

CHAPTER SIX

“I Was a Noble One”:

Analysis of Payeftjauemawyneith’s Self-Presentation

Once again, lack of a tomb hampers the full reconstruction of Payeftjauemawyneith’s self-presentation. It does not seem unreasonable that his tomb will be located in the future at Abusir, where many late Saite tombs have been recently uncovered.⁵³² Until then, we must rely on his four known statues, which allow us again to shed light on the various aspects of Payeftjauemawyneith’s self-presentations and statues: the historical and archaeological issues; artistic, linguistic, and literary notions; and religious and moral values.

PAYEFTJAUEMAWYNEITH’S GENEALOGY

This protagonist’s name was very common in the Late Period.⁵³³ Several proposals for the full form of his name have been suggested: Payeftjauerawyneith,⁵³⁴ Payeftjauherawyneith,⁵³⁵ and Payeftjauemawyneith.⁵³⁶ The last is most reasonable and is that which I follow here. The formation of Payeftjauemawyneith’s name, Payeftjauemawy plus a deity’s name, was common in the Late Period. Ranke lists a name similar to this protagonist’s, “*p3.f-t3w(m-) ʕ.wj-n-(?)njt* sein Atem ist in den Händen der Neith.”⁵³⁷ The full form of this protagonist’s should read “*P3(j)=f-t3w-(m)ʕ(wj)-Njtt* Payeftjauemawyneith,” meaning “His breath is in the hands of Neith.” The different ways of the hieroglyphic writing of Payeftjauemawyneith’s name are:

BMEA 83



⁵³² For example, the tomb of Udjahorresnet. For a review of them, see Bareš et al. 1999; Bareš 2005. For more on Late Period tombs, see above.

⁵³³ See, for instance, Mogensen 1919: 69 (58); Posener 1936: 164 (n. 5), 11; El-Sayed 1975: 230, 235, 245, 266.

⁵³⁴ Lefebvre 1933: 94 (n. 4).

⁵³⁵ Clère 1938: 105; Bakry 1970: 326; Ghalioungui 1983: 31.

⁵³⁶ Posener 1936: 11.

⁵³⁷ Ranke 1935: 128 (2).

Mit Rahina 545 (incomplete)



Louvre A 93



The self-presentations and statues of Payeftjauemawyneith reveal in brief his family and his personal history. He had descended from an elite family of the Delta, where his parents occupied priestly offices. Since his family was based at Sais, his family members may have endorsed the new rule of the Saïtes, or they might have had close connections with the royal house.

The known genealogy from Payeftjauemawyneith's statues is brief. As was the case for Neshor, neither wife nor children are known for Payeftjauemawyneith. His statues reveal only his parents' names and titles. These are:

 Sasobek <i>S3-Sbk</i> ⁵³⁸ Father	↔	 Nanesbastet <i>N^c-ns-B3stt</i> Mother
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The titles of Payeftjauemawyneith's father are:

<i>hrp hwwt</i> ⁵³⁹	director of the buildings	BM EA 83
<i>ʕd mr dp</i>	<i>ʕd mr</i> of Buto	BM EA 83
<i>hm-ntr Hr P</i>	<i>hm-ntr</i> -priest of Horus of Pe	BM EA 83
<i>hm-ntr Jmn-W3st-Mhw</i>	<i>hm-ntr</i> -priest of Amun of Wasset-Mehw	BM EA 83

⁵³⁸ A king called *S3-Sbk* was mentioned in Papyrus Vandier, and his name (as Sasuchis) probably appears in the classical sources; see Jasnow 1996: 179.

⁵³⁹ For more on this title, see Jelinkova 1950; El-Sayed 1976.

His mother's title is:

jhjt n(t) Njtt nbt S3w female musician of Neith, Mistress of Sais BM EA 83

Although his mother's name is incomplete on Louvre A 93, it is clear on BM EA 83. The title of Payeftjauemawyneith's mother as a female musician shows that she was part of the female clergy in the local cult of Neith at Sais. His father's titles are completely religious and differ from the secular titles of his son. H. S. K. Bakry⁵⁴⁰ and Paul Ghalioungui⁵⁴¹ point out that Payeftjauemawyneith's family members were worshippers of Neith of Sais, stating that Payeftjauemawyneith was born at Sais without providing any evidence to support this assumption.

Three children and a wife have been attributed to Payeftjauemawyneith. The first is Udjahorresnet on Vatican statue 196, proposed by Peter Le Page Renouf and Eugène Revillout, and recently by Steven Blake Shubert.⁵⁴² However, Georges Posener does not support this proposal.⁵⁴³ Payeftjauemawyneith's titles on Vatican statue 196 are different from those of our Payeftjauemawyneith on Louvre A 93, who, furthermore, did not hold any religious title.⁵⁴⁴ Therefore, our Payeftjauemawyneith on Louvre A 93 is not Payeftjauemawyneith, the father of Udjahorresnet on Vatican statue 196. Bakry and Paul Ghalioungui,⁵⁴⁵ following Henri Gauthier,⁵⁴⁶ attribute Wahibre as another son to Payeftjauemawyneith based only on the name Payeftjauemawyneith. However, Wahibre's father was not our Payeftjauemawyneith because his titles, too, are different.⁵⁴⁷ Padebehu was a third son alleged to belong to our Payeftjauemawyneith. H. Bakry⁵⁴⁸ and *ESLP*⁵⁴⁹ state that Henri Gauthier⁵⁵⁰ thinks that Padebehu, owner of statue Brooklyn Museum no. 60.II, could be a brother of Wahibre because his father was also named Payeftjauemawyneith, although the name of Padebehu's mother was probably Takhety. Payeftjauemawyneith, Padebehu's father, was not our Payeftjauemawyneith because he was *hm-ntrt*-priest

⁵⁴⁰ Bakry 1970: 229.

⁵⁴¹ Ghalioungui 1983: 66.

⁵⁴² See Posener 1936: 164; Shubert 1993: 34, 36.

⁵⁴³ Posener 1936: 11, 164.

⁵⁴⁴ See Posener 1936: 6. For the placement in which Payeftjauemawyneith on Vatican statue 196 is mentioned, with comments and historical results, see Posener 1936: 6, 7, 10–11 (n. *k*), 164.

⁵⁴⁵ See Bakry 1970: 328; Ghalioungui 1983: 66.

⁵⁴⁶ Gauthier 1922: 81–106.

⁵⁴⁷ For his titles, see Piehl 1895: pl. XLII Y–XLIII Z; 1903: 31; El-Sayed 1975: 229.

⁵⁴⁸ Bakry 1970: 328–329 (n.7).

⁵⁴⁹ *ESLP*: 66.

⁵⁵⁰ Gauthier 1922: 81–106.

⁵⁵¹ See Gauthier 1922: 88 (III); *ESLP*: 66 (pl. 53, fig. 130).

of *nt-jhjt jtt*,⁵⁵¹ whereas, as mentioned previously, our Payeftjauemawyneith did not hold this or any other religious title.⁵⁵²

Moreover, Bakry assigns a wife named Tashebenenneith to Payeftjauemawyneith.⁵⁵³ He⁵⁵⁴ reads her name as “Tasheben-nëit”; Ramadan El-Sayed,⁵⁵⁵ “*Tachebenneith*,” and Nigel Strudwick,⁵⁵⁶ “Tashebenneith.” She also was not our Payeftjauemawyneith’s wife because she was the wife of Payeftjauemawyneith, Wahibre’s father, the second son attributed to Payeftjauemawyneith. Therefore, there is no evidence to support the attribution of those children or that wife to our protagonist. Thus, the only genealogy relationship securely attributed to him is that of his parents.

PAYEFTJAUEMAWYNEITH’S SELF-PRESENTATIONS AND *SCHRIFTKULTUR* TRANSMISSION⁵⁵⁷

Payeftjauemawyneith’s self-presentations reveal possible similarities to earlier texts, and that has led scholars, such as Peter Der Manuelian, to raise the issue of Saite copying from early sources.⁵⁵⁸ I here mean the relation between the tomb self-presentation of Djefaihapi I at Asyut (Siut I⁵⁵⁹), the tomb self-presentation of Puyemre (TT 39),⁵⁶⁰ and Payeftjauemawyneith (BM EA 83), and between the Sixth Dynasty self-presentation of Djau at Abydos and Payeftjauemawyneith’s self-presentation on Louvre A 93.⁵⁶¹ I introduce the first three texts in chronological order, starting with the Middle Kingdom example, then that of the New Kingdom, and ending with the Saite. Then, I compare Djau’s self-presentation with Payeftjauemawyneith’s on Louvre A 93.

⁵⁵² See Bakry 1970: 328.

⁵⁵³ See Bakry 1970: 328.

⁵⁵⁴ Bakry 1970: 328.

⁵⁵⁵ El-Sayed 1975: 229.

⁵⁵⁶ Strudwick 2006: 274.

⁵⁵⁷ See Leahy 1988; Neureiter 1994; Josephson 2001c; Kahl 2010; Wilson 2010; Jurman 2010; Vernus 2014; Bassir 2015b (in progress) and references there. See also Silverman, Simpson, and Wegner 2009; Allen 2009; Leprohon 2009.

⁵⁵⁸ For more on this issue, see Der Manuelian 1983; on BM EA 83, see Der Manuelian 1994: 12–16. See also Kahl 1999, and in the Late Period, see Schenkel 1977.

⁵⁵⁹ This is Griffith’s term; see Griffith 1899: pl. IV (227); Brunner 1937: 29, 62; Otto 1954: 122; Edel 1984: 118; Der Manuelian 1994: 12–16; Kahl 1999: 228–229; Heise 2007: 228 (n. 590).

⁵⁶⁰ TT 39 is Puyemre’s tomb (reign of Thutmose III); for more on this tomb, see *PM* I.1: 71–75; Davies 1922. For the text, see Davies 1922: pl. XX (line 11); Otto 1954: 122; Der Manuelian 1994: 12–16; Heise 2007: 228 (n. 590).

⁵⁶¹ Lefebvre 1933: 96; Leahy 2007: 51.

*Siut I*⁵⁶²

*jr swt rmt nbt sš nb rh-ht nb nds nb tw3 nb ʿk.t(j)=sn r js pn
m33.t(j)=sn ntt jm=f mkj.t(j)=sn sš(w)=f twr.t(j)=sn n hntjw=f
dd.t(j)=sn htp-dj-njswt h3 m t hnkt k3(w) 3pd(w) h3 m šs mnht h3 m
htpwt h3 m df3w h3 m ht nb(t) nfr(t) wʿb(t) n k3 n nb js pn h3tj-ʿ^c df3j-
Hʿpj jw=f r j3w n njwt=f jm3hw n sp3t=f hr-ntt jnk sʿh mnht⁵⁶³*

“Now all people, every scribe, every wise man, every commoner, and every poor man who will enter this tomb, who will see what is in it, who will protect its inscriptions, who will respect its statues, who will say a *htp-dj-njswt*: a thousand of bread, beer, oxen, and fowl, a thousand of alabaster and clothing, a thousand of vegetables, a thousand of provisions, and a thousand of every good and pure thing, for the *k3* of the owner of this tomb, the *h3tj-ʿ^c* Djefaihapi, he will be the elder of his city, and the *jm3hw* of his nome, because I am an excellent noble.”

*TT 39*⁵⁶⁴

*jw swt rmtw nb(w) sš nb rh nb nds nb tw3 nb ʿk.[t(j)?]=sn r js pn
m3.t(j)=sn ntt jm=f mkj.t(j)=sn sš(w)=f twr.t(j)=sn n hntjw=f
dd.t(j)=sn htp-dj-njswt h3 m t hnkt k3(w) 3pd(w) h3 m htp-df3w h3
m ht nb(t) nfrt wʿbt n k3 n nb js pn jt-nt^r⁵⁶⁵ pw-jm-rʿ pn m3ʿ-hrw
jw=f j3[w] n njwt=f jm3hw n sp3t=f hr-ntt jnk sʿh jkr*

“Now all people, every scribe, every wise man, every commoner, and every poor man who will enter into this tomb, who will see what is in it, who will protect its writings, who will respect its statues, who will say a *htp-dj-njswt*: a thousand of bread, beer, oxen and fowl, a thousand of food-offerings, and a thousand of every good and pure thing, for the owner of this tomb, this god’s father, Puyemre, true of voice, he will be

⁵⁶² This Twelfth Dynasty tomb of Djefaihapi I (reign of Senwosret I) is located at Asyut. For more on this tomb as a whole and its shrine, see El-Khadragy 2007; Kahl 2012. This text of Siut I (Griffith 1899: pl. IV [227–229]) is located on the southern part of the eastern wall of the great transverse hall.

⁵⁶³ *Urk.* VII: 53 (9–20), 54 (1–5).

⁵⁶⁴ The self-presentational text is in the lower register on the east wall, the north side of the transverse hall, see Davies 1931: pl. XX (7–11).

⁵⁶⁵ Davies (1931: 29) thinks that this title was “probably purely honorary” and Der Manuelian (1994: 13) does not transcribe the phonetic complement =*f* in the word *jt*.

the elder of his city, and the *jm3ḥw* of his nome, because I am an excellent noble.”

BM EA 83

*jr w^cb nb ḥ^cr ḥwt-ntr nt (j)tm(w) nb jwnw mkj.t(j)=f(j) znn pn dj=f
n=f ḥt nb nfrt m-ḥt ḥtp ntr jm dd=f ḥtp-dj-njswt ḥ3 t ḥnkt p3t ḥt nb
nfrt n k3 n (j)m(j)-r3 pr-wr P(3j)=f-t3w-(m)-^c(wj)-Njtt jw=f r j3w m
njwt=f m jm3ḥw n sp3t=f⁶⁶⁶ jnk s^cḥ n jr n=f*

“As for any *w^cb*-priest who enters into the temple of Atum, lord of Heliopolis, and who will protect this statue, who shall give every good thing to it, after the god is satisfied therewith, he who will recite a *ḥtp-dj-njswt*: a thousand of bread, beer, cakes and every good thing for the *k3* of the chief steward Payeftjauemawyneith; he will be the elder in his city and the *jm3ḥw* of his nome. I am a noble one should act for him.”

Jochem Kahl⁵⁶⁷ also believes that there is similarity between some lines of BM EA 83⁵⁶⁸ and Siut I lines 225-227 of Djefaihapi.⁵⁶⁹ I again provide the two texts for comparison.

Siut I
L. 225
jr swt rmtt nb
sš nb
rh-ḥt nb
nds nb
tw3 nb
ḥ^c.t(y)=sn

EA 83⁵⁷⁰
L. E 1⁵⁷¹
jr w^cb nb⁵⁷² ḥ^cr ḥwt-ntr nt (j)tm(w)
nb jwnw
mkj.t(y)=f snn pn
dj=f n=f ḥt nb(t) nfrt
m-ḥt ḥtp ntr jm
dd=f

⁵⁶⁶ The Saite text does not have *ḥr-ntt*. The following sentence is a main clause.

⁵⁶⁷ Kahl (1999: 219–224) does not refer to Der Manuelian (1994). He also does not make a comparison between BM EA 83 and TT 39 and only compares Siut I with TT 39.

⁵⁶⁸ See Piehl 1893: 88 (*E* Lines 1–2) and above. However, Kahl refers to pp. 90–91 of Piehl’s article as reference to the published text, although they have not the text but rather Piehl’s notes (d–h).

⁵⁶⁹ Kahl 1999: 228–230. For the original publication of the hieroglyphic text, see Griffith 1889: pl. IV (227–229).

⁵⁷⁰ BM EA 83 = BM 805 in Kahl 1999: 228–230.

⁵⁷¹ I here follow Piehl’s letter numbering (1983: 88) to be in accordance with that of Kahl 1999: 229.

⁵⁷² According to Kahl (1999: 229), words in bold face in BM EA 83 in his book refer to “literal agreements” with Siut I.

L. 226

r js pn
m33.t(y)=sn ntt jm=f
mkj.t(y)=sn sš(w)=f
twr.t(y)=sn hntyw=f
dd.t(y)=sn
htp-dj-njswt
h3 m t hnkt k3(w) 3pd(w)
h3 m šs mnht
h3 m htpwt
h3 m df3w

L. 227

h3 m ht nb(t) nfr(t) wcb(t)
n k3 n nb n js pn
n h3tj-^c df3j-H^cpy
iw=f r j3w n njwt=f jm3hw n sp3t=f
hr-ntt
jnk s^ch mnḥ nb kd snhn hhw

L. 228

m tp t(3) r(-dr)=f

L. E 2

htp-dj-njswt
h3 m t hnkt p3t
ht nb(t) nfrt
n k3 n
(j)m(y)-r3 pr-wr
p(3y)=f-βw-(m)-^c(wy)-nt
jw=f r j3w m njwt=f m jm3hw n sp3t=f
jnk s^ch...

The Siut I and TT 39 versions are closer to each other than to BM EA 83. The BM EA 83 version has different phrases missing from the other two texts. Payeftjauemawyneith addresses his speech to those who enter the temple of Atum at Heliopolis, while the other two texts address those who enter their tombs. The verbal forms used in the three texts are different. The media used in these texts are different, tombs at Asyut and Thebes, and statue at Heliopolis.⁵⁷³

It is difficult to believe that there was textual transmission between these three texts. The similarities between the three of them are rather due to biographical traditions and beliefs usually employed in this genre.

Gustave Lefebvre⁵⁷⁴ believes that the Saite scribe of Payeftjauemawyneith's text on Louvre A 93 Statue had copied a section from that of the Sixth Dynasty self-presentation of Djau⁵⁷⁵ at Abydos.⁵⁷⁶ Below, I introduce the two texts for comparison.

⁵⁷³ Der Manuelian 1994: 15–16.

⁵⁷⁴ Lefebvre 1933: 87–104, particularly 94–100, and for the comparison, see 95–99. Very recently, Leahy (2007: 51) briefly refers to this influence.

⁵⁷⁵ On Djau's family connections with the royal house and the marriage of Pepy I to Djau's two sisters, see Goedicke 1955: 180–183.

⁵⁷⁶ This inscription perhaps came from the temple of Khentymentt at Abydos, and probably dates to Pepy II's early reign. It is now in the Cairo Museum under CG 1431; see Lefebvre 1933: 95, (n. 4); Strudwick 2005: 357.

Djau's text (lines 4–5):⁵⁷⁷

j ^c*n**h**w* *tpjw-t3* (*j*)*m*(*j*)-*r3* *h**m*-*ntr* *nb*⁵⁷⁸ *h**m*-*ntr* *nb* *šsmt* *d3j* *nb* *n* *h**w**t*-*ntr* *nt* *h**m* *n* *nb*(=*j*) *Hnt*(*j*)-*Jmnt*(*t*) ^c*n**h* *n*=*tn* *njswt* *ju*=*tn* *r* *šdj**t* *n*(=*j*) *p**r**t*-*h**r**w* *m* *dbw* *n* *h**w**t*-*ntr* *tn* *m* *jrjt* *n*(=*j*) *n* *w**d*⁵⁷⁹ *m* *jrjt*=*tn* *n*(=*j*) *ds*=*tn* *dr* *m33*=*tn* *j3wt*(=*j*) *h**r* *njswt* *n* *šps*(=*j*) *h**r* *h**m* *n* *nb*(=*j*) *r* *s*^c*h*[=*f* *nb*]⁵⁸⁰ [*r* *sr*=*f* *nb* *r* *b3k*=*f* *nb*]

“O living ones upon earth, every overseer of priests, every priest, every *šsmt* and *d3j* priest of the temple of the majesty of my lord, Khent(y)iment(t), as the king lives for you, you will recite for me the invocation-offerings from the income of this temple, from what you do for me of which is commanded, and from what you do for me yourselves. Because you see my offices in the king’s presence for I am honored in the presence of the majesty of (my) lord than any noble one [of his, than any official of his, and than any servant of his].”

Louvre A 93:

(*j*) *w*^c*b* *nb* *jr.t*(*j*)=*f*(*j*) *j**h**t*-*ntr* *h**z**j* *tn* *Hntj*-*Jmntt* *r* *šdj*(*t*)=*tn* *n*(=*j*)⁵⁸¹ *p**r**t*-*h**r**w* *m* *sn-t3* *n* *Hntj*-*Jmntt* *mj* *m33*=*tn* *n* *šps*(=*j*) *3h*(=*j*) *h**r* *ntr*=*tn* *h**r* *h**m* *n* *nb*(=*j*) *r* *s*^c*h*=*f* *nb*

“(O) every *w*^c*b*-priest who will perform the rituals, Khentyimentt will praise you for your reciting the invocation-offerings for (me), while kissing the earth to Khentyimentt; when you see that I am glorious before your god, because I am honored in the presence of the majesty of (my) lord more than any noble one of his.”

Djau’s self-presentation probably comes, like Payeftjauemawyneith’s on Louvre A 93, from a temple environment. Both are different reflections of the appeal to the living. The appeal to the living formula was common and standard throughout

⁵⁷⁷ *Urk.* I: 119 (3–13); Lefebvre 1933: 96; Strudwick 2005: 358.

⁵⁷⁸ Louvre A 93 does not have this bold section from (*j*)*m*(*j*)-*r3* *h**m*-*ntr* *nb* to *Hnt*(*j*)-*Jmnt*(*t*), in Lefebvre’s article, and Lefebvre (1933: 96) puts dots instead.

⁵⁷⁹ Louvre A 93 does not have the section from *m jrjt n(=j)* to *m jrjt=tn n(=j) ds=tn* that constitutes lines 5–6 in Lefebvre’s comparison section; see below and Lefebvre 1933: 96.

⁵⁸⁰ This is the last word of Lefebvre’s section, see Lefebvre 1933: 96.

⁵⁸¹ I restore the suffix pronoun =*j* throughout this text.

ancient Egyptian biographies, with a few orthographical and wording differences according to each period. The temple of (Osiris) Khentyimentt is a joint theme between the two texts. Payeftjauemawyneith's statue was probably placed within the temple of Khentyimentt as reference and dedication to the god. Djau's self-presentation was probably placed in the temple of the god whose temple was the local cult center at Abydos during the Old Kingdom. In the Saite Period, however, Khentyimentt was an epithet for Osiris, whose statuette is still visible in the naos which Payeftjauemawyneith holds. Therefore, it is not striking to glorify him in the late Saite Period as he was in the late Old Kingdom. Payeftjauemawyneith only addresses his speech to every *w^cb*-priest who conducts the rituals at the temple of (Osiris) Khentyimentt at Abydos due to its presence at the temple. Djau addresses his speech to the living ones upon earth and many others who presumably will visit the temple. Djau draws heavily on the king because of his family connections with the royal house. Djau expects that the appointed personnel for his funerary cult will do it, while Payeftjauemawyneith begs the temple *w^cb*-priests to do it for him. The king's presence in Djau's self-presentation is strong, while it is not highly visible in this section of Payeftjauemawyneith's. Djau's self-presentation is lengthy, while that of Payeftjauemawyneith is abbreviated. The priesthood in Djau's self-presentation is detailed, while it is not in Payeftjauemawyneith's. Payeftjauemawyneith's text does not refer to his office as does Djau's. Djau was favored by the king more than all of whom he knew, while Payeftjauemawyneith refers to only any dignitary of the majesty of his lord. Therefore, it seems logical to conclude that the composition of Louvre A 93 was not influenced by the self-presentation of Djau.

The textual features of Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentations do not reflect any textual transmission from earlier texts. While the Saite scribe of Payeftjauemawyneith's biographies was aware of older textual traditions, he did not copy them. He had executed Payeftjauemawyneith's biographies according to his own understanding of philology, grammar, and syntax in an elaborated way reflecting Saite philological characterizations. This trend remakes the older phraseology and thematic concepts in these Saite self-presentations in a new innovative way that characterizes the period.

PAYEFTJAUEMAWYNEITH'S SELF-PRESENTATION IN LEXICAL WORDS AND PHRASES

Payeftjauemawyneith uses specific words and phrases to promote his self-textually. These reveal striking notions.

Payeftjauemawyneith's Statue as Znn

Payeftjauemawyneith uses the word *znn* in his self-presentation on BM EA 83. This word occurs in the context of the appeal to the living:

“As for every *w^c*-priest who enters into the temple of Atum, lord of Heliopolis, who will protect this statue, he who will give to it every good thing.”

Payeftjauemawyneith probably refers to his image and statue BM EA 83, which he set it up at the temple of Atum at Heliopolis. The use of *znn* to describe a non-royal statue shows how this late Saite official bestowed divine and royal prerogatives on himself to promote his self.⁵⁸² Moreover, it is extremely remarkable in representing Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentation, requiring further comment on the word *znn*.

Boyo Ockinga⁵⁸³ points out that *znn* is first attested in the *Teaching for Merikare*.⁵⁸⁴ The stanza, describing the creation of the creator god, is

*znnw=fpw prw m h^cw=f*⁵⁸⁵

which R. B. Parkinson translates as follows:

“They are images of Him, come forth from His flesh.”⁵⁸⁶

Znn also occurs in a stanza of the *Teaching of King Amenemhat for His Son Senwosret I*. The text states:

⁵⁸² See, for example, Hannig 2006b: 779 (28612–28613); *Wb*. III: 460 (7–11, 13, 16–17); Ockinga 1984: 74–79; Wilson 1997: 865 (3–4); Hornung 1967: 136–137; Garr 2003; Schulz 1992: 704–707, 712.

⁵⁸³ The first attestation of *znn* was in the Middle Kingdom, and Ockinga (1984: 52 [53]), following Edel (1959: § 116) uses *znn* for *smn*; see also Wilson 1997: 865.

⁵⁸⁴ For this teaching, see, for example, Blumenthal 1980: 5–41; 1996: 105–135; Tobin 2003.

⁵⁸⁵ Helck 1977: 83, P–C, XLVI; Quack 1992: 78, 132.5, 196, *Merikare* E 131–133, E, M, C.

⁵⁸⁶ Parkinson 1997:226. See also Helck 1977: 85; Quack 1992: 79, 5; Erman 1971: 83; Faulkner 1972a: 191; 1973a: 191 Quirke 2004: 119. Ockinga's translation (1984: 52) is closer to that of Lichtheim (2006b: 106); however he does not translate *znnw*. His translation is “Seine *znn.w* sind sie, die aus seinem Leibe gekommen sind.” But he (1984: 72) quotes Brunner's (1975: 72) “Seine Abbilder (*znn*) sind sie, aus seinem Leib gekommen.”

znnw=j ϵnhw psšw=j m rmtw jrj n=j k3 mdt ntj n sdm.tw=f⁵⁸⁷

R. B. Parkinson this translates as:

“O my living images, my partners among men, make for me mourning, such as was never heard before!”⁵⁸⁸

Znn also occurs in the early Eighteenth Dynasty inscription of Djehuty in the Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn 199. The text reads:

“[hr=j] h3b [nb] hm k3 nb zh3.w nb m33.tj=sn twt.w pn znn=j
jw^c.w=j tp=j t3 sh3=j m hr.t-ntr hzj tn n.j-sw.t n rk=tn hwn fnd=tn
m ϵnh dd=tn htp-dj-n.j-sw.t...n k3 n zh3.w dhwtj”

“[Jeder] [Vorlesepriester], jeder Ka-Priester, jeder Schreiber, die dieses Bild sehen werden, mein znn, mein Erbe auf Erden, mein Andenken in der Nekropole, der König wird euch loben zu eurer Zeit, eure Nasen verjüngen sich, wenn ihr ein Opfergebet sagt...für den Ka des Schreibers Djehuti.”⁵⁸⁹

Nectanebo I's Hermopolis Stela reflects upon the same content of the living image of a god. Its stanza A 2 states:

Znn pw ϵnh r^c ntj⁵⁹⁰ hrj-tp t3⁵⁹¹

“He is the living image of Re who is upon earth.”

On the basis of the context and the book roll determinative⁵⁹² of the word, which

⁵⁸⁷ Helck 1969: 32–33, Va–Vb.

⁵⁸⁸ Parkinson 1997: 206. See also Helck 1969: 37; Faulkner 1972b: 194; 1973b: 191; Blumenthal 1984: 88, (n. 23). Quirke (2004: 127) does not transliterate the suffix pronoun =j after *znnw*. Lichtheim 2006a: 136; Tobin 2003b: 168; Loprieno 1996a: 414. Ockinga 1984: 53 (54) here also does not translate *znn*.

⁵⁸⁹ Ockinga 1984: 53–54 [55].

⁵⁹⁰ Roeder (1954: 387 [n. /]) thinks that *nt* stands for *ntj*. On this issue, see De Meulenaere 1994.

⁵⁹¹ Roeder 1954: 384.

⁵⁹² However, the word *znn* with the book roll determinative could mean “image” or “figure,” see *Urk.* IV: 426 (10); Faulkner 1999: 232. Also in the Late Period *znn* was written with the book role as a determinative, meaning “statue” and “image;” see *Wb.* III: 460.

refers to an abstraction, Boyo Ockinga states that *znn* does not mean here “statue.”⁵⁹³ Thus, all scholars use the same translation “image” or “likeness.” As Ockinga notes, this is just a reference to image or replica, not a statue.

The meaning of *znn* is multifaceted and developed throughout ancient Egyptian textual tradition. In Middle Egyptian, the word meant “likeness,”⁵⁹⁴ “image,”⁵⁹⁵ and “figure.”⁵⁹⁶ In Late Egyptian, its meaning became “image,” “likeness,” and “statues.”⁵⁹⁷ In the Late and Graeco-Roman Periods, *znn* was utilized in different contexts. Moreover, *znn* refers to physical representation of gods or kings in relief and statuary.⁵⁹⁸ However, the different levels of reading of *znn* can be classified:⁵⁹⁹

1. Statue:⁶⁰⁰ This is probably the apparent meaning of the word through which it refers to a statue or other iconographical work. In this category are always the kneeling and squatting statues of the nobles from the Eighteenth Dynasty to the Late Period.⁶⁰¹ This is perhaps the only narrow medium that was left to the non-royal protagonists to represent themselves in a visually artistic way.
2. Figure or image of a deity: In this case *znn* is only concerned with the world of divinity, where *znn* is a pure representation of a deity in her or his various types of artistic representations such as statuary,⁶⁰² relief, and painting since the Eighteenth Dynasty and more often in Ptolemaic Egypt.⁶⁰³
3. Transferred image or copy; or likeness: This medium is only restricted to the overlapped realms of royalty and divinity. Starting from the New Kingdom and more often in the Ptolemaic Period, the king was considered an image (*znn*) of a god,⁶⁰⁴ or a king can be a god’s image “on

⁵⁹³ Ockinga 1984: 52.

⁵⁹⁴ See *Urk.* IV: 412 (11), 1032 (4).

⁵⁹⁵ See *Urk.* IV: 426 (10), 615 (2).

⁵⁹⁶ With this determinative (Gardiner Sign-List A 53) and written with both *s*, see Faulkner 1999: 232.

⁵⁹⁷ In this case *znn* is written with a mummy upright and a seated god with flagellum, or with an upright mummy, or with an upright mummy and a seated woman as determinatives; see Lesko 2002, II: 51.

⁵⁹⁸ Wilson 1997: 866 [3].

⁵⁹⁹ On the different meanings of *znn*, see Hannig 2006b: 779 (28611–28613).

⁶⁰⁰ For *znn* as a “statue,” see Clère 1979: 357 (n. 4).

⁶⁰¹ *Wb.* III: 460 (6).

⁶⁰² *Wb.* III: 460 (7).

⁶⁰³ *Wb.* III: 460 (8).

⁶⁰⁴ *Wb.* III: 460 (9); Ockinga 1984: 74–79.

earth,⁶⁰⁵ which more often attested in Ptolemaic Egypt.⁶⁰⁶ Moreover, the king can be a “living” image of a god.⁶⁰⁷ For instance, the king was “the living image of Thoth.”⁶⁰⁸ Through this royalty-divinity representation, the king stressed a close relationship with the deities.⁶⁰⁹ Through the king’s representation as a living image of the deities; the king’s presence on earth became more potent.⁶¹⁰ Furthermore, a god can be an image of another god,⁶¹¹ or more precisely a living image (*znn ḥnh*) of another god such as “Horus as the living image of Re,”⁶¹² an epithet well attested in Ptolemaic Egypt.⁶¹³

4. Different contexts: *znn* was used in different contexts. For instance, as stated above, *znn* can appear in a Middle Kingdom literary work as a theological concept when describing a human as an image of the creator god⁶¹⁴ on earth “who came forth from his body.”⁶¹⁵ It occurs in the New Kingdom in a title of a priest from Memphis as “beloved image of Ptah.”⁶¹⁶ In Ptolemaic Egypt the figure of truth could be described as “the image of Hathor.”⁶¹⁷

Jacobus Van Dijk⁶¹⁸ states that *znn*⁶¹⁹ is the common term for squatting or kneeling statues.⁶²⁰ There are also other two words probably used to express the same meaning. The first is *hntj*,⁶²¹ which was also used in texts of naophorous statues.⁶²²

⁶⁰⁵ *Wb.* III: 460 (10).

⁶⁰⁶ *Wb.* III: 460 (9).

⁶⁰⁷ *Wb.* III: 460 (9).

⁶⁰⁸ See Wilson 1997: 865 (4).

⁶⁰⁹ See Wilson 1997: 865.

⁶¹⁰ See Wilson 1997: 865 (3).

⁶¹¹ On this issue, see Hornung 1967: 136–137.

⁶¹² *Wb.* III: 460 (11).

⁶¹³ *Wb.* III: 460 (11).

⁶¹⁴ On divine-human relationship in the biblical tradition, for instance, see Garr 2003.

⁶¹⁵ *Wb.* III: 460 (13); see above.

⁶¹⁶ *Wb.* III: 460 (16).

⁶¹⁷ *Wb.* III: 460 (17).

⁶¹⁸ He depends on the *Wb.* III: 460 (6).

⁶¹⁹ For exceptions, see Clère 1951: 147 (D).

⁶²⁰ Van Dijk 1993: 122 (n. 39).

⁶²¹ See Clère 1979: 357 (n. 4); Schulz 1992: 703–707.

⁶²² E.g., BM EA 1377, see Bierbrier 1982: 22 (pl. 49–51); Van Dijk 1993: 122 (n. 39); the Cairo Museum CG 606 and 1105, see Van Dijk 1993: 122 (n. 39), 119.

The second is *twt*. A Ramesside naophorous statue was called *twt*.⁶²³ *Twt* “statue”⁶²⁴ was close to *znn* in meaning.⁶²⁵ As $\epsilon^h \epsilon^w$, *znn* means a “stela.”⁶²⁶ However, *znn* with hntj or *twt* played a great role in revealing the theological image of the king.⁶²⁷

The word *znn* on BM EA 83 is written with ζ (Gardiner Sign List S 29), not with *s* (*z*) (O 34). Starting with the Eighteenth Dynasty, *znn* was written with ζ ,⁶²⁸ not with *s* (*z*). The determinative of *znn* here is unique: a squatting man carrying probably a naophorous statue.⁶²⁹

However, the Late Period determinative of *znn* is different from that of our *znn*.⁶³⁰ The determinative of *znn* on BM EA 83 is close to that of another *znn* (meaning “ointment vessel”) representing a kneeling king making an offering (a vessel) (?).⁶³¹ The only difference on BM EA 83 is that the presenting person holds his offering, which is probably a naos, on his knees, while the other offering person perhaps holds a vessel (?) resting on the ground between his hands. Thus, the word *znn* on BM EA 83 reveals a highly artistic representation of Payeftjauemawyneith that was usually restricted to the deities and kings.⁶³² The word *znn*, “statue,” is related to the similar term *znn*, “replica, image, copy,” and possibly the verb *znj*, “to resemble.” This noun very frequently designates private Late Period statues.

Payeftjauemawyneith’s Self-Presentation as “Royal Presentation”

Payeftjauemawyneith’s self-presentation, with his building activities at Abydos, is similar to those of the kings in their texts. In her monograph on Middle Kingdom self-presentations, Lichtheim⁶³³ excludes royal texts because, in her opinion, they are not “autobiographical.” However, Stephen Quirke does not agree that such texts fall

⁶²³ See Hayes 1959: 349–350; *KRI*: 353 (13); Van Dijk 1993: 122 (n. 39). The text states *jr.t(w) n=f twt r šsp εnh r htp m hwt=f* “A statue is made for him in order to receive life and to rest in his tomb chapel;” see Hayes 1959: 350; *KRI*: 353 (13); Van Dijk 1993: 122 (n. 39).

⁶²⁴ See also Schulz (1992: 704–707), who reads *twtw* “Statue.”

⁶²⁵ *Wb.* III: 460 (14).

⁶²⁶ *Wb.* III: 460 (15).

⁶²⁷ Ockinga 1984: 74.

⁶²⁸ See *Wb.* III: 460 (7–8). The determinative in the *Wb.* is Gardiner Sign-List A 40.

⁶²⁹ Sharpe (1981: 111, e–g 16) has a squatting man carrying nothing as a determinative, while Piehl (1893: 88, E. 1) has Gardiner Sign List A 53, which the *Wb.* (III: 460 [7–8]) also has, but inside brackets.

⁶³⁰ See *Wb.* III: 460 (7–8).

⁶³¹ Dating to the Twentieth Dynasty; see *Wb.* III: 460 (18); Hannig 2006: 779 (28615).

⁶³² For more on the use of *znn* in the royal propaganda from the Nineteenth Dynasty to the conquest of Alexander the Great, see Grimal 1986: 145–147.

⁶³³ Lichtheim 1988: 5.

outside autobiography, pointing out that the “*Königsnovelle*” affords “an analogy with the human autobiography.” He does believe that “the royal ideal” in royal texts differs from “the ideal of officials;” the royal “I” stresses “the ideal of kingship,” while the “I” of officials stresses “the ideal of human behaviour in their society.”⁶³⁴ Royal texts can be also classified “self-presentation” in a sense. However, one should keep in mind the differences between the king as a special kind of human being, similar to a god acting on earth, and the officials who were representatives of the king in the administration, attempting to imitate him. Moreover, the textual formation, themes and concerns, iconography, and placement of each self-presentation were different. Therefore, the relations and differences between “royal self-presentation”⁶³⁵ and “non-royal self-presentation” need further exploration. Actually, the royal “I” versus the non-royal “I”⁶³⁶ was different in some inscriptions of the first millennium such as that of Payeftjauemawyneith on Louvre A 93, in which he states:

“I built the temple of Khentyimentt, as an excellent construction of eternity, at his majesty’s command, that he might see the prosperity in the affairs of Tawer.”⁶³⁷

⁶³⁴ Quirke 1992: 331. For the term *Königsnovelle*, see Hofmann 2004; Spalinger 2011. For more on ideology and propaganda, see Leprohon 2015.

⁶³⁵ Blumenthal (1984: 88) refers to royal self-presentation in her study of the *Teaching of King Amenemhat*.

⁶³⁶ For more on “signs of the ‘I’ (the narrator) in ‘narrating,’” see Prince 1982: 7–16.

⁶³⁷ The use of the first person of the suffix pronoun is notable especially in Payeftjauemawyneith’s building activities. The Saite text of Paderpesu (?) on Berlin stela 8438, from Psamtik I’s reign, refers to a building activity; see Chassinat 1916–1917. Paderpesu seems to refer to building a small potter’s studio in the temple of Hor-Merty, not a full temple. The text reads *jw kḏ.n(=f) pr n jkḏ-nds n Hr-Mrtj-m-r-Mḥt P3-drp-sw(?)* “(I) constructed a potter’s house for Hor-Merty-em-er-mehet, Paderpesu (?).” The key term is *jkḏ-nds*, “potter” (lit. “small builder”). Although this was certainly something to take pride in, Paderpesu was hardly appropriating royal authority for this modest construction. Anthony Leahy does not think “there is anything specific here” with this non-royal Payeftjauemawyneith’s task of carrying on building activities. He further states that use of the first person of the suffix pronoun was common in non-royal self-presentations since the Old Kingdom (Leahy: pers. com.). Although the use of the first person of the suffix pronoun in self-presentations since the Old Kingdom was common, it was only used to express the protagonist’s life and career concerning his own actions, not to express royal actions and prerogatives. Leahy is correct in pointing out that the Egyptians, since the Old Kingdom, took credit for major constructions, including temples: for example, Heqaib, Ankhtify, Senenmut, Bakenchons. In all those cases, just as in the present text, they point out that they only accomplished these deeds “at his majesty’s command.” Even when Old Kingdom officials describe building their mastabas and sarcophagi, they point out that the king allowed them to do so.

It is notable to see an official expressing himself in such a way. Although he further states that was done “at his majesty’s command,” he does not name the king, and the king’s presence is not that strong.

Royal building activities from the Twenty-fifth Dynasty⁶³⁸ put great emphasis on the king’s role in creating monuments for the gods. The first building inscription of Taharqa⁶³⁹ in the Mut Temple at Gebel Barkal (ancient Napata) states:⁶⁴⁰

*jr(j).n=f m mnw=f⁶⁴¹ n mwt=f⁶⁴² mwt np(3)t kd=f⁶⁴³ n=s hwt-ntr n-
m3w(t) m jnr n hd nfr (n) rwd js(t) gm.n hm=f hwt-ntr tn kd m jnr
m-^c (tpjw-)^c m k3t nds(t) wn.jn hm=f (hr) rdj(t) kd.tw hwt-ntr tn m
k3t mnh(t) n dt*

“It is his monuments that he made for his mother, Mut of Nap(a)ta. He built for her a temple anew in beautiful, white, good sandstone.⁶⁴⁴ When his majesty found this temple built in stone by (the ancest)ors being as a modest construction, then his majesty caused that this temple be built as an excellent construction for eternity.”

⁶³⁸ For the Twenty-fifth Dynasty buildings at Kawa, see Welsby 2002: 26–39. On Taharqa’s inscriptions, see Wolf 1991; Dallibor 2005. On this king and his reign, see Pope 2014.

⁶³⁹ Taharqa’s Memphite foundation stela (Cairo Museum JE 36861) has a similar phraseology, which this king employed in the texts of his building activities; see Meeks 1979b: pl. XXXVIII. The main verb usually used for “to build” in Taharqa’s inscriptions is *kd*, (which evokes the creative activities of Ptah of Memphis, and who, in the Memphite theology, had a great impact on Twenty-fifth Dynasty kings). He used the verb *hwsj* in lines 2–3 of his year 10 stela from Kawa (Kawa VII): *hwsj.tw m jnr m mnw n dt* “being built of stone as a monument of eternity” (referring to the temple of Amun at Kawa). This stela was located at the first court of the Amun Temple at Kawa (Temple T), now in Copenhagen under NY Carlsberg Glyptotek Æ.I.N.1713, see Macadam 1949, 41–44, pls. 13–14; *FHN*: 176, 178.

⁶⁴⁰ See Dunham 1970: fig. 3; *FHN*: 132.

⁶⁴¹ *Jr(j).n=f* is as a nominal *sdm.n=f*, and on the dedication formula *jrj.n=f m mnw=f*; see Castle 1993.

⁶⁴² Leahy (1987) argues that the *sdm.n=f* is emphatic and the *n jt=f* + god’s name is the emphasized adverbial adjunct. Therefore, Leahy precedes Castle in formulating this proposed theory; Castle himself confirms this (1993: 99 [*]); see also Jansen-Winkeln 1990. For a recent review of the main five grammatical analyses of the dedication formula *jrj.n=f m mnw=f* and his own, see Depuydt 2001.

⁶⁴³ The main text of the Dream Stela of Tanutamani, from the Amun Temple at Gebel Barkal (Cairo Museum JE 48863, verso, 22), has *kd=f n=f kt h(3)jt n prj(t) r-h3(t)* “He built for him another portico for going outside;” see Grimal 1981: pls. III–IIIa (22); *FHN*: 193, 201; Breyer 2003: 485 (22).

⁶⁴⁴ Lit. “in beautiful, white, good stone of sandstone.”

Furthermore, from the second building inscription is another passage by the same king stating:⁶⁴⁵

*jr(j).n=f m mnw=f n mwt=f mwt nb(t) pt ḥnwt t3-stj ḳd=f pr=s s^c3=f
ḥwt-ntr=s m-m3w(t) m jnr ḥd nfr (n) rwd*

“It is his monuments that he made for his mother, Mut, Mistress of heaven, and lady of Tacity. He built her temple, (and) he enlarged her temple anew in white (and) good sandstone.”⁶⁴⁶

The main text of Taharqa’s year 6 stela (Kawa IV) states that when he passed by this temple, while he was not yet a king (line 10):⁶⁴⁷

gm.n=f ḥwt-ntr tn ḳd.tw m db3(w)t ...

“He found this temple built with bricks ...”

In lines 13–14, Taharqa, now king, speaks to his friends:

*mk jb=j r ḳd ḥwt-ntr n jt=j Jmn-R^c gm-p3-Jtn ḥr-ntt wnn=s ḳd.tw m
db3(w)t (j)^c.tw m 3ḥt*

“Look, my wish is to build a temple for my father, Amun-Re of Gempaaten (Kawa), because it is built with bricks and is covered over with earth.”

This text also describes some of the items within this temple as follows (line 24–25):

wd mnw=s ^cš3 m t3 šd šw=s

“Its many trees were planted in the ground, and its lakes were dug.”

The main text of Taharqa’s year 6 stela from Kawa (Kawa V) states (lines 1–3):⁶⁴⁸

⁶⁴⁵ See Dunham 1970: fig. 3; *FHN*: 132–133.

⁶⁴⁶ Lit. “in white and good stone of sandstone.”

⁶⁴⁷ It was located at the first court of the Amun Temple (Temple T) at Kawa; now in the Khartoum Museum as Khartoum 2678; Macadam 1949: pls. 7–8; *FHN*: 135.

⁶⁴⁸ It was located at the first court of the Amun Temple (Temple T) at Kawa, now in Copenhagen, under number Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek Æ.I.N. 1712; Macadam 1949: pls. 9–10; *FHN*: 145, 148–149.

(j)sk hm=f mrj ntr pw wrš=f m hrw sdr=f m grh hr hñj 3ht n ntrw
 hr kd r3-pr(w=sn w3 r) mrh⁶⁴⁹hr kd r3-pr(w=sn w3 r) mrh hr msj
 sšmw=sn mj sp tp(j) hr kd šn^cw=sn hr sđf⁶⁵⁰h3wt=sn⁶⁵¹ hr sm3^c
 n=sn htpw-ntr m ht nb(t) hr jrjt wdhw(w)=sn m d^cmw hd hmt js(k)
 gr htp jb n hm=f m jrjt n=sn⁶⁵² 3ht r^c nb

“Now his majesty is one who loves god, he spends the day and passes the night seeking what is good for the gods, building (their) temples which had fallen into decay, recreating their images as the primeval time, building their storehouses, provisioning their altars, presenting to them divine-offering(s) of everything, and making their offering-tables of electrum, silver, and copper. Now, moreover, the heart of his majesty is satisfied by doing what is good for them every day.”

The main text of the year 10 stela of Taharqa from Kawa (Kawa VI) speaks of the monuments which the king made for his father Amun of Gempaaten (lines 14–15):⁶⁵³

... nbw h3st=f rd(j).n=f k3rjw r=s m stpw nw
 ddsd mjtt jr(j)w m rmtw nw T3-Mhw

“... gold of its desert⁶⁵⁴ He appointed gardeners to it from the best of the Bahariya Oasis, and the likeness was made from the people of the Delta.”

The same text goes on as follows (lines 19–21):

mh.n=f(st) m mr(t) ^cš3wt rd(j).n=f hmw(t)⁶⁵⁵ r=s m hmwt⁶⁵⁶wrw nw

⁶⁴⁹ The section between *pr* and *mrh* is not clear in the original stela, see Macadam 1949: pls. 7–8.

⁶⁵⁰ Here is a crack in the stela, but the word is clear; see Macadam 1949: pls. 7–8.

⁶⁵¹ Although the *FHN* (148, [3]) translates “their altars,” it does not transliterate the suffix pronoun =*sn*, which is here used as a possessive adjective; however =*sn* is written without the three plural strokes perhaps due to the limited space on the stela; see Macadam 1949: pls. 7–8.

⁶⁵² Here also =*sn* is written without the three plural strokes perhaps also due to the limited space on the stela; see Macadam 1949: pls. 7–8, and also the previous note.

⁶⁵³ It was located at the first court of the Amun Temple (Temple T) at Kawa, now in Khartoum under Khartoum 2679; *FHN*: 164, 171–172; Macadam 1949: pls. 11–12.

⁶⁵⁴ Not “its foreign country” as in *FHN*: 171.

⁶⁵⁵ The transcription does not have *t* as the end, but has the female determinative, see Macadam 1949: pls. 11–12. Since the determinative of the previous word *mr(t)* refers to the collective meaning of “male and female servants,” and the second *hmw(t)* is connected to the wives of the chiefs of the

T3-Mḥw ḥ3m jrꜣ m j3rrw(t) nw njwt tn ʕš3 st r dsds rd(j).n=f k3rjw
r=sn m k3rjw nfrw nw mntjw Sṯt

“He filled (it⁶⁵⁷) with many servants, and he assigned maidservants to it from the wives of the chiefs of the Delta. Wine is pressed from the vineyards of this city; they are more numerous than (those of) the Bahariya Oasis. He assigned gardeners to them from the good gardeners of the best of the nomads of Asia.”

Thus, the Twenty-fifth Dynasty kings took credit for building temples, using the phrase *kd=f*. These passages show how involvement with such projects was a royal prerogative. Although Taharqa’s inscriptions use the singular third person of the suffix pronoun, not the first, they are done in the traditional way of this kind of royal inscription. Statements used by Payeftjauemawyneith are closer in phraseology to those of Taharqa. Payeftjauemawyneith’s self-presentation may draw on this text or other royal texts dealing with the same activity. Payeftjauemawyneith’s self-presentation stresses that he was on a mission on the king’s behalf, while Taharqa’s inscriptions reflect royal propaganda to legitimize his rule, the “*King’s Novel*,” and piety toward the deities. This non-royal involvement in building activities in the period shows how royal prerogatives were probably seized by Saite officials such as Payeftjauemawyneith.

ON THE EXPRESSION *Hwj-mkj*

In his self-presentation on Louvre A 93 Statue, Payeftjauemawyneith says, “I guarded Tawer for its lord; I protected its entire people.”⁶⁵⁸ These two statements refer to a royal action done in the Tawer Nome by a non-royal individual and may also refer to some protective activities conducted by Payeftjauemawyneith there. This expression and the use of these two verbs together are not clear, if the scribe did not want to stress double protection.

Following Eberhard Otto,⁶⁵⁹ Hans Goedicke thinks these statements should refer to the exemption of the Tawer Nome and its people from taxes, and furthermore

Delta, and if we keep in mind the hostile relationship between the rulers of the Delta and the Kushites since the invasion of Piye, this *ḥmw(t)* should be understood as female servants, not male servants, because the latter are already included in the word *mr(t)* and need no repeating here.

⁶⁵⁶ There is wordplay between *ḥmt* “female servant” and *ḥmt* “wife.”

⁶⁵⁷ I.e., the city.

⁶⁵⁸ Lines 7–8; see Chapter Five, above.

⁶⁵⁹ Otto 1954: 165 (n. 4).

points out that this tax exemption was claimed by a high official, not by the king.⁶⁶⁰ He understands the verb *hwj* and the noun *hwt* as terminology for tax exemption; this is, he points out, a term meaning “to protect” and “protection,” but one with “eine juristische Spezialbedeutung.”⁶⁶¹ He also confirms that the exemption expressed thereby concerns what he calls “die grundsätzlichen Verpflichtungen” and not, however, what he calls “die Sonderleistungen.” For this, the exemptions were waived and were a necessarily special decree.⁶⁶² However, Hermann Kees thinks that this is a reference to a policy change in the favor of the temple as a religious institution.⁶⁶³ Goedicke states that Lichtheim and others accept the opinion of Kees.⁶⁶⁴ Therefore, shedding light on this expression might be useful in our understanding of Payeftjauemawyneith’s self-presentation.

I here only cite examples only from the first millennium BCE.⁶⁶⁵ First of all, Gebel Es-Silsilah No. 100 of Shoshenq I has the expression *hwj-mkj*.⁶⁶⁶

*hwj-mkj*⁶⁶⁷ *k3t nbt*

“to double protect any work.”⁶⁶⁸

Ricardo A. Caminos, following Jean Capart, Alan H. Gardiner, and Baudouin Van De Walle,⁶⁶⁹ states that the expression *hwj-mkj* “denotes protection against external interference and is often met with in decretal documents.”⁶⁷⁰ The expression *hwj-mkj* was also typically used in a royal decree in the late Saite Period, very much closer in date to our text. The Mit Rahina stela of Apries again has the *hwj-mkj* expression:

⁶⁶⁰ Goedicke 1982:174.

⁶⁶¹ Goedicke 1967: 246. See also Spiegelberg 1907: 55–57.

⁶⁶² Goedicke 1967: 246.

⁶⁶³ Kees 1953: 103 f.; Goedicke 1982: 173.

⁶⁶⁴ Goedicke 1982:174.

⁶⁶⁵ The expression *hwj-mkj* first appeared in the late Old Kingdom exemption royal decrees; see, for example, *Urk.* I: 287; Goedicke 1967: 116, (fig. 9); Strudwick 2005: 111. However, earlier royal decrees only employed the verb *hwj* in its nominal form, infinitive, without the verb *mkj* or its nominal form *mkt*. For these royal decrees, see Weill 1912; Goedicke 1967; Strudwick 2005. See also Malaise 1989.

⁶⁶⁶ Caminos 1952: 46 (pls. X, XII, 43), 50 (43).

⁶⁶⁷ The two verbs *hwj* and *mkj* are written abbreviated.

⁶⁶⁸ Caminos (1952: 50) translates “to reserve and protect any work.”

⁶⁶⁹ Capart, Gardiner, and Van De Walle 1936: 178–179.

⁶⁷⁰ Caminos (1952: 56 [n. 43]) calls the expression *hwj-mkj* “technical phrase.”

*jw g(rt) wd.n⁶⁷¹ hm(=j) hwt mkt tš pn n jt(=j) Pth Rsy Jnb=f nb
 ʿnh-(tšwj) m-ʿ jrj(t) kšt nb(t) jr(rt) m šw*

“(My) majesty also commanded exemption and protection of this region⁶⁷² for (my) father, Ptah, South-of-His-Wall, lord of Ankh-(Tawy), from conducting any construction done in irrigation (?)⁶⁷³ work.”⁶⁷⁴

The expression *hwj-mkj* in Payeftjauemawyneith’s statements is composed of two verbs, not one; it, moreover, refers to two acts of protection: Payeftjauemawyneith’s protection of the Tawer Nome for its lord and his protection of its entire people. The two verbs are separate, not following each other. The two statements in which this expression is used are short and incomplete. With the expression shortly written, it is difficult to conclude a specific action from it. The use of this two-verb expression in a non-royal context is totally different from that of the royal decrees in all periods. The royal decrees have a specific category mainly dealing with exemption from the public works. If Payeftjauemawyneith’s expression has something to do with this, it would be written in the king’s voice. The two verbs may refer to somewhat limited action, among others, achieved by Payeftjauemawyneith at Abydos, and not to a specific royal exemption. The royal exemption decrees are different in form, content, phraseology, and placement. Payeftjauemawyneith’s statements are generic. It is obvious that the scribe of Apries’s decree might have drawn on an Old Kingdom model,⁶⁷⁵ but this was not the case with Payeftjauemawyneith’s text. The two verbs on Louvre A 93 use the active, not the passive, voice. The word order of the verbal form used is *sdm.n=f* + direct nominal object + dative in the first statement, while *sdm.n=f + n* + direct nominal object in the second statement. These two verbs do not refer to tax exemption made in Abydos by Payeftjauemawyneith. There is no clear reference to that. Apries’s text also does not confirm that.

Goedicke proposes this tax exemption idea, but in his older publication he does not solve this problematic issue or offer any explanation.⁶⁷⁶ The idea of tax exemption

⁶⁷¹ See Gunn 1927: 222; Der Manuelian 1994: 377 (7).

⁶⁷² Gunn (1927: 235) understands the region as reference to “its inhabitants.” The second statement, “I protected its entire people,” on Louvre A 93, may support Gunn’s viewpoint.

⁶⁷³ See Der Manuelian 1994: 379 (n. 318).

⁶⁷⁴ Gunn (1927: 222) translates “My Majesty has further decreed that this region be reserved and protected.” Thus, Gunn translates *hwj* “to reserve” and *mkj* “to protect,” and he thinks that they utilized of “a dominion dedicated to a god.” Vernus (1996: 563) translates the two verbs as “exempter.”

⁶⁷⁵ See Gunn 1927; Vernus 1996.

⁶⁷⁶ Goedicke 1967.

is not totally convincing. It is also hard to believe that the whole Tawer Nome was exempted from taxation. The royal exemption decrees often refer to the exemption of specific group(s) from the public works for some specific purposes at some specific institutions. Moreover, the expression *ḥwj-mkj* appeared from the year after the twenty-second time (or occasion) in the reign of Pepy II. Before that, the verb *ḥwj*, with or without the preposition *n* as dative, was usually used. When a text expresses protection, the verb *ḥwj* is often the verb used. The expression *ḥwj-mkj* was employed in the same way from the Old Kingdom through the Saite Period. Furthermore, all the examples belong to the royal context of this kind of text, not to the non-royal context as Payeftjauemawyneith's. Thus, the *ḥwj-mkj* expression here does not refer to the tax exemption of the whole nome and its people.

The double protection⁶⁷⁷ that Payeftjauemawyneith had performed at Abydos is obscure and not understood. It is known neither exactly what he did there nor why he carried on these actions and from what he protected the Tawer Nome and all its people. We are equally ignorant of how urgent the need was to dispatch this high official to fix the situation at the Tawer Nome. The temple lands which Payeftjauemawyneith sets aside to provide wine and other offerings to the god of the temple were lands excluded from taxes since they were attached to the temple, in addition to other things. However, this is not the exact meaning of these two verbs, and the verb *ḥwj* does not mean only to set aside some of the local fields for the god; also, the verb *mkj* does not mean only to protect the actual citizens from an abusive or exploitative governor. In my opinion, the "double protection" to which the text refers is twofold: the state protection of its citizens; and the protection of the state from the revolts and rebellions of its people against it due to the lack of stability and justice.⁶⁷⁸ It is notable that this double protection is achieved by one of the state representatives, not by the head of the state, i.e., the king. That was probably due to the decline of the central administration during the course of the so-called "civil war" between Apries and Amasis. Therefore, these events might have occurred during the transition from the reign of Apries to that of Amasis.

PAYEFTJAUEMAWYNEITH'S TITLES

Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentations reveal many titles, several of which bear discussion here.

⁶⁷⁷ In a similar context but very different period, the expression *ḥwj-mkj* could be compared with two Arabic verbs usually used to express the same idea. These two verbs are "yassoon" meaning "to preserve" and "yahmi," meaning "to protect."

⁶⁷⁸ For more on law and the concept of maat in ancient Egypt, see Allam 2007a: 263–272.

wr zwnww, chief physician⁶⁷⁹

The Old Kingdom reading of this title is *wr zwnw*,⁶⁸⁰ or “*wrj zwnww* der Oberste der Ärzte.”⁶⁸¹ Henry George Fischer translates it as “greatest of doctors.”⁶⁸² Quirke,⁶⁸³ who lists this title under the personnel of the House of Life, points out that the early Middle Kingdom sources may refer to the inclusion of a chief physician in the court of a local governor. They also make explicit the “palace context” of some holders of this title and similar ones such as *wr swnww njswt* “chief physician of the king,”⁶⁸⁴ and *wr swnww pr-ʿ3* “chief physician of Pharaoh.”⁶⁸⁵ Some of the late Middle Kingdom sources belong to the royal domain of the king, such as the titles on the Cairo stela CG 20023.⁶⁸⁶ That may indicate that Payeftjauemawyneith’s office as chief physician *wr swnww*⁶⁸⁷ refers to his connection with the royal palace. Paul Ghalioungui, following Henri Gauthier, states that “in the Saitic-Ptolemaic Period the title *wr swnw* was the privilege of the high-priest of the Saitic nome and first prophet of Neith.”⁶⁸⁸ That was not always true because Payeftjauemawyneith was not the high priest of the Saite Nome.

wr zwnww Šmʿw Mḥw, chief physician of Upper and Lower Egypt

In the Old Kingdom this title was written as “*wr zwnw Mḥw Šmʿw/Šmʿw Mḥw* greatest/chief of the physicians of Lower and Upper Egypt.”⁶⁸⁹ Diana Alexandra

⁶⁷⁹ One of his epithets, *sʿr ḥrt zwnww r-ḥnw n ʿḥ*, “who presents the affairs of physicians to the interior of the palace,” is related to his offices as chief physician and chief physician of Upper and Lower Egypt.

⁶⁸⁰ See Jones 2000: 396 (1462); Murray 2004: pl. XXXVII; *Urk.* I: 38 (7), 39 (5);

⁶⁸¹ Edel 1955: § 950; or “der Oberarzt;” see *Wb.* I: 329 (11); III: 427 (13); or “(Ober-)Arzt” or “Medikus;” see Hannig 2006b: 218 (7845).

⁶⁸² Fischer 1966: 65. Ward (1982: no. 731) translates it as “chief physician.”

⁶⁸³ Quirke 2004a: 35–37.

⁶⁸⁴ It is Hatnub no. 15 = Ward 1982: no. 732; see Quirke 2004a: 37.

⁶⁸⁵ It is on Cairo CG 447 = Ward 1982: no. 1281; Quirke 2004a: 37.

⁶⁸⁶ See Quirke 2004a: 37. However, Grajetzki (2001: 22 [3.1.]) mentions it is “*swnw*,” not “*wr swnw*,” citing Ghalioungui (1983: 24).

⁶⁸⁷ Jonckheere (1958: 34 [22]) reads this title differently, as “*wr sjnw*,” while Gestermann (2001: 133) reads “*wr sjnw.w*.”

⁶⁸⁸ Ghalioungui 1983: 39.

⁶⁸⁹ Pressl (1998: 233 E 3.5, S. 2, T 1) inserts genitival *n* after *swnww*. See also Jones 2000: 398 (1467). Junker translates this title “der größte der Ärzte von Unter-und Oberägypten,” see Junker (1928: 65), who refers to this title on BM EA 83. Lefebvre (1956: 22 [n. 4]) reads and translates it “*wr swnw(w) šmʿw mḥw* médecin en chef du Sud et Nord.” Gestermann (2001: 133) reads “*wr sjnw.w. šmʿ.w mḥ.w*.”

Pressl⁶⁹⁰ reads and translates “*wr šwnw šm^c.t Mh.w* Großer der Ärzte von ober-und unterägypten.” Hermann Grapow⁶⁹¹ states that this title seems to designate a “Gesundheitsminister.” Payeftjauemawyneith as physician had reached the pinnacle top of this career by holding the title *wr zwnww Šmw^c Mh.w*.⁶⁹²

jmj-r3 pr-wr, high steward

In Old Kingdom texts, Dilwyn Jones translates this title “overseer of the ‘Great House’/sanctuary, (national Shrine of Upper Egypt at El-Kab) (?)”.⁶⁹³ Stephen Quirke describes the nature of this office holder as “one of the highest officials” who was “managing the estates beyond the palace walls.”⁶⁹⁴ According to Betsy M. Bryan, the title “*mr pr wr n nsw*” “chief steward of the king” was among the “second-tier offices of the state” in the reign of Thutmose III.⁶⁹⁵ Although the title *jmj-r3 pr-wr* is not connected explicitly with the king (*jmj-r3 pr-wr n njswt*) or with the royal palace (*jmj-r3 pr-wr n pr-njswt*), it is probably abbreviated and did indeed affiliate Payeftjauemawyneith with king or palace.⁶⁹⁶ This was the most important among Payeftjauemawyneith’s titles, as is evident because it directly precedes his name, is attested on all of his monuments, and is the only title that he uses alone.

jmj-r3 prwj ḥd, overseer of the two houses of silver

This title first appeared in the Old Kingdom. Jones offers another translation, “overseer of the two treasuries.”⁶⁹⁷ William A. Ward translates it as “Overseer of the Double House of Silver,”⁶⁹⁸ while Rainer Hannig reads and translates “*jmj-r3 prwj ḥd* Schatzkanzler, Vorsteher der beiden Schatzhäuser.”⁶⁹⁹

jmj-r3 prwj nbw, overseer of the two houses of gold⁷⁰⁰

⁶⁹⁰ See Pressl 1998: 22.

⁶⁹¹ Grapow 1973: 96.

⁶⁹² Jonckheere (1958: 34 [22]) reads this title differently: “*wr sjnw šm^c mh.w*.”

⁶⁹³ See Jones 2000: 118 (473); see also Murray 2004: pl. XXI; *Wb.* I: 517 (2 ff.); Gardiner 1944: 27 (n. 3); 1953: 25.

⁶⁹⁴ Quirke 2004a: 61 (III.2.4).

⁶⁹⁵ Bryan 2006: 85, 93.

⁶⁹⁶ For more on the chief stewards in the New Kingdom, see Helck 1958: 356–365.

⁶⁹⁷ See Jones 2000: 133 (524); Murray 2004: pl. XXI; Gunn 1933: 105 (§ 32); Jelinkova 1950: 352 (no. 9); Helck 1954: 61 (n. 26); Strudwick 1985: 45.

⁶⁹⁸ Ward 1982: no. 192.

⁶⁹⁹ Hannig 2006b: 60 (2036).

⁷⁰⁰ The title (*jmj-r3 prwj ḥd nbw*, overseer of the two houses of silver and gold, is also associated with Payeftjauemawyneith’s treasury titles, which are mentioned above.

This title existed since the Old Kingdom.⁷⁰¹ Georges Goyon translates it “Intendant à la Double-Maison de l’or.”⁷⁰² Erika Schott reads it “*mr prwj-nb*” and translates it “Vorsteher der beiden Goldhäuser,”⁷⁰³ which is close to Kjell T. Rydström’s translation “overseer for the two gold houses,” which he reads as “*jmy-r3 prwy nwb*.”⁷⁰⁴

hrp ʿh, director of the palace

This title first occurred in the “reign of Wadjj.”⁷⁰⁵ According to the *Wb.*, it means “Palastverwalter.”⁷⁰⁶ Helck translates it “Leiter des Palastes.”⁷⁰⁷ Miroslav Barta translates it as “Inspector of the Palace.”⁷⁰⁸ The holder of this title had a role in ritual.⁷⁰⁹ It is only encountered on Louvre A 93, which is dated to the reign of Amasis. However, Payeftjauemawyneith did not hold it on any of his monuments securely dated to the reign of Apries. Therefore, this title probably refers to the previous role of Payeftjauemawyneith in the palace of Apries (presumably at Memphis), not in the palace of Amasis, in whose reign Payeftjauemawyneith was no longer active in his offices.

PAYEFTJAUEMAWYNEITH’S EPITHETS

Payeftjauemawyneith’s self-presentations display many epithets, including the following.

jm3hw ʿ3 m pr njswt, great *jm3hw* in the king’s house

This epithet shows the importance of Payeftjauemawyneith in the royal house and his close relationship with the king. Although usually thought to have only afterlife connotations, this epithet here refers to the living Payeftjauemawyneith.⁷¹⁰

⁷⁰¹ See Jones 2000: 132–133 (522); Murray 2004: pl. XXI; *Urk.* I: 191 (13); Gunn 1933: 105 (§ 32).

⁷⁰² Goyon 1959: 12 (pls. II, V). Goelet (1982: 133, 202 [n. 214]), also translates it “overseer of the (double) administrations of gold.”

⁷⁰³ Schott 1973.

⁷⁰⁴ Rydström 1994: 71 (App. 126 = Goyon 1959: pls. II). Ward (1982: no. 191) also translates it “overseer of the Double House of Gold.”

⁷⁰⁵ See Jones 2000: 707 (2579); Murray 2004: pl. XLIII.

⁷⁰⁶ *Wb.* I: 214 (10–22), III: 328 (13).

⁷⁰⁷ Helck 1954: 25, 32, 85. El-Sayed 1982: 228, understands it “le directeur du palais.”

⁷⁰⁸ Barta 1999.

⁷⁰⁹ Quirke 2004a: 45 (III. 1. 5).

⁷¹⁰ For more on this aspect, see the epithet *jm3hw hr* below.

Once again this title is only encountered on Louvre A 93, dated to the reign of Amasis, and probably refers to the previous role of Payeftjauemawyneith in the palace of Apries.

jm3hw hr,⁷¹¹ *jm3hw* before

The *jm3hw hr* epithet of Payeftjauemawyneith is most notable at the beginning of his biography on BM EA 83 Statue.⁷¹² According to Anthony Leahy, this introductory section of the text “has a double inversion.”⁷¹³ In this case, the correct word order should place *jm3hw-hr* in front of Apries’s two names, not in front of Payeftjauemawyneith’s. That may lead one to conclude that the two king’s names are introduced for honorific transposition, as is usually done with the gods’ names.⁷¹⁴ This seems to be true in the late Saite/early Persian self-presentation of Udjahorresnet, which has many examples of honorific transposition. It seems that this phenomenon was common in late Saite self-presentations. It was also used with kings’ and deities’ names.⁷¹⁵

mḥ-jb n njswt [m] swt nb(w)t, confidant of the king [in] all places

In the Old Kingdom this title was *mḥ-jb n njswt m s(w)t=f nb(w)t* “confidant of the King in all his places.”⁷¹⁶ This also shows the close relationship between the king and Payeftjauemawyneith.

ꜥ3 n ḥ3, great one of the ḥ3-hall

Payeftjauemawyneith had held the title ꜥ3 n ḥ3 “the great one of the ḥ3-hall,”

⁷¹¹ Vittmann (1976: 143 [n. 6]) refers to the presence of this epithet “*jm3hw hr* Apries” on this statue. De Meulenaere (1956: 253 [n. 5]) points out this epithet refers to death in the reign of the king except in our case; see Leahy 1984a: 46. It is true that Payeftjauemawyneith did not die in the reign of Apries; he lived into the reign of Amasis. However, if De Meulenaere’s argument can be accepted, it would be accepted due to the earthly aspect of this epithet, not because of the existence of Payeftjauemawyneith in the reign of Apries. On the Saite formula *jm3hw-hr-njswt*, see Rößler-Köhler 1989 and above.

⁷¹² Unlike the Middle Kingdom texts, which have this epithet placed “at the end of the offering formula, following the list of requests;” see Doxey 1998: 94.

⁷¹³ Leahy: pers. com.

⁷¹⁴ See, for instance, *jm3hw hr ḥwtḥr* “the *jm3hw* before Hathor;” Clère 1979: 349.

⁷¹⁵ See Chapter Four, under Neshor’s title *jm3hw hr njswt-bjt Ḥꜥ-jb-Rꜥ*, for further discussion of this title.

⁷¹⁶ See Jones 2000: 448 (1678).

which H. S. K. Bakry translates “chief of the bureau (*dīwān*).”⁷¹⁷ Rainer Hannig renders *ḥ3* “Halle,” “Büro,” “Diwan,” “Amt,” and “Amtsgebäude,”⁷¹⁸ and *ʕ3 n ḥ3* “Bürovorsteher.”⁷¹⁹ The king and the court were described as *ḥ3 wr* “the great *ḥ3*-Hall.”⁷²⁰ Patricia Spencer does not list this term in her study of the terminology for halls and courts.⁷²¹

According to Gaston Maspero and Percy Edward Newberry,⁷²² the word *ḥ3* appeared for the first in the Sixth Dynasty, particularly in Spell 432 of the Pyramid Texts of Pepi I,⁷²³ designating a “columned hall.” The *Wb.* also refers to the occurrence of this word in the Old Kingdom, meaning “hall” or “the king’s hall.”⁷²⁴ The determinative of this word (Gardiner Sign-List O 27) may refer to a room or an office for official activities.

Percy Edward Newberry⁷²⁵ points out that from the early Middle Kingdom *ḥ3* was used for “juridical⁷²⁶ and business” reasons. Moreover, he states that the king and his main officials each had his own *ḥ3*, as did each major department of the administration. Therefore, in his opinion, the royal audience hall or “*dīwān es Sultān*” (*ḥ3 n njwst*) was the place in which the king administrated publicly the state affairs and conferred his favors.⁷²⁷ Among the main bureaux and sectors of state providing palace funds was the *ḥ3 n ʔtj*,⁷²⁸ which appears only in a bureaucratic role.⁷²⁹ *ḥ3 n ʔtj* “bureau of the vizier” was mentioned among the Duties of the Vizier in the New

⁷¹⁷ Bakry 1970: 325. Before Bakry, Maspero (1888: 277 [7]), Newberry (1900: 99), and Gardiner (1947a: 23 [84]) translate *ḥ3* “*dīwān*.”

⁷¹⁸ See Hannig 2006b: 622 (22581, 22583).

⁷¹⁹ Hannig 2006b: 622 (22584). Faulkner (1999: 183) translates “office” and “bureau;” see also *Urk.* IV: 150 (13), 152 (12), 1103 (15), 1117 (17), 1119 (7); Sethe 1983: 81 (3); Faulkner 1955: 21 (c); Newberry 1900: 99.

⁷²⁰ Hannig 2006b: 622 (22582).

⁷²¹ Spencer 1984: 63–98.

⁷²² Maspero 1888: 277 (7); Newberry 1900: 99.

⁷²³ For this spell, see Allen 2005: 19 (20).

⁷²⁴ *Wb.* III: 221 (18).

⁷²⁵ Newberry 1900: 99.

⁷²⁶ Maspero (1888: 277 [7], [n.2]) had previously mentioned this function, citing P. Abbott (= P. BM EA 10221), pl. VII, I. 16. *ḥ3* occurs in this line of this papyrus “... .. *m ḥ3 n sšw n ʔtj*.” Peet (1930: 42, 7 [16], pl. IV, 7 [16]) translates the whole line as “A report was drawn up; it is deposited in the archives of the vizier.” For *ḥ3 n sšw n ʔtj*, see Lacau 1949: 11, 15–16, 23–24; Helck 1975: 67–69.

⁷²⁷ Maspero (1888: 278) had previously mentioned this title “le diwan du sultan” and these royal actions within the *ḥ3*-hall.

⁷²⁸ The late Middle Kingdom Papyrus Brooklyn 35.1446 refers to this *ḥ3*-hall, see Hayes (1972: 55, 61, 69, 74, 77, 81, 138–141, 143), who translates “the Office of the Vizier.”

⁷²⁹ See Quirke 1990.

Kingdom, a composition that Quirke dates “on internal grounds to the late Middle Kingdom.”⁷³⁰ According to him, there was another title, *jmj-r3 ʿhwtj n h3 n t3tj* “overseer interior-overseer of the bureau of the vizier.”⁷³¹ He further refers to the existence of the bureau of the vizier as a “physical building” on the basis of the title “doorkeeper of the bureau of the vizier.”⁷³²

In the early New Kingdom, *h3* designated many offices or halls: *h3*, *h3 n 3hwt*, *h3 n pr-njswt*, *h3 n njswt*, *h3 n s3w n t3tj*, *h3 n t3tj n tp-rsj*, *h3 n t3tj ʿnd h3 n dd-rmt*.⁷³³ G. P. F. Van Den Boorn understands *h3* as “hall,” “office,” or “bureau of an official.”⁷³⁴ The expression *h3 n s3(w)*⁷³⁵ “archives”⁷³⁶ (lit. “office of the writings”) occurred in the New Kingdom.⁷³⁷

The viziral archives *h3 n s3w n t3tj qr h3 n t3tj* may fit into our text. Van den Boorn⁷³⁸ points out that the Duties of the Vizier indicates a close relation between the palace and the bureau of the vizier. In the tomb of Rekhmire (TT 100), there is the sentence *jr jst h3 sdm=k jm=f jw wshjt jm=f*⁷³⁹ “Behold, as for the *h3*-hall in which you judge, there is a broad hall in it.”⁷⁴⁰ I: 7 and I: 13 of P. Berlin 10470 mention a *h3 n t3tj*, which Paul C. Smither translates “the Court of the Vizier.”⁷⁴¹ Van den

⁷³⁰ Quirke 2004a: 85 (III.3.1).

⁷³¹ Quirke (2004a: 86) mentions this form of the title *jmj-r3 ʿhwtj n t3tj* “interior-overseer for the vizier.”

⁷³² Quirke 2004a: 86. For “doorkeeper of the bureau of the vizier,” see Ward 1982: no. 503.

⁷³³ For more on these, see Van den Boorn 1988. Some of these already existed in the late Middle Kingdom; see Hayes 1972; Quirke 1990; 2004a.

⁷³⁴ Van den Boorn 1988: 22 (5, n. 59).

⁷³⁵ Redford (2004: 40 [n. P]) reads *h3 n s3w* and translates “the archive” in describing the duties of Ahmose son of Nesatum that he found his fragmentary statue at Mendes; for more on this statue, see Redford 2004: 38, 39 (n. D), 58 (No. 483a), 104 (fig. 57, no. 483a); and above.

⁷³⁶ For more on archive, see Lur’e 1971: 30; Helck 1975: 422–424; Quirke 1996a.

⁷³⁷ *Wb.* III: 221 (4); Blackman 1941: 89 (n. 38); Lesko 2002, I: 343. The correct writing of this expression should be *h3 n s3w*.

⁷³⁸ Van den Boorn 1988: 22 (5).

⁷³⁹ See *Urk.* IV: 1092 (6); Davies 1943: pl. CXVIII (R 18); Faulkner 1955: fig. 2 (18).

⁷⁴⁰ Gardiner (1973: 185 [§ 248]) cites this example as an enclitic usage of *jst*. Faulkner (1955: 22–23) translates the whole line as “And as for the office in which you judge, there is a spacious room in it full of [the records (?) of all (past)] judgments.” Davies (1943: 88 [n. 48]) favors *hr md3wt wdʿ mdw nb*, translating the whole thing “Now the hall in which thou hearest cases has a broad room in it which contains [records of all] legal decisions,” while Faulkner (1955: 27 [n. 54]) favors *hr s3w wdʿ mdw nb*. Faulkner (1955: 22[4], 24 [n. 17]) restores and reads the last sentence of line 4 as *ʿpr [r] sdm m h3 [n t3tj]* “equipped [for?] hearing (?) in the [vizier’s] hall.” He (1955: 24 [n. 17]) sees that *n t3tj* after *h3* is unavoidable. The translations of Davies and Faulkner indicate the juridical function of the *h3*-hall.

⁷⁴¹ See Smither 1948: 32 (7, 13), pl. I (7, 13).

Boorn⁷⁴² refers to the iconographical representation of the *h3*-hall of the vizier (of Upper Egypt) in TT 100 of Rekhmire and TT 29 of Amenemopet. He⁷⁴³ thinks that it was a building with a multiplicity of rooms and a major reception hall (“or session hall”) served by its own personnel.⁷⁴⁴ According to him *h3 n pr-njswt*,⁷⁴⁵ “the *h3*-hall of the king’s house,” housed the royal government, and the vizier appointed the chief of the police to this *h3*-hall. He, thus, suggests that this hall was a kind of “reception-hall” open to people from outside the governmental administration complex. He prefers to translate it “hall” rather than “bureau” and equates it with *wshyt pr-njswt* “the broad hall of the palace.” Thutmose III installed Rekhmire into the office of the vizier of Upper Egypt in this hall.⁷⁴⁶ The most relevant title to our discussion that Newberry describes is “the chief officer” of this hall, (*jmj-r3 h3 n njswt*) “overseer of the royal audience-hall,”⁷⁴⁷ “who had charge of the police regulations” and was probably a “master of the ceremonies.”⁷⁴⁸ According to Newberry,⁷⁴⁹ Nebamun (TT 24, reign of Thutmose II, at Dra Abu Al Naga)⁷⁵⁰ occupied this office.⁷⁵¹

In the Hood-Wilbour Papyrus,⁷⁵² the title *3 n h3 n nbt*⁷⁵³=*f*^c.*w.s.* “the great one of the *h3*-hall of his lord, l.p.h.”⁷⁵⁴ is found.⁷⁵⁵ Alan H. Gardiner⁷⁵⁶ cites some other

⁷⁴² Van den Boorn 1988: 22 (5), 324 (3); 1985:19 (n. 86); Davies 1943: pl. XXIV–V. For the placement of the *h3*-hall of the vizier on the hypothetical layout of *hmw-pr-njswt-pr-3*, see Van den Boorn 1988: 67 (fig. 5).

⁷⁴³ Van den Boorn 1988: 22 (5).

⁷⁴⁴ Davies (1943: 32 [n. 76]) describes the *h3*-hall in TT 29: “There is a considerable space behind the columned hall, enclosed by a wall, and here numbers of men are seated. A scribe records a receipt in kind. ... This seems to imply that the hall had reception rooms behind it.” For its personnel, see Ward 1982: nos. 87, 503; Helck 1958: 53–54.

⁷⁴⁵ Van den Boorn (1988: 252 [n. 3]; 1985: 24 [n. 107]) states that *h3 n njswt* designates any administrative office, and not specifically an office of the palace.

⁷⁴⁶ Newberry 1900: 100.

⁷⁴⁷ My translation of this title is “overseer of the *h3*-hall of the king.”

⁷⁴⁸ Maspero (1888: 278) previously mentions the functions of those officials who were in charge of the *h3*-hall within this hall.

⁷⁴⁹ Newberry 1900: 100.

⁷⁵⁰ Kampff (1996: 209–210) dates this tomb to the reign of Thutmose II/Thutmose III. For more on this tomb, see Kampff 1996: 209–210, figs. 104 and 110; *PM I*: 41–42.

⁷⁵¹ The self-presentation of Nebamun states *rdj.n=f wj (jmj-r3) h3 n njswt* “he (i.e., the king) appointed me the overseer of the *h3*-hall of the king;” see *Urk.* IV: 150 (13). For his title *jmj-r3 h3 n njswt*, see *Urk.* IV: 152 (12).

⁷⁵² It is P. BM EA 10202 (or P. Hood), dating to the Third Intermediate Period; see Parkinson et al. 1999: 61; Gardiner 1947, I: 24–63, particularly 26 (ii), 29–30 (ii), 1*–26*; 1947, II: pl. XIV–XV. *Nbt* is miswritten here; the word should read *nb*.

⁷⁵⁴ Parkinson et al. (1999: 62) translates “Great One of the Office of his Lord l.p.h.”

⁷⁵⁵ See Maspero 1888: 257 (15), 277 (7); Newberry (1900:101) does not transliterate or translate *c.w.s.*; Gardiner 1947, III: pl. XIV (15).

variants of the title such as $\text{ʕ}3 n \text{h}3 n nbw$ ⁷⁵⁷ “the great one of the $\text{h}3$ -hall of all affairs,” and $\text{ʕ}3 n \text{h}3 n nb=f$ ⁷⁵⁸ “the great one of the $\text{h}3$ -hall of his lord.” He translates the title “chief of bureau (*diwān*) of his lord,” and points out that it is a very rarely mentioned title with unknown functions. However, an identical title, $\text{ʕ}3 n \text{h}3$ “the great one of the $\text{h}3$ -hall,”⁷⁵⁹ occurs in a Saite⁷⁶⁰ text on BM EA 525, the black basalt anthropoid sarcophagus of the scribe Nesisout.⁷⁶¹ The limestone stela Stockholm no. 52⁷⁶² has this title in the phrase $Wsjr \text{ʕ}3 n \text{h}3 n nb-t3wj Jmn-w3h-sw$ ⁷⁶³ $m3^c-hrw$ ⁷⁶⁴ “Osiris, the great one of the $\text{h}3$ -hall of the lord of the Two Lands, Amun-wah-sw, true of voice,” and in the phrase $s3=f \text{ʕ}3 n \text{h}3 n nb-t3wj Jmn-w3h-sw m3^c-hrw$ “His son, the great one of the $\text{h}3$ -hall of the lord of the Two Lands, Amun-wah-sw, true of voice.” Newberry⁷⁶⁵ considers that the $\text{ʕ}3 n \text{h}3$ was the same as the earlier official $jmj-r3 \text{h}3 n njswt$. According to Gaston Maspero,⁷⁶⁶ in Ptolemaic Egypt, the $\text{ʕ}3 n \text{h}3$ holders corresponded to the chiefs of the royal audiences cited by Strabo (17: 797) and mentioned by Giacomo Lumbroso.⁷⁶⁷ However, Newberry⁷⁶⁸ sees no reason for connecting those with the earlier $\text{ʕ}3 n \text{h}3$ title holders because those Alexandrian officials were only in charge of “the writing the minutes and records.”

In the first millennium BCE texts we encounter “ $\text{h}3 n sh.w$ ” or “ $\text{h}3 n šs.w$ ”⁷⁶⁹ which Michel Malinine first understands as “archives”⁷⁷⁰ and literally translates “office des écrits.”⁷⁷¹ In Shoshenq’s Stela, as Richard Jasnow⁷⁷² remarks, James Henry

⁷⁵⁶ Gardiner 1947 I: 23* (84).

⁷⁵⁷ See Gardiner 1947, III: pl. XVII (20). It is on BM EA 10379, a strip of leather, recto; see Gardiner 1947 I: 26.

⁷⁵⁸ See Gardiner 1947, III: pl. XVIII (14). It is on BM EA 10379, a strip of leather, verso; Gardiner 1947 I: 26.

⁷⁵⁹ Zivie-Coche (1991: 286 [pl. 47]) translates this title “grand de l’antichambre (?)” See also De Meulenaere 1966: 11 (n. 38).

⁷⁶⁰ De Meulenaere dates to the Thirtieth Dynasty (?); see Limme 1972: 96 (n. 5), while Sharpe (1981 II: pl. 30 [2]) to the Twenty-fifth Dynasty.

⁷⁶¹ See Piehl 1895: pl. XLIII, A; 1903: 32; *PM* III.1; 290–291; Limme 1972: 96–97 (Doc. 1); Sharpe 1981 II: pl. 30 (2); El-Sadeek 1984: 132; Zivie-Coche 1991: 286–287, pl. 47. For the correct reading of this name *Ns-ʕs(w)t*, see De Meulenaere 1962: 31–35; Limme 1972: 96 (n. 7).

⁷⁶² See Mogensen 1919: 58 (e).

⁷⁶³ For this name, see Ranke 1935: 27 (2).

⁷⁶⁴ See Mogensen 1919: 59 (i).

⁷⁶⁵ Newberry 1900: 101.

⁷⁶⁶ Maspero 1888: 278 (n. 2).

⁷⁶⁷ See Lumbroso 1967: 180–182.

⁷⁶⁸ Newberry 1900: 101.

⁷⁶⁹ Malinine 1951: 168 (n. 45).

⁷⁷⁰ Malinine 1951: 160 (24), pl. II (24); 1953: 60–61 (33).

⁷⁷¹ Malinine 1951: 168 (n. 45); Malinine 1950: 168 (n. 45). Then he reads it “ $\text{h}3j n sh.w$ Bureau-des-Écrits;” see Malinine 1953: 36–37.

Breasted referred to a “contract” or “document of endowment” that was registered in “the hall of writings,”⁷⁷³ which Breasted understood as the “temple archives,”⁷⁷⁴ while Aylward Blackman translates “*ḥ3 n sš* the office of archives.”⁷⁷⁵ Aylward Blackman,⁷⁷⁶ moreover, offers the alternation term *st sš* “place of writings,” which occurs on the Ewerot Stela.⁷⁷⁷ Michel Malinine points out that the Kushite texts have “*ḥ3 n sh.w* Hall of Writings,” whereas the Saite texts have “*s.t n sh.w* Place of Writings.”⁷⁷⁸

In his study on the jurisprudence of the Saite and Persian Periods, Erwin Seidl⁷⁷⁹ reads and translates “*ḥ3 n sh.w* Die Halle der Urkunden,” arguing that the *ḥ3*-hall was “a court,” not “an archive.”⁷⁸⁰ He lists the *ḥ3*-hall under the *knb.t* division of the judicial activity of the court system.⁷⁸¹ He cites this example, depending on P. Louvre 3228c,⁷⁸² I 24, P. Vatican 10574,⁷⁸³ P. Turin 2118, 33,⁷⁸⁴ “Ihre Aussage wird in der Halle der Urkunden, *ḥ3 n sh.w*, nicht gehört warden.” He suggests that the “*ḥ3 n sh.w*” was a court run by priests at the temples, without specifying its exact location at the temples. He, however, does not negate the archival nature of the *ḥ3*-hall in the Saite and Persian Periods, and, moreover, points out that the *ḥ3*-hall could have served as a court and an archive. However, he thinks that P. Turin 2118, 28 “is not a clear proof for an archive.” In order to support his opinion, Seidl cites Michel Malinine’s translation, “Leurs écrits (qui sont) dans le bureau (?) ne sont plus valables pour nous,”⁷⁸⁵ which agrees with the *Wb.* in his opinion. He refers to the existence of a

⁷⁷² Jasnow 2003: 788 (n. 98).

⁷⁷³ *BAR* IV: 330; Théodoridès 1995: 452–453 (n. 11).

⁷⁷⁴ *BAR* IV: 330 (n. b).

⁷⁷⁵ Blackman 1941: 84, pl. X, 9, 89 (n. 38).

⁷⁷⁶ Blackman 1941: 89 (n. 38).

⁷⁷⁷ For this stela, see Legrain 1897: 14.

⁷⁷⁸ Malinine 1980: 15 (n. 53). Malinine (1973: 207 [n. w]) refers to incorrect transcription of “*s.t n sš*” (lit. “place d’écrit[s]”) instead of “*ḥ3*” [*n sš*].

⁷⁷⁹ Seidl 1968: 32.

⁷⁸⁰ Seidl 1968: 32, 43; see also Spiegelberg (1892: 52), who previously connected it with *knbt*.

⁷⁸¹ The abnormal hieratic papyri P. Louvre 3228 C, 24 (year 6 of Taharqa; see Malinine 1950: 157; Seidl 1968: 15) and P. Louvre 3228 E, ll. 8–9 (year 10 of Shabaqo; see Seidl 1968: 15) indicate the legal nature of the *ḥ3*-hall as a hearing place. P. Louvre 3228 C, 24, reads “*bn sdm r=f m ḥ3 nb n sšw* His deposition shall not be listened to in any office of writings;” see Revillout and Boudier 1895: pl. 4; Černy 1945: 41 (3); Malinine 1950: 157. P. Louvre 3228 E, ll. 8–9, reads “*jr p3 nt(y) jw=f mdw bn sdm r=f m ḥ3 nb nsw*.” Černy (1945: 41 [3]) translates “As for him who will contest (it) his deposition shall not be listened to in any office;” see also Malinine 1953: 6; Bakir 1978: pl. 12. Černy (1945: 41 [3]) here understands *ḥ3 nb n sšw* as “any court.”

⁷⁸² It dates to year 6 of Taharqa; see Malinine 1951: 157; Seidl 1968: 15.

⁷⁸³ It dates to year 22 of Piye; see Parker 1966: 112; Janssen 1968: 171–172; Seidl 1968: 15.

⁷⁸⁴ It dates to year 30 of Psamtik I; see Malinine 1953: 9; Seidl 1968: 15.

⁷⁸⁵ Seidl 1968: 43.

place to register the important documents, as was the case in the New Kingdom and the Graeco-Roman Period.⁷⁸⁶ However, P. S. Vleeming understands “*ḥ3 n sh.w*” as “a building,” not “a special institution.”⁷⁸⁷ Penelope Wilson points out that when *ḥ3* was “applied to the king it refers to his audience or policy making chamber.” This implies, in her opinion, “a secure and safe place.”⁷⁸⁸

In Arabic, “ديوان *dīwān*” has several meanings, such as “department,” “office,” “council,” and “bureau,” any one of which probably fits nicely with Bakry’s translation.⁷⁸⁹ The word “*dēwān/divan*” means “archive,” “register,” “chancery,” “government office,” and “administration” in Persian.⁷⁹⁰ In modern Egypt, “*dīwān*” or “*dīwān*” refers to the governmental institutions. It dates back to the early Islamic caliphate in Egypt when it was used to record the names of the Muslim troops in Al-Fustāt.⁷⁹¹ However, the origins of this word lie in the earliest years of the caliphate of Omar Ibn Al-Khattab at Al-Medina, when he had established a “*dīwān*” for tax payments records and the names of warriors to receive stipends and to fix rates.⁷⁹² In 706 CE under the Umayyad Caliph ‘Abd Al-Malik Ibn Marwan, the Egyptian governmental institutions (*dīwāns*) were Arabized,⁷⁹³ i.e., Arabic was used as the official language of the administration.⁷⁹⁴ Bakry’s translation, which was used by many previous scholars, is very interesting, but it is not known if the ancient Egyptian word had the same meaning as the modern one. This title means “the great one of the *dīwān*” in the Saite Period. It seems to refer to (a) an audience hall for meetings and ceremonies, and (b) certain rooms containing documents.

The title *ḥ3 n ḥ3* of Payeftjauemawyneith, as the Kushite example mentioned above, is generic and does not specify any viziral or royal connection. The signification of Payeftjauemawyneith’s title *ḥ3 n ḥ3* is not exactly known at the period. Moreover, we do not know this rank status or the function of its holder at the time. Since the function of the *ḥ3*-hall was related to administration and receiving audiences, it might have been the *ḥ3*-hall of the king, because all Payeftjauemawyneith’s titles are related in one way or another to the royal realm. For example, on BM EA 83 he speaks of

⁷⁸⁶ Seidl 1968: 44; Seidl 1962: 64 f.

⁷⁸⁷ Vleeming 1980: 15 (n. 53); Jasnow 2003: 788 (97).

⁷⁸⁸ Wilson 1997: 700.

⁷⁸⁹ Baalbaki 2001: 128, 169.

⁷⁹⁰ De Blois 1985: 432; Kashani and Kashani 1986: 57; Mo’in 1992: ١٥٩٩ [= 1599]; Bateni et al. 1999: 245.

⁷⁹¹ The first capital of Islamic Egypt which was founded by ‘Amr Ibn Al-‘Ās in 641 CE; see Kennedy 1998: 64.

⁷⁹² Bosworth 1985: 432–433.

⁷⁹³ On the administrative and military aspects of early Islamic Egypt, see ‘Athamina 1997.

⁷⁹⁴ Kennedy 1998: 71–72.

himself as “he who presents their affairs to the interior of the palace, the great one of the *h3*-hall,” on Mit Rahina 545 “the one who presents their affairs to the interior of the palace, the great one of the *h3*-hall,” and on Louvre A 93 “the great one of the *h3*-hall, the great *jm3hw* in the king’s house.” These reveal that Payeftjauemawyneith’s title “the great one of the *h3*-hall” often comes after his epithet “he who presents their affairs to the interior of the palace,” or, as on Louvre A 93, this title has something to do with the king’s house. All these show that Payeftjauemawyneith had close connections and played important roles in the royal palace, probably of Apries. If so, therefore, Payeftjauemawyneith might have functioned as director of this *h3*-hall of this king, and he might have been responsible for all of its external contacts and for its order and security, as these fell under the duties of the vizier in the early New Kingdom.⁷⁹⁵

CONCLUSION

In addition to his honorific titles and epithets, Payeftjauemawyneith’s many administrative offices show that he was in charge of palace, treasury, physicians’ affairs, and, moreover, he was a confidant of the king. All these titles show that Payeftjauemawyneith was a high elite member who was amongst the most trusted officials of the king. His titles also reveal his primary function and his involvement with numerous projects which he undertook in many places, such as Heliopolis and Abydos. Vittmann⁷⁹⁶ states that Payeftjauemawyneith reached the top of his career under Apries.⁷⁹⁷ Leahy⁷⁹⁸ believes that there was not “a long gap” between the two statues of Payeftjauemawyneith, BM EA 83 and Louvre A 93. Although Louvre A 93 preserves titles and epithets not held by Payeftjauemawyneith on his monuments securely fixed to the reign of Apries, such as *hrp* *ʿh* and *jm3hw* *ʿ3 m pr njswt*, they should be dated in the reign of Apries because, as mentioned above, Payeftjauemawyneith probably was not active in his offices under Amasis.

The prosopographical study of Payeftjauemawyneith’s titles enables us to fix his monuments chronologically and establish their order of production. It also leads us to conclude that he already reached the pinnacle of his career in the reign of Apries, and probably that he was not as appreciated in the reign of Amasis as he had been previously. His new titles on Louvre A 93 were his last titles in the reign of Apries,

⁷⁹⁵ For this function of the vizier in the early New Kingdom, see Van den Boorn 1988: 252.

⁷⁹⁶ Vittmann 1976: 143 (n. 6); Leahy 1984a: 46.

⁷⁹⁷ Leahy (1984a: 53 [n. 11]) points out that Jelínková-Reymond (1957: 253) had made the same point.

⁷⁹⁸ Leahy 1984a: 46.

not in that of Amasis, and they do not represent significant additions to his outstanding career.

Obelisk.com