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The topic of the dissertation is a study of the Ramesseum Dramatic Papyrus, a document that was discovered together with other papyri and funerary objects in a late Middle Kingdom tomb in the necropolis later associated with Ramses II’s funerary temple on the West bank of Luxor. The thesis will cover an analysis of the complete find, providing information on the provenance of the collection, the circumstances of its discovery, the dating of the papyri, and the identity of the tomb owner. The focus of the dissertation, however, is the Ramesseum Dramatic Papyrus itself, which features the guideline for the performance of a ritual. The fabrication and preservation of the manuscript is described as well as the layout of the text. Based on a copy of the original text made with the help of a tablet PC, an up-dated transliteration and translation of the text is provided, accompanied by a commentary. The text has been studied by several scholars, but a convincing interpretation of the manuscript is lacking. Thus, the dissertation will analyse the previous works on the papyrus, and will compare the activities described in the text of the manuscript with other attested rituals from
ancient Egypt. By highlighting the differences and similarities the text has with texts that describe these other ceremonies, the exact nature of the rites described in the Ramesseum Dramatic Papyrus can be identified. Finally, a new interpretation of the text is offered, suggesting that the ceremony to which it refers concerns a statue ritual performed in commemoration of Senwosret I’s accomplishments at Karnak.
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I. Introduction

The topic of the dissertation is a study of the Ramesseum Dramatic Papyrus, called RDP herein. The manuscript is one of the most interesting, and at the same time intriguing texts that has survived from ancient Egypt. The uniqueness of the document lies in its composition and its application. It is separated into text and illustration components forming most likely a guideline for the performance of a ritual.

The RDP was found together with several other documents, called the Ramesseum Papyri, as well as several funerary objects in a Middle Kingdom tomb in Thebes. Consequently, my thesis begins with an analysis of the complete find, providing information on the provenance of the collection as well as the circumstances of its discovery. A further topic is the dating of the find as well as a discussion on the social status and occupation of the tomb owner. The latter study is especially informative concerning the text of the RDP as the occupation of the manuscript owner might provide information on the usage and purpose of the manuscript.

The second part of the dissertation focuses on the RDP itself. The results of my research at the British Museum in London, where I consulted the original document, are summarized. Statements on the present condition of the document as well as its original length are made; the end of the text is lost today. A subchapter concerns the sketch of a building that is a secondary addition on the verso of the manuscript. It is probably not directly connected to the ritual text on the recto of the document. However, the drawing is useful as it may provide information on the owner(s) of the Ramesseum find, who might have been the master(s) of a large estate in the Theban area.

In the following, the layout of the manuscript is described and a new division of the ritual text into Scenes and Sequences is presented. The only previously existing publication of the manuscript was done by Sethe in 1928, who provided a description of the manuscript as well

---

1 The dissertation is part of the Ramesseum Papyri project based at the British Museum in London. The objective of the research group is a re-evaluation and publication of all papyri comprised under the term Ramesseum Papyri (http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/research_projects/the_ramesseum_papyri.aspx).
2 Specific terms that relate to the textual division of the manuscript are capitalised throughout the thesis. The ritual is divided into several Sequences, which are subdivided into Scenes. Each Scene consists of an Introduction, an Explicatory sentence, divine Speeches, as well as Remarks and mostly an accompanying Vignette. For a detailed explanation of the terms, see IV: 30ff. and V: 37ff.
as a translation and interpretation. He divided the text into 46 Scenes along with 31 Vignettes. I postulate that the text is separated into 48 Scenes and 32 Vignettes that can be grouped into several Sequences (see appendix B: 297ff.). Any comments on Scenes and Vignettes in the course of the thesis refer to my new division of the ritual unless it is explicitly mentioned that I allude to Sethe’s separation.

The main core of the thesis is the translation of the ritual. Up to the present, any research on the text has been based on Sethe’s 1928 translation of the text. The knowledge of the ancient Egyptian language has increased immensely since the beginning of the 20th century, however, and more ritualistic and religious texts are available for comparison. Moreover, Sethe included his own additions of words, which do not appear in the original. Thus, a new translation of the text strictly based on the original and not on Sethe’s hieroglyphic version is necessary. Recent photographs taken of the manuscript are difficult to read due to the poor preservation of the piece. Consequently, I decided to copy the script with the help of a tablet PC. Based on the photographs, the text and the edges of the papyri fragments were traced in Adobe Photoshop (see appendix C: 302ff.). The drawing, representing the up-to-date copy of the document, builds the basis for the study of the text. The transliteration and translation of the manuscript present the current state of the document and do not include any reconstructions. Those and different translation possibilities as well as commentaries on the text are included in notes under each Scene. New readings for some text passages are suggested, which alter not only the translation of parts of the manuscript, but also its interpretation. In addition, translations of sentences or Remarks, which had to remain doubtful in previous studies of the papyrus, are solved. Additionally, many geographical terms for places, buildings etc. are studied in more detail, as they might provide important information about the place(s), where the ritual itself or different events took place – an examination which has not been dealt with thoroughly in previous works on the papyrus. A running translation of the entire text including reconstructions is added in appendix A: 272ff.

Since Sethe’s pioneering work on the RDP several scholars have offered different interpretations of the text based on Sethe’s translation, but a convincing identification of the ritual is still lacking. One of the reasons is the fragmentary condition of the papyrus; large parts of text are missing. A comparison with all rituals preserved from ancient Egypt shows
that the RDP is the only witness for the festival it exhibits thus far. However, the comparison shows that parts of the ritual are also attested during the performance of other festivities, and thus provides information on the character of the ritual. A further study focuses on the varying depictions and epithets of the king in the accompanying illustrations of the manuscript, providing important information on the identification of the ritual. So far, very few scholars have occupied themselves with the questions of why the figure is called “king” and sometimes “the king, the father of the ruler”, or why the shrine on the bark contains a representation of the king in the beginning but is depicted empty towards the end of the manuscript. An examination of the duties of the officials who participate in the events represented in the RDP and an analysis of their appearances in other cultic actions or festivals provide further essential information concerning the identification of the ritual of the RDP. Taking the results of these studies into account together with the new translation of the text, a new interpretation of the ritual is presented at the end of the thesis.

Thus, the dissertation presents the revised course of the ritual for the first time and builds the basis for further studies on the text. At the same time, it contributes to a better understanding of the ritualistic landscape of ancient Egypt and its cultic practices.
II. The Ramesseum Papyri collection

The RDP is part of the so-called Ramesseum Papyri, a collection of at least 24 manuscripts that were found together in a wooden box in a late Middle Kingdom tomb in the Ramesseum necropolis. After the discovery of the collection in 1895/6 by Quibell (1898: 3) the manuscripts were stored at the Edwards Library at the University College London until Gardiner facilitated the conservation of the collection as well as the publication of some of the texts (Gardiner 1955; Barns 1956). When Gardiner moved to Berlin in 1902 to work on the *Wörterbuch* he collaborated with Ibscher, who completed the conservation of the entire find before the Second World War. After that, most of the manuscripts returned to London, and have been kept in the British Museum since then. Only the onomasticon (P. Ramesseum D) as well as the papyrus containing the texts of the Eloquent Peasant and Sinuhe (P. Ramesseum A) remained in Berlin.3

II.a The Provenance of the Ramesseum Papyri collection and the circumstances of its discovery

While excavating the funerary temple of Ramses II in West Thebes in 1895-6, Quibell and Petrie discovered the Ramesseum Papyri collection in a late Middle Kingdom shaft tomb located in the north-west corner of the temple complex (Quibell 1898). The burial is part of the Middle Kingdom cemetery of the Ramesseum necropolis, which is situated in the north-western part of the later storerooms of Ramses II’s funerary temple, as well as outside its enclosure wall (Nelson 2003: 88). Mud-brick chapels with courtyards and deep shafts leading to the burial chambers are characteristic for that necropolis.4 Quibell recorded the position of the burial that housed the Ramesseum Papyri find in chamber 5 of the magazines, in the very north-west corner of the funerary temple.5 Quibell’s published plans were not accurate,

---

3 For a detailed conservation history of the Ramesseum Papyri collection, see Gardiner 1955 and Leach 2006.
4 Parkinson 2009: 139 and Nelson 2003. The cemetery is not the only evidence from the Middle Kingdom in West-Thebes. The funerary temple of Menuthotep II in Deir el-Bahri was still active, and a further necropolis can be found in Sheikh Abd el-Gurna, probably built to surround the temple complex of Amenemhet I (Parkinson 2009: 139).
5 According to Quibell, the shaft is oriented at a different angle from the later wall to the wall of the chamber and extends under it (Quibell 1898: 3).
however, and the exact location of the tomb is unknown today. According to Quibell (1898: 3), the tomb shaft leads 3.96 m deep into the ground and ends in two chambers, each of which probably held a single burial (Parkinson 2009: 140); the two rooms were empty when discovered. After the excavators removed a heap in the middle of the shaft a group of objects was discovered; however, these probably derived from one of the burial chambers and were left behind when the tomb was robbed in antiquity. The objects most likely belonged to the funerary equipment of one of the persons who was buried in the shaft tomb (Quibell 1898: 3). The find consists of a white plastered wooden box that measured 45.75 x 30.5 x 30.5 cm; an image of a jackal was drawn on the lid. Unfortunately, the object is lost today and a sketch does not exist (Parkinson 2009: 142, note 8). The chest contained a bundle of 118 reeds that have not been used, each 40.7 cm long, probably originally included to be used as pens. The fact that the reeds have exactly the same length shows that they were carefully prepared. In addition, the excavators found what may have been as many as 24 papyri in the box. The exact number is hard to determine as the manuscripts were in a very bad condition when discovered; according to Quibell (1898: 3), three-quarter of the documents had decayed away so that the papyri only filled one third of the box. Based on the shape of the chest and according to the usual manner in which papyri were stored, the manuscripts were probably originally arranged lengthwise (Parkinson 2009: 141).

The documents, dating to different time periods (see II.b: 8ff.), can be grouped into several categories. The first group comprises three liturgical texts, written in cursive hieroglyphs: the Ramesseum Dramatic Papyrus (P. Ramesseum B; P. BM EA 10610.1-5), a funerary liturgy for ceremonies at a mastaba (P. Ramesseum E; P. BM EA 10753.1-9), and hymns to

**Notes:**

6 Parkinson 2009: 140. In a personal conversation Parkinson has indicated that – based on the published plans by Petrie and Quibell – an excavation team tried to relocate the tomb, but was unsuccessful.

7 The burial was possibly disturbed by the workmen of Ramses II when they built the funerary temple and discovered the Middle Kingdom cemetery. Based on the objects found in the shaft, it is obvious that the tomb was reused twice later on, first by a family during the 22nd dynasty, and then again during a later period; two ushebtis, a part of a coffin lid, small wax figures, and fragments of leather braces date to the 22nd dynasty (Quibell 1898: 3), while a leather sandal, a glass ring, a small figure, parts of wraths, and fragments of two coffins belong to a burial chronologically later than the 22nd dynasty (Quibell 1898: 4).

8 A similar box was found in el-Lahun. It did not contain papyri however, but offerings (Manchester Museum No. 6198; Parkinson 2009: 141).

9 Manchester Museum No. 1882.

10 For an enumeration of the manuscripts, see also Leach 2006: 236ff.; Quack 2006: 73ff.; and Parkinson 2009: 146ff., with further bibliography on every text.
Sobek (P. Ramesseum VI; P. BM EA 10759.1-7). A second group includes literary texts, written in hieratic: The Discourse of Sasobek (P. Ramesseum I; P. BM EA 10754.1-18 + 7b, A-D), the Tale of the Eloquent Peasant (recto) and the Tale of Sinuhe (verso) (P. Ramesseum A; P. Berlin 10499, A-H), Maxims (P. Ramesseum II; P. BM EA 10755.1-2), and a small fragment of a wisdom text.\(^{11}\) An onomasticon, written in hieratic (P. Ramesseum D; P. Berlin 10495.I-X) as well as a mathematical text (P. Ramesseum VII verso; P. BM EA 10760.1-11)\(^{12}\) represent the group of scientific documents whereas the dispatches from the Nubian fortresses (P. Ramesseum C+18; P. BM EA 10752.1-6 and P. Ramesseum XVIII; P. BM EA 10771.1-2) have to be characterized as administrative documents written in hieratic.\(^{13}\) The majority of texts concern healing and protection, and can thus be grouped under magico-medical manuscripts, mainly written in hieratic: spells against ghosts (P. Ramesseum C verso; P. BM EA 10752.1-6); two texts for mother and child (P. Ramesseum III; P. BM EA 10756.1-13 and P. Ramesseum IV; P. BM EA 10757.1-6); medical prescriptions for vessels (P. Ramesseum V; P. BM EA 10758.1-6); mythological spells (P. Ramesseum VII; P. BM EA 10760.1-11)\(^{14}\); the Banquet of Hedjhotep, a prescription for headaches (P. Ramesseum VIII; P. BM EA 10761.1-14); rituals to protect a house from magic, ghosts, and serpents (P. Ramesseum IX; P. BM EA 10762.1-3); spells for the protection of limbs against serpents (P. Ramesseum X; P. Ramesseum BM EA 10763.1-6); love spells (P. Ramesseum XI; P. BM EA 10764.1-2); invocations to demons against fever (P. Ramesseum XII; P. BM EA 10765); two healing texts (P. Ramesseum XIII; P. BM EA 10766 and P. Ramesseum XIV; P. BM EA 19767); spells to protect the body (P. Ramesseum XV; P. BM EA 10768); spells for protection against serpents and bad dreams (P. Ramesseum XVI; P. BM EA 10769.1-29);

---

\(^{11}\) The fragment does not belong to any of the other manuscripts of the Ramesseum find, and thus has to be counted as a text on its own (Parkinson 2009: 147).

\(^{12}\) The recto of the same papyrus contains mythological spells (see footnote 14 below).

\(^{13}\) P. Ramesseum C+18 is written on the recto of P. Ramesseum C, which contains spells against ghosts on the verso. The scribe who wrote down the magical spells reused the papyrus with the dispatches (Parkinson 2009: 147). Both texts are listed separately in the enumeration above, but belong to one roll. In addition, P. Ramesseum XVIII, containing dispatches as well, is probably part of the very same papyrus (compare Leach 2006: 240).

\(^{14}\) The verso shows a mathematical text (see footnote 12 above).
protection during the epagomenal days (P. Ramesseum XVII; P. BM EA 10770.1-5); and ritual or magical texts (P. Ramesseum XIX; P. BM EA 10772.1-3).\textsuperscript{15}

Several other objects were found lying beside the box containing the papyri. It cannot be said with certainty whether these items and the chest originally belonged to the same funerary equipment. The shaft tomb consisted of two burial chambers that could have contained more than one burial each, and the items were not found in situ (Quack 2006: 76). It is likely that the pieces belonged to the same burial equipment, however, and were left behind in the shaft by thieves (Quibell 1898: 3; Parkinson 2009: 141).\textsuperscript{16}

The objects comprise fertility figurines out of limestone, faience, and wood (Manchester Nos. 1832, 1789, 1787, 1794, and maybe 1788), beads of faience and gemstones (location unknown), model food and vessels\textsuperscript{17}, a small faience lion (Manchester No. 1839), faience baboons of different sizes (Manchester Nos. 1825, 1827), an ivory statuette of a herdsman carrying a calf (current location unknown)\textsuperscript{18}, a pair of ivory clappers (Manchester No. 1796-7), fragments of four ivory magical wands (Manchester Nos. 1798-1801), a part of an ivory magical rod (Manchester No. 1795), an ivory Djed pillar that was probably originally attached to the rod (Manchester No. 1838), the ivory head of a staff or papyrus burnisher (Manchester No. 1834), a bronze wand in the form of a serpent entangled in a mass of hair (Fitzwilliam Museum E.63.1896), and a wooden figure of a naked woman with a Bes-Aha mask holding two bronze serpents (Manchester No.1790). Two pieces of wood that might have belonged to a small box (Manchester No. 1886) as well as parts of a miniature wooden box (Manchester Nos. 1887, 1884) might have belonged to the same find as well (Parkinson

---

\textsuperscript{15} Parkinson (2009: 147) added to the list an administrative text preserved in six fragments (P Berlin 10131 recto) that might have originally belonged to the Ramesseum Papyri find.

\textsuperscript{16} For the list of objects, see also Bourriau 1988: 110ff. and 1991: 20, Quack 2006: 72f. as well as Parkinson 2009: 142f. The meaning of the objects is discussed in II.b: 8ff.

\textsuperscript{17} Faience grapes (Manchester No. 1841), a white faience gourd (Manchester No. 1792), seeds of the dom palm and of balanites (Quibell 1898: 3) as well as a miniature faience lotus-shaped cup that might be a small version of tableware (Manchester No. 1791; Parkinson 2009: 143).

\textsuperscript{18} The piece represents a herdsman (Ritner 2008: 225ff.), and not a boy (Quibell 1898: 3; Quack 2006: 73) or a dwarf (Parkinson 2009: 143). Bourriau (1988: 110) suggested that the statuette is of a later date and did not originally belong to the group of funerary items. Quibell (1898: 3) mentioned that the object belongs to the same deposit as the other finds, and he thus dated it to the 12\textsuperscript{th} dynasty. He added, however, that he would date the object to the Roman Period if he had found it on its own, and not in the context of an assemblage of finds.
2009: 143). The majority of the items are now kept in the Manchester Museum\(^{19}\) and it is possible that the following objects, also kept in the museum, could have come from the same assemblage of funerary equipment\(^{20}\): a faience baboon (Manchester No. 1840), a pottery offering tray (Manchester No. 1863), a double wooden kohl-pot (Manchester No. 1883), and a fragment of a sandal (Manchester No. 1885).

II.b The dating of the Ramesseum Papyri collection

Besides the manuscripts and objects discovered in the shaft, there is hardly any evidence that could help in dating the tomb precisely, as the two burial chambers of the grave were found empty. Finds in the vicinity of the burial allow a dating to the middle of dynasty 13, however.

Pottery found in the Ramesseum necropolis is comparable to objects from Dra Abu en’Naga that date to the late 13\(^{\text{th}}\) dynasty,\(^{21}\) and statues discovered north of the tomb shaft can be chronologically placed in the 13\(^{\text{th}}\) dynasty (Parkinson 2009: 140; Nelson and Kalos 2000: 143ff.). In addition, a kohl-vase was found in the necropolis, which shows a partially preserved cartouche (\(w\text{id}-t\text{wy}\)); the royal name could be completed as the Horus name of Sobekhotep III (\(s\text{hm}-r\text{c}-sw\text{id}-t\text{wy}\)) who ruled in the middle of Dynasty 13.\(^{22}\)

The manuscripts of the Ramesseum collection corroborate such a dating. P. Ramesseum IV (hymns to Sobek) builds a terminus post quem as the hymns are written in honour of a king named Amenemhet whom Gardiner (1955: 1) identified with Amenemhet III; his Horus name is connected to one of the place names listed in the onomasticon (P. Ramesseum D). Gardiner further proposed that the entire collection has to be dated to the 13\(^{\text{th}}\) dynasty.

---

\(^{19}\) A small number of items, like the wand in the form of a serpent, are stored in the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge.

\(^{20}\) Quibell (1898: 3) mentioned only some of the items that were found in the tomb. These objects were listed in the Manchester Museum catalogue as “Ramesseum XII Dynasty” by Murray. But besides those objects several other items are also designated as “Ramesseum XII Dynasty”, and could thus also originally belong to the same find (Parkinson 2009: 142, note 9).

\(^{21}\) The information is based on a personal communication between Parkinson and Seiler in 2004 (Parkinson 2009: 140).

\(^{22}\) Quibell 1898: 5 and Parkinson 2009: 141. Quibell misleadingly assigned the name \(s\text{hm}-r\text{c}-sw\text{id}-t\text{wy}\) to Sobekhotep II whose Horus name, however, is \(s\text{hm}-r\text{c}-h\text{wi-t\text{wy}}\). For Sobekhotep III’s names, see von Beckerath 1997: 138 and 1999: 94.
Gardiner (1955: 2) has suggested that, based on the discrepancies in the hieratic writings, the manuscripts were probably not all written at the same time, but were likely collected during two generations before they were inherited by the tomb owner.23

Based on the different handwritings, Parkinson (2009: 149ff.) divided the papyri into several groups. He suggested that the linear manuscripts (P. Ramesseum B and E as well as V-VII) date to the late 12th dynasty (Parkinson 2009: 149). As mentioned above, the hymns to Sobek seem to date to the reign of Amenemhet III. The RDP mentions, indeed, Senwosret I, the second king of Dynasty 12, but the document was probably written at a later date.24 The hieratic papyri can be divided into three phases on account of the similarities in the handwriting (Parkinson 2009: 149ff.). The first group comprises the military dispatches that probably date to the rule of Amenemhet III (P. Ramesseum C+18); the Discourse of Sasobek (P. Ramesseum I), and the maxims (P. Ramesseum 2) also belong to this group and might date to the late 12th dynasty like the papyri written in linear script. The second phase includes P. Ramesseum A, C, D as well as 3-4, 9-11, 15, and 19. P. Ramesseum D (onomasticon) mentions a toponym that is connected with the name of Senwosret III; the abbreviation of the geographical term alludes to the Horus name of Amenemhet III (Parkinson 2009: 150). Gardiner (1947: 6) dated P. Ramesseum A between the 12th dynasty literary texts and P. Bulaq 18 from the time before the rule of Sobekhotep III; Möller (1909: 16) added that P. Ramesseum A is more similar to the manuscripts from the 12th dynasty. The documents of that period were already mainly concerned with healing (Parkinson 2009: 150). P. Ramesseum 8, 12-14, and 16-17 belong to the third phase. The writings show characteristics common for the Hyksos Period: the hands seem to be stylistically earlier than the Rhind Mathematical Papyrus (1537 BCE), however, and some manuscripts show hands similar to

23 Parkinson (2009: 149) added that the owner might also have acquired some of the documents from different sources. A comparable find is the archive of the Qenherkepshef family (the Chester Beatty Papyri); around 40 manuscripts were collected over the time span of about 130 years and were “passed from Qenherkepshef to his second wife Niutnakht, then to her second husband Khaemnun, then to their son Amennakht, and to his brother Maamakhtef” (Parkinson 2009: 149; compare also Pestman 1982). For a discussion on the owner(s) of the Ramesseum find, see II.c: 13ff.

24 The ritual preserved in the RDP was probably performed in commemoration of Senwosret I (see X: 238ff.).
the 13th dynasty P. Bulaq 18. Hence, one can conclude that the third phase most likely dates to the 13th dynasty.\footnote{For an exact chronological placement of the papyri, see Parkinson 2009: 151ff.} All texts from the third phase exhibit magico-medical contents.

Two fragments of administrative documents, the aforementioned P. Bulaq 18 and Cairo CG 58069 from the tomb of Neferhotep in Dra Abu en-Naga, might also shed light on the dating of the Ramesseum collection. The first one mentions a regnal year 3, possibly of an immediate predecessor of Sobekhotep III (Ryholt 1997: 222, 243-4, 319)\footnote{Ryholt (1997: 22 and 243) noted that Sobekhotep III derived from a non royal family. This king’s family as well as those of his successors Neferhotep I, Sihathor, and Sobekhotep IV, show no connection with the family mentioned in P. Bulaq 18.}, while the latter one includes a regnal year 6; the king’s name is not preserved. The text also mentions the chief scribe of the vizier Resseneb and the estate of the vizier Ankhu (Quirke 1990: 196). It is clear from the content of both texts that Neferhotep was connected to the administration of the royal court at Thebes (Parkinson 2009: 155). A third text, P. Brooklyn 35.1446, was originally written during the reign of Amenemhet III, but was reused later on (Quirke 1990: 130).\footnote{For a detailed discussion of PBrooklyn 35.1446, see Quirke 1990: 127ff. as well as Parkinson 2009: 155f. The latter examined the thematic connection between the three documents as well as their relation to the Ramesseum find.} Two letters to the vizier Ankhu were written in regnal year 6 of a king who preceded Sobekhotep III, while a list of fugitives, given to Senebtisi by her husband, who was probably Ankhu’s son Resseneb, were added in regnal year 1-2 of Sobekhotep III. The aforementioned P. Bulaq 18 derives from the same time period as the additions of P. Brooklyn 35.1446. In addition, both Resseneb and Ankhu are mentioned in both documents. A connection between these three administrative papyri and the Ramesseum find can be made: P. Ramesseum III also mentions a regnal year 6. Only very few kings during the 13th dynasty exhibit such a long reign (Ryholt 1997: 197). Thus, it is likely that all four documents originally belonged to the same scribal circle. Furthermore, P. Brooklyn shows the same length of usage as the Ramesseum collection: from the rule of Amenemhet III to the mid 13th dynasty. Parkinson (2009: 156) concluded that the owner of P. Ramesseum III was connected to the officials mentioned in P. Bulaq 18 and P. Brooklyn 35.1446. Consequently, he dated the third phase of the manuscripts from the Ramesseum collection to the period directly before the reign of Sobekhotep III. He further argued that the Ramesseum documents were probably placed in the shaft tomb shortly after the last manuscript was written, possibly...
during the reign of Neferhotep I or Sobekhotep IV. If his assumption is correct, the manuscripts had been collected over 100 years, a time span of three or four generations (ca. 1780-1680 BCE; Parkinson 2009: 157).

Typical Middle Kingdom grave assemblages vary immensely, especially during the 12th dynasty; artifacts deposited in tombs during that period can include mortuary and cult furniture, ceramic vessels, jewelry, figurines, statuary, tools, cosmetic utensils, stone vessels, and magic items (Richards 2005: 84-85). According to Bourriaux (1991: 11-16; 20), funerary goods like magical figures, wands and rods, as well as model food offerings and miniature cups became especially common in late Middle Kingdom burials.  

Some of the objects from the Ramesseum tomb assemblage can only be dated to the Middle Kingdom in general. Faience models like the lion, baboons (Quibell 1898: pl. III, nos. 5, 6, 14), and grapes from the Ramesseum find are also known from other Middle Kingdom tombs. Only nine serpent wands are known from ancient Egypt dating from the Middle Kingdom to the Late Period (Ritner 2006: 205-225); the object from the Ramesseum assemblage (Quibell 1898: pl. III, no. 4; Bourriaux 1988: 113, no. 100) is the second earliest example. Only the piece discovered in tomb 13 in el-Bersheh was dated to the 12th dynasty based on its archaeological context (Ritner 2006: 210-211). Typical funerary items of the Middle Kingdom are also the Bes/Aha statuettes, sometimes holding a serpent wand in each hand; they can either represent a male or a female figure. The Ramesseum example portrays a female person wearing a lion mask and holding a serpent wand in each hand (Quibell 1898:

---

28 See also Quack 2006: 75f. and Parkinson 2009: 143. Before they were adopted as funerary items, especially magical figures as well as wands and rods were known as items used in everyday life, as similar finds discovered in domestic contexts in the town of Kahun prove. At the same time the decoration of private coffins changed; a decline in the use of object friezes as well as Coffin Text spells as a decoration means for coffins is attested. Bourriaux (1991: 15) suggested that the placement of wands and magical figures in tombs could have replaced the Coffin Text spells.

29 Compare, for example, the finds in Abydos tomb 416 in the E cemetery: lion (Kemp and Merrillees 1980: 140, no. 94; pls. 13, 15), baboon (Kemp and Merrillees 1980: 140, nos. 95 and 96; pls. 10, 11, 13, 15), and grapes (Kemp and Merrillees 1980: 138, no. 84 and fig. 44, 136). Further Middle Kingdom attestations for the object group are the Mataria tomb group, el-Lisht tomb 453, finds from a tomb on the west side of Senwosret I’s pyramid in el-Lisht, and tomb no. 1 in el-Kab (Kemp and Merrillees 1980, 163-175).

30 Depictions of the god on two magical wands are accompanied by the name Aha so that it is likely that the deity was called Aha in the Middle Kingdom; the name Bes became common in the New Kingdom (Dasen 1993: 55f.).
The iconography of the statuette allows a dating to the Middle Kingdom. In the New Kingdom Bes is portrayed in his characteristic form of a “bandy-legged dwarf with a protruding tongue, a paunchy belly, and a feather-head-dress” (Dasen 1993: 58). Finally, faience and gemstone beads are known from Middle Kingdom grave assemblages. Richards (2005: 164) stated that faience beads are found in 30% of the burials in the North Cemetery of Abydos, for example.

Quite a few items of the Ramesseum assemblage are characteristic for the late Middle Kingdom however and corroborate a dating of the entire find to the mid 13th dynasty. The fertility figurines of the Ramesseum find (Quibell 1898: pl. III, nos. 10, 11, 13) belong to type 1 in Pinch’s classification of the object group, dating from the 12th dynasty to the Second Intermediate Period (1993: 198-199; pls. 8, 46a). Pinch (1993: 226) dated the Ramesseum tomb examples to late Middle Kingdom. One figurine (no. 11) can specifically be assigned to type 1c, characterized by the Hathoric wig (Pinch 1993: 199 and 226). The unique feature of type 1 is the lack of feet. In addition, the figurines exhibit “small breasts, high waists, flat stomachs and buttocks, and plump thighs” (Pinch 1993: 198) and were made out of faience, wood, stone, or ivory. Some figurines exhibit markings in the form of dots on their thighs, waists and/or hips representing body paintings or tatooes (compare Quibell 1898: pl. III, no. 11). Paddle dolls, like the one from the Ramesseum assemblage (Quibell 1898: pl. III, no. 9), are typical for the late Middle Kingdom, Second Intermediate Period, and early 18th dynasty (Pinch 1993: 198; e.g. Garstang 1907: fig. 150). These dolls can be seen as a type of fertility figurines. In contrast to the latter, they wear decorated garments however (Bourriau 1988: 126). The Ramesseum example is missing the head with the characteristic hair made out of straw and faience beads that was attached to the body of the

31 Representations of the god also appear on magical wands during the Middle Kingdom; compare the depiction of the Bes/Aha figure on one of the wands found in the Ramesseum tomb (Quibell 1898: pl. III, no. 2). A similar statuette representing Bes/Aha was found in the North Cemetery of Lisht (Allen 2005: 31, no. 24). A Beset/Ahat statuette was discovered in a house in Kahun together with clappers (Petrie 1890: 30 and pl. VIII, no. 14; Quirke 2005: 81ff.). Concerning the latter find, see also II.c: 16.
32 Examples of the early 18th dynasty are, however, still in the tradition of the Middle Kingdom (Dasen 1993: 58).
33 Compare the examples from el-Lisht (Arnold 1988: 62, no. 61 and pl. 75; 66, no. 98 and pl. 78; 75, no. 207 and pl. 91).
34 For Middle Kingdom figurines, see also Desroches-Noblecourt 1953.
35 A comparable figurine was found in the tomb of Sit-rannut (no. 58) of the 12th dynasty cemetery north of Amenemhet III’s pyramid in Hawara (Petrie, Wainwright, and Mackay 1912: 36 and pl. XXX).
doll; the part was possibly lost when the tomb was robbed.\textsuperscript{36} Magical wands are also common in Late Middle Kingdom burials (Allen 2005a: 29). The Ramesseum assemblage included parts of four wands, decorated with different figures of protective deities (Quibell 1898: pl. III, nos. 1-3).\textsuperscript{37} The miniature lotus-shaped cup (Quibell 1898: pl. III, no. 16) is harder to date. Two similar examples in the Fitzwilliam Museum Cambridge are dated to the late 12\textsuperscript{th} or 13\textsuperscript{th} dynasty (Bourriau 1988: 103, no. 89). Based on full-sized versions in metal and faience, the two objects rather belong to the late Middle Kingdom (Bourriau 1988: 131).\textsuperscript{38} Faience chalices in the form of blue lotus, however, became common only in the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period (Friedman 1998: 126 and 224, no. 114).

\textbf{II.c The owner(s) of the Ramesseum Papyri collection}

The tomb in which the Ramesseum collection was discovered did not exhibit any decoration nor did it contain remains of burial(s) or the name of the tomb owner(s). Hence, the different papyri as well as the funerary objects are the only basis for an identification of the tomb owner’s social status and occupation.

As seen in chapter II.b, most objects are typical for a late Middle Kingdom burial, and hence do not necessarily provide any information on the tomb owner. The cobra wand entangled in a mass of hair and the Ahat statuette carrying wands are uncommon burial goods however (Bourriau 1991: 20) and thus provide information on the occupation of the tomb owner. The bronze serpent could have been placed in the tomb to protect the body of the deceased.\textsuperscript{39} I think, however, that it is more likely that the object was used in rituals: the lector and sem-priests perform, for example, the Opening of Mouth Ritual with a stick in the form of a snake in the so-called \textit{Stundenritual} of Osiris (Morenz 1996: 144; Willems 1996: 127ff.). Several women with amuletic knives and serpent staffs in their hands are depicted next to the tomb owner and his wife in the tomb of Bebi in el-Kab, dating to the 18\textsuperscript{th} dynasty; the carrying of

\textsuperscript{36} For a complete example, see Bourriau 1988: 126f., no. 121.
\textsuperscript{37} For a detailed analysis of magical wands, see Altenmüller 1965. For other examples of wands dating to the 13\textsuperscript{th} dynasty, see Altenmüller 1986, Bourriau 1988: 115, no. 103, and Allen 2005a: 28ff.
\textsuperscript{38} Concerning the two full-sized versions of the cup, see Bourriau 1988: 131, no. 126 and 160, no. 184.
\textsuperscript{39} A similar snake was discovered in the 18\textsuperscript{th} dynasty coffin of Mentuhotep (Parkinson 2009: 144).
the snake staffs is probably related to a funerary ritual, through which the deceased’s rebirth is guaranteed (Willems 1996: 131; Ritner 2006: 212). The bronze snake in the Ramesseum tomb was found entangled in hair; the latter could have been used to strengthen the charm recited while holding the snake staff (Ritner 2008: 224f.). The wooden Ahat-statuette is probably connected to childbirth, suggesting that the piece had a function during the life of the tomb owner (Parkinson 2009: 144f.) and was only secondarily placed in the grave to be useful in the afterlife as well. The same might apply to the ivory wands and the clappers found in the tomb. Although they are typical burial goods in the late Middle Kingdom, wands had a protective function in this life (Parkinson 2009: 145; Bourriau 1988: 114f.). The same is true for the clappers that were used in rituals (Parkinson 2009: 145; Bourriau 1988: 113f.). The deposit of four magical wands in the tomb also points towards a ritualistic occupation of the tomb owner; usually only one wand was placed in the grave for protection. The magical knives, decorated with protective deities, were used to ward off evil from infants; a circle was scratched around the place where the baby slept by means of the wand (Allen 2005a: 29). Interestingly, the Ramesseum find also included two magico-medical texts for mother and child (P. Ramesseum III and IV) that might have been recited at the same time as the rite was performed with the wand. The presence of the fertility figurines in the Ramesseum grave corroborates the assumption that the tomb owner was concerned with the protection of children (unborn or born) during his lifetime. These figurines were not only part of grave assemblages, but were also discovered in settlements and temples or shrines.\footnote{Type 1 figurines were found in the settlement of Kahun (Pinch 1993: 227 with further bibliography) and in temples or temple environments in Byblos, Faras, and Gebel Zeit (Pinch 1993: 227 with further bibliography).} In addition, figurines of Pinch’s type 1 have been found outside of tombs, proving that these objects were not necessarily part of the funerary equipment when discovered in tomb contexts. The function of these female figurines has been discussed extensively (Pinch 1993: 211-225). Based on the different finding contexts – settlements, temples, and tombs – Pinch’s hypothesis is the most convincing one; she argued that the figurines were used during magical practices in order to protect and promote fertility to guarantee conception of children as well as their further successful growing up (1993: 225). Thus, it is not surprising that these objects were not only found in tomb contexts, but also in settlements and temples, where they were offered to shrines of ancestors and gods (mainly Hathor) respectively so that these
entities assured the successful conception and rearing of children (Pinch 1993: 218). It is also possible that the figurines were kept in houses as charms to guarantee a successful sex life, and were later placed in the tomb for the continuation of that wish in the afterlife (Pinch 1993: 220-221). As mentioned above, the figurines were also found in the outer area of tombs. The objects were probably offered to dead ancestors, the owners of the tombs, in order to seek help. It is also possible that they were placed there after the performance of magical rites (Pinch 1993: 218). The presence of the fertility figurines in the Ramesseum tomb, in combination with the other magical items, clearly points towards an occupation of the tomb owner as a magician or physician; he was possibly asked by people to empower the figurines with magic by pronouncing spells (Pinch 1993: 217), or the objects were used as magical substitutes for the performance of rites, together with the clappers found in the tomb (Pinch 1993: 222). The ivory statuette of a herdsman carrying a calf was probably also used by the tomb owner during his lifetime – in case the artefact belongs to the Middle Kingdom assemblage and was not deposited in the tomb at a later date (see footnote 18: 7). The object is possibly related to the fording rite and was recited by a magician when the actual herdsman crossed a river with a herd of cows (Ritner 2008: 225ff.). The use of some of the objects – like the cobra, wands, Ahat statuette – during the lifetime of the tomb owner is supported by the fact that they show signs of usage. Thus, their placement in the grave is secondary (Parkinson 2009: 145).

As outlined above, most of the objects are typical for a late Middle Kingdom burial. Quite a few items have a magical or ritualistic function however. Consequently, it is safe to assume that the tomb owner was concerned with the performance of rituals and magic during his

---

41 For a similar concept, compare the so-called Letters to the Dead that deal with requests to dead ancestors for help in certain problematic situations the petitioner experienced in life. Especially interesting in connection with the fertility figurines is the letter on the Chicago jar stand 13945: a son writes to his dead father begging for a son, because his wife was not able to conceive a child due to the negative influence of two maid servants (Gardiner 1930a: 19-22; Guilmot 1966: 17).

42 Ritner referred to the depiction of such a rite in the tomb of Ti from the Old Kingdom. A person wearing a kilt is depicted to the left of the herdsman. The same figure appears in another scene on the same wall, in which the person is identified as $r\hat{b}-ht$ (“the one who is knowledgable of things”), a technical term for a magician. The statue was probably used as a substitute, over which the charm was recited (Ritner 2008: 227).

43 Some of the ivory wands, for example, had been repaired, and the serpent is worn (Parkinson 2009: 145).
lifetime. Especially the fertility figurines, wands, the Ahat-statuette, and two papyri (P. Ramesseum III and IV) argue for an occupation related to the magical protection of the conception of children, childbirth, and the rearing of children. This hypothesis is strengthened by a find in Lahun that includes similar objects as the Ramesseum find: a pair of ivory clappers and a Aha figure were discovered in a house of the so-called rank A category. A lion cartonnage mask that was worn by a person was found in the bedroom of the house next door; both houses were connected through a door, and possibly built a unit used by one owner. If this it true, the three objects might have been used by a professional healer or magician (Petrie 1890: 30 and pl. VIII, Quirke 2005: 81ff.).

Besides a few literary and administrative documents, the texts of the Ramesseum collection show ritualistic, but mainly magico-medical contents; 16 out of the 24 papyri deal with healing and magical performance or a combination of both, and show thus a strong connection to the funerary equipment, chiefly magical in function. Accordingly, Gardiner (1955: 1) identified the tomb owner as a professional magician and physician who was at the same time a story teller and entertainer as the papyri collection also includes literary texts. Eschweiler (1994: 23f.; 281) agreed with Gardiner, but added that the owner travelled the country in order to perform his occupation. The objects do not provide any evidence that the person travelled the country, however, and it seems too far-fetched to assume that he was a storyteller only because he owned literary texts (Quack 2006: 77). He could have inherited the papyri or, as Quack suggested, owned them because he was interested in the stories. Ritner (2008: 231f.) classified the owner as a magician “with professional competence in matters of general medicine, feminine fertility, protection from serpents and demons, childhood ills [...] and agricultural magic” who was a priest at the same time. He referred to the drawing of a jackal on the lid of the chest that contained the papyri to substantiate his argumentation. Ritner interpreted the depiction as ḫry-sḥt (<231>, “He who is over the secrets” [Ritner 2008: 231]). According to Ritner, the title designates a person who was able to access

44 It has to be kept in mind, however, that it is not definite that all objects belonged to one burial as the tomb contained two burial chambers and was re-used twice during later periods. In addition, the items were not found in situ (compare Quack 2006: 76).
45 Rank A refers to the southermmost houses in the western sector of Lahun (Quirke 2005: 81).
46 Eschweiler (1994: 24) mentioned that the magical objects as well as papyri were easy to carry. He added that the owner probably carried out several minor jobs besides his main occupation in the temple cult.
cultic mysteries. He added that ḫrwy-sšt[i] is also a priestly rank, which was equated with the position of the lector priest in the Late Period. Based on the appearance of ḫrwy sšt[i] on the box, Ritner assumed that both titles were already used simultaneously in the Middle Kingdom. Morenz (1996: 145) agreed with Ritner’s reading of ḫrwy sšt[i]. He suggested that the term describes the box itself as a container of mythical content, as religious texts were said to be mysterious. The lid of the box is lost today and a copy of the drawing does not exist. Thus, it cannot be verified whether the drawing showed indeed the sign ± or only a jackal (compare Quack 2006: 77). The jackal, roughly drawn, could have been added on the box as a funerary motif when the object was placed in the tomb (Parkinson 2009: 142). In that case the sign would not provide an indication of the tomb owner’s occupation.

Concerning the manuscripts of the Ramesseum find it has to be kept in mind that the papyri were probably collected over several generations, and thus possibly derive from different sources. The same might be true for the objects that belong to assemblage. Some of the items can only be dated to the Middle Kingdom in general so that it is possible that some of the artefacts were handed down over several generations. Nevertheless, the content as well as the quality of the manuscripts can help with regard to the identification of the(ir) owner(s). The documents written in linear hieroglyphs were copied on high quality papyrus and do not show any signs of reuse. Two texts are concerned with healing (P. Ramesseum V and VII), while the RDP (P. Ramesseum B) as well as the hymns to Sobek (P. Ramesseum VI) have a royal connotation. The funerary liturgy (P. Ramesseum E) was used for a non-royal burial, although it cannot be excluded that it originally served for a royal interment (Parkinson 2009: 148). One of the owners might have acquired these manuscripts from a temple library or a scripторium. It is known that manuscripts were copied in order to place them in priest tombs or were deposited there after they were not used anymore in the temple sphere (Parkinson 2009: 148).

For a discussion on the title ḫrwy-sšt[i], see, amongst others, Helck (1954b: 43), who translated the title as “Geheimrat”, designating an official occupied with daily actions of the king. Balanda (2009: 319ff) suggested a more general translation (“expert”), positing that the title “applied to those officials who actually performed specific functions requiring special qualifications or expertise”.

The Middle Kingdom archive in the pyramid complex of Pepi I is another example of a papyri collection that was kept in a temple (Parkinson 2009: 148). According to Parkinson, it is rather unlikely that the manuscripts were damaged, and thus became useless in the temple sphere and were taken over by a private person (Ritner 2008: 232) or that the temple had been plundered (Morenz 1996: 146ff.).
Administrative notes that were added on six of the manuscripts provide an interesting insight into the social class of the owner(s). The annotations imply that the possessor(s) were linked to the administrative sphere as well as to temples, and must have held a high position as they were able to maintain a wealthy household (Parkinson 2009: 157). P. Ramesseum III and E are especially interesting in this regard. Quirke (1990: 189) stated that the account on the verso of P. Ramesseum III mentions a storehouse that probably belonged to an estate. If this account also derived from the mentioned estate it is possible that the tomb owner was the master of the domain; the handwriting of the jotting resembles those of the Ramesseum papyri find that date to the mid 13th dynasty, and might thus be contemporaneous with the tomb owner (Quirke 1990: 189). The secondary accounts on P. Ramesseum E resemble the hand of the administrative notes on P. Ramesseum III. The content of the account is concerned with granaries that might belong to private holdings of a single estate (Quirke 1990: 190), which could have been identical with the domain mentioned in P. Ramesseum III. In addition, the priestly titles of the lector and wḥ-priest occur. Thus, Quirke (1990: 190) suggested that there might be a connection to the tomb owner.

Based on the find in its entirety, both manuscripts and funerary objects, the identification of the owner as a lector priest seems the most convincing hypothesis. The lector priest (ḥrȝ-hb – “the one who is carrying the book roll”) played a decisive role in rituals as well as in the temple cult of gods or deceased kings (Otto 1975: 940ff.; Ritner 2008: 220; Parkinson 2009: 158). Hence, it is possible that one of the owners actually recited the text of the RDP and the funerary liturgy in his role of lector priest. At the same time the chief lector priest performed apotropaic magical practises in private as well as funerary contexts (Ritner 2008: 220; Schneider 2000: 57ff.), which explains the occurrence of magico-medical texts as well as the magical funerary equipment. Furthermore, lector priests were employed in the royal court, were composers, and played a role as authors and actors of literary pieces as we know, for example, from pWestcar (Parkinson 2009: 158ff.). The latter occupation of the lector priest could explain why the collection also comprises pieces of literature like Sinuhe and the Eloquent Peasant. An embalmment diary was secondarily added on the verso of P.

---

49 P. Ramesseum D, E, I, III, IV, and XIII. For a detailed study on the jottings, see Quirke 1990: 187ff.
50 See also Yoyotte (1957a: 172ff.), Quack (2006: 77, who identified a priest in general and not necessarily a lector priest), Ritner (2008: 220ff.), and Parkinson (2009: 157ff.).
Ramesseum XIII and may suggest that the manuscript owner was an embalmer (Quirke 1990: 187f.) or at least a priest connected to funerary rites (Parkinson 2009: 157). As the latter document belongs to the collection of manuscripts that date to the mid 13th dynasty (see II.b: 8ff.), it is possible that the tomb owner made the annotations himself.

Maybe the last owner of the collection came from a family of lector priests who were occupied with healing and rituals during their lifetime and had acquired the different manuscripts over generations (Parkinson 2009: 159). According to Parkinson, his work might have been connected to a temple in Thebes or the royal court. I agree with Parkinson (2009: 159) that the collection of papyri, found together with a bundle of reeds, as well as the objects found in the tomb, display the occupation of the tomb owner, and were not only deposited in the tomb as simple funerary goods. By placing these magical texts and objects in the grave, they automatically helped the deceased with rebirth in the afterlife as well (Parkinson 2009: 159). One has to wonder, however, why the collection was placed in a tomb after several generations and not handed down to the next heir. Maybe the last owner did not have an heir who followed his father in his occupational footsteps, or the collection became too numerous, or maybe copies of the texts were still available (Parkinson 2009: 160).

Quack (2006: 75) postulated that most of the papyri of the Ramesseum collection originated in the Lisht-Fayum region, the royal residence during the 12th and 13th dynasties,51 and were only later transferred to Thebes for an unknown reason. He argued that the hymns to Sobek were composed in the Fayum.52 His assumption seems plausible as the hymns are addressed to Sobek of Shedet (Gardiner 1955: 10); Shedet was the capital of the Fayyum (Yoyotte 1957b: 86). It is also possible, however, that the hymns were recited during festivals in temples in the Theban area or at Sumenu53, and that they could then be seen as evidence for

51 It is known that Amenemhet I built Iti-taui(-Amenemhet), modern el-Lisht, as the new residence at the beginning of the 12th dynasty. It is, however, not clear at what exact point during his reign the move took place. Many burials of high-ranking officials who served Amenemhet I have been discovered at Saqqara, the necropolis of Memphis. Thus, it is possible that the residence was first moved from Thebes to Memphis, and then at a later point of the king’s reign to Iti-taui (Grajetzki 2006: 30 with further bibliography). There is also a debate when Iti-taui was abandoned, and the capital moved to Thebes again. Ryholt (1997: 79) and Beckerath (1964: 71-78) argued convincingly that Iti-taui remained the royal residence throughout the entire 13th dynasty. Kitchen (1987: 46) and Franke (1988: 258) suggested that the last kings of the 13th dynasty already resided at Thebes.

52 For a translation of the hymns, see Gardiner 1957 and Barucq/Daumas 1980.

53 Sumenu was probably located south of Thebes, in Rizeigat or Gebelein (Yoyotte 1957b: 78).
the spread of Sobek of Shedet’s cult (Zecchi 2010: 94f.), especially since the texts mention Thebes and Sumenu as places where that god lived (Zecchi 2010: 96). The statue of Sobek and Amenhotep III, found in the Luxor cachette\(^5^4\) and the crocodile statue discovered in Amenhotep III’s mortuary temple in Kom el-Hettan (Sourouzian 2004: 14) also stress the connection between Sobek and Thebes. Quack further argued that the RDP is connected to the royal residence; he interprets the ritual of the text as the accession to the throne by Senwosret I (2006: 88). Thus, the ritual was probably performed at the royal court. I think, however, that the ritual was rather performed in commemoration of that king after his death, possibly in Thebes (see X: 238 ff.). If this assumption is correct, the text was probably kept in the Theban region, and not in the royal residence in the north. Quack further referred to the secondary administrative notes on some of the manuscripts that mention, for example, goods that were brought to the residence. Accordingly, he argued that the documents must have been kept close to the royal court at that time. He saw his assumption corroborated by the presence of Nubian dispatches in the Ramesseum find. According to him, these documents were sent from Nubia to the royal residence. It is, however, also possible that these documents were kept in an office of the residence that was situated in the south (Parkinson 2009: 157, note 37; Quirke 1990: 191), possibly the \(w^\text{\`e}rt\) **tp** **rsy** (“the \(w^\text{\`e}rt\) of the head of the south”) situated at Thebes.\(^5^5\) The onomasticon, for example, mentions locations that suggest an origin of the manuscript in the south of the country (Quirke 1990: 194). As the papyri were collected over several generations it is possible that one of the owners, possibly one of the first ones, was employed in the north of the country, but that the family moved to the south later on.

\(^{54}\) For a publication of the statue, see American Research Center in Egypt 1985: 42-43, no. 107, fig. 62.

\(^{55}\) Hayes (1953: 31f.) argued convincingly that Egypt was administratively divided into three departments of the late Middle Kingdom government located at el-Lisht: the Northern \(w^\text{\`e}rt\) (Memphis and the delta), the Southern \(w^\text{\`e}rt\) (Middle Egypt), and the \(w^\text{\`e}rt\) of the head of the south (Thebaid and six adjoining nomes).
III. The Ramesseum Dramatic Papyrus

The text of the RDP is written on the *recto* of the manuscript. The verso shows the drawing of a building that was added at a later date (compare III.c: 26ff.). As mentioned in chapter II.a, the RDP probably dates to the late 12th dynasty based on the handwriting.\(^{56}\) Without doubt the ritual was held in honour of Senwosret I, the second ruler of the 12th dynasty, as his Horus name is preserved in the first two Vignettes. The ritual was probably performed in commemoration of that king after his death so that the dating of the manuscript to the late 12th dynasty is explainable (see X: 238ff.).

The placement of the RDP to the end of the 12th dynasty, however, does not imply that the original version of the ritual was composed during the same time. The original text could have been composed for an earlier king, and was then made suitable for Senworet I by exchanging the royal name. Sethe (1928: 98f.) thought that the ritual is concerned with the coronation of Senwosret I and assumed that the text was recomposed from an older roll concerning the Coronation Ritual of an earlier king. In order to verify his assumption, Sethe referred to the title $\textit{shnw-3h}$\(^{57}\) that is only known from inscriptions of the 1st dynasty. Hence, he argued that the original version must have been composed shortly after the unification of the country. He further pointed to the locations mentioned in the third Remarks that mainly concern sites in Lower Egypt. He thus argued that the choice of the places derives from the political situation before the unification of Egypt. He had to admit, however, that the text mentions the “Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt”, which points to a dating of the original to the time after the unification of the country. Schott (1964: 8f.) agreed with Sethe to some degree. He postulated that the original version of the document features two different developments. First, the Vignettes were composed, probably in the 1st dynasty. He argued convincingly that the text part of the RDP cannot have been written down that early as the script was not yet fully developed. Hence, he assumed that the earthly ritual actions as well

\(^{56}\) Sethe’s (1928: 99) assumption that the RDP was written down during the reign of Senwosret I is, thus, no longer supportable.

\(^{57}\) For a discussion of the title, see VIII.b: 205ff.
as the mythological explanations were added at a later date, sometime after the 2nd dynasty.\textsuperscript{58} It cannot be said with certainty whether the RDP, in fact, was copied from a text that was composed much earlier than the late Middle Kingdom or whether Schott’s assumption that the text part was added later is correct. It is also possible that the Vignettes only served the purpose to summarize the ritualistic events mentioned in the text part, maybe as a means for the performance of the ritual. But it is certainly true that the text of the RDP shows writings and uses grammatical constructions that are typical for Old Egyptian and not Middle Egyptian; significant is the usage of the archaic second person masculine singular dependent pronoun $kw$ instead of $tw$ (columns 28, 32, 74)\textsuperscript{59}. An example of a grammatical construction typical in Old Egyptian is the future negation $n\ sdm.f$ instead of the Middle Egyptian version $nn\ sdm.f$ which appears in columns 22 and 38. The archaic writings appear in the Speeches of the gods, however, for example in the mythological interpretation of the ritual that shows contents similar to those in the Pyramid Texts. Hence, the use of Old Egyptian terms and constructions does not necessarily imply that the entire text was composed during the Old Kingdom. It is rather likely that the mythological part was created based on older religious texts, like the Pyramid Texts, or that the composer intended to let the text appear old to underline its importance so that the Old Egyptian influence is explainable.\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{58} Schott (1964: 9) generally emanated from the fact that religious texts exhibit two separate development steps. The earlier development concerns the depiction of festivals, whereas the later one is characterized by the addition of dramatrical texts. Besides the RDP he referred to the Sed festival as well as the offering table in the Pyramid Texts and the Opening of the Mouth Ritual. Concerning Helck’s (1954: 383f.) assumption that the mythological allusions in the RDP were even added after the actual ritual text, see IV: 30ff.

\textsuperscript{59} In the Coffin Texts, for example, the Old Egyptian dependent pronoun $kw$ appears, but not very frequently (e.g. CT 917, § 121 k or CT 1085, § 357b; see Hannig 2006: 2570 for the few attestations). A preference for the usage of the Middle Egyptian equivalent $tw$ (e.g. CT 36, § 136c, CT 44, § 183a, or CT 45, § 195d) is obvious.

\textsuperscript{60} Another text that shows archaic writings although it has to be dated much later is the Shabaka Stone. Concerning the different age determinations, see Altenmüller 1975b: 1068f. with further bibliography. Additionally, the 26th dynasty is well known for its utilization of archaism concerning language, artistic styles, etc. (see, for example, Manuelian 1994: XXXV). The reasons for the emphasis on archaism are diverse, and comprise the need for legitimation, a cultural and political reaction to previous turbulent times, or a chronological reconciliation to the time of creation (Manuelian 1994: XXXV ff. with further references and 408ff.). The latter reason might especially apply to religious and ritual texts, of which the RDP is an example.
III.a The preservation history of the Ramesseum Dramatic Papyrus and its present condition

The RDP as well as the other manuscripts of the Ramesseum Papyri collection were in poor condition at the time they were discovered by Quibell. The tomb shaft that contained the find is located close to the modern edge of the cultivation. Hence, the documents were presumably exposed to dampness from the ground water during the inundation season, making them fragile and giving them a dark colour (Leach 2006: 227). In addition, the papyrus roll containing the RDP was not only torn into two parts, but also into numerous pieces within these two sections. Nevertheless, thanks to the amazing restoration work of Ibscher and the rearrangement of the pieces by Sethe, the papyrus is nearly completely reconstructed again; only the lower right part is missing, and 38 small pieces could not be reintegrated into the papyrus. These pieces were added by Sethe in his publication (Sethe 1928: 244), but have since been lost; the same applies to the small fragments Sethe was able to rearrange into the text. The two sets of fragments were probably lost when the papyrus was transferred from Berlin to London in 1929. After the restoration work done by Ibscher in Berlin, and the publication of the text by Sethe in 1928, the RDP was acquired by the British Museum in 1929. The fragments of the text are kept in five glass frames in the storerooms of the museum today. The different fragments of the papyrus are supported on gelatine film with cellulose nitrate adhesive, while single pieces are kept in place with the help of courtplaster repairs (Leach 2006: 236).

My research stay at the British Museum in London showed that the condition of the manuscript has, however, deteriorated over time. In general, it is in a very fragile state and powdery at the edges. Small pieces of the larger papyrus fragments have detached themselves. The colour of the document is fairly dark brown, making it difficult to read the black script. Several parts of the text are barely readable due to a dense bloom that built up on the glass. This is a result of its storage under glass for a long period of time, as salt builds up on the papyrus and migrates to the glass (Leach 2006: 236, note 69). The part of the text

---

61 According to Ibscher this part was already lost in antiquity (Sethe 1928: 84).
kept in the second frame (columns 31-63) is easier to read as it bleached over time while it was on display.

**III.b The fabrication of the Ramesseum Dramatic Papyrus**

The study of the original in London has led to some interesting results concerning the fabrication of the manuscript. As no traces of palimpsest can be found on the document, it is most likely that the ancient scribe used a fresh roll to write down the ritual; this is not surprising for a manuscript that was probably used in the temple sphere and contains a royal ritual.

Sethe (1928: 86) mentioned that Ibscher detected adhesive sealings in columns 9/10, 32/33, 56/57, 75/76, 96, and 121. He added that they appear every 35 cm; the first of these is visible 13 cm after the beginning and the last one 23.5 cm from the end. This observation was in a large part verified during my consultation of the original. Through magnified examination of the run of the fibres in addition to the varying thickness of the papyrus, it is possible to say that the document indeed consists of seven sheets that were originally attached to each other to form the manuscript as it is preserved today; the parts where the papyrus sheets were attached are thicker due to the overlap. Most sheets, namely pages three to six, have the same length: 36-37 cm. Thus, it is likely that the other three sheets were originally the same length. The sheets are a little bit shorter than those of the average Middle Kingdom documents that measure between 38 and 42 cm (Černý 1947: 8).

The first sheet is only 12 cm long, and covers columns 1 to 9. It is obvious that the first preserved column is also the first line of the original text as it is framed on the left side by a double line indicating the beginning of the document; the text was read from left to right (see IV: 30ff.). Hence, the missing introduction must have been originally present in the lost upper part of this very column. Consequently, it can be assumed that the missing 20 cm of the sheet were blank, building a frame for the actual text. The overlap between the first and second sheet is not visible anymore. Thus, the exact length of the overlap cannot be ascertained, but based on the still visible joins of other sheets it probably measured between 9
and 15 mm. The average length of overlaps are between 10 and 20 mm (Černý 1947: 9). In accordance with the clearly visible overlaps on some of the following pages, one can assume that it was right over left.

The second sheet covers columns 9 to possibly 30 as the fibres are different before column 30 and after column 31. An overlap is not visible as the papyrus is broken at this point – a circumstance that is not surprising as the joint of two sheets is often more fragile, and thus breakable. The sheet is only 26 cm long, hence 10 cm shorter than the other pages. An explanation could be a bigger loss between columns 30 and 31, meaning that some columns of text have not been preserved. This is unlikely, however, as the Scene would have been very long; on an average a Scene consists of three to five columns. Without additional lines the section already comprises five columns. In addition, the break is in the middle of the Scene. It can be excluded that text is missing as the content of the passage is fluent. Thus, the second sheet was much shorter than the other pages.

As mentioned above, sheets three to six are the same size and the joints of two pages are identified by an overlap. Sheet three, 37 cm long, covers columns 30/31 to 56 and the overlap is definitely right over left, being 10-12 mm long. Page four measures 36 cm in length and consists of lines 56 to 76. The overlap is presumably right over left and is 9 mm long. Sheet five is 37 cm long and includes columns 76 to attentively 95/96. The overlap is presumably right over left and 15 mm in length. Page six is also 37 cm long and covers lines 95/96 to 121. The overlap is definitely right over left and is 9 mm long.

The last sheet, consisting of columns 121 to 138, is 22.7 cm long. Traces after the last preserved column indicate that at least one more row followed in the original. However, if the scribe wanted to leave a nice margin at the end of the text, as he did at the beginning, only one more column would fit. The Scene would then comprise four columns, which corresponds with the average length of a section. Consequently, it is safe to say that not much of the original text is lost. It is highly unlikely that an additional eighth sheet existed, as no traces of it were found in the wooden box.

---

62 A bigger loss refers to more than one column. A column 30bis is reconstructed based on remains of signs.
Another reason to assume that sheet seven is indeed the last part of the text is the sketch on the verso of that page, which shows a building. The part to the right of the drawing is blank, which makes it probable that it was closer to the end of the roll. The easiest way to draw was to open an already used roll and turn it over. If we assume that the papyrus was originally rolled in such a way that the beginning of the text was on the innermost, and consequently the end of the text on the outermost sheet, it is only logical that sheet seven is the last part of the ritual. It is unlikely that the ancient scribe who drew the building on the verso opened that roll more than necessary and left a great amount of space empty. It can also be presumed that the sketch of the building is a secondary use of the papyrus, as it is unlikely that a scribe would write a royal ritual on a used manuscript. It is interesting to note that at the time the papyrus was discovered it was rolled in such a way that the end of the ritual, i.e. the right side, of the manuscript was on the inside whereas the beginning, i.e., the left side, was on the outside. Hence, the ancient reader could start reading the text and had to roll up the document when he wanted to keep on reading. This means, however, that the papyrus was rerolled before it was placed in the tomb as the drawing of the building was on the inside, but should have been on the outside as it was a later addition.

III.c The drawing on the verso of the Ramesseum Dramatic Papyrus

The verso of the RDP shows the sketch of a building (Gardiner 1955: 17). The plan is roughly drawn and was presumably a secondary addition. As mentioned in chapter II.c, some documents of the Ramesseum find exhibit administrative notes that were added some time after the main text, probably applied by the owner(s) of the manuscripts. It is likely that the sketch on the RDP has to be seen in the same context.

The plan of the building is divided into two parts connected by a door. The right side shows an oblong room that occupies a little bit more than half the length of the upper right portion of the plan. The hieratic inscription identifying this room is partly destroyed; only the last letters of the word are still visible (///). The room can be accessed through a door from the main room that is characterized by three circles that Gardiner (1955: 18) identified as

63 For a detailed discussion of the drawing, see III.c: 26ff.
bins. Hence, the right part of the building might depict a storage area. Thus, maybe the word has to be reconstructed as *mḥrt*. The Middle Egyptian lexeme for storage is, indeed, *mḥr* (Wb II: 134), but a *t*-ending is attested in Late Egyptian. Perhaps the feminine version was already in use at the end of the Middle Kingdom when the drawing was added on the papyrus. At the left upper corner of the main room a staircase is depicted, which possibly gave access to a second floor.

The left part of the structure is characterized by a large middle area with two rectangular rooms at the upper and left sides. Both can be reached from the large central room. The hieratic inscription in the upper room is hard to decipher as the letters are too faint. The caption in the left space probably reads *smꜣ tp* (𓎑𓎓𓏏𓇅). The reading of *tp* is not definite, especially since a composite word *smꜣ tp* is not attested. The word *smꜣ* is documented as a verb “to slaughter” or a noun “slaughter offering” (Wb IV: 122f.; compare also Gardiner 1955: 18). Gardiner also referred to the verb *sꜣm* “to burn” (Wb IV: 18). The room could thus be connected to slaughtering. The caption could perhaps be translated as “first slaughtering room”. The *w*-ending of *smꜣ* is, however, not explainable. Another possibility is to read *smꜣwy tp*; the verb *smꜣwy* means “to renew”, also used in connection with the renewal of houses (Wb IV: 126). The caption could then be translated “the first renewal”, indicating a later addition to the building. The lower part comprises two rooms, one that suggests rounded corners and that covers more than half of the length of the left part of the building, and a smaller room in the lower left corner. The depiction is partly destroyed, but it seems that the rectangular room was only accessible from the outside and through the storage area of the right part of the structure. The hieratic text is only partly preserved. The letters 𓏳, 𓍺 and maybe the determinative 𓏻 are still visible, but do not allow a reconstruction of the word. The caption of the smaller room is also barely visible; the two preserved letters could be identified as 𓏻 – and might also refer to a word connected with slaughtering or the renewal of the house. This room was accessible through the inside of the building and it led into another small room below it, which does not show an inscription.

---

64 Gardiner (1955: 18) identified 𓏻𓏻𓏻 ... 𓏻. However, the letter before the 𓏻 is definitely the hieratic sign for 𓏻 (compare Möller 1965: 18, no. 192C), unless Gardiner saw an extra bit of ink that doesn’t show in the photographs.
Gardiner (1955: 18) suggested the identification of the small annex as a porter’s lodge, but there is no proof for his assumption.

In his article Ali (2003: 124) discussed P. Cairo CG 58075, an administrative document that shows the plan of a building on its verso. He compared the sketch with the left part of the structure on the verso of the RDP. The administrative text of P. Cairo CG 58075 mentions a temple of Ptah and Ali concluded that it might be possible that the depiction on the verso might be connected to the text on the recto. Accordingly, he suggested that the building is either the temple itself, with an attached area for allotment of food, or a storage area; he assumed the same use for the building on the RDP. However, the building drawn on the RDP looks more like an independent structure. The layout of the structure is reminiscent of elite houses in Kahun⁶⁵ and buildings in the northern suburb⁶⁶ and central city in Amarna. For example, the property of the sculptor Thutmose in the central city of Amarna exhibits a part with granary bins that is directly attached to his residential area (see Ricke 1967: 41, Kemp 1991: 295, and Tietze 2008: 145). The storage area does not show an additional room like the building on the RDP, however. Additionally, the silos are placed in the middle of the room, whereas they are located by the wall in Thusmosis’ house. There are also discrepancies in the partition of the second half of the structures. The living quarters of Thutmosis consist of more rooms; the main area, especially, is divided into several rooms, whereas the structure on the RDP exhibits a main area that is surrounded by rooms – one of them might be a butchering area. Kemp (1991: 296ff.) identified the following elements for a typical Amarna compound: granaries, animal byres, a well, a garden, a kitchen, sheds and enclosures, a shrine, and a separate accommodation. If the building on the RDP indeed shows a butchering area, it might be possible that the structure depicts only a part of a larger compound, consisting of the storage area and maybe an animal byre with an attached butchering place.

⁶⁵ The city plan provided by Petrie is not detailed and an exact house plan is difficult to identify. Nevertheless, it is obvious that larger buildings included one or more granary bins; compare, for example, a rank B house in the western part of the city that incorporates two bins (Petrie 1890: pl. XV; Quirke 2005: 75-76). See also the description of elite houses in Kahun by O’Connor (1997) and Kemp (1991: 152-155).

⁶⁶ It is obvious from Pendlebury’s map of the North Suburb that granary bins were part of larger estates (Pendlebury 1931: pl. LXVIII). A part of Hatiay’s estate in the wadi area of the north suburb is very similar to the plan on the verso of the Ramesseum papyrus for example; it shows a court with two bins and magazines attached in the south (Pendlebury 1931: 237ff. and pl. LXXIV). Compare also house U.25.7 in the North city that includes a court with 7 bins as well as servant quarters at one end and stables at the other end (Pendlebury 1931: pl. LXXVI).
As mentioned above, several of the manuscripts of the Ramesseum find show administrative notes that were added at a later date. For example, P. Ramesseum III refers to a storehouse that belonged to a private estate. P. Ramesseum E is concerned with granaries that might have belonged to a single estate. As Quirke (1990: 190) pointed out, it is possible that both papyri are concerned with the same estate. Maybe the drawing on the verso of the RDP depicts a storage facility and/or processing area of just that estate. The jottings of P. Ramesseum III probably date to the mid 13th dynasty (see II.c: 13ff.), and thus could be contemporaneous with the tomb owner himself. If, in fact, the jottings of all three papyri deal with the same estate, the tomb owner, in whose possession these manuscripts were, might not only have added the administrative jottings, but could also have been connected to the estate itself, maybe as its owner.
IV. The layout of the Ramesseum Dramatic Papyrus

In its present condition the RDP has a height of 26 cm and a length of 2.15 m (Sethe 1928: 86). The average height of papyri dating to the Middle Kingdom is between 29 and 33 or 6 and 7 cm. Only the RDP and P. Berlin 10482, an early version of the Book of the Dead, show the exceptional height of 26 cm, which is half of an ancient Egyptian cubit (Černý 1947: 15). According to Černý, the size of half a cubit is accidental, however, as the other sizes (6-7 cm; 29-33 cm) do not relate to subdivisions of the cubit (Černý 1947: 16). The manuscript is divided into a textual part separated into columns and an illustration component, situated vertically below the text. The text element shows a height of 18.5-18.7 cm, whereas the Vignettes are 4.6-4.9 cm high. The upper and lower margins of the composition measure between 1 and 2 cm; at the beginning the frame shows a height of 2 cm, but it becomes narrower towards the end of the manuscript (Sethe 1928: 87).

The different lines, building the frames of the Vignettes and the columns as well as the divisions within a column were probably drawn with some sort of a ruler (Sethe 1928: 87). Black dots were applied as a means of drawing the lines that appear thinner and more carefully traced at the beginning of the text (left part of the manuscript) than at the end of the document. The black dots also provide an indication for this decreasing elaborateness towards the end of the manuscript; some of them are completely out of place towards the end of the document; in columns 120 (below the text) as well as in column 129 (below the third Remark) the dots are drawn in the middle of the column for example, and hence were not used as a means to draw the lines anymore. Undoubtedly, the frame for the columns and the illustrations was traced before the text and the drawings respectively were copied down. Otherwise the scribe would not have been able to write the text in a straight and even way. I agree with Sethe (1928: 87) that the lines that separate each column into different fields were also drawn before the text was written down. Some of those fields are kept pretty narrow with regard to the amount of text that had to be copied down. The fields above and below such an area show partly free space so that the scribe could have made the respective field more spacious. This is especially true for certain Remarks; see, for example, the compressed writing of dit tpw ntrw in the first Remarks of columns 98 and 99. Besides the partly narrow fields for Remarks, the ancient scribe only ran into space problems when he forgot to copy
down a part of the text, and included it in the next column after he noticed his mistake\textsuperscript{67} or when the Explicatory sentence is very long.\textsuperscript{68}

The text of the RDP is divided into 138 columns\textsuperscript{69} and is mainly written in cursive hieroglyphs. Some plain hieroglyphs\textsuperscript{70} can be found, however, as well as several genuine hieratic forms.\textsuperscript{71} The latter signs were especially used in captions of Vignettes and in cases where the ancient scribe ran out of space. The text is written in a retrograde way, and hence has to be read from left to right.\textsuperscript{72} I agree with Sethe (1928: 86) that the ritual was copied down the opposite way, namely from right to left; the end of the text was written down before the beginning. Evidence for this assumption is, for example, column 81 (compare also Sethe 1928: 86).\textsuperscript{73} The Introduction and Explicatory sentence of Scene 27 are written in row 80. Column 81 includes the first Speech of Scene 27, but also the second Speech as well as the Introduction of the following Scene 28. This is only explainable if the text was written down from right to left; the scribe had already copied down the first Speech of Scene 27, when he noticed that he had forgotten to write down the second Speech of the section as well as the Introduction of Scene 28, both of which had to be copied down before the first Speech if the ritual was put into writing from the end of the ritual to the beginning.\textsuperscript{74} The different writings for \textit{msw hrw} and \textit{dlhwty} at the beginning of a column, indicating the speaker or addressee of a Speech are, according to Sethe (1928: 86), a further indicator that the text was copied down from right to left. \textit{msw hrw} (“the children of Horus”) is written in a more elaborate way, with the determinative stroke, at the end of the ritual (\textit{msw hrw}; e.g. column 135) than towards the beginning of the text (\textit{msw hrw}; e.g. column 118 or \textit{msw hrw}; e.g. column 118).

\textsuperscript{67} An example is column 111. The row shows the fourth Speech of Scene 37 as well as the Introduction of the following Scene 38. The ancient scribe most likely forgot to copy the Introduction and added it under the Speech of Scene 37 after he noticed his mistake.

\textsuperscript{68} See columns 8 and 46 for example.

\textsuperscript{69} Traces of a 139\textsuperscript{th} column are still visible; possibly this was the last row (see II.b: 8ff.).

\textsuperscript{70} For example \textit{} in column 28 or \textit{} in row 24. For a more elaborate list, see Sethe 1928: 88.

\textsuperscript{71} Compare, for example, the hieratic writing for \textit{} in column 47 compared to the hieroglyphic one of the same sign in column 46. Another example is the sign \textit{}. It is usually written in its cursive form (e.g. columns 7 and 15), but sometimes also appears in its hieratic version (e.g. columns 65 and 66).

\textsuperscript{72} The writing direction within each column is from right to left, however.

\textsuperscript{73} Sethe divided the ritual in 46 instead of 48 Scenes (see V: 37ff.). Hence, Scene 27 is Sethe’s Scene 25 and Scene 28 is Sethe’s Scene 26.

\textsuperscript{74} For another example see footnote 67 above.
Thoth is written with the sign $\text{TCHA}$ in the first Remark of column 125, whereas the god is represented by $\text{TY}$ (e.g. first Remark in column 112) later on. I agree with Sethe that it is more plausible to assume that the scribe switched from a more extensive writing to a simpler one, as it would be the case if the manuscript was copied down from right to left, than the other way around.

The text part of the ritual is divided into different **Scenes**, each of which consists of several columns of text, in most cases three to five columns. In the first row an action is described, which took place in the course of the actual ritual performance, and is called **Introduction** in the following. The sentence always begins with the expression $\text{hpr} \cdot n$ (“It happened that”), followed in most cases by an infinitive introducing the action. Sometimes a past passive $\text{sd} \cdot \text{m} \cdot (w) \cdot f$ or circumstantial $\text{sd} \cdot \text{m} \cdot f$ occurs instead. The performers and objects mentioned in the **Introduction** are designated by their earthly titles or names.\(^{75}\)

In the following clause, the **Explicative sentence**, the plot of the real world is transferred into the divine mythical sphere, namely parts of the Osiris myth. The earthly ritual action obtains its meaning through association with parts of the myth (Assmann 1995: 97). Hence, the ritual action and the mythological theme are mutually conditional, and are thus incomprehensible on their own (Gestermann 2008: 29).\(^{76}\) The transfer is made visible grammatically by a bi-partite $\text{pw}$-sentence followed by a circumstantial clause. Both the **Introduction** and Explicative sentence appear in one column.

In one to four further columns, communications between two parties from the divine world are presented; the names of the interlocutors face each other. These **Speeches** often contain a pun with the object mentioned in the **Introduction**, a typical means used in rituals to connect

---

\(^{75}\) Examples for earthly titles are $\text{irw} \text{id} \cdot \text{f} \cdot \text{wdpw}$ (“ones who are responsible for the $\text{id}$ and stewards”; column 11) or $\text{hr} \cdot \text{y} \cdot \text{hb}$ (“lector priest”; column 18), whereas $\text{bd} \cdot \text{t}$ (“emmer”; column 15) and $\text{im} \cdot \text{i}$ (“$\text{im} \cdot \text{i}$-tree”; column 34) are examples for objects.

\(^{76}\) For the two levels of the ritual, see especially Assmann 1977 and 1995. Quack (2006: 79) refers to pBerlin 23070, a commentary of the Opening of the Mouth Ritual, as a further example, where the earthly ritual action is equated with parts of a myth. Helck (1958: 1954, 383f., and 1984: 271ff.) argued that the ritual text goes back to rites already performed in prehistoric times. He further assumed that the mythological part builds a commentary and was added at a later date. Concerning the flexibility of myths and the purpose of mythemes in different contexts, see Goebs 2002.
the object with the mythological precedent (Quack 2006: 79). Two royal cakes ($\check{s}t\check{y}$) are, for example, mentioned in the Introduction of Scene 7 ([hpr.n di] $\text{hry-hb} \check{s}t/\check{ty}$ nsw – ”[It happened that] the lector priest [brought two] royal cakes”; col. 18). In the following Speech the verb $\check{s}c$ appears, building a pun with $\check{s}t\check{y}$ ($hrw mn n.k i rt.k n \check{s}.s \check{i}.k$ – ”Horus take your eye for yourself, (as if) it had not been taken from you” [col. 19]). It is evident that the name of the cult object, in this case $\check{s}t\check{y}$, demanded the utilization of a homonymous word, similar with regard to the sound and phoneme structure (Assmann 1991: 110), in the following dialogue, influencing the wording of the entire Speech. Hence, the divine dialogue can be seen as an intentional creation to transfer the cult action into a new, divine sphere (Schott 1964: 60); this phenomenon was called sakramentale Ausdeutung by Assmann (1991: 110).

These mythological allusions based on puns are only used in the context of a specific cultic action, and are thus difficult to understand for the modern reader, because these puns are not based on a specific mythical content known from other religious texts, but on the power of the spoken word. The ritual of the RDP is concerned with the dead king (see X: 238ff.), whose transformation into the divine world is confirmed by the divine Speeches, i.e. the sacred words, uttered in the course of the ritual by priests, taking over the role of certain deities (Assmann 1991: 108ff).

Up to three annotations, called Remarks, follow after the communications, divided from each other by a horizontal line. They often only consist of a word or short sentence, and thus remind us of stage directions or object inventories. The first Remark refers in most cases to a certain god; sometimes an action is mentioned that a god has to perform. The second Remark gives a ritual action or an object used during the performance, and hence builds the earthly equivalent to the first Remark. The first Remark in column 38 mentions, for example, the god Seth, whereas the second one alludes to the sacred bark, with which Seth is identified. In some cases a third annotation is added, mainly providing the name of a

---

77 Concerning puns in general, see Guglielmi 1984 and 1986 as well as Noegel 2006 who concentrated on puns in dreams. Compare also Schneider (2000: 37ff., especially 60ff.) who elaborated on the analogies between earthly and mythological events as well as on the analogies of words (puns).

78 On the topic of the power of the spoken word, see Zandee 1964.

79 Comparable annotations can also be found in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual, especially in the scenes, which are concerned with the manufacture and the opening of the Mouth of the statue. The following scenes include Remarks: 9, 10, 12, 13, 17, 28, 29, 31, 33, 35, 36, and 74 C (see Otto 1960 I: 21ff., 31ff., 39ff., 72ff., 76ff., 84ff., 88ff., and 206f. as well as II: 53ff, 60ff., 68ff., 87ff., 90ff., 93ff., 95f., and 169f.).
geographical location or a building. In rare cases an action or a person is mentioned. The following example gives an idea of the components of a Scene:

Col. 34

$hpr.n\ i\til\ im\ r\ h\til\ wi\ h\ bsn\ in\ ir\ i\ h\ wdp\ d\til\ im\ f\ n\ h\ hr\ ir[t]$  
It happened that the $im\$-tree was taken towards the sacred bark along with natron by the “the one who is responsible for the $i\ h$ and steward”. It is Thoth who speaks to Horus about what was done.

Col. 35

$d\til\ h\ hrw\ d\ d\ m\ d\ i\ ms\ y\ n\ pri\ m\ it\ k\ p\ n//80\ wsir\ //\ im\ //\ ms(w)\ h\ hrw$  
Thoth speaks words to Horus: How enjoyable is this that came forth from this father of yours // Osiris // $im\$-tree // Child(ren) of Horus

Col. 36

$hrw\ wsir\ d\ d\ m\ d\ i.\ ms.\ k\ ir(i)\ //\ wsir\ //\ bsn\ //\ pr-hd$  
Horus speaks words to Osiris: To (me) do you come // Osiris // Natron // Treasury

32 Vignettes, drawn horizontally below the textual part, complete the ritual.81 Sometimes the different illustrations are divided from each other by a line.82 A recurring motif is the sacred bark carrying a shrine. Sometimes the depiction of the king – identified by the caption – is

80 The double stroke indicates a division line in the column, separating the Remarks from each other and from the Speech.
81 For example, the Book of the Dead, the Opening of the Mouth Ritual, and the Amduat, also show a combination of text and picture. Chronologically after the Book of Two Ways, the RDP is the second oldest example of a book illustration. The earliest witnesses for the Book of Two Ways, attested on a group of coffins from el-Bersheh, probably date to the late 11th or early 12th dynasty. For the dating of the Bersheh coffins, see Willems 1988: 68-81 and Lapp 1993: 71-94. For a text critical study on the Book of the Two Ways, see Backes 2005.
82 A separating line is preserved between Vignettes 1 and 2, 2 and 3, 4 and 5, 6 and 7, 14 and 15, 15 and 16, 16 and 17, 21 and 22, and 31 and 32. It is possible that more separating lines were originally drawn, but are not preserved (e.g. between Vignettes 3 and 4, or 7 and 8). For the meaning of the lines in connection with the division of the ritual, see V: 37ff.
drawn inside the shrine. At the beginning of the document, the illustrations are executed in a simple way; the actors and objects appear in basic line drawing. Starting with Vignette 22, however, the depictions are done with more detail; for example, the protagonists are shown wearing kilts and sashes. Sethe (1928: 89) believed that the picture of the sacred bark with the shrine contradicts this development. He thought that the depiction of the shrine without the king inside is an abbreviation. I am of the opinion, however, that the king is not depicted on purpose; the royal image actually represents the statue and not the actual king in person. In the cases where the shrine is shown without the figure of the king, the statue was taken out of the shrine (see VIII.a: 183ff., VIII.e: 215ff., and X: 238ff.). The illustrations summarize the events of the different Scenes. Often one depiction represents several Scenes. Vignette 1 represents Scenes 1-3, for example, whereas Scenes 17 and 25 are not given an illustration. The depictions appear directly under the Scene they represent until column 53. Subsequently, the arrangement gets mixed up. The illustrations are most often not drawn exactly under the Scene(s) they summarize. The mistake of the ancient scribe leads to an empty space at the end of the ritual. This free part, as well as the fact that the first Vignettes are copied exactly under the Scene(s) they represent, suggests that the depictions were added on the papyrus from left to right, unlike the text, which was done from right to left (compare Sethe 1928: 87).

Based on the content and layout of the RDP, the text clearly represents a ritual, probably performed before a statue representing Senwosret I (see X: 238ff.). The question that has to be raised, however, is whether the rites were only performed by priests and high officials in the enclosure of a temple or in front of a broader public. An in-depth study on the dramatic performance of ritualistic texts cannot be undertaken in the framework of this thesis, but nevertheless some assumptions should be made concerning the RDP itself. Without doubt, the text mentions actors and cultic actions, and includes dialogues between two or more parties as well as stage directions and possibly even a figurative guideline for the actual performance. As Leprohon (2007: 277) has convincingly shown, however, the manuscript

---

83 For a detailed discussion of the sacred bark motif, see VIII.e: 215ff.
84 The simple line drawings at the beginning of the document are typological older than the depictions that show more details towards the end of the papyrus (see von Lieven 2006: 205ff.).
85 For the exact arrangement of the depictions, see appendix B: 297ff. and Sethe 1928: 92ff.
86 For performance and drama, see Mikhail 1984a-d: Gillam 2005, and Leprohon 2007, among others.
does not show a development of the story itself; it is rather an enumeration of certain cultic actions so that a tension culminating in the climax of the storyline, expected in dramatical performance, is not present. Furthermore, I agree with Leprohon that the mythological allusions may have been hard for the general public to understand. Lastly, the Vignettes show the actors without masks and costumes (Leprohon 2007: 277). If the illustrations were intended to be a guideline for a dramatic performance, one would expect the officials to be depicted wearing masks of the gods they represent so that the public would be able to identify the different roles of the participants. Consequently, it is more likely that the RDP was used as a directive for priests and high officials who carried the ritual out in the temple precinct without the presence of a general public.

---

87 The Anubis mask in the museum of Hildesheim is a witness that priests, indeed, were wearing masks to carry out certain cultic actions; the Anubis mask was probably worn by the priest performing the embalming (Seeber 1980: 1197). This rite did, however, not take place in public.
V. The division of the ritual

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the ritual is divided in different Scenes based on the textual layout of the columns; 48 Scenes are preserved in total. Sethe (1928: 89) separated the text in 46 Scenes, combining Scenes 1 and 2 as well as 10 and 11. Although Scenes 1 and 10 consist only of an Introduction they should be treated as a separate unit. Both lines start with *hpr. n.*, used in the text to introduce a new action in the course of the ritual (see below, note A, VI.1.1: 42 and VI.6.1: footnote 113, 72). The textual part is complemented by 32 Vignettes, summarizing the action of one or several Scenes. Sethe (1928: 92f.) identified 31 illustrations, combining the third and fourth depictions.

Some Vignettes are separated from each other by a line. Such a separation is visible between depictions 1 and 2, 2 and 3, 4 and 5, 6 and 7, 14 and 15, 15 and 16, 16 and 17 as well as 31 and 32. It is likely that these strokes were not used as a general device to mark the beginning and end of a Vignette as such a line was not copied between every single illustration. Some lines might not be preserved (e.g. between Vignettes 3 and 4, 5 and 6, and 7 and 8), but there are also cases where a stroke was definitely not drawn between two illustrations (e.g between Vignettes 11 and 12, 18 and 19, 23 and 24, and 28 and 29). Consequently, one can presume that several illustrations built a unit within the course of the ritual, called here a Sequence. This hypothesis is corroborated by the recurring motif of the sacred bark, which forms a decisive element in the Vignettes. The boat is carrying a shrine, in which sometimes the figure of a king is depicted (see also VIII.e: 215ff.). The ruler is identified as Senwosret I in the first two Vignettes. The illustration of the sacred bark does not appear in all depictions, only in Vignettes 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 22, 24, and 29. It is always drawn on the left side of the illustration, and thus marks its beginning. In most cases a separation line appears right in front of the sacred bark motif, highlighting the division. However, at times the boat is the only division marker (between Vignettes 18 and 19, 23 and 24, 28 and 29, and possibly between 11 and 12); see fig. 1, 38ff.). Three times, the separation line and not the boat is the indicator for the beginning of a new Sequence (between Vignettes 4 and 5, 5 and 6 as well as

---

88 The end of the text is lost, but it can be assumed that only one line is not preserved (see III.b: 24ff.).
89 For a detailed discussion on the reasons for two separate Vignettes, see VI.3.2: 56f.
90 The papyrus is destroyed at this point, but the space between the two Vignettes is too narrow to even fit a line.
Hence, I propose to further divide the ritual into 17 Sequences based on the appearance of the sacred bark motif as well as the separation lines in the Vignettes. The ritual was performed in honour of Senwosret I, represented in the Vignettes by the figure depicted in the shrine, which can be identified as a statue representing the dead king (see VIII.e: 215ff. and X: 238ff.). Hence, it is likely that the entire ritual was built around the figure; the action was either performed in front of the figure, or was directly carried out on the statue itself. In the latter case the statue had to be taken out of the shrine, providing an explanation for the depiction of an empty shrine towards the end of the ritual; starting with Vignette 17 the shrine is illustrated without the figure of the king. The absence of the boat in a few Sequences might imply that the presence of the statue was not necessary. Based on the presence of the sacred bark motif as well as the separation lines, the following division of the ritual into Sequences can be made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Scenes</th>
<th>Vignettes</th>
<th>Separation lines</th>
<th>Depiction of sacred bark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>line between V.</td>
<td>Shrine with king in V. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94 1 and 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>line between V.</td>
<td>Shrine with king in V. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 and 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Papyrus destroyed; space too narrow to fit the bark in V. 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

91 The same probably applies for the division between Vignettes 2 and 3 as well as 6 and 7. The papyrus is destroyed at this point, but the space appears too narrow to reconstruct the drawing of the boat.
92 See also fig. 1, 38ff. and appendix B, 297ff. Gestermann (2006: 32ff.) also divided the ritual into sequences based on the sacred bark motif, but only identified 14 or 15 sequences. She included Scene 6 (Sequence 3) into Sequence 2 and Scene 48 (Sequence 17) into Sequence 16 together with Scenes 44-47. For the argumentation for separate Sequences, see VI.3: footnote 98, 55 and VI.17: footnote 183, 171. Gestermann also mentioned that it is possible to combine Sequences 15 and 16 into one unit, although the sacred bark motif appears between both Sequences. For a comparison of the division presented here and Gestermann’s it has to be kept in mind that she followed Sethe’s Scene and Vignette division (46 Scenes and 31 Vignettes).
93 For a detailed discussion of the meaning of the sacred bark, see VIII.e: 215ff.
94 V. is the abbreviation for Vignette.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Papyrus destroyed at meeting point of V. 3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shrine with king in V. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Line between V. 4 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No sacred bark in V. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Papyrus destroyed at meeting point of V. 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Papyrus destroyed; space too narrow to fit bark in V. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Line between V. 6 and 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shrine with king in V. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14-18</td>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>Papyrus destroyed at meeting point of V. 7 and 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shrine in V. 8; content of shrine not preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>19-23</td>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>Papyrus destroyed at meeting point of V. 11 and 12; space too narrow to fit line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shrine with king in V. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Line between V. 14 and 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shrine with king in V. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Line between V. 15 and 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shrine with king in V. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>27-28</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>Line between V. 16 and 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Empty shrine in V. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>29-33</td>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>No line between V. 18 and 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Empty shrine in V. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>34-37</td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>Line between V. 21 and 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Empty shrine in V. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>38-43</td>
<td>24-28</td>
<td>No line between V. 23 and 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Empty shrine in V. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No line between V. 28 and 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Empty shrine in V. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Line between V. 31 and 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>44-47</td>
<td>29-31</td>
<td>No shrine in V. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1: Division of the ritual considering the presence of the sacred bark motif and the separating lines
VI. The transliteration and translation of the ritual

The following transliteration and translation of the ritual are based on the new drawings of the text and the Vignettes. The reading follows the division of the ritual in Sequences and Scenes as mentioned in chapter V; each chapter presents one Sequence, which itself is divided into subchapters that provide the transliteration and translation of the different Scene(s) as well as the description of the accompanying Vignette(s).

In order to reflect the current condition of the manuscript, the transliteration and translation will not include reconstructions. Those, as well as varying translation possibilities, will be included into notes written below each Scene. A running transliteration and translation of the entire text, including reconstructions, can be found in appendix A: 272ff.

As mentioned in chapter IV, each Scene is divided into distinctive parts, represented here by certain terms: The Introduction provides the actual ritual action. The following Explicatory sentence shows the mythological equivalent of the earthly action. Speeches reflect the discourses between two or more divine parties, while Remarks are the annotations below those Speeches, which refer to certain performers or objects of the ritual, gods, actions, or geographical locations.

According to the “Leiden bracket system”, the brackets <...>, {...}, and [...] designate words or phrases reconstructed, erased from the original, and destroyed parts of the text, respectively. The sign // represents the division lines within a column which are used to separate the Speeches from the following Remarks in the text. Abbreviations used in the chapter are:

col./cols.: column(s)

PT: Pyramid Texts

CT: Coffin Texts

BD: Book of the Dead

---

95 For a discussion of the new drawings, see I: 1ff.
VI.1 Sequence 1 (cols. 1-7)
Sequence 1 comprises Scenes 1-3 (cols. 1-7) as well as Vignette 1.

VI.1.1 Scene 1 (col.1)^A

(1) hpr [...]  

(1) It happened that [...]  

Notes:
A Sethe (1928: 103f.) combined columns 1-4 in one Scene, mentioning, however, that the lines concern two Scenes as hpr always introduces a new section. Because of the shortness of the first Scene, the beginning of the second one was included in the same column. It is also possible that the ancient scribe ran out of space – the document was copied from the end to the beginning, hence column 1 was the last one that was copied (compare IV: 30ff.). Most likely the lost text of this Scene included an introduction to the ritual as it is the first column (compare III.b: 24ff.).

VI.1.2 Scene 2 (cols. 1-4)

(1) hpr. n iri[t...]^A  irt.f^B  

(1) It happened that [...] was built [...] his eye.  

(2) hrw msw hrw dd mdw [...]^C s š // wb)^D  

(2) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus: [...] it [...] the lake // The one who opens the canals^F.  

(3) hrw hrw msw d[d mdw...]^G // ḏḥwty^H // [...]^I  

(3) Horus speaks [words] to the children of Horus: [...] // Thoth// [...]  

(4) [...]^J wsir^K [...][fis]^L [...]  

(4) [...] Osiris [...] to carry [...]  

Notes:
A Scarce remains of two signs after iri are still visible, which do not allow a reconstruction of the text anymore. Sethe (1928: 103ff.) read the remains as pw,
amending \( hpr.n \ iri[t \ wiδ \ hrw] \ pw \ [mdw.f \ n \ msw.f \ hr] \ irt.f \) – “Es geschah, dass [das Königsschiff] gemacht wurde. [Horus] ist das, [der zu] sein[en Kindern spricht über] sein Auge“. A name of a ship (“the one who opens the canals“) is mentioned in the Remark in the following column 3. Hence, Sethe’s reconstruction of the first sentence seems plausible. As only the word \( irt \) is preserved in the second part of the column and the text of the entire Scene is partly destroyed, especially the Speeches of the divine parties, it is not possible to judge whether Sethe’s reading of the second sentence is correct.

B The writing of \( irt \) without \( t \)-ending, and only with the determinative stroke, is not a typical spelling for \( irt \) in the document. Compare e.g. the common writing with \( t \)-ending and determinative stroke in lines 8, 20, 64, and 73. Sethe (1928: 104) referred to the writing of \( irt.f \) without \( t \)-ending in PT 478, § 977d (witness M).

C Sethe (1928: 103) reconstructed: \( [... \ wbį].s \ Ę – [“... damit] es den See [eröffnet“], which is plausible as \( wbį \) is mentioned in the first Remark. Concerning the beginning of the Speech, he suggests “gebt mir” or “bringt mir mein Auge”.

D The remains of the sign are suggestive of the top part of ❼. The Remark \( wbį \ mrw \) is probably the name of the boat mentioned in line 1, in which case Sethe’s reconstruction is correct. He (1928: 105) assumed a feminine form (\( wbįt \)), as the lost space is not sufficient for the masculine form ❼❼. He further argued that the feminine form highlights the identification of the boat with the eye of Horus (\( irt \ hrw \)), or the sign for the boat (a variant of ➋) has to be read \( dpt \). Later on in column 21, Sethe himself (1928: 125) identified the boat with \( wiδ \), based on puns between \( wiδ \) and the verbs \( wį \) (column 22) and \( wįwį \) (column 24). Another pun might be present in columns 37 (\( wiį \)) and 38 (\( wii \)). Words in the Remarks are usually written in an abbreviated form. Hence, it is possible that the masculine form \( wbį \) was only written with ❼, referring to the feminine form \( wiδ \). It should be mentioned that Koemoth (1994: 130f.) identified the bark with the solar bark \( hnw \), based on the depiction of the boat in Vignette 9/10. Lorand (2009: 110) also transliterated \( hnw \). However, only traces are left, and it cannot be verified that the left part of the boat in fact illustrates
an antelope’s head, characteristic for the *hnw*-bark. The *wiḥ*-bark, in contrast, is shown in all other depictions and spellings of the boat.

**E** In accordance with Sethe (1928: 105), I read *mrw* and not *św*. The sign for *ś* appears in the same line and is written with dots in the square – in contrast to the three signs in the Remark. Sethe translated both words with “lake”. There probably is a reason why the ancient Egyptian scribe made use of the two different signs, especially since they appear not only in the same column, but also very close to each other, so that I prefer the translation “canals” for *mrw*.

**F** Lorand (2009: 110) assumed the mention of an action and translated “ouverture des canaux (au moyen de) la barque-*hnw*”. If the Remark, indeed, referred to an action, the text should include the particle *in* to introduce the agent.

**G** Horus’ Speech is completely lost, and hence impossible to reconstruct (compare Sethe 1928: 101 and 105).

**H** The tail of the bird (ﻮ) is still visible.

**I** The text after *dhwty* is lost. Sethe (1928: 106) assumed a second Remark, but did not provide a suggestion.

**J** The beginning of the column is only partly preserved. Based on the arrangement of those fragments, the space seems to imply that only one column is mainly destroyed, and not two (columns 3 and 4). However, remains of the words *dhwty* and *wsir* are still visible at the place where the reader expects a Remark. As it is unlikely that first Thoth, and then Osiris were mentioned in one Remark, it is probable that two lines have to be included (compare also Sethe 1928: 103ff.).

**K** The first parts of the signs ﷖ and ﷕ are still recognizable.

**L** The first parts of the signs ﷗ and ﷝ are still recognizable.

**VI.1.3 Scene 3 (cols. 5-7)**

(5) A *in iryw ġt nsw* B *dhwty pw* C *wsir* D *hr stš tsi* 

(5) [...] by the “ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king”. It is Thoth [...] Osiris on Seth that [...] may raise [...].
(6) $dhwty\ st\ [dd\ mdw]\ n\ dd\ [...]wr\ ir.k\ [...]^{E}$
// [...] // tt\ wrw // [...]^{E}

(6) Thoth [speaks words] to Seth: [...] cannot last [...] one who is older than you // [...] // Crew of the oldest$^{G}$ // [...] 

(7) $dhwty\ wsir\ dd\ mdw\ im\ qbhw\ ib.f\ hr^{H}$ // tt
wrw // prit\ r\ qbhw

(7) Thoth speaks words to Osiris: May his$^{I}$ heart not be cool thereunder$^{J}$ // Crew of the oldest // Going forth to the place of purification$^{K}$

Notes:

A Sethe included fragment 27 in column 5. He (1928: 106) read $[hpr].n\ [i\it m]ns^{3}\ 8\ r\ [\hit wii]\ in\ rhw-nsw$ and translated “Es geschah, daß 8 mns3-Krüge gebracht wurden in [das Vorderteil des Schif]fes durch die Königsabkömmlinge“. Unfortunately, the fragments are lost today (see III.a: 23f.) as well as the depiction summarizing the action of the Scene, so that a verification of Sethe’s reading is not possible.

B The title $\text{\textit{iry hts nsw}}$ can be transliterated $\text{\textit{iry hts nsw}}$ (“one who is concerned with the things of the king” or “keeper of the king’s property”) and $\text{\textit{rh nsw}}$ (“royal acquaintance”) respectively. For the reading $\text{\textit{iry hts nsw}}$, see Jones 2000: 327 who also added the reading $\text{\textit{rh nsw}}$. Ward (1982: 104) transliterated $\text{\textit{rh nsw}}$. Leprohon (1994: 46ff.) suggested the translation “one who is connected to the cultic affairs of the king”. Based on the ritualistic nature of the RDP, his interpretation is the most convincing one in the framework of the ritual. For a detailed discussion on the title, see VIII.b: 202f.

C Sethe (1928: 106f.) reconstructed $\text{\textit{wdi.f}}$ in the lacuna and translated “Thoth is das, der den Osiris auf Seth[‘s Rücken setzt]”. The word “back” ( النبي ) is based on Sethe’s assumption that there might have been space for the sign $\text{\textit{tsi}}$ before the abbreviated writing of $\text{\textit{tsi}}$ ( تم ). However, the sign must have been written in a compressed way. The space in front of $\text{\textit{tsi}}$ only allows the reconstruction of a tall narrow sign – if a sign has to be added at all. In addition, Sethe had to assume an honorific transposition to read $\text{\textit{st}\ s}^{3}$ – “the back of Seth” as the text would show the
writing 𓊐. In column 21, however, the same expression is written 𓊐𓊐 so that an honorific transposition in column 5 is questionable. Hence, I prefer to read “Thoth is it who placed Osiris on Seth”, admitting, however, that Osiris is put on the back of Seth in column 21. The motif of Seth being placed under or carrying Osiris is well known in the Pyramid (e.g. PT 366, 369, 372) and Coffin Texts (e.g. CT 838). Griffiths (1960: 10ff.) argued that the motif can be interpreted as a punishment for Seth. Rusch (1925) put all spells in the Pyramid Texts which are concerned with the theme into one group and thought that they deal with a water ritual (see especially the so-called “Seth-Litanei; Rusch 1925: 22-26). Griffiths (1960: 11) added that the RDP seems to confirm Rusch’s assumption of a water ritual as Seth is identified with the sacred bark.

D Sethe (1928: 106) added 𓊐 (tsi.f sw) and translated “damit [er ihn] emporhebe”.

E Sethe could still read n 𓊐𓊐 k ḫr wr ir.k – “du kannst nicht dauern unter dem, der größer ist als du“. I prefer to translate wr as “older“ rather than “greater“, especially since the second Remark mentions the “elder”; compare also Sethe’s (1928: 106) translation of the second Remark “die Zählung der Ältesten [des Palastes]”. In addition, he included the name Osiris in the first Remark, of which no traces are preserved.

F A separation line as well as unidentifiable traces of signs indicate a further Remark. Sethe (1928: 106) only mentioned “frei?”, but added that the Remark probably referred to the name of a building.

G The Remark of column 7 seems to belong to both columns (6 and 7). The translation of ḫt “crew” follows Schneider 2008: 235; compare Jones 1988: 110, entry 258 and Hannig 2006: 2712. Sethe (1928: 106 and 108) reconstructed ḫn wrw – “die Zählung der Ältesten (des Palastes)”, but had to admit that the counting of the eldest does not make sense.

H The following part of the text is destroyed. It is not likely that there was text before the first Remark as there are no traces of signs directly after ḫr and immediately before the separation line dividing the Speech from the Remark – in contrast to Sethe (1928: 107) who assumed another Remark in the lacuna (the name Seth). His own
transcription of the column does not indicate a missing Remark. The small dot before the Remark *tt wrw* is a device used by the scribe to draw the separation line between columns 7 and 8 (see IV: 30ff.).

I The pronoun “his” is referring to Seth who is mentioned in column 5 where it is said that Seth is under Osiris.

J Lorand (2009: 110) parsed *imy* followed by an infinitive and translated “son coeur ne s’apaise pas en dessous”.

K The appropriate translation of *qbhw* is difficult due to its abbreviated writing (𓀉). Possible meanings are “kühles Wasser” (Hannig 2006: 2513), “Libation” (Hannig 2006: 2513), “Kataraktgebiet” (Hannig 2006: 2515), “Himmelsgewässer” (Hannig 2006: 2516) or “Wassergebiet” (Wb V: 29). Seth (1928: 106 und 109) translated “zum Himmel aufsteigen”, having in mind the ascent of Osiris to heaven, symbolized by the bearing of the vessels mentioned in column 5. However, Seth had to admit that it is not clear where the vessels should be carried. Schneider (2008: 235f.) preferred “Hinausgehen zum frischen Wasser (?)”. Quack (2006: 88) was reminded of the transport of the Apis bull corpse into the *hwt-qbh*, a building connected to the place of embalmment. I agree so far with Quack that the Remark refers to a location in the real world and not a mythological one – maybe a place of purification in a temple (see entry “Wassergebiet” in the Wb that refers to a place of purification in a temple, although in the combination *š n qbhw*). In Hannig 2006: 2981 the name *qbh-n-s-n-wsrt* is listed, which might be the name of the funerary temple of Senwosret III in Dahshur. If this interpretation is correct, it would corroborate the idea of the *qbhw* being a purification place in a temple in the RDP; compare also VIII.d: 213.

**VI.1.4 Vignette 1**

Vignette 1 summarizes Scenes 1-3 and is drawn under columns 1-7. The Vignette is mainly destroyed. Based on a later depiction (e.g. Vignette 6) the traces can be reconstructed as the sacred bark carrying a shrine in which the king stands. The word *nsw* – “king” above the boat is still preserved. The royal name in the cartouche can be completed as *hpr-kꜣ-rc*, the throne
name of Senwosret I\(^{96}\), based on the appearance of the name in the second Vignette. The depiction is completely destroyed under columns 3-7. Hence, it is impossible to say if Scenes 1-3 are, indeed, represented in one Vignette or two. Sethe (1928: 246) assumed one Vignette, representing Scenes 1-3. The text of Scenes 1-3 mentions the name of a sacred bark (Scene 2) as well as something\(^A\) that the “the ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king”\(^{97}\) bring (Scene 3). The destroyed part of the Vignette might have contained the caption that the royal acquaintances bring eight vessels – in case Sethe’s reconstruction is correct.

Notes:

A According to Sethe (see note A, VI.1.3: 45), the officials bring eight mns\(^i\)-vessels.

**VI.2 Sequence 2 (cols. 8-14)**

Sequence 2 comprises Scenes 4-5 (cols. 8-14) as well as Vignette 2.

**VI.2.1 Scene 4 (cols. 8-10)**

(8) *hpr.n stp šsr nsw ḫỉi hrw pw śpt šdi.f īrt\(^A\) m ĵšnbt m-ċ ḏḥwty pw\(^B\) m w[g]s\(^C\) šsr nbw

(8) It happened that a male royal ox was carved. It is Horus who is angry, while he takes the eye as one with a ruffled breast from the hand of the aforementioned Thoth as one who cuts up all beef cattle.

(9) ḥst {ḏḥwty}[stš]\(^D\) ḏd mdw in spt.k īrit

(9) Isis speaks words to {Thoth} [Seth]: It is your lip that acted against you! // Thoth // Carving and binding of the ox for the first time

(i) r.k\(^E\) // ḏḥwty // stp išm šsr sp tpy

(10) ḥst ḏḥwty ḏd mdw in sšr.k // ḏḥwty // šsr\(^F\)

(10) Isis speaks words to Thoth: It is your action\(^G\) // Thoth // Ox

---

97 For the title *iry ḫt nsw*, see note B, VI.1.3: 45 and VIII.b: 202f.
Notes:

A Sethe (1928: 109) transcribed irt.f. Although the text is partly destroyed after :`~~`, traces of the suffix pronoun should be still visible if it was written in the original.

B Sethe (1928: 109 and 112) amended iwi ([Δ] ṣ), assuming a participle “kommend”. Whereas traces of the quail chick are still visible, there are no remains of the walking legs. As Schneider (2008: 236) pointed out, a participle complicates the word structure. Rather he thought that □ has to be reconstructed, building the demonstrative pw. The papyrus is not destroyed here, but the ink has faded away during the millennia. I agree with Schneider that the demonstrative makes more sense; compare also the similarities in the writing of pw in column 69 and the remains in column 8.

C Following Schneider (2008: 236) who suggested wgs (“aufschneiden, ausnehmen,”; Hannig 2006: 742) – “als dessen, der ... zerlegt“, Thoth being the slaughterer. Sethe (1928: 109 and 112) reconstructed whī si stp (']][') – “als der, der es (das Auge) ausleert bei der Auslösung...”. It has to be noted that he translated a preposition (“bei”) that is missing in his hieroglyphic transcription and for which there is no space in the actual text.

D Following Schneider (2008: 237), who argued convincingly that Seth has to be identified with the ox and not Thoth who is rather Osiris’ assistant (see also Otto 1960 II: 76 and Willems 1996: 97, n. 343) and not Osiris’ enemy that has to be punished. Thoth is described negatively and is connected with Seth only in very rare cases: in PT 674, § 1999c, for example, we find the sentence ...dhwty mds pri(w) m stš – “...Thoth, the knife (or: evil-doer) who came forth from Seth”. The mentioning of Thoth instead of Seth would be an aberratio occuli from column 10 to 9 of the ancient scribe – the papyrus was written from back to front, hence column 10 was copied from the original before column 9 (see IV: 30ff.).

E Only traces of the suffix pronoun k are visible; compare scene 23, IIa of the Opening of the Mouth Ritual that shows the same text (Otto 1960 I: 45 and II, 73), except for the second tense irt.s instead of the participle irtit.

F Or ṣsr ṣsr – “Slaughter of the ox” (Sethe 1928: 109 and 114).
Following Schneider (2008: 237f.). Another possibility would be the use of in as an interrogative particle: “Your action?” Sethe (1928: 109 and 113f.) read in ss r.k – “öffnet sich dein Mund (noch)?“, following the slaughtering ritual in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual (𓊲𓊳𓊲𓊲𓊱𓊹𓊳𓊳𓊳𓊳𓊱), Otto 1960 I: 45; for ss “ausbreiten” see Hannig 2006: 2347f.). Assmann (2003: 94) translated the sentence in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual “... durch die Klugheit deines Mundes”, following a transliteration in šsšw r.k.

It is, indeed, obvious to assume the same reading, especially since the sentence before is identical in both rituals. A similar sentence is preserved in the Contendings of Horus and Seth (Gardiner 1932: 45, line 6.14-7.1): in-m r.k i.gd sw ds.k in ššš hr.k wp.tw.k ds.k – “It is your own mouth that said it. It is cleverness concerning you that judged yourself”. However, Schneider pointed out that the sentence “öffnet sich dein Mund” in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual rather refers to Seth and not to Thoth, who is addressed here in the RDP. Without doubt Seth is addressed in the Contendings of Horus and Seth. Furthermore, the noun ssr (“Dinge, Handlungen”, Hannig 2006: 2360) builds a better pun with ššr mentioned in the following Remark as well as in column 9. The comment of Isis has to be understood as a demand towards Thoth (“und deine Handlungen (scil. sind es die gegen Seth zur Anwendung kommen”); Schneider 2008: 238).

**VI.2.2 Scene 5 (cols. 11-14)**

(11) It happened that the “ones who are responsible for the iḥ and stewards” [of] the lord were brought [...].

(12) [...] ḏd mdw [...]D // iry iḥ wdpwE ḏhwty
(12) [...] speaks words to [...] // The “one who is responsible for the iḥ and steward”, Thoth

(13) [...] ḏd mdwF [...]šdi.kG [...] // ḏd mdwH // iyi it n sšI
(13) [...] speaks words to [...], while you take(?) [...] // Words to speak // The father comes to the son
(14) [...] dd mdw s3 nb h3 [...] K s3 n it [...] // (14) [...] speaks words to [...] : The son of the lord is behind [...] the son to the father [...] // [...] // Osiris was searched, while the son lingers.

Notes:

A Parts of the word are destroyed so that an identification of the person remains questionable. Sethe (1928: 115) translated “Schlächter” without providing a transliteration. He could either refer to ššmt (ššmt - “Schlächter”; Hannig 2006: 2357 and Wb IV: 292) or to a participle of the verb rḥs (rḥs - “schlachten”; Hannig 2006: 1521 and Wb III: 448). In both cases an abbreviated writing with only the knife and a determinative would be present. However, the determinative – a standing man holding an item in his hand that is destroyed in the text – does not match the common writings of ššmt or rḥs. In the Vignette under the Scene, a Ḣr y ṣḥ wdpw is mentioned who is not part of Sethe’s translation of the Scene at all, which raises the question why the Ḣr y ṣḥ wdpw would then be included in the summarizing Vignette. Comparing the writing of Ḣr y ṣḥ wdpw in column 34, the similarity of both determinatives is obvious. Hence, I assume an abbreviated writing for Ḣr y ṣḥ wdpw (Hunter IV: 101). In addition, the signs Ḩ and Ḧ look very much alike in cursive script, providing a reason for Sethe’s misreading. For the reading of Ḣr y ṣḥ wdpw, see Fisher 1978: 58ff. Compare also the transliteration spr wdpw as official (having to do with food); Ward 1982: 149, entry 1285. A possible translation of the title could be “the one who is responsible for the ṣḥ and steward” (see also Gestermann 2008: 45). For a discussion of the title, see VIII:b: 203ff.

B The amendment of nw is most likely as remains of the determinative stroke are visible.

C The rest of the column is destroyed and cannot be reconstructed. Sethe (1928: 114ff.) suggested ḫwty iti [...] hrw – “Thoth (ist das, der) bringt [...] Horus”. According to Sethe (1928: 115ff.), fragment 8 might be inserted here, showing pieces of ḫ and the consonant ḫ, the latter one probably being part of pw. As Thoth is mentioned in the
first Remark in the following column 12, Sethe’s assumption seems reasonable. However, Thoth could also be one of the speakers in column 12 – as Sethe assumed (note D below), and was hence referred to in the Remark of this line.


E Sethe (1928: 115) translated “o du Schlächter Thoth”. Concerning the reading of ird ḥw ḏwpw, see note A above and VIII.b: 203f.

F The remains of the signs as well as the common structure of the column beginning with two interlocutors indicate the reading of ḏd mdw. Sethe (1928: 115 and 117) suggested Thoth as the speaker and Horus or Osiris as the addressee.

G Following Sethe (1928: Tf. 12 and p. 115) who did not translate the word (“[...] dein šdi”). The remains of the signs support this reading. A translation of the verb šdi is impossible as the context is lost. Possibilities are: “nehmen, liefern” (Hannig 2006: 2494ff.), “graben” (Hannig 2006: 2497), “lesen, vorlesen” (Hannig 2006: 2497f.) or “aufziehen, erziehen” (Hannig 2006: 2498f.). Sethe assumed that the Speech finished directly after šdi.k, even though the column is destroyed, and there is enough space for additional words before the Remark. He also included the name Osiris as a possible first Remark. No signs are preserved, however.

H The remains of the signs indicate this reading.

I Another possibility would be iyit.f n sḫ - “his coming to the son”. However, the translation in the main text is preferred because it “father” is mentioned in the following column 14.

J Sethe (1928: 115) read ḏhwty ḥrw ḏd mdw – “Thoth spricht Worte zu Horus”. However, due to the scarce remains of the signs indicating the two speaking parties only an assumption is possible.

K Only the sign Ⰺ is still visible. It cannot be proven anymore if the sign is really part of the word ḥṯ - “behind”, since the text is destroyed directly after the sign and the context is not clear. Sethe (1928: 144f. and Tf. 12) amended ḥṯ.jfyi, reading sḫ nb ḥṯ.jfyi sḫ n iy.i - “der Sohn des Herrn ist hinter [ihm, es kommt] der Sohn zu seinem Vater“. Lorand (2009: 135) translated the second part “le fils du père [vient]“. 
Sethe (1928: Tf. 12 and p. 115) reconstructed two Remarks: “[Osiris (oder Horus?) // Worte sprechen”.

Following Schneider (2008: 238) except for his translation of an active tense in the beginning: “Osiris sucht, der Sohn verweilt”; concerning ini “to linger” see Hannig: 2006, 304. The perfect passive $sdm(w).f$ is preferred as it is unclear what Osiris is searching. Maybe the sentence is connected to the expression $hh\ i\ is$ known, for example, from the ritual of driving the calves. Egberts (1995: 345ff.) has shown that the phrase originally describes Horus’ pretended search for Osiris’ tomb in order to mislead Seth and his followers. The text of the RDP is not concerned with Osiris’ or the dead king’s tomb in this Scene, but the mythological interpretations of the previous Scenes deal with the punishment of Seth. Hence, the phrase “Osiris is searched, while the son lingers” could signify another punishment for Seth, namely that he cannot find his brother (see VIII.a, Sequence 2: 184). Sethe (1928: 115 and 118) read $hh\ is\ wsr\ rmw\ i\ pd$ – “suchet den Osiris, Fisch und Vogel“. Lorand (2009: 135) seemed to agree with Sethe, but translated $rmw$ as a plural: “chercher Osiris, les poissons, le gibier d’eau”. One would expect a dependent pronoun after the imperative ($hh\ is\ tn$), however. Griffiths (1980: 25) translated “Osiris seeks fish and fowl”. It is not obvious why a fish and bird should be suddenly mentioned. Sethe thought of the fish and bird looking for Osiris’s limbs. Griffiths (1980: 111) made a connection to BD 18, 99, and 125 where Seth and his followers appear with animal heads when they are pursued and brought to the Djed-pillar. He (1980: 25f.) further referred to the “seeking and finding motif” in the Pyramid Texts, especially to spells 478, § 972a-c, PT 482, § 1007c-1008c, PT 532, § 1255c-1256b, PT 535, § 1280a-1282a, and PT 694, § 2144a-2145c. None of the spells talk, however, about fish and fowl; Isis and Nephthys in their role of kites are mostly mentioned (PT 478, 532, 535, 694). PT 482 states the “eldest daughter of NN”, and BD 18, for example, mentions the followers of Seth represented by donkeys.

VI.2.3 Vignette 2

Vignette 2 summarizes Scenes 4-5 (cols. 8-14) and is drawn under columns 9-14. The text of column 8, the first column of Scene 4, is longer and reaches into the space occupied by the
Vignette. Only remains of the depiction showing the sacred bark with the king inside a shrine are preserved. The accompanying caption mentions ntr [...] hpr-k3-rε nsw – “The god [...] Kheperkara, the king”. The scene in front of the bark shows a man, only partly preserved, but identified as the “one who is responsible for the ḫḥ and steward” by the caption (iry ḫḥ wdpw). A fettered ox is depicted to his right. The caption informs about the action: di [...] šsr ṭi nsw – “causing [...] the royal ox”.

Notes:

A Only traces of the signs are left that do not allow a reading. Sethe (1928: 246) read ntr nfr nb ṭ[wy] and translated “der gute Gott, der Herr beider Länder“.

B Only a small piece of the depiction is left, but the remains support the presence of an ox. Sethe (1928: Tf. 12) included fragment 12 – the back part of the animal.

C Sethe (1928: 246) read n instead of šsr, but added that the remains of the sign can also be read as šsr. Based on the text in column 8 (hpr.n stp šsr ṭi nsw), I prefer the reading of šsr.

D The sign is not identifiable, only the determinative stroke under the hieroglyph is preserved. Sethe (1928: 246) suggested the reading ε (‘ṭi’; “ein Zeichen geben”), but he had to admit that the remains of the sign do not match the hieroglyph ←. He thought that the sign is rather ε, and that the caption is concerned with the application of the rope (di nwh n ṭi nsw – “putting the rope at the royal ox”). Sethe did not provide a transliteration for “rope”. Maybe he was thinking of the word nwh (compare Hannig 2006: 1215). Scene 4 deals with the carving of the royal ox (stp šsr ṭi nsw) and one would expect that this action is depicted in the accompanying Vignette. The remains of the sign do not, however, allow a reading of stp (ε~). As the ox is probably depicted with its legs fettered, Sethe’s assumption of applying the rope to the ox might be correct. He added that the depiction of the man shows him sharpening a knife. Only the upper body and the head of the person is preserved so that Sethe’s assumption cannot be verified. Sethe further argued that the depiction of the man, sharpening the knife, does not fit the action done to the ox. Hence, he assumed that the caption di nwh šsr/n ṭi nsw only refers to the ox and designates an
action that is not depicted in the Vignette itself. Maybe the official sharpening a knife – if Sethe’s assumption is correct – summarizes the butchering of the ox. It is also possible that the official is reciting in front of the ox. The first Remark of column 13 (Scene 5) is “words to speak”. In that case the Vignette represents Scene 5, showing at the same time the result of Scene 4, the carved and bound ox (see also VIII.a, Sequence 2: 184).

VI.3 Sequence 3 (cols. 15-17)\(^98\)
Sequence 3 comprises Scene 6 (col. 15-17) as well as Vignette 3.

VI.3.1 Scene 6 (cols. 15-17)

(15) \(\text{hpr.n wdi}^A \text{bd}t \text{hr spt} \text{hrw} \ldots^B \text{irt}.f^C \]

(15) It happened that emmer was put on the threshing floor. Horus [...] his eye in the presence of his children.

(16) \(\text{hrw} \ldots^D \text{d}[d \text{mdw}] \text{mi} \text{n}(i) \text{irt}(i) \text{s}[p]t^E \]

(16) Horus speaks [words to ...]: Take for (me, my) eye, that remained [...]

(17) [...] \(^E\)

Notes:

A Sethe (1928: 119) parsed \(\text{wdi}\) as the masculine infinitive of \(\text{wdi}\), written without the \(t\)-ending. Another possibility is the perfect passive \(\text{sdm(w).f}\).

\(^98\) Gestermann (2008: 33) assigned Scene 6 to Sequence 2. If she is correct, the action of Scene 6 is not represented by an illustration, however. Sethe (1928: 247) argued that Scenes 6-8 belong together and are represented by the following Vignette 4. In that case the bark would be depicted in the middle of the illustration. In all other Vignettes the boat is, however, drawn on the very left side and forms the marker for the division of the different Sequences (see V: 37ff.). Hence, I assume that Scene 6 is represented by its own illustration that is mainly destroyed. I further suggest that it builds its own Sequence although the depiction of the bark is missing. However, the separation line between Vignette 2 and 3 was drawn for a reason by the ancient scribe. Maybe there was not enough space for the depiction of the bark, or the Scene describes an action that did not need the presence of the sacred boat in the course of the ritual; concerning the latter assumption compare Sequence 6 that deals with barley. The accompanying Vignette 6 does also not show the sacred bark. Vignette 4 starts with the depiction of the bark to the left of the illustration representing Scene 6 (for a detailed discussion concerning a single Vignette, see VI.3.2: 56f., Vignette 3; concerning the significance of the bark, see VIII.e: 215ff).
Sethe (1928: 119) completed \( hrw [pw \text{ mdw}.f \ hrw] \) \( \text{irt}.f \ hft \text{ msw}.f \) - “Horus [ist das, der redet über] sein Auge zu seinen Kindern“. He mentioned that the reconstruction is based on similar sentences in columns 34, 37, and 64. He observed, however, that there is not enough space for \text{mdw}.f in the lacuna.

The preserved endings of the signs support the reading of \( \text{irt}.f [h]ft \text{ msw}.f \).

Sethe (1928: 119) included the children of Horus (\( msw \ hrw \)) as the second party, although the text was already destroyed at the time Sethe consulted the papyrus. However, the mentioning of the children of Horus in the preceding column 15 makes the amendment of the \( msw \ hrw \) in column 16 seem plausible.

The remains of the signs allow the transliteration \( m \ n(i) \ \text{irt}(i) \ spt \ [...] \), but a translation of the Speech is problematic as the right part of the entire column as well as the following column 17 are destroyed. Sethe (1928: 119) translated “Gebt mir mein Auge, das übriggeblieben ist”. The translation of \( mi \) „gebt“ is problematic. The root of the verb is hard to verify as the word is written without a determinative. The writing \( \text{irt} \) can be the imperative “give”, “take”, or “come” (compare Gardiner 1982: § 336). The translation “take” is preferred as the common writings for “give” (\( \text{irt} \)) and “come” (\( \text{irt} \)) show additional letters. Other possibilities are the interrogative \( m \) (“wer, was, wen”; Hannig 2006: 984), the preposition \( m-\zeta \) (“durch, durch die Hand, wegen, verursacht durch, infolge“; Hannig 2006: 973), or the preposition \( m-di \) (“bei, mit“; Hannig 2006: 982). The use of the prepositions \( m-\zeta \) and \( m-di \) can be excluded as prepositions cannot begin a sentence. The interrogative \( m \) does not make sense here. Another possibility would be the verb \( m^n \) (“verschönern”; Hannig 2006: 1038). A possible translation would be “may I beautify my eye, which remained” (\( m^n[i] \text{irt}[.i] s[p]ft \)).

Column 17 is completely destroyed (compare Sethe 1928: 119f.). Sethe further mentioned that maybe a column 17bis has to be included (Sethe 1928: 85).

**VI.3.2 Vignette 3**

Vignette 3 is drawn under Scene 6 (cols. 15-17). Sethe (1928: 247) assumed that Vignettes 3 and 4 are only one illustration as the space for a separate Vignette under columns 15-17
seems to small. I, however, think that there are two separate depictions. If we only assume one depiction, the sacred bark containing the shrine with the king inside would be illustrated in the middle of the Vignette. In all other illustrations the bark is depicted at the left end of the Vignette. In addition, the papyrus contains narrow illustrations that are written under one or two columns (compare Vignette 27 and 28). The infinitive *dit* (*𓊱*) is preserved on the right side of the Vignette, written above the bark. Only the remains of one sign are preserved on the left side of the illustration that Sethe (1928: 247) identified as *ʿnh* (*𓊱𓊱*). The remains are too scarce to verify Sethe’s reading, however. He reconstructed the caption as *ntr nfr nb tšwy hpr-kꜣ-rꜥ di ʿnh* - “the good god, lord of the two lands Nefer-ka-ra, given life”. Sethe added that the infinitive *dit* has to be connected with the king’s title in some way to represent Scene 6. His suggestion is “Spelt geben dem König”. His amendment is weak in some points. Firstly, the emmer is put on the threshing floor, and not given to the king in the text of Scene 6. The following Scene 7 is concerned with two cakes, which are given by the lector priest (col. 18). Hence, one can assume that the grain is used to make the cakes. In that case it would be incomprehensible why the grain would be given to the king. Furthermore, the reading of *ʿnh* is uncertain. It has to be mentioned that the titular of the king only appears in the first two Vignettes. Both times the formula *di ʿnh* is not used, so that one wonders why it would have been added in the third illustration. Lastly, I do not think that the bark belongs to the representation of Scene 6. As mentioned above, the sacred boat is always drawn on the left side of a Vignette. Hence, it is more plausible to assume that the bark belongs to the following Scene 7. Scene 6 deals with the provision of emmer and one would expect a caption like *wdi bdt hr spt* according to the Introduction in column 15. The verb would have been changed to *rdi*, however. Furthermore, the remains of the sign Sethe read as *ʿnh* and that builds the end of the caption do not match the writing of *spt*. It rather reminds me of the writing of *hr* (*𓊱*).

---

99 Based on the reading direction of the caption of Vignette 4 (right to left) I think that *dit* still belongs to Vignette 3. The latter illustration is very narrow, so that the mainly destroyed caption extended into the succeeding depiction. This would also explain the fact that the caption “*nsw*” is missing above the bark (see VI.4.3: 65f.).
VI.4 Sequence 4 (cols. 18-24)
Sequence 4 comprises Scenes 7 and 8 (cols. 18-24) as well as Vignette 4.

VI.4.1 Scene 7 (cols. 18-20)

(18) [...] hry-hb št nsw dhwty pw [...]  (18) [...] the lector priest\textsuperscript{100} two royal cakes.
hrw [...] iri [...]\textsuperscript{B}  It is Thoth [...] Horus [...] to do/does/doing [...].

(19) dhwty hrw gdw mdw hrw mn n.k irt.k n šc.s ir.k // [...]\textsuperscript{C} // [...]\textsuperscript{D}  (19) Thoth speaks words to Horus: Horus, take\textsuperscript{E} your eye for yourself, (as if) it had not been taken from you\textsuperscript{F} // [...] // [...]

(20) hrw dhwty gdw mdw 3hb n.k irt.(i) // dhwty // i3hb // ms(w) hrw\textsuperscript{G}  (20) Horus speaks words to Thoth: May (my) eye be happy\textsuperscript{H} for you // Thoth // Celebrant // Child(ren) of Horus

Notes:

A  Sethe (1928: 120) suggested [hpr.n di] hry-hb št nsw and translated “Es geschah, daß der Vorlesepriester [2] št.v-Kuchen [gab] dem König“. He explained his translation of the dative “dem König” with the fact that the dative n was also omitted in other parts of the document (cols. 22, 55, and 98). By translating “two royal cakes” instead of accepting Sethe’s suggestion of the omitted dative n, I follow Schneider (2008: 238f.). A final determination of which translation is correct, is, however, not possible as the context of the column is lost due to its fragmentary preservation. The amendment of the verb di is convincing as the text of the respective Vignette writes dit št ty – hence the amendment of the dual in the main text.

B  The text after dhwty pw is mainly destroyed, so that the remains only allow a definite reading for hrw and iri. Sethe (1928: 120) translated “Thoth ist das, der das (eine) Auge des Horus dem Seth, das (andere) Auge des Horus ihm (d.i. Horus) [gibt]“ (dhwty pw di.f irt hrw n stš irt hrw n.f). He was convinced that only di.f can be

\textsuperscript{100} For a discussion on the lector priest, see also VIII.b: 205.
restored in the lacuna as verbs like “wegnehmen”, “entreissen”, “absprechen”, which would be more convincing in the context, do not usually require a dative n (Sethe 1928: 121). Sethe argued that the king himself, i.e. Horus, is the one who receives the two cakes, i.e. his two eyes, and that he has to be seen as Horus and Seth – an antagonism to the following column 19 as Sethe had to admit. Schneider (2008: 238f.), on the other hand, restored \( wdf \) instead of \( di.f \) and understood the two words \( irt \) – both written without the determinative stroke – as relative forms and translated “Thoth ist das, der [befiehlt] was Horus dem Seth tut und was Horus für sich tut” (= nämlich Seth das Auge zu entreiβen und es wieder an sich zu nehmen). As mentioned before, Sethe’s hieroglyphic transcription cannot be verified anymore due to the bad preservation of the text. Notwithstanding that perhaps more signs were still readable when Sethe worked on the document, and hence his transcription is reliable, Schneider’s interpretation is more convincing – taking the text of the following column into account (“Horus, take for you your eye”).

C The first Remark is completely destroyed. Sethe (1928: 121f.) restored Thoth based on remains he could still read and which seem to imply the reading of the god’s name here. Yet he had to admit that the name Horus would make more sense as Thoth is not mentioned in the Speech of column 19.

D Sethe (1928: 120 and 122) read \( rdit \ ëf ty \) (“Geben von zwei ëf.t-Kuchen“). The remains that are still visible now do not allow a transliteration and translation. Based on the context of Scene 7 and the accompanying Vignette the mention of the two cakes is possible.

E Sethe (1928: 120) translated incorrectly “Ich reiche dir...” (for the reading \( mn n.k \) and the respective translation see Gardiner 1982: § 336).

F Sethe (1928: 120f.) translated “Es wird nicht (wieder) von dir getrennt werden“. He mentioned that other ritual texts write \( ëy.s \), and he assumed the same meaning here, providing a reason for his translation of a passive. However, the future passive would normally be negated with \( nn \), and not \( n \) and would show the passive \( tw \)-infix. It has to be admitted that a future translation is expected here. A solution might be to parse ëf.s as the archaic negation of the past tense \( sdlm.f \), which is not common in Middle
Egyptian, but is attested occasionally – even without the w or y ending common for the corresponding affirmative past tense $gm.f$ (Gardiner 1982: § 424). The form would be used here to imply a conditional past event (compare also Schneider 2008: 239).

The text shows the singular, and not the plural as Sethe (1928: 120) translated. The singular also appears in columns 60-62, 65, 116, and 118, and one wonders if it is not just a different writing for the plural (Sethe 1928: 123).

A translation of $3hb/ihb$ is difficult. The word $3hb$ is only attested in the RDP (Hannig 2006: 382), listed under $i hb$ (“Jubellied singen und tanzen”), a verb probably derived from the noun $i hbw$ (“Jubeliedsänger und –tänzer”; Hannig 2006: 382 and “ritual dancers”; van der Molen 2000: 50). The so-called $i hbw$ seem to describe “ceremonial dances and dancers, ritual acts, and recitations associated especially with the cult of the god Min of Coptus” (Hayes 1946: 19). It is, however, not clear why the eye of Horus should dance or why Thoth should be associated with a dancer (see second Remark). Based on New Kingdom sources of the word, Brunner-Traut convincingly posited that $i hb$ rather designates the singing of hymns than dancing and can also be translated with “sich freuen” in a more general sense; she presented an example, in which the caption $hr y-hb \ hr y-tp \ hr \ irit \ i hbw$ is written above the depiction of a lector priest reciting from a book (Brunner-Traut 1992: 80). Thus, only the translation “the chief lector priest is reciting the hymn” makes sense and not “the chief lector priest is dancing”. Kinney (2008: 33f.) argued that at least in the New Kingdom the title $i hbw$ should be interpreted as a celebrant or ritualist and “the most inclusive interpretation of the word $i hb$ is ‘ritual performance’ because it covers performances as diverse as ‘hymn’, ‘utterance’, ‘song of praise’, and ‘ritual dance’, ‘mime’ and ‘pantomime’”. Thus, I suggest that the word $i \overline{3}hb$ has not to be seen as ceremonial dancers or dances, but as a ceremonial recitation in the context of the RDP. It might be possible that Thoth, or the priest who played the role of Thoth, made a joyous recitation after the two cakes were given (see also VIII.a, Sequence 4: 185). Consequently, I translate the verb $3hb$ with “to be happy” and the title $i \overline{3}hb$ with “celebrant”. Sethe (1928: 123) assumed that the eye is happy and dances or that Thoth
makes the eye dance – not necessarily a convincing interpretation regarding the
context of the Scene. He further argued that $i3hb$ in the second Remark is a
description of the lector priest who might have given the cakes to the king, while
dancing. It is possible that the verb $3hb/ihb$ was used here as a pun or allusion to $hbi$
(“Ibis”; Hannig 2006: 1562), the Ibis being the animal with which Thoth was
associated (see also Sethe 1928: 123). A derivation from the verbs $hbi$ (“eindringen”;
Hannig 2006: 1561 or “demütigen”; Hannig 2006: 1562) seems unlikely as neither
suits the context. Sethe (1928: 120) translated “Mein Auge tanzt(?) vor dir”. The
prospective form of $3hb/ihb$ was chosen as the present tense $sdm.f$ requires the
particle $iw$ at the beginning of a main clause. It is also not clear why Sethe translated
“vor dir”. One would rather expect the preposition $hft-hr$, and not $n$.

**VI.4.2 Scene 8 (cols. 21-24)**

(21) $hrp.n$ $rdt$ gw$i\hw y$ $imi$ $im$ $wsr$ $pw$ $dyw$

$hr$ $\s$ $st\h$ $nhn^h$ $snwy$

(21) It happened that the mooring$^b$ of two
barks was caused, an $im^h$-tree$^c$ being therein.
It is Osiris who is placed on the back of Seth$^{101}$, the younger one of the two brothers.

(22) $ntrw$ $st\h$ $gd$ $mdw$ $n$ $w3.k$ $hr$ $\s$ $ir.k^{102}$

$wsir$ $it^d$ $st\h$ // $dit$ $imi^3$ $<n>^e$ $wi\hw y$

(22) The gods speak words to Seth: You will
not$^f$ resist$^g$ under the one who is older than
you // Osiris, the father, and Seth // Giving of
the $im^h$-tree $<$of> the two barks.

(23) $hrw$ $wsir$ $gd$ $mdw$ $im^h$ $wy$ $wr$ $pn$ $hr.f$ // $wsir$

// $im^h$ // $ms(w)$ $hrw^{103}$

(23) Horus speaks words to Osiris: How
pleasant is this great one upon$^h$ him // Osiris
// $im^h$-tree // Child(ren) of Horus

---

$^{101}$ Concerning the motif of Seth carrying Osiris see note C, VI.1.3: 45f.
$^{102}$ A similar sentence is attested in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual: $im$ $w3.k$ $hr$ $wr$ $r.k$ (witness 6) – “May you
not resist under the one who is greater than you” (see Otto 1960 I: 207).
$^{103}$ See note G, VI.4.1: 60.
(24) hrw [...]

// wīb

// wīb

(24) Horus speaks words to [...] : You will not conspire under him // [...] // Bark

Notes:

A Only the second n – rather reminding of a separation line than the consonant n (see also Sethe 1928: 126) – of the word is clearly visible. The transliteration is based on Sethe’s reading, and can be supported by the remains of the signs. Sethe interpreted $\overline{\text{hmk}\text{y}}$ as n$\text{hny}$ and translated „des unterlegenen Angreifers(?)“. He chose the translation “assailant” – attested nowhere else (Wb II: 312 provides an attestation for n$\text{hnya}$ “Widersacher” for dynasty 21, but the spelling as well as the determinative are different; compare Hannig 2006: 1323 following Sethe’s translation of that passage) – because the determinative of two men holding each other’s hands reminded him of wrestlers. He justified his translation with a passage from the Pyramid Texts (PT 378, § 664b; $\overline{\text{m}}\overline{\text{n}}\overline{\text{r}}\overline{\text{b}}\overline{\text{m}}\overline{\text{m}}\overline{\text{m}}\overline{\text{m}}\overline{\text{m}}\overline{\text{m}}\overline{\text{m}}\overline{\text{m}}\overline{\text{m}}$). Schneider (2008: 241), however, emphasized that the passage of the Pyramid Texts has to be read correctly n$\text{hi}$ n “Schlange von”. In agreement with him, I think there is no need to invent a translation for n$\text{hn}$ when its common meaning “Knabe, Kind, jung sein” (Hannig 2006: 1323) fits perfectly the context of the sentence. The reference to Seth as the “younger one” of the two brothers is only logical taking into account the designation of Osiris as “older one” in the following column 22. The dual strokes and the determinative of the two men should rather be read as a second word $\text{snwy}$ “die Zwei, die Beiden” (Hannig 2006: 2235; compare Schneider 2008: 241) or even “Bruderpaar, Geschwisterpaar” (Hannig 2006: 2246).

B Sethe (1928: 124) did not translate the word gw$\text{b}$ (“Es geschah, daß man $\text{g}d$ sein ließ die beiden Schiffe”), but referred to a verb g$\text{ji}$/g$\text{ji}$ that appears in the Pyramid Texts (PT 377, § 662b) and that seems to mean “to capsize”. However, he argued that the verb does not fit the context here, as it connotes an evil fate. He rather thought of a verb “ins Wasser lassen, vom Stapel laufen lassen” (see Wb V: 149 and Hannig 2006: 2587 – the RDP being the only reference). Quack (2006: 78) pointed to the Coptic


verbs \( \text{SL} \sigma \omega \gamma \) or \( \text{B} \chi \omega \gamma \eta \) (“Schiff abstoßen, in See stechen”; Westendorff 1965-77: 470) and translated “Es geschah, dass die beiden Schiffe abgestoßen wurden”. Schneider (2008: 240) argued convincingly that the meaning “ins Wasser lassen” would be problematic for the interpretation of the ritualistic action of the Scene, which deals with the control of Osiris over Seth. Merely the image of the two \( \text{im} \) -trees (personifying Osiris) on the bark (symbolising Seth) would illustrate Osiris’s domination over his brother, but not the action of two barks. If Schneider’s preference of the word \( gw \) (“zusammenschnüren, vertäuen”; Hannig 2006: 2589ff. and Wb V: 159) is correct, the mooring of the two barks could imply – according to him – the tying up of Seth.

C The \( \text{im} \) is a broadleaf tree (Maerua crassifolia; Wallert 1962: 54ff.; Koemoth 1994: 131) whose fruits are edible and were seen suitable for the alimentation of the deceased. Its perfumed leaves were eaten as a vegetable and were applied for certain diseases (compare Baum 1988: 184ff. and Koemoth 1994: 130ff.). More important for the context of the RDP is the tree’s identification with the primordial tree (Koemoth 1994: 132f.) and its connection with rejuvenation. Three \( \text{im} \) -trees are, for example, depicted under the funerary bed, on which Osiris lies, and assist with the deity’s rejuvenation; the illustration is part of the decoration in the third Osirian chamber in Dendara, the so-called \( hwt \text{-nbw} \) (Koemoth 1994: 225ff.). Thus, it is not surprising that the tree is identified with Osiris in the RDP.

D Sethe (1928: 124 and 127) reconstructed the two letters \( \text{t} \) and \( \text{t} \), arguing that they have to build a verb spelled \( \text{t} \) with a suffix pronoun attached. He assumed that the \( t \) is an abbreviated writing for the word \( tti \) (“niedertreten”; Hannig 2006: 2655). His assumption seems too far-fetched. It is not convincing that only a verb form would make sense here. A possibility is to interpret \( \text{t} \) as the well attested abbreviated writing for \( it \) (“father”; Hannig 2006: 423) and to translate the word as an apposition of Osiris (compare also Lorand 2009: 109). The usage of the verb \( tf \) (“entfernen, verdrängt sein”; Hannig 2006: 2689) does not make sense here, as the previous sentence stresses the fact that Seth should not resist under Osiris, so that it would be incomprehensible why Osiris should depart.
The destroyed space before wi₅wy seems to allow only the reconstruction of the determinative of imił (♀). Sethe (1928: 124 and 127f.) added the dative n (see Sethe 1928: 124 and 127f.), assuming that the ancient scribe forgot to write the letter, and translated “das imił geben den zwei Schiffen”. The Introduction of the Scene mentions, however, that the two barks already contained one imił-tree. Hence, it is not convincing to assume that the tree is given to the ships. I suggest adding the genitival adjective n, and I translate “The giving of the imił-tree of the bark”. I think that the two trees are taken out of the bark and offered to the image of the king in the sacred bark (see also VIII.a, Sequence 4: 185).

Future is the only tense that makes sense here – compare Sethe (1928: 124) who translated the passage in the future, but did not mention that one would expect the negation mn. Maybe the archaic future negation n sdm.f attested in Old Egyptian has to be applied here, which was replaced by mn sdm.f in Middle Egyptian (Gardiner 1982: § 1079). Lorand (2009: 109) parsed a negation de l’accompli résultatif (following Malaise/Winand 1999: § 635) and translated “tu n’a pas conspire”.

The missing determinative of wi₅ makes a translation difficult. Sethe (1928: 124 and 127) translated “du wirst dich nicht entfernen (?) unter dem, der größer ist als du“, but wi₅ with the connotation “to depart“ is only attested as an adjective „fern sein, entfernt sein“ (Hannig 2006: 585f.). Different verbs spelled wi₅ are known: „sich wehren“ (Hannig 2006: 585), “konspirieren, Schlechtes planen“ (Hannig 2006: 587 and van der Moolen 2000: 82), “go, come out from (m)” (van der Moolen 2000: 82), “remove sand hill” (van der Moolen: 2000, 82) as well as “rot” (van der Moolen: 2000, 82). From those “to resist” and “to conspire” fit best the context of the Scene. As column 24 shows wi₅wi₅ “konspirieren, Böses ersinnen” (Hannig 2006: 595), the translation “to resist” was chosen here to avoid repetition – unless the ancient writer forgot to write one ॐ, and the same verb as in column 24 has to be applied in column 22 as well.

Sethe (1928: 124 and 128) as well as Quack (2006: 78) took hr as a noun (“face”), and not the preposition “on, upon”, translating “Wie lieblich (im исполни) ist doch dieser Große in bezug auf sein Gesicht” and “Wie angenehm (im исполни) ist dieser Große an seinem Angesicht“, respectively. Sethe based his choice on the orthography of hr as
well as the fact that the reference to a second person besides Osiris (suffix pronoun after *hr*) only makes sense if that person is also mentioned in one of the following Remarks. He added, however, that there are cases in the manuscript where two parties are mentioned in the Speech section, but only one of them is mentioned in the following Remark (e.g. column 24). It has to be admitted that the preposition *hr* should rather have been spelled with the face and the additional *r* if a suffix pronoun follows (compare *hr.s* in column 65). However, Sethe’s and Quack’s translations “in Bezug auf sein Gesicht” and “an seinem Angesicht” require a preposition before *hr.f.* But if the “great one” refers to Osiris, and the suffix pronoun *f* after the preposition *hr* alludes to Seth, the entire sentence “How pleasant is the great one upon him” would repeat the main theme of the Scene again, namely that Osiris dominates Seth. Lorand (2009: 109) translated “ce grand arbre-*im♭*, il est dedans”. It seems that he assumed a misspelling of *pw* instead of the exclamatory particle *wy* after *im♭*. One expects, however, a mythical allusion at this point as it is the Speech of Horus and Osiris. The *im♭*-tree does belong to the actual ritual action however. I rather think that the adjective *im♭* is a pun to the *im♭*-tree mentioned in the second Remark of column 23.

Sethe (1928: 124) could still read Seth.

According to Ibscher, the sign of the Seth-animal was still visible when he worked on the document (see Sethe 1928: 128). Sethe included fragment 4, showing the head of the animal as well as a reed leaf above it, reconstructing the first Remark as *ky stš* (“ein anderer Seth”; Sethe 1928: 124; likewise Quack 2006: 78). It has to be mentioned that the reading of *ky* is far from being certain. Sethe explained the reference to a second Seth with the fact that two barks are mentioned in the Scene. Schneider (2008: 241) challenged Sethe’s interpretation and suggested the more plausible translation “der andere, (d.h.) Seth” or “wiederum Seth, und jetzt noch Seth”, referring to the Remark in column 22 that already mentioned Osiris.

**VI.4.3 Vignette 4**

Vignette 4 represents Scenes 7 and 8 and is drawn under columns 18-24. The left part of the Vignette shows the sacred bark with a shrine, in which the king is illustrated holding a staff
and a club. The uraeus is attached to his forehead. The title *nsw*, usually written above the bark, is missing.\(^{105}\) Scene 7 is only represented by the caption *di[t ś]ty* – “Giving of two cakes”.\(^{106}\) The depiction on the right side of the Vignette represents Scene 8. The caption reads *gw\(\̣\)* - “the mooring”, and two, only partly preserved, *hnw*-barks\(^{107}\) are depicted under the heading. According to the Introduction of Scene 8, each boat carried one *im\(\̣\)*-tree, and remains of the trees are recognizable in the illustration. Sethe reconstructed an *\(\̣\)nh*-sign, based on Ibscher’s drawing, and one *im\(\̣\)*-tree for the upper bark, and two *im\(\̣\)*-trees for the second boat. It has to be mentioned that the appearance of an *\(\̣\)nh*-sign is not explainable by the text of Scene 8 as is the fact that two trees are shown on the second bark; the Introduction mentions that one tree is in each boat.\(^{108}\) The word *im\(\̣\)* is written between the captions of Scenes 7 and 8, closer to the heading of Scene 7. According to the Introductions of both Scenes, the *im\(\̣\)*-tree is, without doubt, connected with Scene 8. Maybe the verb *dit* was used for both captions so that we have to read *dit im\(\̣\)* – “Giving of the *im\(\̣\)*-tree” (compare Sethe 1928: 247). It has to be added that the writing of *im\(\̣\)* is peculiar if Sethe’s reconstruction is correct (\(\hat{\text{f}}\) \(\text{\|}\) \(\hat{\text{m}}\)). One would rather expect that the determinative is written at the end of the word. Another possibility is to reconstruct the scarce remains of the first sign as \(\hat{\text{m}}\), and consequently reconstruct *dit im\(\̣\)* – “Giving of the *im\(\̣\)*-tree”. In that case the *dit*, which belongs to the caption of Scene 7, does not have to be used for both headings.

---

\(^{105}\) The reason might be the fact that the preceeding Vignette 3 is very narrow, so that its caption extended into Vignette 4 (see VI.3.2: footnote 99, 57).

\(^{106}\) Sethe (1928: 247) first read \(\hat{\text{f}}\) \(\text{\|}\) \(\hat{\text{m}}\) as *di twy* – “Giving of two breads”, adding that the writing \(\hat{\text{f}}\) for the infinitive of *rdi* is uncommon, and that the term *t* (“bread”) replaced the word *št* (“cake”) mentioned in the Introduction of Scene 7. He then added that Ibscher could still read the sign \(\hat{\text{m}}\), and convincingly reconstructed the entire caption as \(\hat{\text{f}}\) \(\hat{\text{m}}\).

\(^{107}\) The boat is identified as the *hnw*-bark by the antelope head on the bow.

\(^{108}\) For the discrepancy between the amount of *im\(\̣\)*-trees mentioned in the Introduction and the respective Vignette, see also note B, VI.7.2: 79.
VI.5 Sequence 5 (cols. 25-28)

Sequence 5 comprises Scene 9 (cols. 25-28) as well as Vignette 5109.

VI.5.1 Scene 9 (cols. 25-28)

(25) [...]dt hrwA [...] ḫms m [...]B (25) [...] Horus [...] ḫms-mace [...].

(26) ḫhwty wsir [qld] mdw [...]C // hrw [...]D // [...] // q33 ḫc mhty

(27) ḫhwty wsir ṣdq mdw C3.n hrw [...]F // [...]/ // [...]/ // sh ntr

(28) ḫhwty wsir ṣdq mdw ṣd.n hrw ṣdq f kw // [...]/ // ḡd // ḏbn ḡsdI

(26) Thoth [speaks] words to Osiris: [...] // Horus [...] // The northern erected hillE

(27) Thoth speaks words to Osiris: Because [... his] eye Horus became great // [...] // [...] // Embalming hallH

(28) Thoth speaks words to Osiris: So that he can protect you is why Horus has taken (the royal insignia)K // [...] // ḡd-mace // Crossing the desert

Notes:

A The fragment showing the signs d and t and probably the tail and feet of the Horus falcon is now placed in column 26. Sethe (1928: 129) included it in column 25. It is possible that the small fragment has moved since Sethe worked on the papyrus. The document is kept under a glass frame, and the part containing the piece was on display for some time, so that its shifting is definitely possible. For that reason, one should rely upon Sethe’s transcription.

109 It is also possible that Scenes 9-11 and Vignettes 5 and 6 build one Sequence. Both illustrations are partly preserved so that it is possible that the shrine on the bark was originally depicted at the destroyed beginning of Vignette 7, or at least a separation line. The actions of Scene 9 (taking of several maces) and 10 and 11 respectively (placing barley on the threshing floor; bringing of cattle to jump on the barley) show no similarities or a connection to each other. Hence, I assume two separate Sequences. Scene 6, concerned with emmer that was put on the threshing floor, also builds a small Sequence on itself – clearly marked by a separation line on one side of the respective Vignette and the depiction of the shrine on the bark on the other side. Gestermann (2008: 33) integrated both Vignettes and the respective Scenes in one sequence. She mentioned, however, the possibility of two sequences.
B Sethe (1928: 129ff.) reconstructed the following sentence: \[\text{[hpr.n šdt mdw hrw [...] \ ōms mth [...] ] - "[Es geschah, daß] der Horusstab [heraus]genommen wurde [von den Königsabkömmlingen nebst dem] Geiβelstab, das mth [nebst der Keule]". Although the column is mainly destroyed today Sethe’s transcription is plausible based on the captions and depiction in the accompanying Vignette: a man holding a staff is identified as \[\text{iry ht nsw}^{110}\] – “one who is connected to the cultic largess of the king”, and the action of the Scene is summarized as \[\text{šdt mdw hrw mth – "taking the staff of Horus and the mTH". The word ōms is not included in the caption. It is likely that the m after the ōms-mace in the texts of the ritual itself is the beginning of the word mth}. It is surprising, however, that the ōms-mace is mentioned before the mth in the ritual itself, but probably after mth in the caption of the Vignette.

C Sethe (1928: 129 and 131) was reminded of PT 364, § 611a “empfange die Rede des Horus”, building a pun with mdw hrw (“Horusstab”), which he amended in column 25. Based on this thought, he reconstructed a second sentence ending with the dependent pronoun sw referring to Horus.

D The head of the falcon sign is preserved so that a reconstruction of the Horus name is possible. Sethe (1928: 129 and 131; Tf. 13) added fragment 34 showing remains of two eyes as well as the top of the mdw-staff and the head of the Horus falcon, the two latter words building the second Remark. The fragment is not included in the original anymore, and is lost today. He translated “die Augen des Horus // die [beiden] Horusstab[formen]“.

E The third Remark mentions a location – according to Sethe (1928: 131) the building, from which the insignia were taken and that was probably part of the royal palace. He translated the edifice as “nördlicher Schrein des Essens und Stehens”, referring to a structure mentioned in depictions of the Sed-festival (\[\text{[m]\(\text{[m]\(\text{[m]\(\text{[m]\(\text{[m]}]}]}]}]}\] or \[\text{[m]\(\text{[m]\(\text{[m]\(\text{[m]\(\text{[m]}]}]}]}]}\]; Borchardt 1926: 42, Nr. 20). Borchardt, however, did not provide a translation, and the spelling does not show \[\text{[m]}\] (\[\text{[m]}\]–\[\text{[m]}\] [...]). Furthermore, the question has to be raised what purpose a shrine for eating and standing had, and how eating and standing are connected to the depository of royal insignia. Besides that, \[\text{šh n} \] (“chapel of”) is

\[^{110}\text{For the reading iry ht nsw, see note B, VI.1.3: 45 and VIII.b: 202f.}\]
missing in the RDP. The following \( \text{𓊭} \) seems rather to be the determinative for the building called \( \text{𓊑} \), based on the accompanying Vignette. A shrine (𓊑) is depicted and is identified by the caption as \( \text{𓊑} \). Schneider (2008: 241, footnote 40) translated “rechte Seite (\( \text{wnmj} \), Wb I: 322) der nördlichen (Grab-) Stätte (\( m^\text{Ḥ}t \), Wb II: 49)” oder “rechte Seite der (Grab-)Stätte, Norden“. However, the word \( m^\text{Ḥ}t \) is not attested with \( \text{𓊑} \) as a determinative. It either does not have a determinative or \( \text{𓊑} \) or \( \text{𓊑} \) were used. Additionally, the structure mentioned in the third Remark seems to be masculine.

Another possibility is the interpretation of \( \text{𓊑} \) as an abbreviated writing for \( \text{𓊑𓊑𓊑} \) (“Hügel für Gräber”; Hannig 2006: 2506 and “hill, high-ground”; van der Moolen 2000: 644), \( \text{cba} \) being a participle. Based on the depiction in the Vignette the shrine seems to be small as the man standing next to it is taller. Hence, it is questionable that it is a building as Sethe assumed. It rather seems to be a small repository, in which the regalia are stored (see also VIII.d: 213).

\[ F \]
Sethe (1928: 129 and 132) amended the verb \( \text{nḥm.f} \), translating “Horus ist groß geworden und nimmt [sein] Auge wieder in Besitz“. 

\[ G \]
Sethe (1928: 129 and 132) restored \( \text{hrw} \) (“Horus”) in the first Remark and “die unterägyptische Krone(?)” in the second one – parallel to the Remarks in column 26, where Horus (first Remark) is identified with the Horus staff (second Remark). His amendment of the Lower Egyptian crown is based on the reference of the northern chapel in column 26 as well as the mention of the \( m^\text{Ḥ} \) in the same column, corroborated by the fact that Horus was originally a Lower Egyptian god. Sethe’s spelling of \( m^\text{Ḥ}s \) is indeed questionable as the word appears in the addendum of the accompanying Vignette without the attached \( s \). He further argued that \( m^\text{Ḥ}s \) denominates the Lower Egyptian crown – a difficult assumption. The name of the crown is either \( nt \) or \( m\text{ḥ}s \) (Gardiner 1982: 504 and Hannig 2006: 1115). Furthermore, all items mentioned in Scene 8 are staffs or maces (\( \text{ims}-\text{mace} \) and \( m^\text{Ḥ} \) in column 25, possibly \( mdw \text{ḥrw} \) in columns 25 and 26, as well as the \( ḫd-\text{mace} \) in column 28). Hence, one would expect the reference to another staff or mace in column 27, and not the listing of a crown. Unfortunately, the word \( m^\text{Ḥ} \) is only attested in the RDP (see
Hannig 2006: 1159 who translated “Königsinsignie”), so that a final identification of the item is not possible.

H Concerning the association of sh-ntr with Anubis and the translation “embalming hall” see Hannig 2006: 2287 and Badawy 1948: 48f.; see also VIII.d: 213f.

I Sethe (1928: 129) reconstructed Horus as the first Remark.

J For the transliteration of dbn and not phr for the sign =, compare CT 62, § 268, where we read dbn ( carta ) hıswt hn¢ r¢ - “may you traverse the desert with Ra”.

Maybe a ritual run is performed in order to prove royal power (see also VIII.a, Sequence 5: 186 and X: 238ff.). Frankfort (1969: 127) went into the same direction by arguing that the king had “to establish dominion over the valley and the adjoining desert”.

K Sethe (1928: 129) translated “ich habe den Horus großgezogen, damit er dich rächt“.

While Thoth is, indeed, part of the Osiris myth by being the god’s assistant, he is, however, not known as the god who is raising Horus as Sethe admitted himself (Sethe 1928: 133). This role is played by Osiris’ wife Isis, so that Sethe’s translation is questionable. Furthermore, the verb nd is not attested with the meaning “rächen”, but “schützen” (Hannig 2006: 1417; compare also Lorand 2009: 132), which can have the connotation of avenging someone in certain contexts – compare the epithet of Horus nd-it.f – “Beistand seines Vaters” (bes. Horus als Rächer seines Vaters Osiris); Hannig 2006: 1419. In this context the sentence should be understood as “So that he can protect you, Horus has taken”. One may presume that the omitted object after šd.n hrw refers to the royal insignia – compare columns 25-26, where it is explicitly stated that Horus is taking the different maces and staffs.

VI.5.2 Vignette 5

Vignette 5 represents Scene 9 and is drawn under columns 25-28. The depiction shows a small shrine ( ) identified by the caption as qij3 ēh¢ – “the erected hill”.

A man, called

---

111 For the reading qij3 ēh¢, see note E, VI.5.1: 68f. Gestermann (2008: 33) mentioned that the shrine is empty and seemed to think that it is the same shrine as the one on the sacred bark that sometimes contains the figure of the king; she stated it in her division of the ritual into sequences based on the appearance of the sacred bark motif. Clearly, the shrine in Vignette 5 is not the same one that is depicted on the boat. The caption identifies it
iry ht nsw\textsuperscript{112} – “one who is connected to the cultic largess of the king”, is holding a staff and is standing to the right of the chapel. In agreement with Sethe (1928: 248), I think that the official took the staff out of the shrine. This assumption is affirmed by the caption šdt mdw ḫrw mṯḥ – “Fetching of the staff of Horus and the mṯḥ”. In the text of the actual ritual the šms-mace and probably the ḫḏ-mace are also mentioned in connection with regalia, which are taken out of the shrine. The caption of the Vignette does not mention these two maces, however. It is unlikely that the caption originally consisted of a second column that is destroyed today. The row would have been written to the right of the first column, an unusual reading sequence as the text is written from right to left. Consequently, one would expect the second column to be written to the left of the first column. Additionally, the second row would have been written under column 29, which already includes the Introduction to Scene 10. The papyrus is destroyed to the right of Vignette 5 so that it cannot be said for sure if a separation line was drawn between columns 28 and 29, dividing Vignettes 5 and 6, but it is likely that Scenes 9 and 10 belong to two different Sequences as they deal with different topics that do not seem to be connected (see Gestermann 2008: 35)\textsuperscript{B}. If we, indeed, assume a separation line, it would be a further argument against a second text row next to the caption šdt mdw ḫrw mṯḥ.

Notes:

A Only traces of the sign ² are preserved.

B Sethe (1928: 248) did not even mention the possibility that Scenes 9 and 10 could be represented by one Vignette.

**VI.6 Sequence 6 (cols. 29-33)**

Sequence 6 comprises Scenes 10 and 11 (cols. 29-33) as well as Vignette 6.

\textsuperscript{112} For the reading iry ht nsw, see note B, VI.1.3: 45 and VIII.b: 202f.
**VI.6.1 Scene 10 (col. 29)**

(29) *hpr.n dit it hr spt*  
(29) It happened that barley was placed on the threshing floor.

**VI.6.2 Scene 11 (cols. 29-33)**

(29) *hpr[n ...]nw ṭi[w] ẖt[f[...]]* 
(29) It happen[ed] that [...] the male (animals) [...] jump [...] 

(30) *hrw [...] ḡd mdw h[...]* 
(30) Horus speaks words to [...] 

(30bis) *[...]/[ɦ[...]/[...]* 
(30bis) [...] 

(31) *[...]* ḥtw stḥ ḡd mdw m ḥwi it(i) (i)ptn // ḥwi(t) wsir // ḥbīnṯ // it 
(31) [...] speaks words to the followers of Seth: Who is it who beats this father (of mine)? // Beating Osiris // Chopping of the god // Barley 

(32) *hrw wsir ḡd mdw ḥwi.n(i) n.k ḥwiw kw // ḥtw stḥ // kɔw // ḥm* 
(32) Horus speaks words to Osiris: For you have (I) beaten the ones who have beaten you // Followers of Seth // Cattle // Letopolis 

(33) *hrw wsir ḡd mdw im c3 isd.f.r.k // stḥ // cɔw // prit r qbh* 
(33) Horus speaks words to Osiris: May his saliva not dribble against you // Seth // Donkeys // Going forth to the place of purification

---

113 In accordance with columns 1-4 (see note A, VI.1.1: 42), lines 29-33 should be divided into two Scenes based on the fact that *hpr.n* introduces a new Scene.

114 See note K, VI.1.3: 47 and VIII.d: 213.
Notes:

A  Sethe (1928: 134) reconstructed $hprfn\ iniw\ t\dddot{wi}[w]\ ftft\ t\sn\ hr.f\ hrw\ pw\ nd.f\ it.f$ – “Es geschah, daß herbeigebracht wurden männliche (Tiere), [damit sie sie] zerträten. [Horus ist das, der seinen Vater rächt]. The first part of his translation seems plausible, as the accompanying Vignette shows cattle and donkeys. As no signs are preserved for the Explicatory sentence Sethe’s suggestion cannot be verified. If Sethe’s reconstruction is correct, $nd$ should be translated “to protect”, and not “to avenge” (compare note K, VI.5.1: 70 and Lorand 2009: 131). The transliteration of $ftft$ (“springen, hüpfen”; Hannig 2006: 968) has to remain questionable as the only attestation is the RDP. Furthermore, the text of the column is lost directly after the first three letters of the word. Sethe (1928: 134) also suggested an older spelling for $ptpt$ (“niedertreten, zertreten”; Hannig 2006: 955 and Wb I: 563).

B  Sethe (1928: 134) amended the followers of Seth ($htw\ stš$) as the second party and thought of the vocative particle $hš$ as the first word of the Speech (“Horus spricht Worte zu [den Gefolgsleuten] [des Seth]: o (?) […]”. Besides the particle $hš$ Sethe also suggested the verbs $hši$ (“herabsteigen, eintreten, einsteigen” etc.; Hannig 2006: 1546ff.) and $hbš$ (“eindringen, betreten”; Hannig 2006: 1561f.). As the entire Speech is lost, a reconstruction is impossible.

C  The text of the column is mainly destroyed. There is a small part of a sign preserved at the beginning of the column (next to the $h$ of column 30), which does not allow a reconstruction. The word of the first Remark started with an $h$ which Sethe (1928: 134) completed to the verb $hwši$, translating “[den Osiris] schlagen”. If his reconstruction is correct, the same Remark is repeated in the following column 21. The remains of the second Remark could depict the head of an animal, so that Sethe’s assumption “Ziegen(?)” might be correct.

D  Based on the following Speech, the name of Horus must be reconstructed (compare Sethe 1928: 134).

E  The remains of the signs confirm Sethe’s (1928: 134 and 136f.) restoration $hbš\ ntr$. Based on the context of the Scene, Osiris is identified with the barley that is trampled by the animals. However, one might also feel reminded of the $hbs\ tš$ ritual (the
“chopping up of the earth”), originally connected with the foundation of a temple as well as an agricultural ritual beginning the cultivation of land. The ritual was later adopted into the Osiris myth, in which the chopping up of the earth was seen as the justification of Osiris concerning his enemies, recorded in BD 18. Seth and his followers, in the shape of goats, try to kill Osiris, but fail. Instead the goats are killed and their blood fertilized the land (concerning the hbs tꜣ ritual, see Guglielmi 1975: 1261ff.).

Sethe (1928: 134) took m as the negation of the imperative and translated “schlagt diesen meinen Vater nicht”. The same sentence is conveyed in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual (“assignment of the (special) craftsmen”; scene 13, 3b; Otto 1960 I: 34). Otto (1960 II: 63) translated “wer ist es, der meinen Vater schlägt?“, interpreting the m as the abbreviated writing of the interrogative particle in-m introducing a participial statement. A negated imperative does not make sense in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual as the scene concerns the craftsmen who build the statue. Hence, it would be incomprehensible to ask them to stop beating, i.e. building the statue representing the deceased, identified with Osiris. In the RDP the beating of Osiris is symbolized by the animals (followers of Seth) trampling down the barley (Osiris). Hence, it would also make no sense here to ask the followers of Seth to stop the beating. The barley has to be trampled down before it can be processed.

G Sethe (1928: 137) read ihw – based on the possible pun with hwī. He further wanted to reconstruct phr – “Herumgehen” above the determinative for ihw (𓀠𓀲𓀹), referring to the caption in the accompanying Vignette. However, traces of ◊ are still visible in front of 𓀠𓀲𓀹 so that the word kꜣw has to be preferred; ihw is not attested with the sign ◊ (see Wb I: 119). Sethe assumed the spelling 𓊞𓊷 for ih and refers to PT 670, § 1977a and PT 437, § 803a as well as PT 568, § 1432a and PT 610, § 1717b (Sethe 1928: 137). Furthermore, it is more likely to reconstruct ḫ at the beginning of the second Remark to complete the spelling of kꜣw – in accordance with the second Remark in the following column 33 (𓀠𓀲w – “donkeys”) where only the name of the animals appears, and not an additional verb describing the action. As both groups of
animals are listed under each other in the Vignette one would expect phr also in the Remark of column 33.

H Compare the similar sentence in PT 482, § 1007c: hwi.n.f n.k hwi(w) tw – “For you he has beaten the one, who has beaten you” (witness N). Witnesses P and M show the present tense sdm.f and do not include the indirect object n.k. The Pyramid Texts refer to Seth, whereas the followers of Seth are meant in the RDP. Hence the plural “the ones who have beaten you” in column 32.

I In agreement with Sethe (1928: 137), I think that Letopolis refers here to the place where Horus revenged his father and where justice was served on the day before Osiris’ funeral (see also VIII.d: 211). Representative are the following two excerpts from the Book of the Dead: “I was with Horus as savior of that left shoulder of Osiris that was in <Letopolis> ... on the day of expelling the rebels from <Letopolis>.” (BD 1; Allen 1974: 5) and “O Thoth who didst vindicate Osiris against his enemies, vindicate N. against his enemies in the great Council that is in Letopolis on this night of the evening meal in Letopolis. “The great Council that is in Letopolis” consists of Horus with (no) Eyes in His Forehead and Thoth who is in the great Council of Naref. “This night of the evening meal” means <the dawn> of Osiris’ burial“ (BD 18; Allen 1974: 33). Furthermore, the connection of Horus with Letopolis, in his form as Mekhentiirti, should be mentioned (Leitz 2002 III: 394ff.).

J Notice the similarities with PT 593, §1628c: “Geb has wiped your mouth. The Ennead has tended you: they have put Seth under you, so that he is endowed with you, and they have prevented him from expectorating his spit against you” (Allen 2005b: 217). Sethe (1928: 138) referred to PT 455, § 850a where the saliva of Horus is opposed to the saliva of Seth, the latter symbolizing a means for cleaning – according to Plutarch the ancient Egyptians identified salt with the saliva of Seth. In the Opening of the Mouth Ritual the natron, with which the statue is cleansed, is identified with the saliva of Horus and Seth (see Otto 1960 II: 44). However, the sentence in the RDP and the one from PT 593 clearly state that the spit should not be directed against Osiris and the deceased as Osiris respectively. Thus, a connection of Seth’s saliva with cleaning is not convincing as far as these two passages are concerned. It rather seems that the spittle is seen as a means of power used by Seth
and Osiris should not get in contact with it to avoid that Seth gains power over him. Comparable to this idea is the episode in the Contendings of Horus and Seth, in which Seth tries to impregnate Horus with his semen to dominate over him (Gardiner 1932: 51, 11.2-11.4).

VI.6.3 Vignette 6

Vignette 6 represents Scenes 10 and 11 (cols. 29-33) and is drawn under columns 29-33. The left side of the illustration is destroyed. Only the front parts of three oxen and three donkeys are preserved as well as traces of one sign that probably has to be read \(\equiv: \text{phr}\) – “to perambulate” (compare Sethe 1928: 248). Scene 10 mentions the placing of barley on the threshing floor, while Scene 11 deals with the bringing of male animals. Hence, it can be assumed that the depiction shows the result of the action: the animals scrunch the barley on the floor. The destroyed part of the Vignette might have contained the bark with the king in the shrine (see also Sethe 1928: 248).

VI.7 Sequence 7 (cols. 34-40)

Sequence 7 comprises Scenes 12 and 13 (cols. 34-40) and Vignette 7.

VI.7.1 Scene 12 (cols. 34-36)

(34) \(\text{hpr.n} \ i\text{t}\text{i} \ im^3 \ r \ h\text{i} \text{t} \ wi3 \ hn^c \ bsn \ in \ iry \ i^c'h \ wdpw^{115} \ dhwty \ [p]w \ mdw.f \ n \ hrw \ hr \ ir[t]^{\wedge}\)

(34) It happened that the \(im^3\)-tree was taken towards the sacred bark along with natron by the “one who is responsible for the \(i^c'h\) and steward”. It is Thoth who speaks to Horus about what was done.

(35) \(dhwty \ hrw \ dd \ mdw \ im^3wy \ nn \ pri \ m \ it.k \ pn \ // wsir^{D} \ // im^3 // ms(w) \ hrw^{116}\)

(35) Thoth speaks words to Horus: How enjoyable is this that came forth from this father of yours // Osiris // \(im^3\)-tree // Child(ren) of Horus

\(^{115}\) See note A, VI.2.2: 51 and VIII.b: 203f.
\(^{116}\) See note G, VI.4.1, 60.
(36) **hrw wsir dd mdw i.ms.k ir.(i)** // **wsir** // **bsn** // **pr-hd** // **(36) Horus speaks words to Osiris: To (me) do you come // Osiris // Natron // Treasury**

Notes:

A Or **ir[t.f]** – “about his eye“ (compare Sethe 1928: 139). The common writing for “eye” in the document shows the **t**-ending and the determinative stroke. It seems, however, that sometimes the writing **<** can also refer to the eye. Hence, it is difficult to decide whether “eye” or the participle of the verb **iri** “to do” is meant (compare Schneider 2008: 242).

B Schneider (2008: 242) has pointed out that **iti** has to be translated “packen” instead of “bringen” as Sethe (1928: 139) wrote – misleadingly Schneider wrote **tfi** instead of **iti**. The verb **iti** can have the connotation “herbeibringen” (Hannig 2006: 449) or “bringen (n zu Person)” (Hannig 2006: 450). One would, however, expect the prepositions **m** or **n**, rather than **r** after **iti**. As the “one who is responsible for the **iحت** and steward” is carrying the **im3**-tree in the direction of the shrine, I suggest the translation “... was taken towards...” for **itti r**.


D Based on the space before **<** as well as the mention of Horus’ father in the Speech, the reconstruction of Osiris’ name is plausible (see also Sethe 1928: 139).

E Sethe (1928: 139f.) parsed an imperative and an erroneous writing of the dependent pronoun (**i.ms k<w> ir.(i)**) and translated “begib dich zu mir” following PT 357, § 586a and b as well as PT 370, § 645b. It should be mentioned that the dependent pronoun **kw** is usually written **<** and not only **<** in the RDP (compare column 32). Thus, I prefer an emphatic **sadm.f** and not an imperative (for the emphatic **sadm.f** form with an **i**-augment see Edel 1955: § 467). Concerning the writing of **ms** with the goose (√), see Hannig 2003: 557.
See Schott 1984: 267 who referred to the mentioning of pr-hd on seal impressions of the predynastic period. She argued that pr-hd is a designation for “Schatzhaus”. Sethe (1928: 139 and 141f.) transliterated hd and translated “die weiße Kapelle”, referring to PT 219, § 185a where the chapel is mentioned as a housing for Osiris. Sethe assumed that the location hd has to be identified with the chapel on the sacred bark, shown in the Vignettes. He further referred to the ritual of the bringing of the divine statue into the procession chapel in the tomb of Petamenophis, called wdi m hd – the determinative of hd (𓊔) shows the same sign as the chapel depicted in the Vignettes of the RDP. I, however, agree with Schott in so far as the building rather refers to the place from where the natron was brought. See also VIII.d: 214.

VI.7.2 Scene 13 (cols. 37-40)

(37) hpr.n ūt 𓊔 im3 [hnh mn[s3 𓊔 ...] wišwy [?] mdw.f ḫ[t] st莢

(37) It happened that the im3-tree was taken along with the [eight] mn[s3] vessels [...] of the two barks. [...] who speaks to Seth.

(38) ḫrw st莢 dd mdw n w3.k ḫr ḫ3 ir.k // st莢 // wi3 // šḥ ḏsr

(38) Horus speaks words to Seth: You will not resist under the one who is older than you // Seth // Sacred bark // ḏsr-tent ship C

(39) 3št nbtxw t 𓊔 dd ṣt3.ti ḫnt D stī hšt // wsr // im3 // ms(w) ḫrw

(39) Isis speaks words to Nephthys: May you be agreeable to the smell of the feast // Osiris // im3-tree // Child(ren) of Horus

(40) ḫrw ḫhwty dd mdw dp sy mr.k // [...] // (40) Horus speaks words to Thoth: May your

---

117 See note B, VI.7.1: 77.
118 See VI, 4.2, footnote 102: 61.
119 See note F, VI.4.2: 64. Lorand (2009: 107) translated again in the past tense as in column 22: “tu n’a pas comploté en dessous (de lui)”.
120 See note G, VI.4.2: 64.
121 For the motif of Seth carrying Osiris, see note C, VI.1.3: 45f.
122 See note G, VI.4.1: 60.
sickness taste her

Notes:
A Parts of  and  are still visible as well as . Based on the reference of eight vessels in the Vignette, there is no doubt that the number 8 has to be reconstructed here.
B Sethe (1928: 143) reconstructed the missing pieces as “Es geschah, daß 3 im and 8 mnsi-Krüge gebracht wurden in das Vorderteil der beiden Schiffe. [Horus ist das,] der zu Seth redet.” He restored three im-trees, assuming that the number 3 was written accidentally next to the lower part of itit, hence before the word im. The present state of the papyrus does not allow such a reading. The sign Sethe read as the number 3 rather seems to be the front part of the walking legs ( ) – the toe part being curved up (compare the writing of itit in column 34). The fact that the second Remark in column 39 also mentions only one im-tree corroborates my assumption. It has to be admitted, however, that the accompanying Vignette shows an official carrying three im-trees. Maybe the general plural number 3 was used to summarize both Scenes (Scenes 12 and 13); one im-tree is brought in each Scene (compare cols. 34 and 37). Lorand (2009: 107) also translated im in the singular, but did not explain the plural strokes he included in his hieroglyphic text in front of the word im.
C Sethe (1928: 143f.) identified a festival called “das Fest des dšr-Machens des Schiffes”. He had to admit, however, that a reference to a festival is extremely peculiar in this part of the text. He interpreted dšr preceeded by šdi as a verb connected to the building of ships (“kalfaltern”). Altenmüller (2004: 27ff.) questioned Sethe’s explanation and argued that dšr is a designation for imported wood. In his article Altenmüller (2004: 33) also discussed the location pr-dšr, which was an official facility mentioned until the time of Djoser. He concluded that it was a distribution centre for imported goods. Maybe the sh-dšr mentioned in the third Remark is somehow connected, or perhaps even the successor of such an institution; Schneider (2008: 242) thought in the same direction by interpreting the word as a

---

123 The number of trees mentioned in the Introduction of Scene 8 (one im-tree in each boat) does also not conform to the quantity of the trees illustrated in the respective Vignette – if Sethe’s reconstruction is correct; both boats contain two trees.
locality connected to the ship. His interpretation would explain the writing of šr after sh-šr – either used in a direct genitive construction or as a determinative. Another possibility is to translate the word šr in its original meaning “red” (compare Hannig 2006: 2799). I suggest that the Remark describes a sacred bark with a tent covered with a red cloth, the šr being used as the determinative. Maybe the red cloth alludes to Seth’s dominion over the “red” desert as this god is identified with the bark (see also VIII.a, Sequence 7: 187f.).

Sethe (1928: 145) read the remains after šr as bnr (š). In agreement with Schneider (2008: 242), I think that the traces of the sign are rather the back part of šr.

The translation follows Schneider 2008: 242; concerning “stī ht as “Duft des Mahles” see Hannig 2003: 1263. Sethe (1928: 143) wrote “du bist lieblich an Geruch, [du bist] süß an Duft von etwas“, linking the statement to the Osiris myth conveyed by Plutarch; it is said that Osiris committed adultery with Nephthys that was discovered through a clover wreath. Sethe argued that the clover could be identified with the blossoms of the im3-tree. Griffiths (1980: 196) disagreed with Sethe, especially with the identification of the im3-tree with the clover wreath, as three im3-trees are brought to the sacred bark and not one. In Plutarch’s story one clover wreath is mentioned. Lorand (2009: 108) suggested: “comme est bonne l’odeur, agreeable la senteur de la «chose».” The verb im3 shows, however, a t-ending, that is not explainable by Lorand’s translation. If he assumed an adjective, the masculine form would be required for a predicate adjective. Hence, the only explanation for the t is a 2nd person stative or a prospective šdm.f with a second person feminine suffix pronoun.

Sethe (1928: 142f. and 146) restored the first two Remarks: [ḏḥwty] // [iṛy iḥ wpdw] // - “[Thoth] // der Kellermeister //”. He mentioned that one would expect the name Nephthys in the first Remark, as she is referred to in the sentence by the dependant pronoun sy. Based on the remains of the hieroglyph Sethe restored iṛy iḥ wpdw, and hence assumed that Thoth is mentioned before – namely in the first Remark – as he plays the role of the “one one who is responsible for the ḫ and steward” in the text (compare e.g. column 12). The restoration of two, and not one Remark is plausible comparing the Remarks in columns 38 and 39 where the first Remarks
mention a god (Seth and Osiris respectively) and the second ones an object (sacred bark and imi-tree respectively). The space of the first Remarks in columns 38 and 39 is also very narrow so that the space in column 40 would be large enough to fit two Remarks if we assume the same breakdown in column 40. The separation line between the second and third Remark is still visible. Based on the preservation of the document the third Remark can only be very short. Sethe (1928: 142f. and 146) did not suggest a restoration, but mentioned that the space would probably even be too small for a short word like hm (𓇃𓇉) as it is attested in column 32.

A translation of the Speech is difficult as the reading and meaning of 𓇃𓇉 is not clear. Sethe (1928: 143 and 146) read dp sy mnt.k – “kosten soll sie (eam) dein Übel“. He thought that the Speech refers to Nephthys who is supposed to bear the consequences of her adultery, in the text referred to as the evil or sickness of Thoth (mnt.k). He argued that the word mnt is a pun with the mns3-vessels mentioned in column 37. He further identified sy as the dependent pronoun that follows the imperative dp. He had to admit, however, that it is illogical that the sickness tastes Nephthys and not the way around. He referred to the Story of Isis and Re (pTurin 132; Möller 1961: 30) to strengthen his argumentation where we read: nn dp.n.i mnt r-mitt.s – “I have never tasted something painful like it before”. His argumentation is, however, not convincing. The dependent pronoun third person feminine sy after an imperative is uncommon. One would rather expect a second person. Furthermore, the reading of mnt is not clear. Even if Sethe assumed an abbreviated writing (𓇃𓇉), the feminine t-ending should be present in the text. It is also questionable if the bird has to be identified as the swallow (G36, 𓇃𓇉). The bird definitely shows a rounded tail in the text of the RDP and not the swallow tail. Hence, I prefer to read it as a sparrow (G37, 𓇃𓇉). If Sethe’s interpretation of the sentence is correct, the Speech has to be read dp sy mr.k – “may your sickness taste her”, assuming a prospective sḏm.f with mr.k as subject and the dependent pronoun as the direct object of the sentence. Compared to Sethe’s reading, mnt.k has been replaced by mr.k. As the Scene is concerned with the taking of the mns3-vessels and the imi-tree out of the two sacred barks, Sethe’s connection to the episode of Nephthys’ adultery is not convincing.
Another possibility is to read the $\text{𓆃}$ as the determinative of a word with the consonants $s$ and $i$. Possible words are: $\text{si\text{"u}}t$ (𓊕𓊙𓊏) – “Leinentuch (mit Fransen; als Kleidung, Stirnbinde, viell. Mumienbinde”; Hannig 2006: 2099), $\text{si\text{"u}}t$ (𓊕𓊙𓊏) – “Falken-Amulett” (Hannig 2006: 2099), and $\text{si\text{"u}}t$ (𓊕𓊙𓊏) – “Uräus-Schlange (als Amulett, Talisman“; Hannig 2006: 2099). In addition to the missing $i$ in the text all three words show a determinative that is different from the one in the RDP, and also their meanings do not make sense in the context of the text: “may your shroud taste”, “may your falcon amulet taste” or “may your uraeus taste”. For a lack of a better solution I have chosen the translation above although the deeper meaning in the context of the ritual has to remain unclear. Maybe the discovery of a comparable sentence in another text in the future might reveal the meaning.

**VI.7.3 Vignette 7**

Vignette 7 represents Scenes 12 and 13 (cols. 34-40) and is depicted under columns 34-40. The left side of the depiction shows the sacred bark with the shrine, in which the king stands, holding a club and wearing the uraeus at the front of his head. The left arm is stretched out and originally held the staff that is not preserved. The caption above the boat identifies the man as the king ($\text{nsw}$). The caption above the front of the boat ($\text{mns\text{"u} 8}$ – “eight $\text{mns\text{"u}}$-vessels”) summarizes Scene 13, in which eight $\text{mns\text{"u}}$-vessels and an $\text{im\text{"u}}$-tree$^\text{A}$ are taken. The depiction of the “one who is responsible for the $\text{i\text{"h}}$ and steward” ($\text{iry i\text{"h} wdpw}$)$^{124}$ to the right of the bark, carrying three $\text{im\text{"u}}$-trees and a cup with natron$^\text{B}$, represents Scene 12.

Notes:

A It is likely that the $\text{im\text{"u}}$-tree is not mentioned in the caption because the “one who is responsible for the $\text{i\text{"h}}$ and steward” – representing the action of Scene 12 – is carrying three $\text{im\text{"u}}$-trees (see note B, VI.7.2: 79).

B The Introduction of Scene 12 mentions that natron is brought by the “one who is responsible for the $\text{i\text{"h}}$ and steward”. Hence, one can assume that the cup contains this substance.

$^{124}$ For the reading $\text{iry i\text{"h} wdpw}$, see note A, VI.2.2: 51 and VIII.b: 203f.
VI.8 Sequence 8 (cols. 41-54)
Sequence 8 comprises Scenes 14-18 (cols. 41-54) and Vignettes 8-11.

VI.8.1 Scene 14 (cols. 41-45)

(41) *hpr.n dit c r hnk t hrw pw nhm.f irt.f* [...]

(41) It happened that the arm was given towards the *hnkt*-offering. It is Horus who takes his eye [...].

(42) dlhwty [...]*\(^B\)* d[d mdw] w\(^j\)h n.tn tp\(^C\) [... // ...

(42) Thoth speaks [words to ...]: Lay down for yourselves the head [of Osiris?... // ...

(42\(^b\)) *E* [...].k n.k [...] // dlhwty // ss nw

(42\(^b\)) [...] you for you [...] // Thoth // Slaughterer

(43) hrw dlhwty qd mdw wdi n.f\(^F\) tp.f // ntr

di(w) tp\(^G\) n.f // inswy st\(\text{š}()\)\(^H\) // w\(^j\)h \(^I\)

(43) Horus speaks words to Thoth: Give him back his head\(^I\) // The god to whom the head is given back // Testicles of Seth(?) // Supplying the fire basin

(44) hrw ntr niwty qd mdw [t]pi f\(^K\) sti ibb r(i)

// st\(\text{s}\) // ib // w\(^j\)h \(^I\)\(^2\)\(^5\)

(44) Horus speaks words to the town god: It is while (my) mouth thirsts\(^L\) that he breathes in the smell (again) // Seth // Kid // Supplying the fire basin

(45) *[hrw]*\(^M\) st\(\text{s} \) qd mdw smnw it(i)\(^N\) // dlhwty

// ss nw // w\(^j\)h \(^I\)\(^2\)\(^6\)

(45) [Horus] speaks words to Seth: (My) father was strengthened\(^O\) // Thoth // Slaughtering of a goose\(^O\) // Supplying the fire basin

---

\(^{125}\) See note I below: 85.

\(^{126}\) See note I below: 85.
Notes:

A Only traces of nhm.f irt.f are visible, but they support the reading. The rest of the column is severely damaged and it cannot be said for sure whether there was any text after irt.f (see Sethe 1928: 148).

B The name of the dialogue partner cannot be reconstructed. Sethe (1928: 147 and 148f.) suggested ḫtw stš – “Gefolgsleute des Seth”, based on the indirect object n.tn in the following sentence. He mentioned that also the children of Horus could be the addressees. As the Speech is mainly lost it is hard to decide to which of the two parties the text refers.

C The reading is based on Sethe's (1928: 147) transliteration as the text is mainly destroyed. The remains, however, support his reading. Sethe added tp after n.tn translating “senket euch den Kopf. [// die Gefolgsleute des Seth // die Ziegen]”. The entire text of the Scene deals with the ḫnkt-offering and one has to raise the question why the followers of Seth would bow their heads. Thoth is asked in column 43 to give back Osiris’s head (“Horus speaks words to Thoth: Give him back his head”), symbolizing a part of the ḫnkt-offering that usually consists of the head of a goose and of a kid. Hence, it might be more logical to imply that column 42 is already concerned with Osiris’s head and not the heads of the followers of Seth that should be bowed. Maybe the followers of Seth or the children of Horus are asked to lay down or offer Osiris’s head; the correct translation of w/h is difficult – again, due to the poor preservation of the text. Gestermann (2008: 30) translated “Möge für euch der Kopf gesenkt werden”.

D Sethe (1928: 147 and 149) suggested “die Gefolgsleute des Seth” and “die Ziegen” for the Remarks.

E The inclusion of a column 42bis is likely. The remains reconstructed as .k n.k (col. 42) and n.tn (col. 42bis) are divided from each other by a fracture in the papyrus. The remains on both sides of the break do not seem to belong to the same signs. Hence, it can be assumed that they belong to two different columns. A further indicator for two instead of one column is the width. If only one column is reconstructed, it would be wider than the other columns on sheet 3. The reading of the scarce remains of signs in
column 42\textsuperscript{bis} is based on Sethe’s (1928: 147) transliteration. Additionally, he suggested Thoth and Horus as the two speakers: “Thoth spricht Worte zu Horus”.

F The signs \( \underline{\text{nl}} \) are only partly preserved. The signs \( n \) and \( f \) are clearly identifiable. The remains of the sign before \( n.f \) suggest a reading of \( \textit{wdi} \) (\( \Rightarrow \)) – compare the writing of \( d \) in column 40 (\( dp \)).

G The transliteration is based on Sethe’s reading (1928: 147 and 150), which makes sense as the preceding Speech already mentions the phrase “giving the head”.

H Only traces of the second Remark are preserved. Sethe (1928: 147, 150f.) read \( \textit{nwwy} \) \( \textit{s3\text{t}} \) – “2 Töpfe, auf den Boden ausgegossen“. What remains of the first two signs could support a reading of \( \textit{nwwy} \). I think, however, that the traces of the other signs do not belong to the hieroglyphs \( \underline{\text{i}\text{n}\text{w}\text{y}} \), as Sethe argued. The signs Sethe read as \( s \) and \( t \) rather seem to belong to one sign and remind me of a compressed version of \( \textit{st\text{t}} \). The two signs read by Sethe as \( \textit{nwwy} \) (\( \Rightarrow \)) could also be identified as \( \underline{\text{h}} \) (\( \textit{\textit{in}sy\text{w}y} \) – “testicles”; compare columns 83 and 85), building the Remark \( \textit{in}sy\text{w}y \textit{st\text{t}} \) – “the testicles of Seth”. The remains of the determinative are too scarce to suggest a reading.

I The Remark definitely belongs to columns 43 and 44 as the verb \( \textit{w3h} \) (\( \Rightarrow \)) – only preserved partly, but identifiable – is written through the separation line of those two columns. However, it is also possible that it was meant as a Remark for column 45 as the sign \( \underline{\text{t}} \) touches the line separating columns 44 and 45. Maybe it even served as a Remark for columns 42 and 42\textsuperscript{bis} as well, hence the entire Scene 14 (except the Introduction line in column 41). Sethe (1928: 153) assigned the Remark to columns 43-45. According to him, the Remark would have been written in columns 42-43 if it belongs to columns 42-45.

J In accordance with Sethe (1928: 147, 150) who referred to PT 17, § 10b which reads: \( \textit{\textit{d}d \textit{m}d\text{w} \textit{dhwty} \textit{wdi n.f tp.f ir.f}} \) (Sethe 1928: 150). Another possibility is “his head was given back to him” (compare also Gestermann 2008: 30, footnote 11).

K The letter \( t \) is not preserved. Sethe (1928: 147) mentioned, however, that it was present on Ibscher’s copy of the document before he detached the papyrus. The
reading is also logical as it builds a pun on the word tp mentioned in the preceding column 43.

Following Gestermann (2008: 30). Sethe (1928: 147 and 151) translated “er atmet einen Geruch (aus), nach dem mein Mund dürstet“, admitting that it is questionable why someone would thirst for a smell. Hence, I agree with Gestermann that ibb is not a relative form as Sethe assumed, but a circumstantial sdm.f. It is also not clear why Sethe was convinced that tpi has to be translated with “to breathe out”, for which there is no attestation as he mentioned himself. Hence, its usual meaning “to breathe” or “to inhale” is used (see Hannig 2006: 2688).

Sethe (1928: 147) convincingly restored Horus. There can be no doubt that this god is the speaker as he refers to his father – Osiris – in his Speech.

The t is not preserved; it was, however, copied by Ibscher (Sethe 1928: 147, footnote 1).

The translation of smn as “to strengthen” (see Hannig 2006: 2210) seems to make the most sense here. Osiris got his head back and is, thus, again able to breathe, which also means that he is strengthened. The verb smn is not attested with o as a determinative. I think that the n of the sign o (nw) belongs to the word stem smn, and that the w indicates the w-ending of the past passive sdm(w)f; compare smnw (ᚪᚦᚶᚫᚽ), the plural writing for “pillars” (Hannig 2006: 2212), where the w of nw indicates the plural. Gestermann (2008: 3) thought in the same direction, translating “(mein) Vater ist gestärkt (s:mn)!“ She, however, did not explain the writing of o and translated the sentence in the present tense. Sethe (1928: 147 and 152) separated the letter s from the word mnwt and suggested the reading s(y) mnwt.f – “welches ist seine Art(?)”. He interpreted the sentence as a question of how Thoth is slaughtering the goose (compare the two following Remarks). Schneider (2008: 243) offered another possibility by transliterating smn[i] dḥḏ[t] it[i]. He also referred to the verb smn and sees 𓊰 as the ideographic writing of dḥḏ attested since the Old Kingdom (Wb IV: 131). His translation of the sentence is “Ich setze in Kraft das Gericht meines Vaters”. The sentence would refer to the law court of Osiris against Seth, which would be represented by the offering mentioned in the Scene.
The translation follows Sethe 1928: 147 and 152f. The word *ssmn* is not attested elsewhere. Sethe assumed either a causative of a verb *smn* “to kill geese” or a verb *ssmn* with a general meaning of “to strangle”. Based on the determinative 𓊝 and the meaning of *smn* “goose”, the translation “to kill geese” is more convincing than a verb referring to killing in general.

**VI.8.2 Vignette 8**

Vignette 8 represents Scene 14 (cols. 41-45) and is depicted under columns 41-46 as well as the first column of Scene 9 (col. 46). Only the fore and a part of the cabin are preserved of the sacred bark that is depicted on the left side of the Vignette. The right side of the depiction represents the preparation for the *hnkt*-offering, consisting of the head of a goose and of a kid that is announced in Scene 14. Two kneeling men are illustrated. The upper one cuts off the head of goose with a knife, while the lower one cuts off the head of a kid. The Vignette is extended under column 47, which already belongs to the following illustration, representing the *hnkt*-offering itself. If my assumption is correct that the expression *hnkt* rather builds the caption to a Vignette than it being part of the actual text of column 46, one has to raise the question whether the expression belongs to Vignette 8 or 9. Both deal with the *hnkt*-offering; illustration 8 shows the preparation, while depiction 9 represents the actual offering. As Vignette 8 extends under column 46, the caption rather belongs to this illustration.

**VI.8.3 Scene 15 (cols. 46-47)**

(46) *hpr.n ḫnk(w) n ḏd m tp n Ḣ m tpA n smn*  
*[…]B pw shm <w>dn.f iriw n.f ḏd mdt n*  
*شف[...]C*

(46) It happened that an offering was given to the Djed-pillar in the form of a head of a kid and the head of a goose. It is [...] who gained power, being appointed king, after a recitation of [...] was done for him.

(47) *gb ḏhwty ḏd mdw wdi n.f tp.f sp snw // tp*  
*stš // ḫnk tp ib tp smn // hwt- nbw*  

(47) Geb speaks words to Thoth: Give him his head twice // Head of Seth // Offering of a

---

127 See note C, VI.8.3: 88f.
Notes:

A The signs are only partly preserved, but still identifiable.
B Sethe (1928: 153f.) restored Horus.
C A translation of the Explicatory sentence is difficult as the signs are partly destroyed. Additionally, the ancient scribe ran out of space towards the end of the column so that the signs were drawn closer to each other. Sethe (1928: 153) translated the sentence: “Horus ist das, der mächtig geworden ist und dem, was er sagt, getan wird. Worte sprechen: “man gebe mir den (oder: meinen) Königskopfschmuck“. 2 Darbietungen von (šḥ.t-) Korn” ([hrw] pw shm ddt.f iriw n.f dd mdw wdi.t(w) n.i) [s]šd Ḥnkwy sḫt). Sethe’s translation is weak in several points. He read ddt.f after shm, assuming that and are written next to each other. It has to be mentioned that there are no traces of the sign and the papyrus is not destroyed in this part. The sign Sethe read as the feminine t-ending of the participle ddt is rather the beginning of n ( — ), the right part of the sign being not preserved. Consequently, the text shows . I assume a missing w, transliterating <w>dn.f; concerning wdn – “als König einsetzen” see Wb I: 389. Another possibility is to read dn.f – “while he cut off” (for dn – “abschneiden (Köpfe)” see Hannig 2006: 2790). One would, however, expect an object after dn.f that provides information on what was cut off.

Schneider (2008: 243f.) transliterated the first part of the sentence as hrw pw shm dnd.f iriw n.f and translated “Horus ist das, dessen Zorn mächtig ist, der für sich gehandelt hat“, arguing that Osiris’ anger caused the killing of his enemies personified by the offering.

Sethe interpreted the second part ddt mdt [s]šd Ḥnkwy sḫt as the Speech of Horus and a following Remark. He assumed that the ancient scribe forgot to include the Speech, noticing his mistake after he had already copied column 47. Thus, he added the Speech and the Remark in the same column after the Explicatory sentence, leaving out the speakers due to the lack of space. Sethe’s argumentation is comprehensible if we assume that the ancient scribe forgot to add an entire column (Speakers – Speech
– Remarks). But it is also possible that the Explicatory sentence in column 47 is longer and that the entire text belongs to one sentence ([...] pw shm dn.f iriw n.f dd mdt n šcf[...]). In the latter case I think that the part Sethe read as hnkwy sht and identified as the Remark after the Speech is rather the caption of the accompanying Vignette. I further suggest reading hnkt (“hnkt-offering”), taking = as the determinative of the word. I have to admit, however, that one would rather expect ○○○○ or ♦♦ (compare Wb III: 118f.). The hnkt-offering consists of the offering of water as well as a goose and kid head. Hence, it is questionable why corn (sht) should be offered. Sethe (1928: 155) defended his reading of sht by identifying a pun with the aforementioned ššd (“Königskopfschmuck”) and referred to PT 189-190, § 108b-c and PT 161, § 96a-d. Here the word ššd is used in relation to corn, representing the Upper and Lower Egyptian crowns. If we do not take hnkt as the explanation of the depiction, the Vignette would not show a text at all. According to Sethe, the Speech says: wdi.t(w) n(i) [š]šd – “man gebe mir den (oder: meinen) Königskopfschmuck“.

He parsed the signs = as dd mdw wdi.t(w) n(i). I suggest to read dd mdt n ... “recitation of/for...”. The word following after the genitival n is hard to identify. Only the sign = is preserved. Sethe reconstructed ššd – “Königskopfschmuck”. If his amendment is correct, the part of the sentence could be translated as “the recitation for the headdress”. Lorand (2009: 127) also assigned hnkwy it to the text of the ritual and translated “paroles dites: deux offrandes de grains lui sont données.”

D As there is no other verb in the sentence, hnk has to be the verb and cannot be the term for hnkt-offering; concerning hnk “to offer” see Hannig 2006: 1713. It is, however, definite that the hnkt-offering is described as the offering consists of the head of a goose and of a kid.

E Another translation would be “his head was given back to him twice”, assuming a perfect passive sḏm(w).f instead of an imperative. As it is a Speech, the imperative seems the better solution.

F Sethe (1928: 153 and 156) translated “Goldhaus”. He assumed that the Remarks, mentioning a building or place, are concerned with locations indicating the place where the action took place. Hence, he argued that the “gold house” is the site where
statues, in this case the Djed-pillar, were built and enlivened through the Opening of the Mouth Ritual; compare also the Opening of the Mouth Ritual (Otto 1960 II: 26). He further suggested that the offering of the kid- and goose-heads to the Djed-pillar took place in this location. The hwt-nb in Dendara, a sanctuary on the temple roof, is connected with the rejuvenation of Osiris (Koemoth 1994: 225ff.). Schott (1984: 265ff.), however, made a case that hwt-nb is an archaic writing for pr-nsw, derived from a pun (“house of the lord” and not “gold house”). She further argued that the Remarks concerning locations in the RDP do not necessarily indicate the place of action, but rather the site from where the items for the ritual were brought. Her assumption was based on inscriptions in tombs of high officials where it is explicitly mentioned that certain items were brought from certain locations. The “royal house” could stand for the administration in general, including the slaughtering house, or for a special part of the palace, the personal treasury of the king. In the latter case the kid-head and goose-head would be fabricated out of precious stones. See also VIII.d: 214f.

VI.8.4 Vignette 9
Vignette 9 represents Scene 15. It starts under column 47 (Scene 15) and expands under columns 48 and 49 that already belong to Scene 16. The depiction summarises the action of Scene 15, by showing a kneeling man offering a goose- and kid head\(^A\) to the Djed-pillar. The Djed-pillar carries an im\(^\text{b}\)-tree on top and a ribbon is tied around the middle part of the pillar.

Notes:
A Only the front part of the goose head is preserved. In the context of the Scene it is, however, clear that the man offers the heads of these two animals.
VI.8.5 Scene 16 (cols. 48-50)

(48) hpr.\textsuperscript{n} s\textsuperscript{c}h\textsuperscript{c} dd in iryw \textit{ht} nsw\textsuperscript{128} \textit{hrw} \textit{pw} w[d]\textsuperscript{A}.n.f n ms(w)\textsuperscript{B}[s]\textsuperscript{C} h\textsuperscript{C} \textsuperscript{D}  

(48) It happened that the Djed-pillar was erected by the “ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king”. It is Horus who [issued] a [command] to his child[ren] that [...] erect.

(49) hrw msw hrw dd mdw [...].f hr.\textsuperscript{E}.f // [...]\textsuperscript{F} hr wsir rmi\textsuperscript{G} // s\textsuperscript{c}h\textsuperscript{c} dd  

(49) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus: [...] him under him // [...] under Osiris, the mourned one // Erecting the Djed-pillar

(50) 3st nbt-\textit{hw}t msw hrw dd mdw hnp n hr\textsuperscript{H} // msw hrw // iryw \textit{ht} nsw\textsuperscript{129} // wr m\textit{w}  

(50) Isis and Nephthys speak words to the children of Horus: Offer to the fallen one // Children of Horus // “The ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king” // The greatest of seers

Notes:

A The reading is based on Sethe 1928: 156. The sign \textsuperscript{I} is not preserved.

B The plural strokes are not preserved.

C The s is not preserved, but the reconstruction is likely as there is space in front of the sign \textsuperscript{G}, and as the verb \textit{s\textsuperscript{c}h\textsuperscript{c}} appears in the first part of the column.

D The rest of the column is destroyed. Sethe (1928: 156) reconstructed ... \textit{s\textsuperscript{c}h\textsuperscript{c}} st\textsuperscript{s} hr wsir – “[den Seth auf]zurichten [unter Osiris]”. Sethe’s translation demands, however, a different word order: ...\textit{wd.n.f} \textit{s\textsuperscript{c}h\textsuperscript{c}} msw.f st\textsuperscript{s} hr wsir. If one follows Sethe’s translation a subject has to be included after \textit{s\textsuperscript{c}h\textsuperscript{c}}: ...\textit{wd.n.f} msw.f \textit{s\textsuperscript{c}h\textsuperscript{c}.sn} st\textsuperscript{s} hr wsir – “...who issued a command to his children so that they erect Seth under Osiris”.

\textsuperscript{128} See note B, VI.1.3: 45 and VIII.b: 202f.

\textsuperscript{129} See note B, VI.1.3: 45 and VIII.b: 202f.
Schneider (2008: 244), however, questioned convincingly Sethe’s translation as Seth would have to be identified with the Djed-pillar – a symbol that is usually associated with Osiris, at least since the New Kingdom (Altenmüller 1975c: 1103), and has the connotation of endurance. Osiris would have to be identified with the imḫ-tree that is depicted on the Djed-pillar in the accompanying Vignette. Additionally, Schneider noted that in the preceding column a hnkšt-offering was given to the Djed-pillar, hence to Seth, in case Sethe’s interpretation is correct, an action that is doubtful as Seth is Osiris’ enemy. Hence, the question has to be raised why an opponent would be rewarded with an offering. On the other side the mythological interpretation in column 49 mentions that someone or something is under Osiris and one wonders who or what that would be if not Seth – compare Scene 13 where we read: ḫrw stš ḏd mdw n wỉ.k ḫr ḫỉ ir.k – “Horus speaks words to Seth: You will not resist under the one who is older than you”. Another argument for Sethe’s interpretation of Seth being identified with the Djed-pillar could be found in column 51. The Introduction mentions that a rope was put at the Djed-pillar. The following Explicatory sentence refers to Seth (“It is Seth who […] , while Horus ordered (it) to his children”), making it likely that he, indeed, has to be identified with the Djed-pillar (compare also note B, VI.8.6: 94f.). As the text in column 48 is destroyed it is hard to identify the person or object that is supposed to be under Osiris. It can, however, be concluded that it is likely that in this Scene Seth is identified with the Djed-pillar, while Osiris is represented by the imḫ-tree on top. In accordance with Altenmüller (1975c: 1102), I think that the erection of the Djed-pillar is represented by Seth, who is, however, still be dominated by Osiris who is depicted on top of him.

Sethe (1928: 156f.) reconstructed [imi ḏd.ʃ]f ḫr.f – “[lasset] ihn [dauern] unter ihm”, based on his reconstruction of column 48. The preposition ḫr – only partly preserved here – is written without the ∞ in this column as well as in the following one. Concerning the motif of Seth carrying Osiris see note C, VI.1.3: 45f.

If one follows Sethe’s interpretation (see note D above: 91f.), his reconstruction of stš – “Seth” is logical due to the content of the Scene (Sethe 1928: 156f.).
In accordance with Sethe (1928: 156f.). The ancient scribe seems to have added the word *rmi* later by erasing the separation line between the first and the second Remarks.

The translation of the Speech is problematic and a satisfying suggestion cannot be provided at the moment. Sethe (1928: 156 and 158) translated “schiebt (ihn) dem Gefallenen unter” (*hnṣ sw* n *hr*). Only traces of the sign after 𓊣 are preserved. Sethe reconstructed the hieroglyph 𓊣 and identified the word as *hnf* (“Verbum im Opferritual”; Wb III: 291), referring to PT 188, § 108a, where the verb is written 𓊣. The exact meaning of the verb is unknown and Sethe suggested “to push under”. As Schneider (2008: 244) pointed out correctly the word means “backen” (Hannig 2003: 949) and is usually written 𓊣 or 𓊣. Hence, the *f* would have been left out by the ancient scribe in the RDP. Additionally, it is not clear if the reconstruction of the sign 𓊣 is correct. Only a small piece is preserved and I suggest to emend *p* and read *hnḥp* (“darbringen”; Hannig 2006: 1894). Schneider read *hnḥ r shr* – “Seid energisch mit dem Vorhaben”. He argued that the *n* in front of *hr* could also be read as 𓊣 as the sign is partly destroyed. He further mentioned that it is rather improbable that Osiris is called “the fallen one” after his triumph over Seth. His argumentation is convincing, but Osiris is also referred to in the preceding column as the one who is mourned. Maybe the epithet designates him as the one who was killed by his brother Seth.

### VI.8.6 Scene 17 (cols. 51-52)

(51) *hpr.n wdiw𓊣 nhw r ḏḏ stš pw [...]*∅ *wḏ*  
*hrw [...]*† *msw.f*  
(51) It happened that a rope was put on the Djed-pillar. It is Seth who [...], while Horus ordered (it) [to] his children.

(52) *hrw msw hrw ḏḏ mdw imi ḏḥt.f [...]*∅  
*stš [...]*∅  
*dit twy∅ ḏḏ*  
(52) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus: Cause that he may stand [...] // Seth [...] // Causing the support of the Djed-pillar
Notes:

A Sethe (1928: 159) parsed wdis as the masculine infinitive of wdi – transliterating it wd like in column 15 and not as a perfect passive sdm(w).f (see note A, VI.3.1: 55).

B Sethe (1928: 159f.) reconstructed šc, translating “Seth ist das, der geschlachtet ist“.

The palm of the sign ← is preserved. The remains of the signs ← and /, which Sethe read with certainty, are too scarce to verify. The sentence is the mythical explanation for the Introduction of the Scene (“It happened that a rope was put on the Djed-piller”), indicating that Seth is identified with the Djed-pillar or rather with the action of putting the rope around the Djed-pillar; concerning the latter interpretation see also Lorand 2009: 128. Hence Sethe’s reconstruction of šc is questionable as it is unlikely that the pillar was chopped up or that the action of putting a rope around the pillar is compared to the action of chopping something up. The Speech in the following column 52 (“Cause that he may stand”) corroborates the assumption that Seth or the Djed-pillar were not chopped up. The name of the god Seth follows in the Remark after the Speech so that it is clear that he is the one who should be caused to stand. Hence, it would be incomprehensible why he would have been chopped up before. In accordance with Schneider (2008: 245), I think that the rope is only put around the pillar; compare also the depiction of the Djed-pillar in Vignettes 9 and 10 where a rope is attached to the pillar. Schneider referred to BD 39 where the nwh rope was used for the punishment of Apophis. Consequently, Schneider suggested that the rope might have been put around the Djed-pillar in the mythological part of RDP to be available for Osiris to punish Seth. In the actual ritual the rope was rather used to erect the Djed-pillar, and not to decorate it (see Gestermann 2008: 37). Maybe the image of the rope being around the pillar refers to Seth being bound and not killed, as Sethe assumed. It has to be admitted, however, that the spelling of the verbs “to bind” (ntt ←, Hannig 2006: 1412; snh ←, Hannig 2006: 2262f.; qis ←, Hannig 2006: 2508f.) do not match the remains of the signs. Schneider (2008: 245) translated šc as “gerichtet o.ä”. This meaning is, however, not attested for šc. The term rather means “abschneiden, schneiden, fallen” (Hannig 2006: 2425f.). Maybe the
meaning “to cut” in this context can be interpreted in a way that Seth was hurt by the rope that was put around him.

C Sethe (1928: 159f.) amended the dative n between hrw and msw.f. The destroyed part of the column only allows place for a small sign, making Sethe’s reconstruction plausible.

D Sethe (1928: 159f.) amended a stative of the verb hwî and translated “in Fesseln geschlagen”. The remains of the text might show the upper slope of ḫ, but it cannot be verified. Additionally, the verb hwî means “schlagen, prügeln” (Hannig 2006: 1624ff.). The connotation of “beating someone into bonds” is not attested. Sethe referred to PT 587 to strengthen his argument. As he had to admit himself the notion that Seth is beaten while bound is expressed by two verbs, hwî and qšs (hwî.n.f n.k stš qšs – “he has beaten for you Seth, who is bound”). Consequently, Sethe suggested two verbs in the RDP: hwî (only written with ḫ) and a verb written ḫ, that he translated “fesseln” without giving a transliteration. If indeed hwîw was written here, a possible translation is “while he was overwhelmed/beaten”; concerning the meaning “besiegen” for hwî see Hannig 2006: 1626.

E Sethe (1928: 159) reconstructed hwî again, with a double reed leaf ending and used the same translation for the verb: “Seth in Fesseln schlagen”. The remains of the signs allow a reading of hwî, but I think that the Remark should rather be translated as “Seth, the one who is overwhelmed/beaten”. Schneider’s assumption that the rope was used for the punishment of Seth (see note B above: 94f.) would strengthen this translation.

F Sethe (1928: 159) read ḫ as an abbreviated version of the verb kšî and translated “den ḫ-Pfeiler sich beugen lassen”. One has to raise the question, however, why the Djed-pillar was bent. The accompanying Vignette does not show a bent pillar. Hence, I prefer the transliteration of twî, assuming an abbreviated writing of the verb with only the determinative ( 추진 - “stützen”; Hannig 2006: 2659). The translation “Cause the support of the Djed-pillar” might refer to the Speech where Horus asks his children to make Seth/Djed-pillar stand.
**VI.8.7 Vignette 10**

Vignette 10 represents Scenes 16 (cols. 48-50). As Vignette 9 is partly depicted under Scene 16 (cols. 48-49), illustration 10 is only drawn under columns 50-52, hence partly under the following Scene 17. The Vignette shows two men holding the Djed-piller with the $im\beta$-tree ontop. The men are identified as the “the ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king” ($iryw\ htw\ nsw$)$^{130}$ by the caption above the depiction and the action as the erection ($sq^f h^c$) of the Djed-pillar. Scene 17 (cols. 51-52) is not represented in an illustration. The Scene deals with the application of a rope around the Djed-pillar. It is interesting, however, that the rope is already depicted in the illustrations representing the previous Scenes 15 (Vignette 9) and 16 (Vignette 10).

**VI.8.8 Scene 18 (cols. 53-54)**

(53) $[hpr.n\ ...]^A\ ms[w]\ nsw\ [...]^B\ wi^wy\ hrw\ [pw\ ...]^C$  
(53) [It happened that] the royal child[ren] descended$^D$ [...] the two barks. [It is] Horus [...]  

(54) $hrw\ [...]\ gd\ mdw\ [...]^E$  
(54) Horus speaks words to [...]  

Notes:

A Sethe (1928: 161) mentioned that $hpr.n\ h^3$ was still preserved on older photographs.

B Sethe (1928: 161) reconstructed the preposition $r$, which is convincing regarding the context of the sentence ($h^3i\ ...r\ ...$ “... descend into...”).

C The rest of the column is destroyed. Sethe (1928: 161) reconstructed $hrw\ [pw\ mdw].f\ [hr]\ msw.f\ [hft\ st\š\ ...]$ – “Horus [ist das, der über] seine Kinder [red]et [mit Seth(?)]“.

D Sethe (1928: 161) translated $h^3$ as “to enter”. One would rather expect the verb $\dot{c}q$ for that translation (see also Schneider 2008: 245).

E Horus’ Speech as well as his dialogue partner are not preserved. Based on the layout of the different Scenes of the document as well as on column 32 and on his reconstruction of column 53, Sethe (1928: 161f.) reconstructed “Horus spricht Worte

---

$^{130}$ See note B, VI.1.3: 45 and VIII.b: 202f.
zu [Seth(?)]: [“trag mir die, die meinen Vater trugen”] // [die Horuskinder // die Königskinder]”. Due to the poorly preserved condition of the text of Scene 18 in general it cannot be said if Sethe’s reconstruction is correct.

The remains of signs on the left side of the Remarks of the following column 55 do not belong to column 54 as they are not divided by separation lines. As column 54 consists of a Speech, one would expect Remarks at this place of the column comparable to the separation of column 55. Hence, one has to add a further column \(54^{bis}\), which starts a new Scene (see Sethe 1928: 162f.).

**VI.8.9 Vignette 11**

Vignette 11 represents Scene 18 (cols. 53-54) and is completely destroyed except for a small part showing probably the antelope head of the stern of the bark. Sethe (1928: 250 and Tf. 15) reconstructed two barks, drawn above each other. His suggestion makes sense as the text of Scene 18 is concerned with the royal children entering into two barks. As the antelope head is visible at the upper part of the depiction – most likely directly under the not preserved caption – it is convincing to assume that the two boats were originally drawn under and not next to each other.

**VI.9 Sequence 9 (cols. 54bis-68)**

Sequence 9 comprises Scenes 19-23 (cols. 54bis-68) and Vignettes 12-14.

**VI.9.1 Scene 19 (cols. 54bis-55)**

\[
(54^{bis}) \ldots f^A \text{ mnty-n-irty}^B \ldots n.f \text{ irty m\ldots f}^C \\
(54^{bis}) \ldots \text{Mekhenti-en-irty […] he […] two new eyes […]}
\]

\[
(55) \text{hrw mnty-n-irty}^{131} \quad \text{gd mdw m irty(.i) D m} \\
\text{hn.t.k m\ldots k im.sn // irty hrw f\ldots i(.ti) <n> iwty}^E \\
\text{irty.f(y) // f\ldots iit wdiit F // hm}
\]

(55) Horus speaks words to Mekhenti-en-irty:

Take (my) two eyes in your face so that you may see with them // The two eyes of Horus are brought <to> the one without eyes //

\[^{131}\text{See note B below: 98.}\]
Notes:

A Sethe (1928: 162f.) included fragment 1 at the beginning of the column, which shows remains of $hpr.n$.ff[...] (“It happened that ...”). He further reconstructed the text of the column based on the accompanying Vignette as follows: “$hpr.n$.ff$t$. $šₙₜₚ$ $ḏ⁻\text{w}⁻\text{i} v⁻\text{n}$ $h⁻\text{y⁻}ḥ⁻\text{b}$ $n$ $iḥ⁻\text{t} nṯr$” – “[Es geschah, daß aufgetragen wurde ein Laib (Brot) und ein Krug (Bier) durch den Vorlesepriester des Gottesdienstes]”. His amendment is plausible as the infinitive of the verb $fṢ$ appears in the text of the Vignette ($ḥ𝑡$ $nṯr$ $fṢi$) and the $h⁻\text{y⁻}ḥ⁻\text{b}$ priest is depicted carrying bread and beer. As Sethe mentioned himself the title $h⁻\text{y⁻}ḥ⁻\text{b}$ $n$ $iḥ⁻\text{t} nṯr$ is not attested elsewhere. In agreement with Schneider (2008: 245) and based on the graphic division of the text in the Vignette, I prefer a separation between the title $h⁻\text{y⁻}ḥ⁻\text{b}$ and the action $iḥ⁻\text{t} nṯr$ $fṢi$ $t(i)$: “the lector priest” and “the divine offering is brought” – $fṢi$ $t(i)$ being a stative. The text of the Vignette shows $Ṣ$ after $h⁻\text{y⁻}ḥ⁻\text{b}$ (“the great lector priest”). Hence, it is very likely that the adjective $Ṣ$ was also originally written after $h⁻\text{y⁻}ḥ⁻\text{b}$ in the text of column 54$⁻\text{bis}$ instead of $n$ $iḥ⁻\text{t} nṯr$ (see also Schneider 2008: 245). Schneider mistakenly transliterated $iḥᵗ$ $nṯr$ instead of $iḥᵗ$ $nṯr$.

B It is not clear if the god’s name has to be transliterated as $m$h$n$-$n$-$ir$ty – as Sethe (1928: 162f.) did – or as $m$h$n$-$n$-$ir$ty (compare Junker 1942: 51). According to Hannig (2006: 3073), the god $m$h$n$-$n$-$ir$ty is meant if the name is determined with $嚯$, whereas $m$h$n$-$n$-$ir$ty shows $≌$ as a determinative (Hannig 2006: 3075). As the name of the god is only written with $嚯$ in the RDP, I prefer $m$h$n$-$n$-$ir$ty.

C The remains of the signs allow a reading of $[...]$ $n,f$ $ir$ty $m$j, based on Sethe’s (1928: 162f.) reconstruction of the entire sentence: $m$h$n$-$n$-$ir$ty (pw) $[ss]$ $n,f$ $ir$ty $m$j $t$ $h⁻\text{r}⁻\text{w}$ – “$M$h$n$-$n$-$ir$ty$ (ist das), der zwei neue Augen [empfangen] hat von [Horus]”.

D In accordance with Sethe (1928: 165), I think that Horus is talking about his eyes, hence the reading of $ir$ty.$i$. Junker (1942: 51) translated “Nimm die beiden Augen”.

E Sethe (1928: 165) was unsure about the identification of the sign above the $t$. He mentioned that it reminded him of the beginning of $n$ (﹁) and amended the sign as
A closer look, however, reveals that the sign shows half circles at both ends, which look like the open palms of the negative sign ¬¬. Consequently, I have no doubt that the two signs are ¬¬ and have to be transliterated iwty. In agreement with Sethe, I am of the opinion that the dative n was omitted by the ancient scribe. One would expect a separation line if irty hrw and fi(t)i iwty irty:fy were two separate Remarks.

Sethe (1928: 162 and 165) read fiit drt – “die Hand erheben” and interpreted the sentence as the command to bring the offering. He assumed a defective writing of fiit (¬¬) with a double t. I rather think that the second t belongs to the following word wdî, building the infinitive t-ending of the very same word. I have to admit, however, that one would expect the t to be written after the d (¬¬), and not before (¬¬). An instruction “raising the hand” or “giving a sign” – as Sethe interpreted the Remark – would probably be paraphrased with rdi ć; compare column 41 where we read: hpr.n dit ć r hnkt – “It happened that the arm was given towards the hnkt-offering”.

VI.9.2 Vignette 12

Vignette 12 represents Scene 19 (cols. 54bis-55) and expands until column 58 (Scene 20). It shows the sacred bark with the king inside a shrine on the left side. The ruler is wearing an uraeus on the front of his head and is holding a staff in his left hand. The caption is partly destroyed. According to Sethe (1928: 250), the words ıt+¬¬ were still recognizable by Ibscher before the papyrus was detached. Sethe (1928: 250 and 95) thought that the caption has to be read nsw hq3 ty:fy – “the king, the one who will rule” (see also Frankfort 1969: 123), and not nsw it hq3 - “the king, the father of the ruler”.

According to him, the ritual concerns the accession to the throne by Senwosret I (see VII: 174ff.), and it would not be explainable why that king would be called the father of the ruler, or why the caption would refer to his successor and son Amenemhet II. The same expression appears in Vignette 15 (see VI.10.3: 117ff.) as well as in column 114 and the accompanying Vignette 24 (see VI.15.2: 150 and 15.3: 152). In the latter case it is unambiguous that the expression has to be

132 For a discussion on the epithet, see also VIII.e: 215ff.
read *it ḫqȝ* – “the father of the ruler” as he is carried by the “ones who embrace the Akh”.

The depiction shows the person on a much smaller scale than the “ones who embrace the Akh”. Hence, it is plausible that the title *it ḫqȝ* refers to a statue and not a real person. It would be unexplainable why the future king would be carried and why he would be depicted on a smaller scale than the officials (see also VIII.c: 215ff. and X: 238ff.). Furthermore, the title *it ḫqȝ* is identified with Osiris in the Explicatory sentence. Sethe agreed with the translation “father of the ruler” in column 114 and Vignette 24 (Sethe 1928: 95, 221f. and 256), but adhered to his statement that the same expression in Vignettes 12 and 15 has to be read *ḥqȝ.ty.fy* – “the one who will rule” (Sethe 1928: 95, 250, 252). It is questionable that the scribe would use the same writing for two different expressions, especially since they comprise two totally dissimilar statements (compare Gestermann 2008: 43). In addition, the writing ⲳ is attested for *it* (“father”) in the text (compare column 113). Finally, I think that the ritual does not represent the coronation of Senwosret I, but rather a ritual in commemoration of the king performed with a statue of his (see X: 238ff.). In front of the bark the caption *ḥt nṯr fšt* – “the divine offering is brought”134 summarizes the action of the Scene and most likely of Scene 19 as well – the Introduction of Scene 19 is mainly destroyed and the reconstruction is based on the illustration. The right side of the Vignette illustrates a “great lector priest” (*ḥr-ḥb ḫȝ*), wearing a kilt, and offering a jug and bread to the god Mekhenti-en-irti, who is identified by the partly destroyed caption above him. Although the depiction of the god is only partly preserved, it seems that he is depicted without a face. He holds a *wȝs*-scepter in his right hand and carries a sign on his head that resembles ⲁ, the hieroglyph representing the town of Hierakonpolis. The depiction without a face is not surprising: the god can be shown without a face, or with the face of a shrew or an ichneumon (Felde 1995: 13). The sign ⲁ is, however, harder to explain as it represents Hierakonpolis, whereas the cult place of Mekhenti-en-irti is Letopolis. Sethe assumed that the connection lies in the fact that the names of Mekhenti-en-irti and Horus of Hierakonpolis are written with the sign ⲁ.

---

133 For the translation “the ones who embrace the Akh” for *šnw ḫb*, see VIII.b: 205ff.
134 For the different reading of the caption compared to Sethe’s, see note A, VI.9.1: 98.
VI.9.3 Scene 20 (cols. 56-58)

(56) $hpr.n\;mn^{c}\;hrw\;pw\;^{c}h^{3}.f\;hn^{cA}\;st\tilde{s}$

(56) It happened that there was fighting$^B$. It is Horus who fights with Seth.

(57) $gb\;hrw\;st\tilde{s}\;gd\;mdw\;^{c}mw-ib\;//\;hrw\;st\tilde{s}^{C}\;^{c}h^{3}\;//\;mn^{c}$

(57) Geb speaks words to Horus and Seth: Regret$^D$ // Horus and Seth, the fighting$^E$ // $mn^{c}$-fight

(58) $hrw\;msw\;hrw\;gd\;mdw\;n\;tn\;is\;^{c}mw-ib\;//\;ms(w)\;hrw\;[\ldots]^{F}\;//\;^{[^c]}mw^{G}$

(58) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus: To you belongs indeed remorse$^H$ // Child(ren) of Horus [...] // $^{[^c]}mw$-fight

Notes:

A Only traces of the signs are visible, but the reading of $hn^{c}$ is clear.

B Based on the determinative of two men fighting with sticks the word $mn^{c}$ seems to be connected with combat. In this meaning $mn^{c}$ is only attested in the RDP (compare Hannig 2006: 1074). Schneider (2008: 246) suggested that $mn^{c}$ derives from $mn-^{c}$ “mit ausdauerndem Arm (Auszauerkampf)”, while the $^{c}mw$-fight (see second Remark of column 58) designates “Erschöpfungskampf”. Another meaning of $mn^{c}$ is “säuigen, aufziehen” that can have the sign $^{b}=^d$ as a determinative (Wb II, 77). Lesko (2002 II, 186) referred to the noun $mn^{c}t$ as “nurse, guardian”, also attested with the arm-determinative. Supposedly, the combat is ceremonial, in which both actors fulfill a protective role. A comparable fight is attested in the course of Amenhotep III’s Sed festival, where the inhabitants of Pe and Dep fight (Bleeker 1967: 103; see also VIII.a, Sequence 9: 190).

C Only the tail of the Seth-animal is preserved, the reading of $st\tilde{s}$ is, however, unquestionable due to the context.

D Sethe (1928: 166) translated „vergesset!“. As Schneider (2008: 246) has pointed out correctly $^{c}mw$-$ib$ means “bereuen” or “geheim halten” (Wb I: 184). Schneider referred further to the possible translation “ohnmächtig werden” (see also Hannig 2006: 503).
He assumed that Horus and Seth are rather summoned by Geb to fight until exhaustion and that they are not asked to forget or regret the fight. The accompanying Vignette shows two people without sticks, holding hands – the same applies to the second pair that can be identified as personifications of the children of Horus and the followers of Seth, based on column 58. Maybe the scene shows that the combatants regret and make peace?

Sethe (1928: 166) translated “Kampf zwischen Horus und Seth“. The translation above is preferred and ʻḥḥ3 parsed as an infinitive. Another possibility is a honorific transposition of ḫrw and stš, so that ʻḥḥ3 is parsed as a sḏm.f: ʻḥḥ3 ḫrw ṣtš – “Horus and Seth fight”. For Sethe’s translation one would rather expect ʻḥḥ3 ḫrw ṣnʳ ṣtš.

Sethe (1928: 166f.) convincingly restored ḫtw stš ʻḥḥ3 according to the Remark in column 57 (hrw stš ʻḥḥ3). He translated “[Kampf zwischen] den Horuskindern [und den Gefolgsleuten des Seth]“. As mentioned in note E ʻḥḥ3 is an infinitive so that the translation “the child(ren) of Horus and the followers of Seth, the fighting” is appropriate.

Referring to Ibscher, Sethe (1928: 167) assumed a very short third Remark after ʻmw referring to a location, of which no traces are left. As columns 57 and 58 are very similar in their layout and content – especially regarding the first and second Remarks – one would also expect a missing third Remark in column 57. Sethe did not mention any traces of signs that were still visible when Ibscher worked on the document for this column, so that one wonders if the traces Ibscher could still make out for a third Remark in column 58 really belong to a Remark or were rather a dot applied by the scribe to draw the lines.

Sethe (1928: 166f.) translated “ihr seid es ja, die vergessen sollen“. He compared the expression ḥn ṣn is ʻmw-ib with the Old Egyptian phrase ḥn ṣnwt is – “it is indeed you” and parses ʻmw-ib as a participle. The translation above is based on the expression for possession built with the genitival adjective ḥn plus a dependent pronoun plus a noun (Hoch 1997: 140, § 126.1). Schneider (2008: 246) preferred “(auch) euch kommt nämlich Erschöpfung zu”. For the different translations of ʻmw-ib, see note D above, 101f.
**VI.9.4 Scene 21 (cols. 59-63)**

(59) *hpr*[...] *mhwty*[^A] *hrw* [...] *w*[^B]

(59) It happen(ed) that [...] two families [...] Horus [...].

(60) *hrw* *msw* *hrw* *dd* *[mdw* [...] *n* *pr* [...] *n* *hr*[^C] // *ms(w)* *hrw*[^135] // *mhwty*[^136]

(60) Horus speaks [words] to the children of Horus: [...] the box [...] the eye // Child(ren) of Horus // Two families

(61) *hrw* *dhwty* *dd* *mdw* *int(<s>n)*[^D] // *ms(w)* *hrw*[^137] // *imnhwy*[^E]

(61) Horus speaks words to Thoth: May they bring (it) themselves // Child(ren) of Horus // The pair of slaughterers

(62) [...][^F] *dd* *mdw* *hw(.i)* *n* *tn*[^G] // *ms(w)* *hrw*[^138] // *iry[w]* *ht* *nsw*[^139]

(62) [...] speaks words to [...] : For you (I) protect // Child(ren) of Horus // “The one[s] who are connected to the cultic largess of the king”

(63) *hrw* [...][^H] // [...][^I]

(63) Horus [...] // [...]

**Notes:**

**A** The text of column 59 is mainly destroyed. Only the beginning of *hpr* and the determinative of a word of the Introduction are preserved. The determinative shows two men facing each other, probably holding each other’s hands (compare the writing of *snwy* at the end of column 21). It is most likely the same word as in the second Remark of the following column 60, although the determinative shows two men fighting with sticks (compare also Sethe 1928: 168). The identification of the word is difficult, as the term *mhtty* is only attested in the RDP. Based on Sethe’s translation

[^A]: See note G, VI.4.1: 60.
[^B]: For the reading of *mhwty*, see note A below: 103f.
[^C]: See note G, VI.4.1: 60.
[^D]: See note G, VI.4.1: 60.
[^E]: See note B, VI.1.3: 45 and VIII.b: 202f.
Hannig included the entry “Melkerinnenpaar” in his dictionary (Hannig 2006: 1107). Sethe based his translation on the word stem mhr, mhn, mhj that is concerned with milking and dairy farming (see Wb II: 113-116). Schneider (2008: 246f.) argued convincingly that the word mhr is not attested before the New Kingdom and that the text of the RDP should rather show mhrt and not mhtt if the word was connected to this word stem. Furthermore, I agree with Schneider that the appearance of two milkmaids in the context of the ritual is dubious. Schneider suggested a reading of imy-hti – “Der mit Geschrei = der (die aufgehende Sonne anbetende) Pavian)“, based on the lexeme hti/hti („Kreischen wie die hti-Paviane“, imw hti – „die Paviane, welche die Sonne preisen“; Wb II: 504). In connection with the determinative of two men stick-fighting, he translated the word as “die Jubelkämpfer/Der Jubelkampf”, interpreting their function in the ritual as the ones who announce the recovery of the eye of Horus, explained in the following columns. The solution chosen for the translation above is based on the word mhwt – “Sippe, Clan” (Hannig 2006: 1107). Maybe the two families prepare the offering that is presented in Scene 23 (see also VIII.a, Sequence 9: 190). Sethe (1928: 168) restored the beginning of the column as follows: hpr[n] iniw mhtt – “Es geschah, daß man ein Melkerinnenpaar herbeiholte”. He based the reconstruction of iniw on the fact that this verb was chosen every time a word appears in the text that shows the determinative of two men fighting.

B Parts of the Horus falcon as well as of the quail quick are preserved. Based on the sign remains, Sethe (1928: 168f.) reconstructed: hrw [pw mdw.f n ms]/w[f] – “Horus [ist das, der zu seinen Kind]ern [redet]”. The preservation of the text is too poor to verify Sethe’s reading. As Horus is indeed talking to his children in the following column the reconstruction is, however, plausible.

C Horus’ Speech is partly lost. Sethe (1928: 167f.) read mh.tn pr.(i) [tp] t3 hr irt – [“ihr so]llt mein Haus [auf] Erden füllen(?) mit meinem Auge“. The words ... n pr ... hr irt are clearly identifiable. Sethe’s suggestion of mh.tn as the verb in the sentence is based on a possible pun with mhtt in the second Remark. Between n pr and hr irt he restored tp t3 based on the remains of p and a line that reminds him of the sign n.
Whereas the remains of the first sign can, indeed, belong to p – it cannot be verified with any certainty, however, as not enough of the sign is preserved – the second sign is not ti, but definitely n. Hence, the sentence would have to be restored as [mh.\textit{t}n pr(\textit{i}) [...]] pn hr irt. Besides Sethe’s erroneous reading of ti one has also to raise the question why Horus’ house on earth should be filled with milk – Sethe identified the eye with milk –, and what Horus’ house on earth is. Schneider (2008: 248) also identified the sign as n and not ti and suggested to read hr instead of tp: mh.\textit{tn pr} “[hr\{=j\} p\{n\} hr jr.t\{=j\}” – “Möget ihr füllen das Gehäuse dieses meines Gesichtes mit meinem Auge“. He translated \textit{pr} with its meaning “Gehäuse” (“Behälter, Kasten, Futteral”; Wb I: 511) and thought that Horus’ eye sockets have to be filled with the eye. His interpretation is more convincing than Sethe’s as the eye of Horus is a main topic in the previous and following Scenes.

\textbf{D} Schneider (2008: 248) suggested another possibility; “\textit{jnj ʃj nds-šn} “Bring du es, da sie noch klein sind“. Sethe (1928: 170) already noted that it is uncommon that the children of Horus should bring the eye, and not Thoth, who is usually responsible for the task. If Schneider’s translation is correct, Thoth would be fulfilling his customary role. The imperative is also convincing as it is a Speech. The children of Horus are, however, mentioned in the first Remark of the column and one would thus expect that they are the ones who are performing the action, i.e. bring the eye of Horus. Maybe Horus, the speaker, informs Thoth, the addressee, that this time the children of Horus are supposed to bring the eye. This would also explain the mentioning of “themselves” at the end of the sentence – used to stress the fact that not Thoth brings the eye this time.

\textbf{E} The transliteration of the word is questionable. Sethe referred to the BD 17. The Middle Kingdom version shows the writing \textit{\textasciitilde{ım}} (Grapow 1915/17: 60), which is translated by Sethe as “Schlächter (des Osiris)”, based on a New Kingdom version of the same passage that reads \textit{\textasciitilde{ım}} (Grapow 1915/17: 61; for \textit{imnH “Schlächter see Hannig 2006: 273). It has to be mentioned that Grapow (1915/17: 62, notes b, c and f) noted that the reading of \textit{\textasciitilde{ım}} is unsure. In note c he stated that the sign \textit{\textasciitilde{ım}} could also be read \textit{\textasciitilde{ım}}. The RDP definitely shows \textit{\textasciitilde{ım}} with the determinative of two
men holding hands. Hence, it cannot be said with certainty if the two words are identical. The appearance of the knife in the word, however, does support a translation that is connected with cutting.

According to Sethe (1928: 170), a now lost fragment showed the speakers Horus and the children of Horus.

Sethe (1928: 168) transliterated hwi.\(n(i)\) \(tn\) and translated “ich habe euch geschützt”. He mentioned that one would expect a following consecutive clause of result and he assumed that it stood in the following destroyed column. According to Sethe’s translation, hwi.\(n(i)\) has to be seen as a \(sdm.\(n.f\)\). One would, however, expect an \(iw\) as an introduction particle. Hence, I prefer the translation of an emphatic \(sdm.\(f\)\) with the following indirect object stressed; concerning the indirect object stressed in an emphatic construction see Allen 2005b: 407. Another possibility would be an imperative “protect for yourselves” or a subjunctive “may I protect you”.

Remains of the sign are still visible, identifying the speaker as Horus. The name of the partner as well as the Speech is lost. Sethe (1928: 168) suggested the children of Horus as the second party.

At the end of the column remains of signs are visible, most likely belonging to a Remark. The only sign identifiable with certainty is \(\gamma\). Presumably the same sign has to be added next to it – one foot is still recognizable. Sethe (1928: 168 and 171) reconstructed the signs before as \(wdi\ \(r\ \(t\)\)\(\beta\) (\(=\text{□} \\text{□}\)) and translated “zu Boden legen”. The remains could support this reading, but as the complete text of the column is not preserved it is impossible to verify Sethe’s assumption or suggest another reading.

VI.9.5 Scene 22 (cols. 64-65)

(64) \(hpr.\(n\) iniw.\(fnhwy\)\(\wedge\) \(hrw\ pw\ mdw.f\ n\ msw.f\) \(hr\ irt.f\) (64) It happened that two carpenters were brought. It is Horus who talks to his children about his eye.
Horus: May you treat what he separated and depart because of it // Child(ren) of Horus // Two carpenters

Notes:
A The transliteration and translation of the word is difficult as it is not written with its phonetic value. Based on the cursive script it is also not clear which signs were used. Without much doubt the signs \( \equiv \) built the word, with two men holding each other by the hand as a determinative – based on the second Remark in the following column 65. In column 64, however, the first sign of the word does not look identical to the first sign of the same word in column 65. Sethe (1928: 172) mentioned that the knife reminded him of the word for joiner (\( fnh \); compare Hannig 2006: 965 and Wb I: 576), whereas the axe designates the carpenter (\( n\ddot{d}r \); compare Hannig 2006: 1424 – “zimmern” and Wb II: 382). He decided to read \( fn\dot{h}wy \) and translated “Tischlerpaar”. There is a possibility that both signs have to be read separately: \( fnh \ n\ddot{d}r \) – “The joiner and carpenter”. Instead of \( n\ddot{d}r \) one might also read \( m\ddot{d}h \) – “Zimmermann, Schreiner” (Hannig 2006: 1172 and Wb II: 190f.).

B Sethe (1928: 171f.) parsed \( irt(.i) \ n \ p\ddot{sh}nt.f \) and translated “mein Auge gehört dem, der es spalten wird”. He argued that the eye belongs to the carpenters who are supposed to split it. One has to raise the question why the eye should be split. It would be a further injury to the eye (compare also Schneider 2008: 251). Hence, I suggest the translation given above. I think the children of Horus (i.e. the carpenters) should treat the eye that was stolen from Horus. I agree with Sethe that the second part of the sentence (“depart because of it”) builds the request for the children of Horus to leave and start working on the healing of the eye. Schneider (2008: 248ff.) discussed several possible translations for the sentence and preferred the following: “Möget ihr behandeln (oder: möge man handeln für) seine Spaltwunde. Möge er danach/auf Grund dessen für euch leuchten”. The first part is in accordance with the

---

140 See note G, VI.4.1: 60.
141 See note A below: 107.
translation above except that Schneider identified psnt.f with the wound that should be healed. The translation of the second part is not clear. Schneider used psd with its meaning “to shine” (Hannig 2006: 945f.) and argued that “he” will shine again. It is not clear to whom “he” is refering. One would assume Horus after his eye is healed. But Horus is the speaker and it is doubtful that he refers to himself in the third person.

VI.9.6. Vignette 13

Vignette 13 represents Scenes 20-22 (cols. 56-65) and is depicted under columns 59-63; the preceding illustration takes more space than the columns it represents and the succeeding depiction already starts under Scene 22 (cols. 64-65). The beginning of the illustration shows a pair of men holding each others hands. The caption identifies the action as the mnr-fight, mentioned in Scene 20. The couple is followed by a second pair of men holding each others hands, but drawn on a much smaller scale. The action can be recognized as the ‘mhw-fight, also mentioned in Scene 20. The difference concerning the scale between both pairs can be explained by the fact that the text of Scene 20 assigns the mnr-fight to Horus and Seth, while the children of Horus and probably the followers of Seth perform the ‘mhw-fight. The right part of the Vignette is destroyed, only the back part of a person is preserved. In Scene 21 two families are mentioned, making Sethe’s (1928: 252) reconstruction of a third pair of men holding hands plausible. In accordance with the caption of the first two pairs, one would expect the expression mhwty. Sethe argued that the content of Scene 22 was not represented in Vignette 13 because of sign traces under column 63 that do not allow a fourth pair of people. There seems, however, to be enough space to add a fourth pair of men between the third couple and the text. This fourth pair would represent the carpenters of Scene 22. The destroyed caption would have been fnhwy. Hence, I think that Vignette 13 summarizes Scenes 20-22. The aforementioned traces of hieroglyphs were identified by Sethe as and and he amended m snhw or m sn, without providing a translation or explanation for his reconstruction. As only scarce remains are preserved, a reconstruction is difficult. It is possible that the text belongs to the following Vignette 14, and not to Vignette 13 as Sethe assumed. The actors are identified by captions, but the action itself of Vignette 14 is not

---

mentioned in the illustration. Instead of reading 𓊱 and 𓊹 I reconstruct 𓊷 𓊹 𓊷 and the right part of the offering table (𓊨𓊨), allowing the reading fiit ḫiit – “the bringing of the offering table”, the content of the Introduction of Scene 23 in column 66 (see also VI.9.8: 111 f.).

**VI.9.7 Scene 23 (cols. 66-68)**

(66) hpr.n fiit ḫiit in wtw msw hrw [p]w ih.sn n.f ir[t] f

(66) It happened that the offering table was brought by the embalmers. They are the children of Horus who dry\(^A\) for him his eye.

(67) hrw htw stš dd mdw fši.n(i)\(^B\) irt(i) r hr(i) // [...] hr.f // fiit jiwt [//] dhṭwty\(^D\)

(67) Horus speaks words to the followers of Seth: In (my) face have (I) put (my) eye // [...] his face // Bringing of the offering tables // Ibis nome

(68) msw hrw gb dd mdw En [...] š3 ny irt.f\(^E\) // ms(w) [hrw]\(^G\) // dhnw\(^H\)

(68) The children of Horus speak words to Geb: not [...] belonging to his eye // Child(ren) of [Horus] // Conductors

Notes:

A Following Schneider 2008: 251. Sethe (1928: 173) translated “Die Kinder des Horus sind das, die ihm sein Auge wiedereinfangen“ . Schneider argued convincingly that there is no need for the children of Horus to catch the eye as it is already available.

B Sethe (1928: 173ff.) translated an imperative instead of an emphatic sdm.n.f: “hebt mir mein Auge in mein Gesicht“ (fši n(i) irt(i) r hr(i)). One would rather expect the children of Horus to put the eye into Horus’ face, and not the followers of Seth. Hence, I agree with Schneider (2008: 252) that Horus is showing his superiority to the followers of Seth by stating that he has put his eye in his face again.

C Sethe (1928: 173) restored irt hrw fiit r hr.f – “[das Auge des Hor]us [gehoben] in sein Gesicht“ . Based on Horus’ Speech the sentence is logical. Instead of parsing fiit
as a participle one could also analyze *fīī.t(i)* as a stative and translate “the eye of Horus was put in his face”.

**D**

In agreement with Sethe (1928: 175), I think that the ancient scribe forgot to draw the separation line, and that 𓊩 has to be seen as the third Remark of column 67. The sign is the common writing for Thoth in the text. It is, however, unusual that the name of a god appears in the third Remark. One would rather expect the name of a building or a geographical location. Hence, I think that not Thoth is mentioned, but the 15th Lower Egyptian nome, the so-called Ibis nome (see also Sethe 1928: 175 and VIII.d: 211f.). A transliteration for the name of the nome is uncertain (compare Helck 1974: 190ff.).

Based on the fact that the word *hbi* is not attested before the New Kingdom, and that Thoth is known as the main nome god since the Old Kingdom, Montet (1957 I: 137) suggested the reading *dhwty* (see also Gomaà 1987 II: 240). It has to be mentioned however, that *hbi* with the meaning “Ibis, Heiliger Ibis” is already attested in the Middle Kingdom (Hannig 2006: 1562).

**E**

The translation of the Speech is difficult as the text is partly destroyed. Sethe (1928: 173) reconstructed *n [ntr] mḥ ši.ny irt.f* – “nicht gibt es einen (anderen) Gott (?), der erfüllte, was wir zu tun bestimmt sind“. The reading of *ntr mḥ* is not secure, as Sethe mentioned himself. Schneider (2008: 252) offered another suggestion: instead of parsing *ny* as the first person plural suffix pronoun he argued that the writing 𓊩 rather stands for the genitival adjective *ny*. Additionally, Schneider thought that *šši* is not the verb “to determine” (Hannig 2006: 2420ff.), but a noun *ššw* (“Augenkrankheit, Sehstörung (Nachtblindheit)”; Hannig 2006: 2423). He translated “Die Blindheit seines Auges ist nicht (...)”, arguing that the embalmers continue with the healing of the eye. As the first part of the Speech is lost and the reading of *ntr* and *mḥ* by far not clear – barely any traces of the letters are preserved, and hence a transliteration impossible – a suggestion cannot be made. It is especially difficult to suggest a translation for *šš*, written without a determinative, with the context of the sentence lost. Besides Sethe’s and Schneider’s translations (“to determine” and “blindness”) *šš* has a lot of other meanings (compare Hannig 2006: 2419-2421). It has to be stated, however, that Schneider’s translation makes more sense in the context of the Scene.
F Only very few traces of the sign ꝑ are preserved.

G Only the lower part of ❖ is preserved, but the reconstruction of ms(w) ḫrw is logical (compare also Sethe 1928: 173). Concerning the singular writing of msw ḫrw, compare note G, VI.4.1: 60.

H Sethe (1928: 173 and 177) assumed another word after ḫnhw, based on the traces of ink. He suggested wpwt and translated “Chor(?) der Taktangeber”. The papyrus is not destroyed in this part. Hence, Sethe thought that the rest of the word faded over time. It cannot be said with certainty whether the word faded over time or whether the ancient scribe spilled ink. The annotation “Chor der Taktangeber” also appears in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual; witness 7 includes the remark in scene 44 after the presentation of the thigh and heart to the statue. The annotation is followed by a hymn to Ra (see Otto 1960 II: 104). A hymn to Amun-Ra is preserved in the Daily Temple Ritual (Moret 1988: 69ff.). Maybe a hymn is also performed at this point of the ritual described in the RDP (see also VIII.a, Sequence 9: 190).

VI.9.8 Vignette 14

Vignette 14 represents Scene 23 (cols. 66-68) and starts under the text of Scene 22 (cols. 64-65) and possibly already under column 63 of Scene 21. It shows two men, identified as the embalmers (wt) by the caption, who carry an offering table. As mentioned in V.9.6: 108f. the remains of signs to the left of the depiction could be read as the action of the scene: fšt ḫšt – “bringing of the offering table”. The right part of the illustration shows three men with the right hand outstretched in the gesture of conducting (Dominicus 1994: 175f.). The two accompanying captions read dit ḫn – “conducting” (compare Dominicus 1994: 178) and c ḫr-y-hb – “the action of the lector priest”; concerning the translation “action” for c see Hannig: 2006, 467. Sethe (1928: 252) assumed that the two headings belong together and have to be read dit ḫn [in] ḫr-y-hb – “das Taktangeben durch den (d.h. jeden einzelnen) Vorlesepriester”. The two captions stand, however, separately from each other. The first one is above the outstretched hand of the first priest, while the second one is written above the second priest. If it is one caption, it would not be explainable why the ancient scribe left so much space between both headings, especially since Sethe thought that the arm (—we), the first sign of the
second caption, is the determinative of dit hu (the first caption). Hence, I think the text has to be seen as two separate captions, describing, however, the same action.

VI.10 Sequence 10 (cols. 69-75)
Sequence 10 comprises Scenes 24-25 (cols. 69-75) and Vignette 15. The action of Scene 25 – the bringing of carnelian – is not depicted in the Vignette. The illustration is written exactly under both Scenes however, and is not only framed by two barks, but also by two separation lines, starting with the first column of Scene 24 and ending with the last column of Scene 25. Hence, it is undoubtful that Scenes 24 and 25 built a unity (see also Gestermann 2008: 34).

VI.10.1 Scene 24 (cols. 69-71)

(69) hpr.n fši[t] špnt nt irp in msw nsw rdit irt hrw pw n.f in msw.f
(69) It happened that a jug of wine was brought by the royal children. It is the giving of the eye of Horus to him by his children.

(70) msw hrw hrw ḫd mdw mn n.k irt.k r hr.k šp{ʃ}ʃ.t(w)A irp m-çı.snB // irt hrw niwtC // irp im[ty]D // im[t]E
(70) The children of Horus speak words to Horus: Take for youself\textsuperscript{143} your eye for your face, so that the wine can be drunk with them // The eye of Horus, the town // Wine, the one from Buto // Buto

(71) [...]msw [hrw] ḫd [mdw ...]F // irt hrw niwt\textsuperscript{144} // [i]rp snw[y]\textsuperscript{145} // im[t]\textsuperscript{146}
(71) [...] speaks [words] to the children [of Horus: ...] // The eye of Horus, the town // Wine, the one from Pelusium // Buto

\textsuperscript{143} See note E, VI.4.1: 59.
\textsuperscript{144} See note C below: 113f.
\textsuperscript{145} For the reading of snw[y], compare the explanation for im[ty] in note D below: 114.
\textsuperscript{146} See note E below: 114.
Notes:

A A word špš is not attested elsewhere. Sethe (1928: 177ff.) translated šīpt irp m-ꜣ.sn with “das von Wein quillt (o.ä.) durch sie”. He affiliated šīpt with the noun hꜣpt (“Unwetter”; Hannig 2006: 1974) and a verb hꜣpi that is attested in the Pyramid Texts (PT 630, § 1788b), used in context with a well, which is – according to Sethe – abundant of water. Schneider (2008: 253) questioned Sethe’s translation and suggested to use the verb šp “blind sein” (Hannig 2006: 2438 and Wb IV: 443). He argued that it refers to the blind Horus who is able to see again after he got his eyes back (compare e.g. his translation of the previous sentence: ”Die Horuskinder zu Geb, Worte sprechen: “Die Blindheit seines Auges ist nicht (...); column 68, Schneider 2008: 252). He translated the passage: “der du blind warst; Wein aus ihrer Hand“. His argumentation for the use of šp is plausible. But the incomplete sentence “Wein aus ihrer Hand” has the syntactical structure of a Remark. It is rather uncommon for the document to add a Remark in the Speech part. šp is also attested with the meaning “ausfließen“ (Hannig 2006: 2438). As it is used in the context of poison and sniffing, the verb does not match the context of the sentence. Another possibility is the verb špꜣ (“to drink water”; van der Moolen 2000: 614), assuming a mispelling of the word. Concerning the translation “with” for m-ꜣ see Hannig 2006: 978. Another possibility would be “out of the hand of”.

B Only the back part of ḫ is still visible.

C An interpretation of ḫ is difficult. For a genitival construction with irt hrw (“the eye of Horus of the town of the temple/house”) we would expect the genitival adjective nt in front of niwt pr as it is very uncommon to have several direct genitives after each other (compare also Sethe 1928: 179). Sethe suggested to read a nisba adjective niwty (“one who belongs to a town”) modifying Horus and sees ḫ as a determinative. He translated the Remark: “das Horusauge einer Stadt”, and identified the eye of Horus with the wine. He assumed that the location niwt designates the place where the wine is cultivated. His argumentation seems convincing, but there would still be two direct genitives in a row. Another solution is to see niwt as an apposition to the eye of Horus. Sethe’s interpretation of niwt as the place of origin of the wine is still valid,
but the double direct genitive would be avoided (“the eye of Horus, the town”). Instead of interpreting as a determinative it is also possible to read the location as \( niwt \, pr \) – “the town of the temple”.

D For the nisba adjective \( imty \) instead of reading \( imt \) (Buto), see Sethe 1928: 179.

E The Remark \( im[t] \) belongs to columns 70 and 71. The sign \( \equiv \) is written in column 70, whereas the determinative \( \equiv \) is written in column 71.

F Sethe (1928: 177) could still identify Horus as the speaker of the column. Traces of \( \hat{n} \) and the plural sign \( \cdots \) are still visible so that the second party has to be identified with the children of Horus. Remains of \( \sim \) are also preserved. Based on PT 155, § 94a, that also deals with wine of Pelusium, Sethe restored the Speech as \( [n] \, s[nw:s \, ir.(i)] \) – “[nicht soll es sich wieder] tre[nnen von mir.”]. Sethe’s suggestion cannot be verified as barely any traces of the Speech are preserved. The verb \( snw \) would, however, build a pun with \( snwy \) in the second Remark. For the future translation of \( n \, sdm.f \), see note F, VI.4.2: 64.

VI.10.2 Scene 25 (cols. 72-75)

(72) \( hpr.n \, iniw \, \text{hrst \, hwit} \, [hrw \, p]w^A \, \hat{sdi.f} \, i\text{rt.f} \, m- \, \text{c stš} \)

(72) It happened that polished carnelian\(^B\) was brought. [It is Horus] who saves\(^C\) his eye from Seth.

(73) \( hrw \, stš \, \text{qd \, mdw} \, \hat{sdi.n.(i)} \, \text{irt.(i)} \, hrst.k \, // \, i\text{rt}[i] \, // \, [h]rst \, // \, hm^D \)

(73) Horus speaks words to Seth: So that you get distorted with rage is why (I) have saved (my) eye\(^E\) // The eye // Carnelian // Letopolis

(74) \( hrw \, stš \, \text{qd \, mdw} \, psd \, \hat{hsi.n.[s]}n^E \, kw \, // \, i\text{rt}^G \, // \, [h]rs[t] \, [...]^H \, // \, [...] \, // \, hm^{147} \)

(74) Horus speaks words to Seth: Turn away, after [they] have confronted you\(^J\) // The eye // Carnelian [...] // [...] // Letopolis

(75) \( hrw \, stš \, \text{qd \, mdw} \, ini \, n.(i) \, \text{irt.(i)} \, hrst(t).tn.k \)

(75) Horus speaks words to Seth: Bring (me

\(^{147}\) See note D below: 115.
Notes:

A There can be no doubt that the name of Horus has to be restored as the Explicatory sentence mentions “his eye” (compare also Sethe 1928: 180).

B Sethe (1928: 180f.) translated “Es geschah, daß eine ḫ.t-Kette aus Karneol herbeigebracht wurde“. Schneider (2008: 253) argued convincingly that ḥwít derives from the verb ḥwî (concerning the translation “polished” see Wb III: 48), and should not be read ḫt – an otherwise unattested word for necklace. Schneider translated “Es geschah, daß polierter Karneol gebracht wurde”. Carnelian is one of the more important semi-precious stones that is polished. It was used for small objects like amulets, Udjat-eyes, or beads (Harris 1961: 120f.). It has to be mentioned, however, that in column 76 a similar construction appears (ṯḥmt š♭bw – “fayence, namely a necklace”), where a material is mentioned followed by an object that is made out of that material. According to Sethe, the same word order is present in column 87: nbw šn – “gold, a ring”. I, however, suggest the reading n<š>bm(t) km(t) – “black curl” (see VI.13.3: 129f.). All three text passages are hard to translate as they include words that are only attested in the RDP – at least as far as the spelling of the words is concerned. Gestermann (2008: 41) suggested w iht – “Kranz”.


D The Remark ḫm belongs to columns 73 to 75. The sign ḫ is written in column 73, whereas the determinative */ is written in column 75. For the location Letopolis, see also VIII.d: 211.

E Sethe (1928: 180) translated “ich habe mein Auge genommen, deine Karneolperle“. His translation is problematic in two ways: šdi.n.i cannot be a perfect sdm.n.f as we would expect iw in front. Hence, it has to be an empahtic sdm.n.f, which requires an

\[dśr[t] m r.k // īr[t] dśr[t] // ḫs[rt]K // ḫm^{148}\] my eye that you have made distorted with rage¹, the one that was red in your mouth // The red eye // Carnelian // Letopolis

¹ See note D below: 115.
adverbial element in the sentence. If Sethe took hrst.k as an apposition for irt.(i), the sentence would be lacking an adverbial element. The only solution is to parse hrst.k as a verb building a short subordinate clause and a pun with hrst (“carnelian”) in col. 72. For the translation “to be distorted with rage”, see Wb II: 151 (“wutgeröitet sein”).

Concerning the identification of carnelian with anger and violence, but also protection, based on the red colour of the stone, see Aufrère 1991 I: 216-17 and II: 554-56; Andrews 1994: 102. It is also questionable that Horus would identify his own eye with Seth’s carnelian stone.

F  The reconstruction of the suffix pronoun sn is based on Sethe’s reading (Sethe 1928: 180), who mentioned that Ibscher was able to see remains of the letter s.

G  Sethe (1928: 180ff.) argued that the column was wider and restored another next to the one that is preserved and read irty – “two eyes”. It has to be stated, however, that no remains are preserved of the second irt. Additionally, the column would be much wider than the other columns of the papyrus.

H  Based on the Remark in the preceding column 73, the restoration of hrst is logical. Sethe (1928: 180ff.) assumed the writing hrsty – based on the assumption that the column was wider than it is preserved today and based on his reconstruction of irty (“two eyes”) in the preceding column. As mentioned in note G above, there is no proof that this column was indeed wider. In his plate 17 Sethe left space between the first row of signs in the Remark and the second row. I think there is no need for it. Instead the two rows can be drawn closer to each other so that the scarce remains at the right side of the column belong to the right end of the first eye and not the second one. After hrst Sethe restored ḫty pꜣt – „zwei sogenannte [Menschen]bäuche”. The remains are too scarce to verify Sethe’s reading or suggest another solution. Schneider (2008: 254) read hrst šdt – “Die gerettete Karneolperle”. In the context of the Scene his reading is more convincing as one has to raise the question why the two carnelian stones should be identified with two human bellies.

I  Sethe (1928: 180ff.) restored a third Remark, of which he could only identify the hieroglyph □. The remains fit this reading, but not enough of the sign is preserved to
verify it absolutely. Sethe suggested a location called \( hr \, dlhwty \) – “Aufenthaltsort [des Thoth(?)]”, attested in PT 534, § 1271c or \( hr^{c}h^{j} \) - “Kampfplatz (Babylon bei Kairo)”. J

Sethe (1928: 181) translated “wende den Rücken, wenn sie dich grimmig angeblickt haben“. Instead of reading \( hsi.n.sn \) \( (hsi \) – „umkehren, entgegentreten“; Hannig 2006: 1767f. and Wb III: 159) he read \( hsi^{-}n.sn \) \( (hsi \) - “grimmig”; Wb III: 161). It has to be mentioned that \( hsi \) is only attested as an adjective and not a verb. Schneider (2008: 254) suggested a different reading: \( psd(i) \, hsi \, <n> \, snkw \) – “Mein Leuchten hat sich der Finsternis entgegengestellt“. He argued that the use of the archaic form of the dependent pronoun \( (kw) \) is peculiar. But the document shows some archaic writings, and the dependent pronoun \( kw \) is already attested in column 28 \( (sd.n \, hrw \, ng.f \, kw \) – “so that he can protect you is why Horus has taken”; see VI.5.1: 67).

K

Sethe (1928: 180 and 184f.) assumed a location in the second Remark and restored \( hrst \) – “die \( hsf[r.t](?) \)”, thinking of the name of the necropolis in Hermopolis. He had to admit, however, that the reason for mentioning the necropolis in this Remark is unclear. Based on the design of the preceeding columns, I suggest to read \( hrst \) (“carnelian”) again, especially since \( hm \) – Letopolis (third Remark of columns 73-75) already designates a location.

L

Sethe (1928: 181 and 184) parsed \( hrst \, n.k \) and translated “das karneolrot ward für dich”. For the translation \( hrs \) – “to be distorted with rage”, see note E above: 115f. It is also possible to follow Sethe’s parsing and parse \( hrst \) as a participle like \( d\delta rt \) and not a relative form: “Bring (me my) eye, the one that was distorted with rage for you and that was red in your mouth”.

VI.10.3 Vignette 15

Vignette 15 represents Scene 24 (cols. 69-71) and is illustrated under columns 69-75. The action of Scene 25 (cols. 72-75) is not depicted. The left part of the Vignette shows again the sacred bark with the king inside a shrine. As the depiction is partly destroyed, it is not clear whether the ruler carries a staff in his right hand like in Vignette 12. The contures of the figure are also drawn simpler. The king is not depicted wearing his kilt and the uraeus. He is, however, identified as the ruler by the caption above the bark, that reads again \( nsw \, it \, hq^{j} \) –
“the king, the father of the ruler”. The right part of the illustration shows a woman carrying a vessel on her head. The caption, *fiit irp msw nsw* – “Bringing of wine, royal children” – makes it clear that the Vignette represents Scene 24. It is surprising that the royal children are embodied by a female person. In agreement with Sethe (1928: 253), I think that the space to the right of the woman was not filled by a drawing. The papyrus is, indeed, partly destroyed at this point, but not as badly so that at least traces of signs would still be visible.

Notes:
A Sethe (1928: 253) assumed that the Egyptian scribe forgot to include the particle *in* before *msw nsw* and translated “das Auftragen des Weines durch die Königskinder”.

**VI.11 Sequence 11 (cols. 76-79)**
Sequence 11 comprises Scene 26 (cols. 76-79) and Vignette 16.

**VI.11.1 Scene 26 (cols. 76-79)**

(76) *hpr.n iniw Ḟnt šbwA hrw pw wḏ.f n*

(...B) *f ini.t(w) n.f irt.f wḏt m bw nb*

(76) It happened that faience, namely a necklace, was brought. It is Horus who orders his [...] that his green eye is brought to him from anywhere/anyone.

(77) *ḥrw msw [ḥrw] ḡd mdw ini n.i) irt.(i)*

*ṭḥnt šs[...].sD // irt // ṭḥnt šs[bw]E // [...]*

(77) Horus speaks words to the children of [Horus]: Bring (me my) green eye [...] // The eye // Faience, namely a necklace // [...]

(78) *ḥrw msw ḫrw ḫtw ššt ḡd mdw m n.i)*

*irt.(i) Ḟnt hr.(i) // ir[t] // Ḟnt // ḫr[y Ḟnw]*

(78) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus and the followers of Seth: Take for (me my) eye, which brightens (my) face // The eye // Faience // Cheri-tjehenu

---

149 Sethe (1928: 252) read *nsw ḫqį.ty.fy* and translated accordingly “the king, the one who will rule” (compare VI.9.2: 99f. and VIII.e: 215ff.).
Horus speaks words to the children of Horus and the followers of Seth: What he has crossed // The eye // Baboon chapels // Cheri-tjehenu

Notes:

A The word šibw with the determinative ♂ is not attested elsewhere (compare Hannig 2006: 2423). Sethe (1928: 185) transliterated šitbw, but he mentioned that the position of the t (in front of the b) is uncommon. It is possible that it is not a t, but rather a dot that the ancient Egyptian scribe placed to draw the lines (compare IV: 30ff.). Sethe translated the word as “šitb.w-Kette”. The only other meaning of šib is “blind” (Hannig 2006: 2423), which does not fit the context of the sentence. Unfortunately, the accompanying Vignette is partly destroyed so that it does not help in identifying the object that is brought. Based on the determinative, Sethe’s suggestion of a necklace might be correct.

B Sethe (1928: 185) could still read msw.

C It is also possible that wḏ does not represent the colour “green” here, but has to be translated as “healthy” referring to Horus’ restored eye.

D Only remains of signs are preserved after ši. Sethe (1928: 185) amended ši[tb].tn.f [i]m.s – “das er verschont(?) hat“. A verb šitb or šib is not attested. Sethe (1928: 187) suggested hšib “verschonen”.

E It is convincing that Sethe (1928: 185) reconstructed šif[t][bw] so that the second Remark refers to the object that is brought in the Scene.

F Only remains are preserved of the third Remark, which do not allow a transliteration. Sethe (1928: 185 and 187f.) suggested hmwt n(w)t ṯknw – “die lybischen Frauen“. I agree with Sethe that the mentioning of ṯknw (Lybia) makes sense as the word builds a pun with thnt (fayence). Additionally, the sign ⃞ is preserved at the end of the Remark, which matches the writing of ṯknw (⃞). Sethe was also sure that the remains in front of ṯknw have to be read hmwt. He suggested that the Libyan women

---

150 See note H below: 120.
might have worn the fayence necklaces. I think that the term was rather chosen to build a pun with $thnt$ – “faience” (see also VIII.a, Sequence 11: 191). Not enough traces of the word before $thnw$ are preserved so that Sethe’s reading of $hmwt$ cannot be verified.

G Sethe (1928: 185ff.) did not think that the material is mentioned here, but the object building an apposition to the eye. Hence, he translated “Bringt mir mein Auge, mein Perlenschmuckgehänge”. He compared the sentence with the mentioning of $hrst.k$ in the Speech in column 73, which he translated accordingly “ich habe mein Auge genommen, meine Karneolperle”. For the different translation of $hrst.k$, see note E, VI.10.2: 115f. As in column 76 (see note C above: 119), it is possible that $w$ $d$ has to be translated as “healthy”.

H The Remark $hry$ $thnw$ belongs to columns 78 and 79. The signs $\otimes$ are written in column 78, while the hieroglyphs $\boxw$ stand in column 79. $hry$ $thnw$ constitutes a cult place of Thoth in Hermopolis (see Wb V: 394; compare Sethe 1928: 189). Schott (1984: 266) argued that $hry$ $thnw$ designates the place, from where the faience necklace was brought. See also VIII.d: 212.

I Sethe (1928: 185 and 188) translated “was soll mir mein Auge, das mein Gesicht heiter machte?“ He argued that $\boxz$ cannot be the imperative „geben“ as one would expect the writing $\boxm$. He further mentioned that the imperative does not match the context of the sentence. The meaning of “was soll mir mein Auge” is, however, not clear. The writing $\boxz$ could be the imperative “take” – as in column 55, where Sethe himself translated “Nimm”. The translation “to make happy” for $thn$ is not attested besides the RDP (see $thn$-$hr$; Hannig 2006: 2750). Hence, I take $thn$ in its common meaning “to brighten” (Hannig 2006: 2750).

J The translation of $sibt$.n.$f$ is difficult. The subject can only be Seth (compare also Sethe 1928: 185). It is, however, not clear what Seth has crossed.

K In accordance with Sethe (1928: 189), I think that $sibt$ has to be an amulet or small piece of jewellery out of faience, which looks like the determinative ($\boxh$). Sethe referred to an instrument that is offered to goddesses in temple scenes. Borchardt accounted it as a clepsydra, but his identification is not sure. These instruments or
amulets were associated with Thoth and were used to please Hathor (Sethe 1928: 189).

**VI.11.2 Vignette 16**

Vignette 16 represents Scene 26 (cols. 76-79) and is drawn directly under the Scene. The beginning of the illustration shows the king in a shrine on the sacred bark, carrying a staff in his right hand and a mace in his left hand. A uraeus is attached to his forehead. The caption above the shrine reads “king” (*nsw*). The back of the head as well as the shoulders of a standing person are preserved in front of the shrine. The man is identified by the caption as *iry ht nsw* – “the one who is connected to the cultic largess of the king”\(^{151}\). Based on the text of Scene 26, one can conclude that the man originally carried the faience necklace towards the royal image. It is worth mentioning that the official is depicted on a larger scale as the king in his shrine, which is only explainable if the king is represented by a non lifesize statue (see VIII.e: 215ff. and X: 238ff.). Unfortunately, the caption referring to the action is also mainly destroyed. The signs could be read *nt* (←) – the compliment of the sign 𓊃, building the word *tnt* – “faience”. But as Sethe (1928: 253) already mentioned, the determinative as well as the plural signs of the word would be missing as the space between *nt* and *iry ht nsw* is not large enough. In addition, a sign must have been written above *nt*, that cannot have been 𓊃 due to the lack of space. Sethe reconstructed the entire caption as *dit tnt [in] iry ht nsw* – “das Geben der Fayence durch den Königsabkömmling”.

**VI.12 Sequence 12 (cols. 80-82)**

Sequence 12 comprises Scenes 27-28 (cols. 80-82) as well as Vignettes 17 and 18.

**VI.12.1 Scene 27 (cols. 80-81)**

\(^{(80)}\) *hpr.n fīt htp n nsw in iryw iفرض wdpw*\(^{152}\)  
\(^{(80)}\) It happened that a *htp*-offering was brought to the king by the “ones who are responsible for the *iفرض* and stewards”. It is

\(^{151}\) See note B, VI.1.3: 45 and VIII.b: 202f.

\(^{152}\) For the reading of *iryw iفرض wdpw*, see note A, VI.2.2: 51 and VIII.b: 203f.
Thoth who brings the eye of Horus to him.

(81) ḏḥwty ḫrw ḏd Ṁdw mn n.k irt.k ḫtp // Giving of the eye of Horus // [ ... ] //

(81) Thoth speaks words to Horus: Take for yourself your eye and be satisfied with [...] //

Notes:

A The word order in the sentence is peculiar. One would rather expect the pronominal direct object in front of the nominal direct object: ... ḏī.f n.f irt ḫrw. Maybe irt ḫrw was written before n.f because of honorific transposition.

B Traces of ☞ are still visible. Sethe’s reconstruction of s – referring back to the eye of Horus – after ḫr is plausible (Sethe 1928: 190).

C Only traces of dit irt ḫrw are preserved, but the signs ☞ are clearly identifiable.

D Only the hieroglyph ⲧ is preserved of the second Remark. Sethe (1928: 190f.) reconstructed [dit] ḫ[ī.t] – “[das Geben] des Mah[les]”.

E Column 81 also includes the second Speech of Scene 27 as well as the Introduction of Scene 28. Most likely the ancient scribe forgot to copy the lines and only noticed his mistake after he had already written down column 82 – the text was written from right to left (see IV: 30ff.).

F The tail of the Horus bird is still visible. Sethe (1928: 190) restored the children of Horus and Horus as the speakers (“Die Horus[kinder] sprechen Worte zu Horus”). The sign ☞ of ḏd Ṁdw is preserved, written in a flat way probably due to the limited amount of space. The ☞ was either forgotten by the scribe or was placed erroneously in front of the ☞ (compare Sethe 1928: 191).

———

The verb *fš₂i* is only written with the ~ in the Speech as well as in the following Remark, most likely because of the limited space (see Sethe 1928: 192).

Based on PT 92, § 61c (*mn n.k irt hrw fš₂i(i) n.k sy r hr.k*), Sethe (1928: 192) included the dependent pronoun *sy* referring to the eye of Horus. His argumentation is convincing as the eye of Horus is also mentioned in the following Remark. The insertion of the preposition *r* in front of *hr.k* is necessary, although Sethe did not include it. Lorand (2009: 106) translated the signs *[..] ~* as “nous l’apportons pour toi, (pour ta face)”. It has to be mentioned, however, that the 1st plural suffix pronoun is not written in the text. The letter *n* is part of the dative object *n.k*.

**VI.12.2 Vignette 17**

Vignette 17 represents Scene 27 and is written under Scene 27 (cols. 80-81) as well as under Scene 18 (cols. 80-81). It shows the shrine on the sacred bark again, but this time the partly destroyed shrine is empty although the name *nsw* – “king” is written above the depiction. A *iry iʰh wdpw* (“official”) is bringing a *htp*-offering towards the shrine. The action is described as *dit htp n* – “bringing a *htp*-offering to”. In accordance with Sethe (1928: 253), I think that the caption has to be read as *dit htp n nsw* (“bringing the offering to the king”). The word order might be mixed up (*[..] ~* *iry ioH wdpw*) because the scribe did not want to repeat the word *nsw* due to the limited amount of space – the word *nsw* already appears above the shrine. The following *iry iʰh wdpw* can either be a caption standing on its own, or can, as Sethe assumed, be connected to the description of the action by a missing particle *in* (*dit htp n nsw [in] iɾy iʰh wdpw* – „das Geben des *htp*-Mahles an den König durch den śpr-wdp.w”).

Notes:

A For the reason why the shrine is depicted empty, see VIII.e: 215ff. and X: 238ff.

**VI.12.3 Scene 28 (cols. 81-82)**

(81) A[ḥpr.n] ḏbn₄ <šḧw>³ ʃḥ [..]³ k₃ ᵦty [81] [It happened] that the “ones who *bik* (82) ḡḥwty p[w] iṭi.fṣirty hrw n.]*¹⁵⁴ embrace the Akh” [..] went around the two

¹⁵⁴ For the peculiar word order, see note A, VI.12.1: 122.
falcon standards. (82) It is Thoth who takes the two eyes of Horus for him.

(82)  hrw dḥwty F ḏd mdw iš n.k išty.k bik irt ḫ
h.r.k // irt // išty bik // wp wšt mh[t]

(82) Horus speaks words to Thoth: Take for youself your two falcon standards that belong toG your face // Two eyes // Two falcon standards // Opening of the northern wayH

Notes:
A The Introduction of Scene 28 must have been written at the end of column 81 as column 82 starts with an Explicatory sentence (see note E, VI.12.1: 122).

B Sethe (1928: 192f.) read phr instead of dbn. As both have a similar meaning, a decision is hard. Concerning the translation of phr “umwenden, herumgehen, durchziehen” etc., see Hannig 2006: 935ff. and Wb I: 544ff. Regarding dbn “umkreisen, durchziehen”, see Hannig 2006: 2774f. and Wb V: 437.

C The amendment of shnw is based on the appearance of the title in the accompanying Vignette. For a discussion on the title, see VIII.b: 205ff.

D Sethe (1928: 192f.) suggested the title iryw ḫt nsw (concerning the reading of iryw ḫt nsw, see note B, VI.1.3: 45 and VIII.b: 202f.). The Vignette is partly destroyed so that it cannot be verified if indeed the “ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king” are mentioned next to the “ones who embrace the Akh”.

E Following Sethe (1928: 194) who argued convincingly that the word for the two standards with a falcon on top has to be read in a feminine form; the Speech in column 82 refers to them by the word irt — “two eyes”. Sethe referred to PT 254, § 288c, which mentions the erection of the išty (חרפ), showing the same determinative for the two standards as in column 81. A parallel text provides the writing of išty with the classical determinative (☞). The word bik is added after išty in the RDP to take account of the falcon sitting on top of the standards.

F Only traces of ☞ are still visible.
Sethe (1928: 192 and 195) translated the nisba *irty* and the following noun *hr.k* as “die vor deinem Angesicht sind”. The common meaning of *iry/irty* is, however, “belonging to” or “to be on something” (Wb I: 103f.). The translation “to be in front of something” is not attested. Sethe argued that the image of taking the eyes into the face can only apply to Horus and not to Thoth.

Sethe (1928: 195) identified the god Wepwawet, representing Lower Egypt. The translation above is chosen as the third Remark usually refers to a location (see also VIII.a, Sequence 12: 192). Another translation could be “the one who opens the northern way”. The writing for the god Wepwawet generally shows the plural of *wšt* (lit. “the opener of the ways’’); compare, for example, PT 482, § 1009c ((Graphics).

**VI.12.4 Vignette 18**

Vignette 18 represents Scene 28 (cols. 81-82) and is depicted under the following Scene 29 (cols. 83-85). The depiction shows the “one who embraces the Akh”, identified by the caption above. He is wearing a sash and probably a panther skin – the tail is visible in the illustration. He is holding a palm frond in his left hand and a bend stick with a ring at the lower end in his right hand. The rest of the Vignette is completely destroyed. At the right end, however, there are little remains that could belong to a palm frond so that possibly another *sḥn ḫḥ* was originally depicted here (compare Sethe 1928: 254 and Tf. 18). In accordance with Sethe, I think that one of the two falcon standards mentioned in column 81 was depicted in between the two men, summarizing the action of Scene 28 as the going around the two standards. I further agree with Sethe that there is space for the reconstruction of only one, and not two standards. Sethe added fragment 9, showing the base of a standard, here. As the fragments are lost today his suggestion cannot be verified. Only a dot is preserved from the caption describing the action of the illustration. Sethe reconstructed convincingly “Umzug” (Graphics) based on the text of Scene 28. As mentioned in note B, V.12.3: 124, it cannot be said for certain whether *prḥ* (Sethe 1928: 192f.) or *dbn* has to be read.
VI.13 Sequence 13 (cols. 83-96)

Sequence 13 comprises Scenes 29-33 (cols. 83-96) as well as Vignettes 19-21. Scene 30 is not represented by a Vignette.

VI.13.1 Scene 29 (cols. 83-86)

(83) hpr.n iniw c'ōwyA wįh(w) šwtyB n nsw
hrw pw[w] [i']b.f ins(wy) stš šhm[...]\textsuperscript{D}

(83) It happened that two ḫš-scepters were brought and that two šwty-feathers were given to the king. It is Horus who offers the testicle(s)\textsuperscript{E} of Seth so that [...] be mighty.

(84) dhwty [...]\textsuperscript{F} dd [mdw ijcb n[...]\textsuperscript{G} // [...]\textsuperscript{H} // [...]\textsuperscript{I} c'š[wjy] // [...]\textsuperscript{J}

(84) Thoth speaks [words to ...]: Offer for [...] // [...] // [...] the [two] ḫš-scepters // [...] [command to give again]

(85) [...]\textsuperscript{K} hrw dd mdw šhm.t(w).k\textsuperscript{L} // ins(wy)\textsuperscript{155} stš // šhm // [...]\textsuperscript{M}

(85) [...] speaks word to Horus: You are supposed to be given power // Testicle(s) of Seth // Power\textsuperscript{N} // [...] [command to give again]

(86) hrw msw hrw htw stš dd mdw wįh n.(i)
s(y) m // irt // wįh šwty // [...]\textsuperscript{O} wįt hrw

(86) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus and the followers of Seth: Indeed, give it to (me) // The eye // Giving the šwty-feathers // [...] way of Horus

Notes:

A Only the upper part of the first flagsign is still visible. Based on the caption of the accompanying Vignette the reading of ḫšwî is certain. The reading of ḫš, and not šhm for flagsign is preferred as the verb (i'c'b) in the following Explicatory sentence builds a pun with the two scepters (see also Sethe 1928: 196).

B The two signs seem to be the šwty-feathers. One might also think of two šhm-scepters as the second verb in the Explicatory sentence is šhm and would, hence, build a pun.

\textsuperscript{155} See note E below: 127.
with the $shm$-scepters like the two $\text{`b\text{\-
}}$-scepters and the verb $i\text{`b}$ (see note A above).

The hieroglyph for $\text{`b\text{\-
}}$ and $shm$ is the same (\textcircled{1}). As the two sign pairs look different – the first one is open at the top and has a rectangular form, while the second pair is closed at the top and has a round form – I agree with Sethe (1928: 196) that the second pair has to be identified with the $\text{`swty}$-feathers, and not the $shm$-scepter.

C Only the letter $b$ and the suffix pronoun $f$ are preserved. The reconstruction of the verb $i\text{`b}$ is based on Sethe 1928: 195f. The amendment is convincing as the verb builds a pun with the $\text{`b\text{\-
}}$-scepters mentioned in the Introduction. Sethe translated “Horus ist das, der sich die Hoden des Seth einverleibt“. He referred to PT 87, § 60a where we read: $i\text{`b}$ $n.k$ $sy$ $r$ $r.k$ – “absorb it for yourself in your mouth”. There is no indirect object in the Explicatory sentence of column 83 so that I prefer the translation “It is Horus who offers the testicle(s) of Seth”. For the translation “offer” for $i\text{`b}$, see Hannig 2006: 104.

D Sethe (1928: 196f.) completed $shm.f$ – “[damit er] (Zeugungs)vermögen gewinne“. The amendment of the suffix pronoun is convincing. It is, however, also possible that the verb is not referring to sexual power, but to power in general that Horus gains by being supplied with the royal insignia.

E The text shows the singular. As the topic of the Scene are the different insignia, mentioned in pairs, the reading of the testicles in the dual is logical.

F Sethe (1928: 195f.) reconstructed Horus as the addressee of the Speech.

G Sethe (1928: 195ff.) amended convincingly $i\text{`b}$ $n.k$ $[sn]$ – “verleibe [sie] dir ein“, refering to the testicles of Seth mentioned in the preceding column.

H Based on the Explicatory sentence in the preceding column 83, Sethe’s (1928: 195ff.) amendment of $\text{`inswy st}\text{\-
}\$ – “die Hoden des Seth” is persuasive.

I In accordance with the second Remark of column 86 ($\text{`w}\text{\-
}\text{`w}\text{\-
}$ $\text{`swty}$), Sethe (1928: 195ff.) reconstructed the infinitive of $\text{`rdi}$: $dit$ $\text{`b}\text{\-
}\text{\-
}\text{\-
}\text{\-
}\text{\-
}\text{\-
}$ $\text{`swy}$ – “[die beiden $\text{`b\text{\-
}}$-]Szepter [geben]”.

J Sethe (1928: 195f.) did not provide a suggestion for the third Remark as not enough traces of signs are preserved. Probably something similar to the third Remark in column 86 (… $\text{`w}\text{\-
}$ $\text{`hrw}$) is to be expected. Both columns show a similar layout: column 84 focuses on the $\text{`b\text{\-
}}$-scepters, while column 86 discusses the $\text{`swty}$-feathers.
K Sethe (1928: 195f.) identified convincingly Thoth as the speaker, like in the preceding column 84.

L Sethe (1928: 196f.) parsed shmt.k as a noun and translated “dein (Zeugungs)-Vermögen”. He argued that the noun continues the idea of the absorption of the testicles of Seth. He was of the opinion that the Speech refers to the testicles of Seth mentioned in the following Remark. Sethe’s translation rather has the form of a Remark than a Speech, however. Hence, I suggest to translate “may you be given power”. I think that the short sentence states the powerful condition of Horus after receiving the royal insignia, which are identified with the testicles of Seth. The second Remark would support this interpretation (see note N below: 128).

M Only a small stroke of the sign is preserved. Sethe (1928: 195ff.) suggested to read “[der Got]tes[weg(?)]”. The remains can support the reading of ↓, but not enough is preserved of the sign to verify the reading. Based on the Remark in the following column 86, Sethe restored wît in front of ntr.

N Sethe (1928: 196f.) translated a verb “Macht gewinnen” and mentioned that the verb is refering to the power Horus gained through the insignia now, and not the sexual power anymore.

O The signs ✠ and ⤔ are clearly visible, whereas there are only scarce remains of the two first signs. Sethe (1928: 195f. and 198) reconstructed ✠ and ⤔ and read šêi wr – “der große Sand”. He thought that the Remark refers to the “High Sand” at Heliopolis. Not enough traces of the first two signs are preserved to verify Sethe’s amendment. Additionally, the word šêi with ✠ as a determinative is only attested in the RDP (Wb IV: 419). It is also hard to decide whether the bird following ✠ is the Horus bird or the swallow. Both signs are written in a very similar way in the document (see Horus at the beginning of column 86 and the swallow (im3 wr) in the second Remark of column 92).

VI.13.2 Vignette 19

Vignette 19 represents Scene 29 (cols. 83-86) and is illustrated under cols. 86-87. Hence, it occupies the space of the first column of the succeeding Scene 30, that is not depicted by a
Vignette. The illustration shows an empty shrine on the bark with the caption nsw – “king”. On the right side a lector priest – identified by the caption (ḥry-ḥb) – is walking towards the shrine, carrying two ʾbḥ scepters and two šwty-feathers. The caption summarizes the action: di[t] ʾbḥ šwty – “Giving two ʾbḥ scepters and two šwty-feathers”. Sethe (1928: 254) suggested again to read all three captions in one: dit ʾbḥ šwty [n] nsw [in] ḥry-ḥb – “Giving of two ʾbḥ scepters and two šwty-feathers [to] the king [by] the lector priest”.

VI.13.3 Scene 30 (cols. 87-88)

(87) hpr.n iniw n<3>b(t) km(t)ḥ hrw pw wdb.f  (87) It happened that a black curl was brought. It is Horus who turns towards Geb [...] his eye.

g[bB ...] ir[t].f

(88) hrw gb dd mdw ʾši(w) n.f.r.f ḥr [i]t(ī)C pn  (88) Horus speaks words to Geb: Because of this father (of mine it) was indeed determined for himF [...] // Black hair

// [...]D // ʾšni kmE

Notes:

A The item that is brought in Scene 30 is difficult to identify, especially since the Scene is not represented in a Vignette. Sethe (1928: 198f.) read nb šn and translated “ein Ring(?) aus Gold(?)” (see also Barta 1972: 5). He assumed that in accordance with columns 72 and 76 first the material and then the object is mentioned; in column 72 he translated “eine ḥt-Kette aus Karneol” (ḥrst hwit) and in column 76 “eine štbow-Kette aus Fayence” (ṭḥnt ṣtboww). For a different translation for column 72, see above note B, VI.10.2: 115. Frankfort (1969: 130, especially footnote 10) seemed to support Sethe’s reading, but argued that a ring was not part of the regalia. Consequently, he identified the object as a gold diadem. Sethe’s reading of nb šn is, however, questionable. The first word is, indeed, spelled nb, but the determinative does not fit the writing for nb – “gold” (ˁnḥ). The sign is hard to identify, but might depict a curl. If this assumption is correct the word would be missing the ī as well as the t-ending (concerning nḥbt “Locke” see Hannig 2006: 1199). The sign following nḥbt is also
hard to read. Based on the second Remark in the following column 88, Sethe suggested šn – the determinative of the word in the Remark is identical with the sign in column 87 and is spelled šn. The sign is, however, not ☮ as Sethe assumed. It rather reminds me of km (☞). In addition, the RDP is the only attestation for the word šn – “ring” besides a 21st dynasty papyrus, where the word is attested as šni (Hannig 2006: 2467; Wb IV: 488). A gold ring is mentioned in the Contendings of Horus and Seth, but here the expression htm šni n nbw – “a little seal ring of gold” is used (Gardiner 1932: 43, line 5.8). Hence, I suggest the reading nḥḥt km(t) (see also Gestermann 2008: 34).

B The ☮ is preserved. Based on the speakers of the following column 88, the reconstruction of Geb is plausible (see also Sethe 1928: 198). Sethe convincingly restored the preposition hr after Geb, translating “Horus ist das, der sich an Geb wendet wegen seines Auges”.

C The reading of it is based on Sethe (1928: 198). The t is destroyed.

D The text of the first Remark is destroyed. Sethe (1928: 198 and 200) could identify parts of the Seth animal and reconstructed “[das] Au[ge] gegen] Seth”. Too few traces of signs are preserved to verify this reading. Additionally, the amendment “the eye against” is solely based on Sethe’s interpretation of the Speech, namely that the eye is Seth’s fate.

E Sethe (1928: 198 and 200) read šn – “der Ring”. As mentioned in note A above the determinative is not the sign ☮ as Sethe assumed. Hence, I prefer the reading šni km – “black hair”; concerning šni – “hair” see Hannig 2006: 2471. The separation line after the Remark indicates that a third Remark followed. No traces are preserved and although the document is partly destroyed here, enough pieces of the papyrus are preserved so that at least traces of signs should be readable. Hence, it has to be doubted that, indeed, a third Remark was written down. The small spot identified by Sethe (1928: 200) as belonging to a sign (maybe ☮) might be a dot applied by the ancient scribe as a help for drawing the line (see IV: 30ff.).

F Sethe (1928: 198) translated differently: “er hat (es) bestimmt gegen sich wegen dieses meines Vater“. He parsed a sdm.n.f at the beginning instead of a passive
sdm(w), f and r.f as “against him” instead of the particle rf. The interpretation of the sentence is difficult. In agreement with Sethe, I think that the suffix pronoun f refers to Seth. Sethe argued that fate is directed against Seth, which makes sense in the context of the text.

VI.13.4 Scene 32 (cols. 89-90)

(89) hpr.n dd.t(w) mi<sup>A</sup> wrw šmr w mh w dh w ty
<pw> di.f phr n tr w n h r w hr gb

(89) It happened that it was said: Come, Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt!<sup>B</sup> <It is> Thoth who causes that the gods serve Horus on Geb’s behest.

(90) gb msw h rw ht w st š dd md w [...]C hr w twi<sup>D</sup> nb.t n // [...]E // hr w ///F iwt wr w šmr w mh w

(90) Geb speaks words to the children of Horus and the followers of Seth: [...] Horus, as you are your lord // [...] // Horus // Coming of the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt

Notes:

A The reading of the imperative mi “come” (ַכ) is supported by the caption of the accompanying Vignette.

B Sethe (1928: 202) assumed a missing dative n and translated “kommt herbei (zu) den Großen von Ober- und den Großen von Unterägypten“. He mentioned, however, the possibility of a vocative.

C Sethe (1928: 201ff.) reconstructed phr in the lacuna and translated: “[wartet auf dem] Horus.” Based on the Explicatory sentence in the preceding column 89 (“<it is> Thoth who causes that the gods serve Horus on Geb’s behest”), Sethe’s amendment is persuasive.

D The second person singular independent pronoun most likely refers to Horus who is mentioned in the second Remark. One would, however, rather expect the third person

---

<sup>156</sup> Scenes 31 and 33 are depicted together in the succeeding Vignette 21, whereas Scene 32 is illustrated in Vignette 20. Hence, the transliteration and translation of Scene 32 is written before Scene 31.
singular pronoun *swt* or *ntf* as the second person pronoun in the Speech usually addresses the speaking partner (see Sethe 1928: 203). In addition, one would rather expect the third person plural suffix pronoun *sn* after the following *nb*, and not the second person plural.

E Sethe (1928: 201, especially footnote 2) amended *phr nṯrw* – “das Aufwarten der Götter“. He pointed out that the signs were clearly readable on older photographs. The sign traces of the document today support the reading.

F In accordance with Sethe (1928: 203), I think that the word Horus builds a Remark on its own, although the separation line is missing between *ḥrw* and *iw† ṣmr ṣmḥw*.

**VI.13.5 Vignette 20**

Vignette 20 represents Scene 32 (cols. 89-90) and starts already below the last column of Sequence 19 (col. 88). It shows on the left side a lector priest, identified by the caption *ḥry-hb*. He is depicted in the gesture of talking or calling (see Dominicus 1994: 77ff.). Facing him are two men in flexed composure, expressing the gesture of reverence (Dominicus 1994: 21ff.). They are depicted on a smaller scale than the lector priest. Both men are identified by the caption as *wr(w) ṣmr ṣmḥw* – “the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt”. The heading between the priest and the two men summarizes the action as *ḏd mdw mi* – “words to speak: Come!”, i.e. the lector priest invites the Great ones from Upper and Lower Egypt to come.

**VI.13.6 Scene 31 (col. 89)**

(89) \^hpr.n ini[w\(^B\) \(wd\)]n\(^C\) m spty \(ḏd \(mdw\)

(89) It happened that a *wdn*-offering was brought from the two districts. Recitation

Notes:

A Scene 31 consists only of the Explicatory sentence followed by *ḏd mdw*, probably indicating the Speech that generally comes after the Explicatory sentence. The ancient scribe most likely ran out of space and abbreviated the Scene (see Sethe 1928: 201).
B The verb *ini* usually shows the *w*-ending for the past passive *sdm(w).f* in the Explicatory sentence (see, for example, cols. 83 and 87). The ancient scribe probably left it out due to space constraints (see note A above).

C The amendment of *wdn* is based on the caption of the accompanying Vignette (*wdn m spty*; see also Sethe 1928: 201).

**VI.13.7 Scene 33 (cols. 91-96)**

(91) *hpr.n iniw [...] nswA ḏḥwty [pw...]B*  
(91) It happened that was brought [...] king.  
[It is] Thoth [...].

(92) *[..]C ḫrw ḏḏ mdw mn n.k irt.k <w>d[r]t]D r hr.k // [...]E // wšḏw // šwt wrtF*  
(92) [...] speaks words to Horus: Take for yourself your healthy eye to your face // [...] // Green eye paint // The great feather

(93) *ḏḥwty ḫrw ḏḏ mdw sḏm n.k s(y) r hr.k // [...]G // msdmt // ziḏwH*  
(93) Thoth speaks word to Horus: Insert it for yourself in your face // [...] // Black eye paint // What protects

(94) *ḏḥwty ḫrw ḏḏ mdw imi irt.k iḥrr.s iḥrr.t(i) [...] // irt // iḥrrt // kmI*  
(94) Thoth speaks words to Horus: Your eye shall not dim itself so that it is dim [...] // The eye // Grapes // What is black

(95) *[..]J ḏḏ mdw mn n.k [...]rt pr[...]K // irt // snṭr // smnL*  
(95) [...] speaks words to [...]]: Take for yourself [...] came out [...] // The eye // Incense // What lets endure

(96) *[..]L ḫrw ḏḏ mdw ḫr.k ḥr.k im.s pḏpḏ //*  
(96) [...] speaks words to Horus: Widen for

---

157 See note E, VI.4.1: 59.  
158 See note E below: 134.  
159 See note F below: 134f.  
160 See note F below: 134f.  
161 See note E, VI.4.1: 59.
irt // p<i>dwym

... yourself your face by means of it, so that it diffuses\textsuperscript{N} // The eye // Two balls of incense

Notes:

A The Introduction is mainly lost. Only traces of $hpr.n\ iniw$ as well as \textit{nsw} are preserved. Sethe (1928: 203f.) reconstructed $hpr.n\ iniw [...] r [...] in\ hry-hb\ dij\ f\ n\ nsw$ – “Es geschah, daß [allerlei kosmetische Stoffe] herbeigebraucht wurden [von] dem [Vorlesepriester], damit er (sie) dem König [gäbe]“. I agree with Sethe that the space is too limited for an enumeration of the different products (green eye paint, black eye paint, grapes, and incense) mentioned in the following columns and the accompanying Vignette. Maybe a summarizing term like $ht\ sptst\ ²šút$ – “numerous valuable products” has to be reconstructed. Sethe further stated that the lector priest is most likely the person who brought the different products, based on the mentioning of a lector priest in the Vignette. The caption of the depiction is partly destroyed, but the letter \textit{ḥ} is still readable and could belong to the word lector priest (\textit{ḥm}, see VI.13.8: 137). A verb that explains the action in the Vignette is not preserved so that Sethe’s reconstruction of $\textit{di.f}$ cannot be verified, but it is persuasive.

B The Explicatory sentence is destroyed except for the name of the god Thoth. Sethe (1928: 203f.) did not suggest an amendment, but he assumed a similar explanation as in column 34 (“It is Thoth who speaks words to Horus about what was done”), where Thoth is also identified with the lector priest.

C Sethe (1928: 203f.) amended Thoth as the speaker. His suggestion is convincing as the layout of the following columns 93 and 94 is very similar to column 92, and Thoth is the speaker in both columns.

D The reading of $wðšt$ seems logical, although the $w$ is not written. The participle builds a pun with $wðšw$ in the second Remark (compare Sethe 1928: 203f.).

E Sethe (1928: 203f.) reconstructed persuasively $irt$ in the first Remark in accordance with the first Remarks of columns 94 – 96 that show a similar layout as column 92.

F Sethe (1928: 204 and 206) read the third Remarks of columns 92-95 as one sentence, building the Remark for the four columns. He translated “Befestigen der Krone
(durch) den Hüter der großen Feder“ *(smn ḫc iry šwt wrt)* and interpreted the action as the coronation being the main focus of the entire ritual. Sethe’s assumption seems convincing at first. He himself mentioned, however, that one would expect column 96 – which shows the same layout as columns 92-95 – to show the same Remark as well. Two words – ḫt and wrt – are written in column 92 so that it would have been possible for the ancient Egyptian scribe to divide the Remark between all five columns. Sethe argued that the fact that two words appear in column 92 is a sign that the Remark *smn ḫc iry šwt wrt* does not refer to the action described in column 96. He thought that column 96 was read after the coronation. But Sethe’s interpretation shows more weak points. He stated that the title “Hüter der großen Feder” is not attested elsewhere (see Wb IV: 425) and one has to raise the question if *iry šwt wrt* is, indeed, a title. Additionally, the reading of ḫc is not certain. The sign Sethe transliterated as ḫc and translated as “crown” does not really look like 𓊕. It rather reminds of *km* (𓊕). Lastly the Remark would consist of 4 nouns in a row, building three direct genitives – a very uncommon feature of the ancient Egyptian language. To make his translation work Sethe amended *in* in front of *iry šwt wrt*. Finally, the RDP does not feature the Coronation Ritual (see IX.b: 222ff.). For the reasons mentioned above, I prefer to read each Remark separate, and suggest that they refer to the different items brought in the Scene. “What protects” describes the black eye paint (second and third Remark of column 93), “what is black” refers to the grapes (second and third Remark of column 94), and “what lets endure” characterizes incense (second and third Remark of column 95). The connection between the Remark “the great feather” and green eye paint (second and third Remark of column 92) is, however, unclear.

G The word black eyepaint is misspelled in the Remark. The reading shows the word *smdt* (“Kette aus Perlen”; Wb IV: 147). The caption of the accompanying Vignette, however, shows the writing *msdt*. The choice of the determinative (𓊕) also rather refers to black eyepaint, kept in a bowl or a container, than a necklace of pearls. In agreement with Sethe (1928: 205), I think that *smdt* and *msdt* are misspellings for the
word *msdmt* (compare also Wb II: 153). The mentioning of black eyepaint also fits the context of the scene better; green eyepaint is stated in the preceding column 92.

H The reading of *km* is not definite. Sethe (1928: 203) identified \(\equiv\) (compare note F above: 134f.).

I The translation of the Speech follows Sethe (1928: 204), but has some weak points. It is most likely that *imi* is the negative verb (compare Gardiner 1982: § 342) followed by the subject *irt.k* and the infinitive *i\(\)rr. It is, however, not clear how the letter *s* after *i\(\)rr has to be parsed. Due to a lack of a better explanation I follow Sethe’s suggestion of a suffix pronoun designating the reflexive status of the verb *i\(\)rr. It could also be connected to the following *i\(\)rr building a causative “to let be dim”, but the sentence would not make sense (“Your eye shall not be dim, the one that is let to be dim”). Based on the bad preservation of the text, it cannot be said if another word followed after *i\(\)rr.t(i).

J Sethe’s (1928: 203f.) reading of *dhwty hrw dd mdw* (“Thoth spricht Worte zu Horus”) is persuasive as both appear as the speakers in the preceding columns.

K Based on the sign remains Sethe (1928: 203f.) reconstructed the Speech “ich reiche dir den Gottesgeruch, das Reinigende (Auge), das aus dir gekommen ist” (*mn n.k [st\(\)i] ntr [sn]tr pr[t] [i]m.[k]). The condition of the document is too poor to verify Sethe’s reading between *mn n.k* and *pr*. Sethe’s amendment of *st\(\)i ntr* is comprehensible as it builds a pun with *sntr* in the second Remark of the column.

L Sethe (1928: 203) amended Thoth as the speaker, which is convincing as columns 92-95 show Thoth and Horus as speaker and addressee.

M Sethe (1928: 204) translated an infinitive of the verb *pdpd*: “Durchduften”. In accordance with the preceding columns, I identify an object and not a verb as the second Remark; compare green eyepaint in column 92, black eyepaint in column 93, grapes in column 94, and incense in column 95.

N The translation of the Explicatory sentence is difficult due to the meaning of *pdpd*. Sethe (1928: 204) translated “bedufte (?) dir dein Gesicht mit ihm, so daß es ganz durchduftet ist“. He assumed that *pdpd* should not be taken in its original meaning “ausspannen, ausstrecken” (Hannig 2006: 957f.), but that it is rather connected to the
word $p^3\tilde{d}$ (“Kugel (besonders für Weihrauchkugelchen”); Hannig 2006: 856). His suggestion makes sense in so far as incense is mentioned in the preceding column 95, but one has to raise the question how an eye is able to perfume a face – the suffix pronoun $s$ after $im$ can only refer to the eye, mentioned in the first Remark as there is no other feminine word in the column. Hence, I think $p\tilde{d}$ should be translated in its original meaning. Maybe the sentence “widen your face with it” displays an image: the face was smaller without the eye, and is brought back in its original scale by inserting the eye (compare the expression $p\tilde{d}$ $irt$ “weit schauend”, Hannig 2006: 958 and $p\tilde{d}$-$hr$ “weitsichtig, vorherwissend, mit angespanntem Gesicht”, Hannig 2006: 958). A comparable pun between $p\tilde{d}$ “widen” and $p\tilde{d}$ “incense” in connection with the eye of Horus can be found in Edfu: “$p\tilde{d}.s$ $n$-$kwi$ $m$ $rn.s$ $pw$ $n$ [...] ‘it stretches to me in its name of incense’ I 216, 17” (Wilson 1997: 384). For the translation “diffuse” for $pdp\tilde{d}$, see van der Molen 2000: 145. The word $pdp\tilde{d}$ is also attested in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual (scene 6 f; Otto 1960 I: 18). Otto (1960 II: 49f.) left the term untranslated and refered to Sethe’s translation that is mentioned above.

**VI.13.8 Vignette 21**

Vignette 21 represents Scenes 31 and 33 and is depicted under Scene 33 (cols. 91-96), but ends one column before the text of the Scene ends. The depiction summarizes the articles that are brought in Scenes 31 and 33. The left side of the illustration is mainly destroyed; the back of the head of a person as well as the letters $\wedge_1$ and $\wedge_2$ written under each other indicate that the person has to be identified with the lector priest. The caption can be reconstructed as $d[d$ $mdw$ $hr\text{-}h\text{j}]/b$ – “Words to speak, the lector priest”.\(^A\) The enumeration of objects, which are mentioned in Scenes 31 and 33, is written on the right part of the illustration: $w\tilde{d}w$ $msdmt$ $i\text{rrt}$ $wdn$ $sp\text{ty}$ $[s]$nt\text{r} – “green eyepaint, black eyepaint, grapes, a $wdn$-offering of the two districts, and incense”. It is interesting that the $wdn$-offering, which is mentioned in Scene 31, appears in the middle of the enumeration. One would rather expect that the listing starts with the offering as it is mentioned first in the actual text, especially since the other materials are enumerated in the order they appear in the text of the Scene.\(^B\)
Notes:

A  Sethe (1928: 255) added the particle in before hry-hb and read df d mdw <in> hry-hb – “[Worte] sprechen (durch) [den Vorleseprior]ster”.

B  Green eyepaint appears in column 92, black eyepaint in column 93, grapes in column 94, and incense in column 95.

VI.14 Sequence 14 (cols. 97-111)

Sequence 14 comprises Scenes 34-37 (cols. 97-111) as well as Vignettes 22-23.

VI.14.1 Scene 34 (cols. 97-100)

(97)  hpr.n diw gsw n wrw šmʾw mḥw hṛw  
[ p ]w ip f ir t f di t tpw n.sn  

(97)  It happened that halves of bread were given to the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt. It is Horus who allocates his eye and who gives the heads to them.

(98)  hṛw ḏḥwty ḏd mdw imi n.sn tpw.sn // dit tpw nṯrw // dit gsw n wrw šmʾw mḥw  

(98)  Horus speaks words to Thoth: Give them their heads // Giving of the heads of the gods // Giving of the bread halves to the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt.

(99)  ḏḥwty msw hṛw ḥtw stš ḏd mdw [...]D  
 n. t < n > gb ḏi.f n.tn tpw.tn // dit tpw nṯr // ḥtp-di-nsw // ḏḥwty162  

(99)  Thoth speaks words to the children of Horus and the followers of Seth: May Geb [...] to you, by giving to you your heads // Giving of the heads of the gods // A ḥtp-di-nsw-offering // Ibis nome

(100)  [...]E  

(100)  [...]  

---

162 See note D, VI.9.7: 110 and VIII.d: 211f.
163 See note C below: 139.
Notes:

A  For the translation “to allocate” for *ip*, see Hannig 2006: 163. Sethe (1928: 208f.) translated “Horus ist das, der sein Auge zählt”. He referred to PT 223, § 216c where we read: *di.n(i) n.k irt ḫrw ip.n(i) n.k s(y)*. Sethe translated “Ich habe dir das Auge des Horus gegeben, ich habe es dir gezählt“. One has to raise the question what the counting of the eye means. Sethe argued that the counting refers to the different parts of the eye and that the bread halves might have been counted too. I rather prefer the translation “I gave you the eye of Horus, I have allocated it to you”, which makes more sense in the Pyramid Texts spell. In the text of the RDP the expression “who allocates his eye” could allude to the apportionment of the bread to the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt.

B  In accordance with Sethe (1928: 208f.), I think that the heads of gods are meant, which are mentioned in the first Remark of the following column 98. Another translation would be “best of” for *tp* (see Hannig 2006: 2669): “and who gives the best to them”. The Remark in column 98 would then have to be translated accordingly “giving the best of the gods”.

C  Sethe (1928: 208f.) assumed the omission of the dative *n* and translated “die Köpfe den Göttern (wieder)geben”. As the dative *n* is written in the following second Remark (*n wrw šmˇw *mh*̄w*) I prefer the translation of the direct genitive.

D  Sethe (1928: 208f.) amended convincingly *htp*, based on the pun with the *htp-di-nsw*-offering in the second Remark, and translated “[Gnädig ist] euch Geb”.

E  Column 100 is completely destroyed except for one small line, which probably belongs to the sign building the expression *ddl mdw*. Sethe (1928: 208 and 210f.) assigned fragment 25 to column 100 (jsonwebtoken) and reconstructed “[Horus] spricht [Worte zu den Kindern des Horus und den Gefolgsleuten [des Seth:] [.Geht mir] mein Auge, damit ich zufrieden sei [mit ihm“ // das Auge] // [ein *htp*-Mahl // ........]“. His reconstruction of the speakers is based on the distance of the beginning of the column to the sign  of *ddl mdw*. As the column is completely destroyed Sethe’s suggestion cannot be verified. It fits, however, the context of the scene.
VI.14.2 Vignette 22

Vignette 22 represents Scene 34 (cols. 97-100) and is drawn under the last column of Scene 33 as well as under Scene 34 (cols. 96-100). The left side of the illustration shows the empty shrine on a bark with the caption nsw – “king”. A lector priest, identified by the caption hry-hb, is walking away from the shrine. The words dd mdw, written in the same direction as hry-hb, might belong to the same caption, although the space between the two words would not be explainable; the caption would have to be read dd mdw hry-hb – “Words to be said, the lector priest”. The rest of the depiction is mainly destroyed. Two halves of bread are still recognizable as well as a part of the first sign of the caption, which probably has to be read dit (△; compare Sethe 1928: 256) or diw. Based on the text of Scene 34, one would expect the heading dit gsw n wrw ʾmʾw mhw – “Giving bread to the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt”.

VI.14.3 Scene 35 (cols. 101-103)

(101) [hpr.n]^[ iniw [...])^B [hrw pw qni.f it<.f> wdb.f hr gb
(101) [It happened] that was brought [...]. It is Horus who embraces<his> father whom he turns^D towards Geb.

(102) hrw gb dd mdw qni n.(i) it.(i) pn nni r.(i) // wsir // qni // p^E
(102) Horus speaks words to Geb: Embrace for (me) this father (of mine) who became tired compared to (me)^F // Osiris // Bib // Buto

(103) hrw gb dd mdw snb it.(i)^G r.f // wsir // snb // p^164
(103) Horus speaks words to Geb: May (my) father be indeed healthy // Osiris // snb-fringe // Buto

164 See note E below: 141.
Notes:

A Based on the following Explicatory sentence, a new Scene starts with column 101. Hence, the reconstruction of *hpr.n* is clear.

B Sethe (1928: 211f.) amended “[Es geschah], daß ein ḳnj-Brustlatz herbeigebracht wurde durch den Vorlesepriester“. The reconstruction of the *qni*-bib is unambiguous due to the caption of the accompanying Vignette and the pun with the verb *qni* in the following Explicatory sentence. The lector priest is also depicted in the Vignette so that the amendment is convincing. The unusual determinative of *ḥry-hb* (a man holding a bib) summarizes the action of the Introduction (see Sethe 1928: 212).

C Assmann (1995: 96f.) noted that the vitality of the son is transferred to the dead father through the embrace (see also Frankfort 1969: 133). He added that the embrace rite is known from the accession to the throne, and referred to the coronation texts preserved in Deir el-Bahri. Here, the king embraces his daughter, who is at the same time his declared successor, during the proclamation of her rule.

D Sethe (1928: 211) parsed a *sḏm.f* and translated “und sich an Geb wendet“. The interpretation of *wḏb.f* as a present tense relative form is preferred as I think that the sentence is an allusion to the burial – Horus turns Osiris towards Geb, i.e. towards the earth. This is confirmed in the following column 102 where it is clearly stated that Osiris is embraced by Geb and not Horus, and furthermore in column 105, where we actually read that Osiris was buried (“For them this father (of mine) was buried”). At the same time Geb legitimizes Horus as king of Egypt and Osiris as king of the afterlife (see note F below: 142).

E The Remark *p* – Buto belongs to columns 102 and 103. The sign ♂ is written in column 102, while the determinative ♂ stands in column 103. In the context of the Scene, Buto possibly does not refer to the town in the delta, but to a room in a temple. Altenmüller (1972: 172f.) identified the location Buto with the entrance hall of the funerary temple in the course of the Burial Ritual. The RDP does not feature the Burial Ritual, but rather a statue ritual (see X: 238ff.), which ends with rites that remind us of a burial. Hence, the location Buto might refer to a certain room in the temple, in which the ritual was performed (see also VIII.d: 211).
Sethe (1928: 211ff.) interpreted the sentence differently and translated “ich habe diesen meinen Vater, der müde geworden ist, umarmt, bis“.
He argued that the sentence continues in the Speech of the following column 103. He suggested that Horus embraces Osiris as long as the latter is healthy again. He further made a case that the qni-bib is a mourning gown that Horus will not take off until the funeral had ended. I rather think that Osiris died and that Horus asks Geb to take care of him in his realm – the earth, in which the body will be transferred; being tired is used in its traditional euphemistic way to express that a person is dead. At the same time Geb legitimizes Osiris’ kingship in the afterlife, and thus Horus’ rule on earth; Geb is known as the first king, the iring-p’ of the gods, who then bestows the divine and earthly kingships on Osiris and Horus respectively (Goebs 2009: 127ff.). A visual representation of this action is illustrated on a bracelet found on the mummy of queen Ahhotep dating to the 17th dynasty (CG 52069; Goebs 2009: 126ff. and Tf. XVII). Geb is seated on a throne, while king Ahmose is kneeling in front of him. In one depiction Geb is wearing the upper Egyptian crown, and in the other the lower Egyptian crown. His right hand lies on Ahmoses’ should and the left one grasps the king’s arm – a gesture that reminds of an embrace, and thus shows a connection to the text in the RDP. As Goebs (2009: ibid.) pointed out the illustration resembles the scenes from the Coronation Ritual and can be seen as the legitimization of kingship.

Sethe (1928: 211) parsed a sdm.t.f and translated: “er wieder ganz gesund geworden ist“ (see note F above). I suggest that the state of being healthy refers to the afterlife. I have to admit, however, that the particle rf would normally appear directly after the verb and before the subject.

**VI.14.4 Scene 36 (cols. 104-106)**

(104) ḫpr.n iniw srm't hrw pw [...].fḫw ḫt.<f> wdb.f n gb

(104) It happened that beer was brought. It is Horus who [...] because of <his> father whom he has to turn over to Geb.
Horus speaks words to Geb: For them this father (of mine) was buried // Osiris // Dough // Beer

Horus speaks words to Geb: For them (I) let him be mourned // Place of drunkenness // Beer // Bread

Notes:

A Based on traces Sethe (1928: 213f.) included fragment 15 and restored the verb rmi: “Horus ist das, der weint wegen seines Vaters”.

B For Sethe’s (1928: 214) different translation “und sich an Geb wendet”, see note D, VI.14.3: 141.

C Sethe (1928, 214) parsed a perfect sdm.n.f and assumed that the suffix pronoun sn is the subject of the sentence (“sie haben diesen meinen Vater unter die Erde gebracht(?”). A sdm.n.f at the beginning of a sentence needs, however, the introductory particle iw. Hence, it has to be an emphatic sentence with a perfect passive sdm(w).f. Thus n.sn has to be the adverbial element stressed. The meaning of the verb ḫḥw is not known (see Wb I: 13). It is only attested in the RDP and in PT 52, § 38b where we read ḫḥw kki. Sethe connected the word with ḫt (“field”) and suggested “unter die Erde bringen”. Based on his assumption, Hannig (2006: 23) included the word in his dictionary.

D Sethe’s (1928: 214) suggestion that the third Remarks of columns 105 and 106 constitutes one Remark for both columns is also possible. Sethe read the sign ⬜ as ds “vessel”. The transliteration hnq – “beer” is prefered as t “bread” is mentioned in the third Remark of the following column.

---

165 See note D below.
As in the preceding Speech Sethe (1928: 214) parsed a *sdm.n.f* and translated “sie haben ihn beweinen lassen”. I prefer an emphatic *sdm.f* as the introductory particle *iw* is missing.

The reading of the first Remark is difficult. One would expect the name of a god or a reference to the action of the Speech, but the signs Ⲫ/Input error/ do not seem to fit both. Sethe (1928: 214f.) translated “Isis, die Hausherrin” (*ḥst nbt pr*). He mentioned, however, that the writing could also be a mispelling of *nbt-hwt*; the appearance of Isis and Nephthys makes sense as they are the traditional mourners of Osiris. The sign Sethe read as *nb* is, however, not ⲯ/Input error/, but ⲧ/Input error/ (compare the writing of *nb* in column 14 and *ḥ* in column 37). Additionally, the name Nephthys is written differently in the document (compare column 39). Although a reference to a geographical location is unusual for the first Remark – we would rather expect it as the third Remark – I suggest the reading above due to the lack of a better solution. The Ⲫ/Input error/ sign would be the determinative and the *t*-ending erroneously written after the determinative. The place of drunkenness might be connected to the action of the Scene, the bringing of beer.

**VI.14.5 Scene 37 (cols. 107-111)**

(107) *hpr.n iniw ifd sis ḫn[�示] hbsw nw idmi ḫn listar ḫrw <pw> mdw.f n wsir ṣḥn.f ṣḥn.f [ḏ]ḏ.f*A dmi.f r.f

(107) It happened that 4-fibre-linen and 6-fibre-linen were brought together with clothes of *idmi*-linen* and numerous fine linen. <It is> Horus who speaks to Osiris that he may seek the one whom he might embrace, and who says that he may touch him. ₩

(108) [...] wsir ḥḏ mdw ḥḏ(w) n.(i) ḫp[ Shaft] // (108) [...] speaks words to Osiris: For (me) *hpš stš // ifd // pr-hḏ* [...巩 thigh was pulled out // Thigh of Seth // 4-fibre-linen // Treasury*
Horus speaks word to Osiris: Do not let his mind be alert against you // Seth // 6-fibre-linen // Embalming place

Horus speaks words to Osiris: (My) father shall touch (me) // Osiris // idmi-linen // Crocodile

Horus speaks words to Osiris: May your limbs // The eye // Fine linen // Crocodile

Notes:
A. The reconstruction is based on Sethe 1928: 215ff. He assumed that the sign was written in front of the first.

B. The idmi-linen is known from the Sed-festival where it is connected with mummy bandages that rejuvenate the king (Rummel 2006: 381ff.). It is also mentioned in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual and the Daily Temple Ritual (see VIII.a, Sequence 14: 194ff.).

C. Sethe (1928: 216f.) translated differently: “Horus (ist das), der zu Osiris spricht, wenn er antrifft den, den er anzutreffen suchte, und sagt, daß er sich an ihn anschmiegen solle“. He mentioned that the translation of shn.f shn.f is difficult as the verb can have different meanings. He took, however, only the meaning “to seek, to meet” into account, and not the meaning “to embrace” (see Hannig 2006: 2316). As the Introduction is about different kinds of linen, the translation “embrace” makes sense in so far as clothes metaphorically “embrace” a person.

D. Sethe (1928: 216) reconstructed Horus as the speaker. His amendment is convincing as Horus is the speaker in the next column as well and Osiris is the addressee in both columns.

166 See note K below: 147.
Parts of the signs $\odot$ and $\equiv$ are still visible. The reconstruction of $hp\hat{s}$ is based on the first Remark where we read $hp\hat{s}$ st$\hat{s}$. Sethe (1928: 216) added the suffix pronoun $f$ after $hp\hat{s}$, which makes sense as it is Seth’s thigh.

Sethe (1928: 216) parsed a $sdm.n.f$ at the beginning of the sentence and translates “ich habe seinen Schenkel ausgerissen”. One would, however, expect the introductory particle $iw$ in front of $fd.n.i$. Hence, I prefer to parse a perfect passive $sdm(w).f$ with the indirect object $n(.i)$ stressed. In general, it seems more plausible that Horus pulled out the thigh than that the thigh is pulled out for him; compare, for example, PT 477, § 966d-e where we read $stm.f \ell t m hft.k hnt.f s(y) n wsir$ – “From your opponent he (NN = Horus) will annihilate a limb, when he butchers it for Osiris”. However, in column 128 of the RDP Thoth pulled out the thigh of Seth. If Sethe’s translation of column 108 is followed, both thighs of Seth would have been pulled out – one by Horus (column 108) and one by Thoth (column 128), which is rather unlikely. If my translation is correct, both columns would refer to the same action, and only one thigh was pulled out (see note C, VI.15.10: 162f.).

Seth (1928: 216 and 218) translated “die weiße Kapelle” as in column 36. For the translation “treasury”, see note F, VI.7.1: 78 and VIII.d: 214. It can be assumed that the $ifd$-linen was brought from the treasury.

Sethe (1928: 216 and 218) interpreted the Speech as a continuation of the preceding Speech in column 108 and translated “damit nicht sein Herz wieder erwache gegen dich”. He parsed $m$ as the negative verb $imi$ and reconstructed an $i$ in front of the $m$. The text before the $m$ is destroyed, but it has to be mentioned that the negative verb $imi$ is always written $\odot$, the read leaf written besides the owl (compare columns 7, 33, and 94). In column 109, the read leaf would be written above the $m$ if Sethe’s reconstruction is correct. As only a limited part of the text before the $m$ is not preserved I do think that only the lower part of $\odot$ was written here, and not an additional letter. Hence, I parse $\odot$ as the negation of the imperative. The imperative of $rdi, imi$, is written with the sign $\odot$ (compare columns 52 and 98).
I For the location, see VIII.d: 213f.

J It seems questionable that Horus calls Osiris “my father” and does not address him directly as he is talking to him. An interpretation of dmi as an imperative and it as a vocative is impossible. One would expect the word order dmi r.i it.

K In agreement with Sethe (1928: 220), I think that the mention of a crocodile and the role it played in the ritual is peculiar. Sethe referred to a variant of the Osiris-myth, in which Horus, in the form of a crocodile, searches for Osiris’ limbs in the Nile. The Remark msh belongs to columns 110 and 111. The sign ←→ is written in column 110, while [ ] appears in column 111 (see also VIII.a, Sequence 14: 194ff.).

L The signs after are partly destroyed. The remains support Sethe’s (1928: 216) reading of , but not enough traces are left to verify Sethe’s translation or suggest a different reading. He translated: „die Panthergöttin vereinigt (wird vereinigen?) deine Glieder” (dmd mfdt cwt.k). Sethe mentioned that the panther goddess Mafdet is connected with the goddess Seshat, and he referred to PT 364, § 616a/b where a similar sentence occurs: inq.n n.k hwt-nbt cwt.k nbt m rn.s pw n sšt nbt iqd – “For you Nephthys has collected all your limbs in this her name of Seshat, mistress of builder”. He added, however, that the name mfdt does not build a pun with ssf in the second Remark and suggested to read the animal as sfr, a mythical creature with the body of a panther and a head of a bird that is attested in Beni Hassan. One might also think of the panther-goddess mHnt. Her name is used as a designation for one of the four nmst-jars in Edfu, used in a purification formula. Otto (1960 II: 41) assumed, however, that the text is erroneous as usually other goddesses are identified with the vessels. The purification with the nmst-vessels is also attested in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual, in which Horus, Seth, Thoth, and dwn-nwi are identified with the jugs, and not mHnt. The mythological interpretation of the scene consists of the joining of the bones (Otto 1960 II: 37f.), and builds hence a connection to this passage in the RDP. Thus, the word could be read mHnt instead of mfdt, but the term would also not build a pun with ssf.
The ancient scribe seems to have forgotten to write down the Introduction to Scene 38 and added it under the Speech in column 111 after he noticed his mistake (see Sethe 1928: 221). The text was copied down from left to right (see IV: 30ff.).

Note the different spelling of “fine linen” with two s compared to the writing of the term in the Introduction.

VI.14.6 Vignette 23

Vignette 23 represents Scenes 35-37 (cols. 101-111), but is only drawn below columns 101-104. The left part of Vignette 23 is partly destroyed, but the forehead as well as one of the arms of a person is still preserved. The caption 𓊱𓊱𓊱清晰ly identifies the person as the lector priest (ḥry-ḥb). There are four columns of text in front of the priest, summarizing the actions of Scenes 35-37. Although the reading direction implies a reading from right to left, the left column is the first one that has to be read: ḏḏ mdw ini(w)A qni 12 srmt sis ifd ḡbs idmiB sfC – “Words to say: 12 bibsD, beer, 6-fibre-linen, 4-fibre-linen, and clothes of idmi-linen and fine linen were brought”.

Notes:

A Sethe (1928: 256) parsed an imperative, and added that also the infinitive, written without the t-ending, could be present. I think that the lector priest brings the materials. As he is the only person depicted, an imperative seems illogical. Hence, I parce ini as a past passive sḏm(w).f.

B Only parts of the word idmi are preserved, but the sign is recognizable.

C Sethe (1928: 256) already mentioned that the determinative of sf rather reminds of ⲱ than Ⲯ. As the text ends after this sign and also no other object is mentioned in the text, it is likely that the scribe only drew the sign (ⲱ) in a rounder form.

D Sethe (1928: 211f.) only restored one bib in the actual text, which is convincing as only one bib is mentioned in the second Remark of column 102 (see also VI.14.3: 140). The caption in the Vignette shows, however, the number 12 after qni.
VI.15 Sequence 15 (cols. 111-129)

Sequence 15 comprises Scenes 38-43 (cols. 111-129) as well as Vignettes 24-28\(^{167}\).

VI.15.1 Scene 38 (cols. 111-113)

(111) \([hpr.n] \ i[tit \ [...]]f^A\)  \(\begin{array}{l}
(111) \text{[It happened] that [...]} \text{were brought [...].}
\end{array}\)

(112) \(hrw \ dhwty \ dd \ mdw \ shn \ n(i). \ it(i)^B \ // \ dhwty // shn \ 3h // \ dhwty^C\)

(112) Horus speaks words to Thoth: Embrace\(^D\) for (me my) father // Thoth // The “one who embraces the Akh” // Ibis nome

(113) \(hrw \ msw \ hrw \ dd \ mdw \ shn.tn \ n(i). \ it(i) \)

(113) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus: May you embrace\(^{169}\) for (me) this father (of mine) // Children of Horus // The “ones who embrace the Akh” // Ibis nome

Notes:

A The text of the Introduction is mainly lost. Based on the content of columns 112 and 113, Sethe (1928: 220f.) reconstructed “Es geschah, daß die shn.w-3h-Leute herbeigeführt [wurden. Horus (ist das), der befiehlt ihm (?) seinen [Va]ter [aufzusuchen]“ \((hpr.n \ i[titi.t(w)] \ shnw \ 3h \ hrw \ pw \ wd.f \ shn \ n.f \ it(f))\). He assumed an abbreviated writing for \(hpr\) \(\left(\ddagger\right)\) and \(shn\) \(\left(\ddagger\right)\) due to the lack of space. He further thought that the author forgot to write a \(t\) between the two \(fs\) at the end of the Introduction. The addition might, however, not be necessary if we assume an abbreviated writing for \(it\) \(\left(\ddagger\right)\) – as Sethe did. He thought that the first \(\sim\) is the suffix pronoun after the dative \(n\), whereas the second one belongs to the writing of \(it\). It is

---

\(^{167}\) Gestermann (2008: 35) assigned Scene 43 to the following Sequence, but added that this division is uncertain. I think that Scene 43 belongs to Sequence 14 as the respective action is depicted to the left side of the shrine on the bark. Gestermann argued that the “one who embraces the Akh” is turned away from the bark. Hence, it seems that he is directed towards the bark that starts the following Sequence 15. However, in Vignettes 22 and 24 we also see people depicted, turned away from the shrine. In all other depictions the bark starts a new Sequence and the ritual actions are depicted to the right side of the boat.

\(^{168}\) See note C below: 150.

\(^{169}\) Sethe (1928: 221) translated again “suchen”; see note D below: 150.
also possible that the first \( \sim \) belongs to \( it \), whereas the second one is the suffix pronoun after \( it \). In that case the \( t \) does not have to be added. Due to the scarce remains of the column Sethe’s reading cannot be verified. It has to be mentioned, however, that the word order is peculiar. One would expect the indirect object \( n.f \) to be written before \( shn \). Maybe the sentence has to be translated “It is Horus who commands after he embraced his father”. The “ones who embrace the Akh” are mentioned in the second Remarks in the succeeding columns 112 and 113, and the verb \( shn \) dominates the Speeches of those two columns.

**B** It is interesting to note the different syntax in the Speeches of columns 12 and 13, although the content is the same. When Horus speaks to Thoth, a command is used (“embrace for (me..”), while a prospective \( sdm.f \) is employed when the children of Horus are the addressees (“may you embrace…”). In addition, the first Speech mentions “my father”, while the demonstrative pronoun is added in the second sentence (“this father of mine”). The text in column 112 is not destroyed after \( it(i) \), so that it can be excluded that the demonstrative pronoun \( pn \) is not preserved. Furthermore, the term \( it \) is written differently: if it is followed by \( pn \) the writing \( \sim \) is used, whereas the word is written \( \sim \) when it stands on its own.

**C** The Remark \( dhwty \) belongs to columns 112 and 113 as the sign \( \sim \) is written through the separation line dividing both columns. For the location, see VIII.d: 211f.

**D** Sethe (1928: 22) translated “suche mir meinen Vater auf”. As the text of the Scene does not provide a lot of information it is hard to decide whether \( shn \) has to be translated as “search” or “embrace” (Hannig 2006: 2316). As Osiris was present in the Scene before, it is, however, peculiar why he has to be searched now. Hence, I prefer the meaning “embrace” like in column 107 (see note C, VI.14.5: 145).

### VI.15.2 Scene 39 (cols. 114-116)

(114)  
\[
\begin{align*}
hpr.n & f3^A  shnw  \beta h & 170 \quad hq^B h &  \sim wy.sn \\
hrw & pw & wd.f & n & msw.f & fii<.tw>^C & wsir
\end{align*}
\]

(114) It happened that the “ones who embrace the Akh” carried the father of the ruler on their arms. It is Horus who commands to his

---

170 For a discussion on the title, see VIII.b: 205ff.
children that Osiris <is> carr<ied>.


(115) Horus [speaks words] to the children of Horus: May you carry [...] // [Children] of Horus // [...] // To carry

(116) hrw msw hrw1 dd mdw ms t n hr.f // msw hrw // [...]1 // fβ[171]

(116) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus: Put yourself under him // Children of Horus // [...] // To carry

Notes:

A Only a few traces of the verb fβi are preserved, but they support the reading.

B Sethe (1928: 221f.) transliterated h(sic)tf, mentioned, however, that the ⲫ is a writing error for ⲫ. Consulting the original it is clear that the sign in the text is actually ⲫ, and not ⲫ, so that the reading of it hqβ is unequivocal. For a discussion on the reading of it hqβ (“father of the ruler”) versus hqβ.ty.fy (“the one who will rule”), see VI.9.2: 99f. and VIII.e: 215ff.

C Sethe (1928: 221f.) parsed fβi as in infinitive. One would, however, expect a different word order as the infinitive would be the direct object, and hence has to be written before the indirect object n msw.f. Thus, I prefer to parse fβi as a prospective passive: “It is Horus who commands his children so that Osiris is carried”.

D The scarce remains of the signs indicate the reading of hrw msw hrw.

E The reconstruction of the second person plural suffix pronoun t n is logical as the children of Horus are the addressees. Sethe (1928: 221f.) reconstructed “[diesen meinen Vater]”, based on a similar sentence in spells 115/6 of a later ritual (msw hrw ms t n hr it.tn NN fβi.tn sw – “children of Horus, bring yourself under your father NN so that you may carry him”).

F Sethe’s (1928: 221f.) amendment of msw is convincing as the children of Horus are the addressees of the Speech.

171 See note H below: 152.
Sethe (1928: 221f.) reconstructed a g and reads g\text{\textcopyright}f\text{\textcopyright}w – “Affen”. He thought that the apes, together with the wolves mentioned in the second Remark of the following column, represent the animals of Hapi and Duamutef, who are part of the children of Horus. His reading of both animals is, however, not clear (see note J below), and it is questionable why only two of the four sons of Horus are represented in the Remarks of Scene 39. The text of both Remarks is too destroyed to offer another reading. If Sethe’s reconstruction is correct, it is possible that the term was chosen because it builds a pun with f\text{\textcopyright}i.

The Remark f\text{\textcopyright}i belongs to columns 115 and 116. The letter f – only partly preserved – is written in column 115, while i is written in column 116.

The foot of the first Horus bird as well as the sign 𓊒 are clearly identifiable.

Sethe (1928: 221ff.) reconstructed w\text{\textcopyright}n\text{\textcopyright}w – “Wölfe”. He mentioned that he could see parts of the 𓊒 and the front legs of the wolf. The present condition of the papyrus does not allow a transliteration. It is also not clear why wolves should be mentioned (see note G above).

**VI.15.3 Vignette 24**

Vignette 24 represents Scenes 38-39 (cols. 111-116) and appears under the text of the preceding Sequence (cols. 105-108). The illustration starts with the empty shrine on a bark with the caption ns\text{\textcopyright}w – “king”. “The one who embraces the Akh”, identified by the caption, is depicted walking away from the sacred bark. He is carrying a standing figure, depicted on a much smaller scale. Presumably, the figure depicts a statue, that is identified by the caption as it hq\text{\textcopyright} - “the father of the ruler” (see VIII.e: 215ff.). In agreement with Sethe (1928: 256), I think that a second shn 𓊒 was originally depicted on the right side of the Vignette, that is not preserved today.

**VI.15.4 Scene 40 (cols. 117-119)**

(117) hpr.n iri shnw 𓊒 172 m\text{\textcopyright}rena m\text{\textcopyright}menw<t> y\text{\textcopyright}A

(117) It happened that the “ones who embrace the Akh” acted with two sticks.\text{\textcopyright}B

\textsuperscript{172} For a discussion on the title, see VIII.b: 205ff.
(118) \( hrw \ msw \ hrw \ dd \ mdw \ shn.tn \ it.(i)C \ // \ ms(w) \ hrw^{173} \ // \ shn(w) \ th^{D} \ // \ dhwtyn^{174} \)

(118) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus: May you embrace (my) father // Child(ren) of Horus // The “one(s) who embrace the Akh” // Ibis nome

(119) \( msw \ hrw \ [...]^E \ dd \ mdw \ tni \ [...].t<n> \ r \ / pt \ hpdw.tn \ w\ phr^{G} \ // \ tsi \ msw \ htw \ st{s}^{H} \ // \ iri \ m-c \ m^w[t]\ty^{1} \ // \ hm \)

(119) The children of Horus speak words to [...] Raise your [...] towards heaven, while your buttocks are (those of) goats who perambulate // Raising of the ms-sticks of the followers of Seth // Acting with the sticks // Letopolis^{175}

Notes:

A The Explicatory sentence is missing (compare Sethe 1928: 224).

B Sethe (1928: 223f.) assumed that is an old writing for \( m^w\text{t}\text{wy} \) and translated “Es geschah, daß die \( shnw \ th \) die beiden Leiterholmen bildeten”. Sethe suggested that a ladder to the sky is built for Osiris so that he can reach his mother Nut. The word is attested as \( m^w\text{t}\text{w}_y \) (“Stangen der Leiter”; Wb II: 46), showing a different determinative (II), however. Hence, I prefer to read \( m^w\text{t}w^{<t}>y \) (“Wurfholz?, Keule?”: Wb II: 46) that shows the determinative 1 and the preposition \( m-c \) in front; compare also Piccione 1999: 339ff. and Altenmüller 1964: 274. Altenmüller compared the Scene in the RDP with a festival in Papremis that is conveyed by Herodotus. His interpretation of a fight rather than the building of a ladder is supported by the accompanying Vignette that does not show a ladder, but two men holding a stick in their hands. PT 469 corroborates this assumption. The spell deals with stick fighting \( (m^w\text{t}w\text{-sticks}) \) by the leaders of Letopolis. Both texts do not only employ the same word for stick-fighting, but also show the connection to Letopolis (see third Remark in column 119). In addition, the word \( m\text{qt} \) (“Leiter”; Hannig 2003:

---

^{173} See note G, VI.4.1: 60.
^{174} See note D, VI.9.7: 110 and VIII.d: 211f.
^{175} For the location Letopolis, see VIII.d: 211.
505f.) is used in PT 478, § 971a-d when Osiris’ ascent to the sky is described. Piccione (1999: 337ff.) summarized the aim of stick-fighting or fencing as a ritual, in which the protagonists represent certain gods like Horus, Osiris, or the followers of Horus. The opponents personify enemies that have to be defeated. He further referred to the tomb of Kheruef where stick-fighting is connected to the Sed-festival and the erection of the Djed-pillar, performed by the souls of Pe in the context of the resurrection of Osiris and the triumph of Horus over his enemies. Decker (1987: 82) discussed stick-fighting and wrestling scenes in the tomb of Amenmose (TT19) and came to the conclusion that both activities can be seen as funerary games performed at the funeral or as a part of a ceremony in memory of the deceased. The scene in Amunmose’s tomb is especially interesting in so far as Thutmose III is depicted in a shrine standing on a bark, observing the games, probably held in his honour (see also VIII.a, Sequence 15: 196f.).

The document is destroyed after it(i). Sethe (1928: 223f.) suggested to read pn, but he added that the amendment is uncertain as it (חס) is written differently than in column 113 (חס), where pn follows it. I think that it builds the end of the sentence. In column 112 we also do not find the demonstrative pronoun pn after it, and the noun is written in the same way (חס) as in column 113.

The title shnw 3h is written in the singular. The addressees are, however, the children of Horus, so that the plural should me amended – as in the writing for ms(w) Hrw in the first Remark.

Sethe (1928: 223f.) translated shn again with “seek”, and not “embrace”: “ihr sollt [diesen(?)] meinen Vater suchen” (see note D, VI.15.1: 150). He mentioned, however, that the verb could also have another meaning and presented the excerpt of PT 667, § 1936a shn tw r pt, which he translated “ich mache dich shn zum Himmel”. Altenmüller (1964: 274) translated “einführen” and suggested “Ihr sollt meinen Vater (in den Tempel?) einführen”. There is not enough space for the reconstruction r/m r-pr/hwt-ntr after it in the destroyed part of the column however – concerning the construction shn r/m for “einführen” see Wb III: 469. In addition, the meaning “einführen” is only attested during the Late Period and Greek times as Altenmüller
mentioned himself. He argued that a statue was brought into a temple and assumed the same meaning of the word *shn* in col. 112. But it has to be mentioned that a temple is also not mentioned there (“Embrace for (me my) father”). The third Remarks of both columns do not suggest a connection to a temple as well. In both cases the Ibis nome is mentioned. Hence, I prefer the translation “to embrace” for *shn*.

Sethe (1928: 223ff.) reconstructed Nut as the addressee, based on his translation of the Speech. Based on the following Speech, Altenmüller’s (1964: 274ff.) suggestion of the followers of Seth is more convincing, however.

The transliteration and translation of the Speech is difficult as it is partly destroyed. Sethe (1928: 223ff.) transliterated ṭni msw.t r pt ḫpdw.t n ʿnhwt pḥr [ḥ3.f] and translated “erhebe deine Kinder zum Himmel, indem deine Hinterbacken zugewandt sind de[n] Ziegen, die [ihn] umringten”. He added that the children of Nut consist of four, but that in this context only Osiris is meant. He further interpreted the second part (ḥpdw.t n ʿnhwt pḥr ḫ3.f) as a representation of the heavenly cow, expressing the image of disgressing. The goats symbolize the followers of Seth. Sethe’s interpretation seems a little bit far fetched, and shows some weak points. The word *msw* is not preserved at all as is the addressee of the Speech so that it cannot be verified if the sentence is concerned with Nut, who is not attested elsewhere in the ritual, and neither are her children. Even if the text concerns the descendants of Nut it is incomprehensible why the text, talking about several children, should only concern Osiris. The reading of the column follows Altenmüller (1964: 274ff.). He thought that the sentence represents an announcement used by the children of Horus to gain access to a temple. As mentioned in note E above, there is no evidence for the involvement of a temple. Thus, I suggest that the expression is used as an order to start fighting – in the sense of a game in the course of the ritual. Instead of reading *msw*, Altenmüller suggested *ms*. According to him, the word is a variant of the ʿms-ponse. He referred to the *ms*-wood represented in object freezes of the Middle Kingdom, written 𓊇. He added that this writing is an alternative spelling for *msw* (𓊇) and pointed to CT 728, § 358a. Here the word is spelled 𓊇𓊇𓊇𓊇𓊇, however, and rather seems to be a mispelling for the ʿms-ponse. Based on the reconstruction of the followers of Seth as
the addressees of the Speech, he assumed a plural suffix pronoun $t^{<n>}$.
He read the entire Speech as $tni\ ms.T^{<n>}\ r\ pt\ hpdw.T^{<n>}\ n\ t\ wt\ phrw$ — “Raise your $ms$-sticks up to heaven, your arses being like those of goats twisting around”. I agree with Altenmüller that there is no space for $h3.f$ in front of the first Remark, and the addition is also not necessary. Maybe a depiction in the Book of Gates confirms my assumption that the holding of sticks starts the ritual battle. In the tombs of Horemhab and Ramses VI, for example, a pig, called the swallow, is depicted in a bark surrounded by baboons holding sticks (e.g. Hawass 2006: 163). According to Cruz-Uribe (2009: 204f. and 220, fig. 23), the pig symbolizes the harpoon that kills Apophis and can thus be equalized with Seth. He further posited that the baboons make the pig/Seth squeal by using their sticks and the deity then swallows the enemy. Cruz-Uribe based this assumption on Seth’s cry when he immobilizes the enemies on the battlefield. His suggestion is convincing. In both contexts, the Book of Gates and the RDP, the raised sticks would thus be used to initialize an action: in the Book of Gates the immobilization of the enemy and in the RDP the start of a ritual fight, in the mythological sphere performed by the followers of Seth partly identified with goats; concerning another text passage, in which Seth’s entourage is possibly represented by goats, see col. 42, Scene 14 (notes C and D, VI.8.1: 84).

H Following Altenmüller 1964: 275. Sethe (1928: 223) read $tsi\ ms\ [nwt]\ htw\ st\$ — “das Erheben der Kinder [der Nut] den Gefolgsleuten des Seth (zum Trotz)”. He transliterated $msw$ instead of $ms$ and added the name of the goddess Nut after $msw$, arguing that there is enough space for the name of the goddess after $msw$. The original is, however, not as badly damaged at this point so that at least traces of the word should still be visible.

I In accordance with the Introduction, Sethe (1928: 223) transliterated $iri\ m\wedge\ wy$ and translated “das Bilden der Leiterholmen”. For the translation “Acting with the throwing sticks”, see note B above: 153f. The word $m\wedge\ w[/ty]$ is written in a very abbreviated form (–).
VI.15.5 Vignette 25

Vignette 25 represents Scene 40 (cols. 117-119) and is written under the text of Scene 37 (cols. 108-111). The depiction shows two shnw śḥ, identified by the caption above them, holding a stick-like object in each hand. The right arm is bent, while the left arm is stretched out backward. The object in the right hand of each person is clearly visible and looks like a stick, to which something is attached, indicated by dots that run parallel to the actual stick. In contrast to Sethe (1928: 257), I do not see a similarity to the palm leaf depicted in Vignette 18. The object that is carried in the left hand of the “ones who embrace the Akh” is impossible to identify as only remains are preserved to the far right side of the Vignette. Sethe suggested a slightly bent stick with an attached cloth. The only partly preserved caption iri<m [c m<]<t> – “acting with the stick” is written in between the two shnw śḥ. In accordance with his translation of the text, Sethe read iri m<īwy – “den Holm bilden”. As mentioned in note B, VI.15.4: 153f., the depicted action does not show the building of a ladder. It rather looks like that the two shnw śḥ are fighting or playing a game with the sticks.

VI.15.6 Scene 41 (cols. 120-122)

(120) ḫpr.n stp dwšty ʾst pw ħn< c nbt-hwt dwš.sn wsir

(120) It happened that the two mourners were chosen. It is Isis together with Nephthys who mourn Osiris.

(121) ʾst nbt-hwt wsir< ḏḏ mdw dwš nn ṭw // ʾst nbt-hwt // dwšty // ḫm

(121) Isis and Nephthys speak words to Osiris: These will mourn you // Isis and Nephthys // The two mourners // Letopolis

(122) [...]< ṣtp(w).n< n.k wr< ḏḏ mdw // ṣtp dwšty // ḫm

(122) [...] : For you we were chosen, oh great one // Recitation // Election of the two mourners // Letopolis

176 See note B below: 158.
177 See note A below: 158.
178 See note D below: 158.
179 See note A below: 158.
Notes:

A  Sethe (1928: 226) translated the common meaning of *dwḥ* (“Lobpreiserin”; Wb V: 429), but he added that in the context of the Scene the two mourners are meant (for the translation “mourners”, see Wb V: 429.12).

B  The common translation for *dwḥ* is “to praise” (Hannig 2006: 2769ff. and Wb V: 426ff.; so also Sethe 1928: 226). Maybe the verb *dwḥ* has to be translated “to mourn” in the context of the Scene as Isis and Nephthys are the two mourners that mourn for Osiris (compare the translation “the two mourners” in note A). This meaning for *dwḥ* is, however, not attested elsewhere.

C  The lower part of the sign $\rightarrow$ is still preserved.

D  The third Remark belongs to columns 121 and 122, as the sign $\leftarrow$ is written through the line separating both columns. For the location, see also VIII.d: 211.

E  Based on the following Speech (“for you we were chosen”) and the context of the Scene, it is unambiguous that Isis and Nephthys are the speakers, while Osiris is the addressee (compare Sethe 1928: 226f.).

F  The block of wood under the adze is still preserved as well as the front part of the adze itself, so that the reading of *stp* is unquestionable.

G  Sethe (1928: 226) amended the demonstrative pronoun *pn* after *wr*. The papyrus is destroyed at this point so that it cannot be verified whether *pn* was originally written after *wr* or whether the Speech ended after *wr*.

H  Sethe (1928: 226) parsed an imperative followed by the dependent pronoun *n* and translated “erwähle uns dir, o du [die]ser Groβe”, mentioning, however, the possibility of a perfect passive *sḏm(w).f*. He assumed that Osiris chose the two mourners (or praising women according to Sethe) for himself.

**VI.15.7 Vignette 26**

Vignette 26 represents Scene 41 (cols. 120-122) and is depicted under a part of Scenes 38 and 39 respectively (cols. 112-114). The illustration shows two standing women, who can be identified as the two mourners Isis and Nephthys according to the text of Scene 42. The Vignette does not have a caption. The right arm of both women is hanging down at the back,
while the left arms seem to be bent, holding a stick (see Sethe 1928: 257). Based on the context of the Scene, one would expect the two women rather be represented in the mourning or praising gesture.

**VI.15.8 Scene 42 (cols. 123-125)**

(123) \([hpr.n...]w^A hps <in>_B hry-wdb^C hnc^D ifd\)

(124) \([...]^E hrw gdl mdw wdi n^G it.k pn // hrw // [...]^H // ms(w) hrw\)

(125) \(hrw stš^I gdl mdw hr(i) r.k wdi(w) n.k wdbt r.k // ghwy // hry-wdb // skr\)

(123) [It happened that...] a staff\(^E\) <by> the master of largess together with 4-fibre-linen.

(124) [...] speaks words to Horus: Give (it) to this father of yours // Horus // [...] // Child(ren) of Horus

(125) Horus speaks words to Seth: (My)\(^J\) face is directed against you after that what turned against you was given\(^K\) to you // Thoth // Master of largess\(^181\) // Sokar

Notes:

**A** Sethe (1928: 227f.) suggested \(di (\frac{\text{ }}{\text{}})\) because of the little amount of space available for the verb of the sentence. Other possibilities are \(ini (\frac{\text{ }}{\text{}})\) or \(iti (\frac{\text{ }}{\text{}})\). In the next Scene a staff as well as 4-fibre-linen are given to the “ones who embrace the Akh” (“It happened that 4-fibre-linen and the staff were given to the “ones who embrace the Akh”; col. 126). Hence, I assume that in column 123 the staff is brought by and not given to the master of largess. In addition, Vignette 27 shows only one man holding the staff, identified as the master of largess by the caption. If he would give the staff, as Sethe assumed, one would expect a second person, to whom the object is delivered. Thus, the sentence should be translated as “[It happened that] a staff was [brought] <by> the master of largess together with the 4-fibre-linen”.

\(^{180}\) See note G, VI.4.1: 60.

\(^{181}\) See note C below: 160.
Another possibility is to amend a dative *n* instead of the particle *in* so that the objects were given to the officiant (compare Sethe 1928: 228). However, based on the amendedment of *ini*, I prefer the particle *in* (see note A above).

The title *hry-wdb* is only represented by the determinative at this point (𓄭). Based on the second Remark of column 125, which shows the spelling of the word with the same determinative, and the occurrence of the title in the accompanying Vignette the identification of the title is certain (compare also Sethe 1928: 228). For the translation “master of the largess”, see Jones 2000: 603. Sethe (1928: 228 und 230) translated the title as “prince” as he is holding a staff. This meaning is, however, not attested (see Hannig 2006: 1741 and Wb I: 409).

The Explicatory sentence is missing.

Sethe (1928: 228) translated “ein Schenkel”, admitted, however, that the reason for mentioning a thigh at this point of the ritual is peculiar. *hpś* can also mean sword (Hannig 2006: 1873). As the officiant is depicted with a staff in his hand, the translation “staff” is preferred (see also Gestermann 2008: 35). The accompanying Vignette only shows the officiant carrying a stick. If Sethe’s translation “thigh” was correct, the man would be depicted carrying a thigh and not a stick. The mention of the thigh of Seth in the following Scene is the mythological explanation of the action. Hence, the word *hpś* does not necessarily have to be translated with thigh in the actual ritual.

Based on the little amount of space, Sethe (1928: 228) reconstructed Thoth as the speaker. The amendment is convincing as Thoth is usually identified with the role of the officiant in the ritual.

The reading of *wdi n* for the signs 𓄭 is most likely (see also Sethe 1928: 228; compare the writing of the verb in col. 15). The verb *dn* can be excluded as it means “to kill” (Hannig 2006: 2790) and the Speech would have to be translated “kill this father of yours”. An order to kill Osiris in the context of the ritual is, however, unthinkable. Another possibility is to amend a *w* in front of *dn* and read *wdn* – “offer” (Hannig 2006: 755).
Sethe (1928: 228f.) identified the remains of the second Remark as the sign [König']. The relics fit the sign. It is, however, not clear why the sign should be read nsw. It rather represents a man of high rank, not necessarily the king himself. I suggest to read [König'] as šps – “the noble” and assume that the word refers to a high official. The standing man holding a staff (wdb) who is depicted in the Vignette would corroborate that assumption, as it is the costumary writing for sr – “noble”.

The names of the two speakers have faded away over time, but the contours of the words are still visible.

Sethe (1928: 228) translated “ein Gesicht ist gegen dich (gerichtet)“. It is not possible to decide whether Horus refers to his own face or a face in general.

Sethe (1928: 228f.) mentioned that the verb wdi has to be parsed as a passive; the only possibility is a perfect sdm(w).f as the tw infix for the present tense is not written. Sethe, however, translated the verb in the present tense: “gegeben wird dir, was sich gegen dich gewendet hat”. Lorand (2009: 114) read hr(i) r.k di.n.k wdb(i) r.k and translated “(ma) face est (dirigée) contre toi, tu as fait en sorte que (je) me retourne vers toi”. The verb di is, however, usually written with the sign ò and not with ◦ in the text (compare dit in column 40 as well as diti(w) in columns 97 and 126). In addition, he did not take into account the t-ending of wdb that appears in the hieroglyphic text.

VI.15.9 Vignette 27

Vignette 27 represents Scene 42 (cols. 123-125) and is drawn below the text of Scene 39 (cols. 114-115). The depiction is mainly destroyed. Based on the caption hry-wdb – “master of largess” as well as as the remains of a shoulder and hand holding a staff, a male person can be reconstructed (compare Sethe 1928: 257 and Tf. 21). The word following hry-wdb in the caption is hard to identify based on the bad preservation of the Vignette. Sethe read mdw and translated “Sprecher (?)”. Based on the text of Scene 42, 4-fibre-linen is brought by the master of largess in addition to the staff. The linen is, however, not depicted if Sethe’s reconstruction is correct. He only showed a man holding a staff – comparable to depictions of
high officials \((sr)\). Maybe the person carried the linen in his other hand, whose depiction is destroyed. In that case Sethe’s reconstruction has to be corrected.

**VI.15.10 Scene 43 (cols. 126-129)**

(126) \(hpr.n \text{ diw ifd } hp\text{s } n \text{ sḫnw-ḫḫ } [\ldots] \text{ ḫti.f } stš \text{ n wsir } fd.n.f^B [\ldots]^C\) (126) It happened that the 4-fibre-linen and the staff\(^D\) were given to the “ones who embrace the Akh”. \(\ldots\) who takes Seth to Osiris after he had pulled out \(\ldots\).

(127) \([\ldots]^E dd \text{ mdw } fd.n.(i) \text{ hpš } [\ldots]^E // hpš stš // ifd // pr-hd\) (127) \([\ldots]\) speaks words to \([\ldots]: [\ldots] \text{(I) have pulled out the thigh} // \text{The thigh of Seth} // 4\text{-fibre-linen} // \text{Treasury}\^G\)

(128) \(hrw^H [\ldots]^I dd \text{ mdw } fd(w) n.(i) \text{ hpš}[\ldots] // hpš stš // sis // pr-nfr\) (128) Horus speaks words to \([\ldots]: \text{For (me) the thigh was pulled out (too)} // \text{The thigh of Seth} // 6\text{-fibre-linen} // \text{Embalmung place}\^J\)

(129) \([\ldots]^K dd \text{ mdw } h[\ldots]^L \text{ sḫn.(tw).k}^M \text{ w // stš} // hpš // hwt-nb\) (129) \([\ldots]\) speaks words to \([\ldots]: [\ldots] \text{so that you may not} \text{ be met} // \text{Seth} // \text{The staff}\^O // \text{Royal house}\^P\)

Notes:

A The scarce remains of signs do not allow a transliteration. Sethe (1928: 230) identified \(dlḥwty \text{ pw} – \text{“Thoth ist das” based on the traces.}\)

B Only the right parts of the signs \(\equiv\) are preserved.

C No remnants of signs are preserved after \(f\), so that Sethe’s (1928: 230f.) reconstruction of \(n.f \text{ hpš.f}\) cannot be verified. The reading is, however, logical due to the context of the Scene. The thigh of Seth is mentioned in the first Remarks of the following columns 126 and 127. Sethe translated “Thoth ist das, der den Seth zu Osiris bringt, nachdem er für ihn seinen Schenkel ausgerissen hat”. He stated that this
time Thoth is the one who pulls out Seth’s thigh, whereas in column 108 it was Horus. Hence, Sethe assumed that there were two different actions in the course of the ritual, and that both thighs of Seth were pulled out. While Sethe translated in column 108 “ich habe seinen Schenkel ausgerissen” (Horus is the speaker), I prefer the translation “for me the thigh was pulled out (see note F, VI.14.5: 146). In case my interpretation is correct both columns could refer to the same action and Seth lost only one thigh that was pulled out by Thoth.

D Sethe (1928: 230) translated ḫpš with “Schenkel” like in the preceding Scene (see note E, VI.15.8: 160).

E Based on the little space that remains for the two speakers, Sethe (1928: 230f.) amended ḏḥwty ḫrw ḫd ṭḏw – “[Thoth] spricht Worte [zu Horus]”.

F Sethe (1928: 230 and 232) reconstructed ḕn ḫt.k pn and translated “ich habe [seinen] Schenkel [für deinen Vater] ausgerissen“. If his reconstruction is correct, ḕn ḫt.k pn is the adverbial element that is stressed in the emphatic statement: “For this father of yours I have pulled out his thigh”.

G Like in columns 36 and 108 Sethe read ḫḏ and translated “die weiße Kapelle”. For the translation “treasury”, see note F, VI.7.1: 78 and VIII.d: 214. 4-fibre-linen (ifd) is also connected to the pr-ḥḏ in column 108. Schott (1984: 267) made a case to support her theory that the geographical Remarks designate the location from where objects were brought, and not the location where the action took place: she stated that in Scene 43 three different locations are mentioned – the pr-ḥḏ (column 127), pr-nfr (column 128), and pr-nb (column 129). If these buildings referred to the locations where the action took place, the location would have been changed very fast in the course of the ritual; see also VIII.d: 210ff.

H The tail of the Horus bird is still recognizable.

I Sethe argued that only Thoth can be the addressee as the room is too little to reconstruct wsir, and as Seth has to be excluded based on the content of the Speech – Sethe translated “ich habe seinen (anderen) Schenkel ausgerissen”. Sethe reconstructed r.s at the end of the Speech to present a word that builds a pun with sis, mentioned in the second Remark, but left the word untranslated. The Speech can also
be interpreted in a different way. The suffix pronoun $f$ is not preserved after $hpš$. Hence, a possible transliteration is $fd(w)\ n(i)\ hpš[k] – “for me [your] thigh was pulled out (too)”. The addition of “too” is used because the thigh was pulled out for Osiris in column 126. In this case Seth could very well have been the addressee. Additionally, the thigh of Seth would not have been pulled out twice, once by Horus (column 108) and once by Thoth (column 126) as Sethe argued; compare note C above: 162f. As the text is destroyed after $hpš$ it cannot be verified which version is the correct one.

J Sethe (1928: 230) translated “das schöne Haus“, but mentioned on page 218 that it is the embalming place (see also VIII.d: 213f.).

K Sethe (1928: 230 and 232) amended $hrw\ stš$ and translated “Horus spricht Worte zu [Seth]”. He mentioned that Thoth could have been the speaker as well.

L Based on the limited space between $⊙$ and $□$ the word starting with $h$ has to be very short. Sethe (1928: 230 and 232) reconstructed $hp$ as it would build a pun with $hpš$ mentioned in the second Remark. He translated “geh von dannen”.

M Sethe (1928: 230) could still read a $t$-ending, supporting the passive mode of the verb.

N For the $w$ as a negation at the end of a sentence, see Edel 1955: § 1100.

O I think that the Remark refers to the staff and not the thigh. In the two preceeding columns (127 and 128) the second Remarks mention the 4-fibre-linen and the 6-fibre-linen respectively, while the third annotations state a location from where the objects are taken: the treasury and the embalming place. Column 129 mentions a building in the third Remark too, the royal house. Hence, it is likely the $hpš$ designates that staff, kept in the royal house, and not the thigh as Sethe (1928: 231 and 233) assumed.

P Like in column 47 Sethe (1928: 231) translated $hwt-\ nb$ as “die Goldschmiede”. He assumed that the geographical locations indicate the place where the action took place, and hence argued that the $hwt-\ nb$ has to refer to an embalming place in column 129. He further stated that the mentioning of a thigh would also point toward a place of embalment as the thigh appears in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual. But as Schott (1984: 265ff.) has pointed out convincingly the geographical Remarks are rather concerned with the place from where certain objects are brought. She made a
case that *hwt-nb* is an archaic writing for *pr-nsw* and translated it “royal house” (see note F, VI.8.3: 89f. and VIII.d: 214f.). In addition, I think that the Remark before refers to the staff and not the thigh (see note O above: 164).

**VI.15.11 Vignette 28**

Vignette 28 represents Scene 43 (cols. 126-129) and is depicted under the text of Scene 39 (cols. 115-116). The illustration is almost completely destroyed so that it cannot be reconstructed. Traces are portant of a figure, and one can conclude, based on the text of Scene 43, that it has to be the “one who embraces the Akh”, to whom the staff and the linen are given. Sethe (1928: 257 and Tf. 21) could still read the caption *shn šḥ* and reconstructed a man who seems to bring something up to his mouth. It is worth to mention that the official looks into the opposite direction as the persons depicted in the preceding Vignettes 25 and 26 so that it seems that he is leaving the site.

**VI.16 Sequence 16 (cols. 130-136)**

Sequence 16 comprises Scenes 44-47 (cols. 130-136) as well as Vignettes 29-31.

**182**

**VI.16.1 Scene 44 (cols. 130-131)**

(130) *hpr.n* [...]w [...] *n* [...] m *sn*<sup>A</sup>

(131) [...] *n* *mr(?)* [...] *htw* *stš*<sup>B</sup>

(130) It happened that [...]  

(131) [...] the followers of Seth

---

182 The Explicatory sentences as well as Remarks of Scenes 44 and 46 are completely destroyed so that it is impossible to assign with certainty these Scenes to a Vignette. It seems that Scene 45 is represented in Vignette 29 as the text of the Explicatory sentence mentions the verb “eat” and the depiction shows bread halves. Sethe (1928: 257f.) assigned Scenes 44 and 45 to Vignette 29 and Scene 46 to Vignette 30. Due to the bad preservation of the papyrus his suggestion cannot be verified. It has to be mentioned, however, that it is also possible that Vignettes 29 and 30 are only one depiction; the caption *wrḥ*, that Sethe assigned to Vignette 20, is partly written above the illustration of two kneeling men in the *hnw*-gesture that belong to the preceding Vignette 19. An indication that *wrḥ*, indeed, belongs to a separate Vignette is the writing direction of the word, which is different from the one of the captions in Vignette 29. Sethe’s division is adopted as the text is too poorly preserved to offer another convincing suggestion.
Notes:

A The Introduction and the Explicatory sentence are mainly destroyed so that a suggestion for a transliteration is impossible. Sethe (1928: 233ff.) tried to reconstruct “Es geschah, daß Essen herbeigebracht wurde für die Einführung der shnw-ḥh in den Palast. […] unter Erdküssen (?“ (hpr.n [ini]w [wnm] n ibs [shnw-ḥh] itrt […] m sn tį). The remains of a sign in the middle of the column could match the hieroglyph 𓎵, but not enough of it is preserved to verify Sethe’s reading of itrt; one feels reminded of the word itry (𓎶𓎱𓎨) – “dual shrines” in PT 482, § 1009a. In Vignette 29 it rather reminds of the sign 𓎷 (htm). In addition, Sethe translated a preposition m in front of itrt that is not written in his reconstruction of the text. Hence, one would have to translate “… the shnw ḥh of the palace”. At the end of the sentence Sethe read m sn tį. He admitted himself, however, that it would be an uncommon writing of the verb, especially since the complimentary n would be missing – he read the last sign as tį. The transliteration m sn (𓎶𓎱𓎨) is definite, but the last sign rather looks like an n, and not the sign for tį (𓎶𓎱𓎨).

B Like column 130, line 131 is mainly destroyed. Only parts of the signs 𓎷, 𓎵(?), 𓎴 and maybe 𓎵(?) are preserved. Hence, it is impossible to reconstruct the context of the Scene. Sethe (1928: 233ff.) suggested “[…] spricht Worte [zu den Kindern des Horus und den Gefolgsleuten des Seth]: Wenn(?) [ihr] wollt(?) […] // [die Kinder des Horus und] die Gefolgsleute des Seth […]“.

VI.16.2 Scene 45 (cols. 132-133)

(132) [...] wnm[…] hn[…] (130) tpw.snA

(132) [...] eat […] together with […] (130) their heads

(133) [...] r.sn 𓎵𓎹𓎦𓎨.sB // ntr […]C // […]D

(133) […] their mouth so that it may jubilate // God […] // […]
Notes:

A Sethe (1928: 236ff.) reconstructed \[hpr.n iniw... imnty iḥty wnm [... \] \[hn\(^{c}\).sn \[hrw pw ip.f irt.f di.f šsp\] \[ntrw tpw.sn\] – “[Es geschah, daß herbeigeführt wurden die Gauverwalter des] Westens (und) [Os]ten[s, die essen sollten [...] mit ihn[en] ... [Horus ist das, der sein Auge zählt und empfangen läßt] die Götter ihre Köpfe“. I prefer to translate ip.f as “who allocates his eye“ as in column 97 (see note A, VI.14.1: 139). The word wnm is clearly visible. The sign before shows a bird on a standard and could be read – in agreement with Sethe – as imnty. Later on in the column the sign is still preserved, followed by two small horizontal signs that most likely build the word hn\(^{c}\). Sethe argued that the remains of signs at the end of column 130 belong to column 132. They definitely do not belong to column 130 as the text ends after sn. There is free space after sn that could have been used. As column 131 is mainly destroyed it cannot be said if the text reached the end of the line and might have included tpw.sn. Sethe only mentioned that the signs must belong to column 132. He argued that they must belong to the Explicatory sentence he amended in column 133.

B Sethe (1928: 236 and 238) restored the first part of the Speech “[Horus spricht Worte zu Thoth: “gib mein Auge in] ihren Mund, damit es bejubelt werde (?)”. He amended the eye of Horus based on the suffix pronoun s after \(d\). The verb \(d\) “jauchzen, sich laut freuen” (Wb I: 241) is only attested in Late Egyptian and during Greek times. If the Vignette, showing two men in jubilation, belongs to this Scene, the gesture of the men would corroborate the meaning of \(d\) (compare Sethe 1928: 238). Another possibility is to assume an intensification of the verb \(d\) – “wohlbehalten sein” (Wb I: 237). A possible translation could be “so that it may be, indeed, healthy”.

C Based on his reconstruction of column 132, Sethe (1928: 236) amended “die Köpfe den Göttern (wieder)geben” (\(d\)it\(t\) tpw ntrw). In case his reconstruction is correct a dative \(n\) would have to be amended before ntrw.

D Sethe (1928: 238) assumed that the second Remark was very short, as the Introduction and Explicatory sentence of the following Scene must have been written in column 133 (see note A, VI.16.4: 168) as well, without suggesting a reading.
VI.16.3 Vignette 29

Vignette 29 represents Scenes 44-45 (cols. 130-133) and appears below the text of Scenes 40-41 (cols. 117-120). On the left side the empty shrine is depicted on the sacred bark as well as the caption nsw – “king”. In front of the bark, walking away from it, a lector priest is illustrated, identified by the caption ḫry-ḥb. He is facing two men, who are shown in the ḫnw-gesture (Dominicus 1994: 61ff). If Sethe’s reconstruction of column 132 is correct (Sethe 1928: 236f. and note A, VI.16.2: 167), the two men represent the nome administrators of the West and East. In between the two groups of people the signs ⲥ Ⲫ are written, probably representing bread halves (for gsw – “halves of bread” see Wb V: 197). Two captions, written above the two men and the bread halves, read ḡḏ mdw ḥtmA – “words to speak, the sealer(?)” and di(t) gswy – “Giving of two bread halves”.

Notes:
A  Sethe (1928: 258) read the sign as irty – “Der itrt-Palast” like in column 130. The sign rather reminds of ⲥ (ḥtm) than ⲳ (ḥtr), however.

VI.16.4 Scene 46 (cols. 133-135)

(133) [...]A  (133) [...]B

(134) ḥrw msw ḥrw ḡḏ mdw ḥḏt r.fB m ṭpw.tn  (134) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus: What was bright against him isE in your heads // [...] // [...]C

// [...] // [...]D

(135) ḥrw msw ḥrw ḡḏ mdw sfkkF n stš hr.s //  (135) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus: Punish Seth because of it! // [...] // [...]E

// [...] // [...]F

// [...] // [...]G

Notes:
A  No traces of the Introduction are preserved. Based on the caption wrh – “anoint” in Vignette 46, Sethe (1928: 238f) reconstructed “[“Es geschah, daß gesalbt wurden die Gauverwalter...”].
B Parts of are still visible. Sethe (1928: 239) mentioned that the fragment of the document starting with the letter was placed a little bit too high. In case his assumption is correct there would be enough space between the head of the ~ and the beginning of the to write both signs in the normal way.

C Sethe (1928: 238f.) amended irt – “das Auge“. Not enough remains are preserved to verify Sethe’s suggestion.

D According to Sethe (1928: 239), the second Remark is supposed to include the word for oil (hitt), which is convincing as the Scene deals with anointing.

E Sethe (1928: 239) translated “soll an euren Köpfen sein“. He argued that the eye, i.e. the oil, should be at the head of the ones who are anointed.

F For the meaning “to punish” for sfkk, see Hannig 2006: 2191 (sfkk n – “jemanden bestrafen”) and Wilson 1997: 836; the letter is written in an abbreviated way and rather reminds of . Sethe (1928: 239) translated “dessentwegen Seth bestraft werden muß(?)”. According to his translation, he parsed sfkk as a prospective tense passive. In that case the following dative n is not explainable and the tw passive ending would be missing. Hence, I prefer an imperative.

G Sethe (1928: 238f.) reconstructed irt – “[das Auge]” as the first Remark and sf – “[sf-Öl]” as the second Remark.

VI.16.5 Vignette 30

Vignette 30 represents Scene 46 (cols. 133-135) and appears below the text of Scene 41 (cols. 121-122). The illustration is only partly preserved. The caption wrh – “to anoint” is clearly visible, while the rest is destroyed. Some remains of signs are preserved, but not identifiable. Sethe (1928: 258) could still read the sign , added, however, that the remaining traces do not match with the two words for oil (hitt, sft) he reconstructed in the second Remarks of columns 134 and 135. One of the traces reminded him of the sign or functioning as an addition to the name of an oil. He further suggested that the nome administrators could be mentioned at this place. The caption is too poorly preserved to make any suggestions. One would, however, expect the mention of the people that are anointed, or a depiction of them.
VI.16.6 Scene 47 (col. 136)

(136) ẖpr.n ẖt(t) [...]\textsuperscript{A} r sh-nṯr

(136) It happened that [...] was taken to the embalming hall.\textsuperscript{B}

Notes:

A Based on the following Scene, in which the word ẖt appears, Sethe (1928: 240) reconstructed ẖt here. Only a small piece of the word is preserved and Sethe admitted that it does not necessarily has to be the sign 𓊕, but could also be 𓊑. In the accompanying Vignette a man is shown carrying an object (𓊕 or 𓊑) that should be the one mentioned in the Introduction. As the sign shows a base Sethe preferred the sign 𓊕 and assumed the object to be a building. He referred to PT 539, § 1324c where we read NN pw šr ẖt ḫrt ḫk - “This NN belongs to the mount of magic”. Although the determinative for ẖt shows 𓊕 it is probably the word for “Stätte, Ort, Hügelsiedlung” (Hannig 2006: 65; compare also Allen 2005b: 170). Sethe mentioned that obelisks are, for example, used in later times as forms for bread or an incense-cake. He assumed the same use in the RDP and thought that the pyramid represents a cake or natron. He translated “ein ḫt-Gebäck (Natron?)”. As the object is brought to the embalming hall the mentioning of natron would make sense.

B The common translation for sh-nṯr is “Gotteshalle” – compare Sethe (1928: 240), referring, however, to the embalming hall of Anubis (Hannig 2006: 2287). Hence, I prefer the translation “embalming hall” in the context of the ritual; see also VIII.d: 213f.

VI.16.7 Vignette 31

Vignette 31 represents Scene 47 (col. 136) and is drawn below the text of Scenes 42-43 (cols. 123-129). The illustration shows a ḫry-ḥb priest, carrying an object that reminds of a piece of bread or cake. As mentioned in note A, VI.16.6: 170, it could also be natron. The caption reads ẖt(t) r sh-nṯr – “taking to the embalming hall”. Sethe (1928, 258) translated sh-nṯr with “göttliche Kapelle” (see note B, VI.16.6: 170).
VI.17. Sequence 17 (cols. 136-139)
Sequence 17 comprises Scene 48 (cols. 136-139) and Vignette 32.

VI.17.1 Scene 48 (cols. 136-139)

(136) ^hpr.n rdit špnt [...]B

(136) It happened that a mug was given [...].

(137) hrw stš dd mdw m ỉtC m ghstD <n>

it.(i)E // wsir hr // ỉ[t]

(137) Horus speaks words to Seth: Take the standard in Geheset <for> (my) fatherF // Osiris, the fallen one // The standardG

(138) hrw wsir ḏ mdw nṯr r.(i) // wsir // sḥ-

nṯr

(138) Horus speaks words to Osiris: You who you are more divine than (me) // Osiris // Embalming hall184

(139) [...]H

(139) [...]

Notes:

A The ancient scribe probably forgot to write the Introduction in a separate column, and hence, added it under the Introduction of the previous Scene. It is unlikely that he ran out of space as the document was written from right to left (see IV: 30ff.) and the Scene was the first one he had to copy. Both Scenes (47 and 48) are, however, represented by a separate Vignette (see also Sethe 1928: 241).

B Sethe (1928: 241) stated that there are too many options for the reconstruction of the sentence. He suggested “Es geschah, daß ein (?) Krug [mit Wasser] gegeben wurde [dem Vater des Herrschers]“. He mentioned that the word špnt appears in the Pyramid Texts with a certain number, and stated that a number could also have been added

183 Gestermann (2008: 35) assigned Scene 48 to the preceding Sequence. The depiction representing the Scene is not preserved except for the illustration of a person, identified as the lector priest by the caption. The depiction does not start with the bark on the shrine, but the illustration is clearly separated from the previous one by a separation line. It can be precluded that the action of Scene 48 was originally drawn to the left side of the separation line. The papyrus is fragmentary at this point, but remains of the drawing should be still visible; compare also Sethe 1928: 258 who assigns Vignette 32 to Scene 48.

184 See note B, VI.16.6: 170.
after Špnt in the RDP. Based on the scarce remains of Vignette 32, it can be concluded that the lector priest is the actor, so that Sethe’s sentence can be completed: ḥpr.n rdit špnt [n it ḫq.i in hry-hb] – “It happened that a mug was given [to the father of the ruler by the lector priest”].

C The reading is based on the second Remark. The sign gı rather reminds of gı.

D The reading of ghst is not clear. Sethe (1928: 242) mentioned that the location is usually written with two goats. In addition, the two animals do not wear crowns; compare PT 478, § 972c (◻ mmm –).

E In case the signs 习近 have to be read it(i) a dative n is necessary in front of the word. Another possibility would be the demonstrative pronoun tf.

F Sethe (1928: 240) translated differently: “nicht gibt es eine Stätte in Gḥs.tj für meinen Vater“. He was convinced that the m can only be the negation m. Other possibilities are the imperative m185, or the question particle m. The imperative seems to make the most sense here. A translation for išt is difficult as the determinative is not written. If the parsing of m as an imperative is correct, išt cannot be the “place” or “mound”, but the “standard” (Hannig 2006: 65) as something is “taken”.

G Sethe (1928: 240 and 242) did not translate the word išt. He thought that the Remark rather refers to the object brought in the Scene than a location. He mentioned, however, that also the cultic place of Osiris, called išty, could be meant.

H Unidentifiable traces of signs indicate that the text does not end with column 138. Sethe (1928: 240) suggested “Die Gefolgsleute [des Seth sprechen Worte zu …] [....]“. The text most likely ended with column 139 (see III.b: 24ff.).

**VI.17.2. Vignette 32**

Vignette 32 represents Scene 48 (cols. 136-139) and starts below the text of Sequence 16 and 17 (cols. 130-139). Only the figure of a lecture-priest – identified by the caption (hry-hb) – is preserved. The position of the upper arms suggests that the priest was carrying something – according to the text of column 136 a mug. It cannot be said if the rest of the Vignette was

185 Concerning the writing without ← see columns 55 (VI.9.1: 97) and 78 (VI.11.1: 118). Sethe himself (1928: 162) translated 习近 as “nimm”.
left empty. As probably only one more column of text followed after column 139 (see III.b: 24ff.), it is highly unlikely that another depiction followed.
VII. Review of previous scholarship on the interpretation of the ritual

The first interpretation of the RDP was done by Sethe, who published the text for the first time. He (1928: 95f.) suggested that the ritual dealt with the Accession to the Throne by Senwosret I, as this king, identified by his name in the first two Vignettes, takes centre stage in his mythological role of Horus during the entire ritual. Sethe argued that the festival, at which the manuscript was read, starts with the death of the preceding king Amenemhet I and ends with his burial. The main part is the Coronation of Senwosret I, however, which – according to Sethe – took place in between the death and the burial of his father Amenemhet I. Based on the different geographical locations mentioned in the third Remarks of the manuscript, Sethe assumed that the play was performed at several places in Egypt during a journey of Senwosret I, after he had become the legitimate ruler of the country. It is more likely, however, that the buildings and locations in the third Remarks refer to places from where certain items used in the ritual were taken (see also Schott 1984).

Frankfort (1969: 123-139) agreed with Sethe’s interpretation and added that the ritual was performed at the accession of Senworet I. He divided the text into six parts. The first one (Scenes 1-8) is concerned with the preparation of accessories, while the second part (Scene 9) deals with the provision of royal insignia. The third section (Scenes 10-20) describes further preparations as well as the hnk-t-offering and the erection of the Djed-pillar. The fourth part (Scenes 21-27) mentions the bringing of Egypt’s produce to the king as well as the htp-meal right before the coronation. Section 5 (Scenes 28-34) is concerned with the coronation itself and builds the culmination point of the entire ritual, while the last part (Scenes 35-48) deals with the transfiguration of the predecessor.

Sethe’s interpretation was accepted for some time until several scholars reconsidered the RDP, with some even changing the reading sequence of the text. This restructuring of the document led to a different understanding of the ritual. Helck (1954: 383ff.), Altenmüller

---

186 The chapter only presents a summary of all interpretations of the RDP so far. A discussion on these interpretations follows in chapter IX. Lorand’s analysis is, however, commented on in this chapter as he changed again the reading sequence of the text and interpreted the text as a piece of propaganda; chapter IX deals with different royal and statue rituals.
(1965/66: 421ff.), and Barta (1972: 5ff. and 1976: 31ff.) identified the papyrus as a representation of the Sed festival of Senwosret I.

Helck assumed that the ritual is a revision of an earlier version, the so-called *Urfestrolle*, which only consisted of the illustrations and short Remarks. According to him, the text was later on reedited twice: in a first step the mythological background was added, and then some of the annotations.\(^{187}\) Helck thought that the RDP expresses ceremonies performed in the evening before the Sed festival. He identified two agricultural rites as well as the Opening of the Mouth Ritual and a burial of a statue. His interpretation was based on the comparison of the text with the depictions of Amenhotep III’s Sed festival in the tomb of Kheruef.\(^{188}\) In order to prove the similarities between both compositions, however, Helck needed to change the reading sequence of the RDP. He justified his new arrangement by claiming that the ancient scribe who copied the text from the *Urfestrolle* made a mistake. According to Helck, the original version was in a poor condition and torn in two pieces, so that the scribe made mistakes in the arrangement of the text while writing it down. Supposedly, he took a piece from both parts, each consisting of several fragments, and then joined them together wrongly.\(^{189}\) None of Helck’s imaginative assumptions concerning the copying process can be proven, however. Quack (2006: 81f.) argued convincingly that the drawing provided by Helck to corroborate his hypothesis could only be applied when the ritual was written down on three different papyrus rolls; this is, however, not probable as it would not have been practical to read from different papyrus rolls during a ritual.

Nevertheless, Altenmüller agreed with Helck’s interpretation of the ritual, but thought that the RDP actually features the Sed festival and not the ceremonies from the evening before. He also proposed another reading sequence of the text. He was convinced that the papyrus was actually used and could thus not have included mistakes. Based on the lines separating the illustrations from each other, he divided the ritual into 14 chapters, so called *hwt* (“houses”). Besides the eight lines that are preserved in the document, he appended six more. Altenmüller thought that some illustrations were not drawn due to the lack of space. His

\(^{187}\) Helck (1954: 383) was convinced that the core of the ritual goes back to ideas from prehistoric times and was later on connected to the Osiris myth; see III: 21f. and IV: 30ff.

\(^{188}\) For a discussion on the composition in Kheruef’s tomb, see Fakhry 1943 and The Epigraphic Survey 1980.

\(^{189}\) See Helck’s drawings on pages 389, 392, 393, and 395 of his 1954 article.
assumption of missing Vignettes is questionable, however, as the very right part of the manuscripts shows free space so that there would have been enough space for the ancient scribe to add more depictions (compare also Quack 2006: 82). In contrast to Sethe, Altenmüller thought that these chapters have to be read from right to left, while the Scenes within these chapters run from left to right. This reading arrangement seems very unhandy for the person who recites the ritual from the papyrus roll. He had to start reading from the right part of the manuscript, but at the same time had to look to the left to see where the chapter starts. This means he had to unroll the papyrus for a good part, especially since some of Altenmüller’s chapters contain a high number of columns; chapter 12 includes 29 rows for example, a length that is hardly manageable by a person who reads directly from the document (see Quack 2006: 82). Concerning the content of the ritual, Altenmüller’s rearrangement seems, indeed, logical for some Scenes, but it also tears apart several other Scenes, as Quack has pointed out.\(^\text{190}\) Altenmüller’s interpretation was also based on a comparison of the Sed festival as depicted in the tomb of Kheruef, a reading sequence that Wente has demonstrated to be wrong.\(^\text{191}\)

Barta agreed with Altenmüller, although he disagreed with the latter in certain details by changing the position of the added separation lines (Barta 1972: 10ff.). Even though Barta recognized differences in the illustration of the Sed festival in the RDP and the respective depictions in the “world chamber” of Niuserre\(^\text{192}\), he adhered to his interpretation. He thought that there are similarities between the illustrations in the tomb of Kheruef and the papyrus. These similarities only derive from a symbolic interpretation of some Scenes, however. Barta, for example, equated the stick fighting Scene (cols. 117-119) in the RDP with the \textit{Löwenmöbelfolge} in the Sed festival depiction in Abu Gurob. He thought that the fighting Scene symbolizes the unification of the king with his heavenly mother, exercised

\(^{190}\) Quack (2006: 82) argued convincingly that, for example, the presentation of diverse jewellery objects (columns 72-79) would be torn apart.

\(^{191}\) Altenmüller misleadingly read the southern wall before the northern one. For a detailed discussion, see Wente 1969.

\(^{192}\) For the Sed festival depictions in the “world chamber” of Niuserre, see Bissing von/Kees 1923 and 1928 as well as Kaiser 1971.
through rape, leading to a self creation of the king. The Löwenmöbelfolge symbolizes the same mythical event: the lion bed also represents a mother goddess, with whom the king unites himself when he sat down on the piece of furniture (see Barta 1976: 38ff.). Barta’s interpretation of the fighting scene seems too far-fetched (see also Quack 2006: 84). It is more likely that the combat represents a mythological battle between Osiris/Horus and Seth/the followers of Seth, in which Horus triumphs over his enemies (see note B, VI.15.4: 153ff.). In general Barta tried to explain the differences between the compositions with the hypothesis that the depictions in Kheruef’s tomb represent the first Sed festival of Amenhotep III, while the RDP displays the repetition of the ceremony. For the sake of completeness it has to be mentioned that Rummel (2006) adopted Altenmüller’s and Barta’s interpretations of the ritual as a representation of the Sed festival.

Quack (2006: 72-89) emphasized in his article that the interpretation of the papyrus as a representation of the Sed festival is unsustainable. The decoration programme of this event, which can be developed from the depictions in the tomb of Kheruef, the so-called world chamber of Niusserre, the hall of Osorkon II in Bubastis, and other representations, is not similar to the ritual described in the RDP: the most typical scenes of the Sed festival are missing from the RDP, like the king running or sitting on his throne wearing a special cloak. Additionally, Quack argued that the dominant role of the dead king in the papyrus cannot be explained by this interpretation, as he would have been dead for at least 30 years.

Quack was of the opinion that Sethe was closer to the real interpretation of the text than anybody else and returned to Sethe’s reading sequence from left to right. However, Quack’s interpretation differed from Sethe’s in so far as he distinguished between the events of the Accession to the Throne and the Coronation. Barta (1980a) has convincingly pointed out that

---

193 Barta followed Sethe’s translation of column 119: “The children of Horus speak words to Nut: raise your children towards heaven, while your buttocks are turned towards the goats that surround him” (“Die Horuskinder sprechen Worte zu [Nut]: erhebe deine Kinder zum Himmel, indem deine Hinterbacken zugewandt sind de[n] Ziegen, die [ihn] umringten”; Sethe 1928: 223). Barta admitted himself that only the expressions “raise towards heaven” and “buttocks” refer to his interpretation.

194 For the Sed festival representation in the hall of Osorkon II, see Naville 1892 and Barta 1978.

195 The dead king is Senwosret I’s father Amenemhet I, who had been dead at least 30 years at the time of Senworet I’s first Sed festival. Helck (1954: 410f.) tried to explain the occurrence of the predecessor by an original killing of the king after 30 years; there is no evidence for such a custom in Egypt during prehistoric times, however (Störk 1973: 31; Lorton 1979: 461; Quack 2006: 84). For a more detailed explanation against the ritual as a rendition of the Sed festival, see Quack 2006: 83f. and IX.a: 219ff.
the Accession to the Throne was performed on the day after the death of the predecessor, while the Coronation took place after his burial, that is to say at least 70 days after the death of the former king.\(^{196}\) Based on the separation of these two events, Quack took a closer look at both celebrations. He referred to a couple of depictions and papyri, which might be connected to a Coronation.\(^{197}\) Neither of the respective papyri show any similarities with the RDP, so that an interpretation of the text as a representation of the Coronation can most likely be ruled out (see also IX.b: 222ff.).

Hence, Quack (2006: 88ff.) connected the ritual with the Accession to the Throne of Senwosret I, more precisely with the moment of the death of Amenemhet I, when Senwosret I came to power. Based on the appearance of the dead king in his role as Osiris, Quack separated the ritual into three parts.\(^{198}\) The first part deals with the son taking over power from his dead father and the beginning of the provision of the corpse. Transferred to the Osiris myth, this section of the text deals with the revenge of Horus against Seth as well as the punishment of the latter. In the next part the newly appointed king fulfills his rights as the new ruler and is accepted as the legitimate king; he receives the royal insignia and feasts the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt. At the same time the myth describes the inheritance fight between Horus and Seth. The last section broaches the issue of the final care for the dead father. He is brought to a chapel and the cult of mourning starts. In the respective parts of the myth Seth is punished again and his thigh is pulled out.

Quirke (Forman and Quirke 1996: 107) interpreted the text as a ritual for Senwosret I’s commemoration in Karnak. The basis for his hypothesis is the building activity of the king in Karnak. Unfortunately, Quirke did not provide a detailed explanation for his theory. Gestermann (2008: 48ff.) agreed with Seethe that the ruler is clearly the centre of the ritual, but that it is ambiguous whether it is a statue representing him or his mummy. Hence, in contrast to the previous interpretations she thought that the ritual is concerned with the dead king, and not the living sovereign. She based her assumption on the fact that Osiris is the

\(^{196}\) 70 days were needed for an appropriate embalming process (see, for example, Ikram and Dodson 1998: 104).
\(^{197}\) Quack (2006: 87f.) mentioned some illustrations, which he did not further specify as well as rituals written down on papyri like the so-called Reinigung Pharaos in einem memphitischen Tempel as well as pCarlsberg 658, 659, and 660, and pBrooklyn 47.218.50.
\(^{198}\) Osiris appears in Scenes 1-16, is missing until Scene 34, before he is mentioned again in the remaining 13 Scenes.
beneficiary of the ritual, and that the divine beings occurring in the mythological part of the ritual belong to the Osiris cycle. Furthermore, Isis does not appear in her role of mother, as we would expect if the ritual focuses on Horus, i.e. the living king. Instead, she is presented in her role as the mourning wife. Gestermann also argued convincingly that the king does not play an active part in the ritual. He is depicted, probably as a statue, in a shrine and most of the actions are directed towards the shrine, hence towards the ruler. He is never illustrated as the acting person however, as we would expect if the ritual represents the Sed festival, for example, or a ritual that was performed during the rule of the king. She further noted that the presence of the shnw ỉḥ points towards the fact that the king is dead. These officials are known to perform activities for the deceased ruler.\(^{199}\) Gestermann argued that the similarities between the ritual of the RDP and the Sed festival are based on a common origin of both compositions. She disagreed with Sethe that the ritual consists of two main events, the burial of the deceased king and the coronation of the successor, as there is no decisive break within the text. Gestermann rather thought that it is in the realm of possibility that the text describes the Burial Ritual or a part of it. An indicator for this assumption is the changing title of the king; the shrine on the sacred bark shows the caption nsw (‘king’), but also the expression it ḫqı (“the father of the ruler”).\(^{200}\) In connection with the Burial Ritual she argued convincingly that the term “king” is used because the ruler is not buried yet. The expression “father of the ruler” refers then to the fact that the successor has already accessed the throne, but is not crowned yet. As Gestermann pointed out herself, the manuscript shows discrepancies with the known representations of the Burial Ritual and can only be connected to it indirectly (see IX.e: 230ff.). Thus, she noted that the RDP most likely represents a ritual that is not known yet, maybe a ritual performed with a statue as Quirke (Forman and Quirke 1996: 107) has suggested. In this respect she referred to text fragments found in the pyramid complex of Khentkaus that seem to document the cult for a statue (see IX.d: 229f.).

The latest interpretation of the text was done by Lorand (2009). He again changed the reading direction of the text by reading from right to left. He argued that the content of the ritual is reflected by a structure he referred to as “spatio-dynamique” (Lorand 2009: 103ff.):

\(^{199}\) For a discussion on the title shnw ỉḥ, see VIII.b: 205ff.

\(^{200}\) For a discussion of the epithet, see VIII.e: 215ff.
he identified two central elements – the meal of the king (cols. 132-133, 97-100, 80-81) and the preparation of the barks (cols. 53-54, 37-40, 34-36, 21-24, 5-7, 1-4) – that recurs three and six times respectively during the ritual. The first element divides the text in four thematic chapters. The first chapter concerns the death of Osiris (col. 139-132), the second deals with the embalming of Osiris (cols. 131-97), the third comprises the coronation of Horus (cols. 96-80), while the fourth involves the conflict of Horus and Seth (cols. 79-1). The second element, the preparation of the barks, separates the previously mentioned fourth chapter into four subchapters: the resolution of the conflict of Horus and Seth (cols. 79-53), the subchapter “Horus is powerful, that what he says is done for him” (cols. 52-34), the subchapter “Horus grew up ... he protects his father and helps him” (cols. 33-21), and the subchapter “the son of the lord is behind him...” (cols. 20-1). Lorand identified the conflict of Horus and Seth as the main theme of the ritual; the son is the legitimate heir of his father. He then related the content to the political situation of the beginning of the 12th dynasty, and argued that the RDP was composed to legitimize Senwosret I’s rule. Thus, the text was used as a piece of propaganda at the beginning of that king’s reign.\footnote{By interpreting the RDP as a piece of propaganda, Lorand followed in the footsteps of Posener (1956). The latter argued that the kings of the 12th dynasty, especially Senwosret I, used literary pieces as a means for the re-establishment of pharaoh’s esteem and reputation after the First Intermediate Period (Posener 1956: 16f.). He interpreted the Instruction of Amenemhet I, for example, as a work to legitimize Senwosret I as the rightful heir of Amenemhet I (Posener 1956: 61ff.), and understood Sinuhe as a hymn to Senwosret I. According to Posener (1956: 87ff.), the piece explains the change in internal affairs with the reinvigoration of the dynasty.} He claimed that Senwosret I is in the same position as Horus; according to Lorand, Senwosret I has to prove that he is the legitimate successor of his father Amenemhet I as the latter was the victim of an assassination before he could announce his son as the legitimate heir to the throne (Lorand 2009: 140ff.).

Lorand’s attempt to interpret the text is questionable in several regards. If the ritual was, indeed, used as a propaganda means to strengthen Senwosret I’s kingship, the text must have been composed during his reign, probably at the beginning of his rule. The manuscript dates to the late 12th dynasty, however (see II.a: 4ff. and III: 21f.). Whereas one could argue that the RDP was copied from an original that is not preserved and that dates to the reign of Senwosret I, it is difficult to understand why the ritual would have been copied down at the end of the 12th dynasty, with the name of the same ruler. At that time there was no need to
convince the high officials of the country that Senwosret I was the legitimate successor of Amenemhet I. Lorand’s suggestion to read the text from right to left is also problematic. The person who recited the ritual would have had to jump forward several lines to the left, to the beginning of the Scene, to start reading and then backtrack the rest of the Scene towards the beginning of the ritual again. This method might have worked with the first Scene, but after that the reading method gets very confusing. The priest arrived at the end of the text and then had to jump over the columns of Scenes 1 and 2 to the beginning of the 2nd section to start reading that part backwards towards the beginning again. It is hard to imagine that this reading sequence would actually work during the performance of the ritual. Finally, the thematic separation of the text raises some questions. According to Lorand, the coronation of Horus is thematised before the conflict of Horus and Seth. One would, however, expect it to be the other way around. Horus wins the fight, and is thus declared the legitimate heir of his father; compare, e.g. the Contendings of Horus and Seth. Furthermore, the ritual starts with the death and embalmment of Osiris, followed by the coronation of Horus on the mythological sphere. Hence, the actual performed ritual would have been concerned with the death and embalmment of Amenemhet I as well as the succeeding Coronation of Senwosret I.

As stated earlier, this succession of events covers a time span of 70 days as the coronation took place after the burial of the predecessor. In addition, the Accession to the Throne, which happened a day after the death of the former king, would be missing in the course of the ritual (see Barta 1980a). Additionally, Lorand did not take into account the Vignettes accompanying the text. He did not explain why the shrine on the sacred bark, a recurring motif in the illustrations, is empty at the beginning – according to his reading sequence – whereas a figure identified as the king is depicted towards the end of the ritual. He also did not clarify the alternating captions of that shrine; twice we read “the king, the father of the ruler” instead of “king”. It is also difficult to understand why the last two Vignettes, according to Lorand’s reading direction, would mention the Horus name of Senwosret. It is far more convincing to assume that Senwosret’s name appears in the first two illustrations to clarify that he, or his statue, is depicted in the shrine. Lastly, one specific example from Lorand’s chapters is discussed in detail. Columns 114-116 are concerned with the shnw šḥ who carry the “father of the ruler” on their arms. According to Lorand’s division of the ritual, the Scene belongs to the second chapter, the embalmment of Osiris, i.e. of Amenemhet I
(Lorand 2009: 114f. and 120). However, in the accompanying Vignette 24 the alleged previous ruler is depicted as a standing figure, namely a statue (see VIII.e: 215ff.), and not a mummy or a coffin as Lorand’s interpretation would imply.
VIII. The course of the Ritual

The following chapter focuses on different aspects of the ritual. At first, the content of the text is summarized, followed by a discussion on the various earthly and divine participants of the ceremony. Subsequently, the geographical annotations are analyzed as well as the depiction and epithets of the king preserved in the Vignettes.

VIII.a The content of the Ritual

Based on the division of the text into 17 Sequences the content of the actual ritual is condensed in the following chapter, including the additional information provided by the accompanying Vignettes as well as the mythological interpretations of the different actions.  

Sequence 1

Following the lost beginning of the ritual (Scene 1), the sacred bark is built, called the “one who opens the canals” (Scene 2), and eight mns⁻⁻⁻-vessels are brought to its prow by the “ones who are connected with the cultic largess of the king” (Scene 3). The designation “sacred bark” refers to the boat containing a shrine with the image of the king inside depicted in the Vignettes; the royal figure represents a statue (see VIII.e: 215ff. and X: 238ff.). The action is connected to a purification place in the temple that is mentioned in the second Remark of Scene 3 (“Going forth to the purification place”). “The ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king”, identified as the “crew of the oldest” in the first Remark of column 7, probably purify the shrine, and thus rejuvenate the statue of the king with the water kept in the mns⁻⁻⁻-vessels. Purifications also symbolically create a sacred space; the real world is transferred into the divine sphere (Lorton 1999: 177). The mythological counterpart of the

---

202 See also the running translation in appendix A (272ff.), which includes reconstructions, and appendix B (297ff.), which provides an abbreviated summary of the ritual in the form of a chart.

203 Sethe (1928: 96) assumed that the bark is equipped with the vessels. However, the question would then be what use was made of the vessels. Sethe did not specify why they are brought onto the ship. The same jugs are mentioned again in Scene 13, when they are taken to the front of two other barks. Thus, I suggest that they are used for purification at the beginning of the ritual, and are then brought to the two boats after they had served their purpose.
episode identifies the sacred bark first with the eye of Horus (Scene 2) and then with Seth, who is placed under Osiris; the latter is represented by the eight mnsj-vessels (Scene 3). The image of Seth being under Osiris describes Seth’s punishment and Osiris’ dominion over him (see note C, VI.1.3: 45f.; Griffiths 1960: 10ff.).

Sequence 2

Following this, a royal ox is carved and bound (Scene 4) and “the ones who are responsible for the iŷh and stewards” of the lord are brought, who recite according to the second Remark of columns 12 and 13 (“Words to speak”), most likely in front of the carved ox (Scene 5). The action takes place in front of the figure of the king. The episode definitely describes the slaughtering ritual that was earlier a ritual on its own, but was later incorporated into the Opening of the Mouth Ritual (Scenes 23 and 43) and the one described in the RDP, for example. The mythological sphere of Scene 4 still focuses on the punishment of Seth who is identified with the carved and bound ox. Thoth appears as the slaughterer who hands over Seth’s thigh to Horus; the thigh is represented by the eye of Horus. The divine part of Scene 5 is concerned with Osiris coming to his son Horus as well as the search for Osiris. The latter event might be connected to the ḫḥi is rite known from the Driving of the Calves ritual. The so-called “Searching for the tomb” deals with Horus’ pretended search for Osiris’ tomb in order to mislead Seth and his followers (see note M, VI.2.2: 53; Egberts 1995: 345ff.). If the mythological part of the RDP, indeed, refers to this episode from the Osiris myth, the text would further stress Seth’s punishment.

---

204 Sethe (1928: 246) suggested that the iŷh wdtpw is depicted sharpening a knife (Vignette 2). Thus, he assumed that the “one who is responsible for the iŷh and steward” has to be identified with the slaughterer of the ox. However, the Vignette is partly destroyed and the action performed by the official not recognizable. It is just as possible that he stands in front of the carved ox and recites (see also note D, VI.2.3: 54f.).


206 The text only mentions that Horus receives his eye from Thoth, but most likely the eye has to be identified with the thigh of Seth (see also Gestermann 2008: 38). Gestermann identified Horus as the slaughterer, and Thoth as the ox. However, this peculiar interpretation stems from the fact that the text of column 9 features a mistake on the part of the ancient scribe who erroneously wrote down the name of Thoth instead of Seth as the addressee of the Speech (see note D, VI.2.1: 49). Based on the corrected reading, Seth has clearly to be identified with the ox – the same identification is present in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual (Otto 1960: 76). The slaughter of a bull is also part of the funeral. At each stage of the ritual, an animal is slaughtered, identified with Seth (see, for example, Hays 2010, 4f./ http://escholarship.org/uc/item/1r32g9zn).
Sequence 3

The next episode consists of the placing of emmer on the threshing floor (Scene 6), which can be identified as an agrarian rite. The sacred bark with the royal image is missing in the Vignette. Hence, it is most likely that the presence of the dead king is not necessary. The emmer is identified with the remaining eye of Horus that the children of Horus are supposed to take. Based on the mythological interpretation of the Scene, the ritual action seems to be connected with an offering. Maybe the emmer is needed for the preparation of the cakes that are presented in the next Sequence (see also Sethe 1928: 96).

Sequence 4

Subsequently, the lector priest offers two royal cakes (Scene 7) to the statue of the king. In addition, two barks are moored, each containing an *imi*-tree (Scene 8). The leaves of the tree were possibly used to refresh and rejuvenate the royal image, either through the smell or through moving air by using the plant as a fan. The action takes place in the presence of the royal statue. On the mythological level Horus receives his eye back from Thoth, which had been taken by Seth (Scene 7). Hence, the eye of Horus appears as the classic synonym for an offering, namely the two cakes. The first Remark of column 20 (Scene 7) mentions Thoth who is identified with a celebrant (*iḥḥb*) in the following second annotation. Maybe the priest in the role of Thoth recites a jubilation text or song in front of the statue after the delivery of the two cakes. The divine counterpart of Scene 8 is again concerned with the punishment of Seth and the triumph of Osiris. As in Scene 3, Seth, identified with the bark, is placed under Osiris, represented by the *imi*-tree.

---

207 The text does not specifically state that the cakes are offered to the king. The Vignette only mentions the presentation in a caption; it does not show the lector priest bringing the cakes. It is, however, likely that the pastry was presented to the royal image.

208 Sethe (1928: 96) assumed that the two boats are equipped with the *imi*-trees. I rather think that the barks arrive already loaded with the plants.

209 The object more likely represents the leaf of the *imi*-tree than the entire plant. Three of these objects are carried by an official in the course of the ritual (see Vignette 7). It is impossible that one person can carry three trees (see also Sethe 1928: 125).

210 For the smell that the *imi*-tree produces, see Koemoth 1994: 131.

211 The term *iḥḥb* rather seems to refer to the performance of hymns than of dances (see note H, VI.4.1: 60f.).
**Sequence 5**

Afterwards, the staff of Horus, the *ims*-mace, the *mth*, and the *hd*-mace are taken by the “one who is connected to the cultic largess of the king” (Scene 9). The official is depicted in the Vignette in front of a shrine, called the “northern erected hill”. As the shrine is smaller than the official, the monument is not likely to be a large building. It possibly portrays the repository, out of which the different insignia are taken (see also Sethe 1928: 96). Based on the third Remark in column 27, the *mth* is stored in the embalming place, while the *hd*-mace is mentioned together with the action of “Crossing the desert” (second Remark in column 28). The expression “Crossing the desert” and the term *hd*-mace remind us of the ritual run or dance of the newly appointed king during the Sed festival, depicted, for example, in the south tomb of Djoser’s funerary complex. The mythological part of the Sequence concerns Horus who became powerful by receiving the different staffs, symbolized by his eye, so that he is able to protect Osiris. The interpretation of the Scene is difficult as it is not mentioned that the regalia are presented to the royal image. In addition, the depiction of the sacred bark and the image of the king are missing in the Vignette. Furthermore, it is clear from the mythological interpretation of the Scene that Horus, usually representing the living king, receives the insignia in order to protect his father Osiris. Maybe a symbolic run is performed with the royal statue expressing its power. This strength could refer to the ruling power the king had on earth explaining the reference to Horus.

**Sequence 6**

The next Sequence deals with the placing of barley on the threshing floor (Scene 10), which is trampled down by male bulls and male donkeys (Scene 11). As in Scene 6, where emmer is

---

212 A comparable action is attested in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual (see also IX.f: 233ff.). An *ims*- and *hd*-mace as well as a *mnw* object are offered to the statue (scenes 57 A-C; Otto 1960 I: 144ff. and II: 127ff.). Otto added that the rite originated in the Coronation Ritual.

213 For a depiction of the cultic run or dance, see Firth/Quibell 1936: pls. 15f. and 42; Lange/Hirmer 1967: pl. 15. For works on the Sed festival in general, see amongst others, Uphill 1965, Bleeker 1967: 96ff., Hornung/Staehelin 1974, Barta 1975: 62ff., and Hornung/Staehelin 2006. For an in depth study on the Sed festival run, see Kees 1912: 135ff. It has to be mentioned, however, that the king carries the Meket and the flagellum in the cultic run of the Sed festival. A comparable ritual run is also part of the Coronation ceremonies (Scenes 8 and 15; Barta 1985: 7; see also IX.a: 219ff. and b: 222ff.).

214 The text of the Sequence only states that the *iryw bt nsw* take the regalia (col. 25).

215 However, in the Daily Temple Ritual the divine statue of Amun-Re is also equalled with Horus, and not Osiris (see Lorton 1999: 132).
placed on the threshing floor, the figure of the king is not present during the event. After the action is completed a purification rite is performed, probably in the temple; the third Remark of column 33 mentions the “Going forth to the place of purification”. The mythological interpretation of the action is still concerned with Horus, the protector of his father. Osiris is equated with the barley and hence beaten and chopped up (ḥbꜣ nṯr; second Remark of column 31). The annotation ḥbꜣ nṯr especially reminds one of the agricultural ritual ḥbs tꜣ (“hacking up of the earth”), which was adopted into the Osiris myth; here it is interpreted as the justification of Osiris over his enemies (see note E, VI.6.2: 73ff.; Guglielmi 1975: 1261ff.). The triumph of Osiris in the RDP is strengthened by the integration of the episode that deals with the beating of the followers of Seth by Horus. The fight took place in Letopolis (third Remark of column 32), the place where Horus avenged his father (BD 1 and 18); Horus retaliates upon Osiris’ enemies for his father on the day before the latter’s funeral (see note I, VI.6.2: 75).

**Sequence 7**

In the following, the “one who is responsible for the iḥḥ and steward” brings an imḥ-tree and natron towards the sacred bark (Scene 12). Conceivably, the statue of the dead king is purified and divinized with the natron and rejuvenated by the smell of the imḥ-tree. According to the third Remark of column 36, the natron was taken from the treasury. In addition, an imḥ-tree and eight mnsḥ-vessels are brought to the front of the two barks (Scene 13). Those two barks are probably the same boats that arrive in Scene 8, each containing an imḥ-tree. Thus, it is likely that the rite(s), performed with the leaves of these trees, are completed and the objects are brought back to the barks. The same applies to the eight

---

216 A comparable rite is attested in the course of Amenhotep III’s Sed festival, depicted in the tomb of Kheruef; asses and cattle are driven around a wall four times on the day of the erection of the Djed-pillar (Bleeker 1967: 103; for the similarities of both rites, see Egberts 1995: 371). Gaballa and Kitchen (1969: 73ff.) identified the ceremony as an agrarian rite that was taken over into the Osiris myth. They suggested that the driving of the cattle represents the treading in the grain, but also symbolizes the concealing of Osiris’ tomb. The ritual of Driving the Calves is, however, not connected to the event described in the RDP. In the latter, the animals are associated with Seth and his followers who trample down Osiris. In the Driving of the Calves ritual, the cattle are allies of Osiris. In addition, the representations of both rites are not similar (Egberts 1995: 370ff.; see also IX.a: 219ff.).

217 Sethe (1928: 97) assumed again that the three barks were already equipped with the items.

218 Most likely one leaf of the imḥ-tree is kept as it is later arranged on top of the Djed-pillar (see Scene 16 below).
The mythological counterpart is mainly concerned with Osiris who comes to Horus (Scene 12). Moreover, the punishment of Seth is mentioned again, as he is placed under Osiris. Seth is identified with the bark again (first and second Remarks of column 38), and one wonders whether the designation dšr-tent-ship (third Remark of column 38) for that particular boat alludes to Seth’s character, who is said to dominate the “red” desert and can represent anger and violence, among other things.

Sequence 8

After that, the signal for the preparation of the hnkt-offering is given (Scene 14). The heads of a goose and a kid are cut off and prepared on a fire basin before they are offered to the Djed-pillar (Scene 15). The third Remark of column 47 mentions the royal house. It is likely that the butchering of the two animals took place here (see note F, VI.8.3: 89f. and VIII.d: 214f.). The Djed-pillar is erected by the “ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king” (Scene 16), and a rope is put around it (Scene 17). After that, the royal children descend into their two barks (Scene 18) – the two boats are probably the same ones mentioned in Scene 13. The action takes place in front of the sacred bark with the figure of the king inside the shrine. The succession of the five events seems peculiar. The Sequence starts with the signal for the hnkt-offering that is prepared afterwards. The offering is given to the already erected Djed-pillar, however, as the accompanying Vignette indicates; in the text, the erection of the symbol is mentioned after the offering. Additionally, the pillar is depicted with a rope around it, whereas the application of the rope happens after the erection in the text. It is more likely that the rope is applied to the Djed-pillar as a means to lift it up. The initially incomprehensible sequence of events can be explained if several actions take place at the same time (see also Gestermann 2008: 37), a circumstance that cannot be depicted in the
Vignettes or described in the text. I suggest that the offering is made exactly at the moment when the Djed-pillar is erected. In addition, the rope is applied shortly before as it is needed for the lifting of the object. The two main events of the Sequence, the *hnkt*-offering and the erection of the Djed-pillar, are known from other rituals. The *hnkt*-offering is part of the foundation ritual, where it is connected with the ceremony of the stretching of the rope (Sethe 1928: 148). Maybe the essential connection between both rites is the usage of the rope; in the RDP it is applied to the Djed-pillar, whereas the king stretches the rope in the foundation ritual. The erection of the Djed-pillar is attested in the Sed festival depiction of Amenhotep III in the tomb of Kheruef and the Sokar festival. It is interesting to note that the king is performing the erection of the pillar himself in the Sed festival depiction of Amenhotep III (Bleeker 1967: 103), while the “ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king” execute the action in the RDP. The mythological level of the rites focuses on the triumph of Osiris over Seth. While the latter is identified with the kid that is slaughtered (Scene 14) as well as the head of the kid and the goose (Scene 15), Osiris receives his head back, and is thus strengthened again (Scene 14), while Horus gains power (Scene 15). The dominion of Osiris is substantiated by the equation of Seth with the Djed-pillar, while Osiris is represented by the *imɔi*-tree on top of the object (Scene 16). Finally, Seth is injured by the rope that is put around him, i.e. the Djed-pillar, and is caused to stand (Scene 17). Even so, he is overwhelmed as Osiris is still on top of him, and thus triumphs over Seth (see also Altenmüller 1975c: 1102).

---

223 For the foundation ritual in general, see Montet 1964.
224 It is worth mentioning that the erection of the Djed-pillar is only part of the Sed festival of Amenhotep III (see Fakhry 1943: 468f. and The Epigraphic Survey 1980: pl. 53-57). The rite does not occur in the depictions of that festival in the sun temple of Niuserre in Abu Gurob, or the gateway to the festival hall of Osorkon II’s temple in Bubastis (Uphill 1965: 380 and Bleeker 1967: 108). The ceremony takes place in the evening before the Sed festival (Homung/Stuehelin 2006: 93). Van Dijk (1986: 12) challenged the incorporation of the erection of the Djed-pillar into the Sed festival. He suggested that the rite is celebrated every year, independent from the Sed festival. For a comparison of the RDP with the Sed festival, see also IX.a: 219ff.
225 The festival calendar of Ramses III in Medinet Habu dates the erection of the Djed-pillar to the last day of the Sokar festival, on the 30. IV of the month of inundation (Schott 1950: 92). For the Sokar festival, see Gaballa/Kitchen 1969: 72ff.
226 Another example is Seti I, who is depicted erecting the Djed-pillar himself in the inner Osiris hall (west wall, third section from north, lower scenes) of his temple in Abydos (Capart 1912: pls. XXIX and XXX, Calverley 1938: pl. 8, and David 1981: 123ff. and 134).
Subsequently, food and drink are brought to Mekhenti-en-irti by the great lector priest (Scene 19), followed by a fight (Scene 20); the combat is possibly a protective ceremonial fight. A parallel to the battle might be the ritual combat between the inhabitants of Pe and Dep that is described in the Sed festival of Amenhotep III (Bleeker 1967: 103).\textsuperscript{227} Afterwards two families (Scene 21) are brought. The annotations “a pair of slaughterers” (second Remark of column 61), “The ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king” (Second Remark of column 62), and the action “Putting on the ground” (First Remark of column 63) allude to further rites in Scene 21. Possibly the offering is prepared, to then be placed on the table brought in Scene 23. In addition, two carpenters arrive (Scene 22) who probably build the aforementioned offering table that is brought by the embalmers in front of the sacred bark (Scene 23). The episode concludes with the lector priests who are conducting (Scene 23). Maybe a hymn is performed at this point of the ritual. A similar Remark is attested in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual; here a hymn to Ra follows (Otto 1960 II: 104). A hymn to Amun-Re is preserved in the course of the Daily Temple Ritual (Moret 1988: 67ff.).\textsuperscript{228} The action of the Sequence is performed in the presence of the statue of the king. The mythical sphere mainly deals with the eye of Horus. First, Mekhenti-en-irti receives two new eyes from Horus (Scene 19). The Remark “Letopolis” (column 55) probably refers to the cult place of Mekhenti-en-irti\textsuperscript{229} and hence does not necessarily imply a connection to the actual ritual action.\textsuperscript{230} Subsequently, the fights between Horus and Seth as well as the children of Horus and the followers of Seth are mentioned (Scene 20). After that, the focus returns to the eye of Horus, specifically its healing. Horus’ empty eye socket should be filled by his children (Scene 21), who are also supposed to heal the eye (Scene 22). Finally, Horus himself puts the eye back into his face (Scene 23).

\textsuperscript{227} Concerning the nature of the fight, see note B, VI.9.3: 101. Like the erection of the Djed-pillar, the ritual battle is only mentioned in the rendition of Amenhotep III’s Sed festival (see VIII.a, Sequence 8: footnote 224, 189). Another fight, this time performed with sticks, is attested in Scene 40 of the DRP.

\textsuperscript{228} For the hymns, see also note H, VI.9.7: 111.

\textsuperscript{229} The name of the god is attested with an epithet referring to Letopolis: mnty-n-irty-m-hm – “Mekhenti-en-irti-in-Letopolis” (Leitz 2002 III: 396); see also VIII.d: 211.

\textsuperscript{230} At the same time the location might allude to the place where Horus avenged his father Osiris and where the latter was buried (see also Sethe 1928: 97) – this mythological connection with Letopolis is present in Scenes 11 and 25.
Sequence 10

In the following a jug of wine\textsuperscript{231} is brought towards the shrine of the king by the royal children (Scene 24) as well as polished carnelian (Scene 25). The action of the divine sphere is still occupied with the eye of Horus. At first, Horus gets his eye back, identified with the wine (Scene 24). Afterwards Horus saves his eye from Seth (Scene 25). Seth is told to turn away when he is confronted and the locations “arena” and “Letopolis” (second and third Remark of column 74) allude to the mythical event again, in which Horus avenges his father Osiris in Letopolis (see VIII.a, Sequence 6: 186f.).

Sequence 11

After that, a faience necklace is carried towards the royal statue by the “one who is connected to the cultic largess of the king” (Scene 26). An amulet in the form of a baboon chapel was probably attached to the necklace (see second Remark of column 79). The baboon ornament is possibly the reason for the mentioning of \textit{hry \textit{thnw}} in the third Remarks of columns 78 and 79. The god Thoth can be represented as a baboon; \textit{hry \textit{thnw}} is the cult place of that deity in Hermopolis.\textsuperscript{232} Another possibility is that \textit{hry \textit{thnw}} designates the point of origin of the faience necklace (Schott 1980: 266; see also VIII.d: 212). At the same time the name of the location builds a pun with faience (\textit{\textit{thnt}}). The occurrence of Libyan women (\textit{hmwt \textit{n(w)t thnw}}, third Remark of column 77) is harder to explain. Maybe the women do not participate in the ritual; instead the expression is simply used to build a pun with the word faience (\textit{\textit{thnt}}). Sethe suggested (1928: 187f.) that the women are wearing the amulets in the course of the ritual. This is rather unlikely as only one amulet but several women are mentioned. In addition, the necklace is presented to the royal image by the “ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king”, and not the Libyan women. In the divine world the children of Horus are asked to bring Horus his green/healthy eye back. The choice of the colour green is based on the earthly cult object, the faience-necklace, since the colour of faience is green. The colour green (\textit{\textit{w\text{\text}}\text{d}}) might also build a pun with the healthy eye of Horus (\textit{irt \textit{wd\text{\text}}\text{it}}).

\textsuperscript{231} The wine originates from Buto and Pelusium (see second Remarks of columns 70 and 71).
\textsuperscript{232} For the representation of Thoth as a baboon, see, for example, Leitz 2002 VII: 640. For the deity’s affiliation with Letopolis, see Leitz 2002 VII: 649.
Sequence 12

The next episode of the ritual is concerned with the presentation of a htp-offering to the king by the “ones who are responsible for the ēḫ and stewards”; the statue is, however, not represented in the shrine (Scene 27). From now on the shrine is depicted empty as the royal image has been taken out of the shrine (see VIII.e: 215ff. and X: 238ff.). The “ones who embrace the Akh” and the “ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king” go around two falcon standards (Scene 28); the two items probably represent Upper and Lower Egypt (see also Sethe 1928: 194). The annotation “Opening the northern way” (third Remark of column 82) might designate the action performed by the shnw ūḥ and the iryw ħt nsw. The mythological part of the episode still refers to the eye of Horus that is brought to Horus (Scene 27) and that Thoth takes to Horus (Scene 28).

Sequence 13

In the following, royal insignia, namely two ‘hꜣ-scepters and two šwty-feathers, are given to the king (Scene 29). After that, a black curl is brought (Scene 30) and the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt are summoned (Scene 32), who arrive in a gesture of reverence. Subsequently, an wdn-offering is brought from the two districts (Scene 31). Finally, green and black eye paint, grapes, and incense are brought to the royal image (Scene 33). The actions are performed in front of the empty shrine. Most likely the green and black eye paint as well as the grapes are applied to the statue of the king, which is afterwards censed. As the action is performed directly on the statue, it had to be taken out of the shrine. Thus, the shrine is depicted empty. The handing over of royal insignia as well as the ointment and application of make-up are also attested in the Daily Temple Ritual and the Opening of the Mouth Ritual. In the temple of Seti I in Abydos the Daily Temple Ritual includes the handing over of a collar, a pectoral, the crook, and the flail. The coronation with the double

---

233 Scenes 31 and 33 are depicted together in Vignette 21, whereas Scene 32 is illustrated in Vignette 20. Hence, the action of Scene 32 is listed before the ones of Scene 31 and 33.
234 Grapes were used for eye paint. They were also a common part of the offering list, but were also a symbol of Osiris, i.e. of resurrection (Meyer 1986).
235 For the suggestion that eyepaint is used as an adornment for the statue, see, for example, Lorton 1991: 144.
236 For the similarities with the Opening of the Mouth Ritual and the Daily Temple Ritual, see also IX.f: 233ff. and g: 235ff.).
feather constitutes the culmination of the entire ritual. The application of the šwty-feathers is also present in the RDP; instead of the different insignia mentioned in the Daily Temple Ritual, the statue of the king receives two įbi-scepters in the RDP. Although the two rituals differentiate from each other in so far as different insignia are handed over to the statue, the presentation of regalia in general is a common feature of both rituals. The ointment with different kinds of oil and the application of unguent and laudanum in the course of the Daily Ritual is attested in Abydos, where it directly follows the presentation of the insignia. Different unguents and oils as well as green and black eye paint are also applied to the statue in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual. Again, the items used are different in the rituals, but the action of the application, and thus adornment of the statue are the same. On the mythological level, the įbi-scepters are identified with the testicles of Seth, while the šwty-feathers represent the eye of Horus (Scene 29). Possibly the duality of kingship is expressed here, stressing the fact that each king combines the powers of Horus and Seth. After that, Horus turns towards Geb concerning his eye (Scene 30), represented by the black curl. Possibly the curl has to be seen as a sign for mourning. This assumption would explain the connection with Geb, who personifies the earth, i.e. the place where the dead body is buried. In the following, the gods are supposed to serve Horus (Scene 32). Finally, the eye of Horus is the topic again, which is equalled with the different products that are

238 In the Opening of the Mouth Ritual one feather is given to the statue (scene 39; Otto 1960 I: 92f. and II: 99). Here the feather is, however, used as a fan, and not as a regalia (Otto 1960 II: 21).
239 The presentation of the royal insignia is not preserved in the attestations of the Daily Temple Ritual in the sanctuary of Edfu or in P. Berlin 3055 (Barta 1980b: 844). The ointment and application of make-up is, however, attested in all three attestations of the ritual (scenes K 54-57; Moret 1988: 191ff. and scene E12; Alliot 1949: 92ff.).
240 Unguents and oils are presented in scene 55 (Otto 1960 I: 132ff. and II: 120ff.) and green and black eye paint in scene 56 A and B (Otto 1960 I: 143f. and II: 126f.). Based on the similarities, Blackman (1918: 148ff.) argued that the Opening of the Mouth Ritual originated from the rites performed in the pr-dwt, where the king gets robed, crowned, and purified before he enters the temple. Compare also the PT spells belonging to the offering and insignia rituals (e.g. PT of Neith (Nt) 46-227; Allen 2005b: 314ff.). These rites include, amongst others, the presentation of royal insignia (Nt 46-56), the Opening of the Mouth Ritual (Nt 64-70), as well as the presentation of eye paint (Nt 92), and linen (Nt 93).
brought (Scene 33).  

**Sequence 14**

Subsequently, halves of bread, identified as the *htp*-meal, are given to the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt (Scene 34),\(^{242}\) and 12 bibs\(^{243}\) are brought by the lector priest (Scene 35). In addition, beer (Scene 36) and 4-fibre-linen, 6-fibre-linen, clothes of *idmi*-linen as well as numerous fine linen are brought (Scene 37). The different kinds of linen are taken from diverse locations. The 4-fibre-linen is stored in the treasury, while the 6-fibre-linen is kept in the embalming place. The Remarks concerning the *idmi*-linen and the fine linen are difficult to interpret. They do not mention a location, except for the word “crocodile”. The animal has possibly to be seen in the context of the Osiris-myth; Horus, in the form of a crocodile, searches for Osiris’ limbs (see note K, VI.14.5: 147). The Sequence seems to be concerned with burial rites performed in front of or on the statue (see mythological interpretation below), starting with the *htp*-meal before the image is dressed with different kinds of linen.\(^{244}\) As the action is, again, directly performed on the statue, the shrine is depicted empty. The dressing of the statue is also attested in the Daily Temple Ritual.\(^{245}\) Here, the *ssp*-, *nfr*-, and *mnht*-garments as well as the *idmi*-, *jit*-, and *smt*-linen are mentioned (scenes K 49-53, Moret: 1988, 179ff.; A 10 and 19-17; Mariette 1869-80 I: 52ff. and David 1981: 61, 67ff., and 70ff. [episodes 17, 19, 21, 31, and 33]); E 8-11; Alliot 1949: 89ff.). In the Opening of the Mouth Ritual white *mnht*-linen, a *ssmt*-kilt, green *mnht*-, red *ins*, and *idmi*-linen are used (scenes 50-53; Otto 1960 I: 120ff. and II: 112ff.). The DRP mentions *ifd*-, *sis*-, *sf*-, and *idmi*-linen. In all three rituals different kinds of clothes are mentioned, except for the *idmi*-linen.

---

\(^{241}\) Based on the mythological interpretation, Horus is the recipient of the different items. Consequently, Sethe (1928: 97) interpreted the Sequence as the actual coronation of Senwosret I (see also IX.b: 222ff.). I think, however, that the different sceptres are handed over to the statue of the deceased king, and that the eye paint is applied to the royal image – actions that can also be found in other statue rituals as seen above (Daily Temple Ritual, Opening of the Mouth). In the Daily Temple Ritual Amun-Re is also identified with Horus (Lorton 1999: 132) so that the deity does not necessarily have to represent the living king, but rather the royal power the statue receives through the equipment with the insignia.

\(^{242}\) The royal image is probably present at the meal as the shrine is still depicted empty (see also Sethe 1928: 97. He thought, however, that the living king is attending the meal).

\(^{243}\) The text mentions only one bib, but the caption of the accompanying Vignette lists 12.

\(^{244}\) The RDP does not describe a real burial here, but rather the end of the statue ritual when the image is prepared to be brought to the shrine (see X: 238ff.).

\(^{245}\) For the following similarities between the RDP and the Opening of the Mouth Ritual as well as the Daily Temple Ritual, see also IX.f: 233ff. and g: 235ff.).
But evidently a connection between all three rites exists as the action of dressing the statue is the same.\textsuperscript{246} The interpretation of the actions as being part of the burial is underlined in the mythological level of the Sequence. The meal taken by the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt is equalled with the allocation of Horus’ eye and the giving back of the gods’ heads (Scene 34). Following this, Horus embraces his father who is turned towards Geb, and thus Horus transfers his vitality towards Osiris so that the latter can be resurrected (Scene 35).\textsuperscript{247} After that, Horus asks Geb to embrace his father, which can only mean that Osiris is buried and Geb legitimizes Osiris’ kingship. The embrace (\textit{qni}) is carried out in the earthly ritual by the application of the bib (\textit{qni}). The \textit{qni}-bib is said to shield the deceased from the place of slaughter of the gods (Otto 1960 II: 60).\textsuperscript{248} The geographical location Buto does most likely not refer to the actual town in the delta, but to a part of a temple.\textsuperscript{249} The next Scene 36 is concerned with the mourning for Osiris. Finally, the text deals with the rejuvenation and resurrection of Osiris. He shall seek the one who embraces him. At the same time his mind shall be alert and his limbs shall unite again. The regeneration is executed in the ritual through the different kinds of linen that are wrapped around the statue. The \textit{idmi}-linen is especially connected with mummy bandages that rejuvenate (see note B, VI.14.5: 145; Rummel 2006: 381ff.).\textsuperscript{250} In addition, Seth’s thigh is pulled out symbolizing again the deity’s punishment (see also Assmann 2003: 426). In the Opening of the Mouth Ritual the presentation of the thigh is connected to the enlivenment and Akh-transformation of the statue; the warm thigh is held in front of the face so that its vitality can transfer to the object

\textsuperscript{246} The dressing of the statue possibly had its origin in the robing of the living king that was done before he entered the temple (see, for example, Blackmann 1918: 148ff.). The presentation of linen is also mentioned in the PT spells belonging to the offering and insignia rituals (e.g. PT of Neith 93; Allen 2005b: 317). For the dressing of cult statues with linen, see, for example, Lorton 1999: 144.

\textsuperscript{247} For the transfer of the vitality, see Assmann 1995: 96f.

\textsuperscript{248} The garment is also known from the Opening of the Mouth Ritual. Here, the semi-priest wears the \textit{qni}-bib during the scenes concerned with the fabrication of the statue (scenes 11-22; Otto 1960 II: 60ff.). In the framework of the Opening of the Mouth Ritual the bib is, however, seen as a royal attribute that stresses the fact that the semi-priest takes over the role of the king. Fischer-Elfert (1998: 40ff.) suggested that the Semi-priest wearing the bib rather represents the father, i.e. the statue, until the piece is crafted. In the RDP the bibs are probably part of the equipment for the king/his statue as he receives 12 (see also Gestermann 2008: 40).

\textsuperscript{249} Altenmüller (1972: 172f.) suggested that Buto has to be identified with the entrance hall of the funerary temple in connection with the Burial Ritual in the Old Kingdom. He argued that the so-called Muu greet the deceased in this location, which is also called the “hall of the Muu”. As the RDP does not feature an actual burial, the term Buto might refer to another part of the temple, in which the statue ritual is performed (see also VIII.d: 211).

\textsuperscript{250} In a different context, the presentation of cloth is interpreted as the presentation of the white crown (see Roeder 1996: 9ff.).
(Assmann 2003: 427).\textsuperscript{251} Evidently, both actions – the dressing of the statue with linen and the presentation of the thigh – have the same meaning: they both symbolise the rejuvenation of the object. This might be the reason why the mythological episode of the Scene refers to the pulling out of Seth’s thigh.

**Sequence 15**

In the next Sequence the “ones who embrace the Akh” are brought (Scene 38), who carry the father of the ruler (Scene 39) and then perform with two sticks (Scene 40).\textsuperscript{252} An interesting parallel to the RDP can be found in the tomb of Amenmose (TT 19).\textsuperscript{253} A depiction in the tomb shows wrestling and stick-fighting scenes in front of the statue shrine of the deified Thutmosis III (Decker 1987: 81f.).\textsuperscript{254} After that the two mourners are chosen (Scene 41) and a staff together with 4-fibre-linen are brought by the master of largess (Scene 42); both items are given to the “ones who embrace the Akh” (Scene 43). The geographical locations refer to the buildings out of which the items are taken; the 4-fibre-linen is stored in the treasury, the 6-fibre-linen is kept in the embalming place, and the staff is taken from the royal house. It is most likely that the Sequence deals with some kind of procession that is similar to the funerary procession. The “ones who embrace the Akh” carry the deceased king, personified in his statue, to its shrine.\textsuperscript{255} In the course of the procession a ritual fighting game is performed and the deceased is mourned. The linen and the staff, given to the “ones who

\textsuperscript{251} The muscles in the foreleg still contract for a while, after the thigh is cut off (Lorton 1999: 165). Hence, according to the beliefs of the ancient Egyptians, the piece of meat is still “living” when the priest holds it in front of the statue, and can thus revivify the object.

\textsuperscript{252} Sethe (1928: 97 and 223f.) read the passage differently. He assumed that Scene 40 is concerned with the building of a ladder, with which the dead king is able to reach heaven. For the interpretation of the Scene describing an action with sticks, see notes B and G, VI.15.4: 153f. and 155f.

\textsuperscript{253} For a bibliography of the tomb, see Porter/Moss 1960: 33.

\textsuperscript{254} A stick fight is also part of the Sed festival depiction of Amenhotep III, executed by the souls of Pe. The context of the fight is the resurrection of Osiris and the triumph of Horus over his enemies. I agree with Decker (1987: 82) that the stick fight is probably a funerary game, performed at the funeral or in the case of the DRP in a ceremony in memory of the deceased (see note B, VI.15.4: 153f.). Ceremonial dances were also performed in the presence of the living king. Such fights are even attested in modern Egypt, called nabbūt-fight (Wilson 1931: 211ff.).

\textsuperscript{255} The carrying of the statue back to the shrine is reminiscent of scene 73 of the Opening of the Mouth Ritual, where nine smrw, also identified as the children of Horus, carry the statue to its shrine (Otto 1960 I: 164f.). The same scene is also part of the Burial Ritual, and is attested in the ritual of the Osiris chapels in Dendara (Assmann 2003: 430f.; see also IX.e: 230ff. and f: 233ff.).
embrace the Akh”, might be objects used for a final rite on the statue.\textsuperscript{256} Maybe the statue was dressed in the linen; in the Daily Temple Ritual the statue is first clothed with four different kinds of linen and later on clothed in a robe (see Moret 1988: 178ff., scenes 49-53, and 241, 15° tableau; see also IX.g: 235ff.) – the image in the RDP is also already clothed in four different kinds of linen (see Scene 37 above). The mythological sphere of the Sequence is closely connected to the content of the ritual action. First, Thoth and the children of Horus, personified by the “ones who embrace the Akh”, shall embrace Osiris (Scene 38). The location is the Ibis-nome, maybe chosen in connection with the mentioning of the god Thoth.

In the following Scene 39, Osiris is carried by the children of Horus who seem to be identified with apes and wolves.\textsuperscript{257} Subsequently, the children of Horus shall embrace Osiris and a stick fight takes place in Letopolis, performed by the followers of Seth (Scene 40).\textsuperscript{258} After that, Isis and Nephthys mourn Osiris (Scene 41), and Horus’ face is turned away from Seth (Scene 42). Finally, Thoth pulls out Seth’s thigh for Osiris (Scene 43). As mentioned above in the discussion of Scene 36, the presentation of the thigh is connected to the enlivenment and Akh-transformation of the statue in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual. Maybe the recitation of the mythological passage had the same effect through the power of the spoken word; in the actual ritual a ceremony with a staff and 4-fibre-linen is performed on the statue.

\textit{Sequence 16}

In the following, food is brought, probably for the introduction of the “ones who embrace the Akh” of the palace (Scene 44) and the hereditary noblemen (?) of the west and east are brought to eat with them (Scene 45). In the Vignette they are shown performing the \textit{hnw-}

\textsuperscript{256} Sethe (1928: 97) assumed that the two items are used for the Opening of the Mouth performed at the mummy of the deceased. However, the text and the Vignette do not provide any indication that this ritual is performed. On the contrary, the official in the illustration is holding a staff so that the item cannot be connected to the Opening of the Mouth Ritual. Additionally, the characteristic instruments used for the ritual are not mentioned, like the \textit{ntry} or \textit{wr-hk}w (compare Otto 1960 II: 80ff.). Furthermore, the Opening of the Mouth occurs before the presentation of different kinds of linen in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual. In the RDP the rite would take part after these rites.

\textsuperscript{257} The apes and wolves might represent Hapi and Duamutef who are part of the children of Horus (see Sethe 1928: 221ff.).

\textsuperscript{258} A comparable fight is described in PT 469, performed by the leaders of Letopolis (see note B, VI.15.4: 153ff.).
gesture.\footnote{For the \textit{hnw}-gesture, see Dominicus 1994: 61ff. She mentioned that lector- and embalming priests are shown in the same action during the funerary offering rituals. In addition, the gesture is attested in connection with the presentation of offerings and the cult run during the Sed festival in the sun temple of Niuserre. Finally, participants of the funeral procession are depicted in the gesture.} Afterwards the noblemen are anointed with \textit{h\textsuperscript{3}tt-} and \textit{sft}-oil (Scene 46) and the natron (?) is taken back to the embalming hall (Scene 47). The Sequence is most likely concerned with a concluding meal. Maybe the feast is held in order to commemorate Senwosret I.\footnote{The meal might be comparable to a banquet that was held on the occasion of a festival for the god Montu (Redford 1986: 108f.; Lorton 1999: 146) or to a meal to commemorate Amenhotep I, which took place in Deir el-Medina (Janssen 1982: 258; Lorton 1999: 147).} The shrine is depicted empty; the statue is probably brought to its permanent shrine in the temple. In the mythological sphere Horus’ eye is allocated and the heads are given back to the gods (Scene 45) – the same allegory was used for the \textit{htp}-meal in Scene 34. Afterwards Seth is punished (Scene 46).

\textit{Sequence 17}

The ritual ends with the handing over of a mug by the lector priest, probably to the father of the ruler (Scene 48). The text part mentioning the recipient of the mug is not preserved. The mythological interpretation of the Scene concerns Osiris. Thus, it is likely that the statue, i.e. the father of the ruler, receives the mug. Maybe the vessel is deposited in front of the permanent shrine of the statue so that the offering is available anytime.\footnote{The Daily Temple Ritual also ends with an offering that is stored in front of the statue (Moret 1988: 211f.; Lorton 1999: 144; see also IX.g: 235ff.).} The Remark “embalming hall” (column 138) probably refers to the location from which the mug is brought. In the divine counterpart Seth is asked to take a standard in Geheset for Osiris, and Horus states that Osiris is more divine than he is. This statement stresses the fact that Osiris is dead.

In conclusion, the following succession of events can be established:

\textit{Sequence 1}

\begin{itemize}
  \item Beginning is lost (Scene 1)
  \item Building of the sacred bark (Scene 2)
  \item Purification rite on the statue or the sacred bark by the \textit{iryw} \textit{ht} \textit{nsw} (Scene 3)
\end{itemize}
Sequence 2 – Slaughtering Rite
Carving and binding of the ox (Scene 4)
Recitation by officials (Scene 5)

Sequence 3 – Agrarian Rite
Placing of emmer on the threshing floor (Scene 6)

Sequence 4 – Offering
Offering of two cakes to the statue by the lector priest (Scene 7)
Mooring of two barks with imδ-tree (Scene 8)

Sequence 5 – Ritual run to confirm power
Seizing of different maces by the iryw ht nsw and ritual run (Scene 9)

Sequence 6 – Agrarian rite
Placing of barley on threshing floor (Scene 10)
Trampling of the barley by cattle and donkeys (Scene 11)

Sequence 7 – Cleaning rites
Bringing of natron and imδ-tree to statue by the iry iḥ wdpw (Scene 12)
Bringing of imδ-tree and 8 mnsδ-vessels to the barks (Scene 13)

Sequence 8 – Erection of the Djed-pillar
Giving a sign for the ḫnkt-offering (Scene 14)
Offering the head of a goose and a kid to the Djed-pillar (Scene 15)
Erection of the Djed-pillar by the iryw ht nsw (Scene 16)
Putting a rope around the Djed-pillar (Scene 17)
Leaving of the royal children (Scene 18)

Sequence 9 – Feasting
Bringing of food and drink by great lector priest (Scene 19)
Ritual fighting (Scene 20)
Preparation of an offering by two families (Scene 21)
Fabrication of the offering table by two carpenters (Scene 22)
Bringing of the offering table by two embalmers and performing by lector priest (Scene 23)

*Sequence 10 – Provision with certain items*
Bringing of wine to the statue by royal children (Scene 24)
Bringing of carnelian to the statue (Scene 25)

*Sequence 11 – Bringing of jewellery*
Bringing of a faience necklace to the statue (Scene 26)

*Sequence 12 – Offering*
Bringing a *htp*-offering for the statue by the *iryw iḥ wdpw* (Scene 27)
Circumambulation of two falcon standards by the *shnw ḫḥ* and *iryw ḫt nsw* (Scene 28)

*Sequence 13 – Equipment with regalia*
Giving of royal insignia to the statue (Scene 29)
Giving of a black curl to the statue (Scene 30)
Homage by the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt (Scene 32)
*wdn*-offering from the two districts (Scene 31)
Application of green and black eye paint, grapes, and incense to the statue (Scene 33)

*Sequence 14 – Clothing of the statue*
*htp*-meal for the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt (Scene 34)
Bringing of 12 *qni*-bibs for the statue by the lector priest (Scene 35)
Bringing of beer (Scene 36)
Bringing of different kinds of linen for the statue (Scene 37)

*Sequence 15 – “Burial” Procession*
Bringing of the *shnw ḫḥ* (Scene 38)
Carrying of the statue by the *shnw ḫ* (Scene 39)
Funerary game in form of a stick fight by the *shnw ḫ* (Scene 40)
Choosing of two mourners (Scene 41)
Bringing of a staff and 4-fibre-linen by the master of largess (Scene 42)
Staff and 4-fibre-linen are given to the *shnw ḫ* (Scene 43)

*Sequence 16 – Meal after the “Burial”*
Bringing of food for the *shnw ḫ* (Scene 44)
Meal of the *shnw ḫ* and hereditary noblemen of the West and East (Scene 45)
Anointing of the noblemen (Scene 46)
Bringing of natron to the embalming hall (Scene 47)

*Sequence 17 – End of the Ritual*
Giving of a mug to the statue (Scene 48)

*VIII.b The participants of the ritual*262

Different officials, priests, royal family members, and other participants actively take part in the performance of the ritual. The king, however, is never depicted or described as an acting person. The different rites and events are, in fact, carried out directly on or before him. Evidently, there can be no doubt that the representation of the king, depicted in the shrine on the sacred bark, is not the ruler in person, but his statue (see VIII.e: 215ff. and X: 238ff.). In the following, the different participants are characterized with regard to their actions during the course of the ritual; additional information is provided for the main performers of the ritual (*iry ḫt nsw, iry iḫ ḫ wdpw*, lector priest, and *shn ḫ*).

---

262 For a list of the participants and their divine representatives, see also Sethe 1928: 101f. Sethe’s listing shows that the same god is not represented by a certain official throughout the ritual, so that a connection between an earthly and divine participant is not existent.
The title, as written in the RDP, can be transliterated *iry h₇ nsw* (“one who is concerned with the things of the king” or “keeper of the king’s property”) and *rh nsw* (“royal acquaintance”) respectively. For the reading *iry h₇ nsw*, see Jones 2000: 327 who also added the reading *rh nsw*. Ward (1982: 104) transliterated *rh nsw* and mentioned that the title was probably used honorifically by the Middle Kingdom, as high ranked and minor officials could hold the title (Ward 1982: 3). However, Franke (1984: 106f.) argued that it is a rank title (‘Rangtitel’), designating a position at court, and not simply an honorific epithet. It has been extensively discussed that the title was first rendered *iry h₇ nsw*, but was re-interpreted as *rh nsw* from the later Old Kingdom onwards, probably as an honorific epithet (see, e.g., Jones 2000: 327f., Leprohon 1994: 46f., and most recently Baud 1999: 109ff.). Leprohon (1994: 46f.) reasoned convincingly that *ht* does not only have the meaning “things, affairs, possessions”, but also “cult”. By discussing the title in the context of a false door, Leprohon mentioned that the central treasury was responsible for administering goods for the royal funerary cults, and he suggested that the same could be possible for private cults. Hence, he translated the title *iry h₇ nsw* as “the one who is connected to the cultic largess of the king”. Routledge’s analysis of the term *iri h₇* supports the translation of *ht* as “cult”. She stated that the expression *iri h₇* is used to describe the performance of cultic rites (Routledge 2001: 133) and mentioned that the title *nb irt h₇* appears, for example, in royal, cultic, and funerary contexts (Routledge 2001: 213). In a later article (2007: 193ff.), Routledge posited that the title *nb irt h₇* encompasses duties of the king performing Maat, and she suggested the translation “lord of doing effective things”. Based on the ritualistic background of the RDP, I adopt Leprohon’s translation of the title, and think that the officials bearing the title in the RDP are concerned with royal cultic affairs as will be shown in the following.

The *iryw h₇ nsw* perform different tasks. They bring eight *mnsj*-vessels to the front of the sacred bark, which are probably used during a purification rite (Scene 3). They also take certain royal insignia – which include the staff of Horus, the *jms*-mace, the *mṭḥ*, and the *ḥd*-mace – out of a shrine and are responsible for the erection of the Djed-pillar (Scene 16). This task is especially interesting and informative concerning the interpretation of the entire ritual. The rite is also attested during the Sed festival of Amenhotep III, as depicted in the tomb of
Kheruef, where the king performs the rite himself (Fakhry 1943: 468f.; Bleeker 1967: 103; The Epigraphic Survey 1980: pl. 53-57). The *iryw ht nsw* are further mentioned in the second Remark of column 62 (Scene 21). The Scene is concerned with the bringing of two families; the duty performed by the families is not specified. The Remarks “pair of slaughterers” (column 61), “the ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king” (column 62), and “putting on the ground” (column 63) seem to allude to the preparation of an animal offering. Maybe the *iryw ht nsw* have to be identified with the two families who arrange the offering in this Scene. Another duty of the officials is the presentation of a faience necklace (Scene 26). Finally, the “ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king” walk around two falcon standards together with the “ones who embrace the Akh” (Scene 28). In summary, it can be said that the *iryw ht nsw* are concerned with a variety of actions in the course of the ritual, so that a specific task cannot be assigned to them. They play an important role that includes duties usually taken over by the living king, as the responsibility for the erection of the Djed-pillar shows. Thus, it is likely that the *iry ht nsw* are concerned with the royal cult, and not only with the king’s property (see Jones’ translation above). In addition, I think that the different tasks show that they exceed the duties of a court official (*rḫ nsw*), especially if the assumption is correct that *rḫ nsw* later became an honorific title.

*iry ḫ̄ ṭ di thu wdpw – The one who is responsible for the ḫ̄ and steward*

The transliteration of the title is based on Fischer: 1978, 58f. He noted, however, that a definite translation is difficult; the term ḫ̄ is only attested with the meaning “moon” (Wb I:

---

263 For the possibility that the erection of the Djed-pillar is not a part of the Sed festival, see VIII.a, Sequence 8: footnote 224, 189.
264 The assumption that the Scene deals with the preparation of an offering is strengthened by the content of the following Scenes: two carpenters arrive (Scene 22) and an offering table is brought by embalmers (Scene 23). See also VIII.a, Sequence 9: 190.
265 The text of the Scene only states that a faience necklace is brought, but the accompanying Vignette 16 identifies the person as an *iry ḫ̄ nsw*. 
42 and Hannig 2006: 108) and a translation “one who is concerned with the moon” is unsatisfactory as the exact duties of such an official are obscure, especially in connection with a steward. Hence, I do not translate the element ḫ and adopt Gestermann’s (2008: 45) translation “für das ḫ Verantwortliche und Aufwärter”. Ward (1983: 149, entry 1285) read the title spr wdpw and translated “official (having to do with food)”. The element wdpw definitely makes a connection with food/offering plausible. It is important to note in this regard that the title wdpw is not only attested for a steward who serves living people; a number of examples show that he is also concerned with rituals, as well as funerary and divine services (see, for example, Hannig 2003: 391f. with further references). This latter characterization is corroborated by the tasks of the ḫ ḫ wdpw in the course of the ritual preserved in the RDP.

The “ones who are responsible for the ḫ and stewards” are brought in Scene 5, in which at least one of them is concerned with the recitation in front of the carved ox. The slaughtering of the animal occurred in the Scene before, but it cannot be excluded that both Scenes are taking place at the same time. In that case, it is possible that the official is also responsible for the carving of the ox. Later on, the official brings an imḫ-tree and natron (Scene 12), as well as a htp-offering to the statue of the king (Scene 27). In summary it can be said that the ḫ ḫ wdpw is mainly concerned with the bringing of offerings.

---

266 Hannig (2006: 752) also offered “Aufwärter und Zuständiger für die Übernachtung” as a translation. His rendering seems to derive from the attestation of “Herbergswirt” for ḫ (Hannig 2006: 108). However, this meaning is only attested in very few cases; in most examples he even added that the word ḫ is translated with “moon”. He also referred to CT VI, 45c (CT 480), where ḫ is supposed to have the meaning “Herbergswirt”. But, again, the word rather has to be translated with “moon” (see also Faulkner 1977: 125f.).

267 It has to be mentioned, however, that these examples are not attested for the Middle Kingdom (see Hannig 2006: 750ff.).

268 The Introduction of Scene 5 mentions ḫ ḫ wdpw in the plural, but the second Remark in column 12 and the accompanying Vignette 3 show only one person.

269 Vignette 3 is partly destroyed. Sethe (1928: 246) assumed that the official is applying a rope to the ox, and added that he is depicted sharpening a knife. Sethe’s supposition cannot be verified anymore due to the poor preservation of the papyrus at this point. It could also be that the ḫ ḫ wdpw is reciting something in front of the animal; the second Remark in column 12 mentions the word “recitation” (see also VI.2.3: 53f., especially note D: 54f.).

270 In the latter case the text mentions again several officials, while the Vignette shows only one person.
The lector priest is well known from rituals concerning the funerary and temple cult, where he, among other things, accompanies the actions by reciting the different rites. Hence, it is not surprising that the lector priest takes over by far the most duties in the RDP. In Scene 7 he brings two royal cakes to the statue of the king and possibly recites a jubilation hymn. In the following, he presents food and drink to an official representing the god Mekhenti-en-irti (Scene 19), before several lector priests conduct while the offering table is brought by the embalmers (Scene 23). In scene 29, the priest brings two hereditary scepters and the šwty-feathers, while he calls the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt in Scene 32. Subsequently, the lector priest is responsible for the presentation of the wdn-offering and the application of green and black eye-paint, grapes, as well as incense on the statue (Scene 21). After that, the hry-hb gives bread to the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt (Scene 34), 12 bibs (Scene 35), as well as different kinds of linen to the statue (Scene 37). The lector priest further provides bread halves for the introduction of the shnw šḥ in the palace (Scene 44) and takes the natron to the embalming hall (Scene 47). Finally, he presents a mug to the father of the ruler (Scene 48). In conclusion, it can be said that the lector priest is mainly concerned with the presentation of different items or offerings.

The title shn šḥ is not well attested, but appears on archaic stelae from Abydos, in mastabas of the Old Kingdom, in the RDP, and on a statuette of the Saite Period (El-Sayed 1988: 63f.). A translation of the title is difficult as the terms shn as well as šḥ can have several meanings. Accordingly, El-Sayed (1988: 66) suggested four different translations of the

---

271 The second Remark of column 20 mentions the word i#hb (see note H, VI.4.1: 60f. and VIII.a, Sequence 4: 185).
272 The text part of the ritual only mentions the conductors in the second Remark of column 68, but the text does not identify them with the lector priests. The identification is based on Vignette 20.
273 The hry-hb is not mentioned in the texts of Scene 29 or 32, but in Vignettes 19 and 20, respectively.
274 The identification of the lector priest as the acting official is, again, only based on the Vignette (21).
275 The text part mentions only one bib, but Vignette 23 states the number 12.
276 For a collection of the meanings, see El-Sayed 1988: 64ff.
title: “the one who carries the cult objects with his arms” (“celui qui tient entre ses bras (ou
celui qui porte dans ses bras) les objets culte”), “the one who brings what is useful (or
necessary)” (“Celui qui fournit ce qui est utile [ou nécessaire indispensable]”), “the one who
carries/embraces with his arms the luminous manifestation (i.e. a divine statue)” (“Celui qui
tient entre ses bras [celui qui porte entre ses bras: celui qui embrasse]) l’aspect brilliant”, and
“the one who encompasses/embraces the luminous manifestation” (“Celui qui entoure
l’aspect brilliant”).

El-Sayed convincingly added that the ancient Egyptians most likely had all possibilities in
mind when they used the title sXnw #X. He (1988: 66ff.) argued that the first two examples
apply to priests bearing this title in the Old and Middle Kingdoms. According to him, the
sXnw #X are funerary priests who ensure the destiny of the deceased in the afterlife
during these periods. His third and fourth translations rather characterize the
sXnw #X in the Late Period, when they are concerned with the divine cult. He suggested that
the priests had access to sanctuaries out of which they took the statues in order to purify and
clothe the deities, and provide them with offerings and jewellery. I, however, think that both
characterization – the funerary priest as well as the priest concerned with the statue cult – are
combined in the role of the sXnw #X in the RDP, as can be seen by the duties performed by the
priest. Consequently, I leave the term #X untranslated in order to include all meanings of the
word (“cult object”, “divine manifestation”, but also the Akh state received by every
deceased person).

The “ones who embrace the Akh” occur relatively late in the course of the ritual described in
the RDP. Their first appearance is in Scene 28, where they go around two falcon standards
together with the “ones who are connected with the cultic largess of the king”. In Scene 38
they are brought in order to carry the father of the ruler, i.e. the statue of the king (Scene 39).
Subsequently, they perform a ritual fight with sticks (Scene 40) and receive a staff and 4-
fibre-linen in Scene 43, with which they perform rejuvenating rites on the statue. In Scene 44
they are introduced into the palace and eat together with the hereditary noblemen (Scene 45).
Thus, the “ones who embrace the Akh” are clearly concerned with duties directly performed
on the statue. In addition, they appear at a point in the ritual when rites that resemble the

277 For the argumentation that the action of taking the cult statue out of the naos is comparable to an embrace,
Burial Ritual are carried out;\textsuperscript{278} those rites might be connected with the transportation of the royal image to its permanent shrine in the temple (see X: 238ff.).

\textit{Other/Minor officials}

Several other characters appear in the ritual, but with fewer duties than the officials mentioned above. The royal children descend into two barks in Scene 18, and bring wine to the statue in Scene 24. In Vignette 15 they are represented by a female person. Two families are brought in Scene 21, who possibly prepare an offering by slaughtering an animal. It is likely that they have to be identified with the \textit{irtyw ht nsw}.\textsuperscript{279} Following the two families, two carpenters appear in Scene 22, who construct the offering table. Two embalmers bring the aforementioned offering table in Scene 23, and might also conduct a ritual; the second Remark of column 68 mentions “conductors” (\textit{dḥnw}). The Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt are asked to come in Scene 32, and are provided with bread in Scene 34. Two mourners are chosen in Scene 41 and the master of largess brings a staff and 4-fibref-linen in Scene 42. The hereditary noblemen are brought in Scene 45 in order to eat with the \textit{sḥnw ṣḥ}.\textsuperscript{280} After that, they are anointed (Scene 46). A slaughterer is mentioned in the second Remark of column 42bis. The Scene is concerned with the cutting off of a goose and kid head.

Some actions during the ritual cannot be assigned to a specific official. This is true for the offering presented to the Djed-pillar in Scene 15. The accompanying Vignette 9 shows a man performing the task, but the depiction does not include a caption with the title of that person. It is also not clear who ties the rope to the Djed-pillar (Scene 17). The symbol is erected by the “ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king”. Maybe the same officials present the offering and tie the rope as well. The text does also not mention who presents the carnelian (Scene 25). The Scene is not depicted in a Vignette, but builds a Sequence with Scene 24, in which the royal children bring wine. Maybe they also present the carnelian.

\textsuperscript{278} For the argumentation that the \textit{sḥnw ṣḥ} are concerned with rites performed for the dead king, see also Gestermann 2008: 45.
\textsuperscript{279} See the paragraph on the \textit{irtyw ht nsw} above: 202f.
\textsuperscript{280} See the paragraph on the \textit{sḥnw ṣḥ} above: 205ff.
In conclusion, it can be said that the appearance of certain officials and priests and their respective tasks – especially the irdw ḫt nsw, lector priest, and sḥnw ḫḥ – support the assumption that the ritual of the RDP is concerned with the commemoration of the deceased king, who is represented by his statue in the course of the ritual (see X: 238ff.).

VIII.c The gods

The following gods appear in the mythological part of the ritual, either as performers or recipients of divine actions: Horus, the children of Horus, Thoth, Seth, the followers of Seth, Osiris, Isis and Nephthys, as well as Geb. The general designations “gods” (Scene 8) and “town god” (Scene 14) only appear once. The same applies to Mekhenti-en-irti who is mentioned in Scene 19. The latter is the only deity that is mentioned in the actual ritual and in the mythological interpretation. 281 Except for the “gods”, the “town god”, and Mekhenti-en-irti, all deities play a part in the Osiris myth; of those, Horus and Thoth perform the most actions in the course of the mythological sphere of the ritual.

The activities of the gods, mainly identified as plots from the Osiris myth, provide crucial information for the interpretation of the ritual. This sub-chapter will not present a summary of all actions carried out by or on a certain deity. 282 It rather gives a few distinctive examples that highlight the duties of a specific god and that are significant for the characterization of the text.

Horus appears in his typical role of protector and avenger of his father Osiris. While he is mainly concerned with his stolen and injured eye, representing certain earthly items used in the actual ritual, he also avenges his father (e.g. col. 32) by punishing Seth (e.g. col. 51), with whom he also fights (col. 56). Additionally, he receives royal insignia in order to protect Osiris (cols. 28, 29), whom he turns over to Geb (col. 101) and whom he mourns (col. 104). In summary it can be stated that Horus avenges Osiris’ death and is concerned with the latter’s burial.

---

281 The lector priest offers food and drink to the god in the course of the ritual. On the mythological level, Horus asks Mekhenti-en-irti to place the two eyes of Horus in his face.

282 For a complete list of the deities and their actions, see Sethe 1928: 99ff.
Thoth is characterized as the assistant of Osiris and the official who performs or orders certain duties. He places Osiris on Seth (e.g. col. 5), brings Horus’ eye back (col. 80), and pulls out Seth’s thigh (col. 126). Furthermore, he acts as the slaughterer (e.g. col. 8).

Seth is depicted in his classic role of the enemy that has to be punished. He is placed under Osiris (e.g. cols. 5, 21), symbolizing the latter’s victory and dominion over Seth. He is further identified with slaughtered animals that are offered (e.g. col. 44), he is injured by a rope that is applied to the Djed-pillar (col. 51), and he fights with Horus (col. 56). Finally, his thigh is pulled out (cols. 108, 126).

Osiris is passive in the course of the entire ritual. He is placed on top of Seth (e.g. cols. 5, 21) and he is searched for (col. 14). His inactive character is not surprising as he is the personification of the dead king. Accordingly, he is called the mourned one (col. 49) and the fallen one (col. 50) in the course of the ritual. Additionally, Osiris is embraced by Geb (col. 102), buried (col. 105), carried by the children of Horus (col. 115), and mourned by Isis and Nephthys (col. 120).

Consequently, the mythological part of the ritual clearly focuses on Osiris, i.e. the dead king. Especially significant in that regard is the role of Isis and Nephthys as the two mourners. If the text would focus on Horus, i.e. the living king, Isis would appear in her role as mother (see also Gestermann 2008: 49); her mother role is, for example, highlighted in the papyri fragments that feature a part of the Coronation Ritual.\footnote{283} Additionally, the ritual does not focus on the conflict of Horus and Seth.\footnote{284} They, indeed, fight in one Scene, but the punishment and slayer of Seth, and thus Horus’ role as avenger of his father’s death is predominant. Osiris’ death and burial are even explicitly mentioned towards the end of the ritual.

\footnote{283}{The documents in question are P. Carlsberg 658, 659 and 660 as well as P. Berlin 1577c and 14403c; see also Quack 2002: 98f. and IX.b: footnote 327, 224.}
\footnote{284}{A focus on this topic, as it is attested in the Contendings of Horus and Seth, would strengthen Sethe’s assumption that the ritual is concerned with coronation rites. The battle between Horus and Seth in order to ascertain the legitimate heir of Osiris would have been used in the actual ritual to corroborate the king’s legitimacy to rule.}
VIII.d The geographical Remarks

Geographical annotations appear in the third Remarks of a column in a given Scene. Sethe (1928: 96) stated that these locations partly refer to a city where the ritual was supposed to take place. Based on the appearance of the designation nfr ntwty (“town god”) as the addressee of Horus’ Speech in column 44, Sethe further argued that the ritual was performed in different towns during the journey of the newly appointed king; he mentioned the capitals Heliopolis, Thebes, and Memphis as possible performance places and suggested further locations like Elephantine and Abydos. He saw his assumption corroborated by the fact that the shrine, including the image of the king in the Vignettes, is depicted on a boat, implying a journey of the ruler. However, the geographical Remarks do not mention any of the aforementioned towns. In addition, only two cities (Letopolis; cols. 32, 55, 73-75, 119, 121-122 and Buto; cols. 70-71, 102-103) and one nome are named (Ibis-nome; cols. 67, 99, 112-113, 118). Furthermore, Sethe’s assumption that the ritual was performed in different cities based on the appearance of the city god in column 44 seems too far-fetched. The god is only mentioned once during the entire course of the ritual. In addition, the reading of nfr ntwty is ambiguous as the papyrus is partly destroyed at this point. Furthermore, I am of the opinion that the depiction of the bark does not necessarily imply that the king was transported on the Nile in order to visit different cities. I rather think that the boat represents a ceremonial bark, not necessarily used for transportation on water. Finally, the geographical locations do not imply that the action was supposed to take place in a particular town or nome. The sites are rather connected to the mythological interpretation of a rite or can be associated with the storage place of an item of the actual ritual as is proven in the following.

---

285 The designation nfr ntwty would then be replaced with the name of the particular town god (Sethe 1928: 96).
286 I suggest that the bark was placed on a sledge and was pulled during the ritual; for a depiction of such a bark, see the shrine of Thutmose III in the tomb of Amenmose (Decker 1992: 82, fig. 51) or the illustration of the shrine in the Burial Ritual (Altenmüller 1972: 297f.). Lorton (1999: 145) also stated that statues were kept in naoi deposited on portable model boats during festivals; see, for example, the processional bark of Amun (Karlshausen 2009).
The town Letopolis is mentioned eight times during the course of the ritual. The references in column 32 and 73-75 are based on the mythological interpretation of the actual ritual action; both times Letopolis represents the town in which Horus avenged his father.\textsuperscript{287} In Scene 19 food and drink are offered to Mekhenti-en-irti, whose cult place is Letopolis. Hence, the reference of the town in column 55 is plausible. Scene 40 is concerned with a stick fight performed by the “ones who embrace the Akh”. The divine level mentions a comparable fight, carried out by the followers of Seth. Thus, the location Letopolis (col. 119) alludes to the stick fight of the followers of Seth in Letopolis, known from PT 469.\textsuperscript{288} Finally, Letopolis is attested in columns 121/122. The Scene deals with the choosing of two mourners who are identified with Isis and Nephthys in the mythological counterpart. Thus, the location alludes to Osiris’ burial that takes place in Letopolis (see also Sethe 1928: 97).

The ritual annotations refer to Buto in two Scenes. In the first case (Scene 24) wine is brought by the royal children; the wine derives from Buto and Pelusium respectively (second Remarks of both columns 70/71). Hence, the mention of Buto is clearly connected to the origin of the offering. In Scene 35 a bib is presented by the lector priest in the connection of the “burial” of the king/his statue. The mention of Buto here does not refer to the town in the delta, but rather to a part of a temple that is connected with the burial.\textsuperscript{289}

An explanation for the occurrences of the Ibis-nome (\textsuperscript{2}T; \textit{dhwty}) is more difficult. The name of the nome is written with the same sign that represents the god Thoth in the course of the ritual. Hence, it is also possible that the annotations refer to the deity. However, the occurrences of the sign in the third Remarks make the interpretation as the nome more plausible; the third Remarks generally refer to geographical locations. The Ibis-nome is mentioned for the first time in column 67 of Scene 23. The Scene deals with the bringing of an offering table by the embalmers. A connection to the Ibis-nome is not evident; neither the

\textsuperscript{287} In the first case the ritual action mentions cattle that trample down barley. Transferred into the divine world the Scene is interpreted as Horus’ beating of the ones who have beaten Osiris (col. 32). This fight, in turn, refers to Horus’ revenge that took place in Letopolis the night before Osiris’s burial (see also Sethe 1928: 137f.). The second example concerns the bringing of carnelian. On the mythological level, Horus saves his eye from Seth, who is supposed to get distorted with rage, and should turn away after he was confronted. Hence, I suggest that the mythological interpretation alludes, again, to the part of the Osiris myth, where Horus avenged his father in Letopolis.

\textsuperscript{288} For the PT reference, see also note B, VI.15.4: 153f.

\textsuperscript{289} See note E, VI.14.3: 141.
god Thoth is mentioned in the Scene nor does a pun exist between $dlhwty$ and a word mentioned in the Introduction, Explicatory sentence, or the Speeches. The same applies for the occurrence of the nome in Scene 40 (col. 118), in which the “ones who embrace the Akh” perform with sticks. An explanation for the attestation of the nome in these two cases has to remain unsolved. But it can be said that a reading of $\text{�}$ as the god Thoth is also difficult to explain in these two Scenes, as the deity is not mentioned or referred to in either Scene. A motive for the reference of the Ibis-nome in column 99 (Scene 34) might be the presence of the god Thoth, who appears as the speaker in the very same column. The Scene deals with the bringing of the “ones who embrace the Akh”. The same reason might be present in Scene 38, which concerns the bringing of the “ones who embrace the Akh”, with which Thoth is equalled in column 112. Hence, the attestation of the Ibis-nome in columns 112/113 might be based on the mention of the deity again.

The last geographical location attested in the RDP is Cheri-tjehenu ($hry-thnw$). The term designates a cult place of Thoth. The site is mentioned in Scene 26 (cols. 78/79), which deals with the presentation of a faience necklace to which an amulet in the form of a baboon chapel is attached. Thoth can be represented as a baboon so that Cheri-tjehenu might be mentioned in connection with the amulet. It is also possible that it designates the place from which the faience necklace was brought (Schott 1980: 266). Another possibility is that the term was chosen, simply because it builds a pun with the word faience ($thnt$).

In all other examples the geographical annotations refer to buildings, or parts of them. Sethe (1928: 96) argued that these structures specify the stage where the action was performed. I, however, think that his assumption is not true in most cases as the change of location would interrupt the course of the ritual immensely. Scene 43 is discussed here to prove my thesis (see also Schott 1980: 267). This part of the ritual is concerned with the presentation of 4-fibre-linen and a staff to the “ones who embrace the Akh”. The second

---

290 For the significance of puns, see IV: 32f.
291 These edifices are the “place of purification” (cols. 7, 33), the “northern erected hill” (col. 26), the embalming hall (cols. 27, 109, 128, 138), the treasury (cols. 36, 108, 127), and the royal house (cols. 47, 129). For a detailed discussion of these buildings, see below.
292 He assumed, for example, that the action in Scene 9 changed from the “northern erected hill” to the embalming hall (Sethe 1928: 132f.).
Remarks of columns 127-129 mention 4-fibre-linen, 6-fibre-linen, and the staff. The following third annotations refer to the treasury, the embalming place, and the royal house. According to Sethe, the setting is changed three times in the course of this one rite alone, which is highly unlikely. It is much more plausible to assume that the buildings rather refer to the place where the different items are stored, and from which they are brought to the actual performance place. In the following the different edifices that occur in the third Remarks are discussed.

In columns 7 and 33 the annotation “going forth to the place of purification” is given. Column 7 is part of Scene 3, which deals with the presentation of eight mnsi-vessels to the sacred bark. The rite implies that the content of these vessels is used in the course of the ritual; the water in these jugs is probably applied to the statue that is kept in the shrine on the boat. Hence, I assume that the place of purification designates a room in the temple where the statue is purified (see note K, VI.1.3: 47). Scene 10, which includes column 33, deals with the trampling down of barley by cattle and donkeys. Maybe the agrarian rite of trampling down the barley is followed by a purification.

The next reference to a building occurs in column 26, where the “northern erected hill” is mentioned. Without doubt the term refers to a shrine; Vignette 5 includes a caption with the term as well as a depiction of a small building. The official standing in front of the edifice is taller than the building so that it can only be a shrine (see note E, VI.5.1: 68f. and VI.5.2: 70f.). Scene 9 refers to the presentation of several royal insignia. Evidently, these regalia are taken out of that shrine in order to be used in the ritual.

The embalming hall is mentioned four times during the ritual, referred to as sh-nfr (cols. 27 and 138) and pr-nfr (cols. 109 and 128). Maybe the two terms represent two different rooms in the same building. The pr-nfr is mentioned in both cases in connection with the 6-fibre-linen that is used for the dressing of the royal image. The term pr-nfr is generally translated as “Stätte der Balsamierung” (Wb I: 517).

Donohue (1978: 143ff.) mentioned that the

---

293 For the argumentation against Sethe’s translation of “descending to heaven”, see note K, VI.1.3: 47.
294 Sethe (1928: 138) argued that the salive of Seth, mentioned in column 33 of the Scene, represents a means of cleaning. Concerning an argumentation against this interpretation in the RDP, see note J, VI.6.2:75ff.
expression *pr-nfr* does not occur before the late Old Kingdom, when it replaces the *wḥt* ("place of purification" or "place of emblament"), where the body of the deceased is washed in the course of the mortuary ritual. He further stated that the word *nfr*, if referring to a place, is connected with Osiris; compare also Osiris’ epithet *wnn-nfr*. According to Donohue, the hope for an Osiris-like resurrection is present when the body of the deceased is embalmed. Consequently, he translated *pr-nfr* as "house of rejuvenation". The term *pr-nfr* is also mentioned in the tomb tomb of Niankhkhnum and Khnumhotep (Moussa/Altenmüller 1977: 48). It is said that the funerary procession (so-called ‘Westfahrt’) proceeds from the *pr-nfr* to the tomb. Interestingly, the same procession starts at the *pr iriwt* ("Haus of the weaving mill") in the tomb of Ptahhotep I (Moussa/Altenmüller 1977: 48, note 18). Thus, the *pr-nfr* could, indeed, not only be an embalming place, but also a storage room for linen, as it is the case in the RDP, where the connection between the *pr-nfr* and the 6-fibre-linen is evident.

The term *sh-ntr* appears together with the *mtḥ* insignia (col. 27) and the presentation of a mug to the king (col. 138). The latter connection occurs again in the framework of the "burial", while the relationship of the embalming hall and the *mtḥ* is not as evident. Maybe the item is stored in the hall and is brought to the performance place.

The treasury (*pr-ḥd*) appears in three instances. Twice it is menionted in connection with 4-fibre-linen (cols. 108 and 127), and once with natron (col. 36). The *pr-ḥd* is probably a part of the royal palace (Schott 1984: 267) from which these items are taken for the performance of the ritual. Schott referred to tomb inscriptions, which mention the place of origin of certain offerings; the *pr-ḥd* occurs in connection with cloth.

The royal house (*hwt-nb*) is mentioned in columns 47 and 129. Kamal (1938: 10ff.) mentioned that the *hwt-nb* had different functions: it designates a sanctuary, but also a place

---

296 Compare also the title *imy-r pr-nfr*, translated by Jones with "overseer of the funerary workshop"/"house of rejuvenation" (Jones 2000: 120, no. 480).
297 Moussa/Altenmüller (1977: 48, note 18) mentioned that *pr-nfr* does not only mean “embalming place”, but can also have the connotation “house of linen”, based on the attestation in the RDP.
298 Sethe (1928: 141f.) suggested that the term *pr-ḥd* designates the shrine that is depicted in the Vignettes, and that contains the figure of the king.
299 An example is the tomb inscription of Sabny, where we read: *ini.n.f sT Hb m pr-nfr sSt# m wobt [...] m pr-ḥd hbs <m> pr-nfr – “and he brought festive fragrance from the *pr-nfr*, a secret from the wḥt, [...] from the armory, and cloths <from> the treasury” (Sethe 1903/Urk. I: 138.2-7, see Schott 1984: 268).
where statues were built or repaired, as well as a storage place, in which, for example, the gold for the fabrication of the objects was stored as well as a sanctuary. The third Osirian chamber on the roof of the Dendara temple is, for example, called hwt-nb. The decoration of that room includes an illustration, in which Osiris is lying on a funerary bed; below the bed three im3-trees are depicted. The scene is clearly connected with the deity’s rejuvenation (Koemoth 1994: 225ff.; see also note C, VI.4.2: 63). Schott (1980: 265ff.) argued convincingly that the building is a part of the administration, designating, for example, the slaughtering house, or that it refers to a part of the royal palace. It would appear that the hwt-nb in the RDP played a similar role as the sanctuary in Dendara; the ritual of the RDP is concerned with rejuvenation in the broadest sense (see X: 238ff.) and the im3-tree appears in it. However, taking the context of the Scenes into consideration, in which the hwt-nb is attested in the RDP, the interpretation of an administrative building makes the most sense.

The first attestation of the gold house is linked to the offering of a goose and kid head. Hence, it is convincing to assume that the goose and kid are slaughtered before in the hwt-nb. In column 129 the gold house is connected with a staff that is handed over to the king together with 4-fibre-linen. The mythological interpretation of the action refers to the pulling out of Seth’s thigh. Hence, the gold house could be the place from which the staff is taken, or it plays a metaphorical role here as the place where Seth’s thigh is pulled out.

VIII.e *The sacred bark motif and the epithet of the king*

As mentioned in chapter V, the sacred bark with the shrine is a central element in the course of the ritual. Most of the rites or actions are performed in the presence of the boat, as we

---

300 See also Sethe: 1928, 153 and 158, who argued that the hwt-nb is a workshop where the statues are built and enlivened through the Opening of the Mouth Ritual. The term, indeed, appears in this ritual in connection with the Opening of the Mouth: in the heading we read: irit wpt r n twt n NN m hwt nb – “Performing the Opening of the Mouth for the statue of NN in the workshop” (for the hieroglyphic text, see Otto 1960 I: 1). The two references in the RDP are, however, not connected to the Opening of the Mouth. For the meaning of hwt-nb as a workshop, see also Davies/Gardiner 1973: 57f. Compare also the title imy-r hwt-nb, which Jones translated with “overseer of the mansion of gold/sculptor’s workshop” (Jones 2000: 166, no. 632). In addition, the corn-Osiris figures are said to be made in the hwt-nb of Dendara, the sanctuary on the temple roof (Koemoth 1994: 225ff.).

301 Chassinat (1966: 15) added that the hwt-nb can also be a room in a temple, where the divine statues were adorned with jewellery, for example. He also referred to the meaning of the burial chamber in a tomb, and the aforementioned designation of a workshop (for the latter, see also Vernus 1976: 10).
know from the accompanying Vignettes. The image depicted in the shrine can only be a statue representing Senwosret I. He does not perform any rites in the course of the ritual himself. Actions are either carried out in front of him or directly on him. In addition, the entire depiction of the sacred bark has the same height in the Vignettes as the officials. If the image represented the living king himself, he would be illustrated larger than any other participant. Vignette 24 is especially significant in that regard: the royal image is carried by two officials and is only half the size of the two people. Furthermore, the statue is carried on the arms of the officials; a living king would be transported in a carrying chair. The shrine with the statue of the king inside is probably deposited on a portable model boat (see VIII.d: especially footnote 286, 210).

The shrine on top of the bark contains the figure of the king in the first 16 illustrations. Starting with Vignette 17 the king is, however, not drawn inside the shrine. Sethe (1928: 89) assumed that the bark without the figure constitutes an abbreviated version. As mentioned above, the sacred bark is the decisive element in the Vignettes, and the shrine on the boat contains the royal image. Hence, it is unconceivable that the motif would have been drawn in an abbreviated form; it is especially unthinkable that the depiction of a royal image would have been left out. Thus, I agree with Gestermann (2008: 49) that the reason for the empty shrine is not connected to the writing and drawing of the manuscript, but rather lies in the course of the ritual; the figure is missing because the image is taken out of the shrine so that the rites could be performed directly on it.

Another change concerns the epithet of the king in the Vignettes. In the first two depictions the caption belonging to the boat reads nsw hpr-k3-rˁ – “the king, Kheper-ka-ra” (Senwosret

---

302 For an example of a cult statue with comparable features (standing and holding certain insignia), see the cult statue of Amun (Lorton 1999: 129, fig. 4). Redford (1981: 93f.) has mentioned that iconographic features of statues were recorded by means of drawings in manuals (see also Lorton 1999: 200). Concerning the drawing of statues, see also the illustrations of Khentkaus’ cult statues (Posener-Kriéger 2001: 133ff.).

303 Compare, for example, the depiction of Haremhab in Silsila (west wall of Horemhab’s Speos), in which he sits on a chair carried by 12 men (Lepsius 1849-58 III: 121a; concerning a description of the scene, see Hari 1965: 366ff.). See also the carrying-chair found in the tomb of Hetepheres (Partridge 1996: 88ff.).

304 But even Sethe (1928: 89) admitted himself that this assumption contradicts the drawing style of the papyrus. The illustrations are executed in more details towards the end of the manuscript (see also IV: 30ff.).
I) (Vignette 1) and *ntr nfr* \(^{305}\) nb *twy hpr-k3-r\(^c\) – “the good god, the lord of the two lands, Kheper-ka-ra” (Vignette 2), respectively. It is not surprising that the royal name is mentioned in the beginning in order to identify the king for whom the ritual is performed. In the following, the caption is abbreviated to *nsw* – “king”. \(^{306}\) In Vignettes 12, 15, and 24, however, the caption reads \(\sqrt{nsw}\). The epithet has to be transliterated *nsw it hq\(^3\) – “the king, the father of the ruler” in Vignette 24. Two *shmw lh* carry the statue of the sovereign. In addition, the royal image is depicted smaller than the two officials. Consequently, the figure shows a statue representing the dead king. The text of the ritual confirms this assumption. The royal figure is identified with Osiris \(^{307}\), and can, thus, only represent the dead king. In the other two occurrences of the epithet the reading is ambiguous. Sethe (1928: 95; 250; 252) and Frankfort (1969: 123) suggested transliterating *nsw hq\(3\).ty.fy* – “the king, the one who will rule”. Sethe argued that the epithet is used for the newly appointed king who just celebrated his Accession to the Throne (Senwosret I), while the title *it hq\(3\) – “father of the ruler” concerns the deceased king (Amenemhet I), whose burial is mentioned at the end of the ritual. Based on his assumption that the ritual describes Senwosret I’s Accession to the Throne and Coronation, Sethe further stated that it is not explainable why that king would be called “father of the ruler” – he was just appointed king – or why the text would refer to Senwosret’s successor Amenemhet II. As is shown in chapter X, the ritual does not concern the Accession to the Throne or Coronation of Senwosret I, but rather a ritual commemorating him. Hence, Sethe’s argumentation concerning the epithet becomes irrelevant. It is also questionable if the same writing would be applied for two different epithets within one text, \(^{308}\) without providing further information, or at least a slightly different writing. Consequently, I suggest to read all three occurrences of \(\sqrt{nsw}\) as *nsw it hq\(3\) – “the king, the father of the ruler”. Additionally, the writing \(\sqrt{nsw}\) is attested in the RDP for the term *it* –

---

\(^{305}\) According to the Wb, the epithet *ntr nfr* is usually used for the living king. However, it can also be employed to designate a deceased ruler. It is also a designation for Osiris (Wb II: 361f.). Goedicke (1960: 40ff.) mentioned, however, that the epithets *ntr nfr* and *ntr f\(j\)* are not used for the living king, but only the dead ruler, at least during the Old Kingdom. If this is also valid for the Middle Kingdom, the epithet *ntr nfr* for Senwosret I clearly indicates that the ritual is performed for the dead king.

\(^{306}\) For *nsw* as a designation of the deceased king, see Windus-Staginsky 2006: 37ff.

\(^{307}\) Compare col. 114; VI.15.2: 150; Sethe 1928: 221ff. and 256; Gestermann 2008: 43. Sethe, however, thought that the title “father of the ruler” refers to Amenemhet I, and not Senwosret I.

\(^{308}\) See also Gestermann 2008: 43. She further argued convincingly that *nsw* already refers to the crowned king. Consequently, there is no reason why he would be called “the one who will rule”.

“father” (see col. 113). Finally, I interpret the text of the RDP as a ritual held in honour of the deceased king (see X: 238ff.). Accordingly, the epithet “father of the king” is applicable for Senwosret I as he is, indeed, the father of the ruling king Amenemhet II.

Nevertheless, it is ambiguous why he is called “father of the ruler” only three times; in the other occasions Senwosret I is simply designated as “king”. The Scenes that are represented by the Vignettes that mention the epithet “father of the ruler” do not provide a reason for the changed title. A lector priest presents food and drink to Mekhenti-en-irti in Scene 19 (Vignette 12). The following actions belonging to the same Sequence deal with fighting, the bringing of two families who probably prepare an offering, and the bringing of two carpenters who construct the offering table that is then presented by two embalmers. Scene 24 is concerned with the presentation of wine to the figure of the king by the royal children (Vignette 15). The bringing of carnelian to the king is a further rite in the Sequence. As mentioned above, the “ones who embrace the Akh” carry the father of the ruler in Scene 39 (Vignette 24). Subsequently, the same officials perform a game with two sticks, two mourners are chosen, and a staff and 4-fibre-linen are presented to the royal image. The latter sequence of events is probably concerned with the “burial” procession. Hence, it could be argued that the epithet “father of the ruler” was employed to stress the fact that the king is dead. An explanation for the two other occurrences of the epithet is more difficult. In the first example the food and drink are not offered to the image of the king, but to Mekhenti-en-irti shown holding the wıs-scepter. The reason for the usage of the title “father of the ruler” cannot be provided. Concerning the second attestation one could conclude that the usage of the epithet is connected with the presence of the royal children, who perform the action of the Scene. Maybe the ruling king, Amenemhet II, is part of the group. However, the royal children are also mentioned in Scene 18, where they descend into two barks. The Vignette representing the entire Sequence shows the bark with the shrine. The caption is, however, not preserved so that it is unknown which epithet referred to the royal depiction in the shrine.
IX. Ancient Egyptian Rituals

This chapter will not consist of an extensive study on ancient Egyptian rituals in general, or discuss in detail the different ceremonies that are known from ancient Egypt. Instead the main rites of royal and statue rituals will be summarized briefly in order to highlight the discrepancies and similarities between each ritual and the text preserved in the RDP. The aim of the chapter is to show that the ritual of the RDP is not identical with one that is already known from ancient Egypt. The drawing up of the similarities the RDP has with other rituals will also help with the identification of the ceremony.

IX.a The Sed Festival

The main sources providing a detailed representation of the Sed festival are the so-called “world chamber” in Niuserre’s sun temple at Abu Gurob (Bissing von/Kees 1923), the depictions of Amenhotep III’s festival in the tomb of Kheruef at Thebes (Fakhry 1943; The Epigraphic Survey 1980), and the gateway to the hall of Osorkon II’s temple in Bubastis (Naville 1892). The three representations, however, differ from each other concerning certain rites. Additionally, none features the entire ritual, but only a synopsis of it (Uphill 1965: 367; Hornung/Staehelin 2006: 91). Nevertheless, the main events of the ceremony can be identified.

The festival starts with preliminary proceedings, including foundation ceremonies for the buildings especially constructed for the Sed festival, and the arriving of officials and gods. The first procession, in which the royal children also participate, ends in a homage to the king, who sits in a pavilion robed in the cloak typical for the Sed festival. The next sequence consists of the so-called ‘Löwenmöbelfolge’ (“lion furniture sequence”); the king,
still dressed in the cloak and wearing the white crown, lies down on one of four beds. The rite seems to be connected to regeneration and rebirth. Certain regalia and clothing are stored under the beds, which the king is supposed to receive after the rejuvenation. The scene also shows two officials and a sm-priest in front of idmi-linen, placed next to the bed, while two imy-ḥnt-priests seem to stand in front of a statue (Uphill 1965: 379). Following that, the ruler appears in the Heb sed-pavilion, now wearing the double crown symbolizing the restart of his reign. Subsequently, the Min- and the Wepwawet-sequences take place. The first one shows a procession, in which officials carry the Min-symbol. The latter includes the cultic run of the sovereign. The king holds the Meket and the flagellum, while an official carries the Wepwawet-standard and leads the way. This ritual run or dance of the ruler symbolizes the demonstration of his regained power, but also the seizure of the domain, the taking over of the rule, and the “dancing” into the line of ancestors. Following that, the king appears in his Sed festival dress and the presentation of the cattle takes place, before the ruler is carried in a palanquin in order to visit the divine shrines. Certain innovations can be seen in the depiction of Amenhotep III’s Sed festival. The erection of the Djed-pillar is integrated into the ceremony, followed by a ritual battle between the inhabitants of Pe and Dep, as well as the driving of asses and oxen around a wall (Bleeker 1967: 103). These rites are only attested in Amenhotep III’s ceremony, and point to an increasing importance of Osiris. In addition, Amenhotep III’s main royal wife Tiya plays a prominent role in the ritual, and the presentation of the clepsydra is included in the Sed festival from now on. Participants of the Sed festival include, for example, the lector priest, magicians, and the ntr c, who are part of the first procession. As mentioned above, the imy-ḥnt-priests and the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt praise the king, when he sits down in the festival pavilion. The ird-pꜣt, fan-bearers (smrw), two viziers, and hmn-tr-priests appear in the second procession, the so-called Min- and Wepwawet-sequences. Officials present at the ritual run

314 These ritual beds are possibly comparable to those found in the tomb of Tutankhamun; for the latter’s ritual couches, see Reeves 1990: 146ff.
315 For the cultic run or dance, see Kees 1912, Wiedemann 1975, and Decker 1992: 24ff. A comparable ritual run is also part of the Coronation ceremony (see IX.b: 22ff.).
316 It is, however, also possible that these rites are not part of the Sed festival (see VII.a, Sequence 8: footnote 224, 189).
317 For the participants of the Sed festival, see Uphill 1965.
and the subsequent enthronement of the king in the Heb sed pavilion include, amongst others, the sm-priest, singers, hr-nws-priests, and the mouth opener.

As mentioned in chapter VII, Helck (1954: 383ff.), Altenmüller (1965/66: 421ff.), and Barta (1972: 5ff. and 1976: 31ff.) identified the ritual described in the RDP with the Sed festival (see VII: 174ff.). They, however, had to rearrange the reading sequence of the RDP in order to verify their interpretations. I am of the opinion that a reading sequence of a text should not be altered to make it suitable to an interpretation. The text should rather be read in the way it occurs, with the risk that an explanation of the content or an identification of the ritual described in the papyrus cannot be proven at the time, due to the lack of comparable texts or depictions. In addition, Quack (2006: 79ff.) has demonstrated that the depictions of the RDP and the Sed festival are not similar, and that the main rites of the latter event (for example the enthronement and dressing in the sed robe) are not present in the text of the RDP. Further discrepancies can be found: the king plays a passive role in the RDP, and all actions are carried out in front of or on him/his statue. In the Sed festival, however, the ruler is the acting person. For example, he offers to gods, he sits down on the throne, and he erects the Djed-pillar. In the RDP the Djed-pillar is lifted up by officials (Scene 16 and Vignette 10). Furthermore, different priests and officials appear in both rituals. The shnw ḫh (“the ones who embrace the Akh”), iryw ḫḥ wdpw (“the ones who are responsible for the ḫḥ and stewards”) or the iryw ḫt nsw (“the ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king”) do not participate in the Sed festival, but are the main performers in the RDP ritual, besides the lector priest. Finally, the queen and the princesses take part in the Sed festival of Amenhotep III, whereas close royal family members are absent from the RDP ritual. I think these arguments are sufficient to prove that the RDP text is not a representation of the Sed festival.

Nevertheless, some minor similarities can be determined. The erection of the Djed-pillar is already mentioned in the last paragraph. The subsequent event of driving asses and oxen

---

318 Seti I also performs the rite himself – as depicted in his temple in Abydos (Capart 1912: pls. XXIX and XXX; Gardiner 1930b: pl. 8; David 1981: 123ff. and 134). David referred to the erection of the Djed-pillar in the RDP; she mentioned that it is connected with the Coronation ceremony. The RDP does, however, not feature this festival (see IX,b: 222ff.).

319 Hornung and Staehelin (2006: 94ff.) also came to the conclusion that the Sed festival and the ritual described in the RDP papyrus exhibit only very few equivalents.
around four walls in the Sed festival of Amenhotep III might have a common origin with the trampling down of barley in the RDP (see VIII.a, Sequence 6: 186f.). A rite comparable to the cultic run of the king, preserved in the Sed festival depiction of Niuserre, might be included in the ritual of the RDP. Scene 9 states the Remark “Crossing the desert”, which could refer to a ceremonial run performed by the king (see also VIII.a, Sequence 5: 186). The Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt also appear in both rituals. In the Sed festival they praise the king (Uphill 1965: 371) and in Scene 32 of the RDP they arrive in reverence. Finally, the king is possibly equipped with linen and regalia in the Sed festival after his “resurrection” in his tomb (Uphill 1965: 379). In the RDP, the king or his statue receives certain regalia in Scenes 9 (staff of Horus, śms, mth, and hd-mace) and 29 (two ‘bȝ-scepters and two śwty-feathers); Scenes 37 and 42 deal with the provision of different kinds of linen. These similarities do not contradict the hypothesis, however, that both rituals are not identical. Except for the erection of the Djed-pillar, the equipment with regalia and linen, and the cultic run – if the latter is indeed connected to the expression “Crossing the desert” – the common features concern minor proceedings in the course of both rituals. In addition, the erection of the Djed-pillar is only attested in Amenhotep III’s version of the Sed festival. Thus, it is not clear if it is an essential part of the ceremony, or just a preference of that king. It seems more likely that certain rites are essential in the course of several rituals, without them being directly connected. The erection of the Djed-pillar, for example, symbolizes Osiris’ triumph over Seth, and is thus a relevant theme for all rituals concerned with gaining or proving royal power. The equipment with regalia and linen also occurs in other rituals (Opening of the Mouth Ritual and the Daily Temple Ritual; see IX.f: 233ff. and g: 235ff.).

**IX.b The Accession to the Throne and the Coronation**

The Accession to the Throne and the Coronation have to be seen as two different ceremonies that do not take place on the same day. Barta (1980a: 33ff.) has argued convincingly that the

---

320 For the possibilities that this rite is not part of the Sed festival, see VIII.a, Sequence 8: footnote 224, 189.
former event is celebrated at the morning after the predecessor’s death\textsuperscript{321} while the latter takes place after the burial of the deceased king.\textsuperscript{322} Thus, the two events are at least 70 days – the time for the embalment of the predecessor – apart. Barta (1980a: 49f.) further reasoned that both ceremonies fulfill different functions:\textsuperscript{323} the Accession to the Throne documents the concrete assumption of power, which the new sovereign – called the “son of the king” – takes over from his bodily father. In addition, the date of the Accession to the Throne is mentioned in order to guarantee the new counting of the regnal years. The Coronation is rather the mythological protection of the real assumption of power, acknowledged by the gods; the king is called “son of Ra”.

Although no document is preserved which features the entire ritual of the Coronation, the ceremony can be reconstructed from several attestations; the main sources are several blocks of Amenemhet III’s temple in the Fayum,\textsuperscript{324} depictions in the funerary temple of Hatshepsut in Deir el-Bahri and her ‘chapelle rouge’ in Karnak, illustrations of Thutmose III’s Coronation in Karnak, as well as those of Amenhotep III in the temple of Luxor.\textsuperscript{325} In addition, a description of Haremhab’s ceremony is preserved on the back of his statue stored in the Turin Museum (Gardiner 1953). Four sandstone blocks, kept in the Vatican Museum, might also feature a part of the ritual; they show a purification rite performed on Thutmosis

\textsuperscript{321} Barta (1980a: 35) mentioned the biography of Amenemhab, which informs us about Amenhotep II’s Accession to the Throne: $\text{h}g.n\text{ rf t}\d w w h p r\text{ in wbn pr b} i q . t i\text{ nsw-bity}\ s i\text{i-hprw-r}^2 s i\text{r}^2\text{ imn-htp h}q\ i^*\text{ wist d} i\ s h n h^*\text{ smnw hr nst nt it.f}$ - “It was when the land lightened (in) the morning, when the sun disk rose and the sky glared, that the king of Upper and Lower Egypt Aa-Kheperu-Ra, son of Ra Amenhotep (II), ruler of Thebes, given life, was placed on the throne of his father” (Sethe 1907/Urk. IV 896: 1-8).

\textsuperscript{322} Barta (1980a: 37) quoted from P. Harris (I: 76, 1ff.), which mentions that Sethnakht had already been brought into his tomb when Ramses III appeared as king of the two lands in his father’s place.

\textsuperscript{323} He based his assumption on the reports concerning Thutmose III’s Accession to the Throne and Coronation (Sethe 1906/Urk. IV 180: 7-181.5 and 156: 13-162.8).

\textsuperscript{324} Barta (1975: 46) identified the temple as Senwosret III’s. Leprohon (1980: 129, no. 39 and 297ff.) showed, however, that the temple, and thus also the Coronation text have to be assigned to Amenemhet III, who was Senwosret III’s coregent; for the coregency, see also Murnane 1977: 9ff. and 228f.

Finally, P. Berlin 13242, P. Carlsberg 658, 659 and 660, as well as P. Berlin 15775c and 14403c seem to represent parts of the Coronation ceremony (Quack 2002). P. Brooklyn 47.218.50 might be another textual witness for the Coronation. According to Goyon (1972), the document describes the confirmation of the royal power at the New Year’s festival. The papyrus consists of two parts. The first part (‘le ceremonial du Grand-Siège’; Goyon 1972: 19ff.) mainly describes purification rites as well as offerings presented by the king at the “festivals of the earth”, while the second part (‘les rites de l’adoration d’Horus qui confère l’héritage’; Goyon 1972: 23ff.) consists of hymns to Horus and the confirmation of the royal inheritance. I agree with Quack (2006: 87f.), however, that the papyrus rather features two separate rituals that are not necessarily connected to the Coronation.

Based on the aforementioned representations of the Coronation, the ceremony can be divided into four main parts, and 22 scenes. The ritual starts with the purification of the king after he was led from the palace to the temple (scenes 1 and 2). The second part describes the handing over of the Upper Egyptian crown (scenes 3-9). The king is brought to the Upper Egyptian shrine (pr-wr), in which he ascends the throne and is crowned with the white crown. Subsequently, the rite of the unification of the two lands is performed and the Upper Egyptian standard gods are equipped, before the procession visits the Upper Egyptian divine shrines. Following that, the king perambulates the wall on the eastern side and is brought back to the Upper Egyptian shrine. The third part (scenes 10-18) includes the same rites as the second one, but the focus is on Lower Egypt; the king is brought to the Lower Egyptian shrine (pr-nsr) and the red crown is presented, for example. In the last section of the ritual (scenes 17-22) the ruler is led to the Upper Egyptian shrine again, in whose court he receives

---

326 The deities Horus and Thoth purify Thutmose III with ‘nh-signs, poured out of a hs-vase. Gardiner (1950) collected all scenes featuring this motif and argued that Horus (north) and Thoth (west) represent the four cardinal points; Seth (south) and dwn-’nwi (east) are not depicted out of aesthetic reasons. The aim of the scene is to transfer the divine power to the king. Gardiner suggested that the representation is part of the Coronation ceremony.

327 All six papyri seem to feature the same ritual. P. Berlin 13242 describes a royal purification and was published by Schott (1957), who suggested that the rite is part of the Coronation ceremony. The new fragments of the other five documents represent the same rite, but feature additional contents not preserved in P. Berlin 13242. According to Quack (2002: 98f.), the fragments underline the political character of the ritual by including execration spells against enemies. In addition, Isis, in her role as mother, plays an important part in the texts. Thus, Quack agreed with Schott that the content of the papyri fragments feature rites connected with the Coronation.

the uraeus-diadem. After that, he is led to the sanctuary of the temple, his titulary is proclaimed, and the annals of his reign are constituted. Subsequently, the temple deity confirms the assumption of the royal power. The ritual ends with an offering that the king presents to the deity.

The main official of the ceremony is the *imy-hnt*-priest (Barta 1985: 8). The expressions *hꜣi* and *bsi* are characteristic for the Coronation ceremony: *hꜣi* describes the moment of the Coronation; the newly appointed ruler “appears” as the king of Upper and Lower Egypt (Barta 1975: 47), whereas *bsi* indicates the Coronation ritual in its entirety; the king is “established” (Barta 1985: 8; see also Quack: 2002).

As mentioned in chapter VII, Sethe (1928: 95f.) interpreted the text of the RDP as an attestation for the Accession to the Throne and Coronation of Senwosret I. He assumed that the text starts with the death of Senwosret I’s father and predecessor Amenemhet I and ends with the latter’s burial. The focus of the ritual, however, is the Coronation of Senwosret I, which takes place in between the death and burial of Amenemhet I; Sethe read the Remarks of Scene 33 (cols. 92-96) as one sentence: *smn hꜣ iry šwt wrt* – “Befestigen der Krone (durch) den Hüter der großen Feder” (Sethe 1928: 204 and 206; see also note F, VI.13.7: 134f.), and identified the sentence as the essential statement describing the Coronation. The entire Scene 33 deals with the presentation of green and black eyepaint, grapes, as well as incense. Frankfort (1969: 123ff.) agreed with Sethe’s interpretation and divided the text into 6 parts (see VII: 174).

As mentioned above, Barta has shown that the two events, the Accession to the Throne and the Coronation, are at least 70 days apart. Hence, it is very unlikely that they are celebrated in one ceremony. In addition, the aforementioned papyri,³²⁹ which probably feature a part of the Coronation ceremony, do not show any similarities with the RDP (see also Quack 2006: 87f.). The same applies to the sequence of events, reconstructed from the different representations of the Coronation. The RDP does not mention the *pr-wr* or *pr-nsr* shrines, the unification of the two lands, the standard processions of Upper and Lower Egypt, the

---

³²⁹ P. Berlin 13242, P. Carlsberg 658, 659, and 660, P. Berlin 15775c and 14403e, as well as P. Brooklyn 47.218.50.
presentation of the white and red crowns,\textsuperscript{330} the uraeus-diadem, or the proclamation of the
titulary. Sethe’s above mentioned translation “Befestigen der Krone (durch) den Hüter der
großen Feder”, which he identified as the main indicator for the Coronation, also has to be
challenged. It is doubtful that the main statement of the ceremony is written down in a
Remark, broken down in four words, each appearing in a different column (\textit{šwt wrt}, col. 92;
\textit{iry}, col. 93; \textit{ḥc}, col. 94; \textit{smn}, col. 95 – transliteration according to Sethe). In addition, Sethe
read the Remarks against the reading direction of the papyrus (\textit{smn ḥc iry šwt wrt}).
Furthermore, the sign Sethe read as \textit{ḥc} (\textsuperscript{331}) looks more like the hieroglyph \textsuperscript{332} (\textit{km}), and the
title \textit{iry šwt wrt} is not attested elsewhere (see Wb IV: 425) so that it has to remain
questionable whether it actually is a title. For the reasons mentioned above, I prefer to read
the four Remarks separately (\textit{šwt wrt} – “great feather”; \textit{sḥw} – “the one who protects”; \textit{km} –
“what is black”; \textit{smn} – “what lets endure”), and suggest that they refer to the items presented
in the Scene (green eye paint, black eye paint, grapes, and incense; see note F, VI.13.7:
134f.). Another criterion against the interpretation of the text as the Coronation ceremony is
the passive role of the king in the course of the ritual; the different rites are either performed
in front of the royal image or directly on it. One rather expects the sovereign to be an acting
participant in his Coronation ceremony. In addition, the depictions of the ruler in the
Vignettes of the RDP show a royal statue, and not the living king (see VIII.e: 215ff.). Finally,
the \textit{imi-ḥnty}-priest, who participates in the presentation of the crowns, as well as the
terminology typical for the Coronation – the verbs \textit{ḥc}, and \textit{bsi} – do not appear in the RDP.

The only common rite the DRP has with the Coronation is the cultic run, if indeed the
Remark “Crossing the desert” (column 28, Scene 28) in the RDP refers to such a rite. In the
Coronation Ritual the ruler perambulates the wall on the eastern and western sites after
having visited the Upper and Lower Egyptian divine shrines.

There are no identified attestations for the Accession to the Throne ceremony preserved from
ancient Egypt. Having excluded the RDP as a witness for the Coronation ritual, Quack (2006:
88ff.) identified the text as a representation of the Accession to the Throne, more precisely as

\textsuperscript{330} Sethe (1928: 129 and 132) reconstructed the word for red crown (\textit{mḥš}) in the second Remark of column 27.
I rather think that the word has to be read \textit{mḥ} and has to be identified with a staff (see note G, VI.5.1: 69f.).
\textsuperscript{331} For Sethe’s reading of \textit{ḥc} in column 94, see above and note H, VI.13.7: 136.
the moment when Amenemhet I died. Shortly summarized, Quack identified the following events (see chapter VII: 178): Senwosret I takes over the power and prepares the burial for his father. After that, the newly appointed king fulfills his rights as new ruler and is accepted as the new sovereign of Egypt. The ritual ends with the final care of the father. One has to raise the question again why the king is passive in the course of the ritual. One would expect the ruler at least sometimes depicted performing certain actions, if the rites, indeed, concern his Accession to the Throne. According to Quack (2006: 85), the king appears as the acting person several times during the ceremony, but unfortunately he did not mention to which rites he referred. In addition, the shrine containing the royal image, which is depicted in the Vignettes, is illustrated empty in the second part of the ritual, implying that the ruler or rather his statue is not present. This fact seems unexplainable if the rites concern the Accession to the Throne, in which the living king is the major figure. Finally, it is questionable whether the Accession to the Throne and the burial of the predecessor are featured in one ritual – the rites would cover a time span of at least 70 days, the time for the embalmment. In summary, it can be said that the RDP neither features the Coronation nor the Accession to the Throne rituals.

**IX.c The Ritual of Amenhotep I**

The so-called Ritual of Amenhotep I is attested on one papyrus, which is torn into two pieces; the upper half is stored in Cairo, while the lower half is kept in Turin (Nelson 1949a: 201). According to Nelson (1949b: 345), the ritual developed from the Daily Temple Ritual for Amun (see IX.g: 235ff.), of which it is a shorter version, and was made suitable for the cult of the deified Amenhotep I, for whom the rites were performed.

---

332 For the publication of the Cairo text, see Golénischeff 1927: 134-156 and pls. XXIV-XXVII. For the papyrus kept in Turin, see Botti 1923: p. 161ff. who only published certain rubrics, and Bacchi 1942. P. BM 10589 (Gardiner 1935 I: 78-106 and II: pls. 50-61) as well as reliefs from the north half of the east wall of the hypostyle hall in Karnak (Nelson 1949a: 202ff.) and from the north wall of the first court in Medinet Habu (Nelson 1949a: 204ff.) were thought to display the same ritual. Nelson showed, however, that the latter two attestations rather feature a temple ritual; the scenes in Karnak and Medinet Habu are an integral part of the temple ritual performed for Amun (the so-called Daily Temple Ritual; see IX.g: 235ff.), whereas P. BM 10589 presents a ritual for Amun of Opet (Nelson 1949b: 343ff.).
Nelson (1949a and b) divided the ritual in 57 episodes that can be summarized into three major parts: episodes 1 to 31 consist of the presentation of food offerings, episodes 32-40 deal with the reversion of offerings, and episodes 41-57 describe different rites, mainly for certain festivals. The Ritual of Amenhotep I does not include the first actions describing the opening of the shrine – as attested in the Amun ritual. The ceremony starts with the presentation of the roast-meat offering; spells for the preparation are listed, like the set-up for the fire-altar or the placing of meat on the altar (episodes 1-8). Following that, food offerings are presented (episodes 9-14), including cake, beer, and wine, for example. Subsequently, spells for the god’s daily repast are recited (episodes 15-25), incorporating libation rites and the burning of incense. The first part of the ritual ends with the rites for the conclusion of the daily service (episodes 26-31), describing recitations by the lector- and hm-ntr priests, for example, or the fastening of the shrine doors. The second part of the ceremony (episodes 32-40) starts with a libation and incense offering for Ra (episodes 32-33), before the reversion of the offerings takes place (episodes 34-40); the rites include libation and incense offerings again as well as the making and then extinguishing of the torch. The last part of the ritual (episodes 41-46) deals with different rites, like the evening hymn (episode 41), the festival for Amun (episodes 41-44), and the morning hymns (episodes 45-46). The final rites attested for the Amun ritual (episodes 47-57), featuring further ceremonies for certain festivals, are not included in the Ritual of Amenhotep I.

The ceremony described in the RDP is clearly not identical with the Ritual of Amenhotep I, which mainly consists of food offerings and purification rites. Certain offerings, like the presentation of cake and wine, and libations also appear in the RDP, but those are common rites in the course of a ritual, and can thus not be used as an indicator for the relationship of these two ceremonies. The only common characteristic of both is the performance of the rites on a statue. But the Ritual of Amenhotep I does not include the dressing of the statue or the presentation of insignia, for example, which are attested in the extensive version of the Daily Temple Ritual (see IX.g: 235ff.) and in the RDP.

\[333\] For a list of the episodes, see Nelson 1949a: 230ff.
**IX.d The “Ritual” of Khentkaus**

Small papyrus fragments belonging to one or several documents were found in the temple of the royal mother Khentkaus (Posener-Krieger 2001),\(^{334}\) which are comparable to the inventories found in the funerary temple of Neferirkare (‘Abusir papyri’);\(^{335}\) the similarities consist of the handwriting and the layout. The papyri fragments from the Khentkaus temple show depictions of female figures as well as descriptions of these images and the naoi that contain them. The figures are illustrated naked, standing, and sometimes holding a wš-scepter and ʿnh-sign; some images are drawn in a shrine. These female depictions most likely represent cult statues of Khentkaus.\(^{336}\) This identification also explains the fact that the statues are illustrated naked as they are dressed in the course of the ritual; Fragments 27A, F, and 28 B mention officials, who probably carry out certain rites on the statue. In addition, the descriptions on fragments 27 C and 28 C include the word sšr (“linen”) and dit sšr (“giving of linen”) respectively. It is ambiguous whether the papyrus, consisting of a listing of the statues and their descriptions, has to be seen in the context of certain cultic rites or whether it belongs to a festival calendar. The content, however, implies that the document was used at specific times of the year for certain ceremonies. The texts accompanying the depictions of the figures comprise descriptions of the statues themselves or of the naoi. Fragment 27 G mentions, for example, that the two eyes and eyebrows of the statue are made of onyx or agate (Posener-Krieger 2001: 135), while fragment 27 H states that the hair, the vulture headdress, and the tresses are painted in the colour imitating lapis lazuli (Posener-Krieger 2001: 135). We also get to know that the door wings of one naos are made of imported wood, while a part of the shrine is decorated. In addition, electrum, ebony, and acacia wood are mentioned; unfortunately, the names of the parts of the naos, which are made out of these materials, are not preserved (fragment 28 B; Posener-Krieger 2001: 135f.).

Although the text of the very fragmentary manuscript(s) from Khentkaus’ temple in Abusir probably does not feature the course of a ritual, the content is important with regard to the

\(^{334}\) The following description of the papyrus is based on Posener-Krieger’s article.

\(^{335}\) For the Abusir papyri, see Posener-Krieger 1976.

\(^{336}\) The descriptions of these images do not include divine attributes so that the depictions most likely do not illustrate a goddess. It is, however, clear – despite the fragmentary state of the document – that the images represent a female figure as the vulture headdress is mentioned. 12 different statuettes of the royal mother have been found in her temple. A comparable cult statue is, for example, the naked Ka-statue of Hor; for a depiction, see, for example, Shaw/Nicholson 1996: 146.
RDP. The depictions of the female statues in Khentkaus’ document(s) are very similar to the images of Senwosret I in the Vignettes of the RDP; compare especially the illustration of fragment 27 C (Posener-Kriéger 2001: pl. 27), which shows a standing figure in a shrine holding a $w\hat{s}$-scepter.\textsuperscript{337} Thus, my assumption that the royal images in the RDP depict, indeed, a statue, and not the living king, is corroborated. In addition, the Khentkaus fragments prove that certain cultic rites were performed on statues of (deified) royal family members; the mention of the presentation of linen in order to dress the statue is particularly interesting in that regard as the RDP also includes actions, which allude to the dressing of the cult statue (Scenes 37 and 42-43).\textsuperscript{338}

\textit{IX.e The Burial Ritual}\textsuperscript{339}

The Burial Ritual is attested as early as the reign of Aha (Early Dynastic Period) until the Late Period. In the beginning, the ceremony was most likely restricted to the burial of kings, until it was introduced for the burial of high officials from the late 5\textsuperscript{th} dynasty onwards. As Fitzenreiter (2006: 451ff., especially 472f.) has shown, the rites were performed on a statue of the deceased before they were secondarily transferred to the mummy in the Middle Kingdom. Its sequence of events is attested through depictions that are accompanied by texts recited during the ritual.

The ceremony starts with a procession, in which the sarcophagus is transported by boat to the embalmment hall; the coffin is placed under a canopy and accompanied by two kites and embalming priests. After the embalming ritual, the sarcophagus is positioned on a bark and brought to an altar, where offering rites are performed. Subsequently, the procession

\textsuperscript{337} Compare also the illustration of Amun-Ra’s cult statue, on which the Daily Temple Ritual is performed (Moret 1988: 50).

\textsuperscript{338} See also scene 1 of the Opening of the Mouth Ritual, in which the statue is described as: \textit{... r\textit{d}w $hr$ h\textit{h}\textit{s}t nt $\tilde{s}$i $hr$f r r\textit{s}i h\textit{y} m t\textit{i} h\textit{rw} mn\textit{h}t $h$\textit{j}f} – “... placed on the hill of sand, its face towards the south, naked on the ground in daytime, the clothing behind it” (for the text, see Otto 1960 I: 2f.) or the Daily Temple Ritual: \textit{... im\textit{m} r$'$ n$b$ n$st$ ti\textit{wy} $h$\textit{w} h\textit{bs}$ tw$ tr$q $tr$q(w)$ tw} – “... Amun-Ra, lord of the throne of the two lands, who is naked, clothe yourself, so that the ribbon enrobes you” (for the text, see Moret 1988: 49, IV, 5-6).

\textsuperscript{339} The following summary of the Burial Ritual is based on Altenmüller’s extensive entry in the \textit{Lexikon der Ägyptologie} (1975a). For works on the ceremony, see also Vandier 1944: 35ff., Kees 1956: 243ff., Settgast 1960, and especially Altenmüller 1972.
proceeds to a cult place, called “Sais”, in the valley area, where it is welcomed by mourners. The procession continues to travel to “Buto” in the necropolis. The convoy is escorted by mourning men and women, and milk as well as incense are offered to the deceased. Having arrived in the necropolis, the procession is greeted by the dancing Muu, who also place the sarcophagus on a “shrineboat” for further transport in the necropolis. The sarcophagus is brought to the so-called “Heliopolitan sites”, where the mummy is taken from the boat and put up in front of the tomb. Women mourn the deceased and priests offer water, before the Opening of the Mouth Ritual is carried out on the mummy. A Tekenu-procession is also part of the ritual, in the course of which the priest representing the bull-form of the sun god – the so-called Tekenu – quarrels with his opponent Thoth. The latter receives an incense burning, which appears as the application of green and black eyepaint in some representations. The Tekenu- as well as the canopic-processions – the latter consists of the transport of the canopic jars to the tomb – take place at the same time as the sarcophagus procession; both are also welcomed by the dancing Muu in the necropolis. The canopic-convoy is accompanied by two men who carry papyrus plants. Once all three processions have arrived at the tomb, offering rites are performed. Following that, the funerary equipment is carried to the tomb and the slaughter of an ox is carried out, whose thigh and heart are brought to an altar in the necropolis. Subsequently, the coffin is transported by nine smrw into the tomb, while a libation is poured and incense burned. After the placement of the sarcophagus into the tomb, the statue of the deceased is buried and concluding protection rites are carried out by the two kites, while priests recite spells for the protection of the tomb. At the same time, slaughters are performed in the valley in order to protect the deceased.

The main priests participating in the Burial Ritual are the sm-, hry-hb-, it-ntr-, and imy-hnt-priests, which are connected to Thoth, Horus, Seth, and Ra. In addition, the Muu as well as the mourning kites play an important role in the course of the ceremony.

Gestermann (2008: 50) argued that the ritual of the RDP might be connected to the Burial Ritual; her assumption is based on the changing epithet of the king in the Vignettes of the

---

340 In the royal Burial Ritual of the Old Kingdom “Sais” is probably a part of the Valley temple (Altenmüller 1975a: 753).
341 During the Old Kingdom Buto designates a part of the royal funerary temple (Altenmüller 1972: 172f.).
RDP (nsw and it hq). She thought that both titles refer to the same person; the dead king is still called nsw as he is not buried yet, but he is also the “father of the ruler” as his successor has already ascended the throne without having been crowned yet. Gestermann added, however, that the text of the RDP is only indirectly connected to the Burial Ritual.

The latter, indeed, shows barely any similarities with the RDP. A sarcophagus is not mentioned in the text or depicted in the Vignettes of the RDP, and neither are the different processions (coffin, canopic, and Tekenu). In addition, the papyrus does not refer to the cult place “Sais” or mentions the Muu dancers and mourning men and women. The Opening of the Mouth Ritual is also not performed, and the protection rites for the tomb and the deceased are not carried out. The main officials of the Burial Ritual and the RDP are also different; only the lector priest appears in both ceremonies. His presence is, however, not surprising as he participates in most ancient Egyptian rituals as the reciting priest. Finally, the sun god is not mentioned in the RDP. In return, the Burial Ritual does not feature the rites described in the RDP, like the erection of the Djed-pillar or the presentation of royal insignia and different kinds of linen.

Nevertheless, some common characteristics can be identified. While the sarcophagus of the deceased is accompanied by two kites in the Burial Ritual, Isis and Nephthys mourn Osiris in the text of the RDP (Scene 41). The slaughtering ritual also appears in both ceremonies; it is also a part of the Opening of the Mouth Ritual. The term “Buto” refers to the necropolis in the Burial Ritual or a part of the funerary temple in the royal ceremony of the Old Kingdom (Altenmüller 1972: 172f.). The latter designation could also be meant in the third Remark of column 102 (Scene 35; see also note E, VI.14.3: 141). Finally, the rite consisting of the nine smrw transporting the coffin into the tomb recalls Scene 39 in the RDP, in which the shnw šḥ carry the statue of Senwosret I into its shrine. The nine smrw are also attested in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual (see IX.f below: 233ff.).

The appearance of the two kites and Isis and Nephthys respectively is, indeed, an important similarity of both rituals, and the connection to a burial is evident so that both ceremonies are

---

342 For the changing epithets of the king, see also VIII.e: 215ff.
343 It is mentioned in Scene 4 of the RDP.
indirectly linked. Isis and Nephthys are, however, only mentioned in one Scene towards the end of the RDP, while the kites and also mourning men and women are present throughout the entire Burial Ritual. Thus, the burial or a comparable rite builds only a part of the ritual preserved in the RDP. The original Burial Ritual performed on a statue of the deceased has to be mentioned. The rites in the RDP are also carried out on a statue so that it can be concluded that both ceremonies are based on the same concept; an image is used as a medium for the deceased to participate in a ritual taking place in this world. The same applies to the divine statue in the Daily Temple Ritual (see IX.g: 235ff.).

**IX.f The Opening of the Mouth Ritual**

The Opening of the Mouth Ritual is a compilation of rites, which are known from other ritualistic texts. The ceremony is mainly based on the statue ritual, but also on rites attested in the offering, embalming, burial, slaughter, and temple rituals (Otto 1960 II: 1ff.). The Opening of the Mouth Ritual is attested since the Old Kingdom, but underwent developments in the course of time. A version including depictions besides the text part is known since the New Kingdom. The following summary of the ceremony is based on the elaborate New Kingdom version.

The ritual starts with purification rites; the statue is cleansed with water from the *nmst-* and *dšrt*-mugs, natron, and incense. Subsequently, the ceremonies of the statue ritual are performed. After the *sm*-priest is woken up and dressed in the *qni*-bib, craftsmen fashion the statue. Following that, the slaughter ritual is carried out. The thigh of an ox is pulled out and its heart taken out, while the heads of a goose and kid are cut off. The heart and the thigh are then offered to the statue, before the actual Opening of the Mouth is performed on the statue by means of the *ntrty-*-, *wr-hk3w*-, and *mddfi*-instruments as well as the small finger.

---

344 The original statue ritual consists of the manufacture of the statue, its equipment and dressing, as well as its placement in the shrine. These rites were integrated into the funerary ritual later on (Otto 1960 II: 1).

345 It has to be mentioned that a consistent copy for all attestations of the ritual does not exist. The various versions differ from each other to some extent. The summary of the ritual is based on Otto’s publication from 1960. For an in-depth analysis of scenes 9-10, see Fischer-Elfert 1998.

346 For the instruments used for the Opening of the Mouth and an interpretation of the rite, see Roth 1992 and 1993.
Following that, certain items are presented to the statue, like the nms-cloth, ḥt-grain, the psš-kf, grapes, and the šwt-feather, before the second slaughter is carried out. The thigh and heart of the ox are again offered to the statue and the Opening of the Mouth performed, this time with an adze. Subsequently, the statue is clothed with different garments like the idmi, equipped with certain regalia like the Ʒms and hd-mace, and green as well as black eye paint are applied to it. Following that, incense is burned, libations are poured, and the final offering is prepared and presented to the statue. The ritual ends with the sweeping away of the priest’s footprints and the carrying of the statue to the shrine.

Undoubtedly, the text of the RDP does not feature the Opening of the Mouth Ritual as the main ceremonies, namely the manufacture of the statue as well as the actual Opening of the Mouth rites are missing. Sethe (1928: 97) assumed that Scenes 42 and 43 of the RDP are concerned with the Opening of the Mouth. 4-fibre-linen and a staff – identified by Sethe as a thigh – are handed over to the shnw ıḥ. Sethe suggested that both items are used for the Opening of the Mouth of the mummy. The instruments used for these rites, like the nตรy, wr-hkšw, or the mḏḏf, are, however, not mentioned in the RDP. In addition, the ceremony is performed by the sm-priest (for example scenes 26 and 27; Otto 1960 II: 80 and 84) and the “son who loves” (for example scene 32; Otto 1960 II: 91) respectively in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual, and not by the shnw ıḥ. In addition, I think that ḫps does not designate the thigh here, but a staff (see note E, VI.15.8: 160). Thus, the Opening of the Mouth rite is not described in the RDP. Apart from that, the only official who appears in both rituals is the lector priest. Neither the sm-priest, who is the main actor in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual, nor the immutable, ṭiš, ṭiš-ḥr, ṭiš-ḥr, Ʒs-merce, or ḫm-NetMessage-priests perform tasks in the text of the RDP; vice versa, the shn ıḥ, ṭiš ṭs, and ṭiš ṭs ṭm do not appear in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual.

Yet, certain rites are part of both ceremonies. The slaughtering ritual appears in the RDP (Scene 4) and even twice in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual (scenes 23-25; Otto 1960 I: 43ff. and II: 73ff. and scenes 43-45; Otto 1960 I: 96ff. and 1960 II: 102ff.). The presentation of grapes to the statue, its clothing into different kinds of linen, the application of eye-paint,
and the statue’s equipment with certain regalia is also attested in both ceremonies.\textsuperscript{347} Finally, the carrying of the statue to the shrine by the $shnw$ $\beta h$ in the RDP and the nine $smrw$ in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual are common features.\textsuperscript{348} The depiction that shows the carrying of the statue is especially significant for the identification of the text preserved in the RDP; the layout of the illustration is the same in both rituals (see Vignette 24 in the RDP and Otto 1960 II: 193ff.). A standing figure is depicted on a small platform carried by officials. Thus, there can be no doubt that the image in the RDP is, indeed, a statue.

The common rites point towards a common origin or context of both rituals (see also Gestermann 2008: 50). It is especially interesting that the ceremonies concerned with the clothing of the statue and its equipment with certain regalia possibly have their origin in the temple cult (Otto 1960 II: 108), in which rites are performed on divine statues (see the following chapter IX.g).

\textit{IX.g The Daily Temple Ritual}\textsuperscript{349}

The Daily Temple Ritual describes the rites that are performed on every temple deity in the morning when its statue is taken out of the shrine in the sanctuary. The ceremony is attested from the New Kingdom until Graeco-Roman times and possibly has its origins in the ceremonial clothing of the king, which takes place every morning in the so-called $pr$-$dw3t$ (see also Blackman 1918). The ritual is preserved in the six chapels of the sanctuary area in

\textsuperscript{347} The presentation of grapes and the application of eyepaint is attested in Scene 33 of the RDP, whereas the grapes are mentioned in scene 38 (Otto 1960 I: 91f. and II: 98f.) and the eyepaint in scene 56A and B (Otto 1960 I: 143f. and II: 126f.) in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual. The presentation of and dressing in different kinds of linen are stated in Scenes 37 and possibly 42 in the RDP, while the same rites are attested in scenes 48-53 (Otto 1960 I: 117ff. and II: 110ff.) in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual. Both ceremonies mention, however, different kinds of cloths, except for the $idmi$-linen, which appears in both rituals. The presentation of regalia is attested in Scenes 9 (ims- and $hd$-mace as well as $mjh$) and 29 (two $\beta b$-scepters and two $\swty$-feathers) in the RDP. The presentation of the ims- and hd-maces as well as the $mnw$ appears in Scene 57 A-C (Otto 1960 I: 144ff. and II: 127ff.) in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual.

\textsuperscript{348} The nine $smrw$ are also attested in the Burial Ritual, where they carry the sarcophagus into the tomb (see IX.e: 230ff.).

\textsuperscript{349} The following description of the ritual is based on Barta 1980b and Moret 1988.
Seti I’s temple in Abydos (36 scenes; abbreviated A), in three papyri stored in Berlin for the cult of Amun and Mut in Karnak (P. Berlin 3014, 3053, and especially 3055; 66 scenes; abbreviated K), in the sanctuary of Edfu (19 scenes; abbreviated E), and in the sanctuary of Dendara (6 scenes; abbreviated D). In addition, single scenes representing the entire ritual are preserved in numerous temples. None of the attestations features the complete ritual, however. The following summary is mainly based on the P. Berlin 3055 version (the so-called ‘Amunsritual’), which is the most extensive copy; the version from Seti’s temple in Abydos complements the reconstruction.

The ritual starts with the entering of the priest into the sanctuary (K 1-6; 22-23, A 1; 4-5), in which he consecrates the offerings, lights the torch, and cleanses the sanctuary with incense. He opens the shrine (K 7-9; 25, A 2; 21-23, E 1-3, D 1-3), and unveils the face of the cult statue (K 10-11; 26-28, A 24, E 4-5, D 4-5). In the following, the priest praises the image (K 12-17; 29-36, A 25), honours it with a hymn, censes it, and presents myrrh, oils, as well as a figure of Maat (K 18-21; 37-43, A 3; 26-28, E 6-7, D6). He takes the divine statue out of the shrine and cleans the latter (A 6), before he cleanses the image with incense and water, after having taken off its clothing (K 44-48, A 7-9, E 13-14). Following that, the deity is dressed in a linen ribbon (nms) and four different fabrics (mnht hd, mnht w’hd, mnht ins, mnht idmi – white, green, red, and idmi-linen [K 49-53, A 10; 19-17, E 8-11]). The priest then presents the wsh-collar, a pectoral, the crook and flail, as well as bracelets for the arms and feet to the statue, and crowns it with the double feather (A 16-13). Subsequently, the cult image is anointed with 10 oils, green and black eye paint is applied, and the deity is dressed in a robe (K 54-57, A 12-11, E 12). Finally, the floor of the sanctuary is cleaned with sand, the statue with water and different kinds of natron, before it is taken back into the shrine.

---

350 For the publication of the ritual, see Mariette 1869-80 I and David 1981: 58ff. The following numbering of the scenes is based on Mariette’s publication. For a study on the Daily Temple Ritual in Abydos, see also Altenmüller 1969.
351 For the publication, see Moret 1988. The numbering of the scenes is based on his publication.
352 For the publication, see Rochemonteix 1897: 24-36; 40-49; pls. 11-12, and Alliott 1949. The numbering of the scenes is based on Alliott’s publication.
354 For the presentation of Maat theme, see Teeter 1997.
which is sealed afterwards (K 58-66, A 29-36, E 15-19). The priest covers his tracks, extinguishes the torch, and closes the sanctuary (A 20). The only official appearing in the ritual is the great wḥb-priest.

The RDP does not mention the preliminary and final actions of the Daily Temple Ritual, like the opening of the shrine, the cleaning of the sanctuary, the presentation of myrrh and the figure of Maat, for example, or the closing of the sanctuary. Yet, the main rites of the Daily Temple Ritual – the dressing of the statue in different kinds of linen and later on in a robe, the presentation of regalia and the crowning with the šwty-feathers as well as the application of eye paint – have their equivalent in the RDP. These ceremonies, however, appear in an altered sequence and different items are mentioned. Two ḥb3-scepters and two šwty-feathers are presented (Scene 29), and green and black eye-paint as well as incense are given to the statue in Scene 33. Four different kinds of linen (ifd, sis, ḫbsw nw idmi, sf ś3) are brought in Scene 37 and later on (Scene 43) a staff and again ifd-linen is mentioned. In addition, both rituals end with an offering. The priest places an offering in front of the statue shrine in the Daily Temple Ritual (Moret 1988: 211f.; Lorton 1999: 144), while a mug is presented to the royal statue in the RDP (Scene 48). In both cases, the statue is already placed in its shrine, so that the offering probably serves the purpose to make food and/or drink available for the image at any time, and not only during the ritual. Thus, a close connection between both rituals is obvious; the RDP includes, however, various other rites that are not included in the Daily Temple Ritual so that the dressing of the statue and its equipment with certain regalia builds only a part of the complete ritual preserved in the RDP. Interestingly, the same rites that the RDP and the Daily Temple Ritual share are also known from the Opening of the Mouth Ritual (see IX.f: 233ff.), which concerns a statue as well.
X. The interpretation of the Ramesseum Dramatic Papyrus

In the past, scholars have tried to identify the ritual preserved in the RDP with one that is already known from ancient Egypt. The different identifications were, however, only based on minor similarities with other ceremonies and discrepancies between the text in the RDP and the other rituals remained (see VII: 174ff. and IX: 219ff.).\(^{355}\) I agree with Gestionmann (2008: 50) that this approach has to be questioned. The studies accomplished so far in the thesis have shown that the RDP clearly does not feature a ritual already known from ancient Egypt. It is, indeed, difficult to identify the exact purpose of the ceremony as no parallel texts or depictions have survived. The results gained in chapters VIII and IX help, however, in identifying the character of the rites; the duties of the main participants as well as the similarities the RDP shares with other rituals are essential for the identification of the text.

The main acting participants of the ritual besides the lector priest – the *iry ht nsw*, *iry ḫ wdpw*, and *shn ḫ* – are not known from other ceremonies connected with the king or the cult of statues.\(^{356}\) The *iry ḫ wdpw* is mainly concerned with the presentation of offerings so that his responsibilities are not revealing with regard to the character of the ritual. The tasks of the *iry ht nsw* and the *shn ḫ* are, in contrast, informative and indicate that the ceremony concerns the cultic affairs of the king and some sort of a statue cult. The *iry ht nsw* takes over tasks that are usually performed by the living king, like the erection of the Djed-pillar.\(^{357}\) The official also carries out duties that exceed the responsibilities of a court official or someone who is concerned with the king’s property;\(^{358}\) the presentation of royal insignia and the perambulation of two standards together with the *shnw ḫ* point towards rites performed in the course of a royal or statue cult (see below). The connection of the *shn ḫ* (“the one who

---

355 Quirke (Forman/Quirke 1996: 107 and VII: 174ff.) is the only one thus far to have identified the text as a ritual not known from ancient Egypt. He suggested that the ceremony was held in commemoration of Senwosret I. Unfortunately, he did not provide a detailed explanation for his theory.

356 The rituals that have been examined in order to highlight similarities and discrepancies these ceremonies have with the RDP are the Sed festival, the Accession to the Throne and the Coronation, the Ritual of Amenhotep I, the “Ritual” of Khentkaus, the Burial Ritual, the Opening of the Mouth Ritual, and the Daily Temple Ritual (see IX a-g: 219ff.).

357 Compare Amenhotep III’s participation in the erection of the Djed-pillar (Bleeker 1967: 103) and the depiction of Seti I lifting up the symbol in his temple in Abydos (Capart 1912: pl. XXIX and XXX; David 1981: 123ff. and 134).

358 The common translation of the title is “the one who is concerned with the things of the king” (*iry ht nsw*) or “the royal acquaintance” (*rḥ nsw*); see VIII.b: 202f.
embraces the Akh”) with the funerary or statue cult is evident from the title; the picture of the official carrying, and thus embracing, a statue, for example, comes directly to mind. In addition, the shn ḫ only appears towards the end of the ceremony when the rites are comparable to those of the Burial Ritual; the shnw ḫ carry, for example, the royal statue and perform a ritual battle.

The mythological sphere of the RDP corroborates the hypothesis that the rites commemorate the deceased, and not the living king. The main focus lies on the punishment of Seth, and Osiris’ triumph over him. In addition, Isis and Nephthys appear as the two kites who mourn Osiris. Horus is, indeed, one of the main deities in the mythological part, but he does not appear as the opponent of Seth – as we would expect if the ritual dealt with the living king, who has to prove his legitimacy to the throne –, but as the avenger of his father who takes care of the latter’s burial towards the end of the text. The frequent mention of Horus’ eye has to be seen in connection with offerings and items presented to the dead king, which are identified with the eye. Thus, the appearance of Horus does, again, not indicate the presence of the living king.

The passiveness of the ruler throughout the ritual substantiates the assumption that the ceremony is concerned with the dead king. He is not shown in the Vignettes or described in the text as an acting participant of the ceremony. In addition, the ruler’s depictions in the accompanying Vignettes prove that the rites are performed for a royal statue. The illustrations show the royal image standing in a shrine, holding a staff in one hand and possibly a club in the other. A comparable depiction is preserved on the papyri fragments containing the “Ritual” of Khentkaus, where the figure is clearly identified as a statue representing the deceased queen. The accompanying texts provide a description of the statue as well as the naoi containing the images. Furthermore, the depiction of the cult statue of Amun-Ra, on which the Daily Temple Ritual is performed, resembles the illustrations of the king in the RDP. The identification of the royal depiction in the RDP as a statue is further strengthened by a comparison with an illustration in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual. In the

---

359 For a detailed characterization of the performers in the RDP, see VIII.b: 201ff.
360 For the similarities of the depictions in the RDP and the “Ritual” of Khentkaus, see especially fragment 27 C of the papyrus featuring the “Ritual” of Khentkaus (Posener-Krieger 2001: pl. 27).
361 For Amun-Ra’s statue, see Moret 1988: 50.
latter, nine *smrw* carry the statue to the shrine (Otto 1960 I: 164ff.), while the *shnw ḫḥ* perform the same task in the RDP. In both cases the statue is represented by a standing figure on a small platform; it is half the size of the officials who carry the image – compare Vignette 24 in the RDP and Otto: 1960 II, 193ff. for the depiction in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual. Finally, the shrine containing the royal image in the RDP has the same height as the officials in the Vignettes (see, for example, Vignette 12). If the depiction represented the living king, he would be shown on a larger scale than the officials.

Thus far, it can be concluded that the RDP commemorates the dead king Senwosret I, represented by his statue. The comparison with other rituals confirms this statement, and provides further indications towards the exact nature of the rites described in the RDP.

The papyrus shares some rites with the Sed festival, especially with the rendition of Amenhotep III’s ceremony depicted in the tomb of Kheruef. Both rituals include the erection of the Djed-pillar; the king himself performs the rite in Amenhotep’s version, while it is carried out by the *īryw ḫt nsw* in the RDP (Scene 16). This fact supports my assumption that the rites concern the dead king in the latter ritual. Otherwise, it is not explainable why the living king does not erect the symbol himself. The Sed festival illustration of Amenhotep III continues with a ritual battle between the inhabitants of Pe and Dep, which probably takes place at the same time as the erection of the Djed-pillar. Interestingly, some of the fighters joust with papyrus stems, stressing the rejuvenating character of the rite. Fighting rites are also attested in the RDP shortly after the erection of the Djed-pillar (Scene 20) as well as towards the end of the text when the *shnw ḫḥ* perform a fight with sticks (Scene 40). The Sed festival depiction of Amenhotep III proceeds with an agrarian rite, in which asses and oxen are driven around four walls. Transferred to the Osiris myth, the grain is treaded in and Osiris’ tomb sealed (Gaballa/Kitchen 1969: 73ff.). A comparable rite might be present in Scenes 10 and 11 of the RDP, in which barley is trampled down by cattle and donkeys; in the mythological part of the text Horus avenges his father. As these three rites are only attested in the Sed festival rendition of Amenhotep III, these ceremonies might not be representative for

---

362 The king is identified by his throne name (*Kheper-ka-Ra*) in the first two Vignettes.
363 Seti I also erects the Djed-pillar himself – as we know from a depiction in his temple in Abydos (Capart 1912: pls. XXIX and XXX; David 1981: 123ff. and 134).
364 The ancient Egyptian word for papyrus (*wḏ*) also means “green, young, fresh” (Decker 1992: 84ff.).
the Sed festival in general but are rather a preference of Amenhotep III, or are not even a part of the jubilee, but an independent annual celebration (see VIII.a, Sequence 8: footnote 224, 189). They focus on the Osiris myth by stressing Osiris’ triumph over Seth, and the former’s resurrection. Thus, the triumph of the dead king, and specifically his rejuvenation are the common themes of these rites in both rituals.

A cultic run in order to demonstrate royal power and to seize the domain is part of the Sed festival depiction of Niuserre and the Coronation ceremony. In the course of the Sed festival, the king is dressed in a short kilt, holds the Meket and the flagellum, and runs or dances around a field four times (Bleeker 1967: 101). During the Coronation ceremony the ruler perambulates the eastern side of a wall after he is crowned with the Upper Egyptian crown and the western side after the presentation of the Lower Egyptian crown. The rites symbolize the seizure of Upper and Lower Egypt by the sovereign (Barta 1985: 9f.). A comparable rite might be present in the RDP; the Remark “Crossing the desert” in Scene 9 could refer to a symbolic ceremonial run; Scene 9 deals with the presentation of certain insignia (staff of Horus, šms, mth, and hd-mace). The crowns of Upper and Lower Egypt or the double crown – the symbols of kingship par excellence – are, however, not mentioned in the RDP at all, while they play an important part in the Sed festival and the Coronation Ritual. Thus, it can be excluded that the RDP features a ritual that mainly focuses on the assumption of royal power or its renewal. The papyrus commemorates a dead king as is shown at the beginning of this chapter. Maybe a symbolic run is performed with the royal statue (see below).

The RDP shares the slaughtering ritual with the Opening of the Mouth and the Burial Rituals. The slaughter of the ox is emblematic of the punishment of Seth by pulling out his thigh (see, for example, Hays 2010: 4f.), and thus again Osiris’ triumph over his enemy. In the Opening of the Mouth Ritual the thigh is used as a revivifying force as well; it is held at the mouth of the statue in order to resurrect it.

More significant concerning the identification of the RDP is the appearance of Isis and Nephthys in their specific role as Osiris’ mourners towards the end of the text (Scene 41).

---

365 This cultic run or dance is attested in the depictions of the festival in Niuserre’s sun temple, but not in the renditions of Amenhotep III or Osorkon II (Bleeker 1967: 101ff.).
They have their equivalent in the Burial Ritual, in which two kites accompany the sarcophagus of the deceased, while mourning men and women are part of the burial procession. Clearly, the end of the RDP is concerned with rites comparable to those performed at a burial. This assumption is corroborated by another rite, which the RDP shares with the Burial Ritual. In the latter ceremony nine smrw transport the coffin of the deceased into the tomb, while the sḥnw ẖ carry the royal image in the RDP (Scene 39). Conceivably, the statue is brought into its shrine after the performance of the different rites. The presence of Isis and Nephthys in the mythological part of the ritual as well as the feast that is held for officials and participants at the end of the ceremony, however, allude to an actual burial. This would also explain the focus on Osiris’, and thus the dead king’s resurrection as displayed, for example, in the erection of the Djed-pillar.

The most meaningful rites in the course of the RDP with regard to the identification of the ritual are the presentation of linen, the application of eye paint, and the handing over of royal insignia. The same ceremonies appear in the Opening of the Mouth (Otto 1960 I: 117ff. and 143ff.; II: 110ff. and 126ff.) and the Daily Temple Rituals (for example Moret 1988: 179ff., 199ff., and 239f.); both represent ceremonies performed on statues. The rites derive from the Morning Ritual of the king, in which he is clothed, crowned, and equipped with his insignia before he executes the duties of his office (Blackman 1918). The same applies to the statues: in the Daily Temple Ritual the statue is “awakened” every day in the morning, and then dressed and equipped with everything necessary for the day. In the Opening of the Mouth Ritual, the statue is not awakened, but fabricated and brought into life after the Opening of the Mouth, before it is clothed, crowned, and equipped with the regalia. Consequently, the rites must have the same purpose in the RDP; the statue of Senwosret I is provided with everything necessary to fulfill its function.

The RDP has the closest connection with the Daily Temple Ritual. The aforementioned rites of clothing the statue and its equipment with regalia are the main focus of the latter ritual. In addition, it ends with an offering to the statue after it has been brought back to the shrine (Moret 1988: 211f.). The same rite ends the ceremony in the RDP (Scene 48). The latter,

---

366 The same rites are attested in the Sed festival after the rejuvenation of the king, when he is dressed again and equipped with his regalia (Uphill 1965: 379).
however, features other rites as well, so that it does not simply display the daily ritual for Senwosret’s statue. Apart from offering and purification rites, the main actions in the course of the ceremony can be identified as the seizing of different maces in connection with a ceremonial run (Sequence 5), the erection of the Djed-pillar (Sequence 8), the equipment with royal insignia (Sequence 13), the clothing of the statue (Sequence 14), the “burial” procession (Sequence 15), and the meal for officials and other participants (Sequence 16).

Taking the aforementioned results into consideration, I suggest that the RDP features the celebrations held in connection with a statue “burial”. The statue could have been actually buried in a tomb or maybe deposited in a cachette in a temple, or more likely could have been brought into its temple shrine for the first time. The ritual starts with the building of the bark, in which the statue is carried in the course of the ceremony, followed by purification rites and the slaughter of an ox. Subsequently, an agrarian rite is mentioned, possibly performed in preparation for the following offering of two cakes. After that, different clubs and maces (staff of Horus, $ims$, $m\bar{t}\bar{h}$, and $hd$-mace) are presented and probably a ceremonial run is performed. The nature of the latter rite is ambiguous. The insignia are possibly handed over to the statue in order to demonstrate its power, before a ritual run is performed with the statue. It is also conceivable that the ruling king participates in the ritual and shows his ability to reign in the presence of his predecessor’s statue. One would, however, expect the name of the king to be mentioned in the text, which is not the case. Another agrarian rite follows, in which cattle trample down barley, before cleaning rites are performed on the statue. The $hnkt$-offering, consisting of the head of a goose and a kid are given to the Djed-pillar, which is erected at the same time. Subsequently, the statue is provided with food and drink, a ritual fight is performed, and pieces of jewellery are presented to the statue. A $htp$-offering is given and the $shnw$ $\mathfrak{h}$ and $iryw$ $ht$ $ns$ perambulate two falcon standards, before the statue is equipped with two $\check{b}i$-scepters and the double feather. The Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt are called, while the two districts present a $wdn$-offering to the statue; eye paint is applied to the latter and incense is burned. After that, the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt are fed, and the statue is clothed in different kinds of linen. The next part consists of the statue “burial”; the $shnw$ $\mathfrak{h}$ carry the statue, possibly to its shrine or grave, before they perform a ritual stick-fight. The two mourners are chosen and last rites with a staff and linen
are performed on the statue. Following that, the *shnw ḥḫ* and noblemen participate in a meal, and the latter are anointed. The ritual ends with the presentation of a vessel to the statue, which is already in its shrine or tomb, possibly to make offerings available at all times.\(^{367}\)

It should be mentioned here that a statue cult for deceased kings is also attested in the mortuary temples of the pyramid complexes in the Old Kingdom; royal statues were set up in the room with five niches outside the sanctuary. Based on the Abusir-Papyri it is known that rites were performed on these statues at least at the beginning of each month providing the dead king a medium through which he could partake in the events that took place in the mortuary temple, like festivals or the exercise of his office after his death (Stockfisch 2003: 392f.). The ritual included the revealing of the statue, its cleaning, clothing, cleaning, adorning, and censing (Posener-Kriéger 1976: 52ff.). In addition, certain kings were worshipped by local cults; examples are the Old Kingdom rulers who were venerated as local saints in the Memphite area during the Middle Kingdom (Malek 2000).

Quirke (Forman/Quirke 1996: 107) has already suggested that the RDP features a ritual in commemoration of Senwosret I based on this king’s building activity in Karnak.\(^{368}\) Senwosret I had, indeed, an extensive building program at this site.\(^{369}\) He is the founder of the Middle Kingdom temple, possibly the first large complex at the site, of which only remains are preserved in the Middle Kingdom court.\(^{370}\) He also was responsible for merging the cults of Amun and Ra, introducing the new state god Amun-Ra at Thebes. Other buildings erected by Senwosret I in Karnak are the so-called ‘chapelle blanche’ for his Sed festival,\(^{371}\) another shrine for the same celebration, as well as a granite naos. Daressy (1927: 206ff.) suggested that this naos was dedicated to the cult of the deified Senwosret I and housed a statue of his. It is known that Senwosret I was revered by later kings as the founder of the Karnak temple and his accomplishments in the precinct. Ahmose, Amenhotep I, Thutmosis I and III copied, for example, Senwosret I’s buildings, and statues were dedicated to the latter (Blyth 2006: 23ff.).

---

\(^{367}\) For a detailed summary of the ritual and interpretations of the rites, see chapter VIII.a: 183ff.

\(^{368}\) Unfortunately, Quirke did not further explain his theory.

\(^{369}\) The following summary of Senwosret’s building program is based on Blyth 2006: 10ff.

\(^{370}\) Senwosret I’s limestone temple consisted of a facade preceded by a portico featuring statues of the king as Osiris, two courts, and a sanctuary; for a detailed description of the temple complex, see Gabolde 1998.

\(^{371}\) For the ‘chapelle blanche’, see Lacau/Chevrier 1956.
The ritual was possibly performed when the statue was placed in its temple shrine for the first time – maybe even into the naos of Senwosret I mentioned above – and was then maybe repeated every year to commemorate Senwosret I’s accomplishments at Karnak. Other rituals that were annually celebrated are known from ancient Egypt. The rites for the confirmation of royal power (pBrooklyn 47.218.50) were performed at every New Years’s festival (Goyon 1972: 18), and also the Festival of the Victory of Horus was enacted annually in Edfu (Gillam 2005: 114) as well as the processional festival of Osiris in Abydos (David 1981: 162f.; O’Connor 2009: 33). Certain rites most likely enabled the statue to obtain abilities of a living king in order to partake in the ritualistic events. A statue also represented the dead king in the early form of the Burial Ritual (IX.e: 230). Through rites the statue acquires the capabilities that allow the deceased to move and communicate in this life. At the same time the image serves as a medium through which the deceased is transformed into an Akh (Fitzenreiter 2006: 475). Senwosret’s commemoration for his building activity in Karnak would also explain why the document was found in a tomb in Thebes. Maybe the lector priest, in whose grave the papyrus was found, even participated in this ceremony as the main official. The identification of the text as a statue ritual in remembrance of the king also explains why the text dates to the later Middle Kingdom, and not to Senwosret’s own reign.
XI. Conclusion

The RDP is part of the so-called Ramesseum Papyri, which were discovered in a box in a late Middle Kingdom shaft tomb in the north-west corner of Ramses II’s funerary temple complex in Western-Thebes. Based on finds in the vicinity of the tomb, the funerary items discovered in the grave itself, and some of the documents belonging to the Ramesseum Papyri collection, the sepulchre can be dated to the mid 13\textsuperscript{th} dynasty, possibly to the reign of Neferhotep I or Sobekhotep IV. As the earliest manuscripts of the find date to the late 12\textsuperscript{th} dynasty, like the RDP, the papyri collection was assembled over 100 years (1780-1680 BCE), covering a time span of three to four generations. The owners of the collection were possibly lector priests; the papyri mainly feature medico-magical texts, and most of the funerary items were used in magical contexts. Few papyri, like the RDP, display rituals, and it is possible that one of the owners actually participated in the celebrations in his role of lector priest. The sketch on the verso of the RDP probably shows a storage facility and/or processing area of a larger estate, to which the tomb owner was connected, or of which he was even the possessor.

The RDP consists of seven sheets that were attached to each other forming the document as it is preserved today. Due to the bad preservation of the papyrus, the first column is partly destroyed so that the title of the ritual is lost today. A double line indicating the beginning of the document is still visible. Thus, definitely only the very first words of the text are not preserved. The end of the ceremony is lost as well. Based on the average length of the seven sheets (36-37 cm), it is secure to say that only one text column is missing. It is unlikely that an entire sheet is lost, as no traces of it have been found in the box that contained the papyri. The secondary drawing on the verso of the papyrus corroborates the fact that the seventh sheet is, indeed, the last one of the original manuscript. The area to the right of the sketch is blank, indicating that it was closer to the end of the papyrus roll. It is unlikely that the ancient scribe opened the roll more than necessary and left a great amount of space empty when he added the drawing.

The RDP consists of a text and illustration that present a guideline for the performance of a ritual; the depictions summarize the cultic events mentioned in the text part. The ritual is
divided into 48 Scenes, each of which consists of an Introduction describing the cultic action and an Explicatory sentence that transfers the rite into the mythical sphere. Divine Speeches as well as up to three Remarks follow; the latter refer to performers, objects used in the ritual, gods, certain actions, or geographical locations. The 48 Scenes can be summarized into 17 Sequences based on the recurrent motif of the sacred bark with the royal image, which builds the focal point in the Vignettes.

Based on the depictions of the king, identified as Senwosret I in the first two Vignettes, it is clear that the image represents a royal statue and not the living ruler. The illustrations are, for example, comparable to the depictions of Khentkaus’ statues preserved on papyrus fragments that have been found in her funerary temple in Abusir. In addition, Senwosret I is not mentioned as an active participant of the ritual in the text of the RDP, nor is he shown performing rites in the accompanying Vignettes. Evidently, the RDP features a ritual that concerns a royal statue. The comparison with royal and statue rituals has shown that the RDP does not represent a ceremony that is already known from ancient Egypt; the text has certain rites in common with several rituals, however. The closest connection exists between the RDP and the Daily Temple Ritual, stressing again the assumption that the RDP is concerned with a statue ritual. The main rites of the Daily Temple Ritual – the clothing of the statue and its equipment with regalia – are, however, supplemented by other ceremonies in the RDP. The end of the papyrus is especially significant in that regard as two mourners are chosen and rites are performed that are similar to those in the Burial Ritual. Consequently, I suggest that the RDP features a “burial” ritual for Senwosret I’s statue. The king is known to be revered by later rulers for his accomplishments in Karnak; he was the founder of the Middle Kingdom temple of Amun-Re. Conceivably, the ritual was not only performed once, when the statue was “buried” or rather placed in its shrine for the first time, but was repeated every year to commemorate the king and his accomplishments in Karnak.
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XIII. 1 Appendix A – Running translation of the text

Sequence 1

Scene 1

(1) hpr [...]  (1) It happened that [...]  

Scene 2

(1) hpr.n iri[t wi^i hrw pw mdw.f n msw.f hr] irt.f  (1) It happened that [the sacred bark was] built. [It is Horus who talks to his children about] his eye.  

(2) hrw msw hrw gd mdw [ini n(i) irt(i)] wbi].s š // wbi3 mrw  (2) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus: [Bring (me my) eye, so that] it [can open] the lake // The one who opens the canals  

(3) hrw hrw msw [d mdw ...] // ðhwty // [...] (3) Horus speaks [words] to the children of Horus: [...] // Thoth // [...]  

(4) [...] wsir [...] j3i [...] (4) [...] Osiris [...] to carry [...].  

Scene 3

(5) [hpr.n i^iti mns3 8 r ḫt wi^i] in iryw ḫt nsw ðhwty pw [wdi.f] wsir ḫr stš tsi[f sw]  (5) [It happened that eight mns3-vessels were taken to the front of the bark] by the “ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king”. It is Thoth, [who places] Osiris on Seth, [so that he] may raise [him].
(6) ḏḥwty stš ḏḏ mdw n ḏḏ [. n k ḫr] wr ir.k // ḏḥwty stš wṣr ḏḏ mdw im qbh w ib.f ḫr // tt wṛw // [...]  

(6) Thoth [speaks words] to Seth: [You cannot last [under] the one who is older than you // [Osiris] // Crew of the oldest // [...]  

(7) ḏḥwty wsir ḏḏ mdw im qbh w ib.f ḫr // ḏḥwty wsir ḏḏ mdw im qbh w ib.f ḫr // tt wṛw // prit r qbh w  

(7) Thoth speaks words to Osiris: May his heart not be cool thereunder // Crew of the oldest // Going forth to the place of purification  

Sequence 2  

Scene 4  

(8) ḫpr.n stp šsr nsw ṭši ḫrw pw špt šḏi.f irt m  ḫṣ nb ḏḥwty pw m w[...] s šsr nbw  

(8) It happened that a male royal ox was carved. It is Horus who is angry, while he takes the eye as one with a ruffled breast from the hand of the aforementioned Thoth as one who cuts up all beef cattle.  

(9) ḥš st ḏḥwty [stš] ḏḏ mdw in spt.k irt (i)r.k // ḏḥwty // stp ḥš nb ṭš si tpy  

(9) Isis speaks words to {Thoth} [Seth]: It is your lip that acted against you! // Thoth // Carving and binding of the ox for the first time  

(10) ḥš st ḏḥwty ḏḏ mdw in šsr.k // ḏḥwty // šsr  

(10) Isis speaks words to Thoth: It is your action // Thoth // Ox  

Scene 5  

(11) ḫpr.n ini[f] ṭryw ḫh wdpw [nw] nb  ḏḥwty pw ḫ [. f ... ḫrw]  

(11) It happened that the “ones who are responsible for the ḫh and stewards” [of] the
lord were brought. [It is Thoth who takes ...
Horus]

(12) [hrw ḍḥwty] ḍd mdw [in ...] // [wšr(?)]
// [ḍd mdw] // ird ḫh wdpw ḍḥwty

(12) [Horus] speaks words [to Thoth: Have you ...
] // [Osiris(?)] // [Recitation] // The “one who is responsible for the ḫh and steward”, Thoth

(13) [ḥḥwty] ḍd mdw [hrw/wšr ...] šdī.k [...] // [wšr(?)] // ḍd mdw // iyi it n sį

(13) [Thoth] speaks words to [Horus/Osiris ...
], while you take [...] // [Osiris(?)] // Recitation // The father comes to the son

(14) [ḥḥwty ḍḥw] ḍd mdw sį nb ḫṭ[f iyij sį n it[f] // [wšr/ḥḥw(?)] // [ḍd mdw] // ḫḥi(w)
wšr ini sį

(14) [Thoth] speaks words to [Horus]: The son of the lord is behind [him, while] the son comes to [his] father // [Osiris/Horus(?)] // [Recitation] // Osiris was searched, while the son lingers

Sequence 3

Scene 6

(15) hḥpr.n wḥw bdt ḫṛ spt ḍhrw [pw mdw.f(?)
hr] irt.f [ḥḥti msw.f

(15) It happened that emmer was put on the threshing floor. [It is] Horus [who talks(?)
about] his eye in the presence of his children.

(16) ḍhrw [msw ḍhrw] ḏ[d mdw] mi n(i) irt(i)
s[p]t [...] [pdf]

(16) Horus speaks [words to the children of Horus]: Take for (me my) eye that remained ...

(17) [...] (17) [...]

(17) [...]
Sequence 4

Scene 7

(18) [hpr.n di] hry-hb śc[ty] nsw dhwty pw
[wḏ.f irit] hrw [n stš] ir[i]t hrw n.f]
(18) [It happened that] the lector priest [gave
two] royal cakes. It is Thoth [who commands
what] Horus [does to Seth and what Horus]
does [for himself].

(19) dhwty hrw ḡd mdw hrw mn n.k i rt.k n śc.s
ir.k // [dhwty] // [rdit śc.ty]
(19) Thoth speaks words to Horus: Horus,
take your eye for yourself, (as if) it had not
been taken from you // [Thoth] // [Giving of
two cakes]

(20) hrw dhwty ḡd mdw ḡh ṃ n.k ir.t(i) // dhwty
// iḥh // ms(w) hrw
(20) Horus speaks words to Thoth: May (my)
eye be happy for you // Thoth // Celebrant //
Child(ren) of Horus

Scene 8

(21) hpr.n rdit gwỉ wišwy imǐ im wsir pw dyw
ḥr ṳ stš nḥn snwy
(21) It happened that the mooring of the two
barks was caused, an imỉ-tree being therein.
It is Osiris who is placed on the back of Seth,
the younger one of the two brothers.

(22) nṯrw stš ḡd mdw n ṳ ḡ ṳ ir.k // wsir it
stš // dit imỉ <n> wišwy
(22) The gods speak words to Seth: You will
not resist under the one who is older than you
// Osiris, the father, and Seth // Giving of the
imỉ-tree <of> the two barks

(23) hrw wsir ḡd mdw imỉwy wr pn ḡ ṳ.f // wsir
// imỉ // ms(w) hrw
(23) Horus speaks words to Osiris: How
pleasant is this great one upon him // Osiris //
(24) \( hrw\ [st\]) dd mdw n wi\(\bar{\imath}\)k \(hr.f\) // [ky \(st\)] // wi\(\bar{\imath}\)

(24) Horus speaks words to [Seth]: You will not conspire under him // [The other one, Seth] // Bark

Sequence 5

Scene 9

(25) \([\text{bpr}.\ n\ ]\)dt [mdw] \(hrw\ [in\ iryw\ \(ht\)\ nsw\ \(hn^c\)]\) \(\dot{\imath}ms\ m[\(th\ \(hn^c\ h\)!\]

(25) It happened that the staff of] Horus [was taken by the “ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king” together with] the \(\dot{\imath}ms\)-mace, and the \(m[\(th\) together with the \(h\)!-mace].

(26) d\(lhwy\ wsir\ [dd]\ mdw [...]w // [irty] \(hrw\) // [mdwy \(hrw\)] // q\(\bar{\imath}\)\(\bar{\imath}\)e \(m\)!ty

(26) Thoth [speaks] words to Osiris: [...] him // [the two eyes] of Horus // [The two staffs of Horus] // The northern erected hill

(27) d\(lhwy\ wsir\ dd\ mdw\ \(\dot{\imath}\)\(n\) \(hrw\ [nh]\)m,f 
irt[\(f\)] // \([hrw]\) // [m\(th\)] // sh-n\!tr

(27) Thoth speaks words to Osiris: Because he [took his] eye, Horus became great // [Horus] // [The \(m\)!h] // Embalming hall

(28) d\(lhwy\ wsir\ dd\ mdw\ \(\ddot{\imath}d.n\) \(hrw\ nd.f\ kw\) // [hrw] // \(h\)! // dbn \(h\)!st

(28) Thoth speaks words to Osiris: So that he can protect you is why Horus has taken (the royal insignia) // [Horus] // \(h\)!-mace // Crossing the desert
Sequence 6

Scene 10

(29) ḥpr.n dit it ḫr spt  
(29) It happened that barley was placed on the threshing floor.

Scene 11

(29) ḥpr[f.n i]niw tši[w] fitt.sn ḫr.f ḫrw pw nd.f it.f]  
(29) It happened that male cattle was brought [so that they could] jump [on it. It is Horus who protects his father].

(30) ḫrw [ḥtw stš] ḏd mdw ḫ[...]]  
(30) Horus speaks words to [the followers of Seth]: [...]

(30bis) [...] // ḫ[wi wsir] // [nỈw捉?] // [...]  
(30bis) [...] // [Beating Osiris] // [Goats?] // [...]

(31) [ḥrw] ḫtw stš ḏd mdw m ḫwi it(i) (i)ptn // ḫwi(t) wsir // ḫb3 nṯr // it  
(31) [Horus] speaks words to the followers of Seth: Who is it who beats this father (of mine)? // Beating Osiris // Chopping of the god // Barley

(32) ḫrw wsir ḏd mdw ḫwi.n(i) n.k ḫwiw kw // ḫtw stš // kỉw // ḫm  
(32) Horus speaks words to Osiris: For you (I) have beaten the ones who have beaten you // Followers of Seth // Cattle // Letopolis

(33) ḫrw wsir ḏd mdw im ṣỉ isd.f r.k // stš // ṣỉw // prît r qbh  
(33) Horus speaks words to Osiris: May his saliva not dribble against you // Seth // Donkeys // Going forth to the place of purification
Sequence 7

Scene 12

(34) \(hpr.n\ it\overline{it} im^\beta r\ h\overline{fr} wi^\beta h\overline{n} s\ bsn\ in\ iry\ i^\&h wdpw\ dhwyty\ [p]\ w\ mdw.f\ n\ hrw\ hr\ ir[t]\)

(34) It happened that the \(im^\beta\)-tree was taken towards the sacred bark along with natron by the “one who is responsible for the \(i^\&h\) and steward”. It is Thoth who speaks to Horus about what was done.

(35) \(dhwyty\ hrw\ dd\ mdw\ im^\beta wy\ nn\ pri\ m\ it.k\ pn\ //\ wsir\ //\ im\ //\ ms(w)\ hrw\)

(35) Thoth speaks words to Horus: How enjoyable is this that came forth from this father of yours // Osiris // \(im^\beta\)-tree // Child(ren) of Horus

(36) \(hrw\ wsir\ dd\ mdw\ i.ms.k\ ir.i)\ //\ wsir\ //\ bsn\ //\ pr-hd\)

(36) Horus speaks words to Osiris: To (me) do you come // Osiris // Natron // Treasury

Scene 13

(37) \(hpr.n\ it\overline{it} im^\beta [h]n^\beta mn[s^3\ 8\ r\ h\overline{fr}]\ wi^\beta wy\ [hrw\ pw]\ mdw.f\ hf[t]\ st\overline{s}\)

(37) It happened that the \(im^\beta\)-tree was taken along with [eight] \(mn[s]\)-vessels [to the front of] the two barks. [It is Horus] who speaks to Seth.

(38) \(hrw\ st\overline{s}\ dd\ mdw\ n\ w^3.k\ \overline{hr}\ \overline{c}i^\beta ir.k\ //\ st\overline{s}\ //\ wi^\beta\ //\ sh\ d\overline{sr}\)

(38) Horus speaks words to Seth: You will not resist under the one who is older than you // Seth // Sacred bark // \(d\overline{sr}\)-tent ship

(39) \(\overline{i}st\ nbt-hwt\ dd\ mdw\ im^\beta.ti\ hnt\ st\overline{i}\ h\overline{t}\ //\ wsir\ //\ im^\beta\ //\ ms(w)\ hrw\)

(39) Isis speaks words to Nephthys: May you be agreeable to the smell of the feast // Osiris // \(im^\beta\)-tree // Child(ren) of Horus
Sequence 8

Scene 14

(40) hrw ḍḥwty ḍd mdw dp sy m r.k // [ḍḥwty]
// [iry iḥ wdpw] // [...] (40) Horus speaks words to Thoth: May your sickness taste her // [Thoth] // [The “one who is responsible for the iḥ and steward”] // [...] 

(41) hpr.n dit c r ḫnkt hrw pw nḥm.f irt.f [...] (41) It happened that the arm was given towards the ḫnkt-offering. It is Horus who takes his eye [...].

(42) ḍḥwty [ḥtw stš] ḍ[ḍ mdw] w3ḥ n.ṭn tp [n wsir(?) ...] // [ḥtw stš] // [ṭnḥwt] (42) Thoth speaks [words to the followers of Seth]: Lay down for yourselves the head [of Osiris(?) ...] // [Followers of Seth] // [Goats]

(42bis) [ḍḥwty hrw ḍḍ mdw ...].k n.k [...] // ḍḥwty // śšmw (42bis) [Thoth speaks words to Horus: ...] you for you [...] // Thoth // Slaughterer

(43) hrw ḍḥwty ḍḍ mdw wdi n.f tp.f // nṭr ḏi(w) tp n.f // inswy stš(?)) // w3ḥ ʾḥ (43) Horus speaks words to Thoth: Give him back his head // The god to whom the head is given back // Testicles of Seth(?) // Supplying the fire basin

(44) hrw nṭr niwty ḍḍ mdw [t]pi.f stš i bb r.(i) // stš // ib // w3ḥ ʾḥ (44) Horus speaks words to the town god: It is while (my) mouth thirsts that he breathes in the smell (again) // Seth // Kid // Supplying the fire basin

(45) [hrw] stš ḍḍ mdw smnw it.(i) // ḍḥwty // ssmn // w3ḥ ʾḥ (45) [Horus] speaks words to Seth: (My) father was strengthened // Thoth // Slaughtering of a goose // Supplying the fire
Scene 15

(46) hpr. n ḫnk(w) n ḡd m tp n ib m tp n smn [ḥrw] pw ṣḥm <w>d.f iriw n.f ḡd mdt n [s]š[d]

(46) It happened that an offering was given to the Djed-pillar in the form of the head of a kid and the head of a goose. It is [Horus] who gained power, being appointed king, after a recitation of the [headdress] was done for him.

(47) gb ḍhwty ḡd mdw wdi n.f tp.f sp snw // tp stš // ḫnk tp ib tp smn // hwt-nbw

(47) Geb speaks words to Thoth: Give him his head twice // The head of Seth // Offering of a kid-head and a goose-head // Royal house

Scene 16

(48) hpr.n sctr ḡd n iryw ḫt nsw ḥrw pw w[d].n.f n ms(w).f [s]ḥf[f.sn stš ḫr wsir]

(48) It happened that the Djed-pillar was erected by the “the ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king”. It is Horus who [issued] a [command] to his child(ren) [so that they] might erect [Seth under Osiris].

(49) ḥrw msw ḥrw ḡd mdw [ими ḡd].f ḫr.f // [stš] ḫr wsir rmi // sctr ḡd

(49) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus: [Cause that] he [endures] under him // [Seth] under Osiris, the mourned one // Erecting the Djed-pillar

(50) ṣst nbt-ḥwt msw ḥrw ḡd mdw ḫnp n ḫr // msw ḥrw // iryw ḫt nsw // wr mšw

(50) Isis and Nephthys speak words to the children of Horus: Offer to the fallen one // Children of Horus // “The ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king” //
Scene 17

(51) hpr. n wdiw nwh r ḏ ṣtš pw [š]c wd ḫrw [n] msw.f
(51) It happened that a rope was put on the Djed-pillar. It is Seth who [was cut] (by the rope), while Horus ordered (it) [to] his children.

(52) ḫrw msw ḫrw ḏ ṣdw imi ḫc.f [ḫwiw] // stš [ḥwy] // dit twʒ ḏd
(52) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus: Cause that he may stand, being [overwhelmed] // Seth, [the one who is overwhelmed] // Causing the support of the Djed-pillar

Scene 18

(53) [hpr. n h]3 ms[w] nsw [r] wišwy ḫrw [pw mdw.f ḫr msw.f hft stš(?)...]
(53) [It happened that] the royal child[ren] descended [into] the two barks. [It is] Horus [who speaks about his children with Seth(?)...]

(54) ḫrw [stš(?)] ḏ ṣdw [fši n.i fsiw it.i] // [msw ḫrw] // [msw nsw]
(54) Horus speaks words to [Seth(?)]: [Carry for me the ones who carried my father] // [Children of Horus] // [Royal children]

Sequence 9

Scene 19

(54bis) [hpr. n fsjt šns dwiw in ḫry-hb ḫj] mḥnty-n-irti <pw> [šsp].n.f irtṣ m[i]t[y m-c ḫrw]
(54bis) [It happened that food and drink were brought by the great lector priest]. <It is> Mekhenti-en-irti [who receive]d two new
(55) ḫrw ḫḏ mḏw n irty.(i) m ḫnt.k mš.k im.sn // irty ḫrw ḫti.(i) <n> iwty irty.f(y) // ḥt wdt // ḫm

(55) Horus speaks words to Mekhenti-en-irti:
Take (my) two eyes in your face so that you may see with them // The two eyes of Horus are brought <to> the one without eyes // Bringing and putting down // Letopolis

Scene 20

(56) ḫpr.n mnċ ḫrw pw ḫḥ.s f hnc stš

(56) It happened that there was fighting. It is Horus who fights with Seth.

(57) gb ḫrw stš ḫḏ mḏw ḫw-ib // ḫrw stš ḫḥ.s // mnċ

(57) Geb speaks words to Horus and Seth:
Regret! // Horus and Seth, the fighting // mnċ-fight

(58) ḫrw msw ḫrw ḫḏ mḏw n tn is ḫw-ib // mš(w) ḫrw [ḥtw stš ḫḥ.s] // [ċ]mw

(58) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus: To you belongs indeed remorse // Child(ren) of Horus [and the followers of Seth, the fighting] // [ċ]mw-fight

Scene 21

(59) ḫpr[n iniw] mhwty ḫrw [pw mḏw.f n ms]w[f]

(59) It happen[ed] that two families [were brought. It is] Horus [who speaks to his child]ren.

(60) ḫrw msw ḫrw ḫḏ [mḏw mh.t]n pr [ḥr.(i) p]n ḫr irt.(i) // ms(w) ḫrw // mhwty

(60) Horus speaks [words] to the children of Horus: [May you fill] the box [of this (my) face] with (my) eye // Child(ren) of Horus // Two families

eyes [from Horus].
(61) hrw ḏhwty ḏd mdw in(t).sn ḡs.<s>n // ms(w) hrw // imnhwy

(61) Horus speaks words to Thoth: May they bring (it) themselves // Child(ren) of Horus // Pair of slaughterers

(62) [hrw msw hrw ḏd mdw hw(i). n.tn // ms(w) hrw // ʿiry[w] ḫt nsw

(62) [Horus] speaks words to [the children of Horus]: For you (I) protect // Child(ren) of Horus // “The one[s] who are connected to the cultic largess of the king”

(63) hrw [msw hrw ḏd mdw ...] // wdi r tḥ(?)

(63) Horus [speaks words to the children of Horus: ...] // [Putting on the ground]

Scene 22

(64) hpr.n iniw fnḥwy hrw pw mdw.f n msw.f hr ʿirt.f

(64) It happened that two carpenters were brought. It is Horus who talks to his children about his eye.

(65) hrw msw hrw ḏd mdw ʿiri.tn pšnt.f psḏw n.tn ḫr.s // ms(w) hrw // fnḥwy

(65) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus: May you treat what he separated and depart because of it // Child(ren) of Horus // Two carpenters

Scene 23

(66) hpr.n ḫṣit ḥṣit in wtw msw hrw [p]w ih.sn n.f ir[t].f

(66) It happened that the offering table was brought by the embalmers. They are the children of Horus who dry for him his eye.

(67) hrw ḫtw stš ḏd mdw fši.n.(i) ʿirt.(i) r ḫr.(i) // [ʿirt hrw fši.t(i) r] ḫr.f // ḫṣit ḫ[śiwt] [///] ḏhwty

(67) Horus speaks words to the followers of Seth: In (my) face have (I) put (my) eye // [The eye of Horus was put in] his face // Bringing of the offering tables [///] Ibis nome
The children of Horus speak words to Geb: The blindness of his eye is not [...] // Child(ren) [of Horus] // Conductors

Sequence 10

Scene 24

It happened that a jug of wine was brought by the royal children. It is the giving of the eye of Horus to him by his children.

The children of Horus speak words to Horus: Take for yourself your eye for your face, so that the wine can be drunk with them // The eye of Horus, the town // Wine, the one from Buto // Buto

[Horus] speaks [words] to the children [of Horus: It shall not separate from (me again)] // The eye of Horus, the town // Wine, the one from Pelusium // Buto

Scene 25

It happened that polished carnelian was brought. [It is Horus] who saves his eye from Seth.

Horus speaks words to Seth: So that you get distorted with rage is why (I) have saved (my) eye // The eye // Carnelian // Letopolis
(74) ḫrw stš ḏd mdw psḏḥši.n[s]n kw // irt // [hr]s[t šdt] // [ḥr-śḥ] // ḫm

Horus speaks words to Seth: Turn away, after [they] have confronted you // The eye // [Saved] carnelian // [Arena] // Letopolis

(75) ḫrw stš ḏd mdw ini n(.i) irt(t).n.k dšr[t] m r.k // ir[t] dšr[t] // ḡs[rt] // ḫm

Horus speaks words to Seth: Bring (me my) eye that you have made distorted with rage, the one that was red in your mouth // The red eye // Carnelian // Letopolis

Sequence 11

Scene 26

(76) hpr.n iniw thnt ššbw ḫrw pw wd.f n [msw].f ini.t(w) n.f irt.f wḏt m bw nb

It happened that faience, namely a necklace, was brought. It is Horus who orders his [children] that his green/healthy eye is brought to him from anywhere/anyone.

(77) ḫrw msw [hrw] ḏd mdw ini n(.i) irt(i) thnt šš[tb].n.f im].s // irt // thnt šš[bw] // [ḥmw.t n(w)t ḫwnw]

Horus speaks words to the children of [Horus]: Bring (me my) green/healthy eye that [he has spared(?)]) // The eye // Faience, namely a necklace // [Women of Libya]

(78) ḫrw msw ḫrw ḫtw stš ḏd mdw m n(.i) irt(i) ṭḥnt ḫr(.i) // ir[t] // ṭḥnt // ḫr-y ḫwnw

Horus speaks words to the children of Horus and the followers of Seth: Take for (me my) eye, which brightens (my) face // The eye // Faience // Cheri-tjehenu

(79) ḫrw msw ḫrw ḫtw stš ḏd mdw šštb.n.f // ir[t] // šbw[t] // ḫr-y ḫwnw

Horus speaks words to the children of Horus and the followers of Seth: What he has crossed // The eye // Baboon chapels // Cheri-tjehenu
Sequence 12

Scene 27

(80) hpr.n fji.h ttp n nsw in iry i'h [wdpw]
ghwty p w firt hrw n.f

(80) It happened that a htp-offering was brought to the king by the “ones who are responsible for the i'h and stewards”. It is Thoth who brings the eye of Horus to him.

(81) dhwty htw d mdw mn n.k htp hrd.s]
// dit firt htw // [dit] h[t]

(81) Thoth speaks words to Horus: Take for yourself your eye and be satisfied with [it] // Giving of the eye of Horus // Giving of the feast

[msw] htw [htw] d[d mdw] f'it(i)] n.k <sy
r> h.k // [fit] htw

[The children] of Horus speak [words] to [Horus]: <In> your face (I) brought <it> for you // Bringing the eye of Horus

Scene 28

[hpr.n] dbn <shnw> i'h [iryw htw nsw] h3 i'ty
bik (82) dhwty p[w] firt htw n.f

[It happened that] the “ones who embrace the Akh” [and the “the ones who are connected to the cultic largess of the king”] went around the two falcon standards. (82) It is Thoth who takes the two eyes of Horus for him.

hrw dhwty d mdw i'ty n.k i'ty.k bik irt.k //
irty // [irty] bik // wp w't m'h[t]

Horus speaks words to Thoth: Take for yourself your two falcon standards that belong to your face // Two eyes // Two falcon standards // Opening of the northern way
Sequence 13

Scene 29

(83) *hpr.n iniw c'bawy w3h(w) šwty n nsw hrw p[w] [i^]b.f ins(wy) stš šhm[f]

(83) It happened that two *c'b*-scepters were brought and that two šwty-feathers were given to the king. It is Horus who offers the testicle(s) of Seth so that [he] be mighty.


(84) Thoth speaks [words to Horus]: Offer [them] for [yourself] // [Testicles of Seth] // [Giving of the two] *c'b*-scepters // [...] 

(85) [dhwty] *hrw dd mdw šhm.t(w).k // ins(wy) stš // šhm // [wšt ntr(?)]

(85) [Thoth] speaks words to Horus: You are supposed to be given power // Testicle(s) of Seth // Power // [The way of god(?)]

(86) *hrw msw *hrw htw stš dd mdw w3h n(i) s(y) m // irt // w3h šwty // [...] wšt hrw

(86) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus and the followers of Seth: Indeed, give it to (me) // The eye // Giving the šwty-feathers // [...] way of Horus

Scene 30

(87) *hpr.n iniw n<^>b(t) km(t) *hrw pw wdb.f g[b hr] ir[t].f

(87) It happened that a black curl was brought. It is Horus who turns towards Geb [concerning] his eye.

(88) *hrw gb dd mdw šš(w) n.f r.f hr [it.(i) pn // [irt r stš] // šni km

(88) Horus speaks words to Geb: Because of this father (of mine it) was indeed determined for him // [The eye against Seth] // Black hair
Scene 32

(89) hpr.n ḍd.t(w) mi wrw šmḥw mh w ḍḥwty
<pw> di.f phr nṯrw n hrw ḫr gb
(89) It happened that it was said: Come, Great
ones of Upper and Lower Egypt! <It is>
Thoth who causes that the gods serve Horus
on Geb’s behest.

(90) gb msw hrw ḍtw stṣ ḍd md w [phr n] hrw
twt nb.tn // [phr nṯrw] // ḫr w //] iwt wrw
šmḥw mh w
(90) Geb speaks words to the children of
Horus and the followers of Seth: [Attend
upon] Horus, as you are your lord //
[Attending of the gods] // Horus // Coming of
the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt

Scene 31

(89) hpr.n ini[w wd]n m spt ḍd md w
(89) It happened that a wd n-offering was
brought from the two districts. Recitation.

Scenes 33

(91) hpr.n iniw [ḥt špst ḍḥy hnb di.f n]
ns w ḍḥwty [pw md w.f n hrw ḫr irt (?)]
(91) It happened that [many precious
products] were brought [to] the king. [It is]
Thoth [who speaks to Horus about what was
done (?)].

(92) [ṭḥwty] hrw ḍd md w mn ḫ r. k // [irt.k]
<w>ḏ[i]t r ḫr.k // [irt] // wḏw // šwt wrt
(92) [Thoth] speaks words to Horus: Take for
yourself your healthy eye to your face // [The
eye] // Green eye paint // The great feather

(93) ḍḥwty hrw ḍd md w sdmi n.k s(y) r ḫr.k //
[irt] // msdm t // zḥw
(93) Thoth speaks words to Horus: Insert it
for yourself in your face // [The eye] // Black
eye paint // What protects

372 Scenes 31 and 33 are depicted together in Vignette 21, whereas Scene 32 is illustrated in Vignette 20. Hence,
the transliteration and translation of Scene 32 is written before Scene 31.
(94) ḍḥwty ḫrw ḏd mdw ʿmi irt.k ʾārr.s ʾārr.t(i)
[...] // irt // ʾārrt // km

(94) Thoth speaks words to Horus: Your eye shall not dim itself so that it is dim [...] // The eye // Grapes // What is black

(95) [ḍḥwty ḫrw] ḏd mdw mn n.k [ṣṭi nṭr
snt]rt pr[t i]m[k] // irt // snṭr // smn

(95) [Thoth] speaks words [to Horus]: Take for yourself [the smell of the god, the purifying one] that came forth from [you] // The eye // Incense // What lets endure

(96) [ḍḥwty] ḫrw ḏd mdw pḏ n.k ḫr.k ʿm.s
pdpḏ // irt // p<3>ḏwy

(96) [Thoth] speaks words to Horus: Widen for yourself your face by means of it, so that it diffuses // The eye // Two balls of incense

Sequence 14

Scene 34

(97) ḥpr.n ḫiw gsw n wrw šmʾw ṣḥw ḫrw
[p]w ḫp f irt.f ḫi ḫf tpw n.sn

(97) It happened that halves of bread were given to the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt. It is Horus who allocates his eye and who gives the heads to them.

(98) ḫrw ḍḥwty ḫd mdw ʿni n.sn tpw.sn // dit
tpw nṭrw // dit gsw n wrw šmʾw ṣḥw

(98) Horus speaks words to Thoth: Give them their heads // Giving of the heads of the gods // Giving of the bread halves to the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt

(99) ḍḥwty msw ḫrw ḫtw ṣṭš ḫd mdw [ḥtp]
n.<n> gb ḫd.f n.ṭn tpw.ṭn // dit tpw nṭr // ḥtp-
di-nsw // ḍḥwty

(99) Thoth speaks words to the children of Horus and the followers of Seth: May Geb [be gracious] to you, by giving to you your heads // Giving of the heads of the gods // A ḥtp-di-nsw offering // Ibis nome
(100) [hrw msw hrw htw stš ḍd mdw imi n.(i) irt.(i) htp.(i) hr.s] // [irt] // [htp] // [...] (100) [Horus speaks words to the children of Horus and the followers of Seth: Give (me my) eye so that (I) can be content with it] // [The eye] // [A htp-meal] // [...] 

Scene 35

(101) [ḥpr.n] iniw [qni in ḫry-hb] ḫrw pw qni.f it<.f> wdb.f ḫr gb (101) [It happened that a bib] was brought [by the lector priest]. It is Horus who embraces <his> father whom he turns towards Geb.

(102) ḫrw gb ḍd mdw qni n.(i) it.(i) pn nni r.(i) // wsir // qni // p (102) Horus speaks words to Geb: Embrace for (me) this father (of mine) who became tired compared to (me) // Osiris // Bib // Buto

(103) ḫrw gb ḍd mdw snb it.(i) r.f // wsir // snb // p (103) Horus speaks words to Geb: May (my) father be indeed healthy // Osiris // snb-fringe // Buto

Scene 36

(104) [ḥpr.n] iniw srmt ḫrw pw [rmī].f ḫr it<.f> wdb.f n gb (104) It happened that beer was brought. It is Horus who [cries] because of <his> father whom he has to turn over to Geb.

(105) ḫrw gb ḍd mdw ḥḥḥḥ(w) n.sn it.(i) pn // wsir // ḥḥ // ḫnqt (105) Horus speaks words to Geb: For them this father (of mine) was buried // Osiris // Dough // Beer

(106) ḫrw gb ḍd mdw srn<.n>.i n.sn sw // st tht // srmt // t (106) Horus speaks words to Geb: For them (I) let him be mourned // Place of drunkenness // Beer // Bread
Scene 37

(107) $hpr.n$ iniw ifd sis $hn[\sim]$ $hbsw$ nw idmi $hn^c$ sf $\xi$ $hrw <pw>$ mdw.$f$ n wsir $shn.f$ $shn.f$ $[d].f$ $dmi.f$ $r.f$

(107) It happened that 4-fibre-linen and 6-fibre-linen were brought together with clothes of idmi-linen and numerous fine linen. <It is> Horus who speaks to Osiris that he may seek the one whom he might embrace, and who says that he may touch him.

(108) $[hrw]$ wsir $qd$ mdw $fd(w)$ n.(i) $hp[\sim]f.$ // $hp\$ $st\$ // ifd // pr-$hg$

(108) [Horus] speaks words to Osiris: For (me) [his] thigh was pulled out // Thigh of Seth // 4-fibre-linen // Treasury

(109) $hrw$ wsir $qd$ mdw $m$ rsi(w) $ib.f$ $r.k$ // $st\$ // sis // pr-$nfr$

(109) Horus speaks words to Osiris: Do not let his mind be alert against you // Seth // 6-fibre-linen // Embalming place

(110) $hrw$ wsir $qd$ mdw $dmi$ it.(i) $ir.(i)$ // wsir $// idmi$ // $msH$

(110) Horus speaks words to Osiris: (My) father shall touch (me) // Osiris // idmi-linen // Crocodile

(111) $hrw$ wsir $qd$ mdw $dm[d$ $mijdt/sfr]$ $\xi$ $wt.k$ // $irt$ // ssf // $msH$

(111) Horus speaks words to Osiris: May [Mafdet/sfr unite] your limbs // The eye // Fine linen // Crocodile
Sequence 15

Scene 38

[it happened that the “ones who embrace the Akh” were brought. It is Horus who commands, after he embraced (his) father.]

(112) hrw ðhwty ðd mdw swn n.(i) it.(i) // ðhwty // swn ëh // ðhwty

(113) hrw msw hrw ðd mdw swn.ţn n.(i) it.(i) // msw hrw // swn ëh // ðhwty

Scene 39

(114) hpr.n ëb3 shnw ëh it hq3 hr ʕwy.sn hrw pw w.f n msw.f ëbï<.tw> wsir

(115) hrw msw hrw ðd mdw ëbï.t[n it.(i) pn] // [msw] hrw // [g]fïw(?) // ëbï

(116) hrw msw hrw ðd mdw ms ţn hr.f // msw hrw // [wnšw(?)] // ëbï

(114) It happened that the “ones who embrace the Akh” carried the father of the ruler on their arms. It is Horus who commands to his children that Osiris <is> carried.

(115) Horus [speaks words] to the children of Horus: May you carry [this father (of mine)] // [Children] of Horus // Apes(?) // To carry

(116) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus: Put yourself under him // Children of Horus // [Wolves(?)] // To carry
Scene 40

(117) hpr.n iri shnw 3h m-¢ m¢3w<t>y  (117) It happened that the “ones who embrace the Akh” acted with two sticks.

(118) hrw msw hrw dd mdw shn.tn it(i) // ms(w) hrw // shn(w) 3h // dhwty  (118) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus: May you embrace (my) father // Child(ren) of Horus // The “ones who embrace the Akh” // Ibis-nome

(119) msw hrw [htw stš] dd mdw ūni [msw].t<n> r pt ḫptw.t<n> n ćwt pfr // tši msw ḫtw stš // iri m-¢ m¢3[n] // hm  (119) The children of Horus speak words to [the followers of Seth]: Raise your [ms-sticks] towards heaven, while your buttocks are (those of) goats who perambulate // Raising of the ms-sticks of the followers of Seth // Acting with the sticks // Letopolis

Scene 41

(120) hpr.n stp dwšty 3st pw hn¢ nbt-hwt dwš.sn wsir  (120) It happened that the two mourners were chosen. It is Isis together with Nephthys who mourn Osiris.

(121) 3st nbt-hwt wsir dd mdw dwš nn tš // 3st nbt-hwt // dwšty // hm  (121) Isis and Nephthys speak words to Osiris: These will mourn you // Isis and Nephthys // Two mourners // Letopolis

(122) [3st nbt-hwt wsir dd mdw] stp(w).n n.k wr // dd mdw // stp dwšty // hm  (122) [Isis and Nephthys speak words to Osiris]: For you we were chosen, oh great one // Recitation // Election of the two mourners // Letopolis
Scene 42

(123) [hpr.n ini]w ḫpš <in> ḫry-wdb ḫn< ifd

(123) [It happened that] a staff was [brought] <by> the master of largess together with 4-fibre-linen.

(124) [ḏhwty] ḫrw ḥd mdw wdi n it.k pn // ḫrw
// [šps] // ms(w) ḫrw

(124) [Thoth] speaks words to Horus: Give (it) to this father of yours // Horus // [The noble one] // Child(ren) of Horus

(125) ḫrw stš ḥd mdw ḫr(i) r.k wdi(w) n.k wdbt r.k // ḏhwty // ḫry-wdb // skr

(125) Horus speaks words to Seth: (My) face is directed against you after that what turned against you was given to you // Thoth // Master of largess // Sokar

Scene 43

(126) hpr.n diw ifd ḫpš n sḥnw ḥḥ [ḏhwty pw]
iṭi.f stš n wsir fd.n.f [n.f ḫpš.f]

(126) It happened that the 4-fibre-linen and the staff were given to the “ones who embrace the Akh”. [It is Thoth] who takes Seth to Osiris after he had pulled out [for him his thigh].

(127) [ḏhwty ḫrw] ḥd mdw fd.n(i) ḫpš[f n it.k pn] // ḫpš stš // ifd // pr-hd

(127) [Thoth] speaks words to [Horus]: [For this father of yours] (I) have pulled out [his] thigh // The thigh of Seth // 4-fibre-linen // Treasury

(128) ḫrw [stš] ḥd mdw fd[w] n(i) ḫpš[k ...] // ḫpš stš // sis // pr-nfr

(128) Horus speaks words to [Seth]: For (me) [your] thigh was pulled out (too) // The thigh of Seth // 6-fibre-linen // Embalming place
(129) [Horus speaks words to [Seth]: [Go] so that you may not be met // Seth // The staff // Royal house

Sequence 16

Scene 44

(130) It happened that [food] was [brought] for [the introduction of the “ones who embrace the Akh” of the palace ...].

(131) ... speaks words to the children of Horus and the followers of Seth: ...]

Scene 45

(132) [It happened that the hereditary noblemen(?) of the west and east were brought] who eat [...] with [them .... It is Horus who allocates his eye and who causes that the gods can receive] their heads.

Scene 46

[It happened that the hereditary noblemen were anointed ...].
(134) **hrw msw hrw ḍd mdw ḫt r.f m twp.tn** // [irt] // [ḥitt]

(134) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus: What was bright against him is in your heads // [The eye] // [ḥitt-oil]

(135) **hrw msw hrw ḍd mdw sfkk n stš hr.s** // [irt] // [sfḥ]

(135) Horus speaks words to the children of Horus: Punish Seth because of it! // [The eye] // [sfḥ-oil]

**Scene 47**

(136) **ḥpr.n iṯi(t) [iṭf] r ṣḥ-nṭr**

(136) It happened that [natron(?)] was taken to the embalming hall.

**Sequence 17**

**Scene 48**

**ḥpr.n rdit ṣḥmt [n it ḫq in ḫry-hb]**

It happened that a mug was given [to the father of the ruler by the lector priest].

(137) **hrw stš ḍd mdw m ḫt m ghst <n> iṯ.(i) // wsir ḫr // iṭ[t]**

(137) Horus speaks words to Seth: Take the standard in Geheset <for> (my) father // Osiris, the fallen one // The standard

(138) **hrw wsir ḍd mdw nṯr r.(i) // wsir // ṣḥ-nṭr**

(138) Horus speaks words to Osiris: You who you are more divine than (me) // Osiris // Embalming hall

(139) [...] (139) [...]
### XIII.2 Appendix B – Division of the ritual into Sequences taking into account the content of the Scenes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Vignette</th>
<th>Columns of Vignette</th>
<th>Scene</th>
<th>Columns of Scene</th>
<th>Ritualistic Action</th>
<th>Mythological Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>lost</td>
<td>lost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Building of the sacred bark</td>
<td>Horus talks to his children about his eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>Taking of eight <em>mns</em>-vessels to the bark by the <em>iryw ht nsw</em></td>
<td>Thoth places Osiris on Seth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8-14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>Carving of male royal ox</td>
<td>Horus takes the eye from Thoth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>Bringing of the <em>iryw ičh wdpw</em> of the lord</td>
<td>Thoth takes [...] Horus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>Putting of emmer on the threshing floor</td>
<td>Horus talks(?) about his eye in the presence of his children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>Giving of two royal cakes by the lector priest</td>
<td>Thoth commands what Horus does to Seth and to himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>Mooring of the two barks with an <em>im</em>-tree in each boat</td>
<td>Osiris is placed on the back of Seth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25-28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25-28</td>
<td>Taking the staff of Horus, <em>ims</em>, <em>mth</em>, <em>hd</em>-mace by the <em>iryw ht nsw</em></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

373 Sethe (1928: 103f.) summarized Scenes 1 and 2 into one Scene.
374 Gestermann (2008: 33) included Scenes 9-11 into one sequence, but mentioned that the Scenes can also be separated into two sequences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene</th>
<th>10&lt;sup&gt;375&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>Placing of barley on the threshing floor</th>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>29-33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bringing of male cattle who jump on the barley</td>
<td>Horus protects his father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34-40</td>
<td>Taking of the <em>imj</em>-tree and natron towards the bark by the <em>iry iḫ wdpw</em></td>
<td>Thoth speaks to Horus about what was done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>37-40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taking of an <em>imj</em>-tree and eight <em>mnsj</em>-vessels to the front of the two barks</td>
<td>Horus speaks to Seth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41-46</td>
<td>Giving of the arm towards the <em>hnkt</em>-offering</td>
<td>Horus takes his eye [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>47-49</td>
<td></td>
<td>Giving of an offering to the Djed-pillar in the form of the head of a kid and of a goose</td>
<td>Horus is appointed king after recitation of the headdress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50-52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Erection of the Djed-pillar by the <em>iryw ḫt nsw</em></td>
<td>Horus commands his children to erect Seth under Osiris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17&lt;sup&gt;376&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>51-52</td>
<td></td>
<td>Putting a rope on the Djed-pillar</td>
<td>Seth is cut, while Horus ordered it to his children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>53-54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Descending of the royal children into the two barks</td>
<td>Horus speaks about his children with Seth(?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>375</sup> Sethe (1928: 134) combined Scenes 10 and 11 into one Scene.

<sup>376</sup> Scene 17 is not represented in a Vignette. The content of the Scene deals with a rope that is put around the Djed-pillar. As the very same rope is shown around the Djed-pillar in Vignette 10, Scene 17 is assigned to this illustration as well (see VI.8.7: 96).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>55-58</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>54bis-55</th>
<th>Bringing of food and drink by the great lector priest</th>
<th>Mekhenti-en-irti receives two new eyes from Horus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>69-71</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56-58</td>
<td>Fighting</td>
<td>Horus fights with Seth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>64-65</td>
<td>Bringing of two carpenters</td>
<td>Horus speaks to his children about his eye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>66-68</td>
<td>Bringing of the offering table by two embalmers</td>
<td>The children of Horus dry his eye for him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>64-68</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66-68</td>
<td>Bringing of a jug of wine by the royal children</td>
<td>The children of Horus give Horus his eye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>72-75</td>
<td>Bringing of polished carnelian</td>
<td>Horus saves his eye from Seth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>72-75</td>
<td>Bringing of a faience necklace</td>
<td>Horus commands his children to bring him his green/healthy eye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>76-79</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>76-79</td>
<td>Bringing of a faience necklace</td>
<td>Horus commands his children to bring him his green/healthy eye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>80-82</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>80-81</td>
<td>Bringing of a htp-offering to the king by the iryw i$h wdpw</td>
<td>Thoth brings the eye of Horus to him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>83-85</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>81-82</td>
<td>Going around the two falcon standards by the shnw $h and the iryw ht nsw</td>
<td>Thoth takes the two eyes of Horus for him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Scenes</td>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86-87</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>83-86</td>
<td>Bringing of two cbi-scepters and giving of two šwty-feathers to the king</td>
<td>Horus unites the testicles of Seth to become mighty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Horus turns towards Geb concerning his eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>88-90</td>
<td>89-90</td>
<td>37/32</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calling of the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt</td>
<td>Thoth causes the gods to serve Horus on Geb’s behest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>91-95</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>91-96</td>
<td>Bringing of an wdn-offering from the two districts</td>
<td>Recitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bringing of precious products to the king</td>
<td>Thoth speaks to Horus about what was done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96-100</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>97-100</td>
<td>Giving of bread halves to the Great ones of Upper and Lower Egypt</td>
<td>Horus allocates his eye and gives heads to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>101-104</td>
<td>101-103</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bringing of a bib by the lector priest</td>
<td>Horus embraces his father and turns him towards Geb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bringing of beer</td>
<td>Horus cries because of his father whom he turns over to Geb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>107-111</td>
<td>107-111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bringing of different kinds of linen</td>
<td>Horus speaks to Osiris so that he seeks the one he embraces and tells him to touch him</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

377 Scene 32 is listed before Scene 31 as the latter one is represented together with Scene 33 in Vignette 21 (see VI.13.4: footnote 156, 131).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>105-108</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>111-113</th>
<th>Bringing of the shnw 3h</th>
<th>Horus commands after embracing his father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carrying of the father of the ruler on the arms of the shnw 3h</td>
<td>Horus commands his children that Osiris is carried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>108-111</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>117-119</td>
<td>Throwing with throwing sticks by the shnw 3h</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>112-114</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>120-122</td>
<td>Choosing the two mourners</td>
<td>Isis and Nephthys mourn Osiris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>114-115</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>123-125</td>
<td>Bringing of a staff and 4-fibre-linen by the master of largess</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>115-116</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>126-129</td>
<td>Giving of the staff and the 4-fibre-linen to the shnw 3h</td>
<td>Thoth takes Seth to Osiris after he had pulled out Seth’s thigh for Osiris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>117-120</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>130-131</td>
<td>Bringing of food for the introduction of the shnw 3h of the palace</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bringing of the hereditary noblemen(?) of the West and East who eat [...]</td>
<td>Horus allocates his eye and causes that gods can receive their heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>121-122</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>133-135</td>
<td>Anointing of the hereditary noblemen</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>123-129</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Taking of natron to the embalming hall</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>130-139</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>136-139</td>
<td>Giving of a mug to the father of the ruler by the lector priest</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XIII.3 Appendix C – Edition of the text