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ABSTRACT

Among the corpus of ancient Egyptian religious terminology, bA and bAw stand out as two of the oldest, most wide-spread, and enduringly used terms. From the 1st Dynasty until the very end of ancient Egyptian history, these terms were utilized in a wide variety of contexts, including divine, royal, and non-royal names, titles, and epithets, didactic literature, and mortuary, administrative, temple, and royal propagandistic texts. However, despite their prominence and significance in the ancient Egyptian textual record, the function and meaning of these terms are still imperfectly understood, as evidenced by the multiple and varying translations within the Egyptological literature. A major issue which has contributed to this state of research, is the fact that the origins, early function, and original meaning of bA and bAw have not been comprehensively investigated.

This thesis is a study of the earliest material pertaining to bA and bAw from the Late Predynastic Period to the end of the Old Kingdom. The material analyzed includes Late Predynastic art in which the stork (Saddlebill stork, signs G29 & G30) later used as a hieroglyph for bA and bAw appears, as well as a large corpus of Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom texts (1st-6th Dynasty names, titles, and epithets; the Pyramid Texts, and two 6th Dynasty non-royal texts). Through a chronological study of this iconography and of these texts, it was demonstrated that (a) the original ideas and principles encompassed within the terms bA and bAw are apparent in Late Predynastic Saddlebill stork images, (b) that the terms bA and bAw originally functioned to express divine and royal ideology and that their use in the earliest royal mortuary texts was an extension of this function, and (c) that these terms essentially signified, reinforced, and perpetuated the fundamental ancient Egyptian doctrine of “Order over Chaos” or m3Fr vs. isft.
ABBREVIATIONS
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Among the corpus of ancient Egyptian religious terminology, $bA$ and $bAw$ stand out as two of the oldest, most prevalent, and enduringly used terms. From the standardization of writing in the 1st Dynasty until the very end of Ancient Egyptian history, $bA$ and $bAw$ were utilized in a wide variety of contexts, including divine, royal, and non-royal names, titles, and epithets, funerary texts, didactic literature, administrative texts, temple texts, and royal propagandistic texts.

Since the decipherment of Hieroglyphs in the early 19th Century, a number of scholars have recognized the prominence and significance of $bA$ and $bAw$ and several studies have been dedicated to elucidating the nature of these ancient Egyptian terms. Despite the nearly 200 years of scholarship, however, the function and meaning of $bA$ and $bAw$ remain a topic of debate. This is evidenced by the multiple and varying translations and interpretations within the Egyptological literature thus far, including, but not limited to, the ancient Egyptian conception of ‘the soul’, a posthumous ‘state of being’, “supra-mundane and divine power”, “impressiveness”, “visible and earthly manifestation”, and “the creative ability/power to manifest and form manifestations”.

A major issue that has contributed to debates surrounding $bA$ and $bAw$ is the fact that the origins, early use, and original meaning of these terms have not been

---

comprehensively investigated. The term ‘comprehensive’ signifies not only analyzing the content of the early texts in which these terms appear, but also taking into consideration the chronology and types of texts, associated art, larger developments within ancient Egyptian religion and society, as well as the hieroglyphs that were utilized to signify these terms. The latter factor is especially important, as Jiri Janák recently demonstrated that the original and most enduringly used hieroglyphic signifier for $b\beta$ and $b\beta w$, the Saddlebill stork ($G29 & G30$), appears in and is confined to Late Predynastic art (Naqada IID – IIIB). As the Early Dynastic textual evidence for $b\beta$ and $b\beta w$ is limited, an analysis of the stork in Late Predynastic iconography may provide insights into the conceptualization and original meaning of these terms.

This thesis presents a chronological study of the early extant evidence pertaining to $b\beta$ and $b\beta w$. Data analyzed in this thesis dates from the Late Predynastic Period (Naqada IID-IIIB) through to the 6th Dynasty, and includes; a corpus of Late Predynastic images of the Saddlebill stork; Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom divine, royal, non-royal, and place names, divine and royal epithets, and administrative and priestly titles; the Heb-Sed festival reliefs of Niuserre at Abu Ghorab; the 5th and 6th Dynasty Pyramid Texts; and two 6th Dynasty non-royal texts, namely an inscription from the tomb of Herimeru at Saqqara and a legal dispute from Elephantine (pBerlin 9010). These sources provide an overview of the origins, subsequent standardization, development, and contextual use of $b\beta$ and $b\beta w$. This material will help answer the questions posed in this study, namely, in which Late Predynastic iconographic contexts do images of the Saddlebill stork appear? What is the function and meaning

---

10 Dating according to E. Teeter, Before the Pyramids: The Origins of Egyptian Civilization (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2011), 8.
of Saddlebill stork images in Late Predynastic art? Why was this particular bird associated with \( b\dot{z} \) and \( b\dot{A} \)? In which contexts are the terms \( b\dot{z} \) and \( b\dot{A} \) utilized? Is there continuity between the iconographic contexts of the Saddlebill stork and the textual contexts of \( b\dot{z} \) and \( b\dot{A} \)? And finally, what is the function and meaning of \( b\dot{z} \) and \( b\dot{A} \)? By addressing these questions, it may be possible to establish a better understanding of the fundamental principles and ideas encompassed within these terms, and subsequently, provide a basis for future work on \( b\dot{z} \) and \( b\dot{A} \) in texts and art from the First Intermediate Period onward.

1.1 Literature Review

While there are several studies that have dealt with the ancient Egyptian terms \( b\dot{z} \) and \( b\dot{A} \), the majority of these studies, however, have either focused on later material or on a specific text/typology of texts\(^{11}\). In comparison, there are relatively few which have analyzed the early evidence. The small number of works that have been produced lie at two extremes, either only analyzing the content of the Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom texts or focusing specifically on the Late Predynastic images of the Saddlebill stork.

Hermann Kees’ study *Totenglauben und Jenseitsvorstellungen der alten Ägypter* (1926) represents a milestone in scholarship on the terms *ḥ3* and *ḥ3w*. Kees was the first scholar to argue that there was a diversified use and development of the terms *ḥ3* and *ḥ3w* according to period and according to whether it was applied to the gods, the king, or non-royal individuals. According to Kees, prior to the First Intermediate Period, the terms *ḥ3* and *ḥ3w* were used solely in connection with the gods and the deceased king, and it was only after the “democratization of the afterlife” in the First Intermediate Period that these terms were used in relation to non-royal individuals. Furthermore, he argues that the terms *ḥ3* and *ḥ3w* had varying functions and that the meaning was dependent upon the contexts in which they were being used. While Kees’ work laid the foundation for subsequent research, it cannot be considered a comprehensive study of the early use and meaning of *ḥ3* and *ḥ3w*, as he focused solely on the Pyramid Texts and a much later text, the Saqqara Kings’ list. Furthermore, the 6th Dynasty inscription of Herimeru at Saqqara, which was first brought to attention by L.V. Žabkar (1968), is indicative of an earlier use of *ḥ3* by non-royal individuals than posited by Kees. Lastly, while Kees does take note of the Saddlebill stork as a visual signifier for *ḥ3* and *ḥ3w*, he only briefly comments that its bird form was associated with the idea of ‘freedom of movement’.

Louis. V. Žabkar’s *A Study of the Ba concept in Ancient Egyptian Texts* (1968) remains the largest and most comprehensive study on this topic. This seminal work is a philological analysis of *ḥ3* and *ḥ3w* in funerary texts, didactic texts, religious treatise, royal propagandistic texts, and non-royal texts from the Early Old Kingdom through to the Greco-Roman Period. Žabkar commences his study with a critique of the earlier definitions of *ḥ3* as ‘soul’, stating that this term carries connotations of the dualistic perception of the human being, a belief which is not apparent in ancient
Egyptian texts. For the use of these terms in the Old Kingdom, Žabkar analyses a small group of royal and non-royal names and titles, the Pyramid Texts, the inscription on the architrave of Herimeru’s tomb at Saqqara, and the legal dispute from Elephantine (pBerlin 9010). He essentially arrives at the conclusion that $\text{bÅ}$ and $\text{bÅw}$ were originally funerary concepts and that during the late 6th Dynasty they began to be used in a ‘non-mortuary’ sense to express the power of the gods and the king. While Žabkar’s work fruitfully and insightfully furthered the groundwork laid down by Kees and highlighted the fact that there is in fact, a text which associates $\text{bÅ}$ with a non-royal individual prior to the First Intermediate Period, it does not, however, cover all of the material for $\text{bÅ}$ and $\text{bÅw}$ in the earlier periods. This is especially apparent in that he did not take into consideration any of the Early Dynastic names and titles, nor the hieroglyphs used to signify $\text{bÅ}$ and $\text{bÅw}$. With regards to the latter, it is surprising that in the New Kingdom section of his study, he discusses the introduction of a new signifier and symbol for $\text{bÅ}$, the human-headed bird (sign G53), in texts and tomb paintings, but does not even mention the fact that the Saddlebill stork was the original and most enduring used signifier for $\text{bÅ}$ and $\text{bÅw}$.

Elske Marie Wolf-Brinkmann’s PhD dissertation *Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes “bÅ” anhand der Überlieferung der Frühzeit und des Alten Reiches* (1968) is a philological analysis of $\text{bÅ}$ and $\text{bÅw}$ in their earliest textual occurrences in the Early Dynastic Period and Old Kingdom. It includes over 40 royal, non-royal, and place names and titles, as well as the Pyramid Texts. She essentially arrives at the conclusion that during the Early Dynastic Period and Old Kingdom, $\text{bÅ}$ and $\text{bÅw}$ were used exclusively in connection with the gods and the deceased king. Wolf-Brinkmann’s study is a significant contribution to the topic and provides the first comprehensive list of Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom names and titles in which
these terms occur. However, as with Žabkar, she focuses solely on the phonetic value of the hieroglyph used to signify \( b^3 \) and \( b^3w \), and does not take into consideration the visual significance of the Saddlebill stork. Furthermore, her study does not take into account the 6\(^{th} \) Dynasty inscription of Herimeru from Saqqara, nor the legal dispute from Elephantine (pBerlin 9010).

William. A. Ward’s *The Four Egyptian Homographic Roots B-3* (1978) is a detailed philological analysis of a large corpus of ancient Egyptian terms formed around the root-stem \( b^3 \). Using semitic cognates, he argues that there are essentially four roots – (1) “tremble, flutter”, (2) “Break Earth, Open”, (3) “Possess supra-mundane Power”, and (4) “Pour out, mix”. According to Ward, \( b^3 \) and \( b^3w \) belong to the third root and express a uniquely Egyptian idea without a definite or possible foreign cognate. Furthermore, as with Kees, Žabkar, and Wolf-Brinkmann, he states that \( b^3 \) and \( b^3w \) were originally only utilized in relation to the gods and the deceased king. While Ward emphasizes the varying uses of the root \( b^3 \), his study, however, drew all of its arguments from the Pyramid Texts. This, furthermore, brings into question whether one can divide all of the terms with the root-stem \( b^3 \) into four distinct categories, or even, whether there are different roots for the stem \( b^3 \).

The only piece of research which stands out against this exclusively philological background is the article of Jiri Janák, *A Question of Size: A Remark on Early Attestations of the Ba Hieroglyph* (2011). With the aim of elucidating the connection between the terms \( b^3 \) and \( b^3w \) and their earliest hieroglyphic signifier, Janák highlighted the significant fact that representations of the Saddlebill stork appear in and are confined to Late Predynastic iconography (Naqada IID- IIIB). Furthermore, through a brief discussion of the living species, the signification of the Late Predynastic stork images, and the role and meaning of \( b^3 \) and \( b^3w \) in Early
Dynastic and Old Kingdom texts, he emphasizes that the use of the Saddlebill stork as a hieroglyph was intimately associated with the meaning of $b\mathfrak{j}$ and $b\mathfrak{w}$. According to Janák, as Late Predynastic images of the stork appear amongst depictions of other large and powerful animals, such as elephants, lions, and hyenas, and as these animals are mostly carved into the handles of weapons, the stork can be understood as a symbol of ‘power’. It’s subsequent association with $b\mathfrak{j}$ and $b\mathfrak{w}$ is thus not coincidental, as these terms expressed the ‘visible or earthly manifestation of divine (and heavenly) power’. Although Janák’s work has highlighted the significance of the Saddlebill stork in connection with $b\mathfrak{j}$ and $b\mathfrak{w}$, there is, however, a major problem with his research. This is namely that he projected extant definitions of $b\mathfrak{j}$ and $b\mathfrak{w}$ from the studies of Žabkar (1968) and Wolf-Brinkmann (1968) onto the Late Predynastic images of the stork. As a consequence, he did not take into consideration the larger theme and iconographic contexts in which Late Predynastic images of the Saddlebill stork appear.

1.2. Methodology

The aim of the current work is to (a) provide a comprehensive understanding of the original function and meaning of the terms $b\mathfrak{j}$ and $b\mathfrak{w}$, and (b) provide suitable translations that are faithful to the fundamental ideas and principles encompassed within these terms. As is evident in the literature review, the full corpus of early evidence for $b\mathfrak{j}$ and $b\mathfrak{w}$ has not been dealt with in a single study. Furthermore, the studies that have been produced display a distinct tendency to focus on $b\mathfrak{j}$ and $b\mathfrak{w}$ in the Pyramid Texts. This has led to a number of assumptions, the most significant being that these terms originally functioned to express funerary beliefs. The fact that
the term $b\dddot{a}$ was used in a 3rd Dynasty king’s name, $h^\dddot{a}-b\dddot{a}$, and the fact that the earliest textual evidence explicitly associating $b\dddot{a}$ and $b\dddot{aw}$ with a deceased king only appears during the reign of Sahure\textsuperscript{13}, suggests, however, that while these terms where utilized in funerary contexts, they did not necessarily represent and express exclusively funerary concepts. In order to clarify the original function of these terms, this thesis thus utilizes a chronological approach, focusing on and highlighting the contextual use of Saddlebill stork images in the Late Predynastic Period and the terms $b\dddot{a}$ and $b\dddot{aw}$ in the Early Dynastic Period and early Old kingdom.

The iconographic and textual data in this thesis derived from several sources, including previous studies on $b\dddot{a}$ and $b\dddot{aw}$, excavation reports and archaeological surveys, indices and online databases of ancient Egyptian personal names, online museum collections, and James P. Allen’s 6 volume publication *A New Concordance of the Pyramid Texts* (2013). The final corpus of data is constituted of:

- 6 Naqada IID-III A carved handles adorned with a highly standardized motif referred to as the ‘animal-rows’ motif - Carnarvon knife handle (MMA 26.7.1281), Abu Zeidan knife handle (Brooklyn Museum 09.889.118), Pitt-Rivers knife handle (BM EA68512), Davis comb handle (MMA 30.8.224), Sayala Mace handle\textsuperscript{14} (now lost), and the most recently found Abydos K1262b knife handle\textsuperscript{15};
- A Naqada IID cylinder seal impression from Tomb U-210 in Cemetery-U at Abydos (Abydos K2160c) and a Naqada IIB ivory cylinder seal from Tomb L17 in Cemetery L at Qustul in Lower Nubia (L17-26 OIM 23662);

\textsuperscript{12} Ind. Ent. D.
\textsuperscript{13} The earliest is a priestly title containing the ‘name’ of Sahure’s Pyramid (Ind. Ent. EE).
A Late Predynastic rock inscription in the Theban Western Desert - Gebel Djehuty inscription no. 1\textsuperscript{17}, and a Naqada III rock inscription near the modern town of el-Khawy;

- A corpus of 38 1\textsuperscript{st}- 6\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty divine, royal, non-royal, and place names, divine and royal epithets, and administrative and priestly titles (Appendix A);

- Reliefs depicting the \textit{Heb-Sed} festival of Niuserre from his sun-temple at Abu Ghorab;

- The 5\textsuperscript{th} and 6\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty Pyramid Texts of Unas, Teti, Pepi I, Merenre, Pepi II, Neith, and Wedjebtni;

- A 6\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty legal dispute from Elephantine (pBerlin 9010) and the 6\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty inscription on the architrave of Herimeru’s tomb at Saqqara.

The line drawings referred to throughout this thesis were rendered by the author from existing, credited line drawings. Photographs and linked videos were obtained online from sites registered as public domain (i.e. Wikimedia Commons and YouTube).

The Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom names, epithets, and titles are presented in an index (Appendix A) and arranged into five groups - Divine names and epithets; Royal names and epithets; Non-royal names; Administrative and Priestly Titles; and Place names. The entries within each group are arranged chronologically and each entry includes the hieroglyphic rendering and transcription, as well as (a) dating, (b) provenance, (c) type of text i.e. epithet, name or title, and (d) previous transcriptions and translations. Royal names with a \textit{b3} or \textit{b3w} element backdated to the Early

\textsuperscript{17} In the publication, this inscription is referred to as the “Gebel Tjaauti” inscription – J. C. Darnell, D. Darnell, R. Friedman, and S. Hendrickx, \textit{Theban Desert Road Survey in the Egyptian Western Desert, I: Gebel Djehuty rock inscriptions 1-45 and Wadi el-Hôl rock inscriptions 1-45} (Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2002), 10-19.
Dynastic Period and Old Kingdom in didactic literature and Kings’ lists were not included in the index, as this thesis focuses upon textual evidence archaeologically dated to the Early Dynastic Period and Old Kingdom. Names included in the studies of Žabkar and Wolf-Brinkmann, such as \( b\dot{w}.f.r^c \) (Westcar Papyrus pBerlin 3033)\(^{18}\), \( ntr\_b\dot{w} \) (Saqqara no. 3 & Turin 2.20)\(^{19}\) and \( b\_ntr\_w \) (Saqqara no.5)\(^{20}\), were thus omitted as they are not reflected in actual archaeological record of the Early Dynastic Period and Old Kingdom.

In order to contextualize the images of the Saddlebill stork in Late Predynastic iconography, this thesis includes a brief discussion on the species’ appearance, ecology, and characteristic behaviour. The information was gleaned from both broader ornithological studies, as well as studies focusing on classification of stork species. Further additional iconographic and textual sources from the Predynastic Period through to the Coptic Period are included and referenced throughout this thesis, primarily for comparative purposes.

1.3. Thesis Organization

This thesis is organized into 5 chapters following the introduction (Chapter 1). The body of the work (Chapters 2 to 5) follows a broader chronological framework (Late Predynastic to the 6\(^{th}\) Dynasty), with each chapter dedicated to a certain typology of data. Chapter 2 focuses on the earliest material and is an analysis of the Saddlebill stork in Late Predynastic iconography. Chapter 3 introduces the earliest textual evidence and discusses and analyzes the function of \( bi \) and \( b\dot{w} \) in the corpus of 1-6\(^{th}\) Dynasty names, titles, and epithets. Supplementing this analysis is a discussion of the 5\(^{th}\) Dynasty Heb-Sed festival reliefs of Niuserre from his sun-temple at Abu Ghorab.

\(^{18}\) Žabkar, A study of the Ba concept, 58.
\(^{19}\) Wolf-Brinkmann, Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes ‘bA’,10.
These reliefs not only depict and contextualize the roles played by the *hm ḥūw nḥn* “ḥm-priest of the ḥūw of Nekhen” and the *hm ḥūw p “hm-priest of the ḥūw of Pe”*, but also contain images of the ḥūw themselves and thus provide useful information regarding their nature, identities, and function. Chapter 4 is dedicated to a discussion and analysis of ḥūw in the 5th and 6th Dynasty Pyramid Texts, while Chapter 5 focuses on the use of these terms in 6th Dynasty non-royal texts - the legal dispute from Elephantine (pBerlin 9010), and the architrave inscription of Herimeru. This organization and arrangement of the data highlights (a) the development of the Saddlebill stork from image to hieroglyphic signifier, (b) the contextual use of ḥūw and ḥūw, and (c) developments and trends within each type of text (i.e. the names, titles, and epithets, and the Pyramid Texts). The final chapter, Chapter 6, presents the conclusions. Appendix A presents an index of all the Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom divine, royal, non-royal, and place names, divine and royal epithets, and administrative and priestly titles discussed and analyzed in Chapter 3.
Chapter 2 – The Saddlebill Stork in Late Predynastic Iconography

Although a large number of Egyptological studies specifically reference the appearance of the bꜣ as a ‘human-headed bird’ when discussing ancient Egyptian funerary beliefs\textsuperscript{21}, in the history of the bꜣ’s visual representation, the ‘human-headed bird’ actually represents its youngest form\textsuperscript{22}. From their earliest occurrence in names and titles of the Early Dynastic Period through to the large mortuary and temple texts of the Greco-Roman Period, bꜣ and bꜣw’s oldest and most prevalent hieroglyphic signifier was, in fact, a stork ꜣꜣ (G29) ꜣꜣ (G30). This stork has been identified as the Saddlebill stork (\textit{Ephippiorhynchus senegalensis})\textsuperscript{23}, one of the largest and most distinctive avian species on the African continent.

Several spellings of bꜣ with the uniliteral phonetic compliments b and ꞏ in the Pyramid Texts\textsuperscript{24} make it clear that the Saddlebill stork hieroglyph functioned as the biliteral phoneme bꜣ in the ancient Egyptian writing system. In previous studies, this function has been the primary focus and little attention has been given to the use and function of the Saddlebill stork as a meaningful \textit{visual} signifier as well. Whilst scholars such as Kees\textsuperscript{25} have briefly referenced it in connection with ideas of the bꜣ’s flight and movement within the heavenly realms, others, such as Ward, have


\textsuperscript{22} The earliest use of ꜣꜣ (sign G53) in vignettes and texts is during the reign of Thutmosis III, and appears specifically within the Amduat Texts adorning the walls of his tomb in the Valley of the Kings. It should be kept in mind, however, that sign G53 did not replace the older signs used to signify bꜣ and bꜣw in texts.


\textsuperscript{24} PT 539 §1310a, PT690 §2096a, PT 467 §886a & PT 572 §1472b.

\textsuperscript{25} Kees, \textit{Götterglaube}, 58.
dismissed its relevance entirely\textsuperscript{26}.

The more recent study by Janáč has, however, highlighted and emphasized the iconographic origins of the Saddlebill stork hieroglyph. The impact of Janak’s study on our understanding of the origins and development of $b\beta$ and $b\beta w$ is twofold. Firstly, it suggests that the relationship between the Saddlebill stork hieroglyph and the terms $b\beta$ and $b\beta w$ is more than, as previously argued, simply phonetic. And secondly, it suggests that the Saddlebill stork was specifically chosen to represent and signify these terms during the standardization and formalization of writing in ancient Egypt. The aim of the following chapter is thus to establish the role and significance of the Saddlebill stork in ancient Egyptian thought by analyzing the bird’s earliest visual attestations in Late Predynastic iconography. Consequently, establishing this role and significance will allow for a comparison with Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom textual attestations of $b\beta$ and $b\beta w$, and thus provide the opportunity to (a) determine whether there is continuity in meaning, and (b) if so, provide a fuller understanding of $b\beta$ and $b\beta w$ in Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom thought.

In order to achieve this aim, however, it is important that we first consider the Saddlebill stork as a living species. It is well known that the ancient Egyptians regarded the animal world with enormous interest, observing and being inspired by their appearance and behaviour\textsuperscript{27}. Discussing and highlighting these aspects may contextualize the subsequent manner in which it was represented in Late Predynastic

\textsuperscript{26} W.A. Ward is of the opinion that there is no semantic connection between the stork as signifier and the $b\beta$ and $b\beta w$ concepts as signified, and that it was simply used by the ancient Egyptians on a phonetic basis. He posits further that the connection between the stork and the phonetic $b\beta$ is related to the root “to open” (i.e. $wb\beta$), as the stork digs in the earth with its long beak - \textit{The Four Egyptian Homographic roots} B-3, 67-88.

The first part of this chapter will thus be dedicated to describing the stork’s most distinctive features, characteristics, and behavior. The discussion and analysis proper will begin with a brief summary of Janák’s findings in order to establish the current understanding of the relationship between the stork and the terms $b\text{i}$ and $b\text{w}$. A discussion and analysis of Late Predynastic Saddlebill stork imagery will follow. Concluding the chapter will be a summary of the role, function, and significance of the bird in Late Predynastic thought as gleaned from the analysis.

2.1. *The Saddlebill Stork: Appearance, Ecology, and Behavior*

The Saddlebill stork (*Ephippiorhynchus senegalensis*) (Figure 1) is native to the African continent and occurs today throughout sub-Saharan Africa.28 Also known as the African Jabiru stork, the Saddlebill stork is one of the world’s tallest and largest species of stork, standing between 1.3-1.5 meters in height (3-5 ft.), with a wingspan of over 2.5 meters (8 ft.).29 Although the Saddlebill stork is widespread throughout Africa, it is never very numerous, the species’ territoriality and solitary nesting limiting numbers in suitable habitats.31 These habitats include aquatic, as well as open or semi-arid areas, the bird favoring shallow freshwater marshes, swamps, rivers, lakeshores, and flood plains. The Saddlebill stork is a sedentary species, there being no evidence of regular long-distance migration, and will use the same territory continuously if not affected by drought.33

In general appearance, the Saddlebill stork is a stately bird with a slim stature, erect posture, long neck and legs. Its plumage is predominantly black and white, with

30 The most recent surveys state that the population density of the Saddlebill stork is approximately 1 bird per 5.6-5.8 km² - Hancock, Kushlan & Kahl, *Storks, Ibises and Spoonbills*, 116.
glossy black plumage on the head, neck, scapulars, wing coverts, and tail; and white plumage on the back, breast, abdomen, and leading edge and flight feathers of the wing. The tail feathers of the stork are short and squared and the bill is long (± 35 cm), thin, and slightly recurved. The bill is also highly distinctive and unique to this species of stork, exhibiting a deep red color at the tip, a black band in the center, followed by a deep red fleshy lappet that extends back to the eye (Figure 2). Upon this red lappet is a second yellow lappet in the shape of a ‘saddle’, and hanging down on either side where the lower mandible articulates with the neck are two yellow, lobe-like flaps of skin or ‘wattles’.

Storks of this tall species typically forage in shallow fresh water marshes, striding slowly and probing vertically in the water and submerged vegetation. Their diet mainly consists of fish, but the bird will also consume frogs, crustaceans, mollusks, mice, small birds, as well as carrion. Reports from the Kruger National Park in South Africa state that the stork has also been seen consuming snakes, as well as juvenile crocodiles when the opportunity presents itself. With live, moving prey, the Saddlebill stork’s hunting technique includes snatching the prey from the water or ground, dropping it, and repeatedly stabbing it with the tip of its long and pointed beak. The stork will then wash the prey in water, removing mud or sand from the body, and swallow it whole.

Unlike many other species of stork, the Saddlebill stork is most often found

---

38 Hancock, Kushlan & Kahl, Storks, Ibises and Spoonbills, 116.
39 Hancock, Kushlan & Kahl, Storks, Ibises and Spoonbills, 116.
41 Hancock, Kushlan & Kahl, Storks, Ibises and Spoonbills, 116.
singly or in pairs\textsuperscript{42}. Although small groups have been observed feeding together, this usually consists of an adult pair and their offspring\textsuperscript{43}. Despite this communality in family groups, this species of stork is highly territorial and will threaten any other birds, mammals, or large reptiles that impose on their territory or pose a risk to their mate and/or offspring\textsuperscript{44}.

As one of the world’s largest and most distinctive species of stork today, it is hardly surprising that the Saddlebill stork was included in the larger corpus of faunal signifiers in the ancient Egyptian writing system. Its immense size and striking coloration would certainly have caused it to stand out in the Egyptian faunal landscape. Furthermore, as a wading bird that favors shallow fresh water marshes, river banks, and floodplains, and thus environments that were central to the ancient Egyptian \textit{modus vivendi}, the Saddlebill stork would have formed part of a regularly encountered group of fauna, including hippopotamuses, crocodiles, other species of birds, reptiles, as well as fish. The Egyptians would thus have had the opportunity to observe the stork’s behavior, and we can assume that this, in addition to its appearance, must have contributed to its believed significance. The above discussion has also demonstrated, however, that the bird is no longer found in Egypt, its attestations limited to Sub-Saharan Africa. This begs the question as to when the stork disappeared from Egypt.

\textsuperscript{42} Kahl, “Comparative Behavior”, 20.
\textsuperscript{43} According to Hancock, Kushlan & Kahl, the average number of offspring is 2-3 per season - \textit{Storks, Ibises and Spoonbills}, 116-118.
\textsuperscript{44} This threat consists of a defense or ‘Arching’ display in which the stork stands erect, opens its wings fully, lowers and clatters its bill loudly and slowly while advancing, and often lunging, toward the threat. The stork’s subsequent increase in size (i.e. spreading of the wings), flashing black and white wing pattern, loud bill clacks, as well as visible bright red and yellow bill, thus render it an imposing and formidable sight to the threat - Kahl, “Comparative Behavior”, 20.
2.2. J. Janák and the Saddlebill stork in Late Predynastic Iconography

J. Janák’s article, *A Question of Size: A Remark on Early Attestations of the Ba Hieroglyph* (2011), represents the first and only study thus far to investigate the connection between Late Predynastic images of the Saddlebill stork and its later use as a hieroglyph for the *bꜣ* and *bꜣw* concepts. According to Janák, as the Saddlebill stork represents both the earliest and most attested hieroglyphic signifier for the terms *bꜣ* and *bꜣw*, it serves as a crucial witness to their original meaning.\(^{45}\)

Janák’s study essentially starts with an established definition of *bꜣ* and *bꜣw* in texts from the Early Dynastic Period and Old Kingdom. Working from the studies of L.V. Žabkar (1968) and E.M. Wolf-Brinkmann (1968), he states that this early notion of *bꜣ* and *bꜣw* encompassed the idea of a visible or earthly manifestation of divine (i.e. heavenly) powers.\(^{46}\) He then proceeds with a brief description of the Saddlebill stork as a living species, discussing its appearance and highlighting its most characteristics features. The actual size of the bird is, however, focused upon – “The impressive size and stately appearance of the Saddlebill stork, which was probably the largest flying bird of ancient Egypt, might have largely influenced its significance to the Egyptians. These characteristics might also have played a key role in connecting this particular bird with the *bꜣ*-concept, since it seems only logical that such an impressive bird should represent an earthly manifestation of divine (i.e. heavenly) powers.”\(^{47}\)

In support of this argument, Janák proceeds with a discussion of Saddlebill stork imagery. He notes that the most accurate and elaborate depictions of the stork appear on objects dating to the Late Predynastic Period. These include the Carnarvon, Abu Zeidan, and Pitt-rivers knife handles, the Davis comb handle, and the gold mace

\(^{45}\) Janák, “A question of Size”, 143.
\(^{46}\) Janák, “A question of Size”, 144-5.
\(^{47}\) Janák, “A question of Size”, 147.
handle from Sayala (Figures 3-7)⁴⁸. The stork, which is represented in the second row of animals on the flat side of the knife handles, both sides of the Davis comb handle, and on the Sayala mace handle, is easily recognizable due to its characteristic features, namely the long legs and neck, upright stance, recurved bill, short and squared tail feathers, and wattle at the base of the lower mandible.

According to Janák, there are two aspects which are important for our understanding of the meaning of the stork upon these objects. The first is that these objects are primarily carved with images of powerful animals, including elephants, lions, bulls, hyenas, and dogs, and the second is that the objects themselves i.e. knife and mace handles, are symbols of power and strength⁴⁹. The inclusion of the Saddlebill stork amongst powerful animals and upon this class of object is thus not coincidental. Janák states the impressive and distinctive Saddlebill stork must have left a great impact on the mind of the Egyptians and they subsequently connected it not only with ideas of greatness and power, but also with other animals which represented or even manifested these characteristics⁵⁰. Furthermore, the depiction of these powerful animals upon knife and mace handles may have served to increase the power of the appropriate weapon or tool⁵¹.

Part of Janak’s study also includes tracing and elucidating the apparent degradation in accuracy of Saddlebill stork hieroglyphs from the Early Dynastic Period to the Old Kingdom. He notes that from the 1ˢᵗ Dynasty onwards, the Saddlebill stork no longer appears in the artistic record and its depiction is confined to its use as a hieroglyphic signifier⁵². The earliest of the latter appears on the rim fragment of a large porphyry jar from Hierakonpolis (Figure 8), and while only the

⁴⁹ Janák, “A question of Size”, 149.
⁵⁰ Janák, “A question of Size”, 150.
⁵¹ Janák, “A question of Size”, 150.
head and neck of the bird have survived, the remaining features are nevertheless well rendered. Following this date, however, there is steady decrease in the accuracy of Saddlebill stork hieroglyphs. By the 3rd Dynasty, the attitude and posture of the bird has changed, as can be seen in the rendering of bβw from the tomb of Khabawsokar (Figure 9), and by the 4th Dynasty the bird’s signature wattle has shifted from the base of the lower mandible to the neck, such as on slab stela from the tomb of Wepemnofret from Giza (Figure 10). Janák attributes these inaccuracies and schematization to the extinction of the species in Egypt, probably during the Late Early Dynastic Period to Early Old Kingdom. This is further supported by the fact that there are no skeletal or other remains (i.e. mummies) of the Saddlebill stork attested for any period of Egyptian history, as well as no dynastic artistic representations of this bird in scenes where other birds usually occur (i.e. fowling scenes).

Although Janák’s study has highlighted the significance of the Saddlebill stork in connection with bβ and bβw, there are, however, three major interrelated problems with his argument for its meaning in Late Predynastic iconography. The first is the fact that he based his interpretation of the stork not only on the meaning of bβ and bβw in Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom texts, but also specifically on definitions of the latter provided by two scholars who did not study these images of the stork, let alone consider the stork as a meaningful visual signifier. Janák thus projected older understandings of these terms onto Late Predynastic images of the Saddlebill stork, an approach that runs counter to the original sequence and development.

54 By the 3rd Dynasty, the attitude and posture of the bird has changed, and by the 4th Dynasty the bird’s signature wattle has shifted from the base of the lower mandible to the neck - Janák, “A question of Size”, 148-149.
55 Janák, “A question of Size”, 149.
56 Janák, “A question of Size”, 149.
57 Žabkar, 1968 & Wolf-Brinkmann, 1968
This leads to the second major problem. By utilizing this approach, Janák essentially overlooked the larger theme and iconographic context in which the stork appears. The above Late Predynastic carved handles have received a substantial amount of attention within studies of Predynastic art\(^{58}\), and it has been recognized since the early 20\(^{th}\) century that the rows of animals adorning these handles form part of highly standardized and formalized motif\(^{59}\). Furthermore, it has been widely accepted within the last decade that this motif, along with associated Late Predynastic motifs of hunting and military triumph, essentially functioned to represent and eternally replicate the fundamental ancient Egyptian belief in the establishment of “Order” and the subjugation and banishment of “Chaos”\(^{60}\).

This brings us to the third and final problem. Upon review of studies focusing on these objects and this motif, such as that of F. Raffaele\(^{61}\) and G. Dreyer\(^{62}\), as well


as related studies on Predynastic iconography, it became apparent that images of the stork are not confined to the above carved handles, but also appear on a Naqada IID cylinder seal impression from Cemetery-U in Abydos\textsuperscript{63}, a Naqada IIIB cylinder seal from Qustul\textsuperscript{64}, as well as two Late Predynastic rock inscriptions, namely Gebel Djehuty inscription no. 1 in the Theban Western Desert\textsuperscript{65} and an inscription near the modern town of el-Khawy in the Eastern Desert\textsuperscript{66}. Thus, in addition to overlooking the iconographic context in which the stork appears, Janák did not include further significant attestations of the stork in Late Predynastic iconography.

In closing, it is evident that although Janák has widened the range of material to consider when investigating the early function and meaning $b\beta$ and $b\beta w$ and has highlighted the importance of the Saddlebill stork as a meaningful visual signifier, he has not, however, fully explored and investigated the role, function, and significance of the stork in Late Predynastic iconography.

2.3. Reviewing the Evidence: The Saddlebill Stork in Late Predynastic Iconography

A review of the current literature available on Predynastic iconography indicates that images of the Saddlebill stork appear in three Late Predynastic (Naqada IID-IIIB) iconographic contexts - the ‘animal-rows’ motif adorning handles of weapons and items of personal adornment, cylinder seals and cylinder seal impressions, and rock inscriptions. The following discussion and analysis of Saddlebill stork images within these iconographic contexts will be divided into two parts. The first will consist of a description of the iconography within each iconographic context, each description

\textsuperscript{62} Dreyer, “Ein neues Fragment”, 15-22.
\textsuperscript{64} B. Williams, B. The A-group royal cemetery at Qustul: Cemetery L. Excavations between Abu Simbel and the Sudan Frontier 1; The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Nubian Expedition 3 (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1986), 157-8.
\textsuperscript{65} Darnell, Darnell, Friedman, and Hendrickx, *Theban Desert Road Survey*, 10-19.
\textsuperscript{66} J.C. Darnell, ‘The Early Hieroglyphic Inscription at el-Khawy’, *Archéo-Nil* 27 (2017): 49-64.
followed by a brief presentation of extant interpretations. The second part will consist of a wider discussion of the Saddlebill stork within Late Predynastic iconography, comparing and interpreting the images of the stork in terms of significant and recurrent associations, extant interpretations, the distinctive characteristics, ecology, and behavior of the living species itself, as well as related textual evidence and iconography.

2.3.1. The ‘animal-rows’ motif (Figures 3-7 & 11)

The meaning of the ordered rows of animals adorning the Late Predynastic\textsuperscript{67} Carnarvon knife handle (MMA 26.7.1281), Abu Zeidan knife handle (Brooklyn Museum 09.889.118), Pitt-Rivers knife handle (BM EA68512), Davis comb handle (MMA 30.8.224), Sayala Mace handle\textsuperscript{68} (now lost), and the most recently found Abydos K1262b knife handle\textsuperscript{69} have been a subject of much speculation. Starting with G. Bénédite in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} Century, several scholars have not only endeavored to identify all of the species depicted, but also interpret the larger message of the motif. The latter was considered especially significant, since the motif displays high levels of standardization and formalization akin to writing.

2.3.1.1. Description

On both sides of the Abu Zeidan, Pitt-Rivers and Davis handles, on the flat side of the Carnarvon and Abydos knife handles, and on the Sayala mace handle are multiple

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item[67] The precise dating of these objects has remained an issue since the Carnarvon and Pitt-Rivers knife handles and Davis comb handle do not have recorded archaeological provenances. Furthermore, while H. de Morgan did describe the tomb in which the Abu Zeidan knife handle was found, namely Burial 32 at Abu Zeidan, his excavation report of this area in general is lacking and has made dating of the tomb itself a problem. However, the Sayala mace handle, discovered in Tomb 1 at Cemetery 137 in Sayala by C.M. Firth, and the Abydos K1262b knife handle, discovered by G. Dreyer in Cemetery-U at Abydos, does provide an approximate period in which these handles were probably produced. The latter places the earliest date in the Naqada IID Period, while the Sayala Mace handle has been attributed to the Naqada IIIA Period - Firth, \textit{The archaeological survey of Nubia}, 205; Needler, \textit{Predynastic and archaic Egypt in the Brooklyn Museum"}, 58; Dreyer, “Motive und Datierung”, 17.
  \item[68] Firth, \textit{The archaeological survey of Nubia"}, 205.
  \item[69] Dreyer, “Motive und Datierung”, 17.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
horizontal rows of animals (Figures 3-7 & 11). Barring the Davis comb handle, upon which the rows take a boustrophon pattern, the animals are all depicted facing in the same direction. In the case of the knife handles, this is towards the blade.

The flat side of the knife handles, both sides of the Davis comb handle, and the Sayala mace handle display a highly standardized and formalized set and sequence of animals. A ‘classic model’ can be laid out as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row 1</th>
<th>A series of elephants standing upon intertwined snakes or a snake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row 2</td>
<td>A Saddlebill stork with a snake at its beak, followed by a single giraffe, more Saddlebill storks, Herons(^{70}), and Secretary birds(^{71}).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 3</td>
<td>A series of large felines, usually interpreted as lions(^{72})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Rest of the Rows**

(Table 1). Various species of wild and domesticated fauna typical of the deserts, mountain ranges, and semi-desert plains, as well as mythological hybrids. Each row is confined to the depiction of a single species, and often closing the rows is either an image of a hunting dog with its paw raised toward the animal it directly follows, a rosette, or a catfish.

While large parts of the Pitt-Rivers and Abydos knife handles are damaged (Figures 5 &11), the remaining species indicate that the rows followed the above sequence\(^{73}\).

The Carnarvon handle on the other hand, differs in that the first two rows have been switched, and the second and third rows have been condensed so that three large felines follow a single elephant standing upon intertwined snakes (Figure 3). According to Cialowicz, these differences are probably due to problems in composition, the enlargement of the figures resulting in space constraints and the loss of the heads of the animals in the first row\(^{74}\). Space constraints can also be cited as a reason for the differences seen on the Sayala mace handle (Figure 7). While the iconography retains the most important elements, the rows have been condensed and condensed.

\(^{70}\) Churcher, “Zoological study”, 155-56.

\(^{71}\) Churcher, “Zoological study”, 155-6.

\(^{72}\) Churcher, “Zoological study”, 156-7.

\(^{73}\) Dreyer, “Ein neues Fragment”, 16.

\(^{74}\) Cialowicz, “Scènes Zoomorphes Prédynastiques”, 252.
represented by a single animal. One can imagine, however, that upon turning the handle and ‘reading’ the mace from top to bottom, the animals would have followed in rows as on the other objects.

On the boss side of the Pitt-Rivers and Abu Zeidan knife handles (Figures 5 & 6), the rows of animals do not display the same levels of formalization and standardization. Only the first row has the same sequence of species on both knife handles, namely a series of mythological hybrids consisting of a vulture with the head and trunk of an elephant followed by a single catfish. The rest of the rows are composed again of fauna typical of the deserts, mountain ranges, and semi desert plains, and are often closed with the image of a hunting dog.

2.3.1.2. Current Interpretations of the ‘animal-rows’ motif:
The highly standardized nature of the Late Predynastic ‘animal-rows’ motif has caught the attention of several scholars. G. Bénédite posited that it was a reflection of the politico-religious geography of Predynastic Egypt or territorial division into ‘proto-nomes’. B.V. Bothmer viewed it as a hunter’s procession in which the animals depicted embody the fulfillment of what was hoped for in the afterlife i.e. an abundance of game. K.M. Cialowicz, on the other hand, argued for a royal display of power, wealth, and victory.

More recently, however, the motif’s association with the doctrine of ‘Order over Chaos’ has gained wide support and recognition. The association with ‘Order over Chaos’ is based upon three major factors. The first is the actual layout and

---

75 Huyge, “A double-powerful device”, 831.
76 Cialowicz, “Scènes Zoomorphes Prédynastiques”, 249.
77 Row 4 on the boss-side of the Abu Zeidan Knife handle.
79 B.V. Bothmer & J. L. Keith, *Brief guide to the Department of Egyptian and Classical Art.* (Brooklyn: Brooklyn Museum, 1974), 19
81 Refer to footnote 58 for references.
composition of the iconography. According to Raffaele, the clear linear arrangement of the figures constitutes an effective expression of order, balance, and control, and enhances the contrast between the ‘savage’ character of the displayed fauna and the rigorous order in which they proceed\(^{82}\). The second factor is that early prototypes of ordered rows of animals are associated with scenes of hunting and military triumph on Naqada I- early Naqada II C-ware\(^{83}\), the latter two widely accepted as symbolizing the maintenance of order and the subjugation and containment of disorder\(^{84}\). It is noteworthy that although the ‘animal-rows’ motif had largely been separated from hunting and military triumph scenes by the Late Predynastic Period, the boss side of the Carnarvon knife handle is, however, carved with a ‘Desert hunt’ scene\(^{85}\) (Figure 3), which indicates that they were still thematically associated. The third and final factor is the presence of the hunting dog and the rosette often depicted at the end of the rows. These elements, coined as ‘control signs’ by B. Kemp\(^{86}\), have been associated with ideas of ‘control’, ‘power’, and ‘subjugation’\(^{87}\).

Within this context of ‘Order over Chaos’, two scholars have forwarded more detailed ‘readings’ of the motif, as well as of the meaning and symbolism of the

\(^{82}\) Raffaele, “Animal rows”, 258.

\(^{83}\) Early examples in which ordered rows of animals are paralleled with hunting/military triumph scenes include, a jar from tomb U-415 in Cemetery-U at Abydos upon which ordered rows of hippopotamuses and gazelles followed by a hunting dog are paralleled with a row of bound captives; Turin Museum bowl S.1827 upon which hunters holding bows and arrows lead a file of tethered gazelles; and Turin Museum double-jar S.1823, which not only includes a file of tethered gazelles lead by hunters holding bows, as on Turin museum bowl S.1827, but also includes an image of a crocodile followed by a file of figures holding harpoons or spears - Raffaele, “Animal rows”, 247 & 260.


\(^{85}\) Ciałowicz, “Scènes Zoomorphes Prédynastiques”, 255.


Saddlebill stork. Raffaele posits that the Late Predynastic ‘animal-rows’ motif essentially represents a visual replica of a ‘slaughtering’ or ‘offering’ ritual which functioned to ensure the “triumph of Order over Chaos” ⁸⁸. The use of significant compound images within the first two rows, as well as the repetitive and standardized nature of these rows, indicate to Raffaele that they are of primary significance to the meaning of the motif ⁸⁹.

‘Reading’ the motif in a quasi-linguistic sense, Raffaele posits a tripartite structure of meaning in which the various animals depicted represent (a) the subject of the ritual, (b) the action of the ritual, and (c) the object of the ritual. The subject is represented by the elephant standing upon intertwined snakes, which refers to the divine power of the king as the insurer of order ⁹⁰. The action of the ritual is expressed by the foremost Saddlebill stork with a snake at its beak, as well as by the single giraffe which follows it. According to Raffaele, the compound of the stork + snake refers to the concept of ‘capture’, this reading supported by the fact that the same compound appears associated with a scene in a rock inscription of the Theban Western Desert in which a nude and long-haired captive is bound and controlled by a bald, bearded figure holding a mace ⁹¹ (Gebel Djehuty inscription no. 1- Figure 12).

---

⁸⁸ According to Raffaele, the actual practice of such rituals may be indicated by contemporary archaeozoological evidence, such as the large slaughtering and butchering ceremonial center at Hierakonpolis (HK 29A) in which vast numbers of animal bones (both wild and domesticated species) were found. Furthermore, when the motif decorates knife handles, the animal rows are invariably directed towards the blade, signifying their fate as ‘potential victims of the knife’. Raffaele further posits that these knife handles may actually have been used in these rituals - Raffaele, “Animal rows”, 258-269.


⁹⁰ This interpretation is based on the close association of this symbol with a shrine and the figure of a seated king on the flat side of another carved Late Predynastic knife handle, Ashmolean Museum E4975. While the elephant standing upon intertwined snakes may be a designation for this shrine or a symbol referring to the divine entity or god to whom the shrine belongs, Raffaele is of the opinion that it metonymically expresses royal power, as the Late Predynastic Period witnessed an increasing centralization, formalization, and ideologization of religious institutions and beliefs - Raffaele, “Animal rows”, 266.

The giraffe\textsuperscript{92}, owing to its height and its hieroglyphic use as a determinative in \(\text{sr} \leftarrow \text{\textbf{\textit{e}}} \rightarrow \text{\textbf{\textit{r}}} \), is associated with the concepts of foreseeing and prophesying, and combined with the stork + snake compound, thus alludes to a ‘profitable game capture’\textsuperscript{93}. The remaining animals in the lower rows, which do not exhibit a recurring pattern of species arrangement and include species known to have had importance as sacrifice victims (gazelles and cattle), represent the object of the ritual i.e. the forces of chaos\textsuperscript{94}. According to Raffaele, the recurring appearance of ‘control signs’ at the end of these rows, such as the domesticated hunting dog and the rosette, further support this reading and essentially serve to ensure that the ‘forces of chaos’ are subdued\textsuperscript{95}.

Published within the same year as the study of Raffaele, is Dreyer’s study of the Abydos K1262b knife handle (Figure 11). As with Raffaele, Dreyer recognizes and underscores the almost formulaic and repetitive character of the motif’s upper rows. Tracing the image of the elephant standing upon intertwined snakes in Late Predynastic iconography, Dreyer highlights the fact that it is also found carved into two other Late Predynastic knife handles in connection with ‘victory’ scenes, namely the Ashmolean Museum knife Handle (Figure 14) and the Metropolitan Museum Knife handle (Figure 14)\textsuperscript{96}. According to Dreyer, the association of the elephant with


\textsuperscript{93} Raffaele, “Animal rows”, 265-6.


\textsuperscript{95} Raffaele, “Animal rows”, 265.

\textsuperscript{96} The flat side of the Ashmolean Museum knife handle displays the elephant standing upon intertwined snakes beneath a depiction of the pr-wr shrine and behind the figure of a seated king. The boss side of this knife handle includes depictions of kneeling, bound enemies who are tethered and controlled by seated men wielding long sticks. The boss side of the Metropolitan Museum handle displays the elephant standing upon snakes above a procession of six ships heading towards a shrine. Upon the flat side of this knife handle is another similar shrine, before which are three rows of standing...
the *pr-šrt* shrine on the Ashmolean Museum knife handle suggests that it should be regarded as a divine power. Furthermore, the connection of the elephant with victory scenes on both of the above knife handles and its depiction ‘trampling’ snakes, the latter of which represent the (chthonic) forces of chaos, indicate that this compound specifically refers to the divine power that ensures order, including the subjugation of enemies.

The recurrent connection of the elephant standing upon snakes compound with the stork + snake compound suggests to Dreyer that both have a similar meaning. This is further supported by the fact that the stork and snake compound is associated with a *victory* scene in the Gebel Djehuty inscription no. 1, namely the bound captive controlled by the figure holding a mace. Thus like the elephant standing upon intertwined snakes, the stork with a snake at its beak refers to the subjection and subjugation of enemies.

As with Raffaele, Dreyer connects the single giraffe following the foremost stork in the ‘animal-rows’ motif with the concept of ‘foresight’. However, Dreyer does note a significant change in attitude between the animals preceding the giraffe and those that follow. Preceding the giraffe, the animals are depicted in active poses, the elephants trampling snakes and the foremost stork of the second row grasping a and seated figures, as well as a badly damaged, yet discernable smiting scene - Dreyer, “Ein neues Fragment”, 16.

97 Dreyer, “Ein neues Fragment”, 16.
98 i.e. bound captives on the Ashmolean Museum knife handle, and ‘smiting scene’ on the Metropolitan Museum knife handle.
99 The intertwined snakes beneath the feet of the elephant also appear in another contemporary motif in which they are intertwined around a number of rosettes. According to Dreyer, in this symmetrical form, the snakes are controlled by the rosettes, the latter of which should also be understood as signs of divine or royal power - Dreyer, “Ein neues Fragment”, 17.
100 Dreyer, “Ein neues Fragment”, 16-17.
101 Dreyer, “Ein neues Fragment”, 17; Darnell, Darnell, Friedman, & Hendrickx, *Theban Desert Road Survey*, 11.
103 Again this is due to the long neck of the giraffe which allows it to see great distances, as well as its use as a determinative in the word *sr* “predict, prophesy, promise, prospect” - Dreyer, “Ein neues Fragment”, 17.
snake in its beak. Behind the giraffe, however, are storks without snakes, signaling a significant change with the caesura of the giraffe. According to Dreyer, the following message is thus conveyed: in front of the giraffe chaos is fought and subjugated, and following the giraffe is the consequent “desired future state.” This state is characterized by peace without chaos and an abundance of game animals.

2.3.2. Cylinder Seals and Cylinder Seal Impressions

A Naqada IID cylinder seal impression from Tomb U-210 in Cemetery-U at Abydos (Abydos K2160c – Figure 15) and a Naqada IIIB ivory cylinder seal from Tomb L17 in Cemetery L at Qustul in Lower Nubia (L17-26 OIM 23662 - Figure 16) contain images of Saddlebill storks. Although the characteristic ‘wattle’ and ‘saddle’ of the stork are not present, the scholars who have studied the iconography of the above two seals nevertheless agree that the depicted birds are Saddlebill storks.

2.3.2.1 The U-210 Cylinder Seal Impression (Figure 15)

The iconography of the seal consists of a central figure surrounded by alternating rows of smaller symbols. The central figure, which faces to the left, has been identified as a Saddlebill stork, and the surrounding rows alternate between three-peaked mountains signs and bow-tie shaped signs.

According to Hartung, the central figure of the stork may refer to the name of a Predynastic ruler i.e. King Stork, an interpretation which is based upon G. Dreyer’s argument that the combination of an animal + land/vegetation sign in Late

---

Predynastic iconography refers to a district or production center of a ruler\textsuperscript{109}. The latter argument has, however, been widely criticized over the last decade\textsuperscript{110}. J. Hill on the other hand, posits that the alternating rows of mountain signs and bow-tie shaped signs refer to tribute from a foreign area\textsuperscript{111}. This interpretation is based upon the reading of the mountain signs as $h \text{fw}$ (sign V32), which when tripled in later dynastic texts serves as the determinative for $gw$ ‘tribute’\textsuperscript{112}. According to Hill, as the stork also features prominently on an ivory cylinder seal from Qustul in Lower Nubia (discussed below), specifically preceding the figure of a man holding a staff, it may have served as a title designation for an official trade liaison of the Nubians, who had regular dealings with Egypt\textsuperscript{113}.

2.3.2.2. The Ivory Cylinder Seal (L17-26 OIM 23662) (Figure 16)

Although the ivory cylinder seal from Tomb L17 is badly spilt and a section of the seal’s design is missing, B. Williams was able to reconstruct large parts of the iconography\textsuperscript{114}. Between two borders with zig-zag patterns signifying water, is a row of three large long-legged wading birds, followed by a group of smaller wading birds, and finally the figure of a man\textsuperscript{115}. While the latter is mostly damaged, according to Williams, his dress and pose clearly parallel the ‘greeting man’ on the Naqada III (A-group) Qustul incense burner\textsuperscript{116} (Figure 17). The man’s head is indicated by the tip of

\begin{itemize}
  \item\textsuperscript{109} Hartung, Prädynastische Siegelabrollungen”, 214.
  \item\textsuperscript{111}J.A. Hill, Cylinder seal glyptic in Predynastic Egypt and neighboring regions, Oxford: Archaeopress, 2006), 27.
  \item\textsuperscript{112} Hill, Cylinder seal glyptic, 27.
  \item\textsuperscript{113} Hill, Cylinder seal glyptic, 27.
  \item\textsuperscript{114} Williams, The A-group royal cemetery, 157.
  \item\textsuperscript{115} Williams, The A-group royal cemetery, 157-8.
  \item\textsuperscript{116} Williams, The A-group royal cemetery, 158; for dating see D. Michaux-Colombot, “New Considerations on the Qustul incense burner iconography”, in Between the Cataracts, Part 2, fasc.1,
the beard, the tie of the garment is indicated at the waist, and his left arm is bent upward towards the birds in the gesture of presentation, worship, or salutation\textsuperscript{117}. Above the fourth smaller bird is a harpoon, which stretches up to the left and ends above the head of the second larger wading bird\textsuperscript{118}. According to Williams, the position of the harpoon in this context indicates that it was intended as a label\textsuperscript{119}.

While Williams does not specifically identify the first three larger wading birds on the seal as Saddlebill storks, J. Hill has compared them with that on the U-210 seal impression. Hill has also interpreted the raised forearm of the man as the tip of a staff, the rest obscured by the erosion of the seal’s surface\textsuperscript{120}. According to Hill, the combination of the man with a staff suggests that he represents an official, and as stated above, the birds may have served as locational and administrative symbols for a trade liaison between Lower Nubia and Egypt\textsuperscript{121}. According to Hill, the single stork on the U-210 seal impression is thus a condensed version of the Qustul ivory cylinder seal.

2.3.3. Rock Inscriptions

A Late Predynastic rock inscription in the Theban Western Desert (Gebel Djehuty inscription no. 1 – Figure 12) and a Naqada III rock inscription near the modern town of el-Khayy (Figure 18) in the Eastern Desert contain images of Saddlebill storks. Again, while the characteristic ‘wattle’ and ‘saddle’ of the stork are not present, the scholars who have studied the iconography of the above two inscriptions nevertheless agree that the depicted birds are Saddlebill storks.


\textsuperscript{117} Williams, \textit{The A-group royal cemetery}, 158.

\textsuperscript{118} Williams, \textit{The A-group royal cemetery}, 158.

\textsuperscript{119} Williams, \textit{The A-group royal cemetery}, 158.

\textsuperscript{120} Hill, \textit{Cylinder seal glyptic}, 27.

\textsuperscript{121} Hill, \textit{Cylinder seal glyptic}, 27.
2.3.3.1. The Gebel Djehuty Rock Inscription (Figure 12)

During the mapping and recording of the archaeological sites, ancient routes, and rock inscriptions of the Theban western desert\textsuperscript{122}, the \textit{Theban Desert Road Survey} discovered a Late Predynastic rock inscription containing images of Saddlebill storks. The inscription, catalogued as Gebel \textit{Tjauti} (Djehuty) Inscription no. 1, is located in a dominant position high on a rock face that backs a natural shelf where the main track of the ‘Alamat Valley Road ascends to the top of Gebel Djehuty\textsuperscript{123}.

According to J.C. Darnell, R. Friedman, and S. Hendrickx, the inscription essentially consists of two layers. The pair of antelopes or ibex on the right represent the earliest layer of inscription, and the rest of the images or the ‘tableau’ belong to a later layer of inscription\textsuperscript{124}. The tableau proper is composed of two registers in which all figures face to the right. The upper register commences (from right to left) with the image of a tall structure identified as a shrine\textsuperscript{125}, flanked and partially overlain by a pair of Saddlebill storks\textsuperscript{126}. Following this is a falcon preceding a man holding a staff, above which are two more falcons followed by a carrying chair\textsuperscript{127}. The lower register commences with the image of a falcon above a scorpion\textsuperscript{128}. This is followed by a figure carrying a staff, before which is a partially lost image that has been interpreted as representing part of a standard on a pole\textsuperscript{129}. Behind the figure is a single nude and long-haired captive tethered to a rope held by a bald, bearded male figure holding a

\textsuperscript{122} This desert, formed by a high plateau that is bounded to the north by the Darb Naqadiya and to the south by the great bay of the Rayayna Desert, fills the great Qena bend in the Nile.
\textsuperscript{123} Darnell, Darnell, Friedman, and Hendrickx, \textit{Theban Desert Road Survey}, 7.
\textsuperscript{124} Darnell, Darnell, Friedman, and Hendrickx, \textit{Theban Desert Road Survey}, 11.
\textsuperscript{125} According to Darnell, Friedman & Hendrickx, this structure can be identified as a shrine due to parallels on later documents such as the Narmer mace-head and the tablet of Horus Aha, notably in conjunction with long-necked birds identified as Herons - Darnell, Darnell, Friedman, and Hendrickx, \textit{Theban Desert Road Survey}, 11.
\textsuperscript{126} Darnell, Darnell, Friedman, and Hendrickx, \textit{Theban Desert Road Survey}, 11.
\textsuperscript{127} Darnell, Darnell, Friedman, and Hendrickx, \textit{Theban Desert Road Survey}, 11.
\textsuperscript{128} Darnell, Darnell, Friedman, and Hendrickx, \textit{Theban Desert Road Survey}, 11.
\textsuperscript{129} Darnell, Darnell, Friedman, and Hendrickx, \textit{Theban Desert Road Survey}, 11.
mace. Between the latter two figures is a bucranium on a pole and closing the register are a number of enigmatic incisions identified as a three-peaked mountain and vegetation.

Darnell, Friedman & Hendrickx have interpreted the pair of storks and the shrine within the upper register as a representation of a shrine situated in the Coptite Nome, the latter location identified by the two storks as a proto-hieroglyphic writing of the Nome’s Dynastic name $bwy$. The falcons which follow, distinguished by a different set of attributes and internal decoration, are representations of three forms of Horus, each associated with aspects of victory and power. From the arrangement of the composition, the male figure holding the staff appears to be equated with the falcons. Interpreting his high shoulders as indicative of a garment, and based on later documents in which a figure wearing a panther-skin appears in close proximity to the king (i.e. the Narmer Palette), this figure has been interpreted a representation of the king’s son. The upper register of the Gebel Djehuty inscription thus represents a royal procession to a shrine located in the Coptite Nome.

According to Darnell, Friedman & Hendrickx, the falcon and the scorpion in the lower register signify the name of king Scorpion, and based on G. Dreyer’s identification of the owner of tomb U-j as Scorpion, as well as a number of parallels with iconography from Tomb U-j, places the date of the tableau in the Naqada IIIA Period or slightly earlier. The combination of the standard and the figure carrying a staff recall a number of procession scenes on later documents, such as the Narmer...
Palette, and indicate that they should be interpreted as part of the retinue of the king\textsuperscript{138}. The stork and snake compound, which parallels the second row of the ‘animal-rows’ motif, functions as an introduction, announcement, and label for the scene that follows, the main content of which is the triumph of ‘Order over Chaos’, or more simply stated ‘victory’\textsuperscript{139}. This victory is represented by the subjugation of the captive, as well as by the bucranium on a pole\textsuperscript{140}. The three-peaked mountain and vegetation which occur behind the armed bearded figure are locational information, setting the origin of the entire procession in the desert mountains in which the inscription is located\textsuperscript{141}.

Taking into consideration socio-political events which took place during the early part of the Naqada III period in which a number of regional chiefdoms in Upper Egypt became larger kingdoms, Darnell, Friedman and Hendrickx posit that the Gebel Djehuty inscription represents a record of a successful military operation carried out by an Abydene ruler, possibly King Scorpion\textsuperscript{142}. The tableau essentially depicts the result of this victory and shows the dedication of the conquest (i.e. the nude, bound captive) by the victor to a deity or temple (i.e. shrine) situated within the Coptite Nome\textsuperscript{143}. The placement of the inscription on the rock face of Gebel Djehuty thus appears to be concerned with the ruler’s control over the ‘Alamat Valley Road and may therefore have served as an early type of ‘victory stela’\textsuperscript{144}.

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{138} Darnell, Darnell, Friedman, and Hendrickx, \textit{Theban Desert Road Survey}, 15.
\bibitem{139} Darnell, Darnell, Friedman, and Hendrickx, \textit{Theban Desert Road Survey}, 16.
\bibitem{140} According to Darnell, Friedman & Hendrickx, the bucranium that appears between the captive and his capturer is a symbol that signifies the capture and slaughter of an extremely strong enemy and the subsequent power now held over this enemy --\textit{Theban Desert Road Survey}, 16.
\bibitem{141} Darnell, Darnell, Friedman, and Hendrickx, \textit{Theban Desert Road Survey}, 16.
\bibitem{142} Darnell, Darnell, Friedman, and Hendrickx, \textit{Theban Desert Road Survey}, 17.
\bibitem{143} Darnell, Darnell, Friedman, and Hendrickx, \textit{Theban Desert Road Survey}, 17.
\bibitem{144} Darnell, Darnell, Friedman, and Hendrickx, \textit{Theban Desert Road Survey}, 17.
\end{thebibliography}
2.3.3.2. The el-Khayy Inscription (Figure 18)

During surveys of the northern hinterland of Elkab, the *Elkab Desert Survey Project* discovered a rock inscription near the modern town of el-Khayy that contains images of Saddlebill storks. The inscription is located on a high rock face above the modern railroad and adjacent highway\(^{145}\).

According to J.C. Darnell, the inscription forms part of a larger grouping of inscriptions, dubbed the ‘central area’, that date from the Naqada I Period through to the 1\(^{st}\) Dynasty\(^{146}\). The inscription containing the images of the storks is located in the upper left section of this ‘central area’ and is composed of 5 large images or ‘signs’ (the overall size of the inscription is 1.15 m x 0.6 m)\(^{147}\). From right to left the inscription comprises of a bucranium on a pole followed by an addorsed pair of Saddlebill storks, above and between which is an image of a bald ibis\(^{148}\). Behind the bucranium and below the beak of the rightmost stork is an image of a rearing snake\(^{149}\). Barring the leftmost Saddlebill stork, all the images face to the right.

According to Darnell, close parallels between the rendering of the signs in the el-Khayy inscription and those adorning the labels and ceramics discovered in tomb U-j, date the inscription to the late Naqada III Period\(^{150}\). Darnell states that the addorsed Saddlebill storks within the inscription recall zoomorphic and anthromorphic representations of horizon hills, and may thus be a reference to the cosmos\(^{151}\). The bald ibis, which later functioned as the hieroglyph for \(\text{i3h} ‘\text{luminosity’,}\) may specifically function as a designation for the eastern horizon \(\text{i3ht}\)\(^{152}\), an

---

\(^{145}\) Darnell, ‘el-Khayy’, 50.
\(^{146}\) Darnell, ‘el-Khayy’, 52.
\(^{147}\) Darnell, ‘el-Khayy’, 52.
\(^{148}\) Darnell, ‘el-Khayy’, 52.
\(^{149}\) Darnell, ‘el-Khayy’, 52.
\(^{150}\) Darnell, ‘el-Khayy’, 53-54.
\(^{151}\) Darnell, ‘el-Khayy’, 57.
\(^{152}\) Darnell, ‘el-Khayy’, 57.
interpretation which is supported by the reading of the rearing serpent as a proto-hieroglyphic writing of *dw* ‘mountain’\(^{153}\). According to Darnell, the storks, bald ibis, and the snake may thus function to express the concept of a balanced and light suffused cosmos\(^{154}\). Lastly, Darnell states that the bucranium in the el-Khawy inscription is a royal symbol, and specifically refers to the authority and power of the king\(^{155}\). The bucranium on a pole combined with the representation of the cosmos, thus functions to express a politico-religious message, namely the concept of royal authority over the ordered cosmos\(^{156}\). Darnell states that this reading is supported by later developed renderings of this message, namely the decoration on the comb of king Djet (JdE 47176 – Figure 19). The comb’s iconography consists of the king’s name within a *serekh* surmounted by a depiction of Horus framed by two inward-facing *w*s-scepters. Above this the wings of the sky are depicted carrying the solar bark\(^{157}\). According to Darnell, the message conveyed by this iconography is that the power of the sun in the sky and that of the king on earth were essentially equivalent, filling and ordering the cosmos\(^{158}\).

The royal nature of the el-Khawy inscription and its intended visibility, due to the size of the signs and high placement on the rock face, thus indicates to Darnell that it had a similar function to the Gebel Djehuty inscription, serving as a type of public ‘signpost’ or ‘billboard’ and expressing the power and authority of the king to travelers in the area.

\(^{153}\) Darnell, ‘el-Khawy’.
\(^{154}\) Darnell, ‘el-Khawy’, 58.
\(^{155}\) Darnel, ‘el-Khawy’, 59.
\(^{156}\) Darnell, ‘el-Khawy’, 60.
\(^{157}\) Darnell, ‘el-Khawy’, 59.
\(^{158}\) Darnell, ‘el-Khawy’, 59-60.
2.4. The Saddlebill stork in Late Predynastic Iconography: A discussion and Interpretation of the evidence

The above descriptions and review of current interpretations of the iconography in which the Saddlebill stork appears already demonstrates that the function of Saddlebill stork imagery in Late Predynastic iconography is more complex than that forwarded by Janák. This is especially true of the ordered rows of animals adorning the carved handles, which do not simply include depictions of various “powerful animals”, but represent a highly organized, standardized, and formalized motif. The above review has also demonstrated, however, that there is no congruent and widely accepted interpretation of the function and meaning of Saddlebill stork imagery in Late Predynastic iconography.

From a broader perspective, the representation of the Saddlebill stork within the ‘animal-rows’ motif, upon cylinder seals, and within rock inscriptions indicates that the inhabitants of Egypt (and Lower Nubia) were well-acquainted with the species. The fidelity of the stork images and rendering of minute details of the head in the ‘animal-rows’ motif especially implies close and prolonged contact. Certainly the distinctive appearance and large size of the bird caused it to stand out in the faunal landscape, and we can assume that these aspects played a part in its appeal. However, the recurrent representation of the stork with a snake in or at its beak also indicates that the bird’s behavior was observed.

As noted in the discussion of the living species, the Saddlebill stork has been seen consuming snakes in the Kruger National Park in South Africa. An individual even uploaded a video of this on YouTube. In the video the stork snatches a large snake from the water, grasps it by the head, shakes it, drops it, and proceeds to stab it

159 [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NEKVvY_77-g](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NEKVvY_77-g)
repeatedly with its sharp beak while the snake coils in on itself. This pattern occurs for several minutes until the snake dies and the stork swallows it whole. Apart from demonstrating the powerlessness and vulnerability of the snake against the stork, this video also highlights a significant behavioral feature of the bird, namely the hunting technique in which it utilizes its long, thin, and slightly recurved beak to repeatedly impale and kill its prey.

On the Qustul ivory cylinder seal (Figure 16), it has been noted that a harpoon is depicted above the row of storks and smaller wading birds preceding the figure of a man. While J. Hill has interpreted the birds as a title designation for trade relations between Lower Nubia and Egypt, the presence of the stork and other species of wading birds in the ‘animal-rows’ motif and in the Gebel Djehuty and el-Khayw inscriptions, however, indicates that this interpretation is inconsistent with the iconographic evidence. As mentioned by Williams\(^\text{160}\), the position of the harpoon above the birds indicates that it was intended as a label. In this regard it is significant and noteworthy that the harpoon and spear are identified as \(m^h b\)\(^\text{161}\) in Old Kingdom texts\(^\text{162}\), an instrumental noun derived from the verb \(b\)\(^\text{163}\). This suggests that the ability of the stork to snatch prey from the water and subsequently kill through repeated stabs with the beak was equated with the harpoon and the spear, and that the harpoon on the Qustul cylinder seal functions as a label for the birds. It

\(^{160}\) Williams, The A-group royal cemetery, 158.

\(^{161}\) Variant. In a recent study, M. Odler & M. Peterková Hlouchová have demonstrated that \(m^h b\) is the name of the complete harpoon or spear - “May you Receive that favourite harpoon of yours...Old Kingdom spears/harpoons and their contexts of use”, in Studien Zur Altägyptischen Kultur Band 46 (2017): 191-222.

\(^{162}\) E.g. PT 519.

\(^{163}\) G. Takács and several other scholars who have studied Afro-Asiatic and Semitic languages state that the \(m\)- or \(m\)- prefix functions to transform verbs into instrumental nouns, i.e. Egyptian noun \(mn\)ht ‘clothing or garments’ from the verb \(wm\)h ‘to clothe’ – G. Takács. Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian: M- (Vol. III) (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 8; S. E. Thompson. “Egyptian Language and Writing”, in Encyclopedia of the Archaeology of Ancient Egypt, ed. K. A. Bard (London: Routledge): 325-328; E. Lipiński, Semitic Languages: Outline of a Comparative Grammar. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta. (Leuven: Peeters & Departement Oostere Studies, 2001), 223.
should be kept in mind that although the ‘stabbing’ technique is not unique to the Saddlebill stork, as indicated on the cylinder seal itself by the inclusion of other smaller species of wading birds, the larger size and foremost position accorded to the storks in the seal’s iconography, as well as the subsequent use of the stork as a visual signifier in the Egyptian term for harpoon/spear\(^\text{164}\), however, suggests that it held a prominent status among wading birds. This can be attributed to the stork’s immense size, which in territorial displays allows it overpower and drive off its smaller counterparts, as well as predators. It might also, however, be due to the length and sharpness of the stork’s beak, which may have been viewed as the epitomic model of a spear or harpoon, as well as the red coloration that adorns the beak’s tip (Figure 2). The latter may have been seen an emblem of the stork’s effectiveness as a predator, as well as its aggressiveness, the red coloration equivalent to the blood that results from driving the beak into flesh\(^\text{165}\).

Besides the practical function of the harpoon and spear in fishing, Predynastic and Dynastic iconography and texts also present it as a weapon, and specifically as a means for achieving the subjugation and destruction of enemy forces and the establishment of ‘Order over Chaos’. Early hunting motifs on Predynastic White Cross-lined ware (C-ware) include scenes in which hunters harpoon/spear and lasso hippopotamuses and crocodiles from boats (Figure 20), and Decorative ware (D-ware) in the form of hippopotamuses were painted with depictions of hunters carrying

\(^{164}\) It should be kept in mind and recognized that the \textit{bi} syllable in \textit{m'b3} could have been spelt using unilateral signs. This suggests that the Saddlebill stork was specifically chosen as both a phonetic and visual signifier.

\(^{165}\) The representation of blood resulting from impaled flesh is, according to Hendrickx, attested on a clay hippopotamus figurine from Tomb U-239 in Cemetery-U at Abydos. The figurine was painted red and displays a deliberate incision on the neck in the same spot as the impact of harpoons in painted hippopotamus hunting scenes on Naqada I-II C-ware – S. Hendrickx, “Hunting and social complexity in Predynastic \textit{Egypt}”, \textit{Bulletin des séances - Académie royale des sciences d'outre-mer} / \textit{Mededelingen der zittingen - Koninklijke Academie voor Overseese Wetenschappen} 57 (2013): 237-263.
Harpoons and lassoes\textsuperscript{166} (Figure 2). As discussed above, it has been widely accepted that the impaled and lassoed fauna within these scenes signify the defeat of chaos and the establishment of order\textsuperscript{167}. This interpretation is supported by an Early Dynastic royal ‘smiting’ scene on a cylinder seal impression from the tomb of King Den in which the mace typically wielded by the king is replaced by a harpoon, essentially equating the decapitated enemies depicted beneath the king with the impaled hippopotamuses and crocodiles in earlier hunting scenes\textsuperscript{168} (Figure 22). Furthermore, the slaying of the hippopotamus via the harpoon or spear in the Dynastic Royal Hippopotamus Hunt was symbolic of the king’s ability to dispel chaos and establish m\textsuperscript{3}ft, and the deceased king/queen in PT 519 utilizes a harpoon/spear to establish order in the ‘Field of Rest’ by severing the heads of his/her adversaries that dwell there\textsuperscript{169}.

As mentioned in the discussion of the living species, the Saddlebill stork uses this ‘impaling’ technique on all of its live prey. The specific and recurrent representation of the stork with a snake is thus significant. While there are numerous sources that can be cited that highlight the positive aspects of snakes in ancient Egyptian religion, it should be kept in mind that these aspects were utilized apotropaically. Snakes are inherently dangerous creatures and their ability to induce death via spitting and injecting venom or via constriction lead to their portrayal as chaotic and inimical forces. This is especially apparent in later funerary texts, where snakes are posed as the epitomic enemy of the deceased king and sun god Ra\textsuperscript{170}.

\textsuperscript{166} Hendrickx, “Hunting and social complexity”, 249.
\textsuperscript{167} See footnote 58 for references
\textsuperscript{168} Hendrickx, “Hunting and social complexity”, 249.
\textsuperscript{169} Hendrickx, “Hunting and social complexity”, 165.
\textsuperscript{170} A group of spells called the ‘Snake Spells’ in the Pyramid Texts functioned to ward off hostile, dangerous creatures such as scorpions, millipedes, crocodiles, and above all, snakes, which may impede the deceased king’s journey to heaven and continual rebirth PT 226-243, PT 276-299, PT 314, PT 332, PT 375-399, & PT 401 – G. Meurer, Die Feinde des Königs in den Pyramidentexten (Freiburg
The association of the Saddlebill stork with the harpoon in both the iconography of the Qustul cylinder seal and in the term for harpoon/spear in Dynastic texts, and the snake’s prominent connection with chaos and the enemy in later funerary texts, suggests that the stork and snake compound essentially parallels images of hunters or the king harpooning and killing ‘embodiments of chaos’ i.e. hippopotamuses, crocodiles, and enemies. This argument is supported by the larger ‘Order over Chaos’ theme of the contexts in which the compound appears, signified by the ordered rows of animals and mythological creatures on the carved handles, as well as the bucranium on a pole and the bound, nude captive controlled and subjugated by a figure holding a mace in the Gebel Djehuty inscription. Taking this into consideration, it is thus unlikely that the stork and snake compound refers to ‘capture’ as forwarded by Raffaele, as the term ‘capture’ does not carry the nuances of violence, defeat, and conquest that is embodied in the iconography. Rather, as posited by Dreyer, it can be suggested that it refers to the violent subjection and subjugation of chaotic forces.

The compound’s association with the giraffe (i.e. a symbol referring to the future state) in the ‘animal-rows’ motif and the leading position which it is accorded in both this motif, as well as in the Gebel Djehuty inscription, further suggests that it functions as a prelude or introduction to scenes in which ‘Order over Chaos’ has been established. As noted by Dreyer, there is a significant change in the attitude of the animals preceding the giraffe and those following, suggesting a change in meaning.171

Dreyer has posited that the storks, Herons, and Secretary birds following the giraffe signify ‘peace’, based on the fact that they are depicted without snakes\textsuperscript{172}. This argument can be further supported by the fact that all three species of birds are known to feed on snakes, the secretary bird’s Latin name \textit{Sagittarius serpentarius} deriving from its reputation in Africa as the ‘serpent-killer’\textsuperscript{173}. It is noteworthy that once again, the Saddlebill storks have been accorded the foremost position when depicted amongst other birds.

While Dreyer interprets the fauna in the lower rows as an ‘abundance of game’\textsuperscript{174}, the inclusion of mythical creatures within these rows suggests that they rather designate the control of chaos that results from violent action (i.e. the stork and the snake). This control is not only signified by the ordered manner in which the fauna and mythical creatures have been portrayed, but also by the use of domestic hunting dogs and rosettes as ‘control signs’ at the end of these rows. The idea that violent action and subjugation leads to control and order is also evident in the Gebel Djehuty and el-Khawy inscriptions. In the former, this narrative is especially apparent - violent action and subjugation i.e. stork and snake compound, followed by the defeat of a strong enemy i.e. bucranium on a pole, which leads to the control of chaos \textit{i.e.} the ritual ‘parading’ of the nude, bound war-captive controlled and tethered to a rope held by a figure \textit{holding} and not \textit{wielding} a mace\textsuperscript{175}. The bucranium on a pole and the Saddlebill stork also occur together in the el-Khawy inscription, suggesting that their association and meaning was standardized. While Darnell interprets the inscription as a reference to the cosmos and royal authority, there is, however, no explicit evidence

\textsuperscript{172} Dreyer, “Ein neues Fragment”, 17.


\textsuperscript{174} Dreyer, “Ein neues Fragment”, 17.

\textsuperscript{175} Darnell, Darnell, Friedman, and Hendrickx, \textit{Theban Desert Road Survey}, 16.
that specifically links the bucranium with royal power\textsuperscript{176}. Instead it may be suggested that the inscription refers to the defeat and subjugation of an area in the east, this interpretation supported by the reading of the bald ibis and rearing snake as a reference to the eastern mountains\textsuperscript{177} and the bucranium as a reference to ‘defeat’, as in the Gebel Tjaati inscription. The addorsed Saddlebill storks within this inscription could have a similar function to the \textit{w}s\textit{s}-scepters (the term \textit{w}s\textit{s} meaning ‘dominion’\textsuperscript{178}) on the comb of king Djet, signifying the ‘subjugation’ and power over the area. This reading may be further supported by the iconography of the cylinder seal impression from Tomb U-210 in Cemetery-U at Abydos. As forwarded by Hill, the rows of three-peaked mountains could signify a desert or foreign area i.e. \textit{h}s\textit{swt}, and the rows of bow-tie signs, \textit{g}s\textit{wt} ‘tribute’\textsuperscript{179}. Combining this reading with the meaning of the Saddlebill stork in the ‘animal-rows’ motif and the Gebel Djehuti inscription, the iconography of the seal impression could thus represent the subjugation of a desert or ‘foreign’ area and the resulting receiving of tribute as levy.

Finally, it should be noted that there are inconsistencies in the argument of Darnell, Friedman, and Hendrickx that the dual storks in the Gebel Djehuti inscription no.1 are a proto-hieroglyphic writing of \textit{b}s\textit{wy}, the later attested name of the nome in which, the inscription is situated. Firstly, upon inspection of the photographs provided in the publication\textsuperscript{180}, it is evident that the storks and shrine do not belong to the same layer of inscription\textsuperscript{181}. Secondly, and most importantly, the

\textsuperscript{176} Bucrania were used as decorative elements in both royal and non-royal tombs of the First Dynasty. For further information on ‘Bucrania’ see, R. van Dijk, ‘The Use of Bucrania in the Architecture of First Dynasty Egypt’, \textit{Journal for Semitics} 22 (2013): 449-463.
\textsuperscript{178} Wb 1, 260.6.
\textsuperscript{179} Hill, \textit{Cylinder seal glyptic}, 27.
\textsuperscript{180} Darnell, Darnell, Friedman, and Hendrickx, \textit{Theban Desert Road Survey}, plate 9.
\textsuperscript{181} The shrine’s inscription lines are far deeper and cut through the visible lines of the storks, suggesting that the latter are a palimpsest and belong to an earlier layer of inscription.
earliest attestation of the Coptite Nome’s name in texts is actually written with a
double falcon on a standard $n\text{trwy}$ $\text{w} \text{w}$, with $b\text{wy}$ only appearing during the $5^{th}$
Dynasty. The subsequent meaning of the dual storks in the Gebel Djehuty
inscription is difficult to ascertain, but it may be suggested that they were carved over
the antelope or ibex as a means of controlling and eliminating the potential threat that
these images of desert-dwelling, and thus chaotic, animals posed to the larger
establishment of order.

2.5. Conclusion

It is highly contradictory that extant studies on the terms $b\text{3}$ and $b\text{3w}$ have discussed
the significance of the human-headed bird hieroglyph (sign G53) and images thereof
in New Kingdom and later funerary iconography, yet have largely excluded and
disregarded the Saddlebill stork as a meaningful visual signifier. As stated by Janák,
as both the earliest and most attested hieroglyph for $b\text{3}$ and $b\text{3w}$, the Saddlebill stork
serves as a crucial witness to their original meaning.

As demonstrated above, while Janák’s study has contributed to our
understanding of the origins and development of these terms, there are, however,
significant problems with his subsequent arguments on the meaning of the stork in
Late Predynastic iconography. The investigated material was limited to the corpus of
handles carved with the ‘animal-rows’ motif and his argument for the meaning of the
stork was based upon extant definitions of $b\text{3}$ and $b\text{3w}$. The latter approach also
essentially resulted in an interpretation that did not recognize the function and larger

---


183 As noted in the literature review, L. V. Žabkar, who has performed the most exhaustive study of the $b\text{3}$ and $b\text{3w}$ concepts, does not even mention the stork. Yet his analysis of New Kingdom and later attestations of the $b\text{3}$ and $b\text{3w}$ concepts includes a detailed discussion of the Human-Headed bird in various iconography - *A study of the Ba concept*, 83-85.

184 Janák, “A question of Size”, 143.
message of the motif adorning the carved handles. This indicated that the function and meaning of Saddlebill stork images in Late Predynastic iconography had not been fully explored and that it required further investigation.

From a review of studies on Predynastic iconography, it became apparent that the Saddlebill stork appears in three Late Predynastic iconographic contexts – the Naqada IID-IIIA ‘animal-rows’ motif adorning knife, mace, and comb handles; a Naqada IID cylinder seal impression and a Naqada IIIB ivory cylinder seal; and two Late Predynastic (Naqada II-III) rock inscriptions. Several scholars have studied these attestations and provided interpretations of the role and function of the stork in each context. However, upon review of these interpretations it became apparent that there is not a widely accepted and congruent understanding of the meaning of Saddlebill stork imagery. Utilizing these various interpretations and comparing them with related textual and iconographic evidence, as well as the distinctive characteristics and behavior of the Saddlebill stork in Africa today, it was subsequently demonstrated that there is a remarkable continuity in the role and function of Saddlebill stork imagery.

The images of the Saddlebill stork in the above contexts essentially function as a symbol to achieve the subjugation and subjection of, and domination over chaotic forces that pose a threat to ‘order’ or $m3يت$. The association of the stork with a harpoon on the Qustul ivory cylinder seal and the later Old Kingdom use of the stork as both a phonetic and visual signifier in the term $m3ب$، ‘harpoon’ or ‘spear’, corresponds with and represents an Egyptian allegory for the hunting technique of the living species in which it uses its beak to repeatedly impale and kill its prey. The recurrent representation of the stork with a snake at or in its beak in the ‘animal-rows’ motif and the Gebel Djehuty inscription is not only consistent with the known prey of the
living species, but also confers a symbolic and significant meaning on the stork. Based on the chaotic and inimical characteristics of snakes in later funerary texts, as well as the use of the harpoon as a weapon against chaotic forces and enemies in Predynastic and Dynastic iconography and texts, it has been suggested that the stork and snake compound parallels Predynastic and Dynastic images of hunters or the king harpooning the forces of chaos (i.e. hippopotamuses, crocodiles, and enemies). This argument is supported by the larger ‘Order over Chaos’ theme of the ‘animal-rows’ motif and the associated ‘victory’ scene in the Gebel Djehuty inscription, in which a war-captive is bound and controlled by a figure holding a mace.

As with Dreyer, it has also been argued that the stork essentially represents the necessary violence and subjugation that leads to the establishment of ‘Order over Chaos’. This is based upon the fact that the stork and snake compound introduces scenes that depict the result of violent action or conquest. The latter is represented by the control over fauna and mythological creatures depicted in the lower rows of the ‘animal-rows motif, the stork’s recurrent association with the bucranium on a pole in the rock inscriptions, the parading of a war-captive in a ritual procession in the Gebel Djehuty inscription, and the receiving of tribute on the cylinder seal impression from Tomb U-210.

The role and function of Saddlebill stork images in Late Predynastic iconography are thus centered on violence and domination in the service of ‘Order over Chaos’ and control. That the stork was specifically selected to signify this message is not surprising. As one of the largest and most distinctive storks in Africa, it conveys a sense of dominance in the faunal landscape. Furthermore, its territorial behavior and ‘brutal’ hunting technique gives the impression of aggressiveness,
strength, and power. All of these attributes may thus have played an important role in selecting the stork as the hieroglyphic signifier for \( b^{i} \) and \( b^{iw} \) as a powerful force.
Chapter 3 – b\textsuperscript{3} and b\textsuperscript{3}w in Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom Names, Epithets, and Titles

A wide range of textual data from the 1\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty to the 6\textsuperscript{th} attest to the use of b\textsuperscript{3} and b\textsuperscript{3}w in divine, royal, non-royal, and place names, divine and royal epithets, as well as in administrative and priestly titles. While L.V. Žabkar\textsuperscript{185} briefly noted some of these texts in relation to b\textsuperscript{3} and b\textsuperscript{3}w, the only scholar to have presented and studied this corpus of evidence in depth, however, is E.M. Wolf-Brinkmann\textsuperscript{186}. An analysis of these names, titles, and epithets will thus provide a more comprehensive understanding of b\textsuperscript{3} and b\textsuperscript{3}w, as these texts represent both the earliest and largest corpus of evidence for the original function and meaning of these terms.

The aim of the following discussion and analysis is to review and reanalyze this corpus of texts. The focus will be on identifying the function(s) of the terms b\textsuperscript{3} and b\textsuperscript{3}w, co-textual associations and collocations, as well as developments in the use of these terms. Establishing these aspects will not only allow for a better understanding of the overall meaning of b\textsuperscript{3} and b\textsuperscript{3}w, but also contextualize their use in the Pyramid Texts (Chapter 4) and 6\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty non-royal texts (Chapter 5).

A major focal point of this chapter will be the b\textsuperscript{3}w associated with the ancient cities of Nekhen, Pe and Heliopolis. The nature of these b\textsuperscript{3}w has been a major topic of debate\textsuperscript{187} and represents key evidence for our understanding of the basic function and meaning of the terms b\textsuperscript{3} and b\textsuperscript{3}w. Reliefs depicting the b\textsuperscript{3}w of Nekhen and Pe, as well as their associated priests in the Heb-Sed festival of Niuserre, spells specifically referring to the b\textsuperscript{3}w in the Pyramid Texts, and several later texts will be discussed in

\textsuperscript{185} Žabkar, A study of the Ba concept, 54-57.
\textsuperscript{186} Wolf-Brinkmann, Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes 'bA', 9-25.
order to reach a comprehensive understanding of their nature.

The following discussion and analysis is divided into four sections, followed by the conclusion. The first section presents the functions of the terms $b3$ and $b3w$ as gleaned from the entire corpus of names, titles, and epithets. The second focuses on the $b3w$ associated with the ancient cities of Nekhen, Pe, and Heliopolis, presenting previous interpretations, and discussing the related iconographic and textual evidence. The third section presents an overview of developments in the use of $b3$ and $b3w$ in the names and titles from the 1st Dynasty onwards, and focuses specifically on contextualizing these developments. The fourth and final section is a preliminary argument for the meaning of $b3$ as gleaned from a discussion on the function and role of the goddess $b3t$, the $b3w$ of Nekhen, Pe, and Heliopolis, and the associated $\text{šmsw-hr}$ “Followers of Horus” in iconography and texts from the Predynastic Period to the Old Kingdom. Comparisons will also be made with the role and function of the Saddlebill stork in Late Predynastic iconography in order to establish whether there is continuity in meaning. The names, titles, and epithets referred to throughout this chapter i.e. Index Entry (Ind. Ent.), are presented in Appendix A.

3.1. The function(s) of the terms $b3$ and $b3w$

The corpus of Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom names, titles, and epithets indicates that the terms $b3$ and $b3w$ had two major functions, namely (a) to express an attribute/quality of a god or king, and (b) to express a god or king in a state of being.

(a) $b3w$ (abstract noun) - expressing an attribute/quality of a god or king

An established and recurrent typology of non-royal name constituted of the direct genitival subject ‘$b3w$ of god/king’ qualified by an adjective, such as $\text{š3-b3w-ntr}$ (Ind. Ent. G), $\text{ḫ3t-b3w-skr}$ (Ind. Ent. H), and $\text{wr-b3w-ḥnsw}$ (Ind. Ent. N), indicate that various gods and the king were believed to possess $b3w$ (also Ind. Ent. M, R, T, U,
W, X, Y as well as J, O, and Q[^193]. This is paralleled in the 5/6th Dynasty epithets of the syncretic goddess Bastet-Sekhmet-Seshmetet (Ind. Ent. C) and the goddess Sekhmet (Ind. Ent. JJ), both of which state that the goddess causes ‘her b3w’ to ‘appear or arise in glory’; the name of Khasekhemwy’s royal domain[^194] b3w-hrw-dw3w (Ind. Ent. CC), which states that the b3w of Horus is “praised”; the name of Neferefre’s pyramid (Ind. Ent.HH), which designates the king as ntri b3w ‘divine of b3w’; and the names of the mortuary domains of Sahure and an unidentifiable king (Ind. Ents. KK & LL), which describe the king as xnt(y) b3w “preeminent[^195]” and wr b3w “Great of b3w”. Scholars such as Wolf-Brinkmann and E. Hornung have stated that the term b3w within these names and epithets should be read as a false plural denoting an abstract noun[^196], as is the case with terms such as nfrw ‘beauty’ or ‘perfection[^197].

(b) b3 – expressing a god or king in state of being

A second typology of non-royal names constituted of the name of a god or king and followed by the optative sdm.f ‘b3:f’, such as.snfrw-b3:f (Ind. Ent. I) and hrw-b3:f (Ind. Ent. K), further indicate that in addition to possessing b3w, the gods and the king were also believed to be b3 i.e. “Snefru, may he be b3[^198] (also Ind. Ent. L, P,

[^193] According to Wolf-Brinkmann, while these non-royal names do not contain the name of a god/goddess or a king, the parallel use of the adjectives wr and b3 qualifying b3w in Ind. Ent. R and T i.e. wr-b3w-skr (Ind. Ent. R) and b3'-b3w-pth (Ind. Ent. T), indicates that Ind. Ent. J and O are abbreviated versions. Furthermore, the use of b3w.s in Ind. Ent. Q parallels that in the epithets of the syncretic goddess Bastet-Sekhmet-Seshmetet (Ind. Ent. C) and Sekhmet (Ind. Ent. JJ), indicating that the feminine suffix pronoun .s refers to a goddess - Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes ‘bA’, 9-25.


This idea of being b3 is most strongly exemplified in the name of the goddess b3t (Ind. Ent. A), which indicates that she was believed to be a divine feminine personification of b3\textsuperscript{199}, but is also paralleled in the Horus name of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Dynasty king h\textsuperscript{*}i-b3 (Ind. No. D), as well as in the names of the pyramids of Sahure (Ind. No. EE), Neferirkare (Ind. No. GG) and Kakai (Index. No. II), all of which designate the king as either a b3 or a b3 that is h\textsuperscript{*}i ‘appearing or arising in glory’. To the idea of the king being b3 we can also add the name of the 4\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty ship b3-n\textsuperscript{trw} ‘b3 of the gods’ (Ind. Ent. DD) and the 5\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty ship wn-hr-b3w ‘The manifestation/revelation\textsuperscript{200} of b3w’ (Ind. Ent FF). S. Esposito in her lexicographical analysis of Old Kingdom nautical terms, notes that proper names given to official ships during the Old Kingdom were direct references to the living king, accentuating his symbolic authority\textsuperscript{201}. This argument is further supported by other associated Old Kingdom official ship names, such as nb-rht “Lord of the people”, s\textsuperscript{‘}nh-rht “He who causes the people to live”, dw3-t\textsuperscript{‘}wy “He whom the two lands praise”, and s3-p\textsuperscript{ḥt(y)-issi “Great is the strength of Isesi”\textsuperscript{202}, all of which also refer to and express the power and authority of the king.

3.2. The b3w of Nekhen, Pe, and Heliopolis

Two priestly titles from the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} Dynasty (Ind. Ent. AA & BB) indicate that there were active cults dedicated to the b3w of the ancient cities of Nekhen (i.e. Hierakonpolis) and Pe (i.e. Buto). This was eventually extended to include the b3w of Heliopolis by the 4\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty, as indicated by Menkaure’s epithet mr(y) b3w lwnw

\textsuperscript{199} Note the parallel with the term s\textsuperscript{ḥm, which was also personified as the female goddess s\textsuperscript{ḥmt.}

\textsuperscript{200} For the translation of wn-hr as ‘manifestation’ or ‘revelation’ see R. Hannig, Ägyptisches Wörterbuch I: Altes Reich und Erste Zwischenzeit (Mainz: von Zabern, 2003),343 [7532]

\textsuperscript{201} S. Esposito, “Riverboats and Seagoing Ships: Lexicographical Analysis of Nautical Terms from the Sources of the Old Kingdom”, in Stories of Globalization: The Red Sea and the Gulf from Late Prehistory to Early Modernity, eds. A. Manzo, C. Zazzaro & D. J. de Falco (Leiden: Brill, 2018):51

\textsuperscript{202} Esposito, “Riverboats and Seagoing Ships”, 51.
‘beloved of the bꜣw of Heliopolis’ (Ind. No. E)\textsuperscript{203}. In contrast to the use of the false plural and abstract noun bꜣw in the above names, titles, and epithets, when bꜣw is associated with ancient cities, it denotes the true plural form of bꜣ i.e. multiple bas. This interpretation is supported by the representation of these bꜣw in 5\textsuperscript{th} and 6\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty royal mortuary iconography, in which the titles bꜣw nḫn and bꜣw p label three or more anthropomorphic figures with jackal or falcon heads\textsuperscript{204}.

The nature of the bꜣw of Nekhen, Pe, and Heliopolis has remained a major topic of debate and the resulting arguments can be divided into two broader ‘schools of thought’. On the one hand are those scholars who follow K. Sethe’s original hypothesis\textsuperscript{205}: taking into account that the bꜣw of Nekhen and Pe are often referred to as the šmsw-ḥr ‘Followers of Horus’, Sethe equated these bꜣw with Manetho’s ‘dead demigods’ and with the ẖw šmsw-ḥr “Akhs, Followers of Horus” of the Turin Annals, and considered them to be the divinized dead kings of their respective cities\textsuperscript{206}. This argument was subsequently strengthened by A.H. Gardiner, who drew attention to a Roman Period hieroglyphic text from Tanis\textsuperscript{207} that specifically identifies the bꜣw of Pe as “Followers of Horus, the Kings of Lower Egypt” and the bꜣw of Nekhen as “Followers of Horus, the Kings of Upper Egypt”\textsuperscript{208}. Within this ‘school of

\begin{footnotes}
\item[203] The establishment of a cult for the bꜣw iwnw is further supported by the annals on the verso of the Palermo stone, which state that in addition to Ra, the psḏt, and Horus, “donations” (i.e. offerings) were also made to the bꜣw iwnw during the reigns of Userkaf, Sahure, and Neferirkare – M. P. Hlouchová, “Gods with Solar Aspects in Selected Written and Epigraphic Sources of the Old Kingdom”, in Abusir and Saqqara in the Year 2015, eds. M. Bártá, F. Coppens & J. Krejčí (Prague: Charles University, 2017): 346.

\item[204] Žabkar, A study of the Ba concept, 20.


\end{footnotes}
thought’, \( bÅw \) has been and largely still is translated as ‘souls’\(^{209} \). This highlights the
general acceptance within the field of Egyptology that \( bÅ \) and \( bÅw \) originally
expressed funerary beliefs.

The second ‘school of thought’ includes those scholars who follow H. Kees’
original argument\(^{210} \). According to Kees, the term \( bÅw \) did not \textit{originally}
denote the
royal ancestors of the king, but rather the very ancient groups of deities tied to the
cities Nekhen and Pe\(^ {211} \). Furthermore, the addition of the \( bÅw \) of Heliopolis to these
older groups of \( bÅw \) during the Old Kingdom was an artificial creation that resulted
from the increasing supremacy of Heliopolis as a religious center\(^ {212} \). This argument
was subsequently strengthened by E. Hornung, who observed that the two Enneads of
gods, \( \textit{psdt wrt} “The Great Ennead” or Ennead of Upper Egypt (Abydos) and \( \textit{psdt} ³³t “The Elder Ennead” or Ennead of Lower Egypt (Heliopolis)\(^ {213} \), are referred to as part
of the \( bÅw \) of Heliopolis in the Pyramid Texts (PT 606 §1689)\(^ {214} \). According to this
school of thought, the term \( bÅw \) was thus equivalent to the term \( nÅrw \).

There are several factors which favor Kees’ general argument that \( bÅw \)
originally referred to gods. The first is that the \( bÅw \) of Nekhen, Pe, and Heliopolis are
either directly referred to as \( nÅrw \) or are stated to include various gods in the Pyramid
Texts. In the Pyramid Texts of Unas for example, it states – \( j \ n.f \ nÅrw \ bÅw \ p \ nÅrw \ bÅw \ nElew \ nÅrw \ jrw \ pt \ nÅrw \ jrw \ tÅ \) (PT 306) “There come to him (i.e. Unas) the gods, the
\( bÅw \) of Pe, the gods, the \( bÅw \) of Nekhen, the gods who belong to the sky and the gods
who belong to the earth”. That the “gods who belong to the sky” refer to the \( bÅw \) of Pe
and the “gods who belong to the earth” to the \( bÅw \) of Nekhen, is supported by

\(^{209} \) See Ind. Ents. AA & BB.


\(^{211} \) Kees, \textit{Götterglaube}, 188-91.

\(^{212} \) Kees, \textit{Götterglaube}, 188-91.

\(^{213} \) W. Barta, \textit{Untersuchung zur Götterkreis der Neunheit}, MÄS 28 (1973): 50ff; J. G. Griffiths “Some

\(^{214} \) E. Hornung, \textit{Conceptions of god}, 61.
representations of these two groups in 5th and 6th Dynasty royal mortuary iconography, the bꜣw of Pe traditionally depicted as anthropomorphic figures with the heads of falcons, and the bꜣw of Nekhen as anthropomorphic figures with the heads of jackals\textsuperscript{215}. With regards to the bꜣw of Heliopolis, it has already been mentioned that the two Enneads are referred to as part of this group of bꜣw, as described in PT 606 §1689 – īt lwꜣ' it.k gbb m-bꜣh psḏt m ḫwꜣw m tswt n.f jn psḏty wrt ẖnt bꜣw jwꜣw “Acquire your father Geb’s inheritance in the presence of the Ennead in Heliopolis, as one similar to him’, say the two Great and Elder Enneads foremost of the bꜣw of Heliopolis\textsuperscript{216}. A further example also includes PT 539 §1305a –ỉrty N wrt ẖntt bꜣw lwꜣw “N’s two eyes are the great ones (i.e. goddesses) foremost of the bꜣw of Heliopolis\textsuperscript{217}. The use of bꜣw as a designation for gods becomes even more explicit in the later Coffin Texts, in which the bꜣw of various cities, cardinal points, and festivals are directly identified as triads of gods\textsuperscript{218}.

The second factor is that in addition to bꜣw (pl.), Old Kingdom texts also refer to the dual bꜣwy, i.e. a pair of bꜣ. This is first attested in the reliefs from the mortuary temple of Sahure, as well as in a 5th Dynasty priestly title (Ind. Ent. B), both of which refer to the bꜣwy ḫnt(y) pr ẖr(y)-wḏb “The bꜣwy foremost of the house of the master of offerings/largesse” \textsuperscript{219}. The epithet ḫnt(y) pr ẖr(y)-wḏb is already attested in the Early Dynastic Period, specifically on a cylinder seal impression from the tomb of

\textsuperscript{215} Žabkar, A study of the Ba concept, 20.
\textsuperscript{216} Allen, Pyramid Texts, 224.
\textsuperscript{217} Allen, Pyramid Texts, 173.
\textsuperscript{218} The bꜣw of Heliopolis are identified as Re, Shu, and Tefnut, the bꜣw of the New-moon festival as Osiris, Anubis, and Isdes, the bꜣw of Hermopolis as Thoth, Sia, and Amun, the bꜣw of Pe as Horus, Imsety, and Hapy; the bꜣw of Nekhen as Horus, Duamutef, and Kebehsenuef; and the bꜣw of the West as Atum, Sobek, and Seth - Žabkar, A study of the Ba concept, 29.
\textsuperscript{219} According to H. Papazian, the central component in this administrative department’s multipart designation is wḏb ‘to revert’, which implies a function connected to donation management and specifically, the practice of redistributing offerings – H. Papazian, “The Central Administration of the Resources in the Old Kingdom: Departments, Treasuries, Granaries, and Work Centers”, in Ancient Egyptian Administration, ed. J.C. Moreno García (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2013): 77.
Khasekhemwy in Abydos. However, instead of b3wy, this epithet qualifies ntrwy “the two gods,” indicating that the term b3wy was interchangeable with ntrwy by the 5th Dynasty. The Pyramid Texts also present us with further examples of b3wy, such as the b3wy hnt(y) b3w iwnw “The b3wy foremost of the b3w of Heliopolis.” Fischer, Wolf-Brinkmann, and L.J. Cazemier state that these b3wy undoubtedly refer to Isis and Nephthys, as they are described as “spending the night making that god’s (i.e. the king) bewailing” and “kneeling down at the Sun’s (i.e. the king’s) head,” actions which are characteristic of these two goddesses in both mortuary texts and iconography. The fact that these two goddesses are referred to as the b3wy foremost of the b3w of Heliopolis further supports Hornung’s statement that the two Enneads formed part of the b3w of Heliopolis, as Isis and Nephthys were two of the nine gods who belonged to the psdt 3t or Ennead of Heliopolis.

The third and final factor is that while late texts may refer to the b3w of ancient cities and šmsw-ḥr as divinized, deceased kings, the earliest equation of these two groups in texts explicitly refer to them as gods. In the tomb of the Middle Kingdom hm-ntr priest of wp-w3wt and nomarch Hapdjefay at Assyut, he is described as šḥkr(w) b3w nḥn ḡb3(w) ḫtw s3bw ntrw šmsw-ḥrw “one who adorned the b3w of
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220 Fischer, Coptite nome, 45-46; W. M. Flinders Petrie, The royal tombs of the First Dynasty (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1900-1901), Pl. 23 No. 197.
221 According to R. Shalomi-Hen, when the falcon on a standard (G7) was used as an ideogram it signified ntr – R. Shalomi-Hen, The Writing of the Gods: The Evolution of Divine Classifiers in the Old Kingdom (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2006), 159.
222 PT 302 §460a.
223 Fischer, Coptite nome, 45.
225 Cazemier, “Die Baw der alten Hauptstädte”, 73.
226 Allen, Pyramid Texts, 61.
227 Allen, Pyramid Texts, 61.
228 Further references to Isis and Nephthys bewailing the dead king can be found in PT 259, PT 670, PT 701A, and PT 797.
Nekhen, who clothed the bodies of the jackals, the gods Followers of Horus\textsuperscript{230}. Since the $b\bar{\text{w}}$ of Nekhen were traditionally represented with the heads of jackals, it follows that the $b\bar{\text{w}}$ of Nekhen, ‘Jackals’, and ‘the gods Followers of Horus’ within this text refer to the same group\textsuperscript{231}. Although Kees states that the nature of the ancient $b\bar{\text{w}}$ of Nekhen, as well as the $b\bar{\text{w}}$ of Pe was not fixed and that the term $b\bar{\text{w}}$ was used to denote the totality of gods tied to this city\textsuperscript{232}, it is noteworthy and significant, however, that in the various depictions of the $\text{\textit{\textsc{sm}}\text{\textit{\textsc{sw}}-hr}$, i.e. the divine standards (Figures 22 & 23), and in the Pyramid Texts\textsuperscript{233}, Wepwawet, a jackal god, is specifically depicted and referred to as one of these “Followers”. This further indicates that Hapdjefay’s ‘adorning’ and ‘clothing’ of the $b\bar{\text{w}}$ of Nekhen, ‘jackals’, and ‘gods Followers of Horus’ actually describes his service as a $\text{\textit{hm}}$-$\textit{nt}_r$ priest of Wepwawet. The link between Wepwawet, $\text{\textit{\textsc{sm}}\text{\textit{\textsc{sw}}-hr}$, and the $b\bar{\text{w}}$ of Nekhen is further strengthened by the reliefs of the $\text{\textit{Heb-Sed}}$ festival in the sun temple of Niuserre at Abu Ghorab\textsuperscript{234}. Several of these scenes include depictions of a $\text{\textit{hm}}$ $b\bar{\text{w}}$ $\text{\textit{n}_h}$n “$\text{\textit{hm}}$-priest of the $b\bar{\text{w}}$ of Nekhen” performing various activities with the king, such as the ‘ritual run’ (Figure 23). As can be seen in the reliefs, this $\text{\textit{hm}}$-priest is recurrently represented carrying a standard mounted by Wepwawet and his $\text{\textit{sd}_{\text{\textit{sd}}}}$\textsuperscript{235}.

Further evidence from the $\text{\textit{Heb-Sed}}$ reliefs of Niuserre that elucidate the identities and nature of the $b\bar{\text{w}}$ of Nekhen and Pe are two scenes that depict the palanquin procession and offerings to the shrines of Upper Egypt (Figure 24) and the shrines of Lower Egypt (Figure 25). Facing the king and the $\text{\textit{sm}}$-priest, the latter of

\textsuperscript{230} Urk VII, 56 lines 18-20; Žabkar, A study of the Ba concept, 20.
\textsuperscript{231} Žabkar, A study of the Ba concept, 20.
\textsuperscript{232} Kees, Göttergläube, 188-91.
\textsuperscript{233} PT 471 & PT 525.
\textsuperscript{235} A recent study by L. Evans has convincingly argued that the $\text{\textit{sd}_{\text{\textit{sd}}}}$ represents a dug ‘canid den’, emphasizing and symbolizing Wepwawet’s role as the ‘Opener of ways’ – L. Evans, “The Shedshed of Wepwawet: An Artistic and Behavioural Interpretation”, JEA 97 (2011): 103-115.
which invokes a royal offering of ointments, linen, and incense to the irti “Dual shrines”, are depictions of the šmsw-ḥr ntrw “The divine Followers of Horus” and a hm-ntr priest associated with the Upper Egyptian b3w of Nekhen and the Lower Egyptian b3w of Pe. Unsurprisingly, the šmsw-ḥr associated with b3w of Nekhen is Wepwawet, who is accompanied by smaller depictions of a bow and an object upon a standard identified as the nḥn or ‘royal placenta’. The latter two objects also accompany the šmsw-ḥr associated with the b3w of Pe (Figure 25), who are depicted as Horus, Thoth, and again, Wepwawet. The duplication of Wepwawet in both depictions of the šmsw-ḥr ntrw refers to the two forms of Wepwawet, that of Upper Egypt and that of Lower Egypt. The equating of the Lower Egyptian šmsw-ḥr with the b3w of Pe is also found in PT 505 §1089a-1090b, in which Horus, Thoth, and Wepwawet are specifically connected with Pe as part of the b3w of Pe – pr.n NN m p ḫr b3w p ṣt NN m ṣt n ḫrw ḫbs NN m ḫbs n ḫhwṭi ist tp-wy.f nbt-hwt m-hṭ.f wp-wḥt wp.f n.f Ṽt “NN has come from Pe with the b3w of Pe, NN is banded with the breast-band of Horus, NN is clothed in the clothing of Thoth, Isis before him, Nephthys behind him, (while)Wepwawet he parts a path for him”.

The recurrent association of b3w with the term ntrw and with groups of gods (i.e. Enneads and Triads) in the Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts, the interchangeability of b3wy and ntrwy and the use of b3wy as a designation for pairs of gods, and the identification of the šmsw-ḥr and b3w of Nekhen and Pe as gods, all indicate that while late texts may refer to the b3w as divinized, deceased kings, in its earliest use, the term b3w had a parallel meaning to that of ntrw. The shift in meaning
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237 “Upuaut” in E. Graefe, LÄ VI: 863.

238 Allen, Pyramid Texts, 161.
from bɔw as gods to bɔw as divinized royal ancestors in later texts may have been part of the larger mythologization of history characteristic of the New Kingdom through to the Greco-Roman Period. According to scholars such as J. Van Seters, this shift in the historical perspective is evident when comparing texts such as the Turin Canon and the Palermo stone. While the Palermo stone, which is generally accepted to be a 25th Dynasty copy of an Old Kingdom text, bears no suggestion that gods and mythical heroes ruled Egypt before the 1st Dynasty, the 19th Dynasty Turin Canon, however, presents a complete mythologizing of prehistory in which an original unified rule of the country under successive periods of gods and heroes preceded the historical period.

The use of bɔw in the Early Dynastic Period and Old Kingdom to designate gods alongside the term ntrw is not necessarily incongruent with the earlier theological thinking. Hornung has noted that in addition to bɔ (dual bɔwy, pl. bɔw) and ntr (dual ntrwy, pl. ntrw), Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom texts also utilized the term šhm ‘controlling and powerful one’ to refer to gods as well. This use of šhm is apparent in the names of two kings of the 2nd Dynasty, htp-šhmwy and ḫt-i-šhmwy, which refer to Horus and Seth as šhmwy, as well as spells from the Pyramid Texts, such as PT 690 §2110d, which refer to the gods as šhmwy. The above discussion thus strengthens the argument that bɔ (pl. bɔw) functioned to express a god or a king.
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244 wꜣ.tj-mdw ntrw šhm is nṯry šhmwy “You (i.e. the king) govern the gods as the šhm foremost of the šhmwy”.
245 Hornung, *Conceptions of god*, 63.
in a state of being, as is apparent in the above discussed non-royal names $hrw-b3.f$ ‘Horus, May he be $b3$’ (Ind. Ent. K) and $snfrw-b3.f$ ‘Snefru, May he be $b3$’ (Ind. Ent J).\textsuperscript{246}

3.3. Funerary beliefs or divine and royal ideology? A broader view on the development of the use of $b3$ and $b3w$ in 1\textsuperscript{st} to 6\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty names, titles and epithets

As is evident in the literature review of this thesis, the general consensus among scholars is that the terms $b3$ and $b3w$ were used exclusively in association with the gods and with deceased kings. The latter interpretation was especially influenced by the Pyramid Texts, as well as by the use of $b3$ and $b3w$ in the names of 5\textsuperscript{th} and 6\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty pyramids (Ind. Ent. EE,GG, HH, II) and mortuary domains (Ind. Ent KK & LL).\textsuperscript{247} It should be kept in mind, however, that these names represent the first explicit textual association of $b3$ and $b3w$ with funerary contexts.

The names and titles of the Early Dynastic Period, including $b3t$ (Ind. Ent. A), $hw-b3$\textsuperscript{248} (Ind. Ent. F), $\varepsilon3-b3w-ntr$ (Ind. Ent G), $hm-b3w-p$ (Ind. Ent. BB), $hm-b3w-nhn$ (Ind. Ent CC), and $\varepsilon3-mr$ $b3w-hrw-dw3w$ (Ind. Ent. DD), indicate that $b3$ and $b3w$ were originally utilized to refer to (a) god(s) as $b3(w)$ or as possessing $b3w$. This evidence thus suggests that $b3$ and $b3w$ originally functioned within and expressed divine ideology. During the beginning of the Old Kingdom, however, these terms began to be used in direct association with the living and reigning king, as indicated by the Horus name of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Dynasty king $hr3-b3$ “The $b3$ who appears in glory” (Ind. Ent.

\textsuperscript{246} Also Ind. Ent. L, P, and S.

\textsuperscript{247} Žabkar, A study of the Ba concept, 61; Wolf-Brinkmann, Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes ‘bA’, 11.

\textsuperscript{248} The fact that $b3$ in this name is replaced with $b3wy/b3w$ in the 6\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty version (Ind. Ent. Z) indicates that it refers to the protection of (a) god(s). This reading is supported by later 4\textsuperscript{th}-6\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty royal and non-royal names, in which the protection of a god is also evoked, such as in Khufu’s full throne name $hmwn-hrw-f$-wl “Khnum, may he protect me” - Leprohon, The great name, 35; inpw-$hw.f$ “Anubis, may he protect (me)” - A. Mariette, Les mastabas de l’Ancien Empire: fragment du dernier ouvrage de A. Mariette (Paris: Vieweg, 1889), 205 (CG 1482); and $iHy-hw.f$ “Ihy, may he protect (me)” - Urk I: 148, I. 6.
Several scholars who have studied the development of royal names and titles, including T.A.H. Wilkinson and R.J. Leprohon, have noted that changes in names of kings from the 1st Dynasty to the 3rd reflect a shifting emphasis of Egyptian kingship from authority based upon fear, military might, and aggression to authority based upon the ‘divineness’ of the king. This increasing divinity during the Old Kingdom is apparent in Snefru’s eventual adoption of the royal title ntr nfr “The perfect or young God”. Within this context, it is thus not coincidental that the first reference to the king being bꜣ in a non-royal name, namely snfrw-bꜣ.f (Ind. Ent. I), coincides with the first overt and direct reference to the king being a god, i.e. ntr nfr.

In fact, this evidence suggests that the terms bꜣ and bꜣw were appropriated and utilized to legitimize and reinforce the growing ideology of divine kingship.

This interpretation is further supported by names of the 4th Dynasty ship bꜣ-ntrw (Ind. Ent. FF) and the 5th Dynasty ship wn-ḥr-bꜣw (Ind. Ent. DD). According to S. Esposito, the boat hieroglyph used to determine these names indicates that they belong to a category of ships called wiꜣ252. While Gardiner and Faulkner translate wiꜣ as ‘sacred bark’, Esposito demonstrates, however, that it was also used in non-royal tomb biographies to refer to boats belonging to a centralized fleet used by the royal court. Within this context, the names of these types of ships can be understood as epithets of the living and reigning king, reinforcing and accentuating his divine and symbolic authority256. This is especially apparent in the other names of these types of ships, such as nb-rḫyt “Lord of the people” and dwꜣ-tꜣw “He whom
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252 Esposito, “Riverboats and Seagoing Ships”, 42-43.
255 Esposito, “Riverboats and Seagoing Ships”, 42.
256 Esposito, “Riverboats and Seagoing Ships”, 51.
the two lands praise”257.

It is thus noteworthy and significant that overt statements about the deceased king being bꜣ and possessing bꜣw only appear during the 5th Dynasty, as indicated in the name of Sahure’s pyramid (Ind. Ent EE) and mortuary domain (Ind. Ent KK). This suggests that the use of bꜣ and bꜣw in connection with deceased kings was a later development, essentially representing an extension of the ideology of divine kingship into royal funerary beliefs and expressing the king’s continued royal and divine status and authority in the afterlife.

3.4. The role and function of the goddess bꜣt, the bꜣw of Nekhen, Pe, and Heliopolis, and the šmsw-hr

Janák, along with scholars such as Ward258 and Žabkar259 have defined bꜣ and bꜣw as some form of ‘divine or supernatural power’. This definition does not, however, differentiate bꜣ and bꜣw from associated terms such as šhm and wsr, both of which have also been broadly defined as ‘power’260. It can be argued that ‘power’ functions as an umbrella-term for these ancient Egyptian concepts and is thus too broad to be used as a direct translation for bꜣ and bꜣw alone.

On the other hand, E.M. Wolf-Brinkmann has offered a more precise definition of bꜣ and bꜣw within this context of ‘power’. According to Wolf-Brinkmann, bꜣ and bꜣw essentially designate the creative power, will, and ability of divinities (i.e. gods and deceased kings) to reveal themselves in visible and earthly forms. To be bꜣ was thus to be able to manifest – Gestaltfähig, and to possess bꜣw was to possess the creative power that could form manifestations - Gestaltfähigkeit. However, if we take into consideration Old Kingdom verbs formed around the root
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257 Esposito, “Riverboats and Seagoing Ships”, 51.
259 Žabkar, A study of the Ba concept, 54-57.
260 šhm ‘powerful’ in Wb 4, 243.5-245.2; wsr ‘to be powerful’ in Wb 1, 360.7-362.9.
stem \( b\), such as \( wb\) ‘to open, to drill (stone)\(^{261}\), \( hb\) ‘to destroy or diminish\(^{262}\), \( b\)k ‘to work (for), to enslave\(^{263}\), and \( \) ‘to command\(^{264}\), they all signify action that is penetrative, destructive, controlling, and subjugative. This contrasts with the ‘creative’ aspect of Wolf-Brinkmann’s definition and indicates that the meaning of \( b\) and \( b\)w is still not comprehensively understood.

The earliest extant use of \( b\) in the ancient Egyptian textual record is in the name of the goddess \( b\)t (Ind. Ent. A), a rather obscure bovine deity whose cult was celebrated in the 7th Nome of Upper Egypt\(^{265}\) near the town of Hu\(^{266}\). As with \( sjm\), a lion goddess whose nature and name was based on being \( sjm\) ‘controlling and powerful’, \( b\)t represented a divine feminine personification, essentially embodying being \( b\). While the 1st Dynasty Hierakonpolis porphyry bowl represents the earliest extant textual reference to Bat, parallel renderings of her emblem (i.e. a frontally facing trapezoidal bovine head with thick, ribbed, and inward curving horns) on a Naqada IIC-D palette recovered from Gerzeh\(^{267}\) (Tomb 59, Cairo Museum, JE 34173 – Figure 26), as well as on a Naqada IID ivory dagger handle\(^{268}\) from Cemetery U in Abydos (Tomb U-181, K 3475 – Figure 27), indicate that her origins lie in the Predynastic Period\(^{269}\).

\(^{261}\) Wb 1, 290.1-291.7.
\(^{262}\) Wb 3, 253.2-11.
\(^{263}\) Wb 1, 426.3-427.12.
\(^{264}\) Wb 1, 177.1.
\(^{265}\) On the parapet of the White Chapel of Senusret I at Karnak, bAt is explicitly named as the local deity of the 7th nome of Upper Egypt – H.G. Fischer, “The cult and nome of the goddess Bat”, Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt 1 (1962): 7.
\(^{266}\) Fischer, “The cult and nome of the goddess Bat”, 7; Wilkinson, Early dynastic Egypt, 244.
\(^{267}\) W.M.F Petrie, G.A. Wainwright, & E. Mackay, The Labyrinth Gerzeh and Mazghuneh. (London: School of Archaeology in Egypt, University College, 1912), 22, pl. VI, no. 7.
bꜣt’s emblem often includes representations of stars at the tips of the horns and ears and upon the forehead (Figure 26 and Ind. Ent. A), indicating that she had a cosmic function. Furthermore, her appearance on the Naqada IID dagger from Tomb U-181 and on the Narmer Palette (Figure 28) indicates that she had a martial and protective function as well. U. Hartung has noted that the sequence of Bat symbols on the sides of the Naqada IID dagger handle anticipate and parallel the motif on Narmer’s belt, their amuletic-like appearance indicating that they not only functioned to imbue the bearer of the dagger with power, but also to protect both the bearer and the represented figures from the forces of chaos. This parallels the function of the depictions of Bat flanking the serekh on either side of the Narmer Palette, which not only protect the king, but also provide him with the necessary and effective power to subjugate and destroy his enemies. Later Dynastic textual attestations of bꜣt also reference her protective function. PT 506 §1096b for example, refers to her as bꜣt ḥrwy snw “Bat with her two faces”, the epithet ḫrwy snwy functioning as an allegory for her impressive power to both see and guard from forward and behind.

The martial and protective aspects of being bꜣt are further evidenced by the role and function of the bꜣw of Nekhen, Pe, and Heliopolis. Although the first textual evidence for the bꜣw of Nekhen and Pe only appear during the reigns of Qaa (Ind. Ent. AA) and Ninetjer (Ind. Ent. BB), depictions of the šmsw-ḥr are, however, already attested on the mace-head of king Scorpion, as well as on the Narmer Palette (Figure 28). Further depictions of the šmsw-ḥr, specifically Wepwawet, appear on two ivory
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272 B.S. Lesko, *The great goddesses of Egypt* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999), 81
labels from the tomb of king Den in Abydos\textsuperscript{273} (Figures 29 & 30). In all of these representations, the šmsw-ḥr are either associated with ‘smiting scenes’ (Narmer Palette – Figure 28; Den’s ivory label – Figure 29) or with the Heb-Sed festival of the king (Den’s ivory label – Figure 30), indicating that they had both a martial and protective function like bḥt, as well as assisted the king during his Heb-Sed in the renewal of his powers and ability to keep the ‘forces of chaos’ at bay. Once again, the identification of the šmsw-ḥr as the later bḥw of Nekhen and Pe, is supported by the direct parallels between the depiction of Den’s ritual running during the Heb-Sed on the label from his tomb (Figure 30), and the scenes showing the ritual run of Niuserre (Figure 23), both king’s accompanied by Wepwawet upon his standard. In the latter case, however, the standard is specifically carried by the representative ḫm-priest of the bḥw of Nekhen.

In the Pyramid Texts, the roles played by the bḥw of Nekhen, Pe, and Heliopolis parallel that of the šmsw-ḥr. They assist the deceased king in his rebirth and renewal by: (a) conveying the king to the sky - on their arms (Nekhen and Pe – PT 306 & 474), by laying down a stairway (Heliopolis – PT 505), by bearing and gilding a ladder (Nekhen and Pe – PT 530), or by receiving the king’s arm (Heliopolis – PT 532); (b) accepting and inviting the king amongst the gods (Heliopolis and Pe – PT 575, PT 798); (c) invoking the king’s divine heritage and status (Heliopolis – PT 606); and (d) bewailing and tending to the deceased king (Isis and Nephthys as the foremost bḥwy of the bḥw of Heliopolis – PT 302).

In addition to providing assistance, the bḥw also protect the deceased king. In PT 482 §1005a-c, the bḥw of Pe are described as “dancing with sticks for you (i.e. ritual fencing), hitting their flesh for you, striking their arms for you, and shaking for

\textsuperscript{273} British Museum 55586 & Dreyer: 1993, 61, pl. 13b, new fragm. in: MDAIK 59 (2003): 94, pl. 18g, matching with MDAIK 46, pl.26c (by J. Degreef).
you with their braids”. These actions are also accompanied by the following recitation – “Though you have gone away, you have returned; you have awoken, though you have gone to sleep, established in life. Stand up and see this, stand up and hear this, which your son has done for you, which Horus has done for you, beating he who beat you, binding he who bound you, and putting him under his eldest/greatest daughter in Qedem.” According to P.A. Piccione, the recitation by the bꜣw of Pe not only invokes life in the deceased king, but also equates and allegorizes their dancing, striking, and shaking with Horus’ smiting and binding the enemies of Osiris, thus providing the necessary protection and conditions for the king’s rebirth.

Furthermore, in the Pyramid Texts, the individual gods who constituted the šmsw-ḥr and the bꜣw of Nekhen and Pe, including Horus, Thoth and Wepwawet, are recurrently cited as protecting the deceased king – “Horus has come seeking you. He has made Thoth drive back Seth’s followers for you”277; “Thoth behind me! Trample the one of the dark, trample the one of the dark!”278; “Thoth has seized your opponent for you, beheaded along with his retinue, and there is none of them whom he spared”; and “Wepwawet parting a path for me (i.e. the king)”280.

The active roles played by bꜣt, the šmsw-ḥr and the bꜣw in battle, in the Heb-Sed festival, and in the resurrection of the deceased king are not mutually exclusive. In all of these contexts, the principal and driving aim of their actions is the restoration

275 According to J. G. Griffiths, the identity of the goddess referred to as ‘the eldest/greatest daughter in Qedem’ is unknown, although the entire texts refers to the punishment of Seth by Horus for murdering his father Osiris. This Goddess is also described in a text from Deir el-Bahri and may refer to a foreign divinity from the Near East, as there are references in Egyptian texts to a region North of Syria called Qedy and a town in the same vicinity called Qed – J.G. Griffiths, The Origins of Osiris and his Cult (Leiden: Brill, 1980), 127; Piccione, “Sportive fencing”, 340; Allen, Pyramid Texts, 136.
277 PT 356; Allen, Pyramid Texts, 76.
278 PT 279; Allen, Pyramid Texts, 56.
279 PT 367; Allen, Pyramid Texts, 85.
280 PT 505; Allen, Pyramid Texts, 161.
of ‘Order over Chaos’ and the instillation of peace. In war or battle this included ensuring that the king had the necessary protection and power to subjugate and destroy enemies, in the Heb-Sed festival it was assisting the king in the renewal of his power and ability to uphold m3t, and in the Pyramid Texts it was remedying the triumph of isft or chaos embodied in the death of the king by assisting in and ensuring his rebirth and resurrection.

The association of being b3t with instilling order and peace is further supported by the association of b3wy with the pr hry-wdbo “House of the master of offerings/largesse”. The idea of causing peace or shtp is the result of action in accordance with m3t, which also included the continual and proper provisioning and distribution of hipt “offerings” or “that which satisfies/pacifies”281. By ensuring that the gods, deceased kings, and deceased non-royal individuals received continual offerings and are htp ‘satisfied’, the b3wy of the pr hry-wdbo thus safeguard and guarantee ‘Order over Chaos’ and peace.

The parallels between the role of b3t / šmsw-hr / b3w and the Saddlebill stork in Late Predynastic iconography is significant. In both cases they ensured the attainment of ‘Order over Chaos’ through their actions. During the Predynastic Period, the roles played by the Saddlebill and b3t indicate that this was largely based upon martial, violent, and aggressive action directed against the ‘forces of chaos’. However, the roles played by the šmsw-hr, b3w of Nekhen, Pe, and Heliopolis, and the b3wy indicate that by the Early Dynastic Period and Old Kingdom this had widened to include any necessary action that would ensure m3t, including assisting the king in both his Heb-sed Festival and his rebirth and renewal after death, as well as ensuring the consistent and proper distribution of offerings. It can be suggested that

281 V. Davies, Peace in Ancient Egypt (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2018), 59-66.
being \( b\) denoted actively interceding in contexts in which ‘order’ has or will potentially be threatened by ‘chaos’, and subsequently ensuring the restoration and maintenance of peace through that action. This indicates that the use of the Saddlebill stork as a signifier for \( b\) and \( b\wedge w\) was not simply on a phonetic basis, but that the stork itself also contributed to and reinforced the meaning of these terms.

On a final note, it is also not coincidental that the first reference to the king being \( b\) in a non-royal name, namely during the reign of Snefru, not only coincides with the first use of the royal title \( nfr\)–\( nfr\), but also with the phrase \( nb\)-\( m\)\( \overline{t}\) “Lord of \( m\)\( \overline{t}\)", which Snefru used as both his Horus name and his Two Ladies name\(^{282}\). This is indicative of a major development in the believed status, authority, and function of the king, who no longer only dispensed punishment against those who had transgressed \( m\)\( \overline{t}\), but became the very representation of \( m\)\( \overline{t}\) itself, as the term \( nb\) signifies possession in addition to mastery\(^{283}\). Within this context it is thus not surprising that Snefru would be referred to as being \( b\) in a non-royal name, as this state of being specifically expressed the active and protective aspects of kingship in maintaining and ensuring order and peace.

3.5. Conclusion

A study of the terms \( b\) and \( b\wedge w\) in Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom names, titles, and epithets has resulted in the following conclusions. The first is that the terms \( b\) and \( b\wedge w\) had two major functions. The term \( b\) (pl. \( b\wedge w\)) was used to designate a god or king in state of being, while the abstract noun \( b\wedge w\) denoted an attribute/quality of a god or king.

The second conclusion is that the \( b\wedge w\) of Nekhen, Pe, and Heliopolis were not

\(^{282}\) Leprohon, *The great name*, 35.
originally the deceased royal ancestors of the king, but rather various groups of gods
tied to these cities – the bꜣw of Nekhen and Pe most likely being the original Upper
and Lower Egyptian šmsw-ḥr, and the bꜣw of Heliopolis including the Enneads of
Upper and Lower Egypt. This was indicated by three factors, including (a) the
recurrent association of bꜣw (pl.) with the term nṯrw and with groups of gods (i.e.
Enneads and Triads) in the Pyramid Texts and Coffin Texts, (b) the interchangeability
of bꜣwy and nṯrw and the use of bꜣwy as a designation for pairs of gods, such as Isis
and Nephthys as the foremost bꜣwy of the bꜣw of Heliopolis (PT 302), and (c) the
identification of the šmsw-ḥr and bꜣw of Nekhen and Pe as gods in the Middle
Kingdom tomb inscription of Hapdjefay, the reliefs depicting the Heb-Sed festival of
Niuserre, and the Pyramid Texts. Furthermore, it was suggested that the shift in
meaning from bꜣw as gods to bꜣw as divinized deceased kings during the New
Kingdom formed part of the larger mythologization of history characteristic of this
period.

The third and final conclusion is twofold. By examining the development in
use of bꜣ and bꜣw in Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom names, titles, and epithets, it
was demonstrated that prior to the 3rd Dynasty, these terms were used exclusively in
association with gods. Following this period, however, bꜣ and bꜣw also came to be
used in reference to the king. While previous scholars have argued that these terms
were only used to refer to deceased kings, it was demonstrated, however, that this was
in fact a later development. The increasing divinity of the king during the beginning
of the Old Kingdom, and the use of bꜣ and bꜣw in a 3rd Dynasty king’s name, as well
as in the names of official ships expressing the king’s divine and royal status and
authority, indicated that the terms bꜣ and bꜣw functioned to express divine royal
ideology. The use of these terms in pyramid names, in the names of mortuary
domains, and in the Pyramid Texts during the 5th and 6th Dynasties do not indicate that bꜣ and bꜣw represented funerary concepts, but suggests that they were rather utilized to express the king’s continued divine and royal status and authority in the afterlife.

Lastly, through a study of the roles and functions of Bat, the šmsw-ḥr, the bꜣw of Nekhen, Pe, and Heliopolis, and the bꜣwy associated with the pr ḫry-wḏb it was demonstrated that there is a remarkable continuity with the function and meaning of the Saddlebill stork in Late Predynastic iconography. It was argued that being bꜣ encompassed effectively and actively contributing to the restoration and maintenance of ‘Order over Chaos’ and mꜣꜣt. This was indicated by the fact that these gods are predominantly depicted and referenced in contexts in which order or mꜣꜣt has been threatened or needs to be restored, such as war, the Heb-Sed festival of the king, and the death of the king. Within these contexts, their actions, including providing the king with the necessary protection and power to overcome his enemies in battle, protecting and assisting the king in his rebirth and renewal in his Heb-Sed festival and after his death, and ensuring the continual and consistent provisioning of offerings, effectively resulted in the triumph of order over chaos and instillation of peace.
Chapter 4 – $b\ddot{a}$ and $b\ddot{a}w$ in the 5th and 6th Dynasty Pyramid Texts

The Pyramid Texts have played a significant role in previous studies on the terms $b\ddot{a}$ and $b\ddot{a}w$. Being the first extensive and comprehensive exposition on ancient Egyptian religion, this corpus of spells used for funerary purposes has repeatedly been discussed and analyzed, often forming the bulk of evidence for the early use, function, and meaning of the terms $b\ddot{a}$ and $b\ddot{a}w$. However, although the Pyramid Texts are certainly invaluable for our understanding of the nature and role of these terms, they can be misleading. Their mortuary context and function has lead several scholars to argue that the terms $b\ddot{a}$ and $b\ddot{a}w$ were only used to refer to the deceased king, and furthermore, that $b\ddot{a}$ and $b\ddot{a}w$ expressed funerary beliefs. The above discussion has demonstrated, however, that these arguments are unfounded, resulting from an overestimation of the Pyramid Texts and an undervaluation of earlier texts and iconography.

The aim of the following chapter is to provide a clearer and more comprehensive understanding of the function and meaning of $b\ddot{a}$ and $b\ddot{a}w$ by re-analyzing the use of these terms in the 5th and 6th Dynasty Pyramid Texts. The analysis builds on the analysis of personal names, titles, and epithets discussed above and will take into consideration the function of these terms (as presented in the previous chapter), as well as the role of the gods and king as $b\ddot{a}w$. The analysis is divided into three parts followed by the conclusion. The first part includes a brief discussion of the hieroglyphs used to signify $b\ddot{a}$ and $b\ddot{a}w$, the second includes an in-depth analysis of the function of these terms, and the third includes a discussion of the meaning of these terms.
4.1. The Hieroglyphs

While the abstract noun bꜣw, the plural bꜣw, and the dual bꜣwy are consistently written with (sign G30) and (sign G227) respectively, bꜣ, on the other hand, is written in a variety of ways, including and the latter with variations, and (sign W10) and its variants. Scholars such as Žabkar and J. P. Allen have treated all of the above hieroglyphs as referring to the same concept. This treatment is only partly correct. The interchanging of with , and in parallel spells from different Pyramid Texts, such as PT 273-74 §396c & 413c, PT 360 §603d, PT 412 §723a-c & 724a, PT 422 §753a, PT 437 §799c, and PT 450 §833c, indicate that they all signify bꜣ. On the other hand, these terms are never transposed with (sign W10) and its variants. The different ‘spelling’ of the latter and the contexts in which it is utilized actually indicates that it is a homonym, and that it denotes bꜣ ‘ram’ rather than bꜣ. This is most apparent in PT 246 §252a-b:

---

284 PT 11 §8h; PT 214 §139c; PT 215 §144a & 144b; PT 218 §162c; PT 222 §204c & 206c; PT 223 §215b; PT 245 §250d; PT 246 §253a-b; PT 273-74 §394a & 396c, PT 301 §457c; PT 356 §579a & 580a; PT 360 §603d; PT 364 §621c; PT 412 §723b & 723c & 724a; PT 422 §753a, 758b, 760a & 763b; PT 423 §767b; PT 434 §785b; PT 436 §789a; PT 437 §799a; PT 450 §833c; PT 451 §837a & 839b; PT 452 §841a; PT 457 §859a; PT 467 §886a-b & 887b; PT 468 §904a-c; PT 480 §992c; PT 510 §1144b; PT 519 §1209a; PT 535 §1285a; PT 539 §1303c; PT 553 §1362c; PT 572 §1472b; PT 578 §1534b; PT 582 §1559a; PT 599 §1650c; PT 601 §1663a; PT 612 §1730b; PT 663 §22, 24, 25, 26; PT 665 §1921; PT 667A §1943b; PT 667B §1782d; PT 667A §1943b; PT 691E §2133
285 PT 273-74 §396c, 413a & 413c; PT 410 §719a; PT 422 §753a; PT 437 §799c; PT 480 §992c; PT 510 §1144b; PT 519 §1209a; PT 535 §1285a; PT 539 §1303c; PT 553 §1362c; PT 572 §1472b; PT 578 §1534b; PT 582 §1559a; PT 599 §1650c; PT 601 §1663a; PT 612 §1730b; PT 663 §22, 24, 25, 26; PT 665 §1921; PT 667A §1943b; PT 667B §1782d; PT 667A §1943b; PT 691E §2133
286 PT 273-74 §413c; PT 412 §723a & 723c-724a; PT 665D §1921
287 PT 360 §603d; PT 412 §723b; PT 450 §833c.
288 PT 246 §252a; PT 262 §334a; PT 456 §854a; PT 506 §1098c; PT 519 §1205a; PT 555 §1378c; PT 575 §1478c; PT 611 §1724b; PT 614 §1740b; PT 665A §1899b; PT 666 §1913c; PT 666 §1931b; PT 690 §2096c-d; PT 755 §12.
289 Žabkar, A study of the Ba concept, 55.
290 Allen, Pyramid Texts.
Further evidence which points towards the use of the sign W10 and its variants for ‘ram’ include PT 262 §334a, PT 666 §1931b, and PT 755 §12, all of which include the phrase pr bꜣ pf, variously written as 𓊋𓊋𓊋, 𓊋𓊋𓊋, and 𓊋𓊋𓊋. Ward has demonstrated that this phrase refers to the ‘house’ of a ram deity known as bꜣ-pf “Bapef(i)” or “That Ram”, who is further attested during the 4th Dynasty in the title 𓊋𓊋𓊋𓊋𓊋𓊋 hmt-ntr bꜣ-pf “hm-ntr priestess of Bapef(i)” held by several queens, including Hetepheres II, Meresankh III, and Khamerernebty I and II292. This evidence indicates that when 𓊋 and its variants are utilized, it does not denote bꜣ, but rather ‘ram’. Furthermore, the function of the Saddlebill stork hieroglyph in this context is purely phonetic, complementing the sign W10 in order to restrict its significance to the biliteral phonogram bꜣ293.

The confusion amongst scholars with regards to bꜣ and bꜣ ‘ram’ in the Pyramid Texts may be due to the fact that the scribes of the Coffin Texts and later funerary and non-funerary texts utilized the sign W10 as a hieroglyphic signifier for both bꜣ and bꜣ ‘ram’294. Ward has argued that this change is possibly the result of the transmission of the Pyramid Texts onto coffins during the First Intermediate Period 295.

Before beginning with the analysis and discussion of bꜣ and bꜣ in the

291 Allen, Pyramid Texts, 44.
292 bꜣ-pf also appears in the Coffin texts, as well as in the later New Kingdom Book of the Day and Night and the Amduat, where he is either represented as a mummiiform deity, or as an anthropomorphic deity with bull or ram horns - Ward, The four Egyptian homographic roots B-3, 117-119; D. Jones, An index of ancient Egyptian titles, epithets and phrases of the Old Kingdom, (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2000), 512 no. 1916.
293 Other terms in which this sign appears include iṯ ‘cup’, wsh ‘cup’, and šhw ‘width’ - Gardiner, Egyptian grammar, 528.
294 Ward, The four Egyptian homographic roots B-3, 148-149.
295 Ward, The four Egyptian homographic roots B-3, 148-149.
Pyramid Texts, attention should first be given to the use of  as a signifier for $b\dot{3}$, as it has not received any attention in previous studies on these terms. This composite sign, which consists of the Saddlebill stork (G29) and hoe  (sign U7), first appears in the Pyramid Texts of Teti\textsuperscript{296}, and subsequently in that of Pepi I\textsuperscript{297}, Merenre\textsuperscript{298}, Pepi II\textsuperscript{299}, Neith\textsuperscript{300}, and Wedjebtni\textsuperscript{301}. The contexts in which this composite sign is used indicates that the hoe sign (U7) does not carry a phonetic value, such as in PT 412 §723b:

As a determinative, the hoe sign (U7) is utilized in the Old Kingdom terms $h\text{bs}$ ‘to cultivate or hoe (land)’, $\text{d'}$ ‘to hack up’, and $h\text{b}\dot{3}$ ‘to destroy or diminish’, suggesting that it signified varying degrees of penetrative and destructive action\textsuperscript{303}. In this regard, it is significant and noteworthy that the composite sign  is only ever used to signify $b\dot{3}$ when functioning as a stative\textsuperscript{304} or as the verb in a prospective $sd\text{m.}f$\textsuperscript{305}, suggesting that the hoe sign was combined with the Saddlebill stork in order to emphasize the active and destructive aspects embodied in being $b\dot{3}$.

\textsuperscript{296} PT 412 §723b
\textsuperscript{297} PT 412 §723b, PT 450 §§833c & PT 665D §1921
\textsuperscript{298} PT 412 §723b, PT 450 §§833c & PT 665D §1921
\textsuperscript{299} PT 412 §723b, PT 450 §§833c & PT 665D §1921
\textsuperscript{300} PT 412 §723b, PT 450 §§833c & PT 665D §1921
\textsuperscript{301} PT 665D §1921.
\textsuperscript{302} Allen, Pyramid Texts, 90.
\textsuperscript{303} Gardiner, Egyptian grammar, 516; Faulkner, A Concise Dictionary, 187.
\textsuperscript{304} PT 412 §723b & PT 360 §603d.
\textsuperscript{305} PT 412 §723b & PT 450 §833c.
4.2 The function(s) of $b\theta$ and $b\theta w$

As presented in the above discussion of names, epithets, and titles, the plural $b\theta w$ as a designation for gods is frequently attested in the *Pyramid Texts*. In addition to the $b\theta w$ of Nekhen, Pe, and Heliopolis, they also mention the $b\theta w$ of the East$^{306}$, who are subsequently identified in the *Coffin Texts* as *Harakhti*, $b\hs \hwrr$ “the newborn calf”$^{307}$, and the *Morning star*$^{308}$.

The *Pyramid Texts* also use the singular $b\iota$ to refer to a god. For example, *Nut* is referred to as $b\iota \ pn$ “this $b\iota$” in PT 11 §8h $hnm \ nfr.k \ m \ h\ t \ nw \ b\iota \ pn$ “Mingle with your perfection in the belly of this $b\iota$”$^{309}$, and *Wadjet* as the king’s $s\smw t$ ‘Leading Uraeus’ is designated $\ptrt \ b\iota \ h\ t \ ntb.s \ h\ t$ “The $b\iota$ and effective one who is beheld (when) she shoots$^{310}$ fire” in PT 273 §396c. That being designated $b\iota$ referred to a god or a king in a ‘state of being’ is evidenced by the use of $b\iota$ as a verb in a prospective $sdmf$ and as a stative, such as in:

\[
df n.k \ imt - \ h\ tw \ b\iota.k \ im.s \ shm.k \ im.s
\]

“He (Geb) will give to you (the king) what is on Horus’ brow (i.e. Horus’ eye). You will become $b\iota$ through it and you will take control through it”$^{311}$ - PT 214 §139c

\[
dd.n \ gbb \ pr \ m \ r \ npsdt \ bik \ h\ t \ ftf \ in.sn \ m.k \ b\iota.ti \ shm.ti
\]

“Geb has spoken and it has come from the mouth of the Ennead, “O next falcon who acquires (the throne),” they said, “Behold you are $b\iota$ and in control”$^{312}$ - PT 218 §162b-c

---

306 PT 217 §159a.
307 T. T. Shmakov, *New readings in the Pyramid Texts* (Omsk, 2015), 61, [https://www.academia.edu/1319063/New_readings_in_the_Ancient_Egyptian_Pyramid_Texts](https://www.academia.edu/1319063/New_readings_in_the_Ancient_Egyptian_Pyramid_Texts)
309 Allen reads this spell as “(I) protect your perfection inside this (my) $b\iota$” - Allen, *Pyramid Texts*, 247.
310 For $ntb$ as ‘shoots’ see Allen, *Pyramid Texts*, 54.
311 Allen, *Pyramid Texts*, 34.
\[ ntrw \ nb \ rdtn.sn \ nfr \ rwd \ mr \ pn \ k\dot{t} \ tn \ nt \ NN \ inti.sn^{313} \ spd.sn \ inti.sn \ w\dot{t}k.sn \ inti.sn \ b\dot{i}.sn \ inti.sn \ shm.sn \]

“All the gods that will make this pyramid and this work of NN good and firm – they are the ones who will be sharp, they are the ones who will be esteemed, they are the ones who will be \( b\dot{i} \), they are the ones who will have control”\(^{314} \). PT 599 §1650a-c

In addition to \( b\dot{i} \) as a state of being (pl. \( b\dot{i}w \)), the abstract noun \( b\dot{i}w \) is also utilized in the Pyramid Texts. Furthermore, it is also presented as an attribute which the gods and the king possess – \( b\dot{i}w.f \) “his \( b\dot{i}w \)”\(^{315} \), \( wrt \ b\dot{i}w \) “Great of \( b\dot{i}w \)”\(^{316} \), \( b\dot{i}w.k \) “your \( b\dot{i}w \)”\(^{317} \), \( b\dot{i}w.s \) “her \( b\dot{i}w \)”, and \( b\dot{i}w.t \) “my \( b\dot{i}w \)”\(^{318} \). However, unlike the above name, titles, and epithets, in the Pyramid Texts, the singular noun \( b\dot{i} \) is also used in addition to the abstract noun \( b\dot{i}w \) –

\[ h\dot{i}.ppw \ pw \ 3hy \ b\dot{i}.k \ m-m \ ntrw \ m-m \ 3hyw \ snk \ pw \ yr \ b\dot{y}yw.sn \]

“Ho this Pepi! Your \( b\dot{i} \) stands among the gods and among the Akhs: it is the fear of you against their hearts”\(^{319} \). PT 422 §763a-b

\[ ity.tn.t \ ntr \ nb \ hr.t \ 3y \ hb\dot{i}.f \ sb\dot{i}.s \ (n).sn \ m \ b\dot{i}-b\dot{3}.s \]

“You have acquired for yourself every god with you to carry his \( hb\dot{i} \)-boat, that you might make them a star in "she whose \( b\dot{i} \) is thousand-fold" (i.e. Nut)”\(^{320} \). PT 434 §785b

While the use of the abstract noun \( b\dot{i}w \) and the singular noun \( b\dot{i} \) seem to carry different meanings, Žabkar\(^{321} \) has noted in his study of the \( b\dot{i} \) concept that these two terms are interchangeable, such as in:

---

314 Allen, Pyramid Texts, 267.
315 PT 306 §477a & PT 690 §2101a.
316 PT 468 §901a-b.
317 PT 468 §901a-b & PT 570 §1449b-c.
318 PT 493 §1601c.
319 Allen, Pyramid Texts, 105.
320 Allen, Pyramid Texts, 108.
321 Žabkar, A study of the Ba concept, 55.
“his bꜣ atop him, his magic at his sides, his ferocity at his feet”\(^\text{322}\) - PT 480 §992c

“His bꜣw atop him, his ferocity at his sides, his magic atop his feet”\(^\text{323}\) - PT 306 §477a

To this we can also add the following spells -

“This controlling power is one who is glorified because”\(^\text{324}\) of his bꜣ\(^\text{325}\) - PT 436 §789a

“Praise is given to Neith who becomes great because of her bꜣw”\(^\text{326}\) - PT 493 §1061c

The transposition of bꜣ and bꜣw in the former spells and the similar contexts in which bꜣ and bꜣw appear in the latter spells indicates they essentially refer to the same concept. This is paralleled in the use of the related term sḫm, which can appear as the singular noun sḫm ‘control’, such as sḫm.k ‘your ability to control’\(^\text{327}\), or the abstract noun sḫmw ‘controlling power’, such as in sḫmw.k ‘your controlling power’\(^\text{328}\).

The above evidence thus indicates that the terms bꜣ and bꜣw had the same function in the Pyramid Texts as the one they had in the Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom names and titles – designating the gods and the king in a state of being, and as an attribute which the gods and the king possess. While the Pyramid Texts do differ in that they introduced the singular noun bꜣ alongside the abstract noun bꜣw, the

\(^\text{322}\) Allen, Pyramid Texts, 276.

\(^\text{323}\) Allen, Pyramid Texts, 61.

\(^\text{324}\) For the use of n as ‘because’ in the Pyramid Texts see, J.P Allen, Grammar of the ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts, Volume 1: Unis (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2017), 63.

\(^\text{325}\) Allen, Pyramid Texts, 109.

\(^\text{326}\) Allen, Pyramid Texts, 149.

\(^\text{327}\) PT 451 §839b.

\(^\text{328}\) PT 767 §5.
transposition of these terms and the similar contexts in which they are used, however, indicate that they refer to the same concept.

4.3. The meaning of \( b^3 \) and \( b^3w \)

4.3.1. Being \( b^3 \)

Several of the above quoted spells from the *Pyramid Texts* emphasize and highlight an important aspect of being \( b^3 \) that is alluded to in the Old Kingdom non-royal names with the construction \( NN + \text{optative } b^3.f \) i.e. “Snefru, may he be \( b^3 \)” (Ind. Ent. I). This is the idea that the gods and the king are not simply \( b^3 \), but that they become \( b^3 \) through their actions. In addition to PT 599 §1650a-c, which states that the gods will ‘only’ become \( b^3 \) if they make the pyramid and work of Pepi \( nfr \) “good” and \( rwD \) “firm”, other spells that emphasize this causality include:

\[ rdi.n \ hrw \ nfr.k \ hftw.k \ im \ pswt.f \ im.sn \ hft.k \ b^3 \ ir.f \ hrw \]

“Horus has had you seize your opponents and there shall be none of them who will turn their back to you. So Horus becomes \( b^3 \)” - PT 356 §579b-580b

\[ rdi.n \ hrw \ ip \ n.k \ msw.f \ dr \ bw \ mh.n.k \ im \ ip \ kw \ hrw \ rnp \ rnpw \ m \ rn.k \ pw \ n \ mw \ rnpw \ b^3 \ ir.f \ hrw \]

“Horus has had his children assemble you in the place in which you are made whole. Horus assembles you year by year, rejuvenated in this your name of the rejuvenated waters. So, Horus becomes \( b^3 \)” - PT 423 §766d-767b

Spells such as these thus not only support the argument that being \( b^3 \) was closely and specifically associated with acting, but also further indicate that \( b^3 \) was a state attained by divine beings who had effectively taken action.

Other spells that have been mentioned above, such PT 214 §139c, also indicate that the deceased king’s becoming \( b^3 \) is brought about through the receiving

---

329 Allen, *Pyramid Texts*, 76.
331 Refer to page 74
of offerings and Horus’ eye. Further examples include:

\[
\text{ts tw r t.k pn i .hm } \| \text{msd } \text{hnkt.k i .hm}^{\text{t}} \text{m} \| \text{b} \| \text{k im spd.k im s\text{hm.k im}}
\]

“Raise yourself to this your bread that does not molder and your beer that does not sour, that you may become \(b\) through them, that you may become sharp through them, that you may take control through them”\(^{332}\) - PT 457 §859a-c

\[
iw \text{s} \text{t.s ir.k iw st} \text{irt hrw ir.k ppy pw i.b\|k im.s s\text{hm.k im.s w\|s.k im.s if.k wrrt im.s m-m ntrw}
\]

“Its scent is on you. The scent of Horus’ eye is on you, this Pepi. May you become \(b\) through it, may you take control through it, may you become esteemed through it, and may you acquire the \(wrrt\)-crown through it among the gods”\(^{333}\) - PT 687 §2075b

A similar set of circumstances in which the act of offering, as well as the offerings themselves lead to divine beings becoming \(b\) can be found in the above discussed Upper and Lower Egyptian palanquin procession and offering ritual of Niuserre’s \textit{Heb-Sed} Festival (Figures 24 & 25). In addition to offering linen and incense to the dual shrines and \(\text{s\text{msw-hr}}\), the \(\text{hm-ntr}\)-priest also recites the following - \(di \text{\'n\|h w\|s b\|w n\|hn \lq\lq Giving life and dominion (to) the \(b\|w\) of Nekhen\rq\rq\) (Figure 22). In his study of the \textit{Heb-Sed} festival, J. D. Degreef\(^{335}\) has demonstrated that in the sequence of rituals, the palanquin procession and offering to the dual shrines of Upper and Lower Egypt occurs before the king’s rebirth and ‘rising’ at dawn on the throne podium and before the king’s running, the latter two rituals being those in which the \(b\|w\) of Nekhen are present and active (Figures 24). What this evidence thus suggests is the following sequence: (a) the king offers to the gods (i.e. the \(s\text{msw-hr}\)) who reside in the

\(^{332}\) Allen, \textit{Pyramid Texts}, 123.

\(^{333}\) Allen, \textit{Pyramid Texts}, 286.

\(^{334}\) Although the reliefs depicting Lower Egyptian palanquin procession and offering ritual are heavily damaged, the parallels between the two scenes indicate that the same invocation was probably recited by the \(\text{hm-ntr}\) priest associated with the \(b\|w\) of Pe.

\(^{335}\) J.D. Degreef, “The Hebsed Festival Sequence and pBrooklyn 47.218.50”, \textit{Gottinger Missellen} 223 (2009): 27-34.
irti ‘Dual shrines’, providing them with life and dominion and invoking them as b3w in the hopes that they will assist and be effective, (b) they protect and assist the king in his rebirth and the renewal of his powers, and (c) the šmsw-ḥr become and are b3w because of their actions.

The act of offering and the offerings themselves thus initiate the process of the gods and the deceased king becoming b3, not only providing and sustaining them with the life that it necessary to act, but also ensuring that they will act beneficially and contribute to the maintenance of m3ṭ. The latter also emphasizes the conditional and reciprocal relationship between the gods and the king and between the deceased and the living, the offerings essentially functioning as an incentive for support, protection, and assistance, as well as insurance that the gods and the deceased themselves will not act malevolently and cause ısft.

The above argument regarding the function of offerings in relation to becoming b3 is supported by the fact that in Unas’ Pyramid Texts, the first invocation for the deceased king to possess b3 and become b3 occurs within the ‘offering ritual’ itself 336. According to Allen, the offering ritual took place in the initial phases of the entire funerary ritual 337. In subsequent spells, however, Unas’ taking action is directly equated with his becoming and being b3, such as in the ‘Commendation to Osiris’:

isir ii r.f wnix pn ḫwrr ṭḥ ḫm sk ip.f ibw nhm.f k3w nhb.f k3w m tnt.f nḥt šnt nfr ṣpr. nfr ni ḫmw.ti, fl nb ni t.f ni t k3.f ḫ ḫr t.f r.f ḫ ḫn ḫb pr m r ṭḥ ṭḥ t.f in.sn mn b3.ti sḥm.ti

“Osiris, this Unas has come, the Ennead’s fledgling, an Akh who does not perish. He will claim minds, take away Kas, and bestow Kas as what he reckons, including whomever he associates to himself or petitions to him. There is none who will be excluded without his bread, without his Ka’s bread, deprived of his bread. Geb has spoken and it has come from

336 Allen, Pyramid Texts, 30.
the mouth of the Ennead, ‘O next falcon who acquires (the throne)’, they said, ‘behold you are bꜣ and in control’\textsuperscript{338} - PT 218 §161a-162c

The above evidence thus indicates that being bꜣ was a state of distinction, essentially denoting the gods and the king as beings who had acted efficaciously. Furthermore, as with bꜣt, the ṣmsw-ḥr, and the bꜣw of Nekhen, Pe, and Heliopolis, this action was directed towards restoring order and mꜣt, including - removing opposition (PT 222), providing the necessary power to overcome enemies (PT 356), ensuring the rebirth and resurrection of the king by assembling his body (PT 423), and ensuring the continual and everlasting provision of offerings (PT 218). That being designated bꜣ denoted effectiveness, authority, eminence, and prestige is further supported by the recurrent association of bꜣ with being śhm ‘in control and powerful’, wꜣš ‘esteemed and honored’\textsuperscript{339}, and spd ‘sharp and effective’\textsuperscript{340} in the above quoted spells. The consistent appearance of bꜣ and śhm together is also particularly noteworthy, as this parallels the larger theme of the Late Predynastic iconography discussed in the preceding chapter, in which the Saddlebill stork’s destructive and protective action results in the control of the ‘forces of chaos’.

4.3.2. Possessing bꜣ and bꜣw

The role and meaning of the singular noun bꜣ has been a major topic of debate in previous studies. Its occurrence with a suffix pronoun has resulted in arguments that it represented a component part of the deceased king that separated after death, similar to the kꜣ\textsuperscript{341}, or a visible and separate manifestation\textsuperscript{342}. It has already been demonstrated, however, that the abstract noun bꜣw and the singular noun bꜣ

\textsuperscript{338} Allen, \textit{Pyramid Texts} , 37.
\textsuperscript{339} Faulkner, \textit{A Concise Dictionary} , 55.
\textsuperscript{340} Faulkner, \textit{A Concise Dictionary} , 223-24.
\textsuperscript{341} H. Kees, \textit{Totenglauben und Jenseitsvorstellungen der alten Ägypter: Grundlagen und Entwicklung bis zum Ende des Mittleren Reiches} (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1926), 54.
\textsuperscript{342} Žabkar, \textit{A study of the Ba concept} , 51-67.
essentially refer to the same concept, signified by the fact that they can be transposed in parallel spells and are used in similar contexts. Furthermore, the recurrent association of $b\bar{3}$ and $sh\text{m}$ and the striking similarities in their functions (i.e. to designate a state of being and an attribute), suggests that the use of the singular noun $b\bar{3}$ and abstract noun $b\bar{3}w$ parallels that of the singular noun $sh\text{m}$ and the abstract noun $sh\text{m}w$. As has been noted above, these latter two uses of $sh\text{m}$ denote an ability i.e. $sh\text{m}.k$ “your (ability to) control”, and a form of power i.e. $sh\text{m}w.k$ “your controlling power”.

A spell that highlights the meaning of $b\bar{3}$ as an *ability* can be found in the Pyramid Texts of Neith -

```
s\text{h}m.\text{k isir nt w}3\text{s n.k isir nt b}\bar{3} \text{n.k isir nt s}3\text{nh n.k isir nt}
```

“Control is yours Osiris Neith”, esteem is yours Osiris Neith, $b\bar{3}$ is yours Osiris Neith, life-giving (lit. causing life) is yours Osiris Neith” - PT 805 §11

The association of $b\bar{3}$ with the ability to ‘control’ and the ability to ‘cause life’ in this spell indicates that although the $b\bar{3}$ of the king might be referred to as a separate entity, it actually denoted a capability. This is further supported by the fact that it often occurs alongside $h\text{k}3\text{w.f}$ “his magic” and $s^3f.f$ “his (ability to instill) terror”. While both of the latter are also referred to as being visible and acting as independent entities, this could, however, have functioned as a metaphor for the powerful and glorious state into which the deceased king had been transformed, evoking a visual image of the king with his powers upon, before, and around him.

There is also the possibility, however, that the king’s various abilities and

---

343 The appellation *Osiris Neith* and the use of male suffix pronouns in this PT Spell is probably a result of the fact that these texts were originally created and used for the male kings of the 5th Dynasty. K. Cooney has also suggested another interpretation based on her studies on Ramesside coffins, which is namely that women had to be transformed into men during the ‘rebirth process’ as men were specifically associated with creation and regeneration – K. Cooney, “Gender Transformation in Death: A Case study of Coffins from Ramesside Period Egypt”, *Near Eastern Archaeology* 73 no. 4 (2010).


345 PT 245 §250d and PT 480 §992c.
powers, including $b\delta$ and $b\delta\nu$, were represented by real ritual items that were presented during the funerary ritual. In PT 468, the $d\delta rt$ ‘Red Crown’ is not only described as $wrt\ b\delta\nu$ ‘Great of $b\delta\nu$’, but also provides the king with his $b\delta\nu$ –

\[
\text{di.s}\ b\delta\nu.k\ NN\ \hat{n}nt\ psdt\ m\ \text{wtyt}\ \text{intil}\ h\text{hit.k}
\]

“She will put your $b\delta\nu$, O this NN, at the fore of the Ennead as the two begetters on your front”\textsuperscript{346} - PT 468 §902a-b

This suggests that the Red Crown was specifically associated with and embodied the king’s $b\delta\nu$. In PT 221, the Red Crown is also invoked to bestow its ferocity, fearsomeness, and acclaim upon the deceased king so that he might become ferocious, fearsome, and acclaimed like it \textsuperscript{347}. Furthermore, it also places the king’s ‘$b\delta$-scepter and $shm$-scepter at ‘the head of the living’ and ‘the head of the $Akhs$’\textsuperscript{348}. It has often been stated that $shm$ ‘to control’ is embodied in and represented by the $shm$-scepter\textsuperscript{349}. Along the same lines, it may be suggested that the king’s $b\delta$ is embodied in and represented by the ‘$b\delta$-scepter. This argument is supported by the use of the ‘$b\delta$-scepter in the Pyramid Texts, such as in PT 459 §866b-c -

\[
(\text{i}h(y)^{350}.k\ m\ 'b\delta\ hrp.k\ m\ i\beta t\ i.w\text{d.k}\ mdw\ n\ ntrw}
\]

“You strike with the ‘$b\delta$-scepter, you direct with the $i\beta t$-scepter, and you govern the gods”\textsuperscript{351}.

Along with this spell, several other spells\textsuperscript{352} recurrently associate the ‘$b\delta$ scepter with the action of ‘striking’ and control, indicating that it was associated with violent

\textsuperscript{346} Allen, Pyramid Texts, 129.

\textsuperscript{347} Allen, Pyramid Texts, 42; K, Goeb, Crowns in Egyptian funerary literature: royalty, rebirth, and destruction (Oxford: Griffith Institute, Ashmolean Museum, 2008), 204.

\textsuperscript{348} Allen, Pyramid Texts, 42; Goeb, Crowns, 204.


\textsuperscript{350} The full spelling of this can be found in PT 511 - ; for the translation of $ihy$ as ‘strike’ see Allen, Pyramid Texts, 124; there is also the possibility that this verb is $hw$ “to beat, to hit” – Wb 3, 46.1-48.15.

\textsuperscript{351} Allen, Pyramid Texts, 124.
action in service of control and order. Furthermore, the verb "b3" signifies ‘to command’\(^\text{353}\), which expresses both the application and effect of b3 – acting (i.e. ‘striking’) and having authority and control.

The close association between b3, violence, and control is also apparent in the following spells:

\[
\text{h3 ppy pw ḥf b3.k m-m nṯrw m-m ḫw snt.k pw ir h3tyw.sn}
\]

“Ho this Pepi! Your b3 stands among the gods and among the Akhs: it is the fear of you against their hearts”\(^\text{354}\) - PT 422 §763a-b

\[
\text{ii r.ln ḫrw ḫsbd irty s3.ln ḫrw dšr irti mr 3t ni ḥsf}\(^\text{355}\) b3.f
\]

“Blue-eyed Horus comes to you (gods); Beware of red-eyed Horus, the one whose wrath is painful of (moment of) rage, his b3 cannot be avoided!”\(^\text{356}\) - PT 246 §253a-b

The effect of the king’s b3 and Horus’ b3 is one of fear, suggesting that it is related to violent action. This is further indicated by the reference to ‘red-eyed’ Horus in PT 246. According to A. M. Hussein\(^\text{357}\), the color blue when associated with deities signifies pacificity, calmness, and htp “being satisfied”, while the color red expresses anger, rage, and wrath. V. Davies has further noted that the latter emotions are recurrently cited in texts when describing a situation in which mAat has been transgressed, and that violence subsequently plays an important role in restoring mAat and causing the gods and the king to be htp\(^\text{358}\). The reference to red-eyed Horus thus refers to him in a state of anger because of a violation of mAat, who then subsequently

---

\(^{352}\) PT 511, PT 519, PT 614, & PT 691D.


\(^{356}\) Allen, *Pyramid Texts*, 44.


enacts his ‘wrath’ upon the transgressors as a form of punishment. The association of $b\dot{3}$ with red-eyed Horus thus indicates that it denotes the ability to act (i.e. punishment in the form of painful wrath) in order to produce a desired result, the latter being the restoration of $m\dot{3}t$.

This link between $b\dot{3}$ and restoring order is further indicated by PT 412 §723a

$s3h.k\ pt\ mr$ $^359$ $s3h\ spd\ b3.k\ mr\ spd$t

“(when)You (the king) touch the sky like Orion, your $b\dot{3}$ is sharp like Sothis”$^360$ - PT 412 §723a

As noted above, the term $spd$ can denote ‘sharp’ and ‘effective’. However, Faulkner has noted that when it is utilized as a verb, it can also signify ‘restoring order’$^361$.

Furthermore, Sothis or Sopdet, a personification of the star Sirius, was associated with ‘being effective’ and ‘restoring order’, based on the fact that she signaled$^362$ and thus ‘brought about’ the yearly inundation of the Nile$^363$. The equating of the king’s $b\dot{3}$ with Sothis thus not only implies that the king’s $b\dot{3}$ is effective, but also that it is effective in restoring order like Sothis.

The abstract noun $b3w$ has variously been translated as “power”, “mightiness”, “fame” and “reputation”$^364$, the creative power to manifest forms$^365$, and ‘impressiveness’$^366$. However, as mentioned above, the transposition of $b\dot{3}$ and $b3w$ and the similar contexts in which they are used indicate that they refer to the same

---

$^359$ This spelling is the old form of $mi$ before the loss of the final $r$ in the Middle Kingdom—Allen, Grammar, 67.

$^360$ Allen, Pyramid Texts, 90.

$^361$ Faulkner, A Concise Dictionary, 224.

$^362$ i.e. the heliacal rising of Sirius


$^364$ Kees, Totenglauben, 59; Ward, The four Egyptian homographic roots $B$-3, 80-85.

$^365$ Wolf-Brinkmann, Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes ’bA’.

$^366$ Allen, Pyramid Texts.
concept. As demonstrated above, the Red Crown is specifically associated with $b\vec{w}$ in the Pyramid Texts. According to K. Goeds, the $d\text{srt}$ ‘Red crown’ was not only associated with the red light or the sun disc at sunrise, but also with blood, slaughter, and violence.\textsuperscript{367} Texts such as PT 221, indicate that this crown inspired $s\text{nt}$ ‘respect or dread’ and $sn\text{d}$ ‘fear’, and granted the deceased king’s “knife to be firm against his enemies” and for his “$b\vec{z}$- and $sh\text{m}$-scepter to be placed at the head of the living and the Akhs”.\textsuperscript{368} The association between the Red Crown’s $b\vec{w}$ and inspiring ‘fear’ and ‘dread’ directly parallels the effect of the king’s $b\vec{z}$ on the gods and the Akhs in PT 422 §763a-b, further demonstrating that the terms $b\vec{z}$ and $b\vec{w}$ essentially referred to the same concept. Furthermore, the Red crown’s granting of a “firm knife” and the $b\vec{z}$- and $sh\text{m}$-scepters to the king also emphasizes her effectiveness, essentially imbuing the king with the necessary power to act, overcome, subjugate, control, and instill order. The resulting image that is evoked is that the king is endowed with $b\vec{w}$ when he receives the Red Crown, allowing him to inspire ‘fear’ and ‘dread’ in others, overcome his enemies, and instill order among the living, the gods, and the Akhs. This evidence indicates that possessing $b\vec{w}$ denoted possessing the power to restore and enforce order i.e. efficacious power.

The above discussion demonstrates that the king and the gods’ $b\vec{z}$ and $b\vec{w}$ did not denote an independent aspect that manifested after death or a separate manifestation of their power, but rather denoted their ability and power to act in order to restore order. For $b\vec{z}$, the term ‘efficacy’, i.e. the ability to produce a desired result, is probably the closest modern translation, as it not only implies action, but also action that is effective. For $b\vec{w}$, the translation ‘efficacious power’ i.e. the power to produce a desired result, is appropriate, as it not only represents an abstraction of

\textsuperscript{367} Goeds, Crowns, 215 & 371.
\textsuperscript{368} Goeds, Crowns, 215-6.
‘efficacy’ like the term $b\ddot{w}$ itself, but also expresses effective power. A god and a king’s $b\ddot{s}$ and $b\ddot{w}$ thus represented the means through which they enforced $m\ddot{r}$t and ‘Order over Chaos’ and thus also the means through which they attained the state of $b\ddot{s}$.

4.4. Conclusion

The above discussion and analysis has demonstrated that the use, function, and meaning of $b\ddot{s}$ and $b\ddot{w}$ in the Pyramid Texts was an extension and exposition of that in Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom names, titles, and epithets. Thus while they were utilized in a mortuary context, $b\ddot{s}$ and $b\ddot{w}$ were not, however, exclusively funerary concepts.

As with the names, titles, and epithets, the terms $b\ddot{s}$ and $b\ddot{w}$ in the Pyramid Texts had two major functions – to denote a divine being in a state of being (singl. $b\ddot{s}$, dual. $b\ddot{s}\text{wy}$, pl. $b\ddot{s}\ddot{w}$), and to designate an attribute of divine beings (Abstr N. $b\ddot{w}$). The Pyramid Texts further added the singular noun $b\ddot{s}$, which was subsequently shown to be similar in function to the abstract noun $b\ddot{w}$. A discussion of the hieroglyphs used to signify $b\ddot{s}$ further demonstrated that its principal and sole signifier in the Pyramid Texts was the Saddlebill stork (sign G29), and that previous scholars had incorrectly assigned sign W10 as an hieroglyphic signifier for $b\ddot{s}$. Furthermore, a comparison of the hieroglyphs for $b\ddot{s}$ also demonstrated that the scribes of the Pyramid Texts of Pepi modified sign G29 with the hoe (sign U7) when used as a stative or prospective $sd\text{m.f}$ in order to reinforce and emphasize the active aspects encompassed in $b\ddot{s}$.

An in-depth analysis of the various spells in which $b\ddot{s}$ and $b\ddot{w}$ occur has demonstrated that these terms were utilized to express the role and authority of the gods and the king in ensuring order and maintaining peace. The recurrent association between acting and becoming/being $b\ddot{s}$ further indicated that the latter state denoted
gods and the king as beings who had effectively taken action and restored order and peace. With regards to the deceased king, this action is centered around re-attaining his sovereignty and authority in the afterlife.

The means through which the gods and the king achieved the state of being $b\dot{3}$ is furthermore presented as their $b\dot{3}$ (singl. N) and their $b\dot{3}w$ (Abstr. N). While the former has been interpreted as a component part similar to the $k\dot{3}$ that was released after death, or a separate manifestation of power, it has been demonstrated that it actually denoted the ability of a divine being to act in order restore and enforce order i.e. their efficacy. Its recurrent association with $shm$ “to control”, and its appearance alongside $s'n\dot{h}$ “to cause life” in the Pyramid Texts of Neith supported this argument. It has also been suggested that the recurrent presentation of the king’s $b\dot{3}$ and $b\dot{3}w$ as independent entities in the Pyramid Texts refers to the offering of ritual items, namely the Red Crown and ‘$b\dot{3}$-scepter. This was indicated by the fact that the former is said to provide the king with $b\dot{3}w$, and the contexts and manner in which the latter was used i.e. the king ‘striking’ with the scepter in order to gain control and authority over the gods, the Akhs, and the living. The association between $b\dot{3}$ and the ‘$b\dot{3}$-scepter was further indicated by the signification of the verb ‘$b\dot{3}$ itself, which means “to command”.

The transposition of $b\dot{3}$ and $b\dot{3}w$ in parallel texts and the similar contexts in which they are used indicated that these terms essentially referred to the same concept. It has been argued that $b\dot{3}w$ represents an abstraction of $b\dot{3}$, and thus denotes a power to effectively enforce order i.e. a divine being’s efficacious power. That $b\dot{3}w$ also referred to restoring and enforcing order or $m\dot{s}t$, was indicated by the various abilities that the Red Crown bestowed upon the king, namely the power to instill ‘fear’ and ‘dread’ in others, to destroy his enemies, and to control the gods, the Akhs,
and the living.

As with the names, titles, and epithets, $b3$ and $b3w$ in the Pyramid Texts thus functioned to assert and reinforce divine and royal ideology, essentially expressing the power and authority of the gods and the king in maintaining and restoring ‘Order over Chaos’.
Chapter 5 – $b\bar{a}$ and $b\bar{a}w$ in 6th Dynasty Non-royal Texts

During the 6th Dynasty, the terms $b\bar{a}$ and $b\bar{a}w$ were utilized in two non-royal texts$^{370}$. The first, which belongs to the corpus of letters from the so-called Elephantine archive, is a hieratic document (Papyrus Berlin 9010) pertaining to a legal dispute between Sobek-Hetep and Tjau over the will of Tjau’s late father, User $^{371}$. The second, which dates to the late 6th Dynasty, is the inscription on the architrave of Herimeru’s tomb at Saqqara$^{372}$. While the former text has only been briefly noted in previous studies$^{373}$, the latter text has received a significant amount of attention$^{374}$. Žabkar was the first to highlight the existence of the text and discuss it$^{375}$, and it was subsequently published in full in 1975 by S. Hassan and Z. Iskandar as part of their *Excavations at Saqqara* series$^{376}$. The importance accorded to Herimeru’s architrave inscription is based on the fact that it represents the first use of the term $b\bar{a}$ in relation to a non-royal deceased individual, a development that was previously believed to only have occurred after the collapse of the Old Kingdom$^{377}$. The aim of the following discussion is thus to review these two texts in order to determine whether there is continuity in the function and meaning of $b\bar{a}$ and $b\bar{a}w$ in a non-royal context.

---

$^{370}$ Žabkar, *A study of the ba concept*, 60 & 87.
$^{371}$ N.C. Strudwick, *Texts from the pyramid age* (Atlanta; Leiden; Boston: Society of Biblical Literature; Brill, 2005), 186-7
$^{372}$ PM III$^2$: 626
$^{373}$ Žabkar, *A study of the Ba concept*, 87.
$^{375}$ The un-published text was brought to the attention of Žabkar by E. F. Wente - Žabkar, *A study of the Ba concept*, 60.
5.1. The Will Dispute from Elephantine – pBerlin 9010

The text known as Papyrus Berlin 9010 has been dated to the 6th Dynasty by scholars such as Jasnow\textsuperscript{378}, Strudwick\textsuperscript{379}, Theodorides\textsuperscript{380}, and Muhs\textsuperscript{381}. According to Theodorides and Muhs, it records the legal decision of an anonymous judicial institution, most likely the $\text{d$\text{d}$\text{d}$\text{t}$-court, and presents the official report of the tribunal’s finding. The actual dispute appears to have been between Tjau, the eldest son of the late ‘royal noble’ and Overseer of Foreigners’ User, and Sobek-Hetep, who was purportedly appointed as User’s estate administrator by a testamentary disposition document\textsuperscript{382}. Tjau, however, maintains that his father never made this document, and that he, as the eldest son, is now the estate administrator according to customary intestate succession law\textsuperscript{383}. According to the text, the legal decision made by the court is that if Sobek-Hetep can produce three witnesses who are trustworthy and who can make an ‘oath’ swearing that the document contains the words of User, then the estate shall remain with Sobek-Hetep\textsuperscript{384}. However, if Sobek-Hetep does not produce these three witnesses, then the estate shall remain with Tjau\textsuperscript{385}. The part of the text that is of interest to this thesis is the actual ‘oath’ to be said by the witnesses, which was quoted in the document itself (lines 4-6):

\begin{figure}
\centering
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\caption{Image from the document}
\end{figure}

\begin{quote}
\begin{itemize}
\item 379 N.C. Strudwick, Texts, 186-7.
\item 382 possibly a $\text{w$\text{d}$\text{t}$-mdw or imyt-md$\text{p}$ - R. Jasnow, “Egypt: Old Kingdom and First Intermediate Period”, in A history of ancient Near Eastern law 1, ed. R. Westbrook (Leiden: Brill, 2003): 125
\item 383 Muhs, economy, 28.
\item 384 Muhs, economy, 28.
\item 385 Muhs, economy, 28.
\end{itemize}
\end{quote}
‘If this Sobek-Hetep brings 3 excellent witnesses who are convincing concerning this and who will make (the oath) “May your bAw be against him (i.e. Sobek-Hetep) Oh God!” that this document was indeed one that was made according to that which this User has said therein…’\(^{386}\).

While J. F. Borghouts\(^{387}\) maintains that ntr ‘god’ in the above quoted oath is anonymous, N. Strudwick\(^{388}\), on the other hand, argues that it actually denotes the living and reigning king. The latter argument is supported by the study of R. Shalomi-Hen, who demonstrated that the classifier  (sign G7) was specifically used from the 5\(^{th}\) Dynasty onwards to refer to the king as a god\(^{389}\). This evidence thus further strengthens the non-mortuary nature of the terms bAw and bAw, and demonstrates that the living king was believed to possess bAw.

The basic message signified by the above quoted text is that if Sobek-Hetep had lied with regards to the ‘document’, the bAw of the king will be against him. Several later Middle Kingdom texts elucidate the Egyptian view of lying and falsehood. The ‘tale of the Eloquent Peasant’ for example, lists the five basic characteristics of an effective ruler, one being ‘\(shtm grg\) “a destroyer of falsehood”\(^{390}\). Furthermore, throughout Khun-Anup’s discourse, he defines falsehood as one of the cardinal evils, it being corrosive and destructive to mAat, and that it must be expelled in order for mAat to be maintained\(^{391}\). In the above legal text, there is thus a link between bAw and maintaining ‘Order over Chaos’ or mAat. If Sobek-Hetep had lied, he would thus threaten order and must be punished in order for mAat to be maintained.

---


\(^{387}\) J.F. Borghouts, “Divine intervention”, 68.

\(^{388}\) Strudwick, *Texts*, 186 & 206 ft. 1.


restored. While the actual form of punishment is not described, it is insinuated by the threat that the king’s $b^3w$ will be against him. The context in which $b^3w$ is utilized thus indicates that it carries the same meaning as in the Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom names, titles, and epithets, as well as in the Pyramid Texts: the king’s efficacious power to restore order and maintain $m^f\text{t}$.

5.2 The Architrave Inscription of Herimeru

As mentioned above, the late 6$^{th}$ Dynasty inscription on the architrave of Herimeru’s tomb at Saqqara represents the first extant use of the term $b^3$ in relation to a non-royal individual. The inscription essentially consists of three parts – (1) the offering formula, (2) the festival list, and (3) the autobiography and threat formula. Parts 1 and 3 are of specific interest to the function and meaning of $b^3$ in this text:

The Offering Formula

An offering which the king and which Anubis, foremost of the divine booth, who is in his embalming place, who is atop his mountain, lord of the sacred land, give, namely a burial in his tomb in the necropolis as an imakhu whom the god loves. May the West give her arms to him as one who does what satisfies and who has reached (the state of) imakhu, the sole companion, overseer of the $\text{hnty-}$, Herimeru, whose good name is Merery. May he be united with the land, may he cross the heavens,
may he ascend to the Great God. May his Ka be foremost before the king, may his \( b \)\( i \) endure before the
god, may his ‘document’ be accepted by the god at the pure places as a beloved of his father and a
praised one of his mother. An offering which the king and which Osiris give that he may make a
perfect journey on the perfect ways on which the imakhu travel, that he may be followed by his Ka,
that he may be led on the holy ways, that his Kas (may be excellent) before the king, and that his places
be pure before the god” 394.

The Autobiography and Threat Formula

\[ \text{[shd hnt(y)-s pr-\textsuperscript{7}i hr(y)-mrw]} \text{ dd.f ink \( \text{ihr rh(w)} \) \( \text{ht dd(w)} \) nfr whm(w) nfr ni-sp \( \text{dd try.} \)} \text{ (i) \( \text{ht nb dw r r(m)} \)\( \text{m nb m\textsuperscript{5} n(t) hr nfr nfr m(t) rh r(m)} \)\( \text{ir sw si nb } \)} \text{ (i)\( \text{rtl.f rht nb dw r is.(i) } \)\( \text{r rt}\)
\text{ t(\( \text{s.f)\)} \text{ 395 mi smn wdf'.k(wi) hnt\textsuperscript{7} f m \( \text{ddit ntr-\textsuperscript{7}i ir swt rm} \text{ nb prt-lhrw sti.sn mw w\textsuperscript{7}bt} \text{sn mi w\textsuperscript{7}b n nfr}\)
\text{kw.(i) r } \text{h\textsuperscript{7}f \( m \) hnt-ntr}}\]

“[the supervisor of \( hnty\)-\( s \) of the Great House, Herimeru] He says: I am an excellent Akh. One who
knows things, one who speaks good, and one who repeats good, who never said or did any evil thing
against any people, a true servant favored by the perfect/young god (i.e. the king) and known of the
people. But with regard to any man who shall do any evil thing to my tomb and who shall enter into it
wrongly, I shall take (i.e. wring) his neck like a goose, and be judged with him in the DADAt
court of the
Great god. (However), with regards to all people who shall make invocation offerings or shall pour
water, or shall be pure like the purity of the god, I will protect him in the necropolis” 396.

In his brief discussion of this text, Žabkar interprets the reference to Herimeru’s \( b \)\( i \) as
the singular noun \( b \)\( i \), stating that the text indicates that non-royal individuals were
believed to have ‘a \( b \)\( i \)’ prior to the ‘democratization of the afterlife’ in the First
Intermediate Period 397. There is, however, a significant factor that favors the
argument that this text actually utilizes the term \( b \)\( i \) as a state of being rather than as an
attribute. This is namely the sign used to determine \( b \)\( i \) in Herimeru’s text, the seated

---

394 Strudwick, Texts, 219
395 Wb 5, 400.8-9.
396 Strudwick, Texts, 219-220.
397 Žabkar, A study of the Ba concept, 60-61.
nobleman (sign A50). During the Old Kingdom, this sign was used as the 1st person male singular suffix pronoun ‘I’ when the speaker or subject was deceased, to determine the name of a deceased individual, or to determine the name or title of a nobleman. Furthermore, the only other time in which it is used in Herimeru’s text is as the determinative for śḥ, the term śḥ ‘effective, useful and luminous one’ designating a desired state of being in the afterlife. This evidence suggests that sign A50 was utilized in Herimeru’s text to determine bḥ as a state of being.

It has been argued that in the Pyramid Texts, the designation bḥ was a distinction specifically denoting a god or king who had acted effectively in restoring order and maintaining mAat. In this respect, it is significant and noteworthy that having acted in accordance with, and thus also having maintained mAat is a major theme not only in the inscription of Herimeru, but in Old Kingdom non-royal autobiographical funerary texts in general. This distinct genre of self-presentation in which the tomb owner, by narration and declaration, recorded the essential aspects of his life and his morality, emerged during the 4th Dynasty and developed into a repeated and standard set of phrases by the 6th Dynasty. The latter include – “I spoke truthfully”; “I did mAat”; “I judged between two parties so as to content them”; “I rescued the weak from one stronger than he as much as I could”; “I gave bread to the hungry”; “I gave clothes (to the naked)”; “I ferried the boatless”; “I respected my father”; “I pleased my mother”. Statements such as these emphasize the significance accorded to having acted justly and well during life, and furthermore, the

400 i.e. “one who does what satisfies” (Offering Formula), and “one who speaks good and one who repeats good, who never said or did any evil thing against any people” (autobiographical text).
401 M. Lichtheim, Ancient Egyptian autobiographies chiefly of the Middle Kingdom: a study and an anthology (Freiburg; Göttingen: Universitätsverlag; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988), 5.
402 Lichtheim, Ancient Egyptian autobiographies, 6.
importance and necessity of these acts for successfully reaching the afterlife and attaining the states of $im3\vec{w}$ ‘revered one’ and $\vec{h}$.

An important text that highlights the connection between these statements of having acted in accordance with $m3\vec{r}$ and the state of being $b\vec{s}$ is the ‘Instructions of $pt\text{-}Hotp$’. While this text has widely been ascribed to the Middle Kingdom, the reference to Ptah-Hotep as a vizier under King Isesi in the copy preserved on Papyrus Prisse does suggest that the text may have originated in the Old Kingdom. Of interest to this discussion is column 15 line 12 to column 16 line 2:

```
in r\text{h} sm b\vec{s}; f m smnt nfr.f im.f tp t; s3.tw rh hr rht.n.f in sr hr sp.f nfr m3\langle n \rangle 106 ib.f ns.f k\vec{3} spti.fy iw.f hr dd irty.fy hr m3\langle 3 \rangle n\vec{h}w.f t(w)t.(w) hr sdm 3ht n s3.f ir r m3\vec{r}t sw.(w) m grg
```

“It is the knowledgeable who nourishes his $b\vec{s}$ by establishing his goodness upon earth. The knowledgeable is recognized because of what he knows, the official because of his good actions; his mind matches his tongue, his lips are accurate when he is speaking, his eyes when seeing, both ears are assembled for hearing what is useful for his son. Acting in accordance with $m3\vec{r}$ is being free from falsehood.”

This passage thus elucidates that an individual’s state of being $b\vec{s}$ is founded upon his actions during life. Doing good deeds, being knowledgeable, being free of falsehood, and acting according to $m3\vec{r}$ ‘nourishes’ an individual’s state of being $b\vec{s}$. When used

---

407 The use of $\leftarrow$ (sign R7) in this text demonstrates that it is a Middle Kingdom copy, as this sign was added to the various signifiers for $b\vec{s}$ during the Middle Kingdom.
in relation to a deceased non-royal individual, *bꜣ* thus denotes a state of distinction and eminence, designating the individual as one who has acted in accordance with *mꜣf.t*.

Going back to Herimeru’s inscription, the text states that he wishes that his distinction of being *bꜣ* ‘endures’ before the god – *ḥr nfr*. This phrase suggests that Herimeru’s state of being *bꜣ* undergoes a form of divine judgement. This argument is supported by the next reference to Herimeru’s *wsw* “document” or “certificate”, which he hopes will be accepted by ‘the god at the pure places’. During the 5th Dynasty, a number of texts refer to a *wsw ‘royal document’, which according to C. J. Eyre and Strudwick, was a type of written ‘permission’ witnessing the rights and authority bestowed upon the bearer by the king409. The ‘document’ in this context may thus refer to a type of metaphorical written certification or witness of Herimeru’s deeds and worthiness410.

On a final note, the use of *bꜣ* in Herimeru’s text and absence beforehand is most likely due to the decreasing authority and power of the monarchy at the end of the Old Kingdom. This argument is supported by two factors. The first is that the terms *bꜣ* and *bꜣw* were applied exclusively to the gods and the king prior to the inscription of Herimeru. While they were used in Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom non-royal names, it has to be kept in mind that they always referred to a god or a king. Furthermore, these terms were gradually subsumed into royal ideology during the 3rd and 4th Dynasties, essentially expressing the divine role, function, and power of the king as the restorer and maintainer of *mꜣf.t*. The second factor is the parallels between

---


410 This idea is also apparent in Islam, where it is believed that each individual possesses a book in which all deeds are recorded and judged by God – personal communication with Dr. Fayza Haikal.
the earlier funerary texts of non-royal individuals and that of Herimeru, both essentially containing the same wishes, as well as declarations of innocence. However, rather than including direct statements about the deceased non-royal being $b\mathfrak{3}$, the earlier texts include veiled references through declarations of their good deeds and actions in life. It is thus not coincidental that the first attestation of $b\mathfrak{3}$ in a non-royal text occurs during a period that is known for its political instability and for the increasing power of the non-royal\textsuperscript{411}.

5.3. Conclusion

The discussion and analysis of the 6\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty ‘will dispute’ from Elephantine and the late 6\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty architrave inscription of Herimeru at Saqqara has demonstrated that there is a remarkable continuity in meaning between the terms $b\mathfrak{3}$ and $b\mathfrak{3}w$ in these texts and that in the Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom names, titles, and epithets, and the Pyramid Texts. As with the abstract noun $b\mathfrak{3}w$ in the Pyramid Texts, the term $b\mathfrak{3}w$ in the ‘will dispute’ designates and signifies the king’s efficacious power to enforce and maintain order. This is supported by (a) the use of sign G7 as a determinative for the term $nt\mathfrak{r}$ within the quoted ‘oath’, which, during the 5\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty, was used to specifically designate $nt\mathfrak{r}$ as the king, and (b) the contexts in which the term $b\mathfrak{3}w$ has been used, the ‘oath’ essentially embodying a guarantee of divine retribution against Sobek-Hetep if he had lied about the validity and contents of the document.

On the other hand, the discussion and analysis of the term $b\mathfrak{3}$ in Herimeru’s architrave inscription has demonstrated that it does not refer to an attribute, as previously argued, but rather to Herimeru’s state of being $b\mathfrak{3}$. A comparison of Herimeru’s text with earlier non-royal funerary texts and with ‘The Instructions of

Ptah-Hotep’ has demonstrated that like the use of bꜣ as a designation for gods and the king, the non-royal state of being bꜣ also designated a state of distinction and eminence, specifically denoting the individual as one who had acted in accordance with mꜣꜣ.t. This is especially apparent in the ‘Instructions of Ptah-Hotep’, which states that a man nourishes his bꜣ by being knowledgeable and by acting in accordance with mꜣꜣ.t. Furthermore, the wish of Herimeru for his bꜣ to ‘endure’ before the god suggested that the non-royal deceased may have been subject to a form of judgement in the afterlife. This is further supported by the subsequent request that Herimeru’s ‘document’ be accepted by the god, which served as a witness to Herimeru’s good deeds. Finally, it has been suggested that the use of bꜣ in Herimeru’s text is the result of the increasingly declining power and authority of the monarchy during the 5th and 6th Dynasties. This argument is supported by several factors, including the parallels between Herimeru’s text and the earlier non-royal funerary texts (i.e. the declarations of good deeds), the absence of the term bꜣ in these earlier non-royal funerary texts, the exclusively divine and royal nature of bꜣ and bꜣw prior to Herimeru’s text, and the political and social contexts surrounding Herimeru’s text. This evidence thus indicates that as the non-royal began to assume more power and authority, they were also gradually appropriating and utilizing divine and royal terminology.
Chapter 6 – Conclusion

This study has analyzed the earliest extant evidence pertaining to the ancient Egyptian terms b\textit{\textae} and b\textit{\textaw} from Late Predynastic Period to the end of the Old Kingdom in order to elucidate their original function and meaning. The significance of these terms is evidenced by both their antiquity, as well as their widespread use throughout ancient Egyptian history. Although various scholars have recognized this and dedicated studies to elucidating the original function and meaning of these terms, it has been demonstrated that no single study thus far has investigated all of the extant evidence. This is especially apparent with regards to the hieroglyph used to signify $b\textit{\textae}$ and $b\textit{\textaw}$, the Saddlebill stork, which represents the oldest and most prevalent signifier for these terms.

The first and only scholar thus far to recognize the fact that the connection between the Saddlebill stork and $b\textit{\textae}$ and $b\textit{\textaw}$ had not been investigated is Jiri Janák (2011). His study highlighted the significant fact that while there are no representations of this bird in Dynastic iconography, numerous images thereof are attested in the Late Predynastic Period. The latter evidence predates the standardization and formalization of writing in Egypt and suggested that the Saddlebill stork was consciously selected to signify the terms $b\textit{\textae}$ and $b\textit{\textaw}$ in the ancient Egyptian writing system. In order to establish the perceived relationship between the stork and the terms $b\textit{\textae}$ and $b\textit{\textaw}$, and thus also refine the meaning of the $b\textit{\textae}$ and $b\textit{\textaw}$ in their earliest textual attestations, this thesis thus analyzed images of the Saddlebill stork in Late Predynastic iconography.

A review of Janák’s study demonstrated that not only did he project extant later definitions of $b\textit{\textae}$ and $b\textit{\textaw}$ onto the Late Predynastic images of the stork, but also that he had not studied all of the extant attestations. This indicated that the meaning
and function of Late Predynastic Saddlebill stork images had not been fully explored.

Images of the Saddlebill stork appear in three Late Predynastic iconographic contexts – the Naqada IID-IIIA ‘animal-rows’ motif adorning the handles of weapons and items of personal adornment; cylinder seals and cylinder seal impressions; and rock inscriptions of the Eastern and Western Deserts. From a detailed study of this iconography, as well as a discussion of the appearance, ecology, and behavior of the living species, it was demonstrated that images of the Saddlebill stork signified violent action and subjugation in the service of ‘Order over Chaos’ and ‘Peace’. That the stork was not only connected with violence and subjugation, but also enacting violence and subjugating, is supported by its association with a harpoon on the Naqada IIIB cylinder seal from tomb L-17 in Qustul, as well as the fact that it is recurrently depicted with a snake at its beak, such as in the ‘animal-rows’ motif and the Gebel Djehuty inscription no. 1.

The discussion of the living species highlighted the fact that the stork has a unique hunting technique in which it utilizes its long, thin, and slightly recurved beak to repeatedly impale its prey. That the Predynastic Egyptians observed and subsequently associated this technique with the harpoon was further indicated by the fact that the term for ‘harpoon (and spear)’ in Old Kingdom texts was an instrumental noun derived from the verb ḫỉ, mḥb. It was further demonstrated that the harpoon functioned not only as a practical tool, but also as a weapon, and that it was depicted primarily as a means of overcoming and subjugating the ‘forces of chaos’ in Predynastic, Early Dynastic, and Old Kingdom iconography. The recurrent depiction of the stork with a snake at its beak further emphasized and reinforced the stork’s association with subjugating ‘chaos’, as snakes are both known prey of the

\(^{412}\) Refer to pages 38-40.
\(^{413}\) Refer to pages 38-40.
living species\textsuperscript{414} and are associated with ‘chaos’ and ‘the enemy’ in later ancient Egyptian funerary texts\textsuperscript{415}.

The violent action of the stork as a prelude to “Order over Chaos” and “peace” was further indicated by the fact that the stork and snake compound is exclusively depicted in contexts in which order and peace had been established. Thus in both the ‘animal-rows’ motif and in the Gebel Djehuty inscription, it precedes scenes depicting the control over ‘forces of chaos’, the latter signified by the nude, bound war captive controlled by a figure holding a mace (Gebel Djehuty) and the ordered rows of desert fauna and mythological creatures controlled by hunting dogs and rosettes (“animal-rows” motif). This narrative is further emphasized by the fact that a giraffe is recurrently depicted directly following the stork in the ‘animal-rows’ motif. Both Dreyer (2010) and Raffaele (2010) highlighted the fact that the giraffe was associated with the concept of ‘foresight’, and Dreyer further emphasized that the giraffe functions as a \textit{caesura} within the ‘animal-rows’ motif, essentially introducing the result of the stork’s action. The link between the stork, subjugation, and the resulting ‘control’ was also indicated by the fact that it is associated with the bucranium on a pole, a symbol referring to the defeat of a strong enemy, in both the Gebel Djehuty inscription and the el-Khawy inscription. In addition to control over ‘chaos’, this result is also characterized by peace, the latter indicated by the fact that the Saddlebill storks and other species of birds known to feed on snakes directly following the giraffe in the ‘animal-rows’ motif are depicted without snakes.

The argument that the stork was associated with bringing about ‘order’ and ‘peace’ through subjugation was finally emphasized and reinforced by the iconography of the Naqada IID cylinder seal impression from Tomb U-210 in

\textsuperscript{414} Refer to pages 38-41.
\textsuperscript{415} Refer to pages 38-41.
Abydos. While J. Hill (2006) interpreted this impression as evidence for trade relations between Egypt and Nubia, it was demonstrated, however, that it signified the subjugation and subjection of a foreign area and the levy that resulted from that subjugation. This was indicated by the bow-tie shaped signs as signifying $g\text{\textacute{a}}\text{wt}$ ‘tribute’ and the three-peaked mountain signs as $h\text{\textacute{a}}\text{swt}$ “foreign lands” or “desert”.

Images of the Saddlebill stork did not thus simply signify ‘power’ as forwarded by Janák, but formed part of a formalized corpus of images and motifs that expressed, reinforced, and perpetuated the fundamental Egyptian doctrine of ‘Order over Chaos’. That this species of stork was specifically selected to signify the actual subjecting of ‘chaos’ is not surprising. As one of the largest and most distinctive storks in Africa today, and most certainly in ancient Egypt, it conveys a sense of dominance in the faunal landscape. Furthermore, its territorial behavior and ‘brutal’ feeding technique gives the impression of ferocity, strength, and power.

In previous studies on the terms $b\text{\textacute{a}}$ and $b\text{\textacute{w}}$ in Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom texts, the majority of scholars have argued that they express ‘divine or supernatural power’\textsuperscript{416}. This already indicated that the relationship between the Saddlebill stork and $b\text{\textacute{a}}$ and $b\text{\textacute{w}}$ was more than simply phonetic, as previously argued by Ward\textsuperscript{417}. However, it was also noted that the definition ‘power’ is too broad, as there are several other related terms, such as $sl\text{\textacute{m}}$ and $wsr$, which have also been defined as ‘power’. It has been argued that ‘power’ should be considered an \textit{umbrella-term}, which then contains the various types of nuanced power i.e. $b\text{\textacute{a}}, sl\text{\textacute{m}},$ and $wsr$. In order to refine and clarify the nuances of $b\text{\textacute{a}}$ and $b\text{\textacute{w}}$, this thesis thus proceeded with an in-depth analysis of the earliest textural and iconographic evidence for $b\text{\textacute{a}}$ and $b\text{\textacute{w}}$, including 38 Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom divine, royal, non-royal, and place

\textsuperscript{416} Žabkar, \textit{A study of the Ba concept}, 51-57; Ward, \textit{The four Egyptian homographic roots} B-3, 67-88.
\textsuperscript{417} See footnote 26.
names, divine epithets, and administrative and priestly titles; reliefs depicting the *Heb-Sed* festival from the sun temple of Niuserre at Abu Ghorab; the 5th and 6th Dynasty Pyramid Texts; the 6th Dynasty ‘will dispute’ from Elephantine (pBerlin 9010), and the late 6th Dynasty architrave inscription of Herimeru at Saqqara.

The discussion and analysis of the above evidence lead to the following conclusions. The first conclusion is that the terms *bꜣ* and *bꜣw* had two major functions and that their meaning was based not only upon grammar and context, but also on the determinatives used. They could either designate attributes, signified by the use of suffix pronouns and direct genitives, or a state of being, signified by the use of *bꜣ* as a verb in a prospective *sdµ.f* or stative. Studying the evidence chronologically demonstrated that the singular noun *bꜣ* as an attribute was only introduced during the 5th Dynasty, as evidenced in the Pyramid Texts\(^ {418}\). Furthermore, the architrave inscription of Herimeru highlighted the importance of taking into account the hieroglyphs used to determine a term. While previous scholars had interpreted *bꜣ* within this text as an attribute, the use of sign \(\overline{\text{A50}}\) as a determinative indicated that it rather referred to Herimeru in the state of being *bꜣ*\(^ {419}\).

The second conclusion is that there was a gradual development in the characteristics necessary to be considered as being *bꜣ* and possessing *bꜣ(w)*. Through a discussion of the Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom names, titles, and epithets, as well as related iconography, it was demonstrated that originally only the gods were referred to as being *bꜣ* and possessing *bꜣw*. As a result, the *bꜣw* of Nekhen, Pe, and Heliopolis were not originally the deceased royal ancestors of the king, as was the general consensus in Egyptology, but rather various groups of gods associated with these cities – the *bꜣw* of Nekhen and Pe most probably being the Upper and Lower

\(^{418}\) Refer to pages 74.

\(^{419}\) Refer to page 94.
Egyptian šmsw-hr (Horus, Thoth, and the Upper and Lower Egyptian Wepwawet), and the bɔw of Heliopolis including the Enneads of Upper and Lower Egypt. During the 3rd and 4th Dynasties, however, these terms were gradually subsumed into royal ideology, evidenced by the use of bɔ in the royal Horus name of a 3rd Dynasty king hꜣw-bɔ (Ind. Ent. D), as well as the reference to Snefru being bɔ in a non-royal name (Ind. Ent. I). This gradual adoption of divine terminology into royal ideology was shown to coincide with the increasing “divineness” of ancient Egyptian kingship during the early Old Kingdom, as evidenced by Snefru’s use of the royal title nṯr nfr “the perfect/young god”. Furthermore, while previous scholars have argued that only the deceased king could be bɔ and possess bɔw, it was demonstrated that these terms were actually first applied to the living and reigning king, and then subsequently extended into royal funerary beliefs. This argument is supported by the names of two 4th and 5th Dynasty official ships (Ind. Ents. DD & FF), which functioned to express the divine and royal status and authority of the living king, as well as the fact that overt references to the deceased king being bɔ and possessing bɔw only appear during the 5th Dynasty, as evidenced by the name of Sahure’s pyramid and mortuary domains (Ind. Ents. EE & KK). That the living king possessed bɔw was further indicated by the discussion of the 6th Dynasty ‘will dispute’ from Elephantine, the use of sign (G7) as a determinative for the god in the ‘oath’ specifically indicating that this ‘god’ referred to the king. Finally, the text of Herimeru indicated that during the late 6th Dynasty, non-royal individuals began to be referred to as being bɔ. As this is the only extant evidence that associates non-royal individuals with these terms, it is not possible to assert whether they were also believed to possess.

420 Refer to pages 51-58.
421 Ward, The four Egyptian homographic roots B-3, 57-88; Žabkar, A study of the Ba concept, 51-57; Kees, Totenglauben, 53-56.
422 Refer to pages 89-92.
$b\text{\textae}$ and $b\text{\textwe}$, although it is most likely that this is the first timid way to mention it.

The third and final conclusion is that the terms $b\text{\textae}$ and $b\text{\textwe}$ were utilized to express the status, authority, effectiveness, power, and ability of the gods, the king, and non-royal individuals to actively uphold and maintain cosmic order or $m\text{\textae}t$. The Pyramid Texts consistently associate being $b\text{\textae}$ with being $s\text{\textem}$ “in control”$^{423}$, $w\text{i}$ “esteemed”$^{424}$, and $s\text{\textdd}$ “sharp and effective”$^{425}$. This indicated that $b\text{\textae}$ was a state of distinction, prestige, and eminence. Furthermore, various spells from the Pyramid Texts recurrently associate becoming $b\text{\textae}$ with taking action and being $b\text{\textae}$ with having acted. This further indicated that the state of $b\text{\textae}$ was ascribed to and attained by those who had acted effectively. A discussion of the role of $b\text{\textae}$, the $s\text{\textmsw-hr}$, the $b\text{\textwe}$ of Nekhen, Pe, and Heliopolis, and the $b\text{\textwe}$y of the $pr\ \text{hry-w}dlb$ “house of the master of distribution/largesse” further demonstrated that this action was directed towards the restoration and maintenance of “Order over Chaos” or $m\text{\textae}t$ and peace$^{426}$. For the gods, this included providing the king with the necessary protection and power to overcome his enemies in battle, protecting and assisting the king in the renewal of his powers and ability to uphold $m\text{\textae}t$, protecting and assisting the deceased king in his rebirth and resurrection, as well as ensuring the continuous provision of offerings. It should be noted that all of these actions are also mentioned clearly in the didactic text, the “Instructions for king Merykare”$^{427}$.

The Pyramid Texts further indicated that the actions taken by the king essentially parallel that of the gods, PT 218 specifically stating that he ensured the continual provisioning of offerings$^{428}$. On the other hand, with regards to Herimeru’s

$^{423}$ Wb 4, 245.10-248.21.
$^{424}$ Wb 1, 261.9-262.8.
$^{426}$ Refer to pages 61-67.
$^{427}$ Lichtheim, Ancient Egyptian literature, pg. 106 2nd paragraph - parallel noted by Dr. Fayza Haikal.
$^{428}$ Refer to page 79.
text, as well as the later ‘Instructions of Ptah-Hotep’, it is clear that a non-royal individual’s state of being \( b\text{3} \) was associated with their essential ‘goodness’ during life, and was measured by their deeds. This is evidenced by the various declarations in tomb biographies, such as “I spoke truthfully”, “I did \( m\text{3}/t \),” and “I judged between two parties so as to content them”, as well as the direct association between \( b\text{3} \) and acting according to \( m\text{3}/t \) in the “Instructions of Ptah-Hotep”. Furthermore, the use of the phrase \( dq\ b\text{3}/f\ hr\ ntr \) “May his \( b\text{3} \) endure before the god” in Herimeru’s text suggested that, unlike the gods and the king, the non-royal deceased underwent a form of judgement in the afterlife, his distinction of being \( b\text{3} \) essentially brought into question before the god. This judgement of the deceased becomes very clear in the later New Kingdom Book of the Dead Chapter 125, the vignette of this chapter often including an image of the deceased’s \( b\text{3} \) observing the weighing of the heart\(^{429}\).

The Pyramid Texts further illustrated the means through which the gods and the king achieved the state of being \( b\text{3} \), and thus also the restoration of order and peace, was through their \( b\text{3} \) (singular noun) and their \( b\text{3}/w \) (abstract noun). The recurrent association of \( b\text{3} \) with \( s\text{hm} \) “to control”, and its appearance alongside \( s\text{nh} \) “to cause life” in the Pyramid Texts of Neith indicated that it denoted the ability of a god or a king to act in order to instill order or \( m\text{3}/t \) i.e. their efficacy. It has also been suggested that the recurrent presentation of the king’s \( b\text{3} \) and \( b\text{3}/w \) as independent entities in the Pyramid Texts referred to the offering of ritual items to the king, namely the \( d\text{3}/rt \) ‘Red Crown’ and \( b\text{3}/-scepter\(^{430}\).

The transposition of \( b\text{3} \) and \( b\text{3}/w \) in parallel texts and the similar contexts in which they are used further demonstrated that these terms essentially referred to the

\(^{429}\) Development noted by Dr. Fayza Haikal. For an image of the \( b\text{3} \) at the weighing of the heart see the Papyrus of Ani, BM 10470.3.

\(^{430}\) Refer to pages 81-86.
same concept. It has been argued that $b\tilde{w}$ represents an abstraction of $b\bar{z}$, and thus denotes the power to effectively enforce order i.e. a divine being’s *efficaciousness* or *efficacious power*. Furthermore, the king is endowed with $b\tilde{w}$ through the $d\bar{s}r\bar{t}$ ‘Red crown’, which effectively imbued him with the power (i.e. $b\tilde{w}$) to instill ‘fear’ and ‘dread’ in others, to destroy his enemies, to control the gods, the living, and the Akhs, and thus to instill order and $m\tilde{s}t$.

The terms $b\bar{z}$ and $b\tilde{w}$ thus emerged to essentially explain and articulate how the Egyptians viewed the gods’, the king’s, and eventually non-royal individuals’ roles and duties within the cosmos. This centered on the fundamental belief in “Order over Chaos” or $m\tilde{s}t$ versus $i\bar{s}ft$, and how the former was in perpetual battle against the latter.

The parallels noted between the function and meaning of $b\bar{z}$ within the ‘Instructions of Ptah-Hotep’ and Herimeru’s text indicates that there is continuity. A further group of later texts that also highlight this continuity is a corpus of non-royal texts from Deir el-Medina\textsuperscript{431}. These texts include short and fragmentary descriptions of events within the community, including theft, court judgments in which the accused was found to be lying, and social impropriety, and the subsequent result of these actions\textsuperscript{432}. This result was expressed by the phrase $b\tilde{w} ntr hprw$ “the $b\tilde{w}$ of the god happened/came about” and how this caused fear and dread within the transgressor\textsuperscript{433}. The contexts in which $b\tilde{w}$ is used and the resulting dread and fear, exactly parallels the contexts and effect in the above earlier texts, such as the “will dispute from Elephantine”, and PT 422 and 221, which state that the king’s $b\tilde{w}$ will be against transgressors and that it inspires ‘dread’ and ‘fear’. This indicates that $b\tilde{w}$

\textsuperscript{431} Borghouts, “Divine intervention”, 1-70.
\textsuperscript{432} Borghouts, “Divine intervention”, 4-6.
\textsuperscript{433} Borghouts, “Divine intervention”, 4-6.
within these New Kingdom texts retained the meaning apparent in the Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom texts and that it continued to signify the efficacious power of a god/king to restore and enforce order and mīt. On a final note, it is interesting that the term ḫw is preserved in the Coptic ḫw ḫw ‘outrage’, ‘wrath’, or ‘punishment’, \(^{435}\) which very closely parallels the broader meaning of ḫw in the above ancient Egyptian texts.

The use of the Saddlebill stork as a hieroglyph for ḥ and ḫw was thus intimately associated with the meaning of these terms. It not only signified the phoneme ḥ, but also expressed the impactful, authoritative, and effective nature of the gods, the king, and non-royals as ḥ. The interrelatedness between the stork and ḥ and ḫw further underscores the importance of taking into consideration the visual aspect of ancient Egyptian terms and that this also contributed to the signified meaning. As Orly Goldwasser reminds us, “As they (i.e. hieroglyphs) are images, the icons nevertheless always retain the ability to return to their raw iconic phase”\(^{436}\).

Appendix A

Index of Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom Names, Epithets and Titles

Divine names and epithets

A. \( b\tilde{a}(t) \)

(a) Early Dynastic Period, Dyn. 1

(b) Raised relief on reconstructed porphyry bowl, Hierakonpolis ‘Main Deposit’

(c) Name of Goddess

(d) Taken to be the feminine form of \( b\tilde{a} \):

\[ b\tilde{a} \] ‘female power’

\[ b\tilde{a} \] ‘She who possesses supra-mundane power’

B. \( b\tilde{3}wy \ hnty \ pr \ h\tilde{r}yw-w\tilde{d}bw \)

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5 – Sahure

(b) Relief block from the Valley Temple of \( s\tilde{h}w-r' \), Abusir

(c) Divine epithet; is also attested in the priestly title \( h\tilde{m}-ntr \ b\tilde{3}wy \ hnty \ pr \ h\tilde{r}yw-w\tilde{d}bw \)

(d) \( b\tilde{3}wy \ hntywy \ pr \ h\tilde{r}yw-w\tilde{d}bw \) “The two souls (Horus & Seth), preeminent in the house of those in charge of reversions (of offerings)”

C. \( b\tilde{3}stt \ nb(t)-s\tilde{n}(t-b\tilde{3}wy) \ s\tilde{m}t \ s\tilde{m}tt \ l\tilde{s}h\tilde{n}t \ h\tilde{3}w.s \ nbt \ h\tilde{3}bs \)

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5 – Niuserre

(b) Relief fragment (Berlin 16101), Mortuary Temple of Niuserre, Abusir

---

437 These are the only two signs that have survived from the fragments of the bowl. This reading was based on later Old Kingdom attestations of the goddess’ name - (PT 506 §1096b).


439 Lesko, great goddesses, 81.

440 Ward, The four Egyptian homographic roots B-3, 84.


443 Fischer, Coptite nome, 45.
(c) Divine epithet of Syncretic Goddess Bastet-Sekhmet-Seshmetet

(d) shf³t-b³w.s “one who makes her bas shine”⁴⁴⁵

jsh³t-b³w.s “She who makes her creative power (Gestaltfähigkeit) appear”⁴⁴⁶

Royal names and Epithets

D. hrw h³t-b³

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 3 – Khaba

(b) two cylinder seal impressions; Hierakonpolis⁴⁴⁷ & unprovenanced⁴⁴⁸

Inscription on 5 dolomite bowls, Zawiyet el Aryan Mast. Z500⁴⁴⁹

Inscription on diorite bowl, Elephantine⁴⁵⁰

Inscription on stone bowl, Mortuary Temple of Sahure, Abusir⁴⁵¹

(c) Horus name of King

(d) h³t-b³⁴⁵²

hrw h³t-b³ “Horus, the one who is capable of changing forms (Gestaltfähige) appears”⁴⁵³

h³t-b³ ‘arisen as a b³⁴⁵⁴ (Wilkinson, 1999: 173)

h³t-b³ ‘The (very) appearance of a b³⁴⁵⁵

E. […] sn hr sθ h mr(y) b³w twnw

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 4 – Menkaure

---

⁴⁴⁴ L. Borchart, Das Grabdenkmal des Königs Ne-user-re’ (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1907), 94 fig. 72
⁴⁴⁵ Žabkar, A study of the Ba concept, 15.
⁴⁴⁷ J.E. Quibell & F. W. Green, Hierakonpolis vol II (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1900-1902), pl. 70.1.
⁴⁴⁸ W. M. F. Petrie, Scarabs and cylinders with names: illustrated by the Egyptian collection in University College, London (London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt; Constable & Co.; Bernard Quaritch, 1917), pl. 8.2 (UC 11755).
⁴⁵² J. Kahl, Das System der ägyptischen Hieroglyphenschrift, 526.
⁴⁵⁴ Wilkinson, Early dynastic Egypt, 173.
⁴⁵⁵ Leprohon, The great name, 211.
(b) 9 Cylinder seal impressions (Seal 12), ‘Pottery Mound’ in the ‘Western Town’ south-east of
the Sphinx, Giza\(^{456}\)

c) Epithet of Menkaure

d) […] \textit{sn hr sth mr(y) b\textit{\textsc{\textbeta}}w ıw\textit{nw}} “[Menkaure,] brother of Horus and Seth (and) beloved of the
Souls of Heliopolis”\(^{457}\)

\textbf{Non-royal Names}

\textbf{F.} \textit{hw-b\textsc{\textbeta}} \(^{458}\)

(a) Early Dynastic Period, Dyn. 1 - Djer

(a) Inscription on two copper adzes and one ivory label, subsidiary tombs 461 & 612 of Djer’s
Funerary Enclosure, North cemetery, Abydos\(^{459}\)

(b) Name of non-royal individual

(\(s\)) \textit{b\textsc{\textbeta}} \(^{460}\) (Petrie, 1925: 4)

\textit{iht b\textsc{\textbeta}} - “Property of Ba”\(^{461}\)

\textit{iht-b\textsc{\textbeta}} - “Property of the one who is capable of changing form (Gestaltfähigen)”\(^{462}\)

\textit{hw-b\textsc{\textbeta}} - “The one whom the ba protects”\(^{463}\)

\textbf{G.} \textit{\textbeta-b\textsc{\textbeta}w-n\textsc{\textbeta}r} \(^{464}\)

(a) Early Dynastic Period, Dyn. 2 – Khasekhemwy\(^{464}\)

(b) Ink inscription on stone vase fragment, subterranean galleries under the Step Pyramid in
Saqqara\(^{465}\)

\(^{456}\) J. Nolan, \textit{Mud sealings and Fourth Dynasty administration at Giza}. (PhD Dissertation, University
of Chicago, 2010), 5-20.


\(^{458}\) This reading is further supported by later attestations of this name in which the \textit{w} is present – see 5\textsuperscript{th}
Dynasty seated statue of \textit{hw-b\textsc{\textbeta}} and his wife, \textit{b\textsc{\textbeta}rw} MFA 06.1885.

\(^{459}\) W. M. F. Petrie, \textit{Tombs of the courtiers and Oxyrhynchos} (London: British School of Archaeology
in Egypt; Bernard Quaritch, 1925), 4.

\(^{460}\) W. M. F. Petrie, \textit{Tombs of the courtiers}, 4.


\(^{463}\) According to Kahl, the writing of \textit{hw} without the \textit{w} is attested from later renderings of the name of

\(^{464}\) Dating by I. Regulski, \textit{A palaeographic study of early writing in Egypt} (Leuven: Peeters;
Departement Oosterse Studies, 2010), 448.

\(^{465}\) P. Lacau & J.-Ph. Lauer, \textit{La pyramide à degrés. Tome V. Inscriptions à l'encre sur les vases} (Le
Caire: Institut français d'Archéologie orientale, Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte, 1965), no.47, Pl.
22.8.
(c) Name of non-royal individual

(d) \( ntr-\text{imy}(\frac{\text{bAw}}{\text{bAw}}) \) or \( ntr-\text{wn}(\frac{\text{bAw}}{\text{bAw}}) \)\(^{466}\)

\( ntr-\text{imy}(\text{bAw}) \), “god who is in the Bas” or “god in whom the Bas are”\(^{467}\)

\( \text{bAw}-ntr \) “Great is the creative power (Gestaltfähigkeit) of the god”\(^{468}\)

H. \( h^\circ-\text{bAw}-\text{skr} \)

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 3 – Sanakht\(^{470}\)

(b) False door of \( h^\circ-\text{bAw}-\text{skr} \) (CG 1385), Mast. S3037, Saqqara\(^{471}\)

(c) Name of non-royal individual

(d) \( h^\circ-\text{bAw}-\text{skr} \) ‘The \( \text{bAw} \) of the (God) \( \text{skr} \) shine (glänzen)’\(^{472}\)

\( h^\circ-\text{bAw}-\text{skr} \) ‘Resplendent of Bas is Sokar’\(^{473}\)

\( h^\circ-\text{bAw}-\text{skr} \) “The creative power of Sokar appears”\(^{474}\)

I. \( snfrw-b\text{f} \)

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 4 – Snefru\(^{475}\)

(b) False door of \( k\text{f}(\text{i})-\text{nfr} \)\(^{476}\), Mast. of \( k\text{f}(\text{i})-\text{nfr} \), east of North Pyramid of Snefru, Dahshur\(^{477}\)

(c) Name of non-royal individual

(d) \( snfrw-b\text{f} \) “King Snefru is ensouled (beseelt)”\(^{478}\)

\( snfrw-b\text{f} \) “Snefru, he is capable of changing form (Gestaltfähig)”\(^{479}\)

---

\(^{466}\) Lacau & Lauer, *La pyramide à degrés*, 36.

\(^{467}\) Žabkar, *A study of the Ba concept*, 60.

\(^{468}\) Wolf-Brinkmann, *Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes ‘bA’*, 18.

\(^{469}\) Kaplony, *Inschriften Frühezeit*, 444.

\(^{470}\) Kahl, *Das System der ägyptischen Hieroglyphenschrift*, 526.


\(^{475}\) J. de Morgan, ‘Fouilles à Dahchour en 1894-5’ II (Vienna, 1903), pl. XXVI; PM III\(^2\), 893.

\(^{476}\) BM 1324.

\(^{477}\) J. de Morgan, ‘Fouilles à Dahchour’, pl. XXVI.

\(^{478}\) H. Ranke, *Die ägyptischen Personennamen. Band II: Einleitung; Form und Inhalt der Namen; Geschichte der Namen; Vergleiche mit anderen Namen; Nachträge und Zusätze zu Band I; Umschreibungslisten* (Glückstadt: Augustin, 1952), 80 no. 25.

J. $wr\text{-}b3\text{w}$

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 4 – Khufu

(b) Painted tomb relief, eastern wall of Mast. of $wp\text{-}m\text{-}nfrt$ (G1201), Giza

(c) Name of non-royal individual

(d) $wr\text{-}b3\text{w}$ “Great is the creative power (of X)” or “Great in creative power (is X)”

K. $hrw\text{-}b3\text{f}$

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 4 - Khufu

(b) Inscription on red granite sarcophagus (CG1788), shaft A of Mast. of $hrw\text{-}b3\text{f}$ (G7420), Giza

(c) Name of non-royal individual

(d) $hrw\text{-}b3\text{f}$ “Horus is ensouled (beseelt)”

$L$. $b3\text{-}b3\text{f}$

(a) Old Kingdom, Late Dyn. 4 – Early Dyn. 5

(b) Inscriptions from the Mast. of $b3\text{-}b3\text{f}$ (G5230), Western Cemetery, Giza

(c) Name of non-royal individual

(d) $b3\text{-}b3\text{f}$ “The (sacred) ram is ensouled (beseelt)”

---

482 According to Wolf-Brinkmann, in cases such as these where the name of a king or god/goddess is missing, it is the shortened version of the name - *Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes ‘bA’*, 20.
483 PM III**: 194
484 PM III**: 194
488 While the name has previously been read as either $b3\text{-}b3\text{f}$ or $hmwm\text{-}b3\text{f}$, according to Wolf-Brinkmann, a fragment from the tomb containing the name of the deceased does include $\text{W10A}$ (sign) before the ram (E10), which indicates it should be read as $b3$ rather than $hmwm$ - *Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes ‘bA’*, 14.
\[ hnmw-b3.f \]

\[ b3-b3.f \] “The Ram, he is capable of changing form (Gestaltfähig)”

M. \[ h\text{\textsuperscript{3}l-b3w-hwt-hrw} \]

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5 – Usertaf

(b) Tomb relief, west wall of hall, Rock-cut Mast. of \( nj-k\text{\textsuperscript{(j)}}-\text{snf}, \) Tihna

(c) Name of non-royal individual

(d) \( h\text{\textsuperscript{3}l-b3w-hwt-hrw} \) “The \( b3w \) of Hathor shine (glänzen)"

\[ h\text{\textsuperscript{3}l-b3w-hwt-hrw} \] “The creative power (Gestaltfähigkeit) of Hathor appears”

N. \[ wr-b3w-hnmw \]

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5 - Sahure

(b) Relief from the Mortuary Temple of Sahure, eastern section of the southern wall, southern passage, Abusir

(c) Name of non-royal individual

(d) \( wr-b3w-b3 \) “Great in Glory (Ruhm) is the ram”

\[ wr-b3w-b3 \] “Great is the creative power (Gestaltfähigkeit) of Khnum”

O. \[ h\text{\textsuperscript{3}l-b3w} \]

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5 - Neferirkare

(b) False door of \( wS\text{-pt\( \text{h isl} \)}, \) Mast. of \( wS\text{-pt\( \text{h isl} \)} \) (D.38), Saqqara

(c) Name of non-royal individual

(d) \( h\text{\textsuperscript{3}l-b3w} \)

---

494 Urk. 1 26; PM IV: 131
496 Wolf-Brinkmann, *Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes 'bA*', 20.
497 Borchardt, *S’aghu-\( \text{r} \)’, pl. 17.
498 Borchardt, *S’aghu-\( \text{r} \)’, pl. 17.
501 When (W10A) is not included before the ram (E10), Wolf-Brinkmann states that it should be read as \( hnmw \) rather than \( b3 \)-Wolf-Brinkmann, *Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes 'bA*', 15.
502 PM III: 456.
The creative power (Gestaltfähigkeit) (of X) appears

P. $\text{ptb-b3.f}$

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5 - Neferirkare

(b) False door of $w\text{s-ptb isi}$, Mast. of $w\text{s-ptb isi}$ (D.38), Saqqara

(c) Name of non-royal individual

(d) $\text{ptb-b3.f}$ (Ranke, vol I 1935: 139 no.8)

$\text{ptb-b3.f}$ “Ptah, he is capable of changing form (Gestaltfähig)”

$\text{ptb-b3.f}$ “Ptah is immanent”

Q. $\text{iw-m-b3w.s}$

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5 – Neferirkare or later

(b) False door of $nfr-irt-n.f$, Mast. of $nfr-irt-n.f$, east of the Step Pyramid at Saqqara

(c) Name of non-royal individual

(d) $\text{iw-m-b3w.s}$ “It is in her power (?)”

$\text{iw-m-b3w.s}$ “I exist through her creative ability (Gestaltungsvermögen)”

$\text{iw-m-b3w.s}$ “It is in her $b3w$ (?)”

R. $\text{wr-b3w-skr}$

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5 – Niuserre

(b) Tomb relief from the Mas. of $\text{ptb-5pss}$, Eastern wall of room 10, Abusir

(c) Name of non-royal individual

(d) $\text{wr-b3w-skr}$ “Great is the power of Sokar”

---

504 Ranke, Die ägyptischen Personennamen. Band I, 263 no.11.
505 See footnote 482 for this reading and for reference.
506 Mariette, Les mastabas de l'Ancien Empire, 270.
507 Mariette, Les mastabas de l'Ancien Empire, 269.
509 http://www.ifao.egnet.net/bases/agea/noms/?encod=G29&ox=11
510 PM III:584.
511 PM III:584.
512 Ranke, Die ägyptischen Personennamen. Band I,13 no. 15.
514 http://www.ifao.egnet.net/bases/agea/noms/?id=190
516 Verner, Abusir I, 93, 95, 165 no. 131 & pl. 51.
517 http://www.ifao.egnet.net/bases/agea/noms/?id=1088
S.  \textit{k3k3l-b3.f} \begin{center} \includegraphics[width=0.3\textwidth]{image1} \end{center}

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5 – Niuserre\textsuperscript{518}

(b) Relief fragments, west end of the north wall, northern corridor of pillared courtyard, Mortuary Temple of Niuserre, Abusir\textsuperscript{519}

(c) Name of non-royal individual

(d) \textit{\textit{k3k3l-b3.f}} “The (king) \textit{k3k3l} is ensouled”\textsuperscript{520}

\textit{k3k3j-b3.f} “Kakai, he is capable of changing form (Gestaltfähig)”\textsuperscript{521}

T.  \textit{h3l-b3w-pth} \begin{center} \includegraphics[width=0.3\textwidth]{image2} \end{center}

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5- Niuserre\textsuperscript{522}

(b) Inscriptions in Mast. of \textit{h3l-b3w-pth} (D.42), north of the Step Pyramid, Saqqara\textsuperscript{523}

(c) Name of non-royal individual

(d) \textit{h3l-b3w-pth} “It shines (erglänzt) (namely) the glory (Ruhm) of Ptah”\textsuperscript{524}

\textit{h3l-b3w-pth} “The \textit{b3w} of ptah shine (glänzen)”\textsuperscript{525}

\textit{h3l-b3w-pth} “The creative ability (Gestaltfähigkeit) of Ptah appears”\textsuperscript{526}

U.  \textit{nfr-b3w-pth} \begin{center} \includegraphics[width=0.3\textwidth]{image3} \end{center}

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5 - Niuserre\textsuperscript{527}

(b) Inscriptions in Mast. of \textit{nfr-b3w-pth} (G6010), Western Cemetery, Giza\textsuperscript{528}

(c) Name of non-royal individual

(d) \textit{nfr-b3w-pth} “Beautiful of souls is Ptah”\textsuperscript{529}

\textit{nfr-b3w-pth} “Perfect is the creative power (Gestaltfähigkeit) of Ptah”\textsuperscript{530}

\textsuperscript{518} L. Borchardt, \textit{Das Grabdenkmal des Königs Ne-user-re’}. (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1907), 74.

\textsuperscript{519} Borchardt, \textit{Ne-user-re’}, 74.

\textsuperscript{520} Ranke, \textit{Die ägyptischen Personennamen}. Band II, 322 no. 7.

\textsuperscript{521} Wolf-Brinkmann, \textit{Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes ‘bA’}, 15.

\textsuperscript{522} PM III\textsuperscript{F}: 453.

\textsuperscript{523} PM III\textsuperscript{F}: 453; Mariette, \textit{Les mastabas de l'Ancien Empire}, 294-295.

\textsuperscript{524} Borchardt, \textit{S'azhu-Re’}, 124.

\textsuperscript{525} Ranke, \textit{Die ägyptischen Personennamen}. Band I, 263 no. 12.

\textsuperscript{526} Wolf-Brinkmann, \textit{Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes ‘bA’}, 20.

\textsuperscript{527} \url{http://giza.fas.harvard.edu/sites/1363/full/}

\textsuperscript{528} \url{http://giza.fas.harvard.edu/sites/1363/full/}

\textsuperscript{529} Ranke, \textit{Die ägyptischen Personennamen}. Band I, 195 no. 29.
V. *issi-b3.f*

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5 – Djedkare-Iseši

(b) West wall tomb relief, north panel, Mastaba of *snqm-jb-jntj* (G2370), Western Cemetery, Giza

(c) Name of non-royal individual

(d) *issi-b3.f* “Iseši is ensouled”

*issi-b3.f* “Asosi, he is capable of changing form (Gestaltfähig)”

W. *wr-b3w-k3k3l*

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5 – Djedkare-Iseši

(b) The Abusir Papyri, Berlin P.15722

(c) Name of non-royal individual

(d) *wr-b3w-k3k3l* “Great is the Power of Kakai”

X. *wr-b3w-r*°

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn 5–6

(b) Inscription on architrave (Hildesheim, Pelizaeus-Museum 3), from the Mast. of *wr-b3w-r*

(D.19), Western Cemetery, Giza

(c) Name of non-royal individual

(d) *wr-b3w-r*° “Great in glory (Ruhm) is Ra”

*wr-b3w-r*° “Great is the creative power (Gestaltfähigkeit) of Ra”

---

530 Wolf-Brinkmann, *Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes 'bA',* 20.
531 E. Brovarski, *The Senedjemib Complex. Part I: The Mastabas of Senedjem Inti (G2370), Khnumenti (G2374), and Senedjemib Mebi (G2378)* (Boston: Art of the Ancient World/ Museum of Fine Arts, 2001), 37.
532 [http://giza.fas.harvard.edu/ancientpeople/1865/intro/](http://giza.fas.harvard.edu/ancientpeople/1865/intro/)
533 Ranke, *Die ägyptischen Personennamen. Band I*, 45 no. 22.
534 Wolf-Brinkmann, *Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes 'bA',* 15.
535 [http://www.ifao.egnet.net/bases/agea/noms/?encod=G30&os=7](http://www.ifao.egnet.net/bases/agea/noms/?encod=G30&os=7)
536 [http://www.ifao.egnet.net/bases/agea/noms/?encod=G30&os=7](http://www.ifao.egnet.net/bases/agea/noms/?encod=G30&os=7)
537 [http://www.ifao.egnet.net/bases/agea/noms/?encod=G30&os=7](http://www.ifao.egnet.net/bases/agea/noms/?encod=G30&os=7)
538 PM III°: 109
539 [http://giza.fas.harvard.edu/sites/58/full/](http://giza.fas.harvard.edu/sites/58/full/)
540 Ranke, *Die ägyptischen Personennamen. Band I*, 80 no. 28.
541 Žabkar, *A study of the Ba concept*, 60.
Y. \textit{wr-b3w-pth}  

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 6\textsuperscript{543}  

(b) False door of \textit{nfr} (Leipzig 3135), from Mast. of \textit{nfr} (G4351), Western Cemetery, Giza\textsuperscript{544}  

(c) Name of non-royal individual  

(d) \textit{wr-b3w-pth} “Great in glory (Ruhm) is Ptah”\textsuperscript{545}  
\textit{wr-b3w-pth} “Great of Bas is Ptah”\textsuperscript{546}  
\textit{wr-b3w-pth} “Great is the creative power (Gestaltfähigkeit) of Ptah”\textsuperscript{547}  
\textit{wr-b3w-pth} “Great is the power of Ptah”\textsuperscript{548}  

Z. \textit{hw-b3w}  

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 6 – Pepi II\textsuperscript{549}  

(b) ‘House Stela’ of \textit{hw-b3w} (CG 49805), also rendered as \textit{hw-b3w} on two obelisks belonging to the same individual, recovered from cache near the entrance to the secondary enclosure of \textit{wdht-n(j)}, Saqqara\textsuperscript{550}  

(c) Name of non-royal individual  

(d) \textit{hw-b3w} (?)\textsuperscript{551}  
\textit{hw-b3w} “Protégé/dependent (Schützling) of the two creative powers (Gestaltfähigen)”  
\textit{b3w-hw} “The power of the protector”\textsuperscript{553}  

\section*{Administrative and Priestly Titles}  

AA. \textit{hm-b3w-p}  

(a) Early Dynastic Period, Dyn. 1 – Qaa\textsuperscript{554}  

\textsuperscript{542} Wolf-Brinkmann, \textit{Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes 'bA'}, 19.  
\textsuperscript{543} PM III: 120-121  
\textsuperscript{544} \url{http://giza.fas.harvard.edu/sites/1253/full/}  
\textsuperscript{545} Ranke, \textit{Die ägyptischen Personennamen. Band I}, 80 no. 27.  
\textsuperscript{546} Žabkar, \textit{A study of the Ba concept}, 59.  
\textsuperscript{547} Wolf-Brinkmann, \textit{Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes 'bA'}, 20.  
\textsuperscript{548} \url{http://www.ifao.egnet.net/bases/agea/noms/?encod=G30&os=4}  
\textsuperscript{549} \url{http://www.ifao.egnet.net/bases/agea/noms/?encod=G30&os=8}  
\textsuperscript{550} \url{http://www.ifao.egnet.net/bases/agea/noms/?encod=G30&os=8}  
\textsuperscript{551} Ranke, \textit{Die ägyptischen Personennamen. Band I}, 266 no. 15.  
\textsuperscript{552} According to Wolf-Brinkmann, the lower quality of the obelisks in comparison to the stele suggest that the rendering of \textit{hw-b3w} instead of \textit{hw-b3wy} was a mistake on the part of the craftsmen who created the obelisks – \textit{Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes 'bA'}, 22.  
\textsuperscript{553} \url{https://www.ifao.egnet.net/bases/agea/noms/?encod=G30&os=8}
(b) Stela of mr-k3, Mastaba mr-k3 (S3505), Saqqara

(c) Title of mr-k3

(d) hm-b3w-p “Servant of the Souls of Pe”

BB. hm-b3w-ñhn

(a) Early Dynastic Period, Dyn. 2 - Ninetjer

(b) Inscribed diorite bowl fragment, subterranean galleries under the Step Pyramid in Saqqara

(c) Title of non-royal individual, inscription also includes the name k3-n(j)-nb.f

(d) hm-b3w-ñhn “Servant of the Souls of Nekhen”

hm-b3w-ñhn “Servant of the Souls of Hierakonpolis”

CC. ṫd-mr b3w-hrw-dw3w

(a) Early Dynastic Period, Dyn. 2 - Khasekhemwy

(b) Cylinder seal impression from Tomb 5 at Umm el-Qaab, Abydos

(c) Title of non-royal individual

(d) ṫd-mr hr-sb3-b3w “Administrator of the royal domain hr-sb3-b3w”

“dorf hr-sb3-b3w “Administrator of Horus, Star of the b3-souls”

DD. ḫtm(w)/ḥtm-ntr b3-ntrw

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 4

---

554 Regulski, A palaeographic study of early writing, 448 (o4:3_2817_S); Kahl, Das System der ägyptischen Hieroglyphenschrift, 303 & 526.
556 Jones, index, 501 no. 1876.
557 Kahl, Das System der ägyptischen Hieroglyphenschrift, 352 (2817) & 526.
559 Jones, index, 358 no. 1877.
560 Kaplon, Die Inschriften der ägyptischen Frühzeit, 458 & 655.
562 de Morgan, Recherches sur les origins, 243; Kahl, Das System der ägyptischen Hieroglyphenschrift, 361.
563 Jones, index, 358 no. 1330.
Inscription on the Chapel entrance of the Mast. of mr-ib k3p(w)-nswt (G2100-1), Cemetery G2100, Giza.566

(c) Title of mr-ib k3p(w)-nswt

d) htm(w)-ntr b3-ntrw “God’s sealer of (the ship) Manifestation of the Gods”567

b3-ntrw “Incarnation (Verkörperung) of the gods (is Khufu)”568

EE. w3b h3ł-b3-silhw-r

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5 - Sahure569

(b) False door of tp-m-5nh (CG 1564), mast. of tp-m-5nh (D.11), Saqqara570

(c) Title of tp-m-5nh

d) h3ł-b3-silhw-r “The incarnation (Verkörperung) of Sahure appears”571

w3b h3ł-b3-silhw-r “w3b priest of (the pyramid) The Ba-of-Sahure-Appears-in-Splendor”572

w3b h3ł-b3-silhw-r “Pure priest of the pyramid Sahure appears as a Ba”573

FF. htm(w)/htmy-ntr n wn-hr-b3w

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5 - Userkaf-Neferikare574

(b) False door of snb (JE 51297), Mast. of snb, Western Cemetery, Giza575

(c) Title of snb

d) wn-hr-b3w “It reveals the creative power (Gestaltfähigkeit) (of the king/god X)”576

GG. [lm3-r3] htm(w)-ntr nw b3-nfr-ir-k3-r

565 Based on the dating of mr-ib k3p(w)-nswt’s Mast. at Giza – P. de Manuelian, Mastabas of Nucleus Cemetery G2100: Part I: Major Mastabas G2100-G2220 (Boston, Museum of Fine Art, 2009), 72.

566 de Manuelian, Mastabas of Nucleus Cemetery, 74.


570 PM III² 483.


572 Jones, index, 376 no. 1397.


575 http://giza.fas.harvard.edu/sites/1979/full/

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5 - Niuserre

(b) Tomb inscription from the Mastaba of ty (D.22), north west of the Step Pyramid complex, Saqqara

(c) Title of ty

\[ \text{[\textit{imy-\textit{r}]} \ \text{hm(w)-\textit{ntr nw b3-nfr-ir-k3-r}]} \] “Overseer of the \text{hm-ntr} priests \text{May Neferirkare be ba}”

\[ \text{b3-nfr-ir-k3-r} \] “Neferirkare is capable of changing form (Gestaltfähig)"

HH. \textit{imy-ht \ hm(w)-ntr ntry-b3w-nfr.f-r}^c

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5 - Menkauhor

(b) False door of \text{\textit{nh-m-c-r}}, Mast. of \text{\textit{nh-m-c-r}} (D.40), Saqqara

(c) Title of \text{\textit{nh-m-c-r}}

(d) \text{ntry-b3w-nfr.f-r} “Divine is the creative power (Gestaltfähigkeit) of Neferefre”

\text{ntry-b3w-nfr.f-r} “Divine is the power of Neferefre”^584

II. \text{wfb (n) b3-k3k3l}

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5 – Djedkare Isesi

(b) Inscription on sarcophagus lid of \text{f\textasciitilde{f} (good name idw)}, Mast. of \text{f\textasciitilde{f} and \textit{hnit}, Abusir}

(c) Title of \text{f\textasciitilde{f} (good name idw)}

(d) \text{wfb (n) b3-k3k3l} “\text{wfb-priest (of the pyramid) Kakai is the Soul}”

\[ ^577 \text{Nuzzolo & Zanfagna, 'Patterns of Tomb Placement', 264.} \]
\[ ^578 \text{H. Wild, \textit{Le Tombeau De Ti. La Chapelle} (Cairo: l’Institut Français d’Archéologie orientale, 1966), pl. CL 156.} \]
\[ ^579 \text{H. Goedicke, “Two mining records from the Wadi Hammamat”, \textit{Revue d’égyptologie} 41 (1990): 72 no. 35.} \]
\[ ^580 \text{Wolf-Brinkmann, \textit{Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes ‘bA’}, 11.} \]
\[ ^581 \text{PM III\textsuperscript{2}: 455} \]
\[ ^582 \text{Mariette, \textit{Les mastabas de l’Ancien Empire}, 282-2.} \]
\[ ^583 \text{Wolf-Brinkmann, \textit{Versuch einer Deutung des Begriffes ‘bA’}, 11.} \]
\[ ^584 \text{W. Helck, \textit{Geschichte des Alten Ägypten} (Leiden; Köln: E. J. Brill, 1968), 66.} \]
\[ ^585 \text{M. Verner & V. G. Callender, \textit{Abusir VI: Djedkare’s family cemetery}. Excavations of the Czech Institute of Egyptology (Prague: Czech Institute of Egyptology, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague, 2002), 68.} \]
\[ ^586 \text{Verner & Callender, \textit{Abusir VI}, 68.} \]
“Kakai is capable of changing form (Gestaltfähig), embodies himself” (Wolf-Brinkmann, 1968: 11)

**JJ. hm-ntr sḥmt ḫšt bꜣw.s m swt.s nbwt**

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5-6

(b) False door of iht-ḥtp, Mast. of iht-ḥtp, Saqqara

(c) Title of iht-ḥtp

(d) hm-ntr sḥmt ḫšt bꜣw.s m swt.s nbwt “hm-ntr priest of Sekhmet who manifests her powers in all her (cult-) places”

**Place names**

**KK. sḥw-ṛ-hn(y)-bꜣw**

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5- Djedkare Isesi

(b) Inscription on North Wall of the tomb of šm-nfr III (G5170), Western Cemetery, Giza

(c) Name of Mortuary domain of Sahure

(d) sḥw-ṛ hnt(w) bꜣw “Preeminent in Power is sḥw-ṛ”

sḥw-ṛ hnt(w) bꜣw “Sahure is preeminent of Bas”

**LL. (N)-wr-bꜣw**

(a) Old Kingdom, Dyn. 5 – Djedkare Isesi

(b) Inscription on North Wall of the tomb of šm-nfr III (G5170), Western Cemetery, Giza

(c) Name of Mortuary domain of unidentifiable king

---

587 Verner & Callender, *Abusir VI*, 68.
588 PM III²: 638
589 Jones, *index*, 577 no. 2123.
590 [http://giza.fas.harvard.edu/sites/538/full/](http://giza.fas.harvard.edu/sites/538/full/)
(d) \( (N) \text{-} w r \text{-} b h w \) “Great of Power is N”\(^{598}\)

\( (N) \text{-} w r \text{-} b h w \) “Great of Bas King N”\(^{599}\)

\(^{597}\) http://giza.fas.harvard.edu/sites/538/full/


\(^{599}\) Žabkar, \textit{A study of the Ba concept}, 61.
Figures

Figure 1 – The Saddlebill Stork © Lip Kee Yap (2014)

Figure 2 - The head and beak of the Saddlebill stork © Steve Garvie (2010)

Figure 3 – The Carnarvon knife handle; after Benédite, “The Carnarvon Ivory”, pl. 1-2.

Figure 4 – The Davis comb handle; after Raffaele: http://soomer.virgilio.it/francescora f/hesyra/new/Daviscomb-MMA30.8.224.jpg
Figure 5 – The Pitt-Rivers knife handle; after Petrie and Quibell, *Naqada and Ballas*, 51 pl. 77

Figure 6 – The Abu Zeidan knife handle; Churcher, “Zoological study”: fig. 29 & 34.
Figure 7 – The Sayala mace handle; after Firth, *The archaeological survey of Nubia*, fig. 8.

Figure 8 - Fragment of the Hierakonpolis porphyry bowl with Saddlebill stork hieroglyph; after Janák, ‘A Question of Size’: 150.

Figure 9 - Sign G30 from the tomb of Khabawsoark, Saqqara, Dyn. 3; after Janák, ‘A Question of Size’: 150

Figure 10 - Rendering of bsw on the slab stela of Wepemnofret © Bianca van Sittert (2019)

Figure 11 - The Abydos K1262b knife handle; after Dreyer, ‘Ein neues Fragment’: 17.
Table 1 – Animal Species in the Lower Rows of the ‘animal-rows’ motif; after Churcher, ‘Zoological study’ & Huyge, ‘A Double Powerful device’.
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Figure 12 - The Gebel Djehuty Inscription no. 1; after Darnell, Friedman, and Hendrickx, *Theban Desert Road Survey*, 10.
Figure 13 - The Ashmolean Museum knife handle, E4976; after Whitehouse, ‘A decorated knife handle’: 429.

Figure 15 – The Tomb U-210 Cylinder Seal Impression; after Hartung, ‘Prädynastische Siegelabrollungen’; fig. 6.8.

Figure 16 – The Qustul Ivory Cylinder Seal; after Williams, *The A-Group Royal Cemetery*, 156 fig. 57.

Figure 17 – The Qustul Incense Burner; after Williams, *The A-Group Royal Cemetery*, 140 fig. 54.

Figure 18 – The el-Khawy rock inscription; after Darnell, ‘The Early Hieroglyphic Inscription’: 53 fig. 7.
Figure 19 - Ivory Comb of King Djet JdE 47176 © Bianca van Sittert (2019)

Figure 20 - A White Cross-lined plate with depictions of lassoed and harpooned crocodiles and hippopotamuses MMA 35.10; after Hendrickx, ‘Hunting and social complexity’, 239 fig. 1.

Figure 21 - Fragmentary D-ware in the shape of a hippopotamus painted with images of hunters carrying harpoons; after Hendrickx, ‘Hunting and social complexity’, 250 fig. 9.

Figure 23 - Relief depicting Niuserre during the Ritual Run of his Heb-Sed; after Von Bissing & Kees, *Kleine Festdarstellungen*, pl. 13.

Figure 24 - Relief depicting the Upper Egyptian Palanquin procession and offering ritual of Niuserre’s Heb-Sed Festival; after von Bissing & Kees, *Kleine Festdarstellungen*, pl. 18 no. 44d.

Figure 25 - Relief depicting the Lower Egyptian Palanquin procession and offering ritual of Niuserre’s Heb-Sed Festival; after von Bissing & Kees, *Kleine Festdarstellungen*, pl. 21 no. 50a.

Figure 26 – The Gerzeh Palette; after Petrie & Wainwright, *The Labyrinth Gerzeh and Mazghuneh* (London: British School of Archaeology, 1912), 22.

Figure 27 - A dagger handle from Abydos with depictions of bit; after Hartung, “‘Ein Fragment eines verzierten Dolchgriffes”, 181 Abb. 6.
Figure 29 - An Ivory Label from the Tomb of King Den depicting his Ritual Run in the *Heb-Sed* festival; after Dreyer, ‘Umm el-Qaab: Nachuntersuchungen 13/14/15’, pl. 18g.

Figure 30 - A Label from the Tomb of King Den depicting a Smiting Scene; after Dreyer et al., ‘Umm el-Qaab: Nachtuntersuchungen 9/10’, pl. 13b.
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