A RAMESSIDE NAOPHOROUS STATUE FROM THE TETI PYRAMID CEMETERY
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I.

Visitors to the Old Kingdom mastaba of 'Ankhma'hor to the north of the pyramid of Teti at Saqqâra will undoubtedly have noticed a rather badly damaged statue situated on the wall opposite the entrance of the tomb (Pls 1,2)¹. Although it has been there for donkey's years it has never been published or even mentioned in the literature, and there seems to be no record of it in the register of the Antiquities Service at Saqqâra². The statue must have been found in the near vicinity of the mastaba, but neither its exact original position nor the name of the excavator are known³.

The statue is of limestone and is composed of four elements: a male figure is shown kneeling on a rectangular plinth, holding a naos before him and resting against a back-pillar. The upper half of the statue is broken away, including the head and most of the torso of the man, his hands and arms, and part of the top of the naos. The surface of the stone is severely weathered, especially on the frames of the naos, around the plinth and on the back-pillar, where all traces of the original inscription have disappeared. Numerous long vertical cracks in the stone run from the top of the naos down to well into the plinth. All these features tend to indicate that the statue must have been exposed to the elements for quite a long time. The man is dressed in a long pleated costume with a triangular front part extending to his shins. On his feet he is wearing sandals. Before him he holds a naos which rests directly on the plinth. Most of the lower part and back of the naos are not actually shown but have been treated as an integral part of the kneeling figure, “disappearing” into its thighs and dress. The naos was probably of the Lower Egyptian type (pr-nw/pr-nfr) with a vaulted roof between two posts, but the latter have now disappeared completely and the slightly curved top of the naos is the only indication left that it belonged to this type. Remains of a scene carved on top of the roof of the shrine, facing the beholder, show the god Osiris seated upon his throne. Nothing is left of the man who originally stood before him in adoration (fig. 1). In the naos is shown a mumiform figure of Osiris, which has no socle of its own but stands directly on the plinth of the main statue. The god wears a tripartite lappet wig surmounted by the atef-crown⁴, the top of which is broken away. His face is also damaged and only traces survive of his beard and of the uraeus on his brow. The hands are in the opposed position⁵ and the arms have been roughly modelled, but no sleeves are indicated. The god carries the ḫk'-sceptre in his right, and the nḫsḫ-sceptre in his left hand.

A curious feature of the sculpture is the fact that the whole naos including the Osiris figure is markedly tilting to one side and that the feet of Osiris are off centre, as may be seen by comparing the position of the feet in relation to the 'nḫ-sign in the middle of the inscription on the front of the plinth. These facts and the rough and careless carving of the inscriptions add to the general impression of a work of mediocre quality.

The statue is inscribed on the frames of the naos

1. Wall between rooms I and II on the plan in PM III/2, Pl. L.
2. My thanks are due to Mr. Ahmed Moussa, then chief-inspector of the Department of Antiquities at Saqqâra, for permission to publish the statue, to Mr. M.J. Vinkesteijn, photographer of the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leiden, for the photographs published with this article, and to Mrs. Sheila van Gelder-Ottway, who corrected my English.
3. It may have been among the “objets ... très nombreux (près d’un millier) et généralement intéressant” found by Victor Loret, Fouilles dans la nécropole memphite, 1897-1899, BIFOR, série, no. 10 (1899), 85-100. Quibell’s excavations are also a conceivable source, since quite a few blocks and other stone monuments mentioned in his published reports are still to be seen lying about in this area. This applies also to the statue-group recently published by G.T. Martin, A New Kingdom Dyad from the Memphite Necropolis, MDAIK 37 (1981), 307-311, which was not found by Loret but by Quibell and Hayter, who mention it in passing in their description of an (unrelated!) New Kingdom block, see J.E. Quibell & A.G.K. Hayter, Teti Pyramid, North Side (Cairo, 1927), 37 [xxi].
4. This headdress of Osiris is not uncommon in the Ramesside period and does not seem to be restricted to one particular form of the god, see e.g. the scenes in the Osiris Chapel in the Abydos temple of Seti I: A.M. Calverley & M.F. Broome, The Temple of King Sethos I at Abydos, I (London, 1933), Pls. 3-17.
Fig. 1. Scene on top of naos.

Fig. 2. Inscription on frames of naos.

Fig. 3. Inscription around plinth of naos.
(fig. 2), around the plinth (fig. 3) and on the back-pillar. The surface of the latter is extremely pitted and not a single trace of text survives. Insofar as can be judged from the remains of the other inscriptions they all gave the same simple offering-formula: "A boon-which-the-King-gives (to) Osiris, Foremost of the West, Onnophris, Lord of the Sacred Land, that he may give a (cool) breeze and censing and libating to the one greatly praised by the Perfect God (i.e., the King), the Royal Scribe and Overseer of the Treasury ⁸, Rekhahor ⁷. To my knowledge the owner is not known from other sources ⁸, but since the name is not at all common it is tempting to connect him with the "scribe" Rekhahor who was the recipient of three model-letters in the Memphite papyrus Bologna 1094 ⁹ which dates from the eighth year of Mernepthah.

The dimensions of the statue are as follows:

- Total surviving height: 66.2 cm.
- Width of plinth: 39.0 cm (front) - 38.5 cm (back).
- Depth of plinth: 46.0 cm.
- Height of plinth: 12.4 cm.
- Width of back-pillar: 16.5 cm (bottom) - 14.9 cm (highest surviving point).
- Width of naos: 25.2 cm.
- Depth of naos: 19.5 cm (top).
- Height of naos: 53.8 cm.

II.

Naophorous statues, which first appear during the reign of Hatshepsut (CG 42117, Senenmut ¹⁰) and which become very common in the Ramesside period, are usually described as temple statues. Although it is certain that the majority of them originate from the courtyards of temples, it is also true that a considerable number of such statues derive from tombs, and especially from the New Kingdom necropolis of Memphis. This is not surprising, since the tombs in that area usually have an open courtyard leading to a number of cult chapels ¹¹, and evidence has come forth from the recent Anglo-Dutch excavations at Saqqara that such "open courtyard-tombs" were indeed considered as temples. On one of the reliefs from the Memphite tomb of Maya several statues, including a naophorous one, are actually shown being dragged into the tomb as part of the funeral procession ¹². Of the many naophorous statues preserved in museums and elsewhere the following can be assigned with reasonable certainty to the Memphite necropolis:

1. Meryptaḥ, Louvre A 60, temp. Horemheb, PM III²/2,706:

kneeling statue with naos of Osiris, sandstone.
From unknown location at Saqqara.

2. Ḥormin, Leiden Ast 5 (D 38), temp. Seti I-Ramesses II:
knelling statue with naos of Osiris, limestone.
From Lepsius' tomb No. 29, to the west of the tomb of Ḥoremheb ¹³.

3. Ra’a, Leiden Ast 11 (D 74), probably temp. Seti I-Ramesses II:
knelling statue with naos of Ptah, limestone.
From unknown location at Saqqara ¹⁴.

4. Kha’y, Cairo CG 604, temp. Ramesses II, PM III²/2,726:
block statue with naos of mumiform god with hawkhead and sundisc (Osiris/Rā'-Harakhty), limestone.
From unknown location at Saqqara.

5. Kha’y, Cairo CG 606, temp. Ramesses II, PM III²/2,726:
block statue with naos of Osiris, limestone.
From same tomb as no. 4.

6. Tjuneroy, Cairo CG 1105, temp. Ramesses II, PM III²/2,666:

6. Presumably of one of the Memphite temples or palaces
7. H. Ranke, Die ägyptischen Personenamen, I (Glückstadt, 1935), 35-17. In view of the variant 𓊠𓊧𓊰𓊩𓊤𓊣 (op. cit., 226-6) besides 𓊠𓊩𓊧𓊩𓊤𓊣 (op. cit., 30-2) the name on our statue should probably be read Rā'-Irasher rather than "Irsher-ry(w)."
   For other names of this type cf. op. cit., III,87, s.v. ṛḥ.
8. In a private communication Dr Jaromir Málek informed me that he recalled having seen a photograph of a stela of a man with the same name in the archive of the Antiquities Office at Saqqara. The alleged provenance of this stela is the general area north-east of the Step Pyramid and it seems likely that the owner is identical with the Rekhahor of our statue.
12. PM III²/2,662 (4)-(5): LD III, 242; see E. Graefe: Das Grab des Schatzaufsehers und Bauleiters Maya in Saqqara. MDAIK 31 (1975), 202 fig. 69 and Pl. 58.
13. Omitted from the list in PM III²/2,664-665, but undoubtedly from this tomb.
14. Not in PM III², but certainly from Saqqara; cf. the tomb stela of the same man in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, No. E.SS. 49.
kneeling statue with naos of Osiris, sandstone. From area between the Monastery of Apa Jeremias and the Enclosure of Sekhemket.


III.

The significance of naophorous statues is still the subject of controversy, despite some important contributions, notably by Ranke and Otto. On the basis of the texts written on some of these statues they proposed to interpret them as “protective statues” (Schutzstatuen) which show the statue-owner protecting the deity in the naos and thereby demanding divine protection for himself. But neither of these two scholars were able to explain why a private individual could act as the protector of a god, and this may be part of the reason why their theory does not seem to have met with general approval. Bonnet tried to explain away the texts which mention the protection of the god by the statue-owner, stating that these texts refer exclusively to the protection given by the god to the man holding the naos. According to him naophorous statues show the owner carrying the god’s shrine in procession and express his desire to be part of that procession for ever. In order to explain the fact that a great number of such statues are kneeling, not standing statues Bonnet surmised that the procession halted at certain moments, enabling the priests to fall on their knees. That the statue-owner is not actually shown carrying the naos upon his hands, but that he “only touches it with his fingers” is according to Bonnet paralleled by certain scenes on New Kingdom temple walls illustrating the Festival of Min. Here the King is shown standing behind the god, who is usually shown on a much larger scale, and touching him with one hand. But it is hard to see how these scenes could be related with the pose shown in naophorous statues, which is quite different. In the temple scenes the King stretches out one arm to touch the god, or he just simply raises one hand in adoration and protection, while the other arm is falling down his side. The King does not hold the god himself, nor does he put his arms around the god as the owners of naophorous statues do. More recently Wildung called the
Schutzstatue theory “problematic” and adhered to the old and seemingly obvious view that the statue-owner presents the naos as a votive offering to the god in whose temple the statue was erected. A different opinion was expressed by Christine Meyer in her discussion of the naophorous statue of Senenmut. She compares this type of sculpture with the two sistrophorous statues of the same man. These are not simply votive statues, but are an attempt to visualize the desire of the statue-owner to share the daily offerings given to the god in the temple. The sistrum, on Senenmut’s statues combined with a representation of a uraeus on a ka-sign, and the naos with the divine image are symbols of the ka of the divinity and of the offerings (khw) granted to the statue-owner. “So wird man in den ausgestreckten Händen der Dargestellten, mit denen sie das Sistrum, den Naos oder die Gottheit selbst umfangen, nicht den Gestus eines Schützenden sehen dürfen, sondern vielmehr den eines Empfangenden.” This idea of partaking of the ka of a god by sharing his offerings is certainly part of the symbolism of the naophorous statue – it was already recognized as such by Anthes and Otto but it cannot be considered as a comprehensive alternative to the Schutzstatue theory. Significantly, neither Wildung nor Meyer pay any attention at all to the texts adduced by Ranke and Otto which in a clear and unmistakable way speak of the statue-owner as the protector of his god.

As has been said above naophorous statues were set up in the open courts of temples or temple-like tombs. This appears from numerous texts written on these statues referring to the temple in which they stood. Moreover, these texts often contain an appeal to the priests to present the man depicted in the statue with offerings or to recite for him the offering-formulae inscribed on it, implying that the statue was situated in a place not only accessible to the higher ranking priests but to “all servants of the god, w*b-priests, lector-priests, god’s fathers and scribes who are skilled in (reading) hieroglyphic texts”. The offering-formulae written on the statues, whether originating from temples or tombs, are basically similar to the countless offering-formulae found on funerary monuments, and it is clear that, although temple-statues were sometimes set up already during the lifetime of their owners, the wishes expressed in the htp-di-nsw formulae refer not just to life upon earth but especially to eternity and life after death. Most prominent among these wishes is the desire to perpetuate the name of the statue-owner: “May you give a good name in your temple”, “may he grant that my name be enduring in the temple of Amun forever”, “he made this statue (smn) in order to perpetuate his name in the Saite nome”. This wish is a clear indication of the funerary character of the inscriptions, for “commemoration forms the heart of the cult of the dead because it saves the deceased from becoming a lonely wandering ghost and retains him in the community of ordered being as one who is remembered.”

Needless to say these observations do not apply to naophorous statues alone, they are equally valid for all kinds of private statues set up in temples. What obviously distinguishes the naophorous statues from other temple-statues, however, is the naos held by the owner, and this would seem to be a good starting point for an investigation into the symbolism of these statues. The naos of the statue is an open naos, it is a direct reference to the daily temple ritual, or more precisely to the rites carried out after the priest has opened the god’s shrine.

27. Meyer, Senenmut, 89-93.
28. Convincingly interpreted as a depiction of the goddess Renenutet as mistress of food rather than a cryptographic writing of the name Ma‘at-ka-Re.
32. Cairo CG 672.
33. Cairo CG 42157.
34. This seems to be the usual term for kneeling or squatting statues, cf. Wb. III 460, 6: “Statue eines Privaten (immer Knieender oder Hockender)”, but see J.J. Clère, ReE 6 (1951), 147 [D] for exceptions. Texts on naophorous statues occasionally use the term ḫwty (e.g. Cairo CG 606 and 1105, nos. 4 and 6 in our list) A Ramesside naophorous statue from a tomb near Assiut (cf. W.C. Hayes, The Scepter of Egypt, II (New York, 1959), 349-350) is called a twr which was made for the owner “in order to receive life and to rest in his (funerary) chapel” (r ṣps ‘nh r ḫtp m kw.t.f, KRI I 353, 13).
35. Cairo CG 662.
38. Statues actually showing a naos with doors are not known to me. Ranke (op. cit., 107 with n. 8) observed that the Saite statue in Philadelphia (University Museum In. No. 42-9-1) had sockets in the corners of the frame of the naos to contain the pivots of a small door, presumably of wood or metal, but apparently this is exceptional.
The first spell recited after the opening of the naos begins with the words *wn 'iwy pt* “opened are the doors of heaven”\(^{39}\), and it is certainly no coincidence that priests bearing the title *wn 'iwy (n) pt m 'Ipt-Swt*\(^{40}\) often chose naophorous statues to represent themselves in the temple. Once the naos in the temple has been opened the priest, who acts on behalf of the King, prostrates himself, recites a number of hymns, anoints the god’s statue and burns incense before the god. Then one of the most important moments in the ritual is reached\(^{41}\). The priest embraces the god in order to revivify him: “Come to me, Amun-Re’, in this your embrace from which you come forth on this day of your arising as King”\(^{42}\). During the night the god is dead, he is Osiris, and at daybreak he receives his ka in the embrace of the priest, his son Horus; thus the two unite and the god is resurrected from the dead and reborn as Horus. At the same time the priest is Thoth who brings back to the god his Eye, again to revivify him: the “dead” Osiris and Re’ unite and become “He-with-the-two-ba’s”\(^{43}\). Osiris resurrects as Re’. Moret\(^{44}\) has already referred to a similar ritual at Dendera which was studied some 50 years later by Daumas\(^{45}\). On New Year’s day the statues of Hathor and of the other deities of Dendera were carried up to the roof of the temple.

“On la dévoilait alors (...) et elle était illuminée des rayons vivifiants de l’astre qui contenait son Ba divin, tandis que son Ka résidait dans la statue où l’avait appelé l’embrasement rituel dans le temple”\(^{45}\).

When Ranke studied the texts on naophorous statues mentioning the “protection” of the god by their owners he also came across some texts which speak of “embracing” the god. A man holding a naos of Neith “embraces his mistress” and other statue-owners say: “I have embraced your perfection (*nfr*)” or: “[I have put my arms around him] embracing his perfection”\(^{46}\). Ranke considered these quotations as a mere variant of the protection texts, the former constituting “a more neutral expression” for holding the naos\(^{47}\). In the light of what has been said above, however, I think these statements should be taken more seriously. The man holding the naos embraces the god’s image and thereby restores his ka. At the same time the open naos of the statue, set up in the open court of the temple or the tomb\(^{48}\), receives the rays of the sun-god which refill the cult-image of the god with divine life.

Once the context of the statues has been established it is also possible to come to a better understanding of the texts quoted by Ranke\(^{49}\) mentioning the protection of the god: “I have put myself behind you in order to protect (your) body (*r mkt-h-n*)”\(^{50}\); “NN has put his arms around you as protection (*m ir.n.f mkt*) in order that your ka may ordain that rituals are performed for him as he performs the protection-ritual (*m ir.n.f mkt*) behind your naos for ever”\(^{51}\). Clearly the statue-owner is here said to protect the god in his shrine and since, as we have seen, holding the naos can be called “embracing”, i.e. revivifying the god, it seems likely that this protection is also connected with resurrection and rebirth of the god. Evidence for this is again found in a temple ritual, although a full version of it is known only from as late a source as the temple of Edfu. The texts of these “spells of protecting the body” (*nfr n mkt-h-n*)\(^{52}\) are inscribed on the northern part of the girdle wall of the temple. They were recited at the end of the “ritual of embracing the Living Ba of Re’ as King who is upon his throne and as Great God Many-coloured of Plumage”\(^{53}\), the coronation ceremonies of the Opening of the Year which took place at the beginning of the pri-season. In the morning the cult-image of Horus of Edfu was carried in procession to the Temple of the Falcon (*pr-bik*), a small building in front of the main temple. Out of the many birds of prey kept there the god chose one falcon who was to become his Living Ba upon earth, the incarnation of both Re’ and Horus “qui est Râ renouvelé”\(^{54}\), to whom he says: “At day-

---

40. Wb. I 311.5.
41. Moret, op. cit., 79 ff.
42. CT IV 278/9b-280/1a = BD Nav. 17,51-52, where it is stated that this unification of Re’ and Osiris is the result of their mutual embrace.
43. op. cit., 100 n. 4.
44. F. Daumas, *Sur trois représentations de Nout à Dendara*, ASAE 51 (1951), 373-400.
45. Daumas, op. cit., 394.
46. Ranke, op. cit., 111-112 with n. 1.
47. ib., 111.
48. Statue no. 8 in our list is now orientated towards the east, but it is impossible to know whether it is still in its exact original position. The Philadelphia statue published by Ranke says that it stood “on the east side (of the temple?) before the God’s Mother” (*r gs lshy n-hft-hr-n Mwt-ngr*, 18).
49. op. cit., 109-110.
50. Cairo CG 672.
51. Vatican 1370.
52. Edfou VI 300.9.
54. Alliot, op. cit., 601.
break I embrace your majesty with dominion, life and 
stability, that you may be rejuvenated!". Back in
the main temple the actual coronation took place. Horus-
Re of Edfu and his Ennead crowned the Living Falcon
who was identified with the King. At the end of these
complex rites the mkt-h-w-spells of Thoth were recited
by the King. This text begins with a hymn to Re as
"Lord of Protection" (nb mkt) "arising in the east of
heaven" to whom prayers are said for the protection
of the newly reborn King, "for he is Horus in his infancy
in his nest in Khennmis and the amulets for protecting
the body (wdjw n mkt-h-w) were made for him by his
mother Isis". Then follows a long litany identifying the
protection of the Falcon-King with the protection of a
great number of divinities (mkt f mkt N, ts pr). Alliot has
already stressed the very marked funerary character of
this ritual in which Horus of Edfu is Osiris who is
reborn as Horus in the person of the divine Living
Falcon and of the reigning King who performs the
ritual. Isis, identified with the goddess Ujet-Hor, the
personified Edfu temple, gives birth to Horus who
"rejoices (i.e., arises) upon the mnb.t as Great Falcon
exalting himself above the gods" and she says to her
son: "I am around you as a wall of iron, the protection
(st) of my majesty encloses the Lord of Lords".

The "protection" of the Edfu ritual is the protection
given by Re and Isis to the child Horus before, during
and after his birth. Similar "spells for protecting the
body (wdjw n mkt-h-w) to be recited over a child when
the sun rises" using the same formula mkt.k mkt N
are already found in a collection of spells to protect
newborn children, written some 1500 years before the
Edfu temple was built. Even earlier is a mkt-h-w-spell
against snakebite found in two late Middle Kingdom
papyri in which Horus-bity, who according to the
Coffin Texts "establishes Osiris in his place on this his
day of appearance (i.e., accession) says: "My protection
(mkt) is the protection of heaven, my protection is
the protection of the earth, my protection is the
protection of Re in heaven". Horus is protected even before
he is born. When Isis "wakes pregnant with the seed of
Osiris" she calls upon the gods: "Protect him (ir.m n mkt.)
within my womb" and when the child is born it says:
"I am Horus, born of Isis, whose protection (mkt) was made
when he was still in the egg". It is the
dead Osiris who is reborn as Horus and it was "his
sister who made his protection" (ir.n snt.f mkt.) by
making a shade with her feathers and by joining her
brother in order to receive his seed and bear his heir.
Protection and creation, resurrection and rebirth go
together. In the myths relating to the primaeval creation
of the temple of Edfu the earth-god Tatenen who arises
from Nun is called both Protector God (nfr-hm) and
Lord of the Creation (nb-tpk) for it is this god who
"initiated the creation of what was the concrete form
of the protection of the god", viz. the temple. The safe
rebirth of Horus is guaranteed by the protection against
the powers of chaos that might endanger it. At the be-
coming of the Edfu mkt-h-w-text prayers are offered to
Re the Lord of Protection to safeguard the Falcon-King:
"May you deliver him (shyth k sw) from all harm, may
you release him (wh k sw) from all evil". This again
is an ancient phrase, found e.g. in the Ebers papyrus:
"O Isis Great of Magic, release me, deliver me (wh k wi
shyth t wi) from all evil (...), like you were released
and delivered from your son Horus", and in CT Spell
691, where the deceased (Osiris) desires to "arise to be
his own likeness" (Horus) and addresses the gods with
the words: "Make me hale as you make yourself hale,
release me, deliver me (wh k wi shyth k wi)". These
quotations show that the terms shyth and wh refer especially
to the removal of any evil that might endanger the birth
of Horus as the resurrected Osiris.

55. Edifu VIII 148.9; cf. Alliot, op. cit., 673.
56. Edifu VI 300,10-13.
57. Edifu VI 301,2-3.
58. Alliot, op. cit., 634.
59. The throne baldaquin used by the divine child in the
mammisi, cf. F. Daumes, Les mammisés des temples égyptiens
(Cairo, 1955), 247-249 n. 1.
60. Edifu VI 304,10-11.
61. ib., 9.
63. H. Altemmüller, Ein Zauberspruch zum "Schutz des Leibes",
GM 33 (1979), 7-12.
64. CT VI 291; cf. Altemmüller, op. cit., 10-11 n. (g). According to Edifu I 36,12 the King is "like Horus-bity who rules being an infant".
65. CT II 213c.
66. CT II 225b.
67. Louvre C 286,13-16. In the light of the texts quoted here it is
difficult to agree with Bonnet (MDAIK 12,96) who
called mkt a "colourless" term which may be used to
denote human protection as against divine protection which
is called st.
68. E.A. E. Reymond, The Mythical Origin of the Egyptian
69. op. cit., 291.
70. Edifu VI 300,15.
71. Pap. Ebers 1,13-16.
72. CT VI 323b-c.
73. Cf. J. van Dijk, The Birth of Horus according to the Ebers
Papyrus, JEOI 26 (1979-1980), 10-25; see esp. pp. 21 and 25
with n. 95.
Returning to the naophorous statue we can now answer the question posed by Ranke\textsuperscript{74}, why and against what the god in the naos needs protection. The man holding the naos is revivifying his god by embracing him and by protecting him against the powers of chaos that threaten to prevent his unharmed rebirth and resurrection. By doing this the statue-owner resurrects himself together with his god who in turn protects his protector, as the owner of a statue with a naos of Thoth says: “I have stretched out my arms in your embracement, in order that you should be my protection.”\textsuperscript{75} This again is in agreement with the temple ritual. The King who performs the ritual is revivified himself when he revivifies the god by embracing and protecting him. Together with the god he is reborn at daybreak to rule Egypt as the living Horus upon earth.

Naophorous statues are sometimes in the form of a block statue\textsuperscript{76}, a type of sculpture representing the deceased at the crucial moment of resurrection, when his head, revivified by the rays of the Sun-god, emerges from the ist-hill\textsuperscript{77}. The so-called city-god formula, found in a great many cases on the back-pillar of naophorous statues (though not exclusively on these\textsuperscript{78}), also stresses this aspect. The funerary character of the spell is clear, although Otto maintained that this applies only to its origin and not to its use on temple-statues\textsuperscript{79}. The full version of the formula reads: \textit{mr nWty n NN dî tw hj.t.f hjt k.t.f m-bt-h.f n dsw rwy.fy n lhsw ih.f iwny pw (mît-istros) “O city-god of NN! Place yourself behind him while his ka is before him. His feet shall not be opposed and his wish shall not be frustrated, for he is a (justified) Pillar-god!”}. The central verse is a quotation from the Pyramid Texts, but Otto’s statement that it expresses merely “den in den Totentexten häufigen Wunsch, dass der Tote in seiner Bewegungsfreiheit nicht behindert und seine Wünsche ihm nicht abgeschlagen werden mögen” disregards the context of this phrase in Spells 258-259 of the Pyramid Texts. Here the deceased King is said to be resurrected and to ascend to the sky where he joins the Sun-god: “he comes and goes with Rê and he has occupied (lit. “embraced”) his chapels, (...) his foot shall not be opposed and his wish shall not be frustrated”\textsuperscript{80}.

Another reference to the resurrection symbolism is the “Pillar-god” (\textit{iwny}) mentioned at the end of the formula. This is a frequent epithet of both Rê and Osiris, especially of Osiris as nocturnal form of Rê. The Pillargod supports the sky and raises the Sun-god upon his arms from the primal waters\textsuperscript{81}. As a Pillar-god the statue-owner raises his god above the horizon, the god is “high upon his arms and unites himself with him”\textsuperscript{82}. Together with the god the deceased arises himself, for not only he but also the city-god is \textit{iwny}. The city-god formula sometimes adds \textit{mît-istros} or even \textit{mît-istros} NN after \textit{iwny pw}: “he (NN) is a justified Pillar-god”, but at the same time the formula makes it clear that \textit{iwny} refers to the city-god as well, for this god is behind the deceased in the form of the actual back-pillar\textsuperscript{83}.

A similar ambiguity appears as regards the ka mentioned in the formula. As it stands \textit{k.t.f} can only refer to the ka of the man, for the deity is addressed in the 2nd person, and a text from a late version of the Ritual of Opening the Mouth confirms this: “O NN, you have been born by your mother on this day (...), receive him for yourself, your ka, your god (...), your ka is before you, your god is behind you!”\textsuperscript{84}. On the other hand the ka which is before the statue-owner is the ka of the god, as on a Ramesside naophorous statue from Mit Rahina: “O my lord Ptah (...), may you place me before you, while your ka is in front of me (k.t.f hjt-istros)”.\textsuperscript{85} This ka of the god is materialized in the

\textsuperscript{74} Quoted in n. 22 above.
\textsuperscript{75} Vatican 97; cf. Ranke, op. cit., 111.
\textsuperscript{76} E.g. Cairo CG 42165, 42166, 42174; Louvre A 65, A 71 and nos. 4, 5 and 9 in the list above.
\textsuperscript{77} A. Eggebrecth, Zur Bedeutung des Wurfelockers, in: Festgabe für Dr. Walter Will (Köln, 1966), 143-163.
\textsuperscript{78} Cf. Anthes, ZÄS 73 (1937), 26 n. 3 and H.D. Schneider, Shabtis (Leiden, 1977), I. 160-161) 292.
\textsuperscript{79} Otto, op. cit., 454-455.
\textsuperscript{80} Pyr. 310d-e, 311d = 314d-e, 315d; cf. for the first part the related text BD Nav. 153B, 15-16.
\textsuperscript{83} Otto, op. cit., translates \textit{mn} NN as “Die Rückenpfleger-statue ist der NN” and considers this to be the original meaning while all mythological interpretations of \textit{mn} “are most certainly secondary extensions, interpretations, possibilities, which the Egyptians were eager to exploit, but which we should not take as a starting point for an explanation” of the term. It would seem to me, however, that the mythology of the Pillar-god was part of the original concept of the statue and that it was subsequently realized in the form of the back-pillar, and not the other way round.
\textsuperscript{84} E. Otto, Das ägyptische Mundöffnungsritual (Wiesbaden, 1960), I. 139-141 (scene 55A, b.g.); II 125 (7).
\textsuperscript{85} Berlin (East) 2085; cf. Otto, Or. NS 17, 452 and PM III² 3, 838.
food-offerings (\textit{kh\textit{w}}\textsuperscript{86}) presented to the god and at the same time to the person kneeling behind him. In the daily temple-ritual the offerings are given to the god as soon as the King has embraced and revived him. “Le repas sacré commençait dès que le dieu avait repris possession de son âme (...). Le but essentiel du service sacré est désormais atteint; le cadavre divin a retrouvé son âme, s'est revivifié et peut s'alimenter.”\textsuperscript{87} By sharing these offerings through the \textit{htp-di-nsw} formulae inscribed on the statue man partakes of the ka of the god. Even in this offering the unification of god and man is symbolized again: the ka of the god is given to the ka of \textit{(n kî n)} the statue-owner.

The deceased and his city-god\textsuperscript{88} are united in mutual embracement, they protect each other and are resurrected together. This is also stressed in the outward form of the sculpture: naos, man and back-pillar are not treated as three separate elements, but they are integrated into an indissoluble whole, with the naos emerging from the figure of the man holding it while the latter emerges from the back-pillar.

Several authors have remarked upon the fact that naophorous statues reverse the usual proportions of god and man as they appear in New Kingdom royal sculpture showing a god on a large scale behind a much smaller figure of the King\textsuperscript{89}. From this reversal Otto inferred that in naophorous statues man is obviously viewed as being “more powerful” than the god, and the inconceivability of this idea was used by Christine Meyer as an argument against the \textit{Schutzstatue} theory. But the comparison of naophorous statues and statues showing god and King is unjustified. Apart from the fact that private and royal sculpture cannot be compared from a formal point of view alone, without due consideration of the proper meaning of each type, both categories are also incomparable because they show god and man on different levels. In royal sculpture god and King are represented directly, while naophorous statues show a man in a ritual pose holding a cult-image of his god. The god is not depicted directly, “in seinem Sein”\textsuperscript{90}, as in royal sculpture, but he is represented by his cult-image\textsuperscript{41}. The average height of the naos containing the cult-image in the temple was some 50-60 cm\textsuperscript{92}, which is in agreement with the relative proportions of man and naos in the naophorous statues. The fact that the statue-owner is apparently shown on a larger scale than the god therefore does not mean that a human being is credited with a greater “power” than the god, but it is simply a reflection of reality.

That a private individual could be shown in a ritual situation originally reserved only for the King or for the priest representing the King is not really significant when the funerary character of the statue is borne in mind. What is denied to ordinary human beings in life upon earth becomes regular practice as soon as they have passed the borderline between this world and “the god’s domain” (\textit{hrt-nfr}), the netherworld. In the scenes on the walls of his tomb, in the vignettes of his Book of the Dead and in the representations on his funerary equipment the deceased is depicted time and time again in a direct relation to the gods, offering to them or enacting rituals without the intermediary of King or priest. Otto’s statement that the appearance of naophorous statues shows that “a divine element has been discovered in man”\textsuperscript{93} is therefore true only insofar as all of the blessed dead are divine beings.

As has been said before the “protection” offered to the god’s image by the statue-owner is meant to be beneficial to himself, because the god will in turn protect him and grant to him the desires expressed in the \textit{htp-di-nsw} formulae. This reciprocity is usually explained by the principle of \textit{do ut des} and Ranke even thought that the statue-owner by the act of protecting could force the god in a magical way to give his protection in return\textsuperscript{94}. Hornung has already remarked that the words \textit{do ut des}, even if Egyptian texts sometimes suggest the existence of such a concept\textsuperscript{95}, “do not explain very much”, for “before man can give anything the gods have already given everything”\textsuperscript{96}. Generally speaking there is a clear connection between the offering given and the character of the god to whom it is given. To the god is offered what

\textsuperscript{86} Cf. n. 30 above and U. Schweitzer, Das Wesen des Ka im Diesseits und Jenseits der alten Ägypter (Glückstadt, 1956), 68-71.

\textsuperscript{87} Moret, Le rituel du culte divin journalier, 102; see also Alliot, Le culte d’Horus à Edfou, 648-654.

\textsuperscript{88} The god in whose temple the statue was set up; in the case of Saqqâra tomb-statues mainly Osiris as god of the “city of eternity” (\textit{nâwrt nfr ntr}) or Ptah as god of the dead, cf. the connection between Ptah and city-god in BD Nav. 23,1-2: “My mouth has been opened by Ptah, the bonds covering my mouth have been released by my city-god”.

\textsuperscript{89} Ranke, op. cit., 110 with n. 7; Otto, op. cit., 456-458; Meyer, Senenmut, 76-77; 82; 90.

\textsuperscript{90} Bonnet, MDAIK 12,92.

\textsuperscript{91} ib., 96.


\textsuperscript{93} Otto, op. cit., 460.

\textsuperscript{94} Ranke, op. cit., 110 n. 6; cf. Otto, op. cit., 457.

\textsuperscript{95} Cf. Merikare 129-130, ed. W. Helck, Die Lehre für König Merikare (Wiesbaden, 1977), 82.

\textsuperscript{96} E. Hornung, Der Eine und die Vielen (Darmstadt, 1971), 199.
belongs to him or what originates from him. The offering
is a symbol of the god himself and the act of offering
symbolizes the divine activity. By protecting the god
man repeats and reaffirms the protection already given
by his god who is the Lord of Protection (nb mkt) and
in whose unharmed rebirth and resurrection he partici-
pates. This ritual act, like any offering, has the character
of a confession of faith; in it "man realizes his communion
with his god", as Kristensen formulated it. In this
communion man can offer his protection to his god,
for "in his relation to god man passes beyond his own
limitedness, and we can say that his offering serves to
renew and establish god’s kingdom in the world."

The symbolism of naophorous statues is rooted in the
temple-ritual. The statue-owner “embraces” his god
in order to revivify him and he “protects” him against
the powers of chaos during his rebirth and resurrection.
By doing this he participates in the eternal renewal of
the god’s life, being reborn and resurrected himself
together with his god and reinvigorated by sharing his
ka-offerings. Perhaps it should be added that this inter-
pretation does not apply exclusively to naophorous
statues but also to related statues showing a figure
holding an image of the god without a naos or holding
divine symbols such as a sistrum or a ram’s head upon
a surveyor’s cord. But the naophorous statue is the
most “complete” form of this type of sculpture; it shows
in a nutshell all the essential moments of the temple-
ritual and its symbolism makes it an appropriate statue
for both temple and tomb.

97. W.B. Kristensen, Inleiding tot de Godsdienstgeschiedenis
98. op. cit., 118.
99. ib., 122.
100. E. Graefle, Amun-Re, “Patron der Feldmesser”, CDE 48
(1973), 36-46.
Rameside naophorous statue:
front and back sides, top of naos.
Ramesside naophorous statue: right and left sides.