

CHRONIQUE  
D'ÉGYPTE

LXVII (1992)

Fasc. 134

— EXTRAIT —



FONDATION ÉGYPTOLOGIQUE REINE ÉLISABETH  
EGYPTOLOGISCHE STICHTING KONINGIN ELISABETH

BRUXELLES

BRUSSEL

# SOMMAIRE — INHOUD

## ÉGYPTE PHARAONIQUE — FARAONISCH EGYPTE

### Études — Artikelen

- Andrey O. BOLSHAKOV, Princess *Hm.t-Rc(w)*: the First Mention of Osiris? 203  
Eric VAN ESSCHE-MERCHEZ, La syntaxe formelle des reliefs et de la grande inscription de l'an 8 de Ramsès III à Médinet Habou . . . . . 211  
Karl JANSEN-WINKELN, Zu einigen religiösen und historischen Inschriften 240

### Livres — Recensies

- Silvio CURTO-Laura DONADONI, *Bernardino Drovetti Epistolario* (A. Mekhitarian) . . . . . 260  
Günther LAPP, *Die Opferformel des Alten Reiches unter Berücksichtigung einiger späterer Formen* (Michel Valloggia) . . . . . 260  
Georges POSENER, *Cinq figurines d'envoûtement* (Baudouin van de Walle †) 263  
William A. WARD, *Essays on Feminine Titles of the Middle Kingdom and Related Subjects* (H. De Meulenaere) . . . . . 265  
Hans-Werner FISCHER-ELFERT, *Die satirische Streitschrift des Papyrus Anastasi I. Uebersetzung und Kommentar* (Michael Green) . . . . . 267  
Hans-Werner FISCHER-ELFERT, *Literarische Ostraka der Ramessidenzeit in Uebersetzung* (Jésus Lopez) . . . . . 271  
Karola ZIBELIUS-CHEN, *Die ägyptische Expansion nach Nubien. Eine Darstellung der Grundfaktoren* (David Berg) . . . . . 273  
Peter DER MANUELIAN, *Studies in the Reign of Amenophis II* (Michel Defosse) . . . . . 275  
Raphael VENTURA, *Living in a City of the Dead* (C. J. Eyre) . . . . . 277  
Patricia SPRINGBORG, *Royal Persons. Patriarchal Monarchy and the Feminine Principle* (Bernard Van Rinsveld) . . . . . 281  
Sylvie CAUVILLE, *Essai sur la théologie du temple d'Horus à Edfou* (Philippe Germond) . . . . . 282  
Friedrich JUNGE, *Elephantine XI: Funde und Bauteile. 1.-7. Kampagne, 1969-1976* (H. De Meulenaere) . . . . . 289  
Piotr BIENKOWSKI-Edmund SOUTHWORTH, *Egyptian Antiquities in the Liverpool Museum, I: A List of Provenanced Objects* (Jeanne Bulté) 291  
Giorgio CAREDDU, *Museo Barrocco di scultura antica. La collezione egizia* (A. Mekhitarian) . . . . . 292  
M. L. BIERBRIER, *The British Museum Hieroglyphic Texts from Egyptian Stelae etc., Part 11* (Erhart Graefe) . . . . . 293  
Patricia V. PODZORSKI, *Their Bones Shall not Perish. An Examination of Predynastic Human Skeletal Remains from Naga-ed-Deir in Egypt* (André Leguèbe) . . . . . 295

## ÉGYPTE GRÉCO-ROMAINE — GRIEKS-ROMEINS EGYPTE

### Études — Artikelen

- Paul SCHUBERT, Annulation de contrat (?) . . . . . 297  
P. J. SJPESTEIJN, Delenda papyrologica . . . . . 305  
Naphtali LEWIS, Papyrus in Classical Antiquity: An Update . . . . . 308

Voir suite couverture p. 3  
Vervolg omslag p. 3

Jean BINGEN, Le décret du synode sacerdotal de 243 avant notre ère . . . . .	319
P. J. SJPSTEIJN, A Remark on <i>SB V 7905</i> . . . . .	328
Bernard BOYAVAL, Les épithètes funéraires de Kom Abou Billou . . . . .	329
Adam LAJTAR, Isopsephy in a Greek Inscription from Wadi Haggag, Sinai . . . . .	332
Wilfried VAN RENGEM, L'inscription de Syène <i>I.Th.Sy. 237</i> . . . . .	335
Walter E. H. COCKLE, The Breaking of an Altar at Mons Claudianus ( <i>IG Pan 37</i> ) . . . . .	337

### Chronique — Kroniek

Andrea JÖRDENS, <i>CPR XVIII</i> . . . . .	341
--	-----

### Papyrus littéraires et documents — Literaire papyri en dokumenten

Klaus MARESH - Zola M. PACKMAN, <i>Papyri from the Washington University Collection, Part II (P. Wash. Univ. II) (Jean A. Straus)</i> . . . . .	359
Marc HUYS, <i>Papyri Bruxellenses Graecae. Volume II [P. Brux. II] (Didier Marcotte)</i> . . . . .	361
Paul SCHUBERT, <i>Les archives de Marcus Lucretius Diogenes et textes apparentés [P. Diog.] (Jean Bingen)</i> . . . . .	364
Jaakko FRÖSÉN - Dieter HAGEDORN, <i>Die verkohlten Papyri aus Bubastos (Pap. Bub.). Band I (Marie Drew-Bear)</i> . . . . .	369

### Livres — Recensies

Maryline G. PARCA, <i>Ptocheia or Odysseus in Disguise at Troy (P. Köln VI 245) (Jean Lenaerts)</i> . . . . .	372
Reinhold MERKELBACH - Maria TOTTI, <i>Abrasax. Ausgewählte Papyri religiösen und magischen Inhalts. Band 1: Gebete (Michèle Mertens)</i> . . . . .	373
Christine HARRAUER, <i>Meliouchos. Studien zur Entwicklung religiöser Vorstellungen in griechischen synkretistischen Zaubertexten (Jean Winand)</i> . . . . .	375
Julian KRÜGER, <i>Oxyrhynchos in der Kaiserzeit. Studien zur Topographie und Literaturrezeption (Paola Pruneti)</i> . . . . .	377
Joseph MÊLÈZE-MODRZEJEWSKI, <i>Les Juifs d'Égypte, de Ramsès II à Hadrien (Thérèse Liebmann-Frankfort)</i> . . . . .	379
<i>Mélanges Étienne Bernand (Jean Bingen)</i> . . . . .	383
<i>L'Égypte en Périgord. Dans les pas de Jean Clédat. Catalogue raisonné de l'exposition. Musée du Périgord, 16 mai - 15 septembre 1991 (Marguerite Rassart-Debergh)</i> . . . . .	387

## ÉGYPTE CHRÉTIENNE — CHRISTELIJK EGYPTE

### Livres — Recensies

Monika R. M. HASITZKA, <i>Corpus Papyrorum Raineri Archeducis Austriae, XII (Leo Depuydt)</i> . . . . .	389
Douglas M. PARROTT, <i>Nag Hammadi Codices III, 3-4 and V, 1, with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 3 and Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1081. Eugnostos and The Sophia of Jesus Christ (Jean Bingen)</i> . . . . .	390
Anne BOUVAREL-BOUD'HORS, <i>Catalogue des fragments coptes, I. Fragments bibliques nouvellement identifiés (Bruce M. Metzger)</i> . . . . .	391
Julius ASSFALG - Paul KRÜGER, <i>Petit Dictionnaire de l'Orient chrétien (Jean Bingen)</i> . . . . .	391

## Princess *H.M.T-Rr(W)* : The First Mention of Osiris ?

THE idea of Osiris is among the central ones in the Egyptian *Weltanschauung*. Meanwhile, the early monuments do not mention this god and the first half of the Old Kingdom does without the Osirian ideology. Thus, the appearance of Osiris in the inscriptions is a turning-point in the development of the whole *Weltanschauung* <sup>(1)</sup> and so the dating of this moment as exactly as possible is an urgent necessity.

The earliest records of Osiris on the royal monuments are obvious — these are in the Pyramid Texts of *Wnjs* <sup>(2)</sup>. The case is somewhat more difficult if speaking about the inscriptions of the private persons, but anyway it is usual to date the appearance of Osiris in Giza tombs to the late Dyn. V — the early Dyn. VI <sup>(3)</sup> and in Saqqara to a little earlier time, most probably to the reign of *Jzzj* <sup>(4)</sup>. At any rate, there are no trustworthy records of Osiris in the reign of *N(j)-wsr-rr(w)* yet <sup>(5)</sup>.

These facts are well known and the absence of Osiris in the inscriptions until at least the second half of Dyn. V is one of the axioms of Egyptology <sup>(6)</sup>. However, during the last decade the assertion was

(1) Certainly, the concept of Osiris is much older, but the fact of transformation of the god whose name could not be recorded into the god mentioned openly is a matter of principle.

(2) The problem of the existence of the papyrus record of the Pyramid Texts is both important and complicated, but it bears no direct relation to the topic discussed (see note 1).

(3) JUNKER, *Giza* IV, 18.

(4) E.g., *N(j)-kꜣ(j)-ꜣnḥ*, D 48 (BM 1275) — *Hier. Texts*, I<sup>2</sup>, pl. 21-1; *Wr-jr(.t)-n(j)-pḥ* (BM 718) — *ibid.*, pl. 28, 29-1; *ꜣnḥ(j)-m-ꜣ-kꜣ(j)*, D 16 — MARIETTE, *Les mastabas de l'Ancien Empire*, 214-218; *Snḏm-jb(j)*, D 28 — *ibid.*, p. 259; *Htp-ḥr-ꜣḥ.t(j)*, D 60 — HOLWERDA and others, *Beschreibung der ägyptischen Sammlung* I, Taf. 17-18; *Tjj*, D 22 — STEINDORFF, *Das Grab des Ti*, Taf. 45, 109, 135-136, 139-140; etc.

(5) E.g., they are absent in the tomb of *N(j)-ꜣnḥ-ḥnw(w)* and *Hnm(w)-ḥtp(w)* typical for that time — MOUSSA-ALTENMÜLLER, *Das Grab des Nianchchnum und Chnumchotep*.

(6) See GRIFFITHS, *The Origins of Osiris and his Cult*, 113-114.

published several times that the first mention of Osiris dates back to the late Dyn. IV — the early Dyn. V. This assertion is based on the new dating of the tomb of princess *Hm.t-rr(w)* at Giza that was excavated half a century ago (1).

J. Málek, the first who proposed the new dating, was rather careful yet and he supposed the tomb of *Hm.t-rr(w)* to belong to « middle to end Dyn. IV or Dyn. V » (2), but his followers were categorical. B. Begelsbacher-Fischer was sure the tomb belonged to the late Dyn. IV — the early Dyn. V (3). Y. Harpur dated the tomb to the reigns of *Špss-k3.f* — *Wsr-k3.f* (4) or even of *Hr(j).f-rr(w)* — *Wsr-k3.f* (5). If it corresponds to reality, our view-point on many aspects of the Old Kingdom *Weltanschauung* is to be changed. But the conclusions made on the basis of the single monument rather difficult for interpretation are obscure. Our doubts increase when we check up how the dating was made. Only the book by Harpur shows the method of dating, giving us a possibility of such a control and it becomes clear that the dating of *Hm.t-rr(w)*'s tomb was made in an offhand manner, without due regard to the importance of the problem. And what is more, we shall see that Harpur's dating is at variance with many criteria ascertained by the author herself.

Thus we must verify all the circumstances connected with the tomb of *Hm.t-rr(w)* and try to date it as exactly as possible.

At first sight some facts may be regarded as testifying to the early dating, but a more careful examination shows that neither any of them nor the whole complex is conclusive.

1. *Hm.t-rr(w)* is King's daughter of his body and her tomb is situated in the Central Field of Giza (6) where the relatives of *Hr(j).f-rr(w)* are buried. It compels some specialists to regard her as the daughter of *Hr(j).f-rr(w)* and, consequently, to suppose her tomb to have been carved and decorated not later than at the very beginning of Dyn. V. However, there are no reasons to regard her as the daughter of *Hr(j).f-rr(w)*. The Central Field is published rather inadequately, its topography has not been studied well enough, the problems arisen by its

(1) HASSAN, *Excavations at Giza*, VI/3, 43-65.

(2) PM III<sup>2</sup>, 243.

(3) BEGELSBACHER-FISCHER, *Untersuchungen zur Götterwelt des Alten Reiches*, 121, Anm. 2.

(4) HARPUR, *Decoration in Egyptian Tombs of the Old Kingdom*, 35.

(5) *Ibid.*, 268. This supposition is quite surprising since the cartouche of *Špss-k3.f* is present in the tomb.

(6) See HASSAN, *op. cit.*, General Plan.

materials have not been discussed sufficiently well, and so the chronological sequence of the tombs is not established exactly enough. True, the tomb of *Hm.t-rr(w)* is cut in the cliff slope not far from the tombs of the wives and children of *Hr(j).f-rr(w)* (1), but this fact means nothing by itself — at the present stage of investigating the Central Field a possibility of intruding a later tomb among the earlier ones can not be excluded. Finally, even if the tomb in question is approximately synchronous to the adjacent ones, it does not mean that it was originally intended for *Hm.t-rr(w)* and that it was decorated just after hewing. On the contrary, there are some reasons to suppose the opposite. The tomb of *Hm.t-rr(w)* of the total area of 73,74 sq.m. (2) is one of the largest in the Central Field indicating that it was destined for a person of a very high position. Meanwhile, *Hm.t-rr(w)* by no means is the person of such a position. Her husband is never mentioned or represented in her tomb — most probably he was already dead by the moment of decorating and was buried in some other place. Judging by the low titles of the children (they are *jr(j).w h(j) n(j)-sw.t*) they could not inherit any posts of importance from their father. Most probably *Hm.t-rr(w)* was not one of the senior princesses who took part in the dynastic marriages (3). But it means that the tomb is too good for her and we can suppose the utilization of the tomb unused before. Indeed, only the lintels and the pillars are decorated in the chapel. *Hm.t-rr(w)* must have occupied the unused tomb made for some of the nearest relatives of *Hr(j).f-rr(w)* since belonging to the same kin she had a formal reason to do it. Later we shall see that a number of the decoration peculiarities prove our supposition.

2. The names of all estates of *Hm.t-rr(w)* but one include the cartouche of *Hr(j).f-rr(w)* (4) which seems to confirm that *Hm.t-rr(w)* is the daughter of the king in question. True, the king's cartouche in the names of the private person's estates testifies to some ties of relation-

(1) *Ibid.*, 64; REISNER, *A History of the Giza Necropolis*, I, 220.

(2) REISNER, *op. cit.*, 228-229.

(3) Side by side with the title «King's daughter of his body» is *Hm.t-rr(w)* entitled «King's eldest daughter of his body», but this fact does not disprove our reasoning. The titles of the pattern *z3 sms.w / z3.t sms.t* are still difficult for interpretation (see SCHMITZ, *Untersuchungen zum Titel sz-njswt*, 91-102, 109-133); anyway they most probably have nothing to do with the primogeniture. Thus, *Hm.t-rr(w)* can be one of the late infants and a daughter of a minor queen.

(4) HASSAN, *op. cit.*, fig. 37-38.

ship, but, anyway, it does not mean that the owner of the estates is the immediate offspring of the king. Since the early Old Kingdom court was essentially one large family with very complicated relations, the estates could change hands in the most unexpected ways, and so the estates named after  $Hr(j).f-rr(w)$  could belong to one of his distant descendants, not to his daughter.

3. One of the scribes of  $Hm.t-rr(w)$  is named  $\check{S}pss-k\check{z}.f-rrh(w)$  <sup>(1)</sup> and for some reason this fact was interpreted as the grounds for dating the tomb to the reigns of  $\check{S}pss-k\check{z}.f$  or  $Wsr-k\check{z}.f$ . Meanwhile, *termini ante quos non* given by the Old Kingdom basilophorous names can say nothing about the chronological gap between the person bearing the name and the corresponding king — sometimes it covers several centuries.

4. The two daughters of  $Hm.t-rr(w)$  bear the names  $Htp-hr.s$  and  $Mr(j)-s(j)-rrh(w)$  <sup>(2)</sup>. The sister (or halfsister) of  $Hr(j).f-rr(w)$  was named  $Htp-hr.s$  (II) while two of his wives were named  $Mr(j)-s(j)-rrh(w)$  (II and III). Such a coincidence of the names of  $Hr(j).f-rr(w)$ 's women and of  $Hm.t-rr(w)$ 's daughters may seem to be an argument for regarding the latter as the daughter of the king in question. However, the names  $Htp-hr.s$  and  $Mr(j)-s(j)-rrh(w)$  were rather widespread <sup>(3)</sup> and so they can not testify to the special propinquity of  $Hm.t-rr(w)$  to  $Hr(j).f-rr(w)$  <sup>(4)</sup>.

But in this case a number of features testifying against the early dating can be found.

I. The offering formula of three lines is inscribed on the lintel of the entrance to the tomb <sup>(5)</sup>: the first line contains the wishes of a good burial in the necropolis and of a very good old age, in the second there is a list of the feasts when the offerings are to be brought to the tomb owner, the third consists of the titles of  $Hm.t-rr(w)$ . Such three line

(1) *Ibid.*, p. 81, 87, 88.

(2) *Ibid.*, fig. 41.

(3) PM III<sup>2</sup>, 370, 372.

(4) By the way, these facts were considered by HASSAN, *op. cit.*, 64-65, who interpreted them in favour of  $Hm.t-rr(w)$  belonging to the royal family of Dyn. IV, but he never came to the conclusion that she was the daughter of  $Hr(j).f-rr(w)$ . (Basing on the fact that the name of her third daughter was  $Hnt(j)-k\check{z}.w.s$  Hassan supposed  $Hm.t-rr(w)$  to be a near descendant of the celebrated queen  $Hnt(j)-k\check{z}.w.s$  who linked Dynasties IV and V, but this idea cannot be confirmed.)

(5) HASSAN, *op. cit.*, fig. 36.

inscriptions on the lintels are quite unusual for Dyn. IV <sup>(1)</sup> and they do appear much later, in the second half of Dyn. V <sup>(2)</sup>.

II. The first line of the offering formula on the lintel inside the tomb <sup>(3)</sup> containing the wishes of a good burial in the necropolis and of a very good old age terminates with the words *nb.t jmꜣh hr nꜥr ꜣꜣ Hm.t-rꜥ(w)*, the second line gives the list of the feasts and the titles of the tomb owner, and then her name is repeated in the vertical column of hieroglyphs separating the inscription from the representation of the princess. This breaking of the offering formula with the name of the tomb owner is impossible in the early tombs <sup>(4)</sup>. The name of the owner is being mentioned in the first part of the offering formula (besides the name at the end) only at the end of Dyn. V <sup>(5)</sup>.

III. The epithet of Anubis *nb(w) tꜣ ḏsr* is mentioned in the offering formula on the lintel inside the tomb. It is very rare under Dyn. IV <sup>(6)</sup>, but is most common in the later period.

IV. Statue transporting as well as the estates and bringing cattle are represented on the thicknesses of the entrance to the tomb of *Hm.t-rꜥ(w)* <sup>(7)</sup>. Harpur herself notes that though such a location of the transport scenes is rather common at Saqqara, it is unique at Giza <sup>(8)</sup>. Moreover, the estates on the thicknesses of the tomb entrance are not characteristic of Giza as well <sup>(9)</sup>. It is no wonder since in contrast to Saqqara where the subsidiary scenes prevailed in the thickness decoration, the representations of the tomb owner (originally at a table, then standing or sitting) predominated at Giza <sup>(10)</sup>, leaving no room to the subsidiary scenes <sup>(11)</sup>. Thus the emergence of the transport scenes and of the estates

(1) E.g., they are absent in the tombs of *Hꜥ(j).f-rꜥ(w)*'s children.

(2) E.g. *ꜥnh(w)-m-zꜣ.f*, late Dyn. V — HASSAN, *op. cit.*, fig. 142.

(3) *Ibid.*, fig. 46.

(4) BARTA, *Aufbau und Bedeutung der altägyptischen Opferformel*, 11.

(5) *Ibid.*, 19.

(6) *Ibid.*, 8.

(7) HASSAN, *op. cit.*, fig. 37-38. Due to their poor condition the transport scenes are not mentioned neither in PM III<sup>2</sup> nor in EATON-KRAUSS, *The Representations of Statuary in Private Tombs of the Old Kingdom*.

(8) HARPUR, *op. cit.*, 310-313.

(9) See BOLSHAKOV, *VDI* 177 (1986, No. 2), 113, tbl. 1.

(10) *Ibid.*, 113, 118, tbl. 1-2.

(11) This difference is to be explained by different histories of the chapels and their decorations at Saqqara and at Giza, see BOLSHAKOV, *op. cit.*, 122-123.

in  $Hm.t-r(w)$  is most likely to be interpreted as a result of the Saqqara influence. But such a location of these scenes appears at Saqqara for the first time under  $N(j)-wsr-r(w)$  (1) and so the tomb of  $Hm.t-r(w)$  is to be dated back approximately to the same time. In the name of the early dating Harpur neglects these facts and comes into conflict with her chronological conclusions, being very precise, as a rule.

V. The representation of the tomb owner on the entrance lintel of  $Hm.t-r(w)$  is separated from the inscription with a vertical line (2). Harpur notes that «partitioning is characteristic of late Dynasty V to Dynasty VI» (3), but, anyway, she does not renounce the early dating of  $Hm.t-r(w)$ , regarding her tomb as a unique one. The introduction of the dividing line testifies to the fact that the figure of the tomb owner on the lintel was originally just a determinative to his name terminating the inscription, but later (remaining a determinative) it turned into a competent representation (4). Thus we do not deal with a pure stylistic, but with a meaningful phenomenon that took a long time to ripen and that could not appear in a single monument a long time before it became a common practice.

VI. The shape of the cushion on the throne of  $Hm.t-r(w)$  on the entrance lintel is traditional in the second half of Dyn. V (5).

VII. The hieroglyph  $\text{𓆎}$  is inscribed in the tomb of  $Hm.t-r(w)$  in the form of Dyn. V with leaves overlapped in a wrong way or even in the later form with leaves joining without overlapping (6).

VIII. The tomb of certain  $Hmw$  and  $\dot{S}pss-k\dot{z}.f-rn\dot{h}(w)$  is situated not far from that of  $Hm.t-r(w)$  (?). It looks as if one of the owners of the tomb and  $\dot{S}pss-k\dot{z}.f-rn\dot{h}(w)$  represented in  $Hm.t-r(w)$  were one and the same person. True, in  $Hm.t-r(w)$   $\dot{S}pss-k\dot{z}.f-rn\dot{h}(w)$  is the scribe only, while in his own tomb he is  $(j)r(j) \dot{h}(j) n(j)-sw.t, \dot{h}m(w)-n\dot{t}r [Hr(j)].f-[r(w)]/?$ ,  $(j)m(j)-r(\dot{z}) pr$  (of  $Hmw$  ?),  $(j)m(j) r(\dot{z}) \dot{h}m(w.w)-k\dot{z}$  (of  $Hmw$  ?),

(1) HARPUR, *op. cit.*, 312-313.

(2) HASSAN, *op. cit.*, fig. 36.

(3) HARPUR, *op. cit.*, 310-313.

(4) *Ibid.*, 44.

(5) The datings of the tombs by means of the cartouches given by CHERPION, *Mastabas et hypogées d'Ancien Empire*, 151-152, are useless for our purposes here.

(6) See FISCHER, *JNES* 18 (1959), 269-271; IDEM, *Dendera in the Third Millennium BC*, 17; IDEM, *Ancient Egyptian Calligraphy*, 34.

(7) HASSAN, *op. cit.*, 82-91.

but it is not an argument against their identity — the new titles (the more so, as they are not high) can reflect the new stage of the career of *Špss-kꜣ.f-ꜣnh(w)*. On the contrary, the proximity of the two tombs and the relative rarity of the name *Špss-kꜣ.f-ꜣnh(w)* make our supposition of the identity of the two *Špss-kꜣ.f-ꜣnh(w)*'s most probable. The fact that *Hmw* was *hm(w)-ntr* of *N(j)-wsr-rr(w)* gives a *terminus ante quem non* for the tomb which is to be dated back to late Dyn. V according to a number of criteria. This dating, if we consider the two *Špss-kꜣ.f-ꜣnh(w)*s to be one and the same person, gives us some reasons for dating the tomb of *Hm.t-rr(w)*. Of course, since the length of life of *Špss-kꜣ.f-ꜣnh(w)* is unknown, the chronological gap between the tombs of his mistress and of his own remains uncertain, but the late dating of *Hmw* and *Špss-kꜣ.f-ꜣnh(w)* anyway refutes the early dating of *Hm.t-rr(w)*.

Thus, the tomb of *Hm.t-rr(w)* is most probably to be dated to middle or late Dyn. V.

Some other features, though being rather obscure from the chronological point of view, do not contradict the late dating:

A. The order of the feasts in the offering formula on the entrance lintel — *rkh* — *wꜣh ꜣh* — *pr(j).t Mnw* — is usual under Dyn. IV, but it survives under Dyn. V (1).

B. The order of the feasts in the offering formula on the lintel inside the tomb — *wp rnp.t* — *dhwtj.t* — *tp(j) rnp.t* — appeared for the first time under Dyn. IV, but it was in use during Dyn. V as well (2).

C. The form of the hieroglyph *hnt* representing it as a rack of three vessels used in *Hm.t-rr(w)* is common in the late Old Kingdom tombs, but sometimes it does appear under Dyn. V (3), though not under Dyn. IV.

D. The spelling of the word *krs* with the harpoon sign in front of *s* is the early one, but it remains as such till the end of the Old Kingdom (4).

E. The features recently brought forward by N. Cherpion as the dating criteria — the presence of the choker (« collier de chien ») and of the multiple bracelets in the representations of *Hm.t-rr(w)* (5) — do exist

(1) BARTA, *op. cit.*, 10, 18.

(2) *Ibid.*, 10, 18.

(3) E.g. JUNKER, *Giza II*, Abb. 7, 9, 10.

(4) BARTA, *op. cit.*, 9.

(5) HASSAN, *op. cit.*, fig. 39-45.

throughout the greatest part of Dyn. IV-V (1) and so they are of almost no importance for dating the tomb in question.

F. A certain *Snb-w(j)-kꜣ(j)* is represented in the tomb of *Hm.t-rꜣ(w)* time and again as *(j)m(j)-r(ꜣ) pr, (j)m(j)-r(ꜣ) hm(w.w)-kꜣ, jmꜣh.w hr nb(w.t/ ?).f* (2) which means he was the highest attendant of the princess (3). In his own tomb situated near that of his mistress (4) he is called *(j)r(j) h(j) n(j)-sw.t, (j)m(j)-r(ꜣ) pr, (j)m(j)-r(ꜣ) hm(w.w)-kꜣ, jmꜣh.w hr nb(w.t/ ?).f* (5). Thus, in his tomb *Snb-w(j)-kꜣ(j)* besides the titles reflecting his service for *Hm.t-rꜣ(w)* records the title *(j)r(j) h(j) n(j)-sw.t* connected with the state service (6). If he had already held this title when the tomb of *Hm.t-rꜣ(w)* was being decorated, it had to be included into the legends to his representations. Thus, the tomb of *Snb-w(j)-kꜣ(j)* is most probably to be dated later than that of *Hm.t-rꜣ(w)* and so it might give *terminus ante quem* for the tomb of the princess. Unfortunately the tomb gives us no definite dating criteria, but, anyway, it has no evidently early features as well, and so it does not come in conflict with our dating of *Hm.t-rꜣ(w)*.

So on the basis of the materials of the tomb of *Hm.t-rꜣ(w)* there are no reasons to suppose that Osiris was mentioned for the first time in a private tomb as early as in the beginning of Dyn. V. The traditional dating of this event remains invariable — the second half of Dyn. V.

Certainly, one can call in question any listed argument against the early dating of the tomb of *Hm.t-rꜣ(w)*, since every of them is rather questionable, but as a whole they can be regarded as the reliable evidence for the late dating. Anyway, I considered it necessary to draw the attention of the specialists in Egyptian religion and *Wellanschauung* to the serious problems set by the dating of this most important monument.

Andrey O. BOLSHAKOV

(1) CHERPION, *op. cit.*, 192-194.

(2) HASSAN, *op. cit.*, fig. 39-40, 44.

(3) HASSAN, *op. cit.*, 65, supposed *Snb-w(j)-kꜣ(j)* to be the husband of *Hm.t-rꜣ(w)*, that is quite impossible, of course — he was just her servant. REISNER, *op. cit.*, 229, basing on the fact that one of *Hm.t-rꜣ(w)*'s sons is named *Špss-rꜣ(w)-šrꜣj* (HASSAN, *op. cit.*, fig. 41, 44) made an interesting assumption that her husband's name had to be *Špss-rꜣ(w)*. Unfortunately, none of *Špss-rꜣ(w)*'s known in the Memphite region (PM III<sup>2</sup>, 374, 965) can do for this role.

(4) HASSAN, *op. cit.*, 67-71.

(5) *Ibid.*, fig. 51.

(6) On the reading and the meaning of the title see BERLÉV, *Trudovoye naseleniye Egipta v epochu Srednego Tsarstva* (The Working People of Egypt in the Epoch of the Middle Kingdom), 165-171.