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The cloaked man determinative

Jacobus van Dijk, University of Groningen

For Boyo, and a bit for Susanne too

The dedicatee of this volume of essays and the present writer have not only been close friends for some 35 years, but they also share a love of New Kingdom epigraphy. It is purely by chance that the small but intriguing epigraphic detail which is the subject of the following little Misselle does not occur in any of the tombs to which he devoted publications that are each of them models of their kind.1 It is hoped nevertheless that it will give him as much pleasure reading it as it gave me writing it in his honour.

In the New Kingdom, and particularly in Ramesside times, the common determinative of a seated man (𓊃, Gardiner Sign list A1) or official (𓊃, A51; 𓊃, A52) is sometimes replaced by a sign depicting a seated man with both arms jutting out and hands held against the chest; the arms and shoulders appear to be wrapped in a cloak (𓊃, A76a). In painted monochrome inscriptions the sign is usually shown as a black silhouette with the space between the arms and the body filled in, and this is also the case in almost all carved examples.2 A detailed example can be found on a fragment of a column belonging to the famous High Priest of Ptah Khaemwaset, son of Ramesses II, found reused in the temple of Ptah in Memphis and now in the Royal Scottish Museum in Edinburgh (1908.364: FIGURE 1).3 In the inscription on the column fragment the sign concludes the writing of Khaemwaset’s name; it has been personalized by the addition of the sidelock which the prince is also shown wearing in the representation to the left of the inscription. In his study of the monuments of Khaemwaset, Gomaà states that the sign is sometimes (‘manchmal’) shown with the sidelock,4 and this led him to the conclusion that it represents the Sem-priest, referring to depictions of the latter in the Opening of the Mouth Ritual in the tomb of Seti I.5 The lower arms and hands of the sign on the column fragment are clearly outlined, however, making him look distinctly different from the kneeling Sem-priest in the Opening of the Mouth ritual, whose body is completely enveloped in a shroud and who moreover is sitting on his heels and does not have one knee raised in the manner of the determinative (cf. 𓊃, A76b). The exact origin and meaning of the sign remains difficult to establish. One might think of the small figure of a human being occasionally shown underneath the weighing scales in the judgement scene of Book of the Dead Spell 125, which has been interpreted as a representation of the deceased at the moment of resurrection, that is, at the crucial stage between being mumified and being liberated from the mummy bands, ready to assume the ‘dress of daily life’.6 This figure usually has both knees raised, however, and is also shrouded completely with only the head and the hands exposed; moreover, this figure is not attested before the Twenty-First Dynasty.

1 Ockinga and al-Masry (1988–1990); Ockinga (1997); Ockinga (2005); Ockinga (2009). Cf. also n.57 below.
2 Exceptions are rare; see for example, the statue of the vizier Rahotep, BM 712, where the space between arms and torso is open, see James (1970: pl. xiv, B).
3 Petrie (1909: 10–11, pl. xxv); Gosse (1915: 95, fig. 107); the sketch in Gomaà (1973: 115, fig. 15) is based on Petrie’s photograph and does not clarify any details.
4 Gomaà (1973: 22–23). In fact, no other examples of this detail can be found in his corpus.
While most authors agree that the sign is indicative of a Ramesside date, opinions vary on how accurate a dating criterion it actually is. One of the first scholars to discuss the sign was Ahmed Badawy, who suggested it represents a man wearing a short priestly gown (‘einen kurzen Priestermantel’) and dates it to the Nineteenth Dynasty, referring to monuments of the mayor of Memphis Amenhotep Huy and of Prince Khaemwaset as well as to the tomb of Setau at El Kab. He then adds that the sign itself is already known from the Eighteenth Dynasty, albeit not as a determinative, but as a cryptographic writing of the independent personal pronoun ink, as had been pointed out a few years earlier by Drioton. This meaning appears to be limited to a single isolated example on a sistrophorous statue of the army scribe Men from the precinct of Mut at South-Karnak, Cairo CG 901, which dates from the reign of Amenhotep III. The exact reading has been disputed; Newberry and Helck (who collated the text in the Cairo Museum) read it as the sign of the ‘man with hand to mouth’, (A2). Borchardt and Clère on the other hand, render it as a seated man with his elbows jutting out on either side. The photographs published by them clearly show that this reading is the correct one (FIGURE 2). The sign differs from most later examples in that there is an open space between the arms and the torso of the seated man, indicating that although he holds his hands against his chest his shoulders are not wrapped in a cloak. In this respect it resembles a sign of a standing man holding his arms in this position ( , A359), which in an Eighteenth Dynasty version of BD 85 written in cryptography also has the reading ink. An authority often quoted in connection with the determinative is Jaroslav Černý, who wrote that it dates an inscription ‘in the XXth Dynasty’. In an article dealing with the monuments of Ramessuemperre, who is still attested in Years 7 and 8 of Merenptah, Berlandini wrote that the sign is frequently used from the Ramesside period onwards and that it is found on a great number of Memphite monuments. De Meulenaere, discussing a shabti of a harîm scribe Pay in Brussels, writes that the determinative is not attested before the Nineteenth Dynasty and that it is so frequently used in inscriptions of Memphite high officials from the reign of Ramesses II that it constitutes an almost infallible dating criterion. He therefore dates the shabti to the Nineteenth Dynasty, and, equating this Pay with the Memphite harîm official Pay buried at Saqqâra, dates the latter to the Ramesside Period as well (as had several other scholars, including Badawy, Helck, James, Otto, Kitchen and others). Berlandini acknowledges De Meulenaere’s remark, noting that the sign in question is frequently used as determinative or suffix at the beginning of the Nineteenth Dynasty, but nevertheless insists that the Memphite tomb of Pay is contemporary with those of Horemheb and Maya nearby. The tomb has since been excavated by the EES-Leiden mission at Saqqâra and there can be little doubt that it does indeed date from the immediate post-Amarna period; the shabti in Brussels clearly belongs to a different Pay.

7 Badawy (1944: 191).
8 Drioton (1942: 22).
9 Newberry (1899: 332).
10 Urk. IV, 1922.9. Curiously enough, in his translation (‘ich bin der Herold meiner Herrin’) Helck (1961: 319) more or less follows Drioton, effectively interpreting the sign in question as ink and thus contradicting his own reading. In Benedict Davies’ translation of Helck’s text (Davies [1994: 62]) the sign is ignored altogether (‘The herald of my Mistresses’).
11 Borchardt (1930: 145 and pl. 156).
13 Drioton (1933: 37 [no. 11] with n.1). A ‘cloaked’ variant of this sign can be used for ḫsī ‘praise’, from ḫs ‘be cold’ (Sethe [1928: 82, 5]; Simpson [1974: pl. 14, l. 11]), where the arms and shoulders are wrapped to keep warm (cf. Goldwasser [1995: 94 n.61]).
14 Černý (1973: 192 n.2).
16 De Meulenaere (1975: 92).
17 Berlandini (1977: 36 n.5).
18 Van Dijk (1995: 19 n.10); Raven (2005: 8) tentatively suggests that the Pay of the shabti was a grandson of the owner of the Saqqâra tomb.
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In 1987 Henry Fischer, discussing a wooden staff of Qenyamun, wrote that although the object ‘has previously been dated to the Tuthmoside Period’, a later date is suggested by ‘the name-determinative’, which clearly points to the Ramesside Period, either Dynasty XIX or XX. In a footnote he mentions Černý’s dating in the Twentieth Dynasty, ‘but it is known earlier, temp. Ramesses II’, referring to the Memphite tomb of Mose and the stela of Khaemope in Tübingen, both of which date from the reign of that king. In the same year, Caminos remarked that the determinative ‘frequently replaces and in hieroglyphic texts of Nineteenth–Twenty-First Dynasties’. He also mentions ‘many occurrences of this hieroglyph at Gebel es-Silsilah’.

Some of the authors quoted so far were also mentioned by Rob Demarée, who concludes that ‘the available evidence makes it likely that this name-determinative is not such a safe and sharp criterium for dating’. He also refers to the sarcophagus lid of Yupa as being ‘a clear 19th dynasty example’. In his corpus of stelae the sign occurs in five cases, two of Panakh/Panekhu (nos. A 13 and 14), which he dates to the ‘second half of the 19th dynasty’ and ‘late 19th dynasty’, respectively; and two of Khamuy (nos. A 32 and 35, with Penbuy), who he suggests is to be identified with a Khamuy who is ‘known from year 1 of Sethos II … until year 1 of Siptah, while he also occurs in the ostraca from year 3 of Amenmesse …’. The fifth example is on a stela of Dhutymose (no. A 50; UCL 14228), where Demarée appears to have overlooked it. This stela he dates to ‘the second half of the 19th dynasty’ as well.

From this brief and no doubt incomplete survey it transpires that there is no agreement among scholars about the exact date of the sign in question, the dates that have been suggested ranging from the beginning of the Nineteenth Dynasty to as late as the Twenty-First Dynasty. The pages of Kitchen’s Ramesside Inscriptions (KRI) provide a large corpus of reliable handcopies of reasonably well- and sometimes precisely-dated inscriptions and may therefore help to clarify the matter. No examples from before the Nineteenth Dynasty are known to me except in the cryptographic inscriptions already mentioned; apart from these, the sign is completely absent from the 2179 pages of Sethe’s and Helck’s Urkunden der 18. Dynastie.

In KRI I (Ramesses I–Seti I) only two examples can be found; both are Theban graffiti. The first, KRI I 402: 4 = GMT No. 1930 (Figure 3), mentions the chief craftsman Huy; Kitchen identifies him with the owner of TT 361, whose son Qaha and grandson Merywaset are attested in Years 38 and 40 of Ramesses II, respectively, and who is therefore himself usually assigned to the reign of Seti I. None of the inscriptions in TT 361 or on the other monuments of this man (KRI I 397–402) uses this determinative. The other graffito, KRI I 410: 10 = GMT No. 2187 (Figure 4), is one of two mentioning the workman Amunmaht and his son Nebdjefu. The son is identified by Kitchen with the workman and known from two stelae in the British Museum, an offering table in Cairo and various fragments of funerary equipment, including another offering table found in Tomb 1319A at Deir el-Medina (KRI I 409–410). His name also occurs on a libation bowl in the British Museum belonging to his son Hornefer, which lists several other members of his family. None of these objects mentions Nebdjefu’s father Amunmaht, however, making Kitchen’s identification and by consequence the early

20 Caminos (1978: 156).
22 Demarée (1983: 44 and 46, resp.).
29 The other one, GMT 2134, Černý and Sadek (1970–1971: pl. lxxiv), does not use the cloaked man sign.
date of the graffito rather hazardous. The \( \text{\textsc{\textae}} \) determinative does not occur on any of the monuments mentioning Nebdjefa.

These two examples stand isolated, not only among the other monuments of their owners, but also within the whole corpus of texts from the reigns of Ramesses I and Seti I. One wonders whether the appearance of the determinatives here is not due to the nature of the inscriptions in which they occur, which are not carefully carved but roughly scratched onto the rock surface of the Theban mountains.

Both were probably intended as plain seated-man determinatives (\( \text{\textsc{\textae}} \)).

In \textit{KRI II} (Ramesses II) the sign does not occur in royal inscriptions proper, but it does in some inscriptions of members of the royal family and a few private individuals associated with them. Twenty-three examples have been noted; they are associated with the following persons: Huy, High Priest of Ptah (\textit{KRI II}, 369: 5); Imy-ra-ihu, royal retainer (\textit{KRI II}, 374: 11); Prince Khaemwaset (\textit{KRI II}, 872: 4, 11; 882: 10; 884: 2, 9; 886: 13, 15, 16; 888: 4, 6, 7, 10, 11; 897: 16; 898: 15); Prince Merenptah (\textit{KRI II}, 377: 4; 903: 16 and 904: 3;\(^{31}\) 905: 11); Prince Ramessu-nebweben (\textit{KRI II}, 912: 10). A little undated votive stela from Qantir dedicated by one Sur (no title; \textit{KRI II}, 453: 3) need not concern us here.

Unfortunately, few of the monuments in this volume on which the cloaked man determinative occurs can be dated precisely. The High Priest of Ptah Huy is known only from a votive shabti from the Serapeum; it is associated with the Apis burials of Years 16 and 30, which cannot be clearly distinguished from each other.\(^{32}\) Kitchen suggests that Huy should be placed in Year 16 and that Prince Khaemwaset, who also left votive objects in the Apis vault of Years 16 and 30, ‘was installed as a Sem-priest of Ptah as right-hand-man to Huy’.\(^{33}\) He claims that Khaemwaset only became High Priest of Ptah himself sometime around Year 45/46.\(^{34}\) This seems rather unlikely to me. Kitchen’s assumption appears to be based on the fact that Khaemwaset’s votive objects only call him King’s Son and Sem and omit the title of High Priest. In the inscriptions where Khaemwaset announces the first five Sedfestivals of his father (Years 30–42) he also calls himself Sem, but not High Priest of Ptah. On the other hand, there are numerous examples from other monuments of Khaemwaset in which he abbreviates his titles to King’s Son and Sem even when in other parts of the same text he mentions the title High Priest of Ptah (\( \text{wr hrp hnw} \)). Sem-priest was obviously the title by which he was most commonly known and it is with this title (Setem/Setne) that he was still remembered as a literary hero in Graeco-Roman times. Unfortunately, the exact order of succession of High Priests at this time is uncertain and this is not the place to discuss it at any length. Since the Serapeum shabti is the only attestation of the High Priest Huy, it seems entirely possible to associate him with the Year 30 rather than the Year 16 Apis burial. The shabti is strikingly similar to one that Khaemwaset himself donated in Year 30\(^{35}\) and there can be little doubt that the two shabtis come from the same workshop and are roughly contemporary.\(^{36}\)

If the year date 32 on a stela from the Fayyum has been read correctly, Khaemwaset may have become

\(^{31}\) These two examples are both on a block from Benha/Athribis; Kitchen marks them with ‘sic’, but both have been erased and the photographs and drawings published by Engelbach (1930: 197–202, pl. I) and Sourouzian (1989: 20, pl. 6d) do not unequivocally confirm this reading.

\(^{32}\) ‘The burial of two successive Apis bulls in one chamber in Years 16 and 30 (combined with the pre-modern excavation methods of the 1850s) leaves uncertainties as to the true dating of some materials from this chamber’, Kitchen (1999: 220).


\(^{34}\) Kitchen (1985: 242); \textit{RITANC II}, 601: ‘in the 40s of the reign?’. This is contradicted by a fragmentary stela from the Fayyum (\textit{KRI II}, 886 [342]), which, if the date is read correctly, shows that Khaemwaset was High Priest of Ptah in Year 32.


\(^{36}\) Mariette (1857: pl. 10, top left: Khaemwaset, top right: Huy).
Huy’s successor shortly after Year 30. This stela displays three instances of the cloaked man determinative (*KRI* II, 886: 13, 15, 16). The other monuments of Khaemwaset on which it occurs cannot be dated precisely; most of them mention the title of High Priest of Ptah and therefore should probably be dated no earlier than Year 30.

According to Mariette, the Serapeum stela of Imy-ra-ihu (*KRI* II, 374: 11) is to be associated with the Apis burial of Year 30. The Serapeum also yielded a stela of Merenptah as crown prince (*KRI* II, 377: 4), which he became in about Year 55. A statuette inscribed on the back-pillar with a dedication by a prince Merenptah (*KRI* II, 905: 11) cannot be dated precisely, but if this is the future crown prince and king and not another prince Merenptah, it cannot be much earlier than the third decade of his father’s reign as he is still called Khaemwaset’s ‘baby brother’ (*sn=f nxnw*) on a stela commemorating the latter’s announcement of one of Ramesses’ Sed festivals. The determinative also occurs twice on the lid of the inner sarcophagus of Prince Ramessunebweben (usurped from the vizier Paramessu), who does not figure in any of the lists of princes and may well have been born late in his father’s long reign. The sign (*KRI* II, 912:10) differs from the usual forms in that raised knees have not been indicated.

All examples of the cloaked man determinative in *KRI* II are from the north: Memphis, Athribis, Qantir, the Fayyum, with the possible exception of the sarcophagus, the original provenance of which is somewhat of a mystery. The outer sarcophagus was discovered in a tomb at Gurob, the inner one was found empty, hidden away in a shaft outside the enclosure wall at Medinet Habu. Perhaps Gurob, the site of the royal harîm during the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties, is the more likely original location.

The same general pattern can be discerned in *KRI* III, which deals with the private monuments of contemporaries of Ramesses II. Limitations of space prevent us from discussing all individual examples in the 848 pages of this volume, but the following observations can be made. The vast majority of examples comes from the north, that is, Memphis/Saqqâra and Sedment, and none of these can be dated to the first decades of the reign (none, for instance, shows the writings *R-abs-sw* with or , which had gone out of fashion by the end of the second decade). Thus we find the sign used by the viziers Neferrenpet and (P)rahoteb B, but not by their predecessors, and by the mayor of Memphis Amenhotep Huy, but not by his predecessor Ptahmose; of the high stewards of the King and his foundations (*KRI* III 181ff) only Yupa, who announced Ramesses II’s Ninth Sed festival in Year 54, uses it (on his sarcophagus), but not his father and predecessor Urkhyia (but it does occur on two votive stelae dedicated by his funerary priests). The sign is also found on monuments of the High Priests of Ptah Pahemnetjer and Hori, both of whom were in office after Khaemwaset (Hori being the latter’s son). The sign is particularly frequent in the Memphite tomb of Mose, which can be dated both

---

37 See n.33 above. Cf. Gomaà (1970: 20–21), who points out that in the early lists of princes Khaemwaset is mentioned as the fourth son of Ramesses II without title and that he receives the title of Sem priest for the first time in the list at Wadi es-Sebua, which dates from after Year 30, probably from Year 34 at the earliest (Gomaà 1970: 4–5 with n.6).
38 Mariette (1857: 15, pl. 17). The top of the stela with the determinative is now missing, but is unmistakable on Mariette’s photograph.
41 *KRI* III, 50: 10, 12; 54: 1, 6; 56: 10, 13; 62: 15; 65: 14; 67: 14 (doubtful); 116: 3; 152: 16; 153: 3; 165: 10; 166: 2, 7, 11; 169: 2; 170: 3, 5, 15; 171: 2, 7, 9; 192: 9, 12, 16; 195: 7; 197: 14; 234: 12, 14, 16; 235–236: passim; 279: 12, 15; 280: 12–281: 2; 305: 12, 15; 318: 10; 355: 6; 365: 6; 378: 6; 385: 6; 413: 11, 16; 414: 3; 415: 2, 5, 6, 7; 418–435: passim; 459: 13; 489: 7; 509: 4; 660: 8; 730: 16; 731: 6, 9, 12, 16; 733: 16; 785: 13; 817: 16; 818: 6, 7; Addenda: *KRI* VII, 119: 6; 23: 11; 133: 14; 165: 11–166: 7; 212: 12; 409: 2–4.
43 Kitchen reverses the order of the two, but it is clear from the analysis of Ptahmose’s Saqqâra tomb that he must have preceded Huy, see Staring (2014: 497).
44 Van Dijk (2016: 100–102).
45 The pillar in Florence and the statue base on which the sign occurs may in fact belong to another Pahemnetjer who lived in the second half of the Nineteenth Dynasty, as Kitchen notes (*KRI* III, 411, n.4a).
stylistically and on account of the course of the famous lawsuit recorded on its walls to the later years of Ramesses II. The overseer of works in the temple of Re May, who left rock inscriptions and stelae at Giza, likewise belongs to the end of the reign and was still in office under Merenptah. Examples from northern Upper Egypt include a naophorous statue of the granary chief Siese from Deir Durunka, who also lived on into the reign of Merenptah, and a relief block from the tomb of the High Priest of Osiris at Abydos, Wenennefer, who is attested from Years 20 to at least 47 and possibly beyond.

At Thebes the cloaked man sign is still rare at this period. Isolated occurrences can be found on a lintel of the High Priest of Amun Bakenkhonsu and in the tombs of Djehutymose (TT 32), Nedjemger (TT 138) and Nakhtdjehuty (TT 189), all of which date from the second half of the Nineteenth Dynasty, as well as the usurped scenes in TT 45 (Djehuty/Djehuteyemheb), which are probably to be dated to the Twentieth Dynasty. Examples from Deir el-Medina may seem at first sight to be earlier, that is, from the first half of the reign, but their dates largely depend on external evidence, which is in some cases controversial. An architrave fragment belonging to Raweben (KRI III 785: 13) has been associated with the owner of TT 210, but the son Horemwia mentioned on the architrave is absent from the tomb inscriptions and the sign is not found in the latter either, so the connection would seem to be tenuous. Benedict Davies has suggested that this is a Horemwia who is attested as late as the reign of Amenmesse, which would put his father Raweben towards the second rather than the first half of the reign of Ramesses II. A stronger case may be TT 213, the owner of which is Penamun, son of Baki, who lived early in the reign. Cloaked man signs only appear in the interior, not on the entrance doorframe, and are associated with various relatives (Khaemwaset, Nakhtamun, Wenennefer) apparently belonging to later generations. ‘Penamun son of Baki’ himself is named as late as Year 66, although it is unknown if he was then still alive. Four examples of the sign can be found in the burial vault of TT 321 owned by the workman Khaemopet, one of several persons of that name, who probably belongs to the end of the Nineteenth Dynasty rather than the beginning.

With only one exception, no examples of the sign can be cited from the southern border region or from Nubia, the exception being one of three rock inscriptions of Anhurnakht on the island of Sehel (KRI III, 116: 3). Earlier in his career, when he was still only a troop commander of Kush, he had accompanied the stablemaster Amenemope on a mission to that country, but when he left his own mark on the rocks of Sehel he was fan-bearer on the right of the King, troop-commander and overseer of the Southern Countries, so this inscription may well date from the later years of Ramesses II.

Frequency and distribution of the cloaked man sign do not change significantly during the reigns of Merenptah to Tawosret covered by Kitchen’s Vol. IV. It is used abundantly on monuments of the High Priests of Ptah Hori (son of Khaemwaset) and Iyiry, and of the former’s son, the Memphite vizier Hori. Other northern examples include architectural elements from the Saqqâra tomb of Ramessuemperre, a stela of Djehutymose, chief of the mSkbw of the ships Ramessu-mery-Sakhmet and Merenptah-mery-Sakhmet, a bronze bowl of the harîm official Sety from Gurob and a silver pitcher of the royal butler Atumemtaneb from the Bubastis hoard. Theban examples are sparse: a statue from the mortuary temple

---

49 Hofmann (2004: 65–66). Note that in these cases (TT 210, 213 and 321) she does not refer to stylistic evidence as a dating criterion.
50 Davies (1999: 12).
51 Cf. Černý (1949: 93–94). Khaemwaset and Wenennefer are also mentioned with Penamun on a small shrine from Deir el-Medina, KRI VII, 212 [500], with one example of a cloaked man determinative.
52 On the complex genealogy of this family, see Davies (1999: 2–12 with Chart 2).
55 KRI III, 250: 1–6, with early writing of the royal name R’s-m-š(w).
56 KRI IV, 67: 1; 105: 16; 126: 7, 11, 14; 239: 16; 240: 2; 281, 6, 8; 285, 6, 8; 287, 6; 292–293: passim; 357, 8–16; 371, 11; 372, 7; 379, 6–380, 4; 443, 13; 444, 1.
of Merenptah, two *sh ikr n R* stelae of Khamuy and a libation base of Nakhtmin from Deir el-Medina, and a scarab of the chancellor Bay, the only occurrence of the sign in inscriptions of Bay. From Nubia there are only two examples in the tomb of Mery, deputy of Wawat, at Aniba.

With the advent of the Twentieth Dynasty material from the north and particularly from Memphis and Saqqara becomes much more sporadic, which explains why there are so few examples of the cloaked man on northern monuments in *KRI* V (Sethnakht–Ramesses III) and VI (Ramesses IV–XI). In *Vol. V* there are an endowment stela of Ramesses III and a stela of the royal butler Ramessu-sau-mi-iunu from Memphis (the latter in the Addenda in Vol. VII), and three Apis stelae from the Serapeum; other material from the northern part of the country includes another endowment stela of Ramesses III from the region of the Fayyum and a doorway and two stelae from Qantir. The sign is also found on material from abroad: doorway elements from Beth-Shan and ivory plaques from Megiddo. From the reign of Ramesses IV we have the Saqqara tomb chapel of the royal butler Hori (in *Vol. VII*), but no examples from the north can be found in *Vol. VI*.

By contrast, the cloaked man sign now becomes widespread in the Theban area. It is even used in temple inscriptions at Medinet Habu and Karnak, albeit not in religious scenes but in the texts dealing with the Second Libyan War of Ramesses III. It is also found in the tombs of the sons of Ramesses III in the Valley of the Queens, in private tombs at Deir el-Medina and elsewhere, including the tomb of the Theban Mayor Paser at Medinet Habu, and on a great many stelae and other objects from Deir el-Medina and graffiti in the mountains on the Theban West Bank. The sign is also found at Esna and Buhen and in the tomb of Setau at El-Kab. Its wide distribution in the Theban area at this time makes it easy to understand why Černý dated the sign to the Twentieth Dynasty. By the end of the dynasty it appears to have gone out of fashion; among the inscriptions of Butchamon, for instance, only a single example (on a lintel) can be quoted. Caminos’s claim that the sign is still used in the Twenty-First Dynasty cannot be substantiated; I have not been able to detect any examples in Karl Jansen-Winkeln’s corpus of Twenty-First Dynasty inscriptions.

On the basis of the above survey we can now assign a more accurate date to the use of the sign of the cloaked seated man. It clearly originated in Memphis, probably around Year 30 of Ramesses II, in inscriptions of Khaemwaset and his circle, and remained a Memphite, or at least a northern phenomenon for most of the Nineteenth Dynasty. As I pointed out elsewhere, Memphite texts which use *fPt* often also employ the still unexplained *f* for *n* (also first attested in Year 30) and writings such as *sPt*, *sPt*, and *sPt* or *sPt* for the epithet ‘Osiris’ preceding the deceased’s name. I am unaware of any examples of these signs and groups in inscriptions from Upper Egyptian sites, or at least from further south than Sedment. During the second half of the dynasty the *fPt* sign is beginning to appear in the Theban area, where it becomes widespread during the Twentieth Dynasty. After the end of the Ramesside period the sign disappears from the inscriptions.  

---


58 *KRI* VI, 84: 3; 87: 8; 92: 12 (doubtful); 98: 11; 180: 14; 183–195: passim; 196: 7, 16, 197: 1, 6; 198: 3, 4, 199: 16; 200: 6; 204: 8, 15, 16; 205: 3, 8, 13; 207: 2, 10; 208: 16; 210: 4, 8; 211: 2, 4, 14; 212: 1, 7; 213: 1, 12; 219: 12; 272: 10; 273: 2–4; 275: 12–16; 276: 1, 7; 370: 6; 378: 8; 437: 7, 15, 16; 529: 5; 557: 4, 7, 9, 12–14; 669: 1; 675: 3, 14; 700: 15; 875: 2, 8; 876: 8, 12. Addenda: *KRI VII*, 352: 6, 8, 9; 400: 3; 418: 15; 419: 1, 4.

59 In *KRI* VI, 92: 12 and in Gaballa and Kitchen (1981: 171, fig. 7) a single example is quoted from the tomb of Amenemopet (TT 148), almost certainly incorrectly, see Ockinga (2009: pls 22 (b) and 72 [20], Text 54).

60 *KRI* VI, 400: 3.
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