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The subject of this brief study is a pair of proto-dynastic schist dishes that were purchased in Luxor during the winter of 1918–1919, when Ambrose Lansing was conducting the Metropolitan Museum’s excavations in the Theban necropolis, across the river. Apart from some astute remarks by William C. Hayes, which will be mentioned presently, little notice has been given to them, and even less notice has been given to an interesting emblematic parallel in the Third Dynasty tomb of Hesi-Re. These three topics will be explored in turn, beginning with the more important of the two dishes.

1. A Hieroglyphic Dish

The elaborate spouted dish illustrated in Figures 1–5 is the most interesting and handsome object in that part of the Museum’s Egyptian collection which antedates the Old Kingdom.1 It is also the most interesting example among a series of schist vessels in which the First Dynasty sculptors exploited their technical mastery to the limit.2 And, perhaps because the craftsman who created it was more fully aware of the limitations of his material, it is much better preserved than the other examples. The delicate plasticity of the design is securely based upon the solid floor of the dish—a precursor of the “negative space” that is so characteristic a feature of later stone sculpture—and there is an ample, though inconspicuous, amount of reinforcement at particularly vulnerable points, such as the narrow juncture of the spout. Not surprisingly, the functional nature of the piece is combined with an elegance of space, shape, and proportion.

The hollowed outer edge of the dish is enclosed by a pair of arms, the slenderness of which is indicative of their hieroglyphic character, representing the sign LI (k3, “spirit”). They are displayed in low relief on sides and back, with the hands emerging more completely

1. Acc. no. 19.2.16. Length 17.5 cm., width 14.5 cm. Provenance unknown, but in view of the fact that it was purchased in Luxor, Abydos is a possibility. Previously illustrated by N. E. Scott, The Home Life of the Ancient Egyptians: A Picture Book (New York, 1944) fig. 25; C. Aldred, The Egyptians (London, 1961) pl. 3; W. C. Hayes, The Scepter of Egypt, I (New York, 1953) p. 43, fig. 31.

2. W. B. Emery, Great Tombs of the First Dynasty, I (Cairo, 1949) p. 101, fig. 58, pl. 40 (a, b) (also W. S. Smith, Art and Architecture of Ancient Egypt [London, 1958] pl. 9 [a]); W. B. Emery, The Tomb of Hemaka (Cairo, 1938) p. 40, pl. 19 (also W. B. Emery, Archaic Egypt [Harmondsworth, 1961] pl. 39 [a]); Emery, Archaic Egypt, pl. 38 (a); P. Montet, “Tombeaux des Ier et IVe dynasties à Abou-Roach,” Kemi 8 (1946) pp. 176–177, pl. 5. Cf. J.-Ph. Lauer, La Pyramide à Degrés: Compléments, III (Cairo, 1939) pp. 10–11, fig. 16. A First Dynasty example in limestone is shown by Emery, Archaic Egypt, pl. 35 (a); those of the following dynasty, made of schist and other stones, are heavier and less refined, as illustrated by Emery’s pls. 35 (b) and 39 (b).
FIGURE 1
Ritual vessel. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 19.2.16
FIGURES 2–4
Top, rear, and side views of the Metropolitan Museum’s ritual vessel

FIGURE 5
Structure of the Metropolitan Museum’s ritual vessel
in the round. This device similarly frames at least two protodynastic schist cosmetic palettes (Figure 6), but in the present case its meaning is more explicit, for the arms present an emblem that is evidently to be interpreted as an archaic form of the hieroglyph \( n\textbf{r} \) ("nr", "life"). The lower part of the sign serves as a spout, and the three loops of the upper part are inconspicuously pierced with apertures of diminishing width so that water could flow throughout the emblem and become imbued with its potency. This idea is akin to that of the much later "cippi of Horus," such as the Metternich stela (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, acc. no. 50.85), over which water was poured so that the virtue of the stela's magical spells could be tapped for the relief of stings and bites. In the present case, however, the water was almost certainly intended for lustration or libation, and a similar combination of rectangle and projecting spout is echoed in a receptacle used for bathing, as represented at the beginning of the Fourth Dynasty (Figure 7).

The lustration ritual of ancient Egypt, whether it was performed for the living or for the dead, was intended as much more than a purification. As evidenced by the Old Kingdom Pyramid Texts, as well as later scenes from tombs and temples, it also provided the recipient with life. In New Kingdom depictions of lustrations the stream of water takes the form of a series of \( s\textbf{h} \)-signs, sometimes alternating with \( s\textbf{n} \), emblematic of "power" (Figure 8). One unusual example shows water poured over a god from a vessel that is held by

3. J. E. Quibell, *Archaic Objects, Catalogue général du Musée du Caire* (Cairo, 1904–1905) nos. 14234, 14235. In neither case is the provenance known; but both show signs of wear at the center, as well as traces of green eye-paint. I am not altogether certain about the authenticity of a third example, which is illustrated in Henri Asselberghs, *Chaos en Beheerings* (Leiden, 1961) no. 107, pl. 59.


FIGURE 8
Detail of a Twenty-first Dynasty funerary papyrus. Cairo Museum, T. 14/7/35/6 (photo: Archives photographiques, Paris)

FIGURE 9
Drawing on an erased relief of Queen Hatshepsut, Karnak

the ḫ-sign (Figure 9), and in other cases the lustration of the king is poured from a jar in the form of ḫ, combining ḫ and ḫ. This type of vessel more commonly served for libations to the gods, and, in a funerary context, the Pyramid Texts speak of the quickening and rejuvenating effects of cold water offered to the deceased, for example, “A libation is poured! Wake up O sleepers!” In both cases, for purification as well as libation, these texts refer to the water as an exudation that has come forth from Osiris, or “the water which is in thee.” It accordingly seems appropriate that it be dispensed by one’s own ka, but it should be noted that the ka shares the same benefit; one spell says: “Purify thyself. Thy ka purifies himself. He sits and he eats with thee.” If, as these texts suggest, the spouted dish was employed to confer some benefit upon its owner after his death, with the help of his ka, the distinction between lustration and libation becomes difficult, for there was

7. H. Nelson, “Certain Reliefs at Karnak and Medinet Habu,” Journal of Near Eastern Studies 8 (1949) pl. 23. Here the ḫ-sign replaces the erased figure of Queen Hatshepsut, but the same idea is depicted in other cases, e.g., the ḫ-sign with arms enclosing offerings: Oriental Institute, Medinet Habu, VII (Chicago, 1964) pl. 512.
8. Discussed by G. Jéquier, “Materiaux pour servir à l’établisse-

9. Pirt. 1010–1011. Pirt. 1878 has “Arise ye who are in your tombs, cast off your bindings.”
11. Pirt. 789, 1357. Cf. Pirt. 683: “N. is pure and his ka is pure.”
a tendency to regard them as one and the same when the object of the ritual was not immediately at hand.\textsuperscript{12}

While there is no question that its principal function was to "present life" by means of the water poured out of it, the dish may also embody a second idea; as William C. Hayes has suggested,\textsuperscript{13} it may spell out the name of an official called \(\text{"nh-kr[.i?]}\), who is well known from sealings on wine jars of the reign of Den, the fifth king of the First Dynasty.\textsuperscript{14} As will presently be seen, the form of the \(\text{\(\hat{}\)}}\)-emblem would suit that date, as would the workmanship of the dish; nearly all of the protodynastic schist vessels that show the greatest degree of virtuosity derive from tombs dated to the same reign.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{12} Cf. H. Bonnet, \textit{Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte} (Berlin, 1952) p. 425.
\textsuperscript{13} Hayes, \textit{Scepter}, I, p. 42.
\textsuperscript{14} Perhaps to be read \(\text{\(\mathfrak{k}t[.i\}^{-nh{}[\omega]}\), "my spirit lives." For references (all on jar sealings) see A. Klasens, "Een Grafsteen uit de eerste dynastie," \textit{Oudheidkundige Mededelingen uit het Rijksmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden} N. R. 37 (1956) p. 20 (20). Klasens, "The Excavations of the Leiden Museum of Antiquities of Abu-Roash," \textit{Oudheidkundige Mededelingen . . . N. R. 42 (1961) p. 125, and Emery, \textit{Great Tombs}, III (London, 1958) pls. 79 (16), 80 (26-29), 81 (30-32). One example (W. M. F. Petrie, \textit{Tombs of the Courtiers} [London, 1925] pl. 5 [5]) is as early as Djer; the rest are dated to Den and his queen Merneith. Cf. also P. Kaplony, \textit{Die Inschriften der ägyptischen Frühzeit}, I (Wiesbaden, 1965) p. 455, where the suggested reading is \(\text{\(\text{\(\hat{}\)}}\)-ks}, "he whose ka lives." Kaplony thinks that there were two officials bearing this name in the reign of Den.
\textsuperscript{15} The first of the examples cited above, in note 2, comes from the tomb of an official who served under Den and his successor. The second example, from the so-called tomb of Hemaka, and the one published by Montet are linked to no other king than Den. The one first illustrated in Emery's \textit{Archaic Egypt} is similarly "dated to the middle First Dynasty."
Emblematic combinations of hieroglyphs are not uncommon in hieroglyphic writing, the best-known example being the use of \( \text{ḥn} \) in place of \( \text{ḥn} \) in the writing of \( \text{md} \), “give birth,” where the emerging child is replaced by the phonetic sign for \( \text{md} \). A First Dynasty example of such a combination in a personal name is provided by the customary writing of the Horus Aha (Figure 10), in which the falcon holds the hieroglyph \( \text{ḥg} \) (‘ḥ3). An even closer parallel seems to occur on one of the wooden niche panels from the Third Dynasty mastaba of Hesi-Re, also known as \( \text{ḥg} \) (‘ḥ3), where he holds a large \( \text{ḥg} \)-jar, the type of jar generally used for libations (Figure 11). This example will be discussed at greater length in Part 3 of this article.

There is some question, however, whether the \( \text{ḥg} \)-sign would be symbolically presented to a nonroyal person even if he possessed so appropriate a name. If the vessel did belong to Ankha-ka, we must assume that this emblem was used more freely at the beginning of the Dynastic Period than it was thereafter. There is no direct evidence to this effect, but the \( \text{ḥg} \)-emblem, which is closely related to \( \text{ḥg} \) and is interchanged with it in various contexts, encircles the necks of two officials on reliefs dating to the early Old Kingdom, after which it disappeared as a necklace, but is sometimes held in the hand, precisely like the \( \text{ḥg} \)-sign, by divinities in Old Kingdom statuary.23

Here it should be noted that, of the various readings that have been proposed for \( \text{ḥg} \), the name conventionally read as “Den,” one alternative neatly fits the possibility that the libation vessel was made for the king himself; according to Kurt Sethe the pair of hieroglyphs should be transliterated \( \text{ḥg-mw} \), “he who gives water.” But his interpretation remains uncertain, and even if it could be confirmed, it would have no specific application to the form of the lustral vessel beyond the probability that a king of such a name may well have possessed one of exceptional quality. And in such a case one might perhaps expect a costlier material than schist. It remains possible, of course, that the king “who gives water” had such a vessel specially made for his courtier named Ankha-ka, but that possibility is, to say the least, as remote as it is tempting.

Regardless of the question of royal or nonroyal ownership, there can be little doubt that the central emblem of the dish is, in fact, the sign of life. That point seems established by the later connection between life and lustration as well as by the fact that the emblem is held in the hands of the \( \text{ḥg} \)-sign. The only other emblem with which it might be identified—the so-called Isis knot (\( \text{ḥg} \))—is as closely associated with \( \text{ḥg} \) as \( \text{ḥg} \);25

16. This and other “ideographische Verbindungen” are dealt with by E. Edel, Altagyptische Grammatik, I (Rome, 1955) par. 62; for a further example see H. G. Fischer, “An Early Occurrence of \( \text{ḥn} \) servant,” MDIK 16 (1958) pp. 135-137. Similar writings were more commonly adopted in the later periods, as cryptographic alternatives to the usual orthography; for example, the monogram for \( \text{ḥp-di-niset} \) is used by J. Clère in Studi in memoria di I. Rosellini, II (Pisa, 1955) pp. 35-42; cf. E. Drioton, “Recueil de cryptographie monumentale,” ASAE 40 (1940) pp. 305-429.

17. The example in Figure 10 is taken from W. B. Emery, Hor-Aha (Cairo, 1939) p. 20, fig. 13; cf. W. M. F. Petrie, Royal Tombs, II (London, 1901) pl. 3; similarly for \( \text{ḥg} \) for \( \text{ḥg} \) (Petrie, Royal Tombs, II, pl. 2 [12]); \( \text{ḥg} \) for \( \text{ḥg} \) (Petrie, Royal Tombs, II, pl. 13); occasional writings of the name of the Horus Djer with \( \text{ḥg} \) perched on the sign \( \text{ḥg} \) (Petrie, Royal Tombs, II, pl. 15 [105, 106]) and the stela of this king, H. G. Fischer, “An Egyptian Royal Stela of the Second Dynasty,” Artibus Asiae 24 (1961) fig. 6 facing p. 53 (the drawing of P. Newberry in PSBA 96 [1914] pl. iii, 1, is not accurate in this respect). Also the combination \( \text{ḥg} \) surmounted by a panther, for \( \text{ḥg} \) in nb(1)ext ‘nd, the epithet of Mafdet (Petrie, Royal Tombs, II, pl. 7 [10] and 1 [London, 1900] pl. 7 [4]; cf. W. K. Simpson in American Journal of Archaeology 67 [1963] p. 86).

18. J. E. Quibell, Excavations at Saqqara (1911-12): The Tomb of Hesy (Cairo, 1913) pl. 7 (3).

19. I discuss the later history of this question in a forthcoming issue of AÄ 99.


21. G. Jéquier, “Les talismans \( \text{ḥg} \) et \( \text{ḥg} \),” BIFAO 11 (1914) pp. 142-143; also P. Lacau and H. Chevrier, Une Chapelle de Sésostris I à Karnak (Cairo, 1936) p. 143.


23. Mycerinus triad, Cairo J. d’Entrée 40679 (G. Reisner, Mycerinus [Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1931] pl. 43 [b, d]); Sahure dyad, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, acc. no. 18.2.4 (Hayes, Scepter, I, fig. 46 on p. 70).


Unlike these two emblems, however, it was not held in the hands before the Eighteenth Dynasty,26 but was characteristically suspended. The difference in usage may be seen in a Twelfth Dynasty relief that has been cited as a parallel presentation of ♂ and ♂ (Figure 12).27 The ♂-sign was regularly held by anthropomorphic gods, using the loop as a handle, from the Second Dynasty onward;28 it seems to have been extended in the same manner from the claws of the Horus falcon at the very beginning of the First Dynasty.29

26. As pointed out in the forthcoming article mentioned in note 19.
29. Kaplon, Inschriften, III, pl. 5 (5); cf. P. Newberry’s drawing in W. Brunton et al., Great Ones of Ancient Egypt (New York, 1930) fig. 6, p. 45. The falcon presenting the ♂-sign is not otherwise attested before the Third Dynasty (Djoser).
Two comparable emblems, both on ivory fragments dating to the reign of Den or earlier (Figure 13), appear in segments of friezes, alternating with the emblem \( \overset{1}{\text{z}} \). As far as the later evidence is concerned, this context would suit either \( \overset{2}{\text{z}} \) or \( \overset{3}{\text{z}} \). However that may be, the emblem in question represents a three-looped bow that differs in only one particular from the form of \( \overset{4}{\text{z}} \) that is known from inscriptions. In the first case, all the elements are presented edgewise (Figure 14, left), while in the second case the lateral elements are turned ninety degrees so that only one side of the loop is visible (Figure 14, right). In both cases the lower ends may also be flattened out and brought together, as was usual from the Second Dynasty onward. I believe that the first of these alternatives, showing all the elements in profile, was adopted for the libation dish primarily because this provided a system of walls for the compartments and spout, and not because an emblem other than \( \overset{4}{\text{z}} \) was intended.

The explanation that has just been suggested strongly supports Heinrich Schäfer’s conclusion that \( \overset{2}{\text{z}} \) and \( \overset{3}{\text{z}} \) originally had the same meaning, for their structure is even more closely identical than he supposed. A further confirmation is provided by an early Second Dynasty combination of \( \overset{5}{\text{z}} \) and \( \overset{6}{\text{z}} \) (Figure 15), which later became a combination of \( \overset{7}{\text{z}} \) and \( \overset{8}{\text{z}} \) (Figure 16), as it remained in the dynasty following.

The form \( \overset{4}{\text{z}} \) was evidently adopted as a hieroglyph because of its simplicity and clarity. As a hieroglyph it acquired the more explicit meaning of a sign that,

---

30. The first (Petrie, Royal Tombs, II, pl. 6 [1]) is from the tomb or cenotaph of Djer, the second (Petrie, Royal Tombs, II, pl. 39 [34] is from that of Queen Merneith.

31. For a hieroglyphic example from the tomb of Semerkhet see Petrie, Royal Tombs, I, pl. 7 (4).

32. Schäfer, “Djed-Pfeiler,” Griffith Studies, p. 429. On p. 426 he defines the difference between the two emblems in terms of a division in the lateral elements of \( \overset{4}{\text{z}} \), which, as will be pointed out presently, does not seem to have occurred until the Fourth Dynasty.

33. The first combination is from the reign of Ni-netjer: W. M. F. Petrie, Gizeh and Rifeh (London, 1907) pl. 5 e (bottom left); cf. Kaplony, Inschriften, III, fig. 746. The second is from the reign of Kha-sekhemwy: J. E. Quibell, Hierakonpolis, I (London, 1900) pl. 2. Cf. W. Schäfer, “Der Reliefschmuck der Berliner Tür,” MDIK 4 (1933) p. 3, fig. 2 (d, g), where combinations of \( \overset{4}{\text{z}} \) and \( \overset{1}{\text{z}} \), and \( \overset{6}{\text{z}} \) and \( \overset{1}{\text{z}} \), are also exhibited (a, b).

34. Schäfer, “Der Reliefschmuck,” MDIK 4, fig. 2 (c, e) (cf. C. M. Firth and J. E. Quibell, The Step Pyramid [Cairo, 1925] pl. 43 and (f) (Quibell, Tomb of Hesy, pl. 17).
being held, indicates divinity, the power to bestow life. In the more ornamental variation, \( \ddot{\alpha} \), the lateral loops have gradually drooped downward, whereas in the \( \dddot{\alpha} \)-hieroglyph they maintain their horizontal position.

By the beginning of the Fourth Dynasty the conventionalized knot at the center of \( \dddot{\alpha} \) had become elongated and was sometimes vertically divided (Figure 17), as though it represented a superimposed binding,\(^{36}\) and the horizontal projections fairly consistently showed

35. As Margaret Murray points out in “Knots,” *Ancient Egypt* 1922 (London) pp. 14–19, there was a reluctance to represent knots very realistically prior to the Middle Kingdom. A reef knot was shown as early as the Sixth Dynasty, but this is evidently an exception (A. Mariette, *Les Mastabas de l’Ancien Empire* [Paris, 1889] p. 240).

36. Figure 17 is taken from A. Fakhry, *The Monuments of Sneferu at Dahshur*, II, part 1 (Cairo, 1961) fig. 44 (cf. fig. 43, with restoration of the two arms attached to \( \dddot{\alpha} \)). Figure 18 is from F. Bisson de la Roque and J. J. Clère, *Rapport sur les Fouilles de Médamoud* (1927), *Fouilles de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire* 5 (Cairo, 1928) pl. 7. The vertical divisions also appear in the knot of \( \dddot{\alpha} \) : Schäfer, “Der Reliefschmuck,” *MDIK* 4, fig. 2 (c), and Firth and Quibell, *Step Pyramid*, pl. 58, both Third Dynasty (Djoser).
a longitudinal division that extended to the very end. This detail was probably assimilated from the vertical division of the lower part, as in the case of a Twelfth Dynasty example in which a further division was added throughout (Figure 18). In any case the subdivision of the horizontal projections is not an original feature of the sign, although it conceivably was intended to suggest the presence of the two sides of the original loops.37

In view of the identity of $\frac{\pi}{4}$ and $\frac{\pi}{8}$ in the Archaic Period, it is possible that the ornamental inscription shown in Figure 19, which is carved on the lid of a Second or Third Dynasty ivory box from Helwan, is to be read 'nh-htp, "The Living One is Content" (with $\frac{\pi}{8}$ repeated for the sake of symmetry).38 Similarly the bow at the neck of the bst-emblem in the Koffer collection (Figure 20) might be regarded as an $\frac{\pi}{4}$-sign, worn in the same manner as the $\Phi$-necklace mentioned earlier, but it may be inadvisable to refer to subsequent examples of $\frac{\pi}{4}$ in the same way, since this form gradually acquired a distinct identity as an ornamental bow.39 Even as late as the Eighteenth Dynasty, however, it remained strongly associated with $\frac{\pi}{4}$, being employed as a permissible substitute for this in the hands of nonroyal anthropoid coffins and shawabty figurines.40

2. A DISH IN THE FORM OF A LOTUS LEAF

In view of the fact that it was purchased with the libation dish, the schist object shown in Figures 21–23 must also be given some notice, with attention to the possibility that these two pieces may have been associated.41 Unfortunately, it seems likely that the curved edge of the leaflike form was trimmed down in ancient or more recent times in order to eliminate some chipping that made the implement less serviceable or attractive.42 If the edge has been reworked, the end of the stem may also have been trimmed for the same reason. But it is difficult to conceive of the stem as a link to a larger composition, fashioned from one and the same piece of stone; and if the end of the stem is intact, its widening diameter could not have enabled it to be securely mortised to a second piece.

Regardless of these considerations, the object certainly represents a lotus leaf, as may be seen from the notch at the bottom, and the attachment of the stem.43

37. Until and unless there is earlier evidence for the division that extends to the outer edges, Schäfer’s distinction between this and the lateral loops of $\frac{\pi}{4}$ ("Djed-Pfeiler," Griffith Studies, p. 426) does not seem valid. For the same reason G. Jéquier, "Les talismans," BIFAO 11 (1914) p. 135, thinks that the lateral elements are "une autre tige plus courte ou un faisceau de petites brindilles posées horizontalement." W. Westendorf ("Beiträge aus und zu den medizinischen Texten," AAZ 92 [1966] p. 152) also takes them to be a separate element, viz., the hieroglyph $\frac{\pi}{4}$; this comparison again supposes that the horizontal division is original, for $\frac{\pi}{4}$ has four ends; cf. the examples given by Murray, "Knots," Ancient Egypt 1922, pp. 17–18, figs. 34–37.

38. Figure 19 is drawn from a photograph in Zaki Saad, Royal Excavations at Saqqara and Helwan (1941–1945) (Cairo, 1947) pl. 15 (a). For the name 'nh-htp (or Htp-'nh) see H. Ranke, Die Ägyptischen Personenamen, I (Glückstadt, 1935) pp. 66 (6), 258 (2); all the references are Middle Kingdom (with the exception of a possible example of later date, notice 89 below), but there is no reason to think the name may not have occurred earlier; cf. H. Junker, "Der Lebendige" als Gottesbeiname," Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1954, no. 12, p. 180. For a later parallel for the symmetrical repetition of 'nh, see the center of the false door in P. A. A. Boerger, Beschreibung der ägyptischen Sammlung des niederländischen Reichsmuseums der Altertümer in Leiden, II (The Hague, 1909) pl. 7 (8).


40. As pointed out in the forthcoming article mentioned in note 19 above.

41. Acc. no. 19.2.17. Maximum height 18.1 cm., width 11.4 cm. It has not been illustrated previously, but is mentioned as a "slate dish of intricate design ... carved in the shape of a leaf" by Hayes, Stepler, I, p. 42.

42. The rather crudely beveled edge of the leaf probably accounts for the lack of symmetry, as well as the fact that only the very beginning of the uppermost veining is to be seen on the underside. Traces of a sandy accretion seem to be visible in a pitted portion of the beveled edge, and I am inclined to think the reshaping is ancient, but cannot be certain that it is not quite recent, as stated on the Museum’s catalogue entry, and on at least one exhibition label.

43. Since some of the outer edge has evidently been lost, it remains uncertain which of the two types of lotus known to the most ancient Egyptians it represents—the white (Nymphaea lotus Sav.) or the blue (Nymphaea caerulea L.). As L. Keimer points out, the dentated edge of the white variety is rarely represented in Egyptian art ("Note sur la représentation exacte d’une feuille de Nymphaea Lotus L.,” ASAE 28 [1928] pp. 38–42; "Nouvelles recherches au sujet du Potamogonum Lucens L.,” Revue de L’Egypte Ancienne 2 [1929] pp. 232–235). The leaf-shaped vessel cited in the next note does have such an edge, but its convoluted form and fragmentary state leave its identification somewhat in doubt.
**FIGURE 21**
Dish in the form of a lotus leaf, upper side. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 19.2.17

**FIGURE 22**
Underside of the dish shown in Figure 21

**FIGURE 23**
Drawings of the underside and profile of the dish shown in Figure 22
The pattern of veining is schematic but is realistically differentiated on the two sides, carved in relief on the underside and incised on top. Similar relief veining appears on the bottom of a fragmentary bowl dating to the reign of Den.44

Assuming that its present form reflects no more than marginal modification, and that the stem served as a handle, this projection would have been held between the thumb and index finger, or more probably between the thumb and middle finger with the index extended along the underside of the leaf for support. Manipulated in this way, it might have been utilized as a serving dish.

The possible association of the lotus dish and libation dish is suggested not only by their origin, but by the similarity of scale and material. The schist of the lotus dish is bluish gray rather than dark green, however, and the workmanship is somewhat inferior. Although it is undoubtedly protodynastic, there is less certainty that it belongs precisely to the middle of the First Dynasty. And while libation vessels—albeit of quite different form—were used in later periods, there is, to my knowledge, no evidence for a food server of this kind in the presentation of offerings.

It might further be considered that the lotus leaf, equated with the upper part of the hieroglyph ∮ (Figure 24),45 might effect a symbolic multiplication of offerings placed upon it. But, unlike the ∮-sign on the libation vessel, the hieroglyph is not otherwise known to have been associated symbolically with any implement used in the offering rituals.46 In the face of so many uncertainties, it seems best to draw no conclusions from the fact that the two schist pieces were acquired together.

3. PERSONAL NAMES: EMBLEMATIC ALLUSIONS AND IDEOGRAPHIC COMBINATIONS

The panel of Hesi-Re, which has been mentioned earlier in connection with the emblematic aspects of the schist libation dish, is very fragmentary and, perhaps for that reason, has received scarcely any of the attention that has been given to its more complete counterparts from the same Third Dynasty mastaba. Enough is preserved, however, to show that one hand grasps a ∮-jar, while the other holds a round object between the thumb and flattened palm (Figure 25). It might be considered that these appurtenances represent the priestly side of Hesi-Re’s activities, just as, on the other panels as well as this one, the scribal kit betokens his administrative functions.47 Yet it seems unlikely, to judge from royal statuary of the Sixth Dynasty and later,48 that anyone but the king would be shown handling ritual vessels intended for the service of the gods.

The true explanation is to be found in the context of the panels, or, to put the matter more precisely, in their lack of context. Neither the scribal kit nor the jar is to be found in other two-dimensional representations of the tomb owner dating to the Old Kingdom, but in these cases the tomb owner is commonly surrounded by attendants who keep accounts for him and perform complete with stalk and bulb, but this is a naturalistic representation and probably has no reference to the hieroglyph (L. Keimer, "La signification de l’hieroglyphe ∮," ASAE 48 (1948) pp. 97–100, figs. 10, 11).

47. The titles are conveniently listed by Kaplony, Inschriften, I, pp. 581–584.

48. First attested in royal statuary by the schist statuette in the Brooklyn Museum (acc. no. 39.121); good photographs in Cyril Aldred, Old Kingdom Art in Ancient Egypt (London, 1949) pls. 60–61.

44. W. B. Emery, Hemaka, pl. 19c and (more clearly) Archaic Egypt, pl. 39 (a); see note 2 above.

45. Figure 24 is from one of the Third Dynasty panels of Hesi-Re, Cairo Museum Cat. gén. 1428. The leaf was arranged similarly in the preceding dynasty on the base of the statue of Khasekhem (Quibell, Hierakopolis, I, pl. 40), but was turned sideways, with the notch outward, during the first half of the First Dynasty (Narmer; Quibell, Hierakopolis, I, pl. 26 b; Den, Petrie, Royal Tombs, I, pl. 15 [16, 18]).
other services, including the presentation of the \( \frac{\text{h}}{2} \)-jar.\(^{49}\)

Hesi-Re’s reliefs and paintings are remarkable for the absence of such a retinue,\(^{50}\) and it is doubtless for that reason that he himself carries the items in question. This reasoning is supported by the existence of statues, dating from the Fourth Dynasty onward, that represent the tomb owner as a scribe, for the statue is an isolated monument, lacking the context with which the reliefs were so frequently supplied.\(^{51}\)

There is no parallel in statuary for the \( \frac{\text{h}}{2} \)-jar from before the Twelfth Dynasty, but the single example that is known suggests a very similar conclusion. It belonged to a simple steward who is not given any priestly titles either on the statuette or on the coffin in which it was found;\(^ {52} \) thus isolated with the deceased, it provided, as an intermediary identified with himself, a benefit borrowed from the statuettes of two female offering-bearers stationed outside the coffin, each of whom carries a \( \frac{\text{h}}{2} \)-jar as well as a basket of offerings.\(^ {53}\)

**FIGURE 25**

Lower part of the panel of Hesi-Re illustrated in Figure 11

Even if the \( \frac{\text{h}}{2} \)-jar was placed in Hesi-Re’s hand for some such reason as this, it is difficult to believe that it did not, at the same time, allude to his name, and that it would not have been recognized as such by anyone who knew him by the shorter version of his name, Hesy. A rather similar emblematic allusion to the most distinctive element of a name occurred in at least one other instance during the Old Kingdom; the false door of a man named \( N \text{ht}-\text{s3}.i \), “Her protection is mighty,” shows a large \( \text{s3} \)-sign (\( \frac{\text{s}}{3} \)) superimposed on a miniature replica of a false door behind the owner (Figure 26).\(^ {54}\)

The round object in Hesi-Re’s other hand may be a flat loaf of bread \( (\text{\( \frac{\text{o}}{\text{r}} \)\( \text{\( \frac{\text{o}}{\text{r}} \)\)}}) \) or a lump of natron. The position of the hand favors the first alternative, but does not rule out the second. The second alternative is favored by the size of the object, but this does not rule out the first. Perhaps the lump of natron is the more likely alternative, since it is known to accompany the funerary ritual of libation/lustration.\(^ {55}\) In either case one might expect the fingertips to be curled upward; it would seem that they were extended in order to reveal the object’s round contour as clearly as possi-

---

49. For an example of both see H. Junker, *Gizeh*, II (Vienna and Leipzig, 1934) figs. 18, 19.


51. For the earliest examples, belonging to Ka-wab, the son of Cheops, see W. S. Smith, *A History of Egyptian Sculpture and Painting in the Old Kingdom* (London, 1946) pp. 30–31. The generic scribal statue should be distinguished from other cases where an implement is more specifically emblematic; as far as I know, the only example of this kind that antedates the New Kingdom is the Second or Third Dynasty statue of a shipbuilder \( (\text{\( \frac{\text{s}}{3} \)\( \text{\( \frac{\text{s}}{3} \)\)}}) \) who has an adze over his left shoulder (British Museum, no. 70: Hieroglyphic Texts, VI [London, 1922] pl. 19; E. A. W. Budge, *Egyptian Sculptures in the British Museum* [London, 1914] pl. 1).


FIGURE 26
Detail of the false door of Nḥt-st.ā.
After Mariette

57. Thanks to the kindness of Labib Habachi and Henry Riad, I have been able, at the last minute, to check this detail on a photograph that was taken under different lighting. It should also be noted that the hand is represented, for the sake of clarity, as though viewed from the other side. This peculiarity does not occur on the other surviving panels of Hesi-Re, but is known from a Third Dynasty relief of only slightly later date (A. H. Gardiner, T. E. Peet, and J. Černý, The Inscriptions of Sinai, 2nd ed. [London, 1952, 1955] pl. 1 [i 3a] and p. 53, where it is recognized that the king in question is Sekhemkhet, the successor of Djoser). For this last example, cf. W. S. Smith, A History of Egyptian Sculpture and Painting in the Old Kingdom, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1949) p. 273, fig. 32. Dr. Habachi assures me that no detail is to be seen within the disk.


59. Cf. A. Erman and H. Grapow, Wörterbuch der Ägyptischen Sprache, II (Leipzig, 1928) p. 401. This distinction was not made in the Archaic Period, to judge from an unpublished stela uncovered by the excavations of the Egyptian Department of Antiquities at Saqqara, which names a “scribe of the document house,” ḫrt hnw, pronounced “the course of the day,” e.g., N. de G. Davies, Mastaba of Ptahhetep and Akhetetep, II [London, 1901] pl. 17, where the sun disk rests on a butcher’s block.

FIGURE 27
Verso of late Middle Kingdom stela. Louvre, C85 (photo: Archives photographiques, Paris)
1. The praenomen of Amenophis III, *Nb-m3't-R* (Figure 28), and that of Ramesses II, *Wsr-m3't-R* (Figure 29), provide the most familiar ideographic combinations of the kind that is first attested from the First Dynasty. In the first case the king (*nb*, "lord") holds or “possesses” the feather representing *m3't*, and his head is surmounted by a sun disk (*R*). In the second case a personification of *m3't*, with the sun disk on her head, holds the hieroglyph *wsr* as though it were a staff. The names of nonroyal individuals are similarly represented by monograms on two statues dating to the Twenty-second Dynasty (Figures 30, 31); one is presumably meaning “May the beautiful child live!”, while the other is “May (the god) Nefertem save him!”

2. Such abbreviations are also to be found in three-dimensional sculpture of the New Kingdom and later.

---


62. This example is taken from the north wall of the chapel to the south of the great temple of Abu Simbel.

63. Figure 30 is from E. Naville, *The Store City of Pithom* (London, 1888) pl. 4; this is British Museum, no. 1007. Figure 31 is from Borchardt, *Statuen und Statuetten von Koenigen und Privatleuten im Museum von Kairo*, III (Berlin, 1930) no. 741, p. 68. These writings may well have been inspired by royal examples such as that of Ramesses III in Oriental Institute, *Medinet Habu*, VIII (Chicago, 1970), pl. 643.
for example, the seated figure of a queen in a boat in the British Museum, representing the name Mut-m-wis, "Mut is in (her) divine bark"; a contemporary statue in Berlin that presents the praenomen of Mutemweya's royal son, Amenophis III, as described earlier; the well-known statue in the Cairo Museum embodying the name R'-mâ-šw, Ramesses (II), in the form of a child (mâ) who holds ↓ (šw) and wears the sun disk on his head; the statue group representing this king's praenomen (Wîr-mâ'st-R') over the door of his larger temple at Abu Simbel; and the falcon group in the Metropolitan Museum representing Nekht-Hor-heb (Nektanebo II of the Thirtieth Dynasty). In the last case the falcon (Hor) stands behind a smaller figure of the king, who holds a scimitar (for nbt, "mighty") in one hand and the hieroglyph ↓ (ḥb, "festival") in the other; taken together, these elements spell out the name meaning "Horus is mighty in jubilee."

3. Even more remarkable are the rarer cases where an emblem is either supplemented by a hieroglyph or is used as part of a following inscription. One example, dating to the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty, is the fragmentary statue of a man from whose neck a large ↓-pendant is suspended; the hieroglyph ↓ is added below this, and the whole probably represents the owner's name: 'nh-ḥtp. In another case a block statue of the Twenty-third Dynasty has a pendant in the form of ↓, and the column of inscription below it begins with the

67. Most clearly illustrated on the title page of David Roberts, Egypt and Nubia (London, 1846) and in the photograph shown by Labib Habachi, Features of the Deification of Ramesses II, Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, Ägyptologische Reihe 5 (Glückstadt, 1969) pl. 5 (a); cf. Habachi's pp. 9–10 as well as the other rebus writings in statuary of the same king, pp. 37–39, figs. 24–29. It may be added that the statue group over the entrance at Abu Simbel is paralleled by the writing of the king's name within the same temple: ↓↓.
69. E. Naville, The XIIth Dynasty Temple at Deir el-Bahari, part III (London, 1913) p. 22 and pl. 5 (3). Since the principal inscription is lost, it cannot be proven that the combination of hieroglyphs represents the name. The alternative is to interpret both signs as a "motto," like those of the small Middle Kingdom clasps shown in H. E. Winlock, The Treasure of El Lâhûn (New York, 1934) pl. 13. These two hieroglyphs are actually combined in one of the elements of a Middle Kingdom necklace ([J. de Morgan, Fouilles à Dahchour en 1894–1895 [Vienna, 1903] pl. 5 [47]), but it seems likely that this was the central element of a continuous inscription. In the case of the statue the pendant itself is probably simply ↓↓, like the one worn by the Twenty-fifth Dynasty statue of Hor-em-akhet, Cairo Museum, Cat. gên. 42204 (G. Legrain, Statues et Statuettes de Rois et de Particuliers, III [Cairo, 1914] pp. 12–13, pl. 11).
title I Δ. No such title is to be expected, however, and it is perfectly clear that this belongs to the pendant, above it, representing the familiar office of I Δ Π, as elsewhere in the inscriptions of the same statue.

Considering the ease with which hieroglyphs could be used for emblematic purposes, one can hardly find it surprising that this possibility was promptly recognized, and that—in the case of royal monuments at least—it was eventually exploited to the full. If, furthermore, one considers that rebus allusions are also attested on Greek monuments, where the link between writing and representation was far less evident, the paucity of such allusions in the classical periods of Egypt—the Old, Middle, and early New Kingdoms—becomes even more significant. It emphasizes the degree to which, in these periods, the artist-scribe respected the complementary relationship of inscriptions and larger-scale representations; the phonetic aspect of this combination was properly confined to the hieroglyphs, while the larger representations remained purely ideographic.

Postscript: An indirect allusion to a personal name is possibly to be recognized in a late Twelfth Dynasty inscription recently purchased by the Boston Museum of Fine Arts (acc. no. 1971.403); the owner’s name is Ω Π Π, “He who lives,” and in one of his titles (Figure 32), iry mnit, “keeper of the mnit-necklace,” the hieroglyph Ω (or ρ) clearly, and most exceptionally, holds the Ω-sign in place of the knife (?) or the stick and cord.

The ritual vessel Metropolitan Museum 19.2.16 is also mentioned and illustrated by Ursula Schweitzer, Das Wesen des Ka (Glückstadt, 1956) p. 21 and pl. 1a; she reports that Hermann Kees saw a similar piece in the Desert Institute at Esbet Walda in Egypt.

**PERIODICALS ABBREVIATED**

**ASAE**—Annales du Service des Antiquités d’Égypte.

**ÄZ**—Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde.

**BIFAO**—Bulletin de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire.

**BMMA**—The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin.

**MDIK**—Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Abteilung Kairo.

**PSBA**—Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology.

---

70. Cairo Museum, Cat. gén. 42211; Legrain, Statues et Statu-ettes, III, p. 29, pl. 20.


72. To be published in a forthcoming article by William K. Simpson in Chronique d’Égypte. Dr. Simpson has kindly supplied me with a photograph of this piece and has given permission to cite the detail in question.