ABSTRACT
The present study analyses two epithets related to the Egyptian activities abroad: “who brings the produce from the foreign countries” (inn(.w) hr(y.w)t m hšš.wt) and its variants, and “who places the fear of Horus in the foreign countries” (dd(.w) nrw hrw m hšš.wt). As with other Old Kingdom epithets, they have generally been overlooked as informative data on the administrative roles and vital experiences of their holders. In order to evaluate their potential significance as sources of information, both expressions are brought into connection with the titles of their holders and related biographical accounts. As a result, the epithets become complementary data that help to profile the actual functions and actions of these officials. For the sake of completion, certain titles related to the acquisition of intelligence are also included in this study. Moreover, further thoughts on the possible origins and values of Old Kingdom epithets are also presented.

RESUMEN
El presente trabajo estudia dos epítetos asociados a las actividades egipcias en el extranjero: “quien trae los productos de las tierras extranjeras” (inn(.w) hr(y.w)t m hšš.wt) y otras expresiones similares, y “quien pone el terror que inspira Horus en las tierras extranjeras” (dd(.w) nrw hrw m hšš.wt). Como otros epítetos del Reino Antiguo, éstos han sido habitualmente infravalorados como información efectiva sobre las funciones administrativas y las vivencias de quienes los detentaron. Para valorar su posible importancia como fuentes de información, ambos epítetos se han estudiado junto con los títulos y textos biográficos de sus poseedores. El resultado es que ambas expresiones son relevantes para entender y precisar mejor las responsabilidades y acciones de dichos oficiales en el extranjero. En aras de una mayor exhaustividad, también se analizan algunos títulos relacionados con el servicio de inteligencia durante este periodo. Por último, se presentan algunas reflexiones sobre los posibles orígenes y significados de los epítetos durante el Reino Antiguo.
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In 2001 Donald Leprohon raised a series of questions regarding the informative value of several private epithets in Middle Kingdom rock inscriptions at Wadi Hammamat. He finally concluded that “far from being banal and randomly chosen, private laudatory epithets can further help us gain an insight into the mind of an ancient Egyptian official who wished to commemorate his activities for posterity”.

Even though Middle Kingdom graffiti are richer in information than their Old Kingdom counterparts, Leprohon’s view on the usefulness of epithets for profiling the functions of officials can be extrapolated to earlier periods. In this respect, the following pages will deal with some Old Kingdom epithets and, to a lesser degree,

---

1 This study was made possible by a research grant (HAR2014-58242-P) from the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (MINECO). I am extremely grateful to J. Córdoba for inviting me to participate in this Festschrift. I am also indebted to Anna Garnett for checking and improving greatly my English (except for the catalogue). I also thank Juan Pablo Víta and Palmiro Notizia for information on sealing practices in the Levant and Mesopotamia. Any errors or oversights are mine alone.

2 Leprohon 2001: 139.
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The epithets and titles will be studied separately in the initial sections of this chapter. They will firstly include the epithets “who brings the produce/royal exotica/luxuria from the foreign countries” (inn(.w) hry(.w)t/hkr ny-swt m hıs.wt) and similar expressions related to the import of foreign products to Egypt; and secondly, official titles connected with the acquisition of information abroad (i.e. intelligence) will be addressed; and thirdly, the epithet, “who places the fear/respect of Horus in the foreign countries” (dd(.w) nrw Hrw m xAs.wt), which is closely connected to the first group of epithets, will be studied. 

Despite not being epithets, the titles in the second group have been included for the sake of completion of the issue of procurement of foreign goods by the Egyptians. Subsequently, both epithets and titles will be analysed with regards to other offices of their holders to identify common patterns or, alternatively, different trends in their careers. Finally, the epithets under study will be discussed as reliable sources of biographical information.

This study is the first of a series of papers by this author that will deal with several Old Kingdom titles and words connected to the acquisition and management of foreign products. I wish Covadonga could have read this paper. Despite being far from her main research interests, the following pages deal with the contacts between Egypt and its neighbours, a subject dear to her that she addressed several times, especially when dealing with Naucratis.

1. Epithets referring to hkr ny-swt, hry(.w)t and lnw from the foreign lands

The lives and careers of Old Kingdom officials are generally approached by means of three different groups of textual information: their string of titles and epithets, their genealogy and their biographical accounts. This data is mainly accessed from their tombs, but also from other sources such as rock inscriptions, statues and papyrus. These sources can sometimes be interconnected with each other and with other types of evidence, such as anthropological data.

Titles and epithets are, by far, the most common sources of information. While Egyptian titles have been the focus of many studies, epithets have generally been overlooked as evidence for the activities that their holders carried out. They can, however, be illuminating, as is the case of the epithets that will be analysed in this chapter.

The epithets studied in this section have sometimes been considered as extensions of certain titles. Here, however, they will be studied as expressions on their own, as they are not clearly related to a single title and they sometimes appear alone (1.02/3.02, 1.07, 1.11) (see table I). Leaving aside one example (1.01), all their attestations can be dated to the 6th dynasty. They are introduced by the verb “to bring” (in), followed by different words related to products that come “from the foreign countries” (m hıs. wt nb). As with many other epithets, they are tenseless and impersonal expressions. Similarly to other examples, the verb is a transitive imperfective active participle that

---

5. 1.11 is also not well dated. Eichler (1993: 95, no. 201) places it in the 6th dynasty as it is related to other graffiti of similar date and because of the presence of the title imy-ir.ty. Similar epithets and expressions are rarely attested in later periods, see, e.g., Favry 2005: 271-274, no. 187 (in.n(z) lnw.w <m> nb-s); Rothe, Rapp, Miller 2008: 254 (BZ06); Brown, Darnell 2013: 135 (in(.w) inr.w=s <m> hıs.wt rsy(.w)t).
6. For an epithet with the same prepositional expression see Jones 2000: 339, no. 1254 (irr(.w) mrrt nb-f m hıs.wt).
refers to regular, repeated or customary actions, i.e. “the one who brings” (*inn(.w)). The products brought are defined as, “royal *exotica/luxuria* (*hkr ny-swt*) (1.01; 1.03; 1.04; 1.05; 1.11), *hry(.w)t*, (“produce”)(1.02; 1.04; 1.05; 1.06/2.04/3.05; 1.07; 1.08; 1.09), and in one instance as “imported royal *exotica/luxuria*” (*inw n hkr ny-swt*) (1.06/2.04/3.05). This set of epithets is attested in different variants that have been grouped in three main sections (see also tables I-II):

a) Epithets referring to the bringing of *hkr ny-swt*:
   - “who brings the royal *exotica/luxuria* from the southern foreign countries” (*inn(.w) hkr ny-swt m hšs.wt rṣy(.w)t*) (1.01 (?), 1.03, 1.10).
   - “who brings the royal *exotica/luxuria* that loves his lord from all the foreign countries” (*inn(.w) hkr ny-swt m hšs.wt nb(.wt) mrr(.w) nb=f*) (1.04).
   - “who brings the royal *exotica/luxuria* from the foreign countries […] before his lord” (*inn(.w) hkr ny-swt hṛ hšs.wt […]hṛ nb[=f]*) (1.11).

b) Epithets referring to the bringing of *inw n hkr ny-swt*:
   - “who brings the imported royal *exotica/luxuria*” (*inn(.w) inw n hkr ny-swt*) (1.06/2.04/3.05).

c) Epithets referring to the bringing of *hry(.w)t*:
   - “who brings the produce of the foreign countries to his lord” (*inn(.w) hry(.w)t hšs.wt n nb=f*) (1.02, 1.08, 1.09).
   - “who brings the produce of all the foreign countries to his lord” (*inn(.w) hry(.w) t hšs.wt nb(.wt) n nb=f*) (1.06/2.04/3.05, 1.07).
   - “who brings the produce of the foreign countries to his god” (*inn(.w) hry(.w)t hšs.wt n nTr=f*) (1.04).
   - “who brings the produce of the southern and northern foreign countries to the king” (*inn(.w) hry(.w)t hšs.wt rṣy(.wt) mḥty(.wt) n ny-swt*) (1.05).
   - “who brings the produce of the foreign countries […]?” (*inn(.w) hry(.w)t hšs.wt […]?*) (1.05).

---

10 Jones 2000: 307, no. 1118; 276, no. 1044; 769-770, no. 2797.
11 This epithet and the former example are not listed by Jones 2000.
15 Not recorded by Jones 2000.
### Table 1. Order (expressed in numbers) of the epithets in connection with similar expressions. Greyed columns mark officials dated to the 6th dynasty. Superscript letters indicate different attestations of the epithets. Superscript numbers refer to the following notes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>1.01</th>
<th>1.02/3.02</th>
<th>1.03/4.03</th>
<th>1.04</th>
<th>1.05/4.04</th>
<th>1.07</th>
<th>1.08/8.06</th>
<th>1.09/3.05</th>
<th>1.10/3.09</th>
<th>1.11/3.11</th>
<th>2.05/3.08</th>
<th>3.01</th>
<th>3.10</th>
<th>3.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inn(.w) hkr ny-swt m hıs.wt</td>
<td>2nd to 4th dynasty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2♂</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inn(.w) hry(.w) t hıs.wt n nb=f</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1♂</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td>1♂</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1♂</td>
<td>1♂</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inn(.w) inw n hkr ny-swt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ddk(.w) nrw [hrw m hıs.wt] | - | 1 | 1 | - | 3♀ | - | - | 1♂ | 1b | 2♂ | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1?
| Other | 1♀ | - | - | - | 4♂ | 1♀ | 1♂ | 2♀ | - | - | 1♀ | - | - |

1. imy-ib smnty(.w) mrr(.w) nb=f
2. The complete epithet is inn(.w) hkr ny-swt m hıs.wt nb mrr(.w) nb-f
3. irr(.w) hısst n nb-f
4. imy-ib n nb=f irr(.w) hısst nb-f
5. imy-ib n nb=f irr(.w) hısst nb
6. imy-ib n nb-f
7. wHm(.w) mdw hrw
8. wHm(.w) mdw hrw n ūms-f 'nlt hrw m hıs.wt
9. Not precisely an epithet but the title under study: hry-sStA n mdwt nb(.wt) [inn m hıs.wt nb?]

The word *hkr ny-swt* is mainly connected to the earlier holders of the epithet (from the 5th to the mid-6th dynasty) (1.01, 1.03, 1.04, 1.06/2.04/3.05, 1.10, 1.11). Its meaning has long been debated by Egyptologists. Any interpretation of the term is based on the Old Kingdom logogram *hkr* (Gardiner’s sign list Aa31) and the contexts and titles in which it is mentioned. The logogram is attested from the reign of Peribsen onwards. Initially, it was interpreted as an upside-down travertine vase with veining, but it is also closely related to Gardiner’s sign list X3, the “drop-/egg-shaped copper hieroglyph”. The hieroglyph shows a wide range of shapes and colours (white, yellow, red, blue). According to these signs it could depict gold and copper objects, but it could also refer to some minerals, as the inverted travertine stone vase and its veining suggests.

Bearing in mind the different shapes and colours of its logogram, and the ambiguity of their meaning in the texts, the word *hkr* probably refers to a generic term. For instance, it has been translated as “royal ornament”, “royal adornment” or “royal insignia” based on

---

18 Kahl 2004: 376; Regulski 2010: 217; 734.
19 See Griffith in Davies 1900: 37; Fischer 1988: 52; Collombert 2010: 163, §326. For another example of an object with veining see Fischer 1991: 23-25.
20 Brovarski 2008; according to Herslund (2015) Gardiner’s sign list X3 depicts a copper melting furnace. On the other hand, Hussein (1997) suggests that the *hkr* logogram could depict a lamp, as the sign is similar to Gardiner’s sign list Q7.
21 Brovarski 2008.
22 Fakhry 1938.
the meaning of hkr as “ornament”.23 Even though the semagram relates the term to mineral objects, different texts—such as the epithets studied here—suggest that it comprised a wider range of precious products such as gold, linen, ointments and, probably, other metals and minerals kept in a department of the treasure (pr-hq).24 The absence of alternative semagrams for the word (i.e. the three circles suggesting mineral products) points again to the fact that it referred to a general idea, as is also seen below with the word hry(w)t. Both terms are actually interchangeable in the expressions under study. Moreover, the epithets point to the fact that hkr ny-swt comprises imported luxury items.25 A sealing of Neferirkare from the Egyptian factory of Buhen in Nubia could also refer to the imported nature of the hkr ny-swt, as it includes the titles “the one who is charge of the secrets of the hkr ny-swt [...]” ([hry-sš]t3 hkr ny-swt [...]), and “under-supervisor of the prospectors” (imy-hi smnty(w)).26

The hkr ny-swt, among other uses, was given to the officials and palace workers as a reward and, as will be stated below, it also could have served as material for trading with foreign countries. Bearing these circumstances in mind, a translation of hkr ny-swt as “royal luxuria/exotica” fits better with the epithets under study than the traditional “royal ornaments/regalia”.27

As stated above, the word hry(w)t served as a substitute of hkr ny-swt in several variants of the epithet (1.02, 1.04, 1.05, 1.06/2.04/3.05, 1.07, 1.08, 1.09). It is the plural or collective nisba of the preposition “which is at, under” (xr). As hkr, it also doesn’t include semagrams. Consequently, it can be translated as a generic term referring to “affair”, “produce”, “possession”, or “need”.28 When connected to the epithet studied here, hry(w)t is usually translated as “foreign products”,29 but it should only be considered simply as “produce”, as is also evident from a similar expression in the Pyramid texts.30 The word with a similar meaning is rarely attested elsewhere. It is possibly mentioned in a title on another sealing of Menkaure from Buhen: “the overseer of the produce (?) of the smnty(w)-prospectors” (imy-r smnty(w) xry(w)t (?)).31 Other occurrences of the term are present in the Pyramid texts and in some funerary expressions carved on the walls of private tombs, but they do not refer to private or royal products.32

A similar general treatment can be seen in the composite expression inw n hkr ny-swt that is attested only once as a synonym of the previous terms (1.06/2.04/3.05). The precise economic meaning of inw has been discussed by many scholars.33 Here, a general translation as “produce” or “import” (i.e. “what is brought”) fits well with the general meaning of the epithets related to it. In fact, inw is the most frequent general expression used to refer to the foreign products in the biographies. Herkhuf (1.06/2.04/3.05) “bring(s) every produce (inw) from this foreign region (Yam) in great quantity”, and Iny/Inudjefau (1.04) brought “lapis lazuli, lead/tin, silver, sfT-oil and every good produce (inw nb nfr)

---

23 See, e.g., the different translations given by Nord 1970.
25 The nature and management of hkr ny-swt in the Old Kingdom is the subject of a forthcoming article by the author.
26 Kaplony 1981: 227-228, pl. 69, no. 28 = nfr-lr-k3-r=r 28; Jones 2000: 297, no. 1084.
27 Aufrère 2003: 14 translates it as “le tribut exotique”. Moreover, the Middle Kingdom nomarch of Elephantine Sarenput (I) held the title “overseer of every tribute in every entrance of the foreign countries as hkr ny-swt” (imy-r gš.wt nfr r=r hš.s.wt m hkr ny-swt), see Favry 2005: 239-241, no. 163.
28 Wb. III 318, 10 – 319, 14; Hannig 2003: 965 (23968), {23978}, {23980}.
29 Hannig 2003: 965 (23979).
30 PT 248 § 263a: “who brings the produce of the heaven to Re daily” (inw(w) hry(w)t hryt n r=r hrw nb).
32 For a list of occurrences see, e.g., Hannig 2003: 965 (23968), {23978}, {23980}.
that his ka (of his majesty) desired”. Moreover, it is one of the oldest terms mentioning such imports, as it is already attested in the 1st dynasty in the expression “foreign import” (\textit{inw h\textsuperscript{st}t}).

### 2. Epithets/titles referring to information from the foreign lands

Aside from the aforementioned epithets are some titles that could be connected to the bringing of other foreign goods into Egypt. However, they do not mention materials or physical commodities, but abstract ideas: useful information on foreign countries and people or, in other words, intelligence. All their holders can be dated to the 6th dynasty. Leaving aside one exception connected with the title “overseer” (\textit{imy-r}) (2.01), all of them are related to the title \textit{hry-s\textit{s}t\textit{b}}, “keeper of the secrets”\cite{37} which, as will be seen below, is part of the blurred boundary that separates titles from epithets.\cite{38}

Almost all the titles headed with the expression \textit{hry-s\textit{s}t\textit{b}} are, according to Baud, \textit{Beititeln}\cite{39} or, in other words, descriptive or explicative titles on the functions connected to regular titles.\cite{40} For this reason, they rarely appear in connection with usual administrative practices. For instance, they are barely attested in the Abusir papyri.\cite{41} However, they are well attested from official seals (\textit{Amstsieglern})\cite{42} where many epithets, religious titles and expressions were carved along with regular administrative titles in order to picture and better individualize the profiles of their given, but unnamed holders.\cite{43} Generally speaking, titles with the \textit{hry-s\textit{s}t\textit{b}} heading underline the privileged status of their holders as officials with access to some kind of restricted knowledge,\cite{44} referring to specified experience and skill in mentioned fields of action and to related regular titles.\cite{45}

As stated above, these titles have been included in this article despite their status, for the sake of completion of the study of the bringing of foreign products and information. They can be separated in two groups:

- **Expressioins which explicitly mention the bringing of information:**
  - “keeper of the secrets of everything that is said that is brought from the narrow entrance to the foreign countries and the southern foreign countries” (\textit{hry-s\textit{s}t\textit{b} n mdwt nb(t) innt m r-\textsuperscript{3} g\textit{sw} h\textit{\textsc{hs}}\textit{wt} m h\textit{\textsc{hs}}\textit{wt} rsy(.w)t}) (2.03).\cite{46}
  - “keeper of the secrets of every secret that is said that come from the narrow entrance of Elephantine” (\textit{hry-s\textit{s}t\textit{b} n mdwt nb(t) \textit{st}\textit{t} iwt m r-\textsuperscript{3} g\textit{sw} n 3bw}) (2.03).\cite{47}
  - “keeper of the secrets of everything that is said [that is brought from all the foreign countries (?)]” (\textit{hry-s\textit{s}t\textit{b} n mdwt nb(t) [innt m h\textit{\textsc{hs}}\textit{wt} nb(t)]}) (2.05/3.08).

---

34 See respectively Urk. I 125, 6 (\textit{in.n(z-i) inw m h\textsc{hs} tn r \textsc{st} wrt}); Marcolin, Diego Espinel 2011: 581-582 ((\textit{in.n(z-i) h\textsc{hs}d h\textsc{hti h}t\textsc{f} inw nb nfr nr mr.n kizf}).
35 Ogdon 1982; Bleiberg 1996: 36, no. 14; 139, n. 26; 37-38.
36 On some intelligence practices during the Old Kingdom see Diego Espinel 2008.
38 Fischer 2002: 18. For instance, Beatty (2000: 62) has rightly pointed out that titles headed with \textit{hry-s\textit{s}t\textit{b}} manifest “various aspects of behaviour rather than a qualitatively distinct type of behaviour which must be pigeonholed under the rubric of functional or honorific”.
39 Baud 1999: 270; see also Franke 1984: 107, n. 2.
43 Nolan 2010: 65. See also below.
47 Jones 2000: 624-625, no. 2288.
- “keeper of the secrets of every secret that is said [...]” ([ḥr-s]ššt n mdwt nb(t) šš[t][t] [...]?) (2.05/3.08).
- “keeper of the secrets of every secret that is said in the head of the south” ([ḥr-s]ššt n mdwt nb(t) šš[t] n(t) tp-rsy) (2.07).
- “keeper of the secrets of every secret that is said in the narrow entrance to/of Elephantine/foreign countries (?)” ([ḥr-s]ššt3 n mdwt nb(t) šš[t] n t r-ʾ3 gšw ʾbw/ ḫšš.wt (?) ) (2.08).
- “keeper of the secrets of the narrow entrance of the southern desert regarding all [the secrets] (?) that are said” ([ḥr-s]ššt3 n r-ʾ3 gšw ḫšš rš(yt) m mdwt nb[t] šš[t](t)] (?) ) (2.09).48

b) Expressions which do not explicitly mention the bringing of intelligence:
- “keeper of the secrets regarding every command of the entrance to the foreign land” ([ḥr-s]ššt3 m ṣḏt-mdw nb t n r-ʾ3 ḫšš) (2.01).49
- “keeper of the secrets of the king regarding every [secret] command of the entrance to the foreign land” ([ḥr-s]ššt3 n ny-sw t m ṣḏt-mdw nb[t] [šš[t] n t r-ʾ3 ḫšš]) (2.01).50
- “keeper of the secrets regarding every command of every entrance of the southern foreign lands” ([ḥr-s]ššt3 m ṣḏt-mdw nb t n r-ʾ3 nb n ḫšš.wt rš(yt)(w)) (1.06/2.04/3.05).51
- “keeper of the secrets of everything that is said in the head of the south (who is in the heart of his lord)” ([ḥr-s]ššt3 n mdwt nb(t) nyt tp-rsy (imy-ib n nb=f)) (1.06/2.04/3.05).52
- “keeper of the secrets of everything that is said in the narrow entrance of Elephantine” ([ḥr-s]ššt3 n mdwt nb(t) n t r-ʾ3 gšw n ʾbw) (2.06).53

Titles headed with [ḥr-s]ššt3 were held by officials close to the king, and were tightly related to delicate actions which implied discretion. At the same time, these titles would have been an official recognition of that quality.54 They would have been connected to several fields of hidden knowledge ([s]šš[t]): royal or palace secrets (i.e. state secrets), hidden temple ritual, science and religion, medicine, astronomy, the “house of life” (pr-ʾnh) institution, and secret skills of different handicrafts and arts.55 The titles in question draw attention to an additional field: the information that comes from abroad, literally “everything that is said” (mdwt nb) that, in some instances, is defined as secret when determined by šššt.

As seen below, these intelligence offices were held by high-ranking officials concerned with the import of exotica from abroad, either in close contact with the court and the king, in more distant spheres as the provincial administration, or with the expeditions sent abroad by themselves.56 Occasionally, šššt may refer to highly valuable materials or

---

48 The last five epithets are not attested in Jones 2000.
49 Jones 2000: 618, no. 2266, see also Fischer 2002: 29, no. 2266.
50 Jones 2000: 629, no. 2305.
51 Not attested in Jones 2000.
52 Jones 2000: 625-626, no. 2290.
53 Jones 2000: 623, no. 2283.
55 Rydstrohm 1994: 58-81; see also Baud 1999: 269-270; Balanda (2009: 322-326) does not find any precise translation for the term. He divides the term according to two different meanings: on one hand a static one (šššt) that cannot be translated as “secret”, even though this meaning is clear in some attestations, but as a reference to something that is inaccessible, restricted, remote or, even, magnificent. On the other hand, its causative form (sšššt) is “the result of an action or the action itself and is therefore dynamic in nature”.
objects, sometimes related to cults and rituals. A possible connection between st/sšt and goods can be seen on a 4th dynasty official seal from Buhen of a “seal-bearer of the secret products [...]” ([h]tmw nb nb(t) stšt nb=f m r-aA gAw xAst rsy(?)) who also held the title “seal-bearer of the prospectors” (htmw n smnty(w)). Notwithstanding these sources of evidence, the general content of the titles mainly favours their interpretation as receptors of restricted information, and not of “secret” materials or goods.

These titles could be related to the title “keeper of the secrets of every secret that is said that is brought to the province” ([h]ry-sšt n mdwt nb(t) stšt nb=f m r-aA gAw xAst rsy(?)) held by several nomarchs at Dendera and Thebes in the mid-late 6th dynasty. As will be seen below, some of the holders of the titles under study were also nomarchs, so both groups of titles could imply similar actions.

Many of the titles under study can be expanded and detailed versions of similar titles related to the foreign countries, such as “keeper of the secrets of the foreign countries” ([h]ry-sšt n hšs.wt) and its variants, or to the surveillance of the natural entrances to Egypt, as “keeper of the secrets of the narrow door of the foreign country” ([h]ry-sšt n r-3 gšw hšst) and similar titles. For instance, Tjauti held the title “keeper of the secrets of the narrow entrance of the southern foreign country” ([h]ry-sšt n r-3 gšw hšst rsy(t)) and the epithet “who fill the desire of the king/his lord in the narrow entrance of the south(ern) foreign country” (mh(w)-ib ny-swt nb=f m r-3 gšw hšst rsy(t)). Both were recurrently carved in his tomb. They could be shortened versions or elusive references to his title “keeper of the secrets of the narrow entrance of the southern desert regarding all [the secrets] (?) that are said” ([h]ry-sšt n r-3 gšw hšst rsy(t) m mdwt nb(t) stšt nb(?)), carved only once in his burial chamber. Despite this possibility such “shortened” titles haven’t been considered in this study for reasons of convenience and prudence. Moreover, some titles listed in section b) could, rather than referring to the bringing of intelligence, be related to the management of internal affairs in Egyptian posts. This seems to be the case for the titles mentioning “commands” ([w]dt-mdw) (2.01, 2.02).

Finally, the earliest title connected to the acquisition of intelligence seems to be a “regular title”, as it is headed with the office “overseer” ([m]ny-r): “overseer of all the secrets which are said at the entrance of the foreign countries” ([m]ny-r mdwt nb(t) nbt stšt nb(?)), carved in his tomb. This title is attested only once. Its holder, Iunmin/Tjetetu also was “keeper of the secrets of the king regarding every [secret] command of the entrance to the foreign

---

57 Beatty 2000: 63-64, 71. The same author mentions the passage in which the king gave different products of the court to Sabni for the burial of his father Intef/Mekhu. Among them are “sšt-oil from the treasury and secrets (stšt) from the double pure place (of embalmment) (sšt hšb m pr-hd stšt m w’b.ty)”. However, stšt could refer here to religious texts, as it is determined by the usual papyrus roll segram."  
59 Jones 2000: 625, no. 2289. This title was held during the 6th dynasty by three governors at Thebes and three governors at Dendera, see respectively Saleh 1977: 13, no. 5 (Unisankh) (4.02); 18, no. 5 (Khenti) (4.03); 23, no. 8 (Ihy) (4.04); Fischer 1964: 93, no. 3 (Idu I) (4.05); 103, no. 6 (Tjauti) (4.06); 114, no. 1 (Nimunyos/Bebi) (4.07). This title could refer to information coming from abroad. A possible hint to this could be the titles of Abbe (4.01), an official who held the titles “keeper of the secrets of the head of the south” ([h]ry-sšt n sp-rsy) and “keeper of the secrets of the province” ([h]ry-sšt n sp(?)) respectively in two different false doors that could be made for different homonymous officials.
60 Jones 2000: 637-638, nos. 2335-2336.
61 Jones 2000: 157-159, nos. 606-610; 624-625, no. 2290; 633-634, nos. 2320-2322. Sabni (1.09/3.07) was, for instance, [h]ry-sšt n r-3 ’nt w’sr?rsy.
62 For the epithets, see Jones 2000: 447-448, no. 1677.
63 On w’d as “royal command” see Hays 2000; Vernus 2013.
64 Jones 2000: 146, no. 569.
land]” (\[hr\]-\(s\)\(s\)t\(\nu\) \(n\) y\(s\)t m \(w\)\(d\)t-mdw \(n\)bt [\(s\)\(t\)\(\nu\)] \(n\) \(t\) \(r\)-[\(3\) \(h\)\(st\)]. The latter title could be the Beïtitêl-like version of the former or, at least, they could refer to similar responsibilities.\(^{65}\)

### 3. Epithets referring to the fear (\(nrw\)) of the King in the foreign lands

The third group of expressions under study is the epithet “who places the fear/respect of Horus in the foreign countries” (\(dd(.w)\) \(hrw\) \(m\) \(h\)\(s\)\(s\).\(wt\)) which does not present any variant.\(^{66}\) As will be seen below, it is closely related to the epithets referring to the import of products from abroad and, like them, it has sometimes been considered as an extension of some titles and epithets.\(^{67}\) However, it will also be studied as an expression on its own, since it is not clearly connected with a single title or epithet. It is formed with the imperfective active participle (\(dd(.w)\)) of “to put”, “to place” (\(wd\)\(i\)).\(^{68}\) The most interesting element of the epithet is the object: “the \(nrw\) of Horus” (\(nrw\) \(h\)\(rw\)). The word \(nrw\) is usually translated as “fear” in the sense of the fear that somebody (i.e. Horus) inspires in his adversaries, but it can also be translated as “respect” or “power”.\(^{69}\) The semagram of the word is a man holding a staff (Gardiner’s sign list A24). This sign usually determines terms relating to effort, force or violence, suggesting that \(nrw\) could be inserted into the general idea of coercion.\(^{70}\) Curiously, this epithet is one of the rare attestations of the word in non-religious documents. The word as a verb meaning “to shudder” or “to be terrified” (\(n\)\(ri\)) appears in the 5th dynasty biographical text of Washptah, when courtiers fear a possible reaction of their king.\(^{71}\) Even in the religious sphere, \(nrw\) is far from being usual. It only appears in the Pyramid texts and in several snake-spells discovered in the bedstead inside the coffin of Nyankpepy.\(^{72}\) In both cases its meaning is closely connected with the king and the gods, and it is never related to any other living beings (including humans). In the Coffin texts it also features as a divine power which is sometimes held by the deceased.\(^{73}\) In the Pyramid texts, the king’s \(nrw\) extends to person-like beings (opponents, the hearts of unknown beings, those of the sky, gods or sacred images)\(^{74}\) but also, like the epithet, to geographic entities (the Two Lands and the marshes).\(^{75}\) As in the epithet, in one passage of the Pyramid texts \(nrw\) is “placed” (\(wd\)\(i\)) in the hearts of some unknown beings.\(^{76}\)

Curiously, the epithet is related to another that is only attested once: “the throwing stick in the foreign lands” (\(am\)\(it\) \(hrw\) \(m\) \(h\)\(s\)\(s\).\(wt\)), held by Sabni (1.09).\(^{77}\) The word ‘\(mit\)’ is a variant of “throwing stick” (‘\(m\)\(t\)\(\nu\)\(t\)), derived from the verb “to throw sticks” (‘\(m\)\(t\)’).\(^{78}\)

---

\(^{65}\) Similarly Kaplony (1981: 46-49, pls. 15-16 = \(r\)-\(h\)-\(f\) 14), records a 4th dynasty Amtsiegel from Giza of an official that was \(h\)\(r\)-\(s\)\(t\)\(\nu\) \(n\) \(h\)\(st\) \(\i\)\(b\)\(t\)\(\nu\), see Jones 2000: 637, no. 2335; and \(i\)\(m\)-\(r\) \(k\)\(t\) \(n\)\(b\)\(t\)\(\) \(n\) \(\i\)\(b\)\(t\)\(\nu\), see Jones 2000: 261, no. 946.

\(^{66}\) Curiously Hannig 2003: 638-639 records the epithet in different entries: \{15892\} \{15994\} \{15595\} \{15896\}.

\(^{67}\) See e.g. Jones 2000: 48, no. 244; 108, no. 437; 185-186, no. 699; 626, no. 2291; 769-770, no. 2797; see, however, Andrásy 2002a: 394.

\(^{68}\) Again Hannig (2003: 638-639) makes a distinction between some examples with \(rd\)\(i\) \{15994\} \{15995\}, and other with \(wd\) \{15896\}.

\(^{69}\) Hannig 2003: 638-639, \{15994\} \{15595\} \{15896\}. For the word see also Takács 2015: 66 (560).


\(^{71}\) Kloth 2004: 330, fig. 4a. See also Kaplony 1981: 284, pl. 81 = \(r\)-\(n\)\(f\)-\(f\)\(3\) for the epithet \(m\)\(t\)-\(n\)\(h\)\(t\)-\(nr\).

\(^{72}\) The date of Nyankpepy’s spells is debated. According to Fischer (1979: 179) it should date to the end of the Old Kingdom (8th dynasty) or later, see also Brovarski 2006: 106.

\(^{73}\) Bickel 1988: 21-22; the same applies for the Nyankhepy spells, see Lapp 2011: 282-283, vers. 1, \$3-6.

\(^{74}\) See, e.g., PT 197 \$ 113b; PT 364 \$ 614c; PT 256 \$\$ 302c-d; PT 574 \$ 1488a; PT 622 \$\$ 1755b-c; PT 635 \$ 1794c; PT 625 \$ 1766c.

\(^{75}\) See PT 81 \$ 57b; PT 254 \$ 280a.

\(^{76}\) See PT 256, \$\$ 302c-d.

\(^{77}\) Not included in Jones 2000.

\(^{78}\) See respectively Hannig 2003: 271 \{5197\} \{5196\}.
The verb is attested in both religious texts and fowling scenes in some private tombs, but the noun is only present, as *nrw*, in the *Pyramid Texts* and in the religious texts from Nyankhepy’s coffin. As the king’s throwing stick, Sabni boasts his efficiency in a very visual way, recalling violent actions, as sticks were thrown in order to hit or kill birds and other animals. In this sense an utterance of the *Pyramid texts* is illustrative of the meaning and use of this tool against the enemies:

This king N lives with his *ka*, and he repels the evil which is before N, he expels the evil which is behind N, as the throwing sticks of the one who presides Khem, that repel the evil which is in front of him and expel out the evil which is behind him.

Both epithets, with terms rarely attested in non-religious texts, could be inspired by spells or ideas derived from, or recorded in, the *Pyramid texts* and other religious compositions. Indeed, Sabni boasts in his tomb (QH 35e) that he has access to religious texts: “I am a useful *akh* who knows his spells. I know the spell of ascending to the great god, the lord of heaven”.

4. Analysis of the epithets and titles

Taking into account the titularies of the holders of the epithets and titles under study, the first impression is that they had very different careers and responsibilities (Table II). As members of foreign expeditions, an added difficulty is evident in the study of their careers and in the interpretation of their administrative progressions: missions to foreign regions were not periodical, but occasional actions. As a result, many titles and epithets related to these expeditions could be held temporarily rather than permanently. For instance, this seems to be the case, as stated below, with the title “seal-bearer of the god” (*htmw-ntr*). Significantly, the holders of the epithets related to the procurement of products and to the promotion of the fear of the king are never related to the titles connected to the reception of foreign intelligence, except for Intef/Mekhu (2.05/3.08). On the contrary, the aforementioned epithets were frequently held simultaneously. Six, maybe seven, out of eleven officials (1.02/3.02, 1.03/3.03, 1.06/2.04/3.05, 1.08/3.06, 1.09/3.08, 1.10/3.09 and perhaps also 1.05/3.04) who held epithets connected to the bringing of products also “placed the fear of Horus in the foreign lands”. For this reason, in the following pages both sets of epithets will be studied separately from the titles referring to intelligence.

---

79 See PT 553 § 1362b; Lapp 2011: 283 verse 2 § 3-6.
80 PT 469 §§ 908a-g (‘nh N pn hwt k2=f hsr-f dwt tpyt ’wy N shrf=f dwt imyt-ht N mi ’m3=wt hnty hm shrt dwt tpy(f) ’wy=f hsr(f dwt imyt-hr-f).
81 Edel 2008: 816-817, pl. 55 (ink lh kkr rh.(w) r(w)=f lw rh.k(wi) r n i n ntr ‘3 nh pt). For instance, the latter epithet is preceded directly by another epithet “the one who heralds Horus’ words to his retinue” (*whmn(w) mdw hrw n Sms(w)=f*) at the beginning of the same biographical text (the epithet is not recorded by Jones 2000). The sequence of both epithets may vaguely recall two passages of the *Pyramid texts* (PT 471 § 921a; PT 525 § 1245c): “This king N shall be cleaned by Horus’ retinue: the bow and throwstick of Wepwawet” (*wbt2 ti N pn in Sms.w hrw pdt ’m3=ti/tni wp-wt.w*).
82 Quirke 1996: 671. On the contrary, the same author (ibid.: 675-676) rightly states that “through their multiple positions, or at least multiple references to official positions, (private inscriptions remind us) that there is no nine-to-five job in the ancient world, and that the official held his regular title as fixedly as he held his personal name. This obvious Weberian difference between premodern and modern social organization carries important ramifications for our study and understanding of the Egyptian elite.”
is the most frequent, as it is held by five or maybe six officials (Jones 2000: 137, no. 536). According to Jansen-Winkeln (2016: 197-201), they would be troops transported by ship.

Table II. Titulary of the holders of the epithets and titles related to activities abroad. Bold horizontal lines group the holders of the epithets and titles related to activities abroad. Bold squares indicate the different groups of epithets and titles under study. Greyed columns mark officials dated to the 6th dynasty. ● = titles held by the officials under study; ○ = titles held by homonymous officials that are not the officials under study; ◊ = titles held by both the officials under study and homonymous officials.

The holders of both groups of epithets were involved in activities abroad – as will be stated below– that, according to the epithet referring to the “fear of the king”, could have had a coercive nature. Consequently, it is to be expected that the *cursus honorum* of these officials contain a high number of military titles. This is not the case, however. The most representative military title, “overseer of an expedition” (*imy-r mšr*),\(^\text{83}\) is only attested on three or perhaps five occasions (1.02/3.02, 2.05/3.08, 3.01 and, possibly, 1.05/3.04, 3.09); and another similar title, “overseer of the *mnḥš* -troops” (*imy-r mnḥš*), only once (3.09).\(^\text{84}\) The title “overseer of the speaker(s) of foreign languages” (*imy-r iš3.w*)\(^\text{85}\) is the most frequent, as it is held by five or maybe six officials (1.06/2.04/3.05, 1.07, 3.08, 3.09, 3.10/2.05/3.11, 3.12/3.13).
1.08/3.06, 1.09/3.08, 2.05/3.08 and also possibly 1.05/3.04). However, its military nature is not completely clear. The same can be said of naval titles such as “captain” (imy-r.ty (pr.w wi)), which were only attested on three, or maybe four, occasions (1.10/3.09, 1.11, 3.01 and also possibly 1.03/3.03). Other titles include “overseer of the scribe(s) of the crew(s)” (imy-r ss(w) prw), held by one or two officials (1.02/3.02 and also possibly 1.09/3.08) and “director of recruit(s)” (hrp nfr.w), which only appears once (1.04). An exception is the title “seal-bearer of the god in the two great ships” (htmw-ntr m w3.wy 3) which was held by four officials (1.02/3.02, 1.03/3.03, 1.04, 3.01). Of course, these numbers do not disregard the military involvement of these officials abroad at all. For instance, Pepynakht/Heqaib (1.08/3.06) held both groups of epithets and didn’t hold any apparent military title (except for imy-r l3(w)). However, he participated in two military campaigns against Lower Nubia from which he brought different goods and people to the royal court. Furthermore, he also led a military expedition against the “Asiatics” (3m.w) in the Eastern Desert or the Levant.

In any case, the link between both groups of epithets with activities in foreign lands is beyond doubt. Five out of fifteen officials holding both epithets either simultaneously or separately have explicit biographical texts mentioning their participation in foreign expeditions (1.04, 1.06/2.04/3.05, 1.08/3.06, 1.09/3.08, 3.01). Apparently, only Pepynakht/Heqaib (1.08/3.06), and the king’s son Kaiemtenenet (3.01) were involved in military operations. The rest participated in commercial and/or diplomatic missions. It is significant that some officials were sent (h3b) expressly by the king to the foreign countries. That is the case of Iny/Inudjeafu (1.04), sent by three kings to the Levant; Herkhuf (1.06/2.04/3.05), sent by two kings to the African region of Yam (im3); and Pepynakht/Heqaib’s son, Sabni (1.09/3.08), sent to Lower Nubia (w3w3t) at least once. They all brought (in) products, mainly referred as inw, from abroad.

The geographical origin or final destination of some of these officials also stresses their link to foreign lands (see map). Many of them were buried—or at least mentioned—in frontier posts including Elephantine (1.05/3.04, 1.06/2.04/3.05, 1.07, 1.08/3.06, 1.09/3.07) and its periphery (1.11), Coptos (1.03/3.03, 1.10/3.08, 3.09) and Dakhla oasis (3.11, 3.12). Moreover, some of these individuals carved their names and titles, and the epithets under study, in the Eastern Desert (1.01, 1.02/3.02, 1.03, 1.05/3.04 and perhaps also 1.10/3.09) or Lower Nubia (2.05/3.08 and also possibly 1.03/3.03 or 3.10). Moreover, few of them held other titles connected to the management of frontier posts and the reception of foreign goods. Among the latter, the most significant title is “overseer of the foreign countries” (imy-r h3s.wt) and its variants which was held by four or maybe five officials (1.06/2.04/3.05, 1.07, 1.08/3.06, 1.09/3.07 and perhaps 1.05/3.04).

The involvement of the epithet holders in activities abroad is also evident from some titles connected to prospection works made by “prospectors” (smnty.w). That is the case of

---

90 Jones 2000: 769-770, nos. 2796-2797. It is included in table II as an extended version of htmw-ntr.
91 Strudwick 2005: 333-335, no. 242; Edel 2008: 683-686, pls. 33-34. Similarly, Weni, who didn’t hold any apparent military title, led six military expeditions against Levantine regions in the reign of Pepy I.
92 Another possible example is the fragmentary biographical text of Mekhu (II), son of Sabni, at the tomb QH 26 at Qubet el-Hawa. Mekhu (II) mentions that his father was sent (h3b?) by the king to an unknown region (Yam?), and brought different products (inw?). See Edel 2008: 52-55, pl. 8.
93 See e.g., hry-sšt3n mdwt nb(t) tp r3s (1.06/2.04/3.05); hry-sšt3 n r3’3 smw (1.09/3.07), maybe imy-r r3’3 gsw h3s.wt (1.05/3.04) and hry-sšt3 n mdwt nb(t) [innt m h3s.wt] (2.05/3.08).
the titles “under-supervisor of prospector(s)” (imy-ht smnty(w)) (1.01), “staff of regulators of herdsmen and prospector(s)” (mdw mty.w mniw(w) smnty(w) (?)) (1.04), “overseer of prospector(s)” (imy-r smnty(w)) (1.05/3.04), possibly “inspector of prospector(s)” (shḏ smnty(w)) (1.03/3.03) and “prospector of the foreign country” (smnty h₂st) (1.11).

It is also significant that three of these individuals also held the title of “overseer of Upper Egypt” (imy-r ṣm’tw). They may have acquired this title at a later stage of their careers.

---

95 Not attested in Jones 2000.
Andrés Diego Espinel

career (1.06/2.04/3.05; 1.09/3.08; 2.05/3.08) as this office was at the top of the Upper Egyptian administration. Their previous experience abroad, with proved leadership and organizational qualities, could have favoured their appointment to this important post that involved significant responsibilities related to tax activities and financial management.98 This office was also probably in charge—perhaps only circumstantially—of welcoming foreign expeditions, presumably from the Upper Egyptian deserts and Nubia, and receiving the products acquired by them. For instance, Iny/Inudjefau’s biographical text (1.04) mentions that this official was accompanied by an anonymous overseer of Upper Egypt to the royal court after coming from an expedition to an unknown region.99

Curiously, no one among the holders of the epithets and titles under study became vizier, or held one of the highest titles of the central Egyptian administration.100 Instead, some of the holders had minor offices related to that administration. Three officials were “attendants of a royal mortuary complex” (ḥnty.(w)-š [royal mortuary complex]) (1.02/3.02, 1.04, 1.08/3.06).101 This title could imply that these officials were rewarded as tenant landholders connected to the mortuary complexes of the kings to whom they served.102 This is self-evident in the biography of Intef/Mekhu’s son, Sabni (2.06), in which this official received more than 30 arourae of land as attendant of the pyramid of Pepy II because of his deeds in foreign regions.103 Similarly, other holders of the epithets under study obtained other royal rewards and favours. For instance, in his biographical texts Iny/Inudjefau (1.04) mentions that gold collars were given to him. More generally, he also states that he was rewarded (ḫṣî) several times by the king.104 In the same vein, Herkhuf (1.06/2.04/3.05) also was greatly rewarded after his first trip105 and Pepy II stated that “my majesty will do great things for you” if he was successful in bringing the dng-dwarf from the region of Yam to the Egyptian court.106 Pepynakht/Heqaib (1.08-3.06) also refers to similar royal favours, but less clearly. According to his biography, “(my) lord fulfilled his heart” because of his deeds abroad,107 and on two occasions he “accomplished what my lord would reward (me)” for the same reason.108 He was also involved in the management of the royal mortuary complexes, as he was “overseer of the city of the royal mortuary complex” (imy-r niwt [royal mortuary complex]),109 “regulator of phyle(s) of the royal

98 Clarke 2009: 126-130; Brovarski 2013: 98.
99 Marcolin and Diego Espinel 2011: 581, 585-586. The same task was developed, however, by a different official in the biographical text of Herkhuf (1.06/2.04/3.05). He was received by a htmw-bity and imy-r skbb. wy called Khenu (Edel 2008: 625-626, pl. 27). An unknown official possibly with the same office (imy-r [skbb.wy]? pr-aA wy called Khenu (Edel 2008: 625-626, pl. 27). An unknown official possibly with the same office (imy-r [skbb.wy]? pr-aA) welcomed Iny/Inudjefau (1.04) initially (Marcolin and Diego Espinel 2011: 581). Despite its odd name, the title “overseer of the two cool rooms (in the great house)” (imy-r skbb.wy (pr-r)) (Jones 2000: 237-239, nos. 874-875) seems to be connected with titles and epithets related to the counting of Egyptian and foreign products; see also Moreno García 2015: 91-94.
100 On the uppermost titles of the central administration see Strudwick 1985.
103 Edel 2008: 51-52, pl. 9 (= Urk. I 140, 9-11). Unfortunately, there are no other clear references to the giving of lands to officials by the king. Butterweck-Abdelrahim 1999: 32, table 1.1 also includes the 4th texts of Metjen but they do not explicitly mention the concession of royal lands to the official.
105 Edel 2008: 625-626, pl. 27 (= Urk. I 124, 15) (ḫṣî.t(=i) ḫr=s’ i wrt).
106 Edel 2008: 627-628, pl. 28 (= Urk. 131, 1) (iw ḫm(=i) r ir t n-k’ḥt).
mortuary complex” (mty m s3 [royal mortuary complex]), and “scribe of phyle(s) of the royal mortuary complex” (s$ n z3 [royal mortuary complex]).

The holders of the epithets also held other titles connected with internal administrative affairs. Except for some honorific titles, these offices embrace many different fields of action in both the central administration, as for instance “overseer of the residence” (imy-r hnw) (1.02/3.02) and the provincial milieu, such as “overseer of the storehouse(s) in elKab” (imy-r $n’(w) m nhb) (1.09/3.07). All these officials rarely had similar titles in the Egyptian administration. Such diversity of careers confirms the fact that Egyptian officials generally followed varied professional paths conditioned by different circumstances according to their capabilities, background and entourage; very few Egyptian officials had specialist careers due to their family background.

Aside from the military and the “frontier-related” titles, the most frequent offices are, by far, three honorific titles (htmw-nTr, htmw-bity, smr-waty) and one religious title (Xry-HAb). The highest honorific title is “seal-bearer of the bity-king” (htmw-bity), attested on seven occasions (1.02/3.02, 1.05/3.04, 1.06/2.04/3.05, 1.07, 1.08/3.06, 1.09/3.07, 2.05/3.08). Its actual function is unknown. According to Franke, in the Middle Kingdom it would have been an office referring to a field of activity (Signaltitel). Quirke has suggested a more precise function for the title during the same period: the privilege of using official seals by their holders. Bearing the Old Kingdom evidence in mind, such an interpretation is also relevant for the period under study here. The conferment or precise use of the title is seldom mentioned in biographical texts, however. Consequently, it is difficult to have a rough idea of its functions. It is not attested on any Old Kingdom seal or sealing, which perhaps points to the use of the title as a generic –but highly valued– Signaltitel related to the possession and use of official seals. The title could be connected to a similar title that was also held by some holders of the epithets under study: “seal-bearer of the god” (htmw-nTr) (1.02/3.02, 1.03/3.03, 1.04, 1.05/3.04, 1.06/2.04/3.05 and 3.10). Both titles are very similar, but they are clearly different as they consistently use two different words to refer the king: bity and nTr respectively. Only three out of twelve officials with the epithets held both titles simultaneously (1.02/3.02, 1.05/3.04, 1.06/2.04/3.05). Ikhi/Mery (1.02/3.02) probably held both titles because he was involved in activities abroad and in the central administration. The same could have been the case for Tjetji (1.05/3.04) and Herkhuf (1.06/2.04/3.05) since they were probably governors of the Elephantine area.

---

113 Not attested in Jones 2000; on the $n’(w) see Papazian 2012: 63-66.
117 Franke 1984: 107, n. 3.
118 Quirke 1986: 123.
119 On some mentions of the title in biographical texts see Edel 2008: 50-51, pl. 9 (= Urk. I 137, 16 – 138, 1); Fischer 1968: 96 (2) (= Urk. I 270, 16).
120 Possession of seals of the central administration by officials could serve as status symbols both in the administrative and economic spheres; on this matter see a Mesopotamian case study in Patrier 2014.
122 As Ikhi/Mery (1.02), Khui, a seal-bearer of the god involved in expeditions abroad, became an important official of the central administration as “overseer of the residence” (imy-r hnw), see Diego Espinel 2015: 232-234, n. e, 250-252. However, he didn’t include the title “seal-bearer of the bity-king” in his tomb at Qubbet el-Hawa (QH 34c). See Edel 2008: 502.
123 On this question see below, n. 150.
scale, only eleven out of seventy-two seal-bearers of the god studied by Kuraszkiewicz were also seal-bearers of the bity-king.\(^{124}\)

Iny/Inudjefau’s biographical text mentions that the title of seal-bearer of the god was given circumstantially on two occasions. First, he was involved in four expeditions to the Levant “while I was seal-bearer of the god under the majesty of Pepy (I)”.\(^{125}\) Later, quite differently and unexpectedly, king Pepy (II) conferred upon him the titles “sole companion” (smr-w’ty), “lector priest” (hry-h’lb) and, again, seal-bearer of the god after he was “ushered to the most intimate part of the palace (hmw.-t’).”\(^{126}\) Therefore, the title could be only conferred for a brief lapse of time, for special circumstances (as could be the case of the second example of Iny/Inudjefau) or, more likely, for precise missions and actions.

The seal-bearers of the god were not related to nautical activities, except if they were explicitly connected to ships (i.e. “seal-bearer of the god in the two big ships” (htmnw-ntr m w’bwy f’t) or its variants).\(^{127}\) Above all, the title seems to be concerned with the organization of missions in foreign regions and/or to the supplying of exotic or precious materials and goods, not necessarily from abroad.\(^{128}\) Weni, for instance, mentions a seal-bearer of the god who brought his false door from the Tura quarries\(^ {129}\) and, moreover, a papyrus from Saqqara mentions one seal-bearer of the god who was probably involved in the building of Pepy’s II mortuary complex.\(^ {130}\) Consequently, the functions of this title – possibly considered an important privilege by their holders as Iny/Inudjefau stresses – were partially described by some of the epithets under study, but, curiously, the title is not as frequent as expected among the holders of the epithets.\(^ {131}\)

On the other hand, the holders of the title seal-bearer of the bity-king had the privilege of using official seals in their accomplishments in other administrative duties, which may or may not have been connected to the actual undertaking of foreign expeditions. In this sense, four, or maybe five, out of five seal-bearers of the bity-king were also “overseers of the foreign countries” (imy-r his.wt) (1.06/2.04/3.05, 1.07, 1.08/3.06, 1.09/3.07 and, possibly, 1.05/3.04), a title which, as stated above, was probably connected to the reception of products and expeditions, and could demand the use of precise official seals.

The title “sole companion” (smr-w’ty) was held by nine out of fifteen officials who held the epithets (1.02/3.02, 1.04, 1.05/3.04, 1.06/2.04/3.05, 1.07, 1.08/3.06, 1.09/3.07, 2.05/3.08, 3.01 and 3.10).\(^ {132}\) It has been regarded as a Signaltitel which underlines the close

\(^{124}\) Kuraszkiewicz 2006: 201. His table, mainly based on Chevereau’s (1989) list, has some problems: nos. 49 and 50, and nos. 56 and 61 could refer to the same officials respectively. Conversely, nos. 20 and 68 are not the same person (Kuraszkiewicz 2006: 200). Nos. 22 and 68 were not htmw.w-bity, but no. 41 held the title instead. The proportion of htmw.w-ntr holding the title htmw-bity could be even lower, however, as new htm.w-ntr have been recorded recently, see, e.g., Vandeckerckhove, Müller-Wollermann 2001: 342, n. 468, pl. 41 (Idi); Gasse, Rondot 2007: 39, no. 37 (unknown); Rothe, Miller, Rapp 2008: 126 (Geneg, BR 16), 134 (Intef, BR 21), 182 (Khui, BR 66), 309 (Anus, DN 34), 325 (Hornebi (?), DN 41), 326 (Intef, DN 42), 361 (Pepynakht/Geneg, ML 13) and less probably 23 (Khui, AW 06, could be read sHD smnt(y.w) instead of htmw-ntr <imy-r> smnt(y.w) and 279 (BZ 33); BR 16 and ML 13 are probably the same person; BR 66 could be Kuraszkiewicz’s no. 35; BR 21 and DN 42 could be Kuraszkiewicz’s no. 21. For other attestations see Diego Espinel 2015: 36-37 (Nefer), 42-43 (Shendju?).

\(^{125}\) Marcolin, Diego Espinel 2011: 580-581, fig. 4 (sk w(t) m htmw.w-ntr hr hm n ppy nb(z)i).

\(^{126}\) Marcolin, Diego Espinel 2011: 606-607, fig. 5, 610-612 (stɔ.t(z)i r htmw.-t n(z)i) smr-w’ty hry-h’lb htmw-ntr).


\(^{128}\) Kuraszkiewicz 2006: 199 and 200,

\(^{129}\) Urk. I 99, 10-14.


\(^{131}\) The evidence from the few officials under study doesn’t support the idea that the title htmw-ntr was replaced by imy-r i³.w in the mid-6th dynasty, see Manassa 2006: 158-159.

\(^{132}\) Jones 2000: 892, no. 3268.
connection of their holders to the king. Direct contact and/or close proximity of officials to the king were considered privileges that were expressly mirrored in many biographical texts. Indeed, in some biographies the appointment of officials as sole companions probably meant access to the royal palace. In the specific case of the officials studied here, the title could be the result of the bringing of foreign materials to the king himself. This is the case of \textit{Iny/Inudjefau} (1.04), the king’s son \textit{Kaiemtjenenet} (3.01), and, less clearly, \textit{Herkhuf} (1.06/2.04/3.05) and \textit{Pepynakht/Heqaib} (1.08) who dispatched different goods to the main governmental building (\textit{hnw}).

Finally, eight officials held the title of “lector priest” (\textit{hry-h\textsuperscript{$\beta$}b}) (1.04, 1.05/3.04, 1.06/2.04/3.05, 1.07, 1.08/3.06, 1.09/3.07, 2.05/3.08 and 3.10). Such a number seems somewhat surprising among officials connected with activities abroad, as only eight out of seventy-two seal-bearers of the god listed by Kuraszkiewicz held that title (and only five out of eight can be dated to the 6\textsuperscript{th} dynasty). Moreover, this office is rarely attested in expedition graffiti. Eichler recorded only fourteen Old Kingdom rock inscriptions mentioning twelve different lector priests, which can all be dated to the 6\textsuperscript{th} dynasty. Even though its number can be increased significantly, the title was infrequent in such fields of activities.

On one hand, as lector priests, these officials could have acted as healers and ritualists in charge of the burial of the expedition members who died outside of Egypt. It isn’t likely that they played such a role exclusively in expeditions, however, as the careers of these officials were clearly connected to foreign contacts or provincial government, and they very rarely held other priestly and scribal titles. Moreover, they didn’t hold other significant titles connected to religious or medical skills. Old Kingdom expeditions rarely attest the presence of other “healers” such as \textit{swnw}, for instance. Alternatively, the lector priests could have been in charge of rituals connected to the materials that they were obtaining abroad. On the other hand, the title could have had an honorary intention. It could imply closeness to the king and the royal palace. Another possibility is that the title could indicate that their holders were proficient in occasionally performing some rituals or actions connected to the Egyptian presence abroad. Herkhuf (1.06/2.04/3.05) and Pepynakht/Heqaib’s son, \textit{Sabni} (1.09/3.07), mention in their tombs that they knew religious formulae and spells. The former boasted: “I am an able and equipped \textit{akh}-spirit, 

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Baud 1999: 241, 259, 349.
\item Stauder-Porchet 2016: 589-591.
\item Jones 2000: 781-786, nos. 2848-2865.
\item Kuraszkiewicz 2006: 201, tab. 3.
\item Eichler 1993: 255-257.
\item See, e.g., Andrássy 2002b: 13-14 (Khenemti/Ankhkai or, alternatively, Nebkai, or, according to Roccati 1999: 125, Sabni); Seidlmayer 2005: 35-36, fig. 6 (Khui); Gasse, Rondot 2007: 21-22, no. 3 (Khunes, Khenemti); 22, no. 4 (Khunes, Idu\textsuperscript{?}); 24, no. 6 (Abebi, Intef/Mekhu, Sabni); 25, nos. 7 (Abebi, Ikeri), 8 (Mekhu); 26, nos. 9 (Mekhu), 10 (Mererit); 30, no. 16 (Intef\textsuperscript{?}); 31, no. 17 (Intef, Pepyuser); 31, no. 19 (dubious, [...]); 36, no. 28 (dubious, [...]); 47, no. 57 ( [...] ); 50-51, no. 63 (Iq\textsuperscript{?}ri, Satetepet); 51, no. 64 (Khmuhetep[ [...] ]; Petrie 1888: pl. 12, no. 324 (= de Morgan 1894: 207, no. 34) (Abebi). Moreover, according to drawings by Petrie and de Morgan, Eichler’s no. 194 should be read as \textit{smr-w\textsuperscript{ty} hry-h\textsuperscript{$\beta$}b hnm\textsuperscript{?}nt} instead of \textit{smw-w\textsuperscript{ty} hry-h\textsuperscript{$\beta$}b hnm\textsuperscript{?}nt-rh}.
\item Eichler 1993: 257; Forshaw 2014: 123-128.
\item Eichler 1993: 256-257.
\item Forshaw 2014: 127. However, the absence of lector priests in the Sinai or in the unpublished inscription of Merenre at Wadi Hammamat do not support this idea that is also notably absent from the written evidence.
\item Eichler 1993: 257.
\item Baud 1999: 292-293.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
a lector priest who knows his spell”. However, Intef/Mekhu’s son, Sabni (2.06), also held the title but, according to his biographical text, he trusted another lector priest sent from the court to perform the funerary rituals of his deceased father. The most plausible explanation for the title in the expeditionary’s cursus honorum is its use as an indicator of the title holder’s literacy. More precisely, as has recently been suggested by Piacentini, it could have occasionally replaced the title “scribe” in the provinces at the end of the Old Kingdom. Indeed, a lector priest was in charge of recording the arrival of different goods to Elephantine during the early 9th dynasty.

Finally, there are other rarely attested honorific titles. *Iry-pat (iry-p’t)* could have been held by Pepynakht/Heqaib (1.08/3.06) if he is indeed the owner of tomb QH 35d. Another higher title, *haty-a (hity-)*, was held by four officials (1.05/3.04, 1.08/3.06, 1.09/3.08, 2.05/3.08). The title may serve as a Signaltitel of nome governors, even though the role of these officials as nomarchs is far from accepted.

As the holders of the epithets under study, the officials with titles connected to the reception of information and intelligence also had very different careers. Again, military or nautical titles are not frequent. The offices of “overseer of an expedition” (imy-r mSฐ) and “overseer of speaker(s) of foreign languages” (imy-r i’ḇ, w) are only attested two or maybe three times, and one, or maybe two, officials held both titles (see 2.05/3.08, 2.06 and perhaps also 1.06/2.04/3.05 for imy-r mSฐ, and 2.02, 2.05/3.08 and perhaps 1.06/2.04/3.05 for imy-r i’ḇ, w). Nautical titles are also unusual. Only Khuiinkhnum (2.07) was “overseer of scribe(s) of the crews” (imy-r šš(w) ‘pr.w) and “under-supervisor of the great ship” (imy-ḥt wi’ḥ). The rarity of military titles in the careers of these officials seems somewhat surprising, as punitive and exploratory actions were important sources of intelligence, but, as stated above, titles didn’t exactly mirror officials’ experiences. Some titles and, above all, some biographical texts suggest that three, or maybe five, of these officials were involved in expeditions abroad: Herkhuf (1.06/2.04/3.05), Intef/Mekhu (2.05/3.08), his son Sabni (2.06) and, possibly, Inka/Fln (2.02) and Khuiinkhnum (2.07).

Besides their experiences out of Egypt, the officials in charge of the acquisition of intelligence followed two different— but not antagonistic— careers in Egypt: the management of provinces and the central administration (and court). The best examples of provincial careers are Meryranefer/Qar (2.03) and Tjauti (2.09) who were nomarchs of the 2nd (Edfu) and 7th nome (Hiw) of Upper Egypt respectively. They held the usual titles connected to the office of nomarch: “great chief of the province” (ḥry-tp ‘3 n spšt), “overseer of the priest(s)” (imy-r ḫmn(w)-nTR), and haty-a. Tjauti and perhaps also Meriranefer/Qar held the office of “governor of a state” (ḥk3 hw’t), suggesting that they previously gained experience in the provincial administration, being in charge of state landholdings. Other than these officials, at least three or perhaps even four officials could have been governors

---

146 Edel 2008: 621-623, pl. 26 (= Urk. I 122, 13) (ink ‘ḥ ikr ‘pr ḥry-ḥib rḥ(w) r=f); see also n. 81.
147 Edel 2008: 50-51, pl. 9 (= Urk. I 138, 2).
148 Piacentini 2013: 45; Quirke 2010: 55-56; see also Edel 2008: 1756-1757 (Satz 11 und 12).
149 See Edel 2008: 1744-1745, 1811-1813, figs. 21-23, pls. 81-82 (Setka, QH 110).
151 Jones 2000: 496-497, no. 1858.
153 Jones 2000: 283, no. 1021.
154 Sabni (1.09/3.07) could also form part of this list, as he was ḥry-sšt n ršššm’w/ršy? and participated in foreign expeditions.
155 Strudwick 2005: 180-183, 187-193; Tjauti (2.09) was also iry-pat, see Martinet 2011: 193.
156 As is the case of Meryranefer’s father, Isi, see Strudwick 2005: 340-342, no. 246; Martinet 2011: 197.
of the Elephantine area: Herkhuf (1.06/2.04/3.05), Intef/Mekhu (2.05/3.08), his son Sabni (2.06) and, less likely, Khuinkhnum (2.07).\(^{157}\) Leaving aside the title *haty-a*, none of these individuals held other titles connected to the management of the province, meaning that their identification as nomarchs is not clear. The absence of nomarchal titles in the 1\(^{st}\) nome of Upper Egypt could be connected to the special status of the First Cataract region.\(^{158}\) The population of Elephantine, originally a small defensive garrison in the southern Egyptian border, increased considerably during the 6\(^{th}\) dynasty.\(^{159}\) Consequently, it became the main centre in the province in the later part of the dynasty (mid-Pepy II), when officials including Pepynakht/Heqaib’s son, Sabni (1.09/3.07), Iishema/Setkai (tomb QH 98),\(^{160}\) and Sebekhetep (tomb QH 207)\(^{161}\) gained the office of “great chief of the king” (*hry-tp ‘3 n ny-swrt*).\(^{162}\) The increasing administrative and political importance of Elephantine could be mirrored in the creation of the so-called “governor’s residence” (house H2) on the island during the late 6\(^{th}\) dynasty. This building could be the home of “proto-governors” such as Pepynakht/Heqaib (1.08/3.06), his son Sabni (1.09/3.07), Intef/Mekhu (2.05/3.08), or Sebekhetep (tomb QH 90), since the building housed chapels devoted to their cult in a later phase.\(^{163}\)

Management of intelligence in the provinces by local governors could have been an important responsibility. In a biographical text Meryranefer/Qar (2.03) mentions that this was an important task for a nomarch:

> Nothing similar was found regarding any previous governor in this province, because of my vigilance and my excellence in leading the affairs of the Residence. I was the keeper of the secrets of everything that is said and brought from the narrow entrance of the foreign lands and the southern foreign lands.\(^{164}\)

As stated above, other nomarchs in Thebes and Dendera also held analogous titles related to intelligence from the provinces.\(^{165}\) On the other hand, as expected, intelligence was probably also managed from Memphis, at least in an earlier stage. At the beginning of the 6\(^{th}\) dynasty Lunmin/Tjetetu (2.01) and Inkaf/Ini (2.02) held titles related to the central administration and were buried in the Teti cemetery at Saqqara.

Undoubtedly both central and provincial administrations were coordinated with each other to control foreign people and to collect information on regions abroad. For instance, the four alleged governors of Elephantine in the list (1.06/2.04/3.05, 2.05/3.08, 2.06, 2.07) were also overseers of the foreign countries, an office related indistinctively to their role as nomarchs and to their links with the central administration who, among other responsibilities, could also have been in charge of receiving information from abroad.\(^{166}\) Furthermore, four or perhaps five officials (2.03, 1.06/2.04/3.05, 2.05/3.08, 2.09 and also maybe 2.02), held the title *imy-r šmtw*, which also served as a bridge between

---

\(^{157}\) On Sabni (2.06) see Martinet 2011: 74-75 [54]; she doesn’t include Khuinkhnum as nomarch.

\(^{158}\) Raue 2015: 34-35.

\(^{159}\) Raue 2008: 5-7; Raue 2013: 152-155.

\(^{160}\) On the date of this official (mid Pepy II) see Edel 2008: 1351; Vischak 2015: 236.

\(^{161}\) On his date (mid/late Pepy II) see Edel 2008: 1979;

\(^{162}\) Jones 2000: 654, no. 2390; Edel 2008: 1348-1349. Less likely, the latter official was also “great chief of the province” (*hry-tp ‘3 n spAt*). Müller (2003) considers that Iishema/Setkai didn’t hold the title. See however Martinet 2011: 78 [58], 204.

\(^{163}\) Dorn 2015. On the building see Moeller 2016: 220-226; for a different interpretation see also Raue 2014: 3. Apparently, Sebekhotep in tomb QH 90 and in the governor’s residence is not the same official as the homonymous person mentioned on vases from tomb QH 207. The former was *htnw-bity; h3ty-c; htnw-ntr; smr-w’tty* (Dorn 2015: 51-52); the latter was *hry-tp ‘3 n ny-swrt; smr-w’tty* (Edel 2008: 1976).

\(^{164}\) el-Khadragy 2002: 206-207, fig. 1 (=Urk. I 254, 10-12) (*n gmt.n is pw m-a hry-tp wn n sp3 tn tp-c’w n rs-tpl(=) n mnh-c(i) <m> hpr ht n hnw ink hry sk3 n mdwt nb(t) intn m r-c’g w hls.wt m hls.wt rsy.wt*).

\(^{165}\) See n. 59.

\(^{166}\) On the possible links of the title with the nomarchs see Martinet 2011: 205-206.
both spheres of the administration. Some of these individuals were also nomarchs, including Meryrenefer/Qar (2.03), Tjauti (2.09) and, possibly, Herkhuf (1.06/2.04/3.05) and Intef/Mekhu (2.05/3.08). As stated above, this office likely meant that the holder had occasional access to foreign goods and, possibly, to restricted information collected by explorers beyond Egypt. In this sense the aforementioned biographical text of Meryrenefer/Qar (2.03) is illustrative. Unfortunately, it is not possible to ascertain if the offices related to collecting intelligence were held simultaneously by these officials when they were overseers of Upper Egypt, or in earlier or later stages of their careers. For example, Meryrenefer/Qar’s biographical text is not entirely clear regarding his appointment as overseer of Upper Egypt. He could be referring to this event when he states: “I came to my harbour at the head of every nomarch of Upper Egypt in its totality. I was a judge of Upper Egypt in its totality”. With this ambiguity it is not possible to know if he was in charge of the intelligence from the southern lands and the First Cataract, either as nomarch of Edfu or, more plausibly, as overseer of Upper Egypt.

Some officials also held other offices connected to the court. Significantly, they were buried at Saqqara or, at least, partially developed their career in the Memphite area. No one among all the intelligence officials held the highest titles of the central administration. The most significant title connected to the court is “keeper of the secrets in the house of the morning” (hry-sStA n pr-dwAt) held by Inkaf/Ini (2.02), Meryrenefer/Qar (2.03) and possibly also Tjauty (2.09). This office, connected to the daily morning cleaning and dressing of the king, implied a close personal contact with the pharaoh and, consequently, a certain level of confidence. Therefore, their holders probably held this title when they served in the royal court. Another title connected to the royal milieu was “overseer of the attendant(s) (of the palace)” (imy-r hnty(.w)-š (pr-š)), held by Iunmin/Tjetetu (2.01) who was also attendant (hnty-š) in a royal mortuary complex, and by the ubiquitous Meryrenefer/Qar (2.03), who held that title before his appointment as nomarch of Edfu (and possibly as overseer of Upper Egypt). Finally, three of these officials held the title “inspector of priest(s)” in several royal mortuary complexes (šḥḏ ḫm(.w)-nTr [royal mortuary complex]) in the late 6th dynasty, despite being part of the provincial administration (2.06, 2.07, 2.09).

The main links of these officials with the central administration and court were made through their honorific titles. Again, they are the most frequently attested in the cursus honorum of those in charge of the procurement of intelligence. Only one official among the holders of the epithets under study was “first under the king” (tpy ḫr ny-sw t) (1.02/3.02). On the contrary, four intelligence officials held this Signaltitel (2.01, 2.02, 2.03, 2.07)
which could evidence their close contact with the king. At least three of these individuals (2.01, 2.02, 2.03) progressed within the central administration at Memphis. Moreover, seven out of nine were sole friends (smr.w-w’ty), stressing the ties of their holders with the central administration and the court. The presence of five, perhaps six, seal-bearers of the bity-king (htmnw.w-bity) is, again, important in this respect as they were probably in charge of seals of the central administration (1.06/2.04/3.05, 2.05/3.08, 2.06, 2.07, 2.09, and, maybe, 2.03). Only two of them, Inkaf/Ini (2.02) and Herkhuf (1.06/2.04/3.05) were also seal-bearers of the god (htmnw.w nTr). Both officials were involved in expeditions beyond Egypt. For instance, Inkaf/Ini was “overseer of an expedition” (imy-r mSa) and “overseer of prospectors” (imy-r smnty(.w)). Finally, eight out of nine officials were lector priests, reinforcing the idea that the title could underline the literacy level of their holders.

The different groups of epithets and titles under study mirror three important aspects of Egyptian foreign policy: war, diplomacy/trade and intelligence. As stated above, their holders followed very different administrative careers. Almost all of them were mainly involved with expeditions abroad commissioned by the central administration, but many of them were also related to the government of the provinces. According to the data on the officials under study, Egyptian foreign policy during the 6th dynasty was based on both central and provincial administrations. Until the early/mid 6th dynasty, their holders were mainly attached to the state apparatus and the court (1.02/3.02, 1.04, 3.01), even though there were also officials connected to such provincial centres as Elephantine (1.05/3.04, 1.06/2.04/3.05), Coptos (1.03/3.03, 1.10/3.09, maybe 2.01), and, less likely, Akhmim (2.02). From the reign of Pepy II onwards, they were mainly based at provincial sites such as Elephantine (1.07, 1.08/3.06, 1.09/3.07, 2.05/3.08, 2.06, 2.07, 2.08), Ayn Asil (Dakhla Oasis) (3.11, 3.12) and, more unexpectedly, Hiw (2.09) (see map). Despite this apparent decentralizing trend, their holders seem to have been connected to the royal milieu by some Signaltiteln and other minor offices. Moreover, some of them followed official commands explicitly, as is obvious with Herkhuf (1.06/2.04/3.05), Pepynakht/Heqaib (1.08/3.06), and Iny/Inudjefau (1.04) during the reign of Pepy II.

According to several documents, the provincial administration was an important cog in the wheel of Egyptian foreign policy. For example, Weni organized an army recruiting soldiers from many different provinces under Pepy I, and an unpublished graffiti at Wadi Hammamat also refers to the participation of groups of workers from different provinces in a huge quarrying expedition under Merenre. Local initiatives in frontier provinces were also possibly decisive. According to the Ayn Asil tablets, foreign contacts were managed by the local governors of the Dakhla oasis, who could also act as diplomats, at least occasionally. Other tablets and texts from Dakhla also refer to the use of foreign resources –mainly workers– in the oasis, and to trade with far regions. At Elephantine, fragmentary papyri from the governor’s archive suggest similar local initiatives that, in some instances, could result in abusive privately-oriented affairs. This fact would imply that foreign products and intelligence could come directly to the provincial administration where they were recorded and checked and, subsequently, delivered to Memphis.
In both the central administration and provincial nomarchies, it is likely that foreigners both settled in or passing through Egypt, and i³(.w)-troops were important sources of intelligence. However, it is not possible to ascertain how the information they provided was managed by the Egyptians.\(^{181}\) It could have been shared by both administrations. Almost all the overseers of speakers of foreign languages are attested in rock inscriptions beyond the Nile Valley or, at least, far from Memphis. For instance, at the city of Coptos there is evidence of an “overseer of speakers of foreign languages from Yam” (imy-r i³(.w) imt).\(^{182}\) Almost all the officials from Elephantine under study also held that title (1.06/2.04/3.05, 1.07, 1.08/3.06, 1.09/3.07, 2.05/3.08, 2.06 and, possibly, 1.05/3.04). Evidence on foreigners in the Memphite area can also be presented: Nubians (nhsy.w), a “companion(?)-supervisor of speakers of foreign languages from Medja, Yam and Irtjet” (smr/shd? imy-r i³(.w) n.w md3 im3 irt)\(^{183}\) and an overseer of speakers of foreign languages\(^{184}\) were closely connected with the city of Snefru’s pyramids at Dashur, close to Memphis. It is evident that the overseers of foreign speakers could also serve in the central administration and in the court, as a small group of them were buried in Memphis.\(^{185}\)

Titles connected to the reception of intelligence do not suggest that a specific department in the “Residence” (hw) was devoted to this activity.\(^{186}\) This could imply that Egyptian intelligence was not centralized and professionalized, and should be considered cautiously. Intelligence archives did exist, since common information on foreign toponyms and personal names were used in different exorcism texts during this period,\(^{187}\) but the titles under study could be related to the gathering of intelligence, not to its management and record keeping.

This circumstance also applies for the epithets under study. The holders of epithets connected to the bringing of products didn’t hold titles related to the subsequent management and storage of these products in the court. Similarly, as stated above, some officials who “placed the fear of Horus in the foreign countries” didn’t hold military titles, which could imply that “placing the fear of Horus” was not exclusively connected to war and aggression. nrw could also mean “respect” or “power” and, consequently, could refer to diplomacy. Equally, the epithets referring to the bringing of products from the foreign lands could also refer to similar activities, since diplomacy was also based on exchange. The biographical texts of Iny/Inudjefau (1.04) and Herkhuf (2.05/3.08, 2.06) illustrate these practices, as they were apparently not involved in military campaigns but in diplomatic or royal/official trade missions.\(^{188}\) Indeed, Iny/Inudjefau’s travels to the Levant could have been the Egyptian counterpart to diplomatic contacts recorded in the cuneiform archive of Ebla. According to Biga, the region of Dugurasu (du-gú-ra-su\(^{189}\)), mentioned in the Eblaite archive, should be Egypt. Though the philological reasoning for such identification is far
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\(^{181}\) Middle Kingdom evidence from the so-called Semna dispatches offer some insights into this matter, see Kraemer, Liszka 2016.

\(^{182}\) Fischer 1964: 27-30, pl. 10, no. 7; Jones 2000: 74, no. 328.

\(^{183}\) Jones 2000: 74-75, no. 329.

\(^{184}\) de Morgan 1895: 14-15; on other kind of evidence on foreigner in Dashur, see Diego Espinel 2011: 165, fig. 2.12 (2).

\(^{185}\) See, e.g., 4.01; Cervelló-Autuori 2007: 72-73, n. 6.

\(^{186}\) May the “overseer of the scribes of the king’s documents” (imy-r sš(.w) ‘(w) ny-swтр) be the final recipient of intelligence from abroad? On this title see Strudwick 1985: 199-216; Jones 2000: 209-210, nos. 780-781.

\(^{187}\) Diego Espinel 2013: 30-31.

\(^{188}\) The title “overseer of the mission(s)” (imy-r wp(.w)) held by Iny/Inudjefau could stress this circumstance, even though no other holder of the epithets under consideration had that title. On this office see Valloggia 1976; Piacentini 2001: 10-11.
from convincing the contents of the tablets studied by Biga point to that identification persuasively. Ebla sent several diplomatic missions to Dugurasu—sometimes through the city of Dulu (DU-luki), i.e. Byblos—in order to receive linen, ivory, gold, travertine, copper and bronze objects or ivory tusks, and to deliver lapis lazuli, tin, silver, different clothes, black wool or copper. As discussed previously, some of these objects formed part of the royal luxuria (hk3 ny-swt) kept in the Egyptian palace as foreign imports that were subsequently delivered to the elites.

Consequently, several of the holders of the epithets under study could have acted as diplomats who promoted the respect (nrw) of the king in distant lands. The presence of similar diplomats or messengers—probably traders in origin—is well attested in 3rd millennium BC cuneiform texts. On some occasions, administrative texts record far-reaching trade and diplomatic contacts between Mesopotamia and the Mediterranean coast, as is the case of messengers of Byblos in Puzriš-Dagan (Drehem) around 2200 BC. In other instances, literary texts record narratives on diplomatic and military contacts between distant countries, such as the Sumerian poems related to king Enmerkar. Along the same lines, Egyptian officials defined (or not) by the epithets under study could have acted as ambassadors in an ever-developing and changing political landscape both in Africa and Asia in which products, motifs and ideas spread in different directions. This is the case for both the symbolic meanings of lapis lazuli in Egypt and Mesopotamia, and, less clearly, the stone vases with Egyptian typologies in the Near East. It is likely that these officials weren’t the exclusive actors of such contacts—private entrepreneurs were also decisive players in interregional trade during this period and in later times—but they were the most visible in the Egyptian records.

5. Epiteths as sources of biographical information

According to Doxey, Middle Kingdom epiteths were mainly grounded in ethical beliefs and not on actual events lived by the officials. Therefore, they would configure an idealistic profile of their holders. Along the same line, the late Michel Baud recently considered Old Kingdom epiteths as part of Assmann’s kommentierte Titulatur. Quoting Baud, “commented epiteths” would be “a synchronic panorama of the individual’s qualities and specific relationship to the king or to a god”, which he related to the “ethical” or “ideal
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189 Roccati in Biga y Roccati 2012: 37-42; Schneider (2016: 444-447) has suggested that Dugurasu should be the Nubian state of Kush. Despite their appealing philological grounds, such identification is problematic to assume given that direct contacts between Ebla and Kush (Kerma) would have been practically impossible without Egyptian consent. Moreover, Kush is not attested as a toponym during the 3rd millennium BC; and, for instance, lapis lazuli has not yet been attested in Kerma.
190 On a different identification of Dugurasu and Dulu see, however, Archi 2016.
191 Biga y Roccati 2012; Biga 2014a; Biga 2014b: 178; Biga 2014c.
192 See, e.g., Podany 2010; Cripps 2013.
193 Lafont 2009.
194 Vanstiphout 2004; Good 2008; Wilcke 2012.
195 On the transmission of symbolic values connected to specific materials such as lapis lazuli, see Diego Espinel 2011: 47; Casanova 2014a: 40; Warburton 2014: 129.
196 Casanova 2007; Bevan 2007: 181-183; Casanova 2014b: 103-106. Egyptian travertine vessels—and their variegated and unclear contents—featured among the prestige goods given by the king to his officials (Minaul-Gout 1997; Arnold, Pischikova 1999). Their possible diffusion and imitation in the Near East could follow similar ideas reinforced by the idea that foreign courts were attracted to inscribed vases (Sparks 2003: 43-46) and specific shapes and contents.
197 On the role of private trade in the Near East during the period under study (and later), see Moreno Garcia 2014a; Moreno Garcia 2014b.
198 Doxey 1998: 3.
biography” category (ethische/ideal Biographie). Even if this is correct, this idea of epithets as ideal descriptions of the officials can be nuanced, as Leprohon has already underlined. For instance, the epithets under study are clearly related to the fields of action of their holders and, consequently, their actual information transcends the ideal profile. In some way, they can be considered as biographical complements or markers connected to related titles and, less frequently, to biographical texts of the officials, as they refer both to the tasks these officials undertook during his life, and their loyalty and efficiency before the king: two of the main components of Egyptian biographical texts.

As can be seen from the epithets in Middle Kingdom expedition inscriptions mentioned at the beginning of this essay, the epithets under study here have more secular contents and narrative forms than others connected to royal praise, confidence, love or satisfaction. In other words, they seem more “biographical” because they are more precise, informative and allusive to the titles and biographical accounts of their holders. Despite their impersonal style, they refer to actual actions (the bringing of products or information, and the promotion of the fear of the king in foreign places) connected to assumed royal commands. As a result, they serve as hints for recalling precise episodes of the lives and careers of their holders abroad when they are connected with other titles and textual information.

Bearing this circumstance in mind, epithets should be considered as more than decorative additions. They can contain significant elements and emphatic formulas which aim to underline and describe, among other aspects, the offices held by the deceased (such as the epithets studied in this chapter), the effectiveness they had when accomplishing them, or the confidence placed in them by the king. Moreover, expressions in epithets were included –with slight grammatical changes– in the narratives of biographies. Consequently, epithets could inspire biographic texts or, conversely, the former could be influenced by the latter.

Contrarily to biographical texts, titles and epithets were created by relatively fixed rules. For instance, epithets were not very varied despite their many occurrences. As stated above, epithets referring to the officials are impersonal expressions as they are in the third person and they reference the king in general terms such as nb, ny-swt, hnm-f and ntr.

Where did the epithets under study come from? Some officials, including Intef/Mekhu’s son, Sabni (2.06), didn’t hold them even though their tombs include a rich epigraphic repertoire connected to activities abroad that contains other epithets. This

---

201 Baines 1999: 36.
203 Other epithets that could evidence precise or regular actions are those that include the verbs ip (Jones 2000: 9-10, nos. 35-38; see also Altenmüller 2012: 9-10; 14-15); mi (Jones 2000: 419-422, nos. 1552-1562); or s.b.t (Jones 2000: 884, no. 3236; see also Diego Espinel 2006: 80, n. 380).
204 See, e.g., Jones 2000: 660, nos. 2413-2414 (hss(w) nb-f); 338, nos. 1248-1249 (irr(w) wdt nb-f); 338-340, nos. 1250-1256, 1258-1259 (irr(w) nrr.tw nb-f); 340-342, nos. 1260-1268 (irr(w) hss nb-f).
205 See, e.g., Jones 44-47, nos. 231-241 (imy-tb n nb-f); 444, nos. 1659-1660 (nrr(w) (n) nb-f ), 447-449, nos. 1673-1679 (nh(w)-l n nb-f).
206 See, e.g., the biographies of Weni: Urk. I 99, 7; 101, 1; 105, 16 (n nh(w)-l nb(=i) hnm-f), see also Collombert 2015: 148 (x + 9) (m nh(w)-l nb(=i) hnm-f); Urk. I 100, 4 (m nh(w)-l nb(=i) hnm-f); 100, 9 and 10; 106, 11 (ir.k(w)) r hs.t(=i) wb(=i) hnm-f; 107, 13 (mi wdt n nb hnm-f); and Pepynakht/Heqaib (1.08/3.06): Urk. I 134, 5 (ibw ir.n(=i) r hs.t(=i) nb(=i)); 134, 12 (n ir nrr nb(=i)). Similar phraseology is attested in the letter written by Pepy II to Herkhuf (2.05/3.08, 2.06): Urk. I 129, 5 (m nrr hss nb-k); 129, 14 (r ir nrr hss wdt nb-f).
207 Baud 2005: 122. Epithets are seldom connected to a royal name, see, e.g., Jones 2000: 340, no. 1260.
208 Sabni held such epithets as nh(w)-Ib ny-swt or n st-tb nb(=f), see Edel 2008: pl. 13. Some of his household literally copied the epithet ir(w) hss(t) nb-f in their inscriptions, see e.g. Edel 2008: pls. 7, 9, 11, 14, 15 (repeated several times), or n st-tb=f, Edel 2008: pl. 15.
example suggests that these epithets, as titles, were not personal choices or creations for enriching the texts carved in tomb or rock inscriptions. Their content, impersonal tone, and general references to the king point strongly to an official origin. It is likely that epithets were given to these officials by the king or by high officials. In this sense, these expressions could follow the same creative path as other less specific epithets attested, for instance, in official seals. 209 These artifacts can offer important clues as to the dynamics of the origin and spreading of epithets. The incorporation of epithets along with different titles on official seals of the central administration was surely a royal or state initiative in order to individualize and profile the identity of their holders: state officials whose personal names were never carved on their seals. As creations coined by the royal favour and the central administration, epithets on the seals could have subsequently been copied by the officials along with other titles in their tombs or in rock inscriptions. In some cases they could also have been inserted into their biographical texts, and could have inspired other people when copying literarily or in creating parallel epithets referring to familiar, local or divine spheres. 210 Regrettably, despite their abundance, it is difficult to know if the epithets can be considered only as rhetorical clichés or whether significant brands emerged from the court that their holders wanted to proudly exhibit. This is not the place for the attentive study that this phraseology deserves and, consequently, it is not possible to precisely establish if seal epithets developed before, after, or in parallel with the epithets attested from the tombs and other inscriptions. 211 A more superficial study of general works hasn’t confirmed this possibility. As with many other aspects of the past, it is likely that epithets didn’t have a single point of origin and a unique spread and direction, but were probably created, adopted and diffused in variegated circumstances by different agents. As a result, some epithets seem to appear initially in the official seals. 212 Conversely, others are first attested from private monuments. 213 In fact, the epithets under study are not attested in seals. 214 Only a seal of Menkaure from Buhene could include an expression that recalls the epithets related to the bringing of products: “[who] brings the foreign lands daily [in their whole extension]” (in[n(w)?] h{s.s.wt m-mnt r-][w-sn]215). Old Kingdom Egyptian sealing inscriptions are rather different from the administrative seals employed in Mesopotamia during the 3rd millennium BC. Generally, they include specific titles, filiation, and/or the personal name of the official (sometimes only his

209 Baud 2005: 122.
210 See, e.g., Jones 2000: 309, no. 1126 (ir(.w) hssst rmt nb); 445, nos. 1661-1662 (mrr(.w) ntr; mrr(.w) sn.w=f sn.wt=s). For the copy of epithets by private individuals see, e.g. n. 207.
211 Despite its interest, the study of Janssen 1946 is outdated since many new epithets and monuments (including sealings) have since been discovered and published.
212 That is the case of irr(.w) wdt + Royal name/epithet and some variants. The first attestations of this recurring epithet from official seals appear in the reign of Khafre (Kaplon: 1981: 52-53, pls. 17-18, r’-h’s-f 17), but, according to examples presented by Hannig 2003: 184 (46266); 46269, they are more rarely attested in private monuments from the mid-5th dynasty. innw hr/n nbf appears in official seals of Sahure (Kaplon: 1981: 181-182, pl. 58, stltw-r’ 13) but only appears in tombs in the reign of Shesheska, according to the examples given by Jones 2000: 28, nos. 129-130. irr(.w) hzzt nbf is attested for the first time from sealings of Shespekare (Kaplon: 1981: 289-290, pl. 81, Ḗps-kf-r’ 2), but it also appears in private monuments during the 6th dynasty according to the example given by Jones 2000: 309, no. 1125, and the date given in PM III: 143.
213 mrr(.w) (n) nbf is attested in seals during the reign of Khafre (Kaplon: 1981: 37, pl. 13, r’-h’s-f 5) and from mastabas in the reign of Senefru and Khufu, see Sourouzian 1999: 166, fig. 12; Junker 1929: pls. 17a, 2 respectively. hzzt nbf appears in official seals of Pepy I (Kaplon: 1981: 369-370, pl. 99, mry-r’ 3), but it is already attested in private monuments in the 5th dynasty, see Jones 2000: 660, nos. 2413-2414; Urk. I 1180, no. 37; 985, no. 3640; 986, no. 3642.
214 Conversely, some epithets on seals are not attested from private monuments, see, e.g. Jones 2000: 10, no. 37; 985, no. 3640; 986, no. 3642.
name).\(^{216}\) Other texts with biographical information (private epithets) are absent from the seals. The different sealing practices in Egypt and Mesopotamia used to identify their owners evidence the use of combined titles and epithets by the Egyptian administration for individualizing unnamed officials. Epithets were, consequently, identification marks that transcended the seals. They also enriched and enhanced the titles and biographical texts of the officials in their tombs, and served as condensed and highly formulaic biographical accounts by themselves.

These epithets and the titles connected to the acquisition of intelligence encourage us to appreciate the Egyptian administration as a changing and non-linear system of action and promotion. Despite having different backgrounds and careers, their holders carried out significant activities abroad or in the Egyptian frontiers, though in spite of their achievements they never held the highest titles of the Egyptian administration. Moreover, they weren’t involved in the administration and storage of the goods they obtained beyond Egypt. The neat divorce between acquisition and management of the foreign luxuria implies a structured central administration in which foreign activities and internal management were independent matters.

On the other hand, the epithets under study cannot be taken as mere decorative expressions inserted into the titulary of officials. Their inclusion in the *cursus honorum* of some officials cannot be interpreted as a result of a well-defined career, but rather as somewhat arbitrary recognitions by the king and high dignitaries, as they were given to officials with diverse backgrounds. Along with titles and biographical texts, they offer relevant information on the procurement of foreign goods by the Egyptian central and/or provincial administrations. As such, they can be appreciated as important sources of biographical information and as evidence with which to approach the mechanisms of identification and designation of the Egyptian officials by the state.

**Catalogue: Epithets and titles and their holders**

1. Epithets connected to the import of foreign products

1.01 – Hetepu/Neferhetepu (*htpw/nfr-htpw*).

**Monuments:** Rock inscription at Wadi Hammamat: C/M 156 (Couyat, Montet 1912: 93, no. 156; pl. 33; Eichler 1993: 76, no. 137; Sweeney 2014: 286, n. 56); one rock inscription at Wadi Gudami (?) and two rock inscriptions at Wadi Hammama (?) (Green 1909: 321, pl. 53; 321, no. 34; pl. 54; 321; no. 38, pl. 54; Eichler 1993: 46, no. 50; 48, no. 56, 49, no. 61).*

**Date:** 5\(^{th}\) dynasty (?). Sahure (?) (Eichler 1993: 46, 48, 49).

**Titles:** \(\text{imy-ht smnty}(,w)\ mrr(,w)\ nb=f;\ inn(,w)\ hkr\ ny-swt\ m\ h3s.wt\ rsy(,w)t?\)** (Wadi Hammamat C/M 156); \(s\$\ smnty(,w)\) (Wadi Gudami); \(s\$\) (Wadi Hammama).

* According to Eichler (1993: 349), the inscriptions at Wadi Gudami and Wadi Hammama would mention the same official as \(htpw\) (nos. 56 and 61) or \(hpt\) (no. 50). The name in Eichler’s no. 61 could be, however, a misreading of the title \(smr-w’ty\).

** The sign \(rsy(,w)t\) has been read as \(nfr\) (\(nfr-htpw\)) by Eichler (1993: 76, no. 137). It is followed by a \(p\)-phonogram that is difficult to integrate either as part of the epithet, or as part of the name. The complete sequence of titles is: \(\text{imy-ht smnty}(,w)\ mrr(,w)\ nb=f\ inn(,w)\ hkr\ ny-swt\ m\ h3s.wt\ r(y,w)t?\)

1.02/3.02 – Ikhi/Mery (*ih;i; mry (rn=f nfr)*).

**Monuments:** Tomb at Saqqara, cemetery at the west of Netjerierkhet’s complex (Kuraszkiewicz 2014); rock inscriptions at Wadi Hammamat: G 30 (Goyon 1957: 64, no.

---

\(^{216}\) See e.g., Collon 1987: 105-107.
Bringing treasures and placing fears: Old Kingdom epithets and titles related to activities abroad

Date: 6th dynasty. Pepy I – Merenre (Kuraszkiewicz 2014: 215) (after or during the first occasion of the sed-festival, year 18 after the census, according to inscriptions C/M 103 and C/M 133; C/M 61 could also mention this date, see Kuraszkiewicz 2014: 202, 215; Sweeney 2014: 278).

Titles: \textit{imy-r mš} \textit{t}; \textit{imy-r šnw}; \textit{imy-r šš.\(w\)} \textit{pr.w}; \textit{imy-r šš.\(w\)} \textit{pr.w m pr 4}; \textit{inn.\(w\)} \textit{hry.\(w\)} \textit{hš.\(w\) t n nb=f}; \textit{mt} \textit{ny \(pr.w\)} \textit{[nfr.\(w\) \(?=\)} \textit{mt ny \(pr\ wîž\)} \textit{hnty-š mn-nfr-\textit{mry-r\(’\)}} \textit{dd-s.\(w\) t-ttî}; \textit{hmtw-\textit{btty\(\)}} \textit{hmtw-ntr}; \textit{hmtw-ntr m wîž.wy \(?=\)} \textit{smr-w’\(w\) ty}; \textit{tpy \(hr ny-swt\)} \textit{dd.\(w\) nrw \textit{[hrw m hš.\(w\) wt]} \textit{tmb.t m nb=f}} (tomb at Saqqara); \textit{hmtw-ntr} (Wadi Hammamat G30; C/M 61; C/M 107; AE 3100; C/M 103, where he figures as the director of an expedition); \textit{imy-ir.ty} \textit{pr.\(w\) wîž} (Wadi Midrik MD04).

* The epithet follows the sequence […] \textit{dd.\(w\) nrw [hrw m hš.\(w\) wt]} \textit{hry.\(w\) t hš.\(w\) n nb=f}.

1.03/3.03 – Inka\(f\) (\textit{in-k3-f} \textit{(rn=f nfr)})..

Monuments: Stela and drum lintel (Cairo JD 68916 and 68197 respectively) from Zawayda (Coptos) (Fischer 1964: 11-12); rock inscription at Wadi Isa (?) (Bell, Johnson, Whitcomb 1984: 34, fig. 7; fig. 16, no. 3; Eichler 1993: 84, no. 166); two rock inscriptions at Bir Minayh (?) (Rothe, Miller, Rapp 2008: 71-72, MN25 = Almásy, Kiss 2010: 180, E 009/1; Rothe, Miller, Rapp 2008: 81, MN33).

Date: 6th dynasty (Fischer 1964: 30-32). Pepy I (?).

Titles: \textit{inn.\(w\)} \textit{hkr ny-swt m hš.\(w\) rsy.\(wt\)}; \textit{hmtw-ntr m wîž.wy \(?=\)} \textit{dd.\(w\) nrw \textit{hrw m hš.\(w\) wt]} (Cairo JD 68916-68917); \textit{imy-ir.ty} \textit{pr.\(w\) wîž} (Wadi Isa); \textit{hmtw[-ntr?] \textit{[hrw m hš.\(w\) wt]} (Bir Minayh MN25); \textit{imy-ir.ty}; \textit{imy-r šš.\(w\)} (Bir Minayh MN33).

* Kanawati (2004: 56) has proposed that the official Inka\(f\) in a graffiti at Abu Simbel is Inka\(f\)/ Ini buried at Teti’s cemetery at Saqqara (2.02), but he discards an identification between the latter and an homonymous official buried at Zawayda (see n.** below and 3.10).

** An incomplete stela allegedly from Zawayda (Coptos)/Turin Suppl. 1290) mentions another Inka\(f\) (3.10). Other official called Inka\(f\) is mentioned twice at Wadi Hammamat (C/M 211; G 2); he is a \textit{shd smnty.\(w\)} (Couyat, Montet 1912: 104, no. 211; Goyon 1957: 41-43, no. 2; Eichler 1993: 50, no. 63; 81, no. 155). Goyon (1957: 41-43) dated the graffiti back to the Early Dynastic period, but Eichler (1993: 50, 81) dated them from the reign of Sahure.

*** Possibly reign of Pepy I, as the long wig uncovering the ears in Cairo JD 68916 is only frequent after Teti (mainly Pepy I – Pepy II) (Cherpion 1989: 57-58, \textit{critère} 31; Baud 1998: 66); the short curled wig of Inka\(f\)’s wife, Henti, in the same stela suggests Pepy I (Cherpion 1989: 67, \textit{critère} 43), but Baud (1998: 69) predates its use to Teti. According to Fischer (1968: 76) the introduction of the name with \textit{nfr} \textit{nfr} in the 4th-7th provinces would be a feature “limited to a brief span within the reign of Pepy II”. Kanawati (1984: 30), however, thinks these feature could be dated “somewhat earlier”.

**** The epithet follows the sequence \textit{hmtw-ntr m wîž.wy \(?=\)} \textit{dd.\(w\) nrw \textit{hrw m hš.\(w\) wt inn.\(w\)} \textit{hkr ny-swt m hš.\(w\) rsy.\(wt\)}.  

1.04 – Iny/Inudjefau (\textit{iny/in.\(w\)}-\textit{dš.\(w\)})..

Monuments: Unlocated tomb at the Memphite area (probably Saqqara); false door (Barcelona, Museu egipci E-261), lintel (Tokyo, Middle Eastern Culture Centre in Japan, reg. no. 10617- (1-5)); and wall reliefs from an unlocated tomb (Barcelona, Museu egipci E-445; E-561 and block with unknown number; Los Angeles private collection; New York, private collection; Tokyo, Ancient Egyptian Museum cat. no. AEM 3-010; other fragments seen in the antiquities market).

Date: 6th dynasty. Pepy I – early Pepy II.
1.05/3.04 – Tjetji (tti).

Monuments: Tomb QH 103 at Qubbet el-Hawa (Edel 2008: 1499-1533; pl. 68; Fischer 1996: 21); rock inscriptions at Wadi Hammamat: C/M 35, C/M 64 and an unpublished graffiti (Couyat, Montet 1912: 46, no. 35, pl. 10; 60, no. 64; Newberry 1938: 183; Diego Espinel 2004: 13-14; Edel 2008: 1528-1529).

Date: 6th dynasty. Possibly late Pepy I – early Pepy II (Vischak 2014: 231-232).* Merenre or Pepy II (Martinet 2011: 71 [51]).

Monuments: Tomb QH 34n at Qubbet el-Hawa (Edel 2008: 617-661).


1.06/2.04/3.05 – Herkhuf (hrw-hw=f).

Monuments: Tomb QH 34n at Qubbet el-Hawa (Edel 2008: 617-661).


** Tjetji’s rock inscription C/M 35 is related to the inscription C/M 32 of Pepy I (Couyat, Montet 1912: 45, no. 32, pl. 10), that, apparently, is also connected with C/M 34 (ibid.: 46, pl. 34, pl. 10) and, maybe, with another damaged graffiti on which was carved C/M 33 (ibid.: 45, no. 33, pl. 10); C/M 64 could be related to a similar inscription (ibid.: 59-60, no. 16, pl. 16). The same applies with an unpublished graffiti of Tjetji close to the inscription C/M 60 with Merenre’s titulary (ibid.: 58, no. 60, pl. 6). As C/M 35, the unpublished graffiti is introduced by the wpt ny-sw t rtu.n formula. Apparently, Tjetji is not mentioned in the unpublished graffiti of Merenre’s first year after the census.

** The first epithet follows this sequence: htmw-ntr inn(w). hr(y.w) nb(f) hys.wt mbty(w). mh(m) nb(f) n ny-sw.t. The second one – very dubious – would follow the title htmw-ntr.

*** Alternatively, but less plausibly, imy-r nbw (contrarily to Diego Espinel 2004: 13-14, n. a).

**** He could be nomarch of Elephantine, even though he didn’t hold the usual titles connected to the office (Martinet 2011: 72 [51], 204-206).
1.07 – Sabn(i)/Ankhniepey (sĀbn; ‘nh-n-(i)-ppy (rn=f nfr)).

**Monuments:** Tomb QH 34n at Qubbet el-Hawa: pillar and false door (Edel 2008: 630 (text 10), pl. 30, fig. 11; 633-634, pl. 32, fig. 15; Vischak 2015: 101; 190).

**Date:** 6th dynasty. Merenre – early Pepy II (Vischak 2015: 230).

**Titles:** imy-r i3'(w); imy-ib n nb=f; imy-r h3.s.wt nb(t) n.(w)t tp rsy; lnn(w) hry(w)t h3.s.wt n nb=<(i)fbf>; **htmwb-bity; hry-h3b; smr-w’ty.**

* This official was possibly a close relative of Herkhuf (uncle, brother, son?), as his titles and name were carved on a pillar and on a false door carved in Herkhuf’s chapel. In one occasion Edel suggested that he could be Herkhuf himself (Edel 2008: 644, n. 109).

** Monuments:**

Tomb QH 34n at Qubbet el-Hawa: pillar and false door (Edel 2008: 627, fig. 11; 633-634, pl. 32, fig. 15; Vischak 2015: 230).

**Date:** 6th dynasty. Merenre – early Pepy II (Vischak 2015: 230). Pepy II (Martinet 2011: 75 [55]). Alternatively he could be dated from the late third of Pepy II, as Vischak (2015: 225-237) believes that the owners of tombs QH 35 and QH 35d are not the same person. The latter could be son or grand-son of the former. Consequently, his son Sabni (1.09/3.07), the owner of QH 35e, would be slightly later.

**Titles:** imy-iz; imy-r i3(w); imy-r i3'(w) nb(w); imy-r niwt mn-nfr-ppy; imy-r h3.s. wt; lnn(w) hry(w)t h3.s.wt n nb=f;** mty m zī h’-nfr(w)-mr-n’r; h3yττ; hry-tp nbh; hnty-s mn-‘nh-nfr-k3-r’; htmwb-bity; hry-h3b; smr-w’ty; sā n zī mn-‘nh-nfr-k3-r’; dā(w) nrw hrw m h3.s.wt (QH 35); imy-iz; imy-r i3'(w); imy-r h3.s.wt; hry-p’τ; mnw nhn; h3yττ m3τ; hry-h3b; hry-tp nbh; htmwb-bity; smr-w’ty; shd hmn(w)-ntr mn-nfr-ppy; shd hmn(w)-ntr h’t-nfr(w)-mr-n’r (QH 35d); imy-r i3'(w) h3s.wt; imy-r h3s.wt; h3yττ; hry-h3b; htmwb-bity; smr-w’ty (Elephantine, chapel).

* The epithets follows these sequences in the façade: imy-r i3'(w) in(w) hry(w)t h3s.wt n nb=f; in another line of the same text: mty n sā dā(w) nrw hrw h3s.wt (Edel 2008: pl. 33, text 2); in another section: imy-r i3'(w) dā(w) nrw hrw m h3s.wt (Edel 2008: pl. 34, text 2).

** He could be nomarch of Elephantine, even though he didn’t hold the usual titles connected to the office (Martinet 2011: 75 [55], 204-206).

1.08/3.06– Pepynakht/Heqaib (ppy-nht; ḫq3-ib (rn=f nfr))(father of 1.09/3.07).

**Monuments:** Tombs QH 35 and QH 35d at Qubbet el-Hawa (Edel 2008: 679-704; 733-802 respectively); wooden portable chest at Elephantine (Dorn 2015: 52-53)

**Date:** 6th dynasty. Merenre – early Pepy II (Vischak 2015: 230). Pepy II (Martinet 2011: 75 [55]). Alternatively he could be dated from the late third of Pepy II, as Vischak (2015: 225-237) believes that the owners of tombs QH 35 and QH 35d are not the same person. The latter could be son or grand-son of the former. Consequently, his son Sabni (1.09/3.07), the owner of QH 35e, would be slightly later.

**Titles:** imy-iz; imy-r i3(w); imy-r i3'(w) nb(w); imy-r niwt mn-nfr-ppy; imy-r h3.s. wt; lnn(w) hry(w)t h3.s.wt n nb=f;** mty m zā h’-nfr(w)-mr.n-r; ḫtycτ; hry-tp nbh; hnty-s mn-‘nh-nfr-k3-r’; ḫtmwb-bity; ḫry-h3b; smr-w’ty; sā n zā mn-‘nh-nfr-k3-r’; dā(w) nrw hrw m h3.s.wt (QH 35); imy-iz; imy-r i3'(w); imy-r h3.s.wt; hry-p’τ; mnw nhn; ḫtycτ m3τ; ḫry-h3b; ḫry-tp nbh; ḫtmwb-bity; smr-w’ty; shd hmn(w)-ntr mn-nfr-ppy; shd hmn(w)-ntr h’t-nfr(w)-mr.n’r (QH 35d); imy-r i3'(w) h3s.wt; imy-r h3s.wt; ḫtycτ; ḫry-h3b; ḫtmwb-bity; smr-w’ty (Elephantine, chapel).

* The epithets follows these sequences in the façade: imy-r i3'(w) in(w) hry(w)t h3s.wt n nb=f; in another line of the same text: mty n sā dā(w) nrw hrw h3s.wt (Edel 2008: pl. 33, text 2); in another section: imy-r i3'(w) dā(w) nrw hrw m h3s.wt (Edel 2008: pl. 34, text 2).

** He could be nomarch of Elephantine, even though he didn’t hold the usual titles connected to the office (Martinet 2011: 75 [57], 204-206).
1.10/3.09 – Henti (hti (rn=f nfr)).

Monuments: Stela from Zawayda (?) (Coptos) (Karlsruhe Museum H.411) (Fischer 1964: 32-33); rock inscription at Bir Minayh (?) (Almásy, Kiss 2010: 180, fig. 7; 181, E 009/3).

Date: 6th dynasty (Fischer 1964: 32-33).

Titles: imy-ir.ty ‘pr(w) wi; inn(w) hkr ny-swt m h3s.wt rsy(wt)*; dd(w) nrw hrw m h3s.wt (Karlsruhe); htmw-nfr (Bir Minayh).

* The epithet follows this sequence: imy-ir.ty dd(w) nrw hrw m h3s.wt inn(w) hkr ny-swt m h3s.wt rsy(wt).

1.11 – Idi (?) (idi?).

Monuments: Rock inscription at Gebel el-Hammam (Petrie 1888: pl. 12, no. 326; de Morgan 1894: 207, no. 32; Eichler 1993: 95, no. 205.*

Date: 6th dynasty (?).

Titles: imy-ir.ty; [imy-r?] smnty(w) h3st; inn(w) hkr ny-swt hr h3s.wt […]hr/n nb[=f]**

* The inscription is misread by Eichler 1993: 95, no. 205: ṣpsi-ny-swt htmw ny-swt (?) h3s.wt […] hr nbw smnty ty. The reading hkr is clear in Petrie 1888: pl. 12, no. 330.

** The copies of the inscription at hand are not completely reliable enough to offer a definite reading. The sign after hkr ny-swt can be hm(w) or, much more probably, hr. Both possibilities are not attested elsewhere. hr serves occasionally as a substitute for m (Edel 1973). The final part of the sentence can be read as hr n nb<cf>, or hr nb<cf>-hr. It could be interpreted as “to”. The epithet follows the sequence inn(w) hkr ny-swt hr h3s.wt […] hr nb=f [imy-r] smnty(w) h3st imy-ir.ty.

2. Epithets connected to the bringing of foreign information

2.01 – Iunmin/Tjetetu (iwn-mnw; Tttw (rn=f nfr)).*

Monuments: Mastaba at Saqqara, north west of Teti’s pyramid (Kanawati et al. 1984: 29-36; Lloyd et al. 1990: 47, pl. 21, no. 1).

Date: 6th dynasty. Pepy I (Kanawati et al. 1984: 30).

Titles: imy-r mdwt nbt št3t nt r-CN h3st; imy-r ḥnty(w)-; imy-r st ḥnty(w)-s pr-CN; hm-nfr ḏ-s.wt-tti; ḥry-sš3t; ḥry-sš3t n ny-swt m ṣwt-mdw nbt n(t) r-CN h3st; [ḥry-sš3t] n ny-swt m ṣwt-mdw nbt [šš3t] n(t) r-CN h3st; ḥnty-s ḏ-s.wt-tti; ḥry-ḥ3b; smr-w’ty; smr pr; ṣpsi ny-swt; tpy <hr> ny-swt pr-CN.

* This official could come from the Coptite area because of his theophorous name and titles (Kanawati et al. 1984: 29). Moreover, one of his sons is named Intef, a name common in the area around Thebes.

2.02 – Inkaf/Ini (in-k<cf>; ini (rn=f nfr)).*

Monuments: Tomb at Saqqara, north west of Teti’s pyramid, reused by Inkaf from an earlier owner whose name is unknown, but he could come from the area of Akhmim, as Min of Ipu (Akhmim) is mentioned in the original decoration of the tomb (Kanawati 2004).

Date: 6th dynasty. Pepy I (Kanawati 2004).

Titles: imy-r mš<cf>; imy-r smnty(w); imy-r šm<cf> w/imi-ry rsy (?)**; ḥry-sš3t n pr dwšt; ḥry-sš3t m ṣwt-mdw nbt nt r-CN nb n h3s.wt rsy(wt); ḥry-sš3t n h3s.wt n rsy; ḥry-ḥ3b; smr-w’ty; (titles inscribed by in-k<cf>); imy-r ḏt nbt nt ny-swt; irr(w) ḥṣt ny-swt m kl<cf> nbt ṣrw nb; htmw-nfr m wi3.wy ‘3; tpy hr ny-swt pr-CN (titles of the former owner of the tomb, possibly also given to in-k<cf>).

* See 1.03 (note *) for a possible identification of this official with Inkaf of Abu Simbel.

** According to Kanawati (2004: 60, n. 27) the title could actually be a miswriting of imy-r <šm<cf> w>.
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2.03 – Meryrenefer/Qar (mry-r‘-nfr; kfr (rn=f nfr))

Monuments: Tomb at Edfu with offering niche (Cairo JE 43370-43771); possibly (but not probably) tomb at the Teti cemetery at Saqqara (Kanawati 2011; see however Diego Espinel 2015: 244); possibly several reliefs from an unlocated tomb at Saqqara (BM EA 1319A-B, 1330, 1341, 1342, James 1961: 33-36; Hermitage inv. No. 18233, Bolshakov 2005: 111-121; Stanford University Museum of Art T173, van Siclen III 1990: 50; see however Kanawati 2011: 218).*

Date: 6th dynasty. Teti-early Pepy II (Brovarski 2014: 25, no. 21).

Titles: imy-ib n ny-swt; imy-r it šmn‘w; imy-r wp(w)t nb n ny-swt; imy-r hm(.w)-ntr; imy-r hnty(w)-s pr-‘; imy-r ſm(w)t; iry-ht ny-swt; d-mr <n> šib; wr md šmn‘w; mdhw sš ny-swt; (ny?) nst hnttr; bṭty-‘; hṛy-sšt3 n mb w̱ nb(t) lnnt m r-‘ q3w ḫṣ. wt m ḫṣs.wt r.wy(w)t; hṛy-sšt3 n mdw nb(t) ššt3 īwt m r-‘ q3b w̱; hṛy-tp ‘q3 n spṣt imy-ib n ny-swt; hṛy-hṣb; smr-w‘ty; ṭpy ḫr ny-swt m‘ (tomb at Edfu); imy-r hnty(w)-s pr-‘; imy-r gs hmrwt(w); iry-mḥ‘t; iry-ḥt ny-swt (tomb at Saqqara); imy-r gs-pr; ḥk3 ḫwt; hṛy-hṣb; ḥtmw-bḥty; ḥtmw-bḥty m3; smr-w‘ty; sš mḏḥt ntr; sš mḏḥt ntr n st ib nb-f (unlocated tomb at Saqqara).

* There are, at least, two other blocks (Kelsey Museum 81.4.1; Stockholm MME 1990:004) that could come from this tomb, but the titles are somewhat different. In the Kelsey block the individual is called kfr and his nfr is ppy-nfr, and his titles are: hṛy-hṣb imy ib n nb=f; [hṛy-sšt3?] n pr dwšt; ṭḥy-nḥn mṣ (Richards, Wilfong 1995: 26, no. IV.1; Callender 2000: 380, no. 24, who relates it to the blocks kept at the British Museum). The block in Stockholm depicts two offering bringers and an ox which is k n ḥṣb ḫmr-nḥn kfr (see Peterson 1981).

Moreover, Qar “Junior” at Abusir was possibly named Meryrenefer/Pepynefer too (Bárta 2009: 147, 246-247, n. 17). Another inscription at Wadi Barramiya mentioning an official Qar with the title imy-r sš(w). of the 2nd name has been tentatively connected to this official (Eichler 1998: 251-252, no. 1, pl. 28a = Rothe, Miller, Rapp 2008: 180, BR64). A practically identical rock inscription was found at Wadi Dunqash (Rothe, Miller, Rapp 2008: 285, DN02) again with the title imy-r sš(w).

2.04 (=1.06/2.04/3.05) – Herkhuf (ḥrw-hw-w=f).

Date: 6th dynasty. Merenre – early Pepy II.

2.05/3.08 – Intef/Mekhu (in-it=f; mh[w (rn=f nfr)])(father of 2.06).

Monuments: Tomb QH 25 at Qubbet el-Hawa (Edel 2008: 5-265); wooden portable chest at Elephantine (Dorn 2015: 189, no. 17); rock inscription at Tomas (Edel 1971; Eichler 1993: 112, no. 258); papyrus Strasbourg Cb vso, 5 from Elephantine (?) (Möller 1911: pls. 6-6a).*


Titles: imy-r i‘(w)n st-ib nb-f; imy-r mš‘; ** imy-r ḫṣs.wt; imy-r ḫṣs.wt nb; hṭty-‘; hṛy-sšt3 n mb w̱ nb(t) śšt3 śšt3; hṛy-hṣb; ḥtmw-bḥty; smr-w‘ty (tomb QH 25); imy-r ḫṣs.wt; hṭty-‘; smr-w‘ty (Elephantine); imy-r i‘(w)n; imy-r mš‘ ḫr sšt3; imy-r ḫṣs.wt nb-f m ḫns iḥt w̱wšt; hṛy-sšt3 n mdw nb(t) [lnnt m ḫṣs.wt nb(?));** hṛy-hṣb; ḥtmw-bḥty; smr-w‘ty; smr-w‘ty [mh(w)n nb n?] ny-swt; dd(w) ṭrw ḫrw [m ḫṣs.wt r.wy(w)t]*** (Tomas); imy-r pr (pap. Strasbourg Cb vso, 5).****

* According to Martinet (2011: 74 [54]) this papyrus would mention Intef/Mekhu and his son Sabni. However, the title of the former (imy-r pr) raises doubts about an ultimate identification (Edel 2008: 222, n. 679).

** Vischak (2015: 235) suggests that Intef/Mekhu was imy-r šmn‘w according to the inscriptions in his coffin, but Edel (2008: 124-125, 127, figs. 177-179) does not record this title in the coffin remains.
Andrés Diego Espinel

*** The remaining signs in the picture published by Edel (1971) permit that reading or an alternative one: *hry-sšt3 n mdwt nb(t) [ny-sw t m hš3.w] nt r3 g3w n 3bw* (Edel 1971: 55, 58-59).

**** The complete sequence of titles is *ḥtnw-bity snrw-wt ybr-hšb ḳmr-y r3(w) snrw-wt [mh(w) nb n] ny-sw t ybr-hšs.wt n nb-f m ḳmr y r3(w) [hš3.w nb(t) [hš3.w nb(t)]] dd(w.) nrw hrw [m hš3.w rsw t].

***** He could be nomarch of Elephantine, even though he didn’t hold the usual titles connected to the office (Martinet 2011: 73-74 [53], 204-206).

2.06 – Sabni (šibni)(son of 2.05/3.08).

Monuments: Tomb QH 26 at Qubbet el-Hawa (Edel 2008: 5-265); rock inscription at Tomas (Edel 1971; Eichler 1993: 112, no. 258); papyrus Strasbourg Cb vso, 5 from Elephantine (?) (Möller 1911: pls. 6-6a; see 2.05/3.08, n. *); papyrus Berlin P. 8869 from Elephantine (?) (Edel 2008: 222; Manassa 2006 and Dorn 2015: 53 identify the homonymous official in the papyrus with the owner of QH 34e, see 1.09/3.07).

Date: 6th dynasty. Mid-Pepy II or slightly later (Vischak 2015: 234). Late Pepy II (Edel 2008: 230). Early Pepy II (Martinet 2011: 74-75 [54]).

Titles: *imy-r i3(w); imy-r <r>-aA (?);* *imy-r hšs.wt; imy-r hšs.wt mh(w)-lb ny-sw t mp tp rsy; imy-r hšs.wt n nb-f;* *imy-r ḳmr y r3(w) nb-f; imy-r ḳmr y r3(w) nrw hrw [m hš3.w rsw t].

* In Edel (2008: pl. 2, scene 3) the reading *imy-r<i3(w)*, “overseer of the door” is perfectly clear, but it is possibly a miswriting of *imy-r i3(w)* (see Edel 2008: 31).

** He could be nomarch of Elephantine, even though he didn’t hold the usual titles connected to the office (Martinet 2011: 74-75 [54], 204-206).

2.07 – Khuinkhnum (hw1-n-hnmw)

Monuments: Tomb QH 102 at Qubbet el-Hawa (Edel 2008: 1387-1456); rock inscriptions at Sehel (Elephantine area): SEH 12-13 (Gasse, Rondot, 2007: 28-29, 433-434; Eichler 1993: 97, no. 205 = SEH 13; 99, no. 211 = SEH 12); el-Buweib, rock inscription (Eichler 1993: 92, no. 189).

Date: 6th dynasty. Mid-Pepy II or slightly later (Vischak 2015: 235). Late Pepy II (Edel 2008: 1442).

Titles: *imy-r hšs.wt, imy-r šš(w) ‘pr.w, imy-ḫt wiš ‘š, hšty-‘, Ḫry-sšt3 n mdwt nb(t) ššt3(t) n(t) tp rsy, ḫtnw-bity, Ḫry-hšb, snrw-wt(y), šḥḏ hm(w)-nrw mn-’nh-nfr-k3-r-, iry-pṭt (?); hšty-‘; ḫtnw-bity, Ḫry-hšb, snrw-wt(y), šḥḏ hm(w)-nrw mn-’nh-nfr-k3-r’ (tomb QH 25); Ḫry-sšt3 n mdwt nb(t) nt r3 g3w n 3bw; Ḫry-hšb, snrw-wt(y); (Tomas); snrw-wt(y) (pap. Strasbourg Cb vso, 5); Ḫry-hšb.**

** He could be nomarch of Elephantine, even though he didn’t hold the usual titles connected to the office (Martinet 2011: 74-75 [54], 204-206).

2.08 – […]

Monuments: Coffin remains (QH 102/169a) from shaft V of tomb QH 102 at Qubbet el-Hawa (Edel 2008: 1421, 1425-1426, 1429, fig. 78, 1441-1442).

Date: 6th dynasty. Probably from the same period as 2.07.

Titles: *[ḫry-sšt3] n mdwt nb(t) ššt3 n(y) r3 g3w šbw/hš3.wt (?).*

2.09 – Tjauti (t3wīt).

Monuments: Tomb T 73 at el-Qasr wa es-Saiyad (Hiw) (Säve-Söderbergh 1994: 36-56).

Date: 6th dynasty. Mid-late Pepy II (Martinet 2011: 84 [64]).

Titles: *imy-r ḫm(w)-nrw; imy-r šš(w); imy-r šš(w) mṣ‘; iry-pṭt mh(w)-lb nb=f r3 g3w Ḫsr rṣy(t); mh(w)-lb ny-sw t m r3 g3w Ḫsr rṣy(t); hšty-‘; hšty-‘ mṣ‘; Ḫry-sšt3 n pr
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d[wAt (?); Hry-sStA n r-aA gAw; Hry-sStA n r-aA gAw xAst rsy(t) m mdwt nbt S[tAt (?); *
Hry-tp aA n spAt; HqA-Hwt; xrp iAt nbt nTryt; xtmw-bity; Xry-HAb; smr-waty; sHD Hm(.w)-nTr mn-anx-
mry-ra; sHD Hm(.w)-nTr mn-anx nfr-kA-ra; sHD Hm(.w)-nTr xA-nfr mr-n-ra; s$ mdšt-ntr.
* The title is not recorded by Säve-Söderbergh, but is clear (leaving aside s[tAt]) in Säve-

3. Epithets connected to the “fear of Horus in the foreign countries”

3.01 – Kaimtjenenet (k3=i-m-tnnt)
  Date: 5th dynasty. Isesi.
Baud 1999: 592).*
  Titles: [imy-ir.ty] apr.wy wiA[.wy] imy-ib n nb=f; imy-r wDt mdw nbt nt ny-swt; imy-r
wDt mdw nbt nt ny-swt mrr nb=f; imy-r m$t; imy-r sb3w ms.w [ny-swt]; imy-r kIt nbt nt ny-
swt mrr nb=f; htmw-nTr; htmw-nTr m i$3.wy 3; s$ ny-swt; smr-w’t’y; <dd(.w)> nrw hrw m
h3s.wt** (mastaba D 7 at Saqqara); imy-ir.ty pr(w:) wi$; [htmw]-nTr m wi$.[wy ][3$?] (and
other unpublished and unreadable titles) (mastaba G 7411 at Giza).
  * Maybe the owners of both tombs are different officials as the names of their wifes are
different. In any case, the mastabas have similar plans. G 7411 is very similar to the mastaba
of Lesiankh (mastaba D8 at Saqqara; Baud 1999: 421-422, no. 31), a relative, possibly the son, of
Kaimtjenenet at Saqqara (Baud 1999: 591).
  ** The epithet follows the sequence imy-r wDt mdw nb n ny-swt <dd(.w)> nrw hrw m h3st.

3.02 (= 1.02/3.02) – Ikhi/Mery (ih; mry (rn=f nfr)).
  Date: 6th dynasty. Pepy I – Merenre.

3.03 (= 1.03/3.03) – Inkaf (in-k3=f (rn=f nfr)).
  Date: 6th dynasty. Pepy I (?).

3.04 (= 1.05/3.04) – Tjetji (tti).
  Date: 6th dynasty. Possibly late Pepy I – early Pepy II. Merenre or Pepy II (?).

3.05 (= 1.06/3.05/2.04) – Herkhuf (hrw-hwi=f).
  Date: 6th dynasty. Merenre – early Pepy II.

3.06 (= 1.08/3.06) – Pepynakht/Heqaib (ppy-nht; hkt-ib (rn=f nfr))(father of 1.09/3.08).
  Date: 6th dynasty. Merenre – early Pepy II. Pepy II. Late third of Pepy II.

3.07 (= 2.05/3.07) – Intef/Mekhu (in-it=f; mh$w (rn=f nfr))(father of 2.06).
  Date: 6th dynasty. Early Pepy II to late Pepy II. .

3.08 (= 1.09/3.08) – Sabni (s$bn)(son of 1.08/3.06).
  Date: 6th dynasty. Merenre – early Pepy II. Pepy II. Late third of Pepy II. Late Pepy II.

3.09 (= 1.10/3.09) – Henti (hnti).
  Date: 6th dynasty.

3.10 – Inkaf (in-k3=f).
  Monuments: Incomplete stela from Zawayda (Coptos) (Turin Suppl. 1290) (Fischer
1964: 8-14; 33-34, no. 10; pl. XII); rock inscription at Abu Simbel (?) (Fischer 1964: 12;
Eichler 1993: 115, no. 271).
Date: 6th dynasty.

Titles: [ipy-r mn]fš; hry-hšb; [smr]-wty; [dd(.w)] nrw [hrw m šš.w] (Zawayda);
ipy-r mš, ln-mnr <nrw?>, hry-sšš, smš nrw, smr-wty (Abu Simbel).

* He doesn’t seem to be the homonymous official at Zawayda (1.03/3.03), but he could be the person mentioned at Abu Simbel, as both seem to be connected to the Coptite area.

3.11 – […]

Monuments: Doorjamb found at Ayn Asil (Dakhla).
Titles: […] [dd(.w) nrw hrw m šš.w […]].

3.12 – […]

Monuments: Block found at Ayn Asil (Dakhla), northern area of the city.
Titles: […] [dd(.w) nrw hrw m šš.w].

4. Other officials mentioned in the text

4.01 – Abebi (ibbi)

Monuments: False door from Saqqara (?) (Cairo CG 1406); unprovenanced false door (Cairo CG 1459) (Saqqara?) (Borchardt 1937: 68-69, pl. 18; 148-149, pl. 36 respectively); rock tomb QH 109 at Qubbet el-Hawa (?) (Edel 2008: 1663-1714). The owner of both false doors could be the same official (Brovarski 2006: 94-95). If so, they would come from different tombs, as both false doors are rather different in style. Moreover, Brovarski (1989: 984, n. 71) has also suggested an identification between the owner of Cairo CG 1406 and the owner of QH 109, Abebi/Tjesu (ibbi/šw), who held similar titles.

Date: 6th dynasty. Mid-6th dynasty (later than Merenre because of the T-shaped panel).

Titles: imy-r i’š(w), hry-sšš n tp-rsy, hry-hšš, hnty-š mn-nfr-ppy, smr-wty (CG 1406); hry-sšš n spšt, hry-hšš, smr-wty (CG 1459); imy-r i’š(w), hry-hšš, htmw-bity, smr-wty (QH 109).

4.02 – Unisankh (wnis-ªnh).

Monuments: Tomb TT 413 at el-Khokha (Thebes); block (MMA 22.3.325) (Saleh 1977: 12-17).

Date: 6th dynasty. Early 6th dynasty (Martinet 2011: 49-50 [29]).

Titles: imy-r šm’w, imy-r šnw.ty, hry-sšš n mdwt nb ššš innt r spšt, hry-tp ‘š n spšt, tpy hr ny-swt.

4.03 – Khenti (hnti).


Date: 6th dynasty. Possibly same period as 4.02 (Martinet 2011: 81, n. 87) [61].

Titles: hry-sšš n mdwt nb ššš innt r spšt, hry-tp ‘š n spšt, hry-hšš, htmw-bity, smr-wty.

4.04 – Ihy (ihy) (rn=f nfr).

Monuments: Tomb TT 186 at el-Khokha (Thebes) (Saleh 1977: 23-26).

Date: 6th dynasty. Merenre – Pepy II (Martinet 2011: 80 [60]).

Titles: iwn knmwt, imy-ib n ny-swt hnty idb.wy, imy-r šš.w spšt, imy-r šnw.ty, ‘d-mr ššb, mdw rhyt, ny nst hnty, hry-sšš n mdwt nb ššš innt r spšt, hry-tp ‘š n spšt, hkš-hwt, hry-hšš, smr-wty, tpy hr ny-swt pr-šš.
4.05 – Idu (I) (*idw*)(father of 4.06?).

**Monuments:** Mastaba and stela at Dendera (Fischer 1968: 93-100).

**Date:** 6th dynasty, reign of Pepy II (Fischer 1968: 93; Martinet 2011: 82 [62]).

**Titles:** *imy-*lz, *imy-*r *šm*w, *imy-*r *šm*w *nbw* m3’, *imy-*r *š.*w *sp3t, ‘*d-*mr *š*ib, wr *mdw* *šm*w, *ny* nst *hnnty, *hty*-c, *hry-*sšt3 n *mdw* nb *št3(t) innt r *sp3t, [hry]-[sšt3 n *mdw-ntr?], *hry-tp ’3 n *sp3t, *hk3-*hw*t, *hk3-*htw* *nfr*-k’-r’-*mn*-’nh, *hk3-*htw* *mry*-r’-*mn-nfr, *hry-*šib, *htmw-*bity, *smr-*w’ty, *smr-pr, *št3s ny-šwt.

* Fischer 1968: 100-103.

4.06 – Tjauti (I) (*twt*)(son of 4.05?).

**Monuments:** Stela from Dendera (Philadelphia Univ. Museum E 17749) (Fischer 1968: 103-107).

**Date:** 6th dynasty. Late Pepy II (Fischer 1968: 187, 93, n. 420; Martinet 2011: 101-102 [79]).

**Titles:** [hry-sšt3 n] *mdw* nb [št3(t) innt r [sp3t, [hry]-sšt3 n [mdw-ntr?], *hry-tp ’3 n *sp3t, *hk3-*hw*t, *hry-*šib, *htmw-*bity, *smr-*w’ty.

4.07 – Niibunysut/Bebi (*ny-*lb.w-ny-šwt/bbi (rn=f nfr)).

**Monuments:** Tomb 770 at Dendera (blocks lt3, rt 6, lt, tr2) (Fischer 1968: 114-119).

**Date:** 8th dynasty (Fischer 1968: 114, 187; Martinet 2011: 103-104 [81]).

**Titles:** *imy-*r *ḥmt.w*)-ntr, ‘*d* mr *šib, wr *mdw* *šm*w, *ny* nst *hnnty, *rsy*-r *wdt* sr.w, *hry-sšt3 n *wdt-mdw, *hry-*sšt3 n *mdw* nb innt r *sp3t, hry-[sšt3 n] *htmw-ntr, *hry-tp ’3 n *sp3t, *hk3-*hw*t, *hry-*šib, *htmw-*bity, *smr-*w’ty, *ty* ħr ny-*šwt.
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