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§1. The classical tradition. Among the more striking characteristics of hieroglyphic writing is the separateness or discreteness of its elements. In the first place, the phonetic and ideographic components are usually presented as individual signs; secondly, if the constituent parts of the signs sometimes combine diverse elements or points of view, they are generally fitted together in an appropriate fashion, even if it does not always respect the nature of whatever is represented. In inscriptions dating to the classical period of the Old Kingdom the exceptions to the first rule bear out the second, but in other periods the second rule was also infringed to a greater or lesser degree. This question may be examined by following the evolution of composite forms—those combining two or more hieroglyphs in a single monogram. Given the close interrelationship of art and writing in ancient Egypt, one may anticipate that such a survey will provide further insight into the aesthetic taste of that civilization.

§2. Classification of composite forms.

1. For an example of this date see Goedicke, ΑΣ 81 (1956), p. 102. 2. Pyr. à degrés IV, p. 37 and pl. 16 (76).
3. From Petrie, RT I, pl. 20. The reading ḫnw-ḥḥ “who embraces the spirit” is given by the dramatic Ramesseum Papyrus (K. Sethe, Dramatische Texte zu alt-aegyptischen Mysterienspielen [Leipzig, 1928], p. 193).
4. One example as early as the last reign of Dyn. I is recorded by Klasens in Emery, Great Tombs III, pl. 37 (13) and p. 35. The next earliest, at the very beginning of Dyn. IV, occurs in the reliefs of ḫḥ-r ḫḥ-r in the Louvre (R. Weill, La IIe et la IIIe Dynasties [Paris, 1908], pl. 6). Later Dyn. IV examples: G. A. Reisner, History of the Giza Necropolis I (Cambridge, Mass., 1942), figs. 241, 242, 257; D. Dunham and W. K. Simpson, Mastaba of Queen Meresankh III (Boston, 1974), figs. 39b, 7, 12.
5. ḫḥ “magic”; Urk. 1, p. 902 (2); Capart, Rue, pl. 20; Drioton, AsAE 43 (1943) fig. 67, p. 500; etc. In the last two examples ḫḥ is attached to ḫḥ.
ence by the first, is not; it is simply a combination of the two elements of ḫm-kt, “servant of the spirit,”⁶ and the third is similarly a calligraphic combination of two phonetic signs in the word ḫk/x “magic.” Some further mechanical combinations of the last kind came into use only later: 〈U₄, instead of ḫw²(1)⁷ does not seem to have been used until Dynasty XII,⁸ and did not become common until the second half of that dynasty; 〈U₃ for ḫw²(2)⁸ is earliest known from the Second Intermediate Period,⁹ and only became common in the reign of Tuthmosis III.¹⁰

Except for a few early First Dynasty examples, where the frame is penetrated by an external hieroglyph (Figure 1a,¹¹ b¹²), the elements of the enclosed composite signs are usually quite separate. In other types of composites, however, a pair of signs are more immediately connected, and it is these that will be examined more closely, from one period to another, in the following pages, with particular attention to the appropriateness of the combination and the discreteness of the fusion. The second consideration calls for a further distinction between two categories: the cases where the signs simply impinge on one another and those in which one sign is traversed by a second.

§3. The Archaic Period. Emblematic writings of names are particularly characteristic of the early First Dynasty. They are well exemplified by the serekh of the Horus Aha and Queen Hetepw(y)-Neith¹³ (Fig-

6. J. Spiegel (Ā nghĩa 75 [1939] p. 118) has argued that the reading of the uppermost sign is similarly ḫn/w, and Pierre Montet had already come to much the same conclusion some years earlier (Scènes de la vie privée dans les tombeaux égyptiens de l'ancien empire [Strasbourg, 1925] p. 403). This interpretation is disproved by a Fourth Dynasty writing of the plural as 〈(cairo CG 1384), showing that ḫnw refers to the priests, while 〈 is the object of their attentions, which can only be ḫi. Compare Edel, Altag. Gramm. I, §99, who does not mention this evidence but cites the variant writing 〈, subsequently published by A.-M. Abu Bakr, Excavations at Giza 1949–1950 (cairo, 1953) fig. 38.

7. Here, as in the following pages, I refer to Gardiner's Sign List (Grammar, pp. 438–458) wherever a composite form is represented in his hieroglyphic font.

8. E.g. Sinai, pl. 21 (71, temp. Sesostris I); BM 574 (Simpson, TGG, pl. 61 [42.2], temp. Amenemhet II); BM 559 (same reign, HT II, pl. 20); BM 557 (Simpson, TGG, pl. 99 [26.1]; Boeser, Beschreibung II, pl. 7 (both temp. Amenemhet III). Note, however, that an isolated example is known from an Eighth Dynasty decree at Copts (Urk. I, p. 296 [15]) and 〈(fil) also occurs in this decree as well as two others of the same series (Urk. I, p. 300 [8], wrongly transcribed 〈), compare H. Goedicke, Königliche Dukumente aus dem alten Reich [Wiesbaden, 1967] fig. 17); Urk. I, p. 302 (12).

9. J. J. Tylor, Wall Drawings and Monuments of El Kab: Tomb of Sekhemka(t) [London, 1869] pl. 10. The date may be later than the Thirteenth Dynasty; compare Smither, JEA 25 (1939) p. 35.

10. E.g. Urk. IV, pp. 72 (15), 75 (14), 611 (16), 620 (6), 75 (16), 860 (3), etc. (all temp. Tuthmosis III or only slightly earlier); Rekh-mi-Rē, pls. 68, 107 (temp. Amenophis II).

11. From Petrie, RT II, pl. 14 (98). The serekh of King Thi's successor is often similar, in that the name Dr [u], a sheaf] is placed at the top, so that the falcon stands upon it (RT II, pl. 15 [105, 106]).

12. From J. de Morgan, Recherches sur les origines de l'Egypte II (Paris, 1897) fig. 559, p. 169. In addition to these royal names there is the list of besieged towns of the Libyan Palette, Cairo CG 14238, each of which is being pierced by a hoe, as well as the breached hieroglyphic fortress of the Asiatics on the Narmer Palette (W. M. F. Petrie, Ceremonial State Palates [London, 1953] pls. G [19] and K).

13. A. H. Gardiner interprets this as “The Neith Hetepu” (Egypt of the Pharaohs [Oxford, 1961] pp. 411, 412), but the two principal elements of the name are elsewhere presented normally, without the framing serekh. Furthermore the likeliest explanation of the terminal 〈 is that it represents the intensive ending -wy (as in the name 〈 “How gracious she is,” as interpreted by Edel, Altag. Gramm. II, §946).
ure 1a, b), as well as by two nonroyal names (Figure 1c, d) that are evidently to be read ḫšm-kḫt(),14 and ḫšm-kḫt(,)15 both of them being paralleled by normal writings in later archaic inscriptions from Djoser’s Step Pyramid.16 In addition to these, there are other equally early combinations of words such as those shown in Figure 1e, f, where the emblems of Upper17 and Lower Egypt18 are mounted upon legs and feet; the last are very probably patterned on the hieroglyph 𓊕 (W25) which is evidenced from the First Dynasty,19 referring to the “produce” that is brought from these two regions, as in a Second Dynasty inscription that has 𓊕 𓊕 “produce of Lower Egypt.”20 A similar interpretation is possibly to be applied to 𓊕, which occurs among First Dynasty potmarks.21 Such emblematic combinations of words were scarcely ever again employed in the writing of names before the later years of Dynasty XVIII (see §8).22

Another meaningful composite seems to occur in the later archaic writing 𓊕, the first sign combining phonetic 𓊕 and ideographic 𓊕, and the whole phrase perhaps referring to sww-wr “the great round,” a term for the sea, although the ideograph 𓊕 is not otherwise known to be attested for the stem ṣnḫ earlier than Dynasty XVIII. Its use here is not an arbitrary transverse combination but a descriptive “encirclement” of 𓊕.

In addition to 𓊕, the First Dynasty provides evidence for at least one more of the familiar series of composites that mount a phonetic sign upon a pair of legs: 𓊕 (M18),24 and 𓊕 (N40) is known from the Second Dynasty.25 It remains uncertain whether 𓊕 and 𓊕 (V15, T32) were added only in the Old Kingdom.26 An equally familiar series of composites, showing a small hieroglyph at the base of some form of plant, is attested by a Second Dynasty example of 𓊕 mš-nswt “royal child(ren).”27

Several composites of the Archaic Period append a geographical term to the ideographic term for land, as in 𓊕 Thm “Libya.”28 A less common combination, dating to the reign of Narmer, oddly attaches the sign for ur to its phonetic complement, 𓊕,29 so that the bird is perched on a human mouth. This degree of incongruity is avoided in later inscriptions—at least until those of the Eighteenth Dynasty.30

§4. The Old Kingdom. From this period there are many examples of the most usual type of enclosed

14. Emery, Great Tombs III, pl. 37 (9). On p. 34 Klasen suggests the reading 𓊕-kḫt(,?) while Kaplony, Inschr. äg. Frühzeit I, p. 448, reads ḫšm-kḫt. The same form of ḫšm appears in the name ḫšm-Nbny (or ḫšm-Nbny,)? Petrie, RT I, pl. 4 (3).
15. Emery, Great Tombs III, pl. 78 (2); II, fig. 198 on p. 127 and fig. 229 on p. 170; Petrie, RT II, pl. 16 (121); Kaplony, Inschr. äg. Frühzeit III, pl. 68 (242). The earliest of these examples dates to Wadjti, the latest to Den. This is read by Kaplony (I, p. 448) as ḫš-n-kḥt “Mein Ka ist mein Wurfholz.”
16. For 𓊕 see Pyr. degrés V, fig. 98, p. 61; for 𓊕 (var. 𓊕) see index, p. 103.
17. W. B. Emery, Excavations at Saqqara 1937–1938: Hor-Aha (Cairo, 1939) fig. 25, p. 28.
18. Emery, Hor-Aha, fig. 24, p. 27; fig. 26, p. 28.
20. Petrie, RT II, pl. 22 (184), which is correctly interpreted by Godron, Bulletin de l’Institut français d’Archéologie orientale (Cairo) 57 (1958) pp. 150–155; compare also 𓊕 𓊕 𓊕 𓊕 𓊕 𓊕 𓊕 “the produce . . . that Upper Egypt yields,” “the produce . . . that Upper Egypt yields” (Davies, Pithkhetep II, pls. 13, 14).
21. Emery, Great Tombs II, fig. 102, p. 80; Petrie, RT II, pl. 55 (27, 28).
22. Here one may also take note of the similar way in which emblems administer to the king in ritual scenes of all periods: e.g. 𓊕 and 𓊕, equipped with human arms, wielding fans in relief of Djoser: C. M. Firth and J. E. Quibell, Excavations at Saqqara: The Step Pyramid (2 vols. [Cairo, 1935/1936]), pls. 40–42. Later such devices were sometimes used in private tombs: W. M. F. Petrie, Antaeopolis (London, 1930) pl. 28 (Dyn. XII); N. de G. Davies, Five Theban Tombs (London, 1913) pl. 3 (Dyn. XVIII).
23. Pyr. degrés V, fig. 140, p. 74; on p. 116 this is read “𓊕 br?.”
24. The sign 𓊕 in Petrie, RT I, pl. 15 (18); the sign 𓊕 in the same volume, pl. 15 (16).
26. Note also an anomalous occurrence of 𓊕 in the Dyn. IV place name 𓊕 𓊕 𓊕 (Rowe, ASA 38 (1938) pp. 393–395 and pl. 55 [1]; A. Vigneau, Encyclopédie photographique de l’art: Le Musée du Caire [Paris, 1949] pl. 20); this is preceded by the cartouche of Cheops which may be part of the name, as in the similar names of estates (Helen Jacqueline-Gordon, Les Noms des domaines funéraires sous l’ancien empire égyptien [Cairo, 1962] pp. 133, 226, 228).
27. Petrie, RT II, pl. 24 (210).
29. Petrie, RT II, pl. 13 (96). This also reappears in a potmark: RT I, pl. 39 (2).
30. If the same fusion occurred in later times, it was surely only by inadvertence; see, for example, a Thirteenth Dynasty example on an Edfu stela published by Barsanti, ASA 9 (1908) pp. 1–2 and plate (line 11). One might compare Old Kingdom writings of 𓊕, which sometimes show the arms attached to 𓊕 rather than 𓊕, but this is a secondary deformation of the original idea; see the reference to Junker in note 51 below.
composite, in which the identification of a structure is framed by its walls, as well as the more unusual case of \[\text{hwt} \text{ wrt}\], containing the suffix-pronoun of \text{inb.f} in the epithet of Ptah who is “south of his wall.” Probably \[\text{hwt} \text{ wrt}\] (O8) should also be assigned to this same category. The horizontal position of \[\text{hwt} \text{ wrt}\] is not arbitrary, but is evidently usual in Third Dynasty hieratic, where it sometimes appears above \[\text{hwt} \text{ wrt}\] instead of within it. The earliest carefully executed hieroglyphic examples of the Old Kingdom show the ends of \[\text{hwt} \text{ wrt}\] barely projecting on either side (Figures 2a, b), and the amount of overlap may be compared with the slight overlapping of margins that occurs in hieroglyphic inscriptions and figurative representations alike from this time onward, notably in the case of long-tailed birds and mammals. The best parallel is provided by some examples of the enclosed composite hieroglyph for \text{hwt} \text{ wrt} “great mansion” or “tribunal” (Figure 2c). The same considerations apply to \[\text{hwt} \text{ wrt}\], a knife on a chopping block (\text{mnt}); in \text{khb nmt}, a title of butchers; this is frequently written \[\text{hwt} \text{ wrt}\], which may be influenced more directly by \[\text{hwt} \text{ wrt}\]. Among the few emblematic combinations of two words there are two that are literally based on \text{hwt} “that which is under,” the sign \[\text{hwt} \text{ wrt}\] being placed at the bottom in each case, even though it is read first: \text{hwt-ntr} “necropolis” (Figure 3a-i) and \text{hwt-hrw} “course of the day” (Figure 3j-k). And there are some further combinations of two words that follow the pattern of \[\text{hwt} \text{ wrt}\], mentioned earlier: \[\text{hwt} \text{ wrt}\] (M28) in the title “greatest of the tens of Upper Egypt” (\text{mdw Smtw}) and the problematic \[\text{hwt}\]. In other cases of this kind the lower element is a phonetic complement or the feminine ending: \[\text{hwt} \text{ wrt}\] (M5), \[\text{hwt} \text{ wrt}\] (M6), \[\text{hwt} \text{ wrt}\] (M7), \[\text{hwt} \text{ wrt}\] (M24) and \[\text{hwt} \text{ wrt}\] (for \[\text{hwt} \text{ wrt}\] “king”). Although these plant-composites are less meaningful

31. Palermo Stone, recto 4 (8), as pointed out by T. G. H. James, \textit{Hekanakhite Papers and Other Early Middle Kingdom Documents} (New York, 1902) p. 123. 32. J. Garstang, \textit{Mahdis and Bêt Khalluf} (London, 1903) pl. 28 (2) and p. 27. 33. \textit{Pyr. à degrès V}, pls. 27 (4), 31 (9), and p. 9. 34. Example a is from the reliefs of \textit{iby-sf} in the Louvre (A. Vigneau, \textit{Encyclopédie photographique de l’art}: Louvre I (Paris, 1935) pl. 8, and R. Weill, \textit{La IIe et la IIIe Dynasties}, pl. 6); example b is from the chapel of \text{Mn} in Berlin (Goe dicke, \textit{MDIK} 21 (1966) pl. 2); some other examples from this source show no projection whatever (pl. 5, 7, 8). An example on the base of a statue of Djoser conversely shows slightly more projection than this (Firth and Quibell, \textit{Step Pyramid}, pl. 58), but other Old Kingdom examples show very little (e.g. Cairo J. 72201 [\textit{ASAE} 40 (1941) p. 73]); A. Fakhry, \textit{Sept tombeaux à l’est de la grande pyramide de Gizeh} (Cairo, 1935) fig. 10, p. 19; Junker, \textit{Giza III}, figs. 27, 28, foll. p. 166). It should also be noted that some Dyn. IV inscriptions combined \[\text{hwt} \text{ wrt}\] in the same manner: A. Fakhry, \textit{Monuments of Snéfru at Dahshur II}, pt. 2 (Cairo, 1961) p. 5; H. Fischer, \textit{Egyptian Studies I}: \textit{Varia} (New York, 1976) pl. 7 (fig. 4).

35. Good examples in Hassan, \textit{Giza V}, figs. 128–135, pp. 272–273. 36. Cairo T. 64/439/1 (\textit{Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung} [Berlin] 7 (1960) p. 303); a similar example in Hassan, \textit{Giza V}, fig. 122, p. 266. 37. For various writings of this title see \textit{Orientalia} (Rome) 29 (1960) pp. 171–174; Kaplon, \textit{Inscr. Äg. Frühzeit II}, p. 1054, incorrectly reverses the sequence of the signs. 38. In each case the first example is illustrated: (a) Margaret Murray, \textit{Saqqara Mastabas I} (London, 1904) pl. 20; Junker, \textit{Giza VII}, fig. 101; (b) Junker, \textit{Giza VI}, fig. 19; IX, fig. 72; (c) Murray, \textit{Saqqara Mastabas I}, pl. 8; Junker, \textit{Giza V}, fig. 36; (d) Murray, \textit{Saqqara Mastabas I}, pl. 28; (e) Junker, \textit{Giza VIII}, figs. 32, 34; Capart, \textit{Rae}, pl. 95; (f) Cairo CG 1457; \textit{Urk. I}, pp. 120 (11), 122 (12), 123 (6), 263 (14); (g) \textit{HT I}, pl. 3 (2); \textit{Urk. I}, p. 164 (3); (h) Cairo J. 43371 (\textit{Urk. I}, p. 253 (3)); (i) \textit{HT I}, pl. 19; \textit{Urk. I}, pp. 23 (8), 139 (1), 217 (12, 17), etc.

39. (j) MFA 21.3081 (Reisner, \textit{History of the Giza Necropolis I}, pl. 65b); (k) Davies, \textit{Ptolemais} II, pl. 18 (409) (and II, pl. 17, probably same); Capart, \textit{Rae}, pls. 52, 58, 61, 83. In some cases \[\text{hwt}\] is written below \[\text{hwt}\], but there is no link between the signs: \textit{Urk. I}, p. 37 (14); Junker, \textit{Giza XI}, fig. 76.

40. A possible example as early as Dyn. III: \textit{Pyr. à degrès V}, fig. 167, p. 81; this might, however, be a writing of \[\text{hwt}\] in \textit{pr-niet}, as in the case of no. 117 on p. 53 (pl. 32 [53]). Old Kingdom examples may be found in Borchardt, \textit{ Grabb. Satu-ra I}, II, p. 1; G. Jéquier, \textit{Le Monument funéraire de Pepi II}, II (Cairo, 1936) pl. 13. In the Middle Kingdom \[\text{hwt}\] was sometimes employed as a succinct writing of the title \textit{rj niet} “acquaintance of the king” (e.g. Beni Hasan I, pp. 41, 43), but it is difficult to believe that it was originally read the same way; if the original reading was not \textit{try} \[\text{hwt}\] \textit{niet} (for which question see, most recently, Fischer, \textit{Egyptian Studies I}: \textit{Varia}, p. 8, note 15), it may perhaps have been \textit{h(nms) niet} “friend of the king,” as suggested by the writings shown in \textit{JNES} 18 (1959) p. 238 (3). A sign resembling \[\text{hwt}\] is also known from the Late Period (Dyn. XXVI onward), but this represents the Memphite title \textit{sm}: H. De Meulenaere, \textit{Mélanges Mariette} (Cairo, 1961) pp. 285–290. The last also takes the form \[\text{hwt}\], which is once attested in an Eighth Dynasty writing of \[\text{hwt}\]. In Egypt the place-name \textit{Znww} (Turin coffin, Suppl. 13:288: E. Brovarski, in \textit{Studies in Honor of George Hughes} (Chicago, 1976) p. 34). But in the isolated Eighth Dynasty occurrence it probably derives from a hieratic version of \[\text{hwt}\], representing phonetic \textit{znw}, although \[\text{hwt}\] did not normally appear in the name of \textit{Znww} prior to the New Kingdom.

41. Some examples at least as early as Dyn. III, mostly in the phrase \textit{pr-niet} “king’s domain”: \textit{Pyr. à degrès V}, figs. 136, 161, 162, 164, pp. 78–90, pls. 9 (1), 22 (g), 32 (5); probably also fig. 123, p. 69, fig. 147a, p. 76.
than those compounded with 𓊦, they are nonetheless appropriate in that each shows a plant “rooted” in a smaller sign at its base.

At least nine more Old Kingdom composites of two elements, both of them phonetic, or one phonetic and the other ideographic, bring these elements together in the meaningful way that is sometimes called “spor-tive”: a seated man lifts the first sign of 𓊦𓊦 “lift up” (Figure 4a); 42 a standing man beats the initial sign of ḫw “beat” (Figure 4b); 43 a man bears the sign ḫm in

42. The example is from Wild, Ti III, pl. 155. Other examples in Junker, Giza II, fig. 21, p. 155; Davies, Ptahhetep I, pl. 4 (9); Urk. I, pp. 282 (17), 283 (2), etc.

43. This example is from Davies, Ptahhetep II, pl. 7; see also vol. I, pl. 4, and Wild, Ti III, pls. 170, 174. A relatively early example (Dyn. III?) appears in Pyr. à degrés V, fig. 86, p. 58.
It is, of course, difficult to say how many of the foregoing combinations were invented in the Old Kingdom, more particularly in the classical period of the Fourth Dynasty and later, and how many are survivals from earlier times. The inscriptions evidence from the first dynasties is far too incomplete to resolve this question.

Finally there are some meaningful composites that are entirely ideographic: an owl being decapitated, occurs as a determinative for htk “cut off” in the Pyramid Texts; (T29), a knife on a chopping block, in the word nmt “slaughtering place” is a variant of the form mentioned earlier, replacing an earlier writing that shows the knife well above the block; , a Fifth Dynasty sun temple, adds a solar disk to the tip of the obelisk; the sign (M19) apparently represents an assemblage of offerings.

The remaining composites are few. A fusion of two phonetic signs occurs in at least two examples of hkt “magic,” which is essentially an enclosed composite (see note 5). The early Old Kingdom monogram remains unexplained, although it evidently refers to a “master builder.” In the late Old Kingdom the two elements of the name of Osiris are inexplicably con-

44. From MDIK 16 (1938) p. 131; another example on p. 196 (fig. 2).
45. From Abu Bakr, Giza, fig. 29, p. 34; see also Junker, Giza III, fig. 28, foll. p. 166; Hassan, Giza V, fig. 101, p. 241; CG 1431 (H. Fischer, Egyptian Studies II [New York, 1977] fig. 38, facing p. 56).
46. Compare Gardiner, Grammar, p. 533 (X8).
48. From Junker, Giza X, fig. 53, facing p. 144; see also Urk. I, pp. 282 (4), 285 (13); Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt (Princeton) 13 (1976) fig. 4, pl. 11. The first and last examples appear in the word “sp£-cloth.” A later example (Dyn. XII, temp. Sesostis I) occurs in Louvre C 3 (Simpson, TGG, pl. 15 [6.3], line 20).
49. From CG 41491 (R. Weill, Les Décrets royaux de l’ancien empire égyptien [Paris, 1912] pls. 2, 6; Urk. I, p. 284 [12]); also Urk. I, pp. 276 (11), 282 (g–h), 283 (4, g, 17), 286 (1), 287 (2, 12). For the form of the wattle, which hangs down the side of the neck, see Nina Davies, JEA 26 (1941) p. 79.
50. A hand-copy from the tomb of Pty-nbt at Aswan (cf. Urk. I, p. 133 [10], which is inaccurate); also Pyr. 1837; compare , Pyr. 978; Pyr. 1880, Urk. I, p. 103 (8).
51. From Wild, Ti II, pl. 111; explained by Junker, Giza IX, pp. 44-45. As Junker points out, this sign (D33) was often replaced by the meaningless form , probably influenced by hieratic (for which see P. Posener-Kriéger and J. L. de Cenival, Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum, Fifth Series: The Abu Sir Papyri [London, 1968] Pal. pl. 2 [D 33]). This form is not uncommon in Old Kingdom inscriptions (see also, for example, Oriental Institute, Mastaba of Mereruka I [Chicago, 1938] pl. 21; Davies, Piabetep I, pl. 5 [53]) or in those of the Middle Kingdom (including N. de G. Davies, Tomb of Antefkher [London, 1920] pl. 18; Beni Hasan I, pls. 24, 25 [98]; Siut tomb I [Montet, Kemi (Paris) 3 (1930) p. 267] and pl. 8 [21]); CG 20476; etc., but was little used in the New Kingdom (examples in AîAE 56 [1959] pls. 10 to p. 140 ff., first line at bottom; N. de G. Davies, Tomb of Piabetep II [New York, 1922] pl. 67 [35] as opposed to normal in I, pl. 20 [5]).
52. Pyr. 639 (M), 962 (P, M); 227a (W) shows the knife above the head of the owl. Compare the remarks of F. Ll. Griffith, Hieroglyphs (London, 1898) and Newberry, JEA 37 (1951) p. 73.
53. For the early examples, showing the knife above the block, see Pyr. à degrés IV, pls. 9 (46), 14 (68). For the Old Kingdom monogram see Orientalia 29 (1960) pp. 171-172.
54. BM 1156 A (HT I, pl. 27 [1]); BM 1435 (HT I, pl. 18 [2]).
55. Gardiner, Grammar, p. 481, explains the center of this sign as “heaped conical cakes” on the basis of Davies’s remarks in Rakhmi-R, p. 44, note 5, but fails to mention that Margaret Murray made the same observation some years earlier (Ancient Egypt [London] 1929, pp. 43-45); she also plausibly suggests that represents a stylized half-loaf of bread and that the apparent is a jar.
56. For examples see G. Godron, RdE 8 (1951) pp. 91-98.
nected (_charge), and this form may have influenced a monogram of similar appearance, the title  "tomb maker."\textsuperscript{57} A Sixth Dynasty writing of  \textit{undw}u-cattle as  is also difficult to explain as a meaningful combination.\textsuperscript{58} "Silver" and "electrum" are sometimes written  and \textit{mndf},\textsuperscript{59} both of which may have been influenced by the traditional presentation of the "Golden Horus" name as it appears in Dynasty IV and after. A hieratic writing of "Hatnub" is rather similar; \textit{thm}.\textsuperscript{60} At the very end of the Old Kingdom, in the Eighth Dynasty Coptos Decrees, the group  is ligatured in the reversed phrase \textit{wd ns}ut "royal decree," evidently in order to clarify the reversal.\textsuperscript{61}

To the best of my knowledge, the only clear Old Kingdom example of a transverse combination occurs in two Sixth Dynasty writings of the emblem for Upper Egyptian Nomes 13–14 at Meir (Figure 5a),\textsuperscript{62} where the final \textit{f} of \textit{ndf} (\textit{f}) crosses the stem of the tree; other Old Kingdom examples of this emblem show the tree above \textit{swf} (Figure 5b).\textsuperscript{63}

§5. \textit{Heracleopolitan Period.} Apart from the exception that has just been mentioned, the first examples of arbitrarily crisscrossed monograms appear on an Upper Egyptian stela, where \textit{i} is traversed by a recumbent gazelle in an unusual writing of \textit{jfr} "official" (Figure 6a);\textsuperscript{64} on an Eleventh Dynasty stela from Dendera, which shows an early version of \textit{swf}, combining two determinatives (Figure 6b);\textsuperscript{65} and on a pair of Theban stelae dating to the end of the reign of W\textit{h-nfr} Intef, both of which show a composite writing of  "interpreter" (Figure 6c);\textsuperscript{66} although other composite forms of this title more often take the form shown in Figure 6d.\textsuperscript{67} Another Theban stela, dating to the early years of \textit{Nbt-hprp} Mentuhotpe, shows a combination of \textit{swf} and \textit{dm} (Figure 6e)\textsuperscript{68} that is closer to \textit{swf} than \textit{swf} (P7), both of which become common in inscriptions of the Middle Kingdom. A similar type of composite appears in an Eleventh Dynasty inscription that places the sign for \textit{wh} "column" upon the determinative \textit{swf} (Figure 6f).\textsuperscript{69} The same inscription also writes \textit{tr} "span" with the sign \textit{i} on the back of the determinative, an ox (Figure 6g). A ligature resembling Eighth Dynasty \textit{swf} is known from Moalla and from false doors at Saqqara, combining \textit{i} and \textit{swf} (Figure 6h).\textsuperscript{70} And another composite form links phonetic \textit{tm} and the ideograph \textit{swf} (Figure 6i).\textsuperscript{71}

§6. \textit{Middle Kingdom.} Many other arbitrary composites make their appearance in inscriptions of the late Eleventh Dynasty and of the Twelfth Dynasty. One of the Eleventh Dynasty examples resembles the Old Kingdom h\textit{k}-sign (Figure 7); in this case, however, it does not represent a decapitated owl but shows an ideographic use of \textit{dm} (\textit{swf}) with the owl serving as phonetic complement (\textit{m}).\textsuperscript{72} In another case \textit{swf} shows

\textsuperscript{57} \textit{AZ} 93 (1966) pp. 56–69.
\textsuperscript{58} Meir V, pl. 50. For a later (Dyn. XII) occurrence, see A. de Buck, \textit{The Egyptian Coffin Texts I} (Chicago, 1935) p. 129.
\textsuperscript{59} Borchart, \textit{Grabdenkmal des Königs Ne-user-re II} (Leipzig, 1907) pl. 15; similar examples: A. Fakhry, \textit{Monuments of Sneferu at Dahshur II}, pl. 1 (Cairo, 1961) fig. 12, foll. p. 24; Junker, \textit{Giza I}, fig. 51, p. 221; Borchart, \textit{Grabdenkmal des Königs Ne-user-re II}, fig. 51.
\textsuperscript{60} J. J. Clère in \textit{Miscellanea Gregoriana} (Rome, 1941) pp. 455–466.
\textsuperscript{61} From W. M. F. Petrie, \textit{Denderah} (London, 1898) pl. 7A (bottom right). For Dyn. XII examples see Cairo CG 20751 (in the name \textit{jfr}) and Louvre C 166 (in the name \textit{hfr}); cf. Ranke, \textit{Die Ägyptischen Personennamen I} (Glückstadt, 1935) pp. 200 (14), 206 (24).
\textsuperscript{62} Clère-Vandier, \textit{TPPI}, §§18–19.
\textsuperscript{63} Clère-Vandier, \textit{TPPI}, §111; J. Vander, \textit{Mektata} (Cairo, 1950) pp. 162 (I, a 1), 185 (II, a 1), 236 (VII, 1); MMA 65.107 (Goedicke, \textit{JNES} 19 (1960) p. 488); Cleveland 14.543 (to be published in H. Fischer, \textit{Egyptian Studies III}.
\textsuperscript{64} Clère-Vandier, \textit{TPPI}, §26. Note that \textit{swf} above \textit{swf} in the three passages quoted in H. Fischer, \textit{Dendera in the Third Millennium B.C.} (Locust Valley, N.Y., 1968) p. 158, but in one case (D 842) the two signs are brought together and may represent another early example of \textit{swf}.
\textsuperscript{65} Cairo J. 46048, from C. Fisher’s excavations at Dendera (D 3128).
\textsuperscript{66} Clère-Vandier, \textit{TPPI}, §16 (\textit{sm}) and perhaps also H. Fischer, \textit{Inscriptions from the Captite Nome} (Rome, 1964) fig. 16, p. 113 (with note n on p. 116). Many other examples are to be found in A. de Buck, \textit{The Egyptian Coffin Texts} (Chicago, 1938–1954) II, pp. 1, 37, 129, 291; III, pp. 27, 45, 102; V, p. 261; etc.
\textsuperscript{67} Fischer, \textit{Captite Nome}, fig. 16, p. 113, and pp. 116–117 (g). For the Dyn. XVIII use of this monogram, preceded by \textit{swf}, see \textit{Urk. IV}, p. 194 (17).
phonetic $\Upsilon$ ideographically located on top of $\ominus$ in wept “crown” (of the head).\textsuperscript{74} Two other combinations of the same period are among the first to exemplify the transverse imposition of $\rightarrow$, one of them in the emblem of Upper Egyptian Nome 22 (Figure 8a),\textsuperscript{75} the other in $\frac{\text{\textbullet}}{\text{\textcircled{}}} (\text{O12}), \text{\textbullet} \text{“palace”} (\text{Figure 8b}).\textsuperscript{76} The first of these is not altogether arbitrary, however, since $\rightarrow$ not only supplies a phonetic element of the name $\text{Nfrt}$, but also recalls the hand that emerges from the tree extending its flower in earlier examples of the emblem; that meaning is confirmed by examples on the Karnak shrine of Sesostris I, which show $\text{\textbullet}$ in the hand of $\rightarrow$.\textsuperscript{77} And the sign $\frac{\text{\textbullet}}{\text{\textcircled{}}}$ was quite possibly suggested by the earlier $\rightarrow$, in which $\text{\textbullet}$ had become narrower, so that $\rightarrow$ projected more conspicuously on either side. The same pattern may be seen in $\frac{\text{\textbullet}}{\text{\textcircled{}}} \text{78}$ for older (?) $\frac{\text{\textbullet}}{\text{\textcircled{}}} (\text{Og})\textsuperscript{79}$ and hieratic $\frac{\text{\textbullet}}{\text{\textcircled{}}} \text{80}$ for older $\frac{\text{\textbullet}}{\text{\textcircled{}}}$. Similarly another composite sign, the determinative $\frac{\text{\textbullet}}{\text{\textcircled{}}}$, was perhaps influenced by older $\frac{\text{\textbullet}}{\text{\textcircled{}}} (\text{N7})$.\textsuperscript{81} This period also supplies early examples of $\frac{\text{\textbullet}}{\text{\textcircled{}}}$.\textsuperscript{74} Fischer, \textit{Egyptian Studies 1: Varia}, pp. 57, 58.

\textsuperscript{75} MMA 57-95 (\textit{JNES} 19 [1960], fig. 1, opp. p. 258, and p. 262).

\textsuperscript{76} Same, lines 6 and 7.

\textsuperscript{77} Same, p. 262.

\textsuperscript{78} Known a little earlier, on the sarcophagi of the minor queens of $\text{Nf}\text{-}\text{hpt-Rt}$ Mentuhotpe: Cairo J. 47267 (interior of foot end, not shown in Clère-Vandier, \textit{TPPI}, p. 276) ; MMA 07.230.1 (same, p. 277). Sesostris I: Hayes, \textit{Se\textquoteright}n-Wosret-rankh}, pl. 10 (cols. 486, 488, but not 485); G. A. Reisner, \textit{Excavations at Kurna IV-V} (Cambridge, Mass., 1923) p. 509 (32e). Amennepet II: Munich GL W. A. F. 35 (Simpson, \textit{TGG}, pl. 30 [20.2]). Another example at least this early occurs on Turin stela Cat. 1534.

\textsuperscript{79} Compare archaic $\frac{\text{\textbullet}}{\text{\textcircled{}}} (\text{nbt hwt-rnh}$, Petrie, \textit{RT} I, pl. 7 (4) (with II, pl. 7 [10]).

\textsuperscript{80} Anthes, \textit{Hatnub}, pl. 13 (10) and 17 (14).

\textsuperscript{81} Clère-Vandier, \textit{TPPI}, p. 32 (line 2). An example in \textit{JEA} 4 (1917) pl. 8 (line 10), may also be earlier than the end of Dyn. XI. Dyn. XII examples are frequent: e.g. Davies, \textit{Antefoker}, pl. 12; Louvre C 168; \textit{Meir} III, pl. 16. Gardiner, \textit{Grammar}, p. 488, thinks this may derive from $\text{\textcircled{}}$ in words for “tomorrow” and “yesterday,” but it more likely stems from Old Kingdom $\frac{\text{\textbullet}}{\text{\textcircled{}}} (\text{CG} 1482, 1485$; Reisner, \textit{A4} 64 [1926] pl. 3, etc.).
(U35), although in one case — is located almost at the bottom of (Figure 8c), recalling the example of □ mentioned in §5.

In the inscriptions of the Twelfth Dynasty there is more abundant evidence for the use of □,83 and □,84 as well as for the new composite forms □ (M27)85 and □ (Aa22),86 and for □,87 as well as □ (S30).88 The form □ is known from early Middle Kingdom letters in hieratic,89 but also occurs in hieroglyphic texts of the late Middle Kingdom,90 and it is significant that the sign — traverses □ instead of being placed within it, as in Old Kingdom □. A Twelfth Dynasty example of □, similarly contains the suffix-pronoun in tr.91 Two other transverse compounds in the Gardiner Sign List are likewise attested: □ (M14)92 and □ (V21).93

The Middle Kingdom also favored new combinations on the pattern of □ (Figure 9a), which is itself the most common example.94 Others include a combination of □ and = in lrtrh “white stone” (Figure 9b);95 □ and — in the title imr-t (Figure 9c);96 a variant of □

88. Temp. Sesostris I: Louvre C 168 (Studies Presented to F. Ll. Griffith [London, 1932] pl. 48 [b]). Amenemhet II: BM 574 (Simpson, TGG, pl. 61 [42.2]).
89. James, Hekeanahhte Papers, p. 123.
90. BM 905 (HT III, pl. 41); W. M. F. Petrie, A Season in Egypt (London, 1888), pl. 11 (295); CG 20476.
91. Bersheh II, pl. 8 (7).
93. Meir VI, pl. 18, temp. Sesostris III.
94. Amenemhet I (or slightly later): Beni Hasan I, pl. 44 (5, 6). Sesostris I: CG 20539 (verso, 5, shown in figure); CG 20542; Louvre C 168 (Studies Presented to F. Ll. Griffith, pl. 48b); Los Angeles County Mus. A 51.4.1.50–876 (Faulkner, JEA 38 [1952] pl. 1); Hayes, S-en-Wosret-rankh, pl. 7 (374), rare in these texts. Amenemhet II: CG 20541. Amenemhet III: CG 20538 (recto, 10, 23).
95. Late Dyn. XI: Clère-Vandier, TPPI, §32 (12).
96. Beni Hasan I, pl. 44 (1), temp. Amenemhet I or slightly later; pls. 7, 9 (shown in figure), 12–15, 17, end of reign of Sesostris I.

FIGURE 9
Abutted composites of the Middle Kingdom
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An unusual writing of \( u r t h \) “loosen” (Figure 9f);\(^{99} \) an unusual writing of \( \overline{w} \) “scissors” (Figure 9f);\(^{99} \) an unusual writing of \( \overline{w} \) “scissors” (Figure 9f);\(^{100} \) and \( ' \) or \( \Rightarrow \) in “Inhrt “Onuris” (Figure 9h-i);\(^{101} \) and \( \overline{w} \) in \( n p r n p t \) “first of the year” (Figure 9j),\(^{102} \) following the pattern of \( \overline{w} \) \( \overline{w} \) \( . \) \( \overline{w} \) \( \overline{w} \) \( . \) \( \overline{w} \) etc.; \( \overline{w} \) and \( \overline{w} \) in \( n p r n p t \) “opening of the (seasonal) year” (F15: Figure 9k);\(^{103} \) on \( \overline{w} \), like the earlier Dynasty XI compound mentioned previously (Figure 9l);\(^{104} \) the plural of \( \overline{w} \) on \( \overline{w} \) in \( n f r w n b w \) “all the gods” (Figure 9m),\(^{105} \)

Virtually the only new composite form of a meaningful kind is \( \overline{w} \), which adds legs to \( \overline{w} \) \( s m t \) “follow” on the pattern of \( \overline{w} \); this is first attested on stelae dating to the end of the Eleventh Dynasty and otherwise seems to have been restricted to Dynasties XII and XIII.\(^{106} \)

An isolated occurrence of \( \overline{w} \) “arrive” is also known, but it may be fortuitous.\(^{106} \)

§7. Second Intermediate Period. By the

Thirteenth Dynasty the transverse combination \( \overline{w} \) (F50)\(^{109} \) was in use, as well as \( \overline{w} \), a new writing of the old title \( \overline{w} \) “elder of the hall,”\(^{110} \) and \( \overline{w} \) (W5), a new writing for \( h r t b h t \) “lector priest.”\(^{111} \) In the last case the position of \( \overline{w} \) does not enhance the meaning as it does in \( \overline{w} \) (§4), since it is not placed below the other sign but on top, where it produces a neater connection.

The inscriptions of this period are particularly apt to show overlapping in the groups \( \overline{w} \), \( \overline{w} \), although a few examples of the latter group are known from the Twelfth Dynasty.\(^{112} \)

§8. New Kingdom. The new combinations of Dynasty XVIII are arbitrary, rather than meaningful, and are nearly all transverse, rather than simply abutted. The Middle Kingdom form \( \overline{w} \) disappeared almost entirely;\(^{113} \) the combination of \( \overline{w} \) and \( \overline{w} \) regularly took the form \( \overline{w} \);\(^{114} \) \( \overline{w} \) was gradually replaced by \( \overline{w} \) (S14);\(^{115} \) and the last form was accompanied by the

97. The examples are Cairo stelae illustrated by Lange and Schäfer and are all this late: CG 20035, 20056, 20211, 20334.

98. CG 20335, Florence 2561 (TGG, pl. 50 [32.2]); Florence 2590 (TGG, pl. 69 [44.2]); Berlin 7311 (TGG, pl. 32 [22.3]).

101. CG 20570 (Simpson, TGG, pl. 29 [19.3], dfsw), 20520 (TGG, pl. 50 [32.1], dfsw), Stuttgart stela (Steindorff, Agyptische Denkmäler, 233 [1921]) p. 117; MMA 63.154 (TGG, pl. 81, dfsw). T. E. Peet, Cemeteries of Abydos II (London, 1914). pl. 23 (5); J. Monnet Saleh, Les Antiqûités égyptiennes de Zagreb (Paris, 1970) no. 69, pp. 24, 25; Fakhry, Monuments of Sneferu at Dahshur II, pl. 2, fig. 387, p. 66 (the Dyn. XII royal name discussed on p. 64 occurs in an offering formula and does not date the monument); Moscow 11 506 (S. I. Hodjash and O. D. Berlev, Altorientalische Forschungen [Berlin, 3, 1948]) pl. 8, foll. p. 19. For Twelfth Dynasty examples see Berseh II, pl. 8 (7); BM 202 (Simpson, TGG, pl. 3 [1.8]); Meir VI, pl. 17.

113. An example as late as Dyn. XXII: Oriental Institute, Reliefs and Inscriptions at Karnak III: Babistsite Portal (Chicago, 1954) pl. 18 (23). Perhaps a new compound of the abutted type might be recognized in \( \overline{w} \) \( w \) \( m t \) “who judges truth”: Rehkh-mi-Rz, p. 74. A composite of similar structure, combining \( \overline{w} \) and \( \overline{w} \), was also used as a monogram for \( w \) \( w \) \( s \) \( w \) \( w \) in the New Kingdom: M. Valloggia, Recherches sur les "messagers" (Geneva, 1976) p. 206.


115. Temp. Amenophis I: Urk. IV, p. 45 (14). Tuthmosis III: Urk. IV, p. 1045 (8–9); Brooklyn 61.196 (Sauneron, Kimi I 8 [1068]) pl. 7. Tuthmosis IV: N. de G. Davies, Tomb of Two Officials of Tuthmosis IV (London, 1923) pl. 8. Amenophis III: Ramose, pls. 12, 19. The form \( \overline{w} \) is said to occur on a Dyn. XII stela, Berlin 1204 (Arg. Inschr. I, p. 173 [12]), but since the surface is damaged, it may be doubted that the stem of \( \overline{w} \) appears below \( \overline{w} \).
comparable to \(\phi\) and an analogous form \(\phi\) (S13), all of which seem to have come into use shortly before the New Kingdom. On the other hand, the transverse combinations of the Middle Kingdom continued and were supplemented by many others: \(\phi\) (G3), \(\phi\) (G6), \(\phi\) (D59), \(\phi\) (S31), \(\phi\) (T5), \(\phi\), \(\phi\), \(\phi\), all attested in inscriptions that antedate the Amarna Period. In addition there was some further use of transverse combinations involving the suffix-pronoun \(\phi\), as in Middle Kingdom \(\phi\); the new combinations include \(\phi\) \(\phi\) \(\phi\) “his palace,” \(\phi\) \(\phi\) \(\phi\) “his spirit,” and \(\phi\) \(\phi\) “his might.”

Among the abutted combinations there are some that recall those of the Archaic Period, namely \(\phi\) \(\phi\) “Upper and Lower Egypt” and \(\phi\) \(\phi\). It was not until the Amarna Period that the heraldic plants were actually fused with \(\phi\), however, and in this form the sign for Upper Egypt was assimilated to that of Lower Egypt: \(\phi\) \(\phi\); examples are not very common before the end of the New Kingdom, in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties. Some of the Eighteenth Dynasty examples bring the upper and lower elements of \(\phi\) \(\phi\) close together, but there is almost always at least a slight separation. In the other combination \(\phi\) \(\phi\) the resemblance to First Dynasty \(\phi\) \(\phi\) “Libya” is more apparent than real, for both \(\phi\) \(\phi\) and \(\phi\) \(\phi\) are generic determinatives for “foreign land.”


117. For S13 Gardiner cites BM 826 (temp. Amenophis III), subsequently published by I. E. S. Edwards in HT VIII, p. 24 (3, 12) and pl. 21. An example dating to Amenophis I is to be found in the reliefs assembled by Winlock in JEA 4 (1911) pl. 4.

118. The sign \(\phi\) \(\phi\) on an offering table from Edfu: Engelbach, ASAE 22 (1922) p. 123. Also, apparently, \(\phi\) \(\phi\) at the end of line 4 of the stela published by Barsanti, ASAE 9 (1908) pl. 1 to pp. 1–2.


120. Tuthmosis III: Urk. IV, p. 568 (17). Tuthmosis IV: Le Temple d’Amauta IV, C 1–2; Davies, Tombs of Two Officials, pp. 36. Amenophis II: W. C. Hayes, Burial Chamber of the Treasurer Sobk-mosê (New York, 1993) pl. 5; Ahmad Badawi, ASAE 42 (1943) pl. 1 to pp. 1–23 (line 22); CG 34054; Two Sculptors, pl. 15; Ramose, pls. 7, 16.

121. Urk. IV, p. 1640 (7), temp. Tuthmosis IV.

122. Tuthmosis IV: Urk. IV, p. 31 (9). Amenophis III: CG 34025 (5, 22, 27). Note, however, that there is no basis for the odd group \(\phi\) \(\phi\) as transcribed by W. Helck, Historisch-biographische Texte der 2. Zwischenzeit und neue Texte der 18. Dynastie (Wiesbaden, 1975) p. 105; this is \(\phi\) \(\phi\) with \(\phi\) touching the head of \(\phi\) but not traversing it.

123. Tuthmosis III: CG 34013 (5), Urk. IV, pp. 766 (2), 879 (2), 880 (1, 2). Tuthmosis IV: Private Tombs IV, pl. 10.


126. Tuthmosis IV: Urk. IV, p. 6 (13).
Although the details of this evolution need not be pursued beyond the reign of Amenophis III, it should be added that new combinations were continually added in later times. Thus the late New Kingdom writing of old \( \text{ḥō} \) as \( \text{ḥō} \) seems to occur for the first time in the Amarna inscriptions,\(^{142}\) and \( \text{ḥō} \) may be even later;\(^{143}\) so too, with greater probability, the composite form \( \text{ḥō} \), which is known from the Twentieth and Twenty-second Dynasties.\(^{144}\) The almost equally bizarre compound \( \text{ḥō} \) is later still, apparently no earlier than Dynasty XXX.\(^{145}\)

The late Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties revived (whether consciously or unconsciously) the use of monograms of First Dynasty style for the writing of royal names, and this use was subsequently applied to nonroyal names in the Libyan Period.\(^{146}\) Something akin to this procedure is known as early as from the reign of Tuthmosis III, when the name of the king's funerary temple, \( \text{ḥō} \), “the life of Tuthmosis III is offered” is at least once written \( \text{ḥō} \), with the \( \text{ḥō} \)-sign looped over the arm of \( \text{ḥō} \).\(^{147}\) In the case of personal names, the emblematic combinations usually assemble the various elements in the hands and on the head of a human being or anthropomorphic deity, and they lack the ingenuity of their ancient predecessors or of the sportive compounds that were popular in the Old Kingdom.\(^{148}\)

§9. Conclusions. After the First Dynasty, when hieroglyphs were frequently fused in an arbitrary fashion, sometimes with little regard to their pictographic reality, combinations of signs generally respected that reality to a greater extent. A certain degree of meaning or logic is to be found in nearly all of those that are attested in Old Kingdom inscriptions. A much larger proportion of arbitrary fusions made their appearance toward the end of the Heracleopolitan Period and in the Middle Kingdom, and in several cases one sign was inappropriately imposed upon another. In the New Kingdom, transverse combinations greatly increased in number, and often at the expense of comparable alternatives that combined the same elements more discretely—abutted rather than crisscrossed—and this period tolerated the creation of particularly incompatible forms in which an arm or sikele was compounded with a bird. It is true that, in the earlier examples of the bird compounds, the incongruity was often mitigated by showing the arm or sikele behind the bird rather than imposed upon it.\(^{149}\) The latter alternative was at least occasionally preferred before the Amarna Period, however.\(^{150}\) And by the beginning of the Nine-


143. As exemplified in Oriental Institute, *Median Habu* II (Chicago, 1932) pls. 86 (27), 88 (9).


145. Clère, *ReI* 6 (1950) p. 144 (R), gives Dyn. XXX examples. So also Leiden D 61 (C. Leemans, *Monuments égyptiens II* [Leiden, 1842] pl. 15) and CG 697 (Fischer, *Egyptian Studies II*, fig. 33), the latter Ptolemaic. The imposition of \( \text{ḥō} \) also occurred in other composite hieroglyphs from this time onward.


147. *Urk.* IV, p. 1198 (9, 10), from Theban tomb 79, (also given in pp. 1535 [3], 1536 [5], 1537 [12]); later examples from Theban tomb 72, temp. Amenophis II: pp. 1457 (16), 1458 (4, 6).

148. A new sportive writing of the older variety does seem to occur on the wooden base of a statue, probably Dyn. XIX, which shows the name \( \text{ḥō} \text{ḥō} \text{ḥō} \text{ḥō} \) with the first word written \( \text{ḥō} \). The standing man might be explained as \( \text{ḥō} \) (echoing the final consonants of \( \text{ḥō} \)). Florence 7666 (sic) (A. Pellegrini, “Glanures,” *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l’archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes* 20 [1898] p. 96). At the beginning of the New Kingdom (*Urk.* IV, p. 46 [6], reign of Amenophis I) the monogram \( \text{ḥō} \) serves as a writing of \( \text{ḥō} \text{ḥō} \text{ḥō} \text{ḥō} \text{ḥō} \text{ḥō} \) “an offering that the king gives,” but this is wholly pictographic; compare J. J. Clère in *Studia in memoria di I. Rosellini* (Pisa, 1955) pp. 35–38. The later (Dyn. XXX) monogram \( \text{ḥō} \) for \( \text{ḥō} \text{ḥō} \text{ḥō} \text{ḥō} \text{ḥō} \text{ḥō} \text{ḥō} \text{ḥō} \text{ḥō} \text{ḥō} \) “who adheres to the way” is, on the other hand, an emblematic writing of the kind that was sometimes employed for personal names: Gunn, *Bulletin de l’Institut français d’Archéologie orientale* (Cairo) 30 (1930) p. 795, note 2.

149. Thus in the examples from *Rekh-mi-Rēr*, *Private Tombs IV*, and *Two Sculptors* cited in notes 119, 120, 123.

150. Thus in the example from *Le Temple d’Amauta* cited in note 119, the one cited in note 120 being inconclusive; the first of the two examples from *Ramose* is similarly inconclusive, while the second shows the arm superimposed on \( \text{ḥō} \). Two examples of \( \text{ḥō} \) are shown in E. Naville, *Temple de Deir el Bahari* (London, 1897) pl. 81, and V (1905) pl. 140, but these are also inconclusive since the surface is damaged in both cases.
teenth Dynasty, as illustrated by the temple of Sethos I at Abydos, forms such as $\text{sa}$ were used at least as often as $\text{s}$.$^{152}$ This distinction is, of course, scarcely recognizable in relatively small-scale incised inscriptions.

The gradual use of increasingly incongruous combinations of hieroglyphs is paralleled by other developments that similarly violated the classical propriety of the Old Kingdom. Whereas Old Kingdom statues, unlike those of the Archaic Period, normally located the identification of the owner on the base or other structural element, or else on some other logical appurtenance such as a roll of papyrus on the lap or on the belt,$^{153}$ the increasingly lengthy inscriptions of later statuary gradually spread to other clothed areas of the body until finally, toward the reign of Tuthmosis III, inscriptions began to be placed on unclothed areas of the body as well.$^{154}$ An even closer parallel may be seen in the treatment of the animal legs of furniture. While stretchers were placed between plain legs of chairs from the Old Kingdom onward, it was not until the reign of Amenophis III that such structural support was ever attached to legs of animal form.$^{155}$

The last example in particular demonstrates that even in those cases where naturalistic forms were incomplete, there was, for many centuries, a great deal of resistance to the idea of amalgamating such forms with elements that were felt to be incompatible. For this reason, and in view of the gradual and progressive development of hieroglyphic combinations that might be considered incongruous, one may fairly conclude not only that the Old Kingdom scribe failed to invent a composite form such as $\text{sa}$ but that he would, as a rule, have rejected it; and that the scribe of both the Old and Middle Kingdoms would similarly have rejected a form such as $\text{sa}$. Perhaps the Eighteenth Dynasty scribe would have felt later forms such as $\text{sa}$ and $\text{sa}$ to be equally outlandish. Furthermore, although this evolution tended to disregard the concrete forms of hieroglyphs, it rarely, if ever, originated in the more abstract and cursive form of writing known as hieratic, where ligatures are frequent, but was, from first to last, essentially a hieroglyphic phenomenon.$^{156}$

The parallel that is to be drawn from the migration of inscriptions on statuary is scarcely less instructive. Here, as in following the evolution of composite hiero-

---


152. Calverley, *Temple of King Sethos I*, I, pl. 19; II, pl. 5, 6, 7; III, pls. 50, 52 (b). The difference is not related to the orientation of the hieroglyph, right or leftward. Here one may also note the curious example in relief from the temple of Ramesses II at Abydos

(Figure 10), shown by Weigall, *ASAE* 11 (1911), p. 174, fig. 4, where the arm-sign is held by the wing of the quail chick.

153. A very few Old Kingdom statues do show an inscription on the kilt: MFA 12.1488; Berlin 84390 (*Aeg. Inschr. I*, p. 69); CG 76, 268(?); such examples are so rare that they may be considered “exceptions that prove the rule.” For inscriptions on the belt see Cairo CG 37, 89, 196, 201; MMA 26.2.7 and Cairo J. 67369 (same person: A. H. Zayed, *Trois Études d’Égyptologie* [cairo, 1956] p. 8; inscribed sceptor of same, p. 2).

154. MFA 29.7.28 (cartouche of Tuthmosis III on shoulder: Dunham, *JEA* 15 [1929] p. 164 and pl. 32); Cairo CG 42123 (same cartouche and location); University Museum, Philadelphia, E. 10980 (name of owner on upper arm: D. Randall-MacIver and C. L. Woolley, *Bubast* [Philadelphia, 1911] pl. 36); the last example is evidently at least as early as the others.

155. An early Eighteenth Dynasty stool with highly conventionalized lion’s legs (Cairo J. 43165) has stretchers at the front and rear (Earl of Carnarvon and Howard Carter, *Five Years’ Explorations at Thebes* [London, 1912] pl. 71): the earliest examples with stretchers between naturalistic lion’s legs occur in the furniture of Sit’Hamm, the daughter of Amenophis III: T. M. Davis, *Tomb of Inyia and Touyoua* (London, 1907) pls. 33–34 (chair, Cairo CG 51119); pl. 37 (bed, Cairo CG 51110). In the Amarna Period, stretchers (and sometimes braces as well) were placed between the animal legs on either side (N. de G. Davies, *Rock Tombs of El Amarna* II [London, 1905] pls. 14, 38; V [1908] pls. 21, 23). This subject will be dealt with more fully in a forthcoming monograph on Egyptian chairs.

156. There are possibly a few exceptions. Old Kingdom, and Dyn. XI-XII are only known to me in the hieratic inscriptions of Hatnub (notes 61, 80). The form is known earlier in hieratic than in hieroglyphic script (note 89 above), and hieratic occurs in a Dyn. XII copy of the Story of Sinuhe (Ba14: A. M. Blackman, *Middle-Egyptian Stories* [Brussels, 1932] p. 33). Most curiously, the form $\text{sa}$ for seems to occur repeatedly in a Sixth Dynasty papyrus from Elephantine: G. Möller, *Hieratische Paläographie I* (Munich, 1909) no. 149; the hieroglyphic equivalent is found in Hyksos names, as Möller notes, and it occasionally makes a reappearance in names of the Ramesside Period (e.g. K. Kitchen, *Ramesside Inscriptions* [Oxford, 1969–1974] II, p. 186 [9]); VI, p. 16
glyphs, we may trace an ever-widening breach in the unity of art and writing, which was so well respected in the Old Kingdom. That unity was never entirely lost, but hieroglyphic writing thereafter tended to follow its own evolution and to be used for its own sake, with less regard for the naturalistic aspect of the hieroglyphs, or for the forms upon which they were inscribed.

The emblematic creations of the late New Kingdom might seem to revive the spirit of meaningful sportive monograms that were invented in the Archaic Period and (perhaps) in the Old Kingdom, and which, in many cases, continued in use, but the later writings of names are less meaningful and often highly contrived. This insistence on emblematic writing for its own sake must, in fact, be regarded as yet a further step away from Old Kingdom tradition.

ABBREVIATIONS

Aeg. Inschr.—Aegyptische Inschriften aus den Königlichen (or Staatlichen) Museen zu Berlin I-II (Leipzig, 1913–1924)
Anthes, Hatnub—Rudolf Anthes, Die Felsenschriften von Hatnub (Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Aegyptens 9) (Leipzig, 1928)
ASAE—Annales du Service des Antiquités de l’Égypte (Cairo)
AZ—Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde (Leipzig and Berlin)
Beni Hasan I—P. E. Newberry, Beni Hasan I (London, 1893)
Bersheh—P. E. Newberry and F. Ll. Griffith, El Bersheh I-II (London [1894–95])
BM—The British Museum, London
Borchardt, Grabd. Šashu-re—Ludwig Borchardt, Das Grabdenkmal des Königs Šashu-re I-II (Leipzig, 1913)
Cairo J. + number—Monuments in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo, unpublished unless otherwise noted
Cairo T. + numbers—Monuments in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo, listed in the Temporary Register, but unpublished unless otherwise noted
Capart, Rue—Jean Capart, Une Rue de tombeaux à Saqqarah (Brussels, 1907)
CG + number—Monuments in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo, numbers referring to Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire:
CG 1–1294: Ludwig Borchardt, Statuen und Statuetten von Königen und Privatleuten I-V (Berlin, 1911–36)

[1], but no further hieratic examples are attested. The hieratic equivalent of ρ (see note 85) occurs relatively early at Hatnub (Anthes, Hatnub, p. 36 and pl. 16 [no. 16, line 7]), but this inscription may be later than Dyn. XI (W. Schenkel, Frühmittelägyptische Studien [Bonn, 1962] §34). Two Old Kingdom hieratic examples of ρ (see note 93) are given by G. Möller, Hieratische Paläographie I, no. 252, but both are actually ρ (see note 37); compare Posener-Kriéger and de Cenival, The Abu Sir Papyri, pls. 49 (B), 87 (B).

CG 1295–1808: Ludwig Borchardt, Denkmäler des Alten Reiche I-II (Berlin and Cairo, 1937–64)
CG 11001–12000 and 14001–14754: J. E. Quibell, Archaic Objects I-II (Cairo, 1904–05)
CG 34001–34189: P. Lacau, Stèles du Nouvel Empire I-II (Cairo, 1909–26)
CG 42001–42250: Georges Legrain, Statues et statuettes des rois et des particuliers I-III + index volume (Cairo, 1906–25)
Clère-Vandier, TPPI—J. J. Clère and J. Vandier, Textes de la Première Période Intermédiaire et de la XIe Dynastie, Fasc. 1 (Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 10) (Brussels, 1948)
Davies, Ptahhetep—N. de G. Davies, The Mastaba of Ptahhetep at Saqqara I-II (London, 1900–01)
Emery, Great Tombs—Walter B. Emery et al., Great Tombs of the First Dynasty I-III (Service des Antiquités de l’Égypte: Excavations at Saqqara) (Cairo and London, 1949–58)
Hammāmdāt—J. Couyat and P. Montet, Les Inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouâdi Hammāmdāt (Mémoires publiés par les membres de l’Institut français d’Archéologie orientale 34) (Cairo, 1912)
Hassan, Gīza V—Seilim Hassan, Excavations at Gīza V (Cairo, 1944)
HT—The British Museum, Hieroglyphic Texts from Egyptian Stelae, etc., in The British Museum I-IX (London, 1911–70)
JEA—Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, London
ADDENDA

To note 13. The same interpretation of the name Hetepw(y)-Neith has already been suggested by Helck, ÄZ 79 (1954) p. 30.

To note 105. A few earlier examples, including some odd variants, occur on Eleventh Dynasty coffins from Akhmim: Pierre Lacau, Sarcophages antérieurs au Nouvel Empire (Cairo, 1904) pp. 1, 5, 17, 39, 34, 35, 37.

Pyr. à degrés—P. Lacau and J.-Ph. Lauer, La Pyramide à degrés IV-V (Cairo, 1959–65)

Ramose—N. de G. Davies, The Tomb of the Vizier Ramose (London, 1941)

RéE—Revue d’Égyptologie, Paris

Rekh-mi-Rê—N. de G. Davies, The Tomb of Rekh-mi-Rê at Thebes I-II (Publications of The Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition 10, 11 (New York, 1943)


Two Sculptors—N. de G. Davies, The Tomb of Two Sculptors at Thebes (Publications of The Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition 4) (New York, 1925)

Urk. I—K. Sethe, Urkunden des Alten Reichs, 2nd ed. (Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums 1) (Leipzig, 1933)
