1951), 52–57.

⁷ One cannot accept, however, Munro’s translation of a reference to Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ Ⱑ 
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service of Wepwawet, performing that function in his place. Such a conclusion is far from certain, however, since Wepwawet could be identified with Osiris, as might any god who is considered the passive recipient of the priest who serves him and who, in so doing, assumes the filial Horus-role. If a genitival relationship were intended, one would very much like to see it expressed more explicitly, by the use of n.

But even if the safest translation seems to be "warrior, who defends Wepwawet," it is analogous to the sacred titles of I-hr-nfr himself, who says: "I was the loving son of Osiris Khentamentiu," and later, certainly in reference to this same function, "I defended Onnophris on that day of the great fighting."

The early Twelfth Dynasty nomarch Tyf-em-Hapy also refers to himself as a military adjunct of Wepwawet: "one who supplies the arrows of the lord of Asyut." This follows a reference to Wepwawet as "he who is upon his standard, lord of the šdšd, but the arrows can hardly allude to the standard as such; although the standard bears a weapon, the weapon takes the form of a single spear or mace. In addition to providing Wepwawet's arrows, the nomarch, a little later in the same inscription, is "one who drives off the enemies of Osiris in the presence of Horus who is upon the throne of his father."

Yet another case of this kind occurs in the titulary of an individual who is represented in a group statue of the later Twelfth Dynasty, along with his father I-Htp-Sheft and two other members of his family (Pl. 15). He is "True acquaintance of the king, Director of Linen Cloths of the First Weaving, Protector of the Lord of Eternity, Overseer of the Seals, Pepy."

The "Lord of Eternity" certainly refers to a god, and the god is most probably Osiris, although, in the Middle Kingdom, Osiris is more commonly given the synonymous epithet hqf dt "Prince of Everlastiness." Stb-št "protector" is attested from the Old Kingdom, and again from the New Kingdom and later, but is known less frequently from the period in question. It occurs again, however, among the titles and epithets of the Thirteenth Dynasty vizier Ty-my, on his statue in Hildesheim: Rank has convincingly explained the reading of the first sign as imy dsru, and he translates: "He who is in the splendor of Horus, bodyguard."

It seems likely that stb-št again refers to the god in this case, and that one should understand it to mean "protector (of Horus)."

---

8 Siut I, 232: Montet, Kemi 3 (1930), 49.
9 In the Middle Kingdom the spear is superimposed on the support of the standard: e.g., Lacau-Chevrier, Chapelle de Sésostris I, pl. 9 (bottom center).
10 Siut I, 246: Montet, op. cit., 51.
11 University of Pennsylvania Museum, Philadelphia 59231. Previously illustrated in the Museum’s Guide to the Collection: Egypt (1965), and by Wildung, Sesostris und Amenemhet (Munich 1984), fig. 91, p. 102. The mrs-sign appears to have the form in Pl. 15, but this is illusory. The nḫ-sign somewhat resembles a quail chick, but is illusory. The Middle Kingdom: see Gardiner, Grammar, Sign List G21 and p. 361, n. 3. For ṣtḥ-mes see Wh. II, 97 (1).
12 Wh. II, 299 (9), gives one Middle Kingdom example: BM 574 (Hieroglyphic Texts II, pl. 9); and a second one may be seen in Pl. 8 (p. 53 above). Another, referring to Wsnfr is to be found in BM 580 (ibid., pl. 37).
13 E.g., CG 20093b, 20094b, 20053b, 20041b, 20070b; Petrie, Abydos I, pl. 60. Also nb dt CG 20053a.
14 Cf. Wh. IV, 340 (8-10). For the translation of stb-št Goedert (JARCE 25 [1986], 89 f.) prefers "escort."
Finally it may be noted that a certain Ṣfr-ny, again probably dating to the Thirteenth Dynasty, is Ṣfr-ny, “follower of Sokaris and bowman” on his stela in the Louvre.16 The omission of a determinative after the name of the god does not seem unusual,17 and the title or epithet may be compared with another epithet on a stela of the same period (CG 20101 [d, 5–6]): Ṣfr-ny, “revered as a follower of Sokar.” This in turn may be compared with the statement on the Twelfth Dynasty stela (CG 20538 [II, 7]) of a second “loving son” of Osiris: Ṣfr-ny, “thus I was a follower of the god.” In both cases one might also translate “in the following of Sokar/the god,” but the absence of plural strokes after Ṣfr seems more than coincidental.

These titles and epithets are characteristic of a period in which a personal relationship to the gods had acquired more importance as compared with the Old Kingdom, when it was all but precluded by the king as the intermediary between gods and mankind. The ground for the later development was prepared in the Heracleopolitan Period, when the local god tended to replace the king as the focus of society,18 and as commoners began to view themselves as the dutiful son (ṣr ḫpr) in the role of Horus who repelled his father’s enemies and assumed his responsibilities,19 ultimately taking on the identity of Osiris in death.20

16 Louvre C 206: Paul Pierret, Recueil d’inscriptions II (Paris 1878), p. 42. Also seen from the stela itself. Franke, Personendaten, p. 209, identifies Ṣfr-ny as the same individual (Martin, Egyptian Administrative and Private-Name Suffix, pl. 18 [8]).
17 E.g. CG 20443, 20529.
19 Fischer, Dendera, p. 147.
20 ZÄS 90 (1963), 35–38.

_Courtesy of the Museum_
10. A Statuette of the Late Middle Kingdom

The statuette shown in Plate 16 is made of a dense black variety of stone, probably basalt, the hardness of which is manifest from the treatment of the sculpture and the inscriptions. The height is 23 cm, and the width and depth are 8 x 14.3 cm at the base. It evidently came to the University of Pennsylvania Museum, Philadelphia, in 1898, having been entered in the register of the American Exploration Society on October 24th of that year, and there assigned the number 57, later changed to E 3381. The register gives the provenance as Fayum. The other objects listed on that date include a few more that are said to come from the Fayum (one changed to Thebes), along with a papyrus from Thebes and an alabaster shawabty from Dahshur, but some are without any provenance. The circumstances of these acquisitions are not otherwise recorded, but in February of the following year F. Ll. Griffith spoke of "cases of bought antiquities" that had been sent to Philadelphia by Max Müller. At all events it seems likely that they were purchased rather than excavated, so that the provenance was probably attributed on the word of a dealer.

Like several other statuettes of the late Middle Kingdom, the man who is represented wears a long cloak and holds his arms folded across his chest, the right hand closed, the other open, palm downward. His disproportionately large head, framed by a long wig with pointed lappets, seems to sink between his shoulders, reinforcing the huddled attitude. The compactness of his attitude is reinforced by the back pillar which curves out of the seat and curves into the wig, both of which present a continuous surface. The connection between the back pillar and the wig is particularly striking when viewed from the side.

1 I am indebted to David O'Connor for these photographs, for his permission to publish them, and for his help in enabling me to make a facsimile of the inscriptions and to consult the archives of the University of Pennsylvania Museum.

2 Letter of February 18, 1899, to Sara Yorke Stevenson, the first curator of the Egyptian Section, for whom see the articles by O'Connor and Silverman in Expedition 21/1 (Winter 1979), 5-7; 13-15, 33-37. The only excavation undertaken for the American Exploration Society was a fortnight's extension of Petrie's season at Dendera by Charles Rosher in 1898, from April 2 onward. After terminating his connection with the A.E.S. in July, Rosher offered some coffins and other antiquities for sale at the end of September, too late to have sent anything that might have arrived before October 24, and there is no indication that Mrs. Stevenson pursued his offer. She herself went to Egypt at the end of the year and brought back many cases of material for the collection, including finds from Dendera. Bernard P. Grenfell sent pottery from his excavations for the Egypt Exploration Fund in the Fayum, but not until the following year (letter of Joseph Cotton to Mrs. Stevenson, February 15, 1899; there is no mention of Middle Kingdom finds in Grenfell, Hunt and Hogarth, Fayum Towns and Their Papyri (London 1900).

3 Berlin 4435, 15700; Brooklyn 41 83; Cairo CG 532, 1082, J 34572; Copenhagen, Glyptothèque AIN 93; Durham 501 (Farouk Gomaa, SAK 11 [1984], 107-12.
One of the statuettes of the same type, Durham 501, shows a hieroglyph (𓊙) with inner detail that is associated with the end of the Twelfth Dynasty and the Second Intermediate Period.4 The date of the University of Pennsylvania Museum statuette cannot in any case be earlier than the reign of Amenemhet III, to whom the face shows a certain resemblance, and it may well be as late as the Thirteenth Dynasty, as are a good many other cloaked statuettes of Middle Kingdom style.

A column of inscription appears on (1) the back pillar, (2) the proper right side of the seat, and (3) the left side of the seat, respectively, and the three columns are to be translated as follows:

(1) Revered with Hathor, Who Presides\(^a\) over the Western Nome (L.E. 3),\(^b\) the Steward and Deputy\(^c\) Sbk-htp (or Htp-Sbk\(^d\))

(2) The revered son of the Steward Dhwty-htp (? or Htp\(\bar{r}\)),\(^e\) Sbk-htp

(3) The revered Steward Sbk-htp, born of Nfr, justified

COMMENTS: (a) One expects ⲉ ⲥ Ⲭ Ⲝ Ⲩ or the like, but the present variant is known from the Twelfth Dynasty, albeit rarely (Gardiner, Grammar, § 174; e.g., Newberry, Bersheh II, pl. 13 [14, 20], alongside normal writings).

(b) Presumably referring to Hathor Mistress of Imau, Kom el Hisn, for which see Helck, Die altägyptischen Gaue (Wiesbaden 1974), pp. 154–56, and Gomaà, Besiedlung II, pp. 80–83. A priestess of this cult of Hathor is known from the Old Kingdom (Wild, Ti III, pl. 164). Although the town of Huwt-huty “Estate of Cattle” is named as the principal city on the geographical list of Sesostris I at Karnak along with its divinity, Apis (Gomaà, op. cit., pp. 78–79), the present inscription seems to indicate that Hathor’s cult had become more important by the end of the Middle Kingdom. It is possible however, that her preëminence in this case rarely reflects the local sympathies of a native of Kom el Hisn.

(c) See Ward, Index, no. 573. This occurrence is peculiar, for it can hardly refer to the preceding title “steward,” which in any case recurs independently in both the other columns. It is tempting to regard it as a name, as in the series of compounds discussed by Vernus, RdE 25 (1971), 193–99, and Le Surnom au Moyen Empire (Rome 1986), but such a name does not seem to be attested; the single (feminine) example given by Ranke, PNI, 54 (12), is actually to be read Imau (for which see PNI, 36 [19]).

(d) For the alternative see PNI, 259 (12).

and pls. 2–3; Edinburgh 1952.137; MMA 50.8.73 (Hayes, Septer I, fig. 126, p. 209); Rome, Museo Barracco 11 (Giorgio Careddu, Museo Barracco di Scultura Antica: La Collezione Egizia [Rome 1985], no. 15); Louvre N 1586; quartzite statue of the Overseer of Disputes Rs (seen on the London market in 1970); Habachi, Hespe, pl. 73. Many of these are listed by Vandier, Manuel d’archéologie III, p. 231. The position of the hands is also to be found in some cloaked standing figures, including BM 1237 (Evers, Staat aus dem Stein [Munchen 1929], pl. 98); MMA 66.132.1 (Frontispiece); Louvre E 11573 (Boreux, Mon. Prot 25 [1921–22], pl. 7). Also cloaked squatting figures: Baltimore 28.312; Bayonne B 509; Bologna 1839; Brooklyn 62.77.1; Cairo CG 480; Louvre E 11196, E 10975, E 20171; MMA 82.1.199 (all cited by Vandier, op. cit., p. 233 [Ch]), MMA 15.3.226, 30.8.78. For the attitude cf. the determinative of \(\text{𓊙} \text{𓊙} \text{𓊙} \text{𓊙} \text{𓊙}\) “one who is cold” in Louvre stela C 1, line 11, dating to the 24th year of Amenemhet I (Seth, Ägyptische Lesestücke, p. 82 [5], checked against a handcopy by J.J. Cîrle). 4 For the statuette see the preceding note. For the hieroglyph see Egyptian Studies I, p. 109, fig. 16 (a–c, q–u).
(e) The question is whether the sign between ☐ and ☐ belongs to the former or the latter. Note that a stroke accompanies ☐ on the back pillar, but not on the other side of the seat. The thickness of it speaks against this alternative, and the form suggests ☐; the projections on either side may be accidental, however, and this writing of Dhuty is unexpected on such a monument (see pp. 203–204 below). But it may have been inserted here as a correction, in which case it may replace ☐ because there was insufficient space for the latter.

The mention of Hathor of Lower Egyptian Nome 3 brings us back to the question of provenance. It seems unlikely that the statuette came from the Fayum. It more probably derives from Abydos or Kom el Hisn, which in any case seems to have been the owner’s birthplace. In favor of the second alternative, it may be noted that another Middle Kingdom statuette, Cairo J 37891, is said to come from this locality.5

5 As noted by Bodil Hornemann, Types of Ancient Egyptian
Statuary V (Munksgaard 1966), pl. 1165.

Courtesy of the Museum
11. Archaisms in a Statuette of Middle Kingdom Style

The upper part of a schist statuette shown in Plates 17–18\(^1\) poses a most interesting problem, since it combines the style of the later Twelfth Dynasty with an attitude, cloak and coiffure that hearken back to the beginning of the Old Kingdom, or even earlier, and that were no longer in fashion beyond Dynasty IV.

To judge from a profile view of the fragment, the woman who is represented was probably seated, a conclusion which is by no means contradicted by traces of a back pillar. In this case the height, now 16.3 cm, would originally have been more than twice that amount. It is a little difficult to establish the precise angle of the figure in profile, but there seems little doubt that the level of the chin was lower than the shoulders. Aside from this feature, which occurs occasionally in Middle Kingdom statuary, the head seems disproportionately large in relation to the arms; for both features cf. Plate 16 above.\(^2\) Both arms are folded upon the chest, but only the left hand is visible, placed flat upon a cloak that leaves the upper part of the chest bare, and the shoulders partly exposed. The line of the arms and the opening of the cloak very nearly form an X-shaped cross. There is no parallel for such an attitude in the Middle Kingdom; although the arms may be slightly crossed, both hands are normally visible, one clenched,\(^3\) and while a cloak may leave the upper chest exposed, the form of the opening is rather different, as shown by the examples in Plate 19a–d,\(^4\) where the shoulders are partly exposed but the cloak does not stand out sharply from the body. Furthermore all these other examples of the cloak appear on statuettes of men. Statuettes of women rarely show a cloak of any kind; as is well demonstrated by the group shown in Plate 15 above, where three men wear a cloak, while the woman who accompanies them

---

\(^{1}\) MMA acc. no. 65.59.1; the acquisition, by purchase, is noted in *BMMA* 24 (1965), p. 54, and I have there said that it is "probably XXV Dynasty." The provenance is unknown.

\(^{2}\) Similarly Louvre C 16287 (Vandier, *Manuel d’archéologie* III, pl. 83 [2]) and BM 100 (ibid., pl. 92 [6]).

\(^{3}\) All examples are male: e.g., Alnwick 501 (Goma, *SAK* 11 [1984], 107 II, pl. 2); BM 1237 (Vandier, *op. cit.*; pl. 75); Brooklyn 41.83 (ibid., pl. 89); Cairo J 34572: plate 24. One cloaked figure, Cairo CG 460, exceptionally crosses both hands outspread, but they are both uncovered (ibid., pl. 80). Conversely, Berlin 12485 crosses both hands fisted (Jürgen Setzgast, *Ägyptisches Museum Berlin* [1980], no. 18).

does not. I know of only one exception, and here the woman’s cloak is quite different, leaving one shoulder exposed.5

Of the face only the proper left side is preserved; there is scarcely any trace of the nose and no trace whatever of the mouth. The left eye is heavy-lidded and the lower lid slightly pouches. The line of the brow is undercut in a continuous curve, beginning at the root of the nose, and defining the upper edge of the orbital cavity, but the eyebrow itself is not indicated. The ears are large, splayed against a rounded shoulder-length wig. The wig is covered with a series of horizontal striations that continue all around it except for a vertical zone at the front, which becomes somewhat narrower as it progresses upwards to its termination at the crown of the head. This zone displays, in relief, the hood and sinuous body of a royal cobra, the head of which is lost. It is flanked, on the crown of the woman’s head, by a pair of vultures in relief, oriented towards the center, their outspread wings parallel to the central band, their heads turned forward.

Except for the striations on the wig, which are somewhat uneven, the workmanship is excellent, and the subtle modelling of the cloak is comparable to the best standards of the late Middle Kingdom, as illustrated by a statuette from the Price Collection, where the treatment of the flattened hand is also similar (Frontispiece).6

One of the closest parallels for the archaic elements occurs in a fragmentary relief of the Third Dynasty showing King Djoser accompanied by a daughter of his named Ini-tki. and his wife “She who beholds Horus, Htp-hr-nhty” (Fig. 1).7 The wife wears a wig of similar shape with a seemingly bald area at the forehead, and a cloak of nearly identical pattern; she also holds her arms crossed in the same manner. The wig is paralleled even more closely on the archaic Bankfield stela, formerly in the Halifax Museum, which Wm. Stevenson Smith rightly identifies as a woman (Fig. 2a);8 it has the horizontal bands, which are not to be seen in the less detailed wig of Djoser’s wife. The banded wig reappears in the Fourth Dynasty tomb of Hufua-h.f.I, where it is worn by his mother Queen Mrt-it.s (Fig. 2b);9 since she holds her son’s hand, the cloak and gesture are represented only in part, but both these features are attested by the tomb of Queen Msy-nfr III, in a representation of her mother, Queen Htp-hrs (Fig. 2c).10 In the last case, dating to the later years of the same dynasty, the “bald” area is reduced so that it corresponds almost exactly to the statue of Middle Kingdom style, viewed in profile. Here the arms are again folded on the chest, and, together with the cloak,

5 MMA 18.2.2, for which see PM VII, 398, and Hayes, Scepter I, p. 215. Many other groups similarly combine cloaked male figures and uncloaked females; see Vandier, op. cit., pls. 84–85, and Pl. 15 above.
6 MMA acc. no. 66.123.1; illustrated in BMMA 25 (1966), p. 76, and F.G. Hilton Price, A Catalogue of Egyptian Antiquities II (London 1908), pl. 21 (4707); the latter shows that the base was inscribed in paint on at least one side, but the name was evidently too unclear to be read, and no trace of any signs can now be seen.
7 The drawing is taken from Smith, HESPOK, fig. 48, p. 133.
8 The drawing has been made from Gardiner’s photograph in JEA 4 (1917), pl. 55. The figure has erroneously been identified as a man by Gardiner, ibid., 258, and by Vandier, Manuel d’Archéologie I, p. 738; cf. Smith, op. cit., p. 143. Kaplony, Inschriften II, p. 602, identifies the woman as a princess (üt-nw.t).
9 The drawing is taken from Wm. K. Simpson, Kawah Khafkhufu I and II, fig. 96; for further bibliography see PM III5, p. 188 (G 7140, I [2]).
10 The drawing is from Dunham and Simpson, Meren-ankh, fig. 7; cf. PM III7, p. 198 (6).
Archaisms in a Statuette of Middle Kingdom Style

Fig. 1. Detail of relief of Djoser, Turin. After W.S. Smith

Fig. 2. Women’s wigs: (a) Archaic stela; (b) Dyn. IV relief of Heqenu’s mother, after Smith; (c) Mother of Mer- sy-neh II, after Dunham and Simpson
they again form a pattern in the shape of x. Only the top of the cloak is indicated, confirming that it is also only partially indicated in the previous case. Unlike that of Djoser’s queen, the cloak forms an angular peak high above the shoulders, but this feature was probably modified in three-dimensional sculpture, for the same form of cloak is evidently to be recognized in the early Fourth Dynasty statue of Nfrt from Medum (Fig. 3b),\textsuperscript{11} and in a fragmentary statue of a woman which may come from the tomb of Mr-sy-nty III (Fig. 3a).\textsuperscript{12}

Since we have no example of the horizontally banded wig in three-dimensional sculpture of the Old Kingdom, it remains uncertain whether the later statuette borrowed from such a source, or whether the borrowing derives from a two-dimensional representation. In any case two elements were added that are not to be found in any of the Third and Fourth Dynasty examples, namely the royal uraeus and the pair of vultures. A vulture headdress that covered the entire head was probably initially restricted to goddesses—most naturally Nekhbet, as well as to Nekhbet’s Lower Egyptian counterpart, the cobra-goddess Uto. In the latter case the head of the vulture was replaced by that of a uraeus,\textsuperscript{13} and this may also have been true of the Lower Egyptian Mrt, for the two Mrt-goddesses originally seem to have been assimilated to Nekhbet and Uto, since the Old Kingdom representations (unlike later ones)\textsuperscript{14} show that they too wore the vulture headdress.\textsuperscript{15} Although some alabaster fragments of such a headdress have been attributed to queens of the Fourth Dynasty,\textsuperscript{16} the headdress is not known with certainty to have been attributed to queens until the later half of the Sixth Dynasty, when it became customary.\textsuperscript{17} A uraeus seemingly appears on the brow of the mother of Pepy II in a crude relief at Serabit el Khadim in the Sinai,\textsuperscript{18} as also in

\textsuperscript{11} Cairo CG 4: PM IV, 91.

\textsuperscript{12} MFA 30.1461: The drawing is from Wm. S. Smith, \textit{op. cit.}, fig. 14 c, p. 43; cf. Dunham and Simpson, \textit{op. cit.}, pl. 19.

\textsuperscript{13} Borchartd, \textit{Grab. S’kh-b-rt’}, pl. 21; \textit{Grab. Ne-user-r’t’}, pl. 16 (cf. PM III\textsuperscript{a}, p. 337, Room west of Columned Hall). Dyn. VI: J.-Ph. Lauer and J. Leclant, \textit{Le Temple haut du complexe funéraire du roi Teti} (Cairo 1977), fig. 23; Jéquier, \textit{Monument funéraire de Pepi III}, pls. 36, 39.

\textsuperscript{14} A fragment of a relief in the Brooklyn Museum (L 67.1) is the earliest example of the change, now dated by R. Fazzini to the reign of Amenophis I (\textit{The Collector’s Eye: The Ernest Erickson Collections at The Brooklyn Museum} [1987], no. 74). But this change may well have occurred in the Middle Kingdom.

\textsuperscript{15} See Fig. 3, p. 184 below, and the references on p. 185, n. 79. Also Borchartd, \textit{Grab. S’kh-b-rt’}, pl. 22. None of the few Old Kingdom examples is known to pertain to Lower Egypt, however.

\textsuperscript{16} Uvo Hölscher, \textit{Das Grabdenkmal des Königs Chephren} (Leipzig 1912), figs. 140, 141-144, pp. 128-129, show two alabaster heads of women, one more or less complete, the other fragmentary, each of which has a striated wig of unknown length surmounted by a vulture in relief. These might possibly belong to a group showing the king with a
goddess. The same is true of some similar alabaster fragments from Pyramid 3a, south of the Mycerinus Pyramid (George Reisner, \textit{Mycerinus} [Cambridge, Mass. 1921], p. 176 and pl. 170). The colossal statue of Queen Het-mery-nby, Cairo J 48536 (PM III\textsuperscript{a}, p. 274), has no vulture on the head, nor does it appear in the dyad of Mycerinus and his wife (perhaps the same queen), for which see Reisner, \textit{op. cit.}, pls. 54-60. And it is not to be seen in the Fourth Dynasty representations of queens mentioned earlier, nor in one dating to the Fifth Dynasty (Borchartd, \textit{Grab. S’kh-b-rt’}, pl. 16).

\textsuperscript{17} Cairo CG 1431 (facsimile in Fischer, \textit{Egyptian Studies II}, fig. 58); Brooklyn 39.119 (Vandier, \textit{Manuel d’Archéologie III}, pl. 8 [4]; a vulture’s head, supplementing the relief on top, presumably projected from the hole above the forehead; for further bibliography see James, \textit{Corpus of Hieroglyphic Inscriptions}, p. 28); Firth and Gunn, \textit{Tet Pyramid Cemeteries}, pl. 57 (7); Jéquier, \textit{Monument funéraire de Pepi III}, pl. 4: \textit{Pyr. des reines}, fig. 2, pl. 4-5 (the drawing in pl. 4 mistakenly suggests that the broken head of the vulture is a uraeus); Cairo CG 255 (Vandier, \textit{Manuel d’Archéologie III}, pl. 9).

\textsuperscript{18} Gardiner, Peet and Černý, \textit{Sinai}, pl. 9 (17); cf. PM VII, p. 342.
Fig. 3. Women’s cloaks: (a) Dyn. IV statuette, after Smith; (b) Dyn. IV statue of Nfr, from a photograph

another case, where the same queen may be represented. It is not to be seen in other representations of the queen that are earlier than the Twelfth Dynasty, at which point it is exemplified by the renowned pair of statues portraying the wife of Sesostris II, and at least a dozen other statuettes of queens and princesses, some doubtless belonging to the following dynasty. As far as sculpture is concerned, the vulture headdress apparently did not

19 Petrie, Abydos II, pl. 20, representing one of two wives of Pepy I.
21 Cairo CG 581–582; Vandier, Manuel d’Archéologie III, pl. 74 (1, 3); cf. PM IV, pp. 18–19.
22 Berlin 013.255 (~948): Fondation Égyptologique Reine Elisabeth, photo 10,424; Paris BN 24 (Vandier, loc. cit., [2]); Cairo J 39741 (ibid., [5]); MMA 08.204.7 (ibid., [5]); Brooklyn 58.85 (Cooney, Five Years of Collecting Egyptian Art 1951–1956 [Brooklyn 1956], p. 3, pls. 7–10, sphinx); Munich AS 5551 (Staatliche Sammlung Ägyptischer Kunst [Munich 1972], p. 57 and pl. 25 [41]; Moscow, Pushkin Museum 1013 (V.V. Pavlov and S.I. Hodjash, Egitpskaja Plastika Mal’ji Form [Moscow 1985], pl. 53); diorite torso, Sotheby’s Monaco, Catalogue de la Béhague Collection, Dec. 5, 1987, no. 113; University College, London, 16657 (Janine Bourriau, Pharaons and Mortals: Egyptian Art in the Middle Kingdom [Cambridge 1988], no. 14); Walters Art Gallery 22.376 (G. Steindorff, Catalogue of Egyptian Sculpture in the Walters Art Gallery [Baltimore 1946], no. 65, uraeus erased for reuse by a non-royal woman; cf. MMF 9 [1974], 7, n. 13); Brooklyn 43.137 (Romano, MDAIK 48 [1992], 131–43 and pl. 29); Boston MFA 67.9 (Terrace, Connoisseur, August 1968, 269); Istanbul Eski Sark Eserleri Müzesi, 1036 (B.V. Bothmer, SAK 6 [1978], pl. 8). Possibly one should add Uppsala 91 (Pehr Lugn, Ausgewählte Denkmäler aus ägyptischen Sammlungen in Schweden [Leipzig 1928], pl. 1).
reappear until the New Kingdom, although the wife of Amenemhet III wears it in a two-dimensional representation on her false door, and a small vulture is affixed to one of the inlaid gold diadems from Dahshur, dating to the middle of the Thirteenth Dynasty. It became frequent in statuary of the New Kingdom, where the head of the vulture is usually replaced by that of the uraeus. One curious statuette apparently dating to the Middle Kingdom represents a queen in the form of a human-headed bird, presumably a vulture, but the hair is not covered with plumage and the queen wears a uraeus. This is as close an association of the vulture and uraeus as is found in Middle Kingdom statuary representing queens, and from no period, to my knowledge, is there a parallel for the combination of these elements as in the present case, with a pair of vultures flanking a complete uraeus.

The earliest possible date of the statuette is indicated by the very large ears and more particularly by the rather heavy lids of the remaining eye—features which are first encountered in representations of Sesostris III, and which are echoed in private statuary, both male and female throughout the remainder of the Twelfth Dynasty, and in the Thirteenth Dynasty as well. No comparable example of archaism is known from this period—a borrowing of older features which, in this case, spans at least six centuries. Nor is archaism of any kind to be expected in the late Middle Kingdom. While the artistic production of the late Eleventh and early Twelfth Dynasty was inspired, to a considerable degree, by the Sixth Dynasty, that source of inspiration had now been left behind in favor of changes that affected both style and iconography.

One is therefore compelled to consider the possibility that the fragment may be a composite of Old and Middle Kingdom archaisms that was created in the later half of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty, when the style of the Middle Kingdom exercised particularly strong influence. As Bernard Bothmer has pointed out, however, no stone sculpture of a queen

---

23 A life-sized head, Brooklyn 65.144.3, was initially thought to be early 12th Dyn., but is now dated later than the New Kingdom; this will be published by Biri Fay. Walters Art Gallery 22.405, which also has the vulture headdress, is considered by Vandier, Manuel d’Archéologie III, p. 315 to be early Dyn. XVIII rather than Middle Kingdom as Steindorff supposed (op. cit., no. 31), and Edna Russmann informs me that she believes it may belong to the Late Period.

24 J. de Morgan, Fouilles à Dahchour II (Vienna 1903), fig. 147. Another example appears on a stela of the end of Dyn. XIII: Louvre C 13; the date of which is discussed by Spalinger, RdE 32 (1980), 95–116, and illustrated on pl. 8.

25 Cairo CG 54860: Erika Feucht, in Vand eylen, Das Alte Ägypten, p. 388 and pl. LVA. For the date (not much before Neferhotep I) see Bruce Williams, Scroptis 3 (1975–76), 48.

26 E.g., Cairo CG 572, CG 42000, J 45076 (Vandier, Manuel d’Archéologie III, pl. 104 [57]; the cobra head evidently appears in the first two cases, and probably all three); MMA 16.10.224 (Hayes, Sepotier II, fig. 26, p. 55); Barracco 13 (Vandier, Manuel d’Archéologie III, pl. 68 [7]); Giorgio Carredia, Museo Barraco di scultura antica: la collezione egizia, no. 17); Vienna ÂS 5778 (Brigitte Jarol-Deckert, Statuen des Mittleren Reichs und der 18. Dynastie [CAA Wien, Mainz/ Rhein 1988], pp. 126–31).


28 The most striking example is Berlin 14475 (Vandier, Manuel d’Archéologie III, pl. 74 [4]), which he believes to be a queen, and specifically the wife of Sesostris III (ibid., p. 223, n. 5); but the head bears neither the vulture headdress nor the uraeus.

29 For the Eleventh Dynasty see Artibus Asiae 22 (1959), 240–52. For the early Twelfth Dynasty see Hayes, Sepotier I, p. 183 and fig. 114 on p. 186.

30 Bernard V. Bothmer et al., Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period 700 B.C. to A.D. 100 (Brooklyn 1980), p. xxxvii. E. Russmann also notes archaisms of other periods, ranging from the middle-Eighteenth Dynasty onward, but not so early as the Middle Kingdom (MM/8 [1973], 39–40 and n. 22).
or non-royal woman is known to have been made during that dynasty, and although a few statues of couples may be attributed to it, and some representing women are known from the following dynasty, they are still infrequent at that time. The only other point that might be made in favor of this alternative is the fact that globular wigs reappear on most of the surviving statues of queens and non-royal women dating to Dyns. XXII–XXVI, having gone out of fashion since the Eleventh Dynasty. While these wigs show the conventional pattern of overlapping locks, their shape may have favored the reappearance of the more distincively archaic style.

In short, one must weigh two improbabilities. It seems extraordinary that archaisms drawn from the early Old Kingdom would appear in statuary of the late Middle Kingdom, precisely when traditions of the Old Kingdom had been so completely abandoned in sculpture; and to this difficulty is added the unexpected pair of vultures. On the other hand, while the combination of Old and Middle Kingdom archaisms is known from the Late Period, one hesitates to attribute the statuette of a queen to the period when such archaism was most favored. Furthermore it must be acknowledged that the late Middle Kingdom style of the fragment is so pronounced that one would hardly conceive it to be a work of the Late Period were it not for its anachronistic peculiarities.

Addendum

As this volume was nearing readiness for the press, I learned that, owing to an unfortunate misunderstanding on the part of the Metropolitan Museum’s Egyptian Department, Biri Fay has taken up the same subject, covering most of the essential points of this chapter, in a symposium organised by the French Institute in Cairo, at the end of 1994. On hearing that this topic had already been discussed in the present volume, she has very graciously withdrawn the relevant portion of her remarks from her written report. Even more generously, she has offered me a most interesting discovery of her own, namely the existence of

---

31 Bothmer et al., loc. cit.
33 A very good example is to be found in Louvre A 89, dated by Bothmer to Dyn. XV (ibid., p. 8). This shows a standing couple; the man has an Old Kingdom wig and Middle Kingdom kilt, while the woman conversely has a Middle Kingdom wig and an Old Kingdom style of dress, with the shoulder straps forming an angle. In this case, however, the faces betray the later period. I am obliged to Professor Bothmer for providing me with a photograph of the statue, which I know only from the original. He also notes that the provenance is thought to be Heliopolis, and that he knows of several other couples, both in stone and in wood, that are archaizing in the same manner.
34 The difficulty of distinguishing late Middle Kingdom style from that of Dyn. XXV is illustrated by MMA 02.4.191, which is dated “probably” to the later period by Bothmer, *op. cit.*, pp. 8–9, but subsequently redated to Dyn. XIII: Bothmer and De Meulenaere, *Egyptological Studies in Honor of Richard Parker* (Hanover, N.H. 1986), p. 11, n. 34.
a hitherto unnoticed granite head, which, although much battered, shows the same type of archaizing wig as does the fragmentary statue in New York: Glyptothèque Ny Carlsberg ÆIN 595 (Pl. 20). The overall shape of the globular wig is in fact more similar than one might suppose from a front view, for the apparent crease at the center is due to a large pit in the crown of the head. The horizontal striations are much the same, as is the shape of the smooth central area, and the half-erased features again reflect the royal physiognomy of the late Middle Kingdom. The surface is too worn to detect any trace of a pair of vultures, if these were present, but the ghostly outline of cobra’s hood confirms the existence of a uraeus. Traces of a half-dozen evenly spaced lines, which are visible at spectator’s left, below the wig, are suggestive of a necklace, but there is no trace of beaded segmentation, and the lines are so nearly vertical that they may belong to a shoulder strap, in which case there would not have been a cloak. The use of a harder type of stone probably explains the lesser depth of undercutting at the edge of the wig. Although both heads belonged to statuettes, the scale in this case is decidedly larger, by about a third. But there is little doubt that both belong to the same period. And the survival of two such examples—so similar, yet of different scale and material—seems more understandable if they derive from the Middle Kingdom than if one accepts the later alternative.

35 See Otto Koefoed-Petersen, Catalogue des statues et statuettes égyptiennes (Copenhagen 1950), no. 116, described as “tête d’une statuette d’homme. Acquise en 1854 dans le commerce de l’art, en Egypte. Granit. ... Basse époque.” There is no illustration. Biri Fay came upon it in the Late Period photographic archives of Bernard Bothmer, where the date was left in doubt. Koefoed-Petersen gives the height as 15 cm, subsequently revised to 12 cm. The surface is so abraded on all sides that the head, once detached, must have been used for grinding or pounding. 36 This face, unlike the other one, has not been photographed at eye level, but from below, making it somewhat difficult to compare the two.

37 The statues of Queen Nofret, CG 381–382, show a necklace and pectoral, but necklaces are not usual on Middle Kingdom statues of either sex. Probably nothing is to be made of the absence of vertical lines on the corresponding area on the opposite side, of which much less is preserved.

38 Although its identification may not be altogether accurate, the stone is certainly quite hard, as is indicated by the reuse of the head as a tool.
Plate 18. Metropolitan Museum 65.59.1
Plate 20. Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen, ÆIN 595

Courtesy of the Museum
12. A Shrine and Statue of the Thirteenth Dynasty

The painted limestone monument shown in Plate 21 (MMA 69.30) is clearly to be identified as the back of a miniature chapel, more complete examples of which are to be found in the Hermitage\(^1\) and the Louvre.\(^2\) The sides of the two chapels are about twice as broad as the end piece, which, in the present case is 33.5 x 53 cm. To judge from these other examples, the missing wall on the left portrayed the deceased in the company of his family, while the one on the right was occupied by scenes of daily life. The date of the chapel in Leningrad is established by one of the owner’s titles; he is “the treasurer of the vizier “\(\text{nhw}\),” who is known to have lived in the Thirteenth Dynasty, probably as late as the reign of Khendjer.\(^3\) There is no reason to think that the other chapels are much earlier, although the piece in New York shows better workmanship.

As in the chapels that have just been mentioned, the top is surmounted by a \(\text{hkr}\)-frieze, below which is a large pair of \(\text{wst}\)-eyes flanking the \(\text{Sn}\)-sign. The tomb owner and his wife stand at the left, accompanied by a woman of smaller size whose relationship is not specified but, like the wife, is a “mistress of the house.” On the right, below a chest in the form of a shrine, are a kneeling woman and a standing man, each of whom presents offerings—the first, apparently, two bags of incense, and the second a jar of ointment.

Three of the figures call for further comment. The triple kilt is to be found on a few other stelae of the Thirteenth Dynasty, including BM 254,\(^4\) MMA 63.154 (Plate 26) and Copenhagen \(\text{ÆIN}\) 964, the last two belonging to the same individual.\(^5\) It is known again from the Eighteenth Dynasty, in the reign of Tuthmosis III.\(^6\) Suggestions of double kilts are first known from the reign of Amenemhet II;\(^7\) they appear more clearly on a stela of the reign of Amenemhet III,\(^8\) and in the latest of the Twelfth Dynasty tombs at Meir,\(^9\) as well as really a translucent underwrapping of the same kilt) and CG 20538 (the latter doubtful; see Lange and Schäfer, \textit{Grab- und Denksteine des Mittleren Reichs IV}, pl. 75 [272]).

Rita Freed, in an M.A. dissertation for New York University, \textit{Representation and Style of Dated Private Stelae of Dyn. XII} (1976), pp. 50-57 refers to these examples as well as to Leiden V 5, which is equally well dated (Simpson, \textit{op. cit}, pl. 34 and cf. pl. 35).

\(^1\) Hermitage 1064, 1064, and 1075; Lourié, \textit{Mélanges Maspero I}, 907 f.; Simpson, \textit{Terrace of the Great God}, pls. 78 f.

\(^2\) Louvre C 16-18: Boreux, \textit{BIFAO} 30 (1931), 45-48; Simpson, \textit{op. cit}, pls. 70 f.

\(^3\) For the dossier of the vizier and his date see Franke, \textit{Personenliste}, no. 173.

\(^4\) Heteroglyphic Texts III, pl. 26.

\(^5\) See Excursus III below.

\(^6\) Tylor and Griffith, \textit{Pashari}, pls. 3-4.

\(^7\) Louvre E 3492 (\textit{RdE} 24 [1972], pl. 7 [B], foll. p. 66; really a translucent underwrapping of the same kilt) and CG 20538 (the latter doubtful; see Lange and Schäfer, \textit{Grab- und Denksteine des Mittleren Reichs IV}, pl. 75 [272]).

\(^8\) Dunham, \textit{Naga-ed-Dér Stelae}, no. 7.

\(^9\) Blackman, \textit{Meir VI}, pls. 11, 13, 17, 19.
on a number of stelae, some of which are probably as late as the dynasty following. This fashion is attested in the Seventeenth Dynasty, and in the Eighteenth down to the reign of Amenophis III.

The attire of the servant girl is particularly interesting (Pl. 22a). She wears a strapless skirt that leaves her breasts exposed, and her coiffure tapers to a point from which a pigtail falls rather abruptly. The hair is also traversed by wavy lines added in black paint, which emphasize a rippled contour.

A stela of the same period in Moscow shows a servant with a similar strapless skirt and coiffure, the latter banded by incised lines (Fig. 1a). Although young women, as well as boys, sometimes show a pigtail or pendantlock at the back of the head, I know of only four other cases in which the shape of the hair is otherwise similar. One of these appears on the contemporaneous MMA 63.154 (Pl. 22b) and here the girl is exceptionally labelled “Asiatic” rather than “servant.” Another example, probably equally late (Fig. 1b), is much less detailed than a third (Fig. 1c) which is surprisingly early—probably dating to the Twelfth Dynasty. The most detailed rendering of the coiffure is provided by the head of a statuette of indurated limestone in Brussels, 9 cm high (Pl. 23). It has previously been described as Hittite and dated to the New Kingdom, but, in view of its relationship to the reliefs, it is presumably Twelfth or Thirteenth Dynasty. Regardless of the attitude, this was originally a fairly sizable piece of sculpture, about two-thirds life size, and its scale suggests that the coiffure in question may not have been confined to servants. The hair appears to be encircled by six bands, which may, however, simply be a conventionalized rendering of natural waves; it is braided at the top and the braid falls straight downward. This is probably not a foreign feature, and in any case I have been unable to identify it with certainty from the representations of foreigners of earlier and later date.

10 BM 1562 (Hieroglyphic Texts III, pl. 34; 928 (ibid., IV, pl. 30); Liverpool E 30 (Kitchen, JEA 47 [1961], 10–18 and pl. II; 48 [1962], 159 f. Dyn. XIII, temp. Khendjer); CG 2049, 2043 (evidently Dyn. XII).

11 Hieroglyphic Texts IV, pls. 18–21.

12 Tuthmosis IV: Tylor and Griffith, Paheri, pls. 2, 3, 8, 10; Tuthmosis IV: Norman Davies, Tombs of Two Officials (London 1923), pls. 13, 14, 15, 20, 26; Amenophis II: Petrie and Brunton, Sedment II, p. 24 and pl. 52.

13 Hodjash and Berlev, Egyptian Reliefs, no. 40, pp. 86–89.

14 Cairo J 49972 (servant in tomb of Queen Nfrw, Dyn. XI: MMA photo M7C 174); late M.K. or Dyn. XIII examples include CG 20549 (Simpson, op. cit., pl. 41), CG 20709, 20706, 20694, 20731, 20736, 20736 (pictured in this sequence, Lange and Schäfer, Grab- und Denksteine des Mittleren Reichs IV, pls. 67 [163–67], 68 [168]); Garstang, El Arubah (London 1901), pl. 12 (E 312, servant in bottom register).

15 Engelbach and Gunn, Harageh, pls. 71, 73; Cairo CG 20290, 20331, 20679, 20440, 20346, 20394, 20629, 20672 (pictured in this sequence, Lange and Schäfer, op. cit., pl. 64 [91–104]). Also CG 1481. Cf. the discussion of statuettes presenting jars by Barry Kemp in Kemp and Merrillees, Missoua Pottery in Second Millennium Egypt (Mainz 1980), pp. 147–50.

16 Note, however, that the same individual wears a long wig on the Copenhagen stela, and also has a different designation (probably wabuht) before the name: see Excursus III below, comment m.

17 Cairo CG 20747: Lange and Schäfer, op. cit., pls. 67 (168), 114 (959).

18 BM 162: Hieroglyphic Texts IV, pl. 33; Simpson, op. cit., pl. 6.

19 Brussels E 6749; M. Werbrouck, Musées Royaux d’Art et d’Histoire: Département Égyptien: Album (Brussels 1934), pl. 25. I am indebted to Arpad Mekhitarian for preparing the photographs shown here, and to Pierre Gilbert for permitting me to publish them.
It may also be considered whether there is any relationship between the coiffure in question and another worn by servants, as shown in Fig. 1d. Here the hair might conceivably be held in a similar way, but in no case is there any evidence of ribbing, and the hair does not terminate in a pigtail.

Finally, it should be noted that the presentation of a jar of ointment is attested fairly early in the Twelfth Dynasty, in the reign of Sesosiris I, but is more commonly encountered on stelaic dating to the end of the dynasty and Dynasty XIII, and in such cases it is usually the sole presentation; MMA 68.14 (Pl. 25) provides a typical example.

The inscriptions may be translated as follows:

Above the owner: (1) An offering which the king gives and Amen-[Re], Lord of Thrones of the Two Lands, that he may give (2) exhalations of myrrh and incense (3) to the ks of the Judge and Voice of Nekhen born of Hru[d justified.

Above his wife: (1) And to the ks of his wife, the Mistress of the House Zst-Imn (2) born of Nfrw[d justified.

Above second woman: The Mistress of the House, Snbysy, justified.

Before offering bearers: The sweet breath of life to thy nose, Judge and Voice of Nekhen justified. Making (over) md-il[d the ks of the Judge and Voice of Nekhen justified.

Before the kneeling woman: The maidservant Snb-Ddi-mdr-hru[d.

Before the standing man: The wpr-priest of Hathor, Mistress of Dendera, Rn(i)-snb[m.

COMMENTS (a) tw m (lit. “wind from”) is unexpected. The preposition evidently expresses either equivalence (“namely”) or kind (“consisting of”); see Gardiner, Grammar, pl. 48; CG 20546.

20 From Lange and Schafer, op. cit., pl. 67 (158), a detail of CG 20546 uniformly painted black. This occurs as early as Dyn. XI (Petrie, Denderah, pl. XI, bottom left), in Dyn. XII (Newberry, Beni Hasan I, pl. 29 [mourners, a weaver]) and Dyn. XIII (Kitchen, JEA 47 [1961], pl. 3, opp. p. 13). In the last case the coiffure comes to a point at the end. The head of a glazed statuette (Petrie, Researches in Sinai [New York 1908], p. 150 and pl. 155 [1] following) shows a similar coiffure, the end of which again shows an enlargement, but is possibly broken; the date is uncertain, but may well be New Kingdom.

21 Almwik (Durham University) 1932: Simpson, op. cit., pl. 48; CG 20546.

See Excursus II below. Other examples include Boeser, Beschr. ang. Sammlig II, pl. 15 (15), 27 (37), 33 (43); Hieroglyphic Texts III, pl. 46 (BM 215), 48 (BM 239); W. Spiegelberg, Ägyptische Grabsteine III (Strasbourg 1906), pl. 2; CG 20226, 20476, 20536, 20754; S. Birch, Catalogue of the Egyptian Antiquities at Altrincham Castle (London 1886), pl. 7; B. Peterson, Orientalia Suecana 17 (1968), 14, fig. 2; Louvre C 85 (MMF 5 [1971], 20); Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh, 1951.344, Berlin 7286 (Simpson, Terrace of the Great God, pl. 28), Parma 178 (ibid., pl. 83).
§ 162 (5, 6). Cf. an Eighteenth Dynasty offering formula invoking 𓊃𓊎𓊓𓊏𓊐 𓊖𓊎𓊐𓊏 “the breathing of emanations of myrrh and incense” (Montet, Kêmi 6 [1936], 149 [Rifeh Tomb IV, 38–39]); myrrh and incense are also coupled in a statement wishing that the deceased might smell them (Tylor and Griffith, Pahei, pl. 10).

(b) For this title see above, Chapter 4, section 1.

(c) For ḫn cf. PNI, 61 (7–9); 𓊉𓊎𓊏 ibid., 62 (13); 𓊉𓊎𓊏 𓊎𓊏 ibid., 62 (8); all examples but the last (Dyn. 18) are feminine. This may be an abbreviated form of a theophoric name referring to the god as “the beautiful one,” for which Ranke gives two examples, dating to the Middle Kingdom and onward (PNI, 61 [12, 13]).

(d) Attested for both men and women in the Middle Kingdom: PNI, 265 (26 and cf. 27). In the present case the mother is named, the name followed by mšt-hrw, referring to ḫn, but by mšt-hrw on a statuette belonging to the same individual (Figure 2 below).

(e) A common name: PNI, 286 (6).

(f) A common name: PNI, 203 (18).

(g) A common name: PNI, 314 (25).

(h) [tsw nḏm] n ḫnḫ occurs in an offering formula as early as the 43rd year of Amenemhet III (Gardiner, Peet and Černý, Sinai, no. 30, p. 70 and pl. 13; no. 142, p. 141 and pl. 53, provides another example from the same reign). Barta, Operformel, p. 65, n. 5, cites only Cairo CG 20039, which might be as late as Dyn. XIII; see also BM 254 (Hieroglyphic Texts III, pl. 26) and CG 20476 which are equally late. Examples are fairly recurrent in this period.

(i) Cf. tsw nḏm n ḫnty-imntyw r šrt nt NN, cited by Barta, loc. cit., n. 6, referring to Berlin 1188, for which see Simpson, Terrace of the Great God, pl. 17. The date of this is probably no later than the middle of Dyn. XII. Cf. also CG 20164, similarly in an address to the living: “so may ye say ‘the breath of life to the nose of the revered NN’;” this may be somewhat later than Dyn. XIII.

(j) The closest parallel occurs on BM 215 (Hieroglyphic Texts III, pl. 46; Simpson, op. cit., pl. 38). Cf. the front of an inlaid chest, MMA 26.7.1438 (Carnarvon and Carter, Five Years’ Explorations, pl. 49 [1]), where the same legend accompanies the deceased, who presents a jar of ointment to Amenemhet IV; this is paralleled on Louvre stela C 58 (Pierret, Recueil d’inscriptions II [Paris, 1878], p. 8), where the presentation is made to Osiris. The first example is the only other one known to me where the recipient is neither a king nor a divinity.

(k) Evidently the designation, normally written 𓊎𓊖𓊎 𓊎𓊐 wbn(jt (Wb. I, 292 [7, 8]), is here written 𓊎𓊖𓊎 i.e., ibst, as also on the aforementioned rear wall of a contemporary shrine in Moscow (note 13 above). The shift of initial w and i is attested much earlier, see Edel, Altägypt. Gramm. I, § 144.

(l) This seems to be a combination of two names, Snb + Ddi; for the former see PNI, 312 (15), for the latter PNI, 402 (1), both well attested for women as well as men. Such combinations of the Middle Kingdom are discussed by Vernus in RdE 23 (1971), 193–99, and more fully in Le Surnom au Moyen Empire (Rome 1986). The name *Sn,M-Ddi, on the other
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hand, is not attested, unlike Ddi-sn(w) (PN1 402 [6]) and Dd-sn(w) (PN1, 401 [21]); if this were the proper interpretation, one might connect the epithet mri-hrw to the reference to Ddi, since mri lacks a feminine ending, but once again, I know of no parallel for the addition of this epithet to the mention of someone whose memory is honored in a personal name. The writing of the epithet does not preclude its being read as mri-hrw, of course (cf. comment (d) above), although this epithet is not usually applied to the names of servants.

(m) The name and title recur on a scarab in the British Museum, no. 41564 (Martin, Egyptian Administrative and Private-Name Seals, no. 831). According to Martin’s classification of the back, the date is Thirteenth Dynasty, and it is therefore possible that the same individual is involved, although the name Rn(i)-snb was so popular in this period (PN1, 222 [26]) that one cannot be certain. All of the other examples of Middle Kingdom and Thirteenth Dynasty wdb-priests of Hathor of Dendera that are known to me—three in all—are listed by Ward, Index, no. 673: CG 20030; CG 20034; Vernus, RdE 25 (1973), 256. Apart from these, the only other evidence Ward gives for priests of Hathor’s Denderite cult is a lector priest whose title and name have been read [martin, op. cit., no. 746; Ward, op. cit., no. 1203], but are perhaps to be reconstructed as [martin, op. cit., 1398] is also known from a crude stela invoking Hathor of Dendera and Horus the Behdetite, Lord of Dendera (Brussels E 2286), and thus doubtless refers to the same cult. The two stelae are both probably as late as Dyn. XIII.

The lower part of a seated statue, probably of schist (Pl. 24), represents the same individual wearing a long cloak, his right hand placed palm upward on his lap, the other missing, but evidently raised to his chest. The height is 22.5 cm, and that of the entire statue must have been about 33 cm when it was intact. The lower part of the cloak and the left side of the seat are inscribed as follows:

A, on cloak (Fig. 2, Pl. 24a): (1) [An offering that the king gives to] Ptah-Sokaris, that he may grant invocation offerings of bread and beer, oxen and fowl and everything; (2) the sweet breath of life to the h3 of [the Judge and Voice of Nekhen], n, justified.

B, left side of seat (Plate 24b): (1) An offering that the king gives (to) Amen-Re, (2) the Beloved, Who Presides over Karnak (3) in Thebes, that he may grant invocation offerings of bread and beer (4) oxen and fowl, alabaster (jars of ointment) and clothing, and

---

23 The provenance is indicated not only by the titles but by the offering formula, which invokes Hathor Mistress of Dendera, Horus the Behdetite and Haromoutis; for the connection of the last two divinities with this cult see Fischer, Dendera, pp. 26, 125 f.
25 For mnu see Wh. II, 103 f.; p. 104 [8] notes the use of this as an epithet of Amun, although the relevant Beleg-stellen (including [3]) give no evidence prior to the New Kingdom.
26 Note the odd form of what is certainly meant to be ตรา.
everything goodly and pure to the kv of (5) the Judge and Voice of Nekhen "n, born of Hrs. justified.

Nothing further commentary is required except to note the additional mention of Amen-Re of Karnak. It is thus fairly likely that the rear wall of the miniature chapel and the fragmentary statue, both of which were purchased from the same dealer in New York, come from the Theban necropolis rather than from Abydos, which is the provenance of the two intact shrines mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. It seems fairly certain that the statue and chapel belonged together, and the statue could easily have been accommodated within the latter.

The association of breath and incense goes back to the Pyramid Texts, where the dead king is told “thy wind/breath is incense; thy (refreshing) north wind is smoke” (Pyr. 877a); while elsewhere the dead king “receives for himself the breath of life” and “breathes the wind, an abundance of north wind” (Pyr. 1158a, c). Late Old Kingdom scenes in tomb chapels frequently show the deceased holding a jar of ointment to his nose. These themes are very much emphasized at the end of the Middle Kingdom, and on no other monument of the Thirteenth Dynasty is the association of the “breath of life” with ointment and incense so repeatedly stated in the texts and representations.

Excursus I: The colors of MMA 69.30

Yellow: The background on which ḫḏt-eyes and ūn-sign appear; the background of the column of hieroglyphs right of center.²⁷ The lower of the two broad bands at the bottom. At top, every other one of the elements in the border below the ḫkr-frieze. Bottom of the ūn circle. Top of staff held by owner.

Red: Each of the round elements in the ḫkr-frieze. Initial painting of the rim (but not the extended “cosmetic line”) of each ḫḏt-eye, later painted over in black. Traces in inner line of ūn-circle, in incised outline of the bags offered by woman; outline of this woman’s body and kilt of man in the register below her. Upper broad band at bottom of stela. Flesh of the two men.

Blue: Traces in outline of ḫkr elements except for round center; in incised horizontal lines of border below this; in incised outline of brow, cosmetic line and pendant elements of ḫḏt-eyes; in incised border line at right; in right incised border line of the column of inscription; all hieroglyphs.²⁸

²⁷ Cf. the stela in the Pushkin Museum, cited in n. 13 above, where all the hieroglyphs have a light yellow background.
²⁸ Cf. the stela mentioned in the preceding note, but monochrome blue hieroglyphs had already become common on stelae of the Twelfth Dynasty. Plüger, JAOS 87 (1947). 135.
Excursus II: MMA 68.14

The limestone stela shown in Plate 25, 39 cm in height, is of unknown provenance (most probably Abydos). The figures, arranged in three registers are reduced to mere silhouettes, probably originally filled uniformly with green or blue along with the hieroglyphs, although there is now no trace of pigment.

In the uppermost register the owner is seated at the left, wearing a shoulder-length wig and long kilt, one hand extended towards a pair of tall offering stands supporting bowls, an offering table and two jars of wine perched on ringstands. His inscription reads: (1) An offering that the king gives, and Osiris, Lord of Abydos, to the $k$ of (2) the Overseer of Treasurers and Liegemen of the King$^a$ $Izl$, $^b$ (3) born of the Mistress of the House $Btw$, $^c$ justified, (4) engendered by the revered $Ibi$, justified.

A man standing opposite, presenting a jar of ointment, is wigless and wears a projecting kilt; he is: The son of the Supervisor of the $tm$, $^d$ $Rn-sn$, justified, (named) $Rs$, justified, born of the Mistress of the House $Hmt$, justified.

Middle register, man at left: (1) The liegeman $Zs-Imn$, justified, born of (2) the Mistress of the House $\text{\textasciitilde}nh-it.i$, $^e$ The man facing him is: (1) The revered $Pt-hm(t).nwk$, $^f$ justified, born of $Rn.s-sn$. The woman at right: The mistress of the House $Hmt$, justified, possessor of reverence.

Bottom register, man at left: (1) The attendant(?) $Htp-Hn$, $^h$ born of (2) the Mistress of the House $Ik$, justified. The man facing him: (1) The Liegeman of the Ruler, $^i$ $Tt$, justified (2) born of $Mwt$, justified. Three columns at the right identify two (? ) other women as follows: (1) The Mistress of the House $Snb$, justified, born of (2) the Mistress of the House $Rn.s-sn$, justified, (3) (and?) her daughter, $H^t$-$kw$, $^j$ justified.

Comments: (a) Cf. Ward, Index, no. 1523, where $\downarrow$ normally shows honorific transposition.
(b) Ranke, PNI, 46 (5) gives a single example of the same period, but probably not the same person although the mother's name is rather similar: $\frac{\downarrow}{\downarrow}$.
(c) PNI II, 276 (25) gives a single example from the New Kingdom.
(d) See Ward, Index, no. 1087; judging from the variant writing $\frac{\text{\textasciitilde}}{\text{\textasciitilde}}$ (CG 20430) $tm$ refers to land, and the same connection is suggested by the hymn quoted by Schafer, ZAS 40 (1903), 96.
(e) Cf. PNI, 63 (3), where $\text{\textasciitilde}nh$ clearly precedes. Note $\downarrow$ for suffix $i$.
(f) Evidently $\frac{\text{\textasciitilde}}{\text{\textasciitilde}}$ is the same as $\frac{\text{\textasciitilde}}{\text{\textasciitilde}}$, $^i$ “The Third” (PNI, 116 [12], II, 354).
(g) I.e., ‘h’ (Ward, Index, no. 625) rather than shm- (ibid., no. 1339), although the choice is difficult; cf. my Titles, p. 74.

(h) Or Hnsw-bft; but cf. PN1, 276 (6) and 426 (27), II, 404.

(i) Ward, Index, no. 1526. The writing of in the present case is exceptional.

(j) PN1, 264 (24) gives only masculine examples, but (25) both a feminine and a masculine example of Hf-ksw-R; these may be abbreviations of longer names mentioning Sesostris III (PN1, 264 [26], 265 [1–2], 315 [17]). For the fusion of ḫw cf. Engelbach, Riqqeh and Memphis VI, pl. 17 (1, 2).

As is so often the case in stelae of the late Middle Kingdom and Dyn. XIII, many individuals are named whose relationship to the owner is not specified. His wife, who is mentioned as his son’s mother in the uppermost register, presumably appears at the right of the register beneath. The Rn.s-nb mentioned in the middle and bottom registers may or may not be the same person since the name is very common, as are all the other names except those mentioned in the comments.

Excursus III, MMA 63.154 (Pl. 26)

The height of the stela is 120 cm. Although some of the figures are darkened, there is no clear evidence of the pigments that were originally applied. The stone had been clumsily repaired before it was purchased, with an excessive amount of plaster filling the cracks. After this plaster had been removed in the process of desalination, some recutting of detail became evident, most notably in the figure of the dwarf before the deceased, in the second register from the bottom. This recutting could be distinguished from the original carving by means of ultra-violet light, and has been eliminated.

The stela displays five registers, which will be labeled A–E, from top to bottom. At the top (A) are a pair of wgste-eyes flanked by “Anubis of Upper Egypt” (left) and “Anubis of Lower Egypt” (right). The next register (B) contains three horizontal lines of inscription (→). Register C shows the deceased and his wife standing at the left, addressed by two smaller registers of sons (at the top) and daughters (below). In the next register (D) the deceased is shown seated at the right (←) receiving offerings from six servants, including two men, two women and two male dwarfs. The bottom register (E) shows the parents of the deceased seated at the right (←), addressed by “his son” (probably a brother of the deceased), who invokes offerings, and by four other men who carry lotus blossoms.

Wm. K. Simpson has pointed the fact that two other stelae belong to the same individual: Cairo CG 20612 and Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek EIN 964.29 Many of the same individuals appear on the latter, and these have been marked with an asterisk (*).

29 Simpson, Terrace of the Great God, ANOC 59, pp. 21, 24 and pl. 81. Franke, Personendaten, no. 373, suggests that the same Rn.(i)-nb, with the title qw ḫḥ bg (which appears on the Copenhagen stela) is mentioned in Papyrus Boulak 18 and on the fragment in D. Randall-MacIver, El Amra and Abydos (London 1902), pl. 98; but in the latter case this is the father of a woman who is not mentioned among the daughters on MMA 63.154 or the Copenhagen stela; the name of the man’s wife is also different. For the Copenhagen stela see Koeboed-Petersen,
The texts of registers B–E may be translated as follows:

B (1) An offering that the king gives (to) Osiris Lord of Busiris, the Great God, Lord of Abydos, that he may give invocation offerings of bread and beer, oxen and fowl, alabaster (jars of ointment) and clothing, libations and incense, oil, offerings of food, and every offering, all yearly offerings, and everything goodly and pure on which a god lives, that which the sky bestows, earth creates and the inundation brings, the two hands, that they may give; (3) the flood, that it may purify; Thoth, that he offer to the ki of the Treasurer of the King of Lower Egypt, the Director of the Broad Hall Rn.(i)-snb* possessor of reverence, born of Znt, justified. And his wife, his beloved, the Mistress of the House Nhy*, justified.

C (1) His son, the Inspector of Liegemen, Rn.f-rs*, justified
(2) His son, the Inspector of Liegemen, Ddw-Sbk*, justified
(3) His son, the Supervisor of the tm, Nb-Swmmw*
(5) His daughter, Hfnsw-it-fjib*h
(6) His daughter, Nbwt-hnt*
(7) His daughter, Ti-nw-Nbw*ši

D (1) The Treasurer of the King of Lower Egypt, the Director of the Broad Hall, Rn.(i)-snb*
(2) [The baker(?)] Ṝš-Hr(*)
(3) The major domo Wi-n.(i)-Imn, who is called Rašk
(4) The major domo Ṭš.wy*ši
(5) The Asiatic Snb-Rn.(i)-snb*
(6) The servant Ṭš.(i)-snb
(7) Zst-ḥs-Imn(w) (another servant)*

E (1) His father, the stalwart of the town* nhhw*
(2) His (his father’s) wife, the Mistress of the House Znt*
(3) His (his father’s) son, the stalwart of the town, Ddw-Sbk*šo
(4) The Inspector of Liegemen Ṭš-ir*
(5) The Inspector of Liegemen Mny*
(6) The Inspector of Liegemen Mnšt-w-ḥtp*šp
(7) The Inspector of Liegemen Ṭš*ši

COMMENTS: (a) For this combination, which may be reversed, see Wb. V, 28 (15), 29 (1–2).
(b) The terminal sign is well discussed by Jéquier, BIFO 7 (1910), 89–94, but he misleadingly gives the impression that it is to be read hnkt; the rectangular basket is only known as a determinative of this word and of various feasts entailing offerings. See also Lapp, Opferformel, §§ 247–50.

Stèles, no. 16, pp. XXII–XXIV, 15–17 (where, on p. 16, it is noted that the reading of many of the inscriptions relies on Henry Madsen, Revue égyptologique 12 [1907], 218–20, pls. 16a, 16b.)
Junker (Giza III, pp. 111–13; IV, p. 27) persuasively argues that the generally accepted translation "vegetables" should be revised thus in the present context, and the counter-arguments of Lapp, *Opferformel*, §§ 243–46, are not entirely convincing except for his evidence from the New Kingdom. In § 243 the determinative of \( \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{ā} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{y} \end{array} \end{array} \) cannot be considered the equivalent of \( \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{ā} \end{array} \end{array} \), to which it is sometimes added.

(d) Considered to be a late Middle Kingdom formula by Bennet, *JEA* 44 (1958), 121. Also noted by Barta, *op. cit.*, pp. 67, 79 (Bitte 108) for the Thirteenth-Fourteenth Dynasty generally. An apparently early Twelfth Dynasty occurrence is to be found in Blackman, *Meir* II, pl. 12, lacking "what the inundation brings." This much of the phrase is also known from Old Kingdom titles (for which see my *Titles*, p. 7 [289d]), and from a title in the late Eleventh Dynasty tomb of Dgie (*ibid.*, p. 10 [420a]), while the addition of *innt h ropy* occurs in a second title of the same date (*ibid.*, [420b]).

(e) For this formula see Barta, *Opferformel*, pp. 65, 79, Bitte 82, and Hayes, *JEA* 33 (1947), 5 (c). Like the preceding formula, it occurs in Blackman, *Meir* II, pls. 6–7, where the two arms are oddly specified as "my two arms," *bsw* appears instead of *brh* "flood," and Anubis instead of Thoth (in this case noted by Barta). An even earlier example, on a stela of the Eleventh Dynasty (Hodjash and Berlev, *Egyptian Reliefs*, p. 69 [no. 26]), shows the first two phrases in what was to become the traditional form \( \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{ā} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{ŋ} \end{array} \end{array} \) \( \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{ŋ} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{r} \end{array} \end{array} \) \( \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{y} \end{array} \end{array} \) \( \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{ŋ} \end{array} \end{array} \) \( \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{ŋ} \end{array} \end{array} \).

(f) For further examples see Ward, *Index*, no. 1147. Presumably a judicial title, as it was in the Old Kingdom (Helck, *Beamtentitel*, pp. 34, 72 f.). In one case it is preceded by the title "vizier" (J.-E. Gautier and G. Jéquier, *Mémoire sur les fouilles de Licht* [Cairo 1902], fig. 119) and in two other cases it is held by the father or son of a vizier (Habachi, *Heqaib*, p. 67, fig. 1; p. 69, fig. 5, the latter the same individual mentioned in Hayes, *Scepter* I, fig. 227, top center, as Habachi notes).

(g) Evidently misread as Rn.f-snḫb on the Stockholm stela, the surface of which is less well preserved (Koefoed-Petersen, *Stèles*, p. XXII). The title (identical in both cases) is a common one (Ward, *Index*, no. 1336).

(h) The name of this daughter is reduced to *Hns w* on the Copenhagen stela. The full name is not recorded by Ranke, but comparable names are to be found in *PNI*, 12 (9, 11).

(i) The name transcribed \( \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{ā} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{ŋ} \end{array} \end{array} \) by Koefoed-Petersen, *op. cit.*, p. XXIII, is to be emended accordingly.

(j) Restoring \( \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{ā} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{ŋ} \end{array} \end{array} \) (Ward, *Index*, no. 860). A man of the same name on the Copenhagen stela is *wdꜥw* “butler” but may possibly represent the same individual.

(k) Neither name is recorded by Ranke, but for the first cf. *PNI*, 81 (9, 11).

(l) The Copenhagen stela has \( \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{ā} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{ŋ} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{ā} \end{array} \end{array} \) \( \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{ā} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{ā} \end{array} \end{array} \), in which \( \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{ŋ} \end{array} \end{array} \) is apparently a determinative of the title (contra Koefoed-Petersen, *op. cit.*, p. XXIV).

(m) The Copenhagen stela precedes this name by a different designation, which is probably to be read *wḥyṯt*. There the same title *wḥyṯt* is applied to the other maidservant (D, 7 below).

(o) Assuming that “his” refers to the father rather than to the owner of the stela, this would be a brother of the latter; his title does not agree with that of the owner’s son who has the same name. Furthermore the Copenhagen stela likewise represents two men named Ddw-Sbk, one of whom is the owner’s son, and has his title, while the other, whose relationship is unspecified, is similarly ḫḥn n nwt.

(p) Identified on the Copenhagen stela as sn.f n mwt.f (in Madsen’s copy), evidently not “maternal uncle” as Koefoed-Petersen says, but a brother born of the same mother.

(q) Koefoed-Petersen, op. cit., p. XXIII, indicates a lacuna at the end of this name, but the lacuna is probably to be deleted since the title is likewise the same, and it probably represents the same individual.
Plate 21. Metropolitan Museum 69.30
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13. A Chair of the Early New Kingdom

The wooden furniture of ancient Egypt is fascinating for two reasons: first because—in contrast to that of other cultures that antedate our era—a great deal of it has survived in remarkably sound condition, and secondly because much that has survived is admirable in craftsmanship and design. Both of these merits are particularly apparent in the type of chair that is the subject of the following pages, and the example in question is one of the most exceptional of its kind (Pls. 27–31).

1. Construction and materials

To facilitate the description of its construction, a sketch is supplied in Figure 1, giving current terminology. Both the leonine legs and the “coasters” on which they are mounted are made of a single piece of a species of salt cedar (tamarisk), a native wood which is also used throughout the basic structure of the chair. In the absence of stretchers, the legs are braced by the structure of the side rails, as shown in Figure 2, while reinforcement at the front and back is supplied by a pair of knee braces that join, half-lapped, at the center ( ). These are attached to the legs by mortise and tenon, and are glued and pegged to the underside of the crossrails. The shorter cross rails are mortised into the longer side ones, and the space that they frame was originally filled with a webbing of linen cord drawn through a total of 68 holes, sixteen on each side and one in each corner. A sufficient amount remained, in the front left corner, so that the seat could be restored to its original appearance. A total of thirty cords was passed through each of the holes; these subdivide into two groups of fifteen, which are in turn composed of three groups of five. Five cords thus make

---

1 MMA 68.58, purchased with funds donated by Edmun-do and Patricia Lassalle. The height is 86.2 cm, the width 49.5 cm. Initially illustrated and briefly described in BMMA 27 (1968), 90, it has subsequently appeared in several other publications: Metropolitan Museum of Art, Notable Acquisitions 1965–1975 (New York 1975), p. 76; Nora E. Scott in BMMA 31 (1973), 142, fig. 15; H. G. Fischer, L’écriture et l’art, pls. 86–88. Some of the points made in the present article are summarized in the final chapter of that work, and especially pp. 189–96.

2 Analysis by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Products Laboratory. For this and other data I have drawn on notes compiled in 1968 by Miss Kate C. Lefferts, who was then in charge of the Metropolitan Museum’s Conservation Department.

3 Linum usitatissimum; analysis by Malcolm Delacorte.

4 The design has been established by Miss Nobuko Kajatoni, and the reweaving executed by Charles Anello. Miss Kajatoni has analyzed the yarn makeup as follows: the yarns are two single spun “S,” plied again into “S” and four plied yarns replied into “S,” thus:
up one unit of the weave, and the three groups of five were woven into each hole twice, from opposite sides of the chair diagonally, to create the plain weave. The pattern is shown in Figure 3.

As in the case of all animal-legged chairs, the back is mounted separately upon the frame of the seat. The backrest, curved laterally and inclined rearward, is supported by two perpendicular stiles and a center brace between them; both the backrest and its supports are mortised into the rails of the seat frame below them, and into the headrail above. A horizontal board (backrail) is mortised into the crestrails at a distance of about 5 cm below the headrail and a lower one about the same distance above the rear crossrail; a series of seven vertical slats are mortised between these, each isolated by a space of a little less than 4 cm. All the mortise-and-tenon joints are glued with a black adhesive, to be described presently, and secured with blackwood pegs that run completely through the thickness of the wood.
Fig. 2. Chair of Rn.i-snbt, side view
East African blackwood (*Dalbergia melanoxylon*)\(^5\) has been used to cover the front, upper surfaces and sides of the chair with a veneer that varies from 1.5 to 2.5 cm, being thicker on the seat and back than on the legs. All of this is glued and pegged, the pegs varying from 0.02 to 0.04 cm. It shows evidence of a thin oil resin finish that appears to be of considerable age, since it is slightly raised where the pores of the wood have shrunk. In most cases the blackwood is applied to flat surfaces in single pieces, covering the entire area, the chief exception being, apart from the legs, the lateral surface of the stiles and braces. Knots in the veneer have been excised and replaced with boat-shaped insertions (“flying Dutchmen”). The blackwood veneer on the legs is necessarily more piecemeal (Fig. 2 and Pl. 29), and its lesser thickness is doubtless due to its having sustained the final stages of shaping. This is, to my knowledge, the only case where veneer has been used on the animal legs of furniture, and indeed, the only case where it has been used on three-dimensional sculpture of any kind in ancient Egypt.

No veneer was used, however, on the reverse of the backrest, on the stiles and center brace, or on the underside of the seat, and it is very probably for this reason that all of these surfaces have been damaged by rodents, while the more resistant veneered surfaces have been spared.

Ivory veneer, again applied in single pieces of about 2.5 cm thickness, is extensively used on the front of the backrest, where it alternates with blackwood on four of the seven splats, and also covers the horizontal elements to which the slats are attached. In the latter case the veneer was carved with great precision to fit the curved surface, as also in the case of the narrow strips that cover the tops of the braces in front of the crestrails. All of this makes for a beautiful balance of dark and light, and the contrast is cunningly exploited by the use of blackwood pegs on the ivory covering of the forward braces, negatively echoed by ivory pegs on the blackwood veneer of the braces behind them (Pl. 30). Another felicitous touch is the application of ivory inlay for the claws of the lion’s feet, which is known from some other chairs, but with less effect.

A further refinement is the presence of blackening in the animal glue used for the attachment of wood, to match the veneer, while an amber-colored animal glue was used to secure the elements of ivory.\(^6\)

Apart from the loss of nearly all the linen webbing of the seat, the most extensive damage sustained by the chair affects the two stiles and center back brace, parts of which have been gnawed away (Pl. 31a). These losses have been repaired with balsa wood, attached with brass screws (Pl. 31b). The broken-off corners of the headrail have been repaired with balsa and capped with Brazilian rosewood, and a square of missing veneer on the right and left side of the front rail has likewise been restored with rosewood and doweled with rose-

---

\(^5\) Analysis by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Products Laboratory.

\(^6\) Analyzed, using infra-red spectroscopy, by James Howard, at the Institute of Fine Arts Conservation Center, New York University. Both adhesives are animal glue. The black glue has more bulk than usual, containing carbon that is composed of short fibrous lengths unlike the usual carbon blacks. The presence of no other material was noted and the testing of a sample was negative for carbonate.
wood pins set in the original holes. Finally, three small missing pieces of ivory on the left back brace have been replaced with new ivory.  

Fig. 3. Chair of Rtu.i-snḫ, pattern of cords in seat

2. Comparative evidence: the legs

The legs of the chair should be considered first because their form, depending on whether or not they are theriomorphic, affects the other elements of construction. The earliest animal legs, as attested by ivory examples from the royal tombs of the first two dynasties, were uniformly bovine, as in Mesopotamian representations of furniture, but the Egyptians, unlike the Mesopotamians, supplied a full complement of front and rear legs, and in some cases these were so detailed that the left ones can also be distinguished from the

---

7 The remaining restoration is principally a matter of regluing and other means of reinforcement; all of this work was executed by John Canonico.

8 Petrie, *Royal Tombs I*, p. 27 f. and pls. 12 (9), 37 (17, of wood); II, p. 34, and pls. 32, 34, 39, 40, 43. It is not possible to distinguish which of the larger ones were used for stools, chairs or beds; the smallest have been attributed to chests or boxes, but it seems likelier that they were used for gaming boards, as in later periods, from the Middle Kingdom onward (MMA 26.7.1287: Hayes, *Scepter I*, fig. 160, p. 250; MMA 26.3.154 [less complete]: *BMMA February 1928*, section II, fig. 10, p. 10); see also p. 226 below, Fig. 32.

9 In several cases, dating to early Dynastic III, about the time of the Egyptian Old Kingdom, a single leg appears at the front or back and is incorporated into a plain rectangular framework containing vertical or horizontal reinforcements: see Hollis Baker, *Furniture in the Ancient World* (New York 1965), figs. 246, 256, 271. Some examples on cylinder seals show two feet, but they are identical and turn outward (L. Legrain, *Ur Excavations III: Archaic Seal Impressions* [Oxford 1936], pls. 8 [169], 19 [382], 20 [384]); in the last case they also are connected by a stretcher. The combination of an animal leg (at the rear) and a straight leg occurs on a Twenty-Sixth Dynasty false door, some two thousand years later (P. Vernus, *Atrribis* [Cairo 1978], pl. 13), but this is to be explained differently: it is evidently a misinterpretation of an Old Kingdom representation in which the front leg of the chair is concealed by the legs of the person who is seated; cf. Nadine Cherpiion, *Mastabas et hypogées d'Ancien Empire* (Brussels 1989), p. 41 and fig. 26.
right. That is true of the front legs of the present example.

The gradual replacement of bull’s legs by those of leonine form may be observed in a private monument that is as early as Dyn. III and belongs to a non-royal woman whose husband sits on a chair with legs of the older form.\textsuperscript{10} At the very beginning of the next dynasty there is evidence of a lion’s leg on a fragmentary hieroglyph from the Valley Temple of Sneferu, which probably represented the king.\textsuperscript{11} Lion’s legs also appear on the two chairs of his queen Hetep-heres\textsuperscript{12} and on statues of King Chephren,\textsuperscript{13} but in the latter case the legs are paired on each side and each of the front pairs is surmounted by the head of the lion. Since there is a great deal of further evidence for the association of lions and thrones,\textsuperscript{14} one may well suspect that the leonine legs of chairs were initially an attribute of royalty, despite the fact that there is no evidence that it was used by kings before it was adopted by non-royal persons. It might, however, be argued that the use of bull’s legs could also be regarded as an allusion to another avatar of the king, so that the use of animal-legged chairs of any kind might have originated as a royal privilege. However this may be, lion’s legs are relatively infrequent in non-royal reliefs of the Fourth Dynasty;\textsuperscript{15} they became much more frequent on those dating to the end of the Fifth Dynasty,\textsuperscript{16} and are quite common on those of the Sixth.\textsuperscript{17} In the Middle Kingdom they were more frequently represented than bull’s legs. There are few representations of the latter after this period, but bull’s legs continued to be used, for they appear on beds (or biers) of the Second Intermediate Period at Kerma,\textsuperscript{18} on a stool of the Seventeenth Dynasty from Gurna\textsuperscript{19} and on a fragmentary royal bed in the British Museum that is attributed to Queen Hatshepsut.\textsuperscript{20} Furthermore there is, at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, a stool with bull legs that must be still

\textsuperscript{10} CG 57129: Murray, Sannara Mastabas I, pl. 2.
\textsuperscript{11} Ahmed Fakhry, Monuments of Sneferu at Dashur II, Pt. 1 (Cairo 1951), fig. 184.
\textsuperscript{12} Reisner-Smith, Hist. Giza Nkr II, pls. 15–16 and figs. 31–32.
\textsuperscript{13} CG 9, 13, 14.
\textsuperscript{14} See Klaus P. Kuhlmann, Der Thron im Alten Ägypten (Glückstadt 1977), pp. 61–69, 86–89. He does not, however, cite Old Kingdom representations showing lions flanking the thrones of queens, as an addition rather than as an integral part of the chair: Dunham and Simpson, Mersyankh, fig. 7; Wreszinski, Atlas III, pl. 11; Jéquier, Pyr. des reines, pls. 4–5 (on the diadem). Eleventh Dynasty representations show the lion head on chairs of a king (Habachi, MDAIK 19 [1965], 26 and fig. 8 [where the ear should be added] and pl. 8); of royal consorts (Naville, XIX Dyn. Temple II, pl. 20; H.E. Winlock, Excavations at Deir el Bahri 1911–1931 [New York 1942], pl. 8) and of a non-royal couple (Faulkner, JEA 37 [1951], pl. 7 facing p. 47). Cf. also the Sixth Dynasty funerary bier with lion’s head in Blackman and Apted, Mort, pls. 42–45 (clearly a borrowing of a royal prerogative to facilitate access to the afterlife). For this last subject see also Winiwer Fedeler, An Egyptian Funerary Bed (Toronto 1953), p. 5; her example from Petrie, Denderah, pl. 3, is no earlier than Dyn. IX, but she cites others from Heliopolis (ASAE 16 [1916], 196, 202); cf. also Jéquier, Tombeaux de particuliers, pl. 16, apparently showing a chest on a bier, but this can hardly be earlier than the example from Dendera.
\textsuperscript{15} Reisner, Hist. Giza Nkr I, pls. 18 (a, b), 39 (a), 40 (b), 259; LD II, pl. 3.
\textsuperscript{16} E.g., Davies, Pharaohs II, pls. 13, 14, 24, 34; Paget and Pirie, Pharaohs, pls. 34, 53, 58, 39.
\textsuperscript{17} E.g., Memra, passim; James and Apted, Khetika, passim; Blackman, Mort IV, passim; Blackman and Apted, Mort V, passim; Davies, Deir el Gebrais, passim; Simpson, Qar and Idu, passim. A more detailed summary is given by Strudwick, Rde 38 (1987), 144–46, although he overlooks some of the early evidence, including the example cited in n. 10 above. Cf. also N. Cherpi, op. cit., p. 54.
\textsuperscript{19} Petrie, Quarnh (London 1909), pl. 26.
\textsuperscript{20} BM 21574 Baker, op. cit., figs. 64–65 and PM I, p. 586.
later, for it has stretchers on all four sides (Pl. 32a).  

Stretcher are, to be sure, known from representations of chairs with plain legs from the Archaic Period onward.  

They also appear on a fragmentary stool from Naga ed-Deir, dating to the early Eleventh Dynasty, which has legs somewhat resembling those of an animal (Pl. 32b–c); if they derive from animal legs, however, the degree of stylization is strangely un-Egyptian. This form is also known from representations and tomb models of the Eleventh Dynasty, where the stylized feet turn inward, front to back (cf. Pl. 36 below) as was probably the case in the example from Naga ed-Deir. It is known once more from Thebes at the very beginning of the New Kingdom, and survives, perhaps archaistically, in some ritual scenes of the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty. Since such legs appear in an early Twelfth Dynasty representation of a chest, it is apparent that they were not regarded as animal legs, which were not used for this type of furniture.

The earliest evidence for stretchers between true animal legs is no earlier than the reign of Tuthmosis IV in the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty, while further examples are known from the reign of his successor, Amenophis III; in these cases the stretchers were placed in front and back only, replacing the knee braces, as also in the case of the two stools of earlier date that have just been mentioned. In the next reign, that of Amenophis IV (Akhenaton)

---

21 Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, 10550. One of the inlays is shown by H.S. Cartwright, American Journal of Semitic Languages 45 (1928–1929), 191, fig. 23. The stool is made of nakhara wood (Cordia Myaca), inlaid with ebony as well as ivory. The provenance is unknown. Marianne Eaton-Krause discusses the peculiarities of the stool in Divitiae Aegypt: Koptologische und verwandte Studien zu Ehren von Martin Krause (Wiesbaden 1995), pp. 85–87, and doubts its authenticity. It has occurred to me that further New Kingdom evidence for the bovine leg of a chair is perhaps to be seen in the hieroglyph for wnr (F 25) as represented in Calverly, Temple of Seti I III, pl. 30 (b); IV, pl. 65 (Fig. 4), 79 (6w). But if so, one might expect the top to be more horizontal and the “tenon” to be distinctly broader.


23 Hearst Museum of Anthropology, University of California 6-1024. It is this fragment (and others) and not the chair from the same site, that came from tomb N 3765, which also contained Dunham, Naga-ed-Deir Stelae, no. 69; cf. n. 45 below. The fragment is shown in my L’écriture et l’art, pl. 84.

24 Some of the earliest examples are from Gebelein (painting from the tomb of Iti in Turin, showing the owner seated on such a chair); Moalla (Vandier, Mo’alla, fig. 35, p. 82; CG 28116; Lacau, Sarcoptages I, pl. 6), Thebes (sarcophagi: Cairo J 47847; C. Lihyquist, Ancient Egyptian Mirrors [Munich 1979], fig. 129, and Cairo J 47397; Naville, Xth Dyn. Temple I, pl. 20), El Deir (Fischer, Coptite Nome, p. 113, fig. 16 [b], line 9 [det. khkh]), Farshut (coffin, Boston MFA 03.1631: Wm. S. Smith, Ancient Egypt as represented in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 4th ed. [Boston 1960], p. 84, fig. 48). For the later Eleventh Dynasty see Winlock, Models of Daily Life, pls. 34, 35–39, 70, and Fig. 15 below. The evidence from the Twelfth Dynasty includes Petrie, Labyrinths, Gerwa, Maqgrunah (London 1912), pl. 30 (a model couch); Davies, Antefkher, pl. 30, Newberry, Beni Hassan I, pl. 13; Bersheh I, pl. 13. It seems possible that such legs are the result of foreign influence and they have in fact been found at Jericho (Baker, op. cit., figs. 35a–39 and p. 224), but these Palestinian examples are of later date—ca. 1600 B.C.

25 Carnarvon and Carter, Five Years' Explorations, pl. 71. Other early Dyn. XVIII evidence: Tylor, Remni, pl. 7; 13; BM 43467 (T.G.H. James, Egyptian Painting [London 1985], p. 22); MMA 193.3.32 (Pl. 33 below).

26 Davies, Rih-h-Mi-Re', pls. 83, 105–106; also in Theban Tomb 295 (MMA neg. T 2805). Cf. also Davies, Five Theban Tombs (London 1913), pl. 21, where the feet of the legs turn out rather than inward.

27 Davies, Antefkher, pl. 10.


29 Cairo CG 51113 (Theodore Davis et al., The Tomb of Iouitou and Tawouy [London 1907], pls. 33–34 [chair]); CG 51110 (ibid., pl. 57 [bed]).
they were used on all four sides, and sometimes with the addition of diagonal braces that had been used to reinforce stands, tables and chairs with plain legs as early as the reign of Tuthmosis III. Thus the absence of structural elements between the animal legs of chairs and beds remained, for more than 1,500 years, a carefully observed propriety, the breach of which must be regarded, in terms of older tradition, as a lapse of taste.

3. Comparative evidence: the seat

The scale of the chair, and more particularly the height of the seat (36.5 cm) is quite different from another chair in The Metropolitan Museum which has a seat only 20–23 cm high. The difference is evidently explained by the fact that the first belongs to a man, the second to a woman. Although the use of lower seats for women is not apparent in earlier iconography, that of the New Kingdom provides ample evidence for it. In the earliest examples, dating to the first years of the Eighteenth Dynasty, women sit on low stools (more rarely chairs) with their legs curled under them (Pl. 33). In the case of later examples, where their feet are on the ground, their chairs are often so low that their knees are perched high above the level of the seat. Men are occasionally represented in the same way, but much more rarely, and always on low stools rather than chairs with backs. The preference of low

52 Davies, *Rekh-mi-Re*, pls. 37, 44, 51 (tables and stools); Tylor and Griffith, *Paherti*, pl. 3 (plain-legged chair with low back).
53 Cf. the following statement about the advent of the rocking chair of more recent times: "...the idea of fitting bends or rockers to the feet of chairs had not apparently occurred to anybody before the second half of the eighteenth century, or if it had it was not practically applied, possibly because the aura of dignity and power that surrounded chairs in mediaeval times and long after for bade any tampering with their static majesty" (John Gloag, *The Chair* [London 1964], p. 158). It is significant, in this connection, that rockers have enjoyed far greater popularity in America than in England, where the aura of dignity and power would have been felt more strongly.
55 The seats of men and women are normally represented on the same level in this period. When a smaller seat accompanies a larger one, as sometimes occurs on stelae of the Middle Kingdom, this is evidently to be attributed to a difference in scale: e.g., CG 20514, 20544, BM 559 (Simpson, *Terrace of the Great God*, pl. 18), Alnwick 1921 (ibid., pl. 48), Florence 2503 (ibid., pl. 51). In one case (CG 20518) a seated couple are shown on a smaller scale than the owner. Similar examples are known from the Old Kingdom: e.g., CG 1415, 1417, 1444.
56 MMA 19.3.32 (Lansing, *BMMA* 15, July 1920, Pt. II, fig. 3, p. 14). Other examples: G. Jéquier, *Mastabat Farawun* (Cairo 1928), fig. 28, p. 33; Theban Tomb 12 (MMA Neg. T 3720); BM 218 (Hall, *Humayuyu Texts VII*, pl. 10). Cf. also MMA 12.182.3 (Hayes, *Seper II*, fig. 93), now considered a forgery, but undoubtedly copied from a genuine original.
57 E.g., MMA 15.2.4 (Hayes, *Seper II*, fig. 91); Davies, *Rekh-mi-Re*, pl. 64; Davies, *Ramose*, pls. 9, 10; Annalies and Artur Brack, *Das Grab des Tjuiuni* (Mainz 1977), pl. 21 (a); E. Driobek and M. Abdel Razik, *Grab des Sobekkhatep* (Mainz 1990), pl. 28 (b); Berlin 14122 (Spiegelberg and Erman, *ZÄS* 36 [1898], pl. 17, a stool).
58 Most frequently workers on low stools: Davies, *Rekh-mi-Re*, pls. 50, 52–55; Norman Davies, *Tomb of Two Officials*, pls. 8, 10; Menkhpeperasem (London 1933) pl. 11; Nina Davies, *Private Tombs IV*, (Oxford 1963), p. 9. But one banquet scene shows men thus, on low stools, while the women crouch on mats: Davies and Gardiner, *Amenhem*, pl. 15; in Davies, *Rekh-mi-Re*, pl. 109, a single example of the same kind follows a row of men who sit on full-sized chairs; and yet another isolated example appears at the beginning of a row of women, all on low stools: K. Dyroff and B. Pörtner, *Aegyptische Grabsteine II: München* (Strasbourg 1904), pl. 13 [19]).
4. Comparative evidence: the back

Although straight-backed chairs are known from representations as early as the Archaic Period, the curved reclining back, supported by stiles, is not attested with certainty before the reign of Sesostris I, when it was represented twice in the tomb of In-it-fīqr and Znt at Thebes (Pl. 35). A chair from Naga ed-Deir showing this feature was initially dated to the Second or Third Dynasty and subsequently attributed to a tomb of the Eleventh Dynasty, but it has now proven to come from another tomb that contained a stela of about that date, along with some material belonging to the early New Kingdom. A radiocarbon test has recently supported the later alternative, for it indicates an adjusted calendar age of 1880–1450 BC.

40 For the correct provenance of the chair I am indebted to Patricia V. Podzorski, who found a numbered drawing of it on one of Reisner’s tomb cards, listing the tomb number as N 3746; she reports that the field notes for N 3746 indicate that the chair and a stool were found within a pit in chamber C. This pit contained a stela of the late Heracleopolitan Period or early Eleventh Dynasty (Dunham, Naga Ed-Deir Stela, no. 30) and other material of the same period. The New Kingdom material includes pottery, two conical game pieces, one of faience and one of ivory, flat disk beads of purple/black glass and a scarab of early New Kingdom type. Dr. Norick has kindly supplied a photograph, not shown here, and the dimensions: the height is 69 cm, width 43 cm, the depth of the seat 42 cm and the height of the seat (to the top of the rails) 27.5 cm. The lowness of the seat suggests that it may have belonged to a woman.

41 See note 22 above.

42 See note 22 above.

43 Davies, Antiquit., pl. 25 (shown here, from MMA neg. T 1373), 30.


45 In my article “Stuhl,” LA VI, col. 93 and n. 14; similarly L’écriture et l’art, p. 189. This attribution is to be blamed on the ineptness of my initial query to Dr. Frank Norick, which produced a subsequent confusion between the fragments from N 3705 (see n. 23 above) and the more complete chair (Hearst Museum of Archaeology, University of California 6-2062).
for the arrangement of slats in the back, but this is to be seen in a straight-backed chair placed within one of the model boats of Mkt-Rṣ, dating to the end of the Eleventh Dynasty (Pl. 36), while a reclining back with similar slats is represented in a chair placed within another model boat, dating to the Twelfth Dynasty (Pl. 37). This miniature chair again has straight legs as well as a considerable amount of painted detail, including the webbing of the seat and the distribution of dowels. It also provides firm Middle Kingdom evidence for the two stiles and the center brace between them, which are prefigured in the vertical reinforcement of straight backs of Fourth Dynasty chairs from the tomb of Queen Htp-hr-kā, A full scale example of this type of chair is also known from the Middle Kingdom, as described by Petrie in his account of his excavations at El Lahun:

One beautifully made chair is formed of dark wood with ivory pegs in the back. The back was curved, and formed of vertical slips joined together in a top and bottom bar; this all slanted somewhat backwards, and was maintained in place by two [sic] upright struts behind it which joined it at the top, thus forming an acute triangle in side view. The angles of this, as of other chairs, were strengthened by L-angle pieces cut of selected curve-grained wood, and carefully pinned on with a large number of wooden pins.

Petrie provides no illustration, and it has not been possible to discover where the chair is at present. The same was true, for some years, of the remnants of a chair which, along with many other pieces of furniture, was found in a Theban burial dated either to the end of the Seventeenth or the very beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty. William C. Hayes describes it as follows:

What was once a handsome chair is now represented only by numerous fragments of its dark wood veneer and ebony and ivory overlay. The decoration of the back of the chair evidently consisted of alternating vertical bands of ebony and ivory topped by a horizontal panel of ivory, some sixteen inches in length, on which was engraved the winged sun’s disk flanked on either side by the sun god’s epithet “the Behdetite,” written in monumental hieroglyphs. Other bits of the chair... include the ivory overlays for the angle braces joining the back to the seat, thin strips of hardwood veneer which had served as edging for the back and seat, and a great quantity of small notched pieces of ebony inlay of undetermined use.

Some of these pieces are now the in the American Museum of Natural History, New York (Pl. 38). Although the presence of the winged disk seems to indicate that the chair

---

49 MMA 12.183.4. The entire boat is illustrated in Hayes, Scepter I, fig. 179.
50 See note 12 above.
51 Petrie, Kahun, Gurob and Hawara (London 1891), p. 24 (41); more briefly described in his Ten Years Digging in Egypt (New York 1892), p. 117.
52 I have not been able to locate this chair in the Cairo Museum, nor has Edna Russmann, who kindly consulted the Journal d’Entrée on my behalf. Inquiries to the Topographical Bibliography and University College have likewise been fruitless, although University College has a few angle braces from the same source: U.C. 7112-4 (W.M.F. Petrie, Objects of Daily Use [London 1927], p. 46 [46-28], also a "slip of veneer from an angle piece" (ibid., 29)).
53 Hayes, Scepter II, p. 28. A sketch of some of the pieces, among notes made for this work, has been located by Marsha Hill; here the provenance is given as S.A.Pṣ-Pit 3 in Lansing’s Court Tomb.
54 Again determined through Marsha Hill’s work on the departmental archives; they were sold in 1958, during the disposal of Egyptian antiquities which had been decreed by Francis Henry Taylor before his retirement as director in 1955.
belonged to a member of the royal family, the pattern of ivory and ebony in this example may nonetheless be identical to that of the chair under discussion and suggests that the date may also be similar. Otherwise the use of large overlays of ivory, recalling that of some small chests of the Twelfth Dynasty, might lead one to assign it to this earlier period. The top of a fragmentary chair in the Metropolitan Museum, of similar date and provenance (Pl. 39) has a single slat, inlaid with ivory, as are the siderails, and the back is also framed by a thin strip of ivory inlaid in a wider strip of ebony. Later chairs of the Eighteenth Dynasty generally display ivory much more sparingly, in the form of small elements such as concentric circles or flowers. A miniature chair from the tomb of Tutankhamun again has alternating slats of ebony and ivory, but the ivory panels are framed and the transverse element above them contains a more complex pattern of inlay. The effect is less austere—one might even say finicky.

5. Comparative evidence: the materials

The use of ivory in chairs having been discussed, it remains to be observed that African blackwood is a species of rosewood (French palissandre) and, like the other species, is dark reddish brown, richly grained with black layers and occasional layers of much lighter hue, as may be seen to best advantage in Plate 29. It is not mentioned by Lucas, but I have observed some other examples in Eighteenth Dynasty furniture—notably the fragmentary bed attributed to Queen Hatshepsut, in the British Museum, and a bed from the tomb of the parents-in-law of Amenophis III.

6. The Representation on the back

The representation and inscription of the owner, on the central slat of the backrest (Pl. 40) is the only non-royal example known to me that appears on a functional chair—one that would have withstood actual use, and was not designed as an insubstantial piece of tomb equipment. Funerary formulae appear on the chair of Hfr in Turin, which is equally serviceable, but the inscriptions and decorations on the back, imitating inlay, are simply painted, and would not have withstood much use. The chair of Sennetm in Cairo likewise bears inscriptions identifying him on the crestrails and upper part of the back, but this

---

55 It appears on the headrail of Zet-Imu’s throne: CG 51112 (Theodore Davis et al., Tomb of Iouita and Touiyou, pl. 33), and on the headrail of a chair of King Tutankhamun (Carter, Tut-ankh-Amen I, pls. 60–61).
56 Fischer, L’écriture et l’art, pls. 50 (MMA 16.1.1), 51 (MMA 16.1.2), 55 (MMA 26.7.1438); for the last two see also Hayes, Septet I, figs. 155, 157.
57 MMA 25.7.3908A. Width 44 cm.
58 E.g., Brooklyn 37.40E (Baker, op. cit., pl. 173); Louvre 2950 (ibid., pl. 176); BM 2480 (ibid., pl. 184).
59 Carter, op. cit. I, pl. 59.
61 See n. 20 above.
62 Cairo CG 51110: Theodore Davis et al., Tomb of Iouita and Touiyou, pl. 37.
63 Ernesto Schiaparelli, La Tomba intatta dell’architetto Cha (Turin 1927), p. 113; Baker, op. cit., fig. 160.
flimsy piece of furniture was evidently made expressly for the tomb.⁶⁴ That is also true of a fragmentary example in the Louvre, where the owner and his wife are represented in a painted scene at the very top of the back, receiving offerings from a daughter (Pl. 41a).⁶⁵ A few folding chairs are inscribed with the name of the owner on one of the legs,⁶⁶ but this inconspicuous sort of identification is hardly comparable.

In the present case the simplicity of the composition is thoroughly in keeping with the austere style of the adjacent inlay—so much so that it is difficult to believe that they are not contemporaneous. A minute examination of the splats veneered with African blackwood precludes the possibility that the central one has been substituted, and it seems almost certain that the veneer was already applied when the carving was executed. This is indicated by one of the blackwood pegs, located at the bottom of the owner’s kilt, just above the chair he sits in, for the peg would not have been inserted at this point after the carving had been made; as it is, the head of it is bevelled to correspond to the contour of the kilt. This peg has expanded slightly above the surrounding surface, just as have the pegs on the other slats. It is difficult to conceive of such fine work having been executed after the central slat was put in place; the projecting seat would have made that task rather awkward. The presence of an offering formula does not necessarily indicate that the inscription was not present during the owner’s lifetime,⁶⁷ nor does the epithet msr ḫrw “justified” after his name.⁶⁸ It is true that the carving does not show signs of wear, but it is uncertain how much wear should be expected.⁶⁹ It may be shown, moreover, that the representation belongs to the same period that is suggested by the similar ivory decoration of a fragmentary chair dating to the very beginning of the New Kingdom.

7. The Representation: the figure of the owner

The owner is seated upon a chair that is virtually identical to the one on which he is represented; the only difference is that it lacks braces in front of the crestrails. He wears the short

---

⁶⁴ Cairo J 27256; ibid., fig. 179.
⁶⁵ Louvre A.F. 538 + N 3312. I am indebted to J.J. Vandier for the photographs and his permission to use them here.
⁶⁶ Harris, Acta Orientalia 37 (1976), 21 ff., discusses two examples, both dating to the Eighteenth Dynasty (cf. n. 68 below); a third example is to be recognized in Brooklyn Museum 37. 446E, another leg that clearly belonged to a folding stool. I am indebted to Richard Fazzini for data concerning this example. A fourth example is in the Leiden Museum: Leemans, Monuments égyptiens II (1842), no. H. 551, pl. 74 (cf. Hayes, JEA, 24 [1938], 12). Yet another example is given by Birch, Catalogue of Egyptian Antiquities in Altwick Castle (London 1880), p. 77 (no. 527), but the inscription is doubted.
⁶⁷ The clearest evidence for this is provided by the inscriptions on the door frames of habitations of the New Kingdom (Bernard Bruyère, Rapport sur les fouilles de Deir el Medina [1934–1935] [Cairo 1939], pp. 40–45; Manfred Bietak, Proceedings of the British Academy 65 [1979], 230 and pl. 2B). Cf. a late New Kingdom staff, the inscription of which seems to be worn by use; it begins n ḫn ḫn and concludes with the epithet msr ḫrw (MMF 13 [1978], 31); also the same phrases on gold and silver vessels from Tell Basta (Simpson, AJA 63 [1959], 34 f.).
⁶⁸ It is clear that msr ḫrw was applied to the living prior to the New Kingdom (JNES 16 [1957], p. 225, n. 12). Later evidence is provided by Spalinger, JNES 38 (1979), 272 and n. 6; see also the preceding note and T. Eric Peet et al., The City of Akhenaten I (London 1923), pp. 8, 145. In the case of the legs of folding stools, described by Harris (n. 66 above), the name is followed by msr ḫrw. It seems doubtful that they were inscribed for the tomb.
⁶⁹ Especially since a cloth was frequently laid over the
8. The Representation: the \textit{k}t-emblem

The most remarkable feature of the representation is the \textit{k}t-emblem on a standard, toward which the owner extends a hand in the traditional gesture that the deceased makes when back; for an Old Kingdom example see Blackman, \textit{Meir IV}, pl. 14. For the Middle Kingdom see Lange-Schäfer, \textit{Grab- und Denkstätte III}, pls. 95 (608-609, 612), 96 (621); Newberry, \textit{Beni Hassan I}, pl. 29 (carrying chair). For the New Kingdom see Davies, \textit{Ken-Amün}, pl. 56; Nefer-hetep, pls. 25, 26, 29.

For some exceptions, where the ear is covered, see Norman Davies, \textit{Five Theban Tombs} (London 1913), pl. 30; Hayes, \textit{Scepter I}, fig. 114 (clearly patterned on older Memphite models); Lange-Schäfer, \textit{Grab- und Denkstätte IV}, pls. 62-63; Dunham, \textit{Naga ed-Dir Stelae}, no. 7 (temp. Amenemhet III).

In the earlier Old Kingdom the tomb owner simply receives the lotus from an attendant (e.g., Junker, \textit{Giza III}, pl. 2; VI, fig. 13: VII, fig. 71); for Old Kingdom scenes in which the owner smells the lotus see Junker, \textit{Giza VI}, fig. 104; Moussa and Altenmüller, \textit{Nianchchnun}, fig. 20; Kanawati, \textit{El-Hawaish VI}, fig. 9; Cairo J 43370 (false door of \textit{Qr}, Edfu); Simpson, \textit{Western Cemetery}, fig. 42. On Eleventh Dynasty stela men usually hold a jar of ointment rather than the lotus; MMA 57.95 is an exception (\textit{JNES} 19 [1960], pl. 7). For the Twelfth Dynasty see Pfüger, \textit{JAOS} 67 (1947), 130 (5), 132, n. 25.

E.g., on stelae with an otherwise similar representation: Winlock, \textit{BMMA} 18 (Dec. 1923, Pt. 2), 36; Smither and Dakin, \textit{JEA} 25 (1939), pl. 21 (5); CG 34107, 34114, 34119; J.E. Quibell, \textit{Ramesseum} (London 1898), pl. 27 (5).

E.g., Bosticco, \textit{Steil II}, pls. 1, 6, 14; Boeser, \textit{Beschr. aus Sammig II}, pl. 18 (18), VI, pls. 5 (9), 9 (6); Alexander Moret, \textit{Catalogue du Musée Guimet: Galerie Égyptienne} (Paris 1909), pls. 14 (15), 16 (18); A. Wiedemann and B. Pörtner, \textit{Ägyptische Gräbersteine III} (Strasbourg 1906), pl. 3 (6); Berlin (West) 9610 (Werner Kaiser et al., \textit{Ägyptisches Museum Berlin} (Berlin 1967), no. 640); CG 34008, 34105, 34109, 34110; BM 1370 (\textit{Hier. Text V}, pl. 20; Petrie and Brunton, \textit{Sedment II}, pl. 50 (frontispiece); Turin Suppl. no. 9492 (Ernesto Scamuzzi, \textit{Egyptian Art} [New York 1965], pl. 53). In a number of other cases the kilt has been lost: e.g., W.M.F. Petrie, \textit{Six Temples at Thebes} (London 1897), pl. 9 (1); \textit{Labyrinth, Gerzeh, Mazghunah} (London 1912), pl. 20 (13).

Tytor, \textit{Renni}, pl. 8. Some of the stelae cited in the
seated in the presence of offerings. As early as the First Dynasty this hieroglyph is similarly dignified by being placed on the standard that supports the emblems of divinities, and toward the end of the Sixth Dynasty the phrase n kꜣ NN (with or without the standard) makes its first appearance in offering scenes, to link the funerary formula with the name of the recipient. A more direct precursor of the present motif is to be found in a Twelfth Dynasty coffin, where the emblem is introduced at the beginning of the “frieze of offerings.” Since it is oriented towards the tomb owner, and in opposition to the inscription above the frieze, which concludes with his name, I cannot accept Jéquier’s idea that this emblem represents the deceased himself. It is true that the kꜣ-emblem in the case at hand is indeed oriented as he is, but the comparative evidence of the New Kingdom shows that this circumstance is exceptional.

It is only when we come to the beginning of the New Kingdom that really close parallels can be found for the motif in question. The earliest of these, in a tomb at El Kab, dates to the reign of Tuthmosis I (Figure 5). A large-scale representation of ḫꜣ is placed between the offering table and the deceased, facing him, and his gesture, which is identical to that shown on the back of the chair, is appropriately described as “extending a hand towards his kꜣ.” The offering table similarly accompanies the kꜣ-emblem on a false door made by Hatshepsut for Tuthmosis I and on two false doors of non-royal persons, both dating to the reign of Tuthmosis III. A further example occurs in a tomb belonging to the reign of Amenophis II.

In all five of these parallel cases the kꜣ-emblem is empty-handed, apparently serving as an intermediary between the deceased and his offerings, whereas later examples, from the reign of Amenophis III onward, place the offerings between the arms of the kꜣ-emblem. Once this development had occurred, the motif evidently became more popular. At least four occurrences are known from tombs dating to the reign of Amenophis III or Amenophis III–IV, or slightly later, while no fewer than ten are known from those of the preceding note also provide good comparisons: e.g., Moret, op. cit.; Wiedemann and Pörtner, op. cit. Cf. also Sotheby Catalogue, June 1921 (Anmehser Coll.), pl. 4 (191); Brooklyn 07.420 (Richard Fazzini, Art of Ancient Egypt [Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York, 1971], no. 14). This feature persists later in the same dynasty: e.g., Hayes, Scepter II, figs. 166, 167.

Ursula Schweitzer, Das Wesen des Ka im Diissies und jenseits der alten Ägypter (Glückstadt 1956), p. 22, figs. 2–3.

Ibid., p. 81.

Georg Steindorff, Grabfunde des Mittleren Reichs in den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin II: Der Sarg des Sekh-ı (Berlin 1901), pl. 2. A second, almost identical example is to be found in R. Engelbach, Riqqah and Memphis VI, pl. 23; here no stand is visible, but the position of ḫꜣ suggests that a very low one is to be restored.

Jéquier, Friese d’objets, p. 339.

The apparent Old Kingdom example of a kꜣ-emblem filled with offerings shown by Kamal, ASAE 15 (1915), 298, actually represents a basket in the form of a boat; cf. the more accurate copy of Blackman, Meir IV, pl. 9. In a later Twelfth Dynasty tomb in the same cemetery a kꜣ-emblem on a standard appears before the deceased in an unclear context, but it is not located immediately before him in any case (Blackman and Apted, Meir VI, pl. 13 lintel above recess for statue).

81 After Weigall, ASAE 11 (1911), 173.
83 Boeser, Beschr. ang. Sammlg. VI, pl. 18 (28); CG 34047 (Davies, Pueyren II, pls. 48, 51 [B]).
84 Davies, Ken-Amun, p. 55.
85 Oriental Institute Epigraphic Survey, Tomb of Khufu (Chicago 1980), pls. 67, 70, 72; Norman Davies, Tomb of Two Sculptors, pls. 18, 27, 29 (two examples, including CG 34051); Ramose (New York 1941), pl. 19; Nefer-hetep, pl. 19 (A). The last seems to be as late as the reign of Ay.
Nineteenth Dynasty (e.g. Pl. 42a). And in one of these ten cases (Pl. 43) the motif appears three times, and not only before the deceased and his forebears, but also before Osiris and other divinities.

This motif has been linked—mistakenly, I believe—with spell 105 in the Book of the Dead, the "spell for propitiating the kꜣ of NN," which speaks of censing and giving libation to the kꜣ. The accompanying vignettes show the deceased standing in an attitude of respect or, more usually, adoration; in at least one case incense and a libation are offered, as the text indicates, but the emphasis of the text is not on nourishment. In some cases, to be sure, the kꜣ-emblem is filled with offerings, but these may be influenced by the late New

86 The one illustrated is from Theban Tomb 178 (MMA neg. T 1856). Several examples of this motif, including some of those cited above, are listed by M. Abdel-Qader Muhammed, The Development of the Funerary Beliefs and Practices Displayed in the Private Tombs of the New Kingdom at Thebes (Cairo 1966), pp. 105-106, and two of them, dating to Ramesses II are unpublished: Tombs 35 and 157. For the rest see Siegfried Schott, Wall Scenes from the Mortuary Chapel of the Mayor Paser (Chicago 1957), pl. 1; Keith Seele, Tomb of Tjener (Chicago 1959), pl. 11 (cf. Walter Wreszinski, Bericht [Halle a.d. Saale 1927], pl. 73); Davies, Seven Private Tombs (New York 1948), pl. 28; Boeser, op. cit., pl. 3 (12); Cairo J 8386 (described without accession number by Weigall, loc. cit.); Davies, Two Ramesside Tombs (New York 1927), pl. 5.

87 Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, Inv. Nr. 126. I am indebted to Dr. E. Haslauer for bringing this stela to my attention and supplying me with a photograph, and to her and Dr. Satzinger for allowing me to reproduce it here.

88 Mohamed Saleh, Das Totenbuch in den thebanischen Beamtengräbern des Neuen Reiches (Mainz 1984), pp. 55-56.

89 Édouard Naville, Das ägyptische Todtenbuch (Berlin 1886), pl. 117 (P d).

90 It is empty in the preceding reference and loc. cit. (P c), as also in a tomb at Deir el Medineh: Henri Wild, Le Tombe de Nífer-hotep (I) et Néb-nefer (Cairo 1979), pl. 5. It is filled with offerings in R. Lepsius, Das Todtenbuch der Ägypter (Leipzig 1842), pl. 38; Paul Barguet, Le Livre des Morts (Paris 1967), p. 140 (Louvre I 3248 [111]); Thos. George Allen, The Egyptian Book of the Dead (Chicago 1966), pls. 29-30, 72. Probably another example is to be recognized in G.A. Gaballa, The Memphis Tomb of Mose (Warminster 1977), pl. 30.
Kingdom version of the motif under discussion. This influence appears more clearly in three Twenty-first Dynasty copies of the Book of the Dead. In two cases the $k$-emblem, filled with offerings, is given by the deceased to Osiris, as already attested in the Nineteenth Dynasty stela mentioned earlier; in the other the deceased is twice shown seated before a similar representation of offerings, one of which is labelled $\begin{array}{c} k \end{array} \begin{array}{c} t \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} t \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} k \end{array} \begin{array}{c} t \end{array} \begin{array}{c} k \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} t \end{array} \begin{array}{c} k \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} t \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} t \end{array} \begin{array}{c} k \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} t \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} w \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \end{array} \begin{array{...um mit allen Göttern zu ziehen, die die Nahrung dort machen." For the titles that follow the epithet "Osiris" see Jaroslav Cerný, A Community of Workmen at Thebes (Cairo 1973), p. 132.

95 In v. 91–92 and Schweitzer, op. cit., p. 68.

96 An exception occurs on an axehead from a foundation deposit of Thutmose III: Petrie, Koptos, pl. 15 (68), a later one in Pl. 45 below.


98 D. Randall-Maciver and C.L. Woolley, Buhen (Philadelphia 1911), pl. 35, in the emblem of Min.
9. The inscription

The inscription is presented in six columns: (1) A gift which the king gives, and Amun, Lord of Karnak, (2) that offerings go forth (including) bread, beer, oxen and fowl, alabaster (jars of ointment), clothing, incense and oil, offerings (3) of food and everything (4) goodly and pure that comes forth in the presence of (5) the Lord of the Gods (scil. Amun) in the course of every day (6) to the Loving Son of the Lord of the Two Lands, the Scribe Rn.(i)-snb, justified.

From this it may be surmised that the provenance is Thebes. The commonplace title “scribe” is preceded by one that is attested here for the first time in this particular form, and its significance is difficult to define with certainty. Zs-mry.f “loving son”99 is known from an Old Kingdom titulary,100 where the context does not clarify the meaning, and from several later references, dating to the Middle Kingdom and later. In the Twelfth Dynasty it refers to the priest who impersonated Horus in the ritualistic dramatization of the rescue of his father Osiris from his enemies.101 From the New Kingdom onward it designated a funerary priest who was primarily concerned with the opening-of-the-mouth ritual, but was included in other rituals as well.102 Here it may mean that Rn.(i)-snb participated in the funerary rituals of a deceased king. In the Late Period it designated the high priest of Heracleopolis,103 but that can hardly be so in the present case, and the adjunct nb tvy, to be discussed presently, certainly refers to the king rather than to a god.

The inscription is executed in a linear style that is characteristic of hieroglyphs incised in metal, wood or occasionally hard stone.104 In the present case, ḫḥ, ʾēḥ and ḫḥ are the most distinctive examples, as well as ḫḥ, with tufted “ears.” On the other hand, ḫḥ has the normal form rather than ḫḥ, and there is less use of stippling or hatching within the signs than is frequently the case. In general the use of this style precludes any palaeographic indications of dating; there is almost nothing about the aforementioned signs that might not be expected in inscriptions of either the Twelfth or Eighteenth Dynasty. But the top of the pen-case in ḫḥ suggests the later period; cf. p. 224 below.

Some details of phrasing and orthography are likewise suggestive of the New Kingdom, but in all such cases Middle Kingdom examples may also be cited. Thus the group ẖḥ ẖḥ ḫḥ, loved/whom thou lovest.” According to the Wb. Belegstellen III, p. 118 (to p. 410 [4]) Theban Tomb 106 (temp. Seti I–Ramesses II) shows this priest purifying the deceased. Further evidence of such activities is to be found in Theban Tomb 33 (Dyn. XXVI); Johannes Duemichen, Der Graftpilast des Pataumnesf (Leipzig 1884–94) II, pls. 4–5.

99 For the translation cf. Gardiner, Grammar, p. 145 and n. 2a; the interpretation as “his beloved son” is still used occasionally (e.g., Miriam Lichtheim, Ancient Egyptian Literature I [Berkeley 1973], p. 124), but should be discarded.
100 Murray, Sapphina Masabas II, pl. 3.
101 CG 20538 (II e 3); CG 20539 (II b 7).
102 Davies and Gardiner, Amenemhet, pl. 7 and pp. 59–60; Davies, Rekh-mi-Re, pls. 106–107 and p. 77. In both cases he performs the opening-of-the-mouth ritual. Jéquier, BIFAO 19 (1922), 170, aptly cites Pyr. 11 and 15 in this connection, but these passages refer to “thy son thy belo

103 Wb. III, 410 (6); Pascal Vernus, Atrehis, p. 77 (c); Moh. Gamal El-Din Mokhtar, Iḥnāya el-Medina (Cairo 1983), pp. 196–97.
104 Caminos and Fischer, Epigraphy and Palaeography, pp. 40–42.
is known from the reign of Tuthmosis III, but \( \text{\textcopyright} \) occurs in inscriptions of the late Middle Kingdom or Dyn. XIII, as does \( \text{\textcopyright} \), although the latter became more common thereafter. Similarly the writing of \( \text{\textcopyright} \) is said to be attested from the Middle Kingdom onward, no examples are given, and I know of only one Middle Kingdom example, which again may be either late Twelfth or Thirteenth Dynasty. This writing certainly became more common in the Eighteenth Dynasty. The same is true of the independent use of \( \text{\textcopyright} \), which is known at least as far back as the end of Dynasty XI, while the close grouping of in this phrase is known both from the Middle and New Kingdom.

According to the Wörterbuch, the phrase \( \text{\textcopyright} \) occurs only occasionally in titles and epithets of the Middle Kingdom, with a single example cited of each; it is again said to have become more common in the New Kingdom. The last statement is true, but I have collected 16 Middle Kingdom examples, ranging in date from the end of Dynasty XI to the end of Dynasty XII (Excursus I). These might well be interpreted as epithets in every case, and it was probably only in the New Kingdom that the phrase was added to titles.

The name \( \text{\textcopyright} \) was, conversely, most commonly used in the Middle Kingdom, although a few occurrences are known from the end of the Second Intermediate Period and from the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty.

In short, the evidence of the inscription, taken together, offers further support for dating the chair early in the Eighteenth Dynasty, even though this evidence is less conclusive than the indications that have been adduced previously.

**Excursus: Middle Kingdom epithets referring to \( \text{\textcopyright} \)**

1. \( \text{\textcopyright} \) “who is in the heart of Horus, Lord of the Two Lands.” Blackman, , pl. 19 (temp. Amenemhet II)
2. \( \text{\textcopyright} \) “revered with the Lord of the Two Lands.” CG 20476, a 5

---

106 Cf. Wh. IV, 541; e.g., CG 20694; John Garstang, *El Arisab*, pl. 8 (E 236, E 345), Bologna CS 1937 (Simpson, *Terrace of the Great God*, pl. 73).
107 For the entire group see Boeser, Beschr. aeg. Samml. II, pl. 24: Berlin 7732 (Aeg. Inschr. I, p. 205); CG 20003; Munich GL WAF 34 (Simpson, op. cit., pl. 63).
108 Wh. V, 569.
109 Louvre C 43. Note, however, that even before the end of the Eleventh Dynasty writings such as and appear in two stelae of the same individual: Clère and Vandier, *TPPI*, § 32 (5), § 33 (6).
110 Wh. II, 227 (7), citing CG 20693 for the Middle Kingdom (“Osiris, lord of all the gods”); e.g., Louvre C 170 (temp. Sesostris I) where Osiris is “the Great God, lord of the gods.”
111 Clère and Vandier, *TPPI*, § 33 (6).
112 E.g., CG 20003, 20515, 20539 (I, b 4), 20720.
113 E.g., CG 34003, 34025 (recto, last line) 34119; Bosticco, Stele II, pl. 11.
115 Rank, PN I, 222 (26); for examples of Dyn. XVII see Bosticco, Stele I, pl. 51; Winklock, JEA 10 (1924), 219, n. 1; Frankfort, JEA 16 (1930), 219 and pl. 28; Northampton, Spiegelberg and Newberry, *Teubner Nekropolis* (London 1908), p. 17 (9), pl. 16 (10-11).
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(3) -Encoding -Encoding “who does what the Lord of the Two Lands praises.” Siút I, 215–16 (Montet, Kémi 3 [1930–35], 45; temp. Sesostris I)

(4) (same) BM 582, Hieroglyphic Texts III, pl. 22 (first half of Dyn. XII)

(5) (same) BM 557, ibid., II, pl. 3 (year 25, Amenemhet III)

(6) (same) BM 569, ibid., pl. 19 (temp. Amenemhet II)

(7) -Encoding -Encoding “whose excellence was seen by the Lord of the Two Lands.” CG 20538, I, c 3 (temp. Amenemhet III)

(8) -Encoding -Encoding “firm of sandal, easy of gait, adhering to the ways of the Lord of the Two Lands.” Louvre C 176 (Simpson, Terrace of the Great God, pl. 32)

(9) -Encoding -Encoding “possessor of reverence of the Lord of the Two Lands.” W.F.M. Petrie, Lahun II (London 1923), pl. 28 (temp. Sesostris III)

(10) -Encoding -Encoding “whose kš was provided by the Lord of the Two Lands.” BM 1213 (Hieroglyphic Texts III, pl. 12; Simpson, op. cit., pl. 31, temp. Sesostris III)

(11) -Encoding -Encoding “whose authority was granted by the Lord of the Two Lands.” Siút I, 153, 221, 243 (Montet, Kémi 1 [1928], 65; III, 46, 51; temp. Sesostris I)

(12) (same) K. Sethe, Ägyptische Lesestücke (Leipzig, 1928), p. 82 (18); Simpson, loc. cit. (temp. Sesostris III)

(13) -Encoding -Encoding “Privy to the secret of the Lord of the Two Lands.” Louvre C 243 (RdE 24 [1972], pl. 7 B: year 14 Amenemhet II)

(14) -Encoding -Encoding “Privy to the secret of the king’s repast as the one who arranges the tables of the Lord of the Two Lands.” MMA 26.7.1438 (Carnarvon and Carter, Five Years’ Explorations, pl. 49; temp. Amenemhet IV)

(15) -Encoding -Encoding “director of the affairs of the Lord of the Two Lands.” Couyat-Montet, Hammâmât, no. 113 (8) (temp. Mentuhotep Nb-tiwy-Rš)

(16) -Encoding -Encoding “who gives offerings to the Lord of the Two Lands.” MMA 26.7.1438 (Carnarvon and Carter, loc. cit.; temp. Amenemhet IV)
Plate 27. Metropolitan Museum 68.58
Purchase, Patricia R. Lasalle Gift, 1968
A Chair of the Early New Kingdom

Plate 28. Metropolitan Museum 68.58
Plate 29. Detail of Metropolitan Museum 68.58
A Chair of the Early New Kingdom

Plate 30. Detail of Metropolitan Museum 68.58
Plate 31a. Rear view of Metropolitan Museum 68.58, before restoration

Plate 31b. Rear view after restoration
Plate 33. Metropolitan Museum 19.3.32
Rogers Fund, 1919
Plate 34. Theban Tomb no. 22. Photography by
The Egyptian Expedition of The Metropolitan Museum of Art
Plate 37. Chair from model boat, Metropolitan Museum 12.183.4
Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1912
Plate 38a–b. Fragments of ivory overlay from a chair

Courtesy American Museum of Natural History
Plate 39. Remains of a chair, Metropolitan Museum 25.3.308
Rogers Fund, 1925
Plate 40. Detail of Metropolitan Museum 68.58
Plate 41a. Louvre N 3312
Courtesy of the Museum

Plate 41b. Detail from tomb of Rnni,
El Kab, after Tylor
Plate 42a. Theban Tomb no. 178, Photography by The Egyptian Expedition of The Metropolitan Museum of Art

Plate 42b. Theban Tomb no. 359, Photography by The Egyptian Expedition of The Metropolitan Museum of Art
Plate 43. Vienna Inv. Nr. 126
Courtesy Kunsthistorisches Museum
14. Notes on Hieroglyphic Palaeography

1. The evolution of the signs for “herdsman” (A24, 25, 33, 47)

Gardiner, writing more than ninety years ago, could find no certain examples of $\text{qedj}$ (A47) for “herdsman” in hieroglyphic texts of the New Kingdom, apart from its use in the royal epithet $\text{hedj} \, \text{hedj}$ “the good herdsman.” And he observes that this sign was normally replaced by $\text{煦}$ (A33) in that period. In the meantime the Belegstellen volume of Wb. II, 75, makes it clear that $\text{kedj}$ continued to be used in other contexts, and that, in addition to $\text{ kedj}$, the form $\text{qj}$ (A24) or $\text{qj}$ (A25) was also used in the New Kingdom.

The Wörterbuch fails, however, to note that the last of these writings was already used for the word “herdsman” as early as the beginning of the Middle Kingdom, on two stelae of the early Twelfth Dynasty, one dated to the reign of Sesostris I. In both cases the writing is $\text{dje} \, \text{dje}$, and there can be no doubt of the meaning since, in each case, the individual to which this word is applied carries a calf. An Eleventh Dynasty example shows the more unusual variant $\text{dje} \, \text{dje} \, \text{dje}$. Furthermore at least one occurrence of $\text{kedj}$ is known from the Twelfth Dynasty; it very probably belongs to a personal name $\text{kedj} \, \text{dje} \, \text{dje}$ rather than to the title “herdsman,” but the reading and meaning are in any case the same. This is less surprising than it may seem, since the iconography of scenes in earlier and contemporary tombs provides

---

1 ZÄS 42 (1905), 119.
3 Theban Tombs 56 (Urk. IV, 1477 [9], temp. Amenophis II); 127 (Urk. IV, 512 [11], temp. Tuthmosis III). Additional examples: Tylor, Renmi, pl. 4 (temp Amenophis I); Tylor and Griffith, Paheri, pl. 7; Norman Davies, Five Theban Tombs, pl. 39 (both ca. temp. Tuthmosis III); Davies, Private Tombs, pls. 1, 2; Davies, Rasine, pl. 26 (temp. Amenophis III); Norman Davies and F.L. Macadam, Corpus of Inscribed Egyptian Funerary Cones (Oxford 1957), no. 212.
4 One unidentified example in Belegstellen, in addition to which see G. Steinbodeff, Catalogue of Egyptian Sculpture in the Walters Art Gallery, pl. 52, no. 281; Gardiner, Onomatikta II, p. 54* (the first a title, the latter a personal name, for which see Ranke, PNI, 151 [5], II, 360). Both these examples are early Dyn. XVIII. For later ones see Hieroglyphic Texts VIII, p. 24, second reg., 11 and pl. 21 (temp. Amenophis IV) and K. Kitchen, RJI, 39 (6) (CG 34501, temp. Seti I). These two cases refer to the god Re and to the king, respectively.
5 Turin stela Cat. 1534 (Maspero, Rec Trav. 3 [1887], 117, seen on the original); Boeser, Besch. avg. Samml. II, pl. 2 (no. 3) (temp. Sesostris I). For the branched stick cf. MMJ 12 (1977), 11, n. 34; also CG 20313 in $\text{dje}$ (trj).
6 MMJ 12 (1977), 22, fig. 35 (b).
7 CG 20457 (o). Lange and Schäfer provide no photograph, but May Trad has kindly checked this hieroglyph in the Cairo Museum, and it quite certainly has this form.
8 Apart from the fact that there is just enough space for the suggested restoration, one would not expect this “friend” of the owner to be a simple herdsman, since the other friends include two lector priests and a sculptor. For the name see n. 4 above.
parallels, even though the object carried at the end of the staff is rather different; in a relief from the late Old Kingdom this is ꜜ𓏺, i.e., the float carried by herdsmen traversing marshes and canals;9 in the Eleventh and Twelfth Dynasty tomb chapels at Beni Hasan it is replaced by a basket or jars, i.e., provisions.10 The form it takes in ꜜ𓏺 is probably borrowed from contemporary examples of ꜜ𓏺, where ꜜ replaces the goad that is held by their Old Kingdom counterpart.11

The Twelfth Dynasty occurrence of ꜜ𓏺 is nonetheless quite isolated, because there was little or no use of it before the end of the Eighteenth Dynasty (temp. Ay),12 although it was used somewhat earlier as a determinative of words for "wander."13 One might well expect further examples from this period, for the iconographic evidence from tomb scenes provides even closer parallels, from the reign of Tuthmosis III (Fig. 1).14 As in the Middle Kingdom parallels, the other hand holds a short stick, a detail that is known from a variant of the hieroglyph in the temple of Seti I at Abydos (Fig. 2).15 In the Nineteenth Dynasty, and later, the sign ꜜ𓏺 was used frequently,16 almost completely supplanting ꜜ𓏺 but not ꜜ𓏺, which is known from the beginning of the New Kingdom down to the reign of Seti I and even after.18 At either end of this span of time and particularly at the very end, it assumes the form ꜜ𓏺.19 The New Kingdom hieratic

For another example of about the same period (reign of Tuthmosis III) see Tylor and Griffith, Pahuiri, pl. 3; here the other hand holds a whip.

9 CG 1419 (see the drawing in Borchardt, Denkmäler des A.R. II, p. 101); for the float see Fischer, Calligraphy, p. 48.
10 Newberry, Beni Hasan I, pls. 13 (with stick in other hand) and 30; II, pl. 12 (again with stick in other hand, or a pair of jars on a pole supported by both hands).
11 E.g., ibid., pl. 8, 8 (6, 10), 17, 29 (19), 30. This may represent a piece of cloth; cf. the herdsmen in Newberry, Bersheh I, pls. 17, 18, who hold a stick in one hand and a cloth ([new hieroglyph]) in the other. For the Old Kingdom goad see Fischer, Calligraphy, p. 16 (A 47), where other forms of this sign are also noted. This object is replaced by ꜜ in an example of ꜜ for both mnw and ird, dating to the Hereleopolitan Period (note 24 below).
12 Davies, Nefer-hetep I, pl. 24.
13 Gardiner, Grammar, p. 445 (A33), citing Davies, Puyemre II, pl. 50, and Naville, Deir el-Bahari, pl. 113 for the verb ṛu "wander" and Urk. IV, 390 (8) for śmū "wanderers." For the latter see also Faulkner, Concise Dictionary, p. 266, translated "foreigners."
14 The example illustrated is from Davies, Puyemre I, pl. 12; in a register above this the other hand holds the ꜜ staff.
15 Two good examples are to be found in James, Hieroglyphic Texts IX, pls. 28 (no. 150), 49 (304); see also Kitchen, RF1, 311 (7); III, 449 (8); IV, 4 (5); V, 39 (12), 223 (7–8) and the Wb. Belgestellen. Also note the use of ꜜ in a Dyn. XXVI funerary text as determinative of phr "tamer." M. Bieta and E. Reiser-Hadlauer, Das Grab des Anch-her I (Vienna 1978), fig. 44, p. 119 and Plan 24.
16 Still exemplified in the reign of Horemhab: Urk. IV, 2174 (7).
17 Müller, op. cit., 142 f., notes a Dyn. XXII example: ZÄS 28 (1890), 40, and one of Dyn. XXV: Rec. Trav. 22 (1900), 128; the Belgestellen to Wb. II, 75, cite Louvre A 90 (Dyn. XXVI).
18 Earlier and later examples of n. 4 above. Also examples from Dyns. XXV–XXVI: Urk. III, 87 (5); Louvre A 90 (cited by Belgestellen to Wb. II, 75).
form $\text{\textcopyright}$ poses a problem, for it does not correspond to any of the foregoing signs; perhaps one should transcribe it as $\text{\textcopyright}$.²⁰

There are also a few further Nineteenth Dynasty variants of $\text{\textcopyright}$ such as $\text{\textcopyright}\text{\textcopyright}$ (apparently holding a stick in one hand, and a loop of rope or cloth in the other)²¹ and $\text{\textcopyright}$.²²

In hieroglyphic texts of all periods the sign for herdsman need not be followed by other signs except in the case of $\text{\textcopyright}$ which also has the value nht "strong," and had to be distinguished from the latter.²³ The sign $\text{\textcopyright}$ was used alone in the Old Kingdom; in the Middle Kingdom, when both $\text{\textcopyright}$ and $\text{\textcopyright}$ served for irdy "keeper" as well as irdy,²⁴ it was often followed by the phonetic complement $\text{\textcopyright}$.²⁵ In the early New Kingdom $\text{\textcopyright}$ was added; while the later variants of the additions include $\text{\textcopyright}$, $\text{\textcopyright}$ and $\text{\textcopyright}$.

The evidence for the writings of "herdsman" may be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O.K.</td>
<td>$\text{\textcopyright}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.K.</td>
<td>$\text{\textcopyright}\text{\textcopyright}$</td>
<td>rarely + $\text{\textcopyright}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyn. XVIII (to Ay)</td>
<td>$\text{\textcopyright}$</td>
<td>$\text{\textcopyright}$ + $\text{\textcopyright}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyn. XIX (and later)</td>
<td>$\text{\textcopyright}$</td>
<td>$\text{\textcopyright}$, etc. + $\text{\textcopyright}$, $\text{\textcopyright}$, $\text{\textcopyright}$ etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁰ For the sign in question see Möller, *Hieratische Paläographie* II, no. 45, as compared with 47 ($\text{\textcopyright}$); Möller states: "Die hieratischen Formen können nicht auf $\text{\textcopyright}$ zurückgehen. Sie stellen einen Mann dar, der einen Stock vor sich hält." Cf. Gardiner, *JEA* 15 (1929), 54. It is also distinct from hieratic $\text{\textcopyright}$, $\text{\textcopyright}$ however (Möller’s nos. 15, 16).

²¹ M. Baud and E. Drioton, *Tombeau de Panehsy* (MIFAO 57/2, Cairo 1932), fig. 22, following p. 42.

²² Kitchen, *RI* I, 65 (6); the same text has the normal form of $\text{\textcopyright}$, p. 66 (13). The unusual form is to be distinguished from $\text{\textcopyright}$ in Ch. Kuentz, *La face sud du massif est du pylone de Ramses II à Louxor* (Cairo 1971), pl. 21. This is followed by mnhu and the whole is evidently to be read hry mnhu "bearer of milk bottles," cf. Kitchen, *RI* II, 348 (3), where the sign is copied inaccurately. In other cases, dating to the Heracleopolitan Period and the New Kingdom, this sign is read hryy "gardener" (Fischer, *Dendera*, p. 153 [b] and n. 681), but a stela of the Heracleopolitan Period shows a shepherd carrying provisions much like the Rameside example in question (Petrie, *Denderah*, pl. 10, bottom center).

²³ As in a Middle Kingdom occurrence of the title $\text{\textcopyright}$ nht-hru (Spiegelberg-Pörter, *Aegyptische Grabsteine* I, no. 3; cf. Ward, *Index*, no. 837), or the writing of some New Kingdom names: Ranke, *PVI*, 209 (22); 210 (18); 211 (3) (also somewhat earlier: *ibid.*, 211 [1]).

²⁴ This usage goes back to the Heracleopolitan Period (Fischer, *Dendera*, p. 133, fig. 23 [5]).

²⁵ E.g., Newberry, *Beni Hasan* I, pls. 15, 17, 30, 35; Faulkner, *JEA* 37 (1951), 52.
2. The sign  as dual of  (D2) in the Old Kingdom

Elsewhere in this volume (p. 32) I have drawn attention to a title  which is to be read  as attested in another title or epithet which begins  “one who takes stock of the produce of the deserts.” As indicated in note 43 below, Seth took note of this usage as early as 1913, but he did not go into any detail, and his observation seems to have been overlooked by others, including myself.

Additional evidence is to be found in the Pyramid Texts, which regularly employ  for dual  while  is used for the singular. It is true that  is written  in Pyr. 119b, while the singular is  in 574b, but this interchange is rare. Often  alone expresses the dual, where a parallel version shows  (Pyr. 189b, 190b, 375a, 886) or  (1653a). In another case  appears in 1425a (P), while the other versions have  . The same distinction occurs in the funerary inscriptions of Bir at Saqqara, where  is written  in 27 and the singular is written  in three other cases the writing of  as  or  in a similar context, where the Western desert extends her arms to the deceased, and in another it is apparently  although the formula more usually shows  in inscriptions of the late Old Kingdom.

The same tendency to use  in place of  appears in variants of  tpw- , a term for “best quality” (of cloth): Edel has cited four cases that have  and one that has  . He also discusses the legend  in the tomb of Snb (Junker, Giza V, fig. 7 and p. 41) and a virtually identical parallel in LD II, 20a, agreeing with Junker that the meaning is “viewing the cloth of the weaver’s house,” but hesitating to read  as  . The evidence shown above removes all doubt on this point, but  is “production,” not a specific term for cloth. This is the same term (but written  ) that refers to the “production” of cloth by female servants in Blackman and Apted, Meir V, pl. 15.

There are also several cases where  “predecessors” is written  or  whereas at least two examples of  “before” show  . And there is a term

---

66 A variant of  and not  , which normally shows the shoulder in the Pyramid Texts.
68 JARSE 4 (1995), p. 29. Note that  is here distinguished by the form  in the phrase  iws(i) er- rmn.f “I will be his support.”
69 Cairo CG 1434: Simpson, Qur and Idu, fig. 35, and Fischer, JEA 67 (1981), 166. The third case, in Mereruka, pl. 26-27, 211, is a little out of the ordinary:  htp in zmt immt  r. s(n) (var. … in immt nfr  wny s RN on pl. 211) “welcome, welcome, says the western desert, her two arms towards them.” Marianne Eaton-Krauss, Representations of Statuaries (Wiesbaden 1984), pp. 65, 164, takes “them” to refer to statues being transported before the owner and his wife; the variant has “… says the good west, her two arms towards NN.”
70 Hassan, Giza II, fig. 208 and pl. 62, whereas Simpson, Western Cemetery I, p. 18 and fig. 16, clearly shows  .
71 Junker, Giza VIII, fig. 58; W.V. Davies et al., Saqqara Tomb I, p. 2; Hassan, Excavations at Saqqara III, figs. 37b, 39; CG 1403 ( ); Fischer, Coptite Nome, nos. 1, 2, 5, 6; Davies, Dir el Gebrawi II, pls. 8, 21; Petrie, Denderah, pl. 5A (C-D). But James and Apted, Khentka, pl. 19, evidently has . Cf. Lapp, Opterformel, § 96.
72 ZAS 102 (1979), 22.
73 Ibid., 27 f. Note that a third example of the same phrase occurs on the left reveal of the Louvre mastaba (not shown in Junker, Giza V, fig. 9; it appears in a register above this); see Christiane Ziegler, Le Mastaba d’Akhhethetep (Paris 1993), pp. 118-21.
74 James and Apted, Khentka, pl. 6 (D 8); Uruk, I, 222 (17); as shown in Meir IV, pl. 4, the arm looks like  but is slanted downwards to resemble  (as in examples such as Junker, Giza IX, fig. 107; Hassan, Giza VII, fig. 38). Cf.
hry-τυ, meaning "handkerchief, towel," or the like, which is written 𓊉 𓊊 𓊊 in one case\(^{37}\) and 𓊉 𓊊 in another.\(^{38}\) An isolated example of the compound preposition 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 by virtue of" is cited by Edel, Altägypt. Gramm. II, § 800, referring to CG 57188.

It further seems highly probable that 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉, an epithet of the vulture-goddess Nekhbet, is to be read 𓊉 𓊉 "wide of wings." This is known from the funerary temple of Pepy II,\(^{59}\) and the same writing is retained in temple inscriptions of the Eleventh\(^{40}\) and early Twelfth Dynasties.\(^{41}\)

The orthography of this epithet contrasts with one applied to Horus: 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 "strong of hand," which is written thus in the Old Kingdom.\(^{42}\) In one case it is followed by 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉,\(^{43}\) where the distinctive form of the arm may simply be attributed to graphic dissimulation. But it probably more meaningfully indicates that the phrase is to be interpreted "one who acts with his two hands," for the epithet takes the form 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 in texts of the Middle Kingdom referring to non-royal individuals.\(^{44}\)

Two isolated cases may also be interpreted in the same way. One occurs in a Sixth Dynasty address to those who pass by: "Ye shall speak with your mouth and 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 offer with your two hands."\(^{45}\) A similar address of the same period has 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉,\(^{46}\) while two other versions write 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 and 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉.\(^{47}\) The second is the expression 𓊉 𓊉 for "activity" in a Fifth Dynasty decree (Nefereirkare) which is written 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 in an inscription of the early Twelfth Dynasty.\(^{48}\)

The term 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 "schedule of duty," or the like, is consistently written thus in the late Fifth Dynasty papyri from Abusir.\(^{49}\) Although the related term 𓊉-𓊉 𓊉 "functionary" some-

also Uuk I, 201 (17). This writing of 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 is probably also to be recognized in Hassan, Giza VI/3, fig. 188.

\(^{35}\) Uuk I, 46 (10); 201 (6), where James, op. cit., p. 41 emends 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 to 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉.

\(^{36}\) Uuk I, 125 (11); 283 (6).

\(^{37}\) Uuk I, 4 (11).

\(^{38}\) Uuk I, 292 (7).

\(^{39}\) Jéquier, Monument funéraire de Pepi II, pls. 54–55.

\(^{40}\) Dieter Arnold, Der Tempel des Königs Mentuhotep II (Mainz 1974), pls. 26, 51 (3555).

\(^{41}\) Lacau-Chevrier, Chapelle de Sésostris I', pls. 12, 14, 19, 22–24, 27, 30, 34, 37, 38 (writings varying between 𓊉 and 𓊉). On p. 53 Lacau offers the translation given here, and on p. 54 he rightly observes that 𓊉 "est une orthographie archaïque, immobilisée dans ce titre." Further examples from the same reign may be seen on Cairo J 36895 (Kurt Lange and Max Hirmer, Ägypten [Munich 1967], pls. 93–95).

\(^{42}\) Borchardt, Gräb. Säk. 1847, pl. 8; Jéquier, Monument funéraire de Pepi II, II, pl. 65, whereas 𓊉 appears in Gräb. Säk. 1847, pl. 10, and 𓊉 in fig. 49. An example of the early Twelfth Dynasty (Sesostris I) has 𓊉 (Lansing, BMMA 28 [Nov. 1933], fig. 3, p. 6; BMMA 39 [Nov. 1934], fig. 20, p. 27; Dieter Arnold, Pyramid of Senwosret I (New York 1988), pls. 49, 56) as does a late Twelfth Dynasty example (Amenemhet III), where the epithet is applied to Osiris (Dunham, Naga ed-Dér Stela, pl. 5 [7]). Cf. WB, V, 367 (8) and the variant 𓊉 𓊉 𓊉 (7) indicating 𓊉 (but all based on evidence from the New Kingdom).

\(^{43}\) Borchardt, loc. cit. After this study was completed I found that, in the text volume, p. 83, Sethy anticipates my conclusion that: "Die hier gebrauchte Form der Hieroglyphen des Ames pflegt den Dualis zu bezeichnen." He also makes a passing reference to this usage in Die Altägyptischen Pyramidentexte IV (Leipzig 1922), p. 106.

\(^{44}\) Janssen, Egyptische Autobiografies, p. 48 (II F 161–63). The form of the arms in no. 162 should be corrected from 𓊉 to 𓊉.

\(^{45}\) In the original inscription of a reused mastaba: Hassan, Excavations at Saqqara II, fig. 5.

\(^{46}\) Simpson, Western Cemetery I, fig. 12.


\(^{48}\) See Goedicke, Königliche Dokumente, p. 25, fig. 2; on p. 26 he rightly reads the arms as dual 𓊉 𓊉, referring to Junker, ZÄS 77 (1942), 3 ff.; on p. 6 Junker cites a Twelfth Dynasty variant 𓊉 𓊉 for Siut I, 214 (Uuk VII, 66).

\(^{49}\) Posener-Kriéger de Cornwall, Abu Sir Papyri, pls. 1 (A and B), 11 (1), 13 (1), 35 (A); in pl. 16 B it is ligatured with 𓊉. The same sign is probably to be recognized in
times shows —, this also appears as — in Pyr. 398b, 558b (and as — and — in CTVI, 150,c), and it is hardly coincidental that one example discussed earlier (p. 24) has —. The term used in the Abusir papyri is clearly to be read *imy-it-*wry.

In view of the several examples that have been given of — alone as a writing of *wry, it is equally clear that this interpretation is to be applied in some speeches accompanying scenes of daily life:

1. **(1) [Image]**. A woman winnowing grain tells her companion: “lift your arms from this grain; it is (but) straw.”\(^{50}\) This is a particularly likely case, since winnowing requires the use of both hands.

2. **(2) [Image]**. A carpenter hammering a guardrail to the side of a boat tells his companion, “remove your hands (from) under us.”\(^{51}\) Like the preceding quotation, this is from the mastaba of \(T_3\).

3. **(3) [Image]**. “There is a catch (of fowl) for thy hands, O fowler!”\(^{52}\)

Sethe says that in the Pyramid Texts — is to be read "in [Image] (var. [Image]) “wash.”\(^{53}\) Certainly it means no more than “wash” since it is applied to the face\(^{54}\) as well as the hands and — or — is added in the latter case.\(^{55}\) This is also true of [Image] “wetting a stave” in two scenes of the Fifth Dynasty,\(^{56}\) as also in some names such as [Image] and [Image].\(^{57}\) In these cases — replaces —, but it obviously derives from the idea that the two hands are washed. The sign — also designated the ewer and basin in the early Old Kingdom, as in an offering list specifying [Image] \(^{58}\) “a ewer and basin of electrum,” or the representation of an attendant who carries these utensils, identified as — in the label above them.\(^{60}\) Here the reading may include a reference to *wry with the meaning “wash-hands” (as in French “lave-mains”). This is suggested by the fact that the washing of hands is [Image] in an offering list of the Fourth Dynasty,\(^{61}\) which may be compared with [Image] in another that may be somewhat later.\(^{62}\) If the second of these is *bw-r, the first is presumably *bw-*wry. I doubt that the expression [Image], "handwork for the craftsmen," discussed by Posener-Kriéger, *Archives*, pp. 196–97. In Abu Sir Papyri some of the entries for — (Pal. pl. 11) should go with —, and the form of the latter should be corrected to —: namely those from pls. 1 (A), 1 (B), 11 (1), 22 (A, g), 35 (A, 3 b). Two adjacent examples from pl. 41 (C 2) are inappropriately used in place of —, but this is evidently a scribal error.


\(^{53}\) *Die Alatagyptischen Pyramidentexte* IV, p. 106. Cf. also Wh, I, 39.

\(^{54}\) Egy. Pyr. 601b, 1443a.

\(^{55}\) Egy. Pyr. 788c, 1428b.

\(^{56}\) Davies, *Sheikh Saïd*, pl. 4; Verner, *Pharaophores I/1*, pl. 28.

\(^{57}\) Paget and Pirie, *Piatrics*, pl. 36, as corrected in Davies, *Pharaophores I*, p. 42.

\(^{58}\) CG 1495; cf. PNI, 11 (23); II 338 (incorrectly copied). But — is *wy in some other names: [Image] (PNI, 423 [28]); [Image] (Martin-Pardey, *CAA Hildesheim* 1, 38), the latter evidently to be distinguished from the example in Junker, *Giza XI*, fig. 80, which has —. *rmn.*


\(^{60}\) L 11, pl. 4.

\(^{61}\) Junker, *Giza II*, fig. 21 and pl. 10; in *Giza IX*, p. 44. Junker reads only *bk.*

\(^{62}\) BM 11722: *Hieroglyphic Texts* VI, pl. 19. For *bw-r see De Meulenaere, Supplement to BIFAO 81 (1981), 87–89.*
this reading is disproved by an exceptional case where supplies for the afterlife are listed on a Fourth Dynasty sarcophagus, including 𓊒𓊑 𓊐𓊑 “water and washing vessels.” Other lists refer to 𓊐𓊑 “water for the hands” or 𓊐𓊒𓊑 “water upon the hands.” An inscription of the Fifth Dynasty mentions 𓊐𓊔𓊑 𓊐𓊑 𓊘𓊑 𓊒𓊑 𓊔𓊑 𓊐 𓊒𓊔 which is probably ṣ́wt(y) n(t)y iḥ.w nmsgt, “the two vessels of the wash(ing) hands and a jar” much as Junker reads it, but iḥ.w may be iḥ.w-nwk. At a late date (probably no earlier than the Heracleopolitan Period) the term for the ewer and basin was reduced to 𓊐𓊔𓊑 𓊐𓊑 ṣ́ṭl “the two vessels,” and in the Middle Kingdom it was commonly expressed by 𓊐𓊔𓊑 or 𓊐𓊔𓊑 𓊐𓊑 “two vessels of water.”

The group 𓊐𓊑 frequently appears before the face of the deceased in offering scenes of Dynasties II–IV (rarely later) and usually arranged thus, although the sequence is reversed in a few examples, including some of the earliest, and one Third Dynasty example very logically places 𓊐𓊑 below the ewer and above the basin. Occasionally 𓊑𓊑 is added to this configuration, and/or 𓊐𓊑, designating a supply of water.

The most characteristic ideographic uses of 𓊐𓊑 are to be found in the determinatives of ḫst “singing,” mrt “mrt-singer,” and ḫnt “beat (the rhythm),”; also, more rarely, ṭnt “dance” and ṭmt “clap.” The explanation for the connotation of duality that is expressed by 𓊐𓊑 is to be found in the traditional representations of the mrt-singer that shows a single hand extended in this fashion, while the other is not visible (Fig. 5). In the Nineteenth Dynasty the outline of the arm was doubled, making it clear that both hands are extended (Fig. 4) and this reduplication was applied to a group of female mourners as early as the Twelfth Dynasty (Fig. 5). The apparent extension of a single hand is also to be found in several

---

63 Cairo J 48852: W.S. Smith, JEA 19 (1933), p. 151 and pl. 22.
64 Junker, Gis X, fig. 53.
65 Ibid., Vol. VIII, fig. 56.
66 Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 72 and pls. 9-10.
67 Cf. “metal vessels” of 𓊐𓊑 𓊐𓊑 𓊐𓊑 𓊐𓊑; Daressy, ASAE 16 (1916), 200, 203.
68 Jéquier, Tombeaux de particuliers, figs. 42, 43, to be added to the Belegstellen of Wb. IV, 421 (g).
69 Jéquier, Fries, p. 118 and Terrace, Egyptian Paintings of the Middle Kingdom, pl. 11.
70 The latest example that can be dated as such by a royal name (Userkaf) is from Tehna: Fraser, ASAE 3 (1902), pl. 3 to p. 124. Cf. also an archaizing Dyn. XI example in Hodjash and Berlev, Egyptian Reliefs, p. 69 (26).
71 At least three dozen examples, including CG 1391, 1394, 1447, 1513, 1586.
72 Z.Y. Saad, Céline Sola (Cairo 1957), pls. 29, 30; James, Corpus of Hieroglyphic Inscriptions, pl. 17.
74 E.g., Reisner, Hist. Gisa Nwr. I, pls. 18a, b; 46b, 57b.
75 E.g., James, Hieroglyphic Texts, pl. 14; Hassan, Gis X, fig. 94 and pl. 27.
76 Wb. III, 285. For the form (with fem. infinitive) see Faulkner, Concise Dictionary, 192, with reference to 𓊐𓊒𓊑 (CTI, 23).
77 Pyr. 863a, perhaps assimilated from previous mention of 𓊐𓊑 “hands.” Faulkner, Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts (Oxford 1969), p. 214, n. 7, also applies the same interpretation to 𓊐𓊑 alone in 1358b, but it more probably is ḫnt (“your feet beat out the rhythm for you”). More usually the determinative of the dancer shows a man holding a pair of clappers.
78 Merenreka, pls. 113-14; Simpson, Qar and Idu, fig. 38.
79 MMA 22.1.1, after Lindsley Hall’s drawing in Hans Goedicke, Re-used Blocks from the Pyramid of Amenemhat I at Lahun (New York 1971), p. 37; for other early examples see Jéquier, Monuments funéraires de Papi III, pl. 16; Naville, XIXth Dynasty Temple II, pl. 6 (A).
80 From the photograph in A.M. Calverley, The Temple of Sethos IV, pl. 28 (A); cf. pl. 27. For other examples see ibid. II, pl. 29; A. Gayet, Le Temple de Louxor (Paris 1894), pl. 65; Harold Nelson, Great Hypostyle Hall at Karnak I’s (Chicago 1981), pls. 37, 54; Seele, The Tomb of Tja’neru (Chicago 1955), pl. 4. Cf. also a hieroglyphic representation of Meret as 𓊐𓊑 (Kitchen, RF II, 570 [111]).
81 From Davies, Anstedt, pl. 23.
Fig. 3. Old Kingdom mrt-goddess. After Lindsley Hall

Fig. 4. Dyn. XIX mrt-goddess. After Calverly

Fig. 5. Dyn. XII singers. After Davies
representations of men who make the same gesture accompanied by \( \text{\textcopyright} \) in the archaic festival scenes of Neuserre’s sun temple (Fig. 6). They are clearly \textit{hnu. w} “beaters,” “percussionists,” and one may therefore suppose that their attitude is a stereotypical archaic manner of depicting two hands extended to give the tempo by clapping. In the more mundane scenes of private tombs of the Old Kingdom female singers frequently clap their hands in a more natural fashion.

A gesture like \( \text{\textcopyright} \), made with one hand, also figures among the chironomic repertory of Old Kingdom singers, but this sign probably became an ideogram for \textit{hs} in consequence of its association with the \textit{mrs} singers, reinforced by the fact that singers frequently clapped their hands.\(^8\)

\(^8\) Bissing, \textit{Re-Heiligum III}, pl. 16 (274), together with dancers who hold clappers; for other examples see ibid. II, pl. 18 (44f), 19 (45a). A Middle Kingdom variant of the determinative \( \text{\textcopyright} \) is applied to \textit{hn} in Newberry, \textit{Bersheh I}, pl. 12: \( \text{\textcopyright} \) “\( \text{\textcopyright} \) “giving the rhythm to the army.” And the Old Kingdom sign reappears in a funerary scene of the Eighteenth Dynasty (Davies, \textit{Paqents II}, pl. 52), where the caption \( \text{\textcopyright} \) accompanies men whose gesture reduplicates the sign and again shows but one arm.

\(^8\) For the iconography of the \textit{mrs} singer see Jocelyne Berlandini in \textit{LAv IV}, 81; she likewise assumes (without offering evidence) that both hands are extended, although she observes (n. 17) that a single hand is extended by the \textit{mrs} singer in the shrine of \textit{M-bht-R} Mentuhotep from Dendera (\textit{ASAE} 17 [1918], pl. 1 to pp. 226 ff.); this example is altogether anomalous since the second \textit{mrs} singer makes a quite different gesture.

\(^8\) Berlandini, \textit{loc. cit.}, reverses this conclusion; she considers the possibility that the \textit{mrs} singer is clapping her hands, but agrees with Hickmann that her gesture is a melodic signal. This does not seem consistent, however, with her conclusion that both hands are raised, a conclusion that is borne out by the Middle and New Kingdom examples cited in notes 80–81 above. Others, not influenced by Hickmann, have previously agreed that the gesture represents clapping: Hellmuth Müller, \textit{MDAIK} 7 (1937), 88; Jean Sainte Fare Garnot, \textit{L’hommage aux dieux} (Paris 1954), p. 24.
Notes on Hieroglyphic Palaeography

The connotation of duality that was so graphically conveyed by Ꜣ in the Old Kingdom probably did not survive beyond that period except, to a limited extent, in the archaic context of temple scenes. One such archaic example is the epithet nsw-t-ꜜwꜜy, “wide of wings,” mentioned earlier (p. 181), and another is possibly to be recognized in the expression ḫnt-ꜜwꜜy “offering” in the Eleventh Dynasty Temple at Deir el Bahari. But the sign in question only partly resembles ꜜ; there is no Old Kingdom example of the word with which to compare it, and it is therefore probably safer to retain the accepted reading of this phrase as ḫnt-ꜜwꜜy. By the beginning of the Twelfth Dynasty the search for further survivors becomes obscured by the replacement of old ꜜ by ꜜ (D41), which also serves for ṛmn. The old form reappears in the Late Period, but not with any degree of regularity. The form ꜜ is also attested in Old Kingdom inscriptions, but only very infrequently except in the term ꜜ for “washing the hands,” where it is still uncommon but occurs at least seven times. One of these cases lacks the stream of water, and in another case the stream of water is fused with the hand; the latter very probably explains the other five. Other examples of ꜜ are to be found in Fourth and Fifth Dynasty titles concerning ḫ “singer;” in a Fifth Dynasty example of the epithet ḫm-fr-ꜜwꜜy “strong of hands,” as mentioned earlier, and rarely in the phrase ḫm-st-ꜜwꜜy, “schedule of duty,” as well as in a very few Sixth Dynasty examples of ḫwꜜy written ꜜ and ꜜ. ꜜ may be added that a sign rather like the form that has just been noted is also to be found in one of the scenes of a Sixth Dynasty tomb chapel at Meir (Fig. 7). The similarity is coincidental, but the very different reason for it is well worth mentioning. This is an excellent example of those cases where iconography has affected palaeography; the position of the hands that are “smoothing” is reflected in the pair of hands that terminate the word ꜜ ꜜ; sn “above them, which describes that action, replacing ꜜ. The man on the left says: “Ho, see (how well) I am smoothing,” and his companion replies “See indeed (how well) I am smoothing.” In other versions of this scene the hieroglyph in question is written normally.

85 Arnold, Der Tempel des Königs Mentuhotep II, pls. 19, 21 (4936). The sign is ꜜ in Lacau-Chevrier, Chapelle de Sésostris I, pl. 35 (right).
86 Cf. Wb. III, 47 [2-3].
87 Of the examples in Chapelle de Sésostris I cited in note 41 above only those on pls. 12, 22 and 34 (left) have the old form. Also note the determinative of ḫm in note 82, and CTVI, 150 c; VII, 32 k, 389 b.
88 Walters 22.152, 22.153; G. Steindorff, Catalogue of Egyptian Sculpture (Baltimore 1946), no. 274. The form ꜜ (or the like) appears in Klaus Kuhlmann and W. Schenkel, Das Grab des ḫm (Mainz 1983), pl. 28; H. Schäfer and W. Andrae, Die Kunst des Alten Orients (Berlin 1942), pl. 436 (1); W.M.F. Petrie, Memphis II, (London 1909), pl. 5; E. Naville, Festival Hall of Osorkon II (London 1892), pls. 11 and 16.
89 Junker, Gisa II, fig. 21; Hassan, Gisa V, fig. 107 (also written normally): Abu Bakr, Gisa, fig. 40; Mariette, Mastabas, p. 88; Pfr. 34 (N).
90 Junker, Gisa IX, fig. 15.
92 Junker, Gisa I, pl. 23; VII, fig 13; also several times in CG 57173.
93 See n. 42 above.
94 See n. 49 above.
95 Daressy, AAE 16 (1916), pp. 200–203. A similar form is used as the determinative of ḫm “pressing (grapes)” in Blackman and Apted, Meir V, pl. 20, and the form of the hand is also similar in ḫm “cubit” (e.g., Bissing, Be-Heiligustum III, pl. 29). Cf. also n. 28 above.
3. A Middle Kingdom Variant of $\uparrow$ (F12)

The hieroglyphic elements of a necklace of *Hnmt*, the daughter of a king presumed to be Amenemhet II, include one form that is unusual, combining the wigged head of a jackal with the foreleg of the same animal (Fig. 8a).\textsuperscript{39} It has previously been identified as a jackal,\textsuperscript{100} a seated jackal,\textsuperscript{101} or "the symbol of Anubis."\textsuperscript{102} There can be no doubt, however, that it is simply a variant of the hieroglyph $\uparrow$ *wsr* (F12).\textsuperscript{103} That interpretation is demon-

\textsuperscript{39} Blackman and Apter, *Meir V*, pl. 18.
\textsuperscript{38} E.g., Wild, *Ti III*, pl. 174; Davies, *Deir el Geharies I*, pl. 14; *II*, pl. 10; *Meir I*, pl. 30.
\textsuperscript{39} CG 52064. From the photograph in Vernier, *Bijoux et orfèvreries*, pl. 72. The other side is inlaid, and less detailed.
\textsuperscript{100} Ibid., p. 317. Milada Vilímková, *Ägyptische Goldschmiedekunst* (Prague 1969), caption to pl. 18.
\textsuperscript{101} Erika Feucht, in Vandersleyen, *Das Alte Ägypten*, p. 387 (pl. LIVb).
\textsuperscript{103} As Cyril Aldred has evidently recognized in his *Jewels of the Pharaohs* (London 1971), p. 188, referring to pl. 30 ("Strength").

Fig. 7. Dyn. VI craftsmen at Meir. After Blackman
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strained by a cartouche of Sesostri I that shows virtually the same form (Fig. 8b),104 and by another example (Fig. 8c), which occurs in a phrase expressing funerary benefits, wsr msr htw “being powerful and justified,” on a non-royal statue that is probably as late as the reign of Amenemhet III.105 Given the fact that the phonetic value of ạ derives from wst “neck,” it is surprising that the neck should be replaced by a leg, but there are even earlier examples of ạ in Sixth Dynasty hieratic, although the hieroglyphic equivalent of this is known only from the Second Intermediate Period and the later New Kingdom.106 The wig alone appears more frequently in this sign, the earliest examples of it dating to the Heracleopolitan Period107 and the Eleventh Dynasty,108 while a few more are known from the earlier reigns of the Twelfth Dynasty, some at least as late as the reign of Sesostri II.109 Examples of still later date may also be cited, but they are not frequent.110

Fig. 8. (a) Element from the necklace of Hnmt, Dahshur. From a photograph. (b, c) Similar hieroglyphs

---

104 CG 20544. From the photograph in Lange-Schäfer, Grab- und Denkmale des Mittleren Reiches IV, pl. 43. Cf. Simpson, Terrace of the Great God, pl. 11. The sign ạ again shows the wig in the same cartouche (Louvre C 1: ibid., pl. 14), but not the leg.

105 On the proper right side of Turin Suppl. no. 4265; for bibliography see Detlef Franke, Personendaten aus dem Mittleren Reich (Wiesbaden 1984), no. 199. And for the phrase cf. Barta, Opferformel, pp. 59 ff. (Büte 7 a, c); Büte 7 a, c.

106 MMJ 12 (1977), 17, n. 156; also CG 20564.

107 Fischer, Dendera, pl. 15; Captive Nome, no. 13.

108 BM 624 (Blackman, JEA 17 [1931], pl. 8), lines 10, 14; Louvre C 14 (Al. Badawy, GdE 36 [1961], 270; Barta, Das Selbstzeugnis eines ägyptischen Künstlers [Berlin 1970], p. 14, pl. 1).

109 Louvre C 1 (Simpson, Terrace of the Great God, pl. 14); Florence 1774 (Roche 25 [1972], pl. 7; Petrie, A Season in Egypt (London 1888), pl. 10 (273). Sesostri I: 271. Sesostri II.

Except for the presumed central element, a well known device that combines Ⲟ and Ⲝ “live and be at peace,”111 all of the hieroglyphs of Ḥnml's necklace are paired, and those that show a definite orientation, rightward or leftward, are presented in both directions, so that the ensemble is symmetrical. The height of all the elements seems to be much the same, between 18–18.5 mm, including the two rings from which they were suspended, with the exception of the bees, which are said to be 17 mm, and may therefore have been placed at the end of the series.112 In the other cases the slight variation of height is not significant, since it occurs in some of the identical pairs.

In the present restoration113 the sequence is Ⲝ Ⲝ Ⲝ Ⲝ Ⲝ Ⲝ Ⲝ Ⲝ (reversed) Ⲝ Ⲝ Ⲝ Ⲝ. Since this arrangement is, for the most part, arbitrary, it seems likely that Ⲝ should precede Ⲝ, constituting an old variant of the queenly title smwt mry Nbty in which mry Nbty “he who is beloved of the Two Ladies” is reduced to “the Two Ladies,” in both cases meaning “she who joins the king.”114 And it is equally likely that Ⲝ should precede Ⲝ, with much the same meaning, but perhaps ringing a change on the name Ḥnml. While such titles may not seem very suitable for a woman who is only a king’s daughter, their meaning is not essentially different from Ⲝ Ⲝ Ⲝ Ⲝ, “she who joins the White Crown,” which occurs on Ḥnml’s canopic chest.115

Once these two titles have been recognized as such, then all the other hieroglyphs in the necklace evidently precede them as attributes that are desired for the owner: Ⲝ Ⲝ Ⲝ Ⲝ Ⲝ Ⲝ Ⲝ. The first three might then be translated “may (she who joins the king) be strong, enduring, living.” And the sign Ⲝ, the wḥst-eye of Horus, would mean “may (she) be sound.” The sign Ⲝ shows the bit-fetish combined, as often, with Ⲑ the so-called “Isis-knot.” The latter is closely associated with Ⲝ in the Protodynastic Period,117 and these two signs alternate in two friezes dating to the end of the Old Kingdom, in one case showing the form Ⲝ, in the other case the composite form, incorporating the bit-fetish.118 Its propitious meaning is much the same as Ⲝ, which it closely resembles in First Dynasty examples.119

Thus it seems possible, once the hieroglyphic nature of Ⲝ has been perceived, to view all the other elements as having a more hieroglyphic character than has previously been supposed.

The peculiar variant of wsr does not seem to have been used very often, and it seems unlikely that there is any connection between this and the variant Ⲝ for Ⲝ on coffins from

111 MMF 5 (1972), 22, n. 69: 11 (1976), 177.
112 Vernier, op. cit., pp. 306 ff., nos. 52919, 52926–7, 52929 and 31; 52959–74; also two hawk-head terminals (52920–21). The height of the presumed central element is said to be only 16 mm, but this excludes the lower rings; that of the vultures (52973–74) is said to be 19 mm, but the upper ring is much further forward than the right, and the measurement is clearly diagonal. Only the bees are given a lesser height: 17 mm.
113 For which see Vilimkovskij, loc. cit.; Erika Feucht, op. cit., pl. LIVb; Aldred, Jews of the Pharaohs, pl. 30.
114 JEA 60 (1974), 94–97. As noted here (p. 96), this is attested, in the Middle Kingdom (CG 382), in the form smwt Nbty mryt and smwt Ⲝ Ⲝ Ⲝ mryt “the beloved one who joins the Two Ladies/King NN.”
115 Most recently discussed by Olivier Perdu, RiD 29 (1977), 68 ff.; for Ḥnml see p. 82.
117 MMF 5 (1972), 13.
118 Saleh, Three Old Kingdom Tombs at Thebes, pl. 14.
119 Petrie, Koptos, pl. 5 (7); Stewart, Egyptian Stela II, pl. 3 (2).
120 MMF 5 (1972), 12–15.
Akhmim, dating from the very end of the Old Kingdom or later,\textsuperscript{121} with the variant \( \mathfrak{r} \) for \( \mathfrak{r} \) (inst) in a royal decree of the Seventeenth Dynasty, where \( \mathfrak{r} \) assumes its customary form,\textsuperscript{122} or with the still later variant \( \mathfrak{f} \) for \( \mathfrak{f} \), which the \textit{Wörterbuch} attributes to the Graeco-Roman Period,\textsuperscript{123} but was in use at least as early as the Nineteenth Dynasty, in the reign of Ramesses II.\textsuperscript{124}

4. The sign \( \mathfrak{y} \)\textsuperscript{125}

Among the orthographic innovations in titles of the Middle Kingdom, such as |\( \mathfrak{y} \) (tongue) for \textit{imy-r} “he who is in the mouth” and \( \mathfrak{w} \) (Anubis upon his shrine) for \textit{hr}-\( \mathfrak{s} \)-\( \mathfrak{s} \) “he who is over (prival to) the secret,” the substitution of \( \mathfrak{y} \) for \( \mathfrak{f} \) \( \mathfrak{f} \) \( \text{hr}-\mathfrak{t} \) “overlord” (lit. “over the head”) may seem self-evident. But it must nonetheless be asked why the pair of horns alone would not have sufficed to express this meaning, rather than the horns and sun-disk that constitute the emblem of Hator.

An extremely likely explanation has occurred to me in looking over some copies of inscriptions that were made in the rock-cut tombs of Aswan towards the end of the Old Kingdom,\textsuperscript{126} and a little later, during the Heracleopolitan Period.\textsuperscript{127} Here the sign for \textit{hr} “over” is occasionally written \( \mathfrak{y} \) or \( \mathfrak{y} \) instead of \( \mathfrak{r} \). I have subsequently noticed further examples of this kind in inscriptions of the Middle Kingdom (Fig. 9).\textsuperscript{128} Thus the new writing of \textit{hr}-\( \mathfrak{t} \), which is only known from Beni Hasan,\textsuperscript{129} seems to have had a specific graphic origin—an accidental resemblance, which tends to occur in incised inscriptions that omit inner detail. Its fortuitous nature may explain why this usage was not more widespread.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{fig9.png}
\caption{Middle Kingdom examples of \( \mathfrak{r} \)}
\end{figure}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{121} CG 28002–4, 28007–8, 28010–16.
\item \textsuperscript{122} Petrie, \textit{Koptos}, pl. 8, lines 6, 10. Here the hoofed leg may have been suggested by the pair of horns.
\item \textsuperscript{123} Wb. III, 13; the Ptolemaic writing \( \mathfrak{y} \) probably derives from this.
\item \textsuperscript{124} Ch. Kuentz, \textit{La face sud du massif est du pylone de Ramses II à Louxor}, pl. 21 (top); cf. Kitchen, \textit{RII}, p. 346 (6). See also a Dyn. XXVI example in K.P. Kuhlmann and W. Schenkel, \textit{Grab des Ibi} (Mainz 1983), pl. 37 and p. 122 (Ta64).
\item \textsuperscript{125} Reprinted from \textit{Hathor} 3 (Lisbon 1991), 9–13 (and inserted errata), with the kind permission of Maria Helena Trindade Lopes.
\item \textsuperscript{126} Tomb of \textit{Hr-hu-f}, in the king’s letter, to the right of the entrance, line 14 (= \textit{Unk. I}, 129 [13]).
\item \textsuperscript{127} Tomb of \textit{Hq-ib}, later inscription on left reveal of entrance.
\item \textsuperscript{128} Figure 1 (a) is Dyn. XI, from Louvre C 14; (b) is late Dyn. XII, from Louvre C 85; (c) is late Dyn. XIII, from Copenhagen Nat. Mus. Aad 15 (from Simpson, \textit{Terrace of the Great God}, pl. 7).
\item \textsuperscript{129} Newberry, \textit{Beni Hasan I}, pls. 32, 33 (Tomb 3); pl. 41 (Tomb 13).
\end{itemize}
This usage probably would not have occurred at all, however, if the hieroglyph had not already existed in 𓊕 “opening (day)” of the month and 𓊕 𓊕 “opening (day) of the year.” Here one can follow a more gradual and logical evolution. In the earlier half of the Old Kingdom a usual writing of the “opening of the year” festival was 𓊕 𓊕, where the determinative, appropriate to a calendrical event, was placed below 𓊕. This determinative was occasionally moved upwards as early as the Fourth Dynasty, but more frequently during the later reigns of the Fifth Dynasty, producing a second arrangement: 𓊕 𓊕 𓊕 𓊕. At the same time, and during the Sixth Dynasty the sign 𓊕 tended to be partly enclosed by 𓊕. The final step, in which these two elements became united, evidently came about around the end of the Old Kingdom. One of the earliest hieroglyphic examples known to me occurs on a stela from Naga ed Deir that seems to belong to the first years of the Heracleopolitan Period. A hieratic example at Hatnub occurs in a graffito that has been dated even earlier; this date seems improbable, however, in view of the fact that the name of a local nomarch is followed by 𓊕 𓊕 𓊕 𓊕 “may he live, prosper and be healthy” and 𓊕 𓊕 𓊕 𓊕 “may he live for ever and ever”—sentiments that, during the Old Kingdom, had been reserved for the king. The same is true of another example that supposedly antedates the end of the Sixth Dynasty; it appears in one of the burial chambers cleared by Jéquier around the pyramid of Pepy II, many of which show features that are associated with the Eighth Dynasty and the Heracleopolitan Period. In the present case the specifically late feature is the separation of 𓊕 and 𓊕 in place of the older form 𓊕 for hₙtr “necropolis.”

There remains one example of 𓊕 that does, however, seem to antedate the end of the Old Kingdom, if only by a few years. It occurs on one of a group of Naqada stelae that are closely linked with the “transitional” tombs at Dendera, belonging to the very end of the Sixth Dynasty and to the brief span of the Eighth Dynasty. The Eighth Dynasty is more probable in the case of the stela in question, since it seems to be a little later than the other members of the group.

130 E.g., Junker, Giza VI, figs. 31, 32, 92, 93; XI, figs. 70, 83, 104; Hassan, Giza I, fig. 183; II, fig. 205; III, figs. 69, 70; VI/5, figs. 60, 142, 202; Simpson, Western Cemetery I, fig. 41; Qar and Idu, fig. 33; Petrie and Murray, Seven Memphite Tomb Chapels, pl. 4: Pabet and Pirie, Pah-hetep, pl. 39; CG 1424 (temp. Sahure), 1482. An example appears on a Fourth Dynasty sarcophagus, Cairo J 48852 (W.S. Smith, JEA 19 [1933], 150, pl. 21; elsewhere on the same sarcophagus [pl. 24] the sign 𓊕 is missing, as is often the case in contemporary inscriptions).

131 Fifth Dynasty examples in Firth and Gunn, Teti Pyramid Cemeteries, pls. 62, 63 (1); Moussa and Altenmüller, Nischtcham, fig. 4: Moussa and Junge, Two Tombs of Craftsmen, pls. 1, 3, Sixth Dynasty: Macramallah, Iduat, pl. 20; N. Kanasevati et al., Excavations at Saqqara I, pls. 5, 6, 27; W.V. Davies et al., Saqqara Tombs I, pl. 26; CG 1434.

132 Dunham, Naga-ed-Dir Stelas, no. 87, belonging to the Red Group, which E. Browarzky dates to the early Heracleopolitan Period: Dissertation, pp. 558–60; another example, ibid., p. 927 and fig. 87, is dated to the end of Dyn. X.

133 Anthes, Hatnub, pp. 23–24 and pl. 13; discussed further by Černý, ASAE 51 (1951), 444 f.

134 Tombeaux de particuliers, fig. 62.

135 To be discussed in Hommages à Jean-Philippe Lauer (Montpellier 1997).

136 See BES 9 (1987/88), 18, n. 16. A much earlier example is to be found in Abu-Bakr, Giza, fig. 5, but this is an isolated exception.

137 Fischer, Cépide Nome, no. 3, pl. 6.


139 In place of 𓊕 it has 𓊕, which, at Dendera, is first attested in the inscriptions of Nfr-sm-Pepy/Snati, ibid., p. 79, n. 231. The wife’s coiffure also distinguishes this stela from the others; a Dendera stela of the same style as those of Snati (for which see ibid., p. 128, referring to Petrie, Dendera, pl. 10 [right, second from bottom]) similarly shows a woman wearing a long wig, albeit one of more conventional form.
5. Variants of the Old Kingdom form of 𓊈 (F29)

The detail shown in Figure 10 is from the lower edge of an isolated block of relief in the Louvre. The scene above it depicts the preparation of bread, and it is virtually certain that the incomplete captions are related to the same activity. That conclusion is indicated by the composite sign at the left, combining a phonetic element (𓊉) with an ideographic one (𓊈). At least three, and probably four, other examples of the same composite hieroglyph can be cited. In one case the context clearly shows that it is a variant of F29: the caption 𓊈𓊈 replaces the more familiar 𓊈𓊈 “stringing a necklace.” The composite variant is doubtless also to be recognized in a less completely preserved example, written 𓊈𓊈, which is comparable to 𓊈𓊈𓊈𓊈. The last two examples confirm Osing’s reading of the former as str/sti, which is also confirmed by the likelihood that the captions show the masculine infinitive of a triliteral verb. In yet another case 𓊈 also replaces 𓊈 as the infinitive of sti in the sense of “spearing.”

Fig. 10. Detail of Old Kingdom relief in the Louvre, E 17499. After Ziegler

In the example at hand 𓊈 evidently occurs in the same context as the phrase 𓊈𓊈, a command given by a scribe who records the delivery of bread and beer as it is relayed to him by a second scribe: “count this out properly.” This seems again to employ the verb str/sti—either “stringing” together the number of deliveries or “assembling” exceptionally appears in an Old Kingdom title "overseer of the milk herd," which, in an example dating to Dynasties X/ XI, is more normally written 𓊈 (Simpson, Western Cemetery I, pp. 34–35 and fig. 45). The reading str is excluded for any of the examples of 𓊈 discussed here, although the example of 𓊈 (cited in n. 144 above) appears immediately above a scene showing “milking,” and may have been influenced by the latter.

141 To be added to the examples given in MMJ 12 (1977), 9–10 and figs. 3–4.
142 Simpson, Kauah, Khaikhufu I and II, fig. 50.
143 For such scenes see Drenkhahn, Handwerker, pp. 43–44 and Moussa and Altenmüller, Nianchchnun, p. 137 and pl. 64; the phrase also occurs in titles, for which see n. 153 below.
144 Davies, Deir el Gebrawi II, pl. 19.
145 Blackman and Apted, Menk, pl. 17.
146 OLZ 74 (1979), 39, commenting on Middle Kingdom stru: cf. my Titiles, p. 48 (177), where the reading sti-m is to be disregarded. Drenkhahn, loc. cit., n. 81, likewise compares sti and str, citing examples of the latter from the New Kingdom and later. Here it may be noted that 𓊈𓊈 (stt)
them. Sometimes nominal קชำל is used in such scenes, probably based on a masculine infinitive as before: an "assemblage" or "batch" of bread. In one instance the delivery of bread is carried out in the presence of the nḥt-hrw "tally man" and the ḫḏt ṣn ḫt "council of the funerary estate," both of whom are likewise mentioned in the remaining captions of the missing scene in the present case. The caption at the left possibly begins with the words sti n.i.[nuw] "count this out for me," although the residual א is difficult to explain. More probably א is followed by a in the phrase nty hn(ḥ)i: "count, my companion!"

The remaining example of the composite sign occurs in a scene where a man kneading dough is addressed by a baker who holds a loaf in one hand and a bag or basket in the other: ק⎬בכאכ. This is perhaps to be translated "Look at my batch of pzn-loaves."

Three further variants may be noted. The first is ק, which occurs in the title "overseer of necklace-stringers." The second appears at the end of a caption describing the catching of fish by the קפפ קאר "harpooner." Here the substitution of קפפ (an Old Kingdom form of Aa5) for ק has evidently been prompted by an overall similarity of shape. The third occurs in a similar context, where the determinative of קאאא repeats the fish that is speared in the adjacent scene (albeit another species of fish).

![Arrows in Old Kingdom hieroglyphs](image)

Fig. 11. Arrows in Old Kingdom hieroglyphs

---

149 Wh. IV, 332 (13); Epron et al., Ti I, pl. 66–67; Moussa and Altenmüller, Nianchhnum, p. 71 and pl. 25 (Berlin 11406 (Aeg. Inv. I, p. 22). The same word, apparently, is used in Pyr. 1204, 1207 (Wh. IV, 332 (12)).

150 Epron, loc. cit.

151 W. Schurmann, Die Reliefs aus dem Grab des Pyramidenvorsteher des Netjet (Karlsruhe 1982), fig. 15.

152 Schurmann, ibid., p. 40 reads stt (i.e., ק┤), which is invalidated by the other examples of ק—if.

153 James, Corpus of Hieroglyphic Inscriptions I, no. 67, pl. 25. This title is also known from Firth and Gunn, Teti Pyramid Cemeteries, p. 214 (17), as well as Berlin 19999 (Kaplon, Rollekel II, p. 102, pl. 33 (91)). Cf.: קאאא קאאא קאאא קאאא "overseer of necklace-stringers of the king's regalia," unpublished fragment, (Cairo CG 57150)

154 James, Corpus of Hieroglyphic Inscriptions, pl. 26, no. 72. The arrow in this sign (Figure 11 (a), drawn from a photograph kindly supplied by Richard Fazzini, with further assistance from Donald Spanel) may be compared with examples from (b) Hassan, Gia III, fig. 84; and (c) Junker, Gia XI, fig. 73a. Davies, Deir el Gebreli I, pl. 3. Cf. Montet, Scènes, pp. 4–5 (11), 21: the sign in question is not explained.

155 Kanawati, El-Hawawis IX, fig. 15.
Although the standard Old Kingdom form is ꜆Scarab, rather than Scarab, the latter form is pre-
figured by two late Sixth Dynasty examples, at Saqqara, in which the point of the arrow be-
gins to emerge. More surprisingly, two Middle Kingdom examples from Asyut show the 
arrow planted in what appears to be a shield: ꜆Scarab; this might possibly have been 
inspired by Old Kingdom Scarab, but a coffin at Bersha has Scarab, which looks more like a shield 
mounted as a target.

6. Semi-reversed forms of ꜆Scarab (F39)

In my Ancient Egyptian Calligraphy (3rd ed., p. 5) I observe that some signs tend to retain 
their normal rightward orientation when reversed, facing leftward; and that, in such cases, the 
retention of rightward orientation may affect only part of the sign, resulting in a “semi-
reversal.” The most frequently attested example of this curious phenomenon, and the ear-
liest, affects ꜆Scarab (Gardiner’s F39). The word in which it occurs (imih “revered condition”) 
does not seem to be known before the beginning of the Fourth Dynasty, when it assumed 
the form that was henceforth usual. But there are Fourth Dynasty examples of ꜆Scarab (both 
Scarab and Scarab). The reverse of this (Scarab) is attested equally early (example 56 in the terminal 
list), but rarely before the Fifth Dynasty. Both forms continue in use after the Old Kingdom, 
and there are some Eleventh Dynasty examples of each, but especially the second. Further 
examples are probably not to be expected much later than that point, although I have 
not made an exhaustive search for them, and, as in so many other details of Egyptian 
palaeography and iconography, a later recurrence cannot be ruled out.

The semi-reversals are sporadic, and often occur in proximity to examples of the sign 
that are perfectly normal, but the cumulative evidence, as displayed in the terminal list of 
references, is sufficient to yield a certain number of conclusions. It will be seen that the ear-
liest evidence comes from both Giza and Saqqara, but that the Giza necropolis is by far the 
more abundant source, with a ratio of 3:1. Furthermore the examples from Giza constitute 
nearly half of the total. The earliest provincial example is no earlier than the reign of Mer-
enre, at Abydos, the administrative center of Upper Egypt (ex. 49 in the list), while the 
examples from other places may all be later than the Sixth Dynasty.

The possible combinations of normal forms of ꜆Scarab, rightward and leftward, are four in 
all. With the introduction of the semi-reversed ꜆Scarab, the possibilities are increased four-
fold, as shown in Fig. 12. To clarify the comparisons, the normal forms are written ꜆Scarab, the

---

156 Hassan, Excavations at Saqqara II, fig. 5 and pl. 3; III, 
fig. 39 and pl. 56 (A). In another, more unusual Sixth 
Dynasty example the arrow completely traverses the lower 
part of the sign, i.e., the tail rather than the hide: 
Säve-Söderbergh, The Old Kingdom Tombs at Hamra Dom 
(El Qar wa es-Saqqad), pl. 7.
157 CT IV, 99b (two coffins of the same man).
158 CT I, 964 b; c; 966 b; V, 46 b.
159 Petrie, Medum, pls. 12, 13.
160 See the terminal list, exs. 1, 19, 21, 24, 28, 30; ex. 5 is 
also this early: see Nadine Cherpin, BIFAO 84 (1984), 
357–50.
161 Juxtaposed occurrences of Scarab Scarab occur on a false door 
from Heracleopolis that may be as late as Dyn. XII (Lopez, 
Oriens Antiquus 14 [1975], fig. 14, p. 75).
semi-reversed ones ❀. Only a few of these combinations are actually attested on a single monument or within the same tomb. Of the first column only one, the usual situation (a), is at all common, and there seem to be surprisingly few cases of b, showing the retention of normal orientation in a reversed inscription, facing leftward. In citing examples of other combinations, I shall enclose in parenthesis those that show the other form in the same tomb or on the same surface, but are not directly opposite. Combination f is by far the most frequent alternative: exs. 2, 4, (6), 8 (14), 15, 25, 26, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44, (45), 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, (53), 54. This is well illustrated by Pl. 44, an unpublished false door from Saqqara (ex. 32). It is characteristic in that the combination f appears only on the inner jambs, while the outer jambs show the normal configuration (a).

There is relatively little evidence for other combinations that show the semi-reversal; and, as the parentheses show, they are scarcely ever actually paired:

(g) 59, 63, (68), 70
(h) 62
(i) (24), (42)

(m) (3 + 55)
(o) 61
(p) 31 + 66, 55 + 75, (4 + 59), (42 + 72)

It will be noted that the most frequent of these combinations (g, p) are both related to the normal one (a). In several cases the upper part of the form ❀ (←) is only slightly slanted forward, but nearly all of these show a clear contrast with adjacent examples of normal

---

163 Cф. Curtu, Scavi Italiani, pl. 15; Edinburgh 1965,16 (Fischer, Egyptian Studies I, pl. 16, fig. 17); Davies, Die Gräber des Gebäude II, pl. 11. An example of combination d occurs on a false door that is later than the Old Kingdom: H. Schäfer, Priestergräber (Leipzig 1908), p. 12.
164 From a negatively formerly stored at the Saqqara office of the Department of Antiquities, and published with the permission of the late Zakaria Ghoneim and Abbas Bawwam. It was taken in a rock tomb south of the Djoser complex. For the unusual epithet temu mw-rw cf. the similar false door published by Zaki Saad, ASAE 40 (1941), 68z. Two Middle Kingdom examples of combination f are mentioned in note 161 above.
Notes on Hieroglyphic Palaeography

$\leftarrow (\rightarrow)$: 39, 32, 33, 37, 47, 49, 54. An exception is ex. 2, where the tops of both $\leftarrow (\rightarrow)$ and $\rightarrow (\leftarrow)$ are only slightly slanted. It may also happen that in combination a the sign on the right is more upright than the one on the left, showing a tendency towards combination f. There are also a few cases where the orientation of the top of the sign is ambiguously vertical.

A point of particular interest is the great number of cases—some as early as the Fourth Dynasty—that show $\rightarrow (\rightarrow)$, in the context of a normally oriented inscription. Presumably this form originated in inscriptions facing leftward, as confirmed by the large number of examples that appear in combination (f), but it was almost immediately transferred to the opposite situation. It was then gradually replaced, in that situation, by $\leftarrow (\rightarrow)$.

Possibly the semi-reversal under discussion is responsible for the substitution of $\leftarrow$ for $\rightarrow$ (both $\rightarrow$ and $\leftarrow$) on a Fifth Dynasty false door and offering basin in Berlin. Another example of this occurs in Mariette’s copy of an architrave from the cemetery of Akhmim.

The following list documents the evidence, first for $\rightarrow$, then for $\leftarrow$, subdividing the material according to provenance. An asterisk (*) indicates the orientation and number of occurrences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>$\leftarrow (\rightarrow)$</th>
<th>$\rightarrow (\leftarrow)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Junker, <em>Giza</em> I, fig. 63</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) ———— II, fig. 8</td>
<td>(normal $\leftarrow$ opposite)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) ———— III, fig. 14</td>
<td>* (and normal $\leftarrow$)</td>
<td>(in fig. 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) ———— IV, fig. 6</td>
<td>(normal $\leftarrow$ opposite, but $\rightarrow$ in fig. 11)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) ———— V, fig. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) ———— VIII, fig. 46</td>
<td>(normal $\rightarrow$ in fig. 44)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) ———— VIII, fig. 51</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

165 It may also be noted that $\leftarrow$ (D61) has been assimilated to this sign in the cartouche of Sahure, a short distance above it. Conversely, $\rightarrow$ is assimilated to $\leftarrow$ on CG 1336, a small offering slab.

166 Simpson, *Western Cemetery* I, fig. 44; also CG 1565; Hassan, *Excavations at Saqqara III*, fig. 37; B. W. Davies et al., *Saqqara Tombs I*, pl. 11; W. Gangstedt, *Medelhavsmuseet Bulletin* 1 (1961), 43, fig. 1; Kanawati et al., *Excavations at Saqqara*, pl. 27; Fischer, *Coptite Nome*, pl. 13; and a Dyn. XI stela at Chatsworth House (*MDAIK* 4 [1933], 187).

167 Firth and Gunn, *Teti Pyramid Cemeteries*, pl. 58 (6), 85 (2); Schneider, *OMRO* 52 (1971), 10, fig. 1.

168 Berlin 11469, 11477: *Aeg. Inschr.* I, pp. 44 ff. There are three cases in all, as opposed to one normal occurrence of $\leftarrow$.

169 Kanawati, *El-Hawawish II*, fig. 16 (c), from A. Mariette, *Monuments divers* (Paris 1889), pl. 21b. On p. 51 Kanawati implies that Mariette’s copy is not entirely accurate, but the only clear discrepancy between it and the less complete copy in El-Hawawish I, fig. 1, is the omission of $\rightarrow$ in imy. Another example seems to be indicated by Mariette, *Mastabas*, p. 333.
6. Semi-reversed forms of \( \rightarrow \) (F 39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>VIII, fig. 58</td>
<td>(normal ( \not\rightarrow ) opposite)</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>IX, fig. 104</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hassan, <em>Giza</em> I, fig. 143</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I, fig. 168, pls. 63, 64</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>II, fig. 131</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>III, figs. 173, and probably 171</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>V, fig. 127</td>
<td>(normal ( \not\rightarrow ) in fig. 119)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>VII, fig. 38</td>
<td>(normal ( \not\rightarrow ) opposite)</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fakhry, <em>Sept. tombeaux</em>, fig. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>, figs. 10, 11, 12</td>
<td>****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><em>LD II, pls. 10a, 11</em></td>
<td>** (and normal ( \not\rightarrow ))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>, pl. 34 (g); cf. Hassan, <em>Giza</em> VII, pl. 16(A)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>, pl. 82 (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cairo J 48852 (Smith, <em>JEA</em> 19 [1933], pl. 23)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>James, <em>Hieroglyphic Texts</em> I, pl. 11 (probably Giza)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>, pl. 21 (3) (probably Giza)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Fischer, <em>Egyptian Studies</em> I, p. 36, fig. 12 (probably Giza)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(normal ( \not\rightarrow ) on p. 34; retained ( \not\rightarrow ) on p. 33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Eva Martin-Pardey, <em>CAA Hildesheim</em> 1, p. 8</td>
<td>(normal ( \not\rightarrow ) opposite)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td><em>Boston MFA 13.4352</em> (Wreszinski, <em>Atlas</em> III, pl. 69)</td>
<td>(normal ( \not\rightarrow ) opposite)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cairo J 38674 (offering slab from Reisner’s G 2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAQQARA**

<p>| 28  | Hodjash and Berlev, <em>Egyptian Reliefs</em>, pp. 32, 37 | (normal ( \not\rightarrow ) p. 27) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Notes on Hieroglyphic Palaeography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>p. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>CG 1388 (Smith, AJA 46 [1942], p. 512) (normal △ opposite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>Murray, Saqqara Mastabas I, pl. 31 (5) (no. 6 has △)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>Fig. 2 above (normal △ opposite) (also normal △)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>Hassan, Excavations at Saqqara II, fig. 34 b (normal △ opposite) (also normal △)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>Moussa and Nassar, SAK 7 (1979), 156, 159 (normal △ opposite) **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>Capart, Rue de tombeaux, pl. 11 (normal △ opposite) (also normal △)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>Jéquier, Tombeaux de particuliers, figs. 38–40 (post-Dyn. VI) (normal △ opposite) ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>Quibell, Excavations at Saqqara 1905–06, pl. 12 (post-O.K.) (normal △ opposite) (and reversed △)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>Schneider, OMRO 52 (1971), 12 (Dyn. X or later) (normal △ opposite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>Cairo J 59158 (Fischer, ZÄS 90 [1963], pl. 6 [post-O.K.]) (normal △ opposite)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provincial**

| (40) | Davies, Deir el Gebrâwi II, pl. 19 (post-Dyn. VI?) (and normal △) |
| (41) | A. El Khouli and N. Kanawati, Quseir El Amarna (Sydney 1989), pl. 36 (and normal △) (and normal △ elsewhere) |
| (42) | Kanawati, El-Hawawish I, fig. 19a (post-Dyn. VI) (△ in fig. 16g) (and normal △ elsewhere) |
| (43) | I, fig. 24c (post-O.K.) (△) |
| (44) | II, figs. 15, 19 (post-Dyn. VI) (normal △) (△) |
| (45) | VI, pl. 10a and fig. 26a (post-Dyn. VI?) (normal △ elsewhere) |
| (46) | VII, fig. 7 (post-O.K.) |

*
### 6. Semi-reversed Forms of ⦍ (F₃₉)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(→)</th>
<th>(←)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>Petrie, <em>Athisis</em>, pl. 8 (post-O.K.)</td>
<td>(normal ⦍ opposite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>CG 1574 (Fischer, <em>Egyptian Studies I</em>, pl. 20; Abydos)</td>
<td>(normal ⦍ opposite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>CG 1578 (Abydos)</td>
<td>(normal ⦍ opposite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>CG 1619 (Abydos; post-Dyn. VI?)</td>
<td>(normal ⦍ opposite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>Boston, MFA 04.1851 (Brovarski, <em>Studies in Honor of George R. Hughes</em> [Chicago 1977], p. 39; from Thebes?)</td>
<td>(normal ⦍ opposite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>CG 57200 (provenance uncertain; end of Dyn. VI?)</td>
<td>(and normal ⦍)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>Berlin 7779, Pl. 7 above (provenance uncertain; Dynasty VIII?)</td>
<td>(normal ⦍ opposite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>Petrie and Brunton, <em>Sedment I</em>, pl. 27 (C-D) (post-O.K.)</td>
<td>(and ⦍)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(→)</th>
<th>(←)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>Simpson, <em>Kawab, Khafkhufu I and II</em>, fig. 17 (24-12-201) (Dynasty IV)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>Junker, <em>Giza III</em>, fig. 15</td>
<td>(⦍ in fig. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(58)</td>
<td>———— III, fig. 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>———— IV, fig. 11</td>
<td>(and normal ⦍)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>———— V, fig. 48</td>
<td>(and normal ⦍)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>———— IX, fig. 36</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(62)</td>
<td>———— IV, fig. 78</td>
<td>(and normal ⦍)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(63) Hassan, <em>Giza VI/3</em>, fig. 126</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(64) Fisher, <em>Giza</em>, pl. 48 (3)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(65) Petrie, <em>Giza and Rifeh</em>, pl. 7A (right, second from top)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAQQARA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(66) Murray, <em>Saqqara Mastabas I</em>, pl. 31 (6)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(67) Brooklyn Museum 51.1 (Dynasty VI)(^b)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(68) Jéquier, <em>ASAE</em> 35 (1935), 152, fig. 16A (post-O.K.)</td>
<td>**** (and normal (\leftarrow))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(69) Berlin 8800 (provenance uncertain)(^c)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(70) Manchester 10780: Chap. 4 above, Fig. 8</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Misread on p. 8; this is ... mst nb imxh hj[fol] it fi ... true ..., possessor of reverence with his father.

\(^b\) James, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Inscriptions*, pl. 23 (57); Peter Kaplony, *Studien zum Grab des Meketeti* (Bern 1976), p. 64, fig. 12 (a). This form does not occur in any of the other inscriptions illustrated by Kaplony, though it almost does so in his fig. 14 (c), p. 70; cf. Cooney, *Brooklyn Museum Bulletin* 15/1 (Fall, 1953), 22, fig. 13, which is not an exact facsimile.

\(^c\) Illustrated in *Staatsliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Katalog der Originalabgüsse, Heft 1/2* (Berlin 1968), pl. 4 (923); the copy in *Aeg. Inscr.* I, 19, misrepresents the sign. This relief is peculiar in many ways. The extremely prognathous face is unusual, as is the division between the titles and name; the leopard skin oddly disappears beneath the kilt; the musculature of the legs is abnormally exaggerated. The date can hardly be later than Dyn. IV, and is perhaps even earlier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(71) Davies, <em>Deir el Gebrâwi II</em>, pl. 23 (post-Dyn. VI)</th>
<th>* (normal on pl. 25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(72) Kanawati, <em>El-Hawawish I</em>, fig. 16g (post-Dyn. VI)</td>
<td>* (and normal (\leftarrow) elsewhere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(73) Fitzwilliam Museum FMS 1812 (Plate 50 below, Abydos, post-Dyn. VI?)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(74) Petrie, <em>Diospolis Parva</em> (London 1901), pl. 25 (Dyn. XI)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(75) Petrie and Brunton, <em>Sedment I</em>, pl. 27 (C) (post-O.K.?)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(76) Petrie, <em>Dendera</em>, pl. 15 (“Ankhsema, post-O.K.”)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. The hieroglyph ⲟ (G26) and other writings of the name of Thoth

The god Thoth is customarily represented by a hieroglyph that shows an ibis on a standard. Throughout all but the latest years of the Old Kingdom this standard, unlike the one that supports other divine emblems (𓆒, R12), often shows a base in the form of a mound or domed structure. Another, less conspicuous peculiarity is the fact that, in many of the more detailed examples, the ibis does not perch directly upon the standard; his feet rest on a rectangular stand that is distinct from the standard itself; this may be seen in the tomb of Pḥ-htp (Fig. 13a), but appears even more clearly in an example from the tomb of ṯḥ (Fig. 13b). In the Sun Temple of Neuserre a rectangular base of the same kind also supports a falcon that is carried on a standard, but here, as elsewhere, the base is generally confined to the ibis. The proportions of the base vary, and it is sometimes quite thin and elongated. I suspect that it has escaped notice in many copies of Old Kingdom texts.

At the beginning of the Twelfth Dynasty, as seen from an example in the Karnak shrine of Sesostris I (Fig. 13c), the supplementary base is again thin and elongated, but still

---

170 Davies, Pḥahntos I, pl. 8 (112).
171 Ibid., (101).
172 Wild, Ti III, pl. 182; cf. also pl. 184.
173 Bissing, Re-Ḥelīqātum II, pl. 6 (one falcon with base, one without); III, pl. 1 (103, both falcon and ibis have a base). In II, pl. 19, both lack it.
174 The ibis has a base, the falcon does not, ibid. II, pl. 13; III, pl. 8 (188), and the ibis likewise has a base in III, pl. 1 (106, 107). For other examples see Pḥyr. 1271 a and c; Hassan, Gḥa I, fig. 143; Moussa and Altenmüller, Nianchnun, fig. 4.
175 Last example and Borchartd, Grab. Sūhur-rī I, pl. 12.
176 Lacau and Chevrier, Chapelle de Sesostris II, pl. 11 (D 2); this detail is lacking ibid. (C 2), which is reproduced in Epigraphie, pl. 8.
Fig. 13. Variations of ḫ: (a, b) Old Kingdom; (c–d) Dyn. XII; (e) Dyn. XVIII

rectangular. Later in the same dynasty, during the reign of Sesostris III, the most important of the rock-cut tombs at Bersha repeatedly and consistently introduces a curve in the ends of the base, although the shape is not very well defined. A color facsimile from this source (Fig. 13d) indicates that the base is very light in hue—perhaps white.

Despite the absence of other evidence for this detail from the Middle Kingdom, it must have been customary, for it continued into the New Kingdom. Many clear examples are known from the Thutmoside Period of the Eighteenth Dynasty, when the name of Thoth frequently appeared in large-scale cartouches. These examples normally show the base in the form —, and if painted (as in Fig. 13e), the color is white, outlined in red. In a few cases one or both ends are squared off, as previously, but these are probably to be attributed to poor workmanship.

It has occurred to me that the supplementary base might have suggested the sign = (X₄), which in turn might have led to the Middle Kingdom writing of Thoth as △ or □.

As I have pointed out, however, the base is not known to have resembled — before the second half of the Twelfth Dynasty, long after the enigmatic writing came into use at the end of the Heracleopolitan Period. Even if it had occasionally acquired the form — at

---

177 Newberry, Bersekh I, pls. 7, 10, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 27, 29, 32, 33, 34.
178 Griffith, Hieroglyphs, pl. 9 (168); a reference to Newberry’s publication is lacking (pl. 157).
179 Obelisk of Thuthmosis I, Karnak (G. Jéquier, L’architecture I [Paris 1920], pl. 21); Thuthmosis II (M. Abdul-Qader Muhammed, Äsäf 59 [1966], pl. 9 to p. 150); Shrine of Thuthmosis III, Cairo J 38575 (Kurt Lange and Max Hirmer, Ägypten [Munich 1957], pl. 17); block of Thuthmosis III from Abydos, MMA 02.4.199 (Hayes, Scepter II, fig. 61, pl. 119). Later examples: Oriental Institute, Chicago, Tomb of Khaseuf (Chicago 1950), pl. 75, col. 2; Calverley, Temple of Sethos I, III, pl. 5; but not IV, pl. 33 D. The detail in question became less frequent in the Nineteenth Dynasty.
180 Nina M. Davies, Picture Writing of Ancient Egypt (Oxford 1958), pl. 3 (4). Said to come from Theban Tomb 09; cf. Davies, Kenisi I, pl. 8, col. 14 (which does not seem identical, however, nor does the example on pl. 63). For other examples of the color see Lange and Hirmer, loc. cit., and Naville, Deir el-Bahari I, pl. 14.
181 E.g., Mohamed Aly et al., Amada IV (Cairo 1967), C 10, C 31, C 36, E 1–6, as opposed to C 7 (détail).
182 Invariably transcribed as △ by De Buck in CT, but Lacau distinguishes between the two forms; cf. △ in his Sarcophages II, pp. 43 (top), 140 (top, line 2) and △ on pp. 138, 139 (bottom). Kamal, Äsäf 3 (1902), 278, also gives the form △ as well as △, and this may be compared with △ and △ in Hatnub Inschr. X (note following).
183 Rudolf Anthes, Hatnub, Inscr. X, pp. 14–15. On p. 22 Anthes refers to a possible Old Kingdom example (Mariette, Mastabas, D 62), but this is a normal writing of ḫnswt, the Thoth-festival, as may be seen from the more accurate copy by Murray, Saqqara Mastabas I, pl. 8. The sign transcribed as △ in Anthes’ pl. 11 a (6) may well be △; the traces suggest △ (cf. Ranke, PNI, 335 (90) and Hatnub Gr. 48).
that early a date, it seems surprising that the enigmatic writing would always appear as ☼ or the like, and never show the form that hypothetically inspired it.

For much the same reason as the last, I find it difficult to accept the explanation offered by Jacques Parlebas for the writing ☼. ¹⁸⁴ He argues that this writing derives from wḏḥw “offerings,” which sometimes, in the Coffin Texts, has the determinatives ☼ ☼ ☼ or ☼ ☼. But these determinatives indicate food in general, as in ☼ ☼. Although it does not seem theoretically possible that wḏḥw might be followed by ☼ alone, Parlebas is unable to cite any evidence of this except for an incomplete Sixth Dynasty example of wḏḥw from Dendera which is clearly to be restored as ☼ ☼ ☼. ¹⁸⁵ Moreover, he does not mention the more numerous cases in the Coffin Texts where wḏḥw is followed by different groups of determinatives, among which, as it happens, ☼ occurs without ☼ rather than the opposite; these variations include: ☼ ☼ ☼, ☼ ☼ ☼, ☼ ☼ ☼ ☼ (or the like), ☼ ☼ ☼ (most frequently) ¹⁸⁶ and ☼ ☼. The alleged association with ☼ is therefore extremely tenuous and unconvincing.

It is not altogether clear whether, as Lacau has supposed, ¹⁹¹ the enigmatic writing of Thoth’s name was intended to replace the sign ☼ in funerary texts for superstitious reasons, as an alternative to ☼ ☼. All three writings, including the ibis, occur in the Coffin Texts, and even in those from Bersha, where the enigmatic writing is most in evidence. ¹⁹² It may perhaps be compared with some other curious writings that likewise made their appearance on the eve of the Middle Kingdom, notably ☼ ☼ for ☼ ☼ “Isis” ¹⁹³ and ☼ ☼ for ☼ ☼ “join (the land)” ¹⁹⁴—neither of which replaces a hieroglyph that might have been considered dangerous to the occupant of the burial chamber.

Furthermore in at least one case, as mentioned earlier, the enigmatic writing in question appears in an inscription above ground: ☼ ☼ ☼ ☼, but the same is possibly true of the statuette of a Twelfth Dynasty steward named Sbk-ḥtp whose father may be named ☼ ☼ ☼, but the critical sign is doubtful. ¹⁹⁶ Some comparable evidence is to be found in Ranke’s Personennamen and elsewhere, although there is again some doubt in every case. An earlier name, ☼ ☼ ☼, has been interpreted as Ḥw-Dḥwt, ¹⁹⁷ but one would expect honorific transposition, and the identification of the terminal sign seems doubtful (tum?), as does the likelihood that the enigmatic writing was in use as early as the Sixth Dynasty, the presumed date of the false door on which it occurs. The latter consideration also speaks against a Sixth Dynasty name that Ranke transcribes as ☼ ☼ ☼ ☼, following

¹⁸⁵ Petrie, Denderah, pl. 5 A (A). For similar determinatives of wḏḥw in the Old Kingdom see Junker, GAs III, pp. 101 (91), 102 (93) and cf. p. 114.
¹⁸⁶ CT II, 126b (B15C); III, 5a (B17C).
¹⁸⁷ CT III 26b (B17C); also ☼ ☼ ☼ ☼. ¹⁸⁸ CT III 254a (B15C).
¹⁸⁸ CT II, 126b, III, 5a, 26c, 254a, VII, 143: a total of nine occurrences.
¹⁸⁹ CT I, 126b, III, 5a, 26c, 254a: 17 occurrences.
¹⁹⁰ CT VII, 127 f (once).
¹⁹¹ Lacau, ZAS 51 (1914), 59.
¹⁹² E.g., CT II, 324-325b; VII, 304a, 338d, 371j, 393a, 449a.
¹⁹³ Louvre stela C 15 (Drioton, RadE 1 [1933], pl. 9, in the divinity frieze). Clère and Vandier, TTPP, 27, 4, 41, 4.
¹⁹⁴ Ibid., 6, 9, and Siut tomb V, 44 (Montet, Kémi B [1936], 111).
¹⁹⁵ See note 183 above.
¹⁹⁶ University of Pennsylvania Museum, Philadelphia, E 3391; see p. 109 above (comment e).
¹⁹⁷ PV 1, 267 (11), referring to Kamal, ASAE 12 (1911), 131, fig. 6.
Borchardt, and interprets as "möge Thot zu mir kommen."\textsuperscript{198} Here again the critical sign is quite different from $\hat{\alpha}$ and probably represents a title.\textsuperscript{199} By coincidence, a name that looks like $\hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha}$ is to be found in a painted tomb chapel of the Twelfth Dynasty at Meir.\textsuperscript{200} Once more there is reason for doubt, since Blackman disregards the apparent $\hat{\alpha}$, reading "Ini," and he notes that this name occurs in another tomb at Meir.\textsuperscript{201} The apparent $\hat{\alpha}$ covers the toe of one foot of the individual in question, and may simply be a chip in the surface; its shape is rather different from other examples of $\hat{\alpha}$ in the same chapel. A Middle Kingdom stela bears a name that has been read $\hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha}$ "Thot(?) richtet,"\textsuperscript{202} but both of the first two signs are very unclear and might be $\hat{\alpha}$, i.e., $\hat{\alpha}$-wdj-f "Re judges," an interpretation which is more plausible since Thoth only records the judgment that is made by the supreme god. A second stela of the same period is said to mention a woman named $\hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha}$, to be read Zit-Dhuty.\textsuperscript{203} The inscriptions on this stela are very poorly executed, however,\textsuperscript{204} and it seems possible that the initial signs are $\hat{\alpha}$, in which case this may be a variant of the common Middle Kingdom name $\hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha}$.\textsuperscript{205} In short, were it not for the clear example from Hatnub, one might well conclude that the enigmatic writing of the name of Thoth was confined to coffins in the Middle Kingdom.

Two of the cases that have just been discussed are singularly reminiscent of a name which appears on a stela of the early Eighteenth Dynasty, namely $\hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha}$,\textsuperscript{206} in which Parlebas is inclined to recognize a later variant of the enigmatic writing of Dhuty.\textsuperscript{207} The enigmatic writing is indeed known from the New Kingdom, but it retains the form $\hat{\alpha}$ or $\hat{\alpha}$ (without $\hat{\alpha}$) and is confined to the context of funerary spells.\textsuperscript{208} It seems even more unlikely that it is to be recognized in $\hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha}$, the nomen of the Seventeenth Dynasty ruler Seqenenre, to which Parlebas applies the same interpretation. I find it difficult to believe that $\hat{\alpha}$ would appear in none of the many examples of this cartouche\textsuperscript{209} if the name of Thoth were really present.

As for the origin of the writing $\hat{\alpha}$, it remains unexplained. Boylan’s comparison of $\hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha}$ "ibis" in Pyr. 425\textsuperscript{210} does not seem to provide a clue, nor does an isolated example of $\hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha}$ "Dhuty-Festival" in Urk. I, 28 (12). These merely show an Old Kingdom deviner.”

\textsuperscript{198} PNII, 260 (29), referring to CG 1419.
\textsuperscript{199} In PNII, 9 (25), referring to the same example in Mariette, Maukhes, p. 981, he reads the name without the sign in question, which Mariette shows more accurately $\hat{\alpha}$. It seems to represent a pellet of natron on a basin, and may be related to the pail and brush that are carried by the individual who is identified.
\textsuperscript{200} Blackman, Meir III, pl. 22.
\textsuperscript{201} Ibid., pp. 30, referring to Meir II, pl. 15.
\textsuperscript{202} PNII, 407 (21), referring to CG 20715d (3).
\textsuperscript{203} PNII, 295 (5), referring to CG 20117i.
\textsuperscript{204} Not illustrated by Lange and Schäfer, but the style of the carving is said to be poor. Cf. Mariette, Monuments d’Abydos (Paris 1880), p. 329 (q21): "Les hiéroglyphes sont à peine ébauchés et ne se laissent pas toujours deviner.”
\textsuperscript{205} PNII, 294 (18).
\textsuperscript{206} PNII, 293, 22.
\textsuperscript{207} GM 15 (1975), 41.
\textsuperscript{208} Boylan, Thoth (London 1922), p. 22, cites Naville, Das ägyptische Todtenbuch der XVIII. bis XX. Dynastie (Berlin 1886), 94. 4. The Belegstellen to Wh V, 606 (1) refer also to Lorent’s publication of Theban Tomb 57 in MIPAO 1/1, p. 123 (6); and De Buck, in Frankfort, Cenotaph of Seti I (London 1933), pl. 85 and p. 86 (cols. 39 and possibly 41).
\textsuperscript{209} For which see Jürgen von Beckerath, Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte der zweiten Zwischenzeit in Ägypten (Glückstadt 1962), pp. 293–96.
\textsuperscript{210} Boylan, loc. cit., repeated by Wh V, 211 (2).
8. The assimilation of 𓊣 (M12) and 𓊢 (M22)

The sign 𓊣 is occasionally assimilated to 𓊢 in some Old Kingdom lists of offerings, and a more striking example occurs on the false door of the Director of Grain-measurers 𓊣𓊱𓊗𓊣 nn (Fig. 14), in whose title the sign for 𓊱 assumes the same form as that of nn in the name. This similarity has understandably led to some doubt about the reading of both the name and the title. By an odd coincidence a recurrence of the same title again shows this assimilation on a late Old Kingdom stela from Abydos (Pl. 45). A partial assimilation to 𓊢 is also to be seen in a series of Eleventh Dynasty examples of 𓊣, where the roots of the lotus are abnormally extended (Pl. 46 and Excursus). Conversely, the base of 𓊣 seems to be assimilated to that of 𓊢 in an Old Kingdom example of the name Ḥmn.f (Fig. 15), or to the top of 𓊢 in a list of offerings (Fig. 16).

Rowe and Lucas (ASF 1942, 348) illustrate the title from the bottom of the false door, but do not provide a reading. H. Goedicke, *Die privaten Rechtsinschriften* (Vienna 1970), p. 182, rightly translates "der Leiter der Kornmesser," which Cherpin, op. cit., p. 129, n. 4, misunderstands as "le chef du bureau de mesure du grain." She prefers "le chef du mesure du grain;" in this case, however, one would expect the final t of hot.

Goedicke, op. cit., pp. 182 ff., reads Tḥḥḥ. Rowe and Lucas (loc. cit.) and Cherpin, op. cit., p. 127, give a better reading, more or less corresponding to that of Ranke, PNI 431 (5); II, 405: Ḥḥ(j)-nn or Ḥḥ(j)-nn.

Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. E. SS. 76, height 63.5 cm. I am indebted to Janine Bourriau for permission to publish the photograph. The owner, Şps-Pḥb, is also ṣḥḥ pr-ṣr "inspector of the department of stores," and ṣḥḥ pr-ṣr((n)) "overseer of confectioners." His wife's name is Ṣḥḥ (cf. PNI 394 [7]). The son is apparently identified as ṣḥḥ mḥ, and may have the second of his father's titles, of which only ṣḥḥ mḥ is written; in this case his name is Ṣḥḥ. For the orientation of Ḥḥḥ (𓊢) in both cases cf. the same writing of the title in CG 1411 and Habachi, *Sixteen Studies on Lower Nubia* (Cairo 1981), p. 21, fig. 5; also the name Ḥḥḥ 𓊢 on an architrave from Abydos; Cairo J 49803 (Frankfort, *JEA* 14 [1928], pl. 20). And for the provenance of the stela cf. *JARCE* 1 (1962), 8, n. 15.

Cairo CG 57008: Alexandre Moret and D'Abou-Ghazi, *Denkmäler des Alten Rechtes* III/1 (Cairo 1978), p. 18; from Reiser's Giza tomb 1062. Fig. 15 is based on the drawing given there. For the interpretation of the name ("his phallic") see Kaplony, *MIO* 14 (1968), 204–205. A somewhat similar example occurs in the offering list shown by Hassan, Giza II, fig. 239, but in this case it seems to be assimilated to Ḥḥḥ (Q 7) in an adjacent entry.

Junker, *Giza X*, fig. 55.
The second direction of assimilation became more pronounced in the Middle Kingdom. Two Twelfth Dynasty tombs at Beni Hasan show the name of El Kab written \( \text{\text未来字符} \) in place of the usual \( \text{\text未来字符} \).\(^{223}\) The same writing occurs in the Coffin Texts (CT I, 281 e; V, 202 a; VI, 106 g),\(^{224}\) and Faulkner cites some other cases: \( \text{\text未来字符} \) for \( \text{\text未来字符} \) (CT VII, 109 u), \( \text{\text未来字符} \) for \( \text{\text未来字符} \) (CT I, 48 b; IV, 5 a; see also VII, 173–76).\(^{225}\) The provenance of these examples includes Saqqara, Bershah, Meir, Asyut and Thebes. The frieze of offerings in a coffin from Bershah also has a caption identifying a vulture as \( \text{\text未来字符} = \text{Nhbyt} \) (CG 28123, no. 44).\(^{226}\)

\(^{223}\) Newberry, Beni Hasan I, pl. 13 and Urk. VII, 20 (11) (tomb 2); Beni Hasan I, pl. 44 and Urk. VII, 11 (7) (tomb 14).

\(^{224}\) All cited by Farouk Gomaa, Besiedlung, p. 54, along with the references in the preceding note (p. 53).

\(^{225}\) JEA 67 (1981), 173. As Dimitri Meeks notes in Annon Lexigraphique 2 (1978), 78.2934, this eliminates the doubtful entry in Wi. III, 229 (14), which is based on the next example.

\(^{226}\) CG 28123 (Laca, Sarcophages II, p. 141).
8. THE ASSIMILATION OF 𓊴 (M12) AND 𓊵 (M22); EXCURSUS 207

Faulkner suggests that the substitution of 𓊴 for 𓊵 “perhaps arose from a misreading of Hieratic.”

The hieratic signs are quite distinctive, however. The similarity of some hieroglyphic examples of the Old Kingdom provides a more likely explanation.

Excursus

The writing board illustrated on Pl. 46 is briefly mentioned by William C. Hayes, who observes that “it contains numerous incorrect signs and mispellings.” Some of the signs are related to forms that occur as early as the Old Kingdom in semi-cursive hieroglyphs: 𓊷, 𓊸, and 𓊹 (with tufted “ears”). The sign 𓊵 has the cap that was usual from the Eighth Dynasty onward (for which see part 13 below). The form of 𓊷 seems to show lugs on either side of the vessel, as in inscriptions of the Eleventh Dynasty, and 𓊵, with five loops, is typical of the Heracleopolitan Period. I have no parallels for the eyebrow in 𓊹, or for the sign 𓊵, in the form of a box on legs, but the latter doubtless derives from hieratic.

Translation: (1) An offering which the king gives, and Osiris, that invocation offerings go forth (2) to one revered (3) with the Great God, lord of heaven, (4) and with Min, lord of Akhmim, (5) Ipi, deceased (6) one whom his father praised, (7) one whom his mother praised, namely (8) thousands of (9) bread and beer, cattle and fowl (10) to the Count and Overseer of Disputes Ipi.

Comments: (a) The unusual sequence of signs is known from a few other examples; see Lapp, *Opferformel*, 1, n. 4.

(b) The sign 𓊵 seems to be written incompletely.

(c) Note that 𓊷 is omitted from the group 𓊵 𓊷 𓊹.

(d) The determinative 𓊷 is missing.

(e) The suggested restoration is <hбр> kэтому “possession of a kэтому” an epithet that follows personal names, for which see Blackman, *Meir II*, p. 22.

(f) Note that a relative construction is used rather than the expected passive participle.

(g) While the preceding phrase might be read hzı.n it, the suffix pronoun is clearly omitted in this case.

(h) The intrusive 𓊷 is otherwise difficult to explain; it can hardly belong to 𓊷.

(i) The plural strokes after 𓊷 are superfluous.

---

227 Faulkner, *loc. cit.*
228 *Scepter* I, p. 294, Acc. no. 28.9.5; dimensions 22 x 8.5 cm. The provenance is unknown.
229 For the first and last of these see Caminos and Fischer, *Epigraphy and Palaeography*, p. 41, fig. 4, and for the other see *ibid.*, p. 49 and n. 78.
230 ZAá 100 (1973), 18, fig. 2 (t-z), 20 (M); for another Dyn. XI example see Petrie, *Abydos II*, pl. 25. Examples of earlier date are known from hieratic: Goedicke, *Old Hieratic Palaeography* (Baltimore 1988), pp. 46a–b (W 22).
The word  is apparently mmnt, which is known no earlier than the Middle Kingdom. The baseline beneath the animal is well known from the Heracleopolitan Period: Fischer, Dendera, p. 135.

The two birds are difficult to identify, but the group evidently attempts to show graphic dissimilation of the kind discussed by van de Walle, Ägyptologische Studien (Grapow Festschrift, Berlin 1955), pp. 366–78.

This is the earlier writing of the title, which was revised to in the Twelfth Dynasty. Here the determinative is evidently : cf. Fischer, Coptite Nome, pp. 107–109 and fig. 15 (line 4).

While the name Ipi is not particularly indicative of the date, the foregoing remarks on palaeography strongly support Hayes' conclusion that the inscription belongs to the Eleventh Dynasty. And even if some of the signs are less singular than might be supposed, and some even show adroitness, he is also doubtless correct in taking this to be the work of an apprentice scribe.

9. The signs  (O22) and (W4)

The word hb “festival” is consistently written on the verso of the Palermo Stone and in the inscriptions on vessels from the Step Pyramid of Djoser, some dating to the end of the First Dynasty. This usage evidently extended down through the reign of Djoser himself. Thus, prior to the Fourth Dynasty, only the context distinguished the interpretation of this sign as hb or zh “pavilion.” The addition of to clarify the reading as hb is first known from the time of Sneferu in the title , although it occurs there in only one out of four occurrences. Possibly another example is to be found in relief fragments from Sneferu’s valley temple at Dahshur, but here again the old writing occurs as well. The writing of “festival” persisted to some extent throughout the Old Kingdom, when it is attested in names such as (var. ). also occasionally appears as the determinative of various festivals. An offering slab of this period provides evidence of a confusion between hb and zh; the inscription of the principal owner

---

835 It is well attested in Old Kingdom sources; see p. 23 above, comment n.
834 P. Lacau and J.-Ph. Lauer, La Pyramide à Dégrès IV, fasc. 1 (Cairo 1959), pls. A 4 (5), B 8 (41), both reign of Qe-.
835 Uitk I, 134 (4); cf. Smith, HESPÖK, fig. 50, p. 135. Kaplony makes the same observation: CÄE 41 (1966), 34. E.g., in the title  Petrie, Royal Tombs I, pl. 30 (reign of Qe-).
836 Petrie, Meidum, pl. 10, as opposed to other examples on pls. 10, 13, 14. For the title cf. Junker, Giza II, pp. 162, 190, 191, Fischer, Titels, pp. 13 ff. (698c).
838 Ahmed Fakhry, Monuments of Snefru II, Pt. 1 (Cairo 1961), fig. 185, where may possibly represent hb nb “every feast.” The sign is lacking in the estate name Hbs-Senwrs, fig. 11.
839 Uitk I, 138 (4), 165 (18); Mariette, Mastabas, pp. 116, 157; Hassan, Giza II, fig. 17; Mennerika, pl. 20B (festival scene).
840 E.g., Hassan, Giza IX, p. 52.
841 K. G. Posener-Krämer and de Cenival, Abu Sir Papyri, pl. 9, F, Q.
842 E.g., Hassan, Giza II, figs. 217, 237; VII, fig. 29.
invokes offerings 𓊤𓊃 on (every) feast,” while that of his wife has 𓊤𓊣𓊆𓊃. This error has led to another one—the meaningless insertion of 𓊡, from the well-known title ḫrp-zh. The same confusion occurs in a case where the title ḫrp-zh is written 𓊣𓊤, with ḫb replacing zh.²⁴⁴

In the Middle Kingdom the use of 𓊣 for ḫb survived to a lesser extent at Bershah²⁴⁵ and Beni Hasan²⁴⁶ as well as Elephantine.²⁴⁷ In addition, 𓊣 was conversely used for zh at the first two of these sites, if only occasionally, as in the phrase 𓊣 — 𓊣 zh n šrw “council of the officials” at Beni Hasan²⁴⁸ or ḫnty zh-ntr at Bershah, in the familiar epitaph of Anubis,²⁴⁹ and probably also in the title 𓊣 𓊣 ḫrp zh, on a stela of the Heracleopolitan Period.²⁵⁰

It should be noted that the combination of 𓊣 and 𓊣 was written as two separate signs in the Old Kingdom, and that a separation continues to appear between them in most of the more carefully executed inscriptions of the Middle Kingdom. The composite form 𓊣 does not seem to have come into use much before the reunification of Egypt in the Eleventh Dynasty.²⁵¹ It only gradually prevailed over the separated form,²⁵² which is exemplified as late as the Eighteenth Dynasty, if only rarely,²⁵³ and one example from the reign of Amenophis I shows a curious compromise: 𓊣.²⁵⁴ At the end of the Middle Kingdom the composite form was occasionally assimilated to the newly-created composite writing of ḫry-hbt “lector priest” as 𓊤,²⁵⁵ and this, in turn, might be assimilated to 𓊣 𓊣 or even 𓊣.²⁵⁶

²⁴³ Cairo CG 57098. Wb. III, 464, notes that 𓊣 is attested as a writing of zh in the Old Kingdom; the example is probably LD II pl. 6. For other examples see 𓊣 𓊣 in Hassan, Gia VI/3 fig. 195, and Petrie, Denderah, pl. 11B.
²⁴⁴ LD II, 50: two examples in the same register.
²⁴⁵ Newberry, Bershah II, p. 26, in the phrase ḫb “a man of festival.” But ḫb has 𓊣 on pl. 7 and Vol. I, pl. 15.
²⁴⁶ Newberry, Beni Hasan II, pl. 18.
²⁴⁷ Habachi, Hapi, p. 27, fig. 1, in the phrase 𓊣 𓊣 “white bread of festivals.” Also a stela, probably from Abydos (Anastasi), in the phrase 𓊣 𓊣 “festival scent” (Boeser, Beschr. avg. Sommly, II, pl. 27). Many other examples could doubtless be found.
²⁴⁸ Newberry, Beni Hasan I, pl. 9; for the reading of this phrase cf. Bershah II, pl. 13, col. 23; Gardiner, JEA 4 (1917), pl. 8 (line 7).
²⁴⁹ CG 28091: Lacau, Sarcophages II, p. 38; there is a further example of this writing of zh in Newberry, Bershah II, pl. 13 (col. 16, as opposed to 23, which shows the normal form).
²⁵⁰ Published by Clérel, Miscellanea Gregoriana (Rome 1941), 455 ff. Although the lower right of this group has been lost (oriented →), the left end of 𓊣 lines up with the edge of 𓊣 above it, and is not centered below 𓊣; cf. another example of 𓊣 in the same column. For the peculiar name 𓊣 — which follows this cf. 𓊤 𓊣 on a stela of the same period from Gebelein, and the remarks on this in Kush 9 (1961), 57, n. 20.
²⁵¹ Clérel and Vandier, TPPI, 8, 87 (v, but not ψ), § 32 (line 5), § 33 (line 10); Louvre C 14 (line 7); Al. Badawy, CAE 36 (1961), 270.
²⁵² For some relatively early Twelfth Dynasty examples see Louvre C 3, lines 10, 18 (Simpson, Terrace of the Great God, pl. 15, temp. Sesostris I); BM 507 (ibid., pl. 22 [5, 9, 15]) and Munich GL WAF 35 (ibid., pl. 30 [6], both temp. Amenemhet II).
²⁵³ Davies, Rēkh-mi-Rṣ, pl. 16 (15-16). For fused 𓊣 see Griffith, Hieroglyphs, pl. 2 (9); Davies and Gardiner, Amenemḥet, pl. 18 (top); Davies, Payenō II, pl. 50 (upper register).
²⁵⁴ Winlock, JEA 4 (1917), pl. 4.
²⁵⁵ This is anticipated in an occurrence of 𓊣 for ḫb that is as early as Amenemhet II: Blackman, Meir III, pl. 13. A Thirteenth Dynasty example is to be found on CG 20556.
²⁵⁶ Martin, MDAIK 35 (1979), 223 (61). Cf. Daressy, ASAE 17 (1917), 238, although Engelbach’s index, ASAE 22 (1922), 127 f., gives the normal form in this case. Also Winlock, Rise and Fall of the Middle Kingdom in Thebes (New York 1947), pls. 43 (41), 45 (74), although these are not exact facsimiles.
²⁵⁷ Winlock, op. cit., pls. 43 (42), 45 (72); here the absence of 𓊣 is evidently certain.
10. The hieroglyph for “East” (R15)

In the Addenda to my Ancient Egyptian Calligraphy I have observed that A.H. Gardiner, in the Sign List of his Egyptian Grammar, adopts for R15 Sethe’s interpretation of † as a “spear decked out as standard,” whereas Sethe’s own evidence actually indicates that the standard bears a feather, viewed from the front. This conclusion calls for a more detailed explanation than I was able to provide in my brief note.

The notion that † represents a spear was suggested to Sethe by the Protodynastic “Hunt Palette” in the Louvre and British Museum (Fig. 17),—where the emblem in question is carried by one of a row of hunters who brandish various weapons, including spears. The top of the emblem is not identical to the spearheads, however, and Griffith wisely remarks that “the work is too rough to fix the details” of the former. The only specific evidence for Sethe’s interpretation is a cryptic writing of the title imy-r zmyt ibtt “overseer of the eastern deserts” in one of the earliest Middle Kingdom tombs at Beni Hasan (Fig. 18). He, like Griffith, assumes that the seated woman, which expresses the word “eastern,” holds a spear, and he observes that its shaft is red, representing wood, while the top is green, representing copper. The color green does indeed convey the natural patination of copper or bronze to the modern mind, but it seems unlikely that the ancient

Fig. 17. Detail of archaic palette, Louvre E 11254. From a photograph


\[^{259}\] Louvre E 11254. The entire palette is shown together by W.M.F. Petrie, Ceremonial Slate Palettes (London 1953), pl. A(3).

\[^{260}\] Griffith, Hieroglyphs, p. 61.

\[^{261}\] For the normal writing see Newberry, Beni Hasan I, pls. 24, 29, 32. 33; II, pls. 22A, 24; in the last case zmyt is written . The cryptic writing is from Vol. II, pl. 14; details of the uppermost sign from Vol. III (1896), pl. 5 (80).

Egyptians would characterize any metal by its corrosion; in their iconography copper would normally be red.263

The supposed spear is, in fact, a staff, like the one held by the owner’s wife in the very same tomb (Fig. 19).264 Such staves may go back to the very end of the Old Kingdom, and they continued to be represented down to the first half of the Twelfth Dynasty. In some instances, such as the one shown in Figure 20, perhaps dating to the Ninth Dynasty,265 the tip is clearly a lotus bud, and that is how the present case is to be explained. Although I do not know the color of the bud at the top of the staff in Figure 19, an identical example from an adjacent tomb is described as being green,266 and the capital of the lotiform column behind the woman in Fig. 19 is similarly green.267

Thus the supposedly conclusive evidence from Beni Hasan sheds no light whatever on the original nature of the East-emblem, for there is no further indication that the top of the emblem was ever considered to be the bud of a lotus. The use of the lotus staff as a cryptographic allusion to the emblem is apparently based on nothing more than vague resemblance. Conceivably this resemblance was enhanced by the fact that the staff is held, as usual, in the left hand, the words for “left” and “east” being identical, but that seems doubtful since Egyptian two-dimensional representations do not clearly differentiate the left and right hand. The explanation of imy-t, the first element of the cryptographic group, is scarcely less obscure, but if the scribe felt that a lotus-tipped staff might convey the idea of 𓊓, he may equally well have expected the bow drill to serve as an allusion to 𓊓 (imy) with the hieroglyph for mountainland (𓊗𓊓) representing not only imyut "deserts,” but the "mouth" (ﾘ) of the valley (ﾘ-ი�). And the bow drill, applied to one of the hollows of 𓊗𓊓, at the same time conveys the idea that it is imy-t “in the mouth.”268

263 See Caroline Ransom Williams, Decoration of the Tomb of Pen-Neb (New York 1932), p. 53: “The present writer does not know of a demonstrable instance of green for a copper object which had acquired a green patina.”
264 Newberry, Beni Hasan II, pl. 16 (Tomb 17); cf. pl. 4 (Tomb 15).
265 Traced from Cairo Museum J 49804; for the entire monument see Jéquier, Oudjebet, fig. 37. These staves of women are related to the type of sunshade discussed in MMF 6 (1972), 151–56. An example of this type of staff is described as “speerähnlich” by Ali Hassan, Stöcke und Stäbe im pharaonischen Ägypten, Münchner Ägyptologische Studien 33 (Munich 1976), p. 197 and n. 9, though he correctly identifies some of the other examples (both lotiform and papyriform) on p. 199. For the date see my further comments in Orientalia 61 (1992), 144 ff.
266 LD Text II, p. 97, describing the example in Newberry, Beni Hasan II, pl. 4.
268 For ﾘ-ი� see Wh. II, p. 390(14). Or is the drill thought to be “he in whom the mouth is,” the mouth being the bit or point that eats into the wood?
All of the remaining evidence for the nature of the East-emblem indicates that the uppermost element is not a spearhead—as may be seen from the rounded form it takes on an ivory tablet of the First Dynasty (Fig. 21)\textsuperscript{869}—but is indeed a feather, viewed from the

\textsuperscript{869} From an ivory tablet of King Den in the British Museum (55586), in the phrase $\text{zph tpy skr ibt}$ "the first occasion of smiting the East." For bibliography see A.J. Spencer, \textit{Catalogue of Egyptian Antiquities in the British Museum V: Early Dynastic Objects} (London 1980), no. 460.
front, as exemplified by a Fourth Dynasty example (Fig. 22).\textsuperscript{270} This identification is confirmed by a scarcely later representation of three feathers on the top of a tall movable chest (\textit{std}), where the central feather is again viewed from the front, as compared with the profile view of the two feathers flanking it (Fig. 23).\textsuperscript{271} Although he was unable, in 1922, to cite any equally detailed examples of the East-emblem for the Old Kingdom, Sethe recognized that this interpretation must have been applied at least at this early a period, as is indicated by an occurrence in the Pyramid Texts where the emblem shows a feather more recognizably turned sideways: \textsuperscript{272} For the Middle Kingdom Griffith provides examples like \textsuperscript{273}, bearing a pair or feathers, and Sethe notes two New Kingdom examples that resemble Fig. 23, the feather again viewed from the front and showing a certain amount of internal

\textsuperscript{270} From JNES 18 (1959), pp. 270–71, fig. 26(l), where some other examples are cited: Junker, \textit{Giza}, I, fig. 51; III, fig. 27; Reisner, \textit{Hist. Giza Necr.}, I, pl. 19b.
\textsuperscript{271} From a photograph: R. Krause, \textit{Ägyptisches Museum der Kari-Marx-Universität, Leipzig} (1976), cover, and p. 28. The same detail appears on other reliefs from the same tomb: Borchart, \textit{Grab. Königs Ne-user-re}, p. 122, fig. 102; L. Klebs, \textit{Reliefs und Malerei des alten Reiches} (Heidelberg 1915), p. 43, fig. 28. Elsewhere, in the same context, the feathers are usually all shown in profile: Klebs, \textit{Reliefs}, fig. 29; Macramallah, \textit{Idout}, pl. 26. In at least one other case the central feather is displayed frontally, but without inner detail: Moussa and Altenmüller, \textit{Nianchhnum}, pl. 16 and bottom of pl. 19 (a).
\textsuperscript{272} Pyr. 258d.
\textsuperscript{273} Griffith, \textit{Hieroglyphs}, p. 61; Newberry, \textit{Beni Hasan}, III, pl. 3 (26); Newberry, \textit{Bersheh}, I, pl. 15. It is tempting to see a much earlier example in a fragmentary seal impression published by Newberry in \textit{Liverpool Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology} 2 (1909), pl. 23 (VIII), but this is probably the Thinite nome emblem; compare \textit{JAS} 74 (1954), p. 34.
He also cites some New Kingdom examples of the “spear,” but these are certainly only a less accurate representation of the feather.

The front view of the feather agrees with the presentation of the pair or streamers attached to the emblem. As Sethe points out, they are located behind the standard, corresponding to their position in the West-emblem, which shows the same standard in profile: ⅓. Finally, and more importantly, Sethe compares the front view of the feather with the type of feathers worn by Sopdu “Lord Of The East.” The resemblance may be more than coincidental, as also in the case of the feathers of Min, whose city of Coptos commanded one of the principal routes through the eastern desert.

11. An Old Kingdom variant of $\text{A}$ (T25)

Many years ago I illustrated and discussed the inscription on the proper left side of a granite statue, 41.2 cm high, Boston MFA 06.1879 (pl. 47): “The Wb-priest of Re, Sealer of $\text{szpt}$-cloth of the King, $\text{Snw}$. “ The first title suggests a connection with one of the Sun-temples at Abusir, in which case the date may be as early as the Fifth Dynasty. On the back the inscription is only painted: “Possessor of Reverence with his God, $\text{Snw}$,” but on the proper right side it is again incised: “The King’s Acquaintance of the Palace, Major-domo of the Robing Room, $\text{Snw}$. “ $\text{Hry-pr}$ (var. $\text{hry n pr}$) “major-domo” is fairly well attested in the Old Kingdom, usually in combination with $\text{pr-n}$ “of the palace,” and at least one supervisor of such persons is known: $\text{imy-hk hry(w)-pr}$. The title $\text{hry-pr}$ became much more common in the Middle Kingdom, and in many other connections beside the palace, but not the “robing room.” “Robing room” is ordinarily written $\text{A}$ in Old Kingdom titles, rather than $\text{A}$, but it does not seem likely that $\text{Snw}$’s title is to be interpreted as “supervisor of the house of robing.” And it is equally improbable that $\text{A}$ is transposed with $\text{A}$, so that one should read $\text{hry n qbd}$. However this may be, his association with the robing room is undoubtedly linked with the title “sealer of $\text{szpt}$-cloth of the King.”

One of the most interesting points about this inscription is the form of $\text{A}$. This and comparable examples are shown in Fig. 24. The present example is (a). The next is from Posener-Krieger and de Cenival, Abu Sir Papyri, Pal. pl. 17, where it is listed among the signs of uncertain reading. Mme. Posener-Krieger considers the possibility that it may represent
Fig. 24. Old Kingdom variants of $\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\text{\textmu}$

$qbi$, comparing my example (d), but dismisses it as “bien fragile” because it is unlike other forms of this sign in the same papyrus.\textsuperscript{282} This identification is assured, however, by example (c) from the name of an estate $\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\text{\textmu} \text{\textsuperscript{2}}\text{\textmu} \text{\textsuperscript{3}}\text{\textmu} \text{\textsuperscript{2}}\text{\textmu}$, which Helen Jacquet-Gordon plausibly translates “La recompense du labourage,” albeit with a query.\textsuperscript{283} Like these examples, the others (d, e) show a single floater, flanked by two curved lines, but one or both of these lines are shortened. The reading of (d)\textsuperscript{284} is queried by Sethe, who hesitates between $qbi$ and $qbb$, but $qbi$ “payment” is correctly adopted by Goedicke.\textsuperscript{285} The last case (e) occurs in a probably incomplete title $\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\text{\textmu} \text{\textsuperscript{2}}\text{\textmu}$ $\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\text{\textmu} \text{\textsuperscript{2}}\text{\textmu} \text{\textsuperscript{3}}\text{\textmu} \text{\textsuperscript{2}}\text{\textmu}$.\textsuperscript{286} Hassan reads the word correctly, but links it (mistakenly, I think) with the following title $w^b$-$nsut $“w^b$-priest of the king.”\textsuperscript{287}

It should be noted that, with the exception of the one from Abusir, all these examples are from Giza, and I know of only one example from Giza that does not show the single floater.\textsuperscript{288} Example (c) cannot be much later than the beginning of the Fifth Dynasty, and none is necessarily later than the end of that dynasty. The Abusir example (b) is particularly interesting since hieratic forms of $\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\text{\textmu}$ occur in the same group of papyri,\textsuperscript{289} along with other hieratic forms such as $\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\text{\textmu}$ and $\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\text{\textmu}$, that are probably to be identified with the variant in question.\textsuperscript{290} Hieroglyphic $\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\text{\textmu}$ is also known at Abusir from the funerary temple and Sun-temple of Neuserre,\textsuperscript{291} and this is doubtless the original form since it is to be recognized in $\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\text{\textmu}$, which appears on the Narmer Palette, at the beginning of the First Dynasty.\textsuperscript{292}

At Saqqara, where $\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\text{\textmu}$ is the norm in Old Kingdom inscriptions, the Fifth Dynasty tomb of $\text{\textit{Nfr-hr-n-Pht}$} shows two vertical floaters (Fig. 25a) in the word $\text{\textit{qbiw}}$ “cages.”\textsuperscript{293} Above this, where there was insufficient space to complete the words, a sketchier preliminary rendering of the sign (Fig. 25b)\textsuperscript{294} suggests how the Giza variant may have originated. Yet another

\textsuperscript{282} Posener-Krieger, *Archives*, p. 192.
\textsuperscript{283} Jacquet-Gordon, *Domaines*, p. 244.
\textsuperscript{284} D.F. L. 158 (9).
\textsuperscript{285} Goedicke, *Die privaten Rechtsnurischen*, pp. 150, 165.
\textsuperscript{286} Hassan, *Giza VII*, fig. 38.
\textsuperscript{287} *Ibid.*, p. 45. This dubious interpretation is retained in PM III, pp. 298, 942 (336). 937 (V).
\textsuperscript{288} Hassan, *Giza II*, fig. 206.
\textsuperscript{289} Posener-Krieger and de Cenival, *op. cit.*, Pal. pl. 11 (T 25).
\textsuperscript{290} *Ibid.*, Pal. pls. 10 (S 17). 17 (“Uncertain Reading,” last entry).
\textsuperscript{291} Borchardt, *loc. cit.;* Bissing, *Re-Hejigum III*, pl. 29 (446).
\textsuperscript{293} From a photograph. For reproductions of the scene see PM III, p. 637.
\textsuperscript{294} From the photograph by D. Johannes in Vandersleyen, *Das Alte Agypten*, pl. XXII.
variant from Saqqara, with three floaters attached only at the top (Fig. 25c), also bears a certain resemblance to the form from Giza.\textsuperscript{295}

In a few cases the Old Kingdom hieroglyph \(\text{a} (V35)\) tends to resemble \(\text{b} (V26)\)\textsuperscript{296} and in at least one instance (d) it has been mistaken for the latter in the title \(\text{a} \sim \text{b}\) "overseer of cloth (\textit{sfr}) of the house;"\textsuperscript{297} the man who holds this title is also simply \(\text{a} \sim \text{b}\).

Finally it should be noted that a sign that recalls the Giza form of \(\text{a}\) appears in the titulary of a certain \textit{Irr-\textit{khe}(l)}: \(\text{a} \sim \text{b}\)\textsuperscript{298} Here the last sign certainly represents \(\text{a}\) in the title \textit{imy-h\textit{t} hmu\textit{t} pr-\textit{n}} "under-supervisor of craftsmen of the palace," which is known from Saqqara and Wadi Hammamat.\textsuperscript{299}

12. The Old Kingdom form of \(\text{c} (V37)\)

Edel, in his discussion of the signs to be read \textit{idr},\textsuperscript{300} cites only one valid occurrence of the Old Kingdom form \(\text{c}\), namely the word \(\text{c} \sim \text{d} \sim \text{e} \sim \text{f}\) "punishment" in Pyr. 1462d, which is paired with \textit{mtr h\textit{m}rw} "vindication."\textsuperscript{301} There is, however, at least one other example, executed in detailed relief (Fig. 27a).\textsuperscript{302} The overall form resembles one of the objects held

\textsuperscript{295} Drioton, ASAE 43 (1943), 500, fig. 67, republished by W.V. Davies et al., Saqqara Tombs I, pls. 28–29. The horizontal attachment at the bottom is also omitted occasionally in Old Kingdom examples that are otherwise normal: Murray, Saqqara Mastabas I, pl. 28; Cairo CG 1404 (bottom left); JARCE 15 (1976), 10 (fig. 1), 16–17 (fig. 8); A. F. L. Schaeffer, \textit{Pyramid of Unas} (Princeton 1968, pl. 31 (157); more rarely later: Griffith, \textit{Inscriptions of Siut}, pl. 15 (V, 3); cf. Montet, \textit{Kemi} 6 (1936), 179; Louvre C 34 (Simpson, \textit{Terrace of the Great God}, pl. 43); Calverly, \textit{Temple of Sethos IV}, pl. 19; Oriental Institute, \textit{Medinet Habu IV}, pl. 226 (23); \textit{Temple of Khonsu I: Scenes of King Hrhor} (Chicago 1978), pl. 69 (17).

\textsuperscript{296} a. Davies, \textit{Deir el Gebrah} I, pl. 16, and cf. pl. 10; b. Davies, \textit{Ptahhotep} II pl 10, cf. I, pl. 14 (323); c. Blackman, \textit{Merr} IV, pl. 9; d. Cairo CG 1463.

\textsuperscript{297} PM III², pp. 768, 924 (511), 937 (V).

\textsuperscript{298} BM EA 69575: JEA 73 (1987), pl. 11 (1); the right end of a lintel repeating the figure of the tomb owner (cf. Fischer, \textit{Dendera}, pp. 217–19).

\textsuperscript{299} Murray, \textit{Ink}\textit{en}, pl. 25, citing Mariette, \textit{Mastabas}, E 1–2 (CG 1418) and LD II, 115. Another example, of unknown provenance, is illustrated in Sotheby Parke Bernet Auction Catalogue, New York, Sale No. 4380, May 16, 1980, no. 306. This may date to the very end of the Old Kingdom (Dyn. VIII). Like the examples from Saqqara it does not add the feminine \(\text{a}\) after \(\text{c}\), as opposed to an example in Murray, \textit{Saqqara Mastabas I}, pls. 29–30.


\textsuperscript{302} From the photograph in Hassan, \textit{Giza IV}, pl. 17 (H).
by a pair of female divinities named Guwt, on a relief of Pepy II (Fig. 28).\textsuperscript{303} But in the latter case there is no trace of any projection in front of the lower element. This projection—actually a pair of projections—might, however, be compared to those of another Old Kingdom sign that Edel likewise takes to be a precursor of $\approx$ (Fig. 27b),\textsuperscript{305} although this variant seems in part to be assimilated to detailed examples of the sign $\circ$, a heart. Furthermore it resembles the determinative $\approx$ of $\approx$ (Pyr. 1467b), which occurs in an unenlightening context but is evidently to be distinguished from $\approx$ in the preceding spell, both of which are from the pyramid of Pepy I. The lower part of the tall sign shows less resemblance to $\approx$ (sfr “linen”) than does the example from the Pyramid Texts, but the basic idea of idr as verbal “bind” or nominal “binding” is evidently expressed. Other forms, from the late Old Kingdom or Middle Kingdom, usually show two projections, as in Twelfth Dynasty $\bowtie$.\textsuperscript{306}

\textsuperscript{303} CG 1747 (from a photograph). Erika Schott (GM 9 [1974]. 34) plausibly considers that this and the rectangular object are being presented to the king, and surmises that they contain ointment and cloth. Kaplony, BiOr 28 (1971). 48, thinks they contain grain.

\textsuperscript{304} Edel, op. cit, p. 380, confirming the opinion of Helen Jacquet-Gordon in Domains, p. 256.

\textsuperscript{305} From Junker, Giza III, fig. 27; see also ibid., pl. 6 (g).

\textsuperscript{306} Griffith, Hieroglyphs, pl. 9 (181), and Newberry, Bersheh I, pl. 18. For the other forms see Wm. Ward, The Four Egyptian Homographic Roots B–3 (Rome 1978), pp. 166 f.
The example shown here, in Figure 27a, occurs on a fragmentary false door of limestone that had been removed from the tomb to which it belonged; this fact, and its condition, make the dating somewhat difficult, but it is probably no later than the Fifth Dynasty.307 The name is illegible, and only a portion of the titles have been preserved, most of them in two horizontal lines on the crossbar beneath the offering scene. Hassan transcribes them in hieroglyphic type as follows:308

The published photograph shows that the last sign of each line is incomplete. The traces are none too clear, but one is tempted to read 𓊁𓊒𓊉 which is evidently a judicial title,309 and this possibility is supported by 𓊁𓊒𓊉𓊉𓊉𓊉 “[priest] of Maat” on the right jamb. If Hassan’s reading were accepted, this would be an unexpectedly early occurrence of the epithet “pillar of Upper Egypt,” which is not otherwise known to have been used much before the Twelfth Dynasty.310 At the end of the second line the inexplicable second 𓊀 is also questionable; it seems possible to read 𓊁𓊒𓊉𓊉𓊉 ”revered.” The beginning of this line is undoubtedly to be interpreted as “greatest of the tens of Upper Egypt,”311 of preëminent seat,312 although it is not possible to recognize “ten(s)” below 𓊀 and Hassan does not in fact show this in his transcription.313 The first line begins with the familiar title 𓊀𓊒, perhaps here to be translated “acquaintance of the king,”314 followed by hry-tpt rd, the meaning of which remains to be considered.

It may be significant that, apart from the title hry-tpt rd+ nome emblem, designating Sixth Dynasty governors of Upper Egypt, the most common Old Kingdom titles beginning with hry-tpt315 are 𓊁𓊒𓊉𓊉 hry-tpt rd “overlord of clothing” (with a variety of determinatives representing cloth)316 and the less frequent 𓊁𓊒, which takes very nearly the same form in the three cases known to me, all from Giza.317 Idr is not a general term for “cloth” or “clothing,” however,318 and even if the root meaning of “binding” were extended to “accumula-

---

307 But no earlier, to judge from the offering table; cf. Nadine Cherpion, Mastabas et Hypogées d’Ancien Empire, p. 47c.
308 Hassan, op. cit., p. 43.
309 Helck, Beamtenstitel, p. 74; Fischer, JNES 18 (1959), 267 (18).
310 Jansen, Eg. Autobiographie, p. 136.
311 Fischer, op. cit., p. 265 f. (15).
313 Cf. the examples of the variant 𓊉 c. cited by Goedicke (MAIAK 21 [1966], 58).
315 I have likewise excluded 𓊁𓊒 and 𓊉𓊉𓊉, where the element in question is always placed at the end in Old Kingdom inscriptions.
316 Cairo J 48078, a granite sarcophagus from Giza (PM III, 205); Hassan, Giza II, fig. 11, where the last part of the preceding title 𓊁𓊒 is to be read twice, due to haplography; Cairo CG 16139; Cairo J 41979 (statue); Barsanti, ASAÉ 1 (1900), 152 f.; Drioton, ASAÉ 43 (1943), 507; Kanawati et al., Excavations at Saqqara I, pls. 6, 10; Hassan, Excavations at Saqqara III, figs. 40–41, p. 78; Jéquier, Tombeaux des particuliers, pp. 14, 110 (fig. 124), Pyr. des reines, fig. 35; Firth and Gunn, Teti Pyramid Cemeteries, p. 210. For post-Old Kingdom examples see Fischer, Dendera, p. 137.
317 (1) Berlin 1107C: LD II, 22b; Junker, Giza II, fig. 11; Wreszinski, Atlas III, pl. 67. (2) Kayser, Uhmka, pp. 37, 68. (3) Junker, Giza IX, fig. 104.
318 More specifically a belt or wrapping; see Edel, op. cit., p. 384.
13. Variants of 𓅁 (W14)

The sign 𓅁, a jar, representing phonetic hw, was occasionally assimilated to forms like 𓋙 (W9) and 𓅀 (W16). One example, dating to the Fifth Dynasty, is not very significant because it merely repeats the form of a sign that precedes it in the phrase 𓋙 𓋙 𓋙 𓋙 qbh mw hzn "a libation of water and natron." But no such explanation can be given for several Sixth Dynasty examples. One of them takes the form of 𓅁 in the epithet ir hzn nb.f "who does what his lord praisés," which appears on a cylinder seal bearing the name of Pepy I. This recurs as 𓅁 in the epithet wrt-hzn "great of praise," referring to his mother, Queen Iput. An offering slab of not much later date adds a handle to the spouted jar in the feminine name Hzt, written 𓅁 𓋙. This last variation is also known from a late Old King-
dom rock inscription at El Kab, and, a little differently, in inscriptions from three tombs at Balat, in the Kharga Oasis, which are somewhat later: and in the.

The only variation that became at all common or widespread during the Heracleopolitan Period is quite different. It shows the addition of a distinctive cap ( ) rather than a spout or handle. This occurs as early as the Eighth Dynasty in one of the Coptos Decorum, and is known from that time or later at Saqqara as well as in the provinces: Gebelein, Thebes, Naqada, Dendera, Naga ed-Deir, Abydos, Nagarsa, and Assiut. At Naga ed-Deir, in the early Tenth–Eleventh Dynasties, this form was also combined with the addition of a spout ( ). The capped jars occurred much less frequently in the Twelfth Dynasty and even less frequently later (when the cap assumed a rather different shape), although a number of examples are to be found in the tomb chapel of Djeh-Hapy at Assiut, dating to Sesostis I. From the same reign there are also several recurrences of the spouted form ( and the like) in an autobiographical inscription in Wadi Hammamat. This form is again indicated by Gauthier and Lefebvre in their copies of the texts on several wooden coffins from Assiut; so too Chassinat and Palanque, who also

---

331 Janssen, Jarenricht van het Vooraziatische-Egyptisch Genootschap Ex Oriente Lux 12 (1951–52), 169 and pl. 29 (N = Sayce, PSBA 21 (1899), 108–10 and pl. 1 [1]); also LD II, pl. 117q (last line).
332 Oising et al., Denkmäler, pls. 1 (1), 53 (1); Valloggia, BIFAO 93 (1993), 394. For further comments on the palaeographic peculiarities of this site see Leprohon, JSSEA 16 (1986), 59–66, concluding that these tombs postdate the Old Kingdom, and p. 27, n. 99 above.
333 Oising, op. cit., pls. 4, 58 (right, line 7), Valloggia, BDe 97/2 (1985), 333.
335 Jéquier, Tombeaux de particuliers, figs. 38, 41, 46, 51, 111; Deux pyramides du Moyen Empire (Cairo 1933), fig. 30; Cairo J 59158 (ZAS 1965), pls. 6. Also at Memphis: C. Liliquist, JACE 11 (1974), pl. 2 (b).
336 Vandier, Moalla, pl. 21 (right, center), 22 (right = pl. 6, left); Goedicke, JNES 19 (1960), 288 (line 2), now MMA 65.107; Černý, JEA 47 (1961), 7 (4, 15).
337 Clère and Vandier, TAPI, §§ 14, 16 (5, 17, 418), 18 (10, 19), 20 (3, 14), 24 (8). All Dyn. XI, as also Hodjash and Berlev, Egyptian Reliefs, nos. 25(4), 26(10).
338 Fischer, Copitale Nome, nos. 18, 19, 40, 41; Fazzini, Miscellanea Wilbouriana 1 (1972), p. 40, fig. 6.
339 Petrie, Denderah, pl. 6 (bottom left), 8 c (right, 4th from bottom), 9 (top), 10A (bottom right), 13 (right, second from bottom).
340 On two groups of stela: (1) Dunham, Naga ed-Deir Stela, nos. 12, 72, 73, etc.; (2) ibid., nos. 55, 62, 78, 83, etc. The first of these is Bravarski’s Red Group (Dissertation, Table 2, p. 539), which he dates to the beginning of Dyn. IX (ibid., pp. 180 ff.); another example associated with this group is shown in his fig. 57, p. 549. The second is his Polychrome Group, dated later in the same dynasty (ibid., pp. 195 ff).
341 Dyn. XI examples: H.W. Müller, MDAIK 4 (1933), 187; CG 20503; Turin 1447 (Luis Klebs, Reliefs des Mittleren Reichs, fig. 14).
342 Petrie, Atlas, pl. 7 in a caption above one of the cattle.
343 Griffith, Inscriptions of Siut, pls. 15 (28), 16 (40, 70, 85), 15 (15).
344 Bravarski, Dissertation, p. 747; one example is shown in his fig. 79, p. 861.
345 Clère and Vandier, op. cit., § 2; Newberry, Beni Hasan II, pl. 35; Louvre C 1, C 3; Berlin AGM 26/66 (W.K. Simpson, Terrace of the Great God, pls. 14, 153; BM 890 (ibid., pl. 8). At Rifa Tomb 1 (Griffith, op. cit., pl. 16 [5, 7, 11]) the neck of the vessel is eliminated; another example like this is known from Sedment: Petrie and Brunton, Sedment I, pl. 23 (center).
346 Hodjash and Berlev, Egyptian Reliefs, no. 43, p. 96 (Edfu, Dyn. XVII); Quibell, Excavations at Saqqara (1907–8) (Cairo, 1909), pl. 59 (4) (Dyn. XIX); Calverly, Temple of Sethos I, pls. 18 (bottom), 26; II, pls. 4 (top), 14 (bottom). In all these examples the cap is conical or domed.
348 Annie Gasse, BIFAO 88 (1988), fig. 1 on p. 94, and pl. 6 (5, 10, 11, 18).
349 ASAEO 23 (1923), 11.18 (twice), 20 (twice), 26, 30, 31, 32. In some cases the sign is reversed.
350 Une Campagne de fouilles dans la nécropole d'Assiout (Cairo 1911), pp. 115, 185, 212.
show \(\text{\textsuperscript{351}}\). An example of \(\text{\textsuperscript{4}}\) in the tomb-chapel of Iph, at El Saff,\textsuperscript{352} is probably earlier than any of these—as early as the end of the Eleventh Dynasty. Later examples of the spouted forms are to be found in the tomb of Zs-n CUT II at Aswan, dating to the reign of Sesostris II.\textsuperscript{353} The strangest of all these variations appears in an epithet of his grandfather Zs-n CUT I at Elephantine, which is evidently motivated by graphic dissimilation: \(\text{\textsuperscript{4}} \rightarrow \text{\textsuperscript{1}} \rightarrow \text{\textsuperscript{1}} \rightarrow \text{\textsuperscript{4}} \rightarrow \text{\textsuperscript{4}} \); “one does what is praised by him who praises him.”\textsuperscript{354} Still later spouted forms are known from Sinai, dating to the reigns of Amenemhet III (\(\text{\textsuperscript{355}}\) Amenemhet IV (\(\text{\textsuperscript{356}}\) and Tuthmosis III (\(\text{\textsuperscript{357}}\). \text{\textsuperscript{358}} Examples of later date, down to the Ptolemaic Period, are encountered more rarely.

Yet another variation is \(\text{\textsuperscript{4}}\), which appears sporadically in inscriptions ranging from the Fourth to Eleventh Dynasty, some of unknown provenance,\textsuperscript{359} others from a variety of sites, including Giza,\textsuperscript{360} Saqqara,\textsuperscript{361} Bershah,\textsuperscript{362} Meir,\textsuperscript{363} Deir el Gebrawi,\textsuperscript{364} Hemamhy,\textsuperscript{365} Akhmin\textsuperscript{366} and Abydos.\textsuperscript{367} It became less frequent in Dynasties XII–XIII,\textsuperscript{368} but occasionally reappeared in the Nineteenth Dynasty and later.\textsuperscript{369} The projection at the top evidently represents a stopper, to judge from a polychrome example dating to the Fourth Dynasty, where it is painted white in contrast to the upper part of the vessel itself, which is black.\textsuperscript{370}

\textsuperscript{351} Ibid., pp. 174 (also \(\text{\textsuperscript{4}}\)), 179, 199. The normal form \(\text{\textsuperscript{4}}\) evidently occurs more frequently on the coffins, however. A double-spouted example is also known from Wadi el Hudi: A. Fakhry, Inscriptions of the Amethyst Quarries (Cairo 1953), fig. 17 and pl. 78, line 10 (end of Dyn. XI).

\textsuperscript{352} Fischer, The Tomb of Iph at El Saff (New York 1996), p. 15, pl. F.

\textsuperscript{353} H.W. Müller, Die Felsengräber der Fürsten von Elephantine (Glückstadt 1940), pls. 31 a, 33. For the date see p. 105.

\textsuperscript{354} Habachi, Hebrew, p. 25 and fig. 1 d, pl. 9.

\textsuperscript{355} Gardiner, Peet and Černý, Sinai, no. 106 (w. face), pl. 35 (year 40).

\textsuperscript{356} Gardiner, Peet and Černý, Sinai, no. 118, pl. 36 (also the normal form).

\textsuperscript{357} Ibid., no. 119 (n.w. pillar), pl. 92.


\textsuperscript{359} BM 1212 (James, Hieroglyphic Texts I, pl. 13 [1]), BM 1282 (Ibid., pl. 11 [1]), both probably Dyn. IV; BM 212 (Ibid., pl. 38 [1]), no earlier than late Dyn. VI.

\textsuperscript{360} Dunham and Simpson, Miryankh III, figs. 2, 7; Junker, Giza V, fig. 14; Abu-Bakr, Giza, fig. 12—all Dyn. IV.

\textsuperscript{361} A. Vigneau, Encyclopédie photographique de l’art: Le Musée du Caire (Paris 1949), pl. 41 (Dyn. IV); Murray, Saqqara Mastaba I, pl. 11 (Dyn. VI); Wlos-roššš, FM III, 615, Room I 14 (early M.K.).

\textsuperscript{362} Blackman and Apted, Meir V, pl. 26.

\textsuperscript{363} Davies, Deir el Gebrawi II, pl. 3.

\textsuperscript{364} Mackay et al., Bahmid and Hemamieh, pl. 27, Dyn. V; not noted by El-Khouli and Kanawati, El-Hamamieh, pl. 59, but see pl. 57.

\textsuperscript{365} Kanawati, El-Heawawi I, figs. 11, 14; II, figs. 8; IV, fig. 15; VIII, fig. 21.

\textsuperscript{366} Frankfort, JEA 14 (1928), pl. 20 (5), Dyn. VI; BM 850 (Simpson, Terrace of the Great God, pl. 8).

\textsuperscript{367} Gardiner, Peet and Černý, Sinai, no. 47, pl. 16 (Amenemhet II); Louvre C 245 (= E 3466: Râde 24 [1971], pl. 7, Amenemhet II, year 14); Fakhry, op. cit., fig. 32 (Amenemhet IV); BM 1346 Hieroglyphic Texts IV, pl. 22 (Dyn. XIII: Pharaoh’s Shrine).”

\textsuperscript{368} Dyn. XIX: Quibell, Excavations at Saqqara (1907–8), pl. 59 (1); G. Martin, Corpus of Reliefs of the New Kingdom I (London 1987), pl. 28 (75); Centre de Documentation, Le Petit Temple d’Abou Simbel II, pls. 27, 33, 44, 48 etc. Late Period: F. Laming Macadam, Temple of Kawa II (London 1955), pl. 10; Jan Assmann, Grab des Basa (Mainz 1973), pl. 4, 5, 9, 17, 19 (T 40), 20, etc.; Norman Davies, Temple of Hiba III (New York 1953), pl. 27 (n. wall, col. 22); Ptolemaic Period: W.M.F. Petrie, Koptos, pls. 20 (4), 26 (3, 14); Athish, pl. 23.

\textsuperscript{369} Abu-Bakr, Giza, fig. 12. The projection is also separated in some other cases where the paint has been lost: BM 1212 (James, Hieroglyphic Texts I, pl. 15 [1]); Murray, Saqqara Mastaba I, pl. 11; Davies, Deir el Gebrawi II, pl. 4.
Possibly its frequent recurrence in the hierglyph was betted by assimilation to another sign such as 𓊟.\textsuperscript{371}

The incidence of the principal variations may be tabulated as follows:

- Dyn. IV–XII (more rarely in Dyn. XIX and later)
- Dyn. VI–MK (rarely later)
- Dyn. VI–IX
- Dyn. VIII–MK (very rarely later, with cap pointed or domed)
- Dyn. X–XI

14. A detail of the sign 𓊟 (Y\textsubscript{3})

The earliest detailed representations of the scribal kit, on the wooden panels from the Third Dynasty mastaba of H\textsuperscript{2}y\textsuperscript{r}, show the tubular case for brushes with a cap at either end, the lower one more splayed, with a flat bottom, the other one more slender and elongated, less everted, and very slightly curved at the top.\textsuperscript{372} But the top of the cap appears to be flat on the other panels (Fig. 29). A hierglyph from the stela of Wp-m-nfr\textsuperscript{t}, dating to the beginning of the Fourth Dynasty, again has a cap at either end, but both are everted and scarcely differentiated,\textsuperscript{373} whereas in other examples, in the later Fourth Dynasty mastaba of Hufw\textsuperscript{h caf}, the upper cap displays, for the first time, a feature that also occurs in the contemporaneous mastaba of K\textsuperscript{w}(i-r)\textsuperscript{n}'b's wife; it is divided into vertical tabs, only slightly splayed (Fig. 30a).\textsuperscript{374} Other examples of the late Fourth–early Fifth Dynasties generally omit this feature, the tubular case being everted at either end, but without any indication of a cap.\textsuperscript{375} The tabs are more frequently attested in inscriptions of the later reigns of the Fifth Dynasty\textsuperscript{376} (Fig. 30b)\textsuperscript{377} and those of the Sixth;\textsuperscript{378} in this period they are more everted and the tabs are sometimes more numerous.\textsuperscript{379} Quite often, throughout the Old Kingdom, they are suggested only by the outline (Fig. 30c).\textsuperscript{380}

Middle Kingdom forms show greater variety. The tabs are more splayed and separated in a Twelfth Dynasty hierglyph at Bersha, the center being differentiated by a more reddish

\textsuperscript{371} This variant of 𓊟 is likewise known from Dyn. IV: Simpson, Mastabas of Ka\textsuperscript{w}ah, \textit{Khaf'khufu I and II}, figs. 27–29.

\textsuperscript{372} J.E. Quibell, \textit{Excavations at Saqqara (1911–12): The tomb of Hes\textsuperscript{y} (Cairo 1913)}, pls. 29–32. The example shown here is from the panel in pl. 29 (left, CG 1428). Drioton's drawings of this and another example, from CG 1427 (ASAE 41 [1944], 93, figs. 12–13) are not quite accurate; they are reproduced in E.L.B. Terrace and H.G. Fischer, \textit{Treasures of the Cairo Museum} (London 1970), p. 33.

\textsuperscript{373} Smith, \textit{HESPOK}, pl. A; cf. pl 32 b.

\textsuperscript{374} Simpson, \textit{Ka\textsuperscript{w}ah, Khaf'khufu I and II}, figs. 16, 27.

\textsuperscript{375} E.g., Borchardt, \textit{Grab. S\textsuperscript{3}chunre\textsuperscript{II}}, pl. 1; Bissinger, \textit{Re-Heiligtum III}, pl. 21 (345); Junker, \textit{Gita I}, fig. 57; II, fig. 19; III, figs. 11, 14, 28, 30; V, fig. 22; Wild, \textit{Tri III}, pl. 168.

\textsuperscript{376} E.g., Murray, \textit{Saq\textsuperscript{r}ara Mastabas} I, pls. 12, 20.

\textsuperscript{377} From Davies, \textit{Ptahhotep I}, pl. 18 (408); a color reproduction.

\textsuperscript{378} E.g., Jéquier, \textit{Monument funéraire de Pepi III}, pl. 38; Simpson, \textit{Qar and Idu}, figs. 25, 33, 42.

\textsuperscript{379} E.g., Jéquier, \textit{loc. cit.}; Murray, \textit{op. cit.}, pl. 20.

14. A detail of the sign $\text{ citt } (\Upsilon_3)$

Fig. 29. Scribal kit on panel of Hzy-R'. From a photograph

Fig. 30. Variants of $\text{ citt }$: (a–c) Old Kingdom; (d–g) Dyn. XII; (h) Dyn. XVIII
hue (Fig. 30d). One of the early Twelfth Dynasty tombs at Meir represents the tubular holder as a papyrus, either in part (Fig. 30c) or in its entirety (Fig. 30f). And at Beni Hasan something rather like the early Fourth Dynasty form makes a reappearance, with an identical cap on either end of the tube (Fig. 30g).

The tabs reappear in hieroglyphic examples of the Eighteenth Dynasty, assimilated to the “fleur-de-lys” motif that then became popular, and the central element is again distinctively colored; it is red, while the rest is blue (Fig. 30h). By this time two of the elements of the old scribal kit represented by $\text{ḥf}$ had long since—from the end of the Old Kingdom onward—been replaced by a more elongated palette that accommodated both ink and brushes. But tubular containers for brushes continued in use, as attested by actual examples that have been recovered from Eighteenth Dynasty tombs. These show the splayed tabs carried to their ultimate degree of convolution. One such holder, from the tomb of Tutankhamun (Pl. 46 b) is described by Howard Carter as taking the form of “a column with palm-leaf capital; its elaborately decorated shaft and drum are hollowed out to receive the reeds, and the abacus, turning on a pivot, acts as the lid.” His interpretation of this is borne out by kohl tubes of the period in which the palm fronds are more clearly detailed. In another instance, dating to the earlier years of the same dynasty, a tubular case was cut from a stalk of a thick rush (Fig. 31), and Carter says of it:

At the top this has a floral ornament made of four pieces of carved wood which are let into spaces cut in the sides at the end and bound in position by a strip of linen. The node or natural joint of the rush has been utilized for the bottom end, and the top end was stopped by a rag plug.

Thus the top of the tubular case was regarded as various forms of plants—a papyrus in the Twelfth Dynasty; and in the Eighteenth Dynasty both the “fleur-de-lys” that derives from the sedgelike plant of Upper Egypt (𓊅), as well as the palm. Are the everted tabs of the Old Kingdom

---

381 Griffith, Hieroglyphs, pl. 9 (171).
382 Blackman, Meir II, pls. 17 (60 = pl. 11), 10; for the form cf. the wife’s staff in pl. 2, the clump and bundle of papyrus in pl. 4.
383 Ibid., pl. 6; for the form cf. pl. 17 (33). In Blackman, Meir III, pls. 19, 23 (a little later) the forms are like the one from Bersha. It seems probable that the same feature is to be recognized on an Eleventh Dynasty sarcophagus, Cler and Vandier, TPPL, p. 26: $\text{ḥf}$.
384 Griffith, Beni Hasan III, pl. 3 (18).
385 Nina Davies, Picture Writing in Ancient Egypt, pl. 8 (6);
386 For similar examples see pl. 12 and Hayes, Scepter II, fig. 91, p. 166 (MMA 15.2.4).
387 Glanville, JEA 18 (1932), 53-54, publishes two actual examples dating to the Sixth Dynasty, but this form was represented before the end of Dyn. V; e.g., Murray, op. cit., pl. 9, and was certainly in use earlier.
389 E.g., Hayes, Scepter II, fig. 108, p. 193.
390 Carnarvon and Carter, Five Years’ Explorations, pl. 66 and p. 75.
hieroglyphs therefore to be explained on the basis of the New Kingdom brush-holder that has just been described? The Fourth Dynasty hieroglyphs suggest an alternative explanation—that the increasingly everted tabs originated as slits that were designed to provide elasticity for the introduction of a plug to close the top; the binding beneath them would have been added to prevent the slits from progressing any further. It is in any case possible that the distinctively colored central element of the cap in hieroglyphs of the Twelfth and Eighteenth Dynasties represented the plug.

15. An unusual variant of $(Y_5)$

Although both Gardiner and Lefebvre identify the sign $(Y_5)$ as a gameboard, Lefebvre, citing Pillet, thinks it may be “l'image simplifiée de deux objets complètement différents, damier et palissade.” Pillet’s most persuasive evidence for this alternative—a wattle and daub fence with ends projecting at the top—is relatively late, from the reign of Ramesses III and later, but I think this interpretation, if valid, is secondary and divergent from the original representation. His Middle Kingdom evidence is less convincing, and it is difficult to agree with his conclusion that $(Y_5)$ “semble donc représenter, dans la plupart des cas, en tant que graphique, une palissade.” While I doubt that this view has won general approval, it is nonetheless worth noting a group of unusual examples where the sign has a pair of additions that definitely identify it as a gameboard. It takes the form $(Y_5)$ in two tombs at Bersha that apparently date to the end of the Eleventh Dynasty. These additions puzzled me initially; until I realized that they represent a set of legs sloping inward, as shown on gameboards in two tombs at Beni Hasan that are probably not much later (Fig. 32). The inward slope of the legs is also known from an actual gameboard of the Eleventh Dynasty, and from representations of beds and chairs from the same general period; it is related to a more stylized and symmetrical set of legs that similarly turn inward, front to back, and continued later, down to the beginning of the New Kingdom.

The principal interest of this curious variant of $(Y_5)$ is not the fact that it confirms the identification of the sign, however, but that it provides a further instance of a hieroglyph that has been affected by contemporary fashion or by iconography reflecting that fashion.

---

391 Grammaire de l'Égyptien classique² (Cairo 1955), p. 423, nn. 5–6.
392 Revue de l'Égypte ancienne 1 (1927), 157–75.
393 Newberry, Bersheh II, pl. 13 (cols. 9, 11, but not 17, 19); pl. 21 (bottom, cols. 5, 16). In the latter case the same detail is recorded by Sayce, Rec. trav. 13 (1890), 190 f.
394 For a recent discussion of the date of the tombs in question (5 and 8) see H.O. Willems, Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatische Egyptisch Genootschap Ex Oriente Lux 28 (1983–1984), 80–102, and esp. 87 (beginning of Dyn. XII). E. Bravarski has subsequently concluded that tomb 5 must be somewhat earlier: Studies in Honor of Dows Dunham, pp. 26–30.
395 Newberry, Beni Hasan II, pl. 7; cf. also pl. 13.
396 MMA 26.3.154: BMMA February 1928, section II, fig. 10, p. 10.
397 See Chapter 13 above, n. 24.
398 See Caminos and Fischer, Epigraphy and Palaeography, p. 34 and p. 186 above.
A similar feature, of somewhat earlier date, is to be seen in at least two examples of the htp-sign, one of which is shown in Figure 33. Both cases appear in Sixth Dynasty tomb chapels at Qubbet el Hawa, Aswan, where funerary priests of a subsequent generation added their names to the original inscriptions. The first, below the figure of Hr-huw, on the south side of the facade, occurs in the name \( \text{ḥtp-ib} \), a priest who is designated as \( \text{ḥtp-ib} \), excavated by Labib Habachi; it occurs in the name \( \text{ḥtp-ib} \), belonging to an overseer of crews (\( \text{ḥtp-wr} \)).

Evidently the projections below the sign again represent legs of an offering table, the top of which has the form of \( \text{ḥtp} \). Such tables are known from copper and wooden models of the Old Kingdom. One might expect the legs to be placed at the ends of the sign, as in \( \text{ḥtp} \), but their position also occurs in hieroglyphic \( \text{ḥtp} \) and \( \text{ḥtp} \) which serve as the determinative of \( \text{ḥtp} \) “chest.” Here they may represent a pair of transverse bars which keep the chest slightly off the ground. But possibly they derive from hieratic

399 Illustrated in de Morgan, Catalogue des monuments, plate facing p. 164, where the htp-sign is not completely visible, however. The title hmr-ḥtp, ḫr-ḥtp recurs in the labels of funerary priests who added their names in the hall of ḫtp-ib (next note). For the writing of the name, not cited in Ranke, PNI, 271 (12), cf. Wb III, 299 (22); it should probably be transliterated as ḫtp-hw or ḫtp-hw-ḥtp(w).


401 Reisner, Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts 11 (Boston 1913), 61, fig. 16 (including CG 57035-6); Petrie, Denderah, pl. 22; I.E.S. Edwards et al., Introductory Guide to the Egyptian Collection (London 1964), p. 159, fig. 54 (BM 5315). The first four are 14.9 to 22.5 cm wide, the one from Denderah about 14 cm, the last 38.7 cm. Another metal example, 18.5 cm wide and covered with gold leaf, is to be found in Hassan, Giza III, fig. 10 and pl. 3 (2). One, made of wood (CG 1765), is somewhat larger (a little under 52 cm wide). A second wooden example, 18 cm high, is shown in Borchardt, Grubl. Neuser-Rez, fig. 110 (Berlin 1936).

402 Reisner and Smith, Hist. Giza II, fig. 44 and pl. 36 (a); also Junker, Giza I, fig. 36 (assimilated to the writing of ‘, n. 411 below); Giza V, fig. 9 (in captions above chests with legs at the corners); Wild, T III, pl. 174; and later examples in the title zi hmr Petrie, Denderah, pl. 11 C (top left, Dyn. VIII or IX); Newberry, Bersheh I, pls. 15, 18, 20 (Dyn. XII).

403 Murray, Saqqara Mastabas I, pl. 2; also Dyn. VI examples: Pyr. 491a W (Piankoff, Pyramid of Unas, pl. 9); Unk I, 105 (13); Goyon, Nouvelles inscriptions, p. 41 and pl. 4 (determinative of ‘m); Junker, Giza IV, p. 72 and pl. 9 (recognizing the same form of coffer, carried by a funerary attendant, in LD II, 4).

404 I only know of Middle Kingdom examples: Hayes, Scepter I, figs. 157, 189, 209, but a similar use of transverse bars occurs on coffins of earlier date, as shown by Junker, Giza VIII, fig. 40.
forms, which are almost identical.\footnote{Posener-Krieger and de Cenival, *The Abu Sir Papyri*, pls. 21, o; 25, f. 34, 1 c.}
As it happens, the influence of hieratic appears in another label following the second example of the sign under discussion, at the beginning of the title \textit{mty n zt} “regulator of the phyle.”\footnote{Ibid., Pal. 3 (\textit{mty}). Cf. \textit{mty} as the determinative of \textit{nhwt “goats,” Petrie, *Aithiop*, pl. 6 (5), and similarly Dunham, *Naga ed-Deir Sudan*, no. 86 (as noted by Clère in *Miscellanea Gregoriana* [Rome 1944], p. 458, n. 23).}
The date of these labels can hardly be earlier than the Eighth Dynasty, and may well be later.\footnote{Ibid., 115 f.}

The sign \textit{\textendash} also appears to have influenced an example of the sign \textit{\textendash} in the title \textit{\textendash} \textit{\textendash}, as it is written in a tomb of the Heracleopolitan Period at Naga ed-Deir.\footnote{Herta Mohr, *Mastaba of Hetep-Akhety*, passim.}

A rather similar hieroglyph (\textit{\textendash \textendash}) not infrequently occurs as the determinative of \textit{\textendash “brazier” in the lists of festivals that call for offerings.\footnote{Ibid., p. 35.}
In this case the legs probably represent stones placed beneath the flat terracotta tray;\footnote{BM 1272; James, *Hieroglyphic Texts* I, pl. 9.}
in some examples the stones are indicated by rounding off the bottom of the projections.\footnote{Ibid., pl. 22.}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig33}
\caption{Post-Old Kingdom variant of \textit{\textendash}, Aswan}
\end{figure}

\section*{16. The groups \textit{\textendash} and \textit{\textendash}}

In *GM* 74 (1984), 82–86 and 93 (fig. 3), Peter Munro discusses a group of inscriptions on columns in the chapel of Šps-Phth/Imnty, near the Unas Causeway. They show the familiar title \textit{smsw hry}\footnote{C.N. Peck, *Some Decorated Tombs of the First Intermediate Period at Naga ed-Deir*, p. 102 and pl. 11.} “elder of the (judicial)”\footnote{LD II, 58; Hassan, *Giza II*, figs. 50, 195; VII, fig. 23; LD II, 58b; Simpson, *Western Cemetery*, fig. 34; Junker, *Giza VII*, fig. 46.}
with a very exceptional determinative, \textit{\textendash}.
for which no explanation is given (Fig. 34). The determinative is otherwise most commonly —, which frequently appears before the final t: $\text{写}$ or $\text{书}$, occasionally publications indicate that the ends are more or less rounded, but this evidence is not very reli-

Fig. 34. Dyn. VI writing of the title “elder of the court,” Saqqara

(20) Fakhry, Sept tombeaux, figs. 17, 18.
(21) Reinsel tomb G 2370 (PM III, p. 86, room III, offering bearer beside north squint of serekh).
(22) G 2375 (ibid., p. 87).
(23) G 2433 (W.S. Smith, BMFA 56 [1958], 56–57).
(24) G 4311 (PM III, p. 126).
(26) Ahmed Badawy, ASA 40 (1940), 574 and pl. 60.
(27) Cairo T 6/4/49/1: Fischer, MIO 7 (1960), 303, fig. 3.
(30) MMA 58.107.2: Fischer, RIE 30 [1978], 92 and pl. 6 (probably a forgery, but based on a genuine original).
(31) Brooklyn 37.21E, 37.22E: James, Corpus of Hieroglyphic Inscriptions I, nos. 47, 48, pls. 4, 22.
(32) Thos. Midgley, Bankfield Museum Notes 4 (Halifax 1907), fig. 3.
(34) Quibell, Excavations at Saqqara 1907–1908, p. 26 (with — miscopied as ∞).
(35) Maspero, Trois années de fouilles (MIFAO 1/2, 1885), pp. 203–204 (miscopied as noted below, with n. 18).

413 It is frequently linked with sšb note 1 above, exs. 3, 4 (pp. 33, 35, 39), 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 17, 19–24, 29, 31, 34, 36; with r-Nšn sšb exs. 4 (pp. 34, 36, 40, 64, 87), 11, 15, 22, 23, 27, 31; other judicial titles: exs. 4, 6, 15, 22, 23, 25, 27–29, 31, 35, 36 and the present case (see MIO 7 [1960], 304, n. 9). In ex. 35 $\sqrt{2}$ is omitted from both smw ḥjj and r-Nšn because the text is within the burial chamber; for a similar case see MM 9 (1974), 11 and fig. 7.

414 Exs. 1, 3–6, 11, 12 (pl. 270), 13, 16 (pls. 43, 46), 17, 18 (pls. 24A, 25A), 21–23, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31 (pl. 4), 32, 33, 36.

415 Exs. 2, 4 (pp. 34, 79, 87), 14, 16 (fig. 81), 20–22, 26, 27, 31, 32. The configuration $\text{写}$ appears in exs. 3, 4 (pp. 34, 86), 5, 11, 12, 13 (31), 17, 18, 33.

416 Exs. 1, 4, 16 (82), 25, 34; also $\text{写}$, ex. 15. The configuration $\text{写}$ appears in exs. 7, 10, 16 (83), 23, 34, 36; also $\text{写}$, ex. 9.
able. 417 Another variant is —, which is known from at least three examples. 418 And in at least one case it is replaced, perhaps inadvertently, by —. 419 In view of the judicial character of the title, one might be tempted to surmise that — derives from ♂ mrt, but the variants suggest that it may be a baton, i.e., a short stick. There is no indication that the form of the sign changed to —, as happened in the case of ♂ at the end of the Fifth Dynasty and later. 420 It is possible, however, that the original derivation was from ♂. 421 reinforced by the similarity of the word — = “staff.”

The form that is displayed in the present case is totally different from any of these, and represents an elongated bag (Fig. 35) 422 that was used, among other purposes, to store

![Fig. 35. Elongated bag in the mastaba of Ty, Saqqara. After Epron](image-url)
sticks and staves. In favor of this explanation of the various determinatives of ḫwt it may be noted that the stick in the hieroglyph ♂ grow is sometimes replaced by — in inscriptions of the Old Kingdom. It does not appear as a determinative in Old Kingdom titles, nor does —, the stick alone would necessarily have sufficed if it was to be introduced at all.

It is true that there is no evidence for the presence of the "elder of the hall" in taxation scenes that are attended by the nḥt-hrw "tally man" and the znw-pr "police," the latter wielding batons, but the title nḥt-hrw-zib "tally man of the judiciary" is coupled with smsw ḫwt in two of the three cases in which it is known to occur in titulares, and in two other cases the smsw ḫwt is also an under-superintendent of znw-pr.

Apart from the occurrences of smsw ḫwt that have been cited thus far, there is another that is said to take the form ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂. The last sign is probably only an approximation, since it is given in hieroglyphic type; and there is little doubt that it represents a further example of —. This again appears in the context of judicial titles and is at least as late as the case under discussion, i.e., the end of Dyn. VI, and probably later.

There is some other Old Kingdom evidence for ḫwt, although all of it is problematic in some respect. In one case the title smsw ḫwt is written ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂, where — may again be a miswriting of —, but given its position, is more probably the indirect genitive, the last two signs to be translated "of the estate." The indirect genitive similarly appears in some other cases where this official is attached to the funerary cult of a royal pyramid. The sign ♂ more clearly functions as a determinative in ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ "one who judges in the court." For it does not seem likely that ♂ represents ♂ ♂, i.e., ḫtw. A nisbe form, ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂, is attested in an obscure context; it is paired with another class of individuals called ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ imy]-t, lit. "those in the ground/land." The same nisbe form is perhaps also to be recognized in the ḫtw of the Abusir Papyri, for the word transcribed as ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ is more probably ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂.

This discussion cannot be closed without giving some attention to the more common term wp ṟḥt, the festival of the "opening of the year," since this has a determinative that is

---

424 Fischer, MMF 13 (1978), 11, n. 34; cf. also MDAIK 16 (1958), 137.
425 The composite sign ♂ ♂ must be considered as a unit; for its use in titles see ZAS 93 (1966), 68-69. The sign — has been thought to occur in the title ♂ (Malaise, CDE 64 [1989], 117-18), but — is used consistently in this title.
426 For the znw-pr see Yoyotte, Rôte 9 (1952), 142-44. For the nḥt-hrw see LD II, 63 (top register, Yoyotte’s ex. 2, but this detail is not mentioned); Epron et al., TI I, pls. 66, 67, 69 (Yoyotte’s ex. 6). A scene similar to the last also seems to be attested by Louvre E 17499 (Ziegler, Catalogue des titules, no. 59), for which see section 5 above and Fig. 10.
427 Note 1 above, exs. 28, 31. Ex. 53 has nḥt-hrw hwt-ḥrt "tally man of the lawcourt."
428 Exs. 25, 27.
429 Ex. 28. If my reading is correct, this would be the only example of the title in which the horizontal element is lacking.
430 Note 1, exs. 1, 16; in exs. 14 and 25 the name of the pyramid precedes.
431 Hassan, Gia V, fig. 101 (= LD II, 43).
432 This question is raised by Grdslof’s statement that ♂ and ♂ are interchanged (ASAE 43 [1943], 308), but virtually the only clear example like the present one is the ♂ of Berlin Ppa. 8869 (in hieratic, which Smither, JEA 28 [1942], 17, transcribes as ♂ ♂ ).
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virtually identical to —, albeit with much clearer evidence for occasionally rounded ends.\textsuperscript{435} Unlike the case of $\textit{smsw hty}$, however, the determinative is often omitted,\textsuperscript{437} and does not yet appear in most of the earliest examples, dating to the Fourth Dynasty, although a sarcophagus of that period already shows $\textit{sr}$.\textsuperscript{438} which is the most usual configuration down to the middle of the Fifth Dynasty, when it tended to be rearranged as $\textit{sr}$. Besides $\textit{sr}$ there is also abundant evidence for four other basic variations: $\textit{sr}$.\textsuperscript{439} $\textit{sr} / \textit{sr}$.\textsuperscript{441} and $\textit{sr} / \textit{sr}$.\textsuperscript{442} Contrary to what one might suppose from $\textit{sr}$, these configurations indicate that the horizontal (or vertical) element is associated with $\textit{sr}$, and I believe that it may derive from the crown of the head between the two horns, which is often demarcated in Old Kingdom examples of $\textit{sr}$.\textsuperscript{443} Whatever its origin may be, the frequent omission of — and its occasional replacement by $\textit{sr}$ suggest that this feature was neither essential nor well understood. It seems clear, at any rate, that it does not have the same function in $\textit{sr}$ and $\textit{sr}$, for the former never shows —, despite the very much greater number of examples, and in the latter case this element never takes the form of a vertical stroke.

\textsuperscript{435} E.g., Junker, \textit{Giza VI}, fig. 105; VII, fig. 47 and pl. 27 (a); Hassan, \textit{Excavations at Saqqara I}, pl. 37 (a); Corty, \textit{Gi Scavi Italiani}, pl. 27 (a); Murray, \textit{Saqqara Mastabas I}, p. 8; CG 1732.

\textsuperscript{437} Ignoring the occasional addition of $\textit{sr}$, the signs $\textit{sr}$ and $\textit{sr}$ alone occur in the following cases: LD II, pls. 26 (a bis), 24 g, 40 b, 85 b; CG 1413, 1447; Abu Bakr, \textit{Giza}, fig. 10; Hassan, \textit{Giza II}, fig. 217; III, fig. 91; IV, fig. 152; VI, 5; figs. 59, 119; IX, fig. 32; Hassan, \textit{Excavations at Saqqara III}, fig. 39; Davies, \textit{Sheikh Said}, pl. 28; Z.Y. Saad, \textit{Royal Excavations at Saqqara} (Cairo, 1957), pl. 19; MMF 11 (1976), 20; fig. 12; James and Apted, \textit{Khetihan}, pl. 19. With $\textit{sr}$ of \textit{pt}: BM 11779 (James, \textit{Hieroglyphic Texts I}, pl. 39 [2]). With $\textit{t}$ of \textit{rbr}: Mariette, \textit{Mastabas}, p. 116; Dunham and Simpson, \textit{Merinhak}, fig. 7; LD II, 37a; Junker, \textit{Giza IX}, fig. 44; Hassan, \textit{Giza IX}, figs. 132, 136, 142, 144, 162; II, fig. 94; IV, fig. 114; BM 1212 (James, \textit{Hieroglyphic Texts I}, pl. 13 [1]); BM 11766 (ibid., fig. 39 [3]); Fakhry, \textit{Sept tombes du fig. 10; Davies, \textit{Sheikh Said}, pl. 28; Wild, \textit{Ti III}, pl. 182, 184; Martin, \textit{Hetepka}, pl. 21; Daressy, \textit{AASAE} 17 (1917), 134 (IV, 1; corrected); Brooklyn 37.14955 (James, \textit{Corpus of Hieroglyphic Inscriptions I}, no. 72); Berlin 11573 (Aeg. Inscr. I, p. 66). With $\textit{sr}$ and $\textit{ct}$: Hassan, \textit{Giza IX}, pl. 38; CG 1425; Mariette, \textit{Mastabas}, p. 154. With $\textit{sr}$ and $\textit{ct}$: Fischer, \textit{Desahsheh}, pl. 28; $\textit{sr}$: Cairo J 56994 (Chevrier, \textit{BIFAO} 82 [1982], pl. 15; assimilated to $\textit{sr}$). The latest dated example (Daressy, \textit{loc. cit.}) is Dyn. VI (Teii).

\textsuperscript{438} Cairo CG 1790; thus in Grébaut, \textit{Le Musée égyptien I}, p. 19, according to Maspero, and this seems correct. Borchardt, \textit{Denkmäler des Alten Reiches I}, p. 210, gives the last sign as —; Brugsch, \textit{Thesaurus}, p. 253, has $\textit{sr}$, with the bottom restored.


\textsuperscript{440} Petrie, \textit{Desahsheh}, pl. 9; E. Feuchter, \textit{Vom Nil zum Neckar} (Berlin 1986), no. 154.

\textsuperscript{441} Mariette, \textit{Mastabas}, pp. 247, 349; Hassan, \textit{Giza II}, fig. 237; III, fig. 35; VI, fig. 9; VII, fig. 38; Reisner, \textit{Hist. Giza Nec. I}, fig. 270; Fakhry, \textit{Sept tombeaux}, p. 12; Fisher, \textit{Giza}, pl. 49 (2); Kanawati et al., \textit{Saqqara I}, pl. 27; W.V. Davies et al., \textit{Saqqara Tombs I}, pls. 21, 11; CG 1414: 1434, 1434: 1695; BM 52474 (James, \textit{Hieroglyphic Texts I}, pl. 15 [1]); Fischer, \textit{MOI} 7 (1960), 303; Wilson, \textit{JNES} 13 (1954), 248, fig. 4; Simpson, \textit{Qar et Abu}, figs. 33, 44; Moussa, \textit{SAK} 7 (1979), 136; Brooklyn 37.14955 (James, \textit{Corpus of Hieroglyphic Inscriptions I}, no. 71); Bissing, \textit{Gemini-kulti II}, p. 17 (177); Berlin 7513 (Aeg. Inscr. I, p. 30).

\textsuperscript{442} CG 1403, 1404, 1420; Mariette, \textit{Mastabas}, pp. 278, 279 (corrected); 283; Firth and Gunter, \textit{Tei Pyramid Cemeteries}, pl. 65 (1); BM 718 (James, \textit{Hieroglyphic Texts I}, pl. 28); Simpson, \textit{Western Cemetery I}, fig. 16; A.M. Moussa and F. Junge, \textit{Two Tombs of Craftsman} (Mainz a.R. 1975), illustrs. 1, 2; Moussa and Altenmüller, \textit{Niaschnum}, fig. 4; LD II, pl. 8gb (Berlin 1186, Aeg. Inscr. I, p. 8).

\textsuperscript{443} Usually $\textit{sr}$ or $\textit{sr}$; e.g., Junker, \textit{Giza III}, fig. 46; VI, fig. 32; Hassan, \textit{Giza II}, fig. 219; Abu Bakr, \textit{Giza}, figs. 5, 6, 10; Reisner, \textit{Hist. Giza Nec. I}, figs. 258, 263; BM 689 (James, \textit{Hieroglyphic Texts I}, pl. 17); Murray, \textit{Saqqara Mastabas I}, pls. 8, 18; Simpson, \textit{Western Cemetery I}, figs. 16, 22, 41, 42.
The first reappearance of `smdw hwt in the Middle Kingdom, dating to the reign of Hntawy Mentuhotep, is written `smdw hwt.\(^{444}\) with the gratuitous stroke that became common in the Eleventh Dynasty,\(^{445}\) but is otherwise identical to the Old Kingdom writing, except that the proportions of the determinative resemble those of the sign 𓊉 “lake.” I doubt that its subsequent transformation into 𓊉 provides a clue to its original significance.\(^{446}\)

\(^{444}\) Goyon, *Nouvelles Inscriptions*, no. 52.


\(^{446}\) Gardiner, *Onomastica I*, pp. 60–61*, explains this as a borrowing from 𓊉 “ceiling,” “sky,” (ibid. II, 211*) and says of the Old Kingdom determinatives: “Perhaps 𓊉 is a log, 𓊉 a stone roof-beam, while 𓊉 hints at a wooden roof.” A log would not be represented with rounded ends, however, and 𓊉 is not otherwise used as a generic determinative in Old Kingdom titles. And finally, if 𓊉 represented stone, it would probably be shorter, as in 𓊉 (O39); moreover it is highly doubtful that a public hall would have had stone beams.
Plate 44. False door at Saqqara

*Courtesy Egyptian Antiquities Organisation*
Plate 45. Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, SS 76

Courtesy of the Museum
Plate 46a. Metropolitan Museum 28.9.5
Gift of Edward S. Harkness, 1928

Plate 46b. Pencase of Tutankhamun.
Photography by The Egyptian Expedition of The Metropolitan Museum of Art
Plate 47. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 06.1877

Courtesy of the Museum
Addenda to *Egyptian Studies* I, II and III

Volume I

p. 7. Another face-to-face embrace, with the couple seated, occurs on a very late Old Kingdom false door in Moscow: Hodjash and Berlev, *Egyptian Reliefs*, no. 24, pp. 60, 62.

p. 12. The detail shown in fig. 12 is misinterpreted; it does not show an incomplete *mnt*-necklace, but the prows of two very unusual boats, as Borchardt has rightly described it in his text; cf. Karl Martin, CAA, *Pelizaeus-Museum, Hildesheim*, Lieferung 3, *Reliefs des Alten Reiches*, pp. 61–63.

pp. 13–14. The title *shd imyw *h*r*w also occurs in Goyon, * Nouvelles Inscriptions*, no. 33, as pointed out in *Orientalia* 60 (1991), 301.

p. 16. I have overlooked a further example of the title *imy-ht hnw izz* in Blackman, *Meir IV*, pl. 15, as Ogden Goelet has reminded me.

p. 17, n. 51. The restoration must be [ ] rather than [ ], despite the sequence of signs.

p. 19. Gerard Roquet has independently discussed this example of *smt* in *BIFAO* 77 (1977), 119 ff. And Klaus Baer (letter of May 15, 1977) has provided another example from the Second Intermediate Period at El Kab, correcting the third line of the architrave in *LD III*, 62(a), as follows:

\[\ldots\text{[\ldots]}\]

p. 25. The use of — for suffix * should be remarked. Sethe notes several examples of this from the Pyramid Texts, *Das Ägyptische Verbum I* (Leipzig 1899), § 267. The present example is evidently even earlier, for the funerary formulae are more suggestive of Dyn. IV than “late Old Kingdom” as opined in PM III, 348.

p. 42. Another pair of small limestone mourners are illustrated in Hassan, *Excavations at Saqqara* II, pl. 23(A–C); cf. *JEA* 65 (1979), 180 and fig. 1.
pp. 52–53. Wolfgang Schenkel comments further on writings of imḥ in BioR 35 (1978), 43–44, and especially those of somewhat later date than the Old Kingdom.

p. 60. Wm. Ward, Essays on Feminine Titles of the Middle Kingdom (Beirut 1986), p. 22, offers a different interpretation of the acroptic text at the bottom of my fig. 1; this is countered in GM 128 (1992), 78–79.

p. 61 and n. 10. A Heracleopolitan stela, Cairo J 91098 (J. Lopez, Oriens Antiquus 14 [1975], 72, fig. 11; Perez Die, Archéologia 225 [June 1987], 43) has  as the determinative of ḫwt “fields.”

p. 64. The Memphite high priest Nfr-tm, the fourth of those shown on pl. 18, is mentioned as the owner of a fragmentary block statue in the Newark Museum, New Jersey, no. EG 29.1806, as indicated by Herman De Meulenaere and Bernard Bothmer. He is evidently to be added to the end of the list on p. 66.

pp. 66–67. Didier Devaux (RdE 43 [1992], 205–207), defends De Meulenaere’s idea that the second element of the title  refers to Ptah; and, on the basis of an abridged form of the title in demotic, concludes that the reading is wr ḫmw(t) and that  is to be read wr ḫmw(t) nb. This will scarcely seem credible to anyone who is thoroughly familiar with the use of  and  in Old Kingdom titles.

pp. 70–71. To title (5) add another (5a):  “overseer of the ornaments,” from the same source, but hardly visible on the plate. Cf. my Egyptian Women of the Old Kingdom (New York 1989), n. 126; further remarks on women’s titles are to be found on pp. 9–17 of this monograph.

To the evidence for title (17) one should probably add an incomplete example in Jéquier, Oudjebben, p. 16, fig. 12, where only [h] nrt is preserved before the name.

To titles (18–19) add another referring to dancers: (19a) sbt “instructess,” JEA 67 (1981), 168 and fig. 2.

To the evidence for title (22) add Moussa and Altenmüller, Nianchchnum, fig. 11.

Title (24) must be reconsidered in view of the occurrence of ḫnt as a separate title on a false door from Giza. My drawing of it (Fig. 1) has been made from a slide kindly supplied by the excavator, Zahi Hawass, who has also given me permission to publish it. Since it is evidently no later than Dyn. V, this example shows that the determinative (Fig. 2) is not, as I had supposed, a late variant of  . And since the title ḫnt is applied to a gentlewoman who has the title ṭḥt-nsut, it is difficult to believe it designates so menial an occupation as an ordinary weaver, yet the coiffure of the determinative suggests the end of a kerchief such as is sometimes worn by female workers (e.g., Hassan, Gīza II, fig. 219). The interpretation of this detail remains somewhat doubtful, however, since the end of the kerchief usually falls
downward on the neck and back. And it is even more difficult to identify the rectangular object held upright upon the lap.

p. 89 (b). Another Dyn. VI example of ḫ occurs on the entrance architrave of the vizier Mhw at Saqqara, to be published by Zahi Hawass: ḫ ← ḫ → wr.ki ḫ.ki, where wr and ḫ may be nearly synonymous.


p. 103. A third bronze butcher’s knife of the type shown in figs. 5 and 6 may be cited, a model found in a foundation deposit: Petrie, Six Temples at Thebes (London 1897), pl. 16 (34).

p. 116 (to p. 79). Wm. Ward, GM 100 (1987), has cast much doubt on the supposed “women of the council.”
Volume II

p. 7, n. 22. Further evidence is provided by a bronze statue of Dyn. XXII, which shows the left leg advanced as usual, but has the right hand raised to hold a staff: Leclant et al., Les Pharaons: L'Égypte du crépuscule (Paris 1980), fig. 109, p. 127. This readjustment evidently reverts to reality; cf. LA V, col. 190.

p. 28, n. 68. Add an Old Kingdom false door, CG 1727, exceptionally inscribed on both sides, both showing normal rightward orientation.

p. 39, n. 110. The reference for Gunn’s statement is Tetti Pyramid Cemeteries, p. 171, n. 2.

p. 47 and n. 121. Further Old Kingdom evidence for the prevalence of dominant rightward orientation may be found in the pair of scenes shown in Jéquier, Monument funéraire de Pépè II, pls. 36, 42, as noted in LA V, col. 191, n. 13.

p. 49. Another example, probably a little later than the Old Kingdom, is to be found in Kanawati, El-Hawawish I, pl. 19 and fig. 8, where the painter Sni faces right, and the statement he makes is reversed, the signs facing leftward.

A Twelfth Dynasty example, on the elaborately painted coffin published by E.L.B. Terrace, Egyptian Paintings of the Middle Kingdom (New York 1968), pls. 1, 10, where, in opposition to the list of offerings that follows it, a column of signs is reversed, beginning “recitation by the lector priest...”

There is also a Nineteenth Dynasty example in which a document is read, with the reader facing right and the signs in his text oriented leftward; the text is the list of kings in the temple of Seti I at Abydos, read by Prince Ramesses: Jean Capart and Marcelle Werbrouck, Memphis (Brussels 1930), fig. 110, p. 114; for other references see PM VI, p. 25.

p. 56. Although it is no longer certain that the further development of retrograde inscriptions will be followed in the present series, my principal conclusions are presented in L'écriture et l'art de l'Égypte ancienne (Paris 1986), pp. 105–28.

p. 73, § 27. A similar example is to be found in Kanawati, El-Hawawish VII, fig. 21. Where a columnar legend in front of the deceased describes him “viewing the lassoing of the wild beasts of the desert,” and the signs of ḫ ṭa “beasts” are reversed.

But the example in my own fig. 74 must be eliminated, for the sign ḫ has proven not to be reversed, as may be seen from Kent Weeks, Mastabas of Cemetery G 6000 (Boston 1994), fig. 26 and pl. 12(b).

p. 91, n. 231. See Caminos and James, Gebel es-Silsileh I, p. 31, n. 6, where the passage in question is translated: “The doer is I.”
Addenda to *Egyptian Studies I and II*

p. 97, n. 256. For the phrase for queen and god see Naville, *Deir el Bahari II*, pl. 27, V, pl. 132).

p. 110. In his review, *BiOr* 37 (1980), 27, Pascal Vernus points out that it is not *Hr-Inhrt* to whom the suffix pronoun of *hmt.f* refers, but his father *Nfr-htp*, who is named on the opposite side. Thus this case does not constitute an exception.

p. 145 (g). The number of the Dendera stela is 29–66–693, as noted on p. 103 above, n. 103.

Addenda to this Volume

p. 32. There seem to be further traces of signs at the end of the inscription on the proper right, and these possibly add the epithet “possessor of reverence” (𓊘𓊘认𓊘).

p. 215 and n. 288. For another exception from Giza see Ann Macy Roth, *A Cemetery of Palace Attendants* (Boston 1995), pls. 103a, 191. This also shows the absence of a horizontal attachment at the bottom, mentioned on my p. 216, n. 295.
INDEX

A. Personal Names

(Feminine names are so indicated by the addition of [f.], and rejected readings by [*]. Also note that the weak ending of 3ae inf. verbs is omitted.)

ib (Saqqara), 6, n. 39
ib-Nfr, 62
lw-Pth, 67, n. 189
lw-n.(i)-Pth, 67
lw-n-Pth, 67
Im-Nfr, 62
Il-ny (MMA 63.154), 131, 139, Pl. 26
*Il-n.(i)-Dhwty, 203–204
Il-Nfr, 66
Il-nfr (Berlin 1204), 103, 104
Il-k(t).i, 57, n. 34
*Il-Dhwty, 204
Iy-nfr, 104
Iy, 182
I (E), 182
lw-fn.(i) (Saqqara), 25, 24
lw-fn.(i).t (E) (Berlin 7779), 14, Fig. 1, 17, 23, comment l, 24, 38, Pl. 4
*lw-fn-nfr (E), 70
lw-fn-mwt, 61
lw-n-it, 61, n. 75, 69, n. 206
lw-n-fwt, 61, n. 75, 69, n. 206
lw-n-st.(s) (E), 69, 71, n. 231
lw-n.(i) (E), 23
lw-n.i-Pth, 66
lw-Mwt, 48, n. 39
lw-R, 48, n. 39
lw-K(t).i, 48, n. 39
lb (Saqqara), 2
lb (MMA 68.14), 129, 138, Pl. 25
lb-t (MMA 63.154), 131, 139, Pl. 26
lp (El Safi), 24, 221
lp (MMA 28.9.5), 207, 235, Pl. 46a
lp (Berlin 7779), 14, Fig. 1, 17, 23, comments n. 24, 38, Pl. 4
lp (Berlin 7779), 14, Fig. 1, 17, 24, comment r, 38, Pl. 4
lp+t (E), 219
lf (E), 68, n. 198, 70
lm-t, 59, 227
Im-n.(i)-ib.(i), 68, n. 194
lm-nfr, 68, n. 194
lm (MMA 63.154), 131, 139, Pl. 26
ln, 203–204
ln-t, 83, 84, Fig. 4, 90, Pl. 10, 97, n. 26, 102, Pl. 14
ln-t-fig, 149
lnkt, 112, 113, Fig. 1
Inu (E), 108
Inp+hp, 63
In-k(t).i, 216
Inu (E), 84, Fig. 4, 90, Pl. 10
In-nfr (Stockholm Medelhavsmuseet 11415), 8, 12, Pl. 3b
*In-n, 21, n. 58
In-n.k-Pth, 33
In-k(t).i-Pth, 59, n. 50
Inp+hp-Pth, 33
*Inr (Saqqara), 7
Inr-Pth, 7
Int (E), 84, Fig. 4, 90, Pl. 10
Inr (E), 84, Fig. 4, 90, Pl. 10
Inr-nfr (Copenhagen 5129), 8, 10–11, Pls. 1–2
Iny (Saqqara), 4, 5, nn. 34, 36
Iny-nfr (E), 60–61
Iny-m-ty-Myfr, 73, n. 8
Iny-nfr, 60–61
Ih (Hnty-kh) (Saqqara), 1, 3, Fig. 1
Iz (MMA 68.14), 129, 138, Pl. 25
Iz (Louvre C 164), 5, n. 29, 18
Ik (E), (MMA 68.14), 129, 138, Pl. 25
Il, 147, n. 24
Il.(i)-nn, 205, 206, Fig. 14
Il.(j)-nn, 205, n. 219
Il.(j)-nn, 205, n. 219
Il-n.(i), 71, n. 231
*Hr (MMA 63.154), 131, 139, Pl. 26
*Shk, 127
*Hhr, 64
*n (m., f.), 125, 126, 128, Fig. 2, 134, Pl. 21, 137, Pl. 24
*nb, 57
*nfr.-m-Mn-nfr, 73, n. 8
*nhr, 123
*nby-Pth, 61, n. 79
*nby-Pth (MMA 68.14), 129, 138, Pl. 25
*nby-Pth-Mn-nfr, 73, n. 8, 74
*nby-Pth, 59
INDEX

Bk-n-Ph (CG 1731), 8, n. 12
Bk-n-Hnmw (Stockholm Medelhavsmuseet 11415),
8, 12, Pl. 3b
Bii (Saqqara), 180
Bnwi (f.) (MMA 68.14), 129, 138, Pl. 25
Bbi, 127
Bbi (f.), 129
P-bkn(t)-nu (MMA 68.14), 129, 138, Pl. 25
Ppy, 73, n. 4
Ppy, 104, 106, Pl. 15
Ppy-mm-nfr(i), 74
Ppy-nfr, 74
Ph-n-kau, 56, n. 13
Ph-n-nfrt, 66
*Ptw-nfrt, 66, n. 170
Pb-bkt (or Hpt-Pb) (MMA 04.2.6), 31, 39, Pl. 5
Pb-bk (or Hpt-Pb), 61, 201, 202, Fig. 13a
Pb-hp-f, 7
Pb-hp (Manchester 10780), 34, 35, Fig. 4
Sp-srr (Pb), 59
Sp-bk (Impy) (Saqqara), 227
Ph-n (Saqqara), 2
Me(S) (CG 1707), 21, n. 50
M-tu-n(i)-tk (68, n. 194
Mw (f.) (MMA 68.14), 129, 138, Pl. 25
Mw (CG 1586), 16, n. 15
Mw (Dendera), 26, n. 77
Mw-nb, 61
Mn (MMA 63.154), 131, 139, Pl. 26
Mn-nfr-m-tw(i), 73, n. 8
Mn-swt-i-nsat, 76
Mw-kt, 65, n. 164
Mn-nfr-bk (MMA 63.154), 131, 139, Pl. 26
Mn-dj-nfrk, 75
[Mr/i/i(i)], 82, Fig. 3, 83, comment b, 89, Pl. 9
Mr-bk-ntb, 60
Mr-sy-nb III (f.), 112, 114, 115, Fig. 3a
Mr-Tti (Saqqara), 9, n. 16
Mrr, 73, n. 4
Mrr-nfr, 74
Mrr-tti (f.), 68, n. 198, 70
Mrr-mdt (f.), 69
Mrri (Dendera), 26, n. 77
Mrrw (i)-ks(i) (Saqqara), 2, 3, n. 15, 92, 93, 95, Fig.
4, 101, Pl. 13a
Mr-sy-Tii (f.), 60, n. 67, 70
Mr-sy-Tii (f.), 70
Mrr-mdt (f.), 112, 113, Fig. 2b
Mw (Saqqara), 6, 70
Mrr-Rt, 150
INDEX

Mtn (Saqqara), 23, 37, n. 149
Ny-kw (Saqqara), 7
*Nṣr-Hrb, 71
Ny-imu1 (BM 65953), 36, 41, Pl. 7
Ny-imu2-Pht, 36, n. 145
Ny-imu3-Pht, 57, n. 71
Ny-imu4 (Hrb), 71
Ny—an-h3T (f.), 68, n. 198, 70
Ny—an-Wdj, 57, 59
Ny—an-Wr-kf, 56, n. 6, 57, n. 28
Ny—an-Pby, 59
Ny—an-Pby-km, 74
Ny—an-Pby-uk, 57
Ny—an-Pht, 57
Ny—an-Mnu, 71, n. 227
Ny—an-Mnw, 55, n. 2
Ny—an-Mryf-km, 74
Ny—an-Njtrm (Strasbourg 2541A), 8, 12, Pl. 3a
Ny—an-NN (Giza G 2435), 57, n. 28
Ny—an-Nbt (f.) (Turin 1868), 22
Ny—an-Nbt (f.) (Giza), 57
Ny—an-Nbt (f.) (CG 1682, CG 1700), 22, n. 60, 57
Ny—an-nswt, 57
Ny—an-Rc, 57
Ny—an-Hr, 60
Ny—an-Hthr (f.), 55, 57
Ny—an-Hmnu, 56, 57
Ny—an-Si, 59, 70
Ny—an-Tl, 70
*Nṣr-Pht—aT, 60
*Nṣr-Pht-f2, 59
*Nṣr-Pht-knu, 59
Ny-Pht-knu, 60
Ny-Pht-nswt, 56
Ny-Pht-Rc, 55–60
Ny-Pht-nswt, 58, n. 40
Ny-Pht-nswt (f.), 58, n. 40, 64, n. 147
Ny-Rc-nswt, 56
*Nṣr-Rc-nswt, 55
Ny-Pht-Pht, 57
Ny-Pht-Rc, 57
Ny—Hr—aT, 60
Ny-ht-Pth (?), 67
Ny-ht-Hmnu (?), 67
*Nṣr-hb-twr, 58, n. 44
*Nṣr-hb-Pht, 58, n. 44
Ny-hnswt-nswt, 57
Ny-hnswt-knu, 57, n. 34
Ny-hnswt-Pht, 67, n. 186, 68
Ny-n-Nbt (f.) (Cairo J 55618), 22, n. 60
Ny-n-nswt (f.), 55
Ny-n-nswt, 56, n. 17
*Nṣr-sw-swy, 60
Ny-sw-Wrt, 61
Ny-sw-Hr, 71
Ny-sw-Pht, 57
Ny-sw-f2, 57
Ny-sw-Pht, 59
Ny-sw-Pht, 59
Ny-sw-Pht, 57, n. 36
Ny-sw-Pht, 57, n. 36
Ny-hr3T-nm, 59
Ny-hr3T-Pht, 57, n. 37
Ny-hr3T-Nnw, 56
Ny-hr3T-nb3T, 69
Ny-hr3T-Rc, 57
Ny-hr3T-Hr, 57, n. 37
Ny-hr3T-Hr, 57
*Nṣr-kw3T, 7
Ny-kw3T-Inpw (Oriental Institute 10621), 19, n. 34
Ny-kw3T-nw, 59
Ny-kw3T-Pht, 7, 60
Ny-kw3T-Pht (Manchester 10780), 34, 35, Fig. 4
Ny-kw3T-ntrm (Copenhagen 5129), 8, 10–11, Pls. 1–2
Ny-kw3T-Nr, 57
*Nṣr-nb3T-Hthr (f.), 55
Ny-ndty (?), 62, n. 89
Ny-imu1.1 (1m-nb3T-?), 63
Ny-imu2.1 (MMA 63,154), 131, 139, Pl. 26
Ny-br-bnt (f.) (MMA 63,154), 131, 139, Pl. 26
Ny-br-s, 75
Ny-bt (l), 63, 75
Ny-br-t, 75, 237
Ny-br-t, 75
Ny-br-t (Mentuhotecp), 4, 43, n. 2, 96, 185, n. 83
Ny-Sunnu (MMA 63,154), 131, 139, Pl. 26
Ny-tou3T-Rc (Mentuhotecp), 159, 232
Nfr (Edfu), 27, n. 97
Nfr (f.), 68, n. 198
Nfr (f.), 108, 110, Pl. 16
Nfr-Inpw-nb3T-nty, 62
Nfr-tn, 61
Nfr-nty, 182, n. 58
Nfr-nb3T (f.), 23, n. 68, 64
Nfr-nb3T, 62, 75, n. 19
Nfr-nw (f.), 124, n. 14
Nfr-nw (f.), 125, 134, Pl. 21
Nfr-Mtr, 61, 75, n. 19
Nfr-Mnu, 71, n. 227
Nfr-nwy, 105
Nfr-br-n-Pht, 215
Nfr-br-n-Pht, 63, n. 107
INDEX

Hjp-hr-hty (Leiden), 91, 100, Pl. 12
Hjp-hrs-hty, 112, 113, Fig. 1
Hjp-hrs (f.), 63, 112, 113, Fig. 2c, 149, 150
Hjp-Htp, 63-64
Hjp-Hth, 63-64
Hjp-Itam, 226, n. 399
Hjp-Itamu (or Hnmw-Htp) (MMA 68.14), 129, 130, 138, Pl. 25
Hjp-Itamu (? f., Giza), 23, n. 68
Hjp-Itamu, 62
Hjp-Itamu (Stockholm MM 11415), 8, 12, Pl. 3b
Hjp-Skb(?), 108, 110, Pl. 16
Hjp-Smt, 104, 106, Pl. 15
Hjp-Skt, 63-64
Hjp-Sis, 63-64
Hjp-Spt, 62
Hjp-Stm, 63-64
Hjp-Qsy, 62, 63
Hjp-kh(i), 63, 71
Hjp-kh (?), 63
Hjp (Aswan), 226
Hpi, 64
Hr, 151
Hr-Innu, 49, 75, n. 19
Hr-kw (f.) (MMA 68.14), 129, 138, Pl. 25
Hr-kw-Rc (m., f.), 130
Hr-bw-Pth, 75
Hr-bw-Hth, 75
Hr-bw-Zks, 75
Hr-Mrt, 62, 64
Hr-mrr-hthy, 114, n. 16
Hw (f.), 125, 128, Fig. 2, 134, Pl. 21, 137, Pl. 24
Hw (Berlin 7779), 14, Fig. 1, 17, 24, comment q., 38, Pl. 4
Hw-Dhuwy(?), 203
Hwfr-nb (Boston MFA 21.3081), 21, n. 51
Hwfr-f, f. I, 112, 222
Hnrw (Saqqara false door), 51, n. 70
Hnrw (= Hnws-rw-fbr) (f.), 132
Hnrw-rw-fbr (f.) (MMA 63.154), 131, 139, Pl. 26
Hnrw-hfr(w), 226, n. 399
Hnfr-snt-Hth, 23
Hnty-kh (Hbd) (Saqqara), 1-6
Hnty-kh (Saqqara mastaba, below Room III), 1-7, Figs. 1-2
Hnty-kh (funerary priest, Saqqara), 6, n. 39
Hnty-kh, 65
Hnty-kh (?), 65
Hnmw-hfr(w) (or Hfr-Hnmw) (Stockholm Medelhavs- museet 11415), 8, n. 13, 12, Pl. 3b
Hnmw-hfr, 63
Hnmw-hfr (f.), 212, Fig. 19
Hnt (f.), 187, 188, Fig. 8a, 189
Hnty-snt, 182, n. 58
Hnt-n(i), 61
Hty, 4
Zs-st, 205
Zs-nmn (MMA 68.14), 129, 138, Pl. 25
Zs-n-itf, 61
Zs-n-mwt, 61
Zs-npat (Aswan), 221
Zs-Smt, 62, n. 89
Zs-nmn (f.), 125, 134, Pl. 21, 149, 151, n. 55
Zs-Sntrt (f.), 8, n. 6
Zs-Sbk (f.), 127
Zs-khfrw (f.) (MMA 63.154), 131, 139, Pl. 26
Zs-th (f.), 204
*Zs-Dhuwy (f.), 204
*Zs-n-nb, 71, n. 227
Zs-n-hfr-kh(?), 71
Znt (f.) (MMA 63.154), 131, 139, Pl. 26
Znt (f.), 131, 149
[Zh]w (Saqqara), 2
Zts-hfr-l, 64
Sh.f (stela), 49, nn. 42, 50
Shw-Rc, 56
Sm-n-Hbr, 57, n. 22
Sm-nk-r Sm-kn-r, 221, n. 368
*St-nb, 23
St-k, 23, n. 65
*Stw-nb, 23
Sdw-kw, 23, n. 65
Sdw-kh(i) (Giza), 21
Sbn(?), 57, n. 21
Sbk-n, 127
Sbkh-hfr, 63, 108, 110, Pl. 16, 203
Smhn-n, 127
Sni, 240
Snu, 63, n. 108
Sub (m., f.), 57, 70, 126, 180
Sub (f.) (MMA 68.14), 129, 138, Pl. 25
Sub-Rnt-i-nb (f.) (MMA 68.154), 131, 139, Pl. 26
Subtysy (f.), 125, 134, Pl. 21
*Sub-dw-nt, 70
*Sub-Ddi, 126
Sub-Ddi-w-rw (f.), 125, 134, Pl. 21
Snrw-brf (BM 1324), 8
Snrw-hfr, 63
Snrw-f (BM 1324), 8
Snni (Dendera), 191, n. 139
B. Titles, Occupations and Selected Epithets

**Imy-n, "wide of wings" (epithet of Nekhbet), 181, 186**

**Imy-n Ti htq, "attendant of the ruler’s table," 130, n. 29, 237**

**Imy-n, "gentle of hand" (?, 2 (78 [h]), 6, Fig. 2**

**Imy smsw Inhw, "senior pillar of Anubis," 46, Fig. 2, 48**

**Imy smsw Inhw zhr-ntr, "senior pillar of Anubis who belongs to the divine booth," 46, Fig. 2, 48**

**Imy Smtw, "pillar of Upper Egypt," 218**

**Imy Knmt, "pillar of the Knmt," 32, 40, Pl. 6, 218, 219, n. 322**

**Ibt/wb(y), "maid servant," 125, 126, 134, Pl. 21**

**Ip *wry smwy, Ssw, qhw, "one who takes stock of the production of the deserts, marshlands and heavens," 32, 40, Pl. 6, 180 (partial)**

**Ip *wry smwy Hsw-Nsh npt, "one who assessed the production of the nomes of southern Upper Egypt which were to be assessed (?), 20**

**Ip *wry Smtw Ti mkw nswt nh, "one who takes stock of the production of Upper and Lower Egypt and all foreign lands," 14, Fig. 1, 20-21 (i), 38, Pl. 4**

**Ip *b htw, "revered condition," 193-201, 230, n. 434, 238**

**Imw htw, "revered with," 30, 34, 35, Fig. 4, 39, Pl. 5, 108, 110, Pl. 16, 207, 235, Pl. 46a**

**Imw htw, "revered," 28, 129, 138, Pl. 25**

**Imw m smsw Skr, "revered as a follower of Sokar," 105**

**Imw htw nh nqk, "revered with the lord of the two lands," 158**

**Imw, "revered," 14, Fig. 1, 17, 28, 38, Pl. 4, 80, Fig. 1, 218**

**Imw mtmwr, "revered and justified," 195, n. 164**

**Imw htw nswt, "revered with the king," 32, 40, Pl. 6**

**Imy-b Htw nh nqw, "who is in the heart of Horus, lord of the two lands," 158**

**Imy-n, "overseer," 18, n. 24, 20, n. 44, 44, n. 12, 45, 84, n. 23, 190, 196, n. 169, 211**

**Imy-n Imw htw (w) kfr-q, "overseer and under-supervisor of tenant landholders of the palace," 18, n. 23**

**Imy-n in hsw-nswt, "overseer of the chamber [of the king’s regalia]," 30, 39, Pl. 5**

**Imy-n Imw fr nth, "overseer of the two bureaus of the house of documents," 52**

**Imy-n Imw fr htw nh, "overseer of the two bureaus of the registry of serfs," 51, n. 67, 52**

**Imy-n Imw fr htw nqk, "overseer of the two chambers of the king’s regalia," 19, n. 29, 117**

**Imy-n Imw htw hkw htmn n nswt, "overseer of the two bureaus of the registry of royal decrees," 51, 52**

**Imy-n Imw htw hkw htmn, "overseer of the two bureaus of the registry," 51, 52**

**Imy-n Imw htw htmn nqk, "overseer of the two bureaus of the registry of serfs," 51, 52**

**Imy-n Imw nswt, "overseer of the troop(s)," 49, n. 41, 226**

**Imy-n Imw (w), "overseer of foreign mercenaries," 84, Fig. 4, 85, 90, Pl. 10a**

**Imy-n Imw (w) nh, "overseer of the produce of all the deserts," 32, 180**

**Imy-n Imw nswt, "overseer of the king’s repast," 32, 33, 49, Pl. 6**

**Imy-n Imw nswt n dhw st qmt, "overseer of the king’s repast, which heaven gives and earth creates," 32**

**Imy-n Imw nswt, "overseer of the workshop," 20, 34**

**Imy-n Imw nswt, "overseer of the two workshops," 19**

**Imy-n Imw nswt (w), "overseer of fowlers," 81, n. 14**

**Imy-n Imw nswt (w) fr, "overseer of fishing," 81, n. 14**

**Imy-n Imw nswt (w) fr, "overseer of commissions of police," 18, n. 25**

**Imy-n Imw nswt (w), "overseer of confectioners," 205, n. 220, 234, Pl. 45**

**Imy-n Imw nswt (w), "steward," 4, 108, 110, Pl. 16**

**Imy-n Imw nswt (w), "steward and under-supervisor of the household," 18**

**Imy-n Imw nswt (w) mh, "overseer of the house of gold," 20, n. 43**

**Imy-n Imw nswt (w) mk, "overseer of the king’s domain," 2**

**Imy-n Imw nswt (w) mh, "overseer of the treasury," 18, n. 26, 30, 34, 35, Fig. 4, 39, Pl. 5**

**Imy-n Imw nswt (w) mk, ["overseer of the treasury"] for Cheops, 30, 39, Pl. 5**

**Imy-n Imw nswt (w) mh, ["overseer of the treasury"] for Cheops, 39, 39, Pl. 5**

**Imy-n Imw nswt (w) nt, "overseer of the two houses of gold," 20, 34**

**Imy-n Imw nswt (w) mh, "overseer of two treasuries," 14, Fig. 1, 17, 18, 19, 25, 38, Pl. 4**

**Imy-n Imw nswt (w) mk, ["overseer of the army"]; 84, Fig. 4, 85, 90, Pl. 10a**

**Imy-n Imw nswt (w) nt, ["overseer of the mansion of gold"]; 20, n. 43**

**Imy-n Imw (w) mt, "overseer of priests," 18, n. 24, 82, Fig. 3, 85, 89, Pl. 9**
imy-ı hntyw-s, “overseer of tenant landholders,” 227
imy-ı hryw n nfrw, “overseer of directors of recruits,”
17, n. 21
imy-ı htyw(w) zı(w), “overseer of directors of scribes,”
17, n. 21
imy-ı htyw(w) n bnty n nfr w n wfr, “overseer of everything that
heaven gives and earth creates,” 32
imy-ı htm, “overseer of the treasury,” 2 (79 [h]), 3.4.
n. 19, 5
imy-ı htm n t w r dšf, “overseer of the treasury in the
entire land,” 4
imy-ı htm Tršn, “overseer of the treasure of the
Thinite Nome,” 4
imy-ı hmywš, “overseer of sealers/treasurers,” 3, 104,
106, Pl. 15, 129, 138, Pl. 25
imy-ı hry htm, “overseer of the registry,” 51–52
imy-ı hry htm n t w snt n pr-t n mtr n nfr, “overseer of
the registry of royal decrees of the great house for
serfs and for fields,” 51–52
imy-ı hry sf, “overseer of scribebearers,” 50
imy-ı htr-t n snt pr-t n mtr n nfr, “overseer of the regis-
try of royal documents of the palace for serfs and
for fields,” 34
imy-ı hmy wšt šbšt, “overseer of the eastern deserts,”
210, 211
imy-ı šw šwš šršw šwš, “overseer of scribes of the
two chambers of the king’s regalia,” 14, Fig. 1, 19,
25, 38, Pl. 4
imy-ı šw šwš šršw šršw, “overseer of scribes of the two work-
shops,” 14, Fig. 1, 25, 38, Pl. 4
imy-ı šw šršw šršw šršw, “overseer of scribes of the two
houses of gold,” 14, Fig. 1, 20, 25, 38, Pl. 4
imy-ı šw šršw šršw šršw, “overseer of scribes of the two trea-
suries,” 14, Fig. 1, 18, 25, 38, Pl. 4
imy-ı šw šwš htrt, “overseer of scribes of the registry,”
51–52
imy-ı šwš htrt n nfr, “overseer of scribes of the
registry of royal decrees,” 51–52
imy-ı šwš htrt n nfr, “overseer of the august places of
the palace,” 2 (79 [d]), 6, n. 38
imy-ı šwš Mut Hn-Nḥn, “overseer (?) of the nomes of
Hn-Nḥn,” 20, n. 45
imy-ı šwš, “overseer of linen,” 2 (79 [e]), 4, 8, n. 5, 216
imy-ı šwš fr, “overseer of linen of the house,” 216
imy-ı šwš, “overseer of the milk herd,” 192, n. 146
imy-ı šwš(M) nsw, “overseer of necklace-stringers,” 193
imy-ı šwš(M) nsw Hn-Nḥn, “overseer of necklace-
stringers of the king’s regalia,” 193, n. 153
imy-ı šršt, “overseer of stores,” 219, n. 319
imy-ı šršt, “overseer of disputes,” 108, n. 3, 207,
208, 235, Pl. 46a
imy-ı šrš(M) wbr, “overseer of builders of the work-
shop,” 29
imy-ı šrš(w), “overseer of the herd,” 33
imy-šfr, “under-supervisor,” 17, 18
Fig. 1, 18, 25, 34, 35, Fig. 4, 38, Pl. 4
imy-šfr pr-hd ḫy ḫy Hmt .Temp ḫwš ḫwš ḫwš, “under-
supervisor of the treasury who takes stock of the
production of Upper and Lower Egypt and all for-
eign lands,” 14, Fig. 1, 25, 29, 38, Pl. 4
*imy-šfr ḫy, “under-supervisor of the temple,” 18,
n. 23
imy-šfr ḥmtw pr-t, “under-supervisor of craftsmen of
the palace,” 216
imy-šfr ḥtyw(w)-pn, “under-supervisor of achor-domos,”
216
imy-šfr ḥtyw(w)-pn, “under-supervisor of directors of the
army,” 17
imy-šfr ḫwš ḫwš ḫwš, “under-supervisor of those who are
within the palace(?)”, 237
imy-šfr ḫwš ḫwš ḫwš, “under-supervisor of police,” 18, n. 25
imy-šfr, “functionary,” 24, 181
imy-šfr, “functionary,” 26
imy-šfr ḫwš ḫwš, “functionary of tenant-landholdings,”
14, Fig. 1, 17, 24, 25, 38, Pl. 4
imy-šfr ḫwš ḫwš, “functionary of tenant-landholdings of
the palace,” 24
imy-šfr ḫwš ḫwš ḫwš, “functionary of the granary,” 24, n. 72
imy ḫtr Hn Hs ṭp-ś, “he who is in the splendor of
Horus, bodyguard,” 104
imy-šfr, “those in the ground/land,” 230
imy-šfr ḫtrw, “overseer of regalia,” 238
šwr, (meaning uncertain), 238, 239, Fig. 2
šwr Hn šrš(w) nsw, “one who brings back the
produce of the southern and northern lands for the
king,” 21
ir m ṭm m, “one who acts with his two hands,” 181
ir ḫḥš nb, “who does what his lord praises,” 64,
n. 153
ir ḫḥš nb, “who does what his lord praises,” 219
ir, “custodian,” “keeper,” 20, n. 44, 37, n. 146, 44,
177, n. 5, 178, n. 11, 179
ir ṭn, “keeper of (manufactured) production,” or
“of (agricultural) produce,” 21, 37, Fig. 5
ir ṭn ḫḥš(w), “keeper of produce/production of the
Letopolite nome (for) Re in (the sun temple)
Ṣḫp-ḥp-R’ (and for the Pyramid) Mš-nšw-Nṣwšr,”
37
*ir ṭn ḫḥš(w), “keeper of the production of jewelers,”
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*iry P nb, “keeper of every Butite,” 45, n. 16

*iry-p’t, “hereditary prince,” 5, 6, Figs. 2, 45, 82, Fig. 3, 83, 85, 89, Pl. 9

*iry-md(w), “keeper of documents,” 44, n. 12

*iry-Nbn, “keeper of Nekhen,” 44-45

*iry-nfr m st n sswt, “keeper of the diadem in the place (storeroom?) of the king,” 21

*iry-ht pr-hs, “custodian of property of the treasury,” 23, n. 70

*iry-hms, “keeper of what is sealed,” 50

*iry-hst nb twt, “who does what the lord of the two lands praises,” 159

*iry-hzt bss ntwt, “who does what is praised by him who praises him,” 221

*irz hst Hbr “who does what Hathor praises,” 64, n. 153

*iqr ndt r mb n Tnn, “I was excellent in counsel in the council of Thinis,” 103, n. 3

*iqr-sr, “excellent of counsel,” 87

idms, “deputy,” 108, 110, Pl. 16

imt, “servant,” 131, 139, Pl. 26 (See D6) the servant
Rn (i) snb

imb n ntwt, “stalwart of the town,” 131, 133, 139, Pl. 26

*br, “warrior,” 103, n. 2

*br nd Wpwnut, “warrior who defends Wepwawet,”
“warrior and defender of Wepwawet,” 103

*bry, “warrior,” 103, n. 2

*br, “attendant,” 129, 130, 138, Pl. 25

*wr (w) nb, “unique one of the greatest of the festival,” 28

*wr 200, “wr-b-priest of the 200,” 3, n. 15

*wr 200 Mm-nfr-Ppy, “wr-b-priest of the 200 of Mm-nfr-
Ppy,” 2 (79 [K]), 3

*wr 200 pr-t, “wr-b-priest of the 200 of the palace,” 3, n. 15

*wr tk, “great wr-b-priest,” 48, n. 33

*wr n Hbr, nb frnt, “wr-b-priest of Hathor, mistress of Dendera,” 125, 126, Pl. 21

*wr nswt, “wr-b-priest of the king,” 34, 35, Fig. 4, 215

*wr Rc, “wr-b-priest of Rc,” 214, 236, Pl. 47

*wr(C)tbr, “maidservant,” 125, 126, 132, 134, Pl. 21

wr r kw n mdw nb fr n *br, “who is open of mouth on the day of speech, possessor of (a strong) arm on the day of fighting,” 87

wr ldt, “great of incense,” 96

wr bb, “great of bat” (i.e., “abounding in brilliant objects”), 34, 35, Fig. 4, 96

wr mdrw Shw, nb hsm, “greatest of the tens of Upper Egypt, of preeminent seat,” 218

*wr hmtw(t), “wr-scepter of the craftsmen,” 238

*wr hmtw(t) nb, “wr-scepter of all craftsmen,” 238

*wr-hyt(w)-msw n Wnsw, “greatest of the directors of craftsmen of Wns,” 31, 238

wr Smw, “great of Upper Egyptian grain,” 96

wr dtb, “great of leather,” 96

wr-hst, “great of praise,” 219

wr b, “fowler,” 182

Wsr, “Osiris” (as epithet), 71, n. 234

wr, “emalmer,” 47

wbr, “butler,” 132

wr mdw m hsw, “one who judges in the court,” 230

bt, “king of Lower Egypt,” 36

phyr, “runner,” 178, n. 16

ptt n nb twt irs, “whose excellence was seen by the lord of the two lands,” 159

ptty, “bowman,” 105

wr wty Mhsw Shw “who supervises the production of Lower and Upper Egypt,” 21

wr ktt, “supervisor of works,” 21, n. 51

... mtr, “... true...,” 200, n. a

mtr-hsw, “justified,” 125, 126, 127, 128, 131, 134, Pl. 21, 137, Pl. 24, 139, Pl. 26, 152

mtr-hsr, “justified (f.),” 126, 127, 129, 131, 138, Pl. 25, 139, Pl. 26

wr Hr, “she who beholds Horus,” 112, 113, Fig. 1

mn thtw hr twt mdw ntwt nb twt, “firm of sandal, easy of gait, adhering to the ways of the lord of the two lands,” 159

mntrw, “herdsman,” 177-79

mntrw mtr, “good herdsman (royal epithet),” 177

mntrw/siw Nbn, “herdsman/guardian of Nekhen,” 44

mnt, “nurse,” 22, n. 60

mntw htr, “efficient of counsel,” 87

mtr ij, “beloved of his father,” 32, 40, Pl. 6, 71

mtr (n) it, “beloved of his father,” 33, 82, Fig. 3, 89, Pl. 9

mtr Nbn, “he who is beloved of the two ladies,” 189

mtrw, “beloved,” 127, n. 25, 137, Pl. 24

mtrw wnw, “whom [his] brother[s] loved,” 82, Fig. 3, 89, Pl. 9

mtr.t, “his beloved,” 79, 131, 139, Pl. 26, 212, Fig. 19

mntw nswt, “rewarded by the king,” 193, n. 153

msj, “his child of the funerary estate,” 31

msj wsw nb gts, “his children of the funerary estate,” 31

*msj wsw nb gts, “his children and brothers of the funerary estate,” 31

mty n zi, “regulator of a phyle,” 8, n. 5, 227

mdw rhy, “staff of the commoners,” 32, 40, Pl. 6
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Wr-Wnis, (estate name), 74
Wr-nfr-Rc, “great is the beauty of Re” (temple), 75
Wr-Ra’et-ty, 76
Wr-Shepshep, (estate name), 74
wmt, “court,” 230
Bzd, (estate name), 96
pr wsw, “house of royal decrees,” 52
Pw-n, temple of Nekhbet, 13, n. 24
pr nw-em, “house of documents,” 52
pr hbyw sbFH, “house of those in charge of reversion offerings,” 52
pr-bt, “treasury,” 19, n. 42, 31, n. 135
Pr-Hty, “House of Khety,” 88
prw nw mbty, “the domains of the northerner,” 88, n. 31
Pr-Swst-tmyy, “Sesostris beholds the two lands,” 77
Mn-nfy-Ppy, “the life of Pepy abides,” 75
Mn-nfy, Memphis, 73
Mn-nfr-Ppy, “the beauty of Pepy abides,” 75
Mn-nfr(w)-mrty, “the beauty of Meryre abides,” 77
Mn-sw-nswt,37
mr, “pyramid,” 75
mph, “the north,” 86
msph, “haven,” 87
Ny-nfr-Ty, (estate name), 58
Ny-f(i)-Ty, (estate name), 58
Nfr-Wnis, (estate name), 74
Nfr-Rt-bq, (estate name), 74
Nfr-Hfsw, (estate name), 74
Nhb, El Kab, 206
r-nt, “mouth of the valley,” 211
*Rt-hr-fstp(w), 76
hby, “court,” 230
hmr, “mansion,” 48, n. 31
Hvt, “the mansion” (modern Hu), 73
Hvt-hby, “estate of cattle,” 108
hmr-nfr, “temple,” 48, n. 31
Hut-smk, “the mansion-is-powerful,” 73
Hut-smkh-Hprk-rm-btu, “the mansion Kheperkare (justified)-is-powerful,” 73
Hut-hb-h, 4
Hut-kb-Ph, Memphite temple of Ptolemy, 156, n. 92
Ht, pyramid and temple name, 74
Ht-n-Wnis, (estate name), 67
hmr, “(up)land,” 21, n. 54
hmr nb, “every foreign land/all foreign lands,” 21, n. 54
Hr-ws-Shepshep, “the wst-crown of Sahure appears,” (estate name), 74
Hr-bws-Shepshep, 75
Hr-nfr-Mrtr, pyramid of Mrtr, 74
Hr-][Nfr]-Khr, (estate name), 74
Hr-Hfsw, (estate name), 74
Hrmt-nt-ktmr, “she who encompasses the places of Khahpeperre,” 76
Hr-Nbn, “Upper Egypt,” 20, n. 46
hn-nfr, “necropolis,” 28, 191
Hhrw-Ppy, (estate name), 36
zmr, “desert,” 210, n. 261, 211
zh, “pavilion,” 208, 209
zh nbw, “divine booth,” 45–49
swt, “places,” in names of pyramids, 76
Swt, “(the pyramid) ‘the places’” (pyramid of Merykare), 76
Swt Mrrk, “the places of Merykare” (pyramid of Merykare), 76
Swt hn-nfr, “the places of the appearances of Amenemhet (I),” 76
Swt nb-nswr “royal residence,” 21, n. 51
Smw, “Upper Egypt,” 224
Smw Mht nb t jn n dwf, “the south and the north, this entire land,” 86
Sp-tb-Rc, (sun temple), 37
Qn-nfrw Imn-nw, “Exalted is the beauty of Amenemhet,” 77
Tp-nr, “head of the south,” 83
Tp Smw, “head of Upper Egypt,” 83
Tp Smw mbtt, “northern head of Upper Egypt” (region of the Thinite nome), 82, Fig. 3, 83, 89, Pl. 9
Tnt, “Tnt-shrine,” 74
Dwn-(i)-Nfrw, (estate name), 67
Dw-osk, “the wages of tilling,” (estate name), 215
Dbt, “robing room,” 214

D. Words and Phrases

rwn, “bag,” 229, n. 423
rwn n z, “bag of the scribe,” 229, n. 423
nm, “pressing (grapes),” 186, n. 95
nh, “fiery of burning,” 36
n, “diadem,” 36
n, “power,” 36
ii ntr zis tis, “the god is coming! Rejoice!” 97
ii kwis n hbt, “I returned in peace,” 82, Fig. 3, 83, 89, Pl. 9
iw (i) <> rmm, “I will be his support,” 180, n. 28
iw n i b r Hprwnt wd, fr nb it, “I made the procession of Wepwawet, when he proceeds to defend
INDEX

his father,” 103

iw.~n.ti n wa"ir iheh ienjury, “we acted as ‘loving
son’ for Osiris Khentamentiu,” 104

iw.~n.ti n Wnun-nfr hrw jf n ‘bi ’i, “I defended
Omnophis on that day of the great fighting,” 104

iw.~n.ti n ‘um.k whr’ ffn, “there is a catch (of fowl) for thy
hands, O fowler!” 182

im.~un, “pillar,” “support,” 48, n. 39

iub, “purification booth,” 98, n. 27

ipt.~itj ihi nb~i.~ipt, “I assessed everything that was to be
assessed” (Unk. I, 106 [7-8]), 20, n. 47

imy.wt, “who is in the place of embalming,” 4, n. 20,

28

imy-st~n, “schedule of duty,” 181-82, 186

imy-st~s, “staff,” 44, n. 12

innt b~j, “what the inundation brings,” 131, 132,

139, Pl. 26

is, “proleptic, 87

th mk sm n(r).i, “Ho, see (how well) I am smoothing,”

187, Fig. 7

ib wmn n mmsw n nfr, “thus I was a follower of the god,”

105

is, “bureau,” 52

itsy, “two chambers,” 19, n. 42

it, “father,” 71, n. 231

ittiy, kind of cloth, 23, n. 63

ity, “master,” 71, n. 231

idx, “bind,” “binding,” 217

idx, “punishment,” 216

idr n.tn it~sn br n, “remove your hands (from) under
us,” 182

idrs.t, “punishment,” 219

j, (var. j), “wash,” 182

n.mdu, “wetting a sate,” 182

n.dmr, “a ewer and basin of electrum,” 182

n rd.k, rd.k ur, “great is thy foot; thy foot is large,” 76,

n. 33

nwy, “hands,” 183, n. 77

nwy, “production,” “produce,” 20, 32, 33, 49, Pl. 6,

180

nwy Mhwr Smi.w, “production of Lower and Upper
Egypt,” 21

nwy (n) mny, “two vessels of water,” 183

nwy n hmun, “handwork for the craftsmen,” 182

n wy til. sn b’sr swb~s, “the two arms, that they may give;
the flood that it may purify,” 131, 132, 139, Pl. 26

nhu-nwy, “washing of hands,” 182

nhw-nwy, “washing of mouth, repast,” 31, 33, 182

nhw nbv smvb, “may he live, prosper and be healthy
(after name of nomarch),” 191

nh 4 r nnh, “may he live for ever and ever,” 191

nh, “brazier,” 227

Wnu~w n frt rfrt n Sm-kr, “Weprawet at the first
procession from Shenuor,” 103, n. 7

ufm, “mission,” 83

ufs~r, “opening (day) of the month,” 191

ufs~s~r, “opening (day) of the year,” 191, 230, 231

uw n~sn frt nfr, “Open the two doors of heaven that
the god may come forth!” 97

wkh k t.ki, “I am great and mighty,” 239

Wnt, “Osiris,” 28

wrr m frt hrw, “being powerful and justified,” 188

wrrt, “neck,” 188

wdd m wuy pn, “offer with your two hands,” 181

wddh~s, “offerings,” 203

bh, “leopard,” “leopard skin,” 36

bth~d, “be living?,” 189

b’t, “flood,” 131, 132, 139, Pl. 26

bzt, “brilliant objects,” 36

bsw, “flood,” 132

prf n frt hrw, “that invocation-offerings go forth for
him,” 1, 20

phm, “end,” 219, n. 323

fit nwj m it pn tw~s ~fwd, “lift your arms from this grain;
it is (but) straw,” 182

m hmp m hmp in znmt imnn~t nth ~s tsn, “welcome, wel-
come, says the western desert, her two arms
towards them,” 180, n. 29

m-hnwy, “by virtue of,” 181

mu, “see to,” “supervise,” 21, n. 51

mu wuy pr bykrs, “viewing the production of the weaver’s
house,” 180

mu stt m pn, “look at my batch of pn-loaves,” 193

mu kh(w)ti, “supervise works,” 21, n. 51

mu.t(i) ir t in sm m stp~s tah~fr, “(the work) that was
done on them (a pair of false doors) in the stp~s
was supervised throughout the day” (Unk. I, 39
[1]), 21, n. 51

mr frt hrw, “vindication,” 216

mrt, “truth,” 229

mrt, “staff,” 229

mt, “flute,” 229, n. 422

mthi, “clap,” 183

mt w nwy, “water for the hands,” 183

mot hr wuy, “water upon the hands,” 183

mnt, “necklace,” 237

mnmt, “cattle,” 207, 208, 235, Pl. 46a

mrt m itw, “oil from the two chambers,” 19, n. 42

mrt, “mt-singer,” 183, 185

mshm, “box,” 226, n. 403
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mk nbw ii.ti, "Behold, Gold (= Hathor) has come forth!" 97
mk r.k smr(i), "See (how well) I am smoothing," 187, Fig. 7
niuty ptw, "these two (pyramid) cities," 75
nb rnh, "possessor of life," "coffin," 75
nbw, "gold" (epithet of Hathor), 75
*nyfr, "throat," 7
nty hw(i), "my companion," 193
nfr, "counsel," 103
r, "mouth," 44
r n hn, "mound for utterance," 43
r-nty, "activity," 181
rw, "dance," 183
rw, "wander," 178, n. 13
rmn, "support," 186
rmn, "support," 180, nn. 26, 28
rmw, "yearly offerings," 131, 132, 139, Pl. 26
ht, "ceiling," "sky," 232, n. 446
hwt, "court people," "230
hnw, "chest," 226
brw n nqwt, "day of conference," 88
bb, "festival," 208, 209
bb nb, "every feast," 208, n. 238
bnwt(i), "my mistress" (referring to pyramid), 75
brty, "over," 47, 190, Fig. 9
brty, "handkerchief," "towel," 181
hsi, "sing," 183, 185
hsu, "one who is cold," 108, n. 3
hwt, "make offering," 186
btp di nswt, "an offering which the king gives," 63, n. 114
hj nbw m rw wtr q hsm. in Hr, "Gold appears in the great portal: Thy (f.) power is exalted," says Horus," 75, n. 27
ht, "beat (the rhythm)," 183, 185, 186, n. 87
hnw, "plantation," "holdings," 24
htm, "seal," 51, n. 76
htm, "treasure," 50
htm ntr, "treasure of the god," 50
htm bfr sty-hb, "treasure (or "that which is sealed") containing festival scent," 50
hbk, "crooked," "crookedness," 229, n. 421
*hfr, "watch out!," 182, n. 51
hr bwt, "what is sealed, registry," 51, 52
hrwy, "authorizations," 51, n. 77
hr, "products," 21, n. 53
sp fpy sbr lwt, "the first occasion of smiting the east," 212, n. 289
zj m snw, "writing down the (amount of) of linen," 22, n. 56
zi dmt s <n> pr-hfr(?), "writing its balance of the treasury(?)" 50, n. 59
sp, "arrive," 87
sp, "ribbs," 87
swr, "to smooth," 186, 187, Fig. 7
shpr Hbr dr mtns r n nb rtw n nb ti, "Propitiate Hathor! Say what she loves every day! Open the two doors of heaven for the mistress of the two lands!" 97, n. 26
ssn tw m ntw snfr, "breathing of emanations of myrrh and incense," 126
sfr, "linen," 217
srb, "milk," 192, n. 146
sbr, "milk herd," 192, n. 146
sk hmr f mst frb-hw rtw nb, "while his majesty supervised the daily requirements thereof every day" (MFA 21.3081), 21, n. 51
*tfr, "moulding," "throw in," 192
sti/stt, "spearing," 192
sti nfr n nhb, "count this out properly," 192
sti nfr n hmr-t(i), "count, [my] companion," 193
sti/sti/stt nbw, "stringing a necklace," 192
sti nbw in sti(n) pr hfr, "stringing of necklaces by the jewelers of the funerary estate," 193, n. 153
sti, "assemblage," "batch," 193
stf-hb, "festival scent," 208, n. 239, 209, n. 247
*tfr, "turned out," 193, n. 152
stt, "chest," 213
sttr, "seal," 50
sttr m nsw Hqwa, ... r st t rmw, "the revered Hnqwa travelling... to spear fish," 192, n. 147
sfr tyj(n) tyj(t) tww-twy, "the two vessels of the wash (hands) and a jar," 183
sfr, "two vessels" (eater and basin), 183
sm iy nb r st t, "all travelling (lit. every going and coming) to this place," 85
sm.k(t) m npr nb(i) fn rt.n(i) mnt.m.f, "Having gone on a mission of this my lord, I did what he desired," 87
smn, "wanderers," 178, n. 13
sm, "mother-in-law," 237
smfr, "snf-kilt," 85
spfr, "espct-cloth," 2, n. 14, 214
qr, "exalted," "great," 77
qr frw, "libations," 4, n. 20
qrs.tw.f m hfr-ntr, "that he might be buried in the necropolis," 28
qrs.tw.f snr., "that he might be buried well...", 28
INDEX

ks, "ks," 7, n. 4, 65, 153–56
ks Pth, "the ks of Pth," 156
kw, "nourishment," 156
tht hmt hmt, "white bread of festivals," 209, n. 247
thwr, "best quality" (of cloth), 180
thw, "predecessors," 180, 181, n. 34
*thw, "speech," 103, n. 3
*tnt, "tnt-cloth," 2, n. 14
tnh, "ibis," 204
tw, "breath," 73, n. 8
tw m, "wind from/namely/consisting of," 125, 128, 134, Pl. 21
[tw ntm] n nh, "sweet breath of life," 125, 126, 154, Pl. 21
[tw ntm] n hnty-imntsw r šrt "NN, "sweet breath of Khentyamentiu to the nose of NN," 126
[tmhk snr mfr pr k hš] "thy breath is incense; they (refreshing) north wind is smoke," 128
dit bn n mšf, "giving the rhythm to the army," 185, n. 82
*dhsw, 2, n. 10
[dst n dš, "council of the funerary estate," 193
dš, "payment," 215
dsw, "cages," 215
dsw, "food," 36, 157, 158, 173, Pl. 40
dš/dhs, "straw," 182, n. 50
Dhwty, "the Thoth festival," 202, n. 183, 204

E. Forms of Signs

A1 𓊷, as redundant name det. at end of Heracleopolitan Period, 88
A1 𓊷, as feminine det. with long wig, 79, n. 1
A19 𓊷, ssmw, 47
A20 𓊷 for 𓊷, from hieratic 𓊷, 103
A20 𓊷, 𓊷 for 𓊷, 𓊷, 103, n. 1
A21 𓊷, "great," 239
A24 𓊷 for 𓊷 (A47), 177–79
A25 𓊷 for 𓊷 (A47), 177–79
A30 𓊷, det. of name, 28, n. 110
A40 𓊷, 79, n. 6
A47 𓊷, 𓊷, 𓊷, 𓊷 for 𓊷, mniw, "herdsman," iry "keeper," 177–79

A48 𓊷, mniw, "herdsman," iry "keeper," 179, var. 𓊷, 177, n. 5
A50 𓊷, redundant det., 32
A- 𓊷, det. of hsw, "one who is cold," 108, n. 3
A- 𓊷, bry, kmy, 179, n. 22
A- 𓊷 for 𓊷 (7), 179
A- 𓊷, hs, "singer," 21, n. 49
A- 𓊷, 230, n. 425
B1 𓊷, 79, n. 6
B- 𓊷, Mtr, 183, n. 80
B- 𓊷, fem. title, 238
D1 𓊷, emphasized on head end of coffin, 43, n. 6
D2 𓊷, emphasized on front end of coffin, 43, n. 6
D2 𓊷 or 𓊷 for 𓊷, hs, "over," 190
D10 𓊷, wds, "be sound," 189
D21 𓊷, mouth on coffin, 43–45
D28 𓊷, 𓊷, fusion of, 130
D29 𓊷, hs, 153–56
D34 𓊷 for 𓊷, 103
D36 𓊷, 180–87, 230
D41 𓊷, rmm, 182, n. 53
D41 𓊷, mmb, 186
D41 𓊷, nfr, nfr, 186
D45 𓊷, dwd, variants of, 27
D52 𓊷, 227
D61 𓊷 and 𓊷, assimilated, 196, n. 165
D- 𓊷, nfr, as dual of 𓊷 (D2), 32, 180–87
D- 𓊷, hs, "wash," 182, 186
D- 𓊷, 28; 𓊷, 207
D- 𓊷, wtd-eyes in pyramid name, 77
D- 𓊷, nmu, 33, 182, n. 62
INDEX

N35 — for —, 157
N35 —, displaced, 57, 67–68
N35 — for —, 28, 229 (as det. for hpr, "portal," "court, by"; for oo (plural), 230, n. 434
N(35) designation of a supply of water, 183
N37  for —, i. 227
O1  —, det. in in, "storehouse," "ergastum," 219, n. 319; det. in wfr m hpr, "one who judges in the court," 230
O1  —, — for —, det. in hpr, "court people," 230, n. 434
O4  unlikely for — (O15), in wfr, "broad hall," 230
O21  zh-nfr, shy-nfr, 49
O22  for both zh "pavillion" and hpr "festival," 208–209
O28  variant of —, 222, n. 371
O31  94; var. —, 96, Fig. 5
O34  — for suffix —, 237
O44  for — (id), 190
O49  for —, 191, n. 139
O49  for —, det. of imyrw, 28
P5  —, twr, "breath," in personal names, 73, n. 8
P5  in T-wt, "Thinite nome," 20, n. 46
P8  for —, hpr, 43, n. 2
Q5  ——, —, det. of hwr, "chest," 226
Q6  —— for —, det. of gtr, "burial," 1
Q7  ——, det. replacing — (Fq), 36
Q7  replaced by —, 205, n. 221
R3  ——, as det. of hbr, "brazier," 227
R3  ——, det. of wfrh, "offerings," 203
R4  —— for —, hpr, 189, 226, 227, Fig. 33
R7  —, nfr, 158
R8  —, nfr, separated from a in —, 191
R8  —, nfr, gods," 158
R10  —, hbr-nfr, "necropolis," 191
R12  —, 156, 201
R13  ——, imrr, "western," 23, n. 63
R14  — for —, 189
R14  —, 214
R15  —, 210–14
R15  —, (Pyramid Texts), (Middle Kingdom), 213
R— —, —, for —, hbr-nfr, 27, 29
R— —, dw, 9
R— —, Tp-hps(i), Lower Egyptian Nome 2, 37
S19-20  —, hmr, 50–52; —, —, —, hmr, 9, with n. 23
S29  —, 178, n. 11, 192
S42  —, read as *mr, 238
T3  — for —, 28
T7  ——, in titles, 32, 33
T11  ——, variants of, 192
T19  — for —, 26
T20  —, 26
T20  —, —, "sculptor," 19
T21  ——, reversed, 79
T25  —, —, hpr, etc., hbt, 214–16 (with esp. 215, Fig. 24, 216, Fig. 25)
T28  —, nfr, separated from — in —, 191
U1  and —, 33
U1  — or —, in hbr, hbr, "crooked," "crookedness," 229, 421
U6  — for —, 205, n. 220
U15  —, —, —, —, for —, tm, 8
U25  —, 216
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for $\text{nh}$, 57

$\text{nh htp}$, "live and be at peace," 189

$\text{wp(t)-rnt}$, opening (day) of the year," 191, 231

$\text{the third,} 129$

$\text{treasury,} 31, \text{ n. 135}$

$\text{pr-hw, offerings,} 207$

$\text{by virtue of,} 181$

for $\text{mu}$, 21, n. 50

$\text{look at my batch of} \text{pen-loaves,} 193$

$\text{water and washing vessels,} 183$

$\text{water for the hands,} 183$

$\text{water upon the hands,} 183$

$\text{abide, in name of pyramid,} 74$

$\text{mnuw, "herdsman,} 177$

$\text{cattle,} 208$

$n Hr(h(wi), f, 71$

for $\text{Nhbk, El Kab,} 206$

$\text{Nhbk,} 206$

for $\text{Nhbt,} 206$

$\text{Nhbt,} 22, \text{ n. 60}$

$\text{hnt hru,} 179, \text{ n. 23}$

$\text{activity,} 181$

$\text{on coffin,} 43-45$

$\text{support,} 180, \text{ n. 28}$

$\text{and variants,} hnt-kt, 59, \text{ n. 50}$

$\text{towel,} 181$

$\text{major domo, with det,} 132$

$\text{ruler,} 130$

for $\text{hty,} 63$

$\text{beat (the rhythm),} 76, 183$

$\text{Hr-Nkh,} 20, \text{ n. 46}$

for $\text{in the epithet of Anubis hnty zti nfr,} 47, \text{ n. 29}$

$\text{det. hrr-nfr,} 28$

$\text{stoneworkers,} 19$

$\text{councillor,} 48, \text{ n. 36}$

$\text{var. hrr (w),} 45-49$

$\text{they of the divine booth,} 47, \text{ with det.} 47, \text{ n. 29}$

$\text{having arrived (old perfective),} 87$

$\text{smoothing,} 186$

$\text{for} \text{ snb,} 57$

$\text{milking,} 192, \text{ n. 146}$

$\text{milk herd,} 192, \text{ n. 146}$

$\text{for} \text{ st,} 192, 193$

$\text{batch of bread,} 192$

$\text{stringing a necklace,} 192$

$\text{festival scent,} 208, \text{ n. 239, 209, n. 247}$

$\text{the two vessels of the wash (hands) and a jar,} 183$

$\text{the two vessels,} 183$

$\text{alabaster (jars of ointment), clothing, incense and oil,} 157-58$
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 translators, tpy, "before," 180

 translators, tpy, "best quality (of cloth)," 180

 translators, tpy, "ancestors," 180

 translators, "strong of hand," 181

 translators, "food," 158

 translators, "Dhudo-'festival," 204
Other Egyptological Publications by the same author from The Metropolitan Museum of Art

EGYPTIAN WOMEN OF THE OLD KINGDOM AND OF THE HERACLEOPOLITAN PERIOD
1989. Paper; viii + 52 pp., 20 pls. 8½ x 11." $4.50

EGYPTIAN TITLES OF THE MIDDLE KINGDOM: A SUPPLEMENT TO WM. WARD’S INDEX. (PARTS I–III)
1985. Paper; ix + 101 pp. 8½ x 11." $5.00

With other authors
Cyril Aldred, Some Royal Portraits of the Middle Kingdom in Ancient Egypt. Henry G. Fischer, Some Emblematic Uses of Hieroglyphs with Particular Reference to an Archaic Ritual Vessel; Old Kingdom Cylinder Seals for the Lower Classes; Sunshades of the Marketplace; Offering Stands from the Pyramid of Amenemhet I; Redundant Determinatives in the Old Kingdom; The Mark of a Second Hand on Ancient Egyptian Antiquities; An Elusive Shape within the Fisted Hands of Egyptian Statues; Some Early Monuments from Busiris, in the Egyptian Delta; More Emblematic Uses from Ancient Egypt. Herman De Meulenaer, La Statue d’un Chef de Chanteurs d’Epoque Saite. Birgit Nolte, An Egyptian Glass Vessel in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Edna R. Russmann, The Statue of Amenemope-em-het. Index by Edna R. Russmann
Third printing, 1996. Cloth; viii + 201 pp., numerous illustrations. 8½ x 11." $15.00*

Three articles by Henry G. Fischer, The Evolution of Composite Hieroglyphs; More Ancient Egyptian Names of Dogs and Other Animals; Notes on Sticks and Staves.
Second printing, 1987. Paper; 56 pp., 63 figs. 8½ x 11." $5.00

ANCIENT EGYPTIAN CALLIGRAPHY: A BEGINNER’S GUIDE TO WRITING HIEROGLYPHICS
Third edition, 1988. Cloth; xiii + 68 pp., copiously illustrated. 9 x 12." $15.00

ANCIENT EGYPTIAN EPIGRAPHY AND PALAEOGRAPHY With Ricardo Caminos
The Recording of Inscriptions and Scenes in Tombs and Temples (Ricardo Caminos)
Archaeological Aspects of Epigraphy and Palaeography (Henry G. Fischer)
Third edition, 1987. Paper; vii + 60 pp., 6 figs. 7 x 10¼." $5.00

THE TOMB OF IP AT EL SAFF
1996. Cloth; xiii + 41 pp., 8 photographs, 3 color photographs, color frontispiece, 9 figures in the text and 7 foldout line drawings. 8¼ x 11¼." $25.00

Available from Book Sales Department, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, New York 10028
* This and Egyptian Studies III may also be ordered from Van Siclen Books, 111 Winnetka Road, San Antonio, Texas 78229-3613. Fax (210) 522-1081

isbn 0-87099-755-6