Between Identity and Agency in Ancient Egyptian Ritual

Harold M. Hays

Represented in the hieroglyphs of Berlin stele 1204 is the first person account of the Middle Kingdom official Icherneferet, detailing the thirty steps he took while participating in rites for the god Osiris Foremost of the Westerners at the bz.w štB ‘mysteries’ at Abydos. As this autobiographical slice-of-life dominates the greater part of the stele, there is no doubt as to the central message he wished to leave to posterity there: in the construction of ritual equipment and images of deities, in instructing priests in their tasks, in arraying the divine Lord of Abydos in finery, and in carrying out rites for the god as a priest, this singularly capable individual had indeed done his duty.

But Icherneferet places his deeds in context by preceding his account with a letter from his king Senwosret III. More precisely, it is an wd-ni-sw.t, a ‘royal decree’ commanding that his subject go to Abydos ‘to make (iri) a monument for my father Osiris Foremost of the Westerners, and to embellish (smnb) his mysteries.’ Icherneferet’s first words after the frame of the royal command demonstrate his full compliance with the king’s instructions, through appropriation of the instrumental terms of the mission, iri and smnb:

My many thanks to J.F. Borghouts, M. Conde Escribano, and L. Corcoran for comments on and corrections to an earlier version of this essay.


About thirty, so long as one includes clauses where a first person pronoun subject is not expressed but may be read, such as at Sethe, Lesestecke 71, 5 6: ms(=i) nfr.w imiw-bt ‘me bearing the gods of the following’. Even if one does not, the difference between reading such forms thus or as passives is not substantial, because the account’s intention is to list the events in which his involvement was instrumental. These many deeds may be more broadly grouped into four acts; see Assmann, J., Tod und Jenseits im Alten Ägypten, Munich 2001, pp. 310 312.


At his presumably ex voto chapel. See Simpson, Terrace, pp. 22 23, under ANOC 1, with reference to criticism at Lichtheim, Ancient Egyptian Autobiographies, p. 84.

Which in turn is contextualized by titularies of the king and other elements of the stele, including the separate and prominent display of Icherneferet’s own titles and name; see the schematic representation of Hare, T., ReMembering Osiris. Number, Gender, and the Word in Ancient Egyptian Representational Systems, Stanford 1999, pp. 34 43.


Sethe, Lesestecke, p. 70, 17: r ir.t mn.w n t(=i) wsr šntt-lnm.tw r smnb bz.w=f štB

For the sense of frame as active contextualization, as ‘something we do’, see Culler, J., Framing the Sign. Criticism and Its Institutions, Norman 1988, p. xiv.
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I acted (iri) in accordance with that which His Majesty commanded, embellishing (smnh) that which my lord had commanded for his father Osiris, Foremost of the Westerners, Lord of Abydos, resident in the Thinite nome.
I performed (iri) the office of Son Beloved of Him for Osiris, Foremost of the Westerners:
I embellished (smnh) his great bark of eternity and perpetuity. 9

Though having done much on his own at Abydos for the god—in constructing, instructing, investing, and performing—Icherneferet had after all been ordered there. The stele he set up thus represents the intersection of his interests with those of the king and the god. Especially in this way, it has to do with the relationship between his individual activities and the most dominant structures of the world around him, namely the state and cult; it thus has to do with the notion of agency, with how an individual maintains, changes, or ignores the structures of the society within which he is embedded.

An agent within ritual may be said to be a person who performs a ritual action upon a ritual object. 10 Even more essentially, an agent is someone who does something, and the term agency refers most simply to the capacity and office of action. But in the humanities the terminology is regularly used in studies relating the individual to the collective in a quasi-technical fashion, albeit with widely varying connotations. 11 As invocation of the term agency orienta a discussion upon how an individual interacts with his society (or with the doxa shaping his actions), it participates in the social science tension between ‘holism’ and ‘individualism’. 12

In Icherneferet’s case, his act of agency involved the maintenance of the structures of his society: in performing cult, he participated in acts of central ancestral authority, doing the same kinds of things done by generations before him 13 at ‘Abydos, the first ancient place of Neberdjer’. 14 And in acting for the king, he was neither subverting nor ignoring the structuration radiating from the monarch; he was adhering to it.

And yet—as ironic as it may seem given the thirty deeds of service detailed by him as implicit evidence of worthiness—Icherneferet’s compliance with cult and king must have had the necessary consequence of suppressing his own identity during the act.

---

9 Sethe, Lesestccke, p. 71, 24:


14 CT 60 I 255e (B10C): 3ḥw p₂t₁ špt n(ḥ) nb-r-dr.
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The Delegation of Agency

In sending a decree to a specific person, Senwosret III engaged himself in a practice already centuries old, when a letter from the king to one of his subjects could be expressed as an $w[=]-ni-sw.t$ ‘royal decree’;\(^{13}\) and in framing his stele’s account with the content of that letter, Icherneferet was claiming the same kind of status-by-association already claimed centuries before him by others, who had likewise signaled to posterity their favor by inscribing letters from that most august personage:\(^{14}\) here are two men, king and subject, both consciously positioning themselves within the traditions of their society. And though one might otherwise have imagined that the specific actions performed by Icherneferet were prompted by personal initiative—by his heart—his citing of the royal command as the first element of his text cedes initiative, planning, and motivation to his ruler. In view of Icherneferet’s blatant embrace of tradition, I aver that he may be seen as an illustrative protagonist, an example of a type: a member of sacerdotal officialdom of a sort evident since the Old Kingdom, whence the simple and time-honored rule of obedience. Unquestionably the Egyptian priest was an agent in the rites he performed—in that he did and said things—but everything done was done under the aegis of the authority of command and command’s authorization. One might more precisely call someone like Icherneferet an instrument of the state.\(^{17}\)

State and religious duty are condensed in the person of the monarch. In Egyptian temples the king is ubiquitously\(^ {16}\) represented in relief making offerings to the gods, and he is portrayed just as ubiquitously in text making them to the dead in the formulaic phrase $h[t=]-di-nl-sw.t$ ‘the offering which is given of the king’.\(^ {18}\) His service in temple and tomb is paired in a Middle Egyptian text often discussed by Jan Assmann, ‘The King as Sun-priest’, as it transparently expresses the ideological reach of the monarch’s knowledge, powers, and responsibilities. One of those responsibilities is the performance of cult. As for the king, ‘he gives offerings to the gods and mortuary offerings to the $Akh$s’, the beatified dead;\(^ {19}\) in principle, it was the king who officiated in temple and tomb. Even for the ‘Ritual of Amenophis’,\(^ {20}\) where the royal name

---

\(^{13}\) With ‘the same term also used for more formal royal edicts’, as observed by Wente, E.F., Letters from Ancient Egypt, Atlanta 1990, p. 17.

\(^{14}\) The Old Kingdom letters of this kind have been republished and their connections to autobiographical texts discussed at Eichler, E., ‘Zu den Königsbriefen des Alten Reiches’, SAK 18 (1991), pp. 141 171.

\(^{15}\) Contrast notions of agency where it is construed as revolving around subversion of established order, as with Mitchell, J., ‘Ritual Structure and Ritual Agency. “Rebouding Violence” and Maltese $festa$’, in: Social Anthropology 12 (2004), pp. 57 75. For the position that agency and the structures around the individual are inseparable, see Joyce, R.A. and Lopiparo, J., ‘PostScript: Doing Agency in Archaeology’, in: Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory 12 (2005), 365 374. For reference to the relationship between ritual and the maintenance or subversion of social structure, see below n. 93.

\(^{16}\) Scenes of the High Priest of Amun Herihor offering to Theban gods at the temple of Khonsu constitute an obvious exception, but they are understood by Römer, M., Gottes und Priesterherrschaft in Ägypten am Ende des Neuen Reiches (Ägypten und Altes Testament 21), Wiesbaden 1994, p. 25, to be in the tradition of statues of priests emplaced in the temple, ‘wobei der prominente Anbringungsort der Darstellung an der Stelle des rauchernden Königs besonders günstig für die Erlangung göttlicher Gnade war’, and thus the scenes stand ‘in der Tradition der Priesters als Stellvertreter des Königs im Kult’.


severally occurs in the position of ritualist." Alan Gardiner draws out an important distinction between king as donor and those who actually performed the rites, because ‘...the real performers were priests, and their ranks are several times indicated’ in the paratext accompanying that ritual’s recitations. The king’s name is there on papyrus just as his name is on the temple wall: it is an expression of the ideal, of what took place in theory.

In practice, as Gardiner said and as is very well known, the role of officiant was performed by his subjects, as in our example case of Icherneferet. But from the Egyptian point of view it is not a question of pretending to be king; the king does not command his subject to usurp ‘royal prerogative’. It is a matter of royal delegation to perform particular actions and particular sacerdotal offices. Apropos Abydos, the stele of another Middle Kingdom official recounts that, ‘His Majesty caused that I sacrifice cattle even in the temple of Osiris, Foremost of the Westerners in Abydos, Tawer’. But the place might have been wherever any temple was. Already in the Old Kingdom, one finds the king appointing specific persons to priestly service (with attendant grants of land), authorizing the establishment of teams of priests for the mortuary cult of his subjects, and making provisions for the unhindered performance of cult. Reaching forward in time, royal authorization is unequivocally expressed within the script to the daily rites performed for the god Amun-Re at Karnak, as given in the Dynasty Twenty-five Papyrus Berlin 3055: ‘I indeed am a hm-ntr-priest’, announces the priest reciting the liturgical script; ‘it was the king who commanded me to see the god’.

Seen from the point of view of delegation, Icherneferet’s framing of his account not only singles him out as one worthy of regard by virtue of his association with the highest member of society, it also declares his very authorization for participating in rites in the first place. The command passes him the scepter—the staff or scepter of office, the symbol of authorized

---


*c* Where the difference in media dramatically affects the representation of ritual. On walls as opposed to papyri, dynamics of self presentation come into play, owing to the public nature of the medium.


*g* See Urk I 26, 11 (see also 25, 46): in hm n(i) wsr-k3=f wd w/b n hw.t-hr nb.t r3-in.t: ‘It was the Majesty of Userkaf who commanded the performance of priestly service for Hathor, mistress of Ra inet’.

*h* See Goedicke, H., *Königliche Dokumente aus dem Alten Reich* (AgAbb 14), Wiesbaden 1967, p. 209 fig. 27, 3 4 (see also 7 8) (Urk I 302, 13 14; see also 302, 18 303, 3): lw wd.n lm=(=i) g.t n=k shd hm-k3 k12 r hv.t-k3 n(jy) d.r=k r w+b n=k r s3.t n=i k 3bd ‘My Majesty has commanded the setting up for you of twelve Hem Ka inspectors for your own Ka house in order to perform priestly service for you and to recite for you the monthly service’.

*i* As at Goedicke, *Königliche Dokumente*, fig. 5 (Urk I 213, 8 9; see also Urk I 212, 10 13): lr.n hm=(=i) n wv n(i) lw.wt n.wlw.t ptm c str.w pn n-nmr.wt w/b 3bd lr.t-h.t-ntr m n.wlw.t ptm ‘My Majesty has commanded this exemption of these two pyramid cities in this manner precisely in the interest of priestly service, recitation of the monthly ritual, and the performance of divine ritual in these pyramid cities’.


*k* Berlin 3055 IV, 2 (titre 9 of Moret, A., *Le rituel du culte divin jounahier en Egipte d‘apres les papyrus de Berlin et les textes du temple de Seti I*, à Abydos, Paris 1902): lw hm ink hm-ntr w n lw.wt m33 ntr. See also Berlin 3055 IV, 6 (rite 11): hv=1 z x tw r ntr z pH r ntr.w hyy n=i w.l3 zn=1 in n.lxw.t wd w r m33 ntr. ‘God requires, shield yourself from the god (vice versa). Gods, make a way for me that I may pass. It was the king who commanded me to see the god’.
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speech—to adopt a metaphor of the sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. It is a dogmatic or abstract precondition to the performance of the rites. Performed under such a precondition, the actions of the ritual cannot of themselves be efficacious; the utterances recited for the god and the actions done for him are not of themselves performative: their illocutionary force is not inherent; the performance of cult by living priests demands the imprimatur of authority.

But from the moment of authorization on, the bestowed office was at times something like a piece of property, capable of being sold, bequeathed in a testament to one's children, or otherwise claimed by hereditary right. So also could the authorization be transmitted on the spot by the delegate to his subordinates. Thus Icherneferet informs his reader that 'I set the temple personnel at their tasks, causing that they know the daily ritual and the calendrical rituals': the king's appointee ensured that the other ritualists knew the roles they were to fill in cult. This is not merely to be involved in a single ritual event, the mysteries proper, but to ensure that the officiants were trained in the regular operation of service throughout the course of each day, throughout the entire year. Through such direction, the delegation becomes a chain: from king to subaltern, and from subaltern to lieutenant.

Having authority over temple personnel and the actions they are to perform, it is also significant that our illustrious and illustrative protagonist is an outsider: Icherneferet was raised in the court of the king and sent to Abydos to execute a royal command; this is control extended over the periphery from the center, the imposition of a vision from a remote

---


The point is that it is not enough that the ritual be performed, but that it must be performed by persons with certain qualifications. Cf. Tambiah, S.J., 'Form and Meaning of Magical Acts', in: Lambeck, M. (ed.), A Reader in the Anthropology of Religion, Oxford 2002, pp. 340-357, p. 352, where ritual and magical acts are asserted to be illocutionary or performative by virtue of being performed 'under the appropriate conditions'. See the second rule identified for performative utterances by Austin, J.L., How to Do Things with Words, 2nd edition, Cambridge 1962, p. 34 (see also pp. 15 and 53): 'The particular persons and circumstances in a given case must be appropriate for the invocation of the particular procedure invoked', and the extensive elaboration of Austin's observation at Bourdieu, Language, pp. 197-116.

The term performative sentence 'indicates that the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action' (Austin, How to Do Things, p. 9); i.e. such a statement not only says something but also accomplishes something: saying so makes it so. On how the notion of performativity has been applied to ritual in history of religions, see Penner, H.H., 'You Don't Read a Myth for Information', in: Frankenberry, N.K. (ed.), Radical Interpretation in Religion, Cambridge, 2002, pp. 153-176, pp. 156-158. The notion of performativity has seeped into Egyptology in respect to religion and ritual as at Assmann, J., The Search for God in Ancient Egypt, Lorton, D. (trans.), Ithaca 2001, p. 51, in respect to magical practice at Eschweiler, P., Bildzauber im alten Aegypten (OBO 137), Freiburg 1994, p. 14, and in respect to grammar; see the summary thereof at Servajean, F., Les formules des transformations du Livre des Morts (BdE 137), Cairo 2003, pp. 33-38.

That is what the words of a statement accomplish (illocution) as opposed to the true false meaning they communicate (location) or the affective consequences they inspire (perlocution); see Austin, How to Do Things, pp. 99-100.


As at Urk I 26, 14.16 (also cited above); in ingr ns.w~r~r i npw w~r ibw.t-Hr nb t r3-in.t mr irr~i d6s(r) sk w~r (r) r~r mh.t nfr.t m nb nis~h 'Furthermore, it is these children of mine who are to perform priestly service for Hathor, mistress of Ra inet as I now do myself, after I am passed to the perfect West as a possessor of veneratio'.

See for example the filo paternal cliché of pBéring 3055 X, 2 (rite 25 of Moret, Le rituel du culte): iw in mh ntr zi mh-ntr n m r3-pr pn 'and indeed I am a hm-ntr priest, the son of a hm-ntr priest in this temple'.

Lit. what pertains to the hand of every day, i.e. the daily action.


Seth, Lesestücke p. 70, 20-21: 'dr n~i(t) h=r=k is pw m sb.t(t) hm=i tw bpr.n~k h=r=k is m sd.t(t) hm=i sb.t(t) w~r n~i 'it is because it is the case that you were brought to be a pupil of My Majesty, and you became a protege of My Majesty, a singular student of my palace'.

For a nuanced theoretical consideration of center versus periphery in respect to king, court, cult places, and cult, see Gundlach, R., 'Hof, Zentrum und Peripherie im Aegypten des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr.', in: Gundlach, R. and
authority over the local conduct of ritual practice, and, through that, dogma. It is a fresh imposition of a new pattern of action, or it is an existing structure’s maintenance and refinement. Better said, the deeds of the agent, empowered by the monarch, contribute to the formulation or adjustment of the fundamental basis of ritual practice, influencing the practice and beliefs of other officiants there. Indeed, the royal control and protection of the cults has a long history, stretching back to Dynasty Five and before. And even in the construction of temples, as at Heliopolis under Senwosret I, the king directs a member of his court to go forth and execute the preliminary work for him. Afterwards the king arrives to personally oversee the demarcation of the temple’s foundations:

The appearance of the king in the fillet of two plumes, with all the masses in his following:
the chief lector priest, scribe of the god’s book,
stretching the cord and untying the line,
when the putting into the earth was done in this temple.

Abstractly establishing the ideological grounds for the hierarchical structuring of society, the very space in which ritual is performed has its concrete design imposed from outside and above, along a chain of delegation suspended from the one ritualist whose identity genuinely mattered: the king.

The Place of the Non-royal Agent’s Identity

In performing ritual for the god, Ichneferet does not act for himself; he acts for the king. And there are incentives for him to do so. The most obvious is the enhancement of his personal status through having been commanded to a sacred task and through having fulfilled it. That the task and accomplishment were significant to his status is evident in the record of these events commemorated in Berlin stele 1204. Here one sees the Egyptian personality advanced through
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royal service, just as in the Old Kingdom: the privilege of the assignment presumably adds to his cultural capital, to the dimension of social status which is built out of non-material qualities. The stele commemorates and even creates that status, freezing it in time as a fixture of self-presentation. In maintaining the structure of his environment through adhering to royal command, the experience distinguishes the ritualist from among his peers.

Not only in the performance of divine cult does the Egyptian have incentives, but also in the performance of rites for the dead: he secures their praise and protection in this world. Thus an official may say ‘I am one praised of his father, mother, and lords in the necropolis, through performing mortuary service for them, performing their ceremonies on various feast dates. And the dead, for their part, are advised, ‘Watch over your survivors, for they perform your ceremonies!’" As the living ritualist expects forceful protection from his ethereal benefactors, a descendant can make this sort of appeal in a Letter to the Dead from the First Intermediate Period:

Your condition is absolutely like a living one
by the command of the gods who are in the sky and earth.
You will put an end to the enemies, evil of character,
of your house, of your brother, your mother, // and her excellent son, Merer,
for as you were iqgr-outstanding upon earth,
so are you mnj-excellent in the necropolis,
with mortuary service performed for you,
the Haker-ceremony performed for you,
the Wag-ceremony performed for you,
and bread and beer given to you upon the table of Foremost of the Westerners,
with a going downstream in the night-bark, a going upstream in the day-bark,
and truth of voice given to you beside every god,
as I make the praise of the dead for you!"


* On this ceremony, see Assmann Altagyptische Totenliturgien. Band 2, pp. 303 304, with further references at p. 416 n. 106.


\[ \text{iw lpr} \text{l=}=k \text{ mr n} \text{h hq n(} \text{zp} \text{)} \text{m w l} \text{gr} \text{w nt} \text{n(} \text{z}} \text{m p} \text{ t} \text{t} \text{f} \text{n=}=k \text{ l} \text{dr n lht} \text{l(} \text{yw d} \text{w q} \text{d} \text{r pp}=\text{sn k r mw} \text{r}=k \text{ n z}=s \text{ lqr mn} \text{n} \text{ik lqr tp f} \text{n} \text{tik mn} \text{h lht-mr} \text{t pr.f(} \text{w-hrw}=k \text{ (For the delay of n=k after hrw in this expression, cf. the text cited below n. 103) ir.t(w)=k hjkr ir.t(w)=k w}\text{z} \text{r.dl.t(} \text{w) n=}=k \text{ t hr hd} \text{h dm} \text{n(} \text{m} \text{nt-} \text{hm} \text{t=w} \text{tlv ldt}=k \text{ m m sk.t(y) t} \text{mnt}=k \text{ m m n} \text{d.wt} \text{t}

"
The ritually cared-for dead exert themselves on this world for the material benefit of those who make ritual possible: just as the king receives direct benefits from the gods on earth for his performances as \( nb \ h.t \ h.k.t \) 'lord of ritual', so do non-royal delegates expect to receive reciprocal reward for their observance of filial duties. 'But as for any lector priest or any Ka-servant who will act /// and speak for me at this tomb of mine of the necropolis, I will be their protector', declares the dead. Even a purely spoken service yielded benefit both to its deceased recipient and its doer. As one Middle Kingdom stele substantiates its appeal to the living:

because the breath of the mouth\(^a\) is beneficial for the titled dead,
and this is not something through which one wearies,
and because it is more beneficial for the one who does it
than for the one for whom it is done:
it is the one who is helped who protects the one who is upon earth.\(^b\)

Significantly, this same sentiment is repeated as social dogma in the 'Loyalist Instruction',\(^c\) emerging in the Middle Kingdom\(^d\) and transmitted in multiple copies in the New Kingdom. Further incentives for the maintenance of cult are encoded in other socially prescriptive texts. In the Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage, a Dynasty Nineteen papyrus the text of which dates back to as early as the Thirteenth,\(^e\) the reader is told:

Remember the chewing of natron
and the preparation of white bread by a man on the day of washing the head.
Remember to set up the flagstaffs and to carve the altar,
with the Wæb-priest cleansing the cult places,
with the temple painted like milk,
and to make sweet the scent of the horizon\(^f\) and to maintain offering-cakes.
Remember to cleave to the ritual instructions and the arrangement of dates,
and to remove one initiated into priestly service for being physically corrupt:
that is to do it wrongly:
that is to remove the heart of [a man] /// on the day before eternity,\(^g\)

---

\(^a\) Ubiquitous in the various formulaic statements placed in the mouths of gods on temple walls in scenes since the days of Djoser (see Kahl, J., Kloth, N. and Zimmermann, U., Die Inschriften der 3. Dynastie (ÄA 56), Wiesbaden 1995, p. 116 [Ne/Hc/4] and thereafter throughout pharaonic history.  
\(^b\) From the tomb of Khentika; see James, T.G.H., The Mastaba of Khentika Called Ikhshent, (ASE 30), London 1953, pl. 5 B13 15: \( r s \ h w \ h.s \ h.s \ h.s \) nm \( n(f) \ r s \ h.w \ k.t \) nb \( n(s) \ h.s \ h.s \ h.s \) mp n(\( i \) ) \( m(w) \ m(w) \ m(w) \) n(\( i \) ).  
\(^c\) The formula is identified by Vernus, P., ‘La formule «le souffle de la bouche» au Moyen Empire’, RdE 27 (1975), pp. 139 145.  
\(^d\) Berlin 7311, K 1 2 (Berl. Inschr. I, 180, corrected via collation with the photograph of Simpson, Terrace, pl. 32): \( d.r \ n.t(\( i \) ) \( t.w \ n(\( i \) ) \) r3 3h (si) n s\( f\)h \( m n w m w r.d.t h.r=s \) \( h.r-n.t(\( i \) ) \( h.s \) (si) n hrr \( r h.r.w n=f \) \( i n s.m \ m w i m h.r(t)-t3 \).  
\(^f\) On the stele of Sehetepibre (Cairo 20538), for which see Sethe, Lesestücke, pp. 68 69.  
\(^g\) See Parkinson, Voices p. 60, concerning the date of the papyrus and the disputed date of the text.

---
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when months are counted and years are known.

Service is to be performed and performed correctly, lest one incur ultimate consequences. In the *Instructions for Merikare*, composed in the First Intermediate Period or Dynasty Twelve and still copied in the New Kingdom, one encounters the exhortations:

A man should do what is beneficial for his Ba:
perform priestly service at the monthly ritual; receive the white sandals:
go into the cult place; unveil the mysteries:
enter the sanctuary; and eat bread in the temple.

Make the altar flourish, add to the provisions,
and increase the daily service,
for it is what is beneficial for the one who does it.
Strengthen your monument according to your power:
one day gives to eternity,
an hour improves the future,
and the god knows of the one who acts for him.

The benefits of participation in cult point eventually to eternity; they are accrued after death. The mortuary literature well attests to this principle. In the Coffin Texts, for example, justification for one's very presence in the afterworld is based upon such observances in life. Take this striking parallel to the 'King as Sun-priest' mentioned above: 'It has been made that I be in this land because of what I did, as I have set up divine offerings for the gods and mortuary offerings for the Akhs'. And after death, the Egyptian claims involvement in the sorts of rites...

---

`sš3.w wès bzm nw
sspd t-hd ln z(i) hrw bnb tp
sš3.w sšhk sn.w <m> h₃ ḫ b₁
w'b br thyt t₁₃ w-pr
lw.t-ntr sqš3.t ml hr.t
sntm stl ḥ₁₇ t₁₇ t₁₃ w₁₃
sš3.w wrd ṭp-sd ṣšbsd sww
šd t hr m w'b t r ḫ₁₇ t₁₃
ir t st pw m nf
szwa n ṭp n(i) z(i) ! ((hrw ḫnty nhh (The traces do not appear to suit sš3.w)
ḥdb w mn[w] r*n w ṭp<br.>{


Lit. 'join the temple'; see Wb iii 378.9.

For this phrase, see Wb v 119.8.


ir z(i) ḥ₁₇ t n b₁=f
w'b t(i) <m> ḥbd sḫp ḫ₁₇ ty
Inn n-pr k₁₇ ḫve sš3.w
šq hr ḫm wrmn t m lw.t-ntr
swd <wšt₁₇ t w sš3 t₁₇ w
ln b₁₇ w hr mn₄ t
śh₁₇ t pw n lr-sy
srwd mw₄ w=k ḫt wsr=k
lw hrw wè dl=f n nh-h
wmt₁₇ t smnh=s n m-ḥt
rl₁₇ n n₄ t lrr₄ w n=f

Cf. below at n. 115.

CT 39 1 171 a b (B16C): isk ir wmn t m ḫm n(i) ḫn₄ w hr lr.t(i)=l smn n(i)=l ḫšp t-ntr n nrt₄ w pr i-hrw n śh₁₇ w
he performed during life: ‘N. has come, even that she may establish offerings in Abydos.’ In
the process, he can even maintain the solar cycle:

N. is the one who stops that twisted one,
the one who comes to burn your bark upon the Great Plateau,
for N. knows them by their names,
and they will not reach [your] bark
while N. is in it,
that is, N. the maker of offerings.”

But given the present line of inquiry, there is something remarkable about these statements
from the mortuary literature: like the stele of Icherneferet, they all apply to specific persons.
They are tied to a certain individual within the community of the dead. What makes this fact
remarkable is that, insofar as cult is concerned, the identity of the non-royal Egyptian matters
only so long as it is a question of him reaping benefits—and yet these benefits must accrue outside the context of ritual activity proper.

The Displacement of the Agent’s Identity

In talking about what he did at Abydos, it is of paramount importance to Icherneferet that the
reader know his name, know his titles, and know that he was the one who performed rites for
the god Osiris. And in the spells copied for Egyptians to be taken with them to the tomb, they
are designated by name as the otherworldly performers of rites or as the dead recipients of rites.
But within collective ritual as performed by living persons, there is only one non-royal individual who genuinely matters, and that is the divine or deceased beneficiary.

By collective ritual I refer to temple ritual, mortuary ritual, opening of the mouth, and other points of group ritual emergence, the evidence for which stretches from the pyramids to Greco-Roman times, as the layered traces of a cultural complex occupying a central place in ancient Egyptian society, reaching into every dimension of it. The rites are collective inasmuch as they were typically performed by more than one ritualist, and because in any event they always involved at least two persons, one of whom was the beneficiary. This beneficiary, the object of sacerdotal action, may be presumed both to be and to indwell the physical image of the god in his sanctuary, in the case of temple cult. Or, in the case of rites for a deceased

7 CT 1079 VII 349b (B3C): i n N. in smn=s h.t m 3bdw. One may presume that the statement is made
metaphorically.

8 For nb at as ‘twisted’, see Borghouts, J.F., Book of the Dead [39]. From Shouting to Structure (Studien zum Altagyptische Totenbuch) 10, Wiesbaden 2007, p. 42 with n. 323.

9 CT 1099 VII 414e 415e (B1Bo):

in N. pn hxv nb ah pi
iy h v r w 3d=k h r w r t w r t
lw N. pn rh sn m rn w=sn
u ph=sn w[f=k]
sk N. pn im=f
N. pn fr htp wt

10 The close relationship between temple ritual and mortuary ritual in rites, phraseology, and participant role
structures is demonstrated at Hays, H.M., ‘The Worshipper and the Worshipped in the Pyramid Texts’, SAK 30

11 The other being the ritualist, of course. Collective ritual texts in the mortuary literature are distinguishable on the
basis of the grammatical person from personal recitations, wherein the beneficiary is also himself the performer;
see further Hays, H.M. and Schenck, W., ‘Intersection of Ritual Space and Ritual Representation. Pyramid Texts
Function in Ancient Thebes (SAOC’61), Chicago 2007, pp. 97 115, p. 97 with n. 3.
person, he (or his Ka) is represented through or manifest in a statue or false door in his cult chapel.\(^6\)

In Icherneferet's instance, it was a matter of performing service for a god, Osiris. Undoubtedly some of the specific rites he describes were in their details unique to Abydos, the occasion of his personal involvement being a calendrical event or otherwise special. But that these activities shared structural features with other temple rituals—for example, with the Greco-Roman Hour Vigil,\(^1\) and with the mortuary liturgies of the Coffin Texts\(^6\)—is not a serious question, at least to me: that the rites were done for a god, an inert image whose breast Icherneferet adorned with lapis lazuli and other precious materials,\(^5\) is enough to place the events within a well attested framework.

But the case of Icherneferet is merely the touchstone of this essay. The assertion is a general one: one of the characteristics of collective ritual is that there is only one non-royal individual who genuinely matters, and that is the beneficiary. For this reason, many of the rites performed for Ra-Harakhti at the temple of Seti I are virtually identical to those performed for Ptah in the same place,\(^9\) and they in turn can match rites done for Amun-Re at Karnak—except that in each case the name of the deity being propitiated is changed to make the rite appropriate specifically to him. The identity of the sacred beneficiary was critical in the temple liturgies. So also in texts for the mortuary cult. Whether they were to be recited for the king Wen's or for the official Rekhmire,\(^8\) the name of the passive\(^6\) and inert beneficiary is inserted to tailor the rite to apply to him alone. The single meaningful variable among the different exemplars of such texts is the identity of the one for whom ritual is performed.

But as for the rest of the words the ritualists say, as well as their gestures, they remain the same. What, then, of the officiant's relationship to the text? In adhering to a fixed script, he follows the institutionalized furrows of his society.\(^8\) In reciting, his actions are shaped by the stamp of repetition: the rite's words have been and were being repeated by still other ritualists elsewhere and elsewhere. In repeating gestures, he recognizes and submits to the words of his

---


\(^{4}\) Sethe, Lesestücke p. 71, 8 10: iw sbkr.n=i šnb.t šbwt m šbd.w m šbd.w m šmž.št d'm.w 3'.št nb.t m šbkr.w n(iw h.t= w nfr 'I adorned the breast of the Lord of Abydos with lapis lazuli, and turquoise, and every kind of precious metal and precious stone, as an adornment of the flesh of the god'.

\(^{5}\) It is easiest to see the matches between the rites for the cults of each of the gods there (Isis, Osiris, Amun, Ra Harakhti, and Ptah) through examination of Mariette Abydos. Description des fousles. Tome premier. Ville antique. Temple de Séth, Paris 1869, pp. 34 76.

\(^{6}\) See Moret, Le rituel du culte, pp. 2 3.

\(^{7}\) Compare, for example, the vocative in PT 25 §18c in the pyramid of Wen's to that of TT 100 (Davies, N. de G., The Tomb of Rekh m Re at Thebes [ PMMA 11], vol. II, New York 1943, pl. 78).

\(^{8}\) To be sure, the beneficiary of a rite may be orally exhorted to action by the reciting ritualist, but the physical reality is otherwise: stone, metal, and dead flesh are inert. For the observation that mortuary liturgies of an offering situation characterize the beneficiary as active (in contrast to those of an embalming situation), see Assmann, J., 'Verkliren, Grundforrnen hymnischer Rede im Alten Agypten', in: Loprieno, A. (ed.), Ancient Egyptian Literature. History and Forms, Leiden 1996, pp. 313 334, p. 324.

community, and he is involved in perpetuating them. It is to maintain the ritual structure. It is also to let that structure exert whatever power it has to structure the structure of society. Or rather, it is to be instrumental in it.

And yet, as to the officiant's specific identity, within the ritual itself it is of singular irrelevance. As Assmann has observed, the priest does not speak as NN. We do not hear the names of Icherneferet or Niankhkai; the ritualists are effectively anonymous, inasmuch as they are not designated as specific members of society. Their identities are not part of the script. Better said, the living ritualist's personal identity is displaced in favor of the mantle of sacerdotal title or the role of divine officiant. Naturally, he often refers to himself with the first person pronoun, but when the ritualist happens to apply a name to himself in the scripts, it is never his own human one. An excellent example comes from the forty-fourth rite of the ritual performed at the sanctuary of the god. The priest announces to the divine beneficiary:

Hail to you, Amun-Re, lord of the thrones of the two lands,
I have come even with a message of my father Atum:
my arms are upon you as Horus,
my hands upon you as Thoth,
and my fingers upon you as Anubis, foremost of the god’s booth.
I am a living priest (lit. living servant) of Re,
I am a W’ab-priest,
and I am pure,
my purity being the purity of the gods.

Putting his hands upon the image of the deity, the officiant speaks of himself in the first person. As for his named identity, two things are important: that he is in the office of priest and that, at once, he is Horus, Thoth, and Anubis. It is the same when officiants address their fellows or otherwise refer to them, as for example when one priest calls out to another, ‘O

\[\text{\textcopyright} 1998 \text{ by Cambridge University Press. All rights reserved.} \]

---

\[\text{See Tambiah, S.J., } \text{A Performative Approach to Ritual (Proceedings of the British Academy 65), Oxford 1981, pp. 140-141, where it is observed that two of the objectives of ritual (when construed as an act of communication) are submission to constraint and subordination to a collective representation.}

\[\text{Cf. Bourdieu, Language, p. 116.}

\[\text{For a summary of anthropological perspectives on the relationship between ritual and the maintenance or subversion of social structures, see Kelly and Kaplan, Annual Review of Anthropology 19, pp. 139-141.}

\[\text{See Assmann, ‘Dnio liturgica’, pp. 46, 53, and 56.}

\[\text{In view of the fact that the officiant is within the sanctuary while identifying himself as a W’ab priest, cf. Gee, JSSEA 31, p. 98, who claims that such priests did not enter the sanctuary. The present passage contradicts this assertion.}

\[\text{In Berlin 3055 XXVI, 4 6 (rite 44 of Moret, Le rite du culte):}

\[\text{i.n-d-hr=k im-r’ n b nx(wt) t.b wy}

\[\text{i.n=f n t n(1) t.bh t tm}

\[\text{t.wy=f h r=k m h r}

\[\text{t.b k h=h m d b h t y t m}

\[\text{m b= n(n) r t}

\[\text{i.w=f t.b k w t t m}

\[\text{b=h n(wt) n h n r t}


\[\text{Or it may be that more than a several priests recited these lines, with one saying he is Horus, another saying he is Thoth, and so on.} \]
BETWEEN IDENTITY AND AGENCY IN ANCIENT EGYPTIAN RITUAL

butcher, give the foreleg to the lector priest and the heart to the companion! And from a different rite of the sanctuary ritual:

I have ascended to you
with the Great One (sc. Atum) behind me
and <my> purity before me;
I have passed by Tefnut,
even while Tefnut was purifying me,
and indeed I am a priest, the son of a priest in this temple.\(^{10}\)

The officiant is everywhere referred to by generic title and by the names of gods. As the words he recited would be used by other priests, earlier and later, there and elsewhere, so also would his divine roles be played by others. Like the gestures he made, the sacerdotal roles belonged to society beyond the individual. In this manner, for the time being the participant yields his uniqueness and shapes his actions according to prescribed patterns, acknowledging and perpetuating them. His act of agency is to maintain this structure of his society.

Having observed that the officiant's personal identity is displaced, one would like to speculate after some reason for it. The most obvious is that the focus of collective ritual is not on the priests involved, but on the passive beneficiary for whom the rites are performed. Excluding the identities of the sacerdotal officiants has the effect of keeping the object of the activity in central place. Within the context of the ritual itself, it is not about the individualities of the living participants, but strictly about the divine beings whom they serve.

A further impetus for the separation of the officiant from his identity could well be found in the nature of the physical space into which he enters, since it is conditioned by the sacredness of the passive beneficiary: in addition\(^{12}\) to receiving the sedge scepter, a precondition to entering ritual space is purity.\(^{13}\) This holds for rites for a god as for a dead man. Thus Mehuakhti promises protection for 'any of my own Ka-servants who will perform mortuary service for me while in a state of purity, that their heart be strong in respect to it, just as they are pure at the temple of the great god'.\(^{14}\) According to the classical, Durkheimian theory, outside of the cultic space the ritualists 'are profane; their condition must be changed'\(^{15}\) through purifications which prepare

the profane participant for the sacred act, by eliminating from his body the imperfections of his secular nature, cutting him off from the common life, and introducing him step by step into the sacred world of the gods.\(^{16}\)

---

\(^{9}\) Opening of the Mouth rite 24, I b (KV 17) (Otto, E., Das ägyptische Mundöffnungsrersal, vol. I, Wiesbaden 1969): i \(\text{mmh di hps} n \text{hr} \text{-h}_{[\text{b}]} . t \) \(\text{[h]} \) ty n sm\(r\)

\(^{10}\) Berlin 3055 X, 1 (rite 25 of Moret, Le rituel du culte):

\(^{11}\) For an assertion that the efficacy of ritual is contingent upon a combination of interdependent conditions, see Bourdieu, \textit{Language}, pp. 111, 113, and 115.

\(^{12}\) For an assertion that the efficacy of ritual is contingent upon a combination of interdependent conditions, see Bourdieu, \textit{Language}, pp. 111, 113, and 115.

\(^{13}\) For an assertion that the efficacy of ritual is contingent upon a combination of interdependent conditions, see Bourdieu, \textit{Language}, pp. 111, 113, and 115.


That notion finds resonance in the priest’s asseveration that ‘I am pure, and my purity is the purity of the gods’.\textsuperscript{90} Explicitly, the priest’s condition of purity matches the purity of the divine beings he serves; implicitly, the statement distinguishes his present from his former state. Just as he physically separates himself through purification from the human world outside cultic space, thereby acquiring a divine condition, so also does he leave behind his profane identity and assume the mantles of authorized priest and of god. His separation from his human self facilitates passage between the contraries\textsuperscript{92} of the mundane world and the ritual space. The purification signifies ‘sheer difference’, to use the phrasing of the historian of religions J.Z. Smith.\textsuperscript{93} Indeed, because the Egyptian sentient world could be understood as consisting of four parts—the gods, the blessed dead, the king, and humanity\textsuperscript{94}—the existence of a living Horus Ichernefertet, or a Thoth Niankhkai would constitute a transgression across opposing categories.\textsuperscript{95} But, together with authorization and the solemn marking of the passage by the act of purification, the specifically human agent is absent, and the ritualist steps across the threshold.

The specifically human agent is absent out of necessity, out of the nature of the efficacious action: it is really the gods who act. Thus the deceased is exorted: ‘Do not be distant from the gods, as they perform this utterance for you which they perform for Re-Atum’\textsuperscript{96}. The replacement of human with divine identity could be seen as an unio liturgica, the term adopted by Assmann\textsuperscript{97} to describe what he sees as the principle at work; according to him, in addition to involving the donning of a divine role, this principle has to do with knowledge of sacred words (s3hsw, ‘transfigurations’\textsuperscript{98}), their recitation,\textsuperscript{99} and ritual action, with the point of the union being the facilitation of the human officiant’s future transition into the afterlife.\textsuperscript{100} But that is later.\textsuperscript{101}

Within the rites themselves, the focus remains the beneficiary, and to facilitate his transfiguration, a god must speak and act. Thus one may perceive the priest as god reciting the efficacious, Akh-making words to the deceased king: ‘hear this word which Horus said to his father Osins’.

\textsuperscript{90} pBerlin 3055 I, 7 (rite 2 of Moret, \textit{Le rituel du culte}; \textit{tw}=w3bwkhw=bw=i'bw ntrw)
\textsuperscript{91} For the notion of passages between contraries as a dynamic of ritual, see Bourdieu, P., \textit{Outline of a Theory of Practice}, Nice, R., (trans.), Cambridge 1977, pp. 120 and 124 130. See Bourdieu, \textit{Language}, pp. 117 126, on solemn transgressions as marks of consecrated difference. The very act of purification would have the effect of reinforcing the boundaries between the categories of man and god.
\textsuperscript{92} See Smith, J.Z., \textit{To Take Place}, p. 108.
\textsuperscript{93} See Baines, ‘Society’, p. 129.
\textsuperscript{94} And thus even in describing the ritual, Ichernefertet does not specify the divine roles he played, although his chief role is implicitly evident in saying \textit{tw nd.n}=iw w3n-nfr hrw pf n(l)t°h3°? sfr.n=n i hjht(w)=w swh(w) hr iz [w] n(l)t ndy.t
\textsuperscript{95} ‘I saved Wenennefer on that day of the great battle; I felled all of his opponents on the bank of the [district] of Nedit’ (Sethe, \textit{Lesestucke} p. 71, 17 18), by virtue of the use of the verb \textit{nd} in connection with Osiris and his enemies; see for example CT 17 I 51b 52a (B1P): \textit{bw st3nh=sh n nfrw pr.t-hrw n rt m m3.t tw hr hjht(n)t nh.w nd.n}=iw hr jw=tw sm3.w tw jw=tw ‘He guides life to the gods, and a mortuary offering to Re in truth. Horus Foremost of the Living has saved his father Osiris, having nullified the action of the one who slew his father Osiris’.
\textsuperscript{96} PT 606 §§1693c 1694a (M): \textit{m hr jr ntrw lw}=sn n=k rt pw jr sn sn jr^n=m
\textsuperscript{97} See further Assmann, ‘Unio liturgica’; Assmann, \textit{Search for God}, pp. 68 and 250 n. 33; and Assmann, \textit{Tod und Jenseits}, pp. 504 517.
\textsuperscript{98} The Egyptian term \textit{s3hsw} being equated by Assmann, J., \textit{LÄ VI}, col. 998, with the category of ‘Verklarungen’, or ‘mortality liturgies’; the association is derived from observations of Goyon, J. C., ‘Littérature funéraire tardive’, in: \textit{Textes et langages de l’Égypte pharaonique III (BDÉ 64)}, Cairo 1974, pp. 73 81, pp. 79 81.
\textsuperscript{99} To be clear, it should be observed that the activity indicated in the word \textit{s3h} ‘to make into an Akh’ is not exclusively oral. For instance, when oil is applied to the deity’s image, the priest recites, \textit{dl.m}=iw t=xw m h3t lw=tw nb ntr(w) tw sm3nw=tw hr=s s3hsw hr=s ‘I have put <you> even in the brow of Amun Re, lord of the thrones of the two lands, that he be made sweet by it, that he be made an Akh by it’ (pBerlin 3055 XXXIII, 3, rite 55 of Moret, \textit{Le rituel du culte} for the reading \textit{tw}, see pBerlin 3053 XXVIII, 3); similarly with the Pyramid Text version of the rite for mortuary cult, PT 77 §52c.
\textsuperscript{101} See above at n. 76.
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father Osiris, that you be an Akh thereby, that you be great thereby'.

Priest as god, \( s3\hat{h}.w \) as recitation, and purity find confluence in the archaic or archaizing Hour Vigil:

Recitation by the Two Kites, the Mourners:
Ah, let me purify my mouth; let me chew natron!
I have censed myself with incense and fire, thus pure, cleansed, censed with the natron which went forth from Necsheb, with the incense which went forth from Punt, that which is sweet of scent, that which went forth as the Eye of Horus.
How pure is the \( s3\hat{h} \) of Osiris Foremost of the Westerners among the gods, the Followers of Horus!
How beautiful is the \( s3\hat{h} \) of Osiris Foremost of the Westerners!
How ceremonial is the \( s3\hat{h} \) of Osiris Foremost of the Westerners!

The recitation by the kites is the recitation of priestesses as Isis and Nephthys. As the priest's mouth and body are purified, so are his \( s3\hat{h}.w \); in that condition, with him \( w^e b \ twr \ sntr \), the god's \( s3\hat{h}.w \) are \( w^e b \ nfr h2bl \). The quality of purity is necessary not only for the passage between contraries, but for the speech to be efficacious, for it to be 'performative'.

Finally, although the king may delegate his subjects to perform the office of priest, once within that sphere deities such as Anubis, Re, Geb, and Thoth can be said to direct the action. Thus the deceased is told: 'May you go forth at the voice of Anubis, that he as Thoth

\[ \text{PT 734 §32264a b (N): } \text{sdm mdw pw dd.n hr n it=f wsir } s3\hat{h}=k \text{ im } 3=i=k \text{ im. Gods are also specified as those who make one into an Akh at, e.g., PT 431 §781a b (Nut); PT 437 §795b (Re); PT 483 §1083a (Geb); PT 610 §81712a c (Horus) and §81712b c (Thoth and Anubis); PT 690 §2106a (Thoth); CT 74 I 312e (Thoth); CT 229 III 295d (Isis); CT 337 III 309c (Isis); CT 345 IV 375a (Thoth); CT 1068 VII 330a (those in the Netherworld).} \]

That the Hour Vigil is marked by archaic language is observed by Cauville, *Le temple de Dendara*, p. 70, for the statements made by the mourners, with global parallels to Pyramid Texts drawn out already by Junker, H., *Die Stundenwachen in den Osirismysterien*, Vienna 1910, p. 23.

Hour Vigil XIII (Edfu) 61 71 (Junker, *Stundenwachen*):

\[ \text{dd-mdw in dr(i)tl h3.(q)tw} \\
\text{i } b=^e \ i \ w^e b=i \ zmn.w} \\
\text{w^e b.(i) twr kw sntr kw} \\
\text{m zmn.w pr m nhb m sntr pr m pwn.t} \\
\text{ndm sty pr m } \text{pr(i) } hr} \\
\text{w^e b.(i) s3h n(i) wsir } \text{mntl-lmn.tlw m-} \text{t ntr.w } \text{sms-hr} \\
\text{nfr.w(i) s3h n(i) wsir } \text{mntl-lmn.tlw} \\
\text{h2b.w(i) s3h n(i) wsir } \text{mntl-lmn.tlw} \]

See Münster, *Untersuchungen zur Göttin Isis*, p. 23, for the identification of the \( drt.i \) 'kites' as Isis and Nephthys, an identification the tradition for which reaches back to the Old Kingdom, as at PT 335 §1280b (P): \( i \ h3.i \ i \ drt \ h3.t \ ti \ h3.t \ h3.t \ nb \ h3.t \ h3.t \ '\) the waiting bird comes: the mourning kite comes, that is, Isis and Nephthys'. For the vocalization with \( -i \) (-y), see CT 1033 VII 269a: \[ z3 \text{ dry.t n(i) } \text{wsir} \ '\) the son of the kite of Osiris'. For further references on the mourning goddesses, see Cauville, *Le temple de Dendara*, p. 70 n. 117.

As at CT 45 I 199f 200a (B12C): \[ hw \ wld.n n=i } r\ } wld=k \ tpr=k \ smn=k \ t=zk=s3h= [n=]k \ ]f(k)w=e \ k ink mstw ty=k \ tpr(i) tl \ ] Re has commanded me (sc. Horus) that your head be given to you, that your spine be made firm for you, and that your enemies be made to fall [for you], for I am your offspring who is upon earth' and CT 590 VI 210h i (S2P): \[ pr.n } hry it=f \ wsir m nby.t zk=t hr= f \ wld.n n=r \ } \text{hr=f } \text{sw} \ '\) Horus has equipped his father Osiris with the Nebty collar of Zokar himself; Re has commanded that he do it'.

As at PT 477 §567a c (N): \[ L n Ne. hry=k \ wsir ... } hr=y=n \ } k \ Ne. } mw wld.n n } gby=f=n \ ] To you has Neferkare come, O Osiris, ... that Neferkare do for you this which Geb commanded that he do', and PT 373 §637a d (M0): \[ h(w)=k } it=zh=n=k \ } bd.t \ } n } tpr(i)=w\ } k=im } n } tpr(i)=w \ smd.wt=k \ } im } n } wld.t } t=n=k } n \ gby=t \ 'Let barley be threshed for you, emmer harvested for you, being done at your first of the month festivals thereby, being done at your first of the half month festivals thereby, as that which was commanded to be done by your father Geb'. See also PT 357 §§583c and 590b; PT 364 §612a; PT 367 §634a; and PT 369 §640b.
make you an Akh... through this your Sakh which Anubis commanded', while 'it is Thoth who got the lectors, those who recite it during the deeds'. In letting his actions be structured by royal authorization, the human goes to his task, becoming pure and stepping by title and divine name into the formalized ritual space; there, he acts as god, and his mandate stems from the gods.

And yet the ceding of initiative and acceptance of authorization has the effect of empowering the ritualist outside of ritual proper. Prior to it, the authorization imparts authority, granting control over subordinates. Once the ritual is complete, he enjoys the secondary benefits of cultural capital, a claim for superhuman protection in life, and post-mortem advantages. Among such other experiences and results as the agential ritualist might enjoy, in wielding the authorized language of his society he helps perpetuate and support its structures. And so, just as the ritualist stands between the motion of his performance and the stasis of the tradition incarnate in his king, so does a monument like that of Icherneferet emanate a myth of human identity. Irony: it was generated within a society in which that identity was in ritual effaced.

---

129 PT 437 §§796c 797b (P): pr=k hrw inp 3b=f tw m dhw.tl ... m 3b=k pn wr.n inp

130 CT 590 VI 210f g (S2P): in dhw.tl in hrw-h3b.t šdd.w sw m šm.wt