A couple hundred pages have been devoted to distinguishing Pyramid Texts into groups and categories and to determining the general settings of their origins. And yet it seems that the work has really only just begun. Now one is in a position to closely examine the contents of the groups, to compare them and to evaluate the nature of their later contextual connections so as to get a clearer picture of their histories. But to do this properly would require considerably more pages, while a natural resting place has at least been reached.

Still, one last thing which may be done is to suggest a subdivision of the categories into types. The dissertation out of which the present work grew devoted most of its attention to the procedure of subdividing the categories, with the results corresponding to the articulation of the corpus seen by J. Allen in the pyramid of Unas. After having asserted a broad categorical division according to grammatical person, it devoted itself to distinguishing types based on recurring series and motifs. The sacerdotal category was divided into two, and the personal category was divided into three.

The types are less clearly distinguishable from one another than the categories, because their texts (representative of rites) were generally homologous to the same general setting. Because the types of a category belonged to the same larger unit, and because each category is homologous to a particular setting, the types of a single category could be and were more freely deployed together than across the categorical boundaries. This is reflected at the textual level also: texts of different types but the same category could more easily share motifs. Consequently the fault lines between types of the same category are more permeable than those between the two different categories. And yet despite the affinities between types at the categorical level, it is useful to point to salient differences. This will have the effect of providing a better feel for the articulation of the whole corpus.

But to engage in this activity in a formal way now, after having performed a like operation at the categorical level, might tax the reader’s patience. And in any event, the results are more important than the actual procedure of differentiation. Therefore, what follows will explain how the dissertation distinguished the types and then, rather than rehearse that procedure here, the results will be represented. On the one hand it means that there will be a grievous shortcut past rigorous demonstration. On the other, this shortcut does not actually invalidate the results as such, since they remain subject to the independent verification and refinement of other researchers.

A. Methodology

The dissertation subdivided the category of sacerdotal texts into offering texts and priestly recitations, and it subdivided the category of personal texts into apotropaic and transition
It also mentioned one further type within the personal category, provisioning texts, but it did not pursue its formal isolation.

The methodology followed was simple. To develop each type, a very long recurring series was selected to serve as a core set for the type. That the texts of the series were transmitted together showed that they belonged together from the Egyptian point of view. Its texts were then examined to isolate motifs shared between two or more texts within it. The notions, sentiments, and relations expressed by these motifs were deemed to be the most important in the series by virtue of their repetition within it. This set of motifs was then compared against other recurring series, and the texts of these other series were associated with those of the core set. Next all of the texts in this larger set were considered together and still other motifs common to them were isolated among them. By means of the expanded set of motifs, further texts were associated with the set, whether they appeared in a recurring series or not. This last step was carried out because not all Pyramid Texts are attested in a recurring series, in large part because many texts survive in only one exemplar. The final set was deemed to be a type.

This procedure is quite similar to what was carried out above in differentiating categories. The difference is that in the preceding pages the starting point consisted of two core sets of texts distinguished by contrasting features of grammatical person. In the dissertation, grammatical person was also taken into account, but since its significance was taken to be obvious, it was consulted along the way rather than as a preliminary dimension of analysis. But the processes are similar enough that the details of its practice are hopefully intelligible.

A summary of the divisions into types is graphically depicted in Figure 15. It shows the articulation of the Pyramid Texts according to the dimensions of analysis of grammatical person, recurring series, and motifs. The initial division of texts into categories was made on the basis of person, later supplemented by consultation of motifs and series. The categories are subdivided by a refined consideration of the second two dimensions. The types are not as distinct as the categories, and this is abstractly represented in the figure by the overlap of ovals bounding the types. A dashed line is also superimposed to point
toward the homologous relationship of sacerdotal texts to the collective setting, and that of personal texts to the individual setting. As explained in considerable detail in Chapter Four, there are exchanges between settings, and certain sacerdotal texts, namely personal services, are at home in the individual one. To indicate the permeability of relationship, the dividing line between the settings is dashed.

It is the case that, among the texts of a single category, there are some series and motifs particular to the texts of the category as a whole and some motifs especially particular to the types. Naturally it follows that the series and motifs particular to a type are also particular to the category, since a type is a subset of a category. An offering motif is consequently distinctive to offering texts, distinguishing it from priestly recitations, and it is simultaneously a feature which distinguishes the texts bearing it from the opposing category of personal texts. Thus, as a rule, offering and priestly motifs are particular to the sacerdotal category, and it is that aspect of their nature which was consulted in the preceding chapters.

In order to communicate things most economically, the listings in the second volume make distinctions according to the set relations between the categories and types. They are schematized in Figure 16. Like Figure 15, Figure 16 is a shorthand representation, compressing relationships into two dimensions, but now it artificially draws absolute boundaries around typological features. Since a number of motifs are concentrated in one category or type but have small proportions of instances in another, one should more precisely conceive of the circles as intersecting, different-sized spheres with some overlap. But the figure is meant to be a heuristic device. It is meant to show that, from the point of view of oppositions between the categories of sacerdotal and personal texts, all series and motifs labeled as ‘offering’ or ‘priestly’ are in effect sacerdotal, and all labeled ‘apotropaic,’ ‘transition,’ or ‘provisioning’ are in effect personal. They are simply more specific cases of their parent categories. For instance, a series labeled as ‘apotropaic’ consists entirely of apotropaic texts, and a motif called ‘apotropaic’ is always or virtually always found in that particular type of text. Further, an apotropaic series or motif is also distinguishable as a characteristic from the sacerdotal category and its subordinate types. In short, an apotropaic motif distinguishes a text not only from those of the transition and provisioning types but also from texts of the sacerdotal category. Meanwhile, a series or motif labeled simply as ‘personal’ is common to more than one type of personal text.

![Figure 16. Set Relations between Categories and Types](image-url)
It may be remarked that of course there are some exceptions. There are four personal services, therefore sacerdotal texts, which have high proportions of motifs particular to the transition type—thus content particular to a different discourse genre. They will be pointed out in due course.

With that said, in this Coda a picture is sketched of each of the types. The general characteristics of each are summarized, the groups where they are dominant are noted, the series and motifs particular to them are enumerated, and some special details about them are discussed. It should be borne in mind that what follows is just a preliminary account.

B. Sacerdotal Texts

1. Offering Texts

Texts of this type are dominated by themes involving the eye of Horus: it is received by the deceased, employed as an instrument and acted upon, placed in relation to the god Seth, and manipulated by an officiant speaking of himself in the first person. An offering context is evident in the deceased being exhorted to take and maintain items and in multiple references to priestly actions involving the manipulation of things. The things to be manipulated are indicated in paratextual notations of foodstuffs, ritual implements such as altars and incense, and regalia. Texts of this type regularly possess such brief paratextual notations, typically just the naming of an object and quantity.

Group A, the offering ritual, has by far the highest concentration of offering texts; 222 of its 266 different texts are of this type. But most of the other collective groups contain at least one offering text: Groups C, D, E, and G. There are also a few among the individual groups—Groups H, J, L, and M with PT 81. Except for PT 81 in Group M, these were all identified as personal services by their locations of transmission. The mixed Groups I and O have no offering texts.

Offering texts are well known. Texts of the great majority are very short, and consist especially of rites involving the presentation of food and regalia conforming to a standard pattern, im n=k ir.t hr ‘Take the eye of Horus!’ This motif is encapsulated in Listing Four under the heading ‘Takes (im) Eye of Horus.’ This command is normally followed by an attributive verbal phrase or clause which can make a play of words on a physical item designated afterwards in a paratextual notation. As an example:

PT 88 §60b (W)

ω(μ) ρ τ τ τ τ
n=k d=f s(l)

‘O Osiris Unas, take the Eye of Horus;
“prevent that he (sc. Seth) trample (d) it.”
Bread (wt).

926 PT 414, 591, 597, and 637.
927 PT 414, 591, and 621–623.
928 PT 449.
929 PT 77, 201–203, 414, 418, 605, sPT 1032–1054, and 1056.
930 PT 661.
931 PT 680.
932 PT 661 and 686.
933 Transliterated as t-tej at Wb v 250. Read t-ut with Barta 1963, p. 48 with n. 6.
The last word, “bread,” is physically separated from the recitation preceding it by a carved line and constitutes a notation. A mild play of words is made between the consonant l- of lit “to trample” and the word wet, designating the type of bread. The notations are very generally indicated in Listing Four as ‘Object Direction’ and are further subdivided according to the nature of the item—for instance ‘Action Instruction (Miscellaneous),’ ‘Bread Offering Direction,’ ‘Censing Instruction,’ ‘Fruit Offering Direction,’ ‘Grain Offering Direction,’ ‘Lifting Instruction,’ ‘Liquid Offering Direction,’ and others. Thus the texts tell what the priest was supposed to say and name an object to be physically manipulated. The actual rite to which such a text corresponded consisted of speech and action.

This is the case with PT 77 and 81, which concern the presentation of oil and strips of cloth respectively.934 Notably, a Middle Kingdom source935 entitles each of these individually as sḥw.w “transfigurations,” literally “that which makes one into an Akh.” Based on the deployment of captions in the development of pictorial representations of mortuary service, Günther Lapp proposed that this term applies to the recitations accompanying the presentation of captions in the development of pictorial representations of mortuary service, Günther Lapp proposed that this term applies to the recitations accompanying the presentation of the numerous items named in offering lists936 like that first attested with the non-royal personage Debehëni as discussed in Chapter Two. Altogether, ninety entries in such lists correspond to ninety of the texts of Group A.

The facts that offering texts typically involve physical actions, and that they were increasingly designated as sḥw.w, conflict with Assmann’s formulation of the characteristics of this Egyptian category, because he directly associated sḥw.w with the modern terms Verklärung, mortuary liturgies, liturgies funéraires, and Totenliturgien. According to Assmann, a member of it was supposed to constitute “ein Sprechritus (rite oral), der nicht kultische Handlungen begleitet, sondern selbst eine kultische Handlung darstellt und in der Rezitation vollzieht,”937 and so “le rituel de la transfiguration sḥw.w est l’affaire de l’écriture et de la récitation magique et liturgique,”938 and so “offering spells”939 and “Sprüche zum Totenopfer”940 are explicitly excluded from the category. But, while it is the case that the word sḥw.w is often directly associated with the verb sḏi ‘to recite’, as Assmann has pointed out,941 it is equally the case that the word’s signification is not purely oral and textual. Thus sḥw.w are presented (mĒ942) and done (irf943). And thus one finds in the sḥw.w PT 77 that oil is what makes the deceased into an Akh (sḥw).944 The last piece of information is crucial: the text is a permanent element of the offering ritual, it is labeled as sḥw.w, and it employs the word sḥw in indicating the activity of a physical substance. So, while it is quite right to distinguish texts performed by priests from those originally composed for performance by the deceased himself, it is not tenable to find the meaning of sḥw.w exclusively in verbal rites. Pace Assmann, the modern term mortuary liturgy only partially overlaps the ancient category it is purported to encompass. This is another reason why that term has been set to one side here. As discussed in Chapter Two, the other problems with the term are its essentialization, its imprecision in definition, and its

934 The following discussion is drawn from Hays 2009b, pp. 53–54.
935 Sq18X; see Firth and Gunn 1926, p. 287: sḥh.w [r š t n iht] mh.t and sḥh.w r š n iht hh respectively.
936 See Lapp 1986b, p. 184 (“Das Verfahren [sḥ] muss sich daher auch auf die Speisung des Verstorbenen beziehen, d.h. auf das Verlesen von Sprüchen während der Übergabe der einzelnen Speisen, die in der Opferliste aufgeführt sind”), and similarly Blackman 1915, p. 29.
937 See Assmann 1986b, col. 1002, with caveats observed at 1006 n. 58.
938 Assmann 2000, p. 40.
939 Contrasted to ‘mortuary liturgies’ at Assmann 1990, p. 2.
940 Distinguished from ‘Totenliturgien’ at Assmann and Kucharek 2008, pp. 11–17.
941 At Assmann 2000, p. 43. It may be observed that his understanding of sḥw.w in this and other respects matches that of Winlock 1921, pp. 30–54.
942 As at CT 66 I 290a.
943 As at MOR 69A.
944 See PT 77 §52c.
superimposition of a prescribed regularity—in effect a modern canonization—over and against the ancient evidence of dispersion and rupture.

The following recurring series consist homogeneously of offering texts: Sequences 2–5, 9, 11, 13, 15–30, 33, 87, 124, 136, 151, and 158, and Subsequences 1–29, 31–39, 43–66, 105–106, and 139–140. Sequence 25 may be considered the most characteristic set of offering texts; it corresponds very closely to the type of offering list discussed in Chapter Two.

The following thirty-nine motifs are particular to offering texts:

| Action Instruction (Miscellaneous) | Lifting Four Times |
| Adorned with Eye of Horus as Cloth | Liquid Offering Direction |
| Bread Offering Direction | Meat Offering Direction |
| Censing Instruction | Mouth Is Opened by Eye of Horus |
| Exhorted to Maintain Item | Mouth Is Opened by Priest (1cs) |
| Eye of Horus Filled | Natron Offering Direction |
| Eye of Horus Joined to | Object Direction |
| Eye of Horus Tasted | Oil, Eye-paint, Cloth Offering Direction |
| Eye of Horus Torn out (lid) | Paint Eye of Horus |
| Eye of Horus, Your Pat-cake | Place in His Hand |
| Fruit Offering Direction | Priest (1cs) Brings Eye of Horus |
| Grain Offering Direction | Provided with Flow |
| Has Eye of Horus in Brow | Recite Four Times |
| Horus Fills | Regalia Offering Direction |
| Horus Offers (qdl) | Royal, Divine Offering Direction |
| Is Satisfied with Eye | Scent Diffused (pd) |
| Takes Flow (Exhortation) | Vegetable Offering Direction |
| Takes (im) Eye of Horus | Vocative to Horus Who Is in Osiris NN |
| Takes (im) Water | White Eye of Horus |

The 239 offerings texts belonging to these series, possessing these motifs, or both are:

- PT 14–18
- PT 20–21
- PT 23–32
- PT 34–57
- fPT 57A–I
- PT 58–70
- fPT 71
- fPT 71A–I
- PT 72–97
- PT 99–100
- PT 103
- PT 106–203
- PT 244
- PT 414
- PT 418
- PT 449
- PT 591
- PT 597–598
- PT 605
- PT 621–623
- fPT 634
- sPT 635A–B
- PT 637–639
- PT 651–653
- PT 661
- PT 680
- PT 686
- fPT 746–749
- fPT 752–756
- sPT 1032–1054
- sPT 1056
- N 306+11–14
- CT 530
- CT 862

2. Priestly Recitations

While offering texts are dominated by motifs involving imperatives to the beneficiary that he take the eye of Horus, with the eye typically symbolized in items ubiquitously specified in paratextual notations, priestly recitations are dominated by imperatives to the deceased that he arise (a, awaken (ṣrs), and raise himself (iṣziw). Accordingly, they above all deal with the beneficiary’s self-resurrection and the reconstitution of his corpse on the part of gods and himself. They are also replete with mention of the specific actions and attributes by an array of gods for him: Nut and Geb act to protect and exalt him, these two gods being puissant and possessing royal traits; Horus operates as savior, as subjugator of the beneficiary’s foes,

945 Sequences 18 and 19 also consist of offering texts, but they contain texts not found in a kingly pyramid, namely aPT 60A and fPT 62A.
and, with his children, as his supporter or bearer; Seth is seen to be one who acts against the beneficiary, and as such is to be brought under his control; the creator god Atum encloses the beneficiary and merges with him, with the two rising together as the sun; the beneficiary’s wife and sister Isis and Nephthys greet him, find him, and love him; and Anubis, the god of embalming, attends to him and acts for him. Ritual connotations are prominent, with allusions made to the performance of dance and calendrical ceremonies, and to the deceased’s positioning at the offering place. The texts also deal with other actions of the beneficiary besides his self-resurrection and self-reconstitution, in particular his rejection of the buried state and exhortations to him that he go up. His condition is such that he is equipped with protection, devoid of fault, and is in a state of purity. Furthermore, he is identified as a divine jackal, and he is given various other identities—celestial and chthonic. Last, he is incorporated among the gods, and they are satisfied with him.

In contrast to offering texts, priestly recitations generally do not involve the manipulation of objects in the course of their performance—hence the element recitation in the appellation of the type; this word is in opposition to offering. (The element priestly, synonymous with sacerdotal, puts these texts in opposition to the personal texts, which are also recitations.) As mentioned above, offering texts frequently include a paratextual notation indicating an object to be manipulated, generally indicated in Listing Four as ‘Object Direction.’ Among the various kinds of notations, only two are found with priestly recitations: ‘Action Instruction (Miscellaneous)’ and ‘Libation Instruction.’ The former is a catch-all heading, and only one out of eleven sacerdotal texts with it is a priestly recitation. The latter involves the pouring of liquid, and two out of five texts bearing this motif are priestly. Altogether, 179 offering texts have such notations, while only three priestly recitations do. In view of the absence of indications that physical objects were to be manipulated in the course of their performance, priestly recitations may be understood as generally being purely oral.

Still, several priestly recitations do refer to an offering ritual topos even though they do not explicitly indicate the manipulation of objects. For instance, while notations specifying the handling of various types of bread are exclusive to offering texts, priestly recitations nevertheless contain several statements by a first-person officiant to the effect that bread is being given. Such allusions indicate that the texts shared overlapping circumstances of performance. And in fact priestly recitations are frequently transmitted together with offering texts, and offering texts can accompany priestly recitations. There are a number of recurring series consisting of several offering texts and just one priestly recitation, a number consisting of several priestly recitations and one offering text, and some with a mix of both.

But most recurring series with priestly recitations consist homogeneously of texts of this kind. There are 122 like this, namely Sequences 37–41, 43–44, 46, 76, 78–83, 89–92, 94–102, 114, 120, 125, 127–130, 132, 135, 137–142, 144, 146–147, and 152–154, and subsequences 67–68, 75–94, 141–159, 168, 173–174, 178, 181–201, and 203–209. Of these, Sequence 94 may be considered as one of the most characteristic sets of priestly recitations.

As nearly every priestly recitation may be understood as purely oral, such a text might nearly be called “ein Sprechritus (rite oral), der nicht kultische Handlungen begleitet, sondern selbst eine kultische Handlung darstellt und in der Rezitation vollzieht.” But this is actually

---

946 spT 1022.
947 PT 436 (understood with Grimm 1986, p. 105 with n. 48, to be an instruction) and PT 483.
948 See Listing Four under the motif ‘Bread Offering Direction.’
949 Such allusions indicate that the texts shared overlapping circumstances of performance. And in fact priestly recitations are frequently transmitted together with offering texts, and offering texts can accompany priestly recitations. There are a number of recurring series consisting of several offering texts and just one priestly recitation, a number consisting of several priestly recitations and one offering text, and some with a mix of both.
950 See Listing Four under the motif ‘Priest (1cs) Gives Bread.’
951 Sequences 6, 10, 12, 14, 31, 48, and 84, and Subsequences 30 and 42.
952 Sequences 8, and 121–123, and Subsequences 176–177, and 180.
953 Sequences 32 and 47 and Subsequences 175 and 179.
954 Assmann 1986b, col. 1002.
a description given by Assmann to the category he called “mortuary liturgies.” As discussed in Chapter Two, the liturgy element of the term was inappropriate, and as explained a moment ago the term šḥw according to the ancient Egyptians did not refer exclusively to oral rites. And now one encounters a further and final problem with the mortuary liturgy concept. According to a qualification of the concept, non-oral actions such as censing and libation were sometimes supposed to accompany mortuary liturgies.\(^{954}\) Thus, while most of their component texts were supposed to be purely recitational, some liturgies were also supposed to contain texts which involve the physical manipulation of items—above all offering texts drawn from the pyramids.\(^ {955}\) On this ground the description’s utility was cogently challenged by Willems. He rightly sees “little point in differentiating ritual acts accompanied by recitations from recitations accompanied by cultic acts.”\(^ {956}\) Phrased in that fashion, one can only agree.\(^ {957}\)

In this work there is fortunately no need for such a qualification, as the differentiation into types is not aimed at the classification of sets of contiguous texts (as with the mortuary liturgy concept) but at the differentiation of individual texts. The concept of the mortuary liturgy involved, in effect, the modern canonization of whole sets of ancient texts which together constituted a performed unity, rather than individual texts which possess typological affinities. Many priestly recitations are indeed found transmitted together as performed units, especially those in recurring series, but many others possess associations strictly in content and are not transmitted together. So, while Assmann’s concept of the mortuary liturgy was defective for its essentialization, imprecision, superimposition of a prescribed regularity, exclusive association with šḥw, and problematic qualification, his description of an oral rite which does not involve physical action beyond the speech act itself is actually quite apt for the priestly type.\(^ {958}\)

The remaining collective groups and sections consist mainly of priestly recitations: Groups B–G and Sections I.1, O.1, and O.4. Even so, there are quite a few priestly recitations in Group A.\(^ {959}\) Also, largely because there are a number of personal services in individual groups, several priestly recitations are to be found in Groups H,\(^ {960}\) J,\(^ {961}\) K,\(^ {962}\) L,\(^ {963}\) M,\(^ {964}\) and N,\(^ {965}\) and Sections O.2\(^ {966}\) and O.3.\(^ {967}\)

\(^ {954}\) Ibid., col. 1006 n. 58.
\(^ {955}\) Notable are PT 94–95 appearing within Assmann’s ‘Liturgie CT.4’ (see Assmann 2002, pp. 490–491), maintaining their item specifications even within their mortuary liturgy context in TT 353. A further heterogeneous mortuary liturgy identified by him likewise includes some offering ritual texts, namely ‘Liturgie NR.3’ (see Assmann 2002, p. 19, and idem 2005a, pp. 225–272), from the unpublished pBM 10819 (concerning which, see Quirke 1993, pp. 17, 51, and 80; Dorman 1988, p. 83 with n. 73; Assmann 1984, pp. 284–285; idem 1986b, col. 999; idem 1990, pp. 26–27; and idem 2000, pp. 92 and 98–101); PT 25, parallel to vo. 113–119 (BM Photo 197530), the parallel noted by idem 1990, p. 44; PT 32 (with extensive additions), parallel to ro. II 20–23 (BM Photo 197545), the parallel noted by idem 1990, p. 44; compare also ro. II 8–11 (BM Photo 197546), which gives PT 32 with only minor differences; PT 94–95, parallel to vo. 48–49 (BM Photo 197541); and PT 196, parallel to vo. 48–49 (BM Photo 197541).
\(^ {956}\) Willems 2001, p. 356.
\(^ {957}\) Nevertheless, Assmann has not modified the qualities he ascribes to the category; see for instance idem 2008a, p. 16 n. 16.
\(^ {958}\) That, of course, passes over the appropriateness of the term “kultische” in this context. By the present work’s definition of cult, it involves a system of collective religious worship as manifest in external rites and ceremonies, and that must also be at hand with the sets of texts labeled as mortuary liturgies by Assmann.
\(^ {959}\) The priestly recitations in Group A are PT 33, 101, 223–225, 426, 436, 636, 640, 645–644, sPT 645A–B, PT 646–650, 658, 660, sPT 715B, 1012–1015, and 1017–1022.
\(^ {960}\) PT 497, and 603–604.
\(^ {961}\) PT 247, 337, 419, 456–457, 461, 465–466, 468, 477, 482–483, 487–488, and 679.
\(^ {962}\) PT 498 and sPT 734.
\(^ {963}\) PT 679, 685, 687, 690, and sPT 691R.
\(^ {964}\) PT 337, 364, 412, 587, 628–631, 633, 654, and 670.
\(^ {965}\) PT 337, 512, 532, 535, 606, 697, and sPT 1058.
\(^ {966}\) PT 553, 587, and 703.
\(^ {967}\) sPT 561B, PT 577–581, sPT 1058, and 1071.
The majority of the sacerdotal motifs are particular to priestly recitations. This is partly due to the fact that these texts are generally much longer than offering texts. Their 220 motifs are:

- Akh before/more than Akhs
- Akhs Given
- Announced (ḥawt stb)
- Announced to Re, Harakhti, Horus
- Anubis Commands
- Arises, Awakens to Offerings
- Arises, Stands (Exhortation)
- Ascends, Descends as Morning God, Star
- Ascends (prf) (Exhortation)
- At Great Stair
- Atum on High
- Awakens
- Awakens to Horus
- Ba to
- Ba within
- Before Living
- Betake Self to Other
- Beware the Great Lake
- Body Joined (Fb)
- Body Part as Jackal (Not Face)
- Children of Horus Raise up
- Children of Horus Set out (lz't) Bearing Him
- Come in Peace to God
- Comes (Exhortation)
- Cross (Exhortation)
- Dance Performed for
- Day of Reckoning, Binding Bones
- Does Not Cry out
- Does Not Lack
- Does Not Suffer
- Door Bolts Opened (nhbb, xw z)
- Doors of Earth, Geb, Aker Opened
- Doors Which Exclude
- Efflux Be Yours
- Embraced by Atum
- Embraces Gods, Everything
- Embraces Horus
- Enemies Brought, Given by Horus
- Enemy Raises up
- Enters into Protection
- Exhorted to Maintain Enemy
- Eye Gone forth from His Head
- Fear (jib, ṭ) Inspiring
- Festival Performed for
- Fetters Released
- Geb Brings Horus to
- Geb Commands
- Geb Delegates to Other God
- Geb Protects (hak, stp zt)
- God Satisfied upon

Gods Brotherly to
Gods Brought, Given by Horus
Gods Brought, Given by Other
Gods, Ennead Saves (ng)
Goes around, Traverses, Sits on Mounds
Goes as Horus
Goes (zi, zkb) (Exhortation)
Going forth from the Mouth
Grasps Hand of Imperishable Stars
Great One Is Fallen
Greater than Enemy
Hand over Offerings
Has Bread from Broad Hall
Has Jackal-face
Has Meat from Slaughter-block
Has No Father, Mother among Men
Has Power through (Children of) Horus
Has Warm Bread (t stf)
Heart Brought, Given
Herdsman Attends
Himself Collects Body (ṣ3q)
Himself Draws (invest) Bones Together
Horus Assembles Gods
Horus Causes to Arise
Horus Makes Gods Ascend to
Horus (Priest) Gives Heart or Hearts
Horus Protects (ḫ3il)
Horus Raises up
Horus Reckons
Horus Saves (ng)
Horus Smites Enemy
Horus Who Smites, Drowns, Destroys
Ilii-exclamation
In His, Your Name of
In His, Your Name of God
In Name of Horizon of Re
In Other’s Name of
Is Akh in the Horizon
Is among Akhs
Is Anubis
Is Appeared as Wepiu, Geb, Jackal
Is Arisen to Seth
Is Around Haunebu
Is Ba Foremost of Living
Is before Gods
Is Beloved of Isis
Is Born/Conceived with/as Orion
Is Brushed/Dried
Is Drawn Together (dmq, Fb, ing) by God
Is Drawn Together (dmq, Fb, ing) by Goddess

968 The priestly recitation PT 219 is the longest, with well over 700 Egyptian words. The next longest is the transition text PT 539, with over 500 Egyptian words.
Is Father of Horus
Is Foremost of (His) Ennead
Is God (by Verb ntr)
Is Great (wrr) (Exhortation)
Is Greatest of Nut's Children
Is Greeted (txa)
Is Herdsman
Is Hidden of Place
Is His Father (lt=f)
Is Imperishable
Is in/at God's Booth
Is Jackal
Is Ka of (All) Gods
Is Ka of Horus
Is Khentimentiu
Is (Like) He Who Stands Tirelessly
Is Not Weaned
Is Official
Is (One Who Is) in Nedit
Is Osiris + Interpolated NN
Is Power
Is Power before Living
Is (Power) before Powers
Is Power/Osiris Foremost of Akhs
Is Pure, Appeared at Festival
Is Pure (Exhortation)
Is Raised (z³, ñ³)
Is Round
Is Sacred
Is Satisfied with Offerings
Is Sleeper (l.b³m)
Is Sole Star
Is Strong (ph.t³)
Is Successor of Osiris
Is upon Throne of Osiris (hr n.s.t ws³r)
Is Wepiu
Is Who Is in Henet
Is Who Is in His House
Isis, Nephthys Bring Heart
Isis, Nephthys Mourns
Isis, Nephthys Summons
Issues Commands to Akhs
Issues Commands to Gods (nfr.w)
Issues Commands to Hidden of Place
It Is Akh for
Jars Filled (³bh)
Knife Gone forth from Seth
Libation (qbbw)
Lives (Exhortation)
Made an Akh
Made to Come to Life
Made to Rise to Horus, Nut
Maintain Own House, Gate
Member Is Atum
Mourning Prevented/ Ceased
No Disturbance in
None Depart (³ml, pzd)

Not Rot, Decay, Stink (2nd Person)
Not to Be Distant
Nut as Shepet
Nut Gives Heart
Nut Has Power
Nut Makes a God to Enemy
Nut, Mother Comes
Nut Protects (³yµn, sd³³, ³x³³)
Nut Spread over
Nuteknu Nullified
O! Hail!
Oh, Ah! (³x³³ hi³³ t³³)
Osiris Is Your Father (lt=k)
Other at Place of Drowning through Horus
Other Cultivates Grain
Other Put under (by Horus)
Other Saves (nd)
Others Not Distant from Benef
Plural Priest
Powerful through Eye of Horus
Priest (1cs) Gives Bread
Provided with Life
Pure by, Receive Jars
Putrefaction of Osiris
Quickens (Exhortation)
Raised from (Left) Side
Raises Self (Exhortation)
Re Grasps, Receives Hand
Receives Staff, Crook, Flail
Rises (³x³³ r=k) (Exhortation)
Saved from Obstructor, Restrainer
Saves (nd) Self
Scent, Air to Nostrils
See What Is Done
Service Performed (ṣṣm) for
Set on Right Side
Seth Acts against (Someone)
Sister Grasps Hold of
Sisters Come
Sisters Find
Sit on Khened-Throne
Sits before, beside Gods (Exhortation)
Son, Heir upon Throne, Place
Staff before Living, Akhs, Stars
Stands before/among Gods
Structure Founded, Built for, Given to
Take, Receive Head
Throw off Dust, Sand, Earth
Tomb, Sarcophagus Opened
Turns about (³x³³ inn³³, Exclamation)
Vocative to Children of Horus
Vocative to (l.µn-hr=k)
Vocative to (i³³)
Vocative to Isis
Vocative to Nephthys
Was Smitten, Slain (³x³³, sm³³)
Water, Flood Be Yours
### Types of Pyramid Texts and Their Interface with Groups

Water Gone forth  
What Anubis Should Do for  
What Pertains Is Destroyed, Ceases  
Your Going Is by Horus  
Your Thousands of (Thing)  
Zizephyus Bows, Turns Head to

The 229 priestly recitations possessing these motifs, belonging to the homogeneous recurring series mentioned above, or both are:

| PT 33  | PT 532 | PT 640 | PT 690 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| PT 101 | PT 534–537 | PT 643–644 | fPT 691B |
| PT 213–225 | PT 540–548 | sPT 645A–B | sPT 694A |
| PT 245–247 | PT 552–553 | PT 646–650 | PT 697 |
| PT 337 | PT 556–560 | PT 654 | PT 699–700 |
| PT 355–358 | sPT 561B | PT 658–660 | sPT 701A |
| PT 364–374 | PT 577–581 | hPT 662B | PT 703 |
| PT 412–413 | PT 587–590 | PT 663 | sPT 715B |
| PT 415 | PT 592–593 | fPT 664 | sPT 716A–B |
| PT 417 | PT 595–596 | fPT 664A–C | fPT 717–719 |
| PT 419–420 | PT 599–601 | fPT 665 | sPT 721B |
| PT 422–438 | PT 603–604 | fPT 665A–C | fPT 722–723 |
| PT 442–448 | PT 606 | fPT 666 | fPT 734 |
| PT 450–466 | PT 608 | fPT 666A–B | fPT 759 |
| PT 468 | PT 610–612 | fPT 667 | sPT 1001–1009 |
| PT 477 | PT 617 | fPT 667A–D | sPT 1012–1015 |
| PT 482–483 | PT 619–620 | PT 670–677 | sPT 1017–1023 |
| PT 487–488 | PT 628–631 | PT 679 | sPT 1058 |
| PT 497–498 | PT 633 | PT 685 | sPT 1069 |
| PT 512 | PT 636 | PT 687 | sPT 1071 |

#### C. Personal Texts

1. **Apotropaic Texts**

Group K is dominated by apotropaic texts. Virtually all of them are addressed to hostile entities, most often serpents. With a serpent coming forth from the earth (*pri m tḥ*), vigilance against creatures is expressed, through *mḥ* “to see” and *ḥr* “sight,” as well as with *ḥr ḫr=k* “sight is upon you.” The majority of motifs involve the repulsion and suppression of hostile creatures. The repelling is accomplished by imperatives to lie down, slither away, or fall down (*ṣdr, ẁbn, ḫr*), and there are other exhortations that the opponent be overturned or be on its back or side (*pmḥ*, *ḥr ṣḥ, ṣḥz, ḫḥd*). Enemies are exhorted to go away, to turn away, or to reverse direction, through expressions such as the prepositional *ḥḥ=k* “back!” and imperatives, including *ḥḥ ḫr* “turn around!” and ḫḥ “turn back!” And the verb ʂḥ “to encircle” is employed to indicate restraint or binding. Hostile creatures are the direct or indirect object of violence, being threatened with imperatives from the verb ẓḥw “beware!” They are attacked in various ways, for instance by trampling, and the goddess Mafdet acts violently for the beneficiary, sometimes in connection with aggressive action or control through the beneficiary’s hand or fingers.

Understood as having been recited by the beneficiary himself in their prior forms, these texts express vigilance against hostile creatures, with their principal concern being the repelling or attacking of the same. In revolving around that general theme, apotropaic texts constitute one of the most readily recognizable types of Pyramid Texts. On that basis they have often been discussed *en masse*, most recently by Georg Meurer, whose central point is
to argue that the serpents prevalent in them are representative of the god Seth.\(^{969}\) It is noteworthy that Meurer’s list of the members of the type—the most comprehensive account to date\(^{970}\)—conforms closely to those collected here.\(^{971}\)

As most of the texts of this type are addressed to hostile serpents, one could with Meurer refer to them as “Schlangensprüche,” a description which would conform to the title appearing in advance of the apotropaic PT 226 in a number of Middle Kingdom exemplars: “Utterance of stopping a serpent in the necropolis.”\(^{972}\) But since other beings such as lions and scorpions are involved, that designation is too specific. Instead, while still maintaining contact with the Middle Kingdom title through its use of the word ḫw “to oppose, stop, punish,” this type can simply be called “apotropaic texts.” As observed by Joris Borghouts,\(^{973}\) they are primarily defensive in nature\(^{974}\) because their intent is preventative.\(^{975}\) They aim to ward off hostile entities.

Recently an ingenious attempt has been made by Richard Steiner to interpret about a dozen apotropaic texts as having been transcribed into hieroglyphs from early Northwest Semitic.\(^{976}\) But the vision proposed concerning their employment has little to do with the ancient patterns of evidence and nothing to do with human practice. According to the book in which the theory is published, the texts PT 232–238, 281–282, and 286–287 are supposed to constitute a “coherent whole” consisting of three bilingual units, each with its own story line, making “an entire Old Kingdom ritual against serpents,” a set of texts which together form “a beginning, middle, and end.” According to the theory, their order is not arbitrary, but rather the theory brings “a certain degree of cohesiveness and coherence” to what is construed to be a singular group of texts.

To be sure, note is made in passing of the fact that this group—a “tripartite ritual”—is otherwise physically split into two in the pyramid of Unas.\(^{977}\) But there are nevertheless factual difficulties with the account which must now be advanced en passant. Specifically, the difficulties are the association of the terms cohesive and coherent with this isolated set of texts, and the association of the term ritual with the events described.

The theory constructs an interesting narrative out of the conjectured decipherment of its texts, and the decipherment’s value is in part supposed to reside in that narrative’s cohesiveness and coherence. However, it does not treat the distributions of the texts with sensitivity, because in actual reality they are not attested together as anything like a whole. Figure 17 represents an expansion of portions of Chart K, with the relevant texts shown in bold face.

---

969 See Meurer 2002, pp. 269–315. In contrast, cf. Bickel 1998, p. 43, who relates the serpent of the apotropaic PT 298 §442a–b and others to the Middle Kingdom being ‘Aapep.
970 Compare the shorter listing of Borghouts 1999, p. 176, and the comparatively limited number of texts of this kind translated at Leitz 1996, pp. 392–427.
971 In addition to the other texts listed by Meurer loc. cit., PT 501, sPT 502A-B, D-F, H, PT 549, sPT 1035, 1037, and 1041–1042 may be counted as examples of the apotropaic type. One of the texts called “Schlangensprüche” by ibid., p. 269, may be understood as other than apotropaic, namely the transition text PT 332, as it contains the transition motifs ‘is fiery’ and ‘Turns about (inn)’ and no apotropaic motifs. PT 332’s transmitted neighbors are exclusively transition texts at T/S/W, where it first appears. In the later pyramid of Merenre it is found among a mix of priestly and transition texts at M/S/W. In the pyramid of Pepi II it is found among purely priestly recitations at N/S/W, and so also in the Middle Kingdom Sequence 126 at B9C/L and B10C/L.
972 See above at n. 438.
973 See Borghouts 1999, pp. 151–152 and 134, where he contrasts texts which seek to adapt the text owner to a new mode of existence, assuming new identities, and passing through different regions (“productive magic”) against those that seek to prevent things from happening to him (“defensive magic”).
974 Cf. Ogdon 1989, p. 59.
975 Steiner 2011.
976 Steiner 2011.
What is obvious to the casual observer about the disposition of PT 232–238, 281–282, and 286–287 is that they are not transmitted together as a cohesive unit. And it consequently emerges that the coherence of the narrative is artificial rather than genuine. Its artificiality is more grievously problematic than what was encountered with the concept of ‘mortuary liturgies’ in Chapter Two: the dispersion, rupture, and variability abundantly obvious in the ancient arrangements of the texts are ignored. For instance, the theory’s story line neglects PT 283–285, but they stand between PT 282 and 286 in the pyramid of Unas. Further, PT 283–285 regularly appear before the theory’s PT 286–287 in every pyramid—and, indeed, in numerous sources after the Old Kingdom as well—and yet they have been excluded from consideration. As another example, no mention is made of PT 499, 289, 500, 384, and 297 which stand between PT 281 and 233 in the pyramid of Pepi II, with similar configurations in those of Pepi I and Merenre and a later source.

In brief, every rendition of Group K ‘intervenes’ texts between the various elements which are supposed to build a coherent narrative. What, then, is the relationship of the omitted texts to the story?

Further, only the pyramid of Unas offers all of the eleven texts. How can a narrative maintain its identity if its parts may be freely omitted, as they are in the succeeding pyramids?

Finally, this set is supposed to have a beginning, middle, and end, but, for example, the editors of the pyramid of Pepi II did not place PT 233 before PT 281, and they did not place PT 282 before PT 286 and 287. How can a narrative be coherently transmitted if its parts are movable?

In short, these texts are nowhere attested together in juxtaposition, they are always subject to omission according to the rule governing all groups of Pyramid Texts, and according to the rule of displacement they nowhere maintain order from pyramid to pyramid. Without sequential and integral stability, there can be no intelligible story line. The supposed coherence and cohesiveness emerge only after modernly plucking the texts from their contexts and repackaging them as an artificial unity. It is an interesting account, but it coheres in the modern imagination alone.

978 For CT 885 and its derivation from Pyramid Texts, including PT 233, 281–282, and 284–287, see Topmann 2010, pp. 340–349. For the bonding of these texts in other later sources, see Sequences 50 (Pedimetc and Tchannehbu), 51 (Pedimi and Ps.), 53 (S), 137 (Sq1q and Sq2q), and Subsequences 217 (S, Bk., and TT 33), 218 (L1NY), 219 (Sq1C and Sq2C), 224 (Psamitkinebpcht), 226 (Q1Q), 228 (L-PW1A), 231 (Sq B).
979 Namely CT 885 again; see ibid., p. 347.
980 See the reference above at n. 467.
If it is not Old Egyptian, I myself do not possess the skills to make a guess as to the original language of the *voce magicae* at hand in some Pyramid Texts. But it is telling that a series of phon/graphemes cropping up in PT 236 and 281 also occurs in one of the texts skipped over by the theory—PT 285:

PT 236 §240a: *kbb* [\(h/\)] \(i\) \(t\) \(i/bi\)

PT 281 §422a: *kbb* \(i\) \(w\) \(i\) \(b\) \(i\) \(bi\)

PT 285 §426c: *\(it\)* \(t\) \(w\) \(t\) \(i/bi\)

PT 285 §426d: *\(w\)* \(i\) \(\(w\)* \(\(i\) \(\(w\)* \(\(i\) \(\(w\)\)

The texts PT 236 and 281 are understood by the theory to contain early Northwest Semitic, but PT 285, like them, but nevertheless skipped over by the theory, contains a voiced glottal fricative *h/\* followed by *ti* and *bi*. This text also happens to contain a variant spelling of the Egyptian word 3\(w\) “long/extended one,” i.e. serpent. This particular word 3\(w\) also occurs among four texts treated by Steiner. Indeed, the word is so crucial that he devotes an entire chapter to it—although with a radically different interpreted reading than 3\(w\)\(i\)\(w\).\(^{982}\) Now, in the set of texts considered by the theory, the word is generally written with a sequence of “three alephs (\(3\beta\))”\(^{983}\) and an essential element to the argumentation is that such a writing is “VERY non-EGYPTIAN.”\(^{984}\) But in point of fact there are a number of Pyramid Texts with ordinary Egyptian words built in precisely this manner, that is, with the tripling of a weak consonant. In particular, the nonenclitic particle *\(iw\)* is written with triple *\(i\)* at, for instance, PT 272 §392d (\(AII/S/Einf\ 1\)); PT 515 §1179b (\(M\)); PT 531 §1254d (\(M\)); sPT 570A §1444d, §1445c, §1446c, §1447c, and §1448d (\(M\)); PT 571 §1467b (\(P\)) and elsewhere. Thus *iii* can represent *\(iw\)* in the same way that *\(AAA\)* can represent *\(A\)w*. Also there is one clear instance of the dependent pronoun *\(wi\)* written with triple *\(w\)* at PT 327 §536b (\(T\)).\(^{985}\)

These are important details, since in that critical text skipped over by the theory, PT 285, there is a writing which at all events confirms the reading of the triple aleph as *\(A\)w*. At PT 285 §426d (\(WS\)), the word 3\(w\) “long one” is written through the doubling of the biliteral 3\(w\).\(^{986}\) The doubling indicates a vocalization 3\(wi\) on analogy with the -\(w\)\(i\) vocalization of the dual, just as tripled writings of weak consonants are on analogy with the -\(w\) vocalization of the plural. And the verbal root is in fact the final weak 3\(wi\) “to be long.” Thus writings with tripled weak consonants are after all rather Egyptian, and a text skipped over in the fabrication of the theory—even though it happens to contain a series of phon/graphemes like texts actually tackled by it, and even though it happens to sit right in between the last two parts of the “tripartite ritual”—contains a writing which apparently confirms the Egyptianness of this linchpin word.\(^{987}\)

---

\(^{981}\) The Egyptological literature on the topic of *voce magicae* is not fully taken into account by Steiner 2011; for discussion and bibliography, see Wüthrich 2010, pp. 18–21.

\(^{982}\) See Steiner 2011, esp. p. 15.

\(^{983}\) See PT 232 §236b; PT 235 §239a; PT 281 §422a and c; and PT 286 §427a and c. Alternately exemplars sometimes substitute a tripled *\(i\)wa*-bird as a sportive writing. Note that I was consulted in the course of the theory’s development, but my views are not accurately represented at *ibid.*, p. 83.

\(^{984}\) *Ibid.*, pp. 7–8 with n. 38 and 77.

\(^{985}\) This example of the 1cs dependent pronoun is actually cited at Edel 1955/1964, §167aa, although there with mistaken hieroglyphs. This is an exceptionally sportive writing: the quail-chick itself represents the sound *w*, while its tripling also represents the sound *\(w\)*. The quail-chick and its tripling in effect create a double *\(w\)*, therefore invoking a dual vocalization -\(w\)\(i\), which of course is identical to the sound of the 1cs dependent pronoun.

\(^{986}\) Cf. N/A/E 1053\(+60\), where it is written with uniliterals *\(i\)* and *\(w\)* followed by the biliteral *\(w\)\(i\)*. In that writing, the uniliterals stand as phonetic complements to the biliteral.

\(^{987}\) For alternative renderings of these passages, assuming that they are in Old Egyptian, see Listing Four under the motif ‘Enemy Bound (*\(bi\)*).’
As to the ritual component of the set of texts PT 232–238, 281–282, and 286–287, it must certainly be the case that they, like all the other Pyramid Texts discussed here, were performed in a ritualized manner. But the very detailed story which the theory builds out of the texts is no ritual, for the simple reason that no human participants are envisaged. According to the theory's account, the principal party is the dead king, who acts as a frantic “snake-charmer-in-chief” and interacts with various serpents. For instance he whispers to them, transforms himself into a serpent, points at his own reptilian genitalia, and turns around in order to confront a serpent who wishes to eat his dead body like a vulture. All of these fantastic activities are supposed to take place in the sealed sepulcher. Psychologically intriguing, the account nevertheless has nothing to do with human practice and thus nothing to do with ritual. Many human rituals do involve corpses and animals, but inanimate objects and sentient creatures do not respond to stage directions of their own accord, which is why in actual practice real people must be involved to manipulate them. But there are none in the theory’s account. One realizes that the term ritual has been inappropriately used to label a modern reconstruction of ancient beliefs about what was ‘done’ in the crypt.

The theory’s account of the meaning and integral relationship of the texts may be set aside. As to its interpretation of the language, attention should rather be devoted to all the apotropaic texts seeming to exhibit voces magicae instead of just a select few, the full dispositional context of the texts should be evaluated, there should be cognizance of the orthographic behavior of the Pyramid Texts as a full corpus, and one should not dismiss in a priori fashion the possibility that some of these texts may be rather Egyptian after all. Also, it is important to be clear about the meanings of words used in a technical fashion.

To return to apotropaic texts in general, it is evidently the case that they, like all other personal texts, were not composed for the purpose of being performed in the crypt. Thus a number of them were recarved and otherwise adjusted away from the first person; they were understood well enough that they were modified so as to make them suitable for the purpose of decoration. And indeed a setting of performance outside of the tomb is held for apotropaic texts by Meurer, in seeing possible allusions to field hands at agricultural work, to stone workers, and to encounters with serpents in walking through the desert. These circumstances are resonant of what one envisions for the context of use of New Kingdom ‘magical’ texts against serpents and scorpions, and what is actually explicitly stated in the title of a non-mortuary apotropaic text from the First Intermediate Period. But, while Meurer’s interpretation is welcome in tacitly supporting the argument made in Chapter Three concerning personal texts—for it directly asserts that the texts were originally performed by the living—he goes astray in afterwards insisting that they were not ritual texts, since they “wirken als aussprüche an sich und sind nicht auf den Vollzug eines Rituals angewiesen” and, besides, they were “aus dem alltäglichen Leben übertragen, wo sie in Anwesenheit einer Schlange laut gesprochen wurden.” Here again one encounters the antiquated judgment...
that a ritual act must be collectively performed and involve physical action beyond speech.994 Ritual, by the present work’s understanding, involves a fusion of human action and belief, and is characterized by formalization, repetition, special situational constraints, and other strategies of differentiation from quotidian activities, by the reification and objectification of the symbolic and metaphorical, and by a reproductive function in maintaining and transforming collective representations.995 As argued in the preceding chapter, all the Pyramid Texts considered in this work fit this bill. Whether an apotropaic text was deployed so as to secure a result in the everyday world does not exclude it in actual practice from being a ritual text, above all since the language employed separated it from what was used in mundane human discourse.

But, notwithstanding the First Intermediate Period employment of an apotropaic text in a daily life situation—where danger was averted through the intervention of discourse particular to a world apart from the mundane—it is also clear from later Egyptian documents that apotropaic texts were employed in situations more carefully circumscribed as religious, and not only in individual settings but in collective ones. Thus a bedstead inscribed with apotropaic texts and found under a post-Old Kingdom coffin996 was involved in the formal deposition of the ceremonially buried corpse. Much later, apotropaic utterances against serpents evidently initiated a section of rites performed for the god Amun-Re upon his arrival at the small temple of Medinet Habu,997 and still later an entire complex of temple rites revolved around the execration of the serpent ‘A apep, with some of the same phraseology found in these Pyramid Texts.998 In light of later evidence, such texts and their sentiments could be transferred out of the individual domain and used in the collective.

The latter two temple ritual contexts also imply a transcendental significance; they are to ward off malevolent forces as incorporeal as gods. An incorporeal component is evident in apotropaic texts found in the New Kingdom Book of the Dead as well. There one finds, for example, ri n(i) hsf m$h h it r lt.t hk3.w n(i) NN m$t=f “Utterance of stopping a crocodile which comes in order to take NN’s magic away from him.”999 The nature of the threat is telling: it is not the beneficiary’s life which is in danger from the jaws of the crocodile, but the loss of an intangible. The distance of the situation from the physical world is signaled also by the circumstances in which such a text might be employed, since another Book of the Dead utterance against crocodiles is specified for use m hrt-nfr “in the necropolis,”999 a desert environment inhospitable to a creature at home in and near water.

Jorge Ogdon awards appropriate emphasis to the spoken dimension of apotropaic texts.1000 To refine and extend his point, it may be said that, inasmuch as their efficacy resided in their
vocalic properties, then their original purpose was oral rather than inscriptive—the form in which we find them attested. Their vocalic quality is clear not only by the ubiquitous mark $d-mdw$ “recitation” at the beginnings of apotropaic texts$^{1003}$ and by the much more specific $d-mdw$ zp 2 “recite twice” in that position$^{1004}$ but also by statements such as $hpnw$ $d$ $i$ $nn$ $r=k$ “O serpent, against you do I say this”$^{1005}$ and $h3=k$ $inn$ $inn$ $gw$ $im=k$ $iw$ $r$ $bw$ $m(i)$ $T$. $im=f$ $dd$ $rn=k$ $pw$ $r=k$ $ni$ $nm$ $z3$ $nm$.t “Back, serpent! Be hidden, and do not come to the place where Teti is, lest he say your name of ‘traveler son of traveler’ against you!”$^{1006}$ Both statements bear witness to their originally recitative as opposed to textual character. The procedure of uttering the words was to produce the effect.

Many recurring series consist homogeneously of apotropaic texts: Sequences 49–51, 60–63, 85, and 109, and Subsequences 107, 121–126, 162–163, 210, and 217–231. Subsequence 217 may be regarded as one of the most characteristic sets of apotropaic texts. Besides the thirty-four homogeneous series just mentioned, there are seven series in which apotropaic texts are found alongside one or two transition texts, or vice versa: Sequences 54–55, 66, and 148–149, and Subsequences 120 and 134. Note should also be made of Sequence 157 and its Subsequences 215–216, which are attested in the Middle Kingdom and begin with the transition text CT 397.$^{1007}$

Apotropaic texts dominate Group K, with eighty-three of its 108 different texts coming from this type. But they are sporadically found in other groups and sections as well: Groups C$^{1008}$ and L$^{1009}$ and Sections O.2$^{1010}$ and O.5.$^{1011}$

The following nineteen motifs are particular to apotropaic texts:

- Attacks ($ik$) Enemy
- Enemy Bound ($bi$)
- Enemy Exhorted to Go
- Enemy Turns back (Exhortation)
- Exhortation to Be Overturned
- Fall, Lie Down, Slither away
- Go forth from Earth
- Hand of Beneficiary Comes against
- Mafdet Acts Violently for
- Other Is Bound
- Other (Not Eye of Horus) Trampled ($if$)
- Pelican Is Fallen
- Reciprocal Violence
- Serpent Attacked
- Serpent Is Fallen
- Sight Is Upon Another
- Speaks against Inimical Being
- Vocative to Inimical Being (Not Serpent)
- Vocative to Serpent

---

$^{1003}$ As noted by Eyre 2002, p. 26: the “recitational style of ritual texts is generally explicit in their formulaic heading: $dd$ $mdw$."

$^{1004}$ At PT 391 §687a and PT 395 §691a. They are the only two Pyramid Texts to be marked with this particular formulation.

$^{1005}$ PT 227 §227b.

$^{1006}$ PT 293 §434c–c.

$^{1007}$ To be precise, CT 397 is a ferryman text; for bibliography on such texts, see the references at n. 281.

By virtue of its graphic boundaries, CT 397 is described by Hermann 1995, p. 76 with n. 19, as a “Bild-Text-Komposition” on a par with the Book of Two Ways. A text at Ibi/S/S (Aha 587–596) is related to CT 397, as observed by Bickel 2004, pp. 91 and 113, and Bidoli 1976, pp. 27 and 34. No doubt based on Kees 1955, pp. 176–183, T. Allen 1950, p. 59, refers to the Ibi text as “BD 99 «Einl.».” In the pyramid of Ibi, this text is followed by the transition text PT 475. In Sq1Sq and Sq2Sq, CT 397 is separated from the apotropaic texts coming after it by the presence of the title noted above at n. 458.

$^{1008}$ PT 538.

$^{1009}$ PT 314.

$^{1010}$ PT 375–376 in Sequence 85, which is also attested in Group K.

$^{1011}$ PT 549–551.
The following eighty-seven apotropaic texts belong to these series, possess these motifs, or both:

| Series | Description |
|--------|-------------|
| pT 226–243 | |
| pT 276–299 | sPT 502A-B |
| pT 314 | sPT 502D |
| pT 375–393 | sPT 502H |
| pT 395–399 | PT 538 |
| pT 499–501 | sPT 1037 |
| pT 549–551 | fPT 727 |
| sPT 1035 | |
| spT 729B | |
| spT 730–732 | |
| spT 1041–1042 | |
| spT 1035 | |

2. Transition Texts

The texts of this type are concerned with the beneficiary’s exalted position, attributes, actions, and identity, as well as with his transition by ascent, flight, and crossing, mirroring the movement of gods. In addition, they make reference to his actions for the sun god and for himself, and they make general statements concerning the service and opposition of deities for him.

More specifically, a way is open or made for the beneficiary, he is said to ascend to the sky, (often via a ladder), or the sun god takes him out to the sky, and gods are said to witness his ascent. He receives his place in the sky, taking possession of a throne, and is said to sit with divine beings. He possesses magic and dread, protects the sun god, sends messengers, bestows and takes away Kas, and takes various other items away from divine beings for his own use. He is identified as various gods, especially Sobek, Nefertem, “enduring bull,” and the third of a set of deities. The identity as Sobek may be owed to the crocodile’s governing waterways which must be crossed, and among the transition texts are numerous references to ferrymen and ferryboats. For their part, the actions of divine beings for the text owner are expressed in general terms, including statements to the effect that "It is what is to be done for him." Divine beings also are said to serve him, and the sun god commends him to other deities. Adversarially, references are made to Seth’s speaking and in it being rhetorically asked whether Seth has slain or will slay him. Finally, the texts sometimes have men as an audience, and a benevolent bull, typically of solar aspect, is called out to by vocative.

The greatest concentrations of transition texts are to be found in the individual Groups J (fifty-four out of eighty-three different texts), L (forty-two out of sixty), M (thirty-four out of fifty-nine texts), and N (thirty-eight out of forty-eight), and in Section O.2 (thirty out of forty-three). Additionally, some transition texts appear in the individual Group H, Group K, and, by exchange, some occur in the collective Groups B, C, D, F, G.

1012 The affinity of waterborne to airborne passage is noted by Bickel 2004, pp. 91–92 and 108. Assmann 1977a, col. 1206, asserted that "die Entrückung der Menschen aus der Welt der Lebenden vorwiegend in Formen der Horizontalität begriffen wird" while the “offizielle Dogma des Königstodes” expressed the royal forms of transport “im Zeichen der Vertikalität”; the opposition is erroneous, since both forms of transport are attested in the Pyramid Texts and thus are equally applicable to a king—no matter the defunct status of the ‘democratization of the afterlife’ as a historical model. But concerning these particular motifs, Pankoff 1974, p. 6, observes that both the transport of the corpse across a body of water is found equally for both the king and his officials in the Old Kingdom. Nordh 1996, p. 171, cites several Old Kingdom texts clearly showing that non-royal individuals aspired to a celestial afterlife by means of ascent.
and Sections O.1 and O.4. One also occurs in the ambivalent Section O.5. It emerges, then, that of the individual groups and sections, J, L–N, and O.2 are dominated by transition texts, while Group H has provisioning texts (to be discussed below) and K has apotropaic texts, while Section O.5 has a high concentration of personal services.

Personal services are to be found scattered throughout the individual groups and sections, too. They are sacerdotal texts, in their prior forms performed by the text owner for gods or the dead, and most are priestly recitations, with some offering texts. There are, however, four personal services which transgress typological boundaries: PT 323, 568, 682, and sPT 692A. Although these texts are sacerdotal in structure, they have transition motifs equal in number to their sacerdotal motifs or they are in the majority. PT 323 appears in the individual Groups M and N, PT 568 in the individual Section O.2, and sPT 692A in the individual Section O.2 and the individual Group L.

Fifty-one recurring series consist homogeneously of transition texts, namely Sequences 56–59, 64–65, 67–70, 77, 103, 106–107, 110–113, 115–117, 119, 133–134, and Subsequences 40–41, 110–119, 127–133, 135–136, 160–161, 164–166, and 202. Sequence 64 may be regarded as one of the most characteristic sets of transition texts. There are seven series with both apotropaic and transition texts, noted in the previous section, and there are seven with transition texts and one or two personal services: Sequences 53, 104–105, 143, and 155, and Subsequences 108–109. Besides these, there are two series with mixes of priestly recitations and transition texts. One (Sequence 126) is not attested before the Middle Kingdom, and the other (Sequence 131) is found in the collective Section O.1 of the mixed Group O.

The facts that four sacerdotal texts are dominated by transition motifs, that personal services are mainly found in groups dominated by transition texts, that seven series have transition texts and personal services both, and that three other series have transition texts and priestly recitations, show together that transition texts were the most able to intermingle with texts of an opposing category. In fact, of the nineteen personal texts found in contrastive deployments across settings, as discussed in Chapter Four (see Table 11), eighteen are of the transition type. It is the case that there are fewer motifs—actually repeated units of phraseology and semantics—among the personal texts than in the sacerdotal category. This may be owed to the fact that personal texts contain more unique statements than the sacerdotal texts do. And since the transition texts have the longest texts among the personal category, and since they are also the most abundant of the category, with 183 out of 313, they consequently have the most unique statements among the Pyramid Texts as a whole. Their length, abundance, and particularity of statement situate them in the most dynamic field of production in the Old Kingdom mortuary literature.

As transition texts were a site of personal religious practice, and as they were separate from collective performances, they were not as restricted by the formal rules governing cultural projects regarded as belonging to the community. For this reason they admitted greater creativity in their composition. Transition texts were generated by the most dynamic engine of production responsible for the composition of the Pyramid Texts as a corpus. But as transition texts were composed for use in an individual setting and transmitted among colleagues, over

1021 PT 269, 271, 331, 555, 565, and 609.
1022 PT 306, 583, and 613.
1023 PT 339.
1024 It is a matter of the transition text PT 332 among a long set of priestly recitations. For further details about this text’s historical contexts of transmission, see above at n. 971.
1025 Namely with the transition text PT 609 followed by three priestly recitations.
1026 They are PT 262, 264, 267, 301–302, 309, 332, 335–336, 363, 407, 439–440, 668–669, hPT 694B, PT 696, and fPT 725. The remaining transgressive text is the apotropaic PT 538.
time they did come to be regarded as fixtures in culturally owned collections of individual rites. Besides the other effects of introducing personal texts to collective groups as discussed in Chapter Four, since transition texts were a major site of the introduction of original ideas, the incorporation of one of them into a collective group also had the effect of invigorating the older, more culturally restricted context with fresher content. Thus transition texts are the most frequently exchanged of all Pyramid Texts.

The transition type appears also to have been highly important for the productive output of the Middle Kingdom mortuary literature. The sheer abundance of material newly attested at that time is of itself an argument that most Coffin Texts were produced then. But a question which may be asked is the extent to which the new material was connected to the Old Kingdom tradition. Altogether, 400 Pyramid Texts are transmitted into the Middle Kingdom, and, to be sure, of these are only fifty out of the 183 transition Pyramid Texts. It would appear at first glance that the tradition of transition texts did not maintain much of its strength. But the reverse is actually so. As J. Allen has noted, most Coffin Texts are descendants of Pyramid Texts from the antechambers and corridors, which is precisely where texts of the transition type are concentrated: they dominate the individual Groups J, L, and N, and these groups occupy the antechamber west, south, and north walls and the corridors of most pyramids. Thus, while comparatively few transition texts are transmitted into the Middle Kingdom, the type does serve as the inspiration for most of the texts newly composed at that time.

Many Coffin Texts are immediate descendants of transition Pyramid Texts, and this is most evident in numerous variants. Not attested before the Middle Kingdom, these texts are closely related to Pyramid Texts in content and structure but with modifications extensive enough so as to regard them as separate texts rather than more or less exact copies of older ones. Variant texts are not evidence that some Pyramid Texts were particularly royal and required adaptation so as to be suitable for the Middle Kingdom elites who now decorated tombs and tomb items with mortuary texts. Rather, their production is an indication of the vitality of the tradition in the later period, and the engagement of scribes with the ancient material. For example, CT 374 may be compared to the text of which it is a variant, PT 318:

1027 For an account of various datings of the corpus of Coffin Texts, ranging from the First Intermediate Period into the Middle Kingdom, see Jürgens 1995, pp. 5–6, with his own views at pp. 73–84. See also Lapp 1996, p. 87; and idem 1997, p. 56. Naturally, as observed already by Kees 1983, p. 169, some texts known only from Middle Kingdom sources had doubtless been composed in the Old Kingdom.

1028 PT 248–258, 260–263, 267–275, 300–313, 315–321, 332–333, 509, 511, and 689.

1029 J. Allen 1988, p. 40.

1030 The concept that the Middle Kingdom mortuary literature was an adaptation of strictly royal texts is obsolete; see M. Smith 2009, Hays 2010, pp. 1–2, Hays 2011, and above in Chapter Two, Section A.1.c. Despite the obsolescence of the ‘democratization of the afterlfe’ model, the turning point of the most recent comparative study of the texts of Unas and the Middle Kingdom mastaba of Semosretankh (S), occurring at Gundacker 2010, p. 132, is the notion that PT 273–274, the so-called ‘cannibal hymn,’ is specifically royal. The ‘hymn’ has a Middle Kingdom variant in CT 573 (to the references on works dealing with this variant mentioned at ibid., p. 132 n. 73, add Altenmüller 1977, pp. 19–39; L. Morenz 1994, pp. 109–111; and Goebel 2003, pp. 29–49). In focusing narrowly on the Old Kingdom attestations of the ‘hymn’ and contrasting it to this variant, Gundacker supposes that the presence of an older, putatively ’königliche’ version on S is an enigma demanding an explanation. But the Middle Kingdom source Siese also has the beginning of this text—not the supposedly ’non-royal’ variant—as the last element of Sequence 53, consisting of PT 247–258, 260–263, and 267–273. See de Morgan 1903, p. 85, ll. 23–25 with Pyr. §393a–c; on the source, see further Simpson 1988, pp. 57–60. The other representative of this sequence is S. Thus this particular text is not unique to S in the Middle Kingdom, and neither any more nor any less royal than the others.

1031 Their intimate relationship being observed by Barguet 1970, p. 12.
The text describes the relationship between different pyramid texts and their interface with groups. It includes detailed translations from ancient Egyptian texts, highlighting similarities and differences. The structure and meaning are paralleled to such an extent that the genetic relationship between the two texts is unmistakable. To be sure, there are plenty of differences, such as the omission of certain elements from one text to another.
of two clauses from the Pyramid Text, “Teti has come, even that he take away your strength,” matched by the addition of another in CT 374, “I am Nehebkau.” In addition, there are subtle variations in phraseology in the statements which they have in common, and yet both texts are fully intelligible. It is not a question of a garbled Middle Kingdom copy of an Old Kingdom text; it is a matter of a modified version of an older text. Indeed, there are three other Coffin Texts variants of this particular Pyramid Text, none of them precisely like the other, and all of them meaningful. With such genetic affinities present in several other Coffin Texts, one has a clear sign of the tradition’s vitality in the Middle Kingdom. It was not a process of mere mechanical transmission. The authors of works being composed in the Middle Kingdom were familiar with the old ones, and they were producing new ones based on them. It was a living tradition.

The very productive nature of that tradition is especially evident through the example of PT 318, since all four of its Coffin Texts variants receive titles with the elements ḫpr.w m “Metamorphose into….” Texts bearing titles with these elements are very well attested in the Coffin Texts. As a result they are one of the most readily recognizable types from the Middle Kingdom stage of mortuary literature, often referred to as “transformation texts.” In practice, their aim was to bring about a result pertinent to the transcendental world, where the practitioner was to assume a new, temporary identity—in the present case, a serpent, both in the Pyramid Texts and its Coffin Texts variants. As ḫpr.w m titles occur with Coffin Texts variants of five other transition Pyramid Texts, one finds a type recognizably distinct in the Middle Kingdom already nascently attested in the Old Kingdom.

Very closely allied to the phenomenon of the production of variants of Old Kingdom transition texts was the generation of completely new texts of the same type in the Middle Kingdom. Their affinities with the older material are to be found in their possession of transition motifs and by having the personal performance structure. The following will serve as illustration:

CT 550 VI 148 (B1Bo)
VI 148a ḭz mlq.t ḫm mlq.t
VI 148b Ḫ.w t ḫk.t ḫw Ḫ.t ḫj ḫw
VI 148c ḫk.w ḫj ḫt ḫn ḫn ḫn ḫn
VI 148d Ḫ.t ḫj ḫn ḫn ḫn ḫn ḫn
VI 148e ḫj ḫz ḫt ḫw ḫt ḫw
VI 148f ḫw ḫw ḫw ḫw ḫw ḫw ḫw
VI 148g ḫj ḫw ḫw ḫw ḫw ḫw ḫw ḫw
VI 148h ḫz ḫz ḫz ḫz ḫz ḫz ḫz ḫz
VI 148i ḫz ḫz ḫz ḫz ḫz ḫz ḫz ḫz

1034 CT 85–87.
1035 CT 121–125, 127 (< PT 737, 738A–C, 739A–B, 740); CT 128 (< sPT 586A); CT 255 (< PT 268); CT 288 (< PT 261); CT 326 (< PT 257); CT 364 (< PT 248, PT 704); CT 421 (< PT 315); CT 573 (< PT 273–274); CT 575 (< PT 260); CT 619 (< sPT 653C); CT 622 (< PT 254); CT 712 (< PT 312); CT 768 (< PT 262); CT 832 (< PT 306, 474, 480, 572); CT 837 (< PT 477); CT 1016 (< PT 253).
1036 In addition to that given at CT 374 V 36f, they are CT 84 II 49a (T1I): ḫpr.w m ḫh-k3.w ḫr ṣm-npr “metamorphose into Nehebkau in the necropolis”; CT 85 II 51j (Sq6C) and CT 86 II 52a (Sq1C): ḫpr.w m ḫh-k3.w “metamorphose into Nehebkau.”
1037 See Buchberger 1993, pp. 82–84, where “explizite Verwandlungsprüche” are those texts bearing such titles.
1038 See Borghouts 1999, pp. 152–153.
1039 PT 255 > CT 1016 VII 235a (Pap. Gard II): ḫr m ḫr ḫn “metamorphose into Hierakonpolis Horus”; PT 257 > CT 326 IV 157c (SIC): ḫfr m ḫr “metamorphose into Horus”; PT 261 > CT 288 IV 398 (Sq1C): ḫfr m ḫr “metamorphose into air”; PT 273 > CT 573 VI 177a (SIC): ḫn-ḫa-mu  ḫt ḫh-r ḫt ḫw m ḫn “utterance of the metamorphose of NN into a god,” as observed above in Chapter Two, under Group L.
VI 148a The ladder is bound; the ladder stands,
VI 148b with the prow ropes untied by those of Buto,
VI 148c their stern ropes by the gods of Hierakonpolis,
VI 148d in order that NN ascend upon it to the sky,
VI 148e it remaining under NN <at> the great threshing floor of the sky.
VI 148f O bandaged one who went forth from Nu,
VI 148g give your hand to NN,
VI 148h for NN is gone forth from Kenmut.
VI 148i Building a ladder to the sky in the necropolis.

Most of the statements made in the text are unique to the Middle Kingdom, as with “the prow ropes untied by those of Buto” and with the reference to going forth from Kenmut, though the last is resonant of an expression in a Pyramid Text. But the references to ascending to the sky, in particular by a ladder, and tying and setting it up are clearly adapted from Old Kingdom phraseology. That ascent by means of a ladder is what the text is all about is underscored by the title appended to the end. Indeed, it is parallel to a title applied to a Middle Kingdom exemplar of the transition text PT 304, as mentioned in Chapter Two: “Utterance of // building a ladder in the necropolis by NN.” What one is dealing with is an ancient pair of motifs interwoven with new expressions. The purpose of the text was antique, but it was enlivened with the spirit of the time of its composition. The production of new texts according to the characteristics of the Old Kingdom types is important for showing how ideas central to the Pyramid Texts were still in currency in the Middle Kingdom. It is a sign that the authors of the new texts were familiar with the older material, which they creatively manipulated, and greatly extended.

The following 126 motifs are particular to transition texts:

| Adores God | Embalmed |
| Adorn Throne in Bark | Enthroned, Throne Established |
| Advances (hsfl) | Eye Is His Strength |
| Alights | Fear (f.t) at Side, before Him |
| Announced to Nehebkau | Ferryboat Brought |
| Anointed by God’s Anointing | Ferryboat Which Ferries Gods/Akhs |
| Arises at Place | Figs and Wine |
| As for God Who Does Not Assist | Flies |
| Ascends from/upon Thighs | Four Gods/Akhs Brought |
| Ascends to [pri i] Sky | God Awakens in Peace |
| Atum/Shu Takes (sdlt) out (to sky) | God Gives Hand to |
| Behold, Is Ascended | Gods Witness Ascent |
| Belly of Nut | Goes up to Sky on Ladder |
| Bestows, Takes away Kas | Has, Is Given Forked Staff |
| Boat Assembled | Has Writ of Re |
| Born before Sky, Earth, Discord Exist | Henu to Beneficiary and Ka |
| Climbs (hfd, Bld) | Himself Does Henu-gesture |
| Comes to Addressee = Horus | Himself Opens Doors, Sky |
| Cross, Ferry | His Place Made |
| Cross, Ferry to Horizon, Sky | Horns Are Grasped |
| Does Not Forget | I Am NN (ink. NN) |
| Doors, Sky Opened to Other | Is a Noble |
| Earth Is Opened | Is a Pure One |

---

1040 PT 334 §545b: g3.n=f knm.wt m ɛ2m.mw int-μt=f mr ntp “he has crossed Kenmut as Shezmu, the one who is in his Nudet-bark, the one beloved of the god”; and §544c: nm.n T. p g3.n=f knm.wt “Teti has traversed Buto: he has crossed Kenmut.” Compare CT 210 III 164/5c–d (B2L): pr.w=t m p sf.b.n=t m kmnt “I have gone forth from Buto: I have passed the night in Kenmut.”
Is at Prow
Is before, beside Re
Is Belted (š3) as Horus
Is Conceived to Re
Is Conveyed (sḏ3)
Is Fiery
Is Flower, Plant
Is for Sky
Is Fourth of Four Gods
Is in Chemmis
Is Living One
Is Not against King
Is Not Crossed
Is Not Stranded (lwt)
Is Not Weak, Feeble
Is Protected (mḥ3)
Is Questioned (non-rhetorical)
Is Served (ḥ3t)
Is Sobek
Is Son of Re (Predication)
Is Steering-oar (ḥmwt)
Is Summoned
Is Uraeus, Falcon which Came forth
It Is NN
Knows Other, Other’s Name
Knows Re
Ladder Is Set up
Land Not Free of
Libates (for God)
Limbs Are Imperishable Stars
Made to Rise (to Other)
Mythological Precedent: Osiris and Nut
Name Said to Re, Harakhti, Horus
Nebkhet Speaks
NX ḫw A
Not Rot, Decay (3rd Person)
Offspring is Morning God
Other Commends to God
Other Crosses to God
Other Flies
Other Informed (wḏ3 ḫ3) Concerning Him
Other Opens, Makes Way
Other Removed from Place
Performs ṣḏ3 for Re
Possession of Magic
Pure in the Field of Rushes
Rises Self (Not Exhortation)
Re Commends to God
Re Crosses, Ferries
Re Gives Hand to
Re Is Pure
Reaches (ḥḥ) Sky, Height
Reed-Boats Given
Reed-Boats Given to Other
Rises (ṛ3)
Rows Re
Sees Re
Seth Escapes, Rejects Death
Shu Lifts up (mḥ3, sḏ3l)
Sister is Sothis
Sit before, beside Gods
Taken to Field of Offerings
Takes Self away
Those upon Their Staves
Those Who Have Gone to Their Kas
Threat
Travels (ḏ3ḏ3)
True of Voice
Turns about (lnn)
Vocative to Ferryman, Gatekeeper
Vocative to Gods of Cardinal Points
Vocative to Hepati, Hepaf, Heneni
Vocative to Ladder
Vocative to Men
Vocative to Morning God
Vocative to (Non-inimical) Bull
Vocative to Nu
Vocative to Stars
Vocative to Those in the Netherworld
Wing of Thoth/Seth

The following 183 texts possess these motifs, belong to the series mentioned above, or both:

| PT 248–275 | sPT 502E | PT 624 | PT 702 |
| PT 300–313 | PT 503–511 | sPT 625A | sPT 704 |
| PT 315–327 | PT 513–531 | PT 626 | sPT 725–726 |
| PT 329–336 | PT 533 | sPT 627A–B | sPT 736–737 |
| PT 359–361 | PT 539 | sPT 655B | sPT 738B–C |
| PT 363 | PT 555 | PT 668–669 | sPT 739A |
| PT 407 | PT 562–569 | PT 678 | sPT 740 |
| PT 439–440 | sPT 570A–B | PT 681–684 | sPT 1025 |
| PT 467 | PT 571–576 | PT 688–689 | sPT 1031–1032 |
| PT 469–476 | PT 582–583 | sPT 691 | sPT 1046 |
| PT 478–481 | sPT 586B–D | sPT 691A | sPT 1048–1049 |
| PT 484–486 | PT 609 | sPT 692A | sPT 1064 |
| PT 489 | PT 613 | hPT 694B | sPT 1070 |
| sPT 491A | PT 615–616 | PT 696 |
3. Provisioning Texts

Group H is dominated by provisioning texts. J. Allen characterizes its rendition appearing in the pyramid of Unas as a kind of response on the part of the deceased to the offering ritual conducted on his behalf, with the beneficiary establishing himself as the source of his own food-supply and demanding nourishment from deities. The semantic association is unmistakable. Among the texts of Group H, there are numerous invocations of providers of offerings, declarations that offerings have been given by gods, that the beneficiary eats of what the gods eat, that he has abundance, that he does not eat or drink detestable substances, and that he flourishes. And so, as noted in Chapter Two, a Middle Kingdom exemplar labels a common set of provisioning texts as “Making the altar of a man flourish in the necropolis; causing that he have power over mortuary offerings.”

Like offering texts, provisioning ones have to do with outfitting the beneficiary with physical things, but they approach the matter not from the perspective of the living ritualists engaged in the rites of the collective Group A, the offering ritual, but from the point of view of what the dead were supposed to expect.

And so, beyond the general idea of offerings, there are precious few tangible points of contact in content between provisioning and offering texts, or for that matter between them and any other sort of sacerdotal text. While three texts of Group H bear statements which may be understood as paratextual object directions like those seen in offering texts, there is a transition text which also has such notations. And there are a couple other sporadic sacerdotal motifs among the provisioning type. Altogether, six out of thirty-eight provisioning texts have these scattered connections with sacerdotal texts. But, against this, thirty-five share motifs with other personal texts. Thus their topics of discourse only tangentially intersect the interests of the offering ritual and other collective situations. They have to do with the individual’s actions to secure offerings made by priests after death.

But that they hinge around offerings explains the typical physical juxtaposition of Group H with A. All the pyramids except for that of Pepi I situate Group H alongside Group A (see in Chapter Two). In later periods, elements of the Old Kingdom Group H—namely

---

1041 J. Allen 1994, p. 17.
1042 PT 204 §§118a (S1Bas).
1043 Cf. H. Altenmüller 1972, pp. 43–44.
1044 As observed by Kees 1922, p. 120, in connection with PT 207 §124d: ‘x f s w h f n ‘four handfuls of water.” The full statement is PT 207 §124c–d (W): ‘x f s w h f n ‘five handfuls of water,” which is matched in the provisioning text PT 208 §124f–g. As a paratextual notation dealing with objects, it is found in Listing Four under the motif ‘Object Direction,’ further subdivided into ‘Liquid Offering Direction’ and ‘Meat Offering Direction.’ The unusual combination of ‘x f s w h f n ‘shank and roasted meat’ is also found in a declarative statement in the body of the provisioning text PT 212 §133f (W): ‘x f s w h f n ‘for the shank and roasted meat, it is his offering,’” and as a result these three instances are also grouped together under the separate motif ‘Shank and Roast.’ One other paratextual notation in a provisioning text is the miscellaneous action instruction PT 340 §554d (T): ‘x w ‘set down,” with no item specified.
1045 PT 301 §§57c (W); ‘x f s w h f n ‘‘two green falcons’; see Listing Four under the motif ‘Object Direction.’
1046 Three motifs. The sacerdotal motif ‘Has Weret-crown’ occurs at PT 342 §§56c (M): ‘x f s w h f n ‘he [has gone around (i.e. taken possession of)] the Wereter-crown,” and the offering motif ‘Recite Four Times’ appears at PT 404 §702a (T): ‘x f s w h f n ‘(recite) four times continuously.” The latter is found in seventy-five offering texts and two priestly recitations, but it is also found in four transition texts: PT 301, 311, 474, and 527. The priestly motif ‘Is Greeted’ (‘x w) concerns the word ‘x w “greeting” as deployed outside of a genuine vocative, and it appears in the provisioning text PT 493 §1062b (M): ‘x f s w h f n ‘‘even when greeting was given to Neith.” It appears in eight priestly recitations, but also in the transition text PT 508 ‘x w.
1047 Its habitual location is the sarcophagus chamber, east wall. In the pyramid of Pepi I, Group H is located on the antechamber east wall. Teti also places part of it in its normal location.
Sequence 34, consisting of PT 204–205, 207, 209–212—were also sometimes positioned alongside offering texts and lists: in two Middle Kingdom sources, three from the New Kingdom, and one afterwards. But the juxtaposition was made possible by the monumental medium. Provisioning texts do not intermingle with offering ones, and there are no recurring series heterogeneously consisting of both. So the connection between provisioning and offering texts has to do with a central concern, but it is approached from different perspectives, realized in separate settings of action. The difference in setting is matched by difference in structure of performance. Whereas none of the texts of Group A shows signs of editing or retains the first person, there are ten in Group H which do, including two with recarving.

There are seventeen recurring series consisting homogeneously of provisioning Pyramid Texts: Sequences 34–36, 71–74, 86, and 108, and Subsequences 69–74, and 137–138. There are only eleven motifs particular to them:

Conceived at Night
Does Not Eat, Drink Detestable
Eats of What Gods Eat
Flourishes, Is Green (Predication)
Given Offerings by God
Has Abundance

Item to Me
Shank and Roast
Vocative to Butler (swdpw)
Vocative to Providers
Water Poured (ḥb mw)

And the following texts possess these motifs, belong to the series mentioned above, or both:

| Recurring Series | Texts |
|-----------------|-------|
| PT 204–212      | PT 400–406 | sPT 491B | PT 496 |
| PT 338–354      | PT 409   | PT 493   | CT 208 |

---

1048 Due to the frequency of its repetition, the scene and its texts have often been commented upon, most intensely in regards to the interpretation of CT 607; see Kees 1922, Altenmüller 1967, pp. 9–18; idem 1968, pp. 1–8; Barta 1973, pp. 84–91; Kees 1922, pp. 92–120; Kuhlmann and Schenkel 1983, pp. 166ff., Goedicke 1992, pp. 95–102; Hays 2004, pp. 195–196; Hays and Schenck 2007, pp. 99–100; and Osing 1986, p. 136.

1049 Q1Q/S/E and S/S/Ne. Hays and Schenck 2007, p. 100 n. 38, mistakenly state that the source M1Ba also has these texts.

1050 Cf. H. Altenmüller 1972, pp. 89–90, who interprets the set of texts belonging to Sequence 34 as the “1. Handlungzyklus” of the closing rites of the offering ritual, but this interpretation was argued against by G. Lapp 1986b, p. 182.

1051 See the references above at n. 769. This group of Pyramid Texts is drawn into the Book of the Dead to serve as the first half of BD 178, which is also associated with the offering ritual through its introduction by the statement BD 178 (Aa) 2: ĝl-mdw in NN ĝ/l= f m-n=k ỉ.t-l= bkh t=k dbh.t-kp. “Recitation by NN, who says: Take to yourself the Eye of Horus which you sought, the requisite offerings!” The exhortation to take the Eye of Horus is a motif restricted to offering texts (see “Takes [in] Eye of Horus” in Listing Four), and dbh.t-kp, as was seen in Chapter One, is a term associated with the offering ritual. But in addition to drawing from two sacerdotal Coffin Texts (CT 783 and 785) and adding completely new material, its second half consists of two other personal Pyramid Texts, the beginning of PT 251 and the end of PT 249. One source of BD 178 (Cg) also incorporates a passage from the sacerdotal PT 588.

1052 Cf. H. Altenmüller 1972, pp. 89–90, who interprets the set of texts belonging to Sequence 34 as the “1. Handlungzyklus” of the closing rites of the offering ritual, but this interpretation was argued against by G. Lapp 1986b, p. 182.

1053 sPT 491B (P) and PT 496 (P). The other texts with signs of editing or retaining an original first person are PT 207–208, 344–346, 349, 354, and 406.