

PRELIMINARY THOUGHTS ON THE ROLE OF THE ROYAL ADMINISTRATION IN NEW KINGDOM COMMEMORATIVE PRACTICES

LARA WEISS* (RIJKSMUSEUM VAN OUDHEDEN, LEIDEN)

Ever since a wonderful summer internship at the Oriental Institute Chicago in 2008, Emily Teeter has been a great mentor and friend to me. I think we both share a love and curiosity for odd little details as well as for Egyptian religion, and I therefore hope that this article will appeal to her. I would like to thank you, dear Emily, for your kind hospitality and unwavering support.

ROYAL HONOUR AND PRIVILEGE IN THE OLD KINGDOM

In the Old Kingdom, the king appears comparatively frequently in tomb inscriptions: ‘never was his like done for another’ (*n-sp jr.t n ky mj.t=f*) is a well-known quote from the Sixth Dynasty tomb no. 12 at Deir el-Gebrawi, where a son buried his father, the *h3tj-ꜥ* Djau.¹ The quotation celebrates the extraordinary donation king Neferkare (Pepy II) made for this burial out of his treasury, which is mentioned in the line just before the quote. The royal donation included not just the sarcophagus (*krs.w*), clothes (*hbs*), and the festive fragrance from the seven holy oils (*hbs stj-h(3)b*) requested by the son

* This article was written within the framework of ‘The Walking Dead at Saqqara: The Making of a Cultural Geography’ research project, funded by the Dutch Research Council (NWO) within the Vidi-talent scheme as dossier no. 016.Vidi.174.032 and is hosted at the Leiden University Institute for Area Studies (LIAS) between 1 November 2017 to 31 October 2022: <https://www.nwo.nl/projecten/276-30-016-0>. I would like to thank Huw Twiston Davies and Nico Staring for their commitment to the project as well as for their thoughts and feedback, and the Festschrift editorial committee for their fantastic work.

¹ Davies 1902: 12–13, pl. XIII.

for his father's burial, but a lot more. The king is said to have also arranged for the delivery of *kbenti* wood, a second fragrance of the seven holy oils, and 200 more pieces of fine quality linen.² Further down in the text, the son emphasises that he is buried in the same tomb with his father, *not* because he lacked the required permissions to build two tombs, but because he wanted to be united with his father in the afterlife.³ The degree of truth in these words cannot be known since these kinds of statements are a frequent topos in Old Kingdom texts and it is heavily contested how far this and other references prove an actual royal administration of tomb building.⁴ Despite the formulaic character of the text, however, it clearly shows that it was prestigious if the king made a donation to one's burial from his own treasury.⁵ The debate is to what degree this and comparable texts prove actual involvement of the royal administration in tomb construction.⁶ Scholars arguing against an actual involvement of royal administration in tomb building activities usually note the relatively small number of sources available and the absence of clear architectural pattern of the tombs in the various cemeteries that could serve as evidence for the design such as known from ancient Egyptian town planning.⁷ However, whereas sites like workmen's villages are set up at a certain time and built (at least initially) as units, a necropolis evolves slowly over time, which makes it more difficult to maintain accurate building patterns. The absence of these therefore may not serve as a very strong indication against any administrative involvement in necropolis planning. Another matter is the question of how we understand Egyptian society and its administration in general: the question is how strongly bureaucracy needs to intervene in daily life practices before we accept it as actual influence. Recent studies of administration and record keeping by scholars like Christopher Eyre and Juan Carlos Moreno Garcia have demonstrated that we should have a flexible understanding of the work of the ancient Egyptian state and its administration.⁸ Any royal tomb commission system in daily life practice

2 *jw rd.n hm=fjn.t hntj-s krs.w sti-h(3)b sft hn^c D^cw s m h3.tjw m sm^c(.t) nfr.t n rwd šd m pr.wj-hd n hnw n d^cw pn.*

3 *rdi.n(=j) swt krs.t(=j) mjs w^c hn^c sw pn n-mrw.t wnn hn^c=fm s.t w^c.tn-js n tm(=j) wnn hr^c n jr.t js.ty sn.w hr jr.n=(j) nw n-mrw.t m33^c w pn r^c-nb n-mrw.t wnn hn^c=fm s.t w^c.t.*

4 Bolshakov 1991: 204–18, esp. 204–5; Chauvet 2007: 316 and see further references in Kloth 2002: 217–20, and see recently Van Walsem 2020: 117–59, esp. 119 with footnote 7.

5 Kloth 2002: 214–7.

6 Several texts mention the king getting involved e.g. the tomb of Rawer (*temp. Neferirkare*) at Giza cf. Hassan 1932: 18–19, fig. 13, pl. XVIII; Sethe 1932–33: 232 and Allen 1992: 14–20. Note that Eyre 2013: 81 argued that such could record 'cases of special favour, outside normal custom' and see also p. 82 on the reference above. Eyre 2013: 81 argues against using tomb evidence as hard proof for actual practice. He notes that the idea that royal authorisation was mandatory stems from Goedicke 1972–74: 24; Goedicke 1968: 29–30 but had already been criticised by Edel 1981: 23–4. Alexanian 2006: 1–8 returns to the idea of an approval system. Van Walsem 2013: 137 notes that in spite of any potential role of the king it was eventually the tomb owner's own 'achievements and nobody else's which provided him with this tomb' (with reference to the tomb of Seshemhemnefer who took over the tomb of Hesi at Saqqara by explicit royal donation) and see Kanawati 2003: 165.

7 E.g. Chauvet 2007: 315 with references. On town planning of a city like Amarna see e.g. Fairman 1949.

8 Eyre 2013; Moreno García 2013.

should not be imagined too much like our contemporary land registries with their strict procedures. Instead, ancient Egyptian tomb building was probably more loosely organised and driven by a ‘complex interplay between personal wealth, social status, and specific gestures of royal patronage in the location and funding of the tomb’.⁹

ROYAL ADMINISTRATION OF SAQQARA TOMB BUILDING IN THE NEW KINGDOM

Although less explicit in texts after the Old Kingdom,¹⁰ there is also some evidence that the royal administration was in one way or another involved in supervising tomb building in the New Kingdom. Important information is gained from a papyrus dossier found in the mastaba of the Sixth Dynasty vizier Ni‘ankhba, south of the Step Pyramid at Saqqara.¹¹ The dossier is about the construction of the tomb of the royal scribe and general May in the years 15 and 16 of the reign of king Ramesses III. Unfortunately, the existence of the tomb itself has not yet been confirmed by archaeological excavation, but the documentary evidence makes it plausible that its construction was at least planned. What is interesting for the current paper is that the tomb construction work is described as *shn*, a (royal) commission, an expression which is also used for the construction of royal tombs at Thebes.¹² As in the Old Kingdom, it is hard to tell exactly how the tomb administration functioned in daily life practice of the New Kingdom. Yet it seems clear that there was at least some degree of state control, probably once again in a relatively loose sense, but it remains a question for further exploration.¹³

RECONSIDERING THE *hṯp-dj-nsw*.

Let us look at the matter of royal administrative involvement from a different angle, namely following an idea offered by James P. Allen who suggested considering the Egyptian offering formula *hṯp-dj-nsw* as ‘an official imprimatur of the king and the gods for the presence of this monument and its owner in the realm of the afterlife’.¹⁴ One may wonder why such a label would be necessary when the monument itself proved the status of the respective tomb owner and his family, but considering the very limited number of people that could afford such a tomb in ancient Egypt, divine and royal approval was

9 Eyre 2013: 83.

10 For the offering formula on Middle Kingdom statues cf. e.g. Verbovsek 2004: 24–25; 58–59; 82; 110–11; 136 and 168–69. For a lower number of explicit notices of royal donations (*Stiftungsvermerke*) on Middle Kingdom temple statues cf. *Ibid.* 165–66. For a critical perspective on the relatively low number of explicit mentions see Chauvet 2007: 315.

11 JE 52002–4. For the former see Posener-Kriéger 1981 and 1996. JE 52004 is unpublished and has not yet been relocated by Fredrik Hagen and his team. Information thanks to Daniel Soliman.

12 Demarée 2008. Publication of the texts is forthcoming. See also Hagen, Olsen and Soliman forthcoming and Soliman 2017. On *shn* see Erman and Grapow 1930: 217.1–16; Lesko 1987: 77. For *shn* as royal commission see also e.g. Wentz 1990: 39.

13 Compare the ongoing work by Nico Staring on tomb distribution e.g. Staring forthcoming; Raven 2003; 2000. Often quoted in matters of cemetery access is Leahy 1989.

14 Allen 2006.

surely something to state proudly. The fact that the king is omnipresent in the offering formula *htp-dj-nsw*¹⁵ in general should perhaps not be viewed as purely formulaic and a relic of ancient times. Details of what is wished for changed over time, but it is interesting that the formula was used throughout the history of ancient Egypt.¹⁶ While royal action was explicit for (part of) Djau's funerary equipment at Deir el-Gebrawi, scholars seem to agree that the offering formula refers more generally to privileges already granted by the king, commemorated and perpetuated by the *htp-dj-nsw*.¹⁷ Following James P. Allen's lead, and drawing on the Leiden collection, we shall see if there is more to it.

htp-dj-nsw AS EVIDENCE FOR RELIGIOUS PRACTICE

The *htp-dj-nsw* formula appears on statues for the first time during the Middle Kingdom.¹⁸ As a nominalised offering formula, 'the doing of the offering-that-the-king-gives' (*jr.t htp-dj-nsw*) became common not only as an abbreviated reference to the earlier standard offering list,¹⁹ but quite literally as 'a thing' to do for the deceased.²⁰ Examples can be found in both the Middle²¹ and New Kingdoms²² usually promising royal favours to the visitors who recite the *htp-dj-nsw* for the deceased, amongst other benefits.²³ To show just one example, amongst many others, on a statue of the high priest of Ptah Ptahhemnetjer (*temp.* Ramses II) who promises royal favour as well as a peaceful afterlife in return for the successful reciting of the *htp-dj-nsw*.²⁴

This and other references prove that the *htp-dj-nsw* was meant to be performed, although it was probably also in itself performative insofar as its presence already perpetuated the provision of standard offerings, and may have stood in for the king's personal presence in one way or another.²⁵ There is some evidence that suggests that private temple endowments were used for

15 Its literal translation is a nominal phrase, i.e. 'an offering that the king gives' followed by a list of staple foods like beer and bread.

16 Barta 1968.

17 See Allen 2006: 15, with reference to Franke 2003 and see also Satzinger 1997.

18 Verbovsek 2004: 168–69.

19 Barta 1968: 105.

20 In the tomb of Tia and Tia at Saqqara an ostrakon was found on which the formula was written. This might be a nice example of leaving a written formula for the deceased as perpetuated offering, cf. Martin et al. 1997: 74, pl. 104 [75]. The initial interpretation of the find context as a dump can perhaps be challenged.

21 E.g. the Twelfth Dynasty Ity at Dahshur, cf. Shubert 2007: 118–19.

22 E.g. the Eighteenth Dynasty Imaunedjeh in TT 84, cf. Shubert 2007: 209 with reference to Sethe 1909: 939.6–40.1.

23 See also references provided by Barta 1968: 105–6; 137–38; 160; 171.

24 "May the king of your time favour you. May you rest in your tomb(s) in the sacred land, inasmuch as you say a *htp-dj-nsw*" (*hsy=tn nsw n hjw=tn htp=tn hr js=tn m t3 dsr mj dd=tn htp-dj-nsw*). Cf. JE 89046, cf. Shubert 2007: 234 and see also Staring 2018: 94.

25 E.g. Stadler 2005: 152 and compare the discussion of the existing literature summarised e.g. in Weiss 2015.

offerings,²⁶ and that they were part of a kind of funerary contract²⁷ between the deceased and the king. The statue of the chief steward Amenhotep Huy (*temp.* Amenhotep III) exemplifies this idea by addressing all priests and officials ‘who shall be within the walls’ (*hpr.t(y).f(y) m jnb.w*) of the temple of Ptah in Memphis, saying that anyone who might remove his offerings would



FIG. 1: Maya and Merit. (© Rijksmuseum van Oudheden.)

26 Compare e.g. Ashmolean 1913.163, cf. Shubert 2007: 212–13 and Helck 1958: 1798.18–19. For other examples see Kaplony 1965: 302–3 and Verbovsek 2004: 5–8 and 178–79.

27 Morschauser 1991: 179.

be punished by having his office taken away and given to his enemy.²⁸ The offering instalment was apparently granted to Amenhotep as a royal favour.²⁹ Addressees are not just any regular visitors, but professional priests with the explicit task to provide these offerings for the deceased.³⁰

MAYA: AT EYE LEVEL WITH THE KING?

Maya was Overseer of the Treasury under Tutankhamun.³¹ The three larger-than-life statues of Maya of his wife Merit at the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden in Leiden (fig. 1)³² are world-famous as indeed is the story of the rediscovery of their tomb.³³ The statues have been in Leiden since 1829, and excavations of the tomb by the museum together with the Egypt Exploration Society in the late 1980s and early 1990s revealed their original location in the tomb, as well as another statue in the inner courtyard.³⁴ To explain their importance the exceptionally careful carving of the limestone and their size is usually stressed, since – with few exceptions – non-royal individuals in ancient Egyptian history generally did not usually have such large statues.³⁵ Of course size is not everything,³⁶ and other aspects such as material (e.g. limestone vs. more expensive hard stones) played a role in the tomb owners' choices for the design of a statue. Yet the statues' large size in comparison to the majority is evident, and usually explained by Maya's exceptional status.³⁷

28 “Do not obstruct my bread offering which my god, who is within me, has commanded to me in order to pour out water for me at my tomb” (*jmj tn hnty hr p3w.t = j wd(w) n = j ntr = j jmy = j r stt n = j mw hr js = j*). It continues that “(anyone) who shall hold back my bread offering which Ptah-south-of-his-wall has commanded for me (...) being what Amenhotep III has given to me to offer for me at my tomb because my favour is with him” (*nty jw = fr js k p3w.t = j wd n (y = j) Pth-rsj-jnb = f (...) m dd n = j Nb-M3^c.t-R^c r w3h n = j hr js = j n-wr-n hsw = j hr = f*), cf. Shubert 2007: 213 and Helck 1958: 1798.18–19.

29 Or indeed as Morschauser (1991: 181) suggests ‘under the jurisdiction of both the god (including his institutions) and the monarch.’ On the temple estate’s main purpose for the production of offerings see e.g. Haring 2007: 165–70 and Staring 2019: 215. Note that it is unlikely that Amenhotep Huy donated his entire property to the temple. Not only were such statues probably donated during people’s lifetime, but Amenhotep Huy also had a son, Ipy, who probably inherited not only his office, but also a share of his father’s property cf. stela Museo Egizio Florence 2567, cf. Giovetti and Picchi 2016: 254 and see Löhr 1975: 142–44.

30 An interesting aspect to be explored further in the Walking Dead project is the observation that apparently the priests of the Memphis temple could somehow hold back tomb offerings, i.e. that they could illegally set aside offerings, possibly for their own use, even though this would have been considered an abuse of office.

31 For a biographical sketch see Martin et al. 2012: 63–69.

32 In order to keep the number of images and references in this article manageable, for most of the objects in the Leiden collection I refer readers only to the museum’s online database, where photos and literature can be accessed. Visit <https://www.rmo.nl/en/collection/search-collection/> and search by ‘Inventory Number’.

33 Del Vesco et al. 2019; and see most recently Weiss, Staring and Twiston Davies 2020: 13–15.

34 Martin et al. 2012: 24–29; 38–39 and pls 18, 116–30.

35 Maya’s statue (Leiden inv. no. AST 1) is 216 x 74 x 108 cm, his wife Merit’s statue (Leiden inv. no. AST 2) is 190 x 62 x 95 cm, and their double statue (Leiden inv. no. AST 3) is 158 x 94 x 120 cm. There are of course a few others such as the Fourth Dynasty Hemiunu, Roemer- und Pelizaeus-Museum Hildesheim inv. no. 1962: <http://giza.fas.harvard.edu/ancientpeople/1186/full/>. See also Verbovsek 2004: 160 for the matter and an example from the Middle Kingdom.

36 Compare the matter of tomb size recently summarised by Alexanian 2006, with references.

37 For a recent summary of events at the dawn of the Post-Amarna period cf. Van der Perre 2014.

REFLECTIONS ON *htp-dj-nsw* VS. *pr.r.t* IN MAYA'S TOMB

The statues represented the elite couple in their tomb and were meant as focal points for offerings. In this respect the absence of the *htp-dj-nsw* formula on the statues as well as almost everywhere else in the (fragmentary) tomb of Maya and Merit at Saqqara seems curious, and I wondered whether there was a relationship between the king's role in the formula, and the location in tombs and tomb equipment (such as statues) where the formula appears (or does not appear). The formula running over Maya's kilt and Merit's dress is in fact an adapted form of the *htp-dj-nsw* formula saying *pr.r.t nb.t hr whw.t*, i.e. 'everything that comes forth upon the altar' (namely bread, beer etc) for the *kas* of Maya and Merit respectively.³⁸ In this formula it is thus not the king who serves as intermediary to provide the offering as is the case in the standard *htp-dj-nsw*, but it is a participle form that recalls the usual *pr.t-hrw*.³⁹ The king can be absent here, grammatically speaking, because the participle form *pr.r.t* does not need an agent. Sociologically speaking, I wondered whether the powerful Maya might have omitted the young king Tutankhamun on purpose to avoid the implication of the king being an intermediary granting the offering.⁴⁰ Elsewhere in Maya's tomb in relation to offerings to gods, the term *j.w* ('praising' e.g. the adoration of the gods) was favoured.⁴¹ There are two occasions where the *htp-dj-nsw* appears, though: one in Maya's funerary procession, the other in a stela dedicated to Maya and Merit by somebody else, i.e. an adoration by a third person.⁴² The tomb is unfinished and partly demolished and the main offering scenes in the central chapel are missing. Furthermore, in view of the preliminary survey of reliefs and statues in the Leiden collection, we shall see that there is another, more practical, explanation for the distribution of the different types of offering and adoration formulae in Maya's tomb and elsewhere.

htp-dj-nsw VS. *pr.r.t* IN THE LEIDEN COLLECTION

A closer look at the Leiden collection as a case study showed that the *pr.r.t*

38 Martin et al. 2012: 24–28 and pls 18 and 116–30.

39 The 'coming forth of the voice', colloquially translated as 'invocation offering' that usually appears as a kind of summary behind the standard offering list, cf. Erman and Grapow 1926: 528.11 and see also Shubert 2007: 380.

40 On a block now at the Liebieghaus in Frankfurt, Maya calls himself *tsw t3 m sh.r.w*, i.e. 'who unites (i.e. governs) the land with [his] plans' which is strictly (...) a royal epithet, cf. Martin et al. 2012: 68. Jacobus van Dijk has established that Maya had this high status already under Akhenaton as he is probably to be identified as the fan-bearer on the right of the king May who is attested on a statue base now in Copenhagen, cf. ÆIN 102. Unfortunately, the skirt band on a parallel statue of general Horemheb and his wife is left uninscribed and hence cannot provide any clues regarding what Horemheb would have done, cf. BM EA36, cf. Strudwick 2006: 192–93. On the relatively great power of high officials under Tutankhamun cf. e.g. Van der Perre 2014: 101 with reference to van Dijk 1996: 31 and van Dijk 1993: 10.

41 The praise of Osiris in room H, cf. Martin et al. 2012: 42, pl. 39.

42 On a block in Berlin that was destroyed in WWII, cf. Martin et al. 2012: pl. 39. Rock stela 5 has it, but it was not dedicated by Maya himself, but in his veneration by a man whose name has not been preserved, cf. Martin et al. 2012: 41 and pl. 38.

formula found on the statues of Maya and Merit is very common for New Kingdom statues of individuals. In general, none have the standard offering formula on their kilt. Upon further consideration, the idea that their high status could have been an issue for the choice for one form of the offering formula or the other is unconvincing. Rather the solution appeared to be a matter of decorum,⁴³ i.e. the rules of where the respective formula was written, which depended on a conceptual difference regarding the use of different formulae on representations of persons vs. things such as attributes or architectural elements. Yet we shall see that this preliminary survey of distribution of the *hṭp-dj-nsw* adds an interesting 'layer' to Allen's idea of the formula as a status marker.

LEIDEN STATUES

The *pr̄r.t* formula appears frequently on Leiden examples of New Kingdom statues of individuals such as Amennakht (xxi),⁴⁴ Juty,⁴⁵ Ptahmose,⁴⁶ Angeriautef,⁴⁷ and Samut.⁴⁸ A first clue for a possible rule for the distribution of *hṭp-dj-nsw* vs. *pr̄r.t* on the various monumental carriers of writing is provided by the wooden statue of Amennakht (xxi) from Deir el-Medina (*temp.* Ramses II), who has the *pr̄r.t* on his kilt, and the *hṭp-dj-nsw* on both his back pillar and his staff. Both his brother's Khaemtir (i)'s⁴⁹ and his colleague's Ramose (i)'s⁵⁰ statues are uninscribed except for the back pillars which shows the *hṭp-dj-nsw*. Similarly, Juty⁵¹ has the *pr̄r.t* formula on his kilt and the *hṭp-dj-nsw* on the back of his statue. This finding seems to suggest a deliberate difference in use of formula of *pr̄r.t* as restricted to kilts of statues of individuals and *hṭp-dj-nsw* as being used for 'things' such as the statue as such (via the back pillars) or attributes such as staffs. The idea is further supported by the observation that the regular block statue of Samut,⁵² which is shaped as a squatting person, has the *pr̄r.t* on the kilt, whereas the block statue of Tjaneferemheb,⁵³ which has the shape of a naos for the god Ptah (i.e. a thing), has the *hṭp-dj-nsw*. Also, other naophorous statues usually show the *hṭp-dj-nsw* written on the naos, the statue base and/or back pillars (Leiden examples are Hormin,⁵⁴ Tjairy,⁵⁵ Raia,⁵⁶ Iuiu,⁵⁷

43 Baines 1990; see also e.g. Baines and Froot 2011: 17.

44 Leiden inv. no. AH 210; see particularly Davies 1999: 236.

45 Leiden inv. no. AST 10.

46 Leiden inv. no. AST 7 and AST 8. See also Staring 2014: 465.

47 Leiden inv. no. L.X.1. The statue on his knees shows the *hṭp-dj-nsw*.

48 Leiden inv. no. AST 22.

49 Leiden inv. no. AH 209.

50 Leiden inv. no. AH 211.

51 Leiden inv. no. AST 10.

52 Leiden inv. no. AST 22.

53 Leiden inv. no. AST 17.

54 Leiden inv. no. AST 5.

55 Leiden inv. no. AST 6.

56 Leiden inv. no. AST 11.

57 Leiden inv. no. AST 21.

Huy,⁵⁸ Pabes,⁵⁹ Tjaneferehemheb,⁶⁰ and Neferrhenpet⁶¹).⁶²

The naophorous statue of Hormin (*temp.* Ramses II) from his tomb in Saqqara⁶³ sheds further light on the matter. Hormin kneels in front of a small naos featuring the god Osiris. On the back of the statue an appeal to the living is written.⁶⁴ His request for verbalizing 1000 of bread and beer is a very abbreviated request to recite the *htp-dj-nsw*, which is usually followed by 1000 of bread, beer, fowl, etc.; interestingly here without mention of either the king or a god as contributor (or donor?).⁶⁵ The traditional *htp-dj-nsw* in favour of the gods Osiris and Re-Horakhty is written on the frame of the naos and on both sides. This suggests a dual meaning of the *htp-dj-nsw* as on the one hand marking the royal privilege on the tomb equipment (i.e. the naos, the staff or the statue), and on the other hand, symbolizing an actual performance of the *htp-dj-nsw* offerings, which is done by reciting (*dd*) and/or physical placement of offerings (*jr*) in front of the statue. In other words, it seems that the nominal *htp-dj-nsw* refers to both privilege and action on ‘things’ in the wider sense,⁶⁶ whereas the participle *pr.r.t* on ‘people’ anticipates the *htp-dj-nsw*’s eternal immanence (again in the sense of performance of privilege and action, but yet accomplished in perpetuation for eternity). While the statues would also be considered ‘things’ from our modern perspective, for the ancient Egyptians it was clear that they gained life and the ability to act through the opening of the mouth ritual.⁶⁷ When exactly this vivification of the statues happened, i.e. during the funeral or earlier, is hard to tell. For the Old Kingdom, Andrey Bolshakov suggested that the initial placement of the first statue in a tomb could have initiated the cult of the tomb owner.⁶⁸ In this respect we should remember that tombs were usually built during the lifetime of their owners. The distinctive use of the two types of formulae plays on the two levels, marking both royal approval and privilege in this life, and

58 Leiden inv. no. AST 13.

59 Leiden inv. no. AM 108-a.

60 Leiden inv. no. AST 17.

61 Leiden inv. no. AST 16.

62 Interestingly, a few shabtis in the dress of the living also have the *pr.r.t* on their kilts, e.g. Leiden inv. no. AST 63 (Ahmose) and L.VII.7 (Nakhtamun). The former has the *htp-dj-nsw* on its body, the latter the typical *shd*-formula.

63 Leiden inv. no. AST 5.

64 “O all people, all subjects of the king and every scribe, who shall see this statue! May they say 1000 of bread and beer for the lord of this resting place, for the ka of the royal scribe, the overseer of the royal apartments Hormin” (*j.rmt nb rh.yt nb.w.t sš nb nty jw=sn r m33 n hn.t pn jh dd=sn h3 m t hnq.t n nb js pn n k3 sš-nsw jmy-r3 jp.t-nsw hr-mn*). For *rh.yt*, cf. Erman and Grapow 1928: 447.9–48.2.

65 Parallels listed by Shubert 2007, 382 are the statue of lunny from Deir Durunka (MMA 33.2.1), statue of Paser from Deir el-Bahri (CG 561), statue of Pahemnetjer from Saqqara (JE 89046), two Theban statues of Didia (Louvre C50 and CG 42122), and a Karnak statue of Roma-Roy (CG 42186).

66 Compare Eyre 2013: 131 who sees the mentioning of the king’s favour in tomb inscriptions as both ‘asserting authority for the endowment, and an expectation of perpetual protection of the cult’.

67 See e.g. Lorton 1999 with references. Here is not the place to engage into the discussion of object agency, for a brief state of the art with references cf. Brown and Walker 2008.

68 Bolshakov 1991: 208. In spite of recent criticism by Shirai 2006: 325–26, Bolshakov’s arguments still hold true.

ensuring eternal perpetuation of ritual in both this life and the next. Thereby the two formulae thus yet again seem to support this dual function of Egyptian tombs in terms of both social and religious matters and revealing the religious meaning underlying the choice of decorum as one or the other, and again, most often both.

LEIDEN TOMBS

This idea of an explicit choice in formula for ‘people’ vs. ‘things’ is further supported by some Leiden examples of reliefs from Saqqara tombs: the stela of Meryptah (*temp.* Amenhotep III) that shows engaged figures of Meryptah and his extended family in the naos-like frame of the stela (fig. 2).⁶⁹ The *pr.t*



FIG. 2: Meryptah. © Rijksmuseum van Oudheden.

formula is carved on the kilt of Meryptah’s father Djehuty, whereas both sides of the elaborate stela show the *htp-dj-nsw*.⁷⁰ The cavetto cornice is inscribed with an appeal to the living, i.e. a text in which the deceased requests to be visited in his tomb to provide offerings such as reciting the *htp-dj-nsw*.⁷¹ Another example of a deliberate choice of formula for different purposes is the main offering stela in the central chapel of Paatenemheb (*temp.* Tutankhamun)⁷² (fig. 3). Underneath the cavetto cornice framing the representations in the middle is the *htp-dj-nsw* marking privilege by means of royal support. The central scene shows the Royal Butler (*wb3 nsw*) Paatenemheb and his wife Tjpyu in adoration of Osiris, who

69 Leiden inv. no. AP 11.

70 Note that the kilt of Nebnetjeru on a similar contemporary stela (Leiden inv. no. AM 8–b) has just his name and title.

71 *mj dd=tn htp-dj-nsw h3 m h.t nb.t nfr.t w^cb.t n k3 n hm-ntr imy-r3 pr Mry-Pth*, see also Shubert 2007, 249 with reference to Helck 1958: 1910.14–8.

72 Leiden inv. no. AP 52.

is seated in a shrine flanked by the four sons of Horus in front of him, and the goddesses Isis and Nephthys behind him. In the text, Paatenemheb and Tjpuuy address the gods with *dw3* praise,⁷³ typical of hymnal texts elsewhere.⁷⁴ Underneath Paatenemheb's colleague, the servant of the king (*sdm ʕs n pr ʕ3*) Kasa and an anonymous woman stand in front of the deceased couple. Kasa holds a libation and an incense censer, the woman carries two flower bouquets. The text explains that they are performing a *htp-dj-nsw* (*jr.t htp-dj-nsw*) for the deceased couple.

It is clear that whenever the tomb owner speaks to the gods in the texts of the tomb decoration, he addresses them with either *j3w* or *dw3*, whereas he himself is addressed by the performance of *htp-dj-nsw*. This is illustrated by the stela of Ankhenptah (fig. 4)⁷⁵ which shows the *htp-dj-nsw* on the frames and the offering scene to the deceased underneath, whereas the stela owners are shown in adoration and the address to the gods by means of *rdj.t j3w*.

Another Leiden example of making a *htp-dj-nsw* for the deceased couple is the stela of



FIG. 3: Paatenemheb. (© Rijksmuseum van Oudheden.)



FIG. 4: Ankhenptah. (© Rijksmuseum van Oudheden.)

73 Erman and Grapow 1931: 426.6–28.7.

74 Compare, for example, Robins 1997: 143; Luiselli 2007 and others.

75 Leiden inv. no. AP 118.

Djehuty.⁷⁶ Also from Saqqara, this stela shows yet again the *htp-dj-nsw* formula on the stela's frame. Unfortunately the address to Osiris in the register above is damaged, but it should be *j3w* or *dw3*, like all other gods are addressed in Maya's subterranean tomb chambers, and elsewhere.⁷⁷ The only Leiden example that shows the *htp-dj-nsw* inside the stela frame, and in front of the god Osiris, is where Ipu is offering (fig. 5). This is in fact not an exception to the rule described above because the text is explicitly addressed towards Ipu himself (*n k3 n wb3 nsw w3b 3.wy nb 3.wy Ipu3*).⁷⁸ The *htp-dj-nsw* then appears also on



FIG. 5: Ipu. (© Rijksmuseum van Oudheden.)

the left stela frame, whereas the right one has a *j3w*-formula in favour of Osiris Wennefer so that he may cause to come forth the offerings for the living *bas* of the necropolis and the *ka* of Ipu himself. The plinth of the stela shows Ipu's tomb and a procession with some kneeling and mourning, while others are shown walking and carrying his burial equipment. Here, too, a *j3w* formula is addressed to the god Osiris in order to benefit the deceased's *ka*. The only Leiden monument on which the *pr.r.t* formula appears is on the walls on either side of the entrance to the chapel of Paatenemheb in front of the tomb owner. The two columns that were placed inside show the *htp-dj-nsw*.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Gods are always addressed in hymnal texts, i.e. introduced by *j3w* or *dw3*, whereas (doing the) *htp-dj-nsw* remains reserved for addresses to gods in favour of the deceased's *ka*. The distribution of the latter formulae seems to support James Allen's hypothesis that the *htp-dj-nsw* never entirely lost the idea of its original meaning as referring to 'royal offerings'.⁷⁹ Whereas earlier scholars have mainly studied the continuous use of the formula through time, it seems that the formula distribution seems to support a decorum that mostly distinguishes

76 Leiden inv. no. AP 56.

77 E.g. the adoration of Re-Horakhty by Ptahmose, Leiden inv. no. AP 54.

78 In a slightly different spelling.

79 Shubert 2007: 382.

between ‘people’ and ‘things’. Physical elements such as tomb architecture (stelae posts, naoi), but also attributes (staffs) usually show the traditional *htp-dj-nsw*, possibly hinting at some degree of royal administrative privilege involved in acquiring these ‘things’. Statues of individuals (i.e. ‘people’) on the other hand show the *pr.r.t* to refer to the infinitive accomplishment of the *htp-dj-nsw* in perpetuation of the desired recitation and performance by tomb visitors, and show the formula only on bases and back pillars (i.e. on those elements that identify the statues as objects). ¹

REFERENCES CITED

- Alexanian, N. 2006. ‘Tomb and social status: the textual evidence’. In *The Old Kingdom Art and Archaeology. Proceedings of the conference held in Prague, May 31–June 4, 2004* edited by M. Bárta, 1–8. Prague: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic.
- Allen, J. P. 2006. ‘Some aspects of the non-royal afterlife in the Old Kingdom.’ In *The Old Kingdom Art and Archaeology. Proceedings of the Conference held in Prague, May 31–June 4, 2004* edited by M. Bárta, 9–17. Prague: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic.
- Allen, J. P. 1992. ‘Reawer’s Accident’. In *Studies in pharaonic religion and society in honour of J. Gwyn Griffiths* edited by A.B. Lloyd, 14–20. London: Egypt Exploration Society.
- Baines, J. 1990. ‘Restricted knowledge, hierarchy, and decorum: modern perceptions and ancient institutions’. *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 27, 1–23.
- Baines, J. and E. Frood 2011. ‘Piety, change and display in the New Kingdom’. In *Ramesside studies in honour of K. A. Kitchen* edited by M. Collier and S. Snape, 1–17. Bolton: Rutherford.
- Barta, W. 1968. *Aufbau und Bedeutung der altägyptischen Opferformel*. Glückstadt: Augustin.
- Bolshakov, A. O. 1991. ‘The moment of the establishment of the tomb-cult in ancient Egypt’. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 18 (2), 204–18.
- Brown, L. A. and W. H. Walker 2008. ‘Prologue: Archaeology, Animism and Non-Human Agents’. *Journal of Archaeological Method Theory* 15, 297–99.
- Chauvet, V. 2007. ‘Royal involvement in the construction of private tombs in the late Old Kingdom’ In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Egyptologists: Grenoble, 6–12 septembre 2004*, edited by J.C. Goyon and C. Cardin, I, 313–21. Leuven: Peeters.

- Davies, B. G. 1999. *Who's who at Deir el-Medina: a prosopographic study of the royal workmen's community*. *Egyptologische Uitgaven* 13. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- Davies, N. de Garis. 1902. *The Rock Tombs of Deir el Gebrâvi* II. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
- Del Vesco, P. et al. 2019. 'Current Research of the Leiden-Turin Archaeological Mission in Saqqara. A Preliminary Report on the 2018 Season'. *Rivista del Museo Egizio* 3.
- Demarée, R. 2008. 'Reports on tomb-construction at Saqqara in the New Kingdom'. *Saqqara Newsletter* 6, 7–11.
- Dijk, J. van. 1996. 'Horemheb and the Struggle for the Throne of Tutankhamun'. *Bulletin of the Australian Centre for Egyptology* 7, 29–42.
- Dijk, J. van. 1993. *The New Kingdom Necropolis of Memphis. Historical and Iconographical Studies*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. University of Groningen.
- Edel, E. 1981. *Hieroglyphische Inschriften des Alten Reiches*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Erman, A. and H. Grapow (eds) 1926. *Wörterbuch der aegyptischen Sprache im Auftrage der Deutschen Akademien: erster Band*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.
- Erman, A. and H. Grapow (eds) 1928. *Wörterbuch der aegyptischen Sprache im Auftrage der Deutschen Akademien: zweiter Band*. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Erman, A. and H. Grapow (eds) 1930. *Wörterbuch der aegyptischen Sprache im Auftrage der Deutschen Akademien: vierter Band*. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Erman, A. and H. Grapow (eds) 1931. *Wörterbuch der aegyptischen Sprache im Auftrage der Deutschen Akademien: fünfter Band*. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Eyre, C. 2013. *The Use of Documents in Pharaonic Egypt*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fairman, H. W. 1949. 'Town planning in pharaonic Egypt'. *The Town Planning Review* 20 (1), 32–51.
- Franke, D. 1997. 'The Middle Kingdom Offering formula – a challenge'. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 89, 39–57.
- Goedicke, H. 1968. 'Four hieratic ostraca of the Old Kingdom'. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 54, 23–30.

- Goedicke, H. 1972–1974. ‘Hieroglyphic inscriptions of the Old Kingdom’. In *Textes et Langues de l’Égypte pharaonique. Hommage à Jean-François Champollion* edited by S. Sauneron, II, 15–24. Cairo: Institut français d’archéologie orientale.
- Giovetti, P. and D. Picchi (eds). 2016. *Egypt: millenary splendour: the Leiden collection in Bologna*. Milan: Skira.
- Hagen, F., R. Olsen and D. Soliman (eds). Forthcoming. *Ancient Egyptian Tomb Construction: The Archaeology of New Kingdom Funerary Architecture*. Cambridge University Press.
- Haring, B. J. J. 2007. ‘Ramesside temples and the economic interests of the state: crossroads of the sacred and the profane’. In *Das Heilige und die Ware: Eigentum, Austausch und Kapitalisierung im Spannungsfeld von Ökonomie und Religion* edited by M. Fitzenreiter, 165–70. London: Golden House.
- Hassan, S. 1932. *Excavations at Gîza 1929–1930*. Cairo: Egyptian University Faculty of Arts.
- Helck, W. 1958. *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie: Inschriften von Zeitgenossen Amenophis‘ III. [IV, 1776–1954]. Urkunden des Ägyptischen Altertums IV (21)*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Kanawati, N. 2003. *Conspiracies in the Egyptian Palace: Unis to Pepy I*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Kaplony, P. 1965. ‘Die wirtschaftliche Bedeutung des Totenkultes im alten Ägypten’. *Asiatische Studien* 18–19 (1–4), 290–307.
- Kloth, N. 2002. *Die (auto-)biographischen Inschriften des ägyptischen Alten Reiches: Untersuchungen zu Phraseologie und Entwicklung. Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur, Beihefte 8*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Leahy, A. 1989. ‘A Protective Measure at Abydos in the Thirteenth Dynasty’. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 75, 41–60.
- Lesko, L. H. (ed.), 1987. *A dictionary of Late Egyptian: volume III*. Providence: B.C. Scribe.
- Löhr, B. 1975. ‘Ahanjati in Memphis’. *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 2, 139–87.
- Lorton, D. 1999. ‘The theology of cult statues in ancient Egypt’. In *Born in heaven, made on earth: the making of the cult image in the ancient Near East* edited by M. B. Dick, 123–210. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Luiselli, M. M. 2007. ‘Das Bild des Betens – Versuch einer bildtheoretischen Analyse der altägyptischen Anbetungsgestik’. *Imago Aegypti* 2, 87–96.
- Martin, G. T. et al. 2012. *The Tomb of Maya and Meryt I: The reliefs, inscriptions, and commentary*. London: Egypt Exploration Society.

- Martin, G. T. et al. 1997. *The Tomb of Tia and Tia: a Royal Monument of the Ramesside Period in the Memphite Necropolis*. London: Egypt Exploration Society.
- Moreno García, J. C. 2013. *Ancient Egyptian Administration*. Leiden: Brill.
- Morschauer, S. 1991. *Threat-formulae in ancient Egypt: a study of the history, structure and use of threats and curses in ancient Egypt*. Baltimore: Halgo.
- Posener-Kriéger, P. 1981. 'Construire une tombe à l'ouest de Mn-nfr (P. Caire 52002)'. *Revue d'Égyptologie* 33, 47–58.
- Posener-Kriéger, P. 1996. 'Au plaisir des paléographes. Papyrus Caire JE 52003'. In *Studies in Honor of William Kelly Simpson II* edited by P. D. Manuelian, 655–64. Boston: Museum of Fine Arts.
- Perre, A. van der. 2014. 'The Year 16 Graffito of Akhenaten in Dayr Abu Hinnis. A Contribution to the Study of the Later Years of Nefertiti'. *Journal of Egyptian History*, 7 (1), 67–108.
- Raven, M. J. 2000. 'Twenty-five years of work in the New Kingdom necropolis of Saqqara: Looking for structure'. In *Abusir and Saqqara in the year 2000*, edited by M. Bárta and J. Krejčí, 133–44. Prague: Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Oriental Institute.
- Raven, M. J. 2003. 'Twenty-five years of work in the New Kingdom necropolis of Saqqara: looking for structure' In *Egyptology at the dawn of the twenty-first century: proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Egyptologists* edited by Z. Hawass and L. Pinch Brock, I, 385–92. Cairo; New York: American University in Cairo Press.
- Robins, G. 1997. *The Art of Ancient Egypt*. London: British Museum Press.
- Satzinger, H. 1997. 'Beobachtungen zur Opferformel: Theorie und Praxis'. *Lingua Aegyptia* 5, 177–88.
- Sethe, K. 1909. *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie [IV,937–1226]. Urkunden des Ägyptischen Altertums IV (13–16 [= Band 4])*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Sethe, K. 1932–1933. *Urkunden des Alten Reichs [I,1–308], 4 vols. Urkunden des Ägyptischen Altertums I (1–4 [= Band 1])*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Shirai, Y. 2006. 'Ideal and reality in Old Kingdom private funerary cults'. In *The Old Kingdom art and archaeology: proceedings of the conference held in Prague, May 31 – June 4, 2004* edited by M. Bárta, 325–33. Prague: Czech Institute of Egyptology, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague.
- Shubert, S. B. 2007. *Those who (still) live on earth: A study of the ancient Egyptian appeal to the living texts*. Ann Arbor: ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Soliman, D. 2017. 'The contextualisation of a tomb construction dossier from Saqqara'. *Saqqara Newsletter* 15, 3–9.

- Stadler, M. A. 2005. 'Das Ritual, den Tempel des Sobek, des Herrn von Pai, zu betreten: Ein Ritualtext aus dem römischen Fayum'. In *Text und Ritual: Kulturwissenschaftliche Essays und Analysen von Sesostris bis Dada*, edited by B. Drücker and H. Roeder, 149–63. Heidelberg: Synchron.
- Staring, N. 2014. 'The Tomb of Ptahmose, Mayor of Memphis: Analysis of an Early 19th Dynasty Funerary Monument at Saqqara'. *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* 114/2, 455–518.
- Staring, N. 2018. 'Products of the physical engagement with sacred space: the New Kingdom non-textual tomb-graffiti at Saqqara'. In *Decoding signs of identity: Egyptian workmen's marks in archaeological, historical, comparative and theoretical perspective. Proceedings of a conference in Leiden, 13–15 December 2013*, edited by B. J. J. Haring, K. V. J. van der Moazel and D. M. Soliman, 79–112. Leiden: Peeters.
- Staring, N. 2019. 'From Landscape Biography to the Social Dimension of Burial. A View from Memphis, Egypt, c. 1539–1078 BCE'. In *Perspectives on Lived Religion. Practices - Transmission - Landscape*, edited by N. Staring, H. P. R. Twiston Davies and L. Weiss, 207–23. Leiden: Sidestone.
- Staring, N. Forthcoming. 'The adaptation of earlier tombs'. In *Tomb Construction in the New Kingdom* edited by F. Hagen, D. Soliman and R. Olson. Copenhagen.
- Strudwick, N. 2006. *The British Museum: Masterpieces of Ancient Egypt*. London: British Museum Press.
- Verbovsek, A. 2004. „Als Gunsterweis des Königs in den Tempel gegeben...“: private Tempelstatuen des Alten und Mittleren Reiches. *Ägypten und Altes Testament* 63. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Walsem, R. van. 2013. 'Diversification and variation in Old Kingdom funerary iconography as the expression of a need for "individuality"'. *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap Ex Oriente Lux* 44, 117–39.
- Walsem, R. van. 2020. '(Auto-)“bioconographies” versus (auto-)biographies in Old Kingdom elite tombs: complexity expansion of image and word reflecting personality traits by competitive individuality'. In *Ancient Egyptian biographies: contexts, forms, functions*, edited by J. Stauder-Porchet, E. Frood, and A. Stauder, 117–59. Atlanta: Lockwood.
- Weiss, L. 2015. 'Perpetuated Action'. In *A Companion to the Archaeology of Religion in the Ancient World*, edited by J. Rüpke, 60–70. Chichester: Blackwell.
- Weiss, L., N. Staring, and H. P. R. Twiston Davies. 2020. *Saqqara: Living in a City of the Dead*, Leiden: Rijksmuseum van Oudheden.
- Wente, E. 1990. *Letters from Ancient Egypt*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.