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The V Dynasty Sun Temples Personnel.

An overview of titles and cult practise through the epigraphic evidence

Massimiliano Nuzzolo

Abstract.

In this paper, that represents the core of my PhD dissertation, I will take into account the different types of titles of the personnel charged with running the sun temples. In doing so, I will also draw particular attention to the complex organization of the State with the final aim to give some indications towards a broader vision of the royal ideology as well as the religious and socio-political reality of the V dynasty Egypt.

1 Introduction.

Ever since the discovery of the first sun temple in the very end of the XIX century, this particular kind of royal monument of the Old Kingdom has aroused great interest and debate. All the scholars, however, were mainly focused on defining the architectural and decorative features of the temples and largely passed over questions regarding the cult and the rituals performed in the temples, the nature of the involved priesthood, the relationship between this and other religious and administrative offices associated with the King and the State, and thus, as

1 I am very grateful to Rosanna Pirelli and Michel Baud for their suggestions and advice. Nigel Strudwick, Nadine Cherpion, Vassil Dobrev and Stephen Quirke also suggested a number of useful improvements which I very much appreciate.

2 For its content, this paper should be considered as the second part of the article published on this review by the present writer three years ago (M. Nuzzolo, The Sun Temples of the V Dynasty: a reassessment, in: SAK 36, 2007, 217-247). That paper was mainly devoted to the architectural and archaeological problems concerning the sun temples whose topic is now completed by the present prosopographical analysis.


5 The only two studies specifically devoted to this topic are: W. Kaiser, Zu den Sonnenheiligtümern der 5. Dynastie, in: MDAIK 14, 1956, 104-116; E. Winter, Zur Deutung der Sonnenheiligtümer der 5. Dynastie, in: WZKM 54, 1957, 222-233. In both cases, however, they give a catalogue of the titles referring to priests and servants in the sun temples, without going on in analysing the relationship between these offices and the various other titles from the same period, an approach that also characterises Susanne Voss’s recent work (see previous note). Moreover, in the numerous studies dealing with the titles of the Old Kingdom (see for example W. Helek, Untersuchungen zu den Beamtenstiteln des ägyptischen Alten Reichs, AF 18, Glückstadt 1954; K. Baer, Rank and Title in the Old Kingdom. The Structure of the Egyptian Administration in the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties, Chicago 1960; N. Strudwick, The Administration of Egypt in the Old Kingdom. The Highest Titles and Their Holders, London 1985) the role of the sun temples, and their relative offices, is often minimised or in some cases considered as incidental, with little or no influence on developments in the bureaucratic and cult organization of the pharaonic state. On the contrary Paule Posener-Krieger, clearly stressing the key position of the temples in the ranking priestly titles, says: “Comme on sait que St-ib-Ra était, des deux temples de Néferirkarê, le plus
the last consequence, the changes in the symbolic-ideological contents of kingship during the V dynasty.

In this period the cult of the pharaoh seems to have undergone a conceptual and “geographical” split following the introduction of a new setting for the celebration of the king, the sun temple, which complemented the older pyramid complex. Although this “duplication” of cult venues was only short-lived, it appears to have had far-reaching consequences for the religious and bureaucratic personnel serving the kings at the end of the V and throughout the VI dynasty. Moreover, the increase in the personnel who were in charge with this new cult (with officials who were less and less bound to the royal family by personal ties) led to a significant increase in the relative epigraphic material which gives us the possibility to draw a complete picture of the matter.

In spite of the significant progress made by scholars in recent years, our knowledge of the internal organization of the pharaonic state in the Old Kingdom is still far from clear, as regards both the socio-political and the cult-religious spheres. While trying to arrange these officials in a precise *cursus honorum* and to fix in a hierarchical and preordained scheme the routes by which they gained access to the successive levels of power, scholars were sometimes led to misinterpret the value, meaning and rank of several titles.


A number of studies were devoted to the issue of “Kingship”, sometimes with a complete analysis of the development of the concept of royal ideology through the whole Egyptian history. However, none of them did specifically apply to the V dynasty and to the relationship between sun temples and kingship while usually dedicating to the topic only few pages (among the large bibliography in this regard, it is worth mentioning: H. Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods. A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature, Chicago 1948; H. Goedicke, Die Stellung des Königs im Alten Reich, AA 2, Wiesbaden 1960; G. Posener, De la divinité du pharaon, Paris 1960; D. O’Connor/D.P. Silverman (eds.), Ancient Egyptian Kingship, PÅ 9, Leiden/New York/Köln 1995; R. Gundlach, Der Pharao und sein Staat. Die Grundlegung der ägyptischen Königsideologie im 4. und 3. Jahrtausend, Darmstadt 1998). This is also the case for many important and extensive works about pyramids and temples for they consider the sun temples simply as outbuilding cult complex to the pyramids (see for example: R. Stadelmann, Die ägyptischen Pyramiden, Mainz 1985; D. Arnold, Die Tempel Ägyptens, Zürich 1992; M. Lehner, The complete pyramids, London 1997; M. Verner, The Pyramids. The mystery, culture, and science of Egypt’s great monuments, New York 2001).

One should speak of a triplication of cult places since, as we shall see, the ritual used in mortuary and sun temples was certainly modelled on the ceremonies performed in the royal palace that was the seat of many practices concerning the person of the king. See also A.M. Roth, Egyptian Phyles in the Old Kingdom, SAOC 48, Chicago 1991, 193-195; M. Baud, Le palais en temple. Le culte funéraire des rois d’Abousir, in: M. Barta/J. Krejci (eds.), Abusir and Saqqara in the Year 2000, Archiv Orientální Suppl. IX, Prague 2000, 347.

As to the V-VI dynasties, for example, negating the separation of titles into rank-indicators and function-indicators seems to be highly misleading as well as assuming that most of them, although originally endowed with a real function, should have become exclusively honorific.

In fact, as argued by Franke, we can always make a distinction between titles indicating the sphere of competence and field of activities (for example all titles beginning with *imy-r*) and titles only indicating the social status of its owner in the Court/State (for example *smr wty*, *iry-hat nswt*), although in many cases we have to admit that it is not so easy to make a clear distinction between the two since the theory does not correspond to what we know from the epigraphic and archaeological documentation.

This is all the more evident when trying to divide the semantic field pertaining to “religion”, both temples and pyramids, from that associated with the palace, whether as institution (*pr-†3*) or in its temporal, mortal “representative” (*nswt*). This distinction, although suggested by our conception of a modern, lay State divided by the religious Power, and sometimes supported by the epigraphic records, does not seem to fit the Egyptian way of thinking, as we will see in the present paper, at least until the end of the V dynasty.

Also the definition by Quirke of “regular titles” does not completely solve the question since it mainly implies a numeric occurrence of titles in the epigraphic sources of the period in order to place their owner into the Court/State administration. If we would apply his method, elaborated for the Late Middle Kingdom, to the III Millennium B.C., in many cases we can not account either for the meaning of a title or for its actual/symbolical function in the daily business of the cult and state administration.

Moreover, as recently noted by Strudwick, although mainly intended to indicate the holder’s place in the social and court hierarchy, all titles, included the assumed honorific ones, should always point not just to social status but also to specific functions both in the Court and State, and this means, as a matter of facts, a real, practical function in their everyday life and administration.

Furthermore, a more penetrating analysis will clearly show that not all the titles with a common root do belong to the same semantic category, nor correspond to the same rank and function and this complicates even more the question. Not all the *hry-sšt3*, for example, belong

---

9 Baer, Rank and Title, 3 (“...each title had its own rank during the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties and the separation of titles into rank-indicators and function-indicators only complicates the issue”).

10 See for example Helck, Beamten titel, 43-44 (about the *hry-sšt3 n pr-dwšt* title) and 111-119 (for his definitions of “Machtstitel” and “Hofrangstitel” in relationship to the *iry-p†3, hty-†* and *smr-wty* titles). As to the *hry-sšt3* title, for example, Rydström has suggested the opposite process: according to him, the title, at the time of its introduction in the IV dynasty, described the character of duties encompassed by its holders (thus it was originally a honorific title) and only later (V dynasty) became a real title indicating the function proper (see K.T. Rydström, *Hry-sšt3* “In Charge of Secrets”. The 3000-Year Evolution of a Title, in: DE 28 1994, 61-65, 81-82).


12 S. Quirke, The Regular Titles of the Late Middle Kingdom, in: RdE 37, 1986, 107-130, esp. 107-109.

13 It seems very likely that the concept of the “regular titles” should have been already existing in the Old Kingdom. However, the shortage of the epigraphic sources and the strong symbolical implications of many titles do not allow us to get a conclusive, clear picture of the matter like in the Late Middle Kingdom. See also M. Baud, Famille royale et pouvoir sous l’Ancien Empire égyptien, BdE 126/1, Le Caire 1999, 241.

14 N. Strudwick, Texts from the Pyramid Age, Atlanta 2005, 27, notes that “the comparison of the honorific titles with the various titles of nobility in Britain is instructive where “duke”, “lord” and so on indicated not only social status but also standing at court”.

---
to the lowest levels of the social hierarchy\textsuperscript{15}, as Rydström has well shown in a recent article\textsuperscript{16}, although this does not deny the common frame of reference, at least at the theoretical and symbolic level, involving secrecy, inaccessibility, and knowledge of specific, private rules evoked by the generic term \textit{sššt}\textsuperscript{17}.

Therefore, taking into account these elements and starting from the titles of the officials charged with running the sun temples, I shall try to highlight the context in which some of these titles recur, the different types of office and their relationship with other titles held contemporaneously, drawing particular attention to the main “institutions” of the period, i.e. the pyramid complex, the royal palace and the central administration\textsuperscript{18}.

In doing so, however, I shall focus on evidence coming from private funerary contexts while excluding the seal prints which will be only taken into account incidentally because of their anonymity and fragmentary nature\textsuperscript{19}.

\textsuperscript{15} When we speak of “lowest levels of the social hierarchy” we are, of course, dealing with the lowest levels in the upper class, thus in the highest steps of the social pyramid. This class represents the cultural, political and religious elite of the country and, as such, it is in “charge of secrets” of the divine-royal world. See J. Baines, Literacy, Social Organization and the Archaeological Record: the Case of Early Egypt, in: J. Gledhill/B. Bender/ M. Larsen (eds.), State and Society, London 1988, 202-208; id., Restricted Knowledge, Hierarchy and Decorum: Modern Perception and Ancient Institutions, in: JARCE 27, 1990, 1-23.


\textsuperscript{17} Baines, in: JARCE 27, 1990, 9-10. The \textit{hry-sššt} titles are generally considered as typical “Beititeln” (see Franke, in: GM 83, 1984, 107, nr. 2) associated to several important function both in religious and royal sphere (see for example what Baud says about the \textit{hry-hb} title (lector-priest) which he considers, by definition, as keeper and guardian of god’s willing and thus \textit{hry-sššt n mdw ntr} – in charge of the secrets of the divine words: see Baud, Famille royale, 237-238, 269-271. While certainly mirroring a theoretical paradigm, however, the title should have also had a pragmatic implication in defining the ranking of its holders for many reasons: first of all, any office may have had only a specific \textit{hry-sššt} “quality” and in this sense it’s quite evident that all \textit{hryw-sššt} could not belong to the same social level. Moreover, in many cases we can not find a simple correspondence between a title and his \textit{hry-sššt} “quality” since we have many \textit{hry-sššt} titles (particularly the simple \textit{hry-sššt}) without any reference to other offices and this does also concern the \textit{hry-sššt n mdw ntr} title that is not always associated to the \textit{hry-hb} title. In this sense I think that the all \textit{hry-sššt} titles, although theoretically explaining and specifying the sphere of competence of their holders, should also imply a real relevance in the daily fulfillment of the cult and state administration and is not to be considered as a simple “Beititeln”.

\textsuperscript{18} For reason of space I will not deal in detail with those titles attested by the biographies of the sun temples priests and officials which are not directly linked to the topic of the paper which is, in the main place, the role of the sun temples in the evolution of the royal ideology during the V dynasty and the relationship between the sun temple priestly staff, the King and the State. In this sense, the present analysis will be certainly incomplete and one can not find either a complete dissertation on the V dynasty titles and offices or an overall examination of the dynamics of power and running of the Egyptian State of the period, about which see the bibliography mentioned in the notes. The same goes for the chronological problems of the dating of tombs and tomb-owners which have been dealt with in details in my PhD Dissertation “I Templi Solari e il Concetto di Regalità nella V Dinastia”, Naples 2010, forthcoming. For this reason, chronological references in tab. 1 in this paper are based on comparison of several publications about chronology: among them we can particularly recall here, besides Baer and Porter-Moss works, which still represent the base of the chronology of Old Kingdom, and the other studies quoted both in the previous and following notes, the studies by Yvonne Harpur (Decoration in Egyptian Tombs of the Old Kingdom. Studies in Orientation and Scene Content, London/New York 1987) and Nadine Cherpion (Mastabas et hypogèces d’Ancien Empire: le problème de la datation, Bruxelles 1989), as well as the proceedings of the conference “Les critères de datation stylistiques à l'Ancien Empire”, edited by N. Grimal, BdE 120, Le Caire 1998.

\textsuperscript{19} On seal-prints see P. Kaplony, Die Rollseigel des Alten Reichs, 2 Bde, MonAeg II-III. Bruxelles 1977-1981. Indeed, almost all the seal-prints mentioning sun temples were kept in the Berlin Museum and were lost during the II World War. For this reason, they were not included in the present analysis. On this topic a more detailed investigation is going to be published by who is now writing.
2 Religious and administrative personnel of the sun temples.

Out of the approximately 80 officials and priests of the sun temples known from private funerary contexts (tab. 1 at the end of this article), almost all of them (69 individuals, 85% of the total) belonged to the *hmw-ntr* whose functions, according to what we know from the later documentation of the Abusir papyri, covered all the cult rituals performed on the royal and divine statues, i.e. clothing, adorning, purifying, fumigating with incense and oils, and food offerings. Only a very small number (5 people, just over 5%) belonged to the *wrbw* while another part (11 people, about 15%) held offices which did not involve officiating priests such as the *imy-r pr šnِr, shd pr šnِr* and *imy-r hwt-šmr*.

Almost all the priests of the sun temple (63 individuals, just under 80%) were involved in the same cult functions, those of *hm-ntr* and *wrb*, also in the pyramid complex of the reigning pharaoh (and/or preceding kings), and in the service of the pharaoh himself (in this case the *hm-ntr* title is associated to the specific name of the king while the *wrb* title is only documented as *wrb nsrw*).

---

20 In tab. 1, 80 priests and officials in the sun temples are listed but 6 of them are very problematic ([6], [36], [37], [52], [53], [54]) since we have too scanty evidence to make a satisfactory prosopographic reconstruction. In the following notes each priest/official will be only referred to with name and number in square brackets. The latter refers to the tab. 1 where references to Porter & Moss (here abbreviated as PM), or to other publication when missing Porter/Moss references, are given. Only bibliographical references later to Porter/Moss will be eventually given in the notes. Many of these priests/officials, of course, also have references in the most important studies on chronology and titles in the Old Kingdom which, however, will be not recalled in the following notes near their names for simplicity. In this sense see in particular: Baer, Rank and Title, 51-159; Strudwick, Administration, 55-169; Cherpin, Mastabas et hypogées, 145-205, 223-241; Harpur, Decoration, 233-239, 265-376; M. Nuzzolo, I Templi Solari e il Concetto di Regalità nella V Dinastia, Naples 2010, (PhD Dissertation), forthcoming.

21 For a complete list of all the titles held by this personnel in the sun temples see also Nuzzolo, in: SAK 36, 2007, 247, pl. 2.

22 *Hm-nht* [15]; *Nn-hft-k3* [20]; *Ty* [23]; *Ni-k3-snḥ* [30]; *Wf-n*n-Pth* [43]. The latter two also held *hm-ntr* titles in the sun temple of Neferirkara.

23 *W3š-k3* [7]; *Nt-nḥ-Hmnw* [8]; *Nfr* [9]; *Hp-dr* [35]; *Wfd-Hr* [36]; *Pth-śps* [38]; *Smn* [52]; *Nd-mīt* [53]. The three following officials also held cult offices besides the non-religious titles: *Hrdf-ltft* [11] who was *hm-ntr R* and *hry-sšt3* in Userkaf’s sun temple; *R*-*śps* [28] who was *hm-ntr R* *Htw-Hr* in Userkaf and Neferirkara sun temples and zš (*w*) *nswt m htnw nbt ntt* in Userkaf sun temple; *Ty* [56] who was *shd* *hm-ntr R* in Neferirkara’s sun temple and *imy-r* in the sun temples of Sahura, Neferirkara, Neferefra and Niuserra.

24 There is no certainty as to the meaning and functions of the *wrb* title since the papyrus evidence in this regard is very confusing. Posener-Kriéger, Les archives II, 582, maintains that the *wrb* represented a fix personnel of the temple who did not serve in rotation, like the *hm-ntr* and the *hntyw-š*, apparently carrying out the same duties as the other two categories. Also the status of the *wrb* seems to be different, somewhat lower than the *hm-ntr*, since they did not participate in the temple income and food offerings in the same way (Posener-Kriéger, Les archives II, 575). As a matter of fact, however, in the case of the sun temples the most important people concerning with the personal care of the king were almost always *wrb* priests of the god Ra, and most of the priests holding the title of *hm-ntr* of the king, which entailed a close, cult relationship with him (see below), were also often *wrb nsrw* (see tab. 1). In this sense, as we can see in more details later (note 92), it is also worth noting that beginning from the reign of Djedkara the *hm-ntr* title is no more associated to the name of the king but only to his pyramid complex while the *wrb* title still remains linked to both the pyramid and the king (in the latter case always as *wrb nsrw*). I can suggest, thus, that the *hm-ntr* and *wrb* titles may have been complementary during the V dynasty, each of them pointing to a specific aspect of king’s nature: his divinity expressed through the *hm-ntr* title serving his name, and his purity expressed through the *wrb nsrw* title. With the above-mentioned change in the time of Djedkara, further supported by the later introduction of the *wrb* 200 of the king’s pyramid instead of the old *wrb* of the king’s pyramid and *wrb nsrw* (likely under Pepi I: Baer, Rank and Title, 250, tab. 1; see also also Roth, Phyles, 83-84, who suggests a change in the character/status of the *wrb* as a class rather than as a title), the two titles (*hm-ntr* and *wrb*) were going to be reformed according to the different setting of the royal ideology which was also significantly demonstrated by the new, growing importance of the
Besides these strictly “religious” duties, they also held offices in the royal palace and/or central administration (71 persons, about 90% of the total). However, if we observe in detail the specific roles of the individual priests (see tab. 1, last column), we can see that they particularly concerned “fields” associated with caring for, and hence celebrating, the person of the king, rather than the strictly administrative and economic tasks which would have been required for the Palace as institution and indeed for the State in general.

Among the “highest” offices recorded in the epigraphic sources concerning king’s care and the royal palace, we can single out that of *hhrp *h, director of the *h palace, recorded for only 4 individuals. The *h palace seems to be a central part of the royal apartments which must presumably have served not only as the ritual palace for the king during the main religious festivals, like the sed festival, or as a kind of wardrobe for the *regalia, but also as living quarters.

The *hhrp *h title is almost always associated with the hry-sšt3 n pr-dwšt title, “Responsible for the secrets of the House of Morning” (3 cases out of 4): up until the beginning of Userkaf’s reign the two offices had been the exclusive prerogative of the king’s sons. According to most scholars, the pr-dwšt must have been the main part of this “consecrated” area (hhrp) of the palace, hosting the first religious ceremonies honouring the pharaoh’s awakening, his morning ablutions and ritual clothing.

25 As to the definition of high and low titles, we usually adopt in this paper the general system of ranking as defined by Baer, Rank and Title, 9-41 and Strudwick, Administration, 172-175, 337-346, although in some cases a different opinion is suggested. For a somewhat different organization of titles and title ranking see also E. Martin-Pardey, Die Verwaltung im Alten Reich. Grenzen und Möglichkeiten von Untersuchungen zu diesem Thema, in: BiOr 46, 1989, 533-552; Andrassy, in: ZÄS 118, 1991, 1-10; Baud, Famille royale, 236-252 with further bibliography.

26 Hnm-htp [15]; Nn-hfkt-k3 [20]; Ni-k3-tsḥ [30]; Ty [56].


28 As to the evolution of the title in the Old Kingdom, see also M. Barta, The Title Inspector of the Palace during the Egyptian Old Kingdom, in: ArOr 67, 1999, 1-20.

29 Apparently Nj-k3-tmḥ [30] does not hold the title but he likely did since the inscription of this priest is not complete and misses the final part where the title hry-sšt3 probably continued as “n pr-dwšt”.

30 In the IV dynasty we know of 9/13 people holding these offices, all of them kings’ sons (z3 nswt): see Baud, Famille royale, 259-268 and tab. 15; see also Rydström, in: DE 28, 1994, 65.

31 A.M. Blackman, The House of the Morning, in: JEA 5, 1918, 148-165, particularly 151-152; O. Goelet, Royal Palace, 345-357 with further bibliography. For the astronomical association of Dwšt with the eastern morning horizon see R. Krauss, Astronomische Konzepte und Jenseitsvorstellungen in den Pyramidentexten, ÄA 59, Wiesbaden 1997, 207-234. J.F. Quack, Eine Papyruskopie des Textes der Votivellen, in: K. Ryholt (ed.), Hieratic Texts from the Collection. The Carlsberg Papyri 7, Copenhagen 2006, 39-52. Taking into account Quack’s recent analyses on the value of the term dwšt, I can suggest that the pr-dwšt may also have been associated to the ritual of the “opening of the mouth” as the place of the daily awakening and, thus, in a wider sense, rebirth of the king (as to the ritual of the “opening of the mouth” see also Quack, Fragmente des Mundöffnungsrituals aus Tebtynis, in: K. Ryholt (ed.), The Carlsberg Papyri 7, 69-150; A.M. Roth, The psš-kf and the ‘Opening of the Mouth’ Ceremony: a Ritual of Birth and Rebirth, in: JEA 78, 1992, 113-147; id., Fingers, Stars and the ‘Opening of the Mouth’: the Nature and Function of the nTrwj Blades, in: JEA 79, 1993, 57-79). Although this theory is mainly based on much later evidence coming from the Tebtynis Hieratic Papyri of the
Surprisingly, however, they simply give the *hry-sšt3 n pr-dwšt* title an honorific value considering it a typical “Beititel” following Helck’s explanation. Nevertheless, during the V and VI dynasty the *hry-sšt3 n pr-dwšt* title is very often associated with that of Vizier. When we have evidence of the contemporary presence of more than one Vizier in the capital, as for example of K3-*gmn* and Mrrw-*k3* in the reign of Teti, only one of the two holds the *hry-sšt3 n pr-dwšt* title (in this case Mrrw-*k3*), which would indeed be strange if the office only carried an honorific value. It is likely, as Kanawati has argued, that each of the two viziers had his own sphere of competence, and that the higher-ranking was the one who held the office in question, a symbol of closeness to the king and thus, perhaps, of greater prestige. Taking into account these elements, the title must have implied a real participation in the above-mentioned tasks performed for the king in the *pr-dwšt*, also considering that we do not have any other servant explicitly charged with them.

The offices of *hrp ẖ* and *hry-sšt3 n pr-dwšt* are always associated with that of *hry-wdb m ḫwt-_nh*, “Master of Largess in the Mansion of Life”, which is connected, at least according to the term’s literal meaning, with the supply and management of provisions for the pharaoh through a specific institution in the royal palace, namely the *ḥwt- Nh*. Thus, the *ḥwt- Nh* seems to be linked above all to the palace ẖ and the physical person of the king, whose requirements in the way of food must have involved a specific *mensor* provided with a well defined organization in the hands of a few trusty officials, responsible for provisions and very likely also for supervising the properties which yielded these foodstuffs.
However, the \textit{hry-wdb m hwt-\textsuperscript{5}nh} title should not be automatically linked with the other two, since an \textit{hpy-\textsuperscript{7}h – hry-s\textsuperscript{3}t n pr-dw\textsuperscript{it}} was always also \textit{hry-wdb m hwt-\textsuperscript{5}nh}, but not vice versa. In fact, this office is attested for two other priests/officials\textsuperscript{39} in the sun temple (5 individuals in all, just over 5\% of the total) who also held other titles as \textit{hry-tp nswt} (both) and \textit{imy-r hwt wrt} (only one of them), two very important titles in the juridical administration\textsuperscript{40}. They both were also \textit{wd(t)-mdw / wd(t)-mdw \textsuperscript{st}t n hryw-wdb}, namely “Those who gave orders to the \textit{hryw-wdb}”. Therefore, it is likely that the \textit{hry-wdb m hwt-\textsuperscript{5}nh} were the starting level amongst the highest court personnel and that, in consequence, only some of them did also manage to get the other two titles (\textit{hpy-\textsuperscript{7}h and hry-s\textsuperscript{3}t n pr-dw\textsuperscript{it}}). On the other hand, some of the \textit{hryw-wdb m hwt-\textsuperscript{5}nh} climbed the social hierarchy in the juridico – administrative sphere as \textit{hry-tp nswt} and/or \textit{imy-r hwt wrt}\textsuperscript{41}.

The importance of these three officials (\textit{Hnm-htp [15]; Nn-hft-k\textsuperscript{3} [20]; Ty [56]}) distinguished by the sequence of titles \textit{hpy-\textsuperscript{7}h – hry-s\textsuperscript{3}t n pr-dw\textsuperscript{it} – hry-wdb m hwt-\textsuperscript{5}nh}\textsuperscript{42}, finds further confirmation in the presence, in their \textit{cursus honorum}, of the title of \textit{smr w\textsuperscript{f}ty}, “first friend” or “sole friend”\textsuperscript{43} of the king, which is recorded for only two other priests of the sun temples\textsuperscript{44}.

The office seems to have become predominantly honorific only at the end of the V dynasty\textsuperscript{45}; at the time of the construction of the sun temples it must still have implied a certain closeness to the pharaoh, not so much in terms of kinship, as may have been the case during the Vizier, and almost entirely absent in the documentation from the sun temples. Moreover, in all the texts known to us form the V and VI dynasty, the \textit{hwt wrt} is not “served” by the \textit{hry-wdb}, who are exclusively attested for the \textit{pr-hryw-wdb} or the \textit{hwt-\textsuperscript{5}nh}.

\textsuperscript{39} K3-m-nfrt [55]; \textsuperscript{40} nh-m-\textsuperscript{5}k\textsuperscript{3} [64].

\textsuperscript{41} As a matter of fact they are the only two people holding these high rank titles among the sun temples personnel. The exact meaning of the \textit{hry-tp nswt} title is still far from clear: taking into account the occurrences of the title in the Old Kingdom, Helck (Beamtenstitel, 60) suggests it should have been a juridical title linked to the \textit{hwt wrt}. In this sense, see also Strudwick, Administration, 182, who also points out that the \textit{hry-tp nswt} title was closely related to the \textit{smr w\textsuperscript{f}ty} title, although this relationship finds no real correspondence in the case of the sun temple personnel (see tab 1 in the present paper). For a somewhat different opinion, see H. Goedicke, Titles for Titles, in: S. Allam (ed.), Grund und Boden in Altägypten, Tübingen 1994, 234, who suggests that the title could have been connected with food administration.

\textsuperscript{42} For a different opinion about the rank of the \textit{hpy-\textsuperscript{7}h} title see Barta, in: Archiv Orientální 67, 1999, 16, who maintains that this office was one of the first steps on the way to higher titles. As to the \textit{hryw-wdb}, see also Baud, Famille royale, 284-289. He considers the \textit{hryw-wdb m hwt-\textsuperscript{5}nh} as a separate, older branch of the \textit{pr-hryw-wdb}. The latter was depending on the juridical bureau on the V dynasty (i.e. the \textit{hwt-wrt}), and directly on the Vizier on the IV dynasty. For an overview of the complete \textit{hry-wdb} title holders in the Old Kingdom see Moreno Garcia, Études sur l’administration, 146-151.

\textsuperscript{43} On the meaning and value of the titles in this specific sequence see also Blackman, in: JEA 5, 1918, 148-151; Gardiner, in: JEA 24, 1938, 91-93.

\textsuperscript{44} This is one of the four main “Court Titles” (together with \textit{iry-p\textsuperscript{f}t, h\textsuperscript{3}ty-\textsuperscript{5} and iry-\textit{hlt nswt}) which was intended to specify the owner’s position at Court and his proximity to the king during the whole Old Kingdom (see also note 10 in the present paper). For a general evaluation on the use of the titles in private autobiographies in the Old Kingdom and the relationship amongst the different title-holders, the king and the court see also J. Baines, Kingship before Literature: the world of the king in the Old Kingdom and the relationship amongst the different title-holders, the king and the court see also J. Baines, Kingship before Literature: the world of the king in the Old Kingdom in: R. Gundlac/C. Raedler (Hgg.), Selbstverständnis und Realität, AAT 36/1, Wiesbaden 1997, 125-174, particularly 136-140.

\textsuperscript{45} Ni-kA-\textsuperscript{5}nh [30]; \textsuperscript{46} M\textsuperscript{7}h-\textit{hrw-hr-Pth [67]}. For a comparison with the titles of the other contemporary \textit{hpy-\textsuperscript{7}h} who did not hold office in the sun temples see Baud, Famille royale, 261-263, tab. 15; id. in: Barta/Krejci (ed.), Abusir and Saqqara 2000, 352-353 [tab. 1].

\textsuperscript{46} Strudwick, Administration, 182-183, 205, 224-225, 286-287. The author relates this title only to the major offices of state such as vizier. In the VI dynasty this title will be almost always associated to other minor honorific titles (B. van der Walle, in: JNES 36, 1977, 19-20).
IV dynasty, as of a personal relationship with the king. Contrary to Helck’s opinion, in the case of the sun temple personnel, the title was not automatically associated to all the royal hairdressers, singers and doctors since it was usually given only to the imy-r ḫkw nswt and iry nfr-h𓇷t titles holders, i.e. the highest levels of that kind of royal office who were in charge of the royal “ornaments” and “diadem.”

In this context we may also explain another office which is almost always linked to the sequence ḫrp ṭḤ – ḫry-sḥ_cycle n pr-dwḥt – ḫry-wdq m ḫwt-“nh – smr wꜣty, namely the ḫry-tp Nhḥ title usually translated as “Chief of Nekhbite” or “Governor of El-Kab” and held by only two of the three officials who also possessed the abovementioned sequence of titles. Since most of the Old Kingdom holders of the ḫry-tp Nhḥ (sometimes also translated as ḫry-tp Nhḥt) title also had the iry nfr-h𓇷t title, included the two aforementioned priests of the sun temples (see tab. 1), it’s likely to suppose that the title could have been strongly related to the royal “diadem” and the relative ceremonies developed in that part of the royal palace, called ṭḤ-palace, deputed to this function and placed under the direction of the ḫrp ṭḤ. More exactly, the ḫry-tp Nhḥ may have been the keeper of the Upper Egyptian Crown who should have been certainly closely related to the most important religious ceremonies like the sd festival and the ceremony of coronation of the new king.

To sum up, we can consider the role played by the three figures in question as that of a “master of ceremonies”, responsible for the overall supervision of the person of the king and royal protocol, but without any influence in the bureaucratic and administrative matters of the State. In this role of “king’s attendants” they were supported by a vast and heterogeneous cohort of servants of the middle – low ranks, with different tasks and competences, the most

46 In this sense, it is worth noting that beginning from the end of the V dynasty the smr wꜣty title is very often associated to the epithet n mrwt which seems to replace the old epithet n it.f frequently shown by the smr wꜣty title holders who were also sons of the king (zA-nswt) during the IV dynasty. The new epithet (n mrwt) seems thus to point to a fictitious kinship with the king and, as a consequence, to the more and more honorific value of the smr wꜣty title in this period. See also Baud, Famille royale, 257-259, 264-265. For a general scheme of all holders of the abovementioned titles in the IV-V dynasty see ibid., 261-263 (tab. 15).
48 Moreover, according to the epigraphic evidence, the smr wꜣty title could not be considered only as a later form of the previous smr pr title, as stated by Helck (see previous note), since the people who held the two titles had very different titles sequences and ranking respectively. Thus, at least until the end of the V dynasty, the smr wꜣty title certainly stood on a upper level than the simple smr pr/smrm pr-pr tabindex, although both still likely kept a real, not only honorific, value.
49 For a general evaluation of all title-holders in the V-VI dynasties, see Baud, Famille royale, 261-263 (tab. 15).
50 Ḥmn-htp [15]; Ṭy [56].
51 See also Blackman, in: JEA 5, 1918, 149, 152.
52 We have to keep in mind that Nhḥ was one of the most important cities of pre-dynastic Egypt, likely connected to very ancient rituals of the celebration of kingship. Furthermore the city was the seat of the Vulture Goddess Nekhbet who was deputed, side by side with the Cobra Goddess Uadjet in the North of the country, to the celebration and protection of the King in every stage of his life, a concept further developed, and iconographically represented, in the king’s official names of nḥty and nswt-bity.
53 Four if we also consider Ni-kḥt-_IMPORTED FROM HTML TEXT
54 See also M.A. Speidel, Die Friseure des ägyptischen Alten Reiches, Konstanz 1990, 91-94.
55 See also De Cenival, À propos de la stèle de Chéché. Étude de quelques types de titulatures privées de l’Ancien Empire, in: RdE 27, 1975, 63-64.
documented of which is that of \textit{hry-sšt\textbar nswt} (39 individuals – just under 50% of the total)\textsuperscript{56}, a sort of confidant, personal secretary or “counsellors” to the pharaoh\textsuperscript{57}.

On one hand, they were closely connected with the personal care of the king, holding offices concerned with the royal toilette and ornaments (\textit{ir(w)šn nswt}, \textit{ir(w) ŋnt nswt} and variants – 7 out of the 11 individuals holding these titles – see tab. 1)\textsuperscript{58}; on the other hand, however, they often also held juridical offices (for example \textit{hm-ntr M\textasciitilde fti}, \textit{žḥ}, etc., 18 out of the 27 fellows holding these titles – see tab. 1), and/or \textit{wr 10 Šm\textasciitilde} (5 out of the 7 fellows holding this title – see tab. 1)\textsuperscript{59}.

Furthermore, these holders of juridical offices were also very frequently associated to the scribal activities in all its ranks and fields of interest (15 out of the 26 persons holding scribal titles in the sun temples – see tab. 1).

These fellows seem, thus, to represent the backbone of the administrative apparatus of the Egyptian State where two spheres – the juridico-legal and scribal ones – appear to be closely related each other as to both the titles (see for example the title of \textit{sšb žś – žś n žḥ} according to the other readings – and variants\textsuperscript{60} and, very likely, the real practise\textsuperscript{61}.

\textsuperscript{56} Contrary to Baud’s opinion (id., Famille royale, 270), in the V dynasty the title does not seem to be automatically linked to the office of Vizier since none of the priests of the sun temples who also held the \textit{hry-sšt\textbar nswt\textbar nswt m sw\textbar f nbt} title was Vizier (see tab. 1 in the present paper).

\textsuperscript{58} In some cases the title is also recorded in association with the name of a specific king (\textit{hry-sšt\textbar NN}). As to the translation of the title, we have chosen a more general definition as “secretary” although it is quite clear that we can not take it literally. The \textit{hry-sšt\textbar} is likely to be a person who was strictly tied to the pharaoh and all his personal activities which were, as such, private and secret. In this sense he has to be seen simply as a courtier, responsible for the “reserved” life of the king. For the original meaning of the title of \textit{hry-sšt\textbar} and its symbolic and practical implications see also Rydström, in: DE 28, 1994, 55, 64-65.

\textsuperscript{58} This link with the personal care of the king seems to be further documented by the important role of the royal coiffeurs in the rituals performed on the statues of the king in the intimate parts of the funerary temple (see Posener-Kriéger, Les archives II, 576, 577, n. 1, 602; see also Speidel, Friseure, 107-111).

\textsuperscript{59} Although apparently high ranking than the \textit{hm-ntr M\textasciitilde fti}, \textit{žḥ} titles because of its label “\textit{wr}”, the \textit{wr 10 Šm\textasciitilde} title was nonetheless only intermediate in the state administrative hierarchy (see Baer, Rank and Title, 9-41; Baud, Famille royale, 246, 248). Moreover, it is likely that the title had become largely honorific by the second half of the V Dynasty, when there is a considerable increase in the number of records (Strudwick, Administration, 179, 184, 187, 188-190). During the VI dynasty the title seems to have been disappearing in the Memphite necropolis (Helck, Beamtenstitel, 48) although it is still recorded on the Coptos Decree by the time of Pepi II (H. Goedicke, Königliche Dokumente aus dem Alten Reich, AA 14, Wiesbaden 1967, 103; see also Kanawati, Governmental Reforms, 62-66). The office seems also to have been closely connected to the organization of works and to the title of \textit{imy-r k\textasciitilde t/k\textasciitilde t nbt nt nswt} (Strudwick, Administration, 197, 222-223, 229, 233-235). Roth, Phyles, 120-121, has suggested that it may have been related to the organization of work crews during the Old Kingdom, particularly in the IV dynasty. In this regard, see also H.G. Fischer, A Scribe of the Army in a Saqqara Mastaba of the Early Fifth Dynasty, in: JNES 18, 1959, 263-266. As to the meaning and function of the juridical titles in Old Kingdom Egypt, see also E. Martin-Pardey, Richter im Alten Reich und die \textit{sr-Beamten}, in: B.M. Bryan/D. Lorton (eds.), Essays in Egyptology in honor of Hans Goedicke, San Antonio 1994, 157-167; Moreno Garcia, Études sur l’administration, 132-139, 144-145.

\textsuperscript{60} For an overview of the different readings of the titles see D. Jones, An index of Egyptian Titles, Epithets and Phrases of the Old Kingdom, BAR International Series 866 (I-II), Oxford 2000, 811-813 [2964-2972]. A new hypothesis was also suggested by V.G. Callender, A propos the title of \textit{r Nxn n žḥ}, in: Barta/Krejci (eds.), Abusir and Saqqara 2000, 361-380.

\textsuperscript{61} See also Piacentini who notes, concerning the title of \textit{iry-md\textbar t}, this strong relationship between the scribal activities of the \textit{iryw-md\textbar t} and the carrying out of the juridical and legal practise: “Le fait qu’ils soient cités avec les membres de la \textit{djadjat} et/ou avec les \textit{imyw-ht žḥ pr} est particulièrement significatif car il souligne qu’ils pouvaient revêtir, selon toute probabilité, des charges judiciaires ou du moins relatives au maintien de la discipline, taches dans lesquelles ils coopéraient avec les scribes” (P. Piacentini, Les “Préposés aux Écrits” dans l’Égypte du III\textsuperscript{e} Millénaire av. J.-C., in: RdE 53, 2002, 192).
In the same time, as already said, these priests and officials were also inextricably linked to the living pharaoh in their role as people responsible for taking care of his person and for carrying out the sacerdotal function for king’s cult, both in his pyramid and sun temple.

In this regard, we can also note that most of the priests of the sun temple held the irq-ht nswt title (33 individuals, 40% of the total), the largest one in the documentation into account after that of hry-sšt3 / hry-sšt3 (n) nswt. As previously recalled, the title was intended to stress the owner’s proximity to the king (in this respect it is usually translated as “royal acquaintance”), and was particularly held by people of non-royal origin. The title is frequently associated with that of hry-sšt3 (18 people out of the 33, over 50% of the total irq-ht nswt title-holders – see also tab. 1) and/or with scribal and juridical titles (all together 16 persons out of 33, about 50% of the total – see also tab. 1). Sometimes (5 persons out of 33, about 15% of the total) it is also documented alone, maybe simply emphasizing the relationship between the king and the title-holder lacking other more important offices.

Thus, it is likely to suppose that the title irq-ht nswt, during the V dynasty, should only entail a close, although indirect, relationship with the king (or with the king’s house in its variant of irq-ht nswt pr-53) rather than a real superintendence to the “king’s things” as the literary translation of the title may lead to think.

62 This fact seems to be also confirmed by the seal-prints mentioning titles pertaining to the sun temples. In this case too, besides priestly titles in both sun temples and pyramids, the most documented titles are those of hry-sšt3/hry-sšt3 n king NN and scribal ones (see Kaplony, Rollsiegel II, 155 [Wsr-k3-f 17], 190-196 [S3hw-R 19, 24-26], 208-209 [Nfr-ir-k3-R 2], 221-224 [Nfr-ir-k3-R 18], 235-236 [Nfr-ir-k3-R/Nj-wsr-R 1], 266-267 [Nj-wsr-R 37], 284 [R³-nfr-f 3], 289 [Sp-k3-R'], 297-299 [Mn-kw-Hr 2], 314-315 [Dd-k3-R 7], 325-328 [Dd-k3-R 22-23], 344-345 [Wnjs 3], 350-352 [Wnjs 19], 449-450 [K.U. 23], 451 [K.U. 25], 456-457 [K.U. 36]. Seal-prints n. 3-5 [Snfrw 2], 219-220 [Nfr-ir-k3-R 12-14], 231-233 [Nfr-ir-k3-R 36-37], 252 [Nj-wsr-R 16], 319-320 [Dd-k3-R 12], 322 [Dd-k3-R 16], 335-336 [Dd-k3-R 33], 353 [Wnjs 22], 488 [K.U. 114], 489 [K.U. 116] were not taken into consideration on account of their extremely doubtful reading. See also De Cenival, in: RdE 27, 1975, 65 (tab. 1).

63 See notes 43 and 46 in the present paper.

64 H. Brunner, Der Bekannte des Königs, in: SAK 1, 1974, 55-60. For an overview of the discussion about the reading and meaning of the title see Baud, Famille royale, 107-113. In this paper we have privileged the reading “irq-ht nswt” instead of the short variant “rqh-nswt” since it appears closer to the Egyptian writing system (see also Jones, Index, 327 [1206] with further bibliography).

65 In this sense, it is also worth mentioning the fact that beginning from the VI dynasty the title seems to become simply honorific since it is less and less documented in the private mastabas of the Memphite necropolis (even for the owner’s sons who generally held this title during the previous period – in this regard see Baud, Famille royale, 93-94 (tab. 4) and it is not documented at all in the titularies of provincial officials and priests. See E. Brovarski, Akhmim in the Old Kingdom and First Intermediate Period, in: P. Posener-Kriéger (ed.), Mélanges Gamal Eddin Mokhtar, BdE 97/1, Le Caire 1985, 148-149.

66 See the recent suggestion by Barta to read the title as “Property Custodian of the King” (M. Barta, The Title “Property Custodian of the King” during the Old Kingdom Egypt, in: ZAS 126, 1999, 79-89). However, Barta’s reconstruction of the history of the titles shows many inaccuracies: contrary to what he says (ibid., 84-85), the irq-ht nswt title is recorded, ever since the IV dynasty, side by side with all the other titles pertaining king’s service and care like, for example, hry-5h, hry-sšt3 pr dwšt or hry-wd wb m hwtr-5nh; it seems, then, very unlikely that in the IV dynasty the title could have encompassed duties later replaced by the latter, more specific titles. He also suggests (ibid. 89) that “…during the latter half of the Fifth dynasty and during the Sixth dynasty, the title jrr-jht-nswt recurs in connection with the funeral services for the king in the mortuary temples. In this instance, the true nature of the title can be ascertained by the associated priestly titles, among others with that of hnty-3. In this specific context the holders of the property custodian of the king title probably execute a purely symbolic duty in connection with the funeral services for the deceased king”. However, as you can see in tab. 1 in the present paper, in most cases the irq-ht nswt title-holders do not have any title pertaining to the pyramid complex of the king and are not documented at all in the Abusir Papyri. Moreover, as we can see in the following pages, during the whole V dynasty the irq-ht nswt title is not particularly linked to the hnty-3 title.
In this sense, another title takes on particular interest in our analysis, that of hry-sšt3 n ntr.f. The 8 individuals who held this office under the Old Kingdom were concentrated during the V dynasty in the period spanning Userkaf and Djedkara’s reigns and were all attendants in the sun temples (just over 10% of the personnel) and pyramids. The fact that all these officials carried out contemporaneously duties associated with the king (like hry-sšt3 n ntr / hry-sšt3 n wdt-mdw nt nswt), his pyramid complex and/or his sun temple (like hm-ntr/wÓb), points to an effective identity, at least conceptual and symbolic, between king and divinity, very likely expressed through a common cult. The lack of the name of the specific god to whom the hry-sšt3 n ntr.f title did refer, whereas the name is always indicated in the case of the hm-ntr and wÓbw, would seem to bear out this supposition, while the substantial ambiguity and obscurity in the terminology may well have been intended to mask the sensitive reality.

In the line-up of priests and officials reviewed so far, we can find no mention at all, or very little evidence (19 individuals, about 25% of the total), of the highest offices both in politico – bureaucratic and economic circles, such as those concerning the five highest administrative Titles of the State as identified by Strudwick (imy-r šnw / šnwy,70; imy-r k3t/k3t nbt nt nswt71; imy-r pr-hd72/ imy-r prwy-hd; imy-r zS (w) nswt73; imy-r hwt wr74) and other slightly lower75 but nonetheless important titles in the central administration of Egypt in that time such as, for example, the administration of production activities (imy-r sSr / imy-r sSr nswt76, imy-r šwj pr-

which, in turn, seems to be mainly in opposition to that of hm-ntr as to practical and symbolic duties performed in the pyramid temple. Finally, as already said in the previous note, during the VI dynasty the hry-ht nswt title is less and less documented in the pyramid temples of the Memphite necropolis and this seems to be in contradiction with such an important, although mainly symbolic, role as the service in the royal mortuary cult.

68 Nfr-irt-n.f [32]: besides PM references, see also B. van de Walle, La chapelle funéraire de Neferirtenef, Bruxelles 1978, 17-40; Sšmw [40]; HÔ-bšw-Pth [49]; Ptš-spšs [57]; Hhnm-htp [60]: besides PM references, see also H. Altenmüller/A. Moussa, Das Grab des Nianchchnum und Chnumhotep, AV 21, Mainz 1977, 25-30; šh-mm-c-k3 [64]; Dwɔ-hp [65]; Sšbw-ibbi [80].
69 Indeed the only other title which is very frequently associated to the word “n ntr.f” and/or “n ntr f” is the title of jmšh/jmšhw hr which is generally considered, however, as a simple honorific title expressing the close symbolic proximity/association of its owner either to the king or to a specific god (in this sense, see the recent paper by J.P. Allen. Some aspects of the non-royal afterlife in the Old Kingdom, in: M. Barta (ed.), Old Kingdom Art and Archaeology, 2004, Prague 2006, 9-17. For a summary of the different position on the topic see Eyre, in: Powell (ed.), Labor, 21-24). As a matter of fact, contrary to the hry-sšt3 n ntr.f title, we can find the jmšh/jmšhw hr title in the beginning of almost all the funerary offering formulas of the Old Kingdom before the real sequence of titles. Taking into account this element, the two titles (hry-sšt3 n ntr.f and jmšhw hr ntr.f) seem, thus, to get a different meaning and value.
70 H thí [13]; Sšmw [40]; Sštpw [45]; Ni-kt-Rt* [51]: besides PM references, see also K.A.H. Awad, Untersuchungen zu Beamtentiteln des Nj-kt-Rt* anhand der Scheintür Nr. 64.91 in Cleveland Museum of Art, in: G. Moers et al. (Hgg.), jnt dr.w: Festschrift für Friedrich Junge I, Göttingen 2006, 73-87; Kš-m-snwr [66].
71 Dwɔ-Rt* [25]; Ni-kt-nh [30]; Sšmw [40]; HÔ-hwjw [46]: besides PM references, see also W.K. Simpson The Mastabas of Kawab, Khafkhufu I and II, Giza Mastabas III, Boston 1978, 21-27; Ty [56]; Imw-nfr [63]; šh-mm-c-k3 [64]; Sšbw-ibbi [80]. Among the highest offices of the Egyptian State recorded in the biographies of the sun temple personnel, the title of imy-r k3t/k3t nbt nt nswt is by far the most documented, maybe on account of its close relationship with several, minor offices involved in the daily administration of the State as well as the Royal Palace. As to the meaning and function of the titles see Strudwick, Administration, 217-250.
72 Ni-ktw-Pth [16]: besides PM references, see also Strudwick, The Overseer of Treasury Ny-Kšw-Pth, in: RdE 78, 1987, 139-146; Wr-ir-n [33]; Kš-m-kt [41].
73 Ty [56].
74 šh-mm-c-k3 [64].
75 As to the definition of high and low titles, see note 25 in the present paper.
76 Nw-hfr-k3 [20]; Kš-m-kt [41].
The management and distribution of foodstuffs (imy-r bḥt nbt nt nswt\(^77\)), the administration of production regions and farm workers (hrp hwwt Ṣt, hrp hwwt Ṣt Ḥdt, imy-r pr-nswt, imy-r prw msw nswt\(^78\), imy-r plhw\(^79\), imy-r wpt\(^80\), imy-r nswtyw\(^81\)), the direction of troops (imy-r mš\(^83\)), the direction of the “Work Place (in the Two Districts)” and the Great Council (imy-r gs-pr, imy-r dḥdt), the direction and management of the provinces, districts and desert borders and foreign lands (imy-r Šm\(^85\), imy-r zỉw Šm\(^86\), imy-r spwtr Šm\(^87\), ḥkḥwt Ṣt\(^88\), imy-r ḥāswt). All these titles were under the direction of the Vizier (tAyty zAb TAty), the most important office in the Egyptian State, which is not documented at all in the sun temple priestly staff\(^89\). In other words, these are the most important offices in the pharaonic state which had no direct involvement in the various, complex aspects of king’s existence both in this world and the afterlife.

We are now able to give an overview of the topic: during the period of construction of the sun temples, the same individuals were responsible for the celebration of kingship in all its forms and in all the places of its manifestation: in the earthly residence as well as in its otherworldly counterpart (pyramids and sun temples), where the ruler was probably celebrated according to analogous practices and rituals (see fig. 1).

\(^77\) Ka-m-smw [66].
\(^78\) Ni-kA-Ra [51]; Sndm-lb [58].
\(^79\) Ni-kA-Ra [51]; Ṭy [56].
\(^80\) Ṣm-n-kA [64]. According to E. Martin-Pardey, Gedanken zum Titel imy-r wpwt, in: SAK 11, 1984, 231-251, the imy-r wpwt title is not a variant of the imy-r wpt title since the former would have been linked to the expeditions while the latter to the administration of the provinces. For a general evaluation of the meaning of the title and its different readings, see Jones, Index, 88 [375], with further bibliography.
\(^81\) Dw3-Rt\(^9\) [25].
\(^83\) ṢSmw [40]; Ḥḥ-fwfw [46]. A somewhat different title (imy-r mš nfrw) is documented for Ḡr-hww [70]. Chevereau, Cadres Militaires, 19, considers the title one and the same with the imy-r mš although they seem to be two different titles: see Jones, Index, 142 [551-552] with further bibliography.
\(^84\) For the translation of the latter two titles see Jones, Index, 269 [969], 279 [1004], with further bibliography. Quite recently Moreno García, has suggested a different interpretation of the meaning and function of the two offices. See Moreno García, Études sur l’administration, 133-139; id., Administration territoriale et organisation de l’espace en Egypte au troisième millénaire avant J.-C. (V): gs-pr, in: ZÄS 126, 1999, 116-131.
\(^85\) Andrassy includes the direction of the Southern Provinces in the most important bureaux of the State depending by the Vizier and considers the Overseer of these Provinces (imy-r Šm) as the sixth highest title of the Central Administration besides the other five identified by Strudwick (see Andrassy, in: ZÄS 118, 1991, 4-5; id., Untersuchungen zum ägyptischen Staat, 109-112). The title, however, may have been introduced by Djedefra, thus partially explaining its absence in the epigraphic documentation into account, mostly dated before this king (see also Baer, Rank and Title, 274, 281-286; Kanawati, Governmental Reforms, 62-63). On the importance of the title in the provincial administration, particularly during the VI dynasty, see also E. Martin-Pardey, Untersuchungen zur ägyptischen Provinzialverwaltung bis zum Ende des Alten Reiches, HÄB 1, Hildesheim 1976, 96-99.
\(^86\) Dw3-Rt\(^9\) [25].
\(^87\) K3-pw-Pth [79].
\(^88\) Dw3-Rt\(^9\) [25].
\(^89\) In this regard, it is also worth noting that the title of zỉ-nswt, which is the most important one in defining (at least in theory) the bloody ties between its owner and the king (see also notes 43 and 46), was only documented for one person in the sun temple, namely Ḥḥ-fwfw [46]. This element seems to further support the general idea that the most important people both at Court and Central Administration were not concerned with the sun temples either in their daily administration or cult which were, in turn, carried out by lower officials. On the value and meaning of the zỉ-nswt title see: B. Schmitz, Untersuchungen zum Titel zỉ-njswt “Königssohn”, Bonn 1976, particularly 44-135; Baud, Famille royale, 162-188.
Just as in the royal palace the basic events in the king’s life (awakening, morning ablutions, clothing, mealtime) must have been “ritualised” and “theatricalised” according to a complex court etiquette, supervised by specific personnel, so in the sun temple and the pyramid the cult of the pharaoh, together with that of the god Ra, must have been founded on precise rules reflecting the protocol surrounding the living king and supervised by the same group of specialised officials who made up the king’s entourage and followed him wherever he “manifested himself” in his identity as the living Horus. Thus, we are obviously dealing with a divine cult of the monarch which was not restricted to a funerary perspective, in his pyramid complex, but also had a dimension concerning the present, in the sun temple and, for many aspects, in the royal palace too.

Forming select and trusted “bodyguards”, with the privilege of being in continuous contact with the king-god and charged with the security and care for his person, this array of officials/courtiers/priests of middle rank had nothing to do with the highest offices of the State, which were reserved for more prestigious dignitaries who were not usually in charge of the personal needs and cult of the pharaoh.

---

90 See also Nuzzolo, in: SAK 36, 2007, 228-229.
91 We must also bear in mind that the sun temples began to fulfil their function while their “builders” were still ruling, as shown by the Palermo Stone as to the sun temples of Userkaf and Sahura. See M. Nuzzolo, I templi solari della V dinastia: significato e pratiche culturali, in: La Pratica della Religione nell’Antico Egitto, Atti del X Convegno Nazionale di Egittologia e Papirologia (Roma 1-2 Febbraio 2006), Aegyptus 85, 2007, 75-101.
92 See also Goelet, Royal Palace, 610-612.
93 Baud, Famille royale, 306, notes that “les attestations de titres de la pyramide royale ne se rencontrent chez les ‘fils royaux’ qu’à la VIe dynastie”. This hypothesis seems to be also supported by the location of the
This cult organization seems to have undergone a significant change beginning from the reign of Djedkara and lasting throughout the VI dynasty: in this period we have no more evidence of $hm$-$nTr$ priests serving the ruling pharaoh but only $hm$-$nTr$ priests of his pyramid complex. Moreover, according to the epigraphic evidence of the Abusir papyri, the priests in charge of the funerary cult seem to have become increasingly specialised, limiting themselves to the cult and religious duties in the temple without maintaining any office (or only a few) in the royal palace. At the same time the palace provided a specific team of officials, pertaining to all ranks of the social hierarchy, who were detailed to the temple not only for particular festivities and religious ceremonies but, very likely, for its daily running. However, unlike the situation during the first part of the V dynasty, they usually do not seem to hold any sacerdotal functions (neither $hmw$-$nTr$ nor $w^qbw$) and do merely keep administrative prerogatives and duties.

tombs of these priests/officials in the Memphite necropolis. In fact, they were mainly buried at Saqqara (see tab. 1), in the area all around the Step Pyramid, thus quite far from their royal patrons. On the contrary, the most important people of the period, like for example the Viziers, were usually buried in the very northern part of the Saqqara necropolis (sometimes even in Abusir like the famous Pth-$\dot{sp}$ss, son-in-law of Niuserra: see Strudwick, Administration, 89-90, nr. 52) much closer to the royal necropolis. See A.M. Roth, The Organisation of Royal Cemeteries at Saqqara in the Old Kingdom, in: JARCE 25, 1988, 201-214.

Contrary to Baer’s opinion, Helck dates this cult reorganization from the reign of Niuserra when, according to him, the two titles ($hm$-$nTr$ of the king NN and $hm$-$nTr$ of the pyramid complex) would have been coexisting (see Helck, Beamtenstitel, 128; id., Bemerkungen zu den Pyramidenstädten im Alten Reich, in: MDAIK 15, 1957, 95). He also stresses the contemporary introduction of the title of supervisor of the priests (imy-$ht$ $hmw$-$nTr$) of king’s pyramid which should confirm, according to him, the proposed date of the reform in Niuserra’s reign (Helck, in: LA IV, 1086-1087, s.v. Priester, Priesterorganisation, Priesterstitel). In fact, however, the two titles ($hm$-$nTr$ of the king NN and $hm$-$nTr$ of the pyramid complex) seem to be contemporary documented, although sporadically, beginning from the reign of Userkaf (see tab. 1 in the present paper). As to the reasons of the reform, Baer, Rank and Title, 300-301, suggests a very practical explanation, namely a struggle for power between the royal authority and the new bureaucracy, while Helck, Überlegungen zum Ausgang der 5 Dynastie, in: MDAIK 47, 1991, 167, stresses the archaizing tendency of the political system in Egypt during the end of the V – beginning of the VI dynasty (see also Baud, Famille royale, 307-329 as to the relationship between the royal sons and the administration in the same period). However, this reforms seems to have had also actual religious/ideological implications particularly connected with the development of Kingship in the V dynasty (see notes 24 and 31 in the present paper and M. Nuzzolo, Sun Temples and Pyramid Texts: the king’s progress in the evolution of his cult, in: X. International Congress of Egyptologists, Rhodes 22-29 May 2008, forthcoming).

Amongst this personnel, all kinds of titles are mentioned, from the most important overseers of the different bureaus of the State, to the hairdressers, manicurists and musicians, i.e. more or less the same titles we have dealt with before. See Posener-Krieger, Les archives II, 588-609, particularly 589.

The question of the identity of these people is still far from clear, particularly for the period of the V dynasty before Djedkara whose reign most papyri date back to: most scholars believe that these individuals are not the same as those bearing the titles we know from private funerary context suggesting that they were only occasionally quoted in the archives because they would had been allowed by the king to benefit the royal income managed by the pyramid temple (see for example the case of Ni-$m^3$t$-s$sd who is quoted in the archives – Posener-Krieger, Les archives II, 590 – and may be the same as the fellow listed in tab. 1 in the present paper with n. [50]). Their titles should have thus been intended as mainly honorific/ceremonial and should not have implied a real participation in the daily cult rituals and duties that we know from the papyri (see for example Baer, Rank and Title, 247-248; Strudwick, Texts Pyramid Age, 29). However, Posener-Krieger notes that the epigraphic evidence of the Papyri seems to clearly confirm that “le service de $hm$-$nTr$ ou de $w^qbw$ d’un roi défunt n’était pas un vain mot, et que les avantages que l’on devait en tirer, et dont nous n’avons aucune idée précise, comportaient aussi une servitude dont on ne peut nier la réalité. Sans doute, les grandes personnages qui exerçaient des
This practice seems to find further confirmation in some official royal documents like Pepi I edict in favour of the pyramid complexes of Snefru at Dahshur. In the decree, the king of the VI dynasty seeks to tie the priests to this specific royal mortuary complex, setting out their respective duties and provisions.98

This context of change in the bureaucratic and priestly organization that characterised the latest part of the V and early VI dynasty may also give us the possibility to understand the role of another title held by the officials and priests we are dealing with, i.e. the title of hnty-š (see tab. 1). This office deserves a particular attention for its unknown meaning, concerning which none of the hypotheses advanced to date has found a general consensus99, as well as for its anomalous place within the ranking of titles we are examining.

98 Goedicke, Königliche Dokumente, 55-77 and Abb. V.
99 In the New Kingdom the term seems to indicate quite clearly a “gardener” (A. Erman/H. Grapow, Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache III, Leipzig 1971, 310, tab. 11) but this semantic valence has no counterpart in the context in which the office occurs during the Old Kingdom. Other translations have been proposed (“Pächter der königlichen Domänen”, “landowner”, “tenant farmer”, “métayer”, see A.H. Gardiner, Inscriptions from the tomb of Si-renpowet I, prince of Elephantine, in: ZÄS 45, 1908, 123-140; E. Meyer, Geschichte des Alten Reichs I, Berlin/Stuttgart 1909, § 244; H. Kees, Ägypten, München 1933, 30; H. Junker, Giza VI, Wien 1943, 15-19; Helck, Beamtentitel, 108-109; id., in: MDAIK 15, 1957, 98, 102-103; S. Schott, Aufnahmen vom Hungersnot-relief aus den Aufweg der Unaspyramide, in: RdE 17, 1965, 9-12) but without achieving a real consensus, since all imply a concrete, univocal link between the hntyw-š and land ownership (see also P. Andrassy, Die hntyw-š im Alten Reich, in: Gundlach/Roehholz (Hgg.), Ägyptische Tempel, 5, 12), a link which is undeniable in the case of the above-mentioned decree of Pepi I (see previous note for the bibliography) but not so self-evident in the rest of the documentation from the V and VI dynasty (Posener-Krieger, Les archives II, 578-579). In this period a translation reflecting the role played in the royal residence and the pyramid seems much more appropriate: for example “servant”, “pyramid official” (Borchardt, Ein Königserlass aus Dahschur, in: ZÄS 42, 1905, 4) or simply “palace/pyramid attendant” (A.M. Roth, A Cemetery of Palace Attendants, Giza Mastabas 6, Boston 1995, 1, 40-42). On the contrary Rainer Stadelmann, following and developing Posener-Krieger hypothesis, has suggested that the term hnty-š did not designate an office but rather a category of people born and living in the pyramid city, namely that particular “district”(i) connected with a specific pyramid complex, where they would have supervised various economic and religious aspects, drawing on the relative provisions and being tied with it personally and indissolubly until death (see Posener-Krieger, Les archives II, 577-581; Stadelmann, Die hntyw-š der Königsbezirk š n pr-š and the Namen der Grabanlage der Frühzeit, in: BIFAO 81 Suppl., 1981, 153-164). This hypothesis too, however, fails to completely account for their role since, side by side with the hntyw-š of the pyramid, we also have the hntyw-š of the royal palace (hntyw-š n pr-š) for which Stadelmann does not provide any adequate, convincing explanation. Explanation (indeed, his reading of the term pr-š as simply “king” and not “royal palace” does not admit the existence of a separate category of hntyw-š linked to the palace; see also Helck, Untersuchungen Beamtentiteln, 108-109). Quite recently other scholars have proposed a more general interpretation of the title that would sounds like “deputed to the working life of the pyramid/ palace” (Eyre, in: Powell (ed.), Labor, 35-36) although, to my mind, this formulation is still not completely satisfactory.
The title is epigraphically and archaeologically documented at least beginning from the V dynasty\textsuperscript{100} although, in this period, at least according to the private funerary inscriptions, these “personnel” seem to have been working predominantly in the royal palace\textsuperscript{101}.

Indeed, we have only scanty evidence of $\text{hntyw-š}$ of a pyramid complex\textsuperscript{102} (just 1 in the case of the sun temples personnel\textsuperscript{103}) while much more of $\text{hntyw-š n pr-š3}$ who also held other offices in king’s pyramids and sun temples (7 individuals, about 10% of sun temples personnel\textsuperscript{104}). Therefore, following the epigraphic records, two different categories of officials seem to be operating in this period, although both standing on a low social level\textsuperscript{105}: the $\text{hntyw-š}$ of a pyramid complex were exclusively linked to the pyramid and often named after the king they served; the $\text{hntyw-š}$ of the palace, belonging to a slightly upper rank and usually bringing no specific basilophorous name, were bound to the palace but were also “working” in the funerary and solar complexes of the king\textsuperscript{106}.

This dichotomy seems to drop off in the end of the V dynasty, once again in the period spanning the reigns of Djedkara and Unis. In this period, and even more in the VI dynasty, still

\textsuperscript{100} Contrary to Baer’s opinion (Rank and Title, 250, 272-273 and tab. 1), who dated its appearance in a royal funerary complex from the reign of Djedkara, the title “$\text{hntyw-š}$ of the pyramid” is surely documented from at least the beginning of the V dynasty although its existence seems to be strongly corroborated already in the IV dynasty (Baud, La date d’apparition des $\text{hnty-š}$, in: BIFAO 96, 1996, 13-28). Posener-Krieger (Les archives II, 579-580 and note 2) also suggests that this title should be traced back to the very beginning of the IV dynasty when the first monumental pyramids were erected (see also Stadelmann, in: BIFAO 81 Suppl., 1981, 153-154).

\textsuperscript{101} There is no certainty concerning the chronology of the $\text{hntyw-š}$ quoted in the Abusir papyri for the pyramid of Neferirkara and Neferefra since the documents are certainly dated to the time of Djedkara. However, it is not unlikely that such an organization of the cult and the administration of the royal funerary complex could date back to the reign of Neferirkara (Roth, Phyles, 77; Baud, in: BIFAO 96, 1996, 26-27), also considering that the example of Neferirkara’s pyramid has a strong counterpart in the archives of Neferefra’s pyramid (see Posener-Krieger, Les nouveaux papyrus d’Abousir, in: JSSEA 13/1, 1983, 153; id., M. Verner/H. Vymazalova (eds.), Abusir X – The Pyramid Complex of Raneferef: The Papyrus Archive, Prague 2006, 360-380, and particularly 372). See also Baud, Famille royale, 8, 307, and note 103 in the present paper as to the case of Dw3-R$c^2$ [25].

\textsuperscript{102} Stadelmann (BIFAO, Suppl. 81, 1981, 153-154) has suggested that in this period the $\text{hntyw-š}$ of a pyramid would have only represented a very low social category (without any title and monumental tomb) which lived in the cities built around the pyramid valley temples. Only later on, in the middle of the V dynasty, they would have managed to climb up the social ladder thanks to their prestigious birth place, i.e. the pyramid complex. This allowed them to receive their own titles and tombs.

\textsuperscript{103} Dw3-R$c^2$ [25]. This case is very doubtful: taking into account the way in which both $\text{hnty-š}$ and $\text{wšt}$ titles were written, they seem to be linked to the pyramid of Userkaf. However, it cannot be ruled out that in the case of $\text{hnty-š}$, which comes second, it may have been an autonomous title without any specific reference to a monument, as was the case for other titles documented without any specific reference (for instance the $\text{hry-sšt}$ title) as well as for the same $\text{hnty-š}$ title which is written twice alone on the abovementioned bas-reliefs in the funerary temple of Sahura’s pyramid (see note 100).

\textsuperscript{104} K3-i-hp [1]; AM 11467/9 [2]; H3b-nswt [3]; Nfr [10]; Pth-špss [12]; Nfr-kd [72]; Shm-k3 [73].


\textsuperscript{106} In fact, the titles held by these $\text{hntyw-š n pr-š3}$ (see also tab. 1 in this paper) are usually those of $\text{hry-sšt}$/$\text{hry-sšt}$ $\text{n nswt}$ and/or $\text{ir(w)šnl}$/$\text{ir(w) šnt}$, namely low ranking titles closely related to the taking care of the person of the king.
persisting the twofold division of the title-holders and their different rank, both categories appear to markedly increase in number and importance, sometimes even holding very important offices like that of Vizier. All the ḫntyw-š n pr-š, however, do not usually hold any other “cult office” (hm-ntr / wšt), either in pharaoh’s funerary temple or elsewhere, as well as, from the reign of Djedkara onwards, as recalled above, we have no more evidence of hmw-ntr associated to the name (and thus to the cult) of the living king.

As to the role of the ḫntyw-š, most of the information comes from the abovementioned papyrus archives of Abusir where they appear alongside the hmw-ntr in the ordinary and extraordinary management of pharaoh’s cult. Although they are generally recorded in the same columns as to duties and tasks accomplished in the temple, the two offices seem to differ principally in that the ḫntyw-š were responsible for clothing, adorning and purifying the cult statues, while the hmw-ntr fumigated them with incense and performed the consecration rituals such as, for example, the opening of the mouth.

Furthermore, the ḫntyw-š, and only them, were in charge of the transport and delivery of offerings (particularly the bovine meat) from the sun temple and royal residence to the pyramid temple and vice versa. In private context, the most important source is the autobiography of Wnì, overseer (imy-r) of the ḫntyw-š n pr-š in the reign of Pepi I: from his memories we know that these palace personnel were responsible for taking care of the king, supervising his toilettte, clothes, meals, etc.

In other words, both in the pyramid complex and the royal palace, the ḫntyw-š seem to operate like actual, private servants of the pharaoh (or his statues), standing half way between the real priestly staff (hm-ntr and wšt) and the administrative/bureaucratic one and fulfilling

107 Posener-Kriéger, Les archives II, 581. That the ḫntyw-š of the palace should have been more important of their counterpart of the pyramid, seems to be also supported by the fact that only the former, represented by their overseer (imy-r ḫntyw-š pr-š), were depicted in the relief decoration of Pepi II funerary temple, standing after the Vizier (see G. Jéquier, Le monument funéraire de Pepi II, Tome II. Le Temple, Le Caire 1938, pl. 46). For a different opinion about this twofold division of the ḫntyw-š see Andrassy (id., in: Gundlach/Rochholz (Hgg.), Ägyptische Tempel, 7-8), who maintains that the ḫntyw-š of the pyramid did not have any separate administration while directly depending on the ḫntyw-š of the royal palace.


109 For the epigraphic references, apart from the 8 ḫntyw-š quoted in note 70, see: PM III, appendix G 246-297, 413-416, 427-428, 585-588, 852-853, 858-866; Baer, Rank and Title, 249-251, 273 and tab. 1; Jones, Index, nr. 408-409, 709-712, 881-882, 1076-1077, 2530-2537, 3500-3504.

110 In the very end of the VI dynasty the king seems to have had a hm-ntr tpj only during his sed-festival celebration (E. Hornung/E. Staehelin, Studien zur Sedfest, Aegyptiaca Helvetica 1, Geneva 1974, 53). See also note 94 in this paper.

111 In fact there are very few records of the wšt title in the Abusir Papyri. Nevertheless, in these cases, they show a clear similarity in functions and duties to the hmw-ntr (see also Junker, Giza VI, 13-14) although they do not share the same rank in temple hierarchy, as Posener-Kriéger (id., Les archives II, 581-582) has pointed out. At any case, what is important to stress in this context, is that they both belong to the “priestly” main personnel of the funerary temple while the ḫntyw-š seem to stand on a different, somewhat lower level.


113 Posener-Kriéger, Les archives I, 47-52 and tab. I [c-d], tab. IV/2, tab. VII. In this sense, although the specific part of the Papyrus is not preserved, we can suppose that the hmw-ntr, and only them, would have been in charge of the consecration of these offerings during the rituals as in the case of the rituals for the statues.

some of the functions previously carried out by the heterogeneous temple personnel we described above, namely personal service to the king in all its forms\textsuperscript{115}.

On the contrary, they never have anything to do with taking care of the images of the gods and their cult, whether in pharaoh’s funerary temple or elsewhere\textsuperscript{116}, as well as they do not attend the rituals developed on the king’s statues in his pyramid temple as previously said. These duties were, in fact, performed by the $hmw$-$ntr$\textsuperscript{117} who seem, thus, to have been still in charge of the sole sacerdotal functions\textsuperscript{118}.

3 Conclusion.
To conclude, we can briefly summarize this paper as follows: at the beginning of the V dynasty the split of the cult places of the king, one featuring the other-worldly (pyramid), the other the worldly dimension (sun temple), tended to reinforce the dual but intrinsically indivisible nature of the pharaoh. Each was served by the same personnel ($hmw$-$ntr$ / $w^rbw$ with various functions), who were also directly linked to the palace and the personal care of the king.

With the disappearance of the sun temples, on the contrary, the cult of the pharaoh seems to have been again focused exclusively on the pyramid complex and the strictly funerary aspects of kingship, whose earthly and other worldly features (or, as Roth says, “human” and “divine” needs\textsuperscript{119}) were taken care of by two specific categories, the $hntyw$-$s$ on one hand and the $hmw$-$ntr$ / $w^rbw$ on the other (see fig. 1).

The latter were almost completely separated from king’s entourage\textsuperscript{120} and existed in parallel to the $hntyw$-$s$ inside king’s pyramid complex. On the other side, the $hntyw$-$s$ of the palace take the living king under their own care supervising all the faces of his life\textsuperscript{121}.

\textsuperscript{115}See also Roth, in: SAK Beihf 4, 1991, 179, 184-185. Taking into account all these elements concerning their role and functions, we can suggest that the $hnty$-$s$ title could be simply translated as “servant”, both of the royal palace and the pharaoh’s pyramid complex. In this sense the word $s$ in the title may have been intended very literary, at least in its original meaning, as a rectangular place/wall surrounding some kinds of very important buildings like the pyramid complexes, which we know were always bounded by an enclosure wall, and, why not, the royal palace itself. See also Stadelmann who suggests a translation of the $s$ $n$ pr-$et$ as “royal precinct” and, as a consequence, of the $hntyw$-$s$ $n$ pr-$et$ as “those who are in front of the royal precinct”. However, contrary to our opinion as recalled in note 99, he explains this precinct as the sole pyramid city and the $hntyw$-$s$ as its inhabitants. See Stadelmann in: BIFAO 81 Suppl., 1981, 153-164; id., La ville de Pyramide à l’Ancien Empire, in: RdE 33, 1981, 76-77.
\textsuperscript{116}Contrary to what Andrassy says (id., in: Gundlach/Rochholz (gg.), Ägyptische Tempel, 10, 12) the $hntyw$-$s$ are not documented either in the temples of the Gods or in private funerary cult before the Middle Kingdom. See also Roth, in: SAK Beihf 4, 1991, 184.
\textsuperscript{117}Maybe also by the $w^rbw$ although the documentation of the Abusir Papyri is not very exhaustive as to their functions and duties in the temple daily administration and cult. See note 24 in the present paper.
\textsuperscript{118}A very close example could be likely found in modern time in the Catholic Religion where there is a clear distinction, in the ordinary and extraordinary carrying out of the cult, between the real sacerdotal personnel (priests) and the lay one (deacons). The former, for instance, can consecrate the host and wine while the latter can only administrate them during the Mass. However, from a practical point of view, both are almost identically in charge of the administration, management and care of the Church and its cult instruments as well as of its properties. In this sense, we may conclude, with Andrassy: “…dass die $hntiw$-$s$ im Gegensatz zu den $hmw$-$ntr$ eine untergeordnete Rolle beim Kultvollzug und bei der Kultvorbereitung innehabten und den $hmw$-$ntr$ auch bei den profanen Arbeiten die Leistungs- und eventuell Aufsichts- Funktion über die $hntiw$-$s$ zukam…” (Andrassy, in: Gundlach/Rochholz (Hgg.), Ägyptische Tempel, 10).
\textsuperscript{119}Roth, in: SAK Beihf 4, 1991, 185.
\textsuperscript{120}Most of this priestly personnel ($hmw$-$ntr$/$w^rbw$) in fact does often show different administrative titles, as in the past, but generally no specific office directly linked to the taking care of the person of the king. For references to the complete sequence of titles see: PM III, appendix G 197, 200, 207, 209-220, 222, 251, 254-259, 267, 649, 665-676, 691, 704A-705, 837-847, 878, 882-889, 895-896; Baer, Rank and Title, 249-257 [tab 1-4];
To paraphrase Kantorowicz’s famous theory on kingship in medieval times\textsuperscript{122}, we can conclude by saying that, in the period of the construction of the sun temples, the two bodies of the king, the “physical” one, perishable and mortal, and the “political” one, incorruptible, invisible and eternal, were not really separated, as on the contrary seems to have been the case from the end of the V dynasty onwards, either in the cult practices or in the material and daily care of his person.

This duality and at the same time indissolubleness of the “royal essence” was served by a hierarchy that in the course of time became extensive and diversified, but was nonetheless substantially uniform, occupying the same physical, symbolical and ideological spaces.

\textsuperscript{121} This is evidently the general rule but exceptions are to be found since in some cases we can find people holding the title of \textit{hntyw-s} of the palace as well as of the pyramid. See Baud, in: BIFAO 96, 1996, 39-49; Roth, in: SAK Beiheft 4, 1991, 186, fig. 1 with bibliographical references to PM.

\textsuperscript{122} E.H. Kantorowicz, The King’s Two Bodies. A Study in Medieval Political Theology, Princeton 1957, XIII-XXVIII
Tab.1: The sun temple personnel according to the contemporary epigraphic sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name(^{123}/) Classification(^{124})</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>PM III</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>HM-nTr/(w^rb) R(^c) ST</th>
<th>Other offices ST(^{125})</th>
<th>HM-nTr/(w^rb) King(^{126})</th>
<th>HM-nTr/(w^rb) Pyr</th>
<th>Other offices linked to King/Palace/State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>K3-i-(hph^{127}) (1)</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>5,8-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>(\text{ÄM 11467/9}^{128}) (1)</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>5,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>(\text{Hib-nswt}^{129}) (1)</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>(M3-nfr) (1)</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>7,13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5]</td>
<td>(\text{Nfr-/hww}) (1)</td>
<td>Saq.</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>7,13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>(\text{Ws(-k3)}) (1)</td>
<td>Giza?</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>(\text{Ni-nH-Hmmw nmWw}^{130}) (1)</td>
<td>Va?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9]</td>
<td>(\text{Nfr}^{131}) (1)</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>(\text{Nfr}) (1)</td>
<td>Saq.</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W?</td>
<td>5,8-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[11]</td>
<td>(\text{Hgrdff-(htr)}^{132}) (1)</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>12,13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>(\text{Pth-(spss)}^{133}) (1)</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[13]</td>
<td>(\text{Iffi}) (1)</td>
<td>Saq B 10</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>16-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>(\text{Pth-(htp)}) (1)</td>
<td>Saq D 51</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[15]</td>
<td>(\text{Hnm-(htp)}) (1)</td>
<td>Saq D 49</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1-4,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>(\text{Ni-k3w-(Pth)}) (1)</td>
<td>Saq.?</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>(12),13,15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[17]</td>
<td>(\text{Pfr-r-nfr}) (1)</td>
<td>Saq.</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>Va?</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7,(12?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{123}\) Priest and officials are placed in chronological order. The names of priests holding titles in more than one sun temple are underlined in yellow. For further details on the hieroglyphic signs used to determine the name of the sun temple as well as the specific titles held by these fellows see also Nuzzolo, in: SAK 36, 2007, pl. 1-2.

\(^{124}\) Classification will be given only lacking the owner’s name and/or the Porter and Moss bibliographical reference.

\(^{125}\) In this column we included the \(\text{hry-s\(stt\)}\) title which for its very nature should be considered, however, as a separate category for it can not really stand with religious titles like \(\text{hm-nTr/w^rb}\) as well as administrative ones like \(\text{imy-r/shd \(pr\-s\(nswt\)}\).

\(^{126}\) In fact, only the \(\text{hm-nTr}\) title is associated with the name of a specific king while the \(w^rb\) title is documented as \(w^rb\ \text{nswt}\).

\(^{127}\) H. Schäfer (Hg.), Ägyptische Inschriften aus den königlichen Museen zu Berlin I, Leipzig 1913, 44-45.

\(^{128}\) Schäfer (Hg.), Ägyptische Inschriften I, 58 (ÄM 11661).


\(^{130}\) Schäfer (Hg.), Ägyptische Inschriften I, 60 (ÄM 11664).


\(^{132}\) B. van de Walle, in: JNES 36, 1977, 17-24 (RC 1684). The author gives a different date of the priest as \text{“VI dynasty”}.

\(^{133}\) A.O. Bolshakov, Studies on Old Kingdom Reliefs and Sculpture in the Hermitage, ÅA 67, Wiesbaden 2005, 210-227. The author gives a different date of the priest as \text{“mid Dynasty VI or later”}.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Saq.</th>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Va/W</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sn-nw-5nh</td>
<td>Saq. D 52</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ni-k3w-Hr</td>
<td>Saq. S 915</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>Va 134</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>5,7,12,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nn-hft-k3</td>
<td>Saq. D 47</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1-4,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sd3wg</td>
<td>Giza 1012</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Va 135</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Iti</td>
<td>Saq.</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>Va/b</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>7,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ty</td>
<td>Saq. C 15</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>CG 99,130</td>
<td></td>
<td>722</td>
<td>Va?</td>
<td>H?</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Dw3-Rc</td>
<td>Dahshur</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Tp-m-5nh</td>
<td>Saq. D 11</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>5,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hm-Mnw</td>
<td>Saq. D 11</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>Va/b</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Rsc-spss</td>
<td>Saq.</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ni-5nh-Rc nds</td>
<td>Saq.</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ni-k2-5nh</td>
<td>Saq. D 48</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>WH</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1,4-5,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Si3p-k3w</td>
<td>Saq.</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Nfr-irt-n.f</td>
<td>Saq. D 55</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>5-6,12,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Wr-irt-ni</td>
<td>Saq. D 20</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>5nh-ir.s</td>
<td>Saq.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Hp-dr138</td>
<td>Saq.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Wgfr-hr?</td>
<td>Saq.</td>
<td>258,139</td>
<td>Vb?</td>
<td>H?</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>CG 1719140</td>
<td>Saq.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H?</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Pth-spss</td>
<td>Saq. D 54</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,12,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Ni-M5r-Pth</td>
<td>Saq. D 24</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>9-10,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>S5nw</td>
<td>Saq. LS 5</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>5-6,12,14,16,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Ki-m-kd</td>
<td>Saq. LS 14</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>5,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Dw3-n-Rc</td>
<td>Saq. D 61</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Wr-ir-n-Pth</td>
<td>Saq.</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>WH</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>5,7,12,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Ni-k3w-Rc</td>
<td>Saq.</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>5,7,12,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Shtpw</td>
<td>Saq.</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Hfd-Hwfw</td>
<td>Giza 7150</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>5,11-12,14,18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

134 Baer’s dating of this priest is “Djedkara or later”.
135 Baer’s dating of this priest is “VI dynasty”.
137 Borchardt, Statuen I, 183 (CG 310).
138 Borchardt, Denkmäler I, 23 (CG 1349).
139 PM VIII, 258 (801-203-350).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Slnm-k3</th>
<th>Saq. E 9</th>
<th>596</th>
<th>Vb</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>HW</th>
<th>5,7,12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Ilti</td>
<td>Giza 6030</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Hf-b3w-Pth</td>
<td>Saq. D 42</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>5-7,9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ni-m3T-sd</td>
<td>Saq. D 56</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>Vb/c</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>5,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Ni-k3-R*</td>
<td>Saq.</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7,11-12,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Smmw</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>Vb?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Nd-m3Tr</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Vb?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>CG 5703</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Vb?</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>K3-m-nfrt</td>
<td>(1,3,5)</td>
<td>Saq. D 23</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Ty</td>
<td>(2-5)</td>
<td>Saq. D 22</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Pth-spss</td>
<td>(1,3,5)</td>
<td>Saq. C 1</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Sndm-lb</td>
<td>(1,3)</td>
<td>Saq. D 28</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Ni-3nh-Hmnw</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Saq.</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Hnm-Htp</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Saq.</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Ni-m3Tr-R*</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Giza</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Inpw-Htp</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Giza</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Inpw-nfr</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Abusir</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>3nh-m*n-k3</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Saq. D 16</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Dw3-hp</td>
<td>(3,5)</td>
<td>Saq. D 59</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>Vb</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>K3-m-smw</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Saq.</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>Vb/c</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HW 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>M3Tr-hrw-hr-Pth</td>
<td>(3,5)</td>
<td>Saq. S 916</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>Vb/c</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>DmD</td>
<td>(2-3)</td>
<td>Saq. D 22</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>Vb/c</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Htp-hr-3hti</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Saq. D 60</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>Vb/c</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Nh3-t3s</td>
<td>(3,5)</td>
<td>Saq. D 67</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>Vb/c</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

141 James (ed.), Hieroglyphic texts I, 23 (BM 65953).
143 Baer’s dating of this priest is “VI dynasty”.
144 The tomb of this priest, who has no reference in PM publication, has been recently found in Abusir by the Czech Archaeological Mission directed by Prof. Miroslav Barta who friendly communicated me this discovery. I’m very grateful to him for giving me the permission to include this official in the present table only for a comparison of all titles of priest and officials involved in the sun temples administration and cult. For a first bibliographical reference to this tomb, see M. Barta, Equal in rank, different in the afterlife. The late Fifth and the late Sixth Dynasty burial chambers in Abusir South”, in: L. Evans (ed.), Ancient Memphis: “Enduring is the Perfection”. Proceedings of the International Conference held at Macquarie University, Sydney on August 14-15, 2008, Leuven (forthcoming).
145 This is the only case in the whole Old Kingdom where the w'b title is linked to the name of a specific king.
146 This priest is erroneously quoted as Pth-m3Tr-hrw in Nuzzolo, in: SAK 36, 2007, 241-246, pl. 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>ST Date</th>
<th>CG</th>
<th>CG Title</th>
<th>Other Titles</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Qw-hw Hm</td>
<td>Giza LG 95</td>
<td>Vb/c</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7,12,13,18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Nfr-kt</td>
<td>Giza 1151</td>
<td>Vb/c</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>5,7-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Shm-k3</td>
<td>Giza 1029</td>
<td>Vb/c</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>5,7-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Hm-R</td>
<td>Saq. 643</td>
<td>Vb/c</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Nfr-irt-Pth</td>
<td>Saq. D 53</td>
<td>Vc</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>5,7,10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Hnw</td>
<td>Giza</td>
<td>Vc</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>*nh-m c-R</td>
<td>Saq. D 40</td>
<td>Vc</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>5,9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>K3-m ng</td>
<td>Giza 7211</td>
<td>Vc</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>K3-pw-Pth</td>
<td>Saq. 693</td>
<td>Vc</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>5,7,11-12,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Sibw-ibbi</td>
<td>Saq. E 1-2</td>
<td>Vd/VIa</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>5-6,12,13,14,17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations**

- Col. “Name”: (1) = Userkaf’s ST; (2) = Sahura’s ST; (3) = Neferirkara’s ST; (4) = Neferefra’s ST; (5) = Niuserra’s ST; (6) = Menkauhor’s ST.
- Col. “Date”: Va = Userkaf-Sahura; Vb = Neferirkara-Niuserra; Vc = Menkauhor-Djedkara; Vd/VIa = Unis-Tetri.
- Col. “Other offices ST”: X = imy-r; imy-r/shd pr šn; imy-r hwf-smr and other minor titles; Y = hry-sšt.
- Col. “Other offices linked to King/Palace/State”: 1 = hpr šny; 2 = hry-sšt n pr-dwšt; 3 = hry-wdb m hw tšn; 4 = smr wbty; 5 = hry-sšt/hry-sšt n nsaw/hry-sšt n nbš/hry-sšt NN; 6 = hry-sšt n ntr.f; 7 = hry-hl nsaw/hrp nsaw pr-š; 8 = hny-š (and variants); 9 = ir(w) šn/br(w) šmr (and variants); 10 = iry/hrp/hrp nfr-hšt and/or imy-r hkr nsaw; 11 = wr 10 Šmr; 12 = different titles of juridico-legal sphere (iwn knmwt, mhw-rhyt, y(y)-nt hntt, hm-ntr Mšt, zšb, zšb *d-mr, zšb hry Nhnt, etc.), titles associated to the wd-c-mdw and/or titles associated to the hwf wrt; 12a = imy-r hwf wrt; 13 = titles linked to the scribal activities in all its ranks (zš, imy-r zš, shd zš, etc.) and fields of interest (zšb zš/zšb imy-r zš/zšb shd zš, titles associated to the iry išh/spr and/or to the iry-mdšt); 13a = imy-r zš *w(n) nsaw; 14 = imy-r št nbt nt nsaw/kšt nsaw; 15 = imy-r pr-hšd; 16 = imy-r šwnt/šnty; imy-r šwnt nsaw; 17 = imy-r šmwt, wr hpr šmwt, hpr šmwt (and variants); 18 = imy-r mš / imy-r mš nfrw.

---

147 H. Ranke, Die ägyptischen Personennamen I, Glückstadt 1935, 81 (16), 266 (4), gave a different pronunciation as Hwvj-wj-wr.
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