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The aim of this study is to investigate the origins of those commemorated at Abydos in the Late Period, in order to determine the extent to which it was a national, rather than a purely local, cemetery at that time. The basic source material consists of all the hieroglyphic inscriptions which are known or can be said to come from Abydos and which can be dated to the period from c.750-100 B.C. Because the material has been dispersed throughout the world, often without any record of provenance, the first step is to establish the criteria by which to identify Abydene inscriptions. The second essential preliminary is the dating of the corpus. As almost all the objects are undated, it is necessary to establish a relative chronological sequence which can be attached at crucial points to absolute dates, thus allowing inscriptions to be dated with varying degrees of precision. This is done by using epigraphic criteria, which are the only features common to all the inscriptions.

The specifically Abydene titles are then identified and discussed as a preliminary to the division of those commemorated into those who were actually local residents and those who were from other parts of Egypt. This is done mainly on the basis of theo-
phorous elements in names and titles. It appears that although there is clear evidence for non-residents at Abydos, these were only a small proportion of those commemorated, the large majority of whom were local priests. The unsystematic way in which the cemetery has been excavated has meant that the archaeological contexts of inscriptions are rarely known, and it is therefore very difficult to determine the actual form of commemoration - tomb, offering-chapel or commemorative stela. A detailed topographical survey, correlating the date and distribution of Late Period objects within the cemetery of Abydos, shows that there are clear and apparently deliberate changes in the area in use at a particular time, and it is suggested that these are closely related to the popularity of the cult of Osiris. Finally, the fluctuating appeal of the cult of Osiris at Abydos, as reflected in the extant material, is briefly discussed.
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Introduction

This is a study of the people buried at Abydos in the Late Period, which is here defined as c. 750-100 B.C., thus including both the Late Period proper and most of the Ptolemaic era. The beginning of the period corresponds approximately to the advent of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty, which coincided with, and perhaps partly inspired, a revival in the production of funerary inscriptions at Abydos, \(^1\) which distinguishes it from the preceding poorly documented Third Intermediate Period. The lower chronological limit is determined by the replacement of hieroglyphic as the principal means of expression in monumental inscriptions by Greek and demotic. This was a gradual process to which it is impossible to assign precise dates - the production of hieroglyphic inscriptions ceases almost completely towards the end of the Ptolemaic era, and few can be said to be later than c. 100 B.C.. The demotic stelae from Abydos, \(^2\) on the other hand,

---


2. I include here those stelae on which the inscription is largely or entirely in demotic (usually incised), such as those published by W. Spiegelberg, Die demotischen Denkmäler I : Die demotischen Inschriften, (Leipzig 1904) and III : Demotische Inschriften und Papyri (fortsetzung), (Berlin 1932), but not the few examples on which a brief addition has been made (often in ink) to a hieroglyphic inscription (e.g. BM 1423 and Cairo CG 38412-3), and which date to an earlier period.
seem to date to the period of the Roman occupation, so that there is a hiatus in the first century B.C., which provides a convenient terminal point for an epigraphic survey based on hieroglyphic inscriptions.

The site of Abydos requires little introduction. Situated in one of the most fertile parts of Upper Egypt, the eighth nome, it is probably the most famous provincial site in Egypt. Its ancient importance seems always to have been primarily - even solely - religious. Its relationship with Thinis, the exact location of which is not precisely known, is obscure, but it seems clear that, while

3. Very few are actually dated, but see Cairo CG 50027 (Spiegelberg, op. cit. III, 3-4, pl.II) dated to year 17 of Tiberius; Cairo CG 31138 (ibid. I, 54-5, pl.XV), dated to year 7 of Vespasian (?); Ghazouli, ASAE 58 (1964) pl.XXXIII, temp. Tiberius (?). The relatively small number of Greek inscriptions seem also to date to the first and second centuries A.D. - see J.G. Milne, Greek Inscriptions, (Oxford 1905) 65-9.

4. I have consequently not included objects which are certainly Roman in date, even if the inscription is partly in hieroglyphic - see, for instance, the third example cited in n.3 above. The adaption of demotic to stone inscriptions does not in itself necessarily reflect anything more than the increasingly archaic nature of the hieroglyphic script, although it may, of course, coincide with historical change.

5. For a succinct history of the site, in which a number of important new points are made, see B.J. Kemp, "Abydos" in LA I, cols. 28-41.


7. For a summary of the evidence and references, see ABO II, 38*, 353.
the latter was the administrative and economic capital, Abydos was the only important cemetery in the nome from the Middle Kingdom onwards. It may also have attracted a "burial population" from a much wider area, since, from that date, it was regarded as the burial place of Osiris and became his main cult centre. In the Old Kingdom, the local deity had been Khentamentiu, but in the course of the Middle Kingdom Osiris became the principal god. His char-

8. There were cemeteries elsewhere in the Old Kingdom - J. Garstang, The Third Egyptian Dynasty, (London 1904) and Mahâsa and Bêt Khallâf, (London 1902); G. Reisner, A Provincial Cemetery of the Pyramid Age : Naga-ed-Dèr III, (Oxford 1932) - and in the First Intermediate Period, when the principal cemetery seems to have been at Naga-ed-Dèr and not at Abydos; see D. Dunham, Naga-ed-Dèr Stelae of the First Intermediate Period, (London 1937), and W. Schenkel, Fruhmittelägyptische Studien, (Bonn 1962) 103-4 g). However, from the Middle Kingdom onwards (i.e. once the Osiris cult was firmly established at Abydos), there is no evidence for anything more than the occasional isolated burial anywhere else in the nome, with the exception of the Pan-grave cemetery at Balabish - see G. Wainwright, Balabish, (London 1920). See PM V, 28-9, 36-7, 39.

9. D. O'Connor, "A Regional Population in Egypt to circa 600 B.C.", in B. Spooner (ed.), Population Growth : The Anthropological Implications, (Cambridge, Mass. 1972) 60. The phrase "burial population" should be understood to include all those commemorated at Abydos, whether or not they were actually buried there.


11. W.M.F. Petrie, Abydos II, (London 1903) 47-9, pl.XIX. It is noteworthy that the temple was still called hwt-ntr n jnt-imtiw in the Eleventh Dynasty (ibid., pl.XXIV), and even (archaistically ?) in the Twenty-sixth - Jelínková-Reymond, ASAE 54 (1957) 276, lines 3-4 (Louvre A.93). Khentamentiu alone, as distinct from Osiris-Khentamentiu, is mentioned on only one other Late Period inscription from Abydos - PM 1482.
acteristic epithet changed from 'lord of Busiris' (nb Dđw) to 'great god, lord of Abydos' (ntr '3 nb ʒbdw) and he gradually merged with Khentamentiu. 12 Processions were made to his supposed tomb at Poker, almost certainly to be identified with the Umm el-Qa'ab, 13 and an elaborate mystery play on the subject of the death and resurrection of Osiris was enacted. 14 It seems to have been considered highly desirable to have a commemorative monument dedicated at Abydos to enable the deceased to participate magically after death in these festivals, even though he might actually be buried elsewhere, 15 and Abydos became a place of pilgrimage for the dead as well as the living. From the Eleventh Dynasty onwards, but perhaps especially in the New Kingdom, 16 the pilgrimage of the dead to Abydos was a

13. See, for instance, Kees, Ancient Egypt, 242, and E. Otto, Egyptian Art and the Cults of Osiris and Amun, (London 1968) 47. A black stone "sarcophagus" was found in the tomb of Djer (see Appendix I), together with offerings which indicate that this was regarded as the tomb of the god.
16. This may be merely a reflection of the greater survival rate of New Kingdom tombs.
regular part of tomb decoration, while Vandier has plausibly suggested that much of the smaller statuary of the Middle Kingdom was sold to pilgrims at Abydos to be dedicated in the temple, and even that this genre may have originated there for this very purpose.

The idea that large numbers of people who were not residents of Abydos were commemorated there has been widely accepted, but no detailed study has been made, for any period, of the degree to which Abydos actually was a national cemetery. Such interest as there has been has focussed on the Middle Kingdom, for which the textual evidence for the cult of Osiris at Abydos is most abundant. In particular, Simpson has recently formulated a number of pertinent questions about the nature of the monuments and the origin of their dedicators, as a preliminary to a detailed analysis of at least part of the cemetery in the Middle Kingdom.

It is this question that is to be investigated here, but with

17. Most of the preserved examples are Theban, the earliest being that of D3gi (Tomb 103: PM I, 2nd ed., part 1, 216-17). For a list of the Theban tombs in which this scene is preserved, see ibid., 471.


20. See the references cited by Simpson, Terrace, 1.

21. Ibid., 3-5.
reference to the Late Period, which is made particularly propitious to such a study by the proliferation of sacerdotal titles and theophorous names, which can often indicate the origin of their bearer.

The major obstacles to such a study are the dispersal of the monuments of Abydos, many of which are now in museums without any recorded provenance, and the lack of corpora of material, whether of a chronological, regional or typological nature. The first part of this thesis is therefore devoted to the establishment of a corpus of Late Period Abydene inscriptions. The problems involved will be discussed below; here it is sufficient to note its inevitable incompleteness. There are, doubtless, pieces in the museums and private collections of the world which have escaped my notice, and the publication of these, together with future excavation, will certainly augment our knowledge of the period and enable us to extend the present rather meagre genealogies. However, the corpus does contain all the inscriptions found at Abydos in the course of scientific excavations from the time of Mariette onwards, and published as such.

22. It is apparent from my researches that almost every museum of any size possesses several Late Period stelae, of which at least some are likely to be from Abydos.

23. A German expedition has recently begun work at the Umm el-Qa' ab - see Bollettino d'Informazioni no.43 (1977) 10 - and the Pennsylvania-Yale expedition is scheduled to return to Abydos in August 1977.
as well as material from unpublished excavations there. In addition, a substantial number of objects which can be said with some certainty to come from Abydos, on grounds to be discussed below, have been added. The corpus is therefore sufficiently comprehensive to make it unlikely that future work will radically alter the nature of the sources available.

The second preliminary step has been the dating of the inscriptions, virtually none of which is actually dated, or even bears a cartouche. Although a number of studies have indicated the potential value of epigraphic analysis in dating undated inscriptions, these have been confined to earlier periods and no detailed study of a homogeneous group of Late Period inscriptions has been made. Yet it is only through detailed analysis of a large body of material that the significance of variations in palaeography and orthography becomes apparent. I have therefore established a relative chronological sequence of inscriptions, based on epigraphic criteria and related where possible to absolute dates. In the course of this work, it has become clear that the hitherto published copies of texts, made without regard to apparently unimportant epigraphic minutiae, are often not reliable for this purpose, and I have consequently tried

24. I.e. those of Garstang (1906-9), Frankfort (1925-6) and the Pennsylvania-Yale expedition (1967-9).
to see either the original or a good photograph of every piece; where this has not been possible, this is indicated in the catalogue.

The second, interpretative, part consists of a prosopographic study, in which the status, titles, family relationships and origins of those commemorated are examined. The characteristic Abydene title sequences are identified and distinguished from those which relate to non-Abydene cults. This permits individuals from other parts of Egypt to be isolated, and the nature of their commemorations at Abydos is then considered in the light of a topographical survey of the archaeological evidence. Finally, the implications for the religious history of Abydos and the fortunes of the Osiris cult in the Late Period are discussed.
History of Excavation

A brief assessment of the achievements and shortcomings of archaeological work at Abydos is necessary since the current state of our knowledge of the site and its history is largely the result of the way in which the cemetery has been excavated (in the loosest sense of the word). The site seems to have been forgotten after the temple of Seti I was abandoned by its last Coptic inhabitants, probably in the tenth century A.D. It was not known to medieval Arab historians, at least not under that name, and it was not until 1718 that its location was rediscovered. In the wake of the French survey in the early nineteenth century, it became one of the principal targets of the treasure hunters such as Anastasi, d'Athanasi, Drovetti and Passalacqua.

2. The temple of Seti I seems, on at least one occasion, to have been confused with that of Akhmim — see the article cited in n.3 below.
5. See Simpson, Terrace, 5-6, with references. See also A. Mariette, Description des fouilles d'Abydos (abbreviated MDF) II, (Paris 1880) 31 para. 202, 36 para. 218, 39 para. 226; G. d'Athanasi, A brief account of the researches and discoveries in Upper Egypt made under the direction of Henry Salt, esq., (London 1836); J-Ph. Passalacqua, Catalogue raisonné et historique des antiquités découvertes en Égypte, (Paris 1826) passim, esp. 70; G. Maspero, Études de mythologie et d'archéologie égyptiennes VIII, (Paris 1916) 331.
to name only the best known, who rummaged through the cemetery in search of antiquities. Little is known of this first stage of exploitation, but its destructive effects have often been noted by later excavators, and it has affected subsequent work in two main ways.

Firstly, although some of the finds can still be traced to their present location, many objects from this work and that of less well-known men, or from the digging of the "sebbakhin", are dispersed among the museums and private collections of the world without any record of their provenance being preserved. Secondly, no record of the circumstances of individual finds was kept. This irretrievable loss is particularly serious as many more objects seem to have been found in situ at this time than was the case later. Even then, however, untouched tombs were rarely encountered, and one must assume that the necropolis had already been thoroughly ransacked in anti-

6. See the references to MDP II in n.5 above, and also T.E. Peet, Cemeteries of Abydos II (abbreviated CA II), (London 1914) xiii.


8. In d'Athanasi's catalogue appended to his Brief Account, nos. 135-47, 237-97, 429-37, 572-9, 712-21, 840-51, 982-5, 1117-24 are described as having been "taken from the sides of the tombs of Abydos". See also Passalacqua, Catalogue raisonné, 167.
The first major excavation was that of Mariette, who employed thirty men at the site for eighteen years from 1858 onwards, and the publication of the results of this work provided the first real information on the nature of the cemetery. Mariette's work was important in many ways, not least because he was the first to adopt any sort of organised approach, indicating, with the help of a map, the areas in which he worked and to attempt an overall view of the development of the cemetery. His publication of the inscriptions found, though summary, is sufficiently detailed to enable them to be identified in the Cairo Museum today. His work has provided by far the largest number of inscriptions from Abydos, and must form the basis of any epigraphic study; it is therefore particularly unfortunate that almost none of the objects found by him have any recorded archaeological context more precise than a general designation of...
area, such as 'Nécropole du Nord'. Furthermore, it has recently been pointed out that neither Mariette nor his deputy Gabet was normally present during the digging, which was thus in the hands of a native reis. 13 A certain scepticism as to the accuracy of Mariette's statements concerning the provenance of individual objects is therefore in order. 14 The work carried out in his name seems to have been no less superficial than that of his predecessors - the very high proportion of stelae found (as against all other types of object) does not show, as Mariette claimed, 15 that it was impossible, because of the soft gravelly nature of the ground, to dig tombs of any great depth at Abydos, and that the more valuable contents of burials were therefore easily pillaged, 16 but rather that Mariette's men rarely cleared to any depth, so that his finds came from surface debris or superstructures and not from burial chambers. Apart from its general distorting effect on the corpus of objects, the main result of this is that much of the most important part of the cemetery, the 'Nécro-

14. See below, p.22.
15. MCA, v.
16. Mariette's explanation is refuted by the subsequent discovery of hundreds of tombs of all periods; Late Period brick vaulted tombs in particular were dug to a great depth - see W.M.F. Petrie, The Tombs of the Courtiers (abbreviated TC), (London 1925) 2, and CA II, 31. It is noteworthy that Mariette makes absolutely no reference to stratification in the cemetery.
pole du Nord', has scarcely been touched, since later excavators avoided areas previously worked, regardless of how thorough that work had been. 17

Mariette's work was continued briefly by Maspero, 18 before a third Frenchman, Amélineau, took an interest in the site. Although the latter's sondages were small in area, he ranged widely over much of the necropolis before discovering, and thereafter concentrating on, the royal cemetery of the archaic period at the Umm el-Qa'ab. The results of his work were published in a series of verbose and uninformative volumes, concerned mostly with the archaic cemetery and dealing only briefly with later material. 19 His reports are extremely imprecise and a source of constant frustration to the reader — much material which he mentions in passing was never published and would seem subsequently to have been lost. 20

17. See below, p.257, n.8.
18. Études de mythologie VIII, 337. No account of this work was ever published, but a number of stelae in the Cairo Museum (JE 28048-94, 28096-120), the provenance of which is recorded as "Abydos, voyage 1887", may represent the results of it.
19. The most important of these are Les nouvelles fouilles d'Abydos (abbreviated NF) 1895-6 (Paris 1899), 1896-7 (Paris 1902), 1897-8 (Paris 1904) and Le tombeau d'Osiris, (Paris 1897-8). For a full list of Amélineau's works on Abydos, see I. Pratt, Ancient Egypt, (New York 1925) 112-3.
20. E.g. "... quoique le nom de Taharka soit parmi les noms des rois venus honorer Osiris à Om-el-Ga'ab" (NF 1897-8, 409); "J'ai retrouvé des stèles des Osorkons, d'Amasis, de Djeho (Teos), des Psammétiks" (Tombeau, 39). No monuments of Taharka or any of the kings named Psammethicus were published by Amélineau, and the only inscriptions with the name Osorkon were ostraca not stelae — see, for instance, NF 1897-8, 134, 156, 140.
A new phase of excavation was inaugurated in 1899 when Petrie started work on behalf of the Egypt Exploration Fund. British expeditions worked at Abydos for most of the period down to 1914, and again in 1921-2 and 1925-6. Their work, in terms of both supervision and publication, was of a much higher standard than that which had been carried out previously, but it was marred by a lack of overall coordination. Petrie's initial concern was to salvage as much as possible from the depredations of Amélineau at the Umm el-Qa'ab, and other excavators seem also to have regarded their work as being in the nature of a rescue operation. Petrie later became interested in the Osiris temple enclosure, and his work in the necropolis was entirely subsidiary to this, being limited to a part of the South cemetery which he labelled G, excavated only because it lay conveniently close to his expedition house.

Large parts of the North cemetery were excavated at this time by Mace for the Egypt Exploration Fund, and by Garstang for the

23. CA II, xiii.
Their reports are perhaps the best published on the cemeteries of Abydos - in particular, they were the first to describe consistently the context in which objects were found - but they are often deficient in detail. For example, many tombs whose existence is to be inferred from the tomb catalogues are neither listed nor marked on the plans, and no information whatever is available about them. The reason for their exclusion is never stated and nothing can safely be deduced from this silence. The numbers involved are large enough seriously to affect any conclusions about either the chronological development of the cemetery or the status of those buried there.

The same criticism applies to the work of Peet and his assistants, who ranged over a large area of the cemetery for three seasons, filling in the gaps left by earlier excavators. Although these areas are marked on a sketch map, neither their extent nor their


28. Thus, in cemetery D, the highest tomb number is D.120, but only 73 are listed in the catalogue (El Arabah, 97-102), so that nothing is known about 47 (approximately 39%) of them. Only 31 tombs are marked on the plan and numbered (ibid., pl.XXIII) and, of these, two are not in the catalogue. Similarly, in Garstang's cemetery E, although the highest number is E.756, only 106 tombs are described - there is thus no information about 250 (approximately 72%) of them (El Arabah, 44-6).

29. CA I-III.

30. CA II, xiv.
relationship to earlier work is indicated and the information given on some of the smaller regions is virtually negligible. 31

Garstang returned to Abydos for four seasons from 1906 to 1909 and carried out important excavations in various parts of the cemetery, but these remain virtually unpublished. 32 The British work was interrupted by the war and it was not until 1921 that Petrie began work again with the specific intention of investigating the archaic structures touched on by Peet, and subsequently christened the 'Tombs of the Courtiers'. 33 In 1925-6 Frankfort carried out a series of sondages "in almost a dozen separate patches of ground" while waiting to begin the clearance of the Osireion. This work was only summarily published, with a very vague indication of the areas worked. 34

Since that time, the Antiquities Service has occasionally conducted small-scale excavations at Abydos, 35 while in 1967-9 a joint Pennsylvania-Yale expedition started work in a concession extending from the Osiris temple enclosure to the Shunet es-Zebib, only to be

31. E.g. CA II, chapter VI.
32. LAAI II (1909) 125-30.
33. TC.
interrupted by security restrictions. 36 The results of the three seasons' work which were accomplished were, however, sufficient to show that the cemetery, at least in this area, is far from exhausted, and that future excavation will add considerably to our knowledge of the site. The potential value of future work is indicated by the fact that, in only three seasons' excavation in a very limited, although unusually important area, the Pennsylvania-Yale Expedition identified the so-called "portal" of Ramses II as a small temple, uncovered a series of tightly-packed mud-brick chapels of the Middle Kingdom, apparently without associated burials (the first true cenotaphs found at Abydos), and cleared an intact Late Period tomb.

It will be clear, however, that, for a variety of reasons (ancient and modern plundering, inadequate supervision of work, and incomplete publication), the uncovering of Abydos has to date been far from satisfactory. Much of the archaeological evidence which escaped the attentions of ancient robbers was destroyed in the early nineteenth century, before the age of scientific archaeology, by men whose activity was the more devastating because it was authorised

37. O'Connor, Expedition 10, no.1 (Fall 1967) 20. O'Connor estimates that as much as three-quarters of the total remains are uninvestigated.
and need not fear discovery, and it is probable that Frankfort's remark on the 1925-6 season was equally true of Mariette's day:

"The stelae discovered in the last season's work at the cemeteries of Abydos were all found loose in the drift sand or re-used as paving stones in Late tombs but never in connection with the tomb for which they were originally intended." 38 Few indeed of the objects catalogued below were found in their original position, and this separation of inscriptions from their archaeological context is the greatest obstacle to a correct understanding of the cemeteries of Abydos because it makes it impossible to determine the nature of many of the monuments erected. 39 It is precisely this point that future excavation may be expected to clarify.


39. This is particularly unfortunate at Abydos because of the religious significance of the site, and the unusual variety of monuments dedicated there—cf. Simpson, *Terrace*, 3. See below, p.247 ff.
The Establishment of the Corpus

The basic source material for this study is the inscriptions found at Abydos in the course of the controlled excavations detailed above. Most of these were discovered by Mariette, and it is therefore important to establish the reliability of his catalogue with regard to the provenance of the objects listed in it. On at least two occasions, scholars have suggested in passing that objects listed in *MCA* do not in fact come from Abydos. In so doing, they have touched on a major problem without addressing themselves to the wider implications of rejecting individual items of the corpus. It is not impossible that some material from one or more of the numerous sites at which Mariette was simultaneously engaged could have found its way into *MCA*, but, if the principle be conceded, all the material said by him to have been found at Abydos, but which is not characteristic of the site, is open to the same interpretation. Yet it is precisely the representation of "outsiders" at Abydos that distinguishes it from other cemeteries, and subsequent excavations, more closely controlled than those of Mariette, have produced conclusive evidence.

2. See Dawson and Uphill, *Who was Who*, 195.
that people from other parts of Egypt were buried or commemorated at Abydos in the Late Period. It would thus be bad methodology to assume that all non-Abydene material in MCA has somehow been included by mistake, just as it would be wrong to regard Mariette as infallible. Since it is impossible, for want of independent corroborative evidence, to judge each instance on its own merits, a rule of thumb, based on a consideration of the two cases mentioned above, must be enunciated.

Corteggiani's rejection of an Abydene provenance for two sets of canopic jars rests implicitly on the identification of the owners of these canopics with men known to have been buried at Sakkara. The nature of the "Abydos" finds shows that they come from burials, and cannot be regarded as part of a chapel or cenotaph. Consequently, if the identification of the individuals be accepted, then we must

4. Cairo CG 4126-9 (= MCA 1458), and Cairo CG 4308-10 and Alexandria 1348 (= MCA 1457).
6. The identification of the imy-r htm Psmk, son of Mr-nt, whose name appears on the second set of canopics (MCA 1457) with the owner of a number of statues and a tomb at Sakkara may be regarded as proven, since the title is not common and the mother's name is conclusive. See Yoyotte, RdE 24 (1972) 220. The identification of a second Psmk (MCA 1458) with a man buried in the same Sakkara tomb, although probable, is less certain, depending as it does simply on the homonym and the rarity of his title imy-r if-w-r nsw.
assume that Mariette's attribution of the canopic jars to Abydos was wrong, and the fact that it was he who discovered the Sakkara burials in question 7 suggests that this is the correct explanation.

The second case is quite different. Černý's arguments against an Abydene provenance for a New Kingdom stela 8 derive solely from internal criteria, such as the facts that the owner was an official of the 'Place of Truth', which Černý then believed to be a purely Theban locality, 9 that a member of his family bore the Theban name of Mertseger, that one of the deities depicted was Amun-re, ruler of Thebes, and that the style of the stela was Theban. While these certainly indicate the Theban origin of the family, and probably also that the stela was made at Thebes, they do not prove that it was not, or could not have been, set up at Abydos. The epithet ḫw W3st, which accompanies the name of Amun-re, is the only real objection to this stela having been dedicated there. Černý's other arguments take no account of the peculiar position of Abydos as a holy site, to which monuments were sometimes sent, already inscribed, from elsewhere, 10

7. A. Mariette, Monuments divers recueillis en Egypte et en Nubie (abbreviated MND), (Paris 1872-89), pl. 95 A, 96 A-D.
8. Cairo T.26/2/25/5 = MCA 1228.
9. For the existence of a st m3st at Abydos, see Černý, A Community of Workmen at Thebes in the Ramesside Period, (Cairo 1973) 64.
10. Perhaps the best known example is the Middle Kingdom stela of Nebipusenwosret (BM 101), sent from Memphis - see Blackman, JEA 21 (1935) 4-5.
by those unable to make the pilgrimage themselves. It cannot be said
a priori of any such monument that it is out of place at Abydos, and
consequently, although the instance of the canopic jars raises doubts,
particularly with regard to other Memphite material, the only possible
methodology is to assume that Mariette's catalogue is accurate, un-
less there is clear independent evidence to the contrary.

It has already been pointed out that many inscriptions from Aby-
dos have passed into museums or private collections without a record
of their provenance. Much work towards identifying such pieces has
already been done by De Meulenaere 11 and Munro. 12 In supplementing
their work and seeking to establish a corpus of Late Period Abydene
inscriptions, I have preferred to err on the side of caution, ex-
cluding all material about the origin of which there is room for
doubt. 13 Additions to the inscriptions known to come from Abydos
have been made on the basis of the following criteria:

11. See the bibliography for De Meulenaere's extremely important and
wide-ranging contribution, and especially p.24, n.22.
12. See note 16 below.
13. I have not included objects said, without supporting evidence, to
come from Abydos, unless the inscription decisively confirms the
attribution. For instance, E.A.W. Budge, Some Account of the
Collection of Egyptian Art in the Possession of Lady Meux, of
Theobald's Park, Waltham Cross, (London 1896) 86-8, attributes
nos.30 and 32 to Abydos without giving any further information.
Budge's statements with regard to provenance are notoriously in-
accurate, and, since there is nothing characteristic about the
two objects, they have been omitted here.
1) **Style**

Throughout this study, "style" and "stylistic" refer, not to that often indefinable impression derived from a close acquaintance with a large body of material, but to the more tangible non-epigraphic aspects as recently defined by Quaegebeur with reference to stelae:

"répartition et encadrement de la surface; thèmes de la représentation; style de personnages etc.". Munro's comprehensive stylistic analysis of funerary stelae has revealed clear differences among the workshops of different sites in the Late Period and indicated criteria for distinguishing between them. Similar studies of other types of object, such as offering tables or canopic jars, have not been made, and style cannot, therefore, yet be used to determine the provenance of these.

2) **Deities**

The deities invoked in the offering formulae, the epithets applied to them, and the combinations in which they occur can often provide an indication of the provenance of an object. The god

18. See Appendix IV for the deities of Abydos in the Late Period.
most frequently named at Abydos is, not surprisingly, "Osiris-Khentamentiu, great god, lord of Abydos". Since Osiris, as god of the dead, was widely invoked in this fashion, at least in Upper Egypt, this is really a negative criterion - i.e. the absence of these epithets makes it unlikely that an inscription comes from Abydos.

The rare invocation of the Thinite deities Onuris, Mehit and Tefnut constitutes a more positive proof of provenance.

3) Titles

Since the cults of the Egyptian deities were localised, their sacerdotal and temporal officials were normally resident in their cult centre. On this basis, De Meulenaere has assembled the extant documentation of the priesthood of Osiris at Abydos in the Late Period.

19. At Memphis, Osiris appears either as nb r-st³w (see p.244, n.61) or in the form (Ptah-) Sokar-Osiris, and very rarely as "lord of Abydos". See, for instance, Totenstelen, p.58-64. In Lower Egypt, he was worshipped in a number of forms, among the most common of which are nb Sek (Bakry, Studi Classici e Orientali 19-20 (1970-1) 327-8), ln³t lat³ bity (Bakry, ASAE 60 (1969) 3, and Bakry, MDAIK 23 (1968) 73) and hnt³ bity (Bakry, Qem 20 (1970) 29-32).

20. This does not apply to the seventh century, when the deity invoked was often Re-Harakhte - see below, p.67.

21. Most of these date to the Ptolemaic period - see below, p.330.

22. "Le clergé abydenien d'Osis à la Basse Epoque", OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 133-51.
Thinite deities Mehit and Omiris can be assigned to Abydos, as can the holders of the characteristic Abydene title sequences, which are discussed in detail below.

4) Names

The Late Period is propitious to the study of personal names from a variety of angles. Of particular interest here is the fact that a high percentage of the names are theophorous. Because the cults of many deities were geographically limited, such names have long been used by Egyptologists as an indication of the bearer's place of origin. Although the underlying assumption has never been tested by a detailed study, it seems to be valid, in differing degrees, for at least some deities, and individuals with such theophorous names can be localised accordingly, with a reasonable degree of certainty. Thus, taking the name pattern de-idty X-iv.f/s

27. In rare cases, a greater degree of certainty is possible. Thus, although the cult of the lion-god Mahes spread throughout Egypt (L. Zabkar, Apedemak, Lion God of Meroe, (Warminster 1975) 52-3), names compounded with his are thus far attested only at Tell el-Mogam/Lionopolis, his main cult centre. See J. Yoyotte, BIFAO 52 (1953) 181, no.6 and 183, n.2, and B. Bothmer, Kemi 20 (1970) 41, no.17 and pl.VIII.6.
as an example, one finds that the divine element is Nut, Khonsu or Montu at Thebes, Ptah at Memphis, and Onuris at Abydos. On the other hand, the popularity of the Abydene triad of Osiris, Horus and Isis throughout Egypt in the Late Period was such that individuals with theophorous names derived from these deities cannot be regarded as coming from Abydos on that basis alone. Indeed, Osiris is by no means a common element in personal names at Abydos or elsewhere, while Horus, perhaps still ranking second to Amun in overall popularity in Egypt as a whole in the Saite period, had out-

28. On this pattern, see Ranke, CdE 11 (1936) 317, and Quaegebeur, OLP 4 (1973) 86.

29. See, for example, H. Gauthier, Cercueils anthropoides des prêtres de Montou, (Cairo 1913) 542-3 and A. Moret, Sarcophages de l'époque babaste à l'époque saite, (Cairo 1913) 324. The two exceptions listed in the latter publication, compounded with the names of Isis and Onuris, are the grandfather and great-grandfather respectively of the owner of Cairo CG 41031, and their titles show conclusively that they were from Akhmim.


31. See Appendix III.

32. See Appendix III. Osiris is tenth in a list headed by Horus, Isis and Amun and the local deities Onuris, Mehit and Bastet. This is precisely his national position in this period according to PN II, 245.

33. PN II, 245.
stripped him by the Ptolemaic period. 34

A second facet of nomenclature is the popularity of certain names, among which may be numbered Nespakashuty, Ankhorsaese, Padihorpakhered and Nesnubhotep at Abydos. 35 While the occurrence of these is rarely a certain proof of Abydene provenance, 36 they do, nevertheless, provide a useful indication.

5) Material

This, too, is largely a negative criterion. Since hieroglyphic inscriptions were usually inscribed in the place where they were set up, they were normally of local stone. Consequently, all the stelae from Abydos (with one exception) 37 and most of the other stone ob-

34. D.J. Crawford, Kerkeosiris: An Egyptian Village in the Ptolemaic Period, (Cambridge 1971) 133, n.1. The results of a study of the theophorous names at Kerkeosiris are probably fairly typical, except for the unusually high ranking of Osiris - Horus is by far the most popular, followed by the Fayyum crocodile god, Osiris and Isis. "The Triad of the Late Period, therefore, and the local god top the list" (ibid., 137).

35. See the name index and De Meulenaere, JEBL 20 (1967-8) 15-17. The frequency of these names at Abydos is such as sometimes to permit the restoration of a fragmentary name - see, for instance, Abydos 68.90 and Cairo T.5/1/15/13.

36. According to De Meulenaere, the names Ns-mwb-htp and T3i-m 'b3-nht (OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 136, n,16) are only attested on Abydene monuments. Note, however, that the name Nesnubhotep is attested in a demotic document dated to the reign of Hakoris which comes from either Diospolis Parva or, more likely, Thebes - see U. Kaplony-Heckel, Enchoria 3 (1973) 6, 8 and 12.

37. The single exception is a black granite stela, Vienna 5103. For the greater variety of stone used in statuary, see below, p.31.
jects are of limestone. The vast majority of wooden stelae, on the other hand, come from Thebes, and monuments of sandstone or granite were generally confined to sites within the stretch of the Nile Valley in which these stones are to be found—i.e. Aswan and Edfu. These remarks apply only to private inscriptions, since kings disposed of resources, such as means of transport and labour, on a quite different scale.

6) Miscellaneous

The study of the assembled corpus generates its own criteria. For example, since all the known examples of Late Period pyramidions appear to come from Abydos, it is a priori likely that any further examples will too. Conversely, the possibility of an Abydene pro-

38. Totenstelen, 6, 10. A few wooden stelae are known from Edfu, and one from Aswan (ibid., 248-51 and 254).

39. For sandstone stelae from Aswan and Edfu, see ibid., 254-6 and 252-3 respectively. For examples of the use of granite at Aswan, see ibid., 254 and 256. It is curious that quite large numbers of sandstone stelae of Roman date should have been found at Abydos—e.g. Spiegelberg, Die demotische Inschriften, Cairo CG 31097, 31102, 31106, 31119, 31121, 31131-2 and 31159.

40. Thus, for instance, BM 610 and Cairo CG 70017-18 are of red granite, as are the stela of Sheshonk (Blackman, JEA 27 (1941) 83) and the monument of his son Iuput (Vernus, BIFAO 75 (1975) 69) from the poorer Third Intermediate Period. The lintels from the tomb of the princess Peksater are of sandstone—see Cairo JE 32022-3.

41. See below, p. 31.
jects are of limestone. The vast majority of wooden stelae, on the other hand, come from Thebes, and monuments of sandstone or granite were generally confined to sites within the stretch of the Nile Valley in which these stones are to be found - i.e. Aswan and Edfu. These remarks apply only to private inscriptions, since kings disposed of resources, such as means of transport and labour, on a quite different scale.

6) Miscellaneous

The study of the assembled corpus generates its own criteria.

For example, since all the known examples of Late Period pyramidions appear to come from Abydos, it is a priori likely that any further examples will too. Conversely, the possibility of an Abydene pro-

38. Totenstelen, 6, 10. A few wooden stelae are known from Edfu, and one from Aswan (ibid., 248-51 and 254).

39. For sandstone stelae from Aswan and Edfu, see ibid., 254-6 and 252-3 respectively. For examples of the use of granite at Aswan, see ibid., 254 and 256. It is curious that quite large numbers of sandstone stelae of Roman date should have been found at Abydos - e.g. Spiegelberg, Die demotische Inschriften, Cairo CG 31097, 31102, 31106, 31119, 31121, 31131-2 and 31159.

40. Thus, for instance, BM 610 and Cairo CG 70017-18 are of red granite, as are the stela of Sheshonk (Blackman, JEA 27 (1941) 83) and the monument of his son Iuput (Vernus, BIFAO 75 (1975) 69) from the poorer Third Intermediate Period. The lintels from the tomb of the princess Peksater are of sandstone - see Cairo JE 32022-3.

41. See below, p.31.
venance for classes of object which are not attested at Abydos, such as sarcophagi of stone other than limestone, 42 can be ruled out.

These criteria should permit the identification of most inscriptions which are in any way characteristic of Abydos, and should prevent the erroneous inclusion of material from elsewhere. There are two possible sources of bias, however. Firstly, the fact that a comparative stylistic study has only been made for stelae means that, while many stelae which are inscriptionally non-distinctive can still be identified as from Abydos, for other categories of material this is not yet possible, and the distortion may be quite serious, particularly in the case of objects such as bronze statuettes, the inscriptions of which are always short. The percentage of stelae in the corpus is therefore disproportionately high.

Secondly, where there is no record of the discovery of a piece, the criteria established can determine only the place in which a monument was made and not where it was set up. In the case of Abydos, these are not necessarily the same, since, as was pointed out above, there are known examples of stelae being sent, already inscribed, from elsewhere. Consequently, an unprovenanced stela of a Memphite man made at Abydos would be classified as Abydene, whereas, if the same

42. See below, p. 31.
man had a stela inscribed at Memphis and sent to Abydos, it would appear in a Memphite corpus. There are two examples of this in Munro's catalogue where the author seems to have been unaware of the known Abydene provenance of stelae which he assigns to Abydos and Memphis respectively. Fortunately, this practice does not seem to have been common and the distortion is probably only slight.

The categories of inscribed object which make up the corpus are as follows:

Stelae (263)

These constitute about 65% of the total number. They are, with the exception already noted, of limestone, with rounded tops, and of a funerary nature. The preponderance of stelae, as against all other types of inscription, is so great as to require some explanation, but as this question is inextricably linked with the circumstances of excavation, it will be discussed below.

Statues (24)

Almost half of the relatively small number are figures of divinities

---

43. Cairo GG 22006 (= MCA 1307) and Cairo T.9/7/24/4 (= MCA 1306).

44. Two rectangular stelae of the false-door type - Berlin 732 and Rio de Janeiro 2462 - are known, as well as the archaising rectangular stela Cairo JE 41332 and MCA 1309, described by Mariette as a "stèle funéraire de forme rectangulaire".
rather than private individuals, and many of the latter group are fragmentary. The materials used include bronze, limestone, black granite and serpentine.

Pyramidions (16)

De Meulenaere has shown that, in all probability, all the pyramidions of the Late Period came from Abydos. 45

Sarcophagi (13)

These are all anthropoid and of limestone, and date to Dynasty XXX or later.

Coffins and Cartonnage (26)

These are characteristic of burials of Dynasty XXV-XXVI, although some inner coffins of the Ptolemaic period have also escaped the activity of the white ants.

Tomb fragments (15)

With the exception of one relief, these are either lintels or door-jambs.

Miscellaneous

A small number of offering tables (8), canopic jars (5) and other

45. "Pyramidions d'Abydos", JBDL 20 (1967-8) 1-20, pl.I-VII.
funerary equipment such as model coffins, scarabs, canopic boxes etc. have also been found.

Ushabtis (4)

Almost no inscribed ushabtis that are definitely of Late Period date have been found at Abydos, and in particular, none of the classic 'Saite' type. The large numbers found by Mace in cemetery D seem to date mainly to the Third Intermediate Period, and, since there is as yet no way of distinguishing between ushabtis of the Twenty-second and Twenty-third Dynasties and those of the Twenty-fifth, these have all been excluded, except where it is possible to date

46. See Cairo JE 34432, Chicago OIM 6332-3 and 6335-7, Chicago OIM 7142 and UCL 531. One ushabti with the name of ḫp-mn, together with 32 uninscribed examples, was apparently found (Abydos I, 39), but it was never published and its present location is unknown to me. For the numerous ushabtis of the New Kingdom found at Abydos, mostly at Heqreshu hill, see NF 1895-6, 159-67 and pl.V-VI; Petrie, RT I, 32-3; El Amrah, pl.XXXIX; El Arabah, pl. XIV.

47. I.e. those characterised by a pale green faience, text in horizontal bands and a dorsal column - see J-F. and L. Aubert, Statuettes égyptiennes : chaouabtis, ouchebtis (Paris 1974) pl.56-62. The absence of these was first noticed by Mariette in NCA, 79.

48. El Amrah, 78-9, 97-102, pl.XXXIX, LVII-LX.

49. Aubert, op. cit., 203.
them on the basis of associated material. On the other hand, large numbers of uninscribed faience or pottery ushabtis have been found. A possible explanation for this is suggested by the relative numbers of inscribed and uninscribed examples found in two cases. In the tomb of 3st-n-hb, 37 inscribed and 300 uninscribed ushabtis were found, while in the tomb of P3-di-wsir the numbers were 36 and 349. These proportions are strikingly reminiscent of the traditional figure of 365 'worker' ushabtis and 36 'foremen', and since the 'foremen' are no longer distinguished from the ordinary ushabtis by the šndyt kilt at this time, it may be that the former had come to be represented by the inscribed examples. This can only be a partial explanation of why so few inscribed ushabtis of this period

50. The ushabtis of 3st-n-hb (Cairo JE 34432) bear only her name and are indistinguishable from a great many others of the period, but the associated coffin fragments which give her titulary enable her to be dated very closely. Similarly, the ushabtis of T3-h3-n-b3stt from tomb D.57 (Chicago OIM 6332-3 and 6335-7) can be dated on genealogical grounds to the late Twenty-fifth Dynasty - see genealogy II.


52. El Amrah, 78.

53. Abydos I, 39. The number of ushabtis of P3-di-wsir's father was not given by Petrie, but pl.LXXIX.1 suggests that the proportion of inscribed to uninscribed was similar.

54. Edwards, JEA 57 (1971) 120, 123 k. Although the number of 401 does not often seem to have been achieved exactly, there can be little doubt that this was the intention.

55. Aubert, op. cit., 205, 275.
have been found, however, and other factors, such as a general impoverishment compared with Sakkara and Thebes, 56 or decline in the importance of the ushabti 57 must be taken into account.

56. One might compare the relative crudity of the ushabtis of the Third Intermediate Period from Abydos, which were usually of pottery (El Amrah, 75), with the contemporary dark-blue faience ushabtis from Deir el-Bahari, for which see Aubert, op. cit., 139 ff., 169.

57. The intact Late Period tomb discovered by the Pennsylvania-Yale expedition (O'Connor, Expedition 10, no.1 (Fall 1967) 14) contained a lintel and relief of fine quality (Cairo JE 91219 and 91261), but also some rather poor, almost shoddy, burial furniture, including crude uninscribed pottery ushabtis. This suggests that the quality of the ushabti was no longer considered significant — cf. Aubert, op. cit., 277, for the variety in the ushabtis of a single individual in the Thirtieth Dynasty.
The Dating of the Inscriptions

Almost none of the private inscriptions bears a cartouche, \(^1\) let alone a year-date, \(^2\) and the problems inherent in the attempt to date them are consequently formidable. The small number of royal dedications \(^3\) are of minimal use for comparative purposes since they usually consist of no more than a titulary, \(^4\) and the dating of non-royal inscriptions must therefore be based largely on internal criteria.

Until recently, the precise dating of undated inscriptions within this period has received comparatively little attention, and scholars have usually been content with a general designation such as "Saite", "Ptolemaic" or even simply "Late Period". There have been few of the broad studies of different aspects of the inscriptions or the different types of object which might eventually lead to reliable indications of date, and such as there have been have touched only

---

1. Cairo JE 30434 and Louvre A.93 are the only examples.
2. Of the only two year-dates, one (Leiden VI.51) is of doubtful significance, while the other (Cairo CG 38412) is not precise enough to be useful.
3. With the exception of Berlin 14399, these are datable only to a reign.
4. E.g. Amélineau II-V, BM 610, BM 1358, Cairo JE 19769 and JE 20340. The exceptions, such as Berlin 14399 and Cairo CG 70017-18, are so different in content from the funerary inscriptions that little comparison is possible.
incidentally on Abydos. The much richer and better dated genealogical information for Thebes in the Third Intermediate Period has begun to be thoroughly investigated in recent years, but specific links with Abydos can rarely be established. When, in the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, and particularly after the reign of Psammeticus I, the importance of Thebes declined as that of the Delta, with which Abydos was traditionally less closely connected, increased, the identifiable points of contact with dynastic chronology are even fewer. For the Persian and Ptolemaic periods, the well-dated private inscriptions are almost all from Memphis or Lower Egypt. The efforts of, in particular, B.V. Bothmer and his collaborators have resulted


6. The only certain instances in which Theban and Abydene documentation can be linked are those of genealogy II, Amélineau I and Liverpool M.13916.

7. Culturally, Abydos was part of Upper Egypt and looked to the south - see below, p.45. Politically, it was consistently within the area controlled by the Theban rulers - see J. Leclant, Montouemhat, quatrième prophète d'Amon, prince de la ville, (Cairo 1961) 267-8.

8. For the Persian period, see the Serapeum stelae published by Chassinat, RT 25 (1901) 76-91, and below, p.71. The Ptolemaic funerary stelae from Memphis have recently been catalogued by Quaeghebuer, "Inventaire des stèles funéraires memphites d'époque ptolémaïque", CIE 49 (1974) 59-79. Most of these inscriptions are dated by a cartouche or a year-date or both.
in the establishment of criteria for the dating of sculpture in the round, but most of the examples of this genre are from Karnak, Memphis or the Delta, and very few are from Abydos. Similarly, M.-L. Buhl's study of the stone sarcophagi of the Late Period, most of which come from Sakkara, is only marginally relevant to Upper Egypt. Abydos has thus been neglected, partly because of the types of monument preserved, and partly because of the purely funerary nature of its inscriptions, which make no direct contribution to the political history of a still little-known period.

In 1973, however, there appeared Munro's comprehensive stylistic study of Late Period funerary stelae, a substantial part of which is devoted to Abydos. On the basis of an analysis of features such as the division and decoration of the surface, the offering scene, the deity/deities depicted and the treatment of the human figure,


10. An Abydene provenance is suggested for only two of the objects in ESLP - nos. 41 and 68. For the paucity of Abydene statuary, see p. 30-31.


12. Cf. Totenstelen, 6. The work of De Meulenaere, for which see p. 22 n.11, is an exception to this.

13. Totenstelen.
Munro divided the Abydene stelae into three groups: I (seventh century), II (sixth century) and III (Ptolemaic), and subdivided the first two, suggesting rather more precise dates for individual stelae within them. While the validity of Munro's methodology in its own terms may be broadly accepted, two caveats must be made. Firstly, the limitations of stylistic divisions for dating purposes have been pointed out by De Neulenaere, and a work which ignores the fact that stelae are primarily inscribed objects can scarcely be definitive. Epigraphic analysis is a necessary complement to stylistic study - ideally, the two should provide a mutual control. Secondly, Munro's classification cannot, by its very nature, be extended to other types of inscription, and the funerary stelae are only part of the documentation. Their epigraphic nature is the only feature common to all inscriptions and, consequently, the dating of the present corpus has been based primarily on epigraphic criteria, although a whole range of other factors - archaeological, prosopographic, religious and stylistic - have, of course, been taken into account.

The value of epigraphic analysis has been clearly shown in works on the First Intermediate Period and early Middle Kingdom by

Polotsky, Dunham, Schenkel, Fischer and others, but no large-scale attempt has been made to apply the methodology to later periods. Yet it is only through the detailed study of a large and homogeneous body of material that the significance of particular epigraphic variations becomes apparent. A firm basis for the documentation of such changes at Abydos is furnished by the monuments of genealogies I and II, which permit the following skeletal chronological sequence to be established. The dates are

17. Frühmittelägyptische Studien.
20. De Meulenaere has often used individual epigraphic features as dating criteria - e.g. BIFAO 62 (1964) 160, n.6; BIFAO 48 (1973) 54; JEDL 20 (1967-8) 14, n.75; MM 8 (1973) 29, and in his works on the Twenty-fifth Dynasty, Leclant has noted a number of epigraphic peculiarities - see Enquêtes sur les sacerdoces et sanctuaires égyptiens à l'époque dite "éthiopienne" (XXVe dynastie), (Cairo 1954) 114, and Montuemhat, 291-3.
21. See below, p.40. BM 1333 has been omitted here because of the uncertainty as to its date. For the absolute dates of the Third Intermediate Period I have followed those proposed by Kitchen, TIP, with the revisions set forth in his introduction to Bierbrier's LMK, x.
based on the assumption, which will be made throughout this study, that twenty-five years was the average span of a generation in ancient Egypt. 22

c. 800 B.C. Cairo JE 30435, Fitzwilliam E.SS.47* and Hannover 1935.200.210

Two generations

c. 750 B.C. Cairo JE 30434 and Commerce block

Two/four generations averaged out to three

c. 685 B.C. Glasgow 13.176*

c. 675 B.C. Turin 1538

c. 660 B.C. El Amarah XXXV.7*, Berlin 2090 and Bolton 36.01.34*

c. 650 B.C. Vienna 157

c. 635 B.C. Garstang 200.A.07.1 and Chicago OIM 5740-50

c. 625 B.C. Louvre E.14730*

c. 610 B.C. Cairo JE 18520

c. 600 B.C. BM 66943, Cairo T.5/1/15/13 and T.15/3/25/6

c. 585 B.C. Cairo CG 22126 and CG 22178

22. This is to some extent an arbitrary figure, but one that has been used by scholars on a number of occasions - e.g. J. Leclant, Enquêtes, 26, and De Neulensere, Ode 53 (1958) 195, n.6. The work of Bierbrier, in particular, suggests that it is a reasonably accurate figure for the Third Intermediate Period - see LNK, xvi, 112-13. I have also assumed throughout that monuments are approximately contemporary with the death of their owners.
It is the similarity in content of the vast majority of these inscriptions that makes epigraphic comparison possible, yet this same repetitiveness, combined with the brevity of many of the inscriptions, limits the number of features which occur frequently enough for comparison. The inscriptions marked with an asterisk do not contain sufficient of the usual criteria to be useful for this purpose and the omission of these (together with Berlin 2090 and the Commerce block, which I have not seen) creates an imbalance in the sequence in favour of the latter part of the seventh century and especially the first half of the sixth. Nevertheless, the remaining monuments provide an absolute framework to which a relative sequence can be attached. The inscriptions datable to c. 800 B.C. have been included to provide a comparison with the forms of the late Third Intermediate Period at Abydos, although they are outside the limits of the Late Period as defined here. In figures I and II, the development of a number of features in this period is presented.
**Figure I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JE 30435</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hann. 1935.200.210</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE 30434</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turin 1538</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna 157</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garst. 200.A.07.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIM 5740-50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE 18520</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 66843</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.5/1/15/13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG 22126</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG 22178</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst 1921.VI</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna 189</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aix 12</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turin 1532</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Stela classification (S = Special)
2. Gardiner sign-list M.40
3. D.32
4. 0.1
5. I.9
6. Spelling of the name of Osiris.
### Figure II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JE 30435</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ham. 1935.200.210</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE 30434</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turin 1538</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna 157</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garst. 200.A.07.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIN 5740-50</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE 18520</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 66843</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.5/1/15/13</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG 22126</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG 22178</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst 1921.VI</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna 189</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aix 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turin 1532</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Graphic arrangement of the phrase **htp-di-nsw** (n).
2. Benefaction requested of deity.
3. Introduction of name of deceased.
The development set forth in figures I and II serves to date features, especially of the mid-seventh century B.C., which are not represented on these particular monuments. Thus, the fact that when \textit{imi ist} and \textit{hpt-wdjt} appear in the same titulary, the forms \textit{+} and \textit{+}, 23 and \textit{H} and \textit{()}, respectively, are almost invariably found together, shows that \textit{()} is a later form of \textit{}, just as \textit{H} is a later form of \textit{}, and that the palaeographic change took place in the two hieroglyphs at approximately the same time. 24 Epigraphy can usually do no more than provide just such a \textit{terminus a quo}, i.e. establish the date at which a particular feature first occurs 25 and thus show how late an inscription in which it is used must be. Most epigraphic variants thus cease to be useful chronological indicators within a short time of their introduction - for instance, by the Late Period \textit{26} and \textit{27} or \textit{28}, in use for \textit{Hnt} in \textit{Hnt-imntiw} since the Old Kingdom and the Eighteenth Dynasty.

23. BM 809, Cairo CG 23107, Cairo T.26/10/24/1 and T.18/2/25/2, Fitzwilliam E.259.1900 and Louvre C.110.
25. Many changes, particularly in the field of palaeography, are characterised, not by a slow and demonstrable evolution, but, rather, by a single change, after which the earlier form is not used. See below, pp.53 and 56.
27. Gardiner sign-list D.19.
respectively, 28 are used indiscriminately and often occur in the same inscription. More useful are those variants which are current only for a short time, such as the spelling of Re as $\frac{\text{Re}}{\text{nh}}$, which is a peculiarity of the mid-seventh century B.C. 29 In other cases, the value of a criterion lies in its relative frequency at different periods. For example, $\frac{\text{Nh}}{\text{A}}$ as a determinative in names is most common in the second half of the seventh century B.C., 30 but because it occurs both before and after this, it is not in itself a decisive indication of date. In such cases, although no single feature is sufficient to serve as the sole evidence for the date of an inscription, a cumulation of criteria may be.

Several of the epigraphic changes discussed below seem to have occurred first at Thebes - e.g. $\frac{\text{S}}{\text{P}}$, $\frac{\text{F}}{\text{D}}$ and $\text{H}$ - and the same is true of some stylistic features, such as the tripartite division of stelae 31 and the class of stelae called "antithetisch-symmetrische"

28. For $\text{Nh}$, see Wb. III.302. $\text{Rh}$, var. $\text{S}$, is not common until the Nineteenth Dynasty (Wb. III.302 ff.; Erman, ZAS 55 (1918) 87, no.6) but is attested much earlier - on the coffin of Tuthmosis II, for instance (Cairo CG 61013: Daressy, Cercueils des cachettes royales, (Cairo 1909) 18, pl.XIII).

29. See below, 62.

30. See p. 66 below.

31. This was current at Thebes by c. 650 B.C. but not usual at Abydos until c. 600 B.C. - see Totenstelen, 175-6.
by Munro. 32 These changes are too numerous to be explicable entirely in terms of the better preservation of Theban monuments, and the changes could not conceivably have occurred independently in more than one place at the same time, particularly as, with the exception of 33, they had not occurred in the previous two and a half thousand years. It would therefore seem that stimulus to change came from Thebes, which was still the cultural capital of Upper Egypt in the Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth Dynasties. 33 Comparison with the better dated Theban monuments should, in theory, be helpful, but two factors limit its usefulness for precise chronology. Firstly, some of the minor epigraphic variants may be no more than the idiosyncrasies of an individual scribe and are certainly relevant only to Abydos. Secondly, even in cases where the same features occur at Thebes and at Abydos, it is sometimes clear that the period during

32. Totenstelen, 176.

33. A full comparative study is required to determine the extent of Theban cultural influence on Upper Egypt at this and other periods, and to determine how epigraphic changes occurred, were diffused and gradually became standard. The explanation certainly differs from case to case. Lower Egypt was much slower to adopt Theban innovations - the spelling of the name of Osiris as is not attested at Memphis until nearly a century after its appearance at Thebes (see below, p. 319-19), and the same may be true of the change in the form of the title (see p. 54, n. 70 below). The tripartite division of stelae is not found at Memphis at all.
which they were current was different at the two sites. Consequently, the conclusions presented here are based solely on the evidence from Abydos, although reference has occasionally been made to relevant parallels from elsewhere or to criteria whose wider validity has been suggested by others.

The changes that are chronologically significant will now be discussed in turn. These may be divided as follows:

I. Epigraphic — the orientation, position and graphic arrangement of the whole or part of a text.

II. Palaeographic — the forms of individual hieroglyphs.

III. Orthographic — the spelling of individual words.

IV. Phraseological — the different elements which make up the funerary formulae.

I. Epigraphic

1. The most fundamental division of texts is between those which are incised and those written in ink. Ink had long been the usual medium for inscriptions on wooden objects such as coffins, but in the

34. This is particularly so with the spelling of the name of Re as — see below, p.62. There is also the problem of time-lag. is first attested at Thebes c. 750 B.C., but it is not found at Abydos until the mid-seventh century.

35. Incised signs were sometimes filled with pigment (e.g. Leahy, GM 23 (1977) 49-53), but this has so rarely survived that it is not a major factor.
mid-seventh century painted limestone stelae with inscriptions in ink were introduced. 36 Ink inscriptions are naturally more cursive than incised ones and occasionally show a tendency towards hieratic forms 37 which makes palaeographic comparison quite meaningless. The use of ink for stone inscriptions seems to have had the effect of "legitimising" a number of cursive forms, such as \( \text{\textvisiblespace} \) for \( \text{\textvisiblespace} \), \( \text{\textvisiblespace} \) or \( \text{\textvisiblespace} \) for \( \text{\textvisiblespace} \), and, less certainly, \( \text{\textvisiblespace} \) for \( \text{\textvisiblespace} \), which duly appear in incised inscriptions in the sixth century. 38

2. The position of the text in relation to the arc and the offering scene on stelae has been treated by Munro, who shows that the basic change in the surface decoration is from the "Ganzbild-Stele", on which the decorative, iconographic and epigraphic elements form an undivided whole, to the "Bild-Schrift-Stele", on which the three are quite separate. 39 This process may be divided into three stages

36. Totenstelen, 96-7, 269 ff. These are characteristic of the second half of the seventh century.

37. This is especially apparent in the forms of birds - \( \text{\textvisiblespace} \) for \( \text{\textvisiblespace} \) (e.g. Cairo JE 8770) and \( \text{\textvisiblespace} \) for \( \text{\textvisiblespace} \) (Cairo JE 6303). A clear distinction must be observed between cursive palaeographic forms such as these, which are simply the result of the medium, and orthographies such as \( \text{\textvisiblespace} \) (Chicago EM 31275) or \( \text{\textvisiblespace} \) (Louvre C.107) for the name of Osiris, which derive directly from actual hieratic.

38. See figure I. The post hoc ergo propter hoc argument seems to be justified here.

as follows (see also figure 1.1):

A. The essential feature is that the arc is an integral part of the decoration of the stela surface. The text is usually vertical and above the offering scene but may, exceptionally (and particularly on larger stelae), be horizontal and below it. This type of composition was current from at least the late Third Intermediate Period down to c. 650 B.C.

B. The text, which is always above the offering scene, comes to extend over the whole width of the stela and to be separated from both the arc and the scene below by a simple dividing line (or, in the former case, by a more elaborate decorative frieze). The development of this type of stela from group A to a point where arc, text and offering scene are distinct elements took place in the middle years of the seventh century, from c. 675–625 B.C.

C. After a brief transitional period with text both above and below the offering scene, the tripartite division of the stela surface into arc, offering scene and text becomes standard, in both the sixth cen-

40. This is typified by Munro's group I A - Totenstelen, 90-94.
41. E.g. Bologna 1939, BM 809, Cairo JE 21797 and JE 30434, and Louvre C.110.
42. This group corresponds broadly to Munro's group I B - Totenstelen, 94-8.
tery and the Ptolemaic era. 43

3. ḫtp-di-nsw (n) (Figure II.1)

a) The dative n first appears in this introductory formula at some as yet uncertain point in the Third Intermediate Period, 44 but is still infrequent in the seventh century B.C.. At Abydos, it is at first much more common in vertical than in horizontal inscriptions, 45 and it would seem that the necessary adjustment of the traditional graphic arrangement of signs in horizontal inscriptions was not immediately satisfactorily achieved. The earliest horizontal examples show ḫΔ₂₈₃ 46 and ḫΔ₂₈₃ 47 but towards the end of the seventh century both ḫΔ₀₈₃ and ḫΔ₀₈₃ appear, and all three forms, as well as the older writing without n are used in the sixth century. In the Ptolemaic period, the scribes used only ḫ' 48 or,

43. Totenstelen, groups II-III, 103-113. A concomitant of this is the frequent lack of correspondence between text and offering scene with regard to the deity invoked - see below, p.67, IV.1.

44. E.g. Legrain, ḫT 22 (1900) 134; Legrain, Statues et statuettes de rois et de particuliers III, (Cairo 1914) Cairo CG 42207 and CG 42226.

45. That this is not simply a reflection of the greater frequency of vertical texts in the seventh century is apparent from instances in which the phrase is written ḫΔ₀₈₃ vertically and ḫΔ₀₈₃ horizontally in the same inscription (e.g. Louvre C.110).

46. Turin 1538.

47. Florence 2501. See also Cairo T.29/10/24/1 ( ḫΔ₀₈₃ ).

48. ḫ' is never used in vertical writings of the ḫtp-di-nsw formula. Cf. below, p.64.
more commonly, dispensed with the n altogether.

b) The normal arrangement of the signs which make up the phrase htp-di-nsw is the same as in the New Kingdom, i.e. ꜣꜣ. ꜣ is so invariably the second element from the Eighteenth Dynasty onwards that graphic variants such as ꜣꜣ, ꜣꜣ, and ꜣꜣ which occur in isolated cases, may be regarded as conscious archaisms. It is less certain whether the same explanation applies to the form ꜣꜣ which appears briefly in the early sixth century.

c) A quite separate variant is the reversal of the two phonetic complements in the word htp, thus ꜣ instead of ꜣ. This is common at other periods and occurs sporadically throughout the Late Period, but is characteristic of a group of inscriptions of the early seventh century.

49. See Smither, JEA 25 (1939) 34, n.2.
50. Cairo CG 22156 and Cairo JE 41332. This is the normal Middle Kingdom form.
51. Berlin 7700 and Cairo T.29/10/24/7.
53. E.g. Amherst 1921.VI, Liverpool University E.27, Louvre C.229 and E.13067 and Vienna 119.
55. Totenstelen, 263-5, group I a, to which add Bower 8 and Reading E.23.2 and other related stelae.
4. Archaising

The penchant for Old and particularly Middle Kingdom forms generally known as archaising seems to have begun early in the eighth century, before the advent of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty, but to have reached its zenith in the seventh century. At Abydos, it manifested itself in a variety of forms including relief carving, false-door stelae, and titulary, but is most apparent in inscriptions. It is reflected, for instance, in alphabetic writings, in the writing of the plural by repetition rather than with the plural strokes, in the revival of the four-pot hnt sign (𓊨𓊠𓊨𓊠),

56. See ESLP, xxxvii; Nagy, "Remarques sur le souci d'archaïsme en Egypte à l'époque saïte", AA 21 (1973) 53-64, and the references cited there and by Fazzini in Miscellanea Wilbouriana I (1972) 65, n.75.

57. Cairo JE 91219.

58. Berlin 7323 and Rio de Janeiro 2462. Note also the stela Cairo JE 41332.

59. Cairo JE 91261 and Louvre A.93.

60. Cairo JE 91219. For the occurrence of this feature in the Twenty-fifth Dynasty, see Leclant, Montouemhat, 21-2 (a), but note that it occurs as early as c. 750 B.C. — e.g. Redford, JEA 59 (1973) pl. XX - 𓊨𓊠𓊨𓊠 in the Bubastite portion of the chapel of Osiris hkh3 dt.

61. Especially 𓊨𓊠 for ntrw (Cairo T.26/10/24/6 and T.26/10/24/9, Fitzwilliam E.SS.34 and Florence 2502) and 𓊨𓊠 for htpw (BM 809 and Cairo JE 11230).

62. See below, p.59, n.94.
in some writings of ḫtp-di-nsw, and possibly in the use of noinspection as a determinative in personal names, as well as in other less certain ways, such as the spelling ꜜ and the use of ꜜ. 

II. Palaeographic

1. ⲱ (D.29)

This often replaces ⲱ (D.28) in the phrase n kꜜ n in the Ptolemaic period, but not before.

2. ⲱ (D.32) (Figure I.3)

This occurs very frequently in ḫpt-wdꜜt, the third most common title in the Abydene sequence. Early seventh century examples show ꜜ or ꜜ, with the arms joined at the shoulder, but c. 620 B.C. there

63. See above, p. 51.
64. See below, p. 66 c).
65. One should beware of seeing an archaisms in every feature that has earlier parallels. The fact that ꜜ was used briefly in the Eighteenth Dynasty (see Appendix II) does not necessarily make its reappearance in the eighth century a deliberate archaism, though this remains a possible explanation. For ꜜ, see below, p. 64.
66. On the alternation of the two in a Twenty-sixth Dynasty inscription, see Caminos, JEA 50 (1964) 81.
67. See p. 211 below for references.
is a change to \( \text{\textcopyright} \), which is the standard form thereafter. There are no reversions to the earlier form at Abydos, and the wider validity of this criterion is illustrated by the fact that at Akmim, where the production of stelae did not begin until the second half of the sixth century, only the latter form is used. The change may have been influenced by the exceptional writing \( \text{\textcopyright} \), which occurs twice c. 650 B.C., or, more likely, by a cursive form \( \text{\textcopyright} \), var. \( \text{\textcopyright} \)

68. The Wh. gives both the earlier (III.471.11) and the later (I.401.18) forms, as does Goyon, BIFAO 65 (1967) 93, but neither attaches any chronological significance to the variation. The distinction has perhaps been obscured by the fact that the two have often been confused in publication. Thus, in an article in BIFAO 62 (1964), De Maulemaare twice copies \( \text{\textcopyright} \) (Chicago OIM 10802: p.159-60, and Louvre E.11377: p.155), whereas photographs (loc. cit., pl.XXX-XXXI, and C. Boreux, Musée National du Louvre : Département des antiquités égyptiennes, Guide-catalogue sommaire, (Paris 1932) pl.XXIV) show quite clearly \( \text{\textcopyright} \). Conversely, Jelínková-Reymond in ASAE 55 (1958) 113, nos. 20-21, twice has \( \text{\textcopyright} \), whereas the publications of Otto, MDAIK 15 (1957) 206-7, and Chassinat, RT 21 (1899) 66-7, both show \( \text{\textcopyright} \).

69. Totenstelen, 117.

70. Ibid., figs.163-4, 166-7, 170, 175-6. Preliminary investigations suggest that this is also valid for Thebes, and perhaps Upper Egypt in general, but the position with regard to Lower Egypt is less clear. At least two definitely dated later examples of \( \text{\textcopyright} \) from there are known - the Persian period statue of Wedjhorisnet (G. Botti and P. Romanelli, Le Scul ture del Museo Gregoriano Egizio, (Vatican City 1951) pl.XXXIII) and a relief of P\text{\textcopyright}-ir-k\text{\textcopyright}p dated to the reign of Psammeticus II (Boreux, Guide-catalogue, pl.XXIV) - and it may be that, as with other epigraphic innovations which originated at Thebes, it was not common in Lower Egypt until much later - see p.319 below on the late appearance of \( \text{\textcopyright} \) at Memphis.

which is used in some late seventh century ink inscriptions. 72

3. $\text{\textcircled{H.6}}$ (D.60)
This sign is reversed on a number of mid-seventh century stelae. 73

4. $\text{\textcircled{G.6}}$ (H.6)
This is consistently substituted for $\text{\textcircled{Aa.11}}$ in the epithet $\text{\textcircled{m3}}$-hrw in the Ptolemaic period. Only three earlier examples occur in the Late Period, 74 although it had been common in this context in the late New Kingdom. 75

5. $\text{\textcircled{K.9}}$ (Figure 1.5)
In painted inscriptions of the seventh century, this often has the form $\text{\textcircled{\textsuperscript{2}}}$, which then appears in incised inscriptions in the sixth century B.C. 76 A similar phenomenon can be found on a few Middle Kingdom Abydene inscriptions in ink.

72. BM 29422, Cairo JE 34603 and Chicago EM 31280.
73. BM 639, Cairo JE 22139 and JE 22143, Cairo T.26/10/24/3, T.26/10/24/9 and T.29/10/24/2.
74. Glasgow D.1937.29, Leiden VII.11 and Vienna 157 - all single isolated examples.
75. See, for example, T.G.H. James, Hieroglyphic Texts from Egyptian Stelae etc., Part 9, (London 1970) pl.XLV no.132, XLVIII no.290 and LI no.314.
76. See A. de Rossi, RSO 46 (1971) 29, no.4 b. This form is simply cursive, however, and not necessarily specifically influenced by hieratic as the author suggests.
6. \( \text{\textdegree} \) (M.40) (Figure I.2)

This sign occurs most frequently in the title imi ist. The traditional form \( \text{\textdegree} \) is used in most of the seventh century examples, but in c. 620 B.C. there is a change to \( \text{\textdegree} \). The sign is reversed and the cord tied around the bundle of reeds becomes elongated. The earlier form is still in use in c. 635 B.C., whereas the later appears on inscriptions dated to c. 610 B.C. onwards, so

77. See p.209 below.

78. This is the form given by the Wb. I.73.1 and I.127.1. As with hpt (p.53), it has often been incorrectly rendered in copies of texts. For instance, Yoyotte, BIFAO 54 (1954) 94, doc.7, gives \( \text{\textdegree} \) for Vatican 41, whereas pl.XXXIII of Botti-Romanelli, Sculpture, shows the correct form to be \( \text{\textdegree} \); G. Reisner, Canopcis, (Cairo 1967) 250, has \( \text{\textdegree} \), although pl.XLVII shows \( \text{\textdegree} \); A. Kamal, Tables d'offrandes, (Cairo 1909) 89 Cairo CG 23107, renders \( \text{\textdegree} \), while pl.XXIV has \( \text{\textdegree} \). Most recently, J. Asmann, Das Grab des Basa, (Mainz am Rhein 1973), has the correct form \( \text{\textdegree} \) in all his line drawings (pl.V, XIII, XVI, XVII, etc.) but inexplicably reverses it in his text (pp.15, 16, 18). In other contexts, Leclant, Montouemhat, 35, renders the sign in isft as \( \text{\textdegree} \), whereas pl.VI shows clearly that it is \( \text{\textdegree} \), and Wb. Belegst. II, 49.8 and 13, manages to reverse the sign in transcribing the word is in Pap. Abbott 1.4 and 2.1. The number of examples could be multiplied, and it is generally the case that copies of Late Period texts hitherto published are not reliable in this respect.

79. An isolated earlier example of the form occurs on Turin 1538, while according to a copy made by Peet and Newberry, both forms occur on the now-destroyed stela Liverpool M.13916. The older form continues to be used in hieratic - see G. Möller, Hieratische Paläographie III, (Leipzig 1912) 580.

80. See figure I : Garstang 200.A.07.1.
the change may be pin-pointed to within this period. The relatively small number of examples of this sign in other words confirm the change, and the earlier form scarcely recurs, although a few stelae of the first half of the sixth century B.C. show a form \( \text{I}^\prime \), which seems to be a reversal of the whole group imi isit rather than an internal confusion of order.

The change seems to occur slightly earlier at Thebes, perhaps c. 640 B.C. Examples from the tomb of Montuemhat (not later than c. 650 B.C.) and from the Nitocris adoption stela, dated to year nine of Psammetichus I (656 B.C.), show the earlier form, whereas the later occurs on a statue of the Vizier Nespakashuty the Younger, A group of ink inscriptions (BM 29422, Cairo JE 34603 and Chicago 31280) show the earlier form of \( \text{I} \) together with the later writing of hpt, which suggests that the latter change marginally antedates the former. On the other hand, the later form of is occurs with the earlier form of hpt-wdi on Cairo CG 22210.

81. A group of ink inscriptions (BM 29422, Cairo JE 34603 and Chicago 31280) show the earlier form of \( \text{I} \) together with the later writing of hpt, which suggests that the latter change marginally antedates the former. On the other hand, the later form of is occurs with the earlier form of hpt-wdi on Cairo CG 22210.
82. E.g. Abydos III, XXIV, El Amrah XXXVII, Cairo CG 22054, Cairo JE 6291, Horniman, Leiden VII, VII.11 and VII.20.
83. BM 808, Cairo CG 22131, Munich 49 and Vienna 189. Both forms are found on the early sixth century stela Leiden VII.11. In the tomb of Petosiris, the later form is consistently used in the word is /"tomb", while both are found in isf /"evil" - G. Lefebvre, Le tombeau de Petosiris III, (Cairo 1924) 22-3.
84. Cairo CG 647 and CG 42237 (Leclant, Montuemhat, 33, pl.VI and 101, pl.XXVIII respectively). For the dating of Montuemhat, see below, p.74.
85. Caminos, JEA 50 (1964) pl.VIII, line 8.
which cannot be later than c. 635 B.C., 86 and throughout the tomb of Basa, dated by its publisher to c. 640 B.C. 87 On stelae from Akhmim, which date to the second half of the sixth century and after, only the later form is found, 88 and the Lower Egyptian examples of imi ist collected by Yoyotte suggest that the change eventually occurred throughout Egypt. 89

7. (N.1)

The use of the "sky" sign above inscriptions seems not to occur before the Twenty-seventh Dynasty. 90 At Abydos, it is found only on sarcophagi. 91

86. BM 1132 (my copy - the relevant part of the inscription is not shown in the photographs published in ILN, 21st Feb., 1959, 313). See De Meulenaere, Cde 98 (1963) 73, n.2, and, for the date, genealogy II below.

87. Assman, Basa, 22: "etwa in das zweite und dritte Jahrzehnt der langen Regierungszeit Psammetichs I".

88. See the examples noted in n.52 above. Ptolemaic examples from Akhmim sometimes show an abbreviated form î for the title imi ist (A. Kamal, Stèles ptolémaïques et romaines, (Cairo 1905) Cairo CG 22030, CG 22032, CG 22039 and CG 22059), which is very rare at Abydos (Cairo T.13/1/21/4).

89. BIFAO 54 (1954) 95. The earlier form is still found in the word isft on the sarcophagus of Ankhesneferibre - C.E. Sander-Hansen, Die religiösen Texte auf dem Sarg der Anchnesneferibre, (Copenhagen 1937) 77.193 (collated).

90. ESLP, 70, 71, 87.

8. △ (N.29)

This sign is written in reverse on a small group of inscriptions (including one datable to c. 585 B.C.), many of which show the reversed △ sign. 92

9. □ (0.1) (Figure 1.4)

In early incised examples, the correct form is always used, but in ink inscriptions the cursive forms □ and □ are found, and in the sixth century these appear in incised texts. 93 In the Ptolemaic period the classical form is revived.

10. Δ (W.17-18)

The form of this sign varies considerably. It is usually depicted with three pots, sometimes with four, 94 occasionally with only two, 95 while in some late seventh century ink inscriptions a single vertical

---

92. See below, p.60. Most of the examples are in the word krs (Avignon m., BM 640, Cairo CG 22163, Cairo JE 34605 and Glasgow D.1937.29) but it also occurs in hK3 (Turin 1528) and in the name Nespakashuty (on the datable stela Cairo CG 22126 - see above, p.40).

93. A similar "degeneration" occurs at other periods - e.g. Fischer, Dendera, 81, fig.15, col.13.

94. The pots are sometimes clearly delineated ( ) but are more often summarily rendered as . The reappearance of the characteristically Old Kingdom representation with four pots should probably be regarded as archaising.

95. E.g. Cairo JE 20240 and JE 34598, Louvre C.110 and Turin 1632.
line serves the purpose. The only variant which is chronologically significant is the consistent addition of a baseline in the Ptolemaic period. The pots are then sometimes rendered as a solid mass, so ḫḫ, and not as distinct elements.

11. ḫḫ (Y.3-4)

In these inscriptions, contrary to Middle Kingdom usage, the form ḫḥ (Y.3) with reed holder foremost is normal, and ḫḥ (Y.4) very much rarer.

12. ḫ

This sign is reversed in the name ḫnt-imnh in a number of early sixth century inscriptions, in many of which Δ (N.29) is also reversed.

III. Orthography

1. Weir (Figure I.6)

The spelling of the name of Osiris is of fundamental importance because it occurs so frequently. The earliest example of the charac-

96. Cairo JE 20244 and JE 20251.
97. There is one quite isolated earlier example with baseline (Stockholm 58).
98. E.g. Cairo CG 22006 and CG 22043 and Louvre C.116.
100. See those cited in n.92 above, together with Copenhagen 973 and Durham N.1968.
teristic Late Period spelling with the pennant, $\overline{\text{r}}\text{l}_4$, var. $\overline{\text{r}}\text{l}$, at Abydos dates to c. 720 B.C., but the sparsity of monuments of the Third Intermediate Period from Abydos makes it impossible to say at what date the spelling was actually introduced. However, a wider study of all the dated inscriptions of the Third Intermediate Period on which the name of Osiris occurs shows that it is not used before c. 740-730 B.C., and that it therefore serves as an ideal terminus a quo, indicating decisively that an inscription in which it is used dates to the Late Period and not earlier. In the course of the Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth Dynasties, this spelling gradually supersedes $\overline{\text{r}}\text{r}$ and $\overline{\text{s}}\text{r}$, and although these continue to be used, by the Ptolemaic period $\overline{\text{r}}\text{r}$ is almost invariable. The spelling $\overline{\text{r}}\text{r}$, characteristic of the New Kingdom and the Third Intermediate Period, was still in use c. 800 B.C. but, with one isolated exception, is not found in the Late Period. An unusual orthography $\overline{\text{r}}\text{r}$, which is clearly influenced by the contemporary preference for $\overline{\text{s}}\text{s}$ rather than $\overline{\text{s}}$ as the spelling of ntr, is used in some late

101. Cairo JE 32022-3.
102. See Appendix II. The non-occurrence of $\overline{\text{r}}\text{r}$, although by no means conclusive, suggests that an inscription is likely to be nearer 750 B.C. than 300 B.C. because of the predominance which this spelling rapidly acquired in the Late Period.
103. See Erman, ZÄS 46 (1909) 94.
104. See below, p.306, n.42.
seventh century inscriptions. 105

2. Re

The standard spelling of the name of Re is ḫn, but for a period within the seventh century B.C., the determinative is placed first (ḥn) or in between the two phonetic elements (ḥn). 106 Partly contemporary with this, but of less limited duration, is the use of ḫ as a second determinative. 107 The spelling ḫn is attested at Thebes as early as c. 750 B.C., 108 and as late as 535/4 B.C., 109 but at Abydos it is only current for about forty years c. 670–30 B.C.

3. Ntr

The usual spelling is the simple triliteral ḫ, but an alternative ḫ ḫ does occur and is most common at the end of the seventh century. 110

105. BM 29422, West Berlin 13269, Cairo JE 20244, JE 20251 and JE 34603 and Chicago FM 31280.

106. Described by WB. II.401 as "spät", the occurrence of the spelling ḫ in the Twenty-fifth Dynasty was noted by Leclant, Enquêtes, 18 (d).

107. See p. 314, n. 16 below.

108. Redford, JEA 59 (1973) pl. XX-XXI.

109. Totenstelen, 23, 199, fig. 23: Cairo A. 2747.

110. E.g. West Berlin 13269, BM 1180, Cairo JE 34603, Cairo T. 4/7/24/9 and T.26/10/24/6, Chicago FM 31280 and FM 31659, Florence 2509, Leiden VI. 51 and Louvre N. 2722.
4. ḫbdw

For most of the Late Period the classical spelling ḫbdw is used. Spellings with ḫw for ḫ and/or an added ḫ are particularly common at the very end of the seventh century B.C.. Forms with ḫ are rare and spellings with two ṭ's are not found before the latter part of the sixth century. 111 The spelling ḫbdw is common in the Ptolemaic period, when the substitution of the Abydos fetish ḫbdw (R.17) for ḫ (U.23) is also found. 112

5. ḫntw

The characteristic Late Period spelling is ḫbdw, var. ḫbdw, which usually shows the graphic variant ḫbdw in Ptolemaic inscriptions. The most abbreviated writing ḫbdw is characteristic of a group of early sixth century inscriptions. 113

6. (I)ḥt

By far the most common spelling in the phrase ḥt nb(t) nfr(t) is ḥb, 111 Spellings with ḫ or ḫ certainly presage demotic ḫt and Coptic ḫt (J. Černý, Coptic Etymological Dictionary, (Cambridge 1975) 344), but the spelling ḫbdw in particular may also owe something to a confusion with ḫbdw. 112 This also occurs in ink inscriptions in the late seventh century. 113 See nn.92 and 100 above.
but 𓊜, 𓊖, 𓊘 and 𓊚 also occur. The spelling with prothetic 𓊝 occurs in two forms, 𓊝 and 𓊝, each characteristic of a separate group of inscriptions. 115

7. nfr(t)

In the same phrase, nfr(t) is usually written with t omitted, either as 𓊙 or without phonetic complement as 𓊝, but a spelling 𓊙 occurs in the early sixth century B.C. 116

8. 𓊕 (S.3)

The use of this hieroglyph illustrates the way in which epigraphy and orthography overlap. It is first attested with the value n in the Twelfth Dynasty, 117 but is not common as such until the Eighteenth Dynasty. 118 Although it is widely used as n in a variety of contexts in the late New Kingdom, it does not occur at all for most of

114. The spelling with the loaf determinative 𓊜 (X.4) is typical of the Ptolemaic period - see Ranke, JAOS 75 (1955) 197, n.16 - but does occur earlier, e.g. Sydney 36 and 25.37.

115. Those cited in nn.55 and 105 above. According to De Meulenaere, ESLP, 69, it is most common in the early Twenty-sixth Dynasty. This spelling was used as a criterion for the dating of Middle Kingdom inscriptions by Schenkel, Frühmittelägyptische Studien, 69.

116. See nn.92, 100 and 112 above.


118. Silverman (NARCE 90 (1974) 5) has recently suggested that it may have been more common in the late Middle Kingdom than has hitherto been realised.
the seventh century at Abydos. From c. 625 B.C. onwards, it is
used as a substitute for烘焙 in the ḫtp-di-neḥw formula, i.e. before
the name of Osiris. At the same time, it occasionally replaces烘焙
as a dative or genitive before the names of other deities, and sub-
sequently in other prepositional contexts, although not common in
this usage before the Ptolemaic period. It is not until the late
sixth century at the earliest that it is used as烘焙 in other con-
texts. There would thus appear to be grounds for suggesting that
她是 seen as a "sacred" hieroglyph appropriate only to use
before the names of deities in the seventh century, and to have been
extended gradually to other "profane" uses in the course of the
sixth. Even after this, however,她是 was rarely used in vertical
inscriptions.

119. The paucity of monuments makes it difficult to document its use
in the Third Intermediate Period - it occurs before the titles
of the deceased on Cairo JE 30435 - but the possibility that
the restricted use of她是 as烘焙 is a consciously archaising re-
action against New Kingdom usage cannot be excluded.

120. For instance, ḫ (BM 699 and Cairo CG 22054), ḫ (Belfast 421) and ḫ (Pittsburgh, Carnegie Inst. 4210/13).

121. Perhaps because of its derivation from ṇ (the crown of Lower
Egypt) - see Gardiner, loc. cit., and Fairman, ASAE 43 (1943)

122. The process of the extension of this hieroglyph from restricted
to widespread use in the Middle and New Kingdoms is thus re-
peated in the Late Period. It is never as common as烘焙, however.

123. E.g. BM 808 and Cairo T.13/1/21/4. The use of她是 in vertical
inscriptions is not uncommon in the New Kingdom.
9. Determinatives

In the inscriptions of the middle and later seventh century, in addition to the usual \& (A.1), a number of different determinatives are used in personal names.

a) \& (Cf. A.51) The man seated on a chair and holding a flail is characteristic of the second half of the seventh century B.C. 124

b) \& The block statue determinative, which occurs most frequently in the period of transition from the Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth Dynasties, 125 occurs only once in Abydene inscriptions. 126

c) \& (M.17) This is most often used c. 650 B.C. 127

d) \& (B.1) The seated woman determinative is the standard form in female names in the middle years of the seventh century, c. 670-

124. Cf. De Meulenaere, WMJ 8 (1973) 29. Only a few later examples are known from Abydos (e.g. Aix 12, Belfast 421, BM 808, Graz and Munich 49). Contra ESLP, 69, the man in a kneeling position holding a flail \& (cf. A.52) does not seem to be a reliable indication of date, occurring at least as often in the Ptolemaic period as in the seventh century (e.g. Cairo T.13/1/21/4, Chicago OIM 7196, Louvre C.232 and Pittsburgh, Carnegie Inst. 1917.472).


30 B.C., although the usual Late Period form is a woman in a kneeling position, holding a lotus, \( \text{\textbullet} \) (cf. B.7).

IV. Phraseology

1. Many seventh century stelae show the deceased adoring Re-Harakhte, \(^{128}\) and on these the text, which is always above the offering scene, begins \( \text{htp-di-nsw Re-Hr-Hjay ntr (3 nb pt di.f.} \) \(^{129}\) The offering scene and the text are thus closely integrated. In the late seventh and sixth centuries, the solar aspect of funerary religion is less pronounced, and the Abydene triad comes to the fore again, with Osiris especially prominent. \(^{130}\) The offering formula is generally below the scene and the god invoked is \( \text{Wsr-Hnt-imnitw ntr (3 nb 3bdw, regardless of the deity depicted. The text and scene are quite distinct parts, linked only by the name of the deceased.} \) \(^{131}\)

In the Ptolemaic period there is again a general correspondence between the deities depicted and those to whom the text refers, even on those stelae on which a plurality of divinities appear. \(^{131}\)

---

128. Totenstelen, 90 and group I.

129. These are the most common epithets, although others such as \( \text{nb Hzt, hry-ib Hzt and hry ntrw also stress the solar aspect. See Appendix IV.} \)

130. Totenstelen, group II. See above, p.49, C.

131. E.g. BM 1426, Cairo CG 22054, Leiden VII.20, Louvre C.117 and Louvre C.232.
2. (Figure II.2) In seventh century inscriptions, the boon required of a deity in the offering formula is that he will ensure the provision of offerings of a material kind, such as bread and beer, to sustain the deceased in the afterlife. In the late seventh and early sixth centuries, this is replaced or supplemented by the request for a good burial (krst nfrt). This is characteristic of the first half of the sixth century, although it does occur later.

3. (Figure II.3) In the seventh century and earlier, the name of the deceased is usually introduced by the phrase n k3 m. In the first half of the sixth century, however, this is often replaced by n k3 n m3y br Wsir, which is current only for a short time and is no longer found in the Ptolemaic period, when n k3 (n) is again usual. 133

4. The name of the deceased is usually followed by the simple epithet m3-hrw, but in the second half of the seventh century a number of variations on this occur in which the deceased is described as m3-hrw before (hr) the great god (ntr '(3) 134 or another

---

132. The phrase often runs simply di,f/ah prt-hrw t hnt k3w 3pdw ht nbt nfrt w'tbt. A frequent alternative in the seventh century is di.l htpw df3w.
133. An isolated much earlier example occurs on Cairo JE 91219.
134. E.g. Leiden VII.21 and Vienna 138.
The above criteria make it possible to date, with varying degrees of precision, all but the very briefest of the inscriptions. The small number of Third Intermediate Period monuments continue to reflect the traditions of the New Kingdom, and there is in practice little difficulty in distinguishing them from those of the Late Period. Inscriptions are still very scarce in the period 750-700 B.C., and although the numbers increase gradually in the course of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty, it is often not possible to date a monument more closely than to the second half of the eighth or first half of the seventh century.

135. E.g. ntr '3 nb pt (Cairo CG 22210 and Cairo JE 34598), ntr '3 nb m3'it (Cairo JE 36415), ntr '3 nb dw3t (Cairo T.29/10/24/1), Tw nb t3wy Imw R' nb 3пт (Cairo JE 8770), and Wsir (Leiden VI.51). Cf. ESLP, 30, 40, 44, for the similar dating of the phrase m3'-hrw nb im3g, which is rare at Abydos (Cairo T.26/10/24/6, Fitzwilliam E.888.34 and Oxford E.3922).

136. Among the handful of published private inscriptions from Abydos which can definitely be dated to the Third Intermediate Period are: Berlin 15557-8 and Cairo CG 9442 - magic bricks of Ist-enkheb (El Amrah, pl.XLI); BM 642 - stela of Pasebakhanu (ibid., pls.XXI and XXXIV); Cairo CG 23101 - offering table of Ist-enkheb (Kamal, Tables d'offrandes, 86); Cairo JE 66285 - stela of Sheshonk (Blackman, JEA 27 (1941) 83-95); Cairo T.3/4/17/1 - stela of Paiankh (MDF II, pl.57); Glasgow Art Gallery - stela of Rjedinherieufankh (El Amrah, pl.XXI); UCL 14496 - stela of Pashedbast (Jacquet-Gordon, JEA 53 (1967) 63-8); Philadelphia U.M. E.16186 - coffin fragment of a daughter of Harsiese (El Amrah, pl.XLI).
The period from 650-550 B.C. is the best known, not only because of the greater number of monuments and the sequence of absolutely datable inscriptions, but also because of the multitude of well-documented epigraphic changes. The mid-seventh century is characterised by an interest in the past reflected in archaising forms, an emphasis on the close connection between offering scene and text on stelae, the variety of determinatives used in personal names, and, appropriately in view of the contemporary popularity of the solar aspect of funerary religion, by the spelling of the name of Re as \( \text{Re} \). The last quarter of the century represents an epigraphic watershed in many respects, foremost among which are the changes in the palaeography of the titles \text{im\-i\-est} and \text{hpt-wdj\-3t} and the appearance of \( \text{Hfr} \) and a more varied phraseology in the \text{hpt-di-nsw} formula. The early sixth century is marked by the standardisation of the tripartite stele and the concomitant disjunction of text and offering scene, the use in incised inscriptions of cursive palaeographic forms which clearly derive from the ink inscriptions of the preceding half century, and changes in the content of the offering formula and in the introduction of the name of the deceased. Within the hundred years from 650-550 B.C., inscriptions can be dated with confidence to within ten years.

There are no fixed points in Abydene chronology between c. 550 B.C. and c. 300 B.C., and few significant epigraphic changes can be
detected. Consequently, although inscriptions can be assigned to this general period, it is much more difficult to date them within it.

There has been a justifiable reluctance to attribute monuments to the Persian period, 137 which is marked by a paucity of royal inscriptions and an apparently almost total dearth of private monuments, at least in Upper Egypt, 138 and none of the relatively small number of post-Saite and pre-Ptolemaic inscriptions from Abydos can be attributed to it with any certainty. These inscriptions are characterised by crudely incised and badly formed hieroglyphs, defective orthography 139 and deviations from the Middle Egyptian forms in use in the Saite period. 140 In the absence of decisive evidence, I have dated these inscriptions to the late sixth or fourth century depending on whether they show a greater affinity with the inscriptions of the mid-sixth century or the Ptolemaic period.

The post-Persian inscriptions can be divided into two broad groups, which I have called "Dynasty XXX / Early Ptolemaic" (c. 360-275 B.C.)

137. Totenstelen, 173-5 (cf. 113-16) and Buhl, Sarcophagi, 198-9.
138. For Persian monuments in Memphis and the Delta, see the Serapeum stelae cited in n.8 on p.36 above, and ESIP, nos.57-70.
139. This is particularly noticeable in examples such as Cairo CG 22003, CG 22022 and CG 22026.
140. One finds, for instance, krst '3t instead of krst nfr on stelae - e.g. Cairo CG 22019 and Frankfort 213.
and "Later Ptolemaic" respectively. It has often been pointed out that many of the so-called 'Ptolemaic' signs are actually attested, albeit sporadically, at an earlier date, \textsuperscript{141} but they do, nevertheless, provide a useful relative criterion. The multiplicity and frequency of occurrence of such values is the outstanding feature of the later group, \textsuperscript{142} which is also characterised by the use of the baseline in \(_\text{\textipa{m'}}\) for \(_\text{m}\) and \(_\text{\textipa{b}}\) in \(_\text{\textipa{m'\textipa{h}}\text{\textipa{r}}\text{\textipa{w}}}\). Other inscriptions which are clearly of this period are too brief to be dated more precisely than to the Ptolemaic period.

The foregoing epigraphic analysis has produced a relative chronological sequence of change, the validity of which is confirmed by the parallel results of Munro's stylistic analysis of the funerary stelae. A solid chronological base therefore exists for the study of the history of Abydos in this period.

\textsuperscript{141} E.g. Ranke, \textit{JAS} 73 (1953) 196-7. This applies to orthographies such as \(_\text{\textipa{q}}\) for \(_\text{\textipa{r}}\) and \(_\text{\textipa{b}}\) for \(_\text{\textipa{h}}\), as well as to individual signs such as \(_\text{\textipa{t}}\) for \(_\text{\textipa{m}}\), \(_\text{\textipa{i}}\) for \(_\text{\textipa{f}}\) or \(_\text{\textipa{r}}\) for \(_\text{\textipa{m}}\).

\textsuperscript{142} See De Meulenaare, \textit{OG} 3 (1966) 112-13 and \textit{OLP} 4 (1973) 82-3.
Abydos 67.661

Tomb 3, N.W. of the forecourt of the "portal" of Ramses II - see Expedition 10, no. 1 (Fall 1967) 13-14.

Unpublished

Cartonnage fragments belonging to the nbt pr ḥḥpt ḥḥpt-mḥḥb, daughter of the ḫm nṯr ḫmn ḥḥḥp ẖḥḥp nṯr ḫmn m Ipt-ḥḥḥt... X. Another fragment mentions the ... ḫḥw nḥḥw ḫḥw-r ḫḥw t wr ḫḥw (? ) Wəḥkn, who may be her father and therefore also the holder of the first sequence of titles. See, however, genealogy VIII.

c. 650-30 B.C.

Abydos 68.90

Area of Ramses "portal" (Pennsylvania-Yale expedition 1968)

Unpublished

Cartonnage fragments naming the ḫḥw ḫḥw Dḏ-ḥḥw-ḥḥw ẖḥḥt T 自动生成了的和 the ḫḥw ḫḥw... ḫḥw-şḥḥw-ḥḥw ẖḥḥt ẖḥḥt-stw, relationship unknown.

The restoration of the names is based solely on the frequency with which they occur at Abydos. The form of ḫḥw indicates that the fragments are later than c. 620 B.C., while the use of ẖḥḥt as determinative in the name of Neapakashuty suggests that they are not much later than the end of the seventh century.

c. 620-600 B.C.

Abydos I, LXVII

Apparently incised on limestone blocks in the wadi leading to the Umm el-Qa'ab. I was unable to locate them during a visit to Abydos in 1974.

Abydos I, 81, 47-8, pl.LXVII.
PM V, 78.
Leclant, Montouemhat, 187.
Von Zeissl, Äthiopen und Assyrer, 58.
Two inscriptions giving the name and titles (ḥn ntr 4 Imn-r′ nsw ntrw iny-r Ṣn(w mi kd.s) of Montuemhat, in one of which he is called m3t-hrw.

On the dating of the career of Montuemhat, see Kitchen, TIP, paras. 361, 365 and references.

c. 680-50 B.C.

Abydos I, LXVIII
Osiris temple enclosure
Abydos I, 32, pl.LXVIII; II, 20.
PM V, 43.
Red granite naos of Apries and Amasis.

c. 570 B.C.

Abydos I, LXXII A
Tomb G.57
Abydos I, 35, 48, pl.LXXII.
PM V, 75.
Canopic box of Irt-hr-rw, son of W3p-ib-r′ - see genealogy XIII.

Dynasty XXX / Early Ptolemaic

Abydos I, LXXII B
Tomb G.57
Abydos I, 35, 48, pl.LXXII.
PM V, 75.
Model coffin of the ḫsk imi ist Irt-hr-rw, son of Ṣn-hr. See genealogy XIII.

Dynasty XXX / Early Ptolemaic

Abydos I, LXXIII A
Tomb G.57
Abydos I, 35, 48, pl.LXXIII.
PM V, 75.
Coffin of the ḥsk imi ist Irt-hr-rw, son of the ḥsk imi ist (var. mn) Ṣḥḥ-ib-r and the ḫḥt ḫḥt-imntiw Ṣḥḥ-hr. See genealogy XIII.

Dynasty XXX / Early Ptolemaic

Abydos I, LXXIII B

Tomb G.57

Abydos I, 36, 48, pl.LXXIII.

PM V, 75.

Coffin of Ḥḥkh-m3'-hrw, son of Irt-hr-rw and ḫḥt-t3.s-nḥt. For a model coffin of the same man, see Brussels E.487. A painted wooden box, giving him the title of ḥsk, was also found, but fell to pieces soon afterwards (Abydos I, 51.4). See genealogy XIII.

Petrie's emendation of the name to "Mehti-ab-ta-senekht" is both unjustified and unnecessary.

Dynasty XXX / Early Ptolemaic

Abydos I, LXXIII C

Tomb G.57

Abydos I, 36, 48, pl.LXXIII.

PM V, 75.

Coffin of Ṣḥḥ-nḥt, daughter of the ḫḥt-mn Ṣḥḥ-hr and Ṣḥḥ-ḥḥt-nt-mnw. See genealogy XIII.

The name of the deceased is here written sḥḥ-nḥt, yet she is certainly to be identified with the owner of the canopic box (see following entry) and probably also with the ḫḥt-t3.s-nḥt of the preceding entry. The actual reading of her name must therefore remain uncertain.

Dynasty XXX / Early Ptolemaic

Abydos I, LXXIII C

Tomb G.57

Abydos I, 36, 48, pl.LXXIII.

PM V, 75.

Canopic box of Ḫḥḥ-nḥt, daughter of (? the ḫḥt-mn ḥsk... X. See genealogy XIII.
The published copy of the text shows $\text{\textnumero}$ $\text{\textnumero}$, of which the last part must clearly be amended to $\text{\textnumero}$ $\text{\textnumero}$. Petrie apparently did not consider $\text{\textnumero}$ as part of the name, but it can scarcely be anything else since it is immediately preceded by the introductory word h3y.

**Dynasty XXX / Early Ptolemaic**

**Abydos I, LXXIII D**

Tomb G.57

Abydos I, 36, 48-9, pl.LXXIII.  
PM V, 75.

Sarcophagus of Mrt-tfnwt, daughter of the imi lst hsk Dd-hr. For a canopic box of the same woman, see BM 37335. See also genealogy XIII.

**Dynasty XXX / Early Ptolemaic**

**Abydos I, LXXIX**

Tomb G.61

Abydos I, pl.LXXIX.9; III, 42, pl.XXIV.3.  
PM V, 76.

Cartonnage of Hp-mn, for whose sarcophagus see Philadelphia U.M. E,16133. See also genealogy XVII.

**Dynasty XXX / Early Ptolemaic**

**Abydos III, XXX**

Osiris temple enclosure

Abydos III, 52, pl.XXX.  
PM V, 46.

Fragmentary stela belonging to the hm ntr Ns-inhr (PP III, 5534), and also mentioning the hm ntr Hr.

The excavators read the names as hm ntr Dhwti Anher and hm ntr Horpamakhers. The former was corrected by De Neulenaars in BIFAO 54 (1954) 78, while there is no reason for the latter. The sign interpreted as p3 is simply a rather wide vertical stroke serving as determinative of the name Hor, which is followed by the usual epithet m3<-nrw. For another fragment mentioning Nesinher, which may even be part of the same stela, see Lausanne 29991.

**Later Ptolemaic**
Abydos TC 7
Area of the 'Tombs of the Courtiers'
TC, 12, pl.XXXII.7.
Totenstelen, 297-8.
PM V, 56.

Stela of Hr, son of Irt-hr-rw.
Second half of sixth century B.C.

Aix-en-Provence 12
Provenance unknown
Deveria, Mémoires et fragments I, 235.

Stela of the imi ist ḫsk ḫpt-wḏ3t ṛḏ nsw (var. imi ist ḫsk) Ns-hr, son of the mi ḫw Pmḏk and the ḫyṯ ḫnt-imntw ḫnty-rw.
Paternal grandfather: mi ḫw ḫm ṛṯṯm ṛṯ n ḫwir sḏ ṭḏ tṛ ṛṯ ṛṯ Hr ṭḏty-ḥḥ ṭḥm-r ṭḥbw ḫwḥt Pḥ-dḥ-ḥḥt.
Maternal grandfather: ... Ns-hr.
Wife: ṫḥ-ḥḥnḥt-ḥḥḥt, daughter of the ṫḥ ṛṯ ḫḥ ḫḥt Ns-ḥḥḥt-r².
See genealogy I for dating to c. 550 B.C.

Alexandria 1350
Nécropole du Nord
MCA 1456.
Botti, Notice des monuments, 10, no.715.
Canopic jar of ḫmpt-ḥḥḥḥt, daughter of ḫṛ-ḥḥt. For the rest of the set, see Cairo CG 4200-2.
Sixth century B.C. ?

Aménineau 1
Umm ḥl-Qa'ab
NH 1895-6, 159; 1897-8, 200, 342-4, pl.XXX.16.
PM V, 80.
Weil, Venezia, 154, para.33.
Two lintel fragments of P3-di-3st (Title: ... W3st), son of the Im
ntr Imn-rc nsw ntrw /imn-rc ntw t3ty Nm-nnw and the nb pr Espst
T3-br.

These pieces were described by Amélineau as "tables d'offrandes", but
it is clear from his photograph that they are in fact part of a struc-
ture. Two Viziers named Nesmin are known (Kitchen, TIP, para.197),
Nesmin A being the uncle of Nesmin B. Since the name of the wife of
the former is unknown, whereas his nephew was married to a woman
named Tyetese (or Denitese ?), it may be tentatively suggested that
it is the former who is referred to here. Kitchen places the death
of Nesmin A in c. 730 B.C., and on this basis, his son's tomb probably
dates to

c. 700 B.C.

Amélineau II
Umm el-Qa'ab

NF 1897-8, 147.10, 302.
LR IV, 108, n.l, c.

The same vase fragment with the remains of the cartouches of Apries
seems to have been described twice.

589-70 B.C.

Amélineau III
Umm el-Qa'ab

NF 1895-6, 125, 139, 168.6.

These references seem to be descriptions of the same two stela frag-
ments with the prenomen of Amasis.

570-26 B.C.

Amélineau IV
Umm el-Qa'ab

NF 1897-8, 165.13, 301.
LR IV, 122, n.l.
PM V, 80.
Three fragments of a monument or stela with the inscription (Ihms s3 Nt) mry n hr-s3-3st n r-st3w.

570-26 B.C.

Amélineau V

Umm el-Qa‘ab

AF 1897-8, 241, 7, 277.
LM IV, 182, III.
PM V, 31.
Kienitz, Geschichte, 213.

Ostracon with a cartouche which may be that of Teos. The identification was regarded by Gauthier as "hypohtétique" and by Kienitz as "sehr unsicher".

362-1 B.C. (if Teos)

Amherst 1921, VI

Provenance unknown

Sharpe, Egyptian Inscriptions II, 68.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1038.
Hülsenstein, 292-3, fig.147.
De Meulenaere, OIP 6-7 (1975-6) 142, no.17, 151, no.55.

Stela of 3st-n-gb, daughter of the hm ntr whm Wair s3 md3t ntr hm ntr hr ndty-1t. Tm ntr 3st nbt pr ms hm ntr Wrt-ak3yw nbt ch hm ntr n ntrw n s3 gl hm ntr (r n pr-np im-y r Wtw Smw t s3 md3t ntr s3 sn s3 htm ntr imi h3t s3 md3t ntr (r-Di-3St and the drt Wrt n Wair Iry.

Paternal grandfather: hm ntr whm Wair s3 md3t ntr nb-hr-s3-3St.
Maternal grandfather: hm ntr Wair ‘nb-p3-h-r.

See genealogy I for dating to c. 575 B.C.

El Amarah XXXV.7

Tomb D.57

El Amarah, 85, 100, pl.XXXV.7.
Bottom of a stela of the hm ntr Imn m Ipt-swt imy-r niwt t3ty Ne-p3-mdw. See genealogy II for dating to c. 660 B.C.

El Amrah XXXVI.3
Cemetery G
El Amrah, 85, pl.XXXVI.3.
PM V, 76.
Sarcophagus of T3-krnt-nt-mdw, daughter of Nbt-hwt and the hm ntr sm-s ns-3 swt (PP III, 5847).
Later Ptolemaic

El Amrah XLI
Tomb D.7
PM V, 68.
Statue base of the sm3ty hm ntr IIty-hti-htp, son of the mnw Ne-hr and the iIyt Mnw Ilwt-htp. See genealogy XVIII.
Later Ptolemaic

El Amrah D.7
Tomb D.7
El Amrah, 97, pl.LVII, no.43.
Cartonnage of a man named Hr. Since the final element of name compounds of the pattern B3k-n-X is usually the name of a deity (PM I, 91, 1-16), the reading B3k-n-Ew-tfnwt seems preferable to the excavator's Bak-n-rui. The fragment was not published and the dating is that of the excavator.
Dynasty XXV-XXVI

El Amrah D.7.A
Tomb D.7.A
Unpublished (EES negative)
Cartonnage fragments of the ḫn ntr P3-di-p3-wn-ḥt Andersen of the mnn ḫn-ḥr and the ḫytn mwn Mwt-ḥtp. See genealogy XVIII.

Later Ptolemaic

El Amrah D.7.B
Tomb D.7.B
Unpublished (EES negative)
Coffin fragments of the ḫn ntr 3 Imn m ḫpt-swt imi ˁst ḫsk Ṣm nsw ḫnl-imhr-św-t-ḫm, son of the nḥt pr ḫpt 3st-n-ḫt.
The same man is known from a set of canopics found by Garstang in tomb E.301 - see BM 32703-6.

C. 600 B.C.?

El Amrah D.16.C
Tomb D.16.C
El Amrah, 98, pl.LVIII, no.69.
Coffin fragments, three alabaster canopics and glaze ushabtis with the name of Mntw-ḥtp. The dating is that of the excavators.

Dynasty XXV-XXVI

El Amrah D.33
Tomb D.33
El Amrah, 99.
Sealing with the name Psmḥḫ. The name suggests a date in

Dynasty XXVI

Antwerp 263
Provenance unknown (Said to be Abydos by Smekers)
Smekers, Catalogus VIII, no.10, pl.VII.
Totenstelen, 269.
Stela naming T3-irt-t3-ḥn, Ṣmr-ḥr-di-sw and ḫr-ḥr-ḥw, without indication of relationship.
The name of the first man is written \(\text{\textbullet} \Delta\) so that the first element could also be read \(3st\). \(\text{Wai}\)r is preferred here because \(\text{Wai}\text{-ir-di-sw}\) is attested elsewhere as a masculine name (\(\text{PN II, 275,7}\)), whereas \(3st\text{-ir-di-sw}\) is not, and, being a compound based on the name of a female deity, is less appropriate to a man.

C. 640 B.C.

El Arabah E.173
Tomb E.173
El Arabah, 22.
Cartonnage of the "udeb" priest of Amun Neq-qa-shuti, son of the mayor of Thinis Khent-anhur-aaf-ankh (= \(\text{Dj-inhr-ivw.f-cnh}?)\) and Thu-peq-pen.
This inscription was not published and the details are those given by Garstang.

Dynasty XXV-XXVI ?

AR 1908-9
Ayrton and Loat area F
Archaeological Report 1908-9, 4-5.
\(\text{PM V, 71}\).
Wooden coffin of a man named Hr-inp\(\text{w}\).
The fact that this coffin was found inside a limestone sarcophagus shows that it cannot be earlier than the Thirtieth Dynasty.

Dynasty XXX / Ptolemaic

Avignon 12
Provenience unknown
Moret, \(\text{RT 35 (1913) 51-2, no.XXVI, pl.VII.1}\).
Stela of the \(\text{\textbullet kr P3-di-3st}\) and his son the \(\text{\textbullet kr ...inhr}\).
The names and titles are taken from Moret's copy, the stela being now illegible. Two women are inexplicably depicted in the offering scene, shaking sistra before Osiris and Isis.

C. 660 B.C.
Avignon 15
Provenance unknown
Moret, RT 35 (1913) 205-6, no.XLIII, pl.VIII.6.
Offering table naming the hm ntr s3 tpy Imh nb s3 t3 Hr-s3-3st, son of the mh nn Dk-3st-wr f-nb and the imi 3bd tpy pr Imh nb Sky t P3-di-
mwt, son of ...X, daughter of the hm ntr Imn Hr-s3-3st.

First half of seventh century B.C.? 

Avignon 23
Provenance unknown
Moret, RT 35 (1913) 51-2, no.XXIV.
Stela of Ts-tc (?), daughter of the mh nn (sic) wbn Wsir Ns-hr and
Irty.
The erroneous attribution of mh nn to Ns-hr, when no titles have been
mentioned, and other orthographic faults cast some doubt on the authen-
ticity of the piece.

Late sixth century B.C.

Avignon A.30
Provenance unknown
Moret, RT 35 (1913) 203-5.
De Meulenaere, JBOI. 20 (1967-8) 9, pl.IV.
Pyramidion of the imi ist hsk hpt-wd3t sm3ty s3 hwt-ntr n Imh nb P3 4
s3w Ns-mnw, son of the mh nn Irt-hr-rw and St3-irt-bint. His wife
was T3-st, daughter of the imi ist hsk lm nhr tpy n Imh nb Sky t
Nn-(p3)-k3-Sy wty and Ns-tfnwt.
Paternal grandmother : T3-dit-wsir.
The epigraphic evidence for the date is confirmed by the text - re-
ference is made to the provision of a limestone sarcophagus for the
deceased (ir.tw n.k db3t m min hr n ctnw), and these are not at-
tested archaeologically before Dynasty XXX. Similarly, names com-
pounded with that of Tfnwt are almost unknown at Abydos before this
time.

Dynasty XXX
Avignon nn.

Provenance unknown

Moret, RT 35 (1913) 52-3, no.XXII, pl.VII.2.

Stela of T3-krit-nr-writ, daughter of Më and T3-prt. Moret's reading of the name of the deceased is quite meaningless.

c. 590 B.C.

Baltimore WAG 175

Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord

MCA 375.

Steindorff, Egyptian Sculpture, 61, no.175, pl.XXXI.

Black granite statue of the ktn Psnk-mry-r(, son of the imy-r m\(m\)3-k3-'nh.

The name of the deceased requires a date well into the reign of Psammetichus I, while a terminus ante quem is provided by the striations on the wig of the deceased which do not occur after the reign of Necho II (ESLP, 51, no.44).

c. 640-595 B.C.

Belfast 417

Area of the 'Tombs of the Courtiers'

TC, 12, pl.XXXII.9.

PM V, 56.

Totenstelen, 292.

Stela of Hns-wr-di-sw (?), son of W33-hr.

c. 550 B.C.

Belfast 418

Area of the 'Tombs of the Courtiers'

TC, 12, pl.XXXIII.12.

PM V, 56.

Totenstelen, 289 (CT 12).
Lower part of the stela of the ithy ₣nt-immtiw T3w-t3w, daughter of the it ntr Ns-hr and Jst-ir-di-st.

Sixth century B.C.

Belfast 419
Area of the 'Tombs of the Courtiers'
TG, 12, pl.XXXII.8.
PM V, 56.
Totenstelen, 290 (CT 8).
Stela of ḫr (?), son of Ns-mḥḥ and T3-hrw, pace Petrie and Munro, who make Ns-mḥḥ the owner.

Mid-sixth century B.C.

Belfast 421
Area of the 'Tombs of the Courtiers'
TG, 12, pl.XXXIII.10.
PM V, 56.
Totenstelen, 295 (CT 10).
Stela of Nt-ḥr, daughter of the imi ist hsk Rr and Iry-iry.
Paternal grandfather : mw Ns-p3-m3i.
Maternal grandfather : imi ist hsk Rr, son of the mw Rwrw.
See genealogy V.

Late sixth - fourth century B.C.

Berlin 2090
Abydos (Passalacqua)
Passalacqua, Catalogue raisonné, no.1407.
Ausf. Verg., 268.
Weil, Veziere, 140, para. 12 a.
Pyramidion (destroyed in the last war) of the hm ntr Imn imy-ṛ nīwt ḫt3y Ns-p3-mdw.
See genealogy II for the date

C. 660 B.C.
Berlin 7303
Abydos (Passalacqua)
Passalacqua, Catalogue raisonné, no.1392.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1261.
Ausf. Verz., 265.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 148, no.40.
Stela (destroyed in the war) of the hry h3y pr Wsir F3-di-hr-p3-hrd, son of Ṣp-n-ḥ3t.
Neither Passalacqua's description nor Lieblein's copy of the names gives any decisive indication of date.

Berlin 7323
Provenance unknown
Ausf. Verz., 265.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 141, no.13.
Upper part of a rectangular false-door stela which names the imi ḥṣk ḫpt-wd3t ḫmr-ntr Wsir Ṣm b3w ḫr-s3-ḥ3t.
c. 660 B.C.

Berlin 7587
Provenance unknown
Ausf. Verz., 265.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2487.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 145, no.32.
Stela (destroyed in the war) of Nw-hwtyr, daughter of the imi ḥṣk ḫpt-wd3t ḫmr-ntr Wsir Nw-mwb-hṭp and the nbt pr ḫpḥt ...ry.
Lieblein, whose copies are usually accurate in this respect, records the earlier form of the is sign. This, and the fact that ṣw is not part of the titulary, indicate that the stela is not later than c. 620 B.C. On the other hand, it is noted in the Ausf. Verz. that the deceased is depicted twice before Osiris, which suggests that this is one of the stelae described by Munro as "antithetisch-symmetrische". These do not occur before the end of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty at Thebes (Totenstelen, 33), and the few Abydene examples are all later than this, which suggests a date
c. 650-620 B.C.
Berlin 7588
Provenance unknown

Ausf. Verz., 265.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2435.

Stela (destroyed in the war) of \textit{Naa-hwtht}, daughter of the \textit{imi ist} \textit{hsk Rwrw} and \textit{T3-hruat}.

In this case, Lieblein's copy gives the later form of \textit{is}, which indicates a date after c. 620 B.C.. The brief description given by the Ausf. Verz. — two jackals recumbent in the arc, and three deities in the offering scene — is characteristic of Munro's groups G and H (Totenstelen, 105-7) and suggests a date in the

Mid-sixth century B.C.

Berlin 7700
Provenance unknown

Ausf. Verz., 265.
Totenstelen, 233, fig.146.

Stela of the \textit{imi ist} \textit{hsk} (var. \textit{hsk} \textit{Iw.f-T3}, to whom the fragmentary title sequence \ldots \textit{hrty sft3 \textit{r}k hh hm ntr 'ndti m 3bdw imy 3bd hry}, \textit{a}3\ldots probably refers. His father was the \ldots \textit{F3-di-T3st}, son of the \textit{mi} \textit{mw} \textit{Di-hmm}. Also depicted are his wife \textit{T3-wpt}, three daughters (\textit{Irty-wr}, \textit{Naa-hr} and \textit{T3-ym}), three sons (the \textit{hsk} \textit{Di-hmm} and his wife \textit{kb-h3ty-n-T3st}, the \textit{hsk} \textit{F3-f-T3w} and the \textit{hsk} \textit{Dd-hr}) and a couple whose relationship to the owner is uncertain — the \textit{hsk} \textit{Wd3-rs} and his wife \textit{T3-f3-brt}.

The names suggest a possible connection with CG 22131 or Munich 49.

c. 575 B.C.

Berlin 14399
El Ghabat

Daressy, RF 16 (1894) 126-7, CXIV.
Burchardt, ZAS 44 (1907-8) 55-8.
Daressy, BIE 9 (1926) 281.
LR IV, 172.2.
PM V, 106.
Kienitz, Geschichte, 214, no.4.
Stela of Nectanebo II, forbidding quarrying in the mountain "between the Two Falcons" (imytw bik 2), also called H3pt-nb.s.

356 B.C.

Berlin nn.
Provenance unknown

Totenstelen, 300.
De Meulenaere, OLp 6-7 (1975-6) 143, no. 23.

Stela of the hm-ntr Wair (? n dsrt hr-s3-3st, son of the hm-ntr Wn-nfr, son of the mi nn hr-s3-3st, son of the mi nn Wn-nfr.

Late Ptolemaic

(West) Berlin 13269
Provenance unknown

Ausf. Verz., 265.
Totenstelen, 279.
Ag. Mus. Berlin, 91 and plate.

Stela of 'nb.s, daughter of the it ntr Dd-b3tt-tiw.f-~nb and T3-prt.

C. 620 B.C.

Bologna 1935
Provenance unknown

Koinek-Szello, Catalogo Bologna, 205.
L'Egitto antico, 94, pl. 47, no. 87.
Totenstelen, 298.

Stela of the Nn-nfr-htp, son of P3-3ri-n-t3-ih and Kws.
The spelling of 3byr as 3by shows that the stela is later than the date suggested by Munro (c. 580-50 B.C.).

Late sixth century B.C.

Bologna 1939
Provenance unknown
Wiedemann, *PSEBA* 8 (1885) 31-5.
Lieblein, *Dictionnaire*, 2330.
L'Egitto antico, 92, pl.45, no.82.
Totentelen, 262, fig.97.

Stela of the khabi priest of the bmt nsw wrt (Pkr-s3-ri) m3'-hrw lrt-hr-rw, son of Di-pth-13w and T3-kr-t-nt-amt.
Sons: imy-bmt dw3t ntr imy 3bd dw3t ntr P3-di-3st.
       khabi priest Di-pth-13w.

The correctness of Munro's attribution of this stela to Abydos is confirmed by the fact that the deceased are depicted on the left, a feature which does not occur elsewhere in this period.

C. 660 B.C.

* Bolston 54.00.100
  Tomb E.173
  El Arabah, 43.
  Coffin fragments of Nmm.s-b3stt.
  Mid-seventh century B.C.

* Bolston 36.01.34
  Tomb D.57
  El Amrah, 30, pl.XXXIV.
  PM V, 68.
  Reused pyramidion with the name of the imy-r nwt t3ty Ns-p3-mdw - this appears on a side of the pyramidion not illustrated in El Amrah. See genealogy II for the dating to
  C. 660 B.C.

* Bolston 53.02
  Tomb G.50
  Abydos I, 38, 49.6, pl.LXXIII.
  PM V, 75.
Cartonnage of Nb-t3-ikyt, daughter of the hm ntr s3 nsw Mr-fr-tb-r and T3-dit-mht (?). See genealogy XVI.

Dynasty XXX / Early Ptolemaic

Boston 03.1560
Provenance unknown
Unpublished
Stela of Irty-rw mwt. s T3-mrt s3t n P3-di-inhr.
It is probable that P3-di-inhr is the father of Irty-rw, rather than of T3-mrt - for another example of this uncommon method of expressing filiation, see Glasgow, Hunterian Museum D.1926.2.

C. 620 B.C.

Bower 8
Provenance unknown
Unpublished
Stela of Irt-hr-rw, son of Hr-n-P.

C. 670 B.C.

BM 325
Provenance unknown
Guide (Scultpure) (1909) 268, no.1002.
Toentelen, 268.
Stela of the imi ist hsk hpt-md3t rb nsw hm ntr Hr-s3-3st ... hm ntr tpy n Nmt hm ntr H N ... Hr-s3-3st, son of Ht, son of the mi nw Ns...

Budge's misinterpretation of the element Hr-s3-3st as a personal name was corrected by Munro, who, however, did not read the actual name of the deceased.

C. 530 B.C.
BM 338
Provenance unknown (Salt collection)
Guide (Sculpture) (1909) 253, no. 940.
Totentenen, 89-90, 299.
Stela of the imi ist hsk bpt-md3t rh nsw imy 3bd hry s3 3 s3 pr-hd n pr Wair (var. imi ist hsk s3 pr-hd) P3-iw-n-hr, son of the nsn
/l-hr/-hb and Ns-hr.
For the name of the father and the date, see genealogy III.
   c. 600 B.C.

BM 347
Provenance unknown
Guide (Sculpture) (1909) 239, no. 870.
Munro, ZAS 95 (1969) 94 f., fig. 1.
Totentenen, 264.
Stela of the Mast Mwt T3-hs.
Munro's reading of the name as T3-w3h-bs presumably results from a misreading of r3-f as r3-f.
   c. 670 B.C.

BM 610
Osiris temple enclosure
Abeydos I, 32, 48, pl. LXIX.2, LXX.10.
Guide (Sculpture) (1909) 223, no. 807.
PM V, 43.
LR IV, 121, XXXVII.
Red granite offering table with the titulary of Amasis.
   Between 570 and 526 B.C.

BM 617
Provenance unknown
Guide (Sculpture) (1909) 270, no. 108.
Totentenen, 288.
Stela of T3-dit-wair, daughter of ḫḫ3-mnh.
   Early sixth century B.C.

BM 628
Provenance unknown
Guide (Sculpture) (1909) 273, no. 1018.
Totenstelen, 309, fig. 154.
Stela on which a man and a woman are depicted, whose names are unintelligible.
The spelling of ḫḫ3-w as ḫḫ3-w requires a date not earlier than c. 530 B.C.

BM 629
Provenance unknown
Guide (Sculpture) (1909) 270, no. 1009, pl. XXXVIII.
Totenstelen, 268, fig. 111.
Stela of ḫḫ3.
   c. 650 B.C.

BM 640
Provenance unknown
Guide (Sculpture) (1909) 269-70, no. 1007 and fig.
Totenstelen, 268.
Stela of P3-di-hr, son of Irt-hr-rw and ḫḫ3-ni.
   c. 580 B.C.

BM 641
Provenance unknown
Guide (Sculpture) (1909) 268-9, no. 1003.
Totenstelen, 309.
Stela of ḫḫ3-mn-mḥt (?), P3-di-inhr and Irt-hr-rw, relationship not indicated.
The epigraphy, especially the spelling of 3bdw as ⁷jœ and the use of ₆ as instead of ₇ for htp, suggests a date

 c. 530 B.C.

**BM 699**

Provenance unknown

Guide (Sculpture) (1909) 271, no.1011.

Totenstelen, 296-7.

Stela of the imi ist ḫsk hpt-wdȝt ṭ m nsw m 3bdw Chj wr swȝty Ipw ( ?) ₂⁻ Wair-ḥr-ȝȝt imy-r ntw ḫr ḫr, son of the m m ḫr ḫr and the iyȝt m Bhȝt Ns-tȝ-wdȝt.

For the reading of ₆ (Munro's copy is inaccurate), one of the names of Denderah, as Wair-ḥr-ȝȝt, see Faiman, AsAE 43 (1943) 251, VIII. Cf. Wb.1, 54.12. The spelling of 3bdw as ⁷jœ and the use of ₆ in nsw ( *₇ ) suggest a date

 c. 530 B.C.

**BM 798**

Provenance unknown

Guide (Sculpture) (1909) 236, no.851.

Totenstelen, 270.

Stela of Ns-ḥr-pȝ-hrd, daughter of the ... ḫnw Gbtw Pȝ-di-imn, Tȝi-ḥwthm-ḥrw, daughter of ḫr-n-hm ( ?), Ns-wȝt, daughter of Imn-ḥtp, and another woman whose name is lost.

 c. 650 B.C.

**BM 808**

Provenance unknown

Guide (Sculpture) (1909) 251, no.931.

Totenstelen, 299, fig.151.

Stela of the ḫsk imi ist hpt-wdȝt ṭ m sȝ nsw ( ?) sȝ nsw pr-ṁḥ ḫn-ynfr, son of the m m ḫr and Wȝȝt-m.s.

Paternal grandfather: m m Bhȝt Sȝȝt, son of the m m Ns-nb-ḥtp.

On ṭ m sȝ nsw, see genealogy II.

 c. 575 B.C.
BM 809
Provenance unknown
Guide (Sculpture) (1909) 241, no.884.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1061.
Totenstelen, 283, fig.133.

Stela of the it ntr mrt ntr imi ist ḫsk hpt-wd3t Inhr-nḥt, son of the it ntr mrt ntr imi ist ḫsk hpt-wd3t ḫr-e3t-st ḫt and ḫl-mḥt-imw.
Paternal grandfather: it ntr mrt ntr imi ist ḫsk hpt-wd3t ḫd-inhr-\textit{iv}w.f-\textit{nh}.
Maternal grandfather: it ntr mrt ntr imi ist In-imn-n3.f-nbw.

BM 1180
Provenance unknown
Guide (Sculpture) (1909) 252, no.935.
Totenstelen, 279, fig.129.

Stela of a man whose name is no longer legible.

BM 1317
Provenance unknown
Totenstelen, 264-5, fig.106.
De Meulenaere, OIP 6-7 (1975-6) 148, no.41.

Stela of the ḫry ḫk n pr Usir ṭ3w-t3lw, son of P3-b3 and ḫd-b3st-t\textit{iv}w.s-\textit{nh}, and his son P3y.f-\textit{lw-cyw-nnw}.

BM 1333
Provenance unknown
Guide (Sculpture) (1909) 251, no.933.
De Meulenaere, CJE 33 (1958) 197-201.
Totenstelen, 293.
Stela of the imi ist ḫek ḥpt-wḏḥ nb ḫwt ib smyty ẖḥ wšt ḫm nṯr ḫmr n Thḥ ḫḥ nṯr ḥm n ḫmr (var. ḫḥty-ṯ ḫmy-r ḫhw-nṯr ḫmi ist ḫek ḥpt-wḏḥ ḫm nṯr ḫmr n Thḥ ḫḥ nṯr ḥm n ḫmr Ṣn-ḥmn, son of the Ṣn ḫmn ḫmr-hs Ṣn-c ẖṣḏ-hs, daughter of the ḫmr Ṣn nṯr ḫmr-hs Ṣn. See genealogy II for date c. 585 B.C.

BM 1358
Tomb of Hr środk at the Umm el-Qa'ab
RT I, 7, pl.XXXVIII.10 and 11.
Guide (Sculpture) (1909) 222-3, no.84.
PM V, 79 and 97.
Hall, Ancient History, 5th ed., (1920) pl.XXIX.2.
CAH, Plates I, 271 c.7.
Stela fragment showing Apries offering to a deity, whose figure is not preserved, but who, in view of the context and the fact that the king is called "beloved of Osiris", is certainly Osiris.

589-70 B.C.

BM 1428
Provenance unknown
Guide (Sculpture) (1909) 271, no.1010.
Totentenen, 306-7, fig.156.
Stela of the kr-ḥr ḫfr-htp P3-di-hns, son of the kr-ḥr ḫfr-htp Ṣt ḫmr and P3-di-hps P3-hrd.

Later Ptolemaic

BM 1474
Provenance unknown
Guide (Sculpture) (1909) 305, no.1176.
Totentenen, 280.
Stela of the ḫmr ḫmr ḫmr-ḏḥw (?)(var. Ṣn Ṣn Ṣn-c ẖḥty-ṯ ḫm nṯr ḫmr-hs (?)) Ṣn-ḥmn, son of the ḫmr Ṣn nṯr ḫmr-hs (?). See genealogy II for date c. 585 B.C.
BM 1482

Provenance unknown

De Meulenaere, JEDL 20 (1967-8) 13-15, pl. VI.

Pyramidion of Wd3-hr, son of the jm ntr Hr-p3-hrd 'nb-n-nbk.f and T3-bht. The spelling of the name of Re as 2 confirms the dating suggested by De Meulenaere.

c. 650 B.C.

BM 29422

Provenance unknown

Guide, 4-6 (1922) 114, 48.

Stela of T3-sr-tnt-mhit, daughter of the imi kst hsk hpt-wd3t rkh nsw Dd-hr and T3-nt-b3att.

c. 620 B.C.

BM 32703-6

Tomb E. 301

El Arabah, 16, 21, pl. XXIII, XXV.

Canopic jars of the jm ntr lnmn la Hpt-swt imi kst hsk (var. jm ntr lnmn / rh nsw m3t mr.f / imi kst hsk) Dd-inhr-iw.f-'nh. For coffin fragments of the same man, see El. Amrah D.7.B.

c. 600 B.C.

BM 37320

Tomb G. 50

Abydos I, pl. LXXVII, LXXIX. 3.

Guide, 4-6 (1922) 272.

PM V, 75.

Bronze hypocephalus of Dd-hr, son of Wd3-nw. See genealogy XVI.

Dynasty XXX / Early Ptolemaic
BM 37339
Tomb G.57
Abydos I, pl. LXXIV.4-7.
PM V, 75.

Canopic box of Mrt-tfmr, daughter of the imi ist hsk Dd-hr and T3-kr.t-nt-amw. See genealogy XIII.

Dynasty XXX / Early Ptolemaic

BM 66843
Provenance unknown

Unpublished

Stela of the imi ist hsk hpt-wd3t nsw hmt w3r n Wsir s3 md3t ntr P3-di-3st, called (dd.tv.n.f) Dmt.f-sw, son of the mnn n h3-hr-s3-3st and T3-3st-prt. See genealogy I for dating to c. 600 B.C.

Brooklyn 12.911.2
Tomb E.422
CA II, 92, figs. 52-3, pl. XXXVIII, 1, 3, 4.
PM V, 77.

Cartonnage of Ns-p3-h3-kwy.

Ptolemaic

Brussels E.487
Tomb G.57
Abydos I, pl. LXXIV.3.
PM V, 75.

Model coffin of Hr-m3غم-hrw - see genealogy XIII.

Dynasty XXX / Early Ptolemaic

Brussels E.587
Upper levels of the Osiris temenos
Abydos III, 42, 52, pl.XXIV.13.
PM V, 48.

Small headless squatting statue of the it ntr art ntr ḫsk ḥry sšt3 n
∢kh ∢ hh P3-ivr-n-hr.

This statue was dated by the excavators to both "the Roman period" (p.42) and "the XXXth Dynasty" (p.52), but it is certainly much earlier.

Dynasty XXV-XXVI

Brussels E.4070
Drift sand in region D
CA II, 116, no.17, fig.77.
Speeers, Recueil, 83, no.315.
PM V, 62.
Jonckheere, Les médecins, 169.

Statue fragment of the swnw P3-di..., son of ...imn and X.
The use of C as determinative suggests a date

C. 650 B.C.

Brussels E.4338
Provenance unknown
Speeers, Recueil, 95, no.186.
Totenstelen, 286-7, fig.137.

Stela of P3-di-hr-p3-r', son of Ii-šr and T3-šms-tšt-k3i (?).
Sixth century B.C.

Brussels E.4428
Amelineau, Umm el-Qa'ab (Speeers)
Speeers, Recueil, 81, no.306.
PM V, 90.

Fragment of an alabaster vase with the cartouches of Khaneferumut Amenirdis I.

Second half of eighth century B.C.
CA II.XXVI

Surface sand in region R

CA II, 113, no.8, fig.68, pl.XXVI.6.
PM V, 71.

Stela of P3-di-√b3att 27, son of P3-kr-n-3st. The reading of the names is that of the excavator, the present location of the stela being unknown to me and the published plate being illegible.

c. 650 B.C.

CA II.73

Tomb E.1

CA II, 73, fig.36.
PM V, 63.

Coffin fragment of the ḫmn tr ḫmn B3k-n-dhwtn. The use of 4 as the name determinative gives a date of

c. 650 B.C.

CA II.93

Tomb E.460

CA II, 93, fig.55, pl.XXXVIII.5.
PM V, 77.

Model coffin of Dhwtn-ns.

Ptolemaic

CA II.94

Tomb X.7

CA II, 94.
PM V, 64.

Cartonnage fragment apparently reading √Ps/emtk.

Dynasty XXVI?
CA II, 122
Tomb S.61
CA II, 122, fig.67, pl.XXVI.4.
Sauneron, BIFAO 51 (1952) 153-4.
PM V, 62.

Re-used (?) offering table with a cursive ink inscription of the htm
ntr imy-r wt lnw ii-m-htp, son of \( \text{Pt3/8} \text{-}\text{sr}-\text{n-t3-ht} (?) \).

Ptolemaic

Cairo CG 715
Nécropole du Nord
MCA 376.
Borchardt, Statuen III, 52-3, pl.132.
PM V, 56.

Statue of \( \text{Hrs} \), son of \( \text{ln} \) and \( \text{ln} \).

Ptolemaic

Cairo CG 946
Provenance unknown
Borchardt, Statuen III, 167.

Schist statue fragment of the \( \text{Mhw} \text{ ln ntr} 3 \text{ Inhr-Św s3 Rc Wn-nfr}, \)
son of the \( \text{sŚ nw hsb şt nbt nw ŚmŚw Mhpw Na-Św-tfnt} \).

The names and titles are a clear indication of the Thinite / Abydene
provenance of the piece.

Ptolemaic

Cairo CG 3453
Nécropole du Nord
MCA 1474.
Von Bissing, Metallgfäße, 19-20.
RT 7 (1885) 120.D.
PM V, 61.

Bronze situla of the hsb Irt-hr-rw and his wife (?) T3-dit-wsir, son
of the imi ist Na-nnw and 3st-wr.

Ptolemaic
Cairo CG 3460
Nécropole du Nord
MCA 1475.
Von Bissing, Metallgefäße, 23.
PM V, 61.
Bronze situla of T3-imn, daughter of P3-di-mnh, and T3-3rit-nt mmn.

Ptolemaic

Cairo CG 4300-2
Nécropole du Nord
MCA 1456.
Reisner, Canopics, 205-7.
PM V, 61.
Three canopic jars of Rapt-nfrt, daughter of Mr-nt. For the fourth, see Alexandria 1350.

Sixth century B.C.

Cairo CG 4426
Nécropole du Nord
MCA 1455.
Reisner, Canopics, 260-1.
PM V, 61.
One of two canopic jars of Wa3-hr found by Mariette.
The spelling of the name of Cairis as Wa3 contradicts Reisner's dating to the Libyan period, but it is difficult to be more precise since the inscription consists of a single column in ink.

Dynasty XXVI?

Cairo CG 4646-9
Nécropole du Centre – Versant de l'Ouest
MCA 1459.
Reisner, Canopics, 330-2.
PM V, 74.
Four canopic jars of Ns-imn. Dynasty XXVI?

Cairo CG 22003
Abydos (Kamal)
Kamal, Steles, 3-4, pl.II.
Totenstelen, 310.
Stela of h sit n 3st S3t-3st (?), daughter of Pn3 and Tm3.
Ptolemaic

Cairo CG 22006
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord-Est
MCA 1307.
Piehl, Inscriptions III, LXXXIII.T.
Kamal, Steles, 7, pl.III.
Totenstelen, 351 (Indexed as Akhmim II F - not in catalogue).
Stela of Ns-b3-nb-dd, son of Hr and T3,s-nht, daughter of N...
Ptolemaic

Cairo CG 22011
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1315.
Piehl, Inscriptions III, LXXXIII.T.
Kamal, Steles, 12-13.
Totenstelen, 301.
Stela of Hr-rdit-3pss (?), daughter of P3-di-imn and Ns-tfnwt.
Ptolemaic

Cairo CG 22019
Nécropole du Nord
MCA 1305.
Piehl, Inscriptions III, LXXXIII.T.
Kamal, Steles, 20-1, pl.VIII.
Totenstelen, 510-11.
Stela of Irty-r-t3i, son of ḫfr ḫfr and Pw-mwt (?).

The name of the owner was read as Irty-rw by Mariette and Kamal and as Irty-hr-rw by Munro, but Kamal's plate shows quite clearly that the bird is ḫfr and not ḫfr or ḫfr.

Persian?

Cairo CG 22022

Nécropole du Nord

MCA 1304.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2367.
Kamal, Stèles, 23-4, pl.VIII.
Totenstelen, 311.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 150, no.52.

Stela of the imi ist ḫsk hpt-wd3t ṟw nsw imy ṟd ṟw 3s ṟw 3 ṟs hr, son of the mi ṣn ṟs-p3-m3i and the ḫyt ḫnt-imntiw ṟw n ṟw n ṟsir ṭs-3st-prt.

Paternal grandfather: P3-di-imn.

The following, who are probably children of the deceased, are also mentioned: the ṟs mw Irty-hr-rw (PP III, 6790), ṭ3-dit-b3stt, Ks, Irty-rw and ṭs-3st-prt.

Persian / Ptolemaic

Cairo CG 22026

Nécropole du Nord - Zone de l'Est

MCA 1313.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2254.
Kamal, Stèles, 29, pl.X.
Totenstelen, 301-2.

Stela of Sbm-n-gmem, son of 'nh-n-gmem, son of 'nh-hr.

Persian / Ptolemaic

Cairo CG 22031

Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
Stela of Dd-hr, son of Ns-hr and Pri (?).

The name of the mother, which is written ḫ, might equally be taken as a writing of the name (I)hr (PN I, 44, 1), since ḫ and ḫ are frequently confused at this time - see, for instance, De Meulenaere, OLP 4 (1973) 82.

Cairo CG 22036
Provenience unknown

Kamal, Stèles, 34-5, pl.XII.
Totenstelen, 293.

Stela of Indy-wr, daughter of the imi 1st ḫsk hpt-wd3t ṛḥ new s3 new ṛṛ and the ihyt ḫnt-imntiw Dd-mwt.

On the reading ṛḥ new s3 new, see genealogy II.

Late sixth century B.C.

Cairo CG 22041
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord

MCA 1243.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2455.
Kamal, Stèles, 38-9, pl.XIII.
Totenstelen, 274.

Stela of the it ntr ḫnḥt hr ḫn ḫst-iw.f-ḥnḥ, son of the mi nn Ift-šri.

On the name Ift-šri, see De Meulenaere, RdE 14 (1962) 45, n.2.

Mid-seventh century B.C.
Stela of Br, son of Dd-inhr-iv.f-3nh and T3-hwt-3t.

Later Ptolemaic

Cairo CG 22054
Provenance unknown

Kamal, Stèles, 39-40, pl.XIII.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2453.

Totenstelen, 302.

Stela of the hsk imi ist rh nsw hpt-wd3t hm ntr T3i, son of the mi nn hm ntr n hwt nsw Kms-s hmr ntr hpr-p3-r'$ hry-ib 3bdw hpr-hb and the m't hnt-imtiw T3-imnt, daughter of the hsk hm ntr Wrt-hk5w hpr-wn-nfr.

See genealogy XIII.

Late third century B.C.

Cairo CG 22126
Abydos 1887 (JE) Note that this stela is not MCA 12080 (sic) as stated by Kamal, followed by PM and Munro.
MCA 1280 (!) = JE 18520.

Kamal, Stèles, 51, pl.XVII.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2298.
Otto, Biographische Inschriften, no.65.

Totenstelen, 302.

Stela of the hsk imi ist rh nsw hpt-wd3t hm ntr T3i, son of the mi nn hm ntr n hwt nsw Kms-s hmr ntr hpr-p3-r'$ hry-ib 3bdw hpr-hb and the m't hnt-imtiw T3-imnt, daughter of the hsk hm ntr Wrt-hk5w hpr-wn-nfr.

See genealogy XIII for dating to

C. 585 B.C.

Cairo CG 22127
Abydos 1881 (JE)

Kamal, Stèles, 109-10, pl.XXXVII.

Totenstelen, 298.
Stela of the sš hwt-ntr n Imn-war-h3t n Pebt-war-h3t Dw3ti-m3, son of P3-(n)-hr and T3-djt-wrt-hkw, and his wife T3-iw-nn.

Ptolemaic

Cairo CG 22131
Nécropole du Nord – Zone du Nord-Est
MCA 1308.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2483.
Kamal, Stèles, 113-4, pl.XXVIII.
Totenstelen, 298.
Stela of Na-hr, daughter of the imi ist hsk hpt-wd3t r3 nsw P3.f-t3w and Irtw. See Berlin 7700.

Late sixth century B.C.

Cairo CG 22144
Nécropole du Nord
MCA 1302.
Kamal, Stèles, 128-9, pl.XIII.
Totenstelen, 303, fig.161.
Stela of the sš mš Hr-ir, son of the sš mš Hr-wd3 and Nh3t-waht.

Ptolemaic

Cairo CG 22149
Nécropole du Nord
MCA 1303.
Kamal, Stèles, 136-7, pl.XLV.
Totenstelen, 303.
Stela of T3-kr-hb, daughter of the imi ist hsk Ns-imn and T3-šrit-nt-mnw.

Ptolemaic

Cairo CG 22156
Abydos (Kamal)
Kamal, Stèles, 143-4, pl.XLVIII.
Stela of the 'ṣ3 n ist n pdt n Imān Ṣrī-wmt and Ṣp-n-mwt, whose relationship is not specified.

The use of the spelling ḏḥ shows that the stela cannot be earlier than the late eighth century, but a number of features suggest that it is not much later. The form of ṣ provides a definite terminus ante quem of c. 620 B.C., while neither the wig nor the rounded skirt occurs after the middle of the seventh century.

C. 700 B.C.

Cairo CG 22163

Provenance unknown
Kamal, Stèles, 147-8, pl.I.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 149, no. 47.

Part of a stela of the ḫr ṣḥt pr Wṣr Pi-di-wṣr, son of the ḫr ṣḥt pr Wṣr ḫr and T3-dīt-3st-hb. See genealogy IV.

C. 585 B.C.

Cairo CG 22173

Abydos (Kamal)
Pfehl, Inscriptions III, 51-2, LXXX-LXXXI.P.
Kamal, Stèles, 152-3.
De Meulenaere, OLP 4 (1973) 77-83.

Lower part of a stela of ḫr-T3.f-nḥt dedicated by his eldest son ḫr-S3-3st. The iḥyt Tfwt T3-nt-1mn (PF III, 7241) is also mentioned but her relationship to the other two is not clear.

Ptolemaic

Cairo CG 22178

Mencheh (Kamal)
Kamal, Stèles, 156.
Totenstelen, 295.

Lower part of a stela of the imī ist ḫṣk hḥt-wd3t rḥ nsw ḫr-T3.f-nḥt, son of the mi nw hm ntr 3 n Wṣr ḫr and T3-prt.
Paternal grandfather (?) : mi nw Ṣt3-p3-k3-5wḥy.
See genealogy II for date

c. 585 B.C.

Cairo CG 22210

Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord

MCA 1295.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1297 and supplement, 982.
Piehl, Inscriptions I, LAI.9.
Kamal, Stèles, 202-3, pl.LXXIII.
FM V, 59.
Totenstelen, 282.

Stela of the imi ist (var. hm ntr Sw-Tfnwt) ḫsk hpt-wd3t ḥ3 wr Hr-
s3-3st, son of the mi nn P3-n-3t and Mwt-ir-di-st.
Paternal grandfather : mi nn Wd3-hr.
Maternal grandfather : ḫšk hnsw-ix.f-‘nh.

c. 620 B.C.

Cairo CG 23107

Nécropole du Centre - Versant du Nord

MCA 1366.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2347.
Kamal, Tables d'offrandes, 59, pl.XXIV.
FM V, 74.

Offering table of the imi ist ḫsk hpt-wd3t sš tšt pr Inhr Dd-3st-ix.f-
‘nh, son of the mi nn ḫn-s3-3st, son of the imi ist ḫsk hpt-wd3t sš
št pr Inhr ‘nh-hr, son of the mi nn Nh-pr-nwā.

First half of seventh century B.C.

Cairo CG 38239 bis.

Medinet Habu (Daressy)

Daressy, Statues de divinités I, 71-2.
FM II, 2nd ed., 460.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 149, no.45.

Base of a black granite statue of Osiris, dedicated by Imn-ir-di-sw,
son of Gs-n-s, son of P3-hr. See genealogy VII for the attribution
of this object to Abydos and dating to

c. 650 B.C.
Cairo CG 38363
Nécropole du Nord

MCA 6.
Daressy, Statues de divinités I, 98; II, pl.XX.
PM V, 60.
Grey serpentine Osiris statue of the rḥ nsw nb.f m3ṭ mr (var. rḥ nsw nb.f m3ṭ ṣms / rḥ nsw nb.f irt mrrt) Wḥ-lb-r' sn.

Dynasty XXVI

Cairo CG 38390
Abydos (Daressy)
Daressy, Statues de divinités I, 102.
Grey schist Osiris statue of Pr-nfrw (?), son of P3-di-b3att.

? 

Cairo CG 38390
Nécropole du Nord

MCA 7.
Lieb1ein, Dictionnaire, 2481.
Daressy, Statues de divinités I, 105.
PM V, 60.
Green stone statue of Sb3, son of Dd-ʒst-Ιw.f-s nh.

? 

Cairo CG 38412
Abydos (Daressy)
Daressy, Statues de divinités I, 109-10; II, pl.XXI.
Spiegelberg, Die demotischen Denkmäler I, 93.
PM V, 94.
Statue of Osiris (?) dedicated by Ḥr-ms (??).

A demotic inscription in ink gives the date of year 13 of an unspecified Ptolemy.

Ptolemaic
Cairo CG 38413
Nécropole du Nord
MCA 8.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2497.
Daressy, Statues de divinités I, 111; II, pl.XXI.
Spiegelberg, Die demotischen Denkmäler I, 93.
PM V, 56.

Statue of Osiris dedicated by P3-bik, son of Sm3-t3wy and Kh.
The name of the mother is not certain - the group ꜱm might also be taken as a writing of the epithet nbt pr with the following name not preserved.

Ptolemaic

Cairo CG 38414
Nécropole du Nord
MCA 9.
Daressy, Statues de divinités I, 111; II, pl.XXI.
PM V, 56.

Osiris (?) statue dedicated by a man whose name is uncertain.

Ptolemaic

Cairo CG 38416
Abydos (Daressy)
Daressy, Statues de divinités I, 112; II, pl.XXII.

Osiris statue dedicated by P3-di-3st (?)?

Ptolemaic

Cairo CG 38446
Enceinte du Nord - Kom es-Sultan
MCA 246.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2471.
Daressy, Statues de divinités I, 121; II, pl.XXVI.

Bronze statue of Ptah dedicated by Imn-ir-di-sw, son of P3-di-wsir.

?
Cairo CG 38618
Abydos 15/2/95 acc. JE 31016
Daresay, Statues de divinités I, 161.
Bronze statue of Horus dedicated by the imy-r mšc Psmtk-s3-nt, son of Psmtk and B3ste-ir-di-st.
Daresay describes this object as having been bought and gives no provenance.

Mid-late Dynasty XXVI

Cairo CG 70017
Petit temple de l'ouest
MCA 1424.
MDF II, pl.42 a-b.
Roeder, Naos, 50-2, pl.52 a.
PM V, 71.
Red granite naos of Nectanebo II.

360-343 B.C.

Cairo CG 70018
Petit temple de l'ouest
MCA 1424.
MDF II, pl.42 c.
Roeder, Naos, 53-5.
PM V, 71.
Red granite naos with the names of Nectanebo I and II.

360-343 B.C.

Cairo CG 70028
Nécropole du Centre - Versant du Sud
MCA 1431.
Roeder, Naos, 110-11, pl.38 a, 50 c.
PM V, 73.
Wooden naos of Hr, son of Irt-hr-rw and 3st-ir-di-st, and his wife T3-nht-n-pr-3st.
For the family relationships see genealogy X.
c. 670 B.C.

Cairo CG 70043
Provenance unknown
Roeder, Naos, 140-2, pl.44 b.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 134, no.3.
Wooden naos of the hsk hm ntr tpy n Wair Hr-hb, son of Na-hr and 3st.
Ptolemaic

Cairo JE 3476
Nécropole du Nord – Zone du Nord
MCA 1255.
Lintel on which Hr, Irt-hr-rw, T3-nht-n-pr-3st and another woman whose name is lost, are depicted adoring Re.
For the relationships of these people and the probable identity of the second woman, see genealogy X. Mariette's version of the name of T3-nht-n-pr-3st is garbled and should be corrected to T3-nht-n-pr-3st.
c. 670 B.C.

Cairo JE 4591
Nécropole du Centre – Versant de l'Est
MCA 1494.
Manro, ZAS 95 (1969) 96-7, 107-8 n.76, pl.II.
Bronze plaque depicting a woman named Di-b3w-r (?) before Whit nb Th1.

Cairo JE 5386
Nécropole du Nord
Totenstelen, 263.

Stela of the w3h mw Sf (?)-imn (),$ and (his wife ?) 3st-di-st (sic).

The name 3st-di-st is not otherwise attested, and is perhaps a defective writing of 3st-ir-di-st.

c. 670 B.C.

Cairo JE 6288

Tomb G.50

Abydos I, 39, pls.LXXV, LXXIX.7.
PM V, 75.
Buhl, *Sarcophagi*, 70, fig.32, Eb5.

Sarcophagus of the rmn-hpr-hgs-hpr nb 3wt lb sQtp hm.s smn h3t s3h wd3t hm ntr wn s3 pr-cF ipy n hwt-ntr n pr nb W3dt Hr-wd, son of the hm ntr Hbrhr nbt W3dt irt Rr Dd-hr and / Nb-t5/-ihyt.

For the name of the mother and the titles, see genealogy XVI.

Dynasty XXX / Early Ptolemaic

Cairo JE 6291

Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord

MCA 1372.
Lieblein, *Dictionnaire*, 2499.
PM V, 61.
Buhl, *Sarcophagi*, 111, fig.65, Fbl.

Sarcophagus of the ihyt n Mnw Ns-tfnt, daughter of the sm3ty Mnw Ns-hr and Gm.s-3st.

Ptolemaic

Cairo JE 6297

Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord

MCA 1318.
PM V, 72.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 144, no.27.
Stela of the w' b Wsir Pdsr, son of the it ntr mrt ntr hik Hr
?

Cairo JE 6298
Nécropole du Nord
MCA 1272.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 925 and supplement, 974.
De Rouge, Inscriptions hiéroglyphiques, pl. LIII.
Totenstelen, 263.
Stela of T3-pmnt, daughter of T3-krrt.
c. 670 B.C.

Cairo JE 6300
Nécropole du Centre
MCA 1321.
Totenstelen, 271.
Stela of the imi ist hik Nht.f-mwt, his wife Nht-b3st-t-rw, her daughter Dd-mht-iw.s'nh and her (?) son Na-inhr-nb-byt.
c. 650 B.C.

Cairo JE 6301
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1265.
Totenstelen, 290.
Stela of Dd-hr, son of P3.f-t3w-cwy-hr and 3st-wrt.
The reading of the name of the father, written 𓊂𓊢𓊤𓊥𓊤, is not absolutely certain.
Sixth century B.C.

Cairo JE 6303
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1258.
Totenstelen, 269, fig. 113.
Stela of Irt-hr-rw, son of T3.f-iwt and a man whose name is lost.  
c. 640-30 B.C.

Cairo JE 8767  
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1256.  
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1079 = 2477.  
Totenstelen, 310.
Stela of Hr, son of Ns-mmw and Sm-ri.  
Sixth century B.C.

Cairo JE 8769  
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1287.  
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1188 and supplement, 980.  
Totenstelen, 278.
Stela of the imi ist šhk Di-3st-iw.f-Cnh, his daughter Tttt and his wife Hr-fri-di-st.  
c. 630-20 B.C.

Cairo JE 8770  
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1253.  
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1081.  
Totenstelen, 271, fig.116.
Stela of Nmms-b3stt, daughter of P3-di-wn and Ns-hwthr.  
c. 650 B.C.

Cairo JE 8771  
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1251.  
Totenstelen, 259.
Stela of the imi ist šhk Dd-b3stt-iw.f-Cnh.  
c. 670 B.C.
Cairo JE 8773
Nécropole du Nord
MCA 1282.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2442.
Totenstelen, 278, fig.126.
Stela of 3āt-nī, son of the it ntr ḫbḥ P3-di-bṣett and Ṣp-n-bṣett.  
c. 620 B.C.

Cairo JE 11229
Nécropole du Centre
MCA 1322.
Totenstelen, 265.
Stela of Btī (?), and her son/father P3-di-nḥḥt (?).
The name of the man, written ẖ-a-a, might also be read as P3-di-  
im. For ḡa as ḫm, see De Meulenaere, ZAS 101 (1974) 110 (c).  
c. 660 B.C.

Cairo JE 11270
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1245.
Totenstelen, 270-1, fig.115.
Stela of ‘nh-p3.f.hr, son of P3-di-nḥḥt and Dit-nṯr.  
c. 660 B.C.

Cairo JE 12634
Abydos, Nov.1860 (JE)
Totenstelen, 230, fig.140.
Space has been left in the inscription for the name of the deceased,  
but this was never added.

First half of sixth century B.C.
Cairo JE 12638
Abydos, Nov. 1860 (JE)
Totenstelen, 271.
Stela of a-\(\text{\dagger}\) \(\text{\dagger}\) \(\text{\dagger}\) \(\text{\dagger}\) and P3-di-b3stt, relationship uncertain.
c. 650 B.C.

Cairo JE 18520
Nécropole du Nord
MCA 1230.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1080 and supplement, 974.
De Rouge, Inscriptions hiéroglyphiques, pl. LIX.
PM V, 59. (Confused with CG 22126).
Totenstelen, 286, fig. 135.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 138, no. 10.
Stela of the imi ist hau 1p-t-wd3t \(\text{\dagger}\) nsw (var. \(\text{\dagger}\) nsw) fi3ti imi
shty 1m nitr \(\text{\dagger}\) wp-t-t3wy \(\text{\dagger}\) nitr 2 \(\text{\dagger}\) nitr 3 W6ir \(\text{\dagger}\), son of the mi
nn \(\text{\dagger}\) n-s-p3-k3-s\(\text{\dagger}\)t and \(\text{\dagger}\)3-w3.
See genealogy \(\text{\dagger}\).
c. 610 B.C.

Cairo JE 18533
Nécropole du Nord – Zone du Nord
MCA 1254.
Totenstelen, 275.
Stela of two women – \(\text{\dagger}\)3i-mhit-imw and \(\text{\dagger}\)3-mhit-prt – and a man whose
name is illegible.
c. 630 B.C.

Cairo JE 19769
Petit temple ruiné
MCA 1289.
MDF I, 5 (6), pl. 2 b (right fragment).
LR IV, 76, XLI and 85, J.
PM V, 70.
Graefe, GDR 46 (1971) 243-49, esp. 239, n.3, 3 and 239, n.1.
Part of a lintel showing the dw3t ntr (Mnt-i:krt) 'nh.t. ti followed by 
the h3ty- ' n niwt imy-r šm't mi kd.s imy-r pr wr dw3t ntr P3-di-... , 
offering to Wsir-wn-nfr and 3st wrt mwt ntr.

Another fragment of this lintel is now JE 20340. Mariette read the 
name of the man behind Nitocris as P3-di-hr-... , and although the 
final element is no longer legible, the accompanying titles suffice 
to identify him as P3-di-hr-rant, the well-known Chief Steward of 
Nitocris. Assman's unexplained doubts (Basa , 22, n.76) as to the 
identification of the man named on this lintel with the Chief Steward 
who was buried in Theban tomb 196 would seem to be groundless. The 
other monuments of P3-di-hr-rant show him to have been a contemporary 
of Necho II, but, as Psammethicus I is depicted on the other frag­ 
ment of this lintel, it would seem that P3-di-hr-rant was already in 
office in the last years of the latter's long reign, perhaps from c. 
615 B.C., a possibility already envisaged by Christophe, BIFAO 55 
(1955) 82, n.1, and Graefe, op. cit., 239, n.1.

Cairo JE 19776
Nécropole du Centre - Versant du Sud.
MCA 1434.
PA V, 74.
De Meulenaere, JEDL 20 (1967-8) 2 - wrongly numbered 19976.
Lower half of a pyramidion of the wš3 Inhr ḫr-s3-3st, son of the wš3 Inhr ḫr.

c. 650 B.C.

Cairo JE 20239
Provenance unknown
Totenstelen, 308.
Stela of two women, whose names are uncertain.

Cairo JE 20240
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1259.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1077 = 2418.
Totenstelen, 278, fig.125.
De Neulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 142, no.18 and 151, no.54.
Stela of the McKenzie, daughter of the Ayr Wair I and Sp...

Late seventh century B.C.

Cairo JE 20244
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1262.
Totenstelen, fig.127.
Stela of McKenzie...

Late seventh century B.C.

Cairo JE 20247
Abydos (JE)
Totenstelen, 279.
Stela of Irw-rw, daughter of Aynw-rw-di-sw and Imm-ir-di-st.
The name of the mother is as above, and not 3st-ir-di-st as read by Munro.

Late seventh century B.C.

Cairo JE 20251
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1266.
Totenstelen, 230-1, fig.130.
Stela of a woman whose name is illegible.

Late seventh century B.C.
Cairo JE 20262
Nécropole du Nord - Zone de l'Est

MCA 1311.
Totenstelen, 287, fig.138.
De Meulemaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 148-9, no.44.
Stela of the \text{\textit{tst n ntr \textit{T3 nb \textit{T3-dit-p3-ntr-\textit{T3}}} daughter of the \text{\textit{wn-\textit{pr Wsir Gs-n-s (?)}}} and \text{\textit{Hfr}}}.

Sixth century B.C.

Cairo JE 20340
Petit temple ruiné

MCA 1389.
MDP I, 5 (6), pl.2 b (left).
LR IV, 76, XLI and 85, J.
PM V, 70.
Graefe, Cdt 46 (1971) 243-9, esp. 256, n.3 and 239, n.1.
Part of a lintel showing a king \text{\textit{Psmtk (almost certainly the first) offering to Wsir nb \textit{Cnh}}}, who is followed by \text{\textit{hr ndty-it.f}}. See JE 19769 for dating to

C. 615-610 B.C.

Cairo JE 21788
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord-Est

MCA 1227.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2271.
Totenstelen, 303.
Stela of the \text{\textit{gwt n pr Wsir n pr 3st n pr ms \textit{Hr-s3-3st}}} son of \text{\textit{Bs and Ms-stfnwt}}, dedicated by his sister \text{\textit{3st-r}}.

Later Ptolemaic

Cairo JE 21789
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord

MCA 1244.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2424.
Totenstelen, 263, fig.108.
Stela of T3-prt and her son P3-iv-n-hr.

C. 670 B.C.

Cairo JE 21797
Nécropole du Nord
MCA 1281.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2441.
Totenstelen, 284.
Stela of the hs hnw n Imn T3.f-brt, daughter of Pth-ir-di-sw and Dit-t5w-twy-3st, daughter of T3-nt-amw.

Munro's reading of the father's name as I'h-in-di-sw is quite wrong.

Late seventh century B.C.

Cairo JE 21811
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1250.
Totenstelen, 264.
Stela of the 'kr Wsir-ms-st and her daughter Gm-3st.

The filiation is written 'k despite the fact that the first named person is female.

C. 670 B.C.

Cairo JE 21970
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1239.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2417.
Totenstelen, 264, fig.104.
Stela of the w3h mw P3-ir-i'h, son of Ts-hnw-prt.

C. 670 B.C.

Cairo JE 21972
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1238.
Totenstelen, 264, fig.103.

Stela of Hr-hb.

For a possible alternative reading of the name as Hr-n-t3-b3t3, see Janssen, JEA 54 (1968) 167, n.1.

c. 670 B.C.

Cairo JE 21989
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord

MCA 1242.
Totenstelen, 265.

Stela of Sp-n-mhit, daughter of Hnm.s-b3t3t.

c. 650 B.C.

Cairo JE 21991
Nécropole du Nord

MCA 1283.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2422.
Totenstelen, 311, fig.155 (wrongly numbered 21971).

Stela of T3i-hp-imw, son of Hkr and T3-dit-wsir.
Persian / Ptolemaic

c. 650 B.C.

Cairo JE 22010
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord

MCA 1261.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2419.
Totenstelen, 265-6.

Stela of the imy-r m5t K3-mnh, son of Irt-hr-rw.

c. 650 B.C.

Cairo JE 22123
Abydos (JE)

Totenstelen, 295.
Stela of **Imn-ms.**

Late seventh century B.C.

**Cairo JE 22139**
Provenance unknown
Totenstelen, 272, fig.117.
Stela of **T3-kr[t-n-pth]**, daughter of **T3-prt.**
c. 650 B.C.

**Cairo JE 22143**
Néocropole du Nord – Zone du Nord
MCA 1263.
Totenstelen, 272, fig.118.
Stela of **Rr** and his daughter **T3i-b3stt-imw.**
c. 660 B.C.

**Cairo JE 28051**
Abydos 1887 (JE)
Unpublished
Right hand door jamb of the imi ist ḫsk **Ns-(p3)-ḥ3-ḥwty.**
c. 600 B.C.?

**Cairo JE 28096**
Abydos 1887 (JE)
Totenstelen, 281.
Stela of **D3d3** and another woman whose name is illegible.
c. 600 B.C.

**Cairo JE 30434**
Found between the Coptic convent and the Shunet es-Zebib
LR III, 333, III.
PM V, 59.
Totentelen, 85.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 137 a.

Stela of the isk hry s3t3 s3 b h n tr 3 Wsir hsy n nb t3wy nb irt
pt (Ws-r-m3t-r) s3 h nb h'w (Tkrt) m3k-hrw Ns-wrt-hkw, son of the
h n tr s3 m3t n tr fkti imi shty Ns-nb-htp, and his wife the km't n
Wsir Sp-n-spt, daughter of the h n tr lmn m lpt-swt imy-r Smwty nw
Smw Mlw Bs, son of P3-n-wn-mwt.f.

For the identification of this king as Takeloth III, see Kitchen, TIP,
para.77. Since the king is here described as m3k-hrw, the stela is
probably slightly later than his reign, which Kitchen (Bierbrier, LNK,
x) now places c. 764-757 (?) B.C.. See genealogy I.

Cairo JE 30435

Found between the Coptic convent and the Shunet es-Zebib
PM V, 59.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 137 c.
Leahy, CA 23 (1977) 50.

Stela of the it n tr n Wsir s3 m3t n tr P3-di-3st, son of Nb-m3t.
See genealogy I for dating to

Cairo JE 32022-3

Area 7 of Amélineau - within or on the fringe of cemetery D of Mace
NP 1895-6, 11, 52.
Daressy, NF 22 (1900) 142, CLXXIV.
Schäfer, ZAS 45 (1906) 49.
LR IV, 6, VII; 8, XIII B; 10, XV; 24, III.
PM V, 70.
Dunham and MacAdam, JEA 35 (1949) 139-49, nos.53 and 54.
Sandstone lintel and door-jamb fragments naming the s3t nsw (K3$t3) m3$khw nsw (Piya) Pks3$tr, mwt.s (P3-b3-t-$m3). The lintel, now in two fragments, shows the deceased offering, in symmetrically disposed scenes, to Osiris (?) and Isis on the left, and Re-Harakhte on the right. Two of the three jamb fragments are now missing (cf. Leclant, ZÄS 90 (1963) 76, n.5).

Since the name of Kashta is followed by m3$khw, while that of Piye is not, the monument must date to before the death of Piye in c. 716 B.C. For the clear differentiation between dead and living kings on Kushite monuments, see Yoyotte, RdE 8 (1951) 224-8. For Piye as the correct reading of the name formerly read Piankhy, see the references cited by Baer in JNES 32 (1973) 24-5.

c. 720 B.C.

Cairo JE 34431
Tomb D.3
El Amrah, 64, 78, 97.
PM V, 68.
Dunham and MacAdam, JEA 35 (1949) 143, no.26.

Coffin fragments of the jmt nsw wrt nsw nsw s3t nsw (K3$-b3-k3) 3st-n-hb.

These fragments were never published, and I was unable to locate them in the Cairo Museum. However, the Temporary Catalogue entry T.9/2/15/11, under which these fragments were originally recorded, preserves a copy of the titulary as given above. See the following entry.

c. 675 B.C.

Cairo JE 34432
Tomb D.3
El Amrah, 78-9, 86, 97, pl.XXIX, bottom right.
LR IV, 23, XXXI.
PM V, 68.
Aubert, Statuettes égyptiennes, 203.

Ushabtis of 3st-n-hb, daughter of Shabako (see previous entry), which give only her name in a single vertical column on the front. Other examples are Boston MFA 00.696, UCL 531 and Philadelphia U.M. 14650.

c. 675 B.C.
Cairo JE 34597
Abydos 8/8/1900 (JE)
Totenstelen, 275.
Stela of and another woman whose name is quite illegible.
c. 630 B.C.

Cairo JE 34598
Abydos 8/3/1900 (JE)
Totenstelen, 277.
Stela of P3-ìw-ìw-n-hr, son of Be-n-mwt.
c. 640 B.C.

Cairo JE 34603
Abydos 8/8/1900 (JE)
Totenstelen, 279.
Stela of the imi ists hkt-w3t rh nsw Dk-hr, son of the mi nn Dk-inhr-ìw.f nh’ and Rwrw.
c. 620 B.C.

Cairo JE 34604
Abydos 8/8/1900 (JE)
Totenstelen, 269-70.
Stela of P3-k3p, son of P3i-hr-imw (?).
Numro’s reading □ □ □ □ should be corrected to □ □ □ □ .
c. 640 B.C.

Cairo JE 34605
Abydos 8/8/1900
Totenstelen, 287.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 149, no. 46.
Stela of the sht pr Wsir Rr, son of Rr.
The title was read as hry sjt by Munro and De Meulenaere, influenced no doubt by the fact that Mr's brother P3-di-wsir was a hry sjt - see genealogy IV. Here, however, it seems to be simply sjt, the preceding ~ representing ~~~ and not v~~, although a haplography resulting from the similarity of the two in cursive form cannot be entirely discounted.

c. 585 B.C.

Cairo JE 36415
Abydos (JE)
Totenstelen, 270, fig. 114.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 145, no. 29.
Stela of the w'b n Wsir Hrbs, his wife T3iw-di and their son the w'b Wsir P3-di-hkt.

c. 650 B.C.

Cairo JE 36492
Provenance unknown
Unpublished
Stela of the s8 new km3-W3t hpt nrt h3 ntr 3st...hm ntr 3 n W3t nbt Mgb ...X /son of/ ... h3 ntr s8 new mi nn hp--mn/ and the ihyt n W3rt nbt W3dt W3rt-tfnrt.

It is clear from the mi nn before the name Hp--mn that another name is lost in the lacuna. For the restoration of the name Hp--mn, and the Abydene provenance of this stela, see genealogy XVII.

Later Ptolemaic

Cairo JE 41331
Abydos - Garstang 958.A.09.2
Totenstelen, 308.
Stela of a woman named ?
Cairo JE 41332
Abydos - Garstang 983.A.09
Unpublished
Rectangular stela of the [name] of Wd3-hr, son of [name] and Dd-hr-ink-t3y (?) (\[\text{orthographic characters}\]).

The phraseology, orthography and palaeography of this text are so characteristic of the early Middle Kingdom that it must be in large part simply a copy of an inscription of that period. Indeed, if it were not for the names and the fact that the Abydene triad is actually depicted, one would have no doubt that it was a Middle Kingdom piece. The only clue to the date of this uniquely archaizing piece is the use of 4 as determinative in the names of both men, which suggests a date

Mid-seventh century B.C.

Cairo JE 41438
Abydos - Garstang 900.A.09.1
Unpublished
Sandstone offering table of the [name] of Inhr Dd-b3tt-\text{iw-f-\text{ng}}, son of Hr.

Dynasty XXVI?

Cairo JE 47833
Captured by guards at Abydos

Wainwright, ASAE 25 (1925) 259-60.
Sauneron and Yoyotte, BIFAO 50 (1952) 197 ff.
De Meulenaere, Surmam, no.56.

Lower part of a quartzite kneeling statue of the [name] - long series of epithets - \text{beautiful name} \text{[epithets]}, son of \text{Hr} and \text{Hr-nt-it-s}. c. 580 B.C.

Cairo JE 91219
Tomb 3, N.W. of the forecourt of the "portal" of Ramses II - see Expedition 10, no.1 (Fall 1967) 13-14.
O'Connor, Expedition 10, no.1 (Fall 1967) 16; 11, no.1 (Fall 1968) 28
(= photographs of the left side of the lintel)

Lintel in two fragments of Rdi-inhr. His eldest son, the ... Im (sn) ...
ry-hb Wn-nfr (var. tit. Im ntr) pours a libation, and behind him are four more sons - Dd-inhr-lw.f-’nh, the
sp’s sw Imn-r-d1-sw, Dd-dhwti-iv.f-’nh and the 3 Warkn-’nh. In
a register below are the five daughters of the deceased - Dd-mwt-iv.s-
’nh, 3’t-mwb, T3-srit-nt-mhit, Nry-it.us and Rnpt-nfrt. See genealogy
VIII.

The name of the deceased, "He whom Onuris has given", variously writ-
ten ḫḥ$q₃, ḫḥ$q₄ $$ $ $, ḫḥ$q₅ $ $ $, and ḫḥ$q₆ $ $ $ is un-
usual. For similar formations of perfective passive participle +
deity, see PN I, 228, 1 and 6. For the intrusive 't' in forms of
rīt at this time, see Leclant, Montouemhat, 23 (d).

A date in the first half of the seventh century or slightly earlier is
suggested by the use of $ as determinative in the name of ḫnt-imntw,
the use of ḫ as determinative in the name of Wn-nfr, the inverted
form of the truncated cones beneath the lion stool on which the de-
ceased sits (ESLP, 7), and the archaising style of the relief. This
is supported by the numerous examples of alphabetic spelling - $ $ $ ,
SFML $ $, and ḫḥ$q₇ $ $ (Leclant, Montouemhat, 21-2 (a)) and the use of
$p $ for dd (ibid., 18 (d)).

First half of seventh century B.C.

Cairo JE 91251
Debris overlying the "portal" of Ramses II
O'Connor, Expedition 10, no.1 (Fall 1967) 16.
Stela of Nbt-hwt-twt, daughter of ...X and T3-hrr.
Mid-sixth century B.C.

Cairo JE 91258
Debris overlying the "portal" of Ramses II
Unpublished
Stela fragment naming the ḫsk n Wsir P3-nhs.ı.
Early sixth century B.C.
Cairo JE 91261
Tomb 3 - see JE 91219
Unpublished
Relief from the tomb of the h3ty- smr w ty hpr ‘h imy-ib nb. f imy-r k3t nbt n nsw hry-hb hry-tp sgm ntw h3 ‘st h3 ntr Rdi-inhr. See genealogy VIII.

First half of seventh century B.C.

Cairo JE 91263
Debris overlying the "portal" of Ramses II
Unpublished
Stela fragment showing Re-Harakhte. The name of the owner is lost.

Cairo JE 91266
Debris overlying the "portal" of Ramses II
Unpublished
Stela fragment of Irty-rw, daughter of the imy-r pr-hd. . . X.

First half of seventh century B.C.

Cairo JE 91274
Debris overlying the "portal" of Ramses II
O'Connor, Expedition 12, no.1 (Fall 1969) 32.
Stela fragment showing Wsir-hnt-imntiw nb t3 dar hnt Igrt and Hwthr nbt Imntt.

Cairo T.5/1/15/13
Provenance unknown
De Meulenaere, JEGOL 20 (1967-8) 8-9, pl.III.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 144, no.25.
Pyramidion of the imi ist $h$k hpt-wd3t r$y $mew $m-wb-htp, son of the
s$w md3t ntr $hm ntr $w$m n $w$s $r-hr-s3-3st/ and dmnt (?)-nt-3st.

There can be no doubt as to the accuracy of De Meulenaere’s restora-
tion of the name of the father, in view of his almost certain identi-
fication with the owner of Louvre E.14730. On the other hand, the
group $\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \setminus \sqsubseteq \setminus \sqsubseteq$, interpreted by De Meulenaere as part of the
title of Nesnubhotep’s mother, seems to me more likely to be part of an
admittedly peculiar writing of the name dmnt-nt-3st, the name of
Ankhorraaece’s wife on the Louvre monument. The element dmnt is
sometimes written out phonetically (PN I, 400.11-12) but the sub-
stitution of the “bad” bird determinative for $\sqsubseteq$ presents a problem.
See genealogy I for dating to
c. 600 B.C.

Cairo T.8/2/15/11

Nécropole du Nord – Zone du Nord

MCA 1246.
Totenstelen, 281.

Stela of a woman named Ns-3st, daughter of Wd3-rw.

Munro did not recognize the fact that this stela was MCA 1246 and
wrongly regards Wd3-rw as the owner, “ohne Angabe der Eltern”.

c. 600 B.C.

Cairo T.22/8/15/3

Abydos (Daressy)

Daressy, ASAR 5 (1904) 93.
PM V, 93.
Yoyotte, Principautés, 127, no. 27 and 170, para. 78, doc. VI.
Gomaa, Fürstentümer, 63-4.

Stela fragment of the $\sqsubseteq$iny-r m3$\setminus$ wr h3wty F3-m3i, $\setminus$son of $\setminus$ the
wr $\setminus$ 3 n M3w$\setminus$ S3m3k and Ir.s-<$3w-n-mhit.

Daressy’s suggestion that Pamai and Sheshonk should be identified
with the rulers of Busiris mentioned on the stela of Piye was accepted
by both Yoyotte and Gomaa and seems likely. Since Pamai is not called
a great chief of the Meshwesh, it is clear that he had not succeeded
his father when the stela was made. It must therefore slightly ante-
date the stela of Piye (c. 728 B.C. – see Kitchen, TIP, para. 145).
For the same reason, the stela must have been dedicated by Pamai him-
self, and not by a descendant (a possibility envisaged by both Yoyotte and Gomaa), since any descendant would have credited Pamai too with the title of Chief of the Meshwesh.

c. 730 B.C.

Cairo T.1/7/18/2
Provenance unknown

Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2494.
Totenstelen, 277.

Stela of the it ntr kbb (wmt ?) P3-ỉw-ỉr, son of the imi ist ḫsk imy ỉbd (var. it ntr) Ns-wrtḥkỉw and Rmrt3.
Paternal grandfather : mi nn P3...

c. 660 B.C.

Cairo T.4/1/21/1
Nécropole du Nord

MCA 1295.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1029.
MMIB, pl.47.
Totenstelen, 247 (Edfu I).

Stela of T3-wḥr, daughter of the it ntr Dỉ.s-hnsw and ṭhrw.

c. 600 B.C.? 

Cairo T.2/1/21/1
Nécropole du Nord

MCA 1300.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2416.
Totenstelen, 286, fig.136.

Stela of the it ntr kbb m r-stỉw (var. ḫry sḫštỉ r-stỉw) ḫm ntr 2 Mỉmt wrt sḥỉ Nš-pš3-mỉl, son of the mi nn ṭmr-in-di-sw and ṭmr-m-pr-mṣ.
Paternal grandfather : mi nn Wnỉ (?), son of the mi nn Nš-pš3-rč.

c. 600 B.C.
Cairo T.13/1/21/4
Cemetery G
El Amrah, 96, pl.XXXVI.1.
PM V, 76.
Buhl, Sarcophagi, 74-6, fig.36, Eb9.
Sarcophagus of the ššk imi ist hm ntr n ħr-p3-rš hm ntr ntrw n ḫwt n
Wair ħm ntr n ḫwt nsw bity (ḫmn mry-imn) ħm ntr lmjn nsw t3wy ḫm ntr
n ntrw n T3-p (var. ššk hm ntr) ħmnw, son of the mi nn ššk hm ntr ḫr-
Gb and the šššt šnt-imntw T3-imnt. See genealogy XII.
Late third century B.C.

Cairo T.3/3/21/5
Tomb G.50
Abydos 1, 39, 49, pl.LXXV.
PM V, 75.
Buhl, Sarcophagi, 72, fig.34, Eb7.
Sarcophagus of the mnm-hrb-bḥpr nb ḫwt šḥtp hm.s smn ḫst škt
wdšt hm ntr wn šs... ntr pn ħr lmjn mw.t.f P3-di-(n)-3st, son of the
hm ntr ḫwthr nbt ḫ3št ntr R ḫd-hr and Nb-t3-ilḥt. See genealogy XVI.
Dynasty XXX / Early Ptolemaic

Cairo T.3/3/21/7
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1371.
PM V, 61.
Buhl, Sarcophagi, 94, Pə3.
Sarcophagus of Wn-nfr, son of P3-ir.s and Ht.s.
Ptolemaic

Cairo T.3/3/21/13
Nécropole du Nord
MCA 1373.
PM V, 61.
Buhl, Sarcophagi, 137, I 4.
Sarcophagus lid of Ist-s3-di (?) (\(\text{Ist-s3-di}\)) daughter of Nb-nfrw-n.f.

Ptolemaic

**Cairo T.30/5/24/1**

Nécropole du Nord

MCA 1297.
MDP II, p.58.
PM V, 59.
De Meulenaere, CdE 29 (1954) 221-36.
Stela of \(\text{Dj-inhr-wf-nb}\). See genealogy XV for family.

Ptolemaic

**Cairo T.30/5/24/4**

Kom es-Sultan

MCA 1290.
De Meulenaere, OLP 4 (1973) 80, n.7 (wrongly numbered T.30/5/24/8).
Stela of the \(\text{S3t nsw P3-di-hr-p3-hrd}\). See genealogy XIV.

Late third century B.C.

**Cairo T.28/6/24/5**

Provenance unknown

Totenstelen, 260, fig.99.
Stela of the \(\text{S3t nsw mr.f Mrt-imn}\).

Dynasty XXV

**Cairo T.4/1/24/4**

Nécropole du Nord - Zone de l'Ouest

MCA 1299.
Totenstelen, 264.
Stela of the \(\text{Bry swm pr Wsir P3-di-imn}\), son of \(\text{Ns-dhwti}\) and \(\text{N3-t3t}\) (?), daughter of \(\text{T3-dit-wsir-wn-nfr}\).

c. 640 B.C.
Cairo T.4/7/24/1
Nécropole du Nord - Zone de l'Est

MCA 1312.
Totenstelen, 304.
Stela of P3-di-mḥit (?) (𓊊𓊋𓇋𓊎𓊎), son of lw.f-ánchez and T3-ḥr-it-
nt-mḥit.

Later Ptolemaic

Cairo T.4/7/24/2
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord

MCA 1288.
Totenstelen, fig.124 (not in catalogue).
Stela on which two men and a woman are depicted before Re-Harakhte,
The only name given is P3-di-wḥr-wm-\text{nfr} 27.

Late seventh century B.C.

Cairo T.4/7/24/12
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord

MCA 1319.
PΔ V, 72.
Stela of P3-di-hnsw.
The fact that Osiris is depicted with his chest as seen from the front
suggests that the stela dates to the Ptolemaic period.

Ptolemaic

Cairo T.6/7/24/3
Provenance unknown

Totenstelen, 296.
Stela of the h3 n ntr srs m n pr Mnw nb ḫpw P3-wḥr, son of ḫrs-br
and 3st-ỉ-r-di-st, and his wife (?) T3-ḥr-it-nt-mnw, daughter of ḫr and
T3-(nt)-ɪmm-ỉpt.

Sixth century B.C.
Cairo T.6/7/24/7
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1247.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2423.
Totenstelen, 264.
Stela of Ḥnsw-ir-di-st and her daughter T3-mrt-ḥnsw.
The name Ḥnsw-ir-di-st, read by Mariette, is no longer legible.
c. 670 B.C.

Cairo T.6/7/24/9
Nécropole du Nord
MCA 1273.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1267.
Totenstelen, 337.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 149, no. 48.
Stela of the sht pr ḫsir P3-di-ḥr-p3-hrd, son of Diw-ḥ3w and T3-irt-k3p.
Mid-sixth century B.C.

Cairo T.6/7/24/11
Nécropole du Nord - Zone de l'Ouest
MCA 1292.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2370.
Totenstelen, 266.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 137 c.
Stela of the hnt r 3 n ḫsir n 3bdw imi lst n ḫw-Tfnwt P3-di-3st, son of the mn n Nb-sḫt. See genealogy I.
c. 650 B.C.

Cairo T.6/7/24/12
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1278.
Stela of the **hs hnwy Imn**. Ptolemaic?

**Cairo T.9/7/24/4**  
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord-Est

MCA 1306.  
Totenstelen, 332 (described as "unveröffentl." and assigned to Memphis).  
Stela of **hmw-ir-di-sw**, son of P3-di-b3stt and **Hr**. His sons P3-di-b3stt and P3-di-nfr-htp are also named. Cf. MCA 330.  
Sixth century B.C.

**Cairo T.9/7/24/7**  
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord

MCA 1252.  
Totenstelen, 264, fig.105.  
Stela of the **hr-hr-nbt** and **Hr**, relationship not indicated.  
c. 670 B.C.

**Cairo T.23/10/24/1**  
Nécropole du Nord  
MCA 1269.  
Totenstelen, 296.  
Stela of **wh** (?) **Irt-hr-rw** (?) and **... pr ms** (?) **Ns-wsr** (?)  
?

**Cairo T.25/10/24/5**  
Provenance unknown  
Totenstelen, 286.  
Stela of the **it ntr kbh r-stjw** (?) **Ns-nb-htp**, son of **Irt-hr-rw** and **3st-ir-di-st**.  
Early sixth century B.C.
Cairo T.25/10/24/14
Provenance unknown
Totenstelen, 264.
Stela, names illegible.
c. 670 B.C.

Cairo T.25/10/24/15
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1248.
Totenstelen, 266, fig.110.
Stela of Hr, son of Irtx-hr-mw and 3st-ir-di-st, and his wife T3-mht-n-
pr-3st. See genealogy X for the wife's name.
c. 670 B.C.

Cairo T.26/10/24/1
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1240.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2414.
Totenstelen, 266, fig.109.
Stela of the imi ist nsk bnt-wd3t (h3 wr Irty-r-t3i, son of the mi nw
Hr.e-n.f and H 3 1/2 1/2 1/2 1/2 w A S n 1 1 1 1 . The same man is the owner
of Fitzwilliam E.259.1900.
c. 650-40 B.C.

Cairo T.26/10/24/3
Provenance unknown
Totenstelen, 273.
De Meulenaere, DLP 6-7 (1975-6) 143, no.20.
Stela of Di-hr, son of T3w-t3iw and 3st-ir-di-st.
The title of hm ntr Wair is erroneously assigned to this man by Munro
and De Meulenaere. The group in question, H, is simply n kh n
Wair, the usual form of introduction in the mid-seventh century.
c. 650 B.C.
Cairo T.26/10/24/6

Enceinte du Nord - Zone de l'Ouest

MCA 1291.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 926 and supplement, 974.
Totenstelen, 284.
Stela of ȝ3-n-3st, daughter of ḫ, (var. ḫ, ḫ) and the nbt pr
ȝ3wt (ȝ3)ȝ3tȝ3.

Late seventh century B.C.

Cairo T.26/10/24/9

Nécropole du Nord - Enceinte du Nord

MCA 1277.
Totenstelen, 273.
Stela of Tȝ-ȝȝ-ȝ , her mother Ne-ȝ and her sister Ne-wr-ȝ.

C. 640 B.C.

Cairo T.26/10/24/10

Nécropole du Nord - Extérieur de la Shounet es-Zebib, face de l'est

MCA 1294.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1031 and supplement, 977.
Stela of Pȝ-di-imn-mwb-int, son of Pȝ-di-bȝ3stt and Tȝ-prt. His wife
is ḫnsw-ir-di-st, daughter of Pȝ-di-bȝ3stt and Pȝ.f-tȝw-ȝȝw-ȝȝt.

Cairo T.26/10/24/1

Provenance unknown

Totenstelen, 291.
Stela of ȝȝȝ-ȝȝȝ (??).

Sixth century B.C.

Cairo T.26/10/24/2

Nécropole du Nord
MCA 1296.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2444.
Totenstelen, 304, fig.157.
De Neulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 149-50, no.49.

Stela of the hry ḫr n WsIr n Ddw n 3bdw (var. hry ḫr pr WsIr n Ddw n 3bdw / hry ḫr n WsIr) nb-wm-nfr, son of ḫd-hr and ṭ3-dit-wsIr, dedicated by his eldest son, the ḫr ḫd-hr, son of ṭrty-nw.

Ptolemaic

Cairo T.28/10/24/5
Nécropole du Nord
Totenstelen, 298, fig.153.

Stela of the imi ḫnt dw3t ntr Di-hnsw-p3-smnb, son of the imi ḫnt dw3t ntr P3i-bs and ni-nfr-snm.

c. 600 B.C.

Cairo T.29/10/24/1
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1249.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1184 and supplement, 980.
Totenstelen, 276, fig.123.

Stela of ṭ3-h3rt, her mother ṭ3-srtn-tnt-bṣtt and her father the it ntr ma ṭntr ntr ṭr. Cf. MCA 1460.

c. 640 B.C.

Cairo T.29/10/24/2
Provenance unknown
Totenstelen, 274, fig.119.

Stela, names illegible.

Cairo T.29/10/24/5
Provenance unknown
Totentelen, 267.
Stela of Inh-... (?) and Spt-n-... (?)

Seventh century B.C.? 

Cairo T.29/10/24/6
Provenance unknown
Totentelen, 311.
Stela of 3st-n-•••.
Persian?

Cairo T.29/10/24/7
Nécropole du Nord - Zone du Nord
MCA 1241.
Totentelen, 285, fig.134.
Stela of the hsk n Imn 371 7 j 2 3 2 2. 3 3.

Late seventh century B.C.

Cairo T.18/2/25/2
Nécropole du Nord
MCA 1276.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2438.
Weil, Veziere, 159, para.39.
Totentelen, 282-3, fig.132.
Stela of the imi ist ḫsk hpt-wd3t sm3ty Ipw w'b wr 'h3 wr (var. ḫm ntr ḫw-Tfntw ḫsk sm3ty Ipw w'b wr 'h3 wr) Ns-pr-nwb, son of the ḫm ntr lmn-r' nsw ntrw imi ist ḫsk hpt-wd3t imy-r niwt tȝwty sȝb tȝty ḫt- b3stt-iw.r-nb and Tȝw (?). 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3
Paternal grandfather: ḫm ntr lmn m ḫpt-swt Pȝ-dî-ȝst.
Maternal grandfather: ḫm ntr Mntw ḫm ntr 3 Imhr Ns-pr-nb.
The vizier Djedbastefankh is otherwise unknown, and can only have held office ephemerally - cf. Kitchen, TIF, 483-4.
Mid-seventh century B.C.
Cairo T.2/3/25/5
Provenance unknown
Unpublished
Pyramidion of the ḫw Hr-s3-3st.

Cairo T.15/3/25/6
Nécropole du Nord – Zone du Nord

MCA 1435.
PM V, 61.
De Meulenaers, JEO 20 (1967-8) 1 with bibliography.

Pyramidion of the ḫm ntr Ḫmr sỉ ṣdʒt ntr ḫm ntr Ḫr-nḥt-y-it.f ḫm
ntr ḫst nbt pr ms ḫm ntr Ḫrt-hk3w (nbt) n ḫm ntr n ntrw p3 ḫm ntr
ṭpy n p3 pr-†nḫ sỉ ṣdʒt (?) ntr sỉ ḫm ntr Ḫm nḥ nṯ3t (?) ṣḥdw
imy-r (w†bw) ṣmṭ sỉ ṣdʒt ntr Ḫ3-di-3st, son of the ḫm nḥ-hr-s3-
3st.

I was unable to locate this monument in Cairo and the reading of the
titles is therefore based on the garbled text given by Mariette,
emended with the help of the titulary preserved on the stela of P3-
di-3st’s daughter, Amherst 1921.VI.

c. 600 B.C.

Chicago PM 31275
Provenance unknown
Allen, Stelae, 43, pl.XIX.
Totenten, 307.
Stela, names illegible.

Late sixth century B.C.

Chicago PM 31280
Provenance unknown
Allen, Stelae, 43, pl.XX.
Totenten, 279.
Stela of the imi ist ḥkn hpt-mdḥt ḫḏ-ḥnw-ỉw.f-ḥnḫ, son of the imi ỉmr-hr-rw.

C. 620 B.C.

Chicago FM 31659

Provenance unknown

Allen, Stelae, 41, pl.XIX.

Totenstelen, 280.

Stela, names not preserved, except . . . n Tfnwt ỉw.f-ḥnḫ.

Late seventh century B.C.

Chicago FM 31671

Provenance unknown

Allen, Stelae, 46, pl.XXII.

De Meulenaere, OIP 6-7 (1975-6) 134, no. 2 and 150, no. 50.

Stela of the ihyt Wsr-ḥnt-immtiỉw ỉntr (n nb ḫbdw ḫḏm-p3-ỉ3-st, daughter of the imi ỉlst ḥkn ṭnỉt ṭpy n Wsr ỉntr (n nb ḫbdw ḫkti ḫmr-hr and ḫns-ṭfnwt, daughter of the ḥkn ḫns-(p3)-ỉ3-ḥnty.

Ptolemaic

Chicago OIM 5739

Tomb D.15

Allen, BD, 8-9, 14-15, pl.V-XII.

Papyrus fragments with part of the Book of the Dead in hieratic, belonging to nb-p3.f-hr, son of Tỉ-mỉrt. The name of an ancestor called ḫnwỉỉ also survives. See genealogy XI.

C. 600 B.C.?

Chicago OIM 5740-50

Tomb D.57

El Amrah, pl.XLII (not all published).
Cartonnage fragments from the coffins of (1) Ns-hnw, daughter of the pm ntr Im-nr nsw ntrw imy-r nwt t3ty s3b t3wy Ns-p3-mdw and Irty-rw, (2) Ns-p3-mdw himself, son of the pm ntr Im-nr nsw ntrw ..., and (3) the nbt pr 8pt T3-...a, the name of both the sister and the mother of Ns-p3-mdw. See De Meulenaere, CDE 35 (1963) 76, and genealogy II.

c. 660-635 B.C.

Chicago OIM 5743
Tomb D.15 or D.57?
Unpublished
Isolated cartonnage fragment with the name Hr-m3-b3rw.

Chicago OIM 5747-9
Tomb D.15
El Amrah, pl.XLII.
PM V, 68.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 135-6, no.7.
Cartonnage fragments of the [hm ntr Mntw nb W3st imi ist ḫsk ḫpt-wd3t sš ḫpt-ntr pr Imn ṣnš nsw ṣ[nb-p3.f-hr, son of the ḫm ntr Mntw nb W3st imi ist ḫsk ḫpt-wd3t ḫpt-ntr pr Imn ṭ3i-m3'3bt3-nht and T3-g3rt.
Paternal grandfather: mi nw ḫr-s3-r3t, son of the mi nw ṭ3i-m3'3bt3-nht, son of (?) the [hm ntr Imn-r3š nsw ntrw ḫm ntr ṭpy n Inhr Sw sś R3 ḫm ntr ṭpy ḫm ntr 2 ṭ3r n3dnw... Sw-Tmmt hrý-bš lpt-swty imy-r wpwt n ḫpt-ntr ṭ3 ṭ3-hry ṣšw ḫpt-ntr Imn...X.

De Meulenaere suggests that ṭ3i-m3'3bt3-nht the younger was the owner of the coffin but it is clear from the papyrus fragment Chicago OIM 5739 that ṣ[nb-p3.f-hr is the son of T3-g3rt and therefore the owner of these fragments. See genealogy XI.

c. 600 B.C.
Chicago OIM 6332-3 and 6335-7

Tomb D.57

El Amrah, 100, pl.LX, no.154.
Allen, BD, 8-9, pl.CXXIV.

Ushabtis of T3-h3w-n-h3ett with hieratic inscription in ink.

       c. 660 B.C.

Chicago OIM 6408

Tomb D.8 or D.9

El Amrah, 79, 84, 97, pl.XXI.
Schäfer, ZAS 43 (1906) 50.
PM V, 68.
De Neulensere, Surnom, no.26.
Totenstelen, 262.

Stela of the imy-r m3k wr h3wti Pgttrr, beautiful name Ir-p3-hn-knm.f.

       c. 680 B.C.

Chicago OIM 6776-7

Pit of tomb D.13

El Amrah, 98, pl.XL.
PM V, 69.
Monnet, RdE 8 (1951) 155, n.1 (2).

Two clay bricks naming a vizier N3-(p3)-k3-kwty.

These bricks are included here on the assumption that the owner is to
be identified with the vizier Nespakashuty who died in the early
seventh century B.C., since the latter is known to have been buried
at Abydos (see genealogy II). In the absence of reliable indicators
of date, however, it is possible that the bricks date to the Third
Intermediate Period, and that the vizier is Nespakashuty A or B (for
whom see Kitchen, TIR, 483) who lived in the ninth century B.C.

       c. 685 B.C. ?

Chicago OIM 6898

Tomb D.11
EL Amrah, 85, 96, 97, pl. XXXV. 4.
PM V, 69.
Allen, JNES 8 (1949) 349, pl. XXV.
Allen, BB, 15, pl. CII.
Totenstelen, 196.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 143, no. 22.

Stela fragment of the hm ntr Imn m Ipt-sw imi ist hsk hm ntr Wsr M3rf hm ntr Imn spd 'bwy pm ntr Jnsw hry-ib Bmn hm ntr Imn f3-mwtl s5 htp ntr pr Imn Hurw, son of the mi mn lw.f-13 and Iry.

De Meulenaere's suggested date of "époque de transition entre les 25e et 26e dynasties" is rather too high in view of the form of the is sign, while Munro's "ehler spätsaitisch" is too low.

c. 600 B.C. ?

Chicago OIM 7142

Tomb G. 50

Abydos 1, 39, pl. LXXIX. 2.
Petrie, Shabtis, pl. XLV, no. 643.
Allen, BB, 10-11, 62, pl. XXXI.
Aubert, Statuettes égyptiennes, 266.

Ushabtis of the hm ntr Jhthpr nbt W3dt P3-di-wsr.

See genealogy XVI. Other examples are now in Boston, Cairo, University College, London and the Victoria and Albert Museum.

Dynasty XXX / Early Ptolemaic

Chicago OIM 7196-7 and 7199

Cemetery G

Abydos 1, 35, 48, pl. LXXI.
Allen, BB, 10-11, 15, pl. XCVII.
PM V, 76.
De Meulenaere, OLC 3 (1966) 102-3, n. 9.

Coffin fragments of the s§ n Wsr (var. s§ hwt-ntr n Hr wp-8&t-t3wq) Dhwti-ms.

The reading of the name as Dhwti-ms, rather than as Ms as proposed by Allen, is proved by the third fragment from the bottom of Petrie's plate, on which the name and title are s§ hwt-ntr n Hr wp-8&t-t3wq Dhwti-ms. The man's usual title ḫ nb ẖ (var. ħ nb) should be
taken as s$n wsir, with the name of Osiris honorifically transposed, rather than as "the Osiris, scribe..." since the n would otherwise be redundant. Petrie, followed by Allen, dated the coffin to the New Kingdom, but this was corrected by De Meulenaere to "Late Tijd". The use of $ in m3-hrw suggests that it is in fact Ptolemaic

Cincinnati Art Museum 1947.392
Provenance unknown
Budge, Meux, 108-9, no.50 a, pl.IX A.
Petrie, Totenkistelen, 283 (Meux 50 a).
Adams, Sculpture Collection, 23.

Stela of T3-h3w-n-b3stt, daughter of the s$m d3t ntr Inhir P3-bmn.
The title s$m d3t ntr, here written out fully as $m d3t ntr Inhir P3-bmn, is consistently abbreviated to $m d3t ntr from the mid-seventh century onwards, while the tripartite division of the stela makes it unlikely that it is much earlier than this.

First half of seventh century B.C.

Columbia, University of Missouri Museum of Art and Archaeology X.3
Provenance unknown (Gift of Petrie, before 1905)
Unpublished
Stela fragment of the hry-hb n st m3kt P3-k3p, son of P3-nhsi and Mrt.

Cerny (Community, 38, n.8) suggests that this piece dates to the Eighteenth Dynasty, but, as he points out, both the name and the title are Late Period, and the spelling of the name of Re as $ in-dicates a date

c. 650 B.C.

Commerce (Paris)
Provenance unknown
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 137 b.
Block naming the ḫak Wār m ṣbdy imi ʿst משלת ʿs new n nb ṣ3wy ʿs ṣmast ntr pr Wār ṣ3 pr-ḥd pr Wār ḫr-nḥt, son of the ḫak Wār m ṣbdy ʿs mast ntr pr Wār Ne-nb-ḥtp. See genealogy I.

c. 750 B.C.

Copenhagen AeIN 972
Provenance unknown
Koefoed-Petersen, *Stèles égyptiennes*, 38-9, no.51 with bibliography.
Lieblin, *Dictionnaire*, 2457.
Totenstelen, 267.
De Moulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 142, no.19.
Stela of Tš-hmḥt, daughter of the hm ntr Wār P3-di-ḥr-p3-hrd.
c. 640 B.C.

Copenhagen AeIN 973
Provenance unknown
Koefoed-Petersen, *Stèles égyptiennes*, 40, no.53 with bibliography.
Totenstelen, 267-8.
Stela of N3-mnb-3st, daughter of the wšh mw... X and Wd3-rn.s.
The name of the deceased, which was read as Di-mnh-3st by Koefoed-Petersen and as Mnḥ(t)-ist by Munro, is quite clearly ʿmḥm ʿmḥm (PM I, 169, 19), while the former's interpretation of the title as wšh mw is preferable to Munro's wšb.

Mid-sixth century B.C.

Copenhagen AeIN 1067
Provenance unknown
Koefoed-Petersen, *Stèles égyptiennes*, 53-4, no.68 with bibliography.
PM V, 100.
Totenstelen, 288.
Stela of Ḥfr, daughter of the imi ḫt H3 sm ḫÉtat Ṣr and Ne-ḥr.
Sixth century B.C.
Cornell University Museum, Ithaca

Cemetery T (This stela was apparently sent to Cornell before 1914, but could not be traced in 1975)

CA II, pl.XXV.3.
PM V, 71.
Totenstelen, 312 (CA II, pl.XXV.3).
An almost illegible painted stela.

Cortona 356

Provenance unknown
Botti, Antichita` egiziane, 90, pl.XI.
Totenstelen, 263.
Stela of Di`s-irt-rw.

C. 670 B.C.

Danson Coll., Grasmere

Abydos - Garstang 893.A.09.5
Unpublished
Offering table of Ne-inhpr.

Later Ptolemaic

De Rouge 53

Provenance unknown
De Rouge, Inscriptions hi`éroglyphiques, pl.LIII.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2421.
Statuette of the imi ist hsk hpt-wd3t rh nsw Dd/hr, son of the mi nn lw.f-`3 and T3-dd-wp.

Sixth century B.C.
Dewsbury
Tomb D.16
Unpublished
Canopic box of P3-di-wsir-wm-nfr.

Dundee
Tomb D.15.B
El Amrah, 85, pl.XXXIII.
Stuccoed canopic box of X, son of the mi nw Iw.f-l<3.

Durham N.1968
Provenance unknown
Birch, Alnwick, 309-10.
Totenstelen, 287.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 148, no.43.
Stela of the wrsw n htp ntr Wsir Ns-p3-m31, son of Iam-ir-di-sw.
Sixth century B.C.

Durham N.1971
Provenance unknown
Totenstelen, 296, fig.150.
Stela of the hry tkr n 3st hry stw (?) n 3st n pr ms Hpq, son of the hry tkr n 3st hry stw (?) n 3st n pr ms Dd-hrq and Irti-rw.
First half of sixth century B.C.

Durham N.1977
Provenance unknown
Birch, Alnwick, 317.
Totenstelen, 291, fig.141.
Stela of the imi ıst ḫak mn nart ḥpt-wdȝt sȝ sn n pr-ḥḏ n ḫḥt
Nkȝn, son of the mn n Pȝ-dȝ-ḥḥt and ḫḥt-nḥt.

c. 550 B.C.

Durham N.1979

Provenance unknown

Totenstelen, 265.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 145, no. 30.
Stela of the ḡw ṭwir ḡn-hȝ hr-sȝ-ȝst, son of (?) the ḡw ṭwir ḡn-hȝ
dy-hȝ iw-ȝf-nȝ and ḡn-ȝst-ȝw-ȝs-nȝ.

c. 660 B.C.

Durham N.1985

Provenance unknown

Birch, Alnwick, 326-7.
De Meulenaere, JBDL 20 (1967-8) 15, pl. VII.
Derchain, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) pl. IV.3.
Pyramidion of Nkȝn, son of Tȝ-tȝ-nȝt and ḡn-ȝn,... His son Pȝ-hm is
also named.

Dynasty XXX / Early Ptolemaic

E.E.S. negative

Provenance unknown

Unpublished

Stela of Irty-ȝw, daughter of ḡd-hȝr and Tȝ-hȝrt.

Sixth century B.C.

Feuillet de Conches

Provenance unknown

Legrain, BT 13 (1890) 21-2.
Spiegelberg, ZAS 53 (1917) 91.
Stela of the hry dd m šnb P3-di-inhr, son of the hry dd m šnb Dd-inhr- iw.f- ‘nh.

Legrain's brief description of this stela contains no clear indication of date. The spelling of the name of Osiris as <$2$ suggests that it dates to the Third Intermediate Period rather than later. On the other hand, the dative n in the htp-di-nsw formula is very rare before the eighth century and not common until much later.

c. 750 B.C.

Fitzwilliam E.11
Pit of tomb E.11
El Arabah, 16, 36, pl.XXV.
PM V, 66.
Silver strip naming the sm3ty W3st imi ist nḥ nsw mr.f N3-mnḫ-imn.

c. 650-50 B.C.

Fitzwilliam E.252.1900
Pit of tomb E.11
El Arabah, 16, pl.XXIV.
PM V, 66.
Stela of Iwf-dt, son of In-imn-n3.s-nbt.

c. 650 B.C.

Fitzwilliam E.259.1900
Pit of tomb E.11
El Arabah, 16, pl.XXIV.
PM V, 66.
Stela of the imi ist ḫak hpt-wd3t ch3 wr Irty-r-t3.
The same man is almost certainly the owner of Cairo T.26/10/24/1. I have prepared a full publication of this stela, which was described by the excavator as being "without names", to appear in the near future.

c. 650-40 B.C.
Fitzwilliam E.48.1901

Cemetery G

El Amrah, 85, pl.XXXV.1.
LR IV, 180, XLIV.
PM V, 76.
Yoyotte, Kemi 15 (1959) 71, n.5.
De Meulenaere, OLP 35 (1960) 95, n.9.

Sarcophagus lid of the hsk imi ist ry nsw hpt-wd3t hm ntr twt (pr-3) (trt hr-hb) hm (trt) W3dt hry-ib 3bdw hry kb n nsw ... x, son of the hsk hm ntr n fr-p3-r fr... and T3-imn.

The tr sign which begins the name of the father is not indicated in the publication. The restoration tr-hb permits the identification of the parents - see genealogy XII.

Later Ptolemaic

Woodward E.14.1926

Area of the 'Tombs of the Courtiers'

TG, 12, 19-20, pl.XXXIV.
PM V, 56.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 141, no.14.

Coffin fragments of Irt-hr-rw, son of the imi ist hsk P3-di-(3)-st.
His title sequences are as follows: imy-r hnw ntr n Wair m 3bdw / imi ist hsk hpt-wd3t / imi ist hsk ry nsw m3x / hm ntr lwthr nbt lwnt / imi ist hsk / hm ntr lwthr nbt lwnt ry nsw m3x / imi ist hsk hm ntr lwthr nbt lwnt hpt-r-c n 3bdw.

Gardiner's dating of the coffin to the Ptolemaic period was corrected by De Meulenaere to "l'époque éthiopienne ou saute", on the basis of the orthography lwtn for lwnt in the name of Denderah, and this is supported by a whole range of features - the form of x, the use of r and 4 as determinatives, the spelling of Rd as 3n, the spelling of hpt-wd3t as (4) 3n, which is otherwise attested only on the datable stela Vienna 157, and the type of the coffin, which is very uncommon after the Twenty-sixth Dynasty - which permit a fairly precise dating to c. 650 B.C.
Fitzwilliam E.SS.34
Provenance unknown
Unpublished
Stela of 3st-in-di-st, daughter of (?), X and T3...
This stela will be published with Fitzwilliam E.259.1900 – see above.
c. 630 B.C.

Fitzwilliam E.SS.40
Provenance unknown
Unpublished
Stela of the i[t] ntr (?), Irt-hr-rw, son of P3-di-pth and Trr (?).
Late sixth century B.C.

Fitzwilliam E.SS.47
Provenance unknown
Left door-jamb of the i[t] ntr hry s3t3 s3 md3t ntr P3-di-3st, son of
the mi nn Nb-a3ft. See genealogy 1.
c. 800 B.C.

Florence 2493
Provenance unknown
Bosticco, Stele, 35-6, no.24 with bibliography.
Totenstelen, 291, fig.142.
Stela of P3-whr, son of T3-krit-nt-pth (?) and an unnamed man.
First half of sixth century B.C.

Florence 2501
Provenance unknown
Bosticco, Stele, 30-1, no.19 with bibliography.
Totenstelen, 275, fig.122.
Stela of Idrbs and another man whose name is now illegible.

Florence 2502
Provenance unknown
Bostico, Stele, 21, no. 11 with bibliography.
Totenstelen, 282, fig. 131.
Stela of the hray imi wwt n Wsir n 3bdw P3-n-b(w), son of the hray imi wwt n Wsir n 3bdw Has3 and Sp... (?).

Florence 2509
Provenance unknown
Bostico, Stele, 28, no. 16 with bibliography.
Totenstelen, 279, fig. 128.
Stela of the ëm ntr Irt-hr-rw, son of the ii-m st ís the ëk ëd-3st-îw.f-îh.
Munro's mistaken reading of Irt-hr-rw as ëm ntr R' leads him to take ëd-3st-îw.f-îh as the owner.

Frankfort 177
Abydos - Frankfort 1925-6/177
Unpublished (EES negative)
Stela of a man whose name is illegible.
Persian?

Frankfort 193
Abydos - Frankfort 1925-6/193
Unpublished (EES negative)
Stela of a man whose name is illegible.
Persian?
Frankfort 212
Abydos - Frankfort 1925-6/212
Unpublished (EES negative)
Stela of the hst (?) Irty-rw (?), daughter of 'nwt3 and Ns-mnw (?).
Sixth century B.C.

Frankfort 213
Abydos - Frankfort 1925-6/213
Unpublished (EES negative)
Stela of Hr (?).
Persian?

Garstang 200.A.07.1
Abydos - Garstang 200.A.07.1
Unpublished
Offering table of Diw-[3], daughter of the imi ist ḫsk ḫm ntr 3 Ṣr.
See genealogy II.
c. 635 B.C.

Garstang 740.A.09
Abydos - Garstang 740.A.09
Unpublished
Stela fragment naming Wȝ-nfr, son of Ns-nb-ḥtp and Nȝ-tfnwt.
The name Ns-tfnwt and the mention of ḫw sys Wȝwȝ Nȝw 3 Ṣȝw suggest a date in the Ptolemaic period.
Ptolemaic

Garstang 983.A.09
Abydos - Garstang 983.A.09
Unpublished
Cartonnage plaques naming ~n-inhr, son of T3-~rit-nt-t3-iht. Ptolemaic?

Garstang 991.A.09.11
Abydos - Garstang 991.A.09.11
Unpublished
Stela of Irt-hr-rw, son of the hsk Dd-hr and 3st-hb.
A trio with the same names occurs on Turin 1528, and an Irt-hr-rw, son of 3st-hb on Hilton Price 2014.

Sixth - fourth century B.C.

Garstang 1036.A.09.3
Abydos - Garstang 1036.A.09.3
Unpublished
Stela of the adn (?) nb t3wy Irknyt.
This is an unusual, perhaps archaising, stela with the text in columns below the offering scene, in which the deceased offers to Osiris and Isis. The costume of the deceased, consisting of a short kilt, sash, necklace and shaven head, suggests a date
First half of seventh century B.C.?

Glasgow (Burrell Coll.) 13.176
Abydos - Garstang 216.A.07.1
De Meulenaere, JEA 20 (1967-8) 2-4, pl.I.
Pyramidion of the hm ntr Imn-r' nsw ntrw imy-r niwt t3ty (var. imy-r niwt t3ty / t3wty s3b t3ty) Ns-p3-k3-wty. See genealogy II.
c. 660 B.C.

Glasgow, Hunterian Museum, D.1926.2
Abydos - Frankfort 1925-6/184
Frankfort, JEA 14 (1928) 244, no.18.
PM V, 65.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 146, no.35.
Door-jamb of the imi ist ḫsk ṣḥ pr-hd Wsir ḫr-ḥḥ, son of Nbt-ḥwt-iit and P3-ḥw-n-ḥr.

Frankfort’s reading ... Nbt-ḥwt-iit sḥt n P3-ḥw-n-ḥr ... is erroneous. ḫsk should read ḫḥ. See genealogy III.

c. 625 B.C.

Glasgow, Hunterian Museum, D.1937.29
Provenance unknown

Totenstelen, 290, fig.139 (Philip 33).
Stela of T3-dit-ḥr, daughter of the imi ist ḫsk ḥḥt-wḥt ṭḥ nsw ḫw-ḥ’t and ḥst-ir-di-ḥt.

c. 585 B.C.

Graz
Provenance unknown

Von Bissing, Ancient Egypt (1914) 14.
Stela of the imi ḫḥt ḫḥ Nrti-r-ṯ3i, son of Ns-(p3)-ḏ3-ḥḥty.
Sixth century B.C.

Guimet C.32
Provenance unknown

Moret, Catalogue Guimet, 64-5, pl.29.
Totenstelen, 289.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 149, no.47.
Stela of the ḫḥy ṣḥt pr Wsir P3-di-wḥr, son of ḫḥr and T3-dit-ḥḥt-wḥḥḥ.
De Meulenaere erroneously reverses the filiation. See genealogy IV.

c. 585 B.C.

Hannover 2941
Provenance unknown

Munro, Städeljahrbuch 3 (1971) 36, no.36.
Stela of $N\text{aht}-N\text{aht}$, son of $N\text{aht}$ and $P3\text{t}t\text{m}-T\text{m}-3\text{st}$.

Mid-sixth century B.C.

Hannover 2944
Provenance unknown

Munro, Städelpub (1971) 38, no. 37.

Totenstelen, 291, fig. 143.

Stela of $\text{Irt}-\text{rt}$, son of $\ldots X$ and $\text{Wpt-nfrt}$ (??).

Mid-sixth century B.C.

Hannover 1935.200.210
Provenance unknown


Leahy, GM 23 (1977) 50-1.

Stela of the $\text{mdt nfr pr Wair P3-di-3st}$, son of $\text{Nb-m3t}$. See genealogy I.

C. 800 B.C.

Heidelberg 563
Provenance unknown

Totenstelen, 263.

Stela of $\ldots nfr$ and his wife $\text{ts-3st-prt}$.

C. 670 B.C.

Hilton Price 2014
Said to be from Abydos


Stela of $\text{Irt-hr-rt}$, son of $3\text{st-m-hb}$. The same filiation occurs on Garstang 991.A.09.11 and Turin 1528.
Horniman Museum

Tomb G.57

Abydos I, 40, pl.XXXIX.6.
Abydos III, 42, pl.XXV.
PM V, 75.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 143, no.21.

Sarcophagus lid of the ḫsḥ hmn ntr Wsir ṭpt-ty-nn ntr ḫmr-nḥty-it.f hmn ntr 3st wmt ntr hmn ntr ḫmr Wdšt Shmt ỉm-m-ḥtp (PP III, 5605), son of the ḫsḥ hmn ntr ḫmr-ḥb (PP III, 5503) and the ḫmr ḫḥtm-mtn-imn tw Drš (PP III, 7253).

Later Ptolemaic

Karlsruhe H.1048/50
Provenance unknown
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 144-5, no.28.

Relief naming the ṭb Wsir ḫmr-imn, son of the ṭb Wsir ḫmr-ḥb.

Mid-seventh century B.C. (De Meulenaere)

Kyoto
Area of the 'Tombs of the Courtiers'
TC, 12, pl.XXXIII.11.
PM V, 56.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 134-5, no.4.

Sarcophagus fragment of the hm ntr ḫmr-li-m-ḥtp, ḫmr n tr ḫmr ḫmr-ḥb-imy-r hm ntr ḫmr-li-m-ḥtp-nh and ... ḫmr. The incomplete title sequence ḫsḥ hm ntr ḫmr-ḥb Wsir hm ntr n ḫmr ... probably also refers to ḫmr-li-m-ḥtp.

Ptolemaic

Lausanne, Musée Historique (formerly 29991)
Provenance unknown
De Meulenaere, BIFAO 54 (1954) 78, n.5.

Stela fragment of the ḫmr-ḥb-imy-r. See Abydos III.XXX.

Ptolemaic
Leiden VI.20
Provenance unknown
Boeser, Beschreibung VI, 6, pl. VI with bibliography. Totenstelen, 263, fig.107.
Stela of the hmt hm n Imr. sw-imn (sic) and T3-mrt-imn, relationship not indicated.
c. 670 B.C.

Leiden VI.51
Provenance unknown
Boeser, Beschreibung VI, 13-14, pl.XXVII with bibliography. Totenstelen, 278.
Stela of Ap-n-mwt and her mother T3y-irt-rw.
The date "Year 13" which has been incised below the main ink inscription is of uncertain significance and of no use for dating purposes.
c. 620 B.C.

Leiden VI.53
Provenance unknown
Boeser, Beschreibung VI, 14, pl.XXVII with bibliography. Totenstelen, 267.
Stela of nb-hr-s3-3st, son of Ns-hr-k3-3wty.
c. 650 B.C.

Leiden VI.54
Provenance unknown
Boeser, Beschreibung VI, 14, pl.XXVI with bibliography. Totenstelen, 267-8.
Stela of D3-3st-w5n.s, daughter of the it ntr P3.f-w-hr. The hry wn-c3wn pr 3st pr (?) ms 943 is also named.
c. 650 B.C.
Leiden VI, 55
Provenance unknown
Boeser, Beschreibung VI, 14, pl.XXVI with bibliography.
Totenstelen, 299.
Stela of a man whose name is incomprehensible.
Late sixth century B.C. ?

Leiden VII, 9
Provenance unknown
Boeser, Beschreibung VII, 4, pl.XIV with bibliography.
De Meulenaere, OLP 29 (1954) 221-36.
Totenstelen, 300, fig.158.
Stela of the ḫm šš ḫm 3b ḫr ḫp h3st (?) šš dš n šš 4 nb n pr
Inhr ḫm ntr 2 n Hḥt nḥt Wbn ḫm ntr 4 Inhr-3w šš Rś Dd-inhr-iw.f-š-nḫ, son of the mi nn Ne-nnw and the ḫyṯ Hḥt T3-Sṛt-nt-mḥḥt. See genealogy XV for family.

Ptolemaic

Leiden VII, 11
Provenance unknown
Boeser, Beschreibung VII, 4, pl.XIV with bibliography.
Totenstelen, 293-4.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 133-4, no.1.
Stela of the ḫm ḫk ḫp-t-dāt rḥ nsw imy šš ḫy šš 2 Na-nb-hṭp, son of the mi nn Kyf (De Meulenaere, Rde 14 (1962) 49) and the ḫyṯ Hḥt-imn-tiw T3-hṃmt.
Maternal grandfather : the ḫm ḫk ḫp-t-dāt rḥ nsw ḫm ntr ṣḥy n Waṭr ḫktl ḫm ṣḥty Šw.f-ṣ.
His wife ḫṛt-iḥṣt, five sons (Kyf, Ṣḥb-jḥr, ḫn-jḥb, Wn-nfr and Pḥt - all ḫm ḫk) and three daughters (Ḥr-tw, T3-hṃmt and 3ḥt-ṛd-ṣt) are also named.
The same man was the owner of the pyramidion Trieste 7. Two men named Wn-nfr and Wšb-imn-it.f, both with the title of ḫk, appear on a stela which was formerly in the Amherst Collection - see Lieblin, Dictionnaire, 2486.

c. 575 B.C.
Leiden VII.13
Provenance unknown
Boeser, Beschreibung VII, 5, pl.XV with bibliography.
Otto, Biographische Inschriften, 187-8, no.52.
Totenstelen, 284-5.
Stela of 3st-n-hb, daughter of the 3st W3st Ns-w-tfnwt.
c. 675 B.C.

Leiden VII.20
Provenance unknown
Boeser, Beschreibung VII, 7-8, pl.XVI with bibliography.
Stela of the im ntr Inhr-nht (PP III, 5446), also called the imi ist
hk hm s3 hm 2h s8 n p3 wby w hwt-ntr n Tni B3-k-n3-hiw, son of
the mi nm Dwli-ms (PP III, 5589) and the ihyt n Tfnw s3t R- hwt
ntrw Td-rh. (PP III, 7251).

Later Ptolemaic

Leiden VII.21
Provenance unknown
Boeser, Beschreibung VII, 8, pl.XVI with bibliography.
Totenstelen, 291-2.
Stela of Iri-iri, daughter of the it ntr khkh m r-st5w Dd-hr and 4-
im-n3-nti-w3w.
c. 600 B.C.

Leiden VII.22
Provenance unknown
Boeser, Beschreibung VII, 8, pl.XVI with bibliography.
Totenstelen, 291.
Stela of a man whose name is no longer legible.
Sixth century B.C.
Leiden VII.23
Provenance unknown
Boeser, Beschreibung VII, 8, pl.XVI with bibliography.
Totenstelen, 301.
Stela of the \( w'b n h\ddot{3}t n \text{Imn-r} n\text{sw ntrw} \ldots X. \)

Ptolemaic

Leningrad 1066
Provenance unknown
Lieblein, Die aegyptischen Denkmäler, 28, no.52.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2453.
Golenischeff, Ermitage Imperial, 153-4.
Totenstelen, 292, fig.144.
Stela of the \( \text{imi ist hsk mn nrt Nhnt-dhwti}, \) son of the \( \text{mi nn P}\ddot{3}-d\text{mhit} \) and \( T3-k\ddot{3}py. \)
c. 550 B.C.

Leningrad 1070
Provenance unknown
Lieblein, Die aegyptischen Denkmäler, 27, pl.XXXIII, no.50.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2459.
Golenischeff, Ermitage Imperial, 155.
Stela of the \( \text{ihyt Nhnt-imntiw T3-h\ddot{3}rt}, \) daughter of the \( \text{imi ist hsk rh nsw Ptmk} \) and the \( \text{ihyt Nhnt-imntiw Ns-hr}. \)
Lieblein's description of the stela and the absence of \( hpt-wd\ddot{3}t \) in the titulary suggest a date
Late seventh century B.C.

Leningrad 2260
Provenance unknown
Lieblein, Die aegyptischen Denkmäler, 11-12, no.8, pl.II and pl.XXXIII, no.51.
Golenischeff, Ermitage Imperial, 325-6.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2460.
De Meulenaere, *JEDOL* 20 (1967-8) 5-7, pl.II.
Dercchain, *OLP* 6-7 (1975-6) pl.IV.

Pyramidion of the imi ist ḥsk imy 3bd hry s3 ? (var. ḥsk) Ḥr, son of the mi mn ḥrw and the iḥyt Ḥnt-imntiw ʿiri-ʿiri, and his wife ʿnt-ikrt, daughter of the it ntr ḥwty n ṣr-ʿnh ṭ3-dī-hr-p3-hrd and ʿmr-b3st-īt-s. See genealogy V.

Late sixth - fourth century B.C.

Liverpool City Museum 50.43.30
Abydos - Garstang 212.A.07.4
Unpublished
Offering table of ṭ3-ḥri-n-mḥt.

This object was found in a tomb with three uninscribed limestone sarcophagi which, together with the use of ḫ in m3-ḥrw, indicate the date.

Later Ptolemaic

Liverpool City Museum
Abydos - Garstang 228a.A.07
Unpublished
Stela of Th3.

Later Ptolemaic

Liverpool City Museum M.13916
Provenance unknown
Bierbrier, *LNK*, 66.

Stela of Ḥ3-k3, daughter of the imi ist ḥsk Ḥd-pṭh-īw.f-ḥn and Ṙmr-it-s (?)?
Paternal grandfather: the ḫn Ṣntw nb Ṣ3st... Ḥwty nb Ḥmḥy Ṣs-p3-k3-ḥwty, son of the ḫn Ṣs Ṣt n Ṣmt ḫd...; son of the ḫn Ṣḥy Ṣnt Ṣḥy Ṣs-ḥs, son of the ḫn Ṣḥty Ṣḥy-p3-k3-ḥwty (for rest of genealogy see Kitchen).
The imi ist ḫsk Wsir-nht (?), son of ḫḥt-rw (?) is also depicted, while the title ḫmn ntr ḫn-Tfnw occurs in an uncertain context. The ḫmn ntr 2 ḫmn Inhr Kh-ihnhr-lw.T-inh is also named.

The titles of the father of the owner suggest that this stela is from Abydos. Kitchen puts the death of the Vizier Haraise in c. 820 B.C., which dates this stela to c. 720 B.C.

Liverpool City Museum M.13996
Provenance unknown
Gray and Slow, Egyptian Mummies, 32-5, pl.44, no.8.
Coffin of the ḫsk imi ist ḫm nsw ḫp-t-wd3t ḫmn-hrr-hbs-hpr ... (Hr- ?) ḫm-nfr, son of the ḫmn ḫmn ḫnh-ihnhr and ḫ3k-s3t.
Ptolemaic

Liverpool University E.27
Abydos - Garstang X2.A.07
Unpublished
Stela fragment of the ḫmn ntr ḫnn ḫm ntr ḫhnrw ḫm ntr ḫhm ḫr-n-P.
c. 570 B.C.

UCL 641
Tomb G.50
Abydos I, 38, pl.LXXIX.1.
Petrie, Shabtis, pl.XIII, no.641.
Aubert, Statuettes égyptiennes, 265-6.
Ushabtis of ḫl-hr. A number of other examples are in the University Museum, Philadelphia and the Victoria and Albert Museum.

Dynasty XXX / Early Ptolemaic

UCL 14497
Provenance unknown
Totenstelen, 269.
Stela of Ns-p3-33i, son of \(\text{md}-\text{hr}\) and \(\text{3st}-\text{hr}\).

Sixth century B.C.

UCL 14590
Provenance unknown
Totenstelen, 239.
Stela of Imn-ir-di-sw, son of \(\text{3skk}\) and \(\text{Irti}\)-\(\text{rw}\).

Sixth century B.C.

UCL 14649
Provenance unknown
Petrie, Funeral Furniture, 14.
De Meulenaere, JEDIL 20 (1967-8) 7-8.
Pyramidion of Ns-nb\(\text{-htp}\), son of the \(\text{imi\, ist\, \(\text{hsk}\, \text{hm\, ntr\, Nb\, \(\text{-htp}\, Ns\, \text{-hr}\, and\, 3st\, \text{-id\, \(\text{-st}\).\)}}\)

? 

UCL 14774
Provenance unknown
Totenstelen, 268 (o.Nr.).
Stela depicting a woman and a man whose names are illegible.

c. 660 B.C.

Louvre A.93
Provenance unknown
Jelinkova-Reymond, ASAE 54 (1957) 275-87 with bibliography.
Otto, Biographische Inschriften, 164-6, no. 27 a.

Statue of the r-p\(\text{t}\, \text{h3y}\,-\text{t\, sm\, w\, \(\text{hty}\, \text{hrp\, \(\text{r\, wr\, smw\, imy\, r\, prw\, hd\, mwb}\, \(\text{3\, n\, im3}\, \text{3\, m\, pr\, nsw\, imy\, r\, pr\, wr\, P3}\, \text{-\(\text{t}\, \text{3w}\,-\text{wy}\,-\text{nt}\), son of the \(\text{hrp\, hawt}\, \(\text{id\, mr\, Dp\, \text{hm\, ntr\, hr\, P\, 33\,-shk}.\)\}

The content of the inscription makes it likely that this statue was dedicated at Abydos.

570-526 B.C.
Louvre C.107

Provenance unknown

Pierret, Recueil d'inscriptions II, 36.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1028.

False-door stela of the imi ist ḫṣk mn nrt ḫš nsw wr phtṭ ḫm nh n tr ṣḥ tṣ ṣ n ḫḥ nbt ḫḥ ḫn P3-miw, son of the ṣḥ ḫn ṣḥ pr-hd ṣḥ n ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫḥ ḫ therein. imy-st n ṣḥ ṣṭ ṣ tpy ṣḥ ṣ ṣ 4 ṣt-ṭr-wr and the ḫḥt n Sw-Tmwt ṣḥ.

Paternal grandfather: the ṣḥ ḫn P3-miw.
Maternal grandfather: the ḫḥ ntr Sw-Tmwt ḫṣk ṣḥ ḫḥt ntr pr n ḫḥ P3-di-mḥḥt.

For further family details, see genealogy IX. The use of the dative n in the ḫḥt-di-nsw formula suggests a date no earlier than the eighth century B.C., while the form of the ḫḥ sign shows that it cannot be later than c. 620 B.C.

Late eighth century B.C.?

Louvre C.110

Provenance unknown

Pierret, Recueil d'inscriptions II, 41.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2387.
Totenstelen, 260-1, fig.102.

Stela of the imi ist ḫṣk ḫḥt-wd tḥ ṣḥ wr (Ṣḥ n pr n P3 imy-h ḫw ṣḥ ḫw n pr ḫḥ ḫḥ n Sw-imy-šr-di-sw, son of the ṣḥ ḫn P3-di-mḥḥt.

c. 700 B.C.

Louvre C.114

Provenance unknown

Pierret, Recueil d'inscriptions II, 11.
Totenstelen, 268, fig.112.

Stela of the ḫḥy sḥt pr Wair ḫḥ n Sw-imy-di-sw (the title "Gottesvater" attributed to him by Munro is a misreading of the preceding Wair). His father ḫḥ tḥ ṣḥ is also named, although the relationship is not indicated. See genealogy VII.

c. 650 B.C.
Louvre C.116
Provenance unknown
Pierret, Recueil d'inscriptions II, 13.
Totenstelen, 304-5, fig.160.
Stela of the ihyt Tfnwt 3st-wrt (PP III, 7144), daughter of the imi
ist ḥṣk mn nrt sȝ pr-hd Inhr-šw a3 rˁ ḥm ntr ḫmnwt n hwt-ntr n ṭm
Inhr-nḥt (PP III, 5445) and the ihyt Tfnwt 3st-wrt (PP III, 7110).

Later Ptolemaic

Louvre C.117
Provenance unknown
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1278.
De Meulenaere, OIF 4 (1975) 77-83.
Totenstelen, 305.
Stela of the imi ṭst ḥṣk ḥm n sˁĳ ḥm n ṭb ... long series of epithets
... ḥm ntr p3 h3wt sˁĳ hwt-ntr n pr Inhr nb ṣḥyt (3 mḥw ṣw-nw (PP III,
5555), son of the mi ṭn ḫt (PP III, 5899) and the ihyt ṣw-Tfnwt ṭ3-nt-
imn (PP III, 7238).

Later Ptolemaic

Louvre C.239
Provenance unknown
Pierret, Recueil d'inscriptions II, 66-7.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1279.
Totenstelen, 294-5, fig.149.
Stela of the ihyt ṭnt-imntw ṭ3-h3rt, daughter of the imi ṭst ḥṣk ṭ3i-
mˁt bˁȝ-nḥt and ṭnty-rw, and her children the imi ṭst ḥṣk ṭ3i-mˁt bˁȝ-nḥt
and 3st-ir-di-st. Her husband ḫt is also named. See genealogy II.
c. 575 B.C.

Louvre C.232
Provenance unknown
Pierret, Recueil d'inscriptions II, 21-2.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2383.
Otto, Biographische Inschriften, 189-90, no.54.
TOTENSTELEN, 305, fig. 159.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 139-40, no. 12.

Stela of the ūn tš nBM n gm-pr nsw n sȝt n pȝ tȝt-ntr Wsīn
sȝ sȝn hry pr-hd sȝ 3 sȝ 4 hwt ntr n ṣbdw ṣȝ ntr 4 Imn-wṣr-pȝt ṣȝ ntr
4 Wsīn ṣȝ Pȝkr ṣȝ ntr n ṣḥt hry-ib ṣbdw Pȝ tȝt-hr-pȝ t-hrd, son of the
mtmr n ṣȝ nd ṣḥw-nḥṣ.

Later Ptolemaic

Louvre D.17
Provenance unknown
De Rouge, Notice des monuments (1880) 186-7.

Pyramidion of the ūn tš nBM ...

Louvre D.18
Provenance unknown
Pierret, Recueil d'inscriptions II, 17.
De Rouge, Notice des monuments (1880) 187.
Vandier, Manuel II, 523, fig. 306.

Pyramidion of the ṣḥt ūn iḏ nBM ṣȝ, who is perhaps the father of the
owner of MMA 21.2.66.

Sixth century B.C.

Louvre E.13067
Provenance unknown
TOTENSTELEN, 292.

Stela of the ūn ntr Pȝ tȝt-hrd, son of Pȝ tȝt-hrd

Mid-sixth century B.C.

Louvre E.13068
Provenance unknown
Totenstelen, 292.
Stela of the imi ist ḫsk ḫn3w (𓊳𓊨𓊷), son of ḫd-inḥr-iw.f-ı nb ḫn3w.

**Louvre E.13069**
Provenance unknown
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1067.

Mid-seventh century B.C.

Totenstelen, 268.
Stela of the it ntr ḫsir nb ḫ pr Imn Irti-r-t3i, son of the nbw pr Imn ḫr, son of the mi mn (3-tf-nḥt.

**Louvre E.14730**
Provenance unknown
Moret, Catalogue Guimet, 126-7, B.8, pl.LVIII.

Left door-jamb of the sš md3t ntr pr n ḫsir ḫ nb-hr-s3-3st, son of the mi ḫr sš md3t ntr ḫr, and his wife Dnit-(nt)-3st. See genealogy I.

**Louvre E.20091**
Provenance unknown
Moret, Catalogue Guimet, 74, C.38, pl.XXXIV.

Stela of Irti-rw, daughter of the hm ntr ṭpy wrw (? ḫr-s3-3st and ḫ3-hr.

**Louvre N.2722**
Provenance unknown
Totenstelen, 260.
Stela of Ḥr, daughter of the imi ist ḥak ... X and T3....
c. 620 B.C.

Lyon 1.E.328
Provenience unknown
Goyon, Kemi 18 (1968) 29-44.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 144, no. 26.

Stela of Ḥr, son of the wn-ḥmq n pt Wsir n 3bdw hm ntr 4 Skr hm ntr idnw st (?) 3ṣstt nbt hm hm ntr 3ṣmt imy-r wṭbw / 3ṣmt / imy-r ṣn Bw-irt-hr-rw and 3st-ḥṭl.
Paternal grandfather : the imy-r wṭbw 3ṣmt P3-ḥr-n-mhit, son of the it ntr mrt ntr m Ipt-swt Bw-irt-hr-rw, son of the imi ist Ns-inhr, son of B3-k-n-mwt, son of the man nṣrt Ns-inhr, son of Iḥr-ṣms, son of the ḥak Ḥr.
See Goyon, loc. cit., for the maternal line of descent.

Ptolemaic?

MCA 12
Nécropole du Nord

MCA 12.
Osiris statue dedicated by Ḫḏ-ḥp.

MCA 13
Nécropole du Nord

MCA 13.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2484.
Osiris statue dedicated by P3-ḥr, son of Pšmḥk.

MCA 380
Nécropole du Nord
MCA 380.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2480.
PM V, 60.

Sixth century B.C. ?

MCA 1309
Nécropole du Nord – Zone du Nord-Est

MCA 1309.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2482.

Rectangular stela of P3-di-hr, son of T3-šrit-nt-hr, according to Mariette. Lieblein makes μάκαρ保安 (3st-t3.s-nht ?), son of P3-di-hr and T3-šrit-nt-hr the owner.

MCA 1400
Nécropole du Centre – Versant de l’Est

MCA 1400.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2355.

Porphyry heart scarab of Hrw, son of Pth-ir-di-sw and Ht-ikrt.

MCA 1404
Nécropole du Nord – Zone du Sud-Est

MCA 1404.
Green jasper heart scarab of P3-di-ḫnsw.

MCA 1460
Nécropole du Nord

MCA 1460.
PM V, 61.
Canopic set of T3-hrt, daughter of T3-8rit-nt-b3stt.

This woman is probably to be identified with the T3-hrt, daughter of T3-8rit-nt-b3stt named on Cairo T.29/10/24/1, which dates the canopic set to c. 630 B.C.

Manchester 2965

Tomb B.330

El Arabah, 16, pl.XXIII.

Otto, Biographische Inschriften, 127, no.36.

Stela of the imi ist n Wt-Tfnwt m Thh hsk n Wair m 3bw hpt-md3t (var. mnn nart) Na-pr-nwb, son of the mi mn Dd-3st-iw.f-nh and T3-wrrt. His wife was Hrt, daughter of 'nh.f and Imnt.

The name of the dedicator was read as Nub by the excavator, who was followed in this by PM, Otto and Assman (Basa, 20, n.40). However, since N(w)b is only attested as a female name (PN I, 190, 3), and since the unattached title imy-r pr is not common at this period, I prefer to read the name as Na-pr-nwb (PM I, 176, 2).

The spelling of htp-di-nsw and the introductory formula itself - htp-di-nsw Wair nb DdW ntr (3 nb 3bw di Inhr ... Nh3 hrt-b idt di-sm - are archaising. The stela was dated to the Twenty-sixth Dynasty by Garstang and Otto, but the disposition of the hieroglyphs, with as many as five signs above each other, is characteristic of the late New Kingdom, and the absence of Nh as spelling of the name of Osiris suggests a date before c. 700 B.C.

C. 750 B.C.

Metropolitan Museum of Art (MMA) 21.2.66

Provenance unknown

De Meulenaere, JEO 20 (1967-8) 11, pl.V.

Pyramidion of the hsk imi ist hpt-md3t rh nsw lw.f-3, son of lhr and Rnpt-nfrt. See Louvre D.18.

Sixth century B.C.
Meux 50 B
Provenance unknown
Budge, Meux, 109, pl.LX.
PM V, 259.
Totenstelen, 274, fig.120.
Stela of Šânk, son of P3-šri-n-bšt.t.
c. 650 B.C.

Michaelides Coll., Cairo
Provenance unknown
Unpublished (cited by Munro, Totenstelen, 87, n.1).
Statue of P3-di-šst.
See genealogy I.
c. 600 B.C.

Munich 45
Provenance unknown
Dyroff and Portner, München, 48, pl.XXIII, no.36.
Totenstelen, 310.
Stela of Irt-hr-rw, son of Di-ḫr and T3-imn.
Late sixth century B.C.

Munich 47
Provenance unknown
Dyroff and Portner, München, 47, pl.XXIII, no.35.
Totenstelen, 288.
Stela on which Trri and her son P3-di-imn are depicted, although the
invocation is in favour of Na-p3-mššš, son of P3-di-bšt.t and Irt-hr-
hns (?).
Sixth century B.C.
Munich 49
Provenance: unknown
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1050.
Dyroff and Portner, München, 49 ff., pl.XXV, no.38.
Totenstelen, 294, fig.145.
Stela of the ḫak  ḫm  ḫt-ḫt-ỉt ỉtp ỉtr mh nmr ỉtr sỉ3 2 Pỉ-di-hr-pỉ-hrd. See genealogy III for family.
Sixth century B.C.

New Haven PM 6552
Tomb D.7
El Amrah, 85, pl.XXIII.3.
PM V, 68.
Stela fragment of the sm3ty ỉm hỉr ḫt-ỉt (? ỉtr sỉ3 ỉmr nỉt ỉty-ḥti-htp, son of the mỉ mn (var. sm3ty) ỉm-hỉr and the ỉtyt ỉmr ỉwt-htp.
Paternal grandfather: the mỉ mn ỉm-nỉr, son of the mỉ mn ỉty-ḥti-htp.
See genealogy XVIII.
Ptolemaic

New Haven PM 6593
Tomb D.7
El Amrah, 81, 85, pl.XXXV.2.
PM V, 68.
Sarcophagus of the sm3ty ỉt-mỉt (? ỉty-ḥti-htp, son of the sm3ty mỉ mn ỉm-hỉr and the ỉtyt ỉmr ỉwt-htp.
Paternal grandfather: the mỉ mn ỉm-nỉr.
See genealogy XVIII.
Ptolemaic

Osireion XIX
Side room of the Osireion
Murray, Osireion, 24, pl. XIX.
PM VI, 30.

Statuette of the it ntr //mrt ntr //h3k hry s3t3 'rk hh imy 3bd.f hry s3 2 s3 4 imy-st-t hry s3 tpy s3 2 w't Nsmt hry s3 2 hr-s3-3st, son of the mi nn Hr-nht, son of the mi nn Hr-s3-3st.

c. 700 B.C.

Oxford E. 3922
Pit of tomb D. 48
El Amrah, 79, 84, 94, 100, pl. XXXI.
Schäfer, ZÄS 43 (1906) 50.
LR IV, 64. 2.
Dunham and MacAdam, JEA 35 (1949) 146, no. 62.
De Meulenaere, Surnom, no. 17.
Totenstelen, 84, 262.

Stela of the iy1yt n Imn snt nsw s3t nsw mw1t dw3t ntr P3-3bt-t3-mri, beautiful name Hr.s-nipdyw.

Leclant (ZÄS 90 (1963) 76, n. 10) has convincingly demonstrated the linguistic equivalence of the names P3-3bt-t3-mri and P3-b(3)-t-m(3), but the actual identification of the two known individuals with these names is less certain. P-b-t-m is known only from Cairo JE 30223-3 above and Cairo CG 42198. In both cases, her name is written in a cartouche and her titles are hmt nsw and s3t nsw. P3-3bt-t3-mri, whose name is not in a cartouche, was not a royal wife and, although Leclant (BIFAO 51 (1952) 36, n. 2) adduces parallels for the omission of the cartouche and the title hmt nsw in the titularies of the royal family of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty, these are quite isolated and their absence remains an obstacle to the identification. P3-3bt-t3-mri was a princess and the (adoptive?) mother of a God's wife who, as MacAdam and Munro have both pointed out, is most likely to have been Amenirdis II. P3-3bt-t3-mri would, on this reckoning, be of the generation of Taharka and therefore the daughter of Piye.

c. 670 B.C. ?

Philadelphia U.M. 69. 29. 91

Debris overlying the "portal" of Ramesses II (Pennsylvania-Yale expedition 1969)

Unpublished
Fragmentary inscription mentioning an it ntr ḫsk ḫry sḏt3 ṟ√k hh /...

Philadelphia U.M. 69.29.126
Debris overlying the "portal" of Ramses II (Pennsylvania-Yale expedition 1969)
Unpublished
Upper part of a stela on which the deceased is depicted before the dd pillar, Osiris, Isis and Horus. The name of the dedicator is not preserved, but among his ancestors are a man called ḫ3 and his wife ḫm and another woman named Ti (?).
Second half of eight century B.C. ?

Philadelphia U.M. E.16133
Tomb G.61
Abydos I, 39, 49, pl.LXXV,1, LXXX.
Buhl, Sarcophagi, 137-9, 1 6.
PM V, 75.
Sarcophagus of the ḫm3 Ṁwt ḫpt nṣrt ṣk ḫs ḫb ḫt nb(t) ḫm ntr 3 n Ṁwt Ṁt bḥ ḫm ntr ḫr Ṣp-mn (PP III, 5855). See genealogy XVII.
Later Ptolemaic

Pittsburgh, Carnegie Institute 1917,472
Cemetery G
El Amrah, 85, pl.XXXVI.2.
PM V, 76 (numbered 2231/3).
Sarcophagus of the ḫḥt Ṣnt-imnṭw ḫḥt-t3 3-a-nḥt (PP III, 7143), daughter of the ḫsk ḫm ntr Ṣḏt bḥ ḫy-ḥb 3bdw ḫr (PP III, 5900) and the ḫḥt Ṣnt-imnṭw Ṣḏt-wrt (PP III, 7109).
Later Ptolemaic
Pittsburgh, Carnegie Institute 4210/13

Found over tomb R.1

CA II, 111, no.1, fig.64, pl.XXVI.5.
PM V, 71.

Lower part of the stela of Wn-nfr, son of P3-irw-n-ḥr and K3ws, daughter of ʿmwt3 (?)

Ptolemaic

Reading E.23.2

Abydos - Garstang 1036.A.09.4

Unpublished

Stela of Srp and his son the Ṭkr ḫrt-ḥr-rw.

For Ṭkr as an ethnic designation, see Mb. V, 410.15.

c. 670 B.C.

Rio de Janeiro 2462

Provenance unknown

Childe, Quia das Colleccoes, 43.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 135 no.6, 142 no.15, 145 no.31.

False-door stela of the hm ntr Wsir ʿmy 3bd pr Wsir s3 l 2 3 4 Dd-inhr-ʾw.f-ʿnh, son of the hm ntr Wsir P3-di-ḥr-p3-ḥrd. Four sons - the hm ntr Wsir hm ntr 2 Wsir ḫr, ʾw.f-ʿ3, Ṣn-ḥp ḫtp and ḫr (all hm ntr Wsir) - and three daughters are apparently also named.

Suṭe? (De Meulenaere)

Rochdale

Area of the 'Tombs of the Courtiers'

TC, 12, pl.XXII.6.
PM V, 56.

Stela of the hm ntr Ṣntw-dt-wt3 (?), son of the Ṣn mn ḫr and the Ṣnt-ʾmnty Ṣnt-dw-ḥrp. Paternal grandfather: the Ṣn mn Ṣnt-dw-tfmt.

Late sixth century B.C.
Salford (Ordsall Hall Museum)
Provenance unknown
Edwards, RT 10 (1888) 121-2.
Stela of Impt-nf rt, daughter of the imi 1st hsk hpt-wd3t rh nsw imy 3bd.f hry s5 2 Wd3-pr and lirty-rw.
The published copy is faulty in a number of points, including the direction of the is sign.

Stela of the Itn-nt-imtiw Nf rt-it (PP III, 7165).
Mid-sixth century B.C.

South Kensington
Tomb G.58
Abydos I, 40, 49, pl.LXXV, LXXX.
PM V, 75.
Sarcophagus of the Imn't Itn-imtiw Nf rt-it (PP III, 7165).
Ptolemaic

Stockholm NME 58
Provenance unknown
Mogensen, Stèles égyptiennes, 68-9 with bibliography.
Stela of the Itn-nt-imtiw T3w-n-k3m (?), daughter of the imi 1st
hsk P3.f-3w-<wy-nt and T3-<3t.
Mid-sixth century B.C.

Stockholm NME 62
Provenance unknown
Mogensen, Stèles égyptiennes, 70-2 with bibliography.
Stela of the rh nsw Ynsw-ir-di-sw, son of Hrwr and 3st-ir-di-st.
Sixth century B.C.

Sydney, Nicholson Museum 36 and 25,37
Abydos – Frankfort 1925–6/181–2
Frankfort, JEA 14 (1928) 244-5, no.20.
PM V, 65.

Lintel and jamb of P3.f-hry-ntr, son of Trḥy, and his wife Ṣp-n-ḥr, daughter of Irḫ-ḥr-rw.

Seventh century B.C.?

Trieste 7
Provenance unknown
Dolzani, Monumenti egiziani, 10-11.
Dolzani, Aegyptus 30 (1950) 226-8, no.8, fig.8.
De Meulenaere, JEDL 20 (1957-8) 4.


C. 575 B.C.

Turin 1528
Provenance unknown
Rossi, Fabretti, and Lanzone, Regio Museo Torino I, 144.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1293 and 2474.
Totenstelen, 297, fig.152.

Stela of the b3k mnḥ n Wsir-Wn-nfr irr ḥr ḫr Ṣt n Ṣst nṯrt Irḫ-ḥr-rw, son of the imi ʾst ḫsk ḫpt-wd3ṯ ṣḥ Ṣnw ḏd-ḥr and Ṣst-ḥt-ḥḥ.
Maternal grandfather: the imi ʾst ḫsk Ṣn-ḥmn.

C. 585 B.C.

Turin 1532
Provenance unknown
Rossi, Fabretti, and Lanzone, Regio Museo Torino I, 145.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1292 and supplement, 982.

Stela of Dmt-nṯ-ṣṭ, daughter of the imi ʾst ḫsk ḫpt-wd3ṯ ṣḥ Ṣnw Pṣmḥḥk and Irṭy-rw. See genealogy I.

C. 550 B.C.
Turin 1538
Provenance unknown
Rossi, Fabretti, and Lanzone, Regio Museo Torino I, 146-7.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1302 and supplement, 982.
De Meulenaere, DLP 6-7 (1975-6) 136-7 no.9, 146 no.33.
Stela of the hm ntr Wsir m 3bdw hr y sš3-3t c'rk hh it ntr ntr ntr imi
ist hšk (var. hm ntr Wsir) tnh-hr-sš3-3št, son of the hm ntr 3 Wsir
Dd-3št-šw-f-šnh, his son the hm ntr Wsir sš pr-hd Wsir Dd-3št-šw-f-
šnh, his wife Tš-hmr-št-rw and his daughter Gšwt-sšn, dedicated by
his son, the hm ntr Wsir m 3bdw Nš-pš-kš-šwty. See genealogy I.
c. 675 B.C.

Turin 1557
Provenance unknown
Rossi, Fabretti, and Lanzone, Regio Museo Torino I, 152-3.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1304 and supplement, 982.
Maspero, RT 4 (1883) 151, XLVII.
De Meulenaere, DLP 6-7 (1975-6) 139, no.11.
Stela of the imi ist hšk Pš-tšw-šw-mšw, son of the hm ntr 3 Wsir
Pš-n-tššt, and his wife Sšw, daughter of the hm ntr sš tššt Pš-di-ašš-
ššt, and their son šš-hr-sš3-ššt.
c. 660 B.C.

Turin 1632
Provenance unknown
Rossi, Fabretti, and Lanzone, Regio Museo Torino I, 178.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1029.
Totenstelen, 261, fig.98.
Stela of šš-pš-n-wšt, daughter of the hm ntr tpy n Išn Wškn and Tš-n,...
This Osorkon cannot certainly be identified with the only known High
Priest of Amun of that name (Kitchen, TIP, 480) and is otherwise un-
attested.
c. 700 B.C.
Vatican 128
Provenance unknown
Botti and Romanelli, Sculpture, 79-83, pl.LXI with bibliography.
Stela of the imi ist ḫmr n št P3-Šri-n-t3-iḥt (PP III, 5838), son of the imi ist ḫmr ṅg-hr-p3-hrd (PP III, 5449) and Wrt-tfinš. For the others named on this stela, see the publication cited.

The reading of the owner's name proposed here seems to me preferable to the otherwise unattested P3-Šri-(n)-ṣr (?) suggested by Ranke (PN I, 119, 5) and adopted by Botti and Romanelli. The father's name, written ḫmr n št, might also be read as ṅg-p3.iḥt.

Late Ptolemaic

Vienna 119
Provenance unknown
Von Bergman, RT 9 (1887) 49, no.23.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1247.
Totensteilen, 299-300.

Stela of the imi ist ḫsk ḫpt-w3št ṭḥš nsw imy  ComponentFixture 3bd ḫry s3 4 ṅs-imn, son of the ṣmn P3-di-ṣa and ṅs-hwtbr.
Paternal grandfather: the ṣmn ṅs-imn, son of the ṣmn ṅg-p3.iḥt.

C. 575 B.C.

Vienna 138
Provenance unknown
Von Bergman, RT 9 (1887) 48, no.19.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 879 and supplement, 974.
Wressinski, Inschriften I, 18, no.146.
Totensteilen, 270.

Stela of the gwt n pr R Ḥ P3-bs, his father ḫpt-wṣir and his wife ṣp-n-smḥt.

C. 640 B.C.
Vienna 157

Provenance unknown

Von Bergman, RT 12 (1892) 18-22, no.22.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2411.
Totenstelen, 262, fig.96.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 136, no.9.

Stela of the hm ntr Wair hm ntr $N3-Tmwt (var. imi ist $hsk / hm ntr Wair hpt-wd3t it ntr n $r-s3-3st imy 3bd hry s3 3) $N3-p3-k3-3wty, son of the mi nn 'm3-hr-s3-3st and the $m3t n Wair T3-hmwt-hpt-rw. See further genealogy I.

c. 650 B.C.

Vienna 189

Provenance unknown

Von Bergman, RT 7 (1886) 192, no.16.
Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2346.
Wreszinski, Inschriften I, 24, 81-4, no.147.
De Meulenaere, OdA 38 (1963) 74 a.
Totenstelen, 295, fig.148.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 138-9, no.10.

Stela of the imi ist $hsk (var. $hk imi ist) hpt-wd3t rh nsw (var. rh s3 nsw ?) hm ntr 'nati hm ntr w33t m 3bdw Rr, son of the mi nn $amtk and the ibyt hpt-3m&t $N3-3st, daughter of the imi ist $hsk hpt-wd3t rh s3 nsw kmw and T3-y'w-n-b33tt, daughter of the hm ntr 3m-nm3 nsw ntr y3ty $N3-p3-k3-3wty.

Paternal grandfather : imi ist $hsk hpt-wd3t rh nsw hm ntr 3 hm ntr 2 s3 s3n hry s3 tpy s3 2 hm ntr $r tm3 s3 htm ntr Rr, son of the mi nn $N3-p3-k3-3wty.

See genealogy II.

c. 560 B.C.

Vienna 5103

Provenance unknown

Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 2412.
Wreszinski, Inschriften I, 25, 85-93, no.150.
Otto, Biographische Inschriften, 188-9, no.53.
De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 139-40, no.12.
Stela of the ḫm n 'iit sš nsw m ḫt-ntr Wsir sš sḥm hry ṣ-rd 3 ḫt-ntr 3bdw hm ntr 4 ḫm ntr 4 ḫm ntr 4 Wsir ḫw-ḥd hm ntr Wsir ḫw-ḥd, son of the ḫm n 'iit sš nsw ḫt-ntr-hr-p3-hrd and ḫt-hyd.

See further genealogy XIV.

Later Ptolemaic
Genealogy I

Sources:
1. Cairo JE 30435
2. Fitzwilliam E.SS.47
3. Hannover 1935.200.210
4. Cairo JE 30434
5. Commerce block
6. Turin 1558
7. Vienna 157
8. Louvre E.14730
9. BM 66843
10. Cairo T.5/1/15/13
11. Cairo T.15/3/25/6
12. Amherst 1921.VI
13. Aix-en-Provence 12
14. Turin 1532

Five generations

For the genealogy to be derived from numbers 4 and 7, see Totenstelen, 85. De Meulenaere has discussed separately the links between nos. 1, 4, 6 and 7 (OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 136-7), and those between 8, 10, 11 and 12 (ibid., 142, 144, 147 and JBOL 20 (1967-8) 9, 17. He has promised an
article on the family of P3-di-3st III (OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 142, n.56).

This genealogy is of the utmost importance for the chronology of Abydos in the Late Period - not only is it by far the longest, covering most of the Late Period proper and stretching back into the Third Intermediate period, but it is also one of only two that can be directly attached to an absolute date. It is therefore vital that the genealogy should be sound and that the link between what have hitherto always been treated as two quite separate groups of documents should be justified. The suggested relationship between hr and nh-hr-s3-3st I, which is indicated by a broken line, is not thus far attested on any monuments but it is supported by the following considerations:

1. The same names - Ankhhorsaese, Nesnubhotep and Piediese - occur in both groups.

2. The title of md3t ntr pr Wsir, which is hereditary in at least one branch of each group, is not attested in any other Late Period documents from Abydos. It is therefore virtually certain that the two groups are connected.

That the particular link suggested is correct is probable, because it provides an instance of the common pattern of grandparent and grandchild bearing the same name, and because it fits perfectly with the dates arrived at by Munro for no.12 above. It should be emphasised, however, that the proposed filiation does not affect the chronology. If proved, it would merely be a welcome confirmation of an already
of an already established chronological sequence. This is founded on stela Cairo JE 30434, on which the deceased, who is depicted offering to Osiris and to a king Usermaatre Takeloth, is described as ḫey ḫr nb ḫwy ḫrti mꜣḥ-w. Kitchen has recently demonstrated that this king should be regarded as Takeloth III (TTP, para. 77), and if the epithet mꜣẖ-w be taken at face value, the stela should date to shortly after his death, which Kitchen now places in c. 757 B.C. (Bierbrier, LNK, x). A date of c. 750 B.C. for this stela, and a calculation based on twenty-five years per generation, results in the following sequence of inscriptions:

c. 800 Cairo JE 30435; Fitzwilliam E.SS.47; Hannover 1935.200.210

c. 750 Cairo JE 30434; Commerce block

c. 675 Turin 1538

c. 650 Vienna 157

c. 625 Louvre E.14730

c. 600 BM 66843; Cairo T.5/1/15/13; Cairo T.15/3/25/6

c. 575 Amherst 1921.VI

c. 550 Aix-en-Provence 12; Turin 1532

One of the problems of calculating by generation is illustrated by the fact that one of Nesnubhotep I's great-grandsons, Ankhhorase II, married one of his great-great-granddaughters. The period between Nesnubhotep I and this marriage thus comprises two and four generations.
respectively in the different branches. The only solution in such a case is to take the average and allow three generations or seventy-five years. With a high mortality rate in childbirth, the marriage of an elderly widower to a much younger wife would probably have been common.

The dating of the second group of monuments centres on the stela Amherst 1921.VI, dated by Munro to c. 580-70 B.C., on the basis of an unpublished statue of P3-di-3st III which he dates to c. 600 B.C. (Totenstelen, 87). This dating is amply confirmed by the epigraphic evidence, and provides dates for the other monuments which coincide precisely with those required by the proposed filiation.
This genealogy is confined to the documents from Abydos. For the Theban and Akhmim branches of the Nespakashuty family, see Parker, SOP, 15, De Meulenaere, Cér 38 (1963) 76 and Munro, Totenstelen, 87, 89, 119. Parker, however, confuses the whole issue by inserting a second Nes-pamedu into the genealogy.

The crucial question is the identity of the Vizier Nespakashuty who is named as the father of a woman called Takhausenbast on nos. 10
The only woman of this name whose genealogical position is known with certainty is the wife of Nespakashuty I, (De Meulenaere, op. cit. 74 b.), to whom the ushabtis and coffin fragments from tomb D.57 should probably be attributed. The name of her father is unknown but her high date makes it impossible that she should be the woman in question. Indeed, it is by no means certain that the same person is referred to, especially as she has a different husband on the two stelae. De Meulenaere, who established the sequence Nespakashuty I – Nespeamedu – Nespakashuty II, and Parker assumed that the Vizier of BM 1333 was the elder Nespakashuty, while Munro felt unable to commit himself to a date within the period c. 620–570 B.C. The later form of ḫḥ makes it more likely that the reference is to the younger Nespakashuty, and that the stela therefore dates to c. 585 B.C., although if, as Munro suggests, it is copied from a Theban original, then a date c. 635 B.C. and a reference to the elder Nespakashuty cannot be entirely excluded (see p.56-8).

Munro shows that the Vizier of Vienna 189 must be the younger of the two, and this is confirmed by the later forms of ḫḥ and hpt-wdjt.

The absolute date of this genealogy is derived from Pap. Brooklyn 47.218.3, dated to year 14 of Psammetichus I (651 B.C.), in which Nespakashuty the younger was already in office. We have no means of knowing when he succeeded his father, but viziers were
usually elderly men when they attained this office and their tenure was consequently brief (Kitchen, _TIP_, 484). On the assumption that Nespakashuty II had only just become Vizier in 651 B.C. and allowing him a maximum of fifteen years in office, he cannot have died later than c. 635 B.C.. On this basis, the following sequence of monuments can be established:

c. 685  Chicago OIM 6332-3, 6335-7; Glasgow 13.176

c. 660  El Amrah XXXV.7; Berlin 2090; Bolton 36.01.34

c. 635  Chicago OIM 5740-50; Garstang 200.A.07.1

c. 610  Cairo JE 18520

c. 585  BM 1333; Cairo CG 22126; Cairo CG 22178

c. 560  Vienna 189
Sources: 1. Glasgow Hunterian D.1926.2
2. EM 338
3. Munich 49

The connection between nos. 1 and 3 has been made by Munro (Totenstelen, 89-90), while De Meulenaere has suggested the link between all three monuments (OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 146). The fact that the earlier form of is occurs on no.1, and the later form on nos. 2 and 3, makes it possible to date these inscriptions very closely, to c. 625, 600 and 575 B.C respectively.
Genealogy IV

Sources: 1. Cairo CG 22163
2. Cairo JE 34605
3. Guimet C.32

\[ (1;2,3) \text{Hr} \quad \text{T3-dit-(3st-hb)} \quad (1,3) \]

\[ (1,3) \text{P3-di-wsir} \quad \text{Hr} \quad (2) \]

The identification of the owner of nos. 1 and 3 as the same man was suggested by Munro (Totenstelen, 289) and De Meulenaere (OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 149, nos. 46-7). The latter also suggested that the Hr of the three stelae was the same man, and that Hr and P3-di-wsir were therefore brothers. This is confirmed by the epigraphic evidence, which places the contemporaneity of 1 and 2 beyond doubt (the reversal of both \( \Delta \) and \( \mathbf{C} \) occurs on the two stelae). The name of the mother is abbreviated for reasons of space to T3-dit on no. 3. It should be noted that, space Munro and De Meulenaere, the title held by Hr is only sht and not hry sht.
Genealogy V

Sources: 1. Belfast 421
2. Leningrad 2260

De Meulenaere (JSL, 20 (1967-8) 7) has already suggested a connection between the people named on the two objects, but without being specific. The proposed genealogy has the merit of providing two instances of the very common pattern of grandparent and grandchild with the same name. On no.1, all the men have the titles imi ist ħak, whereas no.2 gives Rwrw and Rr I the additional title of imy 3bd ħry s3 3. Iri-iri I was an ihyt ħnt-imntw and P3-di-hr-p3-hrd bore the unusual title of ħnty, for which see below, p.223. The stela Belfast 421 is thus two generations later than the pyramidion Leningrad 2260, but it is very difficult to arrive at an absolute date.
Sources: 1. Leiden VII.11  
2. Trieste 7

\[
\begin{array}{c}
& 'nh-p3.f-hr \\
Dd-inhr- iw.f-'nh \\
Wsb-imn-it.f & Iw.f- (3) \\
(1,2) & Kyf \\
& T3-hnmt (1,2) \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
Nfrt-i3wt & Ne-nwb- htp-hmt (1,2) \\
\end{array}
\]

Kyf Hr-wd3 Hr-hb Pdt Wn-nfr Hr-tw T3-hnmt 3st-ir-di-st

Except where indicated, individuals are known only from the Leiden stela. The genealogy, set out by Munro, Totenstelen, 294 (but without reference to the Trieste pyramidion and omitting Pdt) is also discussed by De Meulenaere, OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 133-4.
The relationship of these men was pointed out by De Meulenaere (OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 149, no. 45). The provenance of neither object is known, but the title of hry sht pr Wsir, held by all three men, clearly points to Abydos. The spelling of the name of Re as on no. 2 dates both inscriptions to c.650 B.C..
Sources: 1. Cairo JE 91219
2. Cairo JE 91261
3. Abydos 67.661

Warkin (3)
Rdi-infr (1, 2)

Exc ept where indicated, individuals are named only on no.1. The rarity of the name suggests that the Satnub of Abydos 67.661 should be identified with the daughter of Rdi-infr. The name of her father is not preserved on the coffin fragments, but he held the title of Im nfr Imn sr knt nfr n Im m Ipt-swt. Another fragmentary sequence mentions the ... Imn-r f ntrw ntrw amry-r Smt ... Warkin. Since the latter cannot be her father if Rdi-infr is so identified, it may be tentatively suggested that he is her grandfather. The very name Osorkon, which is characteristic of the Third Intermediate Period, suggests that such a relationship is appropriate. For the origins of the family, see below, p.239-40, and for the date, p.128-9.
The relationship of P3-miw and T3-šrit-nt-b3stt is nowhere expressed, but the juxtaposition of the two lineages on either side of a false-door stela makes it probable that they were married.
Genealogy X

Sources: 1. Cairo CG 70028
         2. Cairo JE 3476
         3. Cairo T.25/10/24/15

\[
(1,2,3) \cdot \text{Irt-hr-rw} \quad 3st-ir-di-st (1,3) \\
(1,2,3) \text{Hr} \quad T3-nht-n-pr-3st (1,2,3)
\]

No. 3 tells us that \text{Hr} was the son of \text{Irt-hr-rw} and \text{3st-ir-di-st}, but although \text{T3-nht-n-pr-3st} is named, her relationship to the others is not indicated. On no. 1, however, she is named as the wife of \text{Hr}. The reading of her name is certain despite the different writings.

On CG 70028, the groups \text{pr} and \text{3st} are reversed for graphic reasons.

On T.25/10/24/15, Munro's reading \text{T3-nht-n-pr (?)} is explained by the fact that the final element of the name has been lost in the worn final column of the inscription, while Mariette's copy of JE 3476 is inaccurate.

According to Mariette, no. 1 is from the 'Nécropole du Centre', and nos. 2 and 3 from the 'Nécropole du Nord', but this may well be erroneous since all three objects belong to the same man.
Sources: 1. Cairo CG 70028  
2. Cairo JE 3476  
3. Cairo T.25/10/24/15

\[(1,2,3) \text{Irt-}hr-\text{rw} \quad 3\text{st-ir-di-st} (1,3) \]
\[(1,2,3) Hr \quad T3-nht-n-pr-3st (1,2,3) \]

No.3 tells us that Hr was the son of Irt-hr-rw and 3st-ir-di-st, but although T3-nht-n-pr-3st is named, her relationship to the others is not indicated. On no.1, however, she is named as the wife of Hr. The reading of her name is certain despite the different writings.

On CG 70028, the groups pr and 3st are reversed for graphic reasons. On T.25/10/24/15, Munro's reading T3-nht-n-pr (?) is explained by the fact that the final element of the name has been lost in the worn final column of the inscription, while Mariette's copy of JE 3476 is inaccurate.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{CG 70028} & \text{T.25/10/24/15} & \text{JE 3476} \\
\end{array}
\]

According to Mariette, no.1 is from the 'Nécropole du Centre', and nos. 2 and 3 from the 'Nécropole du Nord', but this may well be erroneous since all three objects belong to the same man.
Sources: 1. Cairo CG 70028  
2. Cairo JE 3476  
3. Cairo T.25/10/24/15

\[
\begin{array}{c}
(1,2,3) \text{Irt-hr-rw} & 3\text{st-ir-di-st (1,3)} \\
(1,2,3) \text{Hr} & T3-nht-n-pr-3st (1,2,3)
\end{array}
\]

No.3 tells us that Hr was the son of Irt-hr-rw and 3st-ir-di-st, but although T3-nht-n-pr-3st is named, her relationship to the others is not indicated. On no.1, however, she is named as the wife of Hr. The reading of her name is certain despite the different writings.

On CG 70028, the groups pr and 3st are reversed for graphic reasons.

On T.25/10/24/15, Munro's reading T3-nht-n-pr (?) is explained by the fact that the final element of the name has been lost in the worn final column of the inscription, while Mariette's copy of JE 3476 is inaccurate.

According to Mariette, no.1 is from the 'Nécropole du Centre', and nos. 2 and 3 from the 'Nécropole du Nord', but this may well be erroneous since all three objects belong to the same man.
These pieces of papyrus and cartonnage are so fragmentary that the genealogy can only be tentative. All that is clear from no.1 is that ‘nh-p3.f-hr was the son of T3-h3rt, and therefore the owner of no.2, pace De Meulenaere (OLP 6-7 (1975-6) 135-6) who takes T3i-m‘b3-nht I as the owner. A man named Rwrw is mentioned on no.1, but his relationship to the others is not clear. (The names T3-h3rt and T3i-m‘b3-nht also occur on stela Louvre C.229, and are probably related to the above family, although the precise relationship cannot be established).
Genealogy XII

Sources: 1. Cairo CG 22054
          2. Cairo T.13/1/21/4
          3. Fitzwilliam E.48.1901

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Hr-wn-nfr (1)} \\
(1,2,3) \text{ Hr-hb} \quad \text{T3-imnt (1,2,3)} \\
\text{Hwnw (2)} \quad \text{T3i (1)} \quad \text{X (3)}
\end{array} \]

The connection between 1 and 2 was noted by De Meulenaere, RdE 12 (1955) 71, n.5. Although the name of the owner of no.3 is lost, the name of the mother is the same, while that of the father begins \( \text{Hr-...} \) (this is not shown in the published drawing of the inscription). This, the fact that nos.2 and 3 were found together, and the otherwise unattested title of \( \text{hm ntr Hr-p3-R} \) which is held by Hwnw and the father of the unknown owner of no.3, put the identification beyond doubt.
Sources: 1. Abydos I, LXXII and LXXIII
2. BM 37339
3. Brussels E.487

The genealogy is as established by Petrie. It depends on the assumption that the woman whose name is here rendered T₃₂₃ s-nht, also had the variants Hwth-r₃₂₃ s-nht and Whit₃₂₃ s-nht (see Abydos I, LXXIII, B and C).
Sources: 1. Louvre C.232
2. Vienna 5103

The genealogy, omitting Hr-wd3, was set out by Munro, Totenstelen, 305.
This genealogy was set out by De Meulenaere, CdE 29 (1954) 225. Another woman, called Ns-nwm-'w3yt, is named as the mother of Hr-t3.f-nht, and De Meulenaere identified her with N3-nfrw-iiit, albeit tentatively. It remains possible that the two women are distinct and that both were wives of Dd-inhr-iw.f-’nh II. For examples of brothers with the same name, see Crawford, Kerkeosiria, 138.
Sources:
1. Bolton 53.02
2. BM 37330
3. Cairo JE 6288
4. Cairo T.3/3/21/5
5. Chicago OIM 7142

For the Antaeopolite origins of this family, the occupants of tomb G.50, see below, p.245-6.
Sources: 1. Abydos I, LXXIX
2. Philadelphia U.M. E.16133
3. Cairo JE 36492

(1,2,3) Hp-an  —  Mrt-tfwnw (3)
X (3)

The name of Hp-an is only partly preserved on no. 3 (𓊬𓊳𓈎𓅱𓊳𓈎𓊬𓊳𓈎), but the similarity between the titles on this and no. 2 (especially the title of third prophet of Mut, lady of Megeb, which is otherwise unattested at Abydos) makes it highly likely that the restoration is correct, and that the father of the dedicator of no. 3 should be identified with the owner of nos. 1 and 2. Although the provenance of no. 3 is unknown, the fact that it is dedicated to Osiris-Khentamentiu, "great god, lord of Abydos", together with the known provenance of the other objects (tomb G.61), makes it likely that it too is from Abydos. For the Antaeopolite origin of the family, see below, p. 245-6.
Genealogy XVIII

Sources: 1. El Amrah D.7.B
2. El Amrah XLI
3. New Haven 6552
4. New Haven 6593
5. Chicago PM 31269) These inscriptions are from Akhmim.
6. Hildesheim 1874

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Hnty-hti-htp I (1)} \\
(1,2,5,6) \text{ Na-mmw} & \quad \text{T3-Err-t-nr-mnh} (5) \\
(1,2,3,4,5,6) \text{ Na-hr} & \quad \text{Mwt-htp (1,2,3,4,6)} \\
(6) \text{ Na-mmw} & \quad \text{Hnty-hti-htp} & \quad \text{P3-di-p3-wn-hrf (3)} \\
& & \quad (1,2,4)
\end{align*}
\]

This genealogy, with the exception of P3-di-p3-wn-hrf, was set out by De Meulenaere in CdE 44 (1969) 230. The titles of the family are absolutely typical of Akhmim, and pace De Meulenaere (op. cit., 19), its origins must be sought at Akhmim. It is only two brothers of the fourth generation, Hnty-hti-htp and P3-di-p3-wn-hrf, who are buried at Abydos.
The Priesthood of Abydos

The inscriptions tell us nothing about the actual functions of particular priestly offices, and the following discussion is concerned solely with the identification of those titles and combinations of titles which are characteristic of Abydos. By far the most common of these is a sequence which, in its fullest form, comprises

\[ \text{imi ist ħsk hpt-wdšt and rh nsw.} \]

Imi ist, which first appears at Abydos in the Nineteenth Dynasty, 1 designates the cult official of Shu-Tefnut at This 2 and is effectively equivalent to hm ntr Ṣw-Tfnwt. 3 Its connection with these deities is emphasised by its occurrence at Sebennytos and Heliopolis, where they were also worshipped, 4


2. See De Meulenaere, CdE 29 (1954) 227, n.3. In full the title is Ṣw-Tfnwt - see Kees, ZÄS 73 (1937) 89, MCA 1144, and Kamal, Tables d'offrandes, Cairo CG 23095, for New Kingdom examples. For the Late Period, see BM 1132 (see p.58, n.86), Cairo T.6/7/24/11, Commerce block and Vienna VII.1-4 (W. Wreszinski, Aegyptische Inschriften aus dem K.K. Hofmuseum in Wien, (Leipzig 1906) 181). It is sometimes specified as imi ist (n) Ṣw-Tfnwt m ħnl - Manchester 2965 and Assman, Basa, 13.

3. De Meulenaere, loc. cit.. Imi ist and hm ntr Ṣw-Tfnwt alternate on Cairo T.18/2/25/2 and Vienna 157, while on Louvre C.107 one finds hm ntr Ṣw-Tfnwt precisely where one would expect imi ist - i.e. before ħsk.

4. De Meulenaere, loc. cit..
but it is found, too, at Memphis, Thebes and frequently at Akhmim.

The second title, ḥsk, denotes a priest of Osiris at Abydos, and, like imi ist, it was current from the Nineteenth Dynasty to the Ptolemaic period. At Abydos the two are usually found together, although they occasionally occur separately. For most of the Late Period, imi ist precedes ḥsk, but this order is reversed in a few cases in the sixth century and the Ptolemaic period. The fact that ḥsk alone appears in the Denderah list of priests of the


6. For the title at Thebes and Akhmim, see below, p. 214.

7. De Meulenaere, loc. cit., 228, n.2. Fuller forms are ḥsk n Wsir (Cairo JE 91258), ḥsk m 3bdw (BM 1132 and Vienna VII.4 – see n.1 above), and ḥsk n Wsir m 3bdw (Commerce block, Manchester 2965 and Assman, Saga, 18).

8. See Gauthier, Personnel, 68.

9. The same is true of their occurrence elsewhere with reference to the Thinite cults. Imi ist occurs alone at Memphis and in Lower Egypt, as well as occasionally at Akhmim and elsewhere (see nn.4-5 above and n.27 below and Mallet, RT 18 (1896) 11-12), while ḥsk, which is not attested north of Akhmim, occurs without imi ist at Thebes (tomb 128 : Schenkel, MDAIK 31 (1975) pl.46), Edfu (Philadelphia U.M. E.29.86.422 : Totenstelen, 249, fig.80), and Akhmim (Cairo CG 22087 and CG 23124 : Kamal, Statues and Tables d'offrandes respectively), where it is not certain that the reference is to the Abydene cult.

10. See the title index for the occurrences of the two together and alone. ḥsk occurs notably in the sequence it ntr mrt ntr ḥsk hry sȝt3 ʿrḵ hh (Brussels E.567, Osireion XIX and Philadelphia U.M. E.69.29.91). Cf. ḥsk hry sȝt3 ʿrḵ hh on Cairo JE 30434.

11. See title index under ḥsk.
Thinite nome is probably not significant, as the list appears to be unrepresentative. 12

These two alone may constitute the whole titulary of an individual, but more often they are merely the beginning of the sequence. The title most frequently found in conjunction with them is ḫḥt-wḏ3t, 13 which at Abydos only occurs after ḫḥt-šḥk. 14 It is never explicitly linked to a deity there, 15 although elsewhere it is attached to the cults of Ṝn, Neith and especially Mut. 16 Goyon is quite wrong in saying that it is found "le plus souvent sur des stèles en provenance d'Akhmim en rapport avec Ṝn". 17 It is not particularly common at Akhmim, and a statistical comparison would

12. Mariette, Denderah IV (abbreviated MD), (Paris 1874) 33 = BDG 1375. Of the seven titles listed - ḫkti Ṝmi sḥty, Ḫk, Ḫbk, ḫḥt Ṝ3, Ṝr ḫh't, Ṣḥy- and Ṣnw-št3w - only the first four are actually attested at Abydos, and of these, only Ṣḥk is common.

13. Goyon, BIFA 65 (1967) 93, mm.2-6. Goyon's statement that the title does not occur before the Twenty-sixth Dynasty is refuted by his own references (mm.4 and 6) to Pap. Lansing 13 b, 7 = R. Caminos, Late Egyptian Miscellanies, (Oxford 1954) 423.

14. It is normally found immediately after these (i.e. third in the sequence), but on Durham N.1977 it is preceded by Ṣnw nsrt, and in three Ptolemaic inscriptions by Ṣnw Ṣnw (Cairo CG 22054, Fitzwilliam E.48.1901 and Liverpool M.13996). Its position elsewhere varies considerably.

15. De Neulensere (BIFA 62 (1964) 164, n.8) has suggested that it was probably connected with the cult of Tefnut at this by confusion or assimilation with Mut via Hathor/Sekhmet.

16. See Goyon, loc. cit. for references.

17. Ibid. In only one case is the ḫḥt-wḏ3t specifically connected with the cult of Ṝn (Cairo CG 22030).
certainly show that it is to be found much more often in inscriptions from Abydos and Thebes. 18

These three titles constitute the basic seventh century sequence, to which other titles, such as rmn nart 19 or ch3 wr, 20 are occasionally added. In the late seventh century, rh nsw, which occurs sporadically earlier but in no fixed position, becomes the standard fourth title in the sequence. 21

Our ignorance of the sacerdotal hierarchy is the biggest hindrance to a useful discussion of these titles. Despite the work of Kees, Gauthier and others, 22 little is known about the functions

18. The following thirteen examples from Akhmim are known to me (see Kamal, Stèles for those in Cairo, and Totenstelen for the rest): Berkeley 689, BM 624, BM 1018, BM 1275, BM 1306, Cairo CG 22030, CG 22093, CG 22141 and CG 22209, Guimet C.43, Louvre C.291, PP III 5428, Bouriant, RT 8 (1836) 60 and Kees, RT 36 (1914) 53-5. Nearly half of these (those in the British Museum, Berkeley 689 and Cairo CG 22141) belong to members of a family which had very strong links with Abydos – see Totenstelen, 118. Almost four times as many (47) are known from Abydos – see title index.

19. De Meulenaere, loc. cit., 229. This title is usually only held at Abydos by those who were also imi ist ḫsk. See Durham K.1977 (where it precedes hpt-wdšt), Leiden VII.9, Leningrad 1066, Louvre C.116 (after imi ist ḫsk), Manchester 2965 (fourth after imi ist ḫsk hpt-wdšt) and Louvre C.107 (where it is second after ḫsk).

20. Assman, Basa, 20, n.47. In all but one of the known examples (BM 699, Cairo CG 22210, Cairo T.26/10/24/1 and T.18/2/25/2, Fitzwilliam E.259,1900 and Louvre C.110) this title is associated with imi ist ḫsk. The exception is Cairo CG 22041, where it occurs alone with it ntr Inhr.

21. In this position, the simple form rh nsw is usual, but in other cases rh nsw m3c, rh nsw m3c mr.f and other variations occur.

22. See p.36, n.5 and p.209, n.1 above.
and significance of many priestly offices, while of the relative prestige of the various cults we know nothing. It is not even clear what criteria determine the relative position of titles within a sequence.  

Assman has recently suggested that because imi ist and ḫsk "... erscheinen in der Spätzeit so überraschend häufig in dieser Kombination, oft auch mit sm3ti (sowohl von Achmim wie von Koptos) und sind einzeln so selten belegt ... es handle sich dabei nicht mehr um selbstständige Priesterstellen, sondern um zusammengewachsene Funktionen, die mit dem Amt des obersten Minpriesters besonders verbunden sind, aber auch anderen im abydenischen Raum einflussreichen Priestern und Amtsträgern zukommen". These remarks take no account of the provenance of the inscriptions in which the titles occur, and the statement that imi ist ḫsk is "especially" linked to the office of sm3ty, the characteristic appellation of the chief priest of Min,  

23. One might assume that the cult of Osiris was the most prestigious at Abydos and its priesthood consequently the most influential there, but this cannot be demonstrated from the inscriptions.  

24. Assman (Basa, 18) has suggested that general priestly titles precede specific ones, and this is borne out by the Abydene evidence. Note, however, that ḫsk precedes ḫmr ntr in a Ptolemaic inscription (Cairo T.13/1/21/4) and that ḫmr mrt ntr follows specific titles on Turin 1538.  


26. See ibid., 20, n.37.
needs to be qualified.

On monuments from Akhmim, the titles *imi ist*, 27 *imi ist ḫsk* 28 or *imi ist ḫsk hpt-wdjt* 29 follow the title of *sm3ty*, 30 and may also be precede or followed by other titles characteristic of Akhmim, such as ḫm ḫr and ḫry sāt3 mwt ntr. 31 The frequency with which *imi ist* and ḫsk occur at Akhmim is perhaps not surprising in view of its proximity to Abydos, but they are, in fact, almost the only titles which the inscriptions of the two sites have in common. At Abydos, *sm3ty* hardly occurs at all, 32 while *imi ist ḫsk hpt-wdjt* and ḫr nsw almost invariably begin a sequence. 33 At Thebes, on the other hand,

27. BM 1155, BM 1426, Cairo CG 22151, Louvre E.19262 (see *Totenstelen*, 312-28).
30. All but one of the exceptions (Berkeley 689, BM 624, BM 1235, BM 1306, Cairo CG 22141) belong to a family which was closely tied to Abydos — see n.18 above. Only Cairo CG 22185 does not conform to this rule.
31. E.g. Cairo CG 22093 and CG 22141 and Louvre C.291 (*Totenstelen*, figs. 163, 166, 167).
32. It is found on Avignon A.30, BM 690, Cairo T.18/2/25/2 and Leiden VII.9 after Abydene titles, as well as in the titulary of Akhmim people — see genealogy XVIII and Cairo JE 6291.
33. Apart from BM 809, Leiden VII.11 and Turin 1538, there are only the monuments of non-Abydene individuals. See below, p. 243.
the rare examples of these titles are preceded by a Theban title such as \( \text{hm ntr Inm m ipt-swt} \), \( \text{hm ntr / it ntr Inm-r' new ntrw} \), \( \text{hm ntr Mntw nb W3st} \), or the generic title(s) \( \text{(it ntr) hm ntr} \). It is thus clear that the locality of the first title generally coincides with the place of residence (at the time of death) of the holder, and the order serves to distinguish monuments from different sites. The only plausible explanation of the variations in order is that the local cult title normally preceded offices held in other areas.

34. Hilton Price 2025 and Louvre E.1429 (Totenstelen, 256-7).
35. Berlin 829 (Roeder, Aegyptische Inschriften aus den königlichen Museen zu Berlin II, (Berlin 1924) 353-4), BM 1132 (see above, p.58, n.86) and Pap. Brooklyn 47.218.3 (R. Parker, A Saite Oracle Papyrus from Thebes in the Brooklyn Museum, (Providence 1962) 15, pl.3, B.11.
36. Cairo CG 41017 (Moret, Sarcophages) - also by sm3ty W3st and sm3ty k3-mwt.f.
37. Cairo CG 4398-4401 (Reisner, Canopics, 249-51), Cairo CG 41026 (Moret, Sarcophages), Cairo CG 42224 (Legrain, Statues III), Cairo JE 36963, JE 36964 and JE 39259 (unpublished) and Assman, Basa, 18.
38. It also serves to identify individuals from Thebes or Akhmim commemorated at Abydos - see below, p.298-42.
39. That religious offices could be held in more than one place is certain, and with two centres as close as Akhmim and Abydos, it is not impossible that one man actually carried out duties in both. In cases where the titles reflect a wider geographic distribution (such as Istemkheb, the wife of Pinudjem II, who held a series of benefices outside Thebes - see Kitchen, TIP, para.252), it is probable that the functions were performed by substitutes.
Apart from this characteristically Abydene sequence of \textit{im\textit{i} st hsk hpt-wd3t} and \textit{rh new}, the most frequent titles are those which relate to the cults of the principal local deities - Osiris, and to a lesser extent Horus and Isis, at Abydos, Onuris, Mehit and Shu-Tefnut at This. Not surprisingly, Osiris in his various forms is the best attested; \(^{40}\) it is noteworthy that, while Osiris-Khentamentiu is by far the most common form in which the god is invoked in the offering formula, in titles it is usually simply '\textit{Wsr} ', occasionally followed by an epithet indicating a particular function of the god \(^{41}\) or specifying the location of the cult. \(^{42}\) It is curious, however, that the female office of \textit{i\textit{hyt}} seems to be attached exclusively to Khentamentiu and never to Osiris. \(^{43}\) Examples of the ordinary prophet (\textit{lm ntr}) of Osiris are most common, followed by

\(^{40}\) These references have been collected by De Meulenaere - see above, p.24, n.22. To his list should be added a \textit{wbt} priest of Osiris (Avignon 23) and a \textit{tsn ntr (3 nb 3bdw} (Cairo JE 20262) which clearly refers to Osiris.

\(^{41}\) E.g. \textit{Wsr wp-\textit{\textit{t}}-t3\textit{wy}} (Horniman Museum). For this epithet, which signifies "He who judges the massacre of the Two Lands", see De Meulenaere, Kam\textit{i} 19 (1969) 9-11.

\(^{42}\) E.g. \textit{ntr (3 nb 3bdw} (Chicago PM 31671).

\(^{43}\) One example of \textit{i\textit{hyt Wsr-\textit{\textit{nt}}-imntiw} occurs (Chicago PM 31671), but there are fourteen of \textit{i\textit{hyt \textit{hnt-imntiw} and none of \textit{i\textit{hyt Wsr}. It is clear from the more balanced proportion of instances of \textit{\textit{hnt} - three each of Osiris and Khentamentiu - that this is not specifically related to a female office, nor does it seem to be chronologically limited since examples occur from the Twenty-sixth Dynasty down to the Ptolemaic period.
those of third prophet. However, there are only five and three instances respectively of the first and second prophets of Osiris for the entire first millenium, which is quite striking.

Other priests in the service of Osiris include the usual ones found throughout Egypt attached to all the deities — *imy-r hmw ntr, w'b, hm ntr wjm* and *it ntr* — while a number of personnel concerned with temporal aspects are attested — *sht* and *hr sht, sš and sš sn, gwt* and *iry-c.*

There are also instances of officials of the Neshmet bark, which played a great part in the ritual celebration of the Osiris cult.

The titles of prophet, second prophet and *w'b* priest of the second phyle are known, the existence of other phyles being implicit.

The cult of Isis is attested only by scattered single examples.

---

44. The examples of third prophet relate to only three or four families — see genealogies I and II. Cairo T.6/7/24/11 may possibly refer to members of the same family as genealogy I, but Turin 1557 seems to be unconnected.


46. Temporal personnel are attached to the 'estate' of the god — e.g. *sht pr Wsir* — whereas the priests are directly and personally linked to the deity — e.g. *hm ntr Wsir.* An apparent exception is a *sš n Wsir* (Chicago OIM 7196). B3k mnḫ (Turin 1528) is probably an epithet rather than an actual office.

47. It is perhaps this bark that Montuemhat claims to have restored (Leclant, *Montuemhat,* 61, 63, 217), although he refers to it as *djt ntr n Wsir.*

48. See Kyoto, Cairo T.9/1/21/1 and Osireion XIX respectively.
of titles. 49 Durham N. 1971 is the only stela on which Isis is the sole recipient of offerings (although she is often depicted with Osiris), and the unusual nature of the monument is emphasised by the fact that its dedicator held two rare offices in the cult of Isis - ตรก n 3st 50 and ตรก stw (?) n 3st n pr ms. There is no archaeological evidence for a birthhouse (pr ms) at Abydos but it is attested in several other New Kingdom and Late Period inscriptions. 51

Various cults of Horus are attested by prophets and scribes.

Both a prophet and a scribe of ตรปรก wṣ t-t3wy are known. 52 Horus

49. Ṣm ntr, ตรก kr, ตรก stw (?) and ḫsī - see title index.

50. This title, whose significance is uncertain but which could be held by both men and women, has been discussed by Vittelman, GM 15 (1975) 50. The ordinary title ตรkr occurs three times at Abydos, but is not specifically attached to the cult of Isis. Cf. an ตรkr n 3st n Gbtw lw.t-(nh (Cairo T.26/19/16/16 - unpublished and not listed by Vittelman).

51. This has already been noted by De Meulenaere, Bi. Or. 16 (1959) 223-4. To his documentation may be added two late New Kingdom examples of the title Ṣsīt n 3st (nbt) pr ms (Cairo T.10/3/25/16 = MCA 1177 and Cairo T.14/3/25/15 = MCA 1191) and the Late Period inscriptions Cairo CG 70018, Cairo T.23/10/24/1 (? and Leiden VI.54 (cf. MCA 1271). A graffito in the cenotaph of Seti I begins "Ind Ṣr.k 3st m pr ms ..." - H. Frankfort et al., The Cenotaph of Seti I at Abydos, (London 1933) I, 87-90, no. 12 and II, pl.LXXXVIII.

52. These follow the pattern indicated above, p.217, n.46 - the prophet is Ṣm ntr Ṣr wṣ t-t3wy, whereas the scribe is attached to an institution as Ṣr hwt-ntr Ṣr wṣ t-t3wy. The epithet wṣ t-t3wy usually applied to Osiris - see above, p.216, n.41. Ṣr wṣ t-t3wy is, however, invoked in the ḥtp-di-nsw formula on Cairo JE 30434, and is also known at Abydos in the Middle Kingdom - see Spiegel, Götter, 172-3.
imy-šmwt is discussed below, \(^{53}\) while the forms ḫr nšty-it.f, ḫr-s3-ḥšt, ḫr-p3-hrđ and ḫr-p3-rč also occur. \(^{54}\)

The cults of the deities of This are more frequently found on the Abydene monuments. Mehit appears as nbt Ṭbn, \(^{55}\) but also as ḫr-y-ib ṯbdw \(^{56}\) with the usual priests in her service. \(^{57}\) Prophets of Onuris nb ṭḥyt \(^{58}\) and ṭdj m3τt \(^{59}\) are known, as well as prophets of Onuris of This \(^{60}\) and Onuris-Shu, son of Re, \(^{61}\) and again the usual priests are attested. \(^{62}\) A scribe of the forecourt of the

\(^{53}\) P. 225

\(^{54}\) See index under ḫm ntr.

\(^{55}\) Cairo T.30/5/24/1, Leiden VII.9, Louvre C.107. Ṭbn is probably to be identified with ḫḥt I3bt = Nag el-Meschaikh, the main cult centre of Mehit. See AEO II, 37-8; De Meulenaere, OAE 29 (1954) 228, n.3; Gauthier, ASAE 35 (1935) 207-12.

\(^{56}\) Louvre C.232 and Vienna 5103.

\(^{57}\) ḫm ntr, imy-r ṭmω ntr, imḥyt, sš tšt, sš pr-ḥd, sš…

\(^{58}\) Avignon A.30 and Leiden VII.9. ṭḥyt was probably a cult centre of Onuris near This - see De Meulenaere, OAE 29 (1954) 231, n.5. A sš ḫwτ-ntr ṭn pr ḫhr nb ṭḥyt ṭ3 mrwτ is mentioned on Louvre C.117 - see De Meulenaere, OLP 4 (1973) 79, (1) for the epithet ṭ3 mrwτ applied to Onuris. Note also the personal name ṭš-inhr- nb-ḥḥyt.

\(^{59}\) Leiden VII.9 : Junker, Die Onurislegende, (Vienna 1917) 11.

\(^{60}\) BM 1333.

\(^{61}\) Cairo CG 946, Cairo T.30/5/24/1, Chicago OIM 5747, Leiden VII.9. Only a single high priest of Onuris is known, however (Avignon A.30), whereas for the period from Tuthmosis IV to Ramses III, Helck, Materialen, 169-70 gives a list of seven, to which Nebmes (NCA 1144) and Hori (Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 905) should be added.

\(^{62}\) ḫḥyt, it ntr, wˁb, ḫm ntr ṭmω, sš, sš pr-ḥd, sš ṭdjt ntr, sš tšt, as well as the ṭmω ntr cited in nn.58-61.
temple of This probably belongs to one of these cults. The main official in the cult of Shu-Tefnut was the imi ist discussed above, and ihyt is the only other title attested, although there is an example of a prophet of Tefnut alone. In the Ptolemaic period a family of prophets of Hathor nbt W3dt irt R was buried at Abydos.

Other cults attested by one or more examples which may be regarded as local are those of Anedjti, Bastet, Ha, Nubhotep, 70

63. Leiden VII.9 and Leiden VII.20.
64. Ihyt Sw-Tfnwt: Louvre C.107 and Louvre C.117. Ihyt Tfnwt: Louvre C.116 and Leiden VII.20; the latter gives Tefnut the epithets of s3t R and hwt ntr.
65. Louvre C.116. The compound forms of the Thinite deities - Omuris-Shu, Shu-Tefnut - occurring concurrently with the simple forms Omuris and Tefnut render a clear classification impossible. It should be noted that there are no cults of Shu alone.
66. AEO II, 65*. See genealogy XVI. An ihyt of Hathor nbt W3dt is also known (Cairo JE 36492).
67. Hm ntr cndti m 3bdw (Berlin 7700).
68. Hm ntr B3stt hry-ib 3bdw (Pittsburgh, Carnegie Inst. 1917.472).
69. For the title imi ht H3, see Wildung, Miscellanea Wilbouriana I (1972) 159, n.84.
70. Hm ntr Nwb-htp (UCL 14649). All the examples of this title seem to date to the Late Period - see Vandier, RDe 17 (1965) 134, B.5. Since this man was also an imi ist hsk, it seems likely that Nubhotep, whose origin was at Heliopolis, had a small following at Abydos - see ibid., 127, no.11.
Sekhmet, 71 Thoth, 72 Wadjet, 73 Werthekau 74 and perhaps also Re. 75

The sanctuaries in which these priests officiated are rarely mentioned, although personnel of the temples of Osiris and Horus and of Abydos and This are known. 76 More frequently mentioned is the 'rk hh, about which little more is known than that it was a holy place of Osiris at Abydos and later at Philae. 77 Six of the seven officials whose titles have survived were overseers of the secrets (hry sḏt3) of the 'rk hh, 78 the other being a scribe of this and

71. ḫm nṯr (Horniman) and imy-r ḫm-w-nṯr (Louvre C.107). For the imy-r ḫm-wnṯr, see below, p.224, n.96.
72. ḫm nṯr ḫwṭi hry-ib 3ḏw and ḫm nṯr ḫwṭi hry-ib pr-'nh – see genealogy XIV.
73. ḫm nṯr Wḏt m 3ḏw (Vienna 189) and ḫm nṯr Wḏt hry-ib 3ḏw (Fitzwilliam E.43.1901).
74. ḫm nṯr Wr-t-hkšw – see genealogy I.
75. Gwt n pr R was the only title of a man named P3-bs (Vienna 138). Although the cult of Re is not usually associated with Abydos, a high priest of Re in This is known from the reign of Merenptah – see Helck, Materialen, 169 and Kees, ZÄS 73 (1937) 89.
76. Cairo T.9/1/21/1, Chicago OIM 7197, Louvre C.116, Leiden VII.9, Leiden VII.20, Louvre C.232, Vienna 5103. There is also an isolated example of a prophet of the temple of (Rasā mry-Imn) – see genealogy XII.
77. Wh. I, 213.4 and GDG I, 154. It is mentioned in a catalogue of buildings restored by Peritepwiawneith (Louvre A.93) but only as being made of granite ('rk ḫh m mḏ). This and the usual determinative indicate that it is a specific building and not a general area.
78. This title occurs in a fixed position, closely connected with the cult of Osiris and, in particular, with the office of hsk. Thus, the sequence ḫm nṯr mrt nṯr ḫsk hry sḏt3 'rk ḫh occurs on Brussels E.587, Osireion XIX and Philadelphia U.M. E.69.29.91, ḫsk hry sḏt3 and ḫm nṯr 3 Wdỉr hry sḏt3 'rk ḫh on Cairo JE 30434. Cf. Berlin 7700 and Turin 1528.
other institutions. 79

One of the most famous, yet least known, institutions at Abydos was the House of Life (pr-**nh**), the evidence for which was collected and discussed in detail by Gardiner, 80 who concluded that it was principally devoted to the production of religious works (such as the Book of the Dead) and the composition of texts of all kinds, although it seems also to have had a medical department concerned with healing the sick. Perhaps the most important source for the Late Period is Pap. Salt 825, which contains much information on the institution, its ritual and its associated personnel which has been elucidated by Derchain. 81 It describes "the people who enter it" as "the staff of Re and the scribes of the House of Life" and goes on to specify: "The **ftky** priest is Shu, the slaughterer is Horus who slays the rebels for his father Osiris, and the scribe of the sacred books is Thoth, and it is he who will recite the glorifications in the course of every day, unseen, unheard". 82 In the ceremony of Osiris

79. Louvre C.107. The ʻrk hh is also mentioned in a fragmentary context on New Haven 6552 - see De Meulenaere, CdE 44 (1969) 218.

80. JEA 24 (1938) 157-79.


82. Pap. Salt 825, 7:1-4. N3 nmt nty ʻkt r.f tt pw nt R św pr- ny pw n3 nty m-hnw. If ftkt św pw hntty ḫr pw nty sn3 sḥw n it. ḫ xir s3 md3t ntr Dwnt pw ntf s3n. ḫ m hrt-hrw nt r ng nn m33 nn sdm. The translations from Pap. Salt 825 are those of Gardiner, JEA 24 (1938) 168.
in the month of Khoiak, the fkti performs the role of the sm priest, whose connection with the House of Life has been demonstrated by Volten. The title occurs in the list of priests of the Thinite nome at Denderah, but is also known at other sites in Egypt. In the Abydene inscriptions it is usually held by persons explicitly associated with the cult of Osiris, including two out of five known high priests of Osiris at Abydos. This emphasises the close link between the Osiris cult and the House of Life hinted at several times in Pap. Salt 825. The ointments who is identified with Horus the slayer is much less well known and there is only one instance of the title on an inscription from Abydos.

The title sš md3t ntr, on the other hand, is more frequently attested (although the full form of sš md3t ntr m pr-‘nh does not

83. MD IV, 38, 121; Loret, "Les fêtes d'Osiris au mois de Khoiak", RT 5 (1884) 85-90.
84. Derchain, Salt 825, 73-5.
86. MD IV, 33.
87. Derchain, Salt 825, 73-5. See also Vernus, BIFAO 76 (1976) 9 (f).
89. E.g. 7,7 : ir tt pr-‘nh pw nty hnw.f ḫsm pw nt ḫr s3w s3.f Wsir r’ nb - "As for the staff of the House of Life who are in it, they are the Followers of Re protecting his son Osiris every day".
90. Leningrad 2260. For the title, see Derchain, Salt 825, 72-3.
occur) and has been discussed at length by Gardiner. 91 Almost all the examples refer to a single family, 92 in which the title was hereditary for at least sixteen generations. Several of the inscriptions indicate that this was an abbreviation for $s s \text{ md3t ntr pr Wsir}$ 93 and the question thus arises of the relationship of the pr Wsir to the pr-\text{nh}. P3-di-3st III 94 was a $s s \text{ md3t ntr}$ and hm ntr w\text{m n Wsir} and also held a number of offices connected with the House of Life - $h m \text{ ntr } c r / t p y \text{ pr-\text{nh}}$, 95 imy-r w\text{hw S3mt}$ 96 and $h m \text{ ntr Wrt-pk3w nbt } c h$. 97 This clearly shows the close connection of the cult of Osiris at Abydos and the House of Life there but little more can be said.

The general identification of the $s s \text{ md3t ntr}$ with Thoth requires no explanation, and that of Thoth with the House of Life little

91. AE O, 25-6, 55-9*, nos.129 and 131.
92. See genealogy I. The exceptions are Cincinnati 1947.392, Leiden VII.9 and Vienna 5103.
93. See Leahy, GM 23 (1977) 53.
94. See genealogy I.
95. The equivalence of $h m \text{ ntr } c r$ and $h m \text{ ntr } t p y$ in this context is demonstrated by the fact that they occur in the same position on Amherst 1921.VI and Cairo T.15/3/25/6 respectively.
96. For this title, see Lefebvre, Ar. Or. 20 (1952) 57-64.
97. Wertheikau is not specifically related to the House of Life, but in view of its magical connotations and the other titles of P3-di-3st, it seems a possible link. For the cult of Wertheikau at Abydos in the late New Kingdom, see MCA 1159, 1184, 1189, 1190, 1194 and 1196. For the epithet nbt \text{ch}, see Habachi, CAF 42 (1967) 31.
Ramses IV recorded on a stela at Abydos his searchings in "the annals (?) of Thoth who is in the House of Life" and the title of Rhm ntr Dhwti hry-ib pr-‘nb is attested in the Late Period at Abydos and at Akhmim. Gardiner has suggested that the title of ss pr-‘nh is virtually synonymous with that of ss md3t ntr, and it is probable that the ss nsw n pr-‘nh who occurs on a stela (BM 808) comes into this category.

A deity who, although not mentioned in Pap. Salt 825, was apparently connected with the House of Life is Horus imy-Šnwt, whose cult is attested on two stelae (BM 1474 and Louvre C.107) and whose name occurs in a fragmentary context on the coffin of Irt-ḥr-

98. Korostovtsev, BIFAO 45 (1947) 155-73. ... nt Dhwti imy pr-‘nh.
99. See genealogy XIV. With it goes the title of Rhm ntr Dhwti hry-ib 3bdw, but there is no other evidence for a cult of Thoth at Abydos in this period. Two inscriptions taken by the excavators to read Rhm ntr Dhwti require correction – see Abydos III.XXX and Kyoto. Similarly, the title ss n Dhwti read by Allen on Chicago OIM 7196-9 is erroneous.
100. Kamal, Steles, Cairo CG 22070.
102. Derchain suggests very plausibly that this is because his cult centre at Sohag was outside the Thinite nome, the area with which the ritual of the Salt papyrus was concerned.
103. The basic study of this deity is that of Kees in ZAS 64 (1929) 107-112. See further ABO II, 45-6; J. Borghouts, The Magical Texts of Pap. Leiden 1.348, (Leiden 1971) 164; Van der Walle, JNES 51 (1972) 79, nn.16-18; Zabkar, Apedmaq, 113-16.
linked to the House of Life by a passage in Pap. Leiden 347 which describes him as "master of words, of exalted rank in the House of Life, a creator in the library". 105

There is little evidence as to how the House of Life stood in relation to the other local cults or what part it played in the religious life of Abydos, and even its location is unknown. 106

The prestige of the institution is not in doubt, however, as can be seen from Pap. Rylands IX, which relates how P3-di-3st was chosen to represent Teudjoj among the prophets from other towns who were to accompany Psammetichus I on his Syrian campaign, because, as a scribe of the House of Life, there was no question he could not answer. 107

Reference must be made to the repairs carried out at Abydos by Pf-wy-nf in the reign of Amasis, which included some work on the House of Life which he restored "after its ruin". 108 Since he did

105. Pap. Leiden 347, 3.2 : nb n mdw tw m pr-nh, smty m pr mdjt.
108. Louvre A.93 : sm-n.n(i) pr-nh m-ht w3s. Cf. Vatican 158, a statue of Wd3-hr-nmt who was sent by Darius I "r smn b3 pr-nh m-ht w3s". It is not clear whether this refers to all the Houses of Life or just that of Sais. See Gardiner, JEA 24 (1938) 157-9.
much more work at Abydos and since he carried out similar work at Heliopolis, it is clear that this was only part of a general repair campaign. It must remain uncertain whether the renovations were necessitated by prolonged neglect or by damage sustained during civil strife, although the inscriptions from Abydos provide a record of reasonably continuous activity in the House of Life there.

Civil and military titles are rare at Abydos in this period. This is partly a reflection of the general proliferation of sacerdotal titles in the Late Period, but it also emphasises the absence of recognisable local administrators. Most of the military titles - h3wty, imy-r mšc, imy-r amnyt and kn - occur on monuments of non-local people. Civil titles are difficult to assess because so little is known of the methods by which Egypt was governed in this period, and there is nothing from Abydos to shed any light on this. Examples of h3ty-⁻ n 3bdw and h3ty-⁻ n Tni are

110. For evidence of internal disorder in the reign of Amasis, see ibid., 257-72.
111. Contrast the situation in the Middle Kingdom as reflected in the title indices of H.O. Lange and H. Schäfer, Grab- und Denksteine des Mittleren Reichs III, (Berlin 1925) and Simpson, Terrace.
112. For this title, see De Meulenaere, RSO 34 (1959) 16 (a).
113. See the following chapter. The two army scribes (sš mšc) may well be local, however.
known, but it is by no means clear to what extent these are honorific or what the actual functions of the $h3ty-^c$ were. It is evidently honorific where it is associated with $r-p^c$, but in three cases, it is associated with the title imy-r $hmw-ntr$ at the beginning of a title sequence, and here it may have some actual value. A Twenty-fifth Dynasty lintel records an archaising titulary typical of a high official and courtier of the period, but there is nothing to suggest that he was a local resident. Similarly, the

114. $h3ty-^c$ n Tni is the title I assume to be represented by the translation "Mayor of Thinis" given by Garstang for an unpublished fragment (El Arabah E.173). The title $h3ty-^c$ T3-wr was held by one Dd-k3-r (Vienna VII.1-4 : Wreszinski, Inschriften, 180-1) but he was also $h3ty-^c$ of the Twelfth Upper Egyptian nome and held priestly offices in both nomes, so that it is uncertain where he resided.

115. Cairo JE 47833 and Louvre A.93, neither of which belonged to an Abydene resident. See Leclant, Montuemhat, 269.

116. The association of $h3ty-^c$ and imy-r $hmw-ntr$ is reminiscent of the late Old Kingdom, when civil and religious powers were frequently united in one man - see Fischer, LA II, col.411. The same situation prevailed, at least on occasion, during the New Kingdom - a man named Mnw was imy-r $hmw-ntr$ Wsr Inhr, as well as $h3ty-^c$ n Tni and $h3ty-^c$ n Wh3t (N. de G. Davies and H.F. Laming MacAdam, A Corpus of Inscribed Egyptian Funerary Cones, (Oxford 1957) nos.109 and 222), and a certain Amenhotep combined the functions of imy-r $hmw-ntr$ Inhr with those of $h3ty-^c$ n Tni (ibid., no.482). See further Helck, Materialien, 170.

117. Cairo JE 91261 : $h3ty-^c$ smr w$ty$ byp $^c$h imy-ib nb,f imy-r k3t nb(t) n(t) nsw. The titulary of Peftjauawyneith (Louvre A.93) begins in exactly the same way. For the archaising use of Old Kingdom titles, see Nagy, AA 21 (1973) 53-64, and Leclant, Montuemhat, 269.
two viziers Nespakashuty and Nespmedu who seem to have been buried at Abydos presumably carried out their duties at Thebes.\textsuperscript{118} The only other known civil offices are scribal.\textsuperscript{119}

The reason for this imbalance is not clear. It is improbable in the extreme that there is a large, as yet undiscovered, cemetery in the Thinite nome or that excavation has not been sufficiently random to produce evidence of a separate "civil service" if one existed.\textsuperscript{120} One can only conclude that local political and administrative power was in the hands of men who held offices which are usually termed sacerdotal.\textsuperscript{121}

\textsuperscript{118} See genealogy II and below, p. 240-1.

\textsuperscript{119} See title index under asš nsw, aš nsw m ‘ rsy, hsḥḥ nḥḥ nbt and hsḥḥ nḥḥ n ṣmnw mbσ ṣḥn w.

\textsuperscript{120} It is possible that because civil titles are much harder to localise than sacerdotal ones, there may be an imbalance in the corpus, but this can only be marginal.

\textsuperscript{121} An obvious example of this is the famous Montuemhat, who was the effective ruler of Thebes for much of the first half of the seventh century although his most important title seems to have been that of fourth prophet of Amun – see Leclant, \textit{Montuemhat}, 274-5.
Abydos as a National Cemetery

O'Connor's statement that Abydos "apparently attracted a "burial population" quite out of proportion to the actual living population in the immediate area", reflects a generally held view that, at least during the Middle Kingdom, large numbers of people from elsewhere in Egypt were commemorated at Abydos. Neither the extent of the practice, nor the form it took, nor such aspects as the origin and social status of those commemorated have been investigated. Later periods, in so far as they have been considered at all, have been taken by some to represent a continuation of this tradition, but others have expressed widely divergent views on the subject.

Yoyotte, who minimises the size of the non-local "burial population" at Abydos even during the Middle Kingdom, states that "... le nombre relatif des stèles décroît au Nouvel Empire ... Les religions funéraires locales se suffisent à elles-mêmes et les nécropoles récentes d'Abydos n'accueilleront guère plus que des gens de la province". 4

1. See the article cited in n.9 on p.3.
2. For the beginnings of such an enquiry, see Simpson, Terrace, 2-5.
3. The period after the New Kingdom, in particular, has been largely ignored - for example, Kees, Ancient Egypt, 251, dismisses it in a single paragraph.
4. Pèlerinages, 39.
According to Kemp, on the other hand, "it would seem as if the period (i.e. post-New Kingdom) saw the most important development of Abydos as a national cemetery". 5

That the cult of Osiris at Abydos was still flourishing in the middle of the first millennium B.C. is evident from the number of royal dedications made at the Umm el-Qa'ab and the amount of building done in the Osiris temple enclosure, 6 but there are no texts comparable to those of the Middle Kingdom to illustrate the practical operation of the cult. 7 A further indication of outside interest in the site is perhaps to be seen in the use of the 'pilgrimage to Abydos' 8 theme in the decoration of Theban tombs of the seventh century. 9 The most important evidence for the unchanged position of Abydos, however, is the erection of monuments there by people who were not local residents. The identification of such people is

5. LA I, col.36.
9. This motif is found in the tombs of Aba (no.36 : PM I,1, 2nd ed., 67 (17)), Montuemhat (no.34 : ibid., 58 (6)), Nespakashuty (no. 312 : ibid., 308 (2)), Pabasa (no.279 : ibid., 357 (3) and (4)) and Basa (no.389 : Assman, Basa, 110-21). Because of the absence of tombs of the Third Intermediate Period, it is impossible to say whether the use of this theme represents a continuation of the New Kingdom tradition or a revival of it.
based primarily on theophorous personal names, and on the differentiation of title sequences established in the last chapter, which permit a division into those from Thebes, Akhmim, Memphis, Lower Egypt and elsewhere. An exception to this classification must be made for one group of burials, which will be considered first.

I. The Royal Family of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty

The people of highest rank known from Abydos in the Late Period are princesses of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty:

a) The least ambiguous example is that of Istemkheb, daughter of Shabako, fragments of whose coffin, together with ushabtis, were found in tomb D.3. There can thus be no doubt that Istemkheb was actually buried, rather than simply commemorated, at Abydos.

b) Such would also seem to be the case with Peksater, daughter of Kashta and Pabatjma and wife of Piye. Fragments of door-jambs and lintels bearing her name were found by Amelineau "dans un tombeau" in his area 7 within Mace's cemetery D. No tomb of Peksater has been identified at Kurru, although Reisner proposed "with reserve" to regard no. 54 as hers for this very reason. The tomb contained

10. See Cairo JE 34431-2.
11. See Cairo JE 32022-3.
a female skeleton but no further indication as to its occupant.

c) The princess P3-3bt-t3-mri is known only from a stela found in tomb D.48. This location in the same part of the cemetery as a) and b) suggests that P3-3bt-t3-mri's stela formed part of a tomb rather than that it was free-standing and purely commemorative. I have suggested above that, although the linguistic equivalence of P3-3bt-t3-mri and P-b-t-m (Pebatjma) may be accepted, the identity of this princess with the mother of Peksater is not certain. 14

d) The stela Bologna 1939 was dedicated by a kbb priest of the Great Royal Wife Pekersari, and although it dates to c. 630 B.C., the element pk in the name of the queen indicates that she was a member of the royal family of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty. 15 It does not, of course, necessarily follow that because this stela comes from Abydos, the queen herself was buried there. Nevertheless, since the cult was clearly practised in Egypt and not in the dynasty's home-

14. See Oxford E.3922. Reisner (Kurru, 44) suggested tomb no.7 at Kurru, which did not even contain a skeleton, as the tomb of Pebatjma, again solely because no tomb was known for her.
15. See Totenstelen, 86 and LR IV, 63-4.
16. The fact that the deceased is depicted on the left (a feature which in the Late Period is only found at Abydos) makes the provenance of the stela certain.
land, and since Abydos is the only site in Egypt (with the exception of Thebes) at which members of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty are known to have been buried, it seems very probable that this was the case.

e) The princess ḫrt-imn, dedicator of stela Cairo T.28/6/24/5, appears not to have been recognised. Munro, who was the first to publish the stela, read the name and title as "... ḫrt-imn ... (?)" although even his partial photograph shows quite clearly "s3t ∫nsw / mr.f ḫrt-imn". The Kushite origins of the princess are beyond doubt, and her name pattern is paralleled within the dynasty by that of the princess ḫrt-tfíw.t. It is unfortunately not possible to establish her relationship to any other members of the dynasty.

The possibility that at least some of these are from cenotaphs and that the actual burials were made in the Kurru-Meroe-Nuri area is

17. See below, p.235. It is possible that the queen had a funerary cult at Abydos while actually being buried in Napata (cf. a wʾḥ priest of the good god Shebitku known from Thebes - Edinburgh 1956.50 : Totenstelen, 197).

18. Totenstelen, 260, fig.99. My reading is based on the original in the Cairo Museum.

19. Ibid., 260.

20. LR IV, 46, 2, and J. Leclant, Recherches sur les monoments de la XXVe dynastie dite éthiopienne, (Cairo 1965) 191 and 354, n.1.

21. A well-known example of a queen with a cenotaph at Abydos and a tomb elsewhere is that of Queen Tetisheri (Abydos III, 44, pl. LII) - wnn 's m ḫʾ.t.s m ḫ3t. 3t ḫr s3tw W3st T3-wr.
rendered remote by the fact that no such burials have been found, and by the discovery of b) and c) in the same area as a definite burial a).\textsuperscript{22} It is therefore likely that as many as five Kushite princesses were buried at Abydos.\textsuperscript{23} This is extremely significant because, with the exception of the Divine Adoratresses,\textsuperscript{24} no members of the royal family of this dynasty are known to have been buried anywhere else in Egypt.\textsuperscript{25}

II. Thebes

By far the largest number of identifiable non-local people are

\textsuperscript{22} The discovery of another Twenty-fifth Dynasty monument, a stela of the general P\textit{g}\textsuperscript{t}t\textsuperscript{r} (Chicago OIM 6408), in cemetery D confirms the idea that important burials of this dynasty were clustered on the western edge of the necropolis - see further below, p.278.

\textsuperscript{23} Russman's statement (BMA 10 (1968-9) 87, n.1) that "those who died in Egypt were returned to Kush for burial" is therefore not entirely true. A precedent for the burial of princesses of the reigning dynasty at Abydos is provided by a daughter of Harsiese of the Twenty-second Dynasty, whose name has not survived (Philadelphia U.M. E.16186 = \textit{El Amrah}, 87, 96, pl.XLI). It is noteworthy that this coffin fragment also comes from cemetery D.

\textsuperscript{24} The position of the Divine Adoratresses was quite unique and necessitated their burial at Thebes. For the tomb chapels of Amenirdis I and Shepenwepet II, see U. Hölscher, \textit{Excavations at Medinet Habu, V : Post-Ramessid Remains}, (Chicago 1954) 17-18, 20-23. It is possible that the actual burials were separate from these chapels (Leclant, \textit{Recherches}, 155) but there is no doubt that they were at Thebes.

\textsuperscript{25} Leclant has pointed out that Kushite princesses other than the Divine Adoratresses are generally absent from Egyptian documents (\textit{Kush} 10 (1962) 209, n.40).
from Thebes. These can be recognised not only by their names and titles, but also in some cases by the epithet nbt pr ṣpst. Nbt pr (i.e. a married woman) alone is very common from the Middle Kingdom onwards, but the addition of ṣpst, which does not occur before the Twenty-second Dynasty, is virtually confined to Thebes, and the few examples from Abydos can be shown to refer to women with Theban connections:

a) Cartonnage fragments from tomb D.57 mention a nbt pr ṣpst T3..., a member of the family of the Vizier Nespamedu, who like his father and his son, held office at Thebes as Vizier, Overseer of the City and prophet of Amun-re. 28

b) One Djedinheruufankh, whose most important title was that of prophet (variant third prophet) of Amun in Karnak, was the son of the nbt pr ṣpst Istkheb. 29

c) A nbt pr ṣpst Satnub was the daughter of a prophet of Amun. 30

d) A man named P3-di-3st, one of whose titles was connected with

27. Wh. IV, 449.14.
28. See Chicago OIM 5740-50 and genealogy II.
Thebes, was the son of the Vizier and prophet of Amun-re Nesmin and the nbt pr ḫapist Takhart. 31

e) The Theban origin of a nbt pr ḫapist named Tapert is strongly suggested by the name of her grandfather, Amenemint, and her father's title of prophet of Amun. 32

The presence of nbt pr ḫapist may therefore be regarded as a reliable indication of a Theban connection, even where the names and titles do not permit such an inference. 33 A number of those commemorated at Abydos can be identified with certainty as cult officials of Theban deities with no apparent connection with Abydos, 34 while in other cases, such as the ḫwy-ḥb n st m3ḥt, 35 there is room for

31. Améliaou L.
32. Tapert, whose name was misinterpreted by the excavators as Shepsestapert, is known from some wooden statuettes of the Third Intermediate Period found in tomb D.59 (El Amrah, 85, 100, pl. XXXV).
33. See Cairo T.26/10/24/6 and Fitzwilliam E.33/34.
34. E.g. ḫḥit n ḫw n ḫmn (Cairo JE 21797, Cairo T.6/7/24/12 and T.29/10/24/7, Leiden VI.20), ḫḥ n ṭr ḫmn (various forms - El Amrah D.7.2, BM 32703-6, CA II.73, Chicago OIN 6838, Liverpool University E.27), ḫḥt n ḫms (Fitzwilliam E.11), ḫḥt ḫmr (BM 347) and ḫḥ n ṭr ḫmnb ḫm W3ḥt (Chicago OIN 5747-9). Names alone sometimes suggest a Theban origin - for instance, on stela Cairo T.6/7/24/7 both women have names compounded with that of Khonsu - ḫḥn-ir-di-ḥt and ḫḥt-ḥmr-ḥmr.
35. In the New Kingdom st mḥḥt almost invariably refers to part of Thebes, but in the Late Period this is not necessarily so - see Černy, Community, 38, 62-7.
doubt. Caution must be used with regard to those, especially women, whose parents bear Theban titles but who do not themselves hold titles. There is sufficient evidence of intermarriage between the Theban and Abydene clergy to make it at least possible that in those cases the dedicators had moved to Abydos to marry and had thus become local residents. Thus, a stela in the Louvre (C.107) gives six generations of the ancestors of the wife of the dedicator Pamiu. The first two of these were clearly Theban, bearing the titles of imy-r pr-hd and wn-wy n pt m Ipt-swt respectively, but the third, Ankhpefhor, while being named after his grandfather as was common, was a prophet of Shu-Tefnut and his daughter was given the good Abydene name of T3-3rit-nt-b3att. Her grandson, whose titles leave no doubt as to his being a priest in the Thinite nome, married a woman who, if we may judge from her name (T7-mnt-imn) and her

36. For example, the dedicators of Abydos 67.661, Leiden VII.13 and Turin 1632 were daughters of a prophet of Amun, a sm3ty W3st and a high priest of Amun respectively. The presence of these monuments at Abydos does not, of course, imply that the fathers were commemorated there.

37. The normal Late Period practice of naming only the parents and not the spouse means that such movements are only recognisable after at least one generation.

38. Theophorous names based on Bastet are much more common at Abydos than at Thebes. See Appendix III and De Meulenaere, JERL 20 (1967–8) 6, n.31. For the cult of B3stt hry-ib 3bdw, see above, p.220, n.68.

39. Hn ntr Hr imy-3swt (?) imy-r hsw-ntr ntr pn Sqt (?) m 3bdw imy-r hsw ntr Hpit nb Wbn.
father's title (\textit{wn\text-m\text-wy}), was from Thebes. Thus, it seems that the scion of a Theban family had moved to Abydos and that his great grandson had maintained or renewed the link by marrying a Theban. Similarly, we can deduce from Cairo JE 30434 that an Abydene prophet, Neswerthekau, married a Theban woman, the daughter of a prophet of Amun with the very common Theban name of Bes, and we find her holding the position of \textit{Sm\text-\text-wsir}. Unfortunately, it is rarely possible to fit these family relationships into the framework of known Theban genealogies.

There can be no doubt about the Theban connection of the family of genealogy VIII, but it is much harder to define the relationship precisely. Although the titulary of the head of the family is archaizing and largely honorific, the quality of the tomb reliefs, which are stylistically similar to those of the seventh century at Thebes, suggests that he was a man of some importance. A woman named Satnub, whose coffin was found in the same tomb and who was certainly related, was herself a \textit{nbt pr \text{-\text-psst}} and the daughter of a scribe of the divine offerings (\textit{s\text-{\text-hpw-{\text-atr}}}) of Amun at Karnak and Overseer of Upper Egypt, an office whose holders seem usually to have been Theban, or at least resident at Thebes, in this period. The question is com-

40. See also Cairo CG 22210, the dedicator of which was the son of a marriage between \textit{F\text-j-n-{\text-n\text-st\text-\text-t}} and a woman called \textit{Nwt\text-ir-di-st}, daughter of \textit{Dk-hwsw-{\text-wf-t-\text-nb}}.

41. For the title \textit{imy-r Sm\text-t}, see Leclant, Montouemhat, 271.
plicated, however, by the theophorous names of the family, which
include compounds of the Thinite deities Osiris (2) and Mehit, as
well as of Amun, Mut and Thoth. The name of the head of the family
himself (Rdi-imhr) suggests a Thinite origin. This is a salutary
reminder of the limitations of names alone as an indication of pro-
venance, and also a reflection of the difficulty in distinguishing
between monuments which belong to people connected with Thebes by
marriage or by virtue of holding office there, and those actually
dedicated by Thebans who lived and died at Thebes and had no connec-
tion with Abydos beyond the wish to be commemorated there. 42

This same problem complicates consideration of the important
family of genealogy II. The name of the remotest known ancestor,
Djedinheriufankh, suggests an Abydene origin (although he held the
Theban title of imy-r pr-hd pr Imn), 43 as does the fact that his
son Nespakashuty I, who achieved the rank of Vizier and was presum-
ably, therefore, resident at Thebes, seems to have been buried at
Abydos. 44 The descendants of one of Nespakashuty's sons, Djedhor,
who held the Theban office of mn-ky pt m Ipt-swt, are known to us as

42. The titles of the dedicator of Cairo T.18/2/25/2 show that he
was a Thinite priest, but his father was a prophet of Amun-re,
Overseer of the City and Vizier, although the latter's name,
Djedbastiufankh, may reflect an Abydene origin.

43. Cairo CG 22141 : Totenstelen, 33-4.

44. A pyramidion (Glasgow 13.176) with his name and titles was found
there by Garstang.
priests at Akhmim. Another son, Djedinheriufankh, was third prophet of Amun at Thebes, while a third, with the Abydene name of Neskhutesmut, is not known to have held any office. Another son, Nespamedu, succeeded him as Vizier and was also buried at Abydos, although he is also known from a series of Theban statues. His son and successor as Vizier, Nespakashuty II, is not known at Abydos and was buried at Thebes. On the other hand, descendants of both his sister and his granddaughter remained priests at Abydos. Two interpretations are possible - either it was from Thebes and one branch (the most eminent) chose to be buried at Abydos, or the family was initially Abydene and eventually spread to Akhmim and Thebes. The evidence, and particularly the personal names, is in favour of the latter, but only the discovery of documents revealing the ancestors of Djedinheriufankh can settle the question.

45. Totenstelen, 118-19.
46. Cairo JE 37447: De Meulenaere, CDJE 38 (1963) 74 c.
47. Cairo JE 36963: ibid., 74 d.
48. He was buried in a family tomb which also contained the coffin of his daughter Neskhonsu and some ushabtis of Takhauenbast, who may be either his sister or his mother. See genealogy II.
49. Cairo JE 36948 and JE 37416: De Meulenaere, loc. cit., 74 b and 76.
50. Nespakashuty was buried in tomb no.312 (PM I.1, 2nd ed., 387-8) and his mother Irty-rw in tomb no.390 (ibid., 440-1). It is not clear why Nespamedu and his wife should have been buried separately.
The most eminent Theban who is known from Abydos is Montuemhat, who is named in two inscriptions cut on rocks between the village of El Arabah and the Umm el-Qa'ab. These graffiti have been regarded as proving that Abydos lay within the area controlled by Montuemhat, and this is corroborated by other inscriptions. Petrie went so far as to suggest that they were cut during a visit of inspection to the royal tombs. This was accepted by Von Zeissl, but questioned by Leclant. It goes far beyond what may legitimately be inferred from the inscriptions, and there is no evidence that the royal tombs at Abydos were ever subject to inspection.

III. Akhmim

A variety of objects, all of the Ptolemaic period, can be shown to belong to people from Akhmim. Sokar-Osiris residing in Akhmim

51. See Abydos I, LXVII.

52. His power extended as far north as Hermopolis at one point - Kitchen, TIP, 397, n.915. It may be significant that one of the two titles ascribed to Montuemhat in these inscriptions is Overseer of the whole of Upper Egypt (imy-r ša'ṭ mi ḫd.s) - see Leclant, Montouemhat, 271. The other is his chief religious title of fourth prophet of Amun.

53. Abydos I, 47. One might reasonably have expected a more grandiose testimony of the official visit of so important a man than a cursory graffiti!

54. H. Von Zeissl, Äthiopien und Assyrer in Ägypten, (Glückstadt and Hamburg 1944) 58.

(hry-lb Ipw) is among the deities invoked on a statue and a stela. 56

The titles of the owners of another stela and a sarcophagus (sm3ty Mnw nb Ipw, and ihyt and sm3ty Mnw 57 respectively) indicate their Akhmim origin. A number of inscriptions grouped above as genealogy XVIII come from the tomb of a man named Khentikhetihotep and his brother Padipawenhetef at Abydos. All the names and titles of this family are characteristic of Akhmim and there seems to be no justification for De Meulenaere's belief that it was of Abydene origin. 58

IV. Memphis and Lower Egypt

The number of people from the north of Egypt commemorated at Abydos is small. 59 Perhaps the most eminent of these is Pami, son of Sheshonk, the ruler of Busiris, and later ruler himself, whose sadly fragmentary stela is said to come from Abydos. 60

56. Cairo CG 715 and Liverpool 228a.A.07.
57. Cairo T.6/7/24/3 and Cairo JE 6291.
58. See genealogy XVIII.
59. Reference should be made here to the stela of Pashedbast (UCL 14496; Jacquet-Gordon, JEA 53 (1967) 63-8), dated to the reign of Osorkon I, which mentions stelae "like those which are brought from the necropolis beside Ankh-tawi" (mi inn m r-st3w r-gs 'ny-t3wy). It is quite uncertain whether this refers to stelae which were actually being sent as dedications, or simply to the plunderings of the Memphite necropolis.
60. See Cairo T.22/8/15/3.
origin of the dedicators of two statues, Baltimore WAG 175 and Cairo CG 38363, is clearly shown by the fact that the deity invoked is Osiris nb r-st3w. 61 Names compounded with that of Neith suggest a Lower Egyptian origin for another statue and, less certainly, a set of canopic jars, 62 while a stela, which is stylistically characteristic of Memphis, includes among its dedicators a man named P3-di-nfr-htp. 63 The Abydene provenance of the statue of a general named Hor, said to have been captured by guards at Abydos while being illegally transported, 64 is not certain, but the fact that it is dedicated to 'Osiris-Khentamentiu, great god, lord of Abydos' makes it probable. A fragment of another, granite, statue of the same man was found near Rosetta, 65 and his northern origin is confirmed by the name of his mother, Mr-n-nt-its, and by his own basiliphorous

61. For r-st3w as the necropolis of Memphis, see Jacquet-Gordon, loc. cit., 64-5 and Quaegebeur, CDE 49 (1974) 65. An exact parallel is provided by the invocation of Osiris, lord of Ankh-tawy, on a number of Middle Kingdom Abydene stelae, which conceals, or, rather, reveals a Memphite pilgrim — see Spiegel, Götter, 16-23 (note also the rare Middle Kingdom references to Osiris, lord of Ro-setjau — ibid., 23-5) and Goyon, CDE 51 (1976) 104.

62. Cairo CG 4300-2 (Mr-nt) and Cairo CG 38618 (Psmtk-as3-nt).

63. Cairo T.9/7/24/7. The same name occurs on Bologna 1935.

64. Cairo JE 47833.

65. Kemal, ASAR 5 (1904) 199.
"beautiful name" of (Nfr-ib-r) -m-3ht. 66 If, as suggested by Sauneron and Yoyotte, 67 he took part in the Nubian campaign of Psammetichus II, it is quite possible that he made a brief pilgrimage to Abydos on his way downstream and had this statue dedicated there. 68

One man who was actually sent to Abydos is Peftjaauwnyeth, whose name and titles indicate quite clearly his Lower Egyptian origins. 69 He recorded the success of his mission (see below, p. 289) on a statue which was probably set up in the temple of Abydos.

V. Miscellaneous

a) Two of the Thirtieth Dynasty or early Ptolemaic tombs discovered by Petrie in cemetery G belonged to families whose titles indicate that they came from the region of Antaeopolis (modern Qau el-Kebir).

66. The vast majority of the more than forty basiliphorous "beautiful names" listed by De Meulenaere, Le surnom égyptien à la Basse Époque, (Istanbul 1966), are known, or can be said on the basis of names and titles, to come from the Memphite region or Lower Egypt. Only nos. 11 and 49 (the Theban necropolis and the Karnak cachette respectively) are definitely from Upper Egypt.

67. BIFAO 50 (1952) 197 g).

68. A parallel from the Ptolemaic period is provided by the Greek soldier who left a graffito recording his thanks to Sarapis for his safe return from an elephant hunt in the south - see P. Perdrizet and G. Lefebvre, Les graffites grecs du memnonion d'Abydos, (Nancy-Paris-Strasbourg 1919) ix-x, no. 91.

69. See Louvre A.93.
The occupants of tomb G.50 were prophets of Hathor, lady of Wadjet, and the owner of tomb G.61 was a prophet of Mut, lady of Megeb.

b) One stela found by Mariette is particularly important as some coffin fragments belonging to the owner were later found at Nag el-Hassaia, the Late Period necropolis of Edfu. It seems improbable that the stela could have been found at Edfu and included in MCA by mistake, since the systematic exploitation of Nag el-Hassaia did not begin until 1884, and Mariette's activity at Edfu was confined to the uncovering of the Ptolemaic temple. The stela, which was clearly manufactured at Edfu, must have been sent as a dedication to Abydos, and therefore represents the only certain example of a purely commemorative stela.

c) The title of the owner of stela BM 1428, kr-çr Nfr-htp, suggests that he came from the Seventh Upper Egyptian nome.

---

70. AEO I, 62-4* and genealogy XVI. In addition, they held the priestly title of nb jmt rb, which is also characteristic of the Twelfth Upper Egyptian nome - see De Meulenaere, Câr 33 (1958) 197, n.6.

71. AEO I, 65* and genealogy XVII.

72. Darèssey, RT 23 (1901) 131 n), and Totenstelen, 69, n.l.

73. See De Meulenaere, MDAIK 25 (1969) 91.

74. Totenstelen, 247.

75. Kaplony-Heckel, Enchoria 3 (1973) 11-12 discusses examples of both kr-çr titles connected with the cult of Neferhotep.
The Nature of the Monuments

Plutarch states that "they say that the small town Thinis is so named because it alone contains the real Osiris, and that the wealthy and powerful among the Egyptians are buried mostly in Abydos, deeming it an honour to be buried near the body of Osiris". 76 The major point of interpretation in this passage is the period to which it refers. Plutarch was writing at a time (in the early second century A.D.) when many different sites were regarded with equal reverence as the repository of the remains of Osiris, and this is reflected in the words "it alone", which hark back to a time when the position of Abydos as the burial place of Osiris was unchallenged. The sources for individual statements made by Plutarch can rarely be identified, but Gwyn Griffiths has demonstrated that many of them are pre-Manethonian, and that they themselves can refer to a still earlier period. 77 As will be shown below, it is extremely difficult to reconcile Plutarch's words with the archaeological data for any period after the Twenty-sixth Dynasty.

Plutarch's statement that the wealthy Egyptians were "buried" at Abydos conflicts with the traditional view, derived from the Mi-

76. De Iside et Osiride, ed. J. Gwyn Griffiths, (Swansea 1970) XX.
77. For Plutarch's sources, see Gwyn Griffiths, op. cit., 75-100, and for the derivation of his Egyptian etymologies from hieroglyphic rather than the contemporary demotic, ibid., 104.
dle Kingdom evidence, that the monuments dedicated by people from other parts of Egypt at Abydos were cenotaphs 78 (representing a compromise between the wish to benefit perpetually from the proximity of Osiris and the attraction of burial in the local cemetery). The distinction is important, not so much in the religious sense, since both reflect a desire to participate in the Osiris mysteries, as for the interpretation of the monuments found at Abydos and the circumstances in which they were erected.

The texts are not very illuminating on this point. Many Middle Kingdom inscriptions refer to the erection of a *mḥt* at the 'Staircase of the Great God' (*rwd n ntr* (3)) to enable the owner to be close to Osiris, and these have been regarded by some scholars as a reference to the building of offering chapels (which might in some cases be cenotaphs), 79 in a specific area of the cemetery of Abydos – the 'Nécropole du Nord'. 80 This, the area closest to the Osiris temple enclosure, probably overlooked the processional route

78. Cenotaph here means any kind of memorial (offering chapel or isolated stela) erected at Abydos by someone buried elsewhere.

79. For *mḥt* with the meaning of cenotaph, see Wb. II.49.14: "auch Kenotaph, das in Abydos errichtet wird, während das eigentliche Grab *(is)* an anderer Stelle liegt". The only explicit evidence for this translation is the passage from the Tetisheri stela cited above, p.234, n.21.

from the temple to the "tomb" of Osiris at the Umm el-Qa'ab and was therefore a particularly desirable place for a monument. No such texts are known for the Late Period. The rwd n ntr '3 is never mentioned, and the word m'h't, which certainly had a very wide range of meaning even in the late Middle Kingdom, occurs only once. The words describing funerary structures which do occur all have the meaning of 'tomb'.

Nor is the archaeological record of much assistance in this respect, since the re-use and plundering of tombs has meant that few objects have been found in situ. Burial furniture, such as canopic jars, coffins, sarcophagi and even ushabtis, undoubtedly comes from actual tombs, but there is no way of telling from internal evidence whether a stela was set up in a tomb, in an offering chapel or

81. For the possible meanings of m'h't, see Kemp, LA I, col. 35; Simpson, Terrace, 11; Goyon, CDE 51 (1976) 106-7.
82. It is found on Louvre C.232 in the phrase ht m'h't, describing one of the activities of the scribes of the House of Life. The other common Middle Kingdom expression for an Abydene monument, at nhb (Vernus, BDE 25 (1973) 223-4, 232), does not occur at all in the Late Period.
83. These are Is (Cairo CG 22054, Leiden VII.9, VII.11 and VII.20 and Turin 1538), wbt (Cairo CG 22054, Munich 49 and Vienna 157) and mr (Avignon A.30 and Louvre D.18). Is and wbt usually occur in the "appeal to the living" formula. For mr, see below, p. 271, n. 80.
84. There is no evidence to suggest that any of the ushabtis dedicated as ex-votos at Hekreshu hill (see above, p. 42, n. 36) date to the Late Period. Architectural fragments, on the other hand, cannot be said a priori to come from tombs rather than cenotaphs.
beside a processional route. No Late Period stelae are known to have been found in their original position, although according to Mariette's plans, there were niches for them in the superstructure and in the interior of the pyramid tombs which he found in the 'Necropole du Nord'.

Others were certainly free-standing, close to the Osiris temple enclosure and the processional route, but in no case is it possible to identify the position of a specific stela.

Consequently, it is extremely difficult to prove the existence of private cenotaphs, the evidence for which is, in any case, slight. Simpson can only cite one "almost certain" example for the Middle Kingdom, the period at which this practice is believed to have been at its zenith. One possible later example is the large monument of Iuput, son of Sheshonk I, discovered by Amélineau. It contained no burial equipment of any sort, but since it has recently been shown that the structure was plundered for its stone (red

85. MDF II, pls.66-7.

86. See Simpson, Terrace, 10, quoting Maspero, Études de mythologie VIII, 336-7; MDF II, 29, para.199.3; Totenstelen, 5.

87. For royal cenotaphs at Abydos, see Kemp, LA I, cols.37-9.

88. Terrace, 3, n.18. A series of closely-placed mud-brick structures of the Middle Kingdom (apparently without associated burials) found beneath the "portal" of Ramesses II, and thus directly overlooking the temple enclosure in the Middle Kingdom, seem to be the first definitely identified cenotaphs at Abydos - see Simpson, Terrace, 9, n.40.

89. NF 1895-6, 14-23, 53.
granite) as early as the reign of Amasis, this does not necessarily prove that it never did contain a burial. The coffin fragment found at the Ramesseum bearing the name of Iuput cannot be used to prove that he was buried there because it is so small that it is not possible to be certain whether it was actually part of his coffin or that of a descendant. The only apparently certain Late Period example of a person commemorated at Abydos but buried elsewhere is the stela from Edfu discussed above. Nevertheless, at least some of the stelae dedicated by people from other parts of Egypt, particularly those which are known to come from the 'Nécropole du Nord', are probably just such cenotaphs.

The evidence for the actual burial of such people at Abydos is more extensive (partly, perhaps, because it is more easily identifiable). The rare textual references to the desire to be buried at Abydos may represent an ideal as much as a reality, but a number

90. Vernus, BIFAO 75 (1975) 69.
92. See p.246 (Cairo T.4/1/21/1).
93. E.g. Cairo JE 21797, Cairo T.6/7/24/7, T.6/7/24/12 and T.29/10/24/7, for which see above, p.237. For the high proportion of stelae found in the 'Nécropole du Nord', see below, p.284.
94. On Cairo CG 22054 the wish for a "goodly burial in the Thinite nome / Abydos" (krst nfrt m-hnw T3-wr) is expressed, and on a statue-base from Akhmim (Cairo JE 91300 : Bouriant, RT 9 (1887) 91, no.70) a burial in the "beautiful west in the desert of Abydos" (krst m iantt nfrt m smyt nt 3bdw) is desired.
of tombs can be shown to have been occupied by people from elsewhere in Egypt. Apart from the princesses of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty, people from Thebes, Akhmim and Antaeopolis were buried at Abydos in the Late Period. It is noteworthy that this custom is confined to Upper Egypt, and the difference in the type of commemoration made by Upper and Lower Egyptians is certainly significant. Even allowing for the small number of examples, it is striking that five out of the eight objects which can be assigned to Memphis or Lower Egypt are statues. With the exception of a set of canopic jars, there is nothing to suggest that anyone from Memphis was buried at Abydos, and it is therefore probable that the statues were dedicated in a temple. Nor can it be coincidence that four of the objects were dedicated by military men, and another by an official in

95. See, for instance, Amélineau I, El Amrah D.7.B and BM 32703-6 (see below, p.277), genealogy XI (tomb D.15) and genealogy VIII.
96. See above, p.242-3.
97. See above, p.245-6.
98. Statues thus represent 62.5% of the Memphite dedications, which bears no relation to the overall figure for all dedications of approximately 7%. See above, pp.30-32 for the figures.
99. See above, p.244, n.62.
100. The evidence for a tradition of private temple statuary at Abydos in this period is limited, but cf. Blackman, JEA 27 (1941) 84, and MDF II, 29, para.199.2-3.
101. Baltimore WAG 175, Cairo CG 38618, Cairo JE 47833 and Cairo T.22/8/15/3. The scarcity of military titles has been noted above, p.227, and it must surely be more than chance that so many of them are from the north.
the course of his duties. 102 Thus, it seems that Abydos did not play
a major part in the religious life of Lower Egypt, and that the few
Memphite monuments dedicated at Abydos were the result of incidental
visits made by passing soldiers or officials. 103 One can only specu-
late as to the reason for this - the very distance between Memphis
and Abydos might daunt all but the devoutest pilgrim, 104 and the
presence of another cult centre of Osiris close at hand would render
the journey unnecessary. Busiris, of which virtually nothing sur-
vives and about which very little is known, may well have been that
centre. 105

There are thus some grounds for accepting Plutarch's statement
that Abydos, as the cult centre of Osiris, was regarded as a desir-
able burial ground by people who were not local residents, but this
seems in practice to have been confined to Upper Egypt. The extent of
outside commemoration was limited - the monuments which can definitely
be assigned to people who were not local residents amount to approxi-

102. Louvre A.93.

103. Yoyotte (Pèlerinages, 38) has suggested that most of the monu-
ments bearing the names of non-local people might be interpreted
in this way, as the result of a "pèlerinage occasionel", and
not as the product of a deliberate pilgrimage.

104. It may not be irrelevant to note that at least one of the two
stelae was manufactured at Memphis and was presumably sent to
Abydos (Cairo T.9/7/24/7).

105. For Busiris, see Yoyotte, Pèlerinages, 32-3 and Von Beckerath,
LA I, cols.833-4.
mately ten to fifteen percent of the total - and the evidence does not, on the whole, support Plutarch's qualification of these people as wealthy. The term is, of course, both subjective and relative, but, with the exception of the princesses of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty, few are of high social standing, and the majority are ordinary members of the priesthood. Neither the great Theban families of the Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth Dynasties, nor the important Lower Egyptian nobles of the Saite period are attested at Abydos. The majority of those commemorated there were members of the local clergy, who can be termed wealthy only in the sense that the possession of a stela or tomb implies a certain level in society. The burials of the poor, as always, escape us altogether, but the impression given by the monuments is that the cemetery of Abydos was

106. As exceptions one might note the son of a vizier (Amélineau I) and the family of genealogy VIII.

107. See the titles listed on p.237, n.34.

108. This is on the assumption that the family of the viziers Nespakashuty and Nespa-owedu had its origins at Abydos. The complete absence of identifiable links with, for instance, the detailed genealogies of Bierbrier, LNK, is quite striking.

109. In many cases (148 out of 403 objects, or just over 36%) the social position cannot be even roughly gauged, because neither the deceased nor their relatives are credited with any titles.

110. The materials for a socio-economic study of the priesthood on the lines of Janssen's Commodity Prices do not exist.
predominantly middle-class and provincial. 111

111. This is a largely intuitive judgement. It must be recognised that our knowledge of the social structure and sacerdotal hierarchy of ancient Egypt are equally negligible.
Sketch map of the cemeteries of Abydos (after Mariette)

Key
1. Osiris temple enclosure
2. Kom es-Sultan
3. "Portal" of Ramses II
4. Shunet es-Zebib
5. Coptic village
6. Temple of Ramses II
7. Temple of Seti I
8. Osireion
9. 'Tombs of the Courtiers'
10. Umm el-Qa'ab

---
Approximate limits of Mariette's 'Nécropole du Nord'.

Superlinear '1' distinguishes Peet's cemeteries from those given the same letter by other excavators.
Any overall view of the cemeteries of Abydos is hindered by the haphazard way in which they have been excavated and the results published. The only archaeological map of the whole site is, remarkably, that of the earliest excavator, Mariette. It was used by Amélineau to show the areas in which he worked, and subsequently formed the basis of the plan published in the Topographical Bibliography, which constitutes the only attempt to locate all the published excavations on a single map. The British expeditions of 1899-1926, from which one might have expected a more unified approach, produced a series of individual plans at different scales, which usually only indicated the general area worked in relation to a landmark such as the central depression or the Shunet es-Zebib, and almost never the extent of the excavation or its precise relationship to earlier work. In some cases, no plan at all was published, so that, for instance, the only evidence for the location of Petrie's cemetery G is a verbal

1. MDF I, pl.1.
2. NF 1895-6, frontispiece.
3. PM V, 38.
4. E.g. El Amarah, pl.XXIII (1:1000); El Arabah, pl.I (1:800); Abydos III, pl.VIII (1:4500).
description, and although Peet's sketch map of all the areas in which he worked is potentially useful, the position of the various parts can rarely be checked independently. This failure to produce a comprehensive map which would accurately relate the different "cemeteries" to each other, or even to indicate their location by precise reference to fixed survey points, is particularly regrettable since the individual areas are artificial units, arbitrarily selected by the excavator, and cannot properly be studied in isolation. As a result, the topographical relationships of the various parts of the cemetery, a correct understanding of which is clearly a prere-

5. Abydos I, 1, 34.
6. CA II, xiv.
7. Only Garstang refers to such survey points, but, while his point B is marked (El Arabah, pl.XXXVII), his point D (El Arabah, pl.I) is not precisely identified, and the distance given from it to an unspecified point in cemetery E appears to be too great - see below, p.276-7.
8. The excavator's freedom of choice in practice decreased with time, since later expeditions tended to avoid areas previously excavated, regardless of how thorough the earlier work had been. Thus, the sites of Amélineau's sondages within cemetery D were not touched by the Egypt Exploration Fund (El Amrah, pl.XXIII; cf. Abydos I, 34). Similarly, a large part of the 'Nécropole du Nord' has received only the superficial attention of Mariette (see p.268 below). The choice was rarely entirely arbitrary - in 1921-2, Petrie trench a limited area for the specific purpose of investigating the so-called 'Tombs of the Courtiers' (TC, 1). On the other hand, some work in the necropolis was done simply to keep workmen busy - Abydos I, 1; Abydos III, 6-7; Frankfurt, JEA 16 (1930) 213.
quodate of any study of the chronological development of the whole, have to be reconstructed from imprecise statements, photographs and, in some cases, plans.

All those who have worked at Abydos have noted, as the principal geographic feature, the wadi which runs down from the cliffs which form the bay of Abydos to the cultivation. This divides the necropolis into two distinct parts - those north and south of the wadi, called the 'North cemetery' and the 'South cemetery' respectively by Peet. The latter designation refers only to the 'Nécropole du Centre', and not the 'Nécropole du Sud', of Mariette, while the former includes, but is far from synonymous with, his 'Necropole du Nord'..

In the following analysis of the distribution and date of the Late Period remains at Abydos, which is concerned primarily with the inscribed material and those objects and structures which can be dated by association, I have adopted Peet's terminology but treated Mariette's 'Nécropole du Sud' and the wadi separately. The accompanying map is based on that of Mariette.

9. E.g. El Arabah, 1-2; El Amrah, 63.
10. CA II, 34, 76.
11. MDF II, 42, para. 240.
'Nécropole du Sud'

1. Mariette's 'Nécropole du Sud', the area around the temples of Seti I and Ramses II, contained graves said by the excavator to date from the Nineteenth Dynasty onwards, although nothing was found in them and no reason for this dating was given.

2. A few stelae of the Graeco-Roman period were found by Ghazouli in clearing the debris overlying the palace attached to the Seti temple.

3. According to Peet, the cemetery of the Roman period "undoubtedly lies behind the temenos of the Seti temple".

4. In a short excavation on behalf of the Antiquities Service in 1939, Habachi apparently found three graves said to be of Graeco-Roman date (but without associated objects) among a number of pre-dynastic burials approximately 250 metres east-south-east of the Seti temple.

---

12. MDF II, 39 para. 228, 40 paras. 229-30.
13. Ibid., 40, para. 230. In the cemetery of Senwosret III in the far south of Abydos, two tombs described by the excavators as "Ptolemaic" were found, neither of which contained any objects (Abydos III, 20).
14. ASAE 58 (1964) 180, 184-5, pl. XXXI-XXXII.
15. CA II, xvi.
16. ASAE 39 (1939) 767.
South Cemetery

5. A few objects of late date are said by Mariette to come from the 'Nécropole du Centre'. Of these, two stelae, MCA 1324-5, which were found in adjacent tombs, are inscribed in Greek and demotic respectively and probably date to the Roman period, while the others - a motley collection - date to the Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth Dynasties.

6. Cemetery C was worked solely as a stop-gap by Petrie, a fact which is reflected in the cursory publication of results. It can only be located on the basis of the excavator's rather vague statements to the effect that it lay "close behind our huts", and "opposite

17. MDF II, 39 para.238, 40 para.231.
18. MCA 1324 was published as Cairo CG 9247 by Milne, Greek Inscriptions.
19. Baltimore WAG 175 (statue); Cairo CG 4646-9 (canopic jars); Cairo CG 23107 (offering table); Cairo CG 70028 (naos); Cairo JE 4591 (plaque); Cairo JE 6300 and JE 11229 (stelae); Cairo JE 19776 (pyramidion). Since Mariette also states that the canopic jars Cairo CG 4126-9 and CG 4308-10 are from specific areas of the 'Nécropole du Centre', whereas they would appear not to come from Abydos at all (see p.20), some doubt must exist as to the accuracy of his attributions. As already pointed out, however, the only possible methodology is to accept Mariette's statements, albeit with great reserve, except where they are clearly refuted by independent evidence.

the old fort (the Shunet ez-Zebib) and further back. The "huts" in question, Petrie's first expedition house, have now disappeared, although some traces still mark the site, which was on the southern edge of the central depression. A view looking south-south-east across the late Ptolemaic / Roman cemetery in the wadi, excavated by Garstang in 1907, shows the house in the background. Cemetery G must lie immediately over the rise behind the huts. It contained numerous vaulted tombs dated by Petrie to "about the XXXth Dynasty", but few objects were found. The following tombs contained inscriptions:

(a) G.50 - "extensive and undisturbed" tomb of the family set out in genealogy XVI above.
(b) G.57 - family tomb - see genealogy XIII.
(c) G.58 - "utterly plundered" tomb with the sarcophagus of Nefertiut.

22. Abydos I, 34.
23. Personal observation.
24. The Sphere, August 10, 1907, 127.
25. The tomb numbered G.100 by Garstang (El Arabah, 21) had previously been discovered by Amélineau in the area which he numbered 5 (NF 1895-6, frontispiece and 9-13). This seems to have been some distance to the south of cemetery G, or at least on its southern edge, depending on the southward extent of the cemetery, for which there is no evidence.
27. Loc. cit.
28. Abydos I, 40. The sarcophagus is now in South Kensington.
(d) G.61 - tomb of Hepmen - see genealogy XVII.
(e) Unspecified tomb with the coffin fragments of a man named Djehutymes (Chicago OIM 7196-9).
(f) Four sarcophagi were found in another tomb, described as "domed" by Mace, which was part of Petrie's work and presumably, therefore, of cemetery G.

None of these inscriptions is earlier than the Thirtieth Dynasty and it is a reasonable assumption that all the vaulted tombs in this area are at least as late as this. Petrie refers to the crowding of these tombs with bitumenised bodies in the later Ptolemaic period, when burials were also made in limestone sarcophagi in small chambers just below the surface.

7. The position of Peet's cemetery E as marked on his plan is corroborated by statements that it was situated "on the low mounds immediately to the south of the dry watercourse", and that it was "not very far from the cultivated land, at a distance of about 300

32. CA II, xiv.
33. CA II, 17.
metres north of the temple of Ramses II, and above the valley...". 34 It must therefore have been slightly to the north-east of, and very close (perhaps even adjacent) to cemetery G. Many vaulted tombs were found here, 35 which, from the very small number of inscriptions found, 36 would seem to be Ptolemaic, although Peet suggested that some might date to the Persian period. 37 The burials are characterised by rough-hewn limestone coffins 38 and in some cases bitumenised mummies. 39 Peet states that these tombs were also found to the west of E (i.e. in cemetery G), and over the area separating E from R and T on the eastern edge of the South cemetery. 40 In effect, therefore, these tombs were built over most of the northern part of the South cemetery.

8. No inscriptions were found in connection with the ibis 41 and

34. CA I, 1.
35. CA I, pl.II.1; CA II, pl.XXII.1 and 2. According to Peet, there were nineteen late vaulted tombs but only twelve (E.403-4, 421-2, 437-40, 456-7, 460, 521) can be identified from the information given.
36. CA II, 93 and Brooklyn 12.911.2.
37. CA II, 24, IV.
38. CA I, 26, pl.II.4; CA II, pl.V.5-6. Tombs E.422, E.457 and E.460.
40. CA II, xvi.
41. CA III, 40-8.
dog 42 cemeteries discovered by Petrie in part of E, but from the associated objects they seem to be firmly dated to the Roman period. 43

9) A box containing six hundred bronze statuettes, mostly of Osiris, was found in the course of some preliminary excavations "in the fringe of the cemetery on the southern slope of the valley leading to the Royal Tombs. A small part of this area, descending from the cemetery to the valley had not been touched by any previous explorer". 44 This area was presumably adjacent to either G or Petrie's cemetery E.

10) Wooden coffins of a man called Hr-inpw and his wife were found by Ayrton and Loat inside limestone sarcophagi in the area which they called F. 45 This was "situated on a gently sloping piece of ground about one hundred and fifty yards from the edge of the cultivation", 46 elsewhere described as "the extreme eastern edge" of a "long ridge between two roads" north of the temple of Ramses II. 47

42. CA II, chapter IX.
43. CA II, 101; CA III, 40. A number of graves of the Roman period were found near the ibis cemeteries.
44. Abydos III, 6-7.
45. AR 1908-9, 4.
46. Loat, JEA 9 (1923) 161.
47. AR 1908-9, 2.
11. In this same region, Peet excavated two areas which he labelled R and T. R contained a number of late vaulted tombs, and two stelae, one of the seventh century and one Ptolemaic, were found in the surface sand. Another late stela was found in region T.

This eastern edge of Mariette's 'Nécropole du Centre' was worked by Garstang and Frankfort, as well as Ayrton and Loat and Peet. The results from all these excavations suggest that the ridge, which has now disappeared beneath the village of Beni Mansur, was principally used in the Old Kingdom.

It is apparent that the "late" vaulted tombs in the South cemetery are all Thirtieth Dynasty / Ptolemaic in date, and that the only evidence for its use in the Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth Dynasties consists of a few objects found by Mariette and one by Peet.

Central Depression

12. A stela found by Mace bearing an edict probably originally

48. CA II, xiv, 76.
51. Cornell University, Ithaca - probably of the Persian period.
52. LAAA II (1909) 125-30, area (b).
53. JEA 16 (1930) 215.
54. Kemp, LA I, col.34.
55. El Amrah, 63-4, 84, 93-4, pl.XXIII, XXIX.
promulgated by a Twelfth Dynasty king but usurped by Neferhotep I, forbids burials or even trespass in an area called "the holy ground south of Abydos". It was found on the western edge of cemetery D, and was initially one of four, set up in pairs to the north and south of the sacred area. This could conceivably be the area west of this stela where no burials have been found and which includes the Umm el-Qa'ab, but is more likely to refer to the wadi, which has often (almost certainly correctly) been assumed to have been the procession route to the Umm el-Qa'ab. The reason for the ban was thus to keep this route clear, rather than to limit the burial area as such, and in this the decree seems to have been remarkably effective.

Mariette describes his "Nécropole des "chanteuses"" as "situé sur la pente nord-ouest de la colline dont la nécropole du centre occupe les flancs. Il s'étend, avec quelques interruptions, jusqu'à la Chounet ez-Zebib...". This strip of land must have crossed the wadi, but Mariette does not state specifically whether burials were actually made in the wadi itself or whether this constituted one of the "interruptions".

56. T3 dsr ray ḫbdw.
57. Kemp, LA I, col.36. The import of this stela has often been misunderstood - e.g. Kees, Ancient Egypt, 243; Otto, Egyptian Art, 43-4; and most recently, Simpson, Terrace, 3, n.16.
58. MCA, 441; cf. MDF II, 42 para.241, 45 para.255.
In 1907 Garstang and Jones found a very late cemetery in the wadi which contained hawk burials and numerous stelae, inscribed in demotic, and Roman period in date. These excavations remain unpublished except for two photographs illustrating the position of the cemetery. Pits dug on and around the site of the Pennsylvania-Yale expedition house (built on the same spot as Garstang's house) have revealed only virgin sand. It would therefore seem that the wadi was not used for burials until the Roman period when the Osiris mysteries in their traditional form had long since ceased at Abydos, and the wadi was no longer required for processions.

North Cemetery

13. The limits of Mariette's 'Nécropole du Nord' can be established with some precision. The excavator states that it was bordered on the east by the Osiris temple enclosure and on the west by the Shunet es-Zebib. Its southern edge would presumably have been the wadi,

59. Most of the stelae are in the Cairo Museum (JE 39070-95, JE 39104-5) and some of these were published by Spiegelberg, Demotische Inschriften III, as CG nos. 50028, 50029, 50030, 50032, 50033, 50035, 50038 and 50049.

60. The Sphere, July 27, 1907, supplement p.1, top right; ibid., August 10, 1907, 127.

61. Personal communication from Mr. B.J. Kemp.

62. See below, p. 290-1.

63. MDF II, 42, para. 240.
while its northern limit is indicated by Peet's statement that the northern part of cemetery S "had never been touched in modern times .. ..".  

64 The northern fringe of the 'Nécropole du Nord' therefore overlapped with the southern part of cemetery S, which can be precisely located in relation to the funerary palace of Herneith (and thus to the Shunet-es-Zebib), touched on by Peet and later cleared by Petrie.  

65 This limit is confirmed by photographs taken after Mariette's work but before that of Peet, 66 which show the Shunet es-Zebib seen from the Osiris temple enclosure. Currelly's statement 67 that the area "north and west" of the Shunet es-Zebib had been worked by Mariette's men would seem to be erroneous, and the work to which he refers must be that of Amélineau.  

Mariette seems seriously to have misunderstood the nature of the remains which he found in the 'Nécropole du Nord'. 68 He distinguishes two types of tomb:

64. CA II, 30.  
65. CA II, 30 and fig.; TC, pl.XV; Kemp, JEA 52 (1966) 14, pl.VIII.  
66. Petrie, RT I, pl.I.1; Abydos III, pl.V.4 (N.E. corner of the Shunet es-Zebib); Maspero, Art in Egypt, I, fig.1. In all these, the untouched area on the right of the picture is the northern part of cemetery S. More recent photographs (O'Connor, Expedition 10, no.1 (Fall 1967) 19) show the subsequent work of Peet and Petrie.  
68. This was pointed out by Kemp, LÄ I, col.35.
(a) Vaulted chambers with pyramid superstructures and containing wooden coffins. 69

(b) Rectangular mud brick chambers constructed just below the surface, containing stone sarcophagi and bitumenised mummies. 70

According to Mariette, the stelae which he calls "stèles d'Artmachis" (i.e. those on which the deity depicted is Re-Harakhte) were associated with these burials. 71

Mariette regarded the first type as of Middle Kingdom date, and the second, examples of which were interspersed between the pyramid tombs, as of late date. 72 How he reached these conclusions is unclear, but he must have been strongly influenced by the very large numbers of Middle Kingdom stelae found here. 73 The superficiality of Mariette's work and the fact that he was not usually present must also have contributed to the misunderstanding. The rate of sand deposition was such that it was already possible by the Nineteenth

69. MDF II, 42-4, paras.244-50, pl.66-7.
70. Ibid., 45, paras.257-8.
71. Ibid., 45, para.259.
72. Ibid., 42 para.241, 45 para.259. The misconception about the date of these pyramid tombs has persisted down to the present day - see, most recently, Simpson, Terrace, 6.
73. MDF II, 44, para.251. A few are said to have been found in situ, but the majority were loose in the sand.
74. See above, p.12.
Dynasty for the small temple of Ramses II, on the eastern edge of the 'Nécropole du Nord', to be built over Middle Kingdom structures without seriously damaging them. 75 Thus, the Middle Kingdom levels can hardly have been near the surface in the nineteenth century A.D.. Indeed, it was noted by both Peet 76 and Petrie 77 that the building of vaulted tombs of the Late Period in this area involved much destruction of earlier tombs. 78 It is probable, therefore, that Mariette did not excavate to sufficient depth to reach the Middle Kingdom level, and that the large numbers of Middle Kingdom stelae found by him had been disturbed, and possibly even re-used in the construction of later tombs. 79

However that may be, it is clear that the vaulted chambers with

76. CA II, 30. The Late Period tombs would seem even to have destroyed a wall of the archaic period - ibid., 31.
77. TC, 2.
78. This was also noted by Peet in the South cemetery - CA I, 26; CA II, xvi.
79. Mariette himself suggested such re-use in the Graeco-Roman period - HDF II, 44, para.251. In a late tomb (S.201) Peet (CA II, 91) found several Middle Kingdom stelae which had apparently been used in an attempt to break open a late stone sarcophagus.
pyramid superstructures are much later than the Middle Kingdom. This is apparent from the fact that almost all the tombs with this type of substructure subsequently discovered in the necropolis are of

30. The precise form of the superstructures has been disputed. Mariette states that they were pyramids and in his sections they are drawn as such (MDF II, pl.66-7). This was accepted without question by some (e.g. Naville, CA I, xi, and, more recently, Simpson, Terrace, 6), but was challenged by Petrie, who interpreted it as a reconstruction (although there is nothing in Mariette's reports to justify this assumption). Petrie argued that the usual superstructure of these vaulted tombs was a truncated pyramid filled with gravel - i.e. a mastaba - a conclusion which was accepted by Peet in his discussion of this type of tomb (CA II, 87-8). Although Peet had at his disposal almost all the excavation reports on Abydos, Petrie's interpretation is based solely on the evidence from cemetery G. As has been shown above, this contained nothing earlier than the Thirtieth Dynasty, whereas Mariette's statement refers to the 'Nécropole du Nord', where, as will be shown below, the vaulted tombs are predominantly of the Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth Dynasties. The relevance of the evidence from cemetery G to Mariette's statement is therefore debatable. The mastaba may have been the usual form of superstructure in the Ptolemaic period and the pyramid in the Saite era, although there is no reason why the two should not have been in use contemporaneously. The existence of pyramid superstructures at Abydos in the Late Period is proved, in any case, by the discovery of pyramidions, which seem to be confined to Abydos in this period (see p.31, n.45 above), and by a passage on one of them - Avignon A.30 - which dates to the Thirtieth Dynasty. This refers to the building of a pyramid (kd.tw.n.k mr). For mr as a designation of a private tomb, see WH. II.94.15. The logic of De Meulenaere's discussion of this passage escapes me. It does not "prouve que les égyptiens designaient le pyramidion de la même façon que la pyramide" as he suggests (JBOI 20 (1967-8) 10, n.54). Such would only be the case if mr in this passage meant pyramidion, but he translates it as "pyramide". That the latter is correct is clear from the use of kd, which is a term of construction, especially in mud brick (Badawy, ASAE 54 (1957) 61), and not at all appropriate to quarrying or carving in stone.
Mariette himself noted that some of these tombs contained Late Period objects, but chose to regard this as evidence of re-use. In the relatively small number of cases in which they can be dated by inscriptive evidence, the vaulted tombs found in the North cemetery are of the Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth Dynasties, in sharp contrast to the South cemetery, where all the vaulted tombs seem to be Thirtieth Dynasty or Ptolemaic. That most of the examples of this type of tomb found in the 'Nécropole du Nord' by Mariette date to the earlier period is suggested by the fact that wooden coffins, which, according to him, were associated with these tombs, are characteristic of the Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth Dynas-

81. CA II, 84-91. A vaulted tomb is depicted on stela Leiden VII.9 (De Meulenaere, CdE 29 (1954) 222, fig.30).

82. "Nous avons pu constater que quelquefois on a tout simplement déménagé ce qui restait encore dans l'intérieur d'une pyramide des restes de son antique propriétaire pour y installer un nouvel occupant de basses époques" (MDF II, 45). The logical solution, that the tombs were not Middle Kingdom at all, seems not to have occurred to him. Cf. Simpson, Terrace, 6.

83. E.g. E.173 (El Arabah, 22, pl.XXXVI - coffin fragments in Bolton Museum, 54.00.100). Since only one post-Saitite tomb has been found west of the Shunet es-Zebib (El Amrah D.7.A), it is a reasonable assumption that all the other vaulted tombs found there also date to the earlier period - e.g. D.16.C, D.29.B, D.45 and D.47. An intact vaulted tomb of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty was discovered in 1967 but its superstructure was not preserved. See below, p.275.

84. See above, p.265.
ties rather than later, when anthropoid stone sarcophagi were usual. To judge from the inscriptions of the few intact burials cited by Mariette, the second type of tomb (p.269) dates to the Ptolemaic period, and this is confirmed by the limestone sarcophagi and bitumenised mummies associated with them. Similar burials of the Ptolemaic period were found by Peet and Petrie in the South cemetery. On the

85. CA II, 95. The outermost coffin, which was of wood in the Saite period, became a limestone sarcophagus in later times, but wooden inner coffins were still used in the Ptolemaic period (see following note). The number of wooden coffins to have survived is small, but Abydos 67,661, El Amrah D.7,B, Bolton 54.00.100 and Fitzwilliam E.14.1926 are all fragments of the type, which is typical of the Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth Dynasties (A. Moret, Sarcothages de l'époque babaste a l'époque saite, (Cairo 1913) passim), and all are securely dated to that period. The only later example is Chicago OIM 7196-7 and 7199, although one is depicted on stela Leiden VII.9 - see n.81 above.

86. The statement in CA II, 91 that "along with the rise of the brick vault goes the adoption of the heavy limestone coffin" is not true as it stands - stone sarcophagi are not found at Abydos between the New Kingdom and the Thirtieth Dynasty (cf. Buhl, Sarcothages, 212, and G. Maspero and H. Gauthier, Sarcothages des époques persanes et ptolemaiques, (Cairo 1939) iii). The provision of limestone sarcophagi is mentioned on two monuments - Avignon A.30 (db3t m inr hd nfr n 'aw) and Vienna 5103 (db3t 53t m inr hd nfr) - which date to the Thirtieth Dynasty and Ptolemaic period respectively. For db3t as the outermost coffin or sarcophagus, see Janssen, Commodity Prices from the Ramessid Period, (Leiden 1975) 215. The accompanying inner coffins were made of wood, however - mry-wood in the former case, kdt- and nht-wood in the latter.

87. MDP II, 45 citing MCA 1371-3.

other hand, an analysis of the "stèles d'Armachis" shows that almost all of them date to the seventh century. These cannot, therefore, have been associated with the second type of burial encountered by Mariette, and it is a reasonable assumption that the seventh century stelae were in fact associated with the pyramid tombs of the same date. The 'Nécropole du Nord' should therefore be reinterpreted as follows:

A. In the seventh century, and to a lesser extent in the sixth century and early Ptolemaic period, vaulted chambers with pyramidal superstructures were built. The burials were characterised by wooden coffins and, at least in the seventh century, were accompanied by stelae dedicated to Re-Harakhte.

B. In the later Ptolemaic period, simple burials, characterised by bitumenised mummies and limestone sarcophagi, were made in rectangular brick cavities just below the surface in the gaps between the superstructures of group A.

89. These "stèles d'Armachis" were published by Mariette in MCA, nos. 1238-88. I have been unable to identify three of them (MCA 1257, 1267 and 1271) in the Cairo Museum, and Mariette's descriptions scarcely permit a dating. One (MCA 1268 = Cairo JE 19783 = Lieblein, Dictionnaire, 1082 and supplement, 978) is New Kingdom, one (MCA 1279) probably Third Intermediate Period, and three (MCA 1265, 1269 and 1273 = Cairo JE 6301, T.25/10/24/1 and T.6/7/24/9 respectively) date to the sixth century, while the remaining 43 date to the seventh century. See the concordance below for the Cairo Museum numbers.
14. Peet's cemetery 3 can be precisely located - see above, p.268. It was extensively used in the archaic period and the Middle Kingdom, and "in Late Dynastic times a considerable number of brick-vaulted tombs were constructed in the cemetery, greatly to the detriment of earlier tombs". The slight evidence available indicates that these were of the Ptolemaic period.

15. A vaulted tomb, dated by the associated inscriptions to the Twenty-fifth Dynasty, was discovered by the Pennsylvania-Yale expedition just north-west of the forecourt of the small temple of Ramses II, and thus on the eastern fringe of Mariette's work.

16. In the process of clearing the 'Tombs of the Courtiers' (within the 'Nécropole du Nord'), Petrie encountered vaulted tombs which he dated to "the XXVIth to XXXth dynasties". The only late inscriptions found were a number of sixth - fourth century stelae and...

90. CA II, 46.
91. Limestone sarcophagi were found in S.61 and S.201 (ibid., 93-4), bitumenised mummies in S.621 (ibid., 94) and a Ptolemaic inscription in S.61 (ibid., 122, fig.87, pl.XXVI.4).
92. O'Connor, Expedition 10, no.1 (Fall 1967) 13-14, tomb 3, and Expedition 12, no.1 (Fall 1969) 36-8. For the inscriptions, see Abydos 67.661 and Cairo JE 91219 and JE 91261.
93. TC, pl.XV. A view looking west across this area to the Shunet es-Zebib appears on pl.XXX. Cf. Abydos III, pl.V.2.
94. TC, 2.
some fragments of a seventh century coffin. 95

17. In one of the sondages which he made between the Kom es-Sultan and the Shunet es-Zebib, Amélineau found a tomb which he dated to the Roman period. 96

18. To judge from his sketch map, Peet's areas Y and Z must have been within, and just beyond, the 'Nécropole du Nord' respectively. 97 Vaulted tombs were apparently common in both areas. 98

19. The position of Garstang's cemetery E can be ascertained from his statement that it was part of a strip "eight or ten acres in area, bounded on the south by this valley and on the north by the Shuna and so westward...". 99 To the west lay Mace's cemetery D. 100 The position of cemetery E is also indicated on his plan with the aid of directional pointers, but this is of limited use since only one of

96. NF 1895-6, xxxvii, 5-6 and frontispiece, area 3.
98. CA II, xvi. Only one vaulted tomb, apparently of the Third Intermediate Period, is mentioned in area Y (Y.9 - ibid., 85-6, pl.XXII.3). For area Z, see ibid., 86-7, 94 (Z.2, 14, 18).
100. El Amarah, 63.
the survey points is precisely located. It is clear from later photographs, which show an area of flat, apparently untouched land on the west of the Shunet es-Zebib, that Garstang stopped some way short of this structure, while his plan reveals that he did not excavate the southern fringe very thoroughly. The few tombs which can be dated by inscriptions are all of the Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth Dynasties, while other tombs were attributed by the excavator to the same period on the basis of associated objects. Nothing in this part of the cemetery is of later date.

20. Cemetery D, which lay west of E, and was bounded on the south

101. El Arabah, pl.II. Survey point B at the Kom es-Sultan is located on pl.XXXVII, but point D ("the Shuneh") is not marked and the distance of 1000 ft. from the cemetery to an unspecified part of the Shunet es-Zebib is a useless piece of information.

102. Petrie, RT I, pl.I.2, taken from the Shunet es-Zebib looking west over the spoil mounds of cemeteries E and D, and TC, pl.I.2, an unlabelled view of the Shunet es-Zebib from the west.

103. The coffin fragments from tomb E.173 (Bolton 54.00.100 : El Arabah, 21, pl.XXXVI) are of the mid-seventh century B.C., as are the objects from the pit of tomb E.11 (Fitzwilliam E.11, E.252.1900 and E.259.1900), while the canopics from tomb E.301 date to c. 600 B.C. (BM 32703-6 : ibid., pl.XXIII, XXXIV).

104. E.g. E.148, E.291 and E.299.

105. A photograph (Petrie, RT I, pl.I.2), in which cemetery D is represented by the further mound of spoil heaps, seems to show that there was a strip of unexcavated ground between them, but another piece of evidence suggests that this was not very wide - some coffin fragments belonging to the owner of the canopic set cited in n.103 were found in tomb D.7.B. Even allowing for disturbance, it is improbable that E.301 and D.7.B were very far apart. For the position of the two tombs, see El Arabah, pl.I and El Amrah, pl.XXIII respectively.
by the wadi, 106 constitutes the westernmost limit of the cemetery.

A view across tomb D.57 to the Shunet es-Zebib shows clearly the angular relationship of this, the most northerly tomb excavated by Mace, to that structure, the south and west walls of which are quite visible. 107 The Late Period remains in this area seem to be largely similar in date to those of cemetery E, and only one tomb can be regarded as later than the Saite period. 108 In particular, the finds of Mace and Amélineau in this area combined indicate that tombs of members of the royal family of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty were situated there. 109

21. Peet's areas B, C and X appear to have been situated in the area left uncleared by Garstang on the slopes of the wadi. 110 The position of C can be independently estimated from a photograph in which the spoil mounds of cemetery D are visible in the background. 111 Little is known of these areas, but tomb B.1 can be dated to the mid-

106. El Amrah, 63, pl.XXIII.
107. Ibid., pl.XXX.
108. Tomb D.7.A — see genealogy XVIII. Among the most important vaulted tombs dated by inscriptions to the seventh century are D.3 (El Amrah, 64, 78, pl.XXVII), D.15 (ibid., 65, 80, pl.XXVII) and D.57 (ibid., 65, 80, pl.XXVIII, XXX). See Cairo JE 34431-2 and Chicago OIM 5740-50 and 5747-9.
110. CA II, xiv.
111. Ibid., pl.XI.3.
seventh century and X.7 probably to the Twenty-sixth Dynasty. 112

22. Between 1906 and 1909 Garstang ranged over much of the North cemetery but the results of his work were never published. 113 One area in which he worked can be located from a photograph of part of his 1907 excavations. 114 It shows the west and south walls of the Shunet es-Zebib at such an angle that it is clearly just to the southeast of cemetery D, presumably in the area which Garstang himself had left unfinished in 1901. In some part of the North cemetery, Garstang found a vaulted tomb which contained a Ptolemaic offering table and three uninscribed anthropoid limestone sarcophagi. 115

23. In the area which he designated 'D' "immediately to the north of the Coptic Deir", 116 Peet found two Ptolemaic / Roman tombs, 117 and part of a seventh century statue. 118

112. See catalogue entries CA II.73 and CA II.94.
114. CA I, 49, pl.XVII.6. Another view of this area, looking westwards to the cliffs, appears in The Sphere, July 27, 1907, supplement p.1, top left.
115. Tomb 212.A.07. The offering table is now in the Liverpool City Museum 50.45.30.
116. CA III, xi.
117. CA III, 33-4, pl.IV.1-10.
118. See Brussels E.4070.
A broad pattern of development within the cemetery can be discerned from the foregoing conspectus. The principal burial area in the Middle Kingdom had been the 'Nécropole du Nord', but in the Second Intermediate Period the ground to the west beyond the Shunet es-Zebib began to be exploited for the first time. Garstang remarked that the Middle Kingdom tombs in his cemetery E, which is in precisely this region, were on the eastern edge, closest to the 'Nécropole du Nord', while those of the New Kingdom were on the west towards cemetery D. This westerly movement continued during and after the New Kingdom, culminating in the royal burials of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty on the westernmost fringe of the necropolis. The last important tomb to be situated here was probably that of the Vizier Nespa-medu (D.57), who died c. 660 B.C.. By the mid-seventh century, this area was no longer in use for burials. At approximately the same time, monuments began to appear again in the 'Nécropole du Nord', which became the main burial area during the Twenty-sixth Dynasty.

119. Kemp, LA I, col.35. Virtually all Mariette's Middle Kingdom stelae are said to come from this area.

120. El Arabah, 3.

121. Almost all the material of the Third Intermediate Period found at Abydos comes from cemetery D. See the objects cited in n.136 on p.69, and see also El Arabah, 78-9, for the large number of ushabtis of this period from this area.

122. Only two later tombs have been found west of the Shunet es-Zebib in the North cemetery, one Saite (D.7.B / E.301, for which see p.277) and one Ptolemaic (D.7.A - see genealogy XVIII).
Deep vaulted tombs were cut through the Middle Kingdom level, causing the disturbance which so confused Mariette. Most of the late seventh and early sixth century inscriptions, the provenance of which is known, come from this area. It continued to be used until well into the Ptolemaic era, but by the Thirtieth Dynasty the most popular burial ground was the South cemetery, which was principally used in the Old Kingdom and which had not been significantly used since. Figure I, a correlation of the chronological and topographical distribution of objects, illustrates these general trends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NC (E)</th>
<th>NC (W)</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>0/U</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eighth century</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh century</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth century</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth-fourth centuries</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynasty XXX-Ptolemaic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemaic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later Ptolemaic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NC (E): The North cemetery east of the Shunet es Zebib - see sections 13-18 above.

NC (W): The North cemetery west of the Shunet es-Zebib - see sections 19-21 above.

SC : The South cemetery - see sections 5-11 above.

123. Kemp, LÄ I, col.34.
Objects from other areas and those whose provenance is unknown.

The factors which determined this development are not easy to ascertain. In general, the siting of a tomb might be influenced not only by the next most prominent piece of land, but also by family or religious considerations. In the case of Abydos, the nature of the Osiris cult was undoubtedly the major factor. It was almost certainly the increased importance of the Osiris temple and the introduction of processions to the Umm el-Qa'ab in the Middle Kingdom which led to the abandonment of the South cemetery and the concentration of monuments in the 'Nécropole du Nord'. In turn, it was probably the consequent pressure on space within the latter area that caused the initial westerly spread of tombs towards the end of the Middle Kingdom. The sacrosanct wadi and the Osiris temple enclosure prevented expansion to the south and east respectively, and westward development was, in any case, logical since tombs could then be built overlooking the wadi and the processions to the tomb of Osiris.

There can be no doubt, however, that the shift of burials to the west continued for much longer than was necessary. Middle Kingdom chapels in the 'Nécropole du Nord' were already sanded over by the reign of Ramses II, 124 and there must, therefore, have been am-

124. See above, p. 269-70.
ple space for tombs to be built over them. That they were not is, in part, a reflection on the poverty of the Third Intermediate Period, when it seems to have been usual to re-use an old tomb rather than to build a new one. 125 It also suggests that the 'Nécropole du Nord' was no longer regarded as a peculiarly favourable area. The tombs of the princesses of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty were, therefore, built in the part of the cemetery which was then in use, and not in a specially reserved area.

There is no obvious reason for the rather sudden return to the 'Nécropole du Nord' in the middle years of the seventh century. The cemetery could have continued to expand towards the cliffs almost indefinitely, or could easily have spread to the north, and yet the area was suddenly deserted for the 'Nécropole du Nord'. It may not be entirely chance that the movement coincides with the re-appearance of large numbers of stelae after the dearth during the Third Intermediate Period, particularly as so many of them come from the 'Nécropole du Nord'. The startling disparity between the numbers of stelae as opposed to all other categories of object has already been touched on, 126 but a closer examination is now required. The analysis of the topographical distribution of stelae and other types

125. For the poverty of the burials, see El Amrah, 77-81, and for the re-use of tombs, see ibid., 97-102.
126. See above, p.29.
of object in figure II shows that the disparity is confined to the 'Nécropole du Nord'.

**Figure II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>NC (E)</th>
<th>NC (W)</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>O/U</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stelae</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarcophagi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statues</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyramidions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering tables</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lintels</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canopics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ushabtis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some 75% of the objects found in the 'Nécropole du Nord' are stelae, whereas in the area west of the Shunet es-Zebib, stelae constitute only about 25% of the total. In the South cemetery, the figure is even smaller - only about 13%. The superficiality of Mariette's work might explain why the other areas have a much better balanced array of funerary objects, but not why such a large number (about 85%) of all the stelae of which the provenance is known come from the 'Nécropole du Nord'. It is impossible to escape the conclusion that the return to the 'Nécropole du Nord' in the late Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth Dynasties is connected with the revival of the stela as a method of commemoration. This in turn may
be part of the renewed interest in the cult of Osiris, which is apparent in the buildings of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty at Karnak, and the burial of the princesses at Abydos. The phenomenon of archaising is still far from perfectly understood, and it may well be that the interest of the seventh century B.C. in the art forms of the Middle Kingdom extended to its religious practices.

127. See Leclant, Recherches, 262-86.
128. For references to archaising, see above, p. 52.
The monuments left by the kings of the Late Period at Abydos provide a potentially useful supplementary guide to the fortunes of the Osiris cult, but their value is limited by the fact that a large part of the Osiris temple enclosure has not been excavated at all, and by the apparent loss of objects found by Amélineau at the Umm el-Qa'ab. ¹ In the Late Period as earlier, the supposed tomb of Osiris at the Umm el-Qa'ab was the focus of the cult. The date at which the tomb of Djer was actually identified as that of Osiris is uncertain, but the facts that little Middle Kingdom material has been found there and that the earliest pottery offerings seem to date to the Eighteenth Dynasty accord well with a date in the Second Intermediate Period (perhaps in the reign of Khendjer) for the black stone monument representing Osiris recumbent on a bier which was found in the tomb and which has often been wrongly attributed to the Late Period. ² The New Kingdom dedications from the Umm el-Qa'ab seem to be largely private dedications in the form of ostraca, and it is not until the Third Intermediate Period that the first royal

¹. See above, p.13, n.20.
². See Appendix I.
name is found there. A series of ostraca record the names of Psusennes II and numerous Osorkons and Sheshonks. Indeed, the extant record is so continuous that in the hundred years from Psusennes II, the last king of the Twenty-first Dynasty to Osorkon II, fifth king of the Twenty-second Dynasty (c. 959-850 B.C.), only the notoriously ephemeral Takeloth I is not represented at the Umm el-Qa'ab. When the very small number of attestations of these kings elsewhere is considered, the record is more impressive than at first sight, and a number of monuments from the cemetery confirm the deep interest in Abydos taken by the ruling families of the first half of the Third Intermediate Period.

3. See Kemp, LA I, cols. 36-7 for a summary of the finds. An offering table of Senwosret I was, however, found at Hekrehaq hill.

4. Amélineau, NF 1897-8, 146 (24). This king is also known from a graffito in the Osireion (Murray, Osireion, 36, no. 38, p1. XXI), and perhaps from an ostracon of "one of the Psusennes" (AR 1910-11, 2 = CA I, 36). Another ostracon with the prenomen (Twt-hpr-r) (NF 1897-8, 147 (25)), which is otherwise unknown, may represent a variant of his prenomen Tit-hpr-r.

5. Osorkon I (AR 1910-11, 2 = CA I, 36), the high priest of Amun Sheshonk (NF 1897-8, 130-35, 278 (2)), Sheshonk/"Sesac" (Cairo JE 32070), Osorkon II (NF 1897-8, 136 (14, 15, 18) and 140 (1) = Cairo JE 32068-9) and an unspecified Osorkon (NF 1895-6, 141, 168 (3 and 4) and NF 1897-8, 50 (3) and 134 (4)).

6. For this king, see Kitchen, TIP, para. 71.

7. Gauthier attributed to Psusennes II ("the merest shadow on the stage of history" according to Kitchen, TIP, para. 238) "un rôle tout particulier" at Abydos because of the inscriptions cited in n. 4 above.

8. Pasebakhamu, the son of the high priest of Amun Menkheperre, Iuput, son of Sheshonk I, and a daughter of Harsiese all had monuments at Abydos - see p. 69, n. 136.
poverished age in which the dedications of kings are mere ostraca, and additions to the temple complex were beyond the means of these rulers.

Private monuments are scarce, too, and burials poor until the early seventh century, when the first signs of a revival in prosperity occur, with substantially increased numbers of stelae, and large vaulted tombs being built in the 'Nécropole du Nord'. It is perhaps surprising, in view of the royal burials in cemetery D, that the Twenty-fifth Dynasty appears to have undertaken no construction work at Abydos 9 and also that the only record of Psammetichus I at Abydos is a lintel from Mariette's "petit temple ruiné", which dates to the very end of his reign. 10 It was not, however, until the reign of Apries that any attention was given to the Osiris temple enclosure. The work of both Apries and Amasis is indicated by joint foundation deposits and a red granite naos with the cartouches of both kings. It is clear from both the Peftjauawyneith inscrip-

9. See E. Russman, *The Representation of the King in the XXVth Dynasty*, (Brussels and Brooklyn 1974) 15, n.5 for the Eighteenth Dynasty date of a block which had been assigned to the Twenty-fifth Dynasty. A vase fragment with the cartouches of Amenirdis I was apparently found at the Umm el-Qa'ab - see Brussels E.4428.

10. For the lintel, see Cairo JE 19769 and JE 20340. Note also a lapis lazuli bead with the legend (Psmtkh) mry Wsir from the Osiris temenos (Abydos I, 25, pl.LII).

11. Foundation deposits: *Abydos* I, 32-3, pl.LXX.6-9; naos: *Abydos* I, LXVIII. Note also an offering table of Amasis (BM 610).
tion and the archaeological evidence that most of the work was done during the reign of Amasis. 12

The inscription of the statue of Peftjauawynacht (Louvre A.93) is very revealing about the state of the Osiris temple area in c. 570 B.C... He records that, after he had reported to the king on the condition of Abydos, the king instructed him to carry out repairs (\textit{wd.n hm.f ir kšt m 3bdw n-nw\text{e}t grg 3bdw}). 13 He goes on: "I built the temple of Khentamentiu, of excellent work of eternity as His Majesty commanded ... He saw that the affairs of the Thinite nome prospered ... I surrounded it with a wall of brick ... I built the "\textit{wpg}" sanctuary ... I renewed the offerings (making them) greater than before ... I restored the House of Life after (its) ruin". 14

It is clear from this text that the temple at Abydos had been neglected during the preceding period, if not actually destroyed. It is surprising that it should be at the height of Abydene prosperity.

12. Kemp, \textit{MDAIK} 23 (1968) 146. "Since the name of Ahmose II occurs even in the foundations of the enclosure wall, little progress had presumably been made under his predecessor".

13. The word grg in this context has the meaning of "restore, set in order" and can apply both to affairs and to actual building works. See, for an earlier period, J. Vandier, \textit{Mo'alla}, (Cairo 1950) 165.

14. \texttt{hwsl.n(i) hw-t-ntr n Hnt-i-nntiw m kšt mnh t nhh wd.n hm.f m33.n.f rwd m hš T3-wr ... dbn.n(i) sw m inb n dbt ... iw hwsl.n(i) wpq ... wnh.n(i) n.f htpw-ntr m-hšw wn im m-hšn ... sm3w.n(i) pr-\text{h} m-hšt wšs.}
in the Late Period that such detailed repairs were necessary, and yet it may have been that very prosperity which made the repairs possible. It has been argued that the restoration might have been necessitated by internal disturbances in the reign of Amasis, but it is more likely that the problem was a much older one. As far as we know, no work on the temple had been done for over five hundred years since the Ramesside period, and it may simply be that the temple was collapsing as a result of neglect.

It is precisely the same two kings whose names are attested at the Umm el-Qa'ab, although the possibility that dedications at the tomb of Osiris were much more frequent than is apparent must be born in mind. A chapel was built by Apries and stela fragments and pieces of limestone, inadequately recorded by the excavators but perhaps from a similar chapel (or the same?), show that Amasis shared his predecessor's interest in the cult.

With Amasis and the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, however, the cult of Osiris at the Umm el-Qa'ab comes to an end. Although the wadi re-

16. The Twenty-sixth Dynasty temple was built directly over one of the Eighteenth Dynasty and reused its blocks in the foundations (Abydos II, 19).
17. It is possible that systematic excavation might yet reveal a more continuous record of royal devotion.
18. BM 1358. Note also an ostracon, Amélineau II.
19. Amélineau III-IV.
mainly free of burials until well into the Ptolemaic period, almost nothing from the Umm el-Qa'ab is later than the Twenty-sixth Dynasty. No proper study of the offering pottery has been made, but "it seems to date mainly to the Eighteenth to Twenty-sixth Dynasties with the occasional piece as late as the Roman period". The only inscriptions which might be later than the Twenty-sixth Dynasty are fragmentary cartouches, which may be those of Teos of the Thirtieth Dynasty and one of the Arsinoes.

The Persian period is the largest gap in the history of Abydos in the Late Period. The lack of interest in, and even hostility to, Egyptian religion with which Herodotos and other sources credit these rulers is confirmed rather than contradicted by the inscriptions of the statue Vatican 158. This belonged to one Wedjahorresnet, who was able to secure the assistance of Cambyses in restoring the temple of Neith at Sais which had been desecrated and occupied by the Persian invaders. The underlying indication of what the Persian invasion really meant counts for more than a single tale of compensation written from a very partisan point of view. There is no

21. See Kienitz, Geschichte, 213 and CA I, 36 respectively.
22. G. Posener, La première domination perse en Égypte, (Cairo 1936) 1-36.
23. Wedjahorresnet was promoted by Cambyses and displays a great desire to please the deities of his native Sais. There is no reason to suppose that other cult centres in Egypt were awarded the same protection.
trace of the Persian rulers at Abydos; indeed, it seems that royal, if not popular, interest in the cult of Osiris at Abydos virtually ended with the Persian period.

The only later temples at Abydos were built in the Thirtieth Dynasty. Petrie found a foundation deposit which he dated to Nectanebo I 24 and he attributed a small temple to each of the Nectanebos on largely intuitive grounds. From the much destroyed "petit temple de l'ouest" came two naoi, one with the cartouches of Nectanebo II and one with the cartouches of both kings of that name. 25

The Nectanebos were, however, prolific builders and assiduous devotees of cults throughout Egypt, 26 and their work at Abydos should be seen as part of an overall building programme and not as reflecting a special interest in the cult of Osiris at Abydos.

The Abydene Osiris did not recover from the Persian period. Although there can be no doubt about the popularity of the god in Egypt as a whole in the Ptolemaic period, this included the proli-

24. The foundation deposit (Abydos I, 33, pl.LXX.11) was uninscribed but dated by Petrie to Nectanebo I on the basis of a cartouche fragment found in the ruins of the building, which was not fully excavated. The dating is broadly confirmed by J. Weinstein's unpublished doctoral dissertation Foundation Deposits in Ancient Egypt (University of Pennsylvania 1973).

25. Cairo CG 70017-18.

feration of cult centres, a process which was inevitably at the ex-
pense of Abydos. Not a trace of the Ptolemaic rulers, who built so
extensively throughout Egypt, is to be found at Abydos.
Appendix I

The Osiris "bed"

Although the so-called Osiris "bed" has frequently been attributed to the Late Period,¹ no proper publication of the monument has appeared, and, as its date is of some significance for the history of the Osiris cult, a reappraisal of the evidence is made here.²

The "bed", which is now on display in the Cairo Museum,³ was discovered by Amélineau in the tomb of Djer in the First Dynasty royal cemetery at the Umm el-Qa'ab.⁴ From at least the New Kingdom onwards,⁵ the Egyptians regarded this as the tomb of Osiris himself, a view to which Amélineau subscribed. The "bed"⁶ is a representation in black basalt of the mummified figure of Osiris lying on a bier formed by the bodies of two lions, the heads, tails, legs and both

---

1. E.g. Petrie, RT I, 7 - "The granite bier of Osiris.... was probably of the XXVIth or a later Dynasty". See also the references in n.21 below.

2. This is based on a set of photographs with which Mr. B.J. Kemp kindly provided me, and prolonged study of the original in Cairo.

3. JR 32090 - for bibliography, see PM V, 79, to which add the works of Otto and Von Beckerath cited below.

4. Amélineau, Tombeau, 109-15 and pl.II-IV.

5. Perhaps from as early as the Middle Kingdom, if the identification of the Umm el-Qa'ab with the place known in Middle Kingdom texts as Poker be accepted - see preface.
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Although the so-called Osiris "bed" has frequently been attributed to the Late Period, no proper publication of the monument has appeared, and, as its date is of some significance for the history of the Osiris cult, a reappraisal of the evidence is made here.

The "bed", which is now on display in the Cairo Museum, was discovered by Amélineau in the tomb of Djer in the First Dynasty royal cemetery at the Umm el-Qa'ab. From at least the New Kingdom onwards, the Egyptians regarded this as the tomb of Osiris himself, a view to which Amélineau subscribed. The "bed" is a representation in black basalt of the mummified figure of Osiris lying on a bier formed by the bodies of two lions, the heads, tails, legs and both

1. E.g. Petrie, RT I, 7 - "The granite bier of Osiris... was probably of the XXVIth or a later Dynasty". See also the references in n.21 below.

2. This is based on a set of photographs with which Mr. B.J. Kemp kindly provided me, and prolonged study of the original in Cairo.

3. JE 32090 - for bibliography, see PM V, 79, to which add the works of Otto and Von Beckerath cited below.

4. Amélineau, Tombeau, 109-15 and pl.II-IV.

5. Perhaps from as early as the Middle Kingdom, if the identification of the Umm el-Qa'ab with the place known in Middle Kingdom texts as Poker be accepted - see preface.

6. For general views see Amélineau, Tombeau, pl.II-IV; G. Maspero, Guide to the Cairo Museum, 5th ed. (Cairo 1910) 176; Otto, Egyptian Art, pl.18-19.
front paws of which are clearly delineated. 7 The bier rests on a rectangular base. Osiris wears the white crown and holds his usual insignia, the flail 8 in the right hand and the crook in the left. The hands meet on the chest in the manner classified by Roeder, in his study of bronzes, as characteristic of Middle Egypt and well represented at Abydos. 9 The hands are slightly to the left of centre, but this is only noticeable when looking down the axis from nose to feet. 10 At each end of the bier there are two protective falcons, and resting on the recumbent figure of Osiris is another falcon representing Isis, whose name is inscribed beside it. 11 In the course of his description of the find, Amelineau remarked that one of the end falcons was found in the debris above the tomb 12 and that the others were damaged, while it is clear from his photographs that the

---

7. The lion bier is common from the Old Kingdom onwards — see C. De Wit, Le rôle et le sens du lion dans l'Égypte ancienne, (Leiden 1951) 161-3. In examples in the round, the tail of necessity hangs down, whereas in relief and painting it curls upwards.

8. The form of the flail is unusual, as Amelineau noted.


10. Cf. Amelineau, Tombeau, 113 and pl.IV.15. Amelineau stresses this asymmetry as evidence for his early dating of the bier.

11. For Isis as a falcon in this context, see M. Münster, Untersuchungen zur Göttin Isis, (Berlin 1968) 201, and Otto, Egyptian Art, pls.17 and 19.

12. Tombeau, 110.
Isis falcon was also missing at that time. The latter has since been restored, and, as far as one can tell from Amélineau's plates, there has been little change in other respects. The name of Osiris is incised by his left shoulder, while beside each of the four end falcons, their identity as 'Horus, protector of his father, Osiris' (Hr nd hr it.f Wsir), is expressed in a vertically written group reading from left to right. A single separate line of inscription is cut at the top of each side of the bier, running from left to right at the head and on the right hand side of Osiris, and from right to left at the foot and on the left hand side; these give the largely erased titulary of a king, which Amélineau confessed himself quite unable to read: "Je dis tout simplement que je n'ai pu trouver le nom du roi qui fit graver cette dédicace", and "Tout ce qu'on voit, c'est que ce roi avait un prénom dans lequel le signe du soleil entrait." He proposed the Old Kingdom as a likely date on purely intuitive grounds, but felt that the inscription was probably later than the bier itself. In 1900 two separate articles appeared in the Recueil de Travaux, proposing specific and quite different dates for

13. Ibid., 110, pl.III.12; IV.15.
14. Maspero, Guide, 176, notes that additional pieces were found by Petrie - see RT I, 7.
15. Amélineau, Tombeau, 110.
16. Ibid., 113.
17. Ibid., 112.
the monument. Daressy read the cartouches as \((\ldots k^{3}\text{-r}^{C}) (\text{Nfr}\text{-r}^{C}\ldots)\) and attributed the object to the Second Intermediate Period, concluding: "Toutes les présomptions sont donc pour que le cenotaphe soit de la XIVe dynastie et le style déplorable du monument concorde comme faiblesse, avec les autres œuvres sculpturales de cette époque que nous possédons". A later date had already been envisaged, however: "Tous ceux qui ont pu en juger directement, sauf M. Amélineau, pense qu'il n'est pas antérieur à la XIXe dynastie", and in 1900 Groff read the titulary as that of \((\text{Hpr-k}^{3}\text{-r}^{C}) (\text{Nht-}\text{nb.}^{f})\). Since then several scholars have described the monument as being of late date, but in no case has this been substantiated.

J. Von Beckerath, on the other hand, has recently revived Daressy's

18. RT 22 (1900) 138-40.
19. So Maspero, as quoted by Amélineau, Tombeau, 118. Maspero's own views seem to have changed and were perhaps never fixed. In the passage just cited, he went on to say: "Après avoir vu les photographies je me suis demandé s'il n'y avait pas lieu d'en reculer la date jusqu'au Moyen Empire". He later favoured a Saite date - Guide, 176-7.
20. RT 22 (1900) 80-3, i.e. the king now known as Nectanebo I. Groff too thought the style of the piece appropriate to his dating.
21. E.g. E.A. Budge, Osiris and the Egyptian Resurrection, (London 1911) II, 84: "\ldots belongs obviously to a comparatively late period". Otto, Egyptian Art, pl.18: "Late Period, probably Saitic period". Kees, Ancient Egypt, 234: "\ldots an undoubted work of the Late Period". Roeder, Äg. Stud., 256, states dogmatically that the bier "\ldots in Dyn. XXI in das Grab eines Königs der I.Dyn. gestellt worden ist". In these examples, as elsewhere, the certainty of statement and the use of words such as "obviously" and "undoubted" obscure a complete absence of supporting evidence - cf. Philip Rahtz, Antiquity 49 (1975) 59-61.
dating in a more precise way, reading the cartouches as those of
\( (Nfr-k3-r^t) (Nb-r^t-r-3w) \), an otherwise unknown king whom he assigns,
on the basis of that king's position in the Turin Canon, to the
Seventeenth Dynasty. 22

It will be apparent that attempts to date the bier have approached
the problem from two different angles - the reading of the obliterated
royal names, which, if accomplished, would date the inscription to a
particular reign, and the determination of the appropriate stylistic
milieu, which, at best, can only provide a much more general date. 23
I would suggest that the first approach cannot produce a definitive
reading since the cartouches are so thoroughly erased as to be ulti-
mately illegible. Most of what can be deciphered was indicated long
ago by Daressy and any further readings can only be suggestions
which cannot be demonstrated photographically to the scholarly world.
The second approach has so far proved quite inadequate as a dating
criterion because of the subjectivity of opinion as to the artistic

---

22. Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte der zweiten Zwischenzeit
in Ägypten, (Glückstadt 1964) 183-4, 289, XVII.7 (2). Von Beck-
erath felt that the bier itself was of late Middle Kingdom date
and that the inscription was added later. Habachi, in a review
of Von Beckerath's book in CdE 43 (1968) 81, implicitly challenged
the latter's interpretation in promising a definitive reading of
the text, which has not yet appeared.

23. With the possible exception of Groff, all those who have assigned
a late date to the monument have done so on this impressionistic
basis. The burden of proof therefore rests with those who be-
lieve it to be late.
quality and style of the monument, as is apparent from the diversity of periods which have been suggested for it. We should therefore consider other aspects of the bier and its context in seeking to establish as closely as possible the period to which it belongs. There is little to be gleaned, however, from either the style of the piece, for which there are few real parallels, or the mythology which it expresses. The motif of Isis as a falcon, impregnating herself on the body of the dead Osiris, is attested in relief carving by the reign of Seti I and the scene is described on an early Eighteenth Dynasty stela in Paris, while the underlying myth goes back to the Pyramid Texts.

The most striking feature of the inscription is the thoroughness with which the titulary has been erased. Even the common, uninformative and inoffensive passage $ir.n.f.m.nnw.m.n.t.f$ has been obliterated, and only the passages relating to deities and the element $n$ in some


25. A. Calverly and M. Broome, *The Temple of King Sethos I at Abydos*, III (London-Chicago 1938) pl.62. It may not be irrelevant to note that the falcon on a lion couch is first attested as a determinative of $sd$ as early as the Nineteenth Dynasty - see *Wr.* IV, 390.


of the cartouches have been left untouched, presumably out of respect. The erasure of royal names was common in ancient Egypt but it is nevertheless a noteworthy feature. It immediately suggested to Groff "la dynastie éthiopienne ou le nom d'Amasis", although he rejected this date. Many of the signs or groups were erased individually, and in some cases their shape at least is therefore determinable, making a certain amount of restoration possible. The following text is a reduced facsimile, at a scale of approximately 1:10.

Head

28. Leclant, Recherches, xiii, n.4. A Thirteenth Dynasty example from Abydos is a stela (Cairo JE 35256: El Amrah, pl.29), on which the name of Neferhotep I has been superimposed on the erased names of an earlier king which are now illegible. There is no trace of any such superscription on the Osiris "bed".

29. RT 22 (1900) 81
The Horus (a) (.......rc) (b) Wsîr Ḥnt-ımnty nb 3bdw ḫt nh ḫ mi Rc ḫt beloved of Osiris-Khentamentiu, lord of Abydos, given life like Re for ever.

Hr Dd Ḥprw (c) Nbt. (d) Hr mwb (e) (f) (.......rc) (b) sn Rc n ḫt.f (.......(g) ḫr.n.f m mnw.f n ḫt.f (h) Wsîr Ḥnt-ımnty nb 3bdw ḫr.f ḫ n.f ḫt nh ḫ mi Rc ḫt
The Horus Djed Kheperu, the Two Ladies...., the Horus of Gold....
... (.....re) the Son of Re of his body (.....). He made as his
monument for his father Osiris-Khentamentiu, lord of Abydos, that he
might make for him "given life" like Re for ever.

Foot

Nfr nfr nb t3wy s3 R' (.....) (g) Wpw3wt nb t3 dsr mry 'nh dt

The Good God, Lord of the Two Lands, the Son of Re (.....) beloved
of Wepwawet, lord of the Holy Land, living for ever.

Left side

Hr Dl Hprw (c) Nbtv..... (d) Hr mwb..... (e) ..... (f) (.....r')
(b) s3 R' n ht.f (.....) (g) I.r.n.f m mnw.f n it.f (h) Wsir ënt-
ntiwt n nb 3bdw I.r.f n.f dî 'nh mî R' dt

The Horus Djed Kheperu, the Two Ladies...., the Horus of Gold....
... (.....re) the Son of Re of his body (.....). He made as his
monument for his father Osiris-Khentamentiu, lord of Abydos, that he
might make for him "given life" like Re for ever.

Commentary

a. Daressy's restoration of nb t3wy new bity is probably correct.

b. It is clear that the first sign of the nomen is O . The last
sign was read as 11 by Groff, Daressy and Von Beckerath, and this
is almost certainly correct, although a rounder sign such as O
cannot be excluded. The middle sign is tall and thin. Von Becke-
rath read 6 and Groff was tempted to do so, but almost any thin
vertical sign is possible.

c. The Horus name is the most legible part of the erased section.
The first two signs are clearly 3 3 , the third is oval with
marks at the bottom appropriate to 3 3 , while the fourth is a
bird which can scarcely be other than 3 3 . Groff's mr t3wy is
quite impossible, not least because there are definitely four
signs in the Horus name.

d. The nebty name seems also to begin with 3 , although other verti-
cal signs are possible; all four signs are tall and thin and the
3 3 3 : suggested by Daressy and Von Beckerath is possible.
e. Daressy's remarks on the Horus of Gold title remain valid. The first sign can only be a bird, and in this context almost certainly ר, while the second is tall and very narrow. The י suggested by Daressy is the most likely of the possible alternatives.

f. The restoration was by made by all the commentators is certainly correct in this position but the signs are not distinguishable.

g. The nomen has posed the greatest problem. Five signs can be distinguished. Of the first two, the uppermost is clearly round and was interpreted by Daressy and Von Beckerath as 0. In view of the fact that it has been more consistently erased than the 0 in the prenomen, which was spared on the right hand side and only slightly erased on the other two, it may not be 0 at all but 9. The sign below it, read by Daressy and Von Beckerath as 0, looks like on the right hand side and like at the foot. The next two signs, again one above the other, are quite illegible. Von Beckerath's reading ר seems impossible to me, the upper sign being in fact rather squat, the lower one rather flat. The final, vertical group, read as ח by Daressy and Von Beckerath seems to me much more like ח.

h. On the idea of exchange implicit in this phrase, see S. Taufik, *MDAIK* 27 (1971) 227-34.

The results of a study of the titulary are thus largely inconclusive. I cannot improve substantially on Daressy's readings, which remain basic to any study - some of them seem to me certain, others open to question, while I regard Von Beckerath's restoration of the cartouches as based more on arbitrary selection from a number of possible alternatives than on what is actually visible. In my opinion, the only facts to be ascertained from a study of the titulary are that the Horus name is Djed Kheperu, that the first cartouche includes three signs of which the first is 0 and that the second contains five signs or groups.

The Horus name Djed Kheperu is only once attested elsewhere - on
fragments of ten sealings found at Uronarti fort, in a deposit with others of the Horus Khabau, i.e. Sekhemre Khutawy, the third king of the Thirteenth Dynasty according to Von Beckerath. Since Uronarti was only occupied from the reign of Senwosret II to that of Amenhotep II, a date outside this period cannot be envisaged, but neither can the identity of this king with the Djed Kheperu of the monument in question be definitely asserted. At all events, as the name does not occur elsewhere, it is clear that we have to do with a little-known king.

A number of general arguments can be adduced to support a date in the Second Intermediate Period. As Von Beckerath noted, the religious history of Abydos precludes a date before the Middle Kingdom—the merging of the names of Osiris and Khentamentiu is extremely rare before the Twelfth Dynasty. The Twelfth Dynasty itself is excluded since the nomen is clearly neither Imn-m-ḥ3t nor Smwšt, and Daressy's remark that, since the Horus name does not begin with k3 nḥt,

30. D. Dunham, Uronarti, Shalafk, Mirgissa, (Boston 1967) 64. 4a. One fragment, 28.II.319 (p.40) was found in room 20 (p.17) and nine, 29.I.314 (p.57) in the Commandant's house. Cf. Kush 3 (1955) 36 and 53, fig.1; JEA 61 (1975) 69.


32. Dunham, Uronarti, 5.

33. Untersuchungen, 184.

34. Spiegel, Götter, 31-2.
the entire Eighteenth to Twenty-second Dynasties are excluded remains valid. 35 The inscriptions and, according to Petrie, 36 the offering pottery, from the Umm el-Qa'ab date mainly to the period from the Eighteenth to the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, and there is no evidence for any later dedications there. A later date for the "bier" would therefore seem to be precluded, since it is hardly likely that it postdates the entire corpus of dedications. Groff's reading must, in any case, be rejected since it rests on a combination of the Horus name of Nectanebo II, mr t3wy, with the other names of Nectanebo I. 37 The Horus name of the latter, tm3-, does not fit the traces, while the cartouches of the former do not contain a Ω sign. 38 We are thus left with a choice between the Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth Dynasties on the one hand and the Second Intermediate Period on the other, as concluded by Von Beckerath. 39

The hitherto neglected epigraphic evidence of the unerased part of the inscription is instructive and all in favour of the earlier date. In the first place, the name of Osiris is consistently written

35. RT 22 (1900) 139.
36. Petrie, RT, 7. No proper study of the offering pottery has been made.
37. RT 22 (1900) 82-3.
38. (Snsw-Ib-rv) (Wlt-hr-hb)
Erman noted that this form was common in the Middle Kingdom, but in fact it does not seem to occur before the reign of Senwosret III. It is common until the New Kingdom, when it is gradually superseded by 𓊱 and is extremely rare after the New Kingdom. In short, it is characteristic of the Second Intermediate Period.

Secondly, the writing of the name of Khentamentiu with the tiw bird is uncommon after the New Kingdom, when 𓊱 becomes the normal writing of the second element of the name. Thirdly, the mention of Wepwawet immediately suggests the Middle Kingdom or Second Intermediate Period when the jackal deities, Amabis and Wepwawet, were so popular at Abydos.

---

40. ZAs 46 (1909) 94, 3 b); so too Wh. I.359.
41. JEA 27 (1941) 78.
42. In the corpus of Late Period inscriptions established above, the spelling 𓊱 occurs only once, in an isolated instance on BM 699, and the form 𓊱 once on Pittsburgh, Carnegie Inst. 1917.472, which otherwise have the usual late form 𓊱. The wider validity of the Abydene evidence can be confirmed by consulting the deity indices of any of the Cairo catalogues of Late Period material.
43. It is found, for instance, on the following monuments of the Seventeenth Dynasty: BM 6652, coffin of Nubkheperre Intef (Untersuchungen, 282.14); Leiden canopic box of Sebekemsaf I (ibid., 282.10); Berlin 1175-6, canopic box of Djehuty (ibid., 287.4); Louvre canopic box and coffin of Intef VI (ibid., 292.3-4); Louvre coffin of Intef VII (ibid., 292.12); Cairo CG 61001, coffin of Sagesenre Tao II (ibid., 295.13); Louvre statue of Ahmose, son of the last-named king (ibid., 294.8).
44. In all the examples from Abydos in which the tiw bird does occur, the name of Osiris is written in the usual Late Period way, as 𓊱.
45. Spiegel, Götter, 54-9. Spiegel's index shows that Wepwawet was second only to Osiris himself in popularity in the Middle Kingdom.
the New Kingdom and very uncommon thereafter. Individually, none of these points is decisive but cumulatively the content and epigraphic form require a late Middle Kingdom or Second Intermediate Period date.

The possibility that this is an archaising inscription of the Twenty-fifth or Twenty-sixth Dynasty has to be considered since the interest of these dynasties in the cult of Osiris is well attested and the erasure of cartouches was common at this period, but the titularies of these kings are well known and only Shebitku had a Horus name even remotely similar to Djed Kheperu. We are thus led to the conclusion that the "bed" of Osiris must date to the Second Intermediate Period, a conclusion which perfectly fits the history of the Osiris cult. There is a remarkably continuous record of royal patronage at Abydos in this period, especially in view of the scarcity of monuments of these dynasties elsewhere, and the

46. Cf. Petrie, Abydos II, 47. The decline in his cult thereafter can be traced in the deity indices of P. Lacau, Stèles du Nouvel Empire, (Cairo 1957) and the works cited in n.42 above. Wepwa-wet is scarcely mentioned in the Late Period - see below, p.332-3.

47. On archaising inscriptions, see above, p.52-3.


49. Leclant, Recherches, xiii, n.4.

50. The Horus Djed-khau (LR IV, 28-9). In the few known examples, this name is always written with only one ḳḏ sign, and the other names of Shebitku are quite inappropriate to the traces.

51. I can see no valid reason for asserting that the inscription is later than the "bed" itself.

52. See Kemp, LA I, col.31 and MDAIK 23 (1968) 138-55.
well known interest of the early Eighteenth Dynasty in Abydos is therefore merely part of a continuing tradition. Such a dating means that the monument antedates all the pottery offerings and most of the inscriptions, as one would expect since it symbolises the cause of the dedications.

It is not possible to be more precise. Von Beckerath’s reading requires the virtual invention of a king and does not seem to me to be justified. The nomen Nb-r(3-ir-v-w is otherwise known only from the Turin Canon, where it is written out more fully, 53 and the other names of this king are not known at all. A better known king whose names would fit the disposition of signs within the cartouches is Khendjer, whose activity at Abydos is attested by the stelae of Amenysenb. 54 It is agreed by all who have studied the inscription that the first cartouche reads (...k3-r'), and the missing vertical sign could well be ⬑, which would give War-k3-r', the usual prenomen of Khendjer. 55 I have indicated above that the first sign in the second cartouche may be ✽ and not ◊, and that, on the right hand side of the monument, the sign below looks like ...... The following

53. Von Beckerath, Untersuchungen, 289, XVII.7 (2).
54. Louvre C.11 and C.12: see, most recently, Simpson, Terrace, pl.80.
55. Von Beckerath, Untersuchungen, 238, XIII.17. This is usually written (✪ ṯ ẖ) although spellings without ṯ do occur.
group has been so thoroughly erased that nothing more than the general shape can be determined, but it is clear that there are two signs, one above the other, which would be well suited by $\mathbb{E}$. Von Becket- rath's interpretation of the last vertical group as $\mathbb{E}$ led him to exclude the possibility that the name was that of Khendjer, $^{56}$ and to take it as a terminal $\mathbb{Q}$, as I have suggested, also poses a problem, as such an ending is not known from the monuments of Khendjer. $^{57}$ However, the nebly name of this king is known to be $\mathbb{W}\mathbb{H}\mathbb{M}\mathbb{S}\mathbb{W}\mathbb{T} which would fit the traces on the "bed" very well, $^{58}$ and although the Horus name of Khendjer is unknown, the evidence from Uronarti would suggest that a date in the Thirteenth Dynasty is more appropriate for the Horus Djed Kheperu than one in the Seventeenth Dynasty. $^{59}$ The identification of the Horus Djed Kheperu with Khendjer is therefore not impossible, but this can be no more than a suggestion at present.

In conclusion, it may be stated that the cartouches of the

$^{56}$ Ibid., 184, n.5.
$^{57}$ In every known example, the name of Khendjer is spelt ($\mathbb{Q} \mathbb{E}$). However, the $\mathbb{Q}$ is sometimes written out in related words such as $\mathbb{D}\mathbb{R}\mathbb{T}/\text{"hand"} (\textit{Wb. V}, 580) and $\mathbb{D}\mathbb{R}\mathbb{T}/\text{"kite"} (\textit{Wb. V}, 591).
$^{58}$ G. Jequier, \textit{Deux pyramides du Moyen Empire}, (Cairo 1933) 21, fig.17; 22, fig.18.
$^{59}$ This is on the reasonable but unprovable assumption that the two examples of the Horus Djed Kheperu do, in fact, refer to the same king.
Osiris "bed" cannot be conclusively deciphered, but that a general consideration of the historical context, combined with due attention to the less obvious epigraphic aspects, enables us to date the monument approximately, and to determine that it is certainly not of Late Period date.
Appendix II

The name of Osiris written ḫỉ 1

Most discussions of the name of Osiris have been concerned with its origin and meaning, 2 and in these the spelling with the pennant ḫỉ (Gardiner sign list R.8) has played no part. It was not listed by Erman in his brief discussion of the various forms of the name 3 and the Wörterbuch merely characterizes it as 'spät'. 4 In fact, it first appears in the early Eighteenth Dynasty but only for a short period and in a very restricted context. The following examples are known to me:

1) Sarcophagus of Hatshepsut, modified for Tuthmosis I. 5
2) Sarcophagus of Hatshepsut. 6
3) Sarcophagus of Tuthmosis I, made long after his death, almost certainly in the reign of Tuthmosis III. 7

1. I include here graphic variants such as ḫỉ.
2. See most recently W. Helck, SAK 4 (1976) 121-4.
3. ZAS 46 (1909) 92-5.
6. Ibid., 161-3, D, pl.V-VI.
7. Ibid., 163-5, E, pl.VII.
4) Sarcophagus of Tuthmosis III. 8

5) Sarcophagus of Senemut from his earlier tomb, no. 353. 9

6) A number of examples also occur in the second "secret" tomb of Senemut, no. 71 in the Theban necropolis. 10

7) One example is found in the mortuary temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari. 11

Its use in the New Kingdom is thus confined largely to royal sarcophagi and the tombs of Senemut (whose arrogation to himself of royal prerogatives is well attested), 12 and chronologically to the reign of Hatshepsut and to the early part of that of Tuthmosis III, or to what might be termed the 'Deir el-Bahari era'. These limits are confirmed by the fact that the writing 13 does not occur on either the first sarcophagus of Hatshepsut, made when she was only the queen of Tuthmosis II, or on that of Amenhotep II, the successor of Tuthmosis III. 13 Its origin is presumably to be sought in a

8. Ibid., 165-7, F, pl.VIII-XI.
9. Hayes, JEA 36 (1950) 19-23, pl.IV, VI.
13. Hayes, Royal Sarcophagi, 155-6, A, pl.I and 167-8, G, pl.XII-XIII.
simple substitution of \[\theta\] for \[\delta\] as divine determinative, but why its use should have been so restricted remains unclear. It is not found again until the Late Period, when it is used quite indiscriminately in both royal and private inscriptions. I would suggest that the date of this reappearance can be fairly precisely established, and that this provides a terminus a quo which indicates how late an inscription in which it occurs must be.

The earliest example dated by a royal cartouche is on a block from Medinet Habu, apparently from the tomb of Ne-tr-wy (?), a daughter of the ephemeral Rudamun, the last ruler of the Twenty-third Dynasty attested at Thebes. While a "first" occurrence is, of course, only the first that we know of, and may, in fact, be considerably later than the actual first instance, especially when the extant documentation is not extensive, there are, nevertheless, good reasons for thinking that the reappearance of \[\delta\] does not antedate the advent of

14. Gardiner noted that the pennant is rarely used as a determinative in the names of deities (Egyptian Grammar, third edition, 502, R.8). It is noteworthy that it is also used in the name of Isis on the sarcophagi mentioned here, e.g. Hayes, Royal Sarcophagi, 189, 20 A-F.

15. RT 19 (1897) 20-1, CXLIII - the block is now in Cairo, JE 33902. For Rudamun, see Kitchen, TIP, para.322, and K. Baer, "The Libyan and Nubian Kings of Egypt: Notes on the Chronology of Dynasties XXII to XXVI", JNES 32 (1973) 20, (o).
the Twenty-fifth Dynasty. 16

The number of dated documents of the Third Intermediate Period is relatively small, and it is unfortunate that the name of Osiris tends, because of its funerary connotations, to occur frequently in contexts which are not precisely datable, such as the coffins of the priests of Montu from Deir. el-Bahari, 17 and not in the "secular" royal inscriptions, such as the Karnak annals 18 and records of Nile levels, or the donation stelae which are characteristic of the Third Intermediate Period 19 and constitute such valuable evidence for its chronology. It is significant, however, that this form is not found in a single inscription which is definitely dated to the reign of any king of the Twenty-second or Twenty-third Dynasties, and that it becomes increasingly common from the Twenty-fifth Dynasty onwards.

16. It is surely not a coincidence that also appears as determinative of the name Re or Re-Horakhte in a number of inscriptions of the Twenty-fifth and early Twenty-sixth Dynasties: Antwerp 263, CG 22210, JE 8771, T.26/10/24/1, T.29/10/24/5, Florence 2501, Louvre C.114, Oxford E.3922. Similarly, the sign is used as a determinative in the name of Wennefer on Chicago OIM 6408, and in that of Khentamentiu on JE 91219.


20. The most recent collection of lists of donation stelae is that of Kessler, SAK 2 (1975) 104, n.3.
The chapel of Osiris ḫ3 ḏt at Karnak provides a striking confirmation of the date of the reappearance of this form. In the Bubastite portion, built by Osorkon III and Takeloth III and also inscribed with the cartouches of Rudamun, the form 𓊟 occurs consistently and 𓊲 once. In the extension added by Shebitku, the forms 𓊟 and 𓊲 are used. Similarly, while the victory stela of King Piye from Napata, dated to year 21 of his reign (c. 727 B.C. on the chronology set out below), shows 𓊱, both 𓊱 and 𓊲 occur on a lintel and door-jamb from the tomb of his wife Pekaster at Abydos. Examples of 𓊲 also occur on objects dedicated by Piye's sister, Amenirdis I.

21. My remarks on the chapel of Osiris ḫ3 ḏt are based on the incomplete publication of the texts by Legrain, RT 22 (1900) 125-34, 146-9, the photographs in Leclant, Recherches, pls.XXI-XXVIII and the preliminary report on Redford's study of the chapel in JEA 59 (1973) 16-30 and pls.XVII-XXII.

22. RT 22 (1900) 128-34.

23. RT 22 (1900) 125-3; Leclant, Recherches, 54.


25. Cairo JE 32022-3. For the dating of these pieces to before c. 715 B.C., and for Piye as the correct reading of the name formerly read Piankhy, see the catalogue entry above.

26. Examples of 𓊲 occur on monuments of Amenirdis I from several sites: statue from Karnak, CG 565; statue fragment from Armant, ASAE 7 (1906) 44; bronze from Memphis, ASAE 3 (1902) 142, 12 - the cache in which this bronze was found was probably of Theban origin (Yoyotte, RDÉ 8 (1951) 218, no.10) and contained objects with the cartouches of Psammetichus II. In the tomb-chapel of Amenirdis I at Medinet Habu, on the other hand, only 𓊲 is found (RT 23 (1901) 4-18).
who was God's wife of Amun from early in the period of Kushite rule until c. 700 B.C. 27 The evidence for the reigns of Shabako and Shebitku is slight but in the majority of inscriptions is found, and the number of occurrences of this form increases substantially in the reign of Taharqa. 28

I have tabulated below the forms of the name of Osiris current in each reign from the beginning of the Twenty-second Dynasty to the end of the Twenty-fifth, using only inscriptions dated with certainty (i.e. by a cartouche) to the reign of a particular king. These are listed at the end of this appendix. The period of time thus represented may seem unnecessarily long, but because of the small number of documents extant and the continuing uncertainty over the absolute chronology of the Third Intermediate Period, it is important to establish clearly the forms in use throughout the period. There are, doubtless, omissions, although I have tried to make the list as complete as possible, but the table serves to illustrate both the range of spellings in use and the fact that does not occur before the Twenty-fifth Dynasty. It should be noted that no account is taken here of the frequency of occurrence of a particular form, and

27. Kitchen, TIP, 480, table 13; Baer, JNES 32 (1973) 20 (m).
28. See, in addition to the monuments cited below, some of the inscriptions of Montuemhat, whose career lasted from the reign of Taharqa into that of Psammetichus I: Leclant, Montuemhat, 60, 139-40, 169.
that, in order to compress the data, I have included together all the different graphic variants of each form. I have also listed the kings according to numerical order of dynasty and have not attempted to intersperse the contemporary monarchs; an arrangement on those lines would not affect the pattern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheshonk I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheshonk II</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon II</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsiese</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth II</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sheshonk III</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pami</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) * Sheshonk V</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedubast I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iuput I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon III</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth III</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudamun</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bocchoris</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Piye</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabsko</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Shebitku</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taharka</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No examples are attested for the reigns of Takeloth I, Sheshonk IV, Osorkon IV or Iuput II. On two objects bearing the name of an unspecified Osorkon, the spelling $[\text{??}]$ is used - *PSBA* 13 (1890-1) 36; W.M.F. Petrie, *Koptos*, (London 1896) pl. XIII.

(a) Graphic variants $\text{??}, \text{??}, \text{??}$
(b) Graphic variants $\text{??}, \text{??}, \text{??}, \text{??}, \text{??}, \text{??}, \text{??}, \text{??}, \text{??}, \text{??}, \text{??}, \text{??}, \text{??}$

29. For the contemporaneity of the latter part of the Twenty-second Dynasty and the Twenty-third Dynasty, see Kitchen, *TIP*, para. 146.
(c) Graphic variant \[ \text{Graphic variant} \]

(d) The orthography \[ \text{orthography} \] occurs in the tomb of Osorkon II - P. Montet, \[ \text{La nécropole royale de Tanis I, (Paris 1947) pl.XXXIV.} \]

(e) A cryptic form \[ \text{A cryptic form} \] occurs on a donation stela from Atfieh. \[ \text{AA} \] as a writing of \[ \text{w in the name of Osiris is attested at Edfu}\] (Fairman, \[ \text{ASAE 43 (1943) 253, no.232,}\] \[ \text{must represent s}\] and it is tempting to suggest a derivation from the usual value \[ \text{stp on the acrophonic principle, since no explanation on the}\] consonantal principle readily presents itself (Fairman, \[ \text{loc. cit.,}\] \[ \text{298-305}.\] Similarly, \[ \text{f,m} \] as \[ \text{r may derive from the sportive}\] writing \[ \text{of m in the name of Osiris is attested at Edfu}\] (Fairman, \[ \text{BIFAO 43 (1943) 108}.\] To is, of course, the hieratic determinative \[ \text{w}.\]

(f) The form \[ \text{form} \] on BM 24429 may be a scribal error, but cf. Osing, \[ \text{MDAIK 30 (1974) 109}.\]

* Examples of hieratic writings on stone monuments from these reigns are included here.

It should be clear from the appended list that both the types of inscription and their geographical provenance are sufficiently varied to nullify any distortion produced by typological or regional peculiarities. In view of the multiplicity of forms in use, no single inscription in which \[ \text{form} \] does not occur can be used to prove that this form was not current at that particular time, but the cumulative evidence presented here seems to me sufficient to establish that it was re-introduced in the early years of Kushite rule in Egypt, and thereafter became increasingly common, gradually replacing \[ \text{as the pre-dominant form in the course of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty. It is noteworthy that it is not certainly attested at Memphis before the reign of Ptolemaicush I, and, while this may be in part the result of differential preservation, that fact that it occurs on only one of} \]
the seventy or so Serapeum stelae dated or ascribed to years 20–21 of Psammetichus I 30 seems to indicate that this spelling was still not common at Memphis as late as 644 B.C. We are thus probably justified in assuming a Theban origin and gradual northward diffusion for this orthography.

I have so far refrained from any discussion of the chronology of the Third Intermediate Period, which has recently been studied in great detail by Kitchen 31 and much more briefly by Baer. 32 It is not my intention to reiterate all the possible permutations of data (for which the reader is referred to Kitchen's work) but some comment is necessary since the usefulness of $\Delta$ as a dating criterion depends to some extent on being able to give an absolute date to the reign of Rudamun. This, in turn, depends on the length of reign attributed to his successor Iuput II. Since the publication of The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt, Kitchen has accepted 33 the long reign for Iuput II suggested by Bierbrier 34 and

30. Malinine, Posener, Vercouter, Catalogue des stèles, nos. 180–252 are dated or attributed to Psammetichus I, but only on no. 212 does a writing with the pennant occur. I have indicated above (n.26) that a bronze with the name of Amenirdis I, found at Memphis, may have been brought there at a later date.

31. TTP
32. JNES 32 (1973) 4–25.
33. JEA 61 (1975) 272 and Bierbrier, LNK, x.
34. LNK, 100.
Gomaa, and has set forth his revised chronology in his foreword to Bierbrier's *The Late New Kingdom in Egypt*. The idea of a long reign for Iuput II may derive support from a consideration of the scenes in the chapel of Osiris hkt at Karnak. The Bubastite section depicts Osorkon III and Takeloth III in a relationship which clearly dates it to their co-regency, i.e. after year 23 of Osorkon III. The cartouche of Rudamun occurs once (perhaps twice?) and was regarded by Legrain as contemporary with the rest of the building. This implies that the reign of Rudamun, or at least his accession, followed hard upon the very brief independent reign of Takeloth III. Since Amenirdis I is not depicted in the Bubastite part of the chapel, whereas Shepenwepet I, her senior colleague, is, it would seem that

---


36. *LNK*, x.

37. RT 22 (1900) 133-4 and *JEA* 59 (1973) 23. The cartouche of Rudamun is one of the painted ones in the third room which were apparently all added at the same time, a further indication that the adoption of Amenirdis I postdates the reign of Rudamun.

38. The statement in *PM* II, 2nd ed., 205 (5), followed by Baer, *JNES* 32 (1973) 18, para. 24 (e), that Amenirdis and Osorkon III are depicted together is quite wrong. The king in this scene (Leclant, *Recherches*, pl. XXV-XXVI) is clearly Shebitku - the remains of the erased second uraeus are clearly visible while the garb of the king is exactly the same as in the representation of Shebitku on the facade of the Kushite addition (Leclant, *Recherches*, pl. XXII-XXIII) and quite unlike that of Takeloth III or Osorkon III as depicted in the original chapel (*JEA* 59 (1973) pl. XIX, XXI).
she had not yet been adopted at the time that the chapel was built, in which case the year 19 of the Wadi Gasus inscription cannot refer to any of these kings - Osorkon III's nineteenth year would have passed and neither Takeloth III nor Rudamun reached so high a date - and can only refer to Iuput II, as already envisaged by Bierbrier.  

The difference between Kitchen's revised dates (c. 757-754 B.C.) for the reign of Rudamun and those of Baer (c. 772- ? ) is reduced when Kitchen's demonstration that Osorkon s3-3st is Osorkon III is applied to Baer's chronology. The main result of this identification is that Nile level Text 13 must refer to Osorkon III and not Osorkon II, which gives the former a reign of at least twenty-eight years instead of the five allowed him by Baer, and proves a co-regency of at least five years between Osorkon III and Takeloth III.  

For convenience, I have tabulated below Kitchen's revised chronology of the Twenty-third Dynasty together with that of Baer, as revised by Wente in the light of Kitchen's arguments:  

40. LMK, 100.  
41. TIP, para.73.  
43. JNES 35 (1976) 276.
The difference between the two is thus reduced to only ten years, and it can therefore be said with some confidence that Rudamun reigned briefly in the middle 760's or 750's B.C.. His daughter's tomb, and the reappearance of $\text{\textcopyright}$, would thus date to about 740-30 B.C., allowing twenty-five years per generation.

The monuments of this period on which the name of Osiris occurs, and on which the orthographic table above is based, are listed below.

### Dynasty XXII

#### Sheshonk I

- Abydos: Dedication stela
- Memphis: Alabaster block
- Abnas el-Medineh: Temple endowment
- Tanis: Canopic jars

#### Osorkon I

- Karnak: Private statues
- Thebes: Stela of Iuwelot, son of Osorkon I
- Abydos: Private stela
- Abydos: Cenotaph of Iuput, son of Sheshonk I

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pharaoh</th>
<th>Baer/Wente</th>
<th>Bierbrier/Kitchen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedubast I</td>
<td>828-803</td>
<td>818-793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iuput I</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>804-803 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheshonk IV</td>
<td>803-797</td>
<td>793-787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon III</td>
<td>797-759</td>
<td>787-759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taleloth III</td>
<td>774-767</td>
<td>764-757 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudamun</td>
<td>767- ?</td>
<td>757-754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iuput II</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>754-720 or 715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The monuments of Iuwelot and Iuput are included under Osorkon I for convenience, the exact dates of their deaths being unknown.

**Sheshonk II**

- **Tanis**  Coffin  Montet, *op. cit.* II, pl.XVII.

**Osorkon II**

- **Karnak**  Hathor chapel  *PM* II, 2nd ed., 203-4, 44
- **Karnak**  Private statues  CG 42213; CG 42225.
- **Bubastis**  Festival hall  Naville, *Festival Hall of Osorkon II*, pl.VII, X, XXII.
- **Tanis**  Tomb  Montet, *op. cit.* I, pl.XXIV-XXVI, XXXI-XXXV.
- **Tanis**  Canopic jars  *Ibid.*, 58, fig.17.
- **Tanis**  Statue of king  *JEA* 46 (1960) 3-23, pl.I-VIII.

**Harsiese**


**Takeloth II**

- **Karnak**  Bubastite Portal  *Reliefs and Inscriptions at Karnak* III, pl.XVIII, col.33; pl.XXI, cols.3 and 13.
- **Memphis**  Tomb of Sheshonk, son of Osorkon II  *ASAE* 54 (1956) 153 ff.
- **Tanis**  Ushabtis  *Ibid.* I, 83, fig.27.

---

44. I owe the reading of the name of Osiris in this chapel to Mr. Cl. Traunecker, who was kind enough to send me a latex copy of the relevant part of the inscription. The reading given by Leclant, *Recherches*, 275 E, is erroneous, being a misinterpretation of the only other writing in the chapel.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Item Type</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheshonk III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnak</td>
<td>Dubastite Portal</td>
<td>Reliefs and Inscriptions at Karnak III, pl.XXII, col.15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnak</td>
<td>Private statue</td>
<td>CG 42232.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heliopolis</td>
<td>Donation stela</td>
<td>ASAE 16 (1916) 61.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busiris</td>
<td>Donation stela</td>
<td>RT 35 (1913) 41-5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanis</td>
<td>Tomb</td>
<td>Montet, op. cit. III, pl.XXIX, XXXI, XXXIII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>Donation stela</td>
<td>Chicago 01M 10511, unpublished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Delta</td>
<td>Donation stela</td>
<td>Moscow 5647 : Epigraphica Vostoka 5 (1951) 95-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Serapeum stelae</td>
<td>Malinine, Posener, Vercouter, Catalogue des stèles, nos.22-5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheshonk V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atfich</td>
<td>Donation stela</td>
<td>JEA 6 (1930) 56-7, pl.VII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Serapeum stelae</td>
<td>Catalogue des stèles, nos.26 and 28 (year 11); 31-3, 35-42 (year 37).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynasty XXIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedubast I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnak</td>
<td>Private statues</td>
<td>CG 42226-7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CG 42227 does not actually bear a cartouche, but as its owner is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the same man as the owner of CG 42226, which is dated to the reign of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedubast, it can safely be assigned to the same date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iuput I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell el-Maqdám</td>
<td>Door hinge</td>
<td>RT 30 (1908) 202.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The attribution of this object to the first Iuput is tentative -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see Kitchen, TIP, para.98.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Osorkon III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karnak</td>
<td>Chapel of Osiris</td>
<td>RT 22 (1900) 129, III, Chamber B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{hk3 dt} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnak</td>
<td>Chapel</td>
<td>PM II, 2nd ed., 223, U; LD Text III, 42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell el-Moqdam</td>
<td>Private statues</td>
<td>CG 42222-4, 42229.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scarab of mother</td>
<td>ASAE 21 (1921) 25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{K3m'w mry-Mwt} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Takeloth III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karnak</td>
<td>Chapel of Osiris</td>
<td>RT 22 (1900) 130, Chamber B and 132, Chamber C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abydos</td>
<td>Private stela</td>
<td>JE 30434 - see corpus entry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abydos</td>
<td>Statue</td>
<td>Abydos III, pl.XXIV.2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rudamun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karnak</td>
<td>Chapel of Osiris</td>
<td>RT 22 (1900) 134, Wall D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medinet Habu*</td>
<td>Tomb of daughter</td>
<td>RT 19 (1897) 20-1, CXLIII.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tomb of his daughter certainly postdates the reign of Rudamun, in view of the brevity of his reign, but it is listed here for convenience.

Dynasty XXIV

Bocchoris

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Dynasty XXV

Piye

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Napata</td>
<td>Victory stela</td>
<td>Schäfer, Urkunden, 11, line 18; 46, line 116.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abydos*</td>
<td>Tomb of wife</td>
<td>JE 32022-3 - see corpus entry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakhla</td>
<td>Donation stela</td>
<td>JEA 54 (1968) 165-72.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shabako

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thebes*</td>
<td>Private statue</td>
<td>Leclant, <em>Enquêtes</em>, 17, pl.V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esna</td>
<td>Naos</td>
<td>CG 70007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Memphite Theology</td>
<td>ZÄS 39 (1902) 39-54.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relevance of the Memphite Theology is perhaps debatable, if it is an accurate copy of an earlier text.

Piye-Shabako*

The objects of Amenirdis I listed in n.26 above.

Shebitku

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karnak*</td>
<td>Chapel of Osiris</td>
<td>IV 22 (1900) 126-7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebes*</td>
<td>*hk3 dt</td>
<td>Edinburgh 444: Leclant, Recherches, 269, n.3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Edinburgh stela is probably slightly later than the reign of Shebitku, as the owner was a *wgb* priest of the Good God Shebitku, *m3'-hrw*.

Taharka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karnak</td>
<td>Chapel of Osiris</td>
<td>Leclant, Recherches, 44, fig.15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnak*</td>
<td>Wenmefer hry-ib</td>
<td>Ibid., pl.LXIX-LXX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnak*</td>
<td>Chapel of Osiris-Ptah nb 'nh</td>
<td>Ibid., pl.VIII-X.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnak*</td>
<td>Chapel of Osiris nb 'nh</td>
<td>Ibid., 100, pl.LXII-LXIII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnak*</td>
<td>Statues of Pedsimen</td>
<td>Ibid., 75-83, pl.XVI-XXII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebes*</td>
<td>Tomb of Ramose</td>
<td>Leclant, Recherches, pl.LXXXVI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Serapeum stelae</td>
<td>Catalogues des stèles, nos.125, 127-8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The asterisk * indicates the inscriptions in which the spelling ° occurs.
Appendix III

Theophorous name patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isis</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bastet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omiris</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khonsu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osiris</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nubhotep</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tefnut</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The name patterns numbered on the top axis are as follows:

1. D̲d̲-deity X- iw.f/s-nḫ
2. P̲3̲/t̲3̲-di(t)-deity X
3. P̲3̲/t̲3̲-Mari(t)-n(t)-deity X
4. P̲3̲/t̲3̲-n(t)-deity X
5. N̲s̲-deity X
6. S̲p̲-n-deity X
7. Deity X-ir-di-sw/st
8. Others

Only those deities for which ten or more theophorous names are attested.
have been included. Comparison with the overall popularity list given by Ranke (PN II, 245) shows that, as one would expect, the Thinite deities Bastet, Onuris and Mehit are ahead of the Theban Mut and Khonsu, and of the Memphite Ptah. Osiris was not a popular element in theophorous names.
Appendix IV
The Funerary Deities

The depiction of deities and their invocation in the htp-di-nsw formula are an essential part of the inscriptions under consideration. Comparison with Spiegel's detailed monograph, which is based on an extensive index of the occurrences of divine names on Abydene stelae from the end of the Old Kingdom to the end of the Fourteenth Dynasty, permits some assessment of the changes which had taken place in funerary religion. The representation of deities on stelae developed during the New Kingdom out of an occasional Middle Kingdom practice and is standard in the Late Period, when examples without a divinity are very rare. The deceased is shown worshipping one or more deities, although very occasionally the Abydos fetish may be substituted. In the late New Kingdom the most frequently depicted deity was Osiris, alone or with Isis in attendance; Horus

1. Spiegel, Götter. The author is primarily concerned with the syncretistic aspects of Egyptian religion. His study is based on 1120 stelae of which it can be said that only about 50 are definitely from Abydos.

2. In the Middle Kingdom it is usually Min who is depicted - see Simpson, Terrace, pls.25, 65, 67, 69, 79, 81 and 82. Sometimes, as on Louvre C.11 (ibid., pl.80), a number of divinities appear.


4. BM 808, BM 809, Cincinnati 1947.392.
sometimes completes the Abydene triad, either as ḫnḥš-ḥšt or as ḫnḥš-nḥty-it.f. This pattern continued in the Third Intermediate Period, but after the Advent of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty, the solar deity, usually (and almost always at Abydos) in the form of Re-Harakhte, came to play an increasingly important role in funerary affairs, and was sometimes closely associated with Osiris. At Abydos a large number of stelae of seventh century date show the deceased adoring Re-Harakhte alone, but the sixth century brought a revival in the fortunes of the Abydene triad, and henceforth Re-Harakhte appears only as one of a number of deities. Osiris is rarely shown alone in the Late Period, appearing firmly in the context of the Abydene triad. In the Ptolemaic era a number of deities are depicted in procession on stelae and it is on these that the local Thinite deities Onuris-Shu and Tefnut make almost their only appearances.

The principal cult at Abydos in the first millennium B.C. remained that of Osiris. The relationship of Osiris and Khentamentiu

5. Leclant, Enquêtes, 19 e). On the stela Cairo T.18/2/25/2, one of the so-called "antithetisch-symmetrische" stelae characteristic of Thebes but found in small numbers at Abydos, Osiris and Re-Harakhte are both depicted. On Bologna 1939 Osiris is shown with Isis but the offering formula is for ḫnḥš-ḥšt nṯ ṣ ḫnty nṯ ṣ hṛ nṯw.

6. Totenstelen, 90 and group I.

7. BM 1426, Cairo CG 22054, CG 22144 and CG 22149, Leiden VII.20, Louvre C.117 and C.232.

8. Both are depicted on an early sixth century stela (Turin 1528).
is not entirely unambiguous. The most frequent designation in the Late Period is Wsir-Hnt-imntiw ntr 3 nb 3bdw, which reflects the complete merger of the two gods - a process which seems already to have been completed by the late Twelfth Dynasty. By the Late Period the Busirite connection, although not totally forgotten, is rarely mentioned; it occurs on two archaising stelae, the texts of which may well have been copied directly from Middle Kingdom originals, and in only six other inscriptions. There are, however, occasional indications that the two could still be regarded as distinct. A reference to the temple (hwt-ntr) of Hnt-imntiw has already been noted, as has the common title of ihyt Hnt-imntiw, and De Meulenaere has pointed out examples of Wsir-Hnt-imntiw ntr 3 nb 3bdw di.sn, concluding that the two were indeed separate. Nevertheless, it is generally true to say that in the Late Period, the two were insepar-

9. Spiegel, Götter, 31. Wsir-Hnt-imntiw ntr 3 nb 3bdw is not found at all in the Eleventh Dynasty and is rare before the second half of the Twelfth. It scarcely occurs in the New Kingdom (there is only one example listed in Lacau's Stèles du Nouvel Empire, 258) when ntw ntrw and other epithets are more common, but is revived in the Late Period.

10. See Cairo JE 41332, Manchester 2965 and above, p.52-3.

11. Cairo CG 22028, Cairo T.29/10/24/2 and T.29/10/24/7, Leiden VII.21, Philadelphia U.M. 69.29.126, Vienna 157.

12. See above, p.3, n.11 and p.216.

ably linked.

Isis, the consort of Osiris, had come to play a much more prominent part in the iconography of Abydos since the Middle Kingdom, when her role was quite insignificant.  

She remains subordinate to Osiris, appearing alone on a stela only once. She is most often described as 3st wrt mwt ntr and her cult is attested by a few scattered titles.  

The third member of the Abydene triad appears on stelae as ḫṛ ndty-it.f or ḫṛ-s3-3st and occasionally ḫṛ-(s3-3st-)s3-ỉsir. He can be depicted either in front of or behind Isis but is always behind Osiris and rarely outside the context of the triad. His cult is attested by a number of titles but seems not to have been of any great significance.  

One of the major differences between the Middle Kingdom and the Late Period is the striking decline in the importance of the jackal gods at Abydos. In Spiegel's index of deities, Wepwawet and Anubis are the second and third most frequently cited.  

---

17. See above, p. 218-19.
18. Spiegel, Götter, 179 and 170 respectively.
Period Wepwawet is mentioned on only eleven stelae, half of which date to the Ptolemaic period, when there seems to have been a minor revival in the importance of this god.  

19. Anubis, too, is rarely represented or mentioned except on the Ptolemaic 'procession' stelae and on pyramids.  

20. The motif of two recumbent jackals facing each other in the arc of stelae dates from the Middle Kingdom  

21. and recurs quite frequently from the sixth century onwards. They are sometimes named as Anubis, less often as Wepwawet, but usually themselves represent ideogrammatic writings of the name of Anubis,  

22. and are followed by two or more of his characteristic epithets. Even more often there is no accompanying inscription and one cannot then say whether Anubis or Wepwawet is intended, although the much greater frequency with which Anubis is represented makes him the more likely of the two. 

The only other divinities to be represented (except in isolated examples) are Sokar or (Ptah-)Sokar-Osiris, the falcon-headed necropolis deity of Memphis, who does not appear in the seventh century but is very commonly invoked by the Ptolemaic period, and Atum nb t3wy Imw, who appears as the solar complement of Re-Harakhte on the

19. BM 699, BM 1423, Cairo CG 22054, New Haven 6593, Vienna 5103.  
few "antithetisch-symmetrische" stelae to come from Abydos. 23

The usual offering formula is ḫtp-di-nsw (n) deity / deities
di.f / di.am, the suffix pronoun agreeing in number with the deity /
deities named. There are, however, cases in which a list of several
divinities is followed by di.f. This has been taken as proof that
only one composite deity is intended, 24 but this gives rise to some
unlikely combinations, 25 and a better explanation is perhaps to be
found in the earlier form of the offering formula. In the Middle
Kingdom the phrase di.f is often omitted from the formula but when
it is used, the singular and plural suffix pronouns usually corres-
pond to the number of deities listed. Cairo CG 20542, however,
reads: ḫtp-di-nsw Wsir nb Ddw ḫnt-imntiw ntr (3 nb 3bdw di Wpw3wt
nb t3 qsr di Inpw ḫnty sh ntr di ḫkt ḫn Ǝmmw di.f .... 26 It is
clear from this that each god was regarded as being an independent

23. BM 1333, Cairo CG 22210, Cairo T.4/1/21/1, Chicago OIM 6938,
Florence 2502.

24. See Leclant, Enquêtes, 19 e): "Comme l'indique le singulier
dd.f, il ne s'agit sans doute que d'un seul dieu: Re-Horakhty-
Aton-Osiris". The text in question (BM 24429) reads: ḫd mdw
in R'-Ir-3hty ntr (3 nb pt Tm nb t3wy Ǝmmw Wsir-Ḥnt-imntiw ntr
(3 di.f ....

25. E.g. Florence 2502: Wsir-Ḥnt-imntiw ntr (3 nb 3bdw Gb r-p't
ntrw R'-Ir-3hty ntr (3 nb pt ḫry ntrw pr m 3ḥt Tm nb t3wy Ǝmmw
di.f ...., and Cairo T.28/10/24/2: R'-Ir-3hty Pḥ-Smr-Wsir nb
ṣtyt Tm nb t3wy Ǝmmw Wsir nb Ddw ḫnt-imntiw ntr (3. For some of
the well-attested syncretisms, see Spiegel, Götter, and B. Alten-

26. Simpson, Terrace, pl.11.
donor of offerings and that the final di.f refers to each individually. The repeated di soon fell out of use but the divinities continued on occasion to be regarded as separate, although the relative scarcity of such cases makes it clear that the collective approach implicit in di.sm was much more common.
Concordance

There follows a correlation of the MCA numbers of the Late Period inscriptions found by Mariette, with the numbers under which they can now be found in the Cairo Museum. A single object can have as many as three numbers if entered successively in the Temporary Catalogue and the Journal d'Entrée, and then published in the Catalogue Général. In such a case, only the CG number is given, since the others can be found in the individual entries of the Catalogue Général.

For objects with a JE number but not published in the Catalogue Général, the JE number is given, and, for objects without either of these, the Temporary Catalogue number. The list of Abydene stelae of all periods to be found in the Cairo Museum, published in the Topographical Bibliography, identifies only those of Mariette's stelae published in the Catalogue Général, which represent a very small percentage of the total number, at least for the Late Period. Many more identifications were made by Munro in his individual catalogue entries, and a concordance of these (still with numerous errors and omissions) was provided by Graefe in his index to Munro's work.

2. Totenstelen, 259-312.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA</th>
<th>TE</th>
<th>JE</th>
<th>CG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21783</td>
<td>3363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21782</td>
<td>3390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21970</td>
<td>3413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21970</td>
<td>3414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21989</td>
<td>33446</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>22041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery 175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>21789</td>
<td>715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>11230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>21811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1227</td>
<td>21811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1238</td>
<td>21789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239</td>
<td>11230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1240</td>
<td>8/2/15/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1241</td>
<td>6/7/24/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1242</td>
<td>25/10/24/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1243</td>
<td>22143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1244</td>
<td>22143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245</td>
<td>22143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1246</td>
<td>6/7/24/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1247</td>
<td>8/2/15/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248</td>
<td>6/7/24/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249</td>
<td>8/2/15/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>6/7/24/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1251</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1254</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1255</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1256</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1257</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1258</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1259</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1260</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1261</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1262</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1264</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1265</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1266</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1267</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1268</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>T.</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>CG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery 175</td>
<td></td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1227</td>
<td></td>
<td>21783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1238</td>
<td></td>
<td>21972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239</td>
<td></td>
<td>21970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1240</td>
<td>26/10/24/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1241</td>
<td>29/10/24/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1242</td>
<td></td>
<td>21989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1244</td>
<td></td>
<td>21789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245</td>
<td></td>
<td>11230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1246</td>
<td>8/2/15/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1247</td>
<td>6/7/24/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248</td>
<td>25/10/24/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249</td>
<td>29/10/24/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td></td>
<td>21811</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1251</td>
<td></td>
<td>8771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252</td>
<td>9/7/24/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253</td>
<td></td>
<td>8770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1254</td>
<td>18533 ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1255</td>
<td></td>
<td>3476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1256</td>
<td></td>
<td>8767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1258</td>
<td></td>
<td>6303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1259</td>
<td></td>
<td>20240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1260</td>
<td></td>
<td>15095 ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1261</td>
<td></td>
<td>22010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1262</td>
<td></td>
<td>20244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td></td>
<td>22143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1264</td>
<td>26/10/24/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1265</td>
<td></td>
<td>6301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1266</td>
<td></td>
<td>20251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269</td>
<td>23/10/24/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270</td>
<td>26/10/24/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCA</td>
<td>T_2</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>CG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1271</td>
<td>6/1/24/9</td>
<td>6298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272</td>
<td>23/10/24/3</td>
<td>5386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1273</td>
<td>18/2/25/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274</td>
<td>26/10/24/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1275</td>
<td>6/1/24/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1276</td>
<td>28/10/24/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1277</td>
<td>25/10/24/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1278</td>
<td>4/1/24/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279</td>
<td>30/5/24/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280</td>
<td>26/10/24/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1281</td>
<td>4/1/21/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1282</td>
<td>28/10/24/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1283</td>
<td>30/5/24/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1284</td>
<td>4/1/24/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1285</td>
<td>9/1/21/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1286</td>
<td>9/1/24/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1287</td>
<td>22144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1288</td>
<td>22149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1289</td>
<td>22022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290</td>
<td>22019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1291</td>
<td>22006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1292</td>
<td>22131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1293</td>
<td>22011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1294</td>
<td>22031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1295</td>
<td>22144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1296</td>
<td>22149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1297</td>
<td>22022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1298</td>
<td>22019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1299</td>
<td>22006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>22131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301</td>
<td>22011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302</td>
<td>22031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1303</td>
<td>22144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1304</td>
<td>22149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1305</td>
<td>22022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1306</td>
<td>22019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1307</td>
<td>22006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1308</td>
<td>22131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1309</td>
<td>22011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310</td>
<td>22031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311</td>
<td>22144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1312</td>
<td>22149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1313</td>
<td>22022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1314</td>
<td>22019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1315</td>
<td>22006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1316</td>
<td>22131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1317</td>
<td>22011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1318</td>
<td>22031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table contains entries for HCA, T_2, JE, and CG, each with specific date values.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA</th>
<th>T.</th>
<th>JF</th>
<th>CG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1319</td>
<td>4/7/24/12</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td>23107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1321</td>
<td></td>
<td>11229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371</td>
<td>3/3/21/7</td>
<td>6291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373</td>
<td>3/3/21/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1434</td>
<td></td>
<td>19776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1435</td>
<td>15/3/25/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1456</td>
<td></td>
<td>4300-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1457</td>
<td></td>
<td>4308-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1458</td>
<td></td>
<td>4126-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459</td>
<td></td>
<td>4646-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1474</td>
<td></td>
<td>3453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
<td>3460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1494</td>
<td></td>
<td>4591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another jar from each of these canopic sets is in the Alexandria Museum, nos. 1350 and 1348 respectively.
Name Index

3h-m (?) f.  Berlin 7700
3h-mii f.  Munich 49
3st f.  CG 70043
3st-ir-di-st f.  Belfast 418; CG 70028; T.6/7/24/3; T.25/10/24/5; T.25/10/24/15; T.26/10/24/3; Fitzwilliam E.9.34; Glasgow D.1937.29; Leiden VII.11; UCL 14649; Louvre C.229; Stockholm 62
3st-wrt f.  CG 3453; JE 6301; Louvre C.116; Louvre C.232; Pittsburgh, Carnegie Institute 1917.472; Vatican 128; Vienna 5103
3st-n... f.  T.29/10/24/6
3st-n' m.  JE 8773
3st-ršt f.  JE 21788
3st-ḫr-ti f.  Lyon I.E.328
3st-(m/n)-ḥb f.  El Amrah D.7 B; Amherst 1921 VI; JE 34431; JE 34432; Garstang 991.A.09.11; Hilton Price 2014; Leiden VII.13; UCL 14497; Turin 1528
3st-sš-di (?) f.  T.3/3/21/13
3st-di-st f.  JE 5386

Ii m.  JE 20240
Ii-š-ḥtp m.  CA II,122; Horniman; Kyoto; Louvre C.232; Vienna 5103
Ii-šr m.  Brussels E.4338
Berlin 7700; BM 325; Chicago OIM 6898; De Rougé pl. 53; Dundee; Glasgow D.1937.29; Guimet C.36; Leiden VII.11; MMA 21.2.66; Munich 49 (2); Rio de Janeiro 2462

T.4/7/24/7; Chicago FM 31659

Fitzwilliam E.252.1900

Lyon I.E.328

Louvre C.232

CG 38239 bis; CG 38446; JE 91219; T.9/1/21/1; Durham N.1968; UCL 14590; Louvre C.114

JE 20247

JE 22123

BM 798

Manchester 2965

Louvre C.107

BM 809

Fitzwilliam E.252.1900

Lyon I.E.328

BM 809; Leiden VII.20; Louvre C.116

JE 91219; JE 91261

T.29/10/24/5

Amherst 1921.VI

Leiden VII.21; Leningrad 2260

Chicago OIM 6898

Chicago OIM 6406
Irknyt m. Garstang 1036.A.09.3
Ir-s-3w-n-mhút f. T.22/8/15/3
Irt-rw M. Aix 12; Avignon 23; Belfast 421; Berlin 7700; Boston NFA 03.1560; CG 22022; CG 22036; CG 22131; JE 20247; JE 41331; JE 91266; T.26/10/24/2; Chicago OHM 5740-50; Durham N.1971; EES; Frankfort 212 (?); Hannover 2944; UCL 14590; Louvre C.107; Louvre C.229; Louvre E.20091; Munich 49; Salford; Turin 1532
Irt-hr-rw m. Abydos I, LXXII A and B; Abydos I, LXXIII A and B; Abydos TC pl.7; Antwerp 263; Avignon A.30; Bologna 1939; Bower 8; BM 640; BM 641 (?); CG 3453; CG 22022; CG 70026; JE 3476; JE 6303; JE 22010; T.23/10/24/1; T.25/10/24/5; T.25/10/24/15; Chicago FFM 31280; Fitzwilliam E.14.1926; Fitzwilliam E.33.40; Florence 2509; Garstang 991.A.09.11; Hilton Price 2014; Louvre C.107 (2); Louvre C.232; Munich 45; Munich 49 (2); Reading E.23.2; Sydney, Nicholson Mus. 36 and 25.37; Turin 1528; Vienna 5103
Irt-hr-hns (?) m. Munich 47
Irt-y-r3i m. CG 22019; T.26/10/24/1; Fitzwilliam E.259. 1900; Graz; Louvre E.13069
Ihr m. Louvre D.18; NMA 21.2.66
Itf-3rí m. CG 22041
'3(?)-t3f-níht m. Louvre E.13069
'nw-t3 m. Frankfort 212; Pittsburgh, Carnegie Institute 4210/13
'nh-wm-nfr m. T.28/10/24/2
'nh-p3f-hr m. Amherst 1921.VI; JE 11230; Chicago OHM 5739; Chicago OHM 5747-9; Leiden VII.11; Louvre C.107 (3); Vienna 119
| NH-nb.f | BM 1482 |
| NH-nhb(?).f | T.28/10/24/1 |
| NH-n-smgm | CG 22028 |
| NH-hr | CG 22028; CG 23107 |
| NH-hr-p3-hrd | Vatican 128 |
| NH-hr-s3-st | Amherst 1921.VI; BM 66843; T.5/1/15/13; T.15/3/25/6; Durham N.1979; Leiden VI.53; Louvre E.14730; Turin 1536; Turin 1557; Vienna 157 (2) |
| NH.f | Manchester 2965 |
| NH-f-n-P | Louvre C.107 |
| NH.s | West Berlin 13269 |
| R-imn-n3-nty-w3w | Leiden VII.21 |

<p>| W3h-ib-r'c | Abydos I, LXXII A; Abydos I, LXXIII A |
| W3h-ib-r'-mn | CG 38363 |
| W3h-k3-chn | Baltimore, WAG 175 |
| Wnt-hnt | Vatican 128 |
| Wn-imn | Karlsruhe H.1048/50 |
| Wni | T.9/1/21/1 |
| Wn-nfr | Berlin nn. (2); BM 806; CG 946; JE 91219; T.3/3/21/7; Garstang 740.A.09; Leiden VII.11; Liverpool City Mus. B.13996; Pittsburgh, Carnegie Inst. 4210/13; Vatican 128 |
| Wsir-mr-di-sw | Antwerp 263 |
| Wsir-ma-st | JE 21811 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warkn m.</td>
<td>Abydos 67.661; Turin 1632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warkn-‘nh m.</td>
<td>JE 91219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wgb-ian-it.f m.</td>
<td>Leiden VII.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wg3-r(w) f.</td>
<td>T.8/2/15/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wg3-rn.s f.</td>
<td>BM 808; Copenhagen 973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wg3-r(n).s f.</td>
<td>Berlin 7700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wg3-hr (?) f.</td>
<td>Louvre E.20091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wg3-hr m.</td>
<td>Belfast 417; BM 1482; CG 4426; CG 22144; CG 22210; JE 6288; JE 41332; Leiden VII.11; UCL 14497; Louvre C.232; Salford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wg3-św (?) f.</td>
<td>BM 37330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3is m.</td>
<td>BM 608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3b3 m.</td>
<td>Karlsruhe H.1048/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3att-ir-di-st f.</td>
<td>CG 38618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3k-n-mwt m.</td>
<td>Lyon I.E.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3k-n-św-tfnwt m.</td>
<td>El Amrah D.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3k-n-św-tfīti m.</td>
<td>CA II, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3k-n-śi-śtīw m.</td>
<td>Leiden VII.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bw-irt-hr-rw m.</td>
<td>Lyon I.E.328 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Br m.</td>
<td>CG 22043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bs m.</td>
<td>JE 21738; JE 30434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bțd f.</td>
<td>JE 11229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P3-3bt-t3-mri f. Oxford E.3922
P3-iw m. Vienna 157
P3-iw-n-hr m. BM 339; Brussels E.567; JE 21789; JE 34598; T.1/7/18/2; Glasgow D.1926.2; Pittsburgh, Carnegie Inst. 4210/13
P3-iw-n-mwt m. JE 30434
P3-iw-n-pWF m. JE 21970
P3-iw-r s m. T.3/3/21/7
P3-iw-y m. Lyon I.E.328
P3-iw-inpw (?) m. BM 1474
P3-iw-nfr m. Lyon I.E. 328
P3-whr m. T.6/7/24/3; Florence 2493
P3-b3 m. BM 1317
P3-bik m. CG 38413
P3-brm m. Cincinnati 1947.392
P3-bs m. T.26/10/24/5; Vienna 138
P3-m3i m. T.22/8/15/13
P3-miw m. Louvre C.107 (2)
P3-n-b(w) m. Florence 2502
P3-n-hr m. CG 22127
P3-n-hmm m. Durham N.1985
P3-n-8t m. CG 22210
P3-n-£3t m. Turin 1557
P3-n-£(n)f m. Louvre E.13067
P3-nhsy m.  
JE 91258; Columbia X.3

P3-hwt m.  
Lyon I.E.328

P3-hř m.  
CG 38329; MCA 13

P3-hř-n-mḥit m.  
Lyon I.E.328

P3-tṛṭy m.  
Lyon I.E.328

P3-ḥri-n-3ṣṭ m.  
CA II,XXVI.6

P3-ḥri-n-bṛṣṭṭ m.  
Meux 50 B

P3-ḥri-n-mḥit m.  
Liverpool City Museum 50.43.30

P3-ḥri-n-tṣ-ḥṭ m.  
Bologna 1935; CA II.122; Vatican 128

P3-kṛṣḥwty m.  
Lyon I.E.328

P3-kṛṣp m.  
JE 34604; Columbia X.3

P3-di-3ṣṭ m.  
Aix 12; Amélineau; Amherst 1921.VI; Avignon 12; Berlin 7700; Bologna 1939; BM 66843; CG 38416 (?); JE 30435; T.3/3/21/5; T.6/7/24/11; T.10/2/25/2; T.15/3/25/6; Fitzwilliam E.SS.47; Hannover 1935.200.210; Michaelides; Vienna 157 (2)

P3-di-imn m.  
BM 793; CG 22011; CG 22022; JE 11229 (?); T.4/7/24/4; Munich 47

P3-di-imn-m-ipt m.  
T.30/5/24/1

P3-di-imn-nb-iwt m.  
T.26/10/24/10

P3-di-inḥr m.  
BM 641; Feuillet de Conches; Boston 03.1560

P3-di-ḥṣṣ m.  
Fitzwilliam E.14.1926; Vienna 119

P3-di-ḥṣṣ-ḥṭ m.  
Turin 1557

P3-di-wm m.  
JE 8770

P3-di-wsir m.  
CG 22163; CG 38446; Chicago OIM 7142; Guimet C.32
P3-di-wsir-wn-nfr m. Dewsbury
P3-di-wsir-wn-(nfr ?) T.4/7/24/9
P3-di-b3stt m. CA II.XXVI.6; CG 36380; JE 8773; JE 12638; T.9/7/24/4 (2); T.26/10/24/10 (2); MCA 380; Munich 47
P3-di-p3-wn-wtf m. El Amarah D.7.A
P3-di-pth m. Fitzwilliam E.SS.40
P3-di-mwt m. Avignon 15
P3-di-mlf m. CG 3460
P3-di-mhit m. T.30/5/24/1; T.4/7/24/7 (?); Durham N.1977; Leningrad 1066; Louvre C.107; Louvre C.110; Louvre E.13067
P3-di-nwb m. JE 11230
P3-di-nfr-htp m. T.9/7/24/4
P3-di-nkm (!) m. JE 11229
P3-di-hr m. BM 640; MCA 1309
P3-di-hr-p3-rc m. Brussels E.4338
P3-di-hr-p3-hrd m. Berlin 7303; T.30/5/24/4; T.6/7/24/9; Copenhagen 972; Leningrad 2260; Louvre C.232 (2); Munich 49; Rio de Janeiro 2462; Vienna 5103 (2)
P3-di-hr-rsnt m. JE 19769
P3-di-hkt m. JE 36415
P3-di-wnsw m. BM 1428; T.4/7/24/12; MCA 1404
P3-di... m. Brussels E.4070
P3-drt m. Leiden VII.11
P3-f-iw-hr m. Leiden VI.54
P3.f-ḥry-ntr m. Sydney, Nicholson Museum 36 and 25.37
P3.f-ḥ3w m. Berlin 7700; CG 22131
P3.f-ḥ3w-ḥwy-3st m. T.26/10/24/10
P3.f-ḥ3w-ḥwy-mnw m. BM 1317; Turin 1557; Vatican 128 (?) 
P3.f-ḥ3w-ḥwy-n̄t m. Louvre A.93; Stockholm 58
P3.f-ḥ3w-ḥwy-n̄hr m. JE 6301
P3.s-ḥ3w-ḥwy-3st f. Hannover 2941
Pn3 m. CG 22003
Pri f. CG 22031
Pr-nfrw m. CG 38380
Prw-nwt f. CG 22019
Psmtkh m. Aix 12; El Amrah D.33; CA II.94; CG 38618; Leningrad 1070; MCA 13; Turin 1532; Vienna 189
Psmtkh-mry-rc m. Baltimore WAG 175
Psmtkh-s3-nt m. CG 38618
Pk-s3-ṭr f. JE 32022-3
Pkr-s3-ri f. Bologna 1939
Pgṭrr m. Chicago OIM 6408
Ptrw...(? ) m. BM 1474
Pṭḥ-ir-di-sw m. JE 21797; MCA 1400
Pdsk m. JE 6297
Pdt m. Leiden VII.11
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wy (?) m.</td>
<td>Lyon I, B. 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nc m.</td>
<td>Avignon nn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwt f.</td>
<td>Vatican 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwt-ir-di-st f.</td>
<td>CG 22210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwt-m-pr-ms f.</td>
<td>T. 9/1/21/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwt-htp f.</td>
<td>El Amrah D.7.A; El Amrah XLI; New Haven 6552; New Haven 6593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mntw-m-ḥ3t m.</td>
<td>Abydos I, LXVII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mntw-ḥtp m.</td>
<td>El Amrah D.16.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mntw-di-wt3 m.</td>
<td>Rochdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr-b3stt-it.s f.</td>
<td>Leningrad 2260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr-ḥth-ḥtp f.</td>
<td>Vatican 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr-nt-it.s f.</td>
<td>JE 47833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr-n-ḥnum (?) m.</td>
<td>BM 798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr-tfnwt f.</td>
<td>Abydos I, LXXIII D; BM 37339; JE 36492; Louvre C.116; Vatican 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.s-nipdw f.</td>
<td>Oxford E. 3922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrt f.</td>
<td>Columbia X.3; Vienna 157 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrt-iam f.</td>
<td>T. 28/6/24/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrt-it.s f.</td>
<td>JE 91219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrt-nt f.</td>
<td>Alexandria 1350; CG 4300-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrt-sw-iam f.</td>
<td>Leiden VI.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mri-mwt m.</td>
<td>CG 22156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whit-waḥt f.</td>
<td>CG 22144; T. 30/5/24/1; Leiden VII.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NhIt-t3.s-nht f. Abydos I, LXXIII B and C; Pittsburgh, Carnegie Inst. 1917.472

N3-mnh-3st f. Copenhagen 973
N3-mnh-imn m. Fitzwilliam E.11
N3-nfr-ii f. T.30/5/24/1; Leiden VII.9
N3-nfr-sfmt f. T.20/10/24/5
N3-t3t (?) f. T.4/7/24/4
Ns-3st f. T.8/2/15/11; Vienna 189
Ns-imn m. BM 1333; CG 4646-9; CG 22149; Turin 1520; Vienna 119 (2)
Ns-inhr m. Abydos III, XXX; T.30/5/24/1; Danson Coll. (893.A.09); Garstang 983.A.09; Lausanne; Liverpool M.13996; Lyon I.B.328 (2)
Ns-inhr-nb-xyt m. JE 6300; T.30/5/24/1 (2)
Ns-wnh-i m. Louvre C.107
Ns-wrt f. EM 798
Ns-wrt-hk3w f. JE 30434; T.1/7/15/2; Vienna 157
Ns-wsir (?) m. T.23/10/24/1
Ns-b3-mnh m. Lyon I.B.328
Ns-b3-nb-dd m. CG 22006
Ns-b3st-n m. Hannover 2941
Ns-p3-m3i m. Belfast 421; CG 22022; T.9/1/21/1; Durham N.1968; UCL 14497; Munich 47
Ns-p3-mdw m. El Amrah XXXV.7; Berlin 2090; Bolton 36.01.34; Chicago OIM 5740-50
Ns-p3-r c m.
Aix 12; T.9/1/21/1

Ns-p3-k3-ewty m.
Abydos 68.90; El Arabah E.173; Avignon A.30; BM 1333; Brooklyn 12.1911.2; CG 22126; CG 22176; JE 18520; JE 26051; Chicago FM 31671; Glasgow 13.176; Graz; Turin 1528; Vienna 157 (2); Vienna 189 (2)

Ns-p3-k3-mwtf f m.
Munich 49

Ns-pr-nwb m.
CG 23107; T.18/2/25/2 (2); Manchester 2965

Ns-anw m.
Amélineau; Avignon A.30; CG 3453; JE 8767; T.30/5/24/1 (4); Leiden VII.9 (4); New Haven 6552

Ns-anw f.
Frankfort 212

Ns-mhit m.
Belfast 419

Ns-nwb-htp m.
Berlin 7567; BM 808; JE 30434; T.5/1/15/13; T.25/10/24/5; Commerce; Garstang 740.A.09; Leiden VII.11; UCL 14649; Rio de Janeiro 2462; Trieste 7; Vienna 157 (2)

Ns-nfr-htp m.
Bologna 1935

Ns-nhm-ewyt f.
T.30/5/24/1

Ns-n... f.
Durham N.1985

Ns-hwthr f.
Berlin 7567; Berlin 7583; JE 8770; Vienna 119

Ns-hr m.
Abydos I, LXXII B; Abydos I, LXXIII A; Aix 12; El Amrah D.7.A; El Amrah XLI.; Avignon 23; Belfast 418; Berlin 7700; CG 22022; CG 22031; CG 22131; CG 70043; JE 6291; T.6/7/24/5; Copenhagen 1067; Hannover 2941; Leningrad 1070; UCL 14649; Munich 49; New Haven 6552; New Haven 6593

Ns-hr f.
BM 338

Ns-hr-p3-hrd f.
BM 798

Ns-hr-k3-ewty m.
Leiden VI.53
Ns-ḥnsw f. Chicago OIM 5740-50
Ns-ḥsw m. Louvre C.117
Ns-ḥsw-tfnwt m. CG 946; T.30/5/24/1 (2); Leiden VII.13; Rochdale (?)
Ns-t3-wrrt f. Manchester 2965
Ns-t3-wd3t f. BM 699
Ns-tfnwt f. Avignon A.30; CG 22011; JE 6291; JE 21788; T.30/5/24/1; Chicago FM 31671; Carstang 740.A.09
Ns-ty (?) m. Lyon I.E.328
Ns-dḥwti m. T.4/7/24/4
Ns-... m. BM 325
Ni-ni... f. BM 640
Nt-i3rt f. Belfast 421; Leningrad 2260; RCA 1400
Nc-ns-b3att f. Louvre A.93
Nb-m3't m. JE 30435; T.6/7/24/11; Fitzwilliam E.33.47; Hannover 1935.200.210; Vienna 157
Nb-nfrw-n.f f. T.3/3/21/13
Nb-t3-iḥyt f. Bolton 53.02; JE 6288; T.3/3/21/5
Nb-... f. Louvre E.13067
Nbt-ḥwt f. El Amrah XXXVI.3
Nbt-ḥwt-iti f. Glasgow D.1926.2
Nbt-ḥwt-thti m. JE 91251
Nfr-i3wt f. Leiden VII.11
Nfr-ib-r c m. Bolton 53.02
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nfr-ib-rc-m-3ht</td>
<td>JE 47833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nfnt-ixt</td>
<td>South Kensington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nhm.a-b3att</td>
<td>El Arabah E.173; Bolton 54.00.100; JE 8770;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JE 21989; Munich 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nḥbt-nḥt (?)</td>
<td>Durham N.1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nḥt-veis</td>
<td>Vienna 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nḥt-b3att-rw</td>
<td>JE 6300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nḥt-dḥwti</td>
<td>Leningrad 1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nḥt-f-awt</td>
<td>JE 6300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nk3w</td>
<td>Durham N.1977; Durham N.1985; Louvre E.13068 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣdm-p3-ṣ-ṣt</td>
<td>Chicago FM 31671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R'mas</td>
<td>Lyon I.E.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwrrw</td>
<td>Belfast 421; Berlin 7588; Chicago OIM 5739;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicago OIM 6698; Leningrad 2260; Vienna 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwrrw</td>
<td>JE 34603; T.1/4/21/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rnwtṣ</td>
<td>T.1/7/18/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rnpt-nfr</td>
<td>Alexandria 1350; CG 4300-2; JE 91219; Han-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nover 2944; NMA 21.2.66; Salford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rr</td>
<td>Belfast 421 (2); RM 699; RM 808; CG 22036;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CG 22126; CG 22176; JE 18520; JE 22143; JE 34605; T.29/10/24/1; Copenhagen 1067; Gar-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stang 200.A.07.1; Leningrad 2260; Munich 49;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rio de Janeiro 2462; Vienna 189 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫr</td>
<td>Louvre N.2722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫr-inpw</td>
<td>AR 1908-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hr-ir-di-st f.  JE 8769
Hr-rdit-śps (?) f. CG 22011
Hr-s-n.f m. T.26/10/24/1
Hr-tw f. Leiden VII.11
Hrt f. Manchester 2965
Hrwr m. Stockholm 62
Hkr m. JE 21991

H3 (?) m. Philadelphia UM 69-29-126
Hwmw m. T.13/1/21/4
Hp m. Durham N.1971
Hpw m. Florence 7643
Hpir m. CG 22144
Hpmn m. Abydos I, LXXIX.9; JE 36492; Philadelphia UM E.16133
Hpm-nnh m. BM 637
Hrrt f. Copenhagen 1067
Hms3 m. Florence 2502
Hr m. Abydos III, XXX; Abydos TC 7; Belfast 419 (?); BM 639; CG 715; CG 22006; CG 22163; CG 70028; JE 3476; JE 6297; JE 8767; JE 19776; JE 34605; JE 41458; JE 47833; T.30/5/24/1; T.6/7/24/3; T.25/10/24/15; Guimet C.32; Louvre C.117; Louvre C.229; Louvre C.232; Louvre E.13069; Louvre E.14730; Lyon I.E.328 (4); Munich 49 (2); Pittsburgh, Carnegie Inst. 1917.472; Pittsburgh, Carnegie Inst. 2231.4; Rio de Janeiro 2462; Vienna 157; Vienna 5103
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hr m.</td>
<td>JE 47833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hr f.</td>
<td>T.9/7/24/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrdw-nh f.</td>
<td>Louvre C.232; Vienna 5103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hts f.</td>
<td>T.3/3/21/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3-sbk m.</td>
<td>Louvre A.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3t-3st f.</td>
<td>CG 22003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3t-nwb f.</td>
<td>Abydos 67.661; JE 91219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3t-hwthr f.</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, Carnegie Inst. 2231.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sb3 m.</td>
<td>CG 38390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm3-t3wy m.</td>
<td>CG 38413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smst f.</td>
<td>T.30/5/24/1; Leiden VII.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr-imn m.</td>
<td>JE 5386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srp m.</td>
<td>Reading E.23.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3t3 f.</td>
<td>T.26/10/24/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3t-irt-bint f.</td>
<td>Avignon A.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3m-n-gagm m.</td>
<td>CG 22028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3iwt f.</td>
<td>Turin 1557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3m-ri (?) f.</td>
<td>JE 8767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3p-n-3st f.</td>
<td>Berlin 7303; T.26/10/24/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3p-n-wpt f.</td>
<td>Turin 1632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sp-n-b3stt f.  JE 8773
Sp-n-mwt f.  CG 22156; Leiden VI.51
Sp-n-mhit f.  JE 21969; Vienna 138
Sp-n-hr f.  Sydney, Nicholson Mus. 36 and 25.37
Sp-n-spdt f.  JE 30434; Vienna 157 (2)
Sp... f.  JE 20240; T.29/10/24/5; Florence 2502
Šsnk m.  T.22/8/15/13; UCL 14590; Meux 50 B

Kws f.  Bologna 1935
Kb-h3ty-n-3st f.  Berlin 7700
Ks f.  CG 22022

K3-anh m.  JE 22010
K3-cw.s f.  Pittsburgh, Carnegie Inst. 4210/13
Kif m.  Leiden VII.11 (2); Trieste 7
Kh (?) f.  CG 38413

G3wt-sän f.  Turin 1538; Vienna 157
Gm-3st f.  JE 21811
Gm.s-3st f.  JE 6291
Gs-n-s (?) m.  CG 38239 bis; JE 20262; Louvre C.114
T3-irt-rw f. Leiden VI.51
T3-irt-k3p f. T.6/7/24/9
T3-irt(?)-t3-hn f. Antwerp 263
T3-(3t f. Stockholm 58
T3-wpt f. Berlin 7700
T3-whr(t) f. CG 22126; T.4/1/21/1
T3-pnwt f. JE 6298
T3-f3-brt f. Berlin 7700 (?); JE 21797
T3-art f. Boston 03.1560
T3-art-iman f. Leiden VI.20
T3-art-hnsw f. T.6/7/24/7
T3-(nt)-iwnn f. CG 22127
T3-(nt)-iman f. CG 3460; CG 22054; CG 22173; T.13/1/21/4;
Fitzwilliam E.48.1901; Louvre C.117; Munich 45
T3-(nt)-iman-ipt f. T.6/7/24/3
T3-(nt)-b3att f. BM 29422
T3-(nt ?)-bw-ry.s f. Leiden VII.20
T3-(nt)-prt f. Avignon nn.; West Berlin 13269; CG 22178; JE 21789; T.26/10/24/10
T3-(nt)-mmw f. JE 21797
T3-(nt)-hwt-(3t f. CG 22043
T3-nt-8 f. T.18/2/25/2
T3-nt-grmi f. Vatican 128
T3-nht-n-pr-3st f. CG 70028; JE 3476; T.25/10/24/15
T3-ḥnwt-ḥḥt f.  Vatican 128
T3-ḥnwt-ḥḥt-ṛw f.  Turin 1538; Vienna 157
T3-ḥṛw f.  Belfast 419
T3-ḥṛṛ(t) f.  JE 91251
T3-ḥḥs f.  BM 347
T3-ḥḥṛḥt f.  EES
T3-ḥḥ3-r-n-bḥṣṭt f.  BM 1333; Chicago OIM 5740-50 (?); Chicago OIM 6332-3, 6335-7; Cincinnati 1947.392; Vienna 189
T3-ḥḥṭ f.  BM 1482; Vienna 5103
T3-ḥḥṃḥt f.  Copenhagen 972; Leiden VII.11 (2); Trieste 7
T3-ḥḥṛt f.  Amélineau; T.29/10/24/1; Chicago OIM 5739; Chicago OIM 5747-9; Leningrad 1070; Louvre C.229; MCA 1460
T3-ḥḥṃḥt f.  Berlin 7588
T3-ḥṣ f.  Avignon A.30
T3-ḥḥḥṣ-ḥḥ-kḥjī f.  Brussels E.4338
T3-ḥḥṛḥt-nt-bḥṣṭt f.  T.29/10/24/1; Louvre C.107 (2); MCA 1460
T3-ḥḥṛḥt-nt-ḥḥṣḥ f.  JE 22139; Florence 2493
T3-ḥḥṛḥt-nt-ḥḥnw f.  Abydos I, LXXIII C; El Amrah XXXVI.3; BM 37339; CG 3460; CG 22149; T.6/7/24/3; Florence 7643
T3-ḥḥṛḥt-nt-ḥḥḥḥt f.  Aix 12; Avignon nn.; BM 29422; JE 91219; T.4/7/24/7; Leiden VII.9
T3-ḥḥṛḥt-nt-ḥḥṛ f.  MCA 1309
T3-ḥḥṛḥt-nt-ḥḥṃḥt f.  Bologna 1939
T3-ḥḥṛḥt-nt-tḥḥḥḥt f.  Garstang 983.A.09; Vatican 128
T3-ḥrit-nt-t3-ḥrt(?) f. Vatican 126
T3-ḥr(rt) f. JE 6293
T3-kḥpy f. Leningrad 1066
T3-ḥr-hb f. CG 22149
T3-di f. CG 22163; JE 36415
T3-dit-ḥst-n f. Munich 49 (2)
T3-dit-ḥst-hb f. CG 22163; Guimet 0.32
T3-dit-ḥmn f. Vienna 157
T3-dit-wrt-kḥjw f. CG 22127
T3-dit-wsir f. Avignon A.30; BM 637; CG 3453; JE 21991; T.26/10/24/2
T3-dit-wsir-wn-nfr f. T.4/7/24/4
T3-dit-bḥst f. CG 22022
T3-dit-pḥ-nfr-ḥḥ f. JE 20262
T3-dit-mḥḥt f. Bolton 53.02
T3-dit-ḥr f. Glasgow D.1937.29
T3-dit-ḥr-pḥ-hrd f. EM 1428
T3-dd-wp f. De Rouge pl.53
T3.f-ḥwt f. JE 6303
T3.f-nḥt (?) m. Durham N.1985
T3iω-di f. JE 36415
T3... f. Fitzwilliam E.SS.34; Louvre N.2722
Ti (?) f. Philadelphia UM 69-29-126
TWTW m. El Amrah XXXVI.3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thwt</td>
<td>Liverpool City Mus. N.13996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th3</td>
<td>CG 22003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tryr (?)</td>
<td>Fitzwilliam F.33.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thry</td>
<td>Sydney, Nicholson Mus. 36 and 25.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th3...</td>
<td>Liverpool 228a.A.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tst (?)</td>
<td>Avignon 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr3i m.</td>
<td>CG 22054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr3i-3st-imw f.</td>
<td>JE 20240; Vienna 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr3i-b3ett-imw f.</td>
<td>JE 22143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr3i-m3b3-nht m.</td>
<td>Chicago OIM 5747-9 (2); Louvre C.229 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr3i-mhit-imw f.</td>
<td>BM 809; JE 18533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr3i-hwthr-imw f.</td>
<td>BM 798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr3i-hp-imw f.</td>
<td>JE 21991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr3i-hr-imw f.</td>
<td>JE 34604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr3i...imw (?) f.</td>
<td>JE 22143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trw-t3w m.</td>
<td>BM 1317; T.26/10/24/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trw-t3w f.</td>
<td>Belfast 418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trw-n-k3m (?) f.</td>
<td>Stockholm 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thm (?) f.</td>
<td>Philadelphia UM 69-29-126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs-3st-prt f.</td>
<td>BM 66843; CG 22022 (2); Heidelberg 563; Rochdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs-prt f.</td>
<td>JE 22139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs-mhit-prt f.</td>
<td>JE 18533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tt hñsw-prt f.</td>
<td>JE 21970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ttt t.</td>
<td>JE 8769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tt f.</td>
<td>Louvre C.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tt-n... f.</td>
<td>Turin 1632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di-imn-hb-sd m.</td>
<td>BM 1333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di-ir m.</td>
<td>Belfast 417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di-pth-i3w m.</td>
<td>Bologna 1939 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di-æn-æhit (?) f.</td>
<td>BM 641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di-æ3w-rc f.</td>
<td>JE 4591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di-hñsw-p3-snb m.</td>
<td>T.28/10/24/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di-hnnm m.</td>
<td>Berlin 7700 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di-t3w-æwy-3st f.</td>
<td>JE 21797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di-nt... f.</td>
<td>JE 11230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diw-ç f.</td>
<td>JE 18520; Garstang 200.A.07.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diw-ç m.</td>
<td>T.6/7/24/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di e-irt-rw f.</td>
<td>Cortona 356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di e-hñsw m.</td>
<td>T.4/1/21/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dnit-(nt)-3st f.</td>
<td>T.5/1/15/13; Louvre E.14730; Turin 1532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dnit-(nt)-æhr m.</td>
<td>Chicago FM 31671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drš f.</td>
<td>Horniman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dd-æht-ætr (?) m.</td>
<td>CG 22019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D3d3 f.  
D4y m.  
Dhwti-ms m.  
Dd-3st-iw.f-šnd h. m.  
Dd-3st-iw.s-šnd h. f.  
Dd-3st-w3h.s f.  
Dd-inhr-iw.f-šnd h. m.  
Dd-wsir-iw-ir-sw m.  
Dd-b3att-iw.f-šnd h. m.  
Dd-b3att-iw.s-šnd h. f.  
Dd-mwt f.  
Dd-mwt-iw.s-šnd h. f.  
Dd-mhit-iw.s-šnd h. f.  
Dd-hp m.  
Dd-hr m.  
Dd-hr-iw.f-šnd h. m.  

je 28096  
Lyon I.E.328  
CA II.93; CG 22127; Chicago OIM 7196-9; Leiden VII.20  
Abydos 68.90 (?); Avignon 15; CG 22041; CG 23107; CG 38390; Je 8769; Florence 2509; Manchester 2965; Turin 1538 (2); Vienna 157  
Durham N.1979; Vienna 157  
Leiden VI.54  
El Amrah D.7.8; El Arabah E.173; BM 809; BM 32703-6; CG 22043; Je 34603; Je 91219; T.30/5/24/1 (2); Feuillet de Conches; Kyoto; Leiden VII.9 (4); Leiden VII.11; Louvre E.13068; Rio de Janeiro 2462  
Munich 49  
West Berlin 13269; Je 8771; Je 41438; T.16/2/25/2  
BM 1317  
CG 22036  
Je 91219  
Je 6300  
MCA 12  
Abydos I, LXXIII C and D; Abydos I, LXXIX.2; Berlin 7700; BM 29422; BM 37330; BM 37339; CG 22031; Je 6288; Je 6301; Je 34603; Je 38355; T.3/5/21/5; T.30/5/24/1; T.26/10/24/3; T.28/10/24/2 (2); De Rougé pl.53; Durham N.1971; EES: Garstang 991.A.09.11; Hannover 2941; Leiden VII.21; Munich 45; Munich 49 (2); Rochdale; Turin 1528  
Durham N.1979
Dd-qnsw-iw.f-ثن m. CG 22210; Chicago FM 31280
Dd-dhwti-iw.f-ثن m. JE 91219

...imn m. Brussels E.4070
...inhfr m. (?) Avignon 12
...nfr m. Heidelberg 563
...ry f. Berlin 7587
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louvre A.93</td>
<td>im3b '3 m pr nsw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.1/7/18/2</td>
<td>imy 3bd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bologna 1939</td>
<td>imy 3bd dw3t ntr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leiden VII.11; Munich 49; Salford</td>
<td>imy 3bd ḫry a3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG 22022</td>
<td>imy 3bd ḫry a3 2 a3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osireion XIX</td>
<td>imy 3bd ḫry a3 2 a3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 338; Leningrad 2260; Vienna 157</td>
<td>imy 3bd ḫry a3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna 119</td>
<td>imy 3bd ḫry a3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin 7700</td>
<td>imy 3bd ḫry a3 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avignon 15</td>
<td>imy 3bd tpy pr Inḫr nb ṣtyt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio de Janeiro 2462</td>
<td>imy 3bd pr Wsir a3 tpy, 2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE 91261</td>
<td>imy ib nb.f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abydos 68.90; BM 809; CG 3453; Fitzwilliam E.11; Lyon I.E.328 (?); Vatican 128</td>
<td>imi ist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.6/7/24/11; Commerce</td>
<td>imi ist šw-Tfnwt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester 2965</td>
<td>imi ist šw-Tfnwt m Tni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abydos 68.90; Abydos I, LXXIII C and D; Aix 12; El Amrah D.7.B; Avignon A.30; Belfast 421; Berlin 7323; Berlin 7587; Berlin 7588; Berlin 7700; BM 325; BM 338; BM 699; BM 809; BM 1333; BM 29422; BM 32703–6; BM 37339; BM 66843; CG 22022; CG 22036; CG 22126; CG 22131; CG 22149; CG 22178; CG 22210; CG 23107; JE 6300; JE 8769; JE 8771; JE 18520; JE 28051; JE 34603; T.5/1/15/13; T.1/7/</td>
<td>imi ist ḫsk (see also ḫsk imi ist)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
imi ist ḥsk (cont.)

18/2; T.30/5/24/1; T.26/10/24/1; T.18/2/25/2; Chicago FM 31260; Chicago FM 31671; Chicago OIM 5747-9; Chicago OIM 6893; De Rouge pl.53; Durham N.1977; Fitzwilliam E.259.1900; Fitzwilliam E.14.1926; Florence 2509; Garstang 200. A.07.1; Glasgow D.1926.2; Glasgow D.1937.29; Leiden VII.9; Leiden VII.11; Leiden VII.20; Leningrad 1066; Leningrad 1070; Leningrad 2260; Liverpool M.13916; UCL 14649; Louvre C.107; Louvre C.110; Louvre C.116; Louvre C.117; Louvre C.229; Louvre D.17; Louvre E.13068; Louvre N.2722; Salford; Stockholm 58; Trieste 7; Turin 1528; Turin 1532; Turin 1538; Turin 1557; Vienna 119; Vienna 157; Vienna 189

imi-r wδbw Shmt

Aix 12; Amherst 1921.VI; T.15/3/25/6; Lyon I.E.328

imi-r wδbw Shmt nsw bity (Mn(?)-m;ṭ(?)-r<)

imi-r wpwt ḫtp-ntr T3 ḫm<w

Chicago OIM 5747-9

imi-r wt Inpw

CA II, 122

imi-r pr wr

Louvre A.93

imi-r pr-hd

Louvre C.107

imi-r pr-hd nbw

Louvre A.93

imi-r mnfyτt

JE 47833

imi-r mš<

Baltimore WAG 175; CG 38618; JE 22010

imi-r mš< wr

Chicago OIM 6408

imi-r niwt

El Amrah XXXV.7; Berlin 2090; Bolton 36.01.34; BM 1335; T.18/2/25/2; Chicago OIM 5740-50; Glasgow 13.176; Liverpool M.13916

imi-r niwt rey

Abydos 67.661
imy-r ḫmw-ntr
BM 699; BM 1333; Kyoto

imy-r ḫmw-ntr n Wsir m 3bdw
Berlin 7323; Fitzwilliam E.14.1926

imy-r ḫmw-ntr n Mḥt nbt Wbn
Louvre C.107

imy-r ḫmw-ntr ntr pn Shmt m 3bdw
Louvre C.107

imy-r ḫṭm
JE 47833; Pittsburgh, Carnegie Inst. 2231.4

imy-r Smw mi kd.s
Abydos I, LXVII

imy-r šn
Lyon I.E.328

imy-r šn pr Wsir
Berlin 7587

imy-r šnwty nw Smw Mḥw
JE 30434

imy-r k3t nbt n new
JE 91261

imi ḫ3t (?)
Amherst 1921.VI

imi ḫnt dw3t ntr
Bologna 1939; T.26/10/24/5

imi ḫt ḫ3
Copenhagen 1067; Graz

imi st-Ś ḫry s3 tpy s3 2
Osireion XIX

imi st-Ś s3 tpy s3 3 s3 4
Louvre C.107

ir mr rʿ nb
CG 38363

irr ḫr w3t n 3st ntr
Turin 1528

ihyt n Imn-rʿ
Oxford E.3922

ihyt n Wsir-ḥnt-immtiw ntr (3 nb 3bdw
Chicago FM 31671

ihyt m Bḥdt (?)
BM 699

ihyt n pr Mḥt Inḥr
Leiden VII.9
ihyt n Mnw
El Amrah D.7.A; JE 6291; New Haven 6552; New Haven 6593

ihyt n Hwthr nbt W3dt
JE 36492

ihyt Hnt-imntiw
Abydos I, LXXIII A; Aix 12; Belfast 418; CG 22022; CG 22036; Horniman; Leiden VII.11; Leningrad 1070; Leningrad 2260; Louvre C.229; Pittsburgh, Carnegie Inst. 1917.472; Rochdale; Stockholm 58; Vienna 169

ihyt Swn-Tfnwt
Louvre C.107; Louvre C.117

ihyt Tfnwt
Louvre C.116

ihyt n Tfnwt s3t Rc hmwt ntrw
Leiden VII.20

it ntr
Aix 12; Belfast 418; West Berlin 13269; T.1/7/18/2; T.4/1/21/1; T.9/1/21/1; T.25/10/24/5; Fitzwilliam E.SS.40; Fitzwilliam E.SS.47; Leiden VI.54; Leiden VII.21; Leningrad 2260; Louvre E.13067; Munich 49; Osireion XIX; Philadelphia UM 69-29-91; Rochdale; Vienna 157

it ntr Inhr
CG 22041

it ntr Wair
JE 30435; Louvre E.13069

it ntr Mnw
CG 715

it ntr mrt ntr
BM 809; Brussels E.587; JE 6297; T.29/10/24/1; Louvre C.107; Turin 1528

it ntr mrt ntr m Ipt-swmt
Lyon I.E.328

it ntr hs ntr
JE 8773

<3 n pr n imy-r ihw (?) Louvre C.110

<3 n h3 Louvre A.93
CG 22156
Philadelphia UM E.16133
BM 699; BM 1333; CG 22041; CG 22210;
T.26/10/24/1; T.18/2/25/2; Fitzwilliam
E.259.1900; Leiden VII.9; Louvre C.110
Avignon 12; JE 21811; T.9/7/24/7
Louvre A.93
CG 22022; JE 5386; JE 21970
Copenhagen 973
JE 19776
T.18/2/25/2
Avignon 23; JE 6297; JE 36415; Durham
N.1979; Karlsruhe 1048/50
Osireion XIX
Leiden VII.23
CG 715
Lyon I.E.328
Louvre C.107
JE 20262
BM 1333; Leiden VII.9; Louvre C.107
Louvre A.93
Abydos 67.661
Durham N.1968
b3k mnḥ n Wsird-Wn-nfr

Turin 1528

fkti

Chicago FM 31671

fkti imi stti

JE 18520; JE 30434; Leiden VII.11; Vienna 157

mwt nfr n dw3t nfr

Oxford E.3922

nb 3wt ib

BM 1333; JE 6288; T.3/3/21/5

nb n pr Imn

Louvre E.13069

nb n pr Inhr

T.30/5/24/1; Leiden VII.9

r-p'ct

JE 47833; Louvre A.93

rmn nsrt

T.30/5/24/1; Durham N.1977; Leiden VII.9; Leningrad 1066; Louvre C.107; Louvre C.116; Lyon I.E.328; Manchester 2965

rmn-ḥri-ḥbs-ḥpr

JE 6288; T.3/3/21/5; Liverpool M.13996

rh nsrw

Aix 12; Belfast 417; BM 325; BM 339; BM 29422; BM 66843; CG 22022; CG 22054; CG 22126; CG 22131; CG 22176; JE 34603; T.5/1/15/13; Chicago OIM 5747-9; De Rouge pl.53; Fitzwilliam E.48.1901; Glasgow D.1937.29; Leiden VII.11; Leningrad 1070; Liverpool M.13996; Louvre C.107; MMA 21.2.66; Munich 49; Salford; Stockholm 62; Turin 1528; Turin 1532; Vienna 119; Vienna 189

rh nsrw m 3bdw

BM 699

rh nsrw m3<

Fitzwilliam E.14.1926
rh nsw m3< (sp sn ?)  
JE 91219

rh nsw m3< mr.f  
BM 32703-6

rh nsw mr.f  
Fitzwilliam E.11

rh nsw nb.f m3<  
CG 38363

rh s3 nsw (?)  
BM 808; CG 22036; JE 18520; Vienna 189

h3wty  
Chicago OIM 6406

h3ty-<  
BM 1333; JE 47833; JE 91261; Fitzwilliam E.14.1926; Kyoto; Louvre A.93

h3ty-< n 3bdW  
Fitzwilliam E.14.1926

h3ty-< n Tni  
El Arabah E.173

hpt wd3t  
Aix 12; Avignon 30; Berlin 7323; Berlin 7587; BM 325; BM 338; BM 699; BM 808; BM 809; BM 1333; BM 29422; BM 66843; CG 22022; CG 22036; CG 22054; CG 22126; CG 22131; CG 22178; CG 22210; CG 23107; JE 18520; JE 34603; T.5/1/15/13; T.30/5/24/1; T.26/10/24/1; T.15/2/25/2; Chicago FM 31280; Chicago OIM 5747-9; De Rouge pl.53; Durham N.1977; Fitzwilliam E.259,1900; Fitzwilliam E.48.1901; Fitzwilliam E.1.1926; Glasgow D.1937.29; Leiden VII.9; Leiden VII.11; Liverpool M.13996; Louvre C.110; Manchester 2965; MMA 21.2.66; Munich 49; Salford; Turin 1528; Turin 1532; Vienna 119; Vienna 157; Vienna 189

hpt nart  
JE 36492; Philadelphia UM E.16133

hm-n<-iiit  
Louvre C.232; Vienna 5103

hm ntr  
Abydos III, XXX; El Amrah XXXVI.3; El Amrah XLI; Bolton 53.02; CG 22054; JE 30434; JE 36492; JE 91219; JE 91261; T.13/1/21/4; T.25/10/24/5; Florence 2509;
hm ntr (cont.)

Horniman; Kyoto; Lausanne; Louvre C.232; Lyon I.E.328; New Haven 6552; New Haven 6593; Rochdale; Turin 1557; Vatican 128

hm ntr 2

Vienna 189

hm ntr 3

CG 22126; Garstang 200.A.07.1; Louvre C.107 (?); Vienna 189

hm 3st

JE 91261

hm ntr 3st...

JE 36492

hm ntr 3st wrt mwt ntr

Horniman

hm ntr 3st nbt pr ms

Amherst 1921.VI; T.15/3/25/6

hm ntr Imn

Abydos 67.661; Avignon 15; Berlin 2090; BM 32703-6; CA II, 73

hm ntr tpy n Imn

Turin 1632

hm ntr Imn m Ipt-swt

Abydos 67.661; El Amrah XXXV.7; BM 32703-6; JE 30434; T.18/2/25/2; Chicago OIM 6898

hm ntr 3 Imn m Ipt-swt

El Amrah D.7.B

hm ntr 4 Imn wsr-h3t

Louvre C.232; Vienna 5103

hm ntr Imn nsw t3wy

T.13/1/21/4

hm ntr Imn apd 'bwy

Chicago OIM 6898

hm ntr Imn k3-'bwy

Chicago OIM 6898

hm ntr Imn-r' new ntrw

BM 1333; T.18/2/25/2; Chicago OIM 5740-50; Chicago OIM 5747-9; Glasgow 13.176; Liverpool Inst. of Archaeology E.27; Vienna 189

hm ntr 4 n Imn-r' new ntrw

Abydos I, LXVII

hm ntr s3 tpy n Inhr

Avignon 15

hm ntr 3 n Inhr

JE 41438; T.18/2/25/2; Leiden VII.20
hm ntr Inhr wd< w3ct
hm ntr tpy n Inhr nb Scyt
hm ntr 4 Inhr nb Scyt
hm ntr n Inhr m st wrt
hm ntr Inhr n Thn
hm ntr tpy Inhr-Sw s3 R<'c
hm ntr 3 Inhr-Sw s3 R<'c
hm ntr 4 Inhr-Sw s3 R<'c
hm ntr 5 sdm r.s
hm ntr 'ndti
hm ntr 'ndti m 3bdw
hm ntr W3dt
hm ntr W3dt m 3bdw
hm ntr W3dt hry-ib 3bdw
hm wn
hm ntr tpy wrw (?)
hm ntr Wrt-hk3w
hm ntr Wrt-hk3w nb 'h
hm ntr n Wsir
hm ntr Wsir m 3bdw
hm ntr tpy n Wsir

Leiden VII.9
Avignon A.30
Leiden VII.9
Vatican 128
BM 1333
Chicago OIM 5747-9
CG 946
T.30/5/24/1; Leiden VII.9
Leiden VII.9
Vienna 189
Berlin 7700
Abydos I, LXXIX.2; Chicago OIM 7142; Horniman
Vienna 189
Fitzwilliam E.48.1901
JE 6288; T.3/3/21/5
Louvre E.20091
CG 22054
Amherst 1921.VI; T.15/3/25/6
Amherst 1921.VI; JE 20240; Copenhagen 972; Horniman; Louvre C.232; Rio de Janeiro 2462; Turin 1538; Vienna 157; Vienna 5103
Turin 1538
CG 70043; Chicago OIM 5747-9; Kyoto; Leiden VII.11
hm ntr Inhr wd c m3/st
hm ntr tpy n Inhr nb Štyt
hm ntr 4 Inhr nb Štyt
hm ntr n Inhr m st wrt
hm ntr Inhr n Tni
hm ntr tpy Inhr-Šw s3 R'
hm ntr 3 Inhr-Šw s3 R'
hm ntr 4 Inhr-Šw s3 R'
hm ntr €š &m r.s
hm ntr &ndti
hm ntr cndti m 3bdw
hm ntr W3dt
hm ntr W3dt m 3bdw
hm ntr W3dt hry-ib 3bdw
hm wn
hm ntr tpy wrw (?)
hm ntr Wrt-hk3w
hm ntr Wrt-hk3w nb c h
hm ntr n Wsir
hm ntr Wsir m 3bdw
hm ntr tpy n Wsir

Leiden VII.9
Avignon A.30
Leiden VII.9
Vatican 128
BM 1333
Chicago OIM 5747-9
CG 946
T.30/5/24/1; Leiden VII.9
Leiden VII.9
Vienna 189
Berlin 7700
Abydos I, LXXIX.2; Chicago OIM 7142; Horniman
Vienna 189
Fitzwilliam E.48,1901
JE 6288; T.3/3/21/5
Louvre E.20091
CG 22054
Amherst 1921.VI; T.15/3/25/6
Amherst 1921.VI; JE 20240; Copenhagen 972; Horniman; Louvre C.232; Rio de Janeiro 2462; Turin 1538; Vienna 157; Vienna 5103
Turin 1538
CG 70043; Chicago OIM 5747-9; Kyoto; Leiden VII.11
hm ntr tpy n Wsir ntr (3 nb 3bdw
hm ntr 2 n Wsir
hm ntr 2 Wsir nb 3bdw
hm ntr 3 n Wsir
hm ntr 3 Wsir m 3bdw
hm ntr 4 Wsir
hm ntr 4 Wsir n W-Pkr
hm ntr Wsir wp-š'ę-t3wy
hm ntr Wsir N3rf
hm ntr Wsir n dert (?)...
hm ntr idnw st n B3att nbt hh
hm ntr B3att ḥry-ib 3bdw
hm ntr (3 pr-šnh
hm ntr tpy p3 pr-šnh
hm ntr 3 Nwt nbt Mgb
hm ntr Mntw
hm ntr Mntw nb W3st
hm ntr Mhit nbt Wbn
hm ntr 2 Mhit nbt Wbn
hm ntr Mhit ḥry-ib 3bdw
hm ntr Nwbhtp
Chicago FM 31671
JE 18520; Rio de Janeiro 2462; Vienna 189
Chicago OIM 5747-9
CG 22126; CG 22178; JE 18520; JE 30434; Turin 1538; Turin 1557; Vienna 157
T.6/7/24/11
Vienna 5103
Louvre C.232; Vienna 5103
Horniman
Chicago OIM 6898
Berlin nn.
Lyon I.E.328
Pittsburgh, Carnegie Inst. 1917.472
Amherst 1921.VI
T.15/3/25/6
JE 36492; Philadelphia UM E.16133
T.16/2/25/2
Chicago OIM 5747-9; Liverpool M.13916
T.30/5/24/1; Leiden VII.9
T.30/5/24/1
Louvre C.232; Vienna 5103
UCL 14649
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ntr n Nasm...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ntr tpy (?) n Nasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ntr 2 Nasm wrt s3t Rc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ntr n ntrw n pr-’nh (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ntr n ntrw n hwt n Wair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ntr n ntrw n T3-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ntr n hwt n new bity (R&lt;mass mry-Imn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ntr Hwthr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ntr Hwthr nbt Itnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ntr Hwthr nbt W34t irt Rc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ntr Hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ntr Hr imi-’snwt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ntr Hr-W34t-Shmt (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ntr Hr wp-’ct-t3wy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ntr n Hr-p3-rC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hr P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ntr Hr-p3-hrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ntr Hr ndty-it.f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ntr Hr tm3[-C] (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ntr 3 Hri-8f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kyoto
BM 325
T.9/1/21/1
Amherst 1921.VI; T.15/3/25/6
T.13/1/21/4
T.13/1/21/4
CG 22054; T.13/1/21/4
Chicago OIM 7142
Fitzwilliam E.14.1926
JE 6266; T.3/3/21/5
New Haven 6552
Horniman; Philadelphia UM E.16133
BM 1474; Louvre C.107 (?)
Horniman
JE 18520
CG 22054; T.13/1/21/4; Fitzwilliam E.48.1901
Louvre A.93
BM 1482
Aix 12; Amherst 1921.VI; T.15/3/25/6;
Horniman
Vienna 189
Lyon I.E.328
hm ntr p3 h3wt
hm ntr hnsw hry-ib Bnm
hm ntr Hnm
hm (n) Si3 hm (n) 3h
hm ntr Shmt
hm ntr 4 Shmt
hm ntr Sw-Tfnwt
hm ntr Tfnwt n hwt-ntr Tni
hm ntr Tfnwt s3t R<
hm ntr twt (pr-(3)
(Nht-hr-hb))
hm ntr Dhwti hry-ib 3bdw
hm ntr Dhwti hry-ib pr-<nh
hm ntr whm n Inhr
hm ntr 2 whm n Inhr
hm ntr whm n Wair
hm nsw
hm nsw wrt
hnwty n pr-<nh
hry imy wnwt Wair m 3bdw
hry <kr n 3st
hry wn < n pr 3st pr ms (?)
hry wn n Nḥit
hry pr-hd s3 3 s3 4
hwtntr 3bdw
hry hsw n Wsir
hry ḥ3y n pr Wsir
hry swnw pr Wsir
hry sḥt pr Wsir
hry sš hwtntr Imn
hry sšt3
hry sšt3 ḥr ḥh
hry sšt3 mwt ntr
hry sšt3 m ṣḥṭ sw
hry ṣhw n 3st n pr ms
hry ṣmṭ pr Wsir n(b?)
Ddw n(b?) 3bdw
hry ḫbh n nsw...
ḥr y ḥd m snbw
ḥs n 3st
ḥs ntr (?)
ḥs ḫnw n Imn
ḥs...
ḥsbd

Louvre C.107
Louvre C.232; Vienna 5103
CG 22022
Berlin 7303
T.4/7/24/4
CG 22163; CG 38329 bis; Guimet C.32;
Louvre C.114
Chicago OIM 5747-9
Fitzwilliam E.58.47
Berlin 7700; Brussels E.587; JE 30434;
Osireion XIX; Philadelphia 69-29-91;
Turin 1538
New Haven 6552
T.9/1/21/1
Durham N.1971
T.28/10/24/2
Fitzwilliam E.48.1901
Feuillet de Conches
CG 22003
El Amrah D.7.A
JE 21797; T.6/7/24/3; T.29/10/24/7;
Leiden VI.20
Frankfort 212
CG 3453
hsbštntbt
hsbštntbnWSmWmhw
hsk
hsknWsir
hsknWsirm3bdw
hskimiist
(seealsoimiisthsk)

 şimdi
hrp\'h
hrp\hwmt
hrp\msst(?)
htm- c
htmntr

hrυ-\hb
hrυ-\hbhrυ-tp
hrυ-\hnstm3it
hrυhck

PhiladelphiaUME.16133
CG946
Berliner7700;BrusselsE.587;CG22054;
CG70043;JE6297;JE30434;T.13/1/21/4;
T.12/3/25/5;ChicagoFM31671;Commerce;
FitzwilliamE.48.1901;Garstang991.A.
09.11;Horniman;Kyoto;LouvreC.107;
LyonI.E.328;Munich49;OsireionXIX;
PhiladelphiaUM69-29-91;Pittsburgh,
CarnegieInst.1917.472;Trieste7;
Vienna5103

JE91258
Commerce;Manchester2965

AbydosI,LXXIII A;BM808;CG22054;
T.13/1/21/1;FitzwilliamE.48.1901;
LiverpoolM.13996;LouvreD.18;NMA
21.2.66;Munich49;Vienna189

T.6/7/24/3
JE91261;LouvreA.93
LouvreA.93
LeidenVII.9
NewHaven6552;NewHaven6593
CAII,122;NewHaven6593

JE91219
JE91261
ColumbiaX.3
BM1317
s3b
Chicago OIM 5740-50; T.18/2/25/2; Glasgow 13.176

s3h w3t
JE 6288; T.3/3/21/5

s3t nsw
JE 32022-3; JE 34431; T.28/6/24/5;
Oxford E.3922

swww
Brussels E.4070

sm3ty
El Amrah XLI; Avignon A.30; BM 1333;
JE 6291; New Haven 6552; New Haven 6593

sm3ty Ipw
BM 699; T.18/2/25/2; Leiden VII.9

sm3ty h3st
Fitzwilliam E.11; Leiden VII.13

sm3ty Mnw
JE 6291

sm n3t
T.15/1/21/1; T.3/3/21/5

smr w'ty
JE 91261; Louvre A.93

smsg h3yt n pr n Mnw
nb Ipw
T.6/7/24/3

sm...
Copenhagen 1067

snt nsw
JE 34431; Oxford E.3922

shtp hm.s
T.15/1/21/1; T.3/3/21/5

shm ntrw
JE 91261

sht pr Wsir
JE 34605; T.6/7/24/5

sš imy-r ihw
Leiden VII.9

sš...ihw n pr Imn
Louvre C.110

sš ihw
Louvre C.107

sš ( nsw n hft hr
JE 47833

sš (rk hh (?)
Louvre C.107
sā n Wsir
sā n p3 wbwy n ḫwt-ntr n Tni
sā n p3 wbwy n st tn
sā (pr-’3) iw.f ipy n ḫwt-ntr n pr-nb-W3dt
sā pr-hd
sā pr-hd n Inhr
sā pr-hd n Inhr-Sw s3 RC
sā pr-hd n pr Wsir
sā pr-hd n Mḥit
sā mšc
sā md3t ntr
sā md3t ntr ḫmn war-h3t
sā md3t ntr n Inhr
sā md3t ntr pr Wsir
sā md3t ntr n tm3 (?)
sā nsw
sā nsw m cray
sā nsw pr-ṣnh
sā nsw n nb t3wy

Chicago OIM 7196-9
Leiden VII.9; Leiden VII.20
Leiden VII.9
JE 6298
Leiden VII.9; Louvre C.107
T.30/5/24/1; Leiden VII.9
Louvre C.116
BM 338; Commerce; Glasgow D.1926.2; Munich 49; Turin 1538
Durham N.1977
CG 22144; Leiden VII.9
Aix 12; Amherst 1921.VI; BM 66843; JE 30434; JE 30435; T.5/1/15/13; T.15/3/25/6; Fitzwilliam E.SS.47; Leiden VII.9; Louvre E.14730; Vienna 157
Vienna 5103
Cincinnati 1947.392
Commerce; Hannover 1935.200.210; Louvre E.14730
Amherst 1921.VI
Kl Amrah XXXVI; Bolton 53.02; CG 946; JE 36492; T.30/5/24/4; Louvre C.232; Vienna 5103
Vienna 5103
BM 808
Commerce
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sš nsrw n ge-pr rey</td>
<td>Louvre C.232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš ḫwt-ntr n Imn wsr-ḥ3t n Pbst wsr-ḥ3t</td>
<td>CG 22127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš ḫwt-ntr n Inhr p3 sšw 4</td>
<td>Avignon A.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš ḫwt-ntr n pr Inhr nb Šṣyt sš mrwt</td>
<td>Louvre C.107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš ḫwt-ntr pr Imn</td>
<td>Chicago OIM 5747-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš ḫwt-ntr nt pr n ḫmr</td>
<td>Louvre C.107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš ḫwt-ntr n ḫr ṭp-št-št3wy</td>
<td>Chicago OIM 7196-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš ḫt-p-ntr pr Imn</td>
<td>Chicago OIM 5747-9; Chicago OIM 6898</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš ḫt-p-ntr n Imn m ṭp-swt</td>
<td>Abydos 67.661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš ḥtm ntr</td>
<td>Amherst 1921.VI; T.15/3/25/6; Vienna 189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš n pš ḫt-p-ntr n Wsr</td>
<td>Louvre C.232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš šḥ०ʷ</td>
<td>Durham N.1977; Leiden VII.9; Louvre C.107; Louvre C.232; Vienna 5103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš šḥ०ʷ ḫry sš ṭpy sš 2</td>
<td>Vienna 189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš šḥ०ʷ n ḫt-p-ntr Wsr</td>
<td>Louvre C.232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš sḥt pš ḫt-p-ntr Wsr</td>
<td>Louvre C.232; Vienna 5103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš stš n šṃw nb ḫpr ḫwt-ntr n 3bdw</td>
<td>Louvre C.232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš šṭ n ḫ ray</td>
<td>Liverpool M.13916</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš šn</td>
<td>Amherst 1921.VI; T.15/3/25/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš šn n pr Wsr n sš 3</td>
<td>Leiden VII.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš ṭš</td>
<td>Avignon 15; Turin 1557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš ṭš n ḫmr nbt Wbn</td>
<td>Louvre C.107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sš t3 pr Inhr
sš dš n sš 4
sš...pr ḫwt-nṯr 3bdw
sš...nṯr pn Ṣ (?) Ṣr
imn wmt.f
sdm n nb tšwy

Špsš nsw
Šm ḫr mw...
Šmt n Wsir
Šmt n ḫnt-imnštw
Šms
Šmt Mwt

kbh
kbh m r-stšw
kbh ḫwt-nṯr
kbh n ḫmt nsw wrt
km₃ Mwt

krʾšr Ṣfr-ḥtp
ktn

CG 23107
T.30/5/24/1; Leiden VII.9
Vienna 5103
T.3/3/21/5
Carstang 1036.A.09.3

JE 91219
Leiden VII.11
JE 20240; JE 30434; Vienna 157
CG 22054; T.13/1/21/4; South Kensington
CG 38363
BM 347

Aix 12; Bologna 1939
T.9/1/21/1; T.25/10/24/5; Leiden VII.21
T.1/7/18/2
Bologna 1939
JE 36492; Philadelphia UM E.16133

BM 1428

Baltimore WAG 175
gwt n pr Wsir n pr 3st n pr ms

JE 21783

Vienna 138

T.18/2/25/2; Chicago OIM 5740-50; Glasgow 13.176

El Amrah XXXV.7; Berlin 2090; Bolton 36.01.34; BM 1333; T.18/2/25/2; Chicago 5740-50; Glasgow 13.176; Liverpool M.13916; Vienna 189

JE 20262

Reading E.23.2

Vienna 157

Amherst 1921.VI

Liverpool M.13916

BM 798

Chicago OIM 5747-9

Chicago FM 31659

...4 Dhwti nb Hmnw

...Mnw Gbtiw

...Sw-Tfnwt hry-ib Ipt-swt

...Tfnwt
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