



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## The Worshipper and the Worshipped in the Pyramid Texts

Hays, H.M.

### Citation

Hays, H. M. (2002). The Worshipper and the Worshipped in the Pyramid Texts. *Studien Zur Altägyptischen Kultur*, 30, 153-167. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16535>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16535>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

# The Worshipper and the Worshipped in the Pyramid Texts\*

von

Harold M. Hays

## Abstract

Three kinds of connections are drawn out between Pyramid Texts and later ritual texts, such as temple ritual texts and the opening of the mouth: there are shared rites, common statements, and like role characteristics for the officiant and the recipient of cult. Illustrating these connections in detail, it is observed that the points of contact serve to draw the texts together despite the temporal distance between them, and to draw the setting of mortuary cult toward that of the temple. One may thus see as Schott did that there was a common stock from which rituals could be formed, and even farther – that there was a ritual milieu comprehending both the temple and the tomb, with but a permeable boundary between them.

At the back of Luxor temple, just to the right of the sanctuary's entrance, Amun-Re of Karnak is shown seated upon a dais of the sort which might once have stood within that sanctuary<sup>1</sup>, while before him the king is shown in the „*wdn*-gesture“,<sup>2</sup> signifying that he is making a recitation to the god. In between the two figures is one of the oldest extant offering lists from a „divine temple“, a list prefaced with the statement „Presenting requisite offerings to Amun-Re“<sup>3</sup>, leaving no doubt as to the setting of the ritual epitomized by the list: temple cult, with the king performing rites for a god<sup>4</sup>.

But the ritual which this list represents<sup>5</sup> is older by at least eight centuries. Appearing in the Pyramid Texts of Wenis<sup>6</sup>, it occurs in a different setting altogether: mortuary cult,

\* A draft of this essay was presented at Brown University at the 2001 Annual Meeting of the American Research Center in Egypt. It has benefited from Robert K. Ritner and James P. Allen's having read it and their having provided useful suggestions. Responsibility remains the author's.

<sup>1</sup> See H. Brunner, *Die südlichen Räume des Tempels von Luxor*, AV 18, 1977, pls. 14 and 57 (XVII/24).

<sup>2</sup> „*wdn*-Gestus“ and „*Ruf*-Gestus“ being the terms of Assmann, *Sonnenpriester*, 2-3, for the posture of the king at Brunner, *Die südlichen Räume*, pls. 16 and 65 (XVII/30), the mirror-image of the posture shown at XVII/24.

<sup>3</sup> Brunner, *Die südlichen Räume*, pl. 57 (XVII/24) a: *wdn dbh-htp n jmn-r*.

<sup>4</sup> As L. Bell, in: *JNES* 44, 1985, 280, observes, Luxor temple is not a „funerary temple“, and indeed is treated by L. Bell, in: B. Shafer (ed.), *Temples of Ancient Egypt*, 1997, 127, as being „representative in so many ways“ of a „divine temple“.

<sup>5</sup> The key words and phrases specified in offering lists were tied to ritual texts, which were recited during the execution of specific cultic actions; these ritual texts as a rule adopt a wordplay with the object being manipulated: this general principle is noted by Barta, *Opferliste*, 67. The Luxor list (as other lists) therefore constitutes a listed sequence of events. By their key words, the Pyramid Texts presently discussed match the sequence of key words in offering lists of which the Luxor list is an exemplar: the Pyramid Texts provide the ritual texts which would have been recited during the cultic manipulation of the objects listed in the offering lists.

<sup>6</sup> The contents of the list in sequence: PT 23, 25, 32, 34-42, 32, 43-57, 72-79, 81, 25, 32, 82-96, 108-171; see T.G. Allen, *Occurrences of Pyramid Texts with Cross Indexes of These and Other Egyptian Mortuary Texts*, SAOC 27, 1950, 48. This is a „type A/B“ list, according to the classification of Barta, *Opferliste*, 78 (with him noting that the „type B“ list always occurs in conjunction with the „type A“ list), just as the Luxor list is a „type A/B“ list, by the classification of Barta, *Opferliste*, 104-105.

with an officiant performing rites for a dead man. Indeed, what appears in the pyramid of Wenis is actually an expansion of a ritual appearing in list form<sup>7</sup> for the first time no later than the beginning of Dynasty 5, in the tomb of Debeheni<sup>8</sup>. Pictorial depictions accompanying this earlier list showing the performance of rites – depictions complete with a priest in the „*wdn*-gesture“<sup>9</sup> – confirm the identification of setting: this offering ritual is situated in mortuary cult. And it is within this context that the offering list and its ritual continue to appear through the Middle<sup>10</sup> and New<sup>11</sup> Kingdoms until being attested also in the temple of Luxor.

At that moment, this single ritual's presence in two different settings complicates our understanding of it. One would like to draw a line in time between the Wenis and Luxor rituals and see that the one attested later was derived from the earlier; more simply, one would like to draw from these specifics a more general vector: an influence of mortuary cult upon temple cult. But a solid chain of transmission is not so easily captured in the details; there are simply no extant offering lists from a divine temple context from

Notice, however, that the composition of each of the two examples is not perfectly identical, and in this regard their variation is in accordance with a principle observed by Barta, *Opferliste*, 73: a fixed scheme for the offering lists was never adhered to. To be perfectly precise, the Luxor list is a condensation of the Wenis list, preserving the exact sequential relationship between items, but omitting items from the middle of the ritual. Luxor (see Brunner, *Die südlichen Räume*, pl. 57 [XVII/24], a-i) gives items A1-2, B1-B10, and A26-A87 in that order, omitting B11-B29, A3-A25, and A88-A90. In terms of the offering list, Wenis gives A1-2, B1-B29, and A3-A87. For the itemization code, see Barta, *Opferliste*, 47-50 and 78-79. *PT* refers to the utterance (*Spruch*) numbers assigned the texts of K. Sethe, *Die altägyptischen Pyramidentexte*, 4 vols, 1908-22.

<sup>7</sup> The connection having been noted as early as Junker, *Giza II*, 80. The earlier list is called a „type A“ list by Barta, *Opferliste*, 47. As noted above, the Wenis and Luxor rituals are of „type A/B“, a term intended to show that the „type A“ series has been augmented by the addition of a „type B“ series. The key words and utterances of the B series deal with the opening of the mouth (Barta, *Opferliste*, 78), but the ritual of this series does not correspond to the fully presented opening of the mouth ritual which is attested first in the New Kingdom, but is, according to Davies/ Gardiner, *Amenemhet*, 76, a brief recapitulation of what had been fully performed on the day of burial; on the latter's first appearance and the silence of attestation from before that first appearance, see Otto, *Mundöffnungsritual II*, 10.

<sup>8</sup> Debeheni is identified as one of the first bearers of this list by Barta, *Opferliste*, 47. His tomb was allotted him by Menkaure, but it is his son who completes its dedication (Urk I, 18.10 *ir iz pn in (ni-)sw.t bi.ti mn-k3.w-r' [nh d.t r]di n it(=i)* „As for this tomb, it was the king of UE and LE, Menkaure, [living for ever], who gave (it) to (my) father“), thus making it possible that the tomb (and the ritual inscription in question) was completed as late as the beginning of Dynasty 5, as noted by Barta, *Opferliste*, 47 – as few as seven years span the end of Menkaure's reign and the beginning of Userkaf's (see J. von Beckerath, *Chronologie des pharaonischen Ägypten*, MÄS 46, 1997, 188).

<sup>9</sup> See LD II 35, with its position in funeral service and mortuary cult discussed by J.A. Wilson, in: *JNES* 4, 1944, 213. The priest is described as being „im Redegestus“ at G. Lapp, *Die Opferformel des Alten Reiches*, DAIK Sonderschrift 21, 1986, 148 (§253). The caption accompanying the priest begins *wdn h.t*.

<sup>10</sup> As in the Lisht tomb of Senwosretankh, noted by Barta, *Opferliste*, 98.

<sup>11</sup> Barta, *Opferliste*, 105 with n. 230 stating that in his study he draws upon four „type A/B“ lists, all from Dynasty 18.

before the New Kingdom<sup>12</sup>. It is therefore impossible to know when the ritual represented by this list first entered into temple cult; it may have been employed in this setting only in the New Kingdom, or in the Middle Kingdom, or in the Old Kingdom – conceivably even before the time of Wen<sup>13</sup>. Naturally, one attestation is older than the other, but the question necessarily remains open as to whether one composition was a direct descendent of the earlier, or whether both had a common source.

Whatever its transmission history might have been, the ritual represented by the texts from these two periods erodes the temporal distance between the Old Kingdom and the New Kingdom, creating a situation of textual synchrony despite temporal diachrony<sup>14</sup>. In the process, two settings in life are drawn together which a modern westerner would perhaps have expected to be completely distinct – mortuary cult and temple cult. Whatever its transmission history, this single ritual performed two roles, spanning cultural settings and time.

But its position is not unique: other features of the Pyramid Texts are found in later times and in non-mortuary contexts. In fact, the substance of this observation was made in general terms by Schott quite a while ago, holding that the Pyramid Texts, understood as cultic texts, in part draw from a common textual stock<sup>15</sup>. What I would like to do in

<sup>12</sup> To judge from the fact that, besides two seeming exceptions to be mentioned presently, Barta, *Opferliste*, neither catalogues nor deals with such. The lack corresponds to a general paucity of temple materials, especially inscriptional, from before the New Kingdom. As to the first exception, Barta, *Opferliste*, 61, places the Pepi I fragments from the Abydos Khentimentiu precinct bearing elements of a „type A“ list within the context of „royal offering list“ rather than in temple context proper – feasible, since a king such as Pepi II could have his own cult statue there (see Abydos III at Goedicke, *Königl. Dokumente*, fig. 7, corresponding to Urk. I, 279.3 & 30, where is mentioned items for *[h]3b nb im n twt-nfr-k3-r nt(i) m hwt.t-ntr n(i)t hnti-imn.tiw* „every festival there for the image of Neferkare which is in the temple of Khentimentiu.“) In regards to the second exception, Barta, *Opferliste*, 97, similarly contextualizes fragments from the same place at Abydos of a „type A/B“ list of Mentuhotep Nebhepetre.

<sup>13</sup> Without conjecturing earliest dates of joint use, Barta, *Opferliste*, 105, suggests that the „type A/B“ list was originally used in both temple and mortuary cult settings, before being supplanted by offering rituals of other types beginning to appear in the New Kingdom, on which see *ibid.*, 135–152.

<sup>14</sup> See R. Jakobson, in: D. Lodge (ed.), *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader*, 2000, 33: „Literary studies, with poetics as their focal portion, consist like linguistics of two sets of problems: synchrony and diachrony. The synchronic description envisages not only the literary production of any given stage but also that part of the literary tradition which for the stage in question has remained vital or has been revived.“

<sup>15</sup> See Schott, *Pyramidenkult*, 136–137, who makes note of a „noch mannigfachere Verwendung einer Reihe dieser [Pyramid Texts] Sprüche,“ attesting to „ihr Weiterleben im allgemeinen Kult,“ and who goes on to hold that „Der Kult in den Pyramidentempeln [i.e. for him the Pyramid Texts] schöpft so zum Teil aus einem allgemeinen Textbestand.“ The notion was not entirely new with him, however, since, in a more limited fashion, A. Moret, *Le rituel du culte divin journalier en Égypte*, 1902, 190, had already held that relations between CDJ 54–57 and episodes of the New Kingdom opening of the mouth showed that these stemmed from a common ritual. Since Schott’s discussion, Barta, *Opferliste*, 154, within the context of offering lists, suggested that there initially was not a prominent differentiation between temple and mortuary cult, with both cult forms originally coinciding with a „royal cult“ (*Königskult*). Barta, *Die Bedeutung der Pyramidentexte für den verstorbenen König*, 50, in arguing against the method of H. Altenmüller, *Die Texte zum Begräbnisritual in den Pyramiden des Alten*

what follows is to reinforce this observation and even develop it, through sketching out the contours of a ritual milieu, as evidenced in connections between the Pyramid Texts and two kinds of later ritual texts: temple ritual texts, since these are from a different setting than the mortuary; and the opening of the mouth, since this ritual was employed for the charging of statues for mortuary as well as temple use<sup>16</sup>, thus inherently making easy transit between mortuary and temple settings.

After the use of a single ritual in two different settings, the first dimension of connections is in the close correspondence of rites from the Wenis offering ritual to rites in other rituals besides the Luxor offering list. An example is Pyramid Texts utter. 34:

*Zemern-natron, zemern-natron which opens your mouth!*  
*O Wenis,*  
*may you taste its taste before the booths of the god!*  
*The spit of Horus is zemern;*  
*the spit of Seth is zemern;*  
*the reconciliation of the Two Lords is zemern!*  
*Recite 4 times.*  
*May you be purified in the company of the Followers of Horus!*  
*Southern natron of Nekheb, 5 pellets<sup>17</sup>.*

Reiches, *ÄA* 24, 1972, also supposed that New Kingdom ritual texts (specifically, funeral service texts and representations) as well as the Pyramid Texts might come from a common set of ritual texts, but note that his ultimate point was to assume that the Pyramid Texts as inscribed were not ritual texts. The opposite viewpoint is that the later ritual texts were derived from the Pyramid Texts themselves, as by A. Grimm, in: *GM* 31, 1979, 42, who, after having discussed what he believed to be elements of Pyramid Texts in a text accompanying a ritual scene at Edfu, speaks of the transposition from one genre (mortuary) to another (temple) by sphere of use (i.e. *Sitz im Leben*, or setting). But this is to confound the archaeological pattern of evidence's survival with a cultural transfer of setting.

<sup>16</sup> Its temple use clearly evident at Edfu (see A. Blackman/ H. Fairman, *A Group of Texts Inscribed on the Façade of the Sanctuary in the Temple of Horus at Edfu*, in: *Miscellanea Gregoriana*, 1946, in this context esp. p. 86) and Luxor (see Brunner, *Die südlichen Räume*, pls. 22 and 118 [XIX/101]); one might consider also *Urk.* I, 247.15-16. In full accord with the notion of a permeable boundary between mortuary and temple settings are the points of contact shared by PT 540, the opening of the mouth, and the mirror texts on the exterior south wall of the bark station of the Dynasty 18 temple at Medinet Habu, these points of contact being first observed by K. Sethe, in *ZÄS* 70, 1934, 51-56. In this connection see further H.-W. Fischer-Elfert, *Die Vision von der Statue im Stein. Studien zum altägyptischen Mundöffnungsritual*, 1998, 3 and 52-57, who highlights a series of intertextual connections to see these Medinet Habu texts resuming the opening of the mouth *in nuce*, to form a kind of *version abrégée*. Seldom direct is the genealogical relationship between elements of the opening of the mouth as manifest in the New Kingdom and from such sources as one supposes for it, a factor obscuring prospects for anything like a proper redaction history of the ritual, as observed by Otto, *Mundöffnungsritual* II. 2 – a situation so obscure that, with W. Helck, in: *MDAIK* 22, 1967, 36, one even may see in a few passages „daß die Pyramidentexte entwicklungsgeschichtlich jünger waren als unser Mundöffnungstext.“

<sup>17</sup> PT 34 (Pyr. 26): *zmrn zmrn wpp r3=k / h3 W. / i.dp=k dp.t=f hnti zh.w-ntr / išš.w hr zmrn / išš.w stš zmrn / t(w)t-ib nb.wi zmrn / dd-mdw zp 4 / hzmn=k m-cb šms.w-hr / ntri šm' t3 5 nhb.*

The core of this utterance is the central element both in episode 4 of the New Kingdom opening of the mouth ritual<sup>18</sup> and in episode 59 of the Dynasty 22 pBerlin 3055, a papyrus script for a portion of the „daily temple ritual“<sup>19</sup> for Amun of Karnak<sup>20</sup>. From the latter:

*Utterance of semin-natron, circumambulating 4 times.*

*Recitation:*

*Semin-natron, semin-natron which opens your mouth!*

*May you taste its taste before the booth of the god!*

*O Amun-Re, lord of the thrones of the two lands,  
take the eye of Horus, which he tasted!*

*The spit of Horus is semin;*

*the spit of Thoth is semin;*

*the reconciliation of the Two Lords is semin!*

*Your purity is the purity of the gods, the Followers of Horus!*

*Pure, pure, o Amun-Re, lord of the thrones of the two lands!*

*4 times*<sup>21</sup>.

One notices variations principally in introductory and closing material<sup>22</sup>, but the central content of the texts is nevertheless unmistakably the same<sup>23</sup>. Likewise, there are still other texts from the Wenis offering ritual (PT) which also appear in recognizable form in the opening of the mouth (MÖR) and the Karnak temple ritual (CDJ); they are identified in the following figure:

<sup>18</sup> MÖR 4 a-e. MÖR references the composite edition of Otto, Mundöffnungsritual, vol. i, in the present citation and hereafter, by episode and line designation.

<sup>19</sup> So-called because of its title: CDJ Title (pBerlin 3055 I 1): *h3.t-ε m r3.w n(i)w h.wt ntr irr.wt n pr imn-r3 ni-sw.t ntr.w m hr(it) rε n(i)t rε nb* „Beginning of the utterances of the divine rites which are done in the house of Amun-Re, king of the gods, in the course of the day, every day.“ Properly speaking, the papyrus deals with just a portion of a larger ritual, as it deals only with the preparation of the officiant, the approach to the sanctuary and naos, and the purification and robing of the god's image. CDJ, for „culte divin journalier,“ references Königliche Museen zu Berlin 1901, vol. 1, in the present citation and in those following, by the episodic designation assigned by Moret, Le rituel du culte, and by sheet and line number.

<sup>20</sup> Virtually identical is the Dynasty 22 pBerlin 3014/ 3053 (for Mut) and closely related is the Dynasty 19 Abydos „Kultbildritual“; on their relationship see H. Altenmüller, in: MDAIK 24, 1969, 16, and R. David, A Guide to Religious Ritual at Abydos, 1981, 74-82.

<sup>21</sup> CDJ 59 (pBerlin 3055 XXXIV 2-6): *r3 n(i) zmin r phr h3 zp 4 / dd-mdw / zmin zp 2 wp r3=k / dp=k dp(.t)=f hnti zh-ntr / imn-rε nb ns(.wt) t3.wy / m-n=k ir.t hr dp(.t).nεf / išš n(i) hr zmin / išš n(i) dhwti zmin / twt ib n(i) nb.wi zmin / εb=k εb ntr.w šms hr / wεb zp 2 imn-rε nb ns(.wt) t3.wy / zp 4.*

<sup>22</sup> H. Altenmüller, in: ZDMG, Supplement II, 1974, 9, notes how ritual texts in the Pyramid Texts represent only a part of a whole ritual plan, which would have included recitation text, title, notes, and a depiction. The common denominator of PT 35, MÖR 5, and CDJ 62 is in the recitation.

<sup>23</sup> As noticed by Moret, Le rituel du culte, 202; n. 3. Otto, Mundöffnungsritual, vol. ii, 45, notes the relationship between PT 34 and MÖR 4.

| PT <sup>24</sup> | MÖR <sup>25</sup> | CDJ <sup>26</sup> |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 23               | 69B               |                   |
| 25               |                   |                   |
| 32               |                   |                   |
| 34               | 4                 | 59                |
| 35               | 5                 | 62                |
| 36               | 6                 | 61                |
| 37-57            |                   |                   |
| 72-76            | cf. 55 II         | cf. 54            |
| 77               | 55 II (end)       | 55                |
| 78               | cf. 55 II         | cf. 54            |
| 79-81            |                   |                   |
| 25               |                   |                   |
| 32               |                   |                   |
| 82-171           |                   |                   |

Figure: Correspondences: Wenis Offering Ritual to Rites of Two Later Rituals

To the texts listed in the preceding figure may be added other Pyramid Texts utterances from outside the offering ritual, also found in recognizable form in later rituals<sup>27</sup> – utterances 20<sup>28</sup>, 2<sup>29</sup>, 173<sup>30</sup>, 268<sup>31</sup>, 269<sup>32</sup>, 591<sup>33</sup>, and the frequently encountered utterance 601<sup>34</sup>, found, for example, in the New Kingdom temple meal ritual pChester Beatty IX<sup>35</sup>. With all of these, it is no longer a case of an entire ritual appearing in both mortuary and temple settings, but now of the sharing of individual rites or utterances by

<sup>24</sup> This column lists elements of the offering ritual in the order in which they appear within the pyramid of Wenis by utterance number. For the order of texts, see Allen, *Occurrences of Pyramid Texts*, 48.

<sup>25</sup> The numerals in this column correspond to the designations of the episodes in New Kingdom opening of the mouth ritual exemplars in the composite edition of Otto, *Mundöffnungsritual*.

<sup>26</sup> The numerals in this column correspond to the designations of the episodes of the Dynasty 22 „daily temple ritual“ for Amun of Karnak (pBerlin 3055) by Moret, *Le rituel du culte*.

<sup>27</sup> See further the listings of Allen, *Occurrences of Pyramid Texts*; Altenmüller, *Begräbnisritual*, 54-55; and T.J.C. Baly, in: *JEA* 16, 1930, 184-186.

<sup>28</sup> In later form as MÖR 25, corresponding also to MÖR 45.

<sup>29</sup> In later form as MÖR 26, corresponding in part to MÖR 46.

<sup>30</sup> In later form as MÖR 35.

<sup>31</sup> In later form as MÖR 63.

<sup>32</sup> In later form as MÖR 64.

<sup>33</sup> In later form as CDJ 50 = MÖR 50B.

<sup>34</sup> As recognized by A.H. Gardiner, *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum*, 3d series, 1935 vol. i, 91 with n. 3; see also H. Nelson, in: *JNES* 8, 1949, 325 with n. 119. In this later version, PT 601 has undergone condensation, especially in regard to omission of reciprocal reference to the name of the king, and the series of gods has been slightly altered. In addition, it incorporates statements from accompanying Pyramid Texts utterances, esp. the beginning of PT 600 and also a bit of PT 599. A considerable portion of PT 600 appears in MÖR 54, as noted by Otto, *Mundöffnungsritual*, vol. ii, 120. On PT 600's association with temple ritual representations, see now E. Graefe, in: *Fs Derchain*, 1991, 129-148.

three different rituals: the Wenis offering ritual, the opening of the mouth, and temple ritual. In short, a single text could be employed in rituals of different settings.

After another manner, this phenomenon is evident even internally to the Pyramid Texts themselves, for example through the repetition of Pyramid Texts utterance 32 in different sequences of texts. In the pyramid of Neith, it appears within the aforementioned offering ritual, and it turns up outside it<sup>36</sup>, nestled in among texts of a sort which Assmann calls *s3h.w* or „mortuary liturgies“<sup>37</sup>. Not dealing with the physical presentation of items, as in the offering ritual, the mortuary liturgies fall into another category of ritual altogether, where the act of recitation is itself constitutive of the rite<sup>38</sup>. The mortuary setting is the same, but utterance 32 is being used in two different ritual sequences.

The shared use of rites between the Pyramid Texts and the later rituals is one indication of how the Pyramid Texts participate in a ritual milieu. Another may be found in their sharing of phraseology – distinctive statements found in rites which are otherwise very different. As an example, the liturgical hymns in the Karnak temple ritual repetitively employ a distinctive phraseology after the form of the following:

<sup>35</sup> Called the „Ritual of Amenophis I.“ Nelson, in: JNES 8, 1949, 343-344, argues that pChester Beatty IX (labelled „B“ by him) is „certainly not a ritual for the worship of Amenophis I, but is devoted primarily to the service of Amun of Opet.“ Cf. R. David, *Religious Ritual*, 85, who tells rather than shows that the text represents what she terms „The Ritual of the Royal Ancestors,“ dismissing the fact that it is a god rather than ancestor who is the text's object of worship in stating that Amun of Opet „had connections with the Ancestor cult“ – an ineffectual observation, since the text makes ample reference to Amun of Karnak as well. In contrast, Nelson, in: JNES 8, 1949, 202, recognizes that pChester Beatty IX „seems to complete the ritual found in the Berlin papyrus 3055.“

<sup>36</sup> The rite appears in the offering ritual (Barta 1963 „type A/B“) on the north wall of Neith's burial chamber, with the sequence PT 23-25, 32, 34-42, 32, 43-57, 72-81, 25, 32, 82-96, 108-171, and within the following series on the south wall of the burial chamber: PT 690, 674, 462, 675, 676, 32, 665 (beginning), 468, and 412. For the positions and sequences, see Allen, *Occurrences of Pyramid Texts*, 56.

<sup>37</sup> All except for one of the texts surrounding PT 32 in the second sequence (see preceding note) are in fact members of „*s3h.w* II“ as identified by J. Assmann, *Egyptian Mortuary Liturgies*, in: Fs Lichtheim, 1990, vol. i, 9 and 35-36. The exception is PT 665 (beginning), which however exhibits the most prominent and readily perceptible characteristic of spells of this genre, namely an interpersonal structure where the deceased beneficiary is in the second person and is addressed by an anonymous speaker („0:2“). On this characteristic, see J. Assmann, in: LÄ VI, 1986, 1001, s.v. *Verklärung*, and Assmann, *Mortuary Liturgies*, 9, where it is called the „typical »0:2« form.“

<sup>38</sup> According to the earlier Assmann, in: LÄ VI, 1986, 1002: „Die V. [Verklärung] ist ein Sprechritus (rite oral), der nicht kultische Handlungen begleitet, sondern selbst eine kultische Handlung darstellt und in der Rezitation vollzieht.“ The position is softened at the later Assmann, *Mortuary Liturgies*, 21: „Liturgies consist of recitations and perhaps accompanying performances, while rituals consist of performances with concomitant recitations.“ However, Assmann, in: LÄ VI, 1986, 999; Assmann, *Mortuary Liturgies*, 4; and J. Assmann, *Images et rites de la mort dans l'Égypte ancienne l'apport des liturgies funéraires*, 2000, 81, directly associate the mortuary liturgies with captions such as *s3h.w* 'š3 in *hri-h3b.t* accompanying mortuary ritual scenes from the Old Kingdom, and yet Lapp, *Opferformel*, 184, for his part, concludes nearly the very opposite, that they were the recitations made during the presentation of individual food items contained in the offering list. So far as I know, no attempt has yet been made to reconcile these opposing views.

*Awaken! Be at peace!*

*May you awaken in peace:*

*awaken, o Amun-Re, lord of the thrones of the two lands, in peace!*<sup>39</sup>

As it appears in the Karnak temple ritual, this „morning song“ was recited as the officiating priest was entering the sanctuary<sup>40</sup>. But the phraseology is found not only in the setting of temple cult, but also within the mortuary sphere<sup>41</sup>, appearing in the Pyramid Texts, for example in utterance 81, which deals with ritual robing<sup>42</sup>:

*May you awaken in peace:*

*awaken, o Tait, in peace!*<sup>43</sup>

The New Kingdom phrasing of the statement has added a set of imperatives to the beginning of the formula, and naturally the names of the deities involved are different, but besides these differences the wording of the cited sections is identical<sup>44</sup>. However, entirely different are the larger remainders of the texts, for this reason not presented here: it is only this stock formula which is common to them. Thus one has moved from the presence of the same ritual in different settings and from the same rite in different rituals to the same phraseology in different rites.

This process of employing the same formula in different texts is already at work in the Pyramid Texts, where the „morning song“ appears in four different utterances – this one and utterances 270<sup>45</sup>, 573<sup>46</sup>, and 576<sup>47</sup>. Its presence in multiple utterances shows that the phraseology was not tied to a specific text. This phenomenon is in parallel to the employment of the same rite in different rituals, because those rites were manifestly not ritual specific. In both cases, one is dealing with constituent elements from which different rites and different rituals could be constructed.

Moreover, the circumstances surrounding the usage of the „morning song“ are not unique: found in the Pyramid Texts and in the later rituals are other shared statements such as „I have robed you with the reneut-garment“<sup>48</sup>, „Your water be yours, your flood

<sup>39</sup> CDJ episode 38 (pBerlin 3055 XVI 1-2; see also CDJ 37, 39, 41, and 6): *rs tw htp tw / rs=k m htp rs imn-r nb ns(.wt) t3.wy m htp*. (For the first line of the example, A. Erman, *Hymnen an den Diadem der Pharaonen*, 1911, 20, understands *rs tw htp.ti*, imperative plus 2. m. s. dependent pronoun plus stative.)

<sup>40</sup> As observed by Blackman/Fairman, *Group of Texts*, 426.

<sup>41</sup> In this regard, see also the discussion of Assmann, *Liturgische Lieder*, 182-183.

<sup>42</sup> See Pyr. 57e, which names the object to be manipulated (*wnh.w 2*).

<sup>43</sup> PT 81 (Pyr. 56a): *rs=t m htp / rs t3.i.t m htp*.

<sup>44</sup> Erman, *Hymnen an den Diadem*, 18-20, identifies three basic forms of the „morning song“, whose use extends considerably farther beyond the texts dealt with here.

<sup>45</sup> PT 270 (Pyr. 383a): *rs=k m htp; hr=f-h3=f m htp; m3-h3=f m htp* „May you awaken in peace, o Herhaf, in peace, o Mahaf, in peace!“

<sup>46</sup> PT 573 (Pyr. 1478a-d): *rs=k m htp hzmnw m htp* „May you awaken in peace, o Hezmenu, in peace,“ with this formula repeated for the names of three other beings subsequently.

<sup>47</sup> PT 576 (Pyr. 1502a-b): *rs=k m htp; rs wsir m htp; rs imi-ndit m htp* „May you awaken in peace! Awaken, o Osiris, in peace! Awaken, o one who is in Nedit, in peace!“

be yours<sup>49</sup>, „I have brought you your heart into your body“<sup>50</sup>, and others<sup>51</sup>. This is stock phraseology suitable to multiple rites from both periods. The long-lived currency of these phrases is yet a further indication of textual synchrony, and the suitability of them to rites in mortuary as well as temple ritual is another indication that the milieu to which the phrases belonged comprehended different settings.

Besides the sharing of an entire ritual, of rites, and of phraseology, the last aspect of the participation of the Pyramid Texts in a ritual milieu is in the structuring of the identities of key figures according to patterns for the two chief participants in a ritual, the officiant and the recipient of rite, the worshipper and the worshipped. From the point of view of the role in which each participant is cast, how he is described, and the kinds of actions associated with him, again utterances from the Pyramid Texts are linked with the later rituals.

To begin with the characteristics of the object of worship, in the later rituals he is cast in a number of roles, including Sokar and Osiris<sup>52</sup> but also Horus<sup>53</sup>. In addition, one finds

<sup>48</sup> From CDJ 49 (pBerlin 3055 XXVIII 4-6): From PT 622 (Pyr. 17551-c. Similar, PT 635):

|                                                         |                                        |
|---------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| <i>ḏb3.n(=i) tw &lt;m&gt; ir.t ḥr</i>                   | <i>ḏb3.n(=i) kw m ir.t ḥr</i>          |
| <i>m ḏb3 rnnw(.tit)</i>                                 | <i>rnnw.t(i)t itn nr.t.n n=s ntr.w</i> |
| <i>imn-r nb ns(.wt) t3.wy</i>                           |                                        |
| <i>m-n=k ir.t ḥr ḥd.t {n(i)w} &lt;n(i)t&gt; mw-ntr?</i> |                                        |
| <i>nrw n=k ntr.w</i>                                    | <i>nr n=k ntr.w</i>                    |
| <i>nr n=s ntr.w</i>                                     |                                        |
| <i>mi nr=s n m ir.t ḥr</i>                              | <i>mr nr.t=s n m ir.t ḥr</i>           |

<sup>49</sup> See Gardiner, Hieratic Papyri I, 84, with nn. 8-11.

From pChester Beatty IX Rt. 2, 5-6:

*mw=k n=k*  
*bch=k n=k*  
*bd=k n=k pr im=k*

From PT 436 (Pyr. 788a-c):

*mw=k n=k*  
*bch= n=k*  
  
*rdw pr m ntr*  
*ḥw33.wt pr.t m wsir*  
*i3ii c.wi=k(i)*  
  
*wb3 msdr.wi=k(i)*

Further substantial connections of this pChester Beatty utterance are with PT 450 (Pyr. 833c) and PT 460 (Pyr. 870b).

<sup>50</sup> From CDJ 16 (pBerlin 3055 V 8):

*in.n(=i) n=k ib=k m ḥ.t=k*  
  
*r di.t ḥr s.t=f*  
*mi inn 3s.t ib n(i) z3=s ḥr n=f*  
*r di.t ḥr s.t=f*  
*tz phr*

From PT 595 (Pyr. 1640a-c):

*in.n(=i) n=k ib=k*  
*d(=i) n=k sw m ḥ.t=k*  
  
*mr in.t ḥr ib n(i) mw.t=f 3s.t*  
  
*mr in.t <3s.t> ib n(i) z3=s ḥr.*

<sup>51</sup> As two further examples, cf. PT 313 (Pyr. 503) to CDJ 11 (pBerlin 3055 IV 6); cf. PT 200 (Pyr. 116) to CDJ 21 (pBerlin 3055 VIII 3), the relationship of the latter example noted by Bell, in: JNES 44, 1985, 283.

<sup>52</sup> Sokar, at MÖR 73 h, where the children of Horus bear the beneficiary up like Horus, *w3z=f tw m ntr m rn=k n(i) zkr* „when he raises you up as a god in your name of Sokar,“ employing phraseology appearing in utterances from the Pyramid Texts, as noted by Otto, Mundöffnungsritual, vol. ii, 166 n. 9. Identifications as Sokar and Osiris are perceivable through parallelism at CDJ 44 (pBerlin 3055 XXVI

the recipient of cult named as father<sup>54</sup>, as in opening of the mouth episode 74B, where the lector-priest<sup>55</sup> announces:

*I am Horus,*

*o my father Osiris:*

*let me take hold of the phallus of Seth<sup>56</sup> with my hand<sup>57</sup>!*

In the Pyramid Texts, these same roles (among others) can be performed by the deceased beneficiary<sup>58</sup>, who at times is identified as Horus<sup>59</sup> as well as Sokar<sup>60</sup> and Osiris<sup>61</sup>, and as the father of the priestly officiant, as in Pyramid Texts utterance 662, when the officiant recites:

*O my father Neferkare, arise!*

*Receive this first cold water of yours which came forth from Chemmis<sup>62</sup>!*

Beyond being identified through significant names, the object of rite in the later ritual texts is characterized through description. Notably, he assumes the wereret-crown<sup>63</sup>, has

2): *i.nd-ḥr=k imn-r nb ns(.wt) t3.wy; i.nd-ḥr=k zkr; i.nd-ḥr=k wsir m hrw pn nfr m hnk šc.w* „Hail to you, Amun-Re, lord of the thrones of the two lands; hail to you, Sokar; hail to you, Osiris, on this beautiful day of offering sand!“

<sup>53</sup> In the following, the identity is perceivable through poetic parallelism: CDJ 54 (pBerlin 3055 XXX 9–XXXI 1): *nḥrḥr ib n(i) imn-r nb ns(.wt) t3.wym ḥsfir.t=f n(i)t d.t=f; nḥrḥr ib n(i) hr m ḥsfir.t=f n(i)t d.t=f* „Joyful is the heart of Amun-Re, lord of the thrones of the two lands, at the approach of his eye of his body: joyful is the heart of Horus, at the approach of his eye of his body.“

<sup>54</sup> With the recipient characterized as the father, and the officiant as the son, one is dealing with a set of roles ubiquitously encountered in captions to temple representations and in other temple-related texts, for example in pBerlin 3029 I 14–15 (A. de Buck, in: AnOr 17, 1938, 49): *ii.kw m hr ip.n=i d.t=i smn{n}=i p3.wt ntr.w irii=i k3.wt m ḥw.t-č3.t n it(=i) tm* „I am come as Horus, having come of age, so that I may establish the offerings of the gods, so that I may build a temple for my father Atum“ and in the foundation text of the Dynasty 18 temple at Medinet Habu (P. Barguet, in: RdE 9, 1952, 6–7, ll. 17–18): *ir.n hr n it=f wsir ir.n sw ni-sw.t bi.ti nb t3.wi mn-ḥpr-r n it=f imn nb ns.wt t3.wi* „Just as Horus has acted for his father Osiris, so has the king of UE and LE, the lord of the two lands, Menkheprre, made it for his father Amun, lord of the thrones of the two lands.“ J. Assmann, in: H. Tellenbach (ed.), *Das Vaterbild in Mythos und Geschichte*, 1976, 40–41, supposes that temple cult developed out of mortuary cult, bringing along with it a cultic relationship of son-Horus-officiant to father-Osiris-deceased. The pattern of Horus-son as officiant to Osiris-father as object of (mortuary) cult was perhaps first noticed by A. Rusch, in: ZÄS 53, 1917, 76 n. 2.

<sup>55</sup> As MÖR 74B b (text 7) begins *ḡd-mdw [in ḥri]-ḥ3b.t*.

<sup>56</sup> The phallus of Seth a metaphor for the handles of the door, according to Nelson, in: JNES 8, 1949, 229, or the bolt of the same, according to H. Bonnet, in: Angelos I, 1925, 104, and H. Brunner, *Altägyptische Religion: Grundzüge*, 1989, 89.

<sup>57</sup> MÖR 74B b (similar pChester Beatty IX Rt. 3, 7–8): *ink hr / it=i wsir / ndr=i n=k ḥnn n(i) stš m dr.t=i*.

<sup>58</sup> Because the deceased beneficiary may also appear as officiant, as is drawn out below, it is obviously reciprocally the case that the role of object may be played by those other than him.

<sup>59</sup> As at PT 264 (Pyr. 346a-b): *ḡi.t(i) n=f i.ḥ.t in nḥb-k3.w hr is 3ḥ.ti is* „Let something be given him by Nehebkau, as Horus, as the Horizoner“.

<sup>60</sup> As at PT 483 (Pyr. 1013b-d): *wdn sw wrš.w pi sḥ sw wrš.w nḥn zkr is ḥnt(i) pḡ.w-š hr ḥ3 ḥmn* „let the watchers of Pe install him, the watchers of Nekhen ennoble him, as Sokar Foremost of Pedju-Esh, and Horus, Ha, and Hemen.“

<sup>61</sup> As at PT 637 (Pyr. 1804a): *it n=k wrr.t=sn ḥpr.ti m ir.w wsir* „Take possession of their (the gods following Osiris) wereret-crown, being equipped with the form of Osiris“.

<sup>62</sup> PT 662 (Pyr. 1877c-d): *it(=i) N. ḥc / šzp n=k qbḥ=k ipn tpiw pr.w m 3ḥ-bi.t*.

power<sup>64</sup>, and is a possessor of awe, the latter as in Karnak temple ritual episode 35:

*May you appear among them (the gods) as lord of fear,  
with awe of you coming to be among them*<sup>65</sup>.

The deceased beneficiary of the Pyramid Texts can be described in similar fashion: he assumes the wereret-crown<sup>66</sup>, has power<sup>67</sup>, and is a possessor of awe, the latter as in utterance 412:

*Let terror of you come to be in the heart(s) of the gods!*<sup>68</sup>

Finally, the object of worship is the recipient of ritual action: he is clothed<sup>69</sup> purified<sup>70</sup>, protected by the eye of Horus<sup>71</sup> or of Re<sup>72</sup>, and he receives items such as his head<sup>73</sup>, the eye of Horus<sup>74</sup>, and offerings<sup>75</sup>, as in pChester Beatty IX:

<sup>63</sup> CDJ 54 (pBerlin 3055 XXXII 5), where Geb gives the god his inheritance, his voice being true against his opponents, *is it n=k wrr.t hnti ntr.w tp(i)w t3* „you having taken the wereret-crown even before the gods who are upon earth.“ MÖR 55 III d, where the beneficiary is justified against his enemies, *it n=k wrr.t hnti ntr.w* „you having seized the wereret-crown before the gods“.

<sup>64</sup> CDJ 23 (pBerlin 3055 IX 6-7): *htp zp 2 b3 nh hw hft(i)w=f b3=k hn=k shm=k r-gs=k* „At peace (twice), o living Ba which smites his enemies, your Ba with you, your power beside you!“ MÖR 52 h (a text appearing also as CDJ 52): *wr ph.ty=f, h3=s m h3.t[=f; hw]=f shm=f m ntr.w nb.w* „His power is great, with her (the eye of Re) appearing in [his] brow, him [being protected,] him having power over all the gods“.

<sup>65</sup> CDJ 35 (pBerlin 3055 XII 9): *h3=k im=sn m nb snd / hpr šfy.w=k im=sn*.

<sup>66</sup> PT 422 (Pyr. 753b): *wrr.t=k n=k tp=k* „let your wereret-crown be yours upon you.“

<sup>67</sup> As at PT 214 (Pyr. 139c), where the deceased ascends to the place where his father Geb is *di=f n=k im(i)t h3.(t) hr b3=k im=s shm=k im=s* „so that he may give you what is in the brow of Horus, so that you may be a Ba by it, so that you may have control of it.“

<sup>68</sup> PT 412 (Pyr. 724a): *hpr š3.t=k r ib ntr.w*.

<sup>69</sup> A principal object of temple ritual and the opening of the mouth being the robing of the god; see Otto 1960 vol. II 37 with n. 1. CDJ 35 (pBerlin 3055 XII 7): *ii ntr db3.w m h3.w=f* „The god comes, even adorned of his body....“ MÖR Title-1 a-b, where the opening of the mouth is performed for the image, with it *h3ii.w m t3 hrw mnht h3=f* „naked in the earth, on the day when clothing is to be around it“.

<sup>70</sup> CDJ 26 (pBerlin 3055 X 8-9): Horus and Thoth are come, *b=s<n> tw m mw n(i)w nww m t3.w n(i)w nhb di=sn md.t n h3.ti=k mnht n h3.w=k nb.(w)* with them purifying you with the water of Nu, and with (incense)-pellets of Nekheb, with them putting salve to your forehead, and clothing to all your body....“ MÖR 62 x: *ms.ti r=s sw3b=s t(w) m sntr* „betake yourself to it (the nemset-vessel as goddess) so that it may purify you with incense“.

<sup>71</sup> CDJ 1 (pBerlin 3055 I 4-5): the eye of Horus is given to Horus, *hr hr ir.t=f ir.t hr hr. dr hft(i)w n(i)w [i]mn-r nb ns.(wt) t3.w m s.(w)t=sn nb.w(t)* „with Horus upon his eye, the eye of Horus driving out the opponents of Amun-Re, the lord of the thrones of the Two Lands, from all their places“.

<sup>72</sup> MÖR 52 b-g: *h3 ir.t r ... mi (i)r=t m-hnt=s; h3=t m h3.t=s; hw=t s(t) mk=t s(t)* „Let the eye of Re appear... Come then before her, (o eye of Re,) and appear in her brow, protecting her, guarding her“.

<sup>73</sup> CDJ 47 (pBerlin 3055 XXVII 5-6): *m-n=k mw imyw ir.t hr dšr.t, b n=k ir.t=k, b n=k tp=k, b <n=k> qs.w=k, smn n=k tp=k r qs.w=k* „Take the water which is in the red eye of Horus, your eye joined to you, your head joined to you, your bones joined <to you>, your head made firm upon your bones for you“.

<sup>74</sup> CDJ 35 (pBerlin 3055 XII 9): *m-n=k st rdi(=i) n=k st ir.t hr pw* „Take it, as I give it to you. It is the eye of Horus.“ MÖR 44 e: *m-n=t hps ir.t hr hph* „Take the foreleg, the eye of Horus, the Khepekh“.

<sup>75</sup> CDJ 26 (pBerlin 3055 X 11): *wdn.tw n=k h3 m h3.wt nb.(wt) hr. h3w.wt=k n(i)w d3m.w* „Let there be offered to you a thousand things upon your altars of electrum“. MÖR 65C a: *sm mz t r wsh.t r n k3.w*

*Be pure, o Amun!  
Receive your bread,  
receive your incense,  
receive your divine offerings which are the eye of Horus!*<sup>76</sup>

The deceased in the Pyramid Texts can likewise appear as the recipient of these actions: he is clothed<sup>77</sup>, purified<sup>78</sup>, protected by the eye of Horus<sup>79</sup>, and he receives items such as his head<sup>80</sup>, the eye of Horus<sup>81</sup>, and offerings, as in utterance 223:

*Just as a god is provided with divine offerings,  
so is Neferkare provided with this bread of his.*<sup>82</sup>

To sum up so far, the character of the deceased beneficiary in the Pyramid Texts can reflect the same character as the object of worship in the later ritual texts. Possessing characteristics appropriate to the object of rite in temple ritual and in the opening of the mouth, the deceased in such circumstances may be understood as filling this role<sup>83</sup>.

But the deceased beneficiary in the Pyramid Texts can also be presented as possessing characteristics appropriate to the role of the officiant in the later ritual texts<sup>84</sup>, though presumably on a plane different than that of human action.

In the later texts, the officiant may take on a number of divine guises, including Thoth<sup>85</sup> and Horus<sup>86</sup>, and indeed specifically the son, as in opening of the mouth episode 25:

*n(i) N. n r<sup>c</sup> n k<sup>j</sup>.w=f*, „Sem-priest: bring bread to the broad-hall of Re for the provisioning of N., for Re, for his provisioning“.

<sup>76</sup> Gardiner's episode 9 of pChester Beatty IX Rt. 2, 1-2: *w<sup>c</sup>b imn / šzp n=k t=k / šzp n=k sntr=k / šzp n=k htp-ntr imy ir.t-hr*.

<sup>77</sup> As at PT 473 (Pyr. 937c-d): The Akhs are told that Pepi will come with them, *hbs P. pn m hbs.t=tn im; wrh P. pn m wrh.t=tn im* „this Pepi being clothed with that with which you are clothed, this Pepi being anointed by that by which you are anointed“.

<sup>78</sup> As at PT 676 (Pyr. 2012b-c): the deceased is bidden to rise, *w<sup>d</sup>.n inp hnti zh-ntr w<sup>c</sup>b.t(i)=k m 8.t=k nms.t 8.t ʿb.t* „for Anubis foremost of the god's booth has commanded that you be purified with your eight nemset-jars and eight a'abet-jars“.

<sup>79</sup> As at PT 260 (Pyr. 320a): *iw nh.t W. m ir.t=f; iw mk.t W. m ir.t<=f>* „Wenis's shelter is his eye; Wenis's protection is <his> eye“; Wenis is Horus in this utterance; see Pyr. 316a.

<sup>80</sup> As at PT 17 (Pyr. 10b): *ḏd-mdw ḏhwty d(=i) n=f tp=f ir=f* „Recitation of Thot: Let me set him his head upon him“.

<sup>81</sup> As at PT 106 (Pyr. 69b-c): *iw.n(=i) in(.n=i) n=k ir.ti hr n(i)t ḏ.t=f; ndr sn iwn n=k sn* „I [the officiant as Horus] have come even having brought you Horus's own eyes“.

<sup>82</sup> PT 223 (Pyr. 215a): *htm ntr m htp-ntr / htm N. m t=f pn*.

<sup>83</sup> One would have expected this anyway: it goes without saying that the deceased was the object of daily cult in the pyramid temple above his tomb chambers; finding him cast as the recipient of rite in the texts of his tomb is in full accord with this state of affairs.

<sup>84</sup> That the owner of mortuary texts may be stated in them as performing a sacerdotal role has been documented already for the Coffin Texts by H. Willems, in: Fs Te Velde, 1997, most explicitly at pp. 349, 360, and 364; and H. Willems, The Coffin of Heqata (Cairo JdE 36418), OLA 70, 1996, most explicitly at pp. 377 fig. 79 and 380.

<sup>85</sup> As at MÖR 71 k: *ii.n(=i) n=k ink ḏhwty sn.t(i)=k* „to you have I come, (o Re); I am Thoth, one like you“; CDJ 22 (pBerlin 3055 VIII 9): *i.n=i hr=k imn-r<sup>c</sup> ink ḏhwty* „to you have I come, o Amun-Re; I am Thoth“.

*I am your son, beloved of you;  
for you have I opened your mouth.<sup>87</sup>*

In the Pyramid Texts, the deceased beneficiary may appear in the same roles – as an officiating Thoth<sup>88</sup> as Horus<sup>89</sup>, and as the son, for example in utterance 310, where the deceased says:

*Wenis is Horus:  
Wenis has come after his father:  
Wenis has come after Osiris.<sup>90</sup>*

In the later temple ritual, the officiant like the recipient is described as being pure<sup>91</sup>, and, even as the recipient of cult is fear-inspiring, his worshipper, reciprocally, is one who is in fear, as in episode 17 of the Karnak temple ritual:

*Hail, Amun-Re, lord of the thrones of the Two Lands,  
let fear of you be in my body,  
awe of you throughout my limbs!<sup>92</sup>*

In accord with this description, in the Pyramid Texts the deceased beneficiary is said to be pure and can appear in a state of fear, as in utterance 220:

*He has come even before you, o Great One;  
he has come even before you, o Great of Magic,  
him pure for you, him in fear of you.<sup>93</sup>*

Finally, in terms of what he does, the officiant in the later rituals performs service for the god, as when presenting him with items, such as the eye of Horus<sup>94</sup>, or bread, for example in pChester Beatty IX:

*Your bread be yours,  
your beer be yours,  
so that you may live upon that upon which Re lives.  
It is the priest who brought them to you within your temple.<sup>95</sup>*

<sup>86</sup> As in MÖR 74B b, cited above. CDJ 5 (pBerlin 3055 II 6): *ink hr hr(i) p.t nfr šfy nb nr.w ʿš šfy qʿ šw(.ti) ʿš m ʿbqdw* „I am Horus, the one over the sky, beautiful of awe, lord of terror, one great of awe, raised of plumes, the great one in Abydos“.

<sup>87</sup> MÖR 25 b: *ink zʿ=k mr=k / wp.n(=i) n=k rʿ=k*; MÖR 25 b (text 62) gives simply *ink zʿ=k wp.n(=i) n=k rʿ=k*, omitting „beloved of you“.

<sup>88</sup> As at PT 524 (Pyr. 1233b): *P. pw dhwti nd tn* „Pepi is Thoth who protects you, (o two Enneads)“.

<sup>89</sup> As at PT 313 (Pyr. 503b): *ir=sn wʿ.t n W. swʿ W. im=s W. pi hr* „Let them make a way for Wenis so that Wenis may pass upon it, (for) Wenis is Horus“.

<sup>90</sup> Pyr. 493a: *W. pw hr / i.n W. m-ht it=f / i.n W. m-ht wsir*.

<sup>91</sup> CDJ 65 (pBerlin 3055 XXXVI 6-7): *wʿb.n.tw hr sntr.n=f tw m ir.t=f n(i)t d.t=f* „Just as Horus has been purified, so has he censured you with his eye of his body“.

<sup>92</sup> CDJ 17 (pBerlin 3055 VI 1): *i.nd-hr=k imn-rʿ nb ns(.wt) tʿ.wi / snd.t=k m h.t=i / šfšf=k m-ht hʿ.w=i*.

<sup>93</sup> PT 220 (194c-d): *iw.n=f hr=t wr.t / iw.n=f hr=t wr.t-hkʿ.w / wʿb n=t snd n=t*.

<sup>94</sup> MÖR 3 (text 83): *ʿšb=i (< ʿb=i) n=k ir(t) hr* „let me join to you the eye of Horus“; CDJ 7 (pBerlin 3055 III 4): *i.n=i in.n=i n=k ir.t hr* „I have come even having brought you the eye of Horus“.

<sup>95</sup> Gardiner's episode 9 of pChester Beatty IX Rt. 2, 3: *t=k n=k / hnq.t=k n=k / ʿnh=k m ʿnh(t) rʿ im=sn in hm-ntr in n=k sn m-hnty hw.t-ntr=k*. Note that *wʿb* rather than *wʿb.w* is read, in conformity with the observation of Gardiner, Hieratic Papyri, vol. i, 84 n. 5.

Likewise, the deceased in the Pyramid Texts can also perform services for the god, presenting him with such items as the eye of Horus<sup>96</sup> and bread<sup>97</sup>. The deceased's performance of priestly service comes forth with crystal clarity in utterance 477:

*To you has Neferkare come, o lord;  
to you has Neferkare come, Osiris,  
so that Neferkare may dry your face,  
so that Neferkare may clothe you with a god's clothing,*

...

*so that Neferkare may perform priestly service for you.*<sup>98</sup>

Thus even as the deceased in the Pyramid Texts may be cast in the role of the object of worship, so also may he be cast as the officiant. In such cases as this, clearly the ritual references must be only that – references, allusions, with the texts not constituting recitations which would have accompanied any physical actions<sup>99</sup>, for a dead man cannot perform them in the concrete world. Rather they must be denoting his situation in the incorporeal world<sup>100</sup>.

To sum everything up, a spectrum of points of contact between a layer of Pyramid Texts and the later temple and opening of the mouth rituals has been traversed: shared rites, phraseology, and role structures. These points of contact serve to pull the bodies of texts toward one another, despite the temporal distance between them; one perceives a measure of textual synchrony.

This is important, since the textual synchrony is between texts from different settings. Besides the opening of the mouth, which already flows between the mortuary and temple settings, there is at least one other ritual which was at home in both temple and tomb, the offering ritual at Luxor and in Wenis. Moreover, we have seen that a number of rites were manifestly not ritual specific, finding place in mortuary, temple, and opening of the

<sup>96</sup> As at PT 524 (Pyr. 1235c-d): *is p3 gb P. pn ir p.t šd P. pn ir.t hr n=f*, „Indeed Geb flies Pepi to the sky that Pepi may take out the Eye of Horus to him (i.e. to Horus)“. Note the position of the suffix dative: it here follows a noun object as it can do elsewhere, with that object containing the referent of the pronoun. The phenomenon is discussed at G. Lefebvre, *Grammaire de l'égyptien classique*, 2d ed. rev., BdE 12, 1955, §583, where an example of similar phraseology is presented.

<sup>97</sup> As at PT 301 (Pyr. 448a-b), where Shu and Tefenet are bidden *i.dd=tn n it=tn wn.t rdi.n n=tn W. p3.wt=tn štp.n tn W. m twt=tn*, „may you tell your father that Wenis has given you your offering loaves, that Wenis has satisfied you with your \*due“.

<sup>98</sup> PT 477 (Pyr. 967a-968c): *i.n N. hr=k nb / i.n N. hr=k wsir / isk N. hr=k hbs tw N. m hbs ntr / ... / wcb N. n=k*. On the last line, cf. versions of P and M; the delay of the suffix dative suggests an original 1st person.

<sup>99</sup> And therefore one might infer that even utterances situating the deceased in the role of an officiant may also be non-ritual utterances, thus only making allusion to ritual situations. According to J. Allen, in: Fs Leclant, 1994, 18, spells within the antechamber and corridor of Wenis's pyramid are „primarily non-ritual – meant for the personal use of the king's spirit as it makes its way to the next world“, with a similar view to be found at Assmann, *Mortuary Liturgies*, 14. Utterances situated there and cited above are PT 260 at n. 79, 270 at n. 45, 301 at n. 97, and 313 at nn. 51 and 89.

<sup>100</sup> This is of interest, for it shows how references to ritual acts, which in themselves are necessarily physical, can yet be employed figuratively: concrete ritual comes to signify the abstract, incorporeal state.

mouth rituals. Further, in this and in the sharing of phraseology by different rites, we meet with constituent elements from which different rites and different rituals could be constructed; the formulae belong to no specific rite, and the rites belong to no specific ritual, but all appear in mortuary, temple, and opening of the mouth texts. Finally, the characteristics of both of the two basic participants in the ritual texts, the worshipper and the worshipped, appear in the Pyramid Texts in association with the deceased beneficiary. In sum, with an evidently permeable boundary between them, one may conceive of the mortuary and temple settings as situated within a ritual milieu comprehending them both.

# STUDIEN ZUR ALTÄGYPTISCHEN KULTUR

Herausgegeben von  
Hartwig Altenmüller  
unter Mitwirkung von  
Nicole Kloth

Band 30 – 2002



HELMUT BUSKE VERLAG HAMBURG