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Battiscombe Gunn has long since made the observation that hieroglyphic inscriptions of the Old Kingdom characteristically omit determinatives if these ideographs are supplied by the accompanying representations. Thus, on a stela or architrave, the two-dimensional figure of the owner may itself be regarded as an enlarged determinative, supplementing the phonetic writing of the name that precedes it. And a statue may similarly be regarded as a three-dimensional enlargement of the determinative belonging to the name inscribed on its base.

It is therefore appropriate, as far as the monuments of this period are concerned, to speak of “redundant determinatives” in describing those exceptional cases where a hieroglyphic determinative is added to a personal name even though the name is directly connected with a representation that performs the same function. As might be expected, a certain number of exceptions do in fact exist. But a rather more surprising feature emerges when the exceptions are tabulated in which men and women are associated. In such cases—and they constitute the majority of the total—the feminine names tend to show the determinative while the masculine names do not. The first and most important category to be considered is statuary, either pairs of statues or group statues, representing the tomb owner and the members of his household.

1. STATUARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Son(s)</th>
<th>Daughter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Figure 1 (two statues)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Figure 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Figure 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Figure 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Abubakr, Giza, pls. 20, 21 (two statues)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>Figure 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. A granite statue of the owner (Junker, *Giza V*, fig. 29 b) likewise shows his name without determinative.
4. For the identification of the two figures see below, pp. 14–15. A statue of the tomb owner and two daughters (Hassan, *Giza I*, p. 116, pl. 74) shows no determinatives.
5. A second statue of the owner’s wife (pl. 22) lacks the determinative.
6. Limestone statuette of seated couple from tomb G 2231x = G 22178 (Smith, *History of Sculpture and Painting*, p. 74). I am indebted to Dr. William K. Simpson for helping me to locate and copy this
(7) Figure 7

(8) M. G. Fraser, “The Early Tombs at Tehneh,” *ASAE* 3 (1902) pp. 123-124 (second example)

(9) Figure 8

(10) CG 55

(11) CG 100

(12) CG 376

(13) Figure 9


(15) B. A. Turayev, *Stuoi i Stsntk* (Petrograd, 1917) p. 6 and pl. 2 (2)

---

To this list one may also add (16) the female servant statues CG 110, 114 (Figure 10), 118, all from the funerary estate of the Overseer of the Treasury  Vương-n(i),” and more specifically from his tomb. In each case this designation of the tomb owner, without determinative, is followed by the name of the servant, which has the determinative $\overline{\text{f}}$.

Most of the 16 examples are from the Memphite cemeteries, either Giza (1-6), Saqqara (10-12, 16, and probably 13), or Medum (9); two are known from Tehna, in Middle Egypt (7-8). The earliest of them is no. 9, dating to the beginning of the Fourth Dynasty; the next earliest are 1, 7, 8 (beginning of the Fifth Dynasty); most of the others also belong to the same dynasty, but no. 2 is as late as the Sixth, and nos. 4 and 5 cannot be much earlier. It will be noted that the determinative $\overline{\text{f}}$ follows the names of women throughout the Old Kingdom, but $\overline{\text{f}}$ does not appear in this context before some point well within the Fifth Dynasty.

I have found only four group statues that show the determinative after the name of the principal male figure and, with a single exception, the woman’s name shows the same feature. In one case (CG 62) the determinative $\overline{\text{f}}$ is given to a man—presumably the

---

7. One might compare this and the following example with architraves like those considered below, in section 3. A masculine name-determinative appears in a somewhat similar context, Hassan, Giza III, fig. 197, p. 151, but here the name is preceded by an offering formula, so that this inscription is a much more independent entity than in the case of examples 7 and 8.

8. John D. Cooney, “Three Egyptian Families of the Old Kingdom,” *Bulletin Brooklyn Museum* 13/3 (Spring, 1952) p. 6. The drawing is based on a rubbing made by Edna Russmann. On another family group of the same person (Metropolitan Museum of Art 29.19) the name of the daughter lacks a determinative, as does that of the owner; the wife’s name has not survived.

9. Determinatives are also absent from the names on a statue of a male funerary priest belonging to the same group (CG 119) and on one of the statues representing the owner (CG 272), but another statue of his does show a determinative (CG 211).

10. Note also the example of $\overline{\text{f}}$ Junker, Giza I, fig. 63, p. 252. It may also be noted that the wife who has the determinative $\overline{\text{f}}$ in example 1 is given the determinative $\overline{\text{f}}$ on the false door of her son (BM 1293: T. G. H. James, *Hieroglyphic Texts from Egyptian Stela*, etc., 2nd ed. [London, 1961] pl. 8, p. 8): for this distinction see Henry G. Fischer, “Four Provincial Administrators at the Memphite Cemeteries,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 74 (1954) p. 28. The early Fourth Dynasty use of the determinative $\overline{\text{f}}$ after the name of Queen $\overline{\text{f}}$ (Reisner and Smith, *Hist. Giza Necrop.* II, fig. 40, pl. 29) may similarly be explained by her status; $\overline{\text{f}}$ II has the same determinative on the coffin of her daughter $\overline{\text{f}}$ III (J. d’E 54935).
FIGURE 1
Example 1. From Junker, *Giza III*, fig. 32, p. 186

FIGURE 2
Example 2. From Junker, *Giza V* fig. 29A, p. 109
FIGURE 3
Example 3. From Junker, *Gīza IX*, fig. 27, p. 68 (corrected)

FIGURE 4
Example 4. Drawn from photograph, Hassan, *Gīza I*, pl. 75

FIGURE 5
Example 6. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 12.1485
FIGURE 6
Portion of inscription of Nḥbw. After Dunham

FIGURE 7
Example 7. From Fraser, ASAE 3 (1903) pl. 3

FIGURE 8
Example 9. Cairo Museum, CG 4, 5
FIGURE 9
Example 13. Brooklyn Museum, 49.215

FIGURE 10
Example 16. Cairo Museum, CG 114
tomb owner—as well as to a woman who is presumably his wife, but is absent from the name of the son that is adjacent to his father's.\textsuperscript{11} In the second case (Junker, Giza V, fig. 42, p. 149), the names of a man and woman have the determinative Ⲡ and Ⲡ, respectively. It is probably significant that they do not represent the
tomb owner and his wife, but their relationship to him, and to each other, is unspecified. The third statue shows, on the rearward surface of the backpillar, an incised inscription (Figure 11) identifying a man named Kthrop (determinative Ⲡ) and a woman whose relationship was specified but is now obliterated; her name is Hy (determinative Ⲡ).\textsuperscript{12} Since a fragment of a second, seated statue of Kthrop was found near this one, it seems likely that both represent the tomb owner.\textsuperscript{13} The fourth case (CG 44) is the only one that gives the man a determinative (again Ⲡ) while the name of the woman, his daughter, lacks it. In this case, however, the name of a second female figure, designated "wife,"\textsuperscript{14} was never added to her titles, and so it seems possible that the omission of a determinative after the daughter's name was unintentional. It is also possible that addition of a determinative after the man's names may have been fostered by the somewhat complex manner in which they are presented: Ⲡ Ⲡ Ⲡ Ⲡ Ⲡ Ⲡ Ⲡ Ⲡ, who is called 'Ip.' The form of the determinative, as in the two preceding cases, is most unusual; the other male statues that have a name-determinative (nine examples noted, including the aforementioned CG 62)\textsuperscript{15} all have the more honorific Ⲡ rather than the commonplace Ⲡ.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure11.png}
\caption{Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 21.2602}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{11} The name of the son in Borchardt's copy is to be corrected to Ⲡ Ⲡ Ⲡ Ⲡ Ⲡ Ⲡ Ⲡ Ⲡ, compare PN, p. 263 [10].
\textsuperscript{12} Mentioned by Smith, History of Sculpture and Painting, p. 72, and Reisner, Hist. Giza Necrop. I, pl. 67 [d]. I am obliged to Dr. Simpson for enabling me to copy the inscription. The man's titles are evidently to be read Try sdw d n pr\textsuperscript{13} (compare Junker, Giza VI, fig. 83, p. 215, and VII, fig. 50, p. 135) and ḫnty ṱ. In the wife's inscription Smith reads Ⲡ Ⲡ as Ⲡ in [ḥmt.f n]rt.f, and that may be the most plausible interpretation, especially since the preceding traces on the much eroded surface suggest the form of Ⲡ.
\textsuperscript{13} Smith (see preceding note) thinks that this and the first statue, found in the debris of a street, came from the serdab of G 4592, whereas Reisner assumed that they belonged to G 4520, the mastaba of Ḥufus- nb, along with a statue of Ḥufus- nb that was found with them.
\textsuperscript{14} For this designation, instead of the usual Ḥmt.f, see also Junker, Giza III, figs. 14, 15, pp. 129, 131.
\textsuperscript{15} Junker, Giza VIII, fig. 4, p. 17 (two other statues lack determinatives); XI, fig. 11, p. 17, fig. 51a, p. 109; Hassan, Giza I, p. 115, pl. 70 (no determinative on other statues pls. 72, 74); S. Hassan, "Excavations at Saqqara 1937-1938," ASAE 38 (1938) p. 506; Abd el Hamid Zayed, Trois études d'égyptologie (Cairo, 1956) p. 16; CG 67, 211 (no determinative on other statues of the latter, as noted in note 9, above), CG 377 (no determinative on other statues, CG 61, 65, 66, 181).
if the tomb owner is represented, in contrast to the use of a determinative with the name of a son in example 1. The majority of group statues, like Old Kingdom statues in general, show no determinatives whatever; I know of about forty such groups. And a surprising number of statues were evidently not inscribed at all, as though the context of the tomb provided sufficient identification. In the case of a well-preserved polychrome statue such as that of spinw (Abubakr, Giza, pls. 50–51, pp. 89–90) the omission of an inscription hardly seems fortuitous, and the presence of his wife’s name on her own statue (Abubakr, Giza, pl. 52, p. 90), although lacking a determinative, may be analogous to the use of the determinative after the wife’s name in contrast to its absence after the name of the husband. In another case the statues of the tomb owner and his wife lack inscriptions (Hassan, Giza II, pls. 18, 19), whereas the statue of an estate manager named Pr-nb(i) is identified by title and name (Hassan, Giza II, pl. 20, p. 61).

A group statue in the Metropolitan Museum inscribed with the names Mmi and 5hw (Figure 12) would seem to contradict the evidence of the preceding examples, since both names evidently belong to the man, leaving the woman (presumably his wife) unnamed. But the fact that he has his arm around her, reversing the usual procedure, suggests that this statue belongs to her burial rather than his; a close analogy is provided by the group statue of Queen Hetep-heres II with her arm around her daughter Meresankh III, from the tomb of the latter. This conclusion is confirmed by a second statue that represents the wife alone, yet again bears her husband’s name: 4\ 5\ 6\ 7\ 8\ 9\ 10\ 11\ 12\ 13. Similar considerations are also to be recognized in the case of example 4, which has inaccurately been described as a standing couple representing the tomb owner Mr-5w-nh and his wife. The sole inscription

16. One further example shows the determinative following the name ‘nh(i)-m-R’, Turayev, Statui i Statuetki, p. 5 and pl. 3 (4), but the inscription is only given in typescript, and not altogether accurately.
18. Theoretically 4\ 6\ 8\ 10\ 12\ 14\ 16\ might designate the woman, since the writing of the title might apply to either sex and the second name 4\ 5\ 6\ 7\ 8\ 9\ 10\ 11\ 12\ 13 is written in signs of lesser height. But Mmi does not seem to be attested as a feminine name before the Middle Kingdom (PN I, p. 149 [18]) while both Mmi and 5hw are well known for men; the feminine counterparts of these names in Old Kingdom inscriptions are Mmilt (CG 1586, wife of Mmi) and 5hit 5hit (PN I, p. 299 [20–21]).
20. As seen from the photograph published in the article cited above, note 17, and the accompanying text. The owner of the statue died in 1962, and I have not been able to trace its present location.
21. Hassan, Giza I, caption to pl. 75.
identifying the man is a vertical column of hieroglyphs between the two figures: 𓐇𓐆𓐇𓐌𓐆𓐇. One might expect another name to follow, i.e., "Mr-sw-'nh's eldest son NN," but there is no trace of any hieroglyphs on the sole remaining space that might have been used for this purpose, beside the right leg of the figure. A second Mr-sw-'nh, who is evidently a son, is shown on the owner's false door (Hassan, Giza I, fig. 182, p. 109), and it seems likely that he is "the eldest" son who is represented in the statue. The unusual inscription is perhaps to be explained by comparison with a stela in the Cairo Museum, CG 1394 (Figure 13), the top half of which is occupied by the dedication of a grandson. It reads: "The overseer of the treasury and scribe of royal archives, 'Isi, the son of her daughter; it is he who made this for her." In this case the terminal position of the filiation formula is intended to point downward, as it were, to the grandmother who is represented beneath—Nfrt-wnn.i. In the case of Mr-sw-'nh's statue, the formula "his eldest son" may similarly refer to his father's burial beneath the serdab, rather than to one of the representations of the latter with which this statue was placed.

The woman who stands beside Mr-sw-'nh is identified as the owner's daughter on another statue group (Hassan, Giza I, pl. 74, p. 116). The beginning of her inscription is lost, but traces of the sign ~ can be detected, and this must apply to a term of relationship that—since it is placed in its normal position, before her name—presumably refers to the adjacent figure. The restoration that is indicated is accordingly [𓐇𓐆]—"his sister."

2. TWO-DIMENSIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Old Kingdom representations in relief are, as one might anticipate, even more rarely accompanied by redundant name-determinatives than statues are; if both the determinative and representation are on the same plane, the redundancy is much more apparent. A few examples may nonetheless be cited, and in every case the presence and absence of determinatives conforms to the same pattern as the 16 examples in statuary:

(17) Fourth Dynasty slab stela of Nfrt (Figure 14). Of all the Fourth Dynasty slab stelae this is the only one that shows a determinative at the end of the owner's identification. Inasmuch as the early Fourth Dynasty example in statuary (example 9) involves virtually the same name, it may be considered whether the determinative has not been suggested by the meaning, "One who is beautiful." But in that case one would expect to find the same writing on the


23. For ideographs of this sort compare 𓐇𓐆𓐇𓐌𓐆𓐇 (Junker, Giza VI, fig. 32, p. 110; XII, p. 122; CG 57135, etc.); 𓐇𓐆𓐇𓐌𓐆𓐇 (CG 110; compare PVI, p. 49 [24]); 𓐇𓐆𓐇𓐌𓐆𓐇 (CG 1454, 1466); 𓐇𓐆𓐇 (E. Drioton and J.-Ph. Lauer, "Un groupe de tombes à Saqqarah," ASAE 55 (1958) p. 229); 𓐇𓐆𓐇 (Gustave Jéquier, Le monument funéraire de Pepi II III [Cairo, 1949] fig. 22, p. 37).
FIGURE 14
Example 17. From H. F. Lutz, Egyptian Tomb Steles (Leipzig, 1927) pl. 2 (2)

It therefore seems reasonable to conclude that $\text{\textcopyright}$ is, in fact, simply a name-determinative.

(18) The false door of $\text{\textcopyright}r-k^3$ and $\text{Ttt}$ (Figure 15$^{25}$ is not easy to date; it can hardly be as early as the beginning of the Fourth Dynasty, as Curto states (Gli Scavi, p. 33), and judging from the form of the determinatives, it would seem to be later than the beginning of Dynasty V. The offering niche may well belong to

24. Compare, for example, Abubakr, Giza, fig. 74, pp. 88, 90 (the latter a statue); Hilda F. Petrie and Margaret A. Murray, Seven Memphite Tomb Chapels (London, 1932) pl. 2; Junker, Giza IX, fig. 15, p. 41. The sign $\text{\textcopyright}$ does occur as a determinative of the name itself in some Middle Kingdom examples, but all of these cases involve a plural: $\text{\textcopyright} (\text{CG 20219b}) Nfrwut (\text{PN I, p. 202 [18] suggests Nfr-wwut (?)})$; $\text{\textcopyright} (\text{CG 20086k, 20540f}, \text{variant writings of Hpt-Ipsut and $\text{\textcopyright} (\text{CG 20057h}$), evidently $\text{\textcopyright}$. Note also the Middle Kingdom title of a priest of Hathor who was $\text{\textcopyright} (\text{G. Maspero, Le Musée Égyptien III (Cairo, 1915) p. 56}$).

25. Curto, Gli Scavi, fig. 22, pl. 2. I am indebted to Professor Curto for providing me with the photograph on which my drawing is based, and to William Pons for rephotographing to correct distortion.
the woman who is seated at the left of the offering table, opposite her husband. Her name, \textit{Ttt}, has the determinative \hiragana\ while his lacks it, and their names are written together on the crossbar and drum lintel beneath this scene, \textit{Nfr-k3} and \textit{Ttt}, again with a

26. As suggested by the reiteration of her name on the crossbar and drum-lintel, and by the prominence of female offering bearers (as well as men). Her position on the dominant left side of the offering scene also fits this conclusion, although this point in itself is not conclusive; compare Abubakr, \textit{Giza}, fig. 95A, p. 109, and the other examples cited in Henry G. Fischer, \textit{“A Scribe of the Army in a Saqqara Mastaba,” Journal of Near Eastern Studies} 18 (1959) p. 272. In the present case, however, it is confirmed by the fact that her figure is somewhat larger than that of her husband.

27. The presence of \hiragana\ after the epithet \textit{im\textasciitilde{h}(t)} is remarkable, although \hiragana\ sometimes occurs as a determinative after \textit{im\textasciitilde{h}w} in other contexts (for example, \textit{Urk. I}, p. 217, line 15; p. 252, line 13; \textit{LD II}, 110[k]). Curto is probably right in taking the next group of signs as a feminine name (pp. 21–22), but the name may be \textit{Hnwt.\textasciitilde{i}n}, and not \textit{Hnwt.\textasciitilde{s}}; compare the writing \hiragana\ \hiragana, \textit{Junker, Giza VI}, fig. 29, p. 106, and compare \textit{PVI}, p. 243 [29], 244 [1] and II, p. 337. Possibly one might read \textit{im\textasciitilde{h}(t) nt h\textasciitilde{w}t.\textasciitilde{i}}. For \textit{im\textasciitilde{h}w} + the genitive see \textit{Wb. I}, 82 [7], and for the epithet “revered with her (or his) mistress” see Henry G. Fischer, \textit{Dendera in the Third Millennium B.C.} (Locust Valley, New York, 1968) p. 211, note 820; Norman de G. Davies, \textit{The Rock Tombs of Sheikh Sa	extsc{d}} (London, 1901) pl. 25; Clarence S. Fisher, \textit{The Minor Cemetery at Giza} (Philadelphia, 1924) p. 143, pl. 48 (1); and the unpublished drum-lintel of \hiragana\ \hiragana, \textit{Toledo (Ohio) 06.24}. In most of these examples, however, the identity of \textit{hnwt} is indicated by the context, and no such indication is provided in the present case.

\textbf{FIGURE 15}

Example 18. Drawn from photograph, courtesy Turin Museum
determinative applied to her name only: 𓊧 on the crossbar and 𓊨 on the lintel.

(19) The architrave of a simple false door from the tomb of Mr-ỉw-ỉnḥ, from which example 4 derives, names the owner and his mother, who are represented at the bottom of the jambs, with the determinative 𓊨 applied to her name only, and not to his (Figure 16).

(20) Of still later date, probably within the Sixth Dynasty, is the false door of Ỉtw (Figure 17), which shows the owner seated opposite his wife. The architrave above this scene gives her name the determinative 𓊨 and not his, and to this extent it bears out the testimony of the preceding examples.²⁸ Unlike example 18, however, the name-determinative is not actually redundant because it appears at the end of the architrave that is furthest from the wife, and her name is repeated, without a determinative, above her figure. It may be significant that no determinative is added to her name on the architrave above her own false door (Junker, Gīza V, fig. 36, p. 139).

²⁸. Note also the false door CG 1462, which similarly shows no representations of the owner and his wife and supplies no determinative to the owner’s name, while his wife is identified as 𓊧 𓊧 𓊨. In this case, however, the sign 𓊨 probably belongs to the word ỉ in St-ỉnḥḥḥḥ; compare the writing of 𓊨 𓊨 𓊨 𓊨 S-n-ỉḥḥḥ, Junker, Gīza VI, fig. 36, p. 117. Another example worth mentioning here is LD II, pls. 10–11; the wife’s name shows the determinative 𓊨 on the architrave above her false door (pl. 10) while, in a similar context (pl. 11), the name of her husband lacks it.
3. OTHER LINTELS AND ARCHITRAVES

There are also a number of cases in which an isolated lintel or architrave shows the same distinction between men and women in the use of name-determinatives. Some of them may have accompanied an offering scene, as in the case of examples 18 and 20, but even so, the determinative could not, strictly speaking, be called “redundant” any more than it could in the example that has just been considered.

(21) Name-determinatives are completely omitted on one of a pair of lintels (Figure 18) that bear the names of “the Craftsman Nfr, the Mitri My, and the Butcher of the Slaughterhouse ‘Iy-wt,” but the second lintel adds a determinative to the name of the woman alone: . The drum lintels that were presumably placed beneath each of these (Figure 19) include the names of Nfr and My only, and they show the determinatives and , respectively, in both cases.

(22) An architrave from Reisner’s excavations at Giza, above the entrance of tomb G 1208 (Figure 20), is inscribed for: “The Custodian of the King’s Property (?) , Wh-priest of the King, Hm-nfr Priest of Cheops, Inspector of the Boat(s?), Overseer of the Army, Overseer of the Pyramid , Leader of the Phyles, , and his wife the Custodian of the King’s Property (?), Mrt-it.” She alone has the name-determinative: . One might take the owner of this inscription to be “’Iy-wt’s wife . . . Mrt-it,” but, in view of the number of titles that precede his name, it seems more likely that the architrave primarily belongs to him.

(23) The lintel over the entrance of another tomb at Giza (Figure 21) was inscribed for the “Sealer of the King’s Granary , Nfr-hr-n-Pth (together with) his wife .

30. Brussels E. 5270 (previously reproduced in Fischer, “The Butcher Ph-r-nfr,” p. 171) and Field Museum Chicago 31297, reproduced here by permission of Dr. James W. Van Stone, and by the Oriental Institute, who provided the photograph on which this drawing is based. This second lintel completes the writing as a variant of , the sign being incompletely preserved on its counterpart in Brussels. This hieroglyph is apparently a phonetic complement; compare , Wb. II, pl. 105 (18) and mr/mi with determinative , Wb. II, pl. 105 (19).
31. Based on a drawing and photograph kindly supplied by Dr. William K. Simpson.
32. From W. M. F. Petrie, Gizeh and Rifsh (London, 1907) pl. 7A; now in the Manchester Museum, 1617.

**FIGURE 18**
Example 21. Brussels, E. 5268 (above) and 5271

**FIGURE 19**
Brussels E. 5270 (left) and Field Museum, Chicago, 31297
FIGURE 20
Example 22. From excavation records, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston

FIGURE 21
Example 23. From photograph, Petrie, Gizeh and Rifeh, pl. 7A

FIGURE 22
Example 24. From excavation records, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston

FIGURE 23
Example 25. From LD II, pl. 94a
Nfrt and his children, The Overseer of Crews 'Imi, HwR, K3.i-m-rday, Kki.' To the left is a statement: "the Stonemason Ppi is satisfied with the contract that I made with him." Nfrt has the determinative 𓊫. The only other name that has one (𓊫) is that of the stonemason, who is not a member of the family.

(24) Yet another lintel from Giza, found by Reisner in the vicinity of Giza tomb 1227 (Figure 22), shows an offering formula and the name of the Estate Attendant (literally "Son of the House") 'In-k3.f, who lacks a name-determinative, and a woman (presumably his wife), who has it. The offering formula is directed to the man "as possessor of reverence" (men nb imḥl) and the woman's title and name are separated from his by a vertical dividing line. In this case the addition of the determinative may have been reinforced by the form of the name, since Mdw-nfrt is probably the same as the masculine name Mdw-nfr, with the addition of the feminine ending t. Perhaps the sign ḳ is to be read ḳmt "the woman," in which case the determinative is even more explainable in terms of the name itself. The addition of ḳmt may be compared to the words "she-ass" (Pyr. 323) and "wild cow" (Pyr. 389, 1370), to which Faulkner has recently called attention.35

(25) An architrave reused in one of the houses of Kafra el Batran, near the Giza cemetery (Figure 23) invokes offerings for "the inspector of the palace S nb and his wife Hnut.im," with a determinative (𓊫) applied only to the name of the wife. It should be noted that he is explicitly designated as the primary recipient of offerings, since the formula concludes with the words pri n.f ḳrw "that the voice be emitted for him."

(26) A second architrave from the same place (Figure 24) shows the same use of the determinative after the wife's name alone (𓊫), but in this case the offering formula concludes with pri (n).s ḳrw [m] ḳb nb "that the voice be emitted [for] her [on] every feast."37 Thus the pair of names is to be interpreted as "the Inspector of the Palace K3.(i)-pr's wife Rnpt-nfrt." In this particular instance the name-determinative might accordingly be regarded as the equivalent of a terminal representation; but a terminal representation is usually omitted on the smaller lintels and architraves of the type exemplified by nos. 18–22, 24–27, and a small-

34. Discussed in Fischer, "Old Kingdom Inscriptions," p. 301, note 5.
35. "Hmt 'woman' as a feminine suffix," JEA 58 (1972), p. 300. The sign ḳ also appears in a late Old Kingdom writing of the feminine title mnt (𓊫𓊩𓊫; Junker, Giza IX, p. 243) but here it seems to be the equivalent of ideographic 𓊩 as in the variant writing 𓊩𓊩 (CG 1707). Note also a further Middle Kingdom example, 𓊩𓊩𓊩𓊩𓊩 (the "female children of the Count," in Newberry, Beni Hasan I, pl. 29.
36. The presence of the sign ḳ within ḳ cannot be verified; presumably the title in question is identical to the one in the following example, no. 26, and is to be compared with the more familiar titles ḳ and ḳ. Otherwise, as far as Old Kingdom sources are concerned, the monograph combining ḳ and ḳ usually occurs with the addition of ḳ (CG 1935 [wrongly transcribed in Urk. I, p. 83, line 11]; Urk. I, p. 52, line 8, p. 242, lines 1, 5; and especially积蓄 Firth and Gunn, Teti Pyramid Cemeteries, pp. 135, 148. Compare P. Kaplon, Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde 88 (1962) p. 6, n. 3. It also replaces 𓊩 (sh-nfr) in CG 1652 (Henry G. Fischer, "Monuments of the Old Kingdom in the Cairo Museum," Chronique d'Égypte 45 [1966] p. 31); possibly 𓊩 (Urk. I, p. 20, line 15) is the same as the second of these, but Elmar Edel, Altägyptische Grammatik 1 (Rome, 1955) §67, transliterates nfr "Kapelle."
37. For the emendation of (n.) with the examples cited by Clère in "Le fonctionnement grammatical de l'expression pri ḳrw en ancien égyptien," Mélanges Maestro 1 (Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire LXVI) (Cairo, 1935–38) p. 761, note 1, and compare ḳ with "the voice be emitted for him."
scale hieroglyphic determinative rarely serves this function. 38

(27) A drum-lintel of unknown provenance in Cairo, CG 1751, 39 has an offering formula that shows masculine forms (nb im\textsuperscript{h}... ivw nfr\ wrl) and is therefore primarily directed to the first of the two persons mentioned subsequently. His name, lacking a determinative, is 'Iy-nfr\mbox{t}, and his title (\textsection \textsection \textsection) is obscure. The name that follows belongs to "the mi\textsuperscript{rrt} T\mbox{ntt}," followed by the determinative 俐. She is presumably his wife, but their relationship is not specified.

(28) A small lintel of unknown provenance, University College, London 8453 (Figure 25), 40 bears the name of the mi\textsuperscript{rrt} T\mbox{ntt}, with the determinative 俐, and, in a separate compartment, a name that is apparently masculine and lacks the determinative. The reading of the latter is problematic, but the final \textsection can hardly be anything but s "man" and I can suggest no explanation better than 'Iy-s(\textsection)w-s "The one who is made—he's a man!" 41

It will be noted that all of the examples of known provenance (22–26) are from Giza. I feel doubtful that the date of no. 21 is as early as the Third Dynasty, as I have suggested previously, but I am uncertain how much later it may be. Klaus Baer has suggested that no. 22 is no earlier than the reign of Neferirkare in the Fifth Dynasty (Rank and Title in the Old Kingdom [Chicago, 1960] pp. 52 [10], 240). No. 23 is probably even later, as are all the rest.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND SEQUEL

The Old Kingdom evidence that has been presented is, in the first place, sufficient to establish the fact that women's names were frequently given a determinative in situations where a masculine name lacks it. The examples include some cases where the woman is evidently the owner of the monument (18, 19, 26). In no case, however, can it be proven that the monument did not come from the tomb of the man with whom she is associated, and that is certainly true in the case of no. 19 (the owner's mother). Furthermore the distinction is definitely known to occur on the husband's monument in several other instances (for example, 2, 8, 15, 16, 20, 23, 24, 25, 27).

It might be considered, then, whether the distinctive use of the feminine determinative derives from the idea that she is a secondary occupant of her husband's mastaba. But the same determinative is twice given to a daughter when a son lacks it (2, 4), and to a wife when it is omitted from the names of her sons (2, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 23). In the case of no. 23, however, a daughter lacks the determinative as well as a son. The last case is particularly interesting because another man, the builder of the tomb (and in all probability not a kinsman), does have a name-determinative.

Perhaps we should not place too much weight on the cases where the distinction in the use of the determinative is extended to other members of the family, but they suggest that two considerations were simultaneously operative: the first being a tendency to use a feminine determinative to distinguish the female entity from generic Man (俐); 42 the second being a
tendency to apply a determinative to the names of persons who are not so immediately present as the owner of the tomb.

The second consideration is reinforced by the fact that, in some cases, the statue of the owner was not felt to require any inscription whatever, taking its identity from the context of the tomb in which it was placed. And if, in such a case, the owner was a woman, her statue might omit her own name and show only that of her husband (Figure 12). Similarly the statue of a son, in his father’s serdab, might allude to the father without mentioning his name since, here again (example 4), that identity is supplied by the context. This study may, in fact, be regarded as a demonstration of the way in which every aspect of the context—archaeological, iconographic, and epigraphic—may affect a hieroglyphic inscription.

After the Old Kingdom, and particularly during the later part of the Eleventh Dynasty, redundant determinatives were more frequently applied to names on tomb stelae. The majority of the examples are from the Theban area—Dendera, Thebes itself, and Gebelein, but a few cases are known from Naga ed-Deir, and some of these are earlier than the others. The later examples are sometimes to be explained by the semicursive character of the inscriptions, which tends to isolate them from the representations which they accompany. In any case they are exceptional even in the Eleventh Dynasty; they rarely apply the determinative to the wife alone, and not to the owner; and they do not seem to have had a lasting effect of any significance, once the country was reunited and older traditions were re-established. A particularly conspicuous exception is to be found in Beni Hasan tomb 2, dating to the second reign of Dynasty XII, where the representations of the tomb owner’s wife are identified as $\text{X} \text{X}$ while the determinative is consistently omitted from the name of the owner himself, even in those cases where he is not depicted.

I know of only four Middle Kingdom group-statues that omit the determinative after the owner’s name and supply it to the name of his wife. The earliest and clearest example is an Eleventh Dynasty seated couple from Dendera who are named $\text{X} \text{X}$ and

49, line 1, and Kim 15 (1959) pl. 1 [3], following p. 22, and, in addition there is the ideographic use of $\text{X} \text{X}$ (Urk. I, p. 23, line 6, and often elsewhere), which may represent the same word or s (\$); compare Edel, Altägyptische Grammatik I, §53, and Raymond O. Faulkner, The Plural and Dual in Old Egyptian (Brussels, 1929) §30. The writing $\text{X} \text{X}$ also occurs occasionally after the Old Kingdom: Jacques Vandier, Mo‘alla (Cairo, 1950) p. 298; Norman de G. Davies, The Tomb of Anefokhef (London, 1920) pl. 9.

43. Dr. Helmut Nickel informs me that a similar logic was more systematically applied to Viking tombstones; those marking an actual burial are unscribed, while runic inscriptions identify the cenotaphs of those lost at sea. We must suppose, however, that the wife of Mm(l)Shu was named elsewhere in her tomb chapel. The influence of the proprietary context is also to be recognized in the use of Old Kingdom epithets indicating seniority and juniority. In the event that father and son have the same name, a distinguishing epithet may be applied to the son’s name (\$ “junior”) if—as is usually the case—he is shown in his father’s tomb chapel. But in one case, where the father is shown in the son’s tomb chapel, it is the older man who has the epithet; he is $\text{X} \text{X}$ “senior.” And if both are mentioned together in some other context, beyond their own funerary domain, each of them may receive an epithet; in one such example they are given the single name they have in common, which is followed by $\text{X} \text{X}$ “senior and junior.” The evidence is presented at the beginning of a forthcoming article, Egyptian Studies I: “Epithets of Seniority.”

44. W. M. F. Petrie, Denderah (London, 1900) pls. 11 (bottom left, bottom center, and right, second from bottom), 12 (right, second from bottom); J. d’E. 36423 (wife and daughter only), 44301, 44302 ( = CG 20804).

45. J.-J. Clérel and J. Vandier, Textes de la Première Période Intermédiaire (Brussels, 1948) §§ 2 (CG 20003, probably later than the end of Dyn. XI), 14 (Metropolitan Museum 14.2.7), 23 (British Museum 1203—wives only); Naville, Deir el Bahari: Xlth Dyn. I, pl. 17 G, H; III, pls. 2–3, 9 D. Also CG 20007, which may well come from Thebes.

46. CG 1622, CG 1654 (wife only).

47. Dows Dunham, Naga ed-Deir Stelae of the First Intermediate Period (London, 1937) nos. 45, 49, 70 (man, but not wife), 83 (same), 20 (wife only), 81 (wife only), CG 1648 (husband, not wife).

48. At least two examples (Dunham nos. 20 and 45) are evidently earlier than the end of Dyn. VIII.

49. For example, J. d’E. 44301 (from Dendera); Naville, Deir el Bahari: Xlth Dyn. III, pls. 2–3, and the labels of some officials shown in an early Twelfth Dynasty tomb (Newberry, Beni Hasan I, pl. 13). An Old Kingdom example may also be cited, Toledo (Ohio) 49-4, where determinatives follow the names of a son and daughter who are represented in relief on the sides of a seated statue.

50. See above, notes 44–47; at Naga ed-Deir the determinative is sometimes applied to the husband alone.

51. Some later examples (besides CG 20003, mentioned above in note 45): CG 1597, 1753, 20518 (some of the captions); MMA 63.154 (captions of three daughters); Brooklyn Museum 37.1347E (captions of one of two men, and wives of both).

52. Newberry, Beni Hasan I, pls. 12, 18.
Statuary of the New Kingdom generally shows the determinative after the names of both husband and wife, although one Eighteenth Dynasty example, probably dating to the reign of Tuthmosis IV, evidently perpetuates the old distinction (Figure 27). The name of the husband (‘Im‘-k4) lacks a determinative while those of his wife (Nbt‘-Iwnt) and daughter (Mut-nfrt) in both cases end with 5. The inscriptions on the backs and sides show no determinatives whatever.56


54. As exemplified by CG 597, 613, 624, 626, 42126.


56. The same distinction appears on at least two other New Kingdom statues, both in the Cairo Museum: CG 772 and 934, but in the first case both names show determinatives in the inscriptions on the back. All three examples are exceptional.

**Sources Abbreviated**


BMFA—Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts (Boston).

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 Privilegien I–IV (Berlin, 1911–34);

CG 1295–1808: Ludwig Borchardt, Denkmäler des Alten Reiches I–II (Berlin, 1937–64);

CG 20001–20780: H. O. Lange and H. Schäfer, Grab- und Denksteine des Mittleren Reichs I–IV (Berlin, 1902–25);


CG 42126: Georges Legrain, Statues et statuettes de rois et de particuliers I (Cairo, 1906).


JEA—Journal of Egyptian Archaeology.

J. d’E. + number—Monuments in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo, unpublished unless otherwise noted.


Petrie, Denderah—W. M. F. Petrie, Denderah (London, 1900).

PN—Hermann Ranke, Die Ägyptischen Personennamen I–II (Glückstadt, 1935–52).

Pyr.—Kurt Sethe, Die Altägyptischen Pyramidentexte (Leipzig, 1908, 1910).


FIGURE 27
Eighteenth Dynasty couple with daughter. The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Gift of Mrs. S. W. Straus, 25.184.8