

ANTHONY SPALINGER

FIVE VIEWS ON EGYPT

LINGUA AEGYPTIA

Studia monographica 6

Herausgegeben von

Frank Kammerzell und Gerald Moers
unter Mitwirkung von Kai Widmaier

Seminar für Ägyptologie und Koptologie
Göttingen

FIVE VIEWS ON EGYPT

Anthony Spalinger

Göttingen 2006

Titelaufnahme

Spalinger, Anthony

Five Views on Egypt/

Göttingen: Seminar für Ägyptologie und Koptologie, 2006

(Lingua Aegyptia — Studia monographica; Bd. 6)

ISSN 0946-8641

© Frank Kammerzell & Gerald Moers, Göttingen 2006

Printed in Germany

Nachdruck, Wiedergabe, Vervielfältigung und Verbreitung (gleich welcher Art), auch von
Teilen des Werkes oder von Abbildungen, Abschrift, Übersetzung, auch auf
fotomechanischem oder ähnlichem Wege oder Magnettonverfahren, Vortrag, Funk,
Fernsehsendung sowie Speicherung in Datenverarbeitungsanlagen bedürfen einer schriftlichen
Genehmigung der Herausgeber.

Reproduktion, Druck und Verarbeitung: Hubert & Co., Göttingen

Gedruckt auf säurefreiem, archivierfähigem Papier

For Harold Spalinger
25 March 1913 – 26 August 1975

Contents

Introduction.....	1
The Paradise of Scribes and the Tartarus of Soldiers	5
Land Brightens, Day Begins	51
The Eulogy to Ahmose at Karnak and Connected Texts.....	87
The Re-Use of Propp for Egyptian Folktales. An Introduction.....	123
Datings of the Kadesh Reliefs.....	137
Bibliography.....	157

The Eulogy to Ahmose at Karnak and Connected Texts

Royal encomia occupied a major place within the literary canon of the New Kingdom.¹ Often but not always lacking a title, they nevertheless performed a major function to the subsequent historically oriented accounts of the Pharaohs. Sometimes these eulogies acted as lengthy introductions to the narrative record. On other occasions they occupied the major segment of a royal hieroglyphic text and thus can help us to determine their performance aspect. Thanks to the numerous extant stelae and wall inscriptions, we can analyze these hymns of praise to a far greater degree than in earlier times. Owing to recent work in the area of literary analysis, we are fortunate that this corpus has been dealt with in a modern sophisticated fashion. Moreover, the presence of a sizeable (relatively speaking) number of hieratic papyri dating from the Ramesside Period, allows us to see the cursive complement of the hieroglyphic record. The following remarks have their basis in previous research associated with royal war inscriptions and the related question of martial eulogies. Here I shall deal with some of the better-known examples dating from Dynasties XVIII to XX, although I have allowed myself more than a brief look at earlier examples owing to the ongoing research into literature by many Egyptologists.

In Karnak and south of the VIIIth Pylon the famous undated Ahmose Stela was discovered.² Significantly, the object was placed with the carved hieroglyphic text

1 In my "New Kingdom Eulogies of Power: A Preliminary Analysis", presented in: Nicole Kloth, *et al.*, eds., *Es werde niedergelegt als Schriftstück. Festschrift für Hartwig Altenmüller zum 65. Geburtstag*, Beihefte SAK 9, Hamburg (2003), pp. 415-428, I have presented summary of the secondary literature on the royal eulogies, their style, and their importance at this time. Hence, this follow-up discussion will not overly concentrate on the numerous secondary sources relating to the historical background of the specific kings or eras. Texts later than Dynasty XX have been purposely omitted for a later analysis.

The major studies remain those of Jan Assmann, "Eulogie, Königs-", in: Eberhard Otto and Wolfgang Helck, eds., *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* II, Wiesbaden (1977), 39-46, with his *Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete*², OBO, Göttingen (1999), pp. 58-69. In this volume he also provides the reader with some key eulogies dating to the Middle and New Kingdoms on pages 512-547 of the volume.

Kenneth A. Kitchen, *Poetry of Ancient Egypt*, Jonsered (1999), pp. xiii-xx ("Introduction"), and 471-481, covers the main structural "rules" of Egyptian poetry.

The recent work of Richard B. Parkinson, *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt*, London and New York (2002), provides additional and pertinent comments on the type of these hymns within a far more global presentation. There is also the earlier study of Ludwig D. Morenz, *Beiträge zur Schriftlichkeitskultur im Mittleren Reich und in der 2. Zwischenzeit*, ÄAT 29, Wiesbaden (1996). Section I covers the questions of orality, textual transmission, and reading.

2 *Urk.* IV 14-42 with a new presentation by Andrea Klug, *Königliche Stelen in der Zeit von Ahmose bis Amenophis III*, Monumenta Aegyptiaca 8, Turnhout (2002), pp. 25-34. A photograph of the object will be found in Pierre Lacau, *Stèles du Nouvel Empire*, Cairo (1926), Pl. 1. Unfortunately,

underneath, a situation that led the Egyptologist Lacau to surmise that it was originally employed as part of the floor in this area and, as he stressed, probably situated at the south side of the pylon. A later and by no means insignificant analysis by Andrea Klug revealed that Ahmose's monument resembled to no small extent the well-known victory stelae of Kamose, not only in dimension but also in arrangement.³ That is to say, both inscriptions appear to have been carved in the same royal/religious atelier and even if the carving of the hieroglyphs differs on both stelae, there nonetheless is a strong resemblance between the palaeography that allows us to support this contention. Naturally, the historical and literary content of both are quite different.

The Ahmose stela presents us with the first known case of a royal eulogy from the XVIIIth Dynasty. Owing to its fully developed format and arrangement, Jan Assmann stressed the remarkable nature of this literary style and indicated that a lengthy period of time in which similar encomia were preceding the reign of Pharaoh Ahmose, orally and subsequently in written format, must be assumed.⁴ Therefore, before turning to the historical setting of the words and their connection to royal decrees, it is necessary to study the actual format of the presentation.

This monument commences with the expected five-fold titulary of the king and then turns to a series of attributive phrases, all serving as epithets of the ruler. The opening series is rather long even if each phrase is moderate in length:⁵

His heir to whom he gave his throne; the good god in truth;
 Powerful of arms; without falsehood in him.
 The powerful one; the likeness of Re;
 The pair of children of Geb; his heir who rejoices in happiness.
 The offspring of Re whom he created;
 The avenger whom he has placed on earth.

At this point we can stop as the structure of these introductory lines is relatively easy to evaluate. Unlike the very early Dynasty XII encomia there are no *pw* sentences

it is too small. Assmann's poetical rendition will be found in *Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete*², pp. 519-523. There are useful comments to be found in Morenz, *Beiträge zur Schriftlichkeitskultur*, pp. 182-183; see as well Gerald Moers, *Fingierte Welten in der ägyptischen Literatur des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr.*, PdÄ 19, Leiden, Boston, and Köln (2001), p. 222 and note 284 (arguing for a citation in the Ahmose Stela derived from the Eloquent Peasant).

3 Klug provides a very useful analysis of its physical arrangement on pages 32-33 of her work.

4 This is summarized in his entry for the *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* II, 41, and *Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete*², p. 523 (bottom).

5 Here I can refer to Assmann's latest study of these encomia in "Verkünden und Verklären. Grundformen hymnischer Rede im alten Ägypten", in: Antonio Loprieno, ed., *Ancient Egyptian Literature. History and Forms*, PdÄ 10, Leiden, New York, and Köln (1996), pp. 313-319. Additional references will be found in my study referred to in note 1.

present.⁶ Instead, the set-up operates within a simple series of bimembral phrases, cola if you will, by means of which the king's power and glory are revealed. The verbal formations are participial in nature with expected Relative Forms used to elaborate upon the king's relations with other deities and the like.⁷ As to be expected, the verses, reflecting a formal – indeed, heavy-toned – series of cadences, appear to follow a couplet-orientated format: “King of kings in all the lands; Sovereign, l.p.h., who subdues the two river banks”. Or to take another example, see “The king in Pe; the ruler in Egypt; the floor of heaven; the rudder of earth”. The entire opening lines orient themselves to a rhythmic pattern that one can imagine being spoken to the king during his official visit to Karnak. (John Baines' concept of decorum is most appropriate here.)⁸ In a few cases we may note the intrusion of a more narrative verbal pattern. For example, at the beginning of line seven there is: “When he ruled that which the Aten encircled, the white crown and the red crown remain on his head”. Here the verse commences with a *s_{dm}.n.f* thereby diverging somewhat from the earlier series of orally stressed phrases.⁹ Other uses of the *s_{dm}.n.f* may be noted soon after, thereby highlighting an important linguistic turn in the enunciation. They serve not merely to differentiate a more complex series of attributive passages relating to the monarch but also to move the listener (and reader) to lengthier verses in which Ahmose is praised, and at this point the Stative tends to be employed more frequently. At the end of line ten this newer mode of oral delivery concludes with a *iw s_{dm}.n.f* (*iw*

6 According to Assmann the use of sentences/clauses was the major hallmark of Middle Kingdom eulogies (e.g., the Hymns to Sesostri I in Sinuhe): see his brief comments in the study cited in the previous note. Parkinson takes a more nuanced position in his work *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt*, p. 46 (dissemination of literature), 56-57 (with the argument that Middle Kingdom Egypt was “predominantly” oral), 61 (probable derivation of eulogies from semi-cultic contexts), 63, 68 (the circulation of Dynasty XII-XII literary compositions and the possible evidence for palace libraries where encomia could have been kept).

See as well his “Two New ‘Literary’ Texts on a Second Intermediate Period papyrus? A Preliminary Account of P. BM EA 1045”, in: Jan Assmann and Elke Blumenthal, eds., *Literatur und Politik im pharaonischen und ptolemäischen Ägypten*, BdE 127, Cairo (1998), pp. 187-190, and “Types of Literature in the Middle Kingdom”, in: Loprieno, ed., *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, pp. 306-307.

7 For eulogies and their Relative Forms, see Assmann, *Liturgische Lieder an den Sonnengott. Untersuchungen zur ägyptischen Hymnik I*, MÄS 19, Berlin (1969), pp. 90-91, 130, and 310-311.

8 This aspect of Egyptian civilization was first brought forward in detail by John Baines, *Fecundity Figures: Egyptian Personification and the Iconology of a Genre*, Warminster (1985). R. Parkinson correctly places emphasis on his professor's theory in *Poetry and Cult in Middle Kingdom Literature*, pp. 91-98 in particular.

9 The most detailed study of the internal morphological arrangements of Egyptian hymns will be found in the lengthy commentaries of Assmann, *Liturgische Lieder*, p. 361 presents a useful summary of eulogies of a non-royal nature. The author stresses the presence of such hymns in a cultic setting. According to him this setting was the origin of the encomia. On p. 4 will be found his analysis of the dichotomy between the verbal (“narrative”) style and the nominal (“enumerative”) style in hymns. This procedure applies to eulogies as well.

ḥf.n.f ḥnmmt), and not unexpected, right at the beginning of the following line short declarations by various peoples or groups (the “patricians,” the *ḥ3w-nbw*, and the “flat lands”) may be found. Here also may be seen a few simple nominal phrases with *pw*. Soon thereafter the might of the Pharaoh is declaimed as the presentation switches to the Pharaoh’s overwhelming might (lines 12-14). This preceding section is rather long, as befits what all the countries recognize in Ahmose. By and large the literary style remains the same as what was presented earlier even though one may find the presentation carefully reverting to the opening style of a simple A-B arrangement. In the middle of line 16 the “two river banks” then verbally declare their opinions of the ruler. Here too the verbal set-up is similar to the second part. We may signal the use of participial phrases, some *sdm.f*’s, common non-verbal (adverbial) passages, one additional *pw* sentence, and the like.¹⁰

The structure of these opening 21 or so lines has been separately analyzed by Assmann and Klug in particular. Even though their conclusions differ to some degree, the basic parameters of both are similar. The crucial question regarding these verses nonetheless remains unanswered. Namely, by what means did this lengthy introduction fit within the royal presence? In order to answer this question I feel that we must direct our attention to a closer study of this portion of the stela and attempt some historical setting.

First and foremost, one can argue from the basis of what is not indicated. By this means we can readily dismiss any connection to coronation or accession. None of the eulogistic phrases concerns Ahmose’s connection to his “real” (earthly) father. Some passages indicate Ahmose’s relationship to his father Amun; heirship is not excluded. Nonetheless, the entire section covers a percentage of the inscription far more than what, to take a case in point, Amunhotep II recorded in his lengthy Sphinx Stela.¹¹ It is fair to state that even though Ahmose has received the attributes of royalty, a detailed recitation of his rise to power is avoided. Such portions of the inscription that deal with his kingship cover a broader field of action: might over Egypt, power in the foreign lands, submission of the foreigners, connection to Amun (as befits the lo-

10 Different interpretations of the structure to this eulogy are by Assmann, *Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete*², p. 523, and Klug, *Königliche Stelen*, pp. 25-31.

11 *Urk. IV 1276-1279* and Christiane M. Zivie, *Giza au deuxième millénaire*, BdE 70, Cairo (1976), pp. 64-89. See as well Klug, *Königliche Stelen*, pp. 223-234. Donald B. Redford addresses the importance of the historical sections in “The Coregency of Thutmose III and Amenophis II”, *JEA* 51 (1965), pp. 117-118, as does Peter Der Manuelian, *Studies in the Reign of Amenophis II*, HÄB 26, Hildesheim (1987), pp. 189-190, and Klug, *Königliche Stelen*, p. 234.

cality), relationship to and the like. There is mention of Thoth and Seshat, two deities connected to kingship,¹² and other verses place emphasis upon Re and Geb.

It might be argued that this lengthy section reflects the king's visit to Thebes soon after he was crowned. On the other hand, the avoidance of the Hyksos is striking. When we face foreign peoples the terms employed are vague or age-old ones: "foreigners" (*h3styw*), the *Fnhw*, or *hnt-hn-nfr*. Anything remotely specific or contemporary is avoided. For example, the passage "The southerners, northerners, easterners, and westerners come to him" revels in non-specificity. The crowns of kingship occur juxtaposed to the portions of Horus and Seth. Similarly, his regalia is mentioned as befits a monarch new upon the throne. Perhaps this is why his fame or renown (*hmhmt*) plays such a general role.¹³ Perhaps this is why the visual image of Ahmose is compared to the sun god (and even the sun) in lines 16ff. Instead of locating the Pharaoh in contemporary time and space, the eulogy prefers instead to fix its attention upon the effective physical/martial attributes of Ahmose as well as his background in connection with Amun and other gods.

Yet the virtual absence of the hated northerners and other enemies of Ahmose cannot be overlooked. Even the Nubians, against whom he campaigned for so many years, do not appear in the encomium. In their place we find verses centered upon rulership and power, both within and without the Nile Valley. Owing to this I feel that the date of the composition must precede at least the final war against the Hyksos, and indeed be set at a time when Ahmose had not decided to continue in an earnest fashion the deeds of his predecessor Kamose.¹⁴ The repeated mention of attributes of kingship and his involvement as Amun's son who has come to the throne tend to allow us a reasonable leeway in determining the basic *Sitz im Leben* of the composition. Although this point will be elaborated upon subsequently, there is evidence enough to conclude that the time of the king's visit to Karnak ought to have occurred not too long after his accession.

A more important conclusion regarding the manner of the eulogy, however, needs to be explained. At this point we must enter into a carefully nuanced viewpoint, one

12 I can now refer to Kenneth A. Kitchen, *Ramesside Inscriptions. Notes and Comments I*, Oxford and Cambridge MA (1993), pp. 126-127, on the connection of Thoth and Sheshat to the king; cf. the comments, of Morenz, *Beiträge zur Schriftlichkeitskultur*, p. 184.

13 Classically, see Joachim Spiegel, "Der 'Ruf' des Königs", *WZKM* 54 (1957), pp. 191-203. Add Erik Hornung, "Zur geschichtlichen Rolle des Königs in der 18. Dynastie", *MDAIK* 15 (1957), pp. 120-133 with page 127 in particular. The terms brought forth by Hornung are all quite frequent in the eulogies. Add Nicholas-Christophe Grimal, *Les termes de la propagande royale égyptienne de la XIX^e dynastie à l'époque d'Alexandre*, Paris (1986), for a compendium of the key lexical items.

14 Klug, *Königliche Stelen*, pp. 33-34, discusses the importance of the king's mother Ahhotep in this context. See as well the earlier analysis of Claude Vandersleyen, *Les Guerres d'Ahmosis, fondateur de la XVIII^e Dynastie*, Monographies Reine Élisabeth 1, Brussels (1973), pp. 129-192 (with discussion of this inscription).

that has to consider the nature of these eulogies. Were, for example, these hymns of praise composed for specific occasions? By itself, could this one have been employed from a pre-existent (hieratic) exemplar lying at the court and ready for future use at any occasion?¹⁵ Although I do not feel that this query can be answered with total assurance, from the words it appears that with the absence of any specific event or any contemporary lands/peoples a general setting can be hypothesized. Whether or not this section was recited to Ahmose at Karnak cannot, of course, be categorically answered. On the other hand, because the following two sections (as well as the narrative conclusion) present two separate praises spoken in honor of Ahmose and his mother, Ahhotep, allow us to conclude that all three portions can be combined into one harmonious historical event.¹⁶

The opening eulogy could have been recited for another king or else kept as part of a series of encomia available for use in composing a royal inscription. In fact, it can be argued that these 21 lines were merely tacked onto what follows in order to expand the presentation into a nicely presented memorial of the king's deeds at Karnak. This I do not deny, but the entire composition speaks against it. The clear-cut arrangement of the stela indicates a rather well designed and thought out report:

- a. Opening eulogy. This is the lengthy one.
- b. Praise of the king with loyalty to him stressed. Two main parts:
The first ends with praise and the second opens with an imperative ("hear" [pl.]). The latter concludes with the name of the king (vocative, as befits the presentation) plus a short epithet.
- c. Praise to Ahhotep with her role in protecting Egypt indicated.
- d. Official report concerning Ahmose's benefaction to Karnak. This is the only: "narrative segment".

Thus even if the first part of the composition cannot be set to any specific event, the last portion indicates its aim. There, the specific works that the Pharaoh performed for Amun of Karnak are listed. Preceding it are two relatively small sections that follow a style that can best be described as eulogistic. Because all four sections of the stela belong together we can argue that the last must be quite singular attributes, we can see that some type of event had to have taken place, one in which the royal pair presented themselves at Karnak amidst eulogistic acclamation. The first of the two stresses the

15 Parkinson, *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt*, pp. 61, 63, 68-69 (on the texts of commemorative inscriptions" circulating throughout the Nile Valley and the so-called palace libraries during the New Kingdom). Jan Assmann, "Cultural and Literary texts", in: Gerald Moers, ed., *Definitely Egyptian Literature*, Göttingen (1999), pp. 1-15, deals with the theory of cultural texts.

16 This is my basic conclusion in "New Kingdom Eulogies of Power" (note 1 above).

people's loyalty to their Pharaoh.¹⁷ Here, the "patricians, commoners, and sun-folk" are exhorted to follow the king wherever he goes. One must as well respect Ahmose "in his name". In similar fashion this declaration, acting as a fitting conclusion to the preceding encomium, places emphasis upon the oath that one takes in the name of Ahmose. Praise must be given to him as one does for the sun god Re, and equally he must be adored as the moon. (The latter two verses clearly form a couplet, as indeed do the preceding four lines.) It is fitting in this context to cite a recent evaluation of the final response of an audience to a royal eulogy: loyalism is indicated.¹⁸

In the second we are dealing with praise to Ahhotep. Here, the key theme is her role as savior and protector of Egypt during unnamed trials. The removal of rebels and her association with the infantry form but two of the six major verses. Owing to these unique passages it is probable that queen Ahhotep had played a major role within Egypt at the time that the land had undergone major political difficulties, a point that was not lost upon Claude Vandersleyen in his able study of this inscription. At least at this point the perspicacious reader may observe a distinct move to something vaguely historical although, once more, the account remains historically dim.

Subsequent to these two addresses is the king's command to supply Karnak with additional offering implements and yet another divine bark and additional supplies. Here, at last, we apparently reach the focus of the inscription. Most scholars usually focus their attention upon this final section and purposely ignore the three earlier literary portions of the inscription. Yet it must be stated that all four portions belong together. It is only the final one that, narrowly speaking, provides the aim of the composition. Yet the work that Ahmose declared that he would accomplish must follow upon the former passages. Hand in hand the opening eulogy and the following two brief hymns of praise to king and queen have to be read in context with the final historical presentation.

We are thus faced with the necessity of interpreting the entire account as a unit, one in which the final narrative presentation is intimately linked with the preceding hymns. It is only for this reason that I prefer to view the account as a unit wherein the king (with mother) arrived at Karnak soon after his accession to the throne of Egypt. At that cult center he was greeted by a lengthy encomium of praise, and then the whole gamut of Egyptians, clearly not those present, were exhorted to follow in his footsteps and adhere to him. The orientation was loyalistic, as was the following address concerning Ahhotep, although in the latter we find specific references to her political/social/military role. (One may argue that she held some type of power at the

17 Note already, Assmann, *Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete*², p. 523, with Klug, *Königliche Stelen*, p. 32.

18 Parkinson, *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt*, p. 82.

death of Kamose.) Most certainly, the absence of Ahmose's wife is telling, especially with regard to the dating of the royal benefactions. The presence of the queen mother is equally significant insofar as it reveals a time during the reign of her son when he had not yet secured firm control over the land, or at least proved himself (in deed) to be an able Pharaoh.

The above comments have carefully eschewed the question whether the first three eulogies were actually presented in the temple of Karnak. This I believe to be the case although it may be argued that such encomia are mere window-dressing to the ensuing fourth historical account of temple benefaction.¹⁹ Unfortunately, no final resolution of this matter can be made even though this reconstruction has the benefit of providing an explanation of the textual redaction.

The fourth portion of Ahmose's stela effects the aim or goal of the account. With the king's commands – there are two separate ones – we at least reach a point where the king has entered into history, where he appears in the royal of an actor and not a mere receiver of grandiloquent rhetoric. In other words, the role of Pharaoh is paramount. How does this fit in with other narrative monumental inscriptions that have been labeled as *Königsnovelle* records? For the moment I wish to outline the recent study of Loprieno and attempt to connect this *non-dated* monument with the plethora of other royal narratives in which various encomia are presented to the reigning Pharaoh.

Loprieno stressed the movement of the king into history.²⁰ “At the crossroads of History” the monarch appears to inaugurate some activity, be it of a military or a peaceful nature such as a building project. By and large such *Königsnovelle* accounts were dated. In addition, a specific locality was given in order not to leave any questions open with regard to the action. But it can be stated that Ahmose's stela provides the same background, albeit within an interplay between ruler and populace. In this case a date is missing; the same can be said with regard to the location. The account of the stela may not need the latter since its location and the account of part four clearly enunciate Karnak as the locus. On the other hand, the even is a “concrete episode from the king's life”, and as such would seem to belong to the series of definitions that Loprieno has given us in order to explain what, exactly, was the *Königsnovelle*. Hence, I feel that a more specific analysis of Egyptian hieroglyphic narrative

19 I have made this point in “New Kingdom Eulogies of Power”; see as well Parkinson, *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt*, pp. 61 and 63. It is one of Kitchen's recurring comments in his commentary to the editions of *Ramesseide Inscriptions*.

20 “The ‘King's Novel’”, in: Loprieno, ed., *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, pp. 279-295. Note as well Parkinson, “Teachings, Discourses and Tales from the Middle Kingdom”, in: Steven Quirke, ed., *Middle Kingdom Studies*, New Malden (1991), pp. 101, 118-119 (on eulogies within an overarching narrative: this point will be discussed later).

texts is necessary lest with subsume a large number of historically oriented inscription underneath this rubric.

Ahmose's stela does not need to explicitly delineate the locality. Reasons for this were given above. Likewise, there was no necessity in providing a two-and-fro presentation of king (plan) followed by courtier eulogy, the latter leading to a second declaration by the monarch and possibly a final series of rhetorical praises on the part of the high officials, general populace, or the like. It can also be stated that the actual "workings-out" of the royal commands is left unsaid. Enough was presented by the literary artist to enable the reader to determine the royal wishes. But the last were preceded by various eulogies, among which the lengthy first one forms the bulk of the presentation. Therefore, this inscription separates itself from those *Königsnovelle* accounts in preferring to emphasize the eulogies and to downplay the sovereign's personality traits. In fact, from the latter vantage point, all is frozen and impersonal: Ahmose merely lists his commands.

The lack of any date may imply to some that the account was eternal with respect to intent.²¹ That is to say, though explicit in detail, the Pharaoh's deeds reflect the continual necessity of cultic performance on the part of any Egyptian ruler. Equally, it may be argued that the lack of any "developed" *Königsnovelle* narrative indicates an approach at variance to that common presentation. In our case it is the opening eulogy that provides the backdrop, just as various literary (indeed often fairy-tale) backdrops provide a location and temporal setting for the ensuing action of the *Königsnovelle*. Yet at this point I do not wish to over-interpret from a modern viewpoint the necessity of including or excluding various portions of narrative. As with the pictorial development of a campaign, certain portions could be included or omitted, and the reasons for such may not simply have been caused by reasons of space.

Clearly, the Ahmose stela does not present a literary form that is akin to the *Königsnovelle* accounts although it ends up with the king's deeds to his father Amun. The interpose of eulogies explicitly located in the mouths of courtiers or warriors (e.g., the account of the battle of Megiddo) is replaced here by the opening enco-

21 Loprieno indicates that "When literary discourse is applied to the royal sphere, the result is always a *Königsnovelle*" (page 295). Therefore, these eulogies, set independent of such compositions, must be viewed separately, and their avoidance of such historical (and literary) settings/framework in such "King's Novels" is not mere happenstance.

Yet in this case the eulogies are embedded in the *Königsnovellen* (Assmann, "Eulogie, Königs-", in: *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* II, 40 and 45 (note 4). In addition, as Parkinson stressed (*Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt*, p. 63, "Types of Literature in the New Kingdom", in: Loprieno, ed., *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, p. 307, and "Two New 'Literary' Texts", in: Assmann and Blumenthal, eds., *Literatur und Politik*, pp. 187-189), they could be placed within other narrative literary compositions. Therefore, the frequent use of lengthy introductory hymns of praise to the Pharaoh in monumental New Kingdom hieroglyphic texts can be seen to a further extension of this use.

mium.²² Moreover, the second and third exhortations, which might have been taken from more lengthy loyalistic compositions of the day, ably supplement the first but also work in providing the reader with an explicit direction to his ruler and mother. In other words, we now have reached the point wherein the royal participants are assumed to have been present. Once more, then, it can be argued that the second and third sections reflect an actual event at Karnak.

Despite the lack of similarity between this inscription and those of the *Königsnovelle* format, the conclusion of the former does bear a closer reading because it reveals the final aim of the text. In this case there is no specific command. No individuals, either by name or title or in general (e.g., courtiers) are mentioned. Instead, the concluding narrative presentation merely offers the reader a straightforward list, commencing in the third person but suddenly turning to the first in line 32, of the additions to the temple of Amun.²³ This approach further differentiates the means of enunciation. Here, the account is barely historical. It avoids a specific *Sitz im Leben* as it eschews any interaction between Pharaoh and mortal(s). Quite to the contrary, the account is nothing more than coda – detailed though it may be – to the stela's preceding three hymns of praise. We can therefore agree with Loprieno's analysis of the *Königsnovelle* wherein he pointed out the historicity of the various narratives and in particular placed emphasis on the personal "here and now" role of the king. The Ahmose stela shows none of the "re-entry" into history so well described by this scholar.²⁴

22 I am no longer convinced that the discussions of the Pharaoh with his high-ranking military warriors properly belong to the *Königsnovelle*. Although such a scenario (which goes back to Dynasty XI: see the Ballas Inscription of Nebhepetre Montuhotep II) parallels the discussions between king and high officials, it does not follow the overt use of employing eulogies. The military men reply to their Pharaoh by advocating a plan different than that of their ruler (e.g., The First Kamose Stela; Battle of Megiddo) or provide a very different non-hymnic presentation (Battle of Kadesh). To put it another way, royal eulogies were not used with such military accounts as in the *Königsnovellen* where hymns addressed to the Pharaoh in response to a particular historical event were *de rigueur*.

23 For the second and third person accounts in hymns, see Assmann, *Liturgische Lieder*, p. 3: At this point he discusses the "enumerative" (pure nominal predication in appositional format) as well as the "narrative" nature of the presentation (use of finite verbal forms or pseudoparticipial constructions).

24 "The 'King's Novel'", pp. 286-290. We can add that our eulogies, which are set within a more lengthy monumental composition, do not indicate any literary discourse that the *Königsnovelle* employs (as argued by Loprieno). Hence, they are not "historical" per se.

Other Material

As a contrast we can turn to the well-known Gebel Barkal Stela of Thutmose III.²⁵ There, the account is dated and the setting is self-evident: the Nubian temple of Amun at the Fourth cataract. Various speeches of the king are interwoven with parallel eulogistic addresses of officials (*smrw*) and “people” in general. Little doubt remains that Redford’s pertinent evaluation of the entire inscription is valid.²⁶ Namely, that most of the stela is devoted to recording an official presentation of the king at this site wherein he spoke to various nobles and assorted Egyptians. If there were any question regarding this interpretation they are easily dismissed by reference to the participants and the uncommon first person addresses of Thutmose. Through his words we feel the monarch’s personal vanity, or at least his desire to impress his listeners with a lengthy account of his victorious deeds, most of which have to do with wars and personal acts of valor. One can almost feel the auspicious nature of the Pharaohs’s words as they are oriented to a rather detailed account of his effective deeds in Asia as well as Nubia.

Yet the beginning of the inscription parallels Ahmose’s insofar as there is a lengthy series of eulogistic passages. Once the opening is completed (date, titulary, reference to the monument itself), then in the second line follow common bimembral phrases with Participles and Relative Forms predominating. The style in this rather large section is virtually the same as our other text even though narrative forms (*sdm.f* and *sdm.n.f*) occur more frequently and various existential negations occur. The reason for this must be placed upon the author’s intent to provide a background to the ensuing address of the king, for in the latter sections Thutmose does, in fact, describe

25 *Urk.* IV 1227-1243; Klug, *Königliche Stelen*, pp. 193-208; Anthony Spalinger, *Aspects of the Military Documents of the Ancient Egyptians*, New Haven and London (1982), pp. 204-206; and Donald B. Redford, in: A. Kirk Grayson and Donald B. Redford, eds., *Papyrus and Tablet*, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall (1973), pp. 25-28. The inscription was found by Reisner in the great temple of Amun at Gebel Barkal, but not in its original location. Klug discusses its provenience on pages 193-194 of her study: perhaps in temple B 300-first.

I am ignoring the same king’s Armant Stela (*Urk.* IV 1243-1247 and Klug, *Königliche Stelen*, pp. 151-158) owing to its fragmentary condition. Yet this is an account narrated in the third person to us, the reader (unless this simple phrase is mere rhetoric).

The first person account of the Pharaoh should remind us of the common Ramesside proclamations by their kings of their military deeds. The lengthy inscriptions at Medinet Habu (temp. Ramesses III; see especially the Year 8 Inscription: *KRI* V 39.6ff) as well as the famous “historical section” in the Great P. Harris indicate this other use of literary presentations. Whether the ruler actually spoke these words and where would it have taken place (not to mention the actual listeners) are separate matters, ones deserving an independent analysis. For the moment, let me indicate this narrative presentations, one uttered through the mouth of the Pharaoh, as yet a further rhetorical presentation, but one that was not eulogistic in style.

26 See his introduction to a translation in the edition referred to in the last note. Christopher J. Eyre, “Is Historical Literature ‘Political’ or ‘Literary’?”, in: Loprieno, ed., *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, pp. 415-433, attempted an overview of this matter.

his earlier glorious deeds, all of which needed to reflect past finite verbal formations. Furthermore, key separations can be found in which one portion of the encomium comes to and end, only to be resumed with a variant them highlighted. For example, see the use of Noun + *pw* as well as the use of the royal name in a cartouche) as a break or ending to a subsection.

It is hard to determine where, exactly, the opening encomium ceases and Thutmose's speech begins. I feel, nevertheless, that we have to turn to the actual historical narrative in line nine because it is at this point that a first person account commences with *hb.n.ỉ*. The arrangement at this point is odd. Previously in the stela four separate eulogies were given, all beginning with a simple nominal sentence: *nswt pw*, *Hr pw*, *k3 pw*, and *nswt pw*.²⁷ In contrast, at this point the direction of the inscription carefully moves to the king's address²⁸:

He is a king, powerful as Montu;
Who seizes and one dies not seize from him.
Who tramples all the rebellious foreign lands,
And there is no one who protects them in this land of Naharain
that its lord has/had abandoned through fear.

Suddenly the king speaks: "I have hacked up his cities and his inhabitants" ²⁹ The reason for such a sudden alteration in the approach must be understood as a reaction, probably carefully prepared, at the temple of Gebel Barkal. To put it another way, the "eruption" of the first person address of Thutmose III is not surprising. The eulogies direction to him have come to and end. In fact, the four-fold series of *X-pw* sentences, all descending in order of length, winds up with a reaction on the part of Pharaoh.³⁰ With the series of martial enunciation complete, king then reacts. At this point we enter the actual historical setting of the event at Gebel Barkal.

Even if there is no title or heading to the stela the purport of the king's words fit neatly into the structure of the composition. The core series of royal address and

27 The line of transition is in *Urk.* IV 1231.5-6, preceding the king's first person address. Note, however, that the conclusion to Thutmose's speech includes final eulogistic passages (*Urk.* IV 1233.4-11). In other words, his words are embedded within royal hymns. Can we assume that they actually were spoken? I believe that this possibility ought not to be automatically excluded.

28 *Urk.* IV 1231.2-6.

29 Brief comments on the king's address are by Christopher J. Eyre, "Why was Egyptian Literature?", in: *Sesto Congresso Internazionale di Egitologia*, Atti II, Turin (1993), p. 117.

30 For the *pw* sentences at the beginning of this text, see *Urk.* IV 1229.14 (*nswt pw*), 1230.11 (*Hr pw*; after the lengthy introduction and the king's cartouche), 1230.16 (*k3 pw*), 1231.2 (*nswt pw*); note the return to the physical and blatant image of the king. In *Urk.* IV 1233.5 the *nswt pw* serves to commence a final eulogy immediately after the king's first person narrative (Megiddo campaign) is completed. The latter is especially well designed.

mortal reactions to the Pharaoh's addresses is now presented. In many ways the ensuing account can be read as a narrative of various military successes of Thutmose. More importantly, I feel, is the presence of passages recited by the Pharaoh that could have been converted into an eulogy to the ruler. That is to say, parts of Thutmose's address at Gebel Barkal have a "quasi-eulogistic" orientation, one in which certain phrases or sentences could have been converted into non-narrative units if one desired. This approach, so well evident in lines 26 and following, indicate the actual formal speech of Thutmose. Even when the monarch covers the falling star in lines 33ff. We can see that the presentation remains a formal and serious one, carefully attuned to his listeners. Indeed, he carefully moves over into a generalized series of rhetorical phrases that sound as if they were previously constructed by a master *literato* who was interested in royal encomia.

The reasons of the courtiers are rather short, and owing to this Thutmose resumes his address. Observe that although the final portions of the inscription are missing, it is relatively clear that a specific and historically fixed event had taken place. First speak the *smrw*; then comes the king's response, itself followed by a further address, this time spoken by the "people". Finally, the account ceases with a historical setting of very few words, thereby indicating the conclusion to the narrative.

The reason why I have chosen the Gebel Barkal Inscription of Thutmose III is that it does not present a title to the monument. We moderns have to determine its import: location, time, and setting.³¹ On the other hand internal evidence allows us the ability to place our attention upon the structure of the composition and to isolate the subsections of the document. Virtually at the outset we can determine when the text was drawn up and where it was placed. In fact, its purpose is also explicitly indicated: to exalt the power(s) of Thutmose in comparison to any Pharaoh that has ever existed. That being so, there only remains the actual importance of the lengthy if not long-winded series of royal encomia. Once more I cannot but conclude that they, although forming a common literary basis in the New Kingdom, nonetheless ought to be seen as having been performed at this ceremony in year forty-seven of the Pharaoh. The carefully if not also cleverly interwoven alteration in line nine cannot but indicate that a major switch had taken place. If we regard Thutmose's personal remarks that follow as reflecting his own works in the temple so far south in Nubia, then it ought to be clear that the preceding lengthy encomia must have been recited to the Pharaoh upon his arrival or else spoken before he commenced his address.

31 The nature of the *sdd nhtw* (especially in comparison to the *sdd b3w* that reflect personal piety) was discussed by me in "New Kingdom Eulogies of Power". The Gebel Barkal Stela is clear-cut on this matter. The king recites his occasion(s) of *nhtw*: see especially *Urk.* IV 1233.13: *ky sp gr<t> n nht*.

Once more then I am led to the conclusion that such royal stela were not mere commemorations drawn up or composed at a time after the Pharaoh's presence in a locality and independent of that event. I feel that these two introductory encomia plus the interconnected passages that follow both indicate a basic unity, one in which adulation was followed by royal action. Just as the Ahmose stela indicates a lengthy preamble in which fulsome praise in a semi-poetical context was given to the reigning monarch, so too at Gebel Barkal was the king's address preceded by a lengthy hymn of praise. Nevertheless, the crux to this argument relies upon the interdependence of opening eulogy with the following historically set event. In the second case we can more easily ascertain that Thutmose III actually spoke in a serious and strictly structured format through which he recounted his past deeds.

The major difference that the Gebel Barkal Stela shows in comparison to that of Ahmose clearly lies in the more explicit indication of the speeches. The two subsections that present the addresses of the officials and the "Egyptians" serve as an answer to the Pharaoh's first person accounts. Not surprisingly, they are short unlike Thutmose's oral declarations. On the other hand, the introductory eulogies on both inscriptions are as long as they are fulsome in praise.³² The affects of Thutmose, however, provide the reader (and listener) with a hefty backdrop of the king's martial arts. That aspect is evident from the start. In the first portion of the eulogy the Pharaoh's might and power over lands and peoples are stressed, albeit in generalized terms. This theme is resumed in the second portion of that hymn but the emphasis tends to be more centered upon Thutmose's war leadership in connection with his army. Following this we turn to a shorter portion wherein the aspect return is more overarching; the fourth – king as a mighty bull – re-presents the far away lands and the geographic extent of Thutmose's dominion, the known universe. At the conclusion, a final short eulogy serves as a coda to what precedes yet at the same time leads on to the king's own narration, and at this point various historical aspects are given.

Notwithstanding the differences between both inscriptions, the problem remains as to the historical setting of the opening encomia. Are both to be viewed as mere window-dressing to the ensuing narrative-based presentations that provide the reason for the texts' existence.³³ Or, can we argue that these eulogies were spoken at a specific time and place, thereby providing the commencement to each important occasion? Communality of vocabulary and linguistic structure do not provide an answer to this question, and we are forced back upon the horns of our dilemma. Either these

32 It is therefore incorrect to claim that this stylistic device first began in earnest during the Ramesside Period.

33 Once more I can return to Parkinson's remarks concerning the use of eulogies that are embedded within narratives: *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt*, 61.

hymned presentations were part and parcel of a “bag of eulogies” that could be ransacked for use in order to introduce any monumental inscription, or else they may have been copied from the actual presentations.³⁴ The latter supposition does not exclude the possibility that such lengthy proems were reworked and improved before the stelae were carved, with the input of the reigning Pharaoh, of course.

From the carefully worked out arrangement in line nine of the Thutmose stela I believe that the second alternative ought to be chosen. The account is cleverly interwoven in order to provide a lead from the final brief eulogy to the immediate declaration of the Pharaoh. In the Ahmose inscription such boundaries are stark and rigid. In addition, the second and third portions of that text presents an address to the entire universe of human inhabitants, thereby indicating that the text is to be read by all who acquaint themselves with its contents. Here, our conclusions regarding the performance aspect of the events are more difficult to ascertain.

A third series of eulogies that is worthwhile to discuss occur in the famous Dedicatory Inscription of Ramesses II, a text that belongs to the *Königsnovelle* format.³⁵ The opening section, which covers lines 25 to 30, also provides a later example of an encomium. Its structure, however, fails to parallel the earlier two examples previously discussed. In order not to overburden this paper with a detailed analysis of the composition, let me highlight the key segments of the text’s beginning. First, we commence with no regnal year; that occurs in line 30. Second, lines 25-30 place emphasis upon the king in his role as Horus, the son of Osiris. Because the narrative account that follows is concentrated upon the renewal of architectural decoration in Ramesses’ father’s temple at Abydos, it is not surprising that this preamble concentrates on the mythic relationship of god father and god son. Not surprisingly, the immediate em-

34 Of course, the final product would have been approved by the living monarch; improvements upon an original hymn of praise (if the text actually reflects a performance) must have taken place. I will anticipate my discussion by referring to the useful analysis of Elaine Fantham, “Two Levels of Orality in the Genesis of Pliny’s *Panegyricus*”, in: Anne Mackay, ed., *Signs of Orality. The Oral Tradition and its Influence in the Greek and Roman World*, Leiden, Boston, and Köln (1999), pp. 221-237. In this chapter a detailed perspective is given through which Pliny’s encomium was changed over time owing to more than one cause.

35 A lengthy study on this composition is in preparation. For the moment I can refer to the editions of Kitchen: *KRI* II 323-336. Because there are no photographs of the inscription I can only refer to August Mariette, *Abydos. Descriptions des fouilles exercitées sur l’emplacement de la ville* I, Paris (1869), pls. 5-9. Through the kind offices of Prof. John Baines I have secured large professional photographs of the inscription.

Kitchen’s translation is in his *Ramesside Inscriptions Translated and Annotated. Translations* II, Oxford and Cambridge MA (1996), pp. 162-172. A detailed and useful commentary is located in the complementary work of *Ramesside Inscriptions. Translated and Annotated. Notes and Comments* II, Oxford and Malden (1999), pp. 191-197.

A recent study is that of Claudia Maderna-Sieben, “Die grosse Bauinschrift von Abydos”, in: Sibylle Meyer, ed., *Egypt – Temple of the Whole World. Ägypten – Tempel der gesamten Welt. Studies in Honour of Jan Assmann*, Leiden and Boston (2003), pp. 237-282.

phasis upon Horus and Osiris was pointed out by Assmann in his acute analysis of the mythic constellation so prevalent in the Dedicatory Inscription.³⁶

But it is to the eulogy later spoken at Abydos to the young Ramesses that we will focus our attention. When the various members of the king's court, army, building overseers, and archive masters who were summoned by the king at Abydos came to his presence, they declaimed to their monarch a series of implied metaphors through which Ramesses' beneficence to the world is evident. This type of eulogy is often nested within the various *Königsnovelle* inscriptions. In fact, it may be said to be an integral part of such hieroglyphic compositions. Such a policy was age-old, and can be seen as early as Sesostris I if not Nebhepetre Montuhotep (II). Once again, the latter inscriptions differ extensively with these other eulogistic inscriptions. The *Königsnovellen* make sure that the praises to the king are embedded within a historically oriented narrative, and the participants who shower their Pharaoh with fulsome verbiage are named. To be sure, they speak as a group, but this is perfectly fitting in the royal scenario. The king enunciates a plan and his officials reply with a eulogy. Hence, the setting is as defined as are the individuals mentioned. Action or reaction, in other words, enters into the account, and this is a further reason why Loprieno's stress upon the *historical* aspect of such compositions makes perfect sense.

But what can we do with such royal hieroglyphic texts such as Thutmose III's "Poetical Stela" or Amunhotep III's Third Pylon Inscription.³⁷ In the latter cases, an obvious poetical account (both in visible structure as well as in internal arrangement) can be seen. That inscription, which passed on in style and format to later times, offers a hymn by Amun-Re of Karnak to the living ruler, Thutmose. Because the latter is greeted by his father god, we can suppose that it was drawn up to commemorate some official presentation within that religious edifice. Yet note that on a stela of Amunhotep III erected in his mortuary temple, Amun thanks his son, the Pharaoh, for various deeds there, and similar passages in the eulogistic style may be found.³⁸ In

36 "Das Bild des Vaters im Alten Ägypten", in: Hubertus Tellenbach, ed., *Das Vaterbild in Mythos und Geschichte*, Stuttgart et al. (1976), pp. 12-49 with page 36 in particular.

37 The first text (*Urk.* IV 610-619 with Parkinson, *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt*, p. 227 and Bernard Mathieu, "Études de métrique égyptienne III: Une Innovation métrique dans une 'litanie' thébaine du Nouvel Empire", *RdE* 45 [1994], pp. 139-154) is covered by Klug, *Königliche Stelen*, pp. 111-120 and Kitchen, *Poetry of Ancient Egypt*, pp. 165-176 (with a brief note on its combination with Amunhotep III's triumphal hymn); the second will be found in *Urk.* IV 1722-1732.

Kitchen also discusses the "triumphal" traditions in New Kingdom Egypt and later on pages 433 and 440. He points out that "The scribes under Sethos I ... then adapted the two great hymns for Amenophis III and Thutmosis III (in that order) to serve as the text of Amun's address to the king in such 'smiting' scenes" (page 433).

38 This is the main one that shows the eulogistic style: *Urk.* IV 1646-1657 and Klug, *Königliche Stelen*, pp. 393-403. Note as well two others: *Urk.* IV 1671-1677 with Klug, *Königliche Stelen*, pp. 376-383; the northern companion is discussed by Klug on pages 384-390.

contrast, the “Poetical Stela” allows the god-father to recount his divine aspects that have affected Thutmose III, for example, victories over various foreigners. We can imagine the king being proclaimed by Amun (i.e., the high priest or at least the clergy of that temple) in a ceremony of victory.

The Third Pylon Inscription of Amunhotep III, on the other hand, tells us what type of eulogistic performance took place. Offerings are presented to Amun and praise is then given to the Pharaoh (*nīś* [*hknw*]?).³⁹ The stylistic arrangement is complex, not merely composed of a series of metaphors or similes drawn up with a plethora of Participles and Relative Forms. The move to N + *pw* is present, as are some *sḏm.n.f* and *sḏm.f* formations, thereby linking this arrangement with the one of Ahmose described earlier. In the middle of this lengthy composition the style alters slightly though significantly. Amunhotep himself speaks when the account turns to the first person in line 18. Once more we can observe the careful melding of the first portion of a eulogy to a subsequent narrative approach. At least two *sḏm.n.f* formations for a bridge to the new narrative presented in the mouth of the living ruler, and they switch over to identical constructions but now with the king specifically mentioned (either with the dependent pronoun *wī* or the suffix *.ī*) This progression allows us to interpret an original even that took place at Karnak: the king arrives at his new pylon, praise is offered to him in an eulogistic address, and then the king responds. The latter portion of the account allows the first person reaction to center upon the various building and cultic activities of Amunhotep. Hence, it parallels Ahmose’s deeds on his stela even though the emphasis is far more concentrated upon the interactions between Amun and the Pharaoh.

By and large the eulogistic style of these five examples does not differ among themselves to any great degree. Many more from the New Kingdom could have been chosen, but my purpose has been concentrated upon the difficult question of provenance. Notwithstanding their more developed (or complex) nature from earlier ones such as can be found in the Loyalist Inscription, the Berlin Leather Roll,⁴⁰ the hymn of praise to Sesostris I embedded in the Story of Sinuhe, and others dated to the Second Intermediate Period,⁴¹ it remains clear that the method of presentation within the later time period is relatively homogeneous. True, the “Poetical” Stela of Thutmose III can be placed aside for the moment, as it follows a logical presentation differing from the remaining New Kingdom ones. Nevertheless, the overriding theme

39 This is the restoration of Helck in *Urk.* IV 1722.8, but is it correct? For the word, *nīś*, “to call out”/“to acclaim”, see Assmann, *Liturgische Lieder*, pp. 194-195.

40 The most recent edition of this literary composition is that of Jürgen Osing, “Zu zwei literarischen Werken des Mittleren Reiches”, in: Jürgen Osing and Erland Kolding Nielsen, eds., *The Heritage of Ancient Egypt*, CNI Publications 13, Copenhagen (1992), pp. 109-119.

41 See our comments below on those inscriptions of the Second Intermediate Period.

of my approach has been to concentrate instead upon the possible *Sitz im Leben* of some of the royal encomia that are not explicitly defined, and to contrast those inscriptions with the historically based group of *Königsnovelle* texts. We can maintain that such hymns of praise were easily incorporated into *any* monumental hieroglyphic composition, and thereby claim that the author or authors' working method was to find an appropriate series of encomia that would suit the stela or wall inscription. This is the expected scholarly reaction. After all, when one considers the quite lengthy – indeed, often immense – liturgic preambles that introduce many Ramesside monuments, it seems a safe bet that at least they were written independent of the ensuing narrative.

The opening lines of Tutankhamun's Restoration Stela, to take a case in point, were listed by Assmann in his *Lexikon* entry for eulogies.⁴² It is in the final verses that one might note their pertinence for the ensuing renovations undertaken by the ruler. There, we come face-to-face with such concepts as renovating what was in ruin, performing benefactions for the gods (note the plural), driving out evil that had pervaded the land with truth firm in the country, and ultimately confronting (and thereby removing) falsehood, an abomination.⁴³ Most assuredly, the conclusion to the opening eulogy can be read in the context of the Pharaoh's historical deeds which are given prominence in the following historical account. Other inscriptions listed by Assmann include the Great Sphinx Stela of Amunhotep II (in which the encomium is divided into two main sections) and that of Thutmose IV.⁴⁴ In both cases the commencing verses provide a useful backdrop to the purport of the monument; their words and phrases indirectly signal parameters of kingship and royalty. With the Amada Stela of Amunhotep we come across a eulogy that concentrates upon the warlike attributes of the monarch in addition to his building activities.⁴⁵ These two themes, not surprising, are resumed in the historical portion of the composition. Additional cases could be listed as they, too, indicate that such opening paeans of praise were expressly composed to fit into the aim of the account.

42 Conveniently, see *Urk.* IV 2025-2032; Assmann's comments are in his study referred to in note 1, page 41.

43 The background to such historical inscriptions was described by Redford as a common *topos*: of "Dissolution and Restoration": *Pharaonic King-Lists, Annals and Day Books*, SSEA Publications 4, Mississauga (1986), pp. 259-275. Such passages may be included is a *Königsnovelle* although, as one has come to expect, they were not required. Note that the theme of chaos may occur in hymns/eulogies as well: Parkinson, *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Literature*, p. 59, referring to Amunnakht's hymn on the coronation of Ramesses IV.

I suspect that many of the assumed "regular" components of historical inscriptions could be included, abbreviated, or omitted owing to exigencies that are often lost to us moderns. Clearly, space reasons were a constraint, but other, literary-oriented ones could have come into play.

44 *Ibid.*

45 *Urk.* IV 1287-1299; Klug, *Königliche Stelen*, pp. 286-292.

In the Second Intermediate Period a few considerably shorter royal inscriptions provide us with one earlier phase's employ of such eulogies.⁴⁶ Neferhotep III, for example, prefers to introduce this section with "hail to you", thereby highlighting the poetical aspect of the presentation. When we read the following line it becomes clear that the king is being saluted because of his military character and his close and loving relationship to Thebes, Amun, and his people. Therefore, it is not surprising to see that in the lunette the figure of Victorious Thebes appears on the left and the right, visually signaling the verbal orientation of the monument. According to Pascal Vernus, this royal eulogy was composed at a precise circumstance owing to the mention of particular (and striking) events.⁴⁷ In this case it is readily evident that the royal panegyric was composed and later made permanent in stone for a specific occasion; the verses do not merely serve as an atemporal or generalized account of the king's might.

A further badly preserved royal stela of the little-known Pharaoh Montuhotepi at Karnak similarly presents us with an encomium.⁴⁸ Here the tone and orientation of the composition differs somewhat from those XVIIIth examples that we have already covered. After a brief eulogistic introduction the king speaks to us in the first person and highlights his deeds, but all remains in the sphere of an official statement of the Pharaoh, in poetry, however. By line fourteen the praise of the king is emphasized, using the same formula that Ahmose had carved for his stela at Karnak. The orientation thus switches to one concentrated upon the people's loyalty to their sovereign, a theme common enough in the Middle Kingdom. One can add here two other eulogies from the same era: that of Rahotep and Neferhotep I.⁴⁹ Both place their praises within the more standard format of the *Königsnovelle*, and thus must be viewed differently that "bare" encomia that avoid mentioning any specific date and location.

46 Pascal Vernus, "La Stèle du roi Sekhensankhtaourê Neferhotep Iykhernofret et la domination Hyksôs (Stèle Caire JE 59635)", *ASAE* 68 (1982), pp. 129-135. Compare the remarks of Detlef Franke, "Erste und Zweite Zwischenzeit: Ein Vergleich", *ZÄS* 117 (1990), pp. 119-129.

47 *Ibid.*, 134-135.

48 Pascal Vernus, "La Stèle du Pharaon *Mntw-htp* à Karnak", *RdE* 40 (1989), pp. 145-161. Useful comments on this inscription will be found in Morenz, *Beiträge zur Schriftlichkeitskultur*, pp. 181-182. Following Vernus, he refers to the possible origins of the royal propaganda in early Dynasty XVIII as having already occurred in the preceding era.

49 Rahotep: Elke Blumenthal, "Die Koptosstele des Königs Rahotep (London U. C. 14327)", in: Erika Endesfelder, *et al.*, eds., *Ägypten und Kusch*, Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients 13, Berlin (1977), pp. 63-80; and Neferhotep I: Max Pieper, *Die grosse Inschrift des Königs Neferhotep in Abydos*, Leipzig (1929). A new translation of the latter is by William Kelly Simpson, in his edited volume, *The Literature of Ancient Egypt*³, New Haven and London (2003), pp. 339-344.

Both texts will be found in the compendium of Wolfgang Helck, *Historisch-biographische Texte der 2. Zwischenzeit und neue Texte der 18. Dynastie*, KÄT, Wiesbaden (1975), pp. 21-29 and 59-60.

That such encomia can be traced top many centuries before the commencement of Dynasty XVIII should not surprise us. The style of these second Intermediate Period compositions does, in fact, parallel that of the later periods of Egyptian history, thereby helping us to see how such hymns persisted with a standard method of presentation despite the earlier ones of Dynasty XII.⁵⁰ Assmann maintained that the nominal style of the various prayers and praises to gods was prominent at that time, and he further developed the themes of propaganda and kingship so prevalent in other literary compositions of that age.⁵¹ He further maintained that the laudative nature of the opening “May you be greeted”, etc., indicated, with the ensuing participial orientated structure, a stress upon the royal cult as well as the royal figure himself. Assmann claimed that in the Middle Kingdom, such eulogies were predominantly in the literature whereas hymns to gods would be found only in private tombs. For royal hymns of praise three specific localities can be determined: the literature (papyrus or on stone), the cult (as may be expected), and in a few cases in the private sphere.

Thus the expansion of the eulogistic discourse, easily traced back to early Dynasty XX in perhaps a more primitive form (e.g., the dependence upon *pw* sentences), must be seen in the light of the growing use of monumental inscriptions throughout the Nile Valley. How much this is due to the preservation of such text creates a quandary for the scholar, and it is fair to state that our written royal hieroglyphic material of the New Kingdom greatly dwarfs the extant Pharaonic stelae and wall inscriptions of the earlier ages of Egyptian history. Richard Parkinson, following to some extent Assmann’s studies, has recently contended that such Middle Kingdom eulogies arose from semi-cultic contexts.⁵² Certainly a detailed list of royal text from the end of Dynasty XI through the XIIth indicates that this period was not devoid in erecting numerous stone hieroglyphic compositions but we can note that hieratic documents as well contain such encomia.⁵³

50 In this context, see Parkinson’s remarks dealing with the connection of the Sporting King and later New Kingdom literature (with eulogies) in Loprieno, ed., *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, pp. 306-307. He argues that it is possible that “such eulogistic discourses could have been part of the literary canon by the end of the Middle Kingdom, although possibly no earlier than the second half of Dyn. XII”. In his *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt*, pp. 62-63, commemorative inscriptions earlier than late Dynasty XII are covered.

51 “Verkünden und Verklären”, in: Loprieno, ed., *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, pp. 313-321, provides a summary.

52 *Literature and Poetry in Middle Kingdom Egypt*, pp. 61 and 82. Note that he considers such hymns of praise can be textually “differentiated from works of literature in the narrow sense by the contextually determined manner of reception, by their decorum, and by not being fully fictionalized”. But equally the royal eulogies have a broad context insofar as they could be placed within different settings, e.g., within tales or the *Königsnovelle*.

53 Of course, this is to be expected, considering the means of transmission. My study cited in note 1 provides some of the key Ramesside examples among which we may cite: *KRI VI 17-25* (with Anthony J. Peden, *Egyptian Historical Texts of the Twentieth Dynasty*, Documenta Mundi

The Second Intermediate text P. BM EA 10475 apparently provided a narrative frame in which various eulogies to the king were enclosed.⁵⁴ Here, Parkinson's interpretation of the hieratic copy fits neatly into the presuppositions of this argument. His further remarks concerned the possible cultic use of such compositions, but Parkinson also cautioned against over-interpreting such encomia. In this literary text "the topic of the transition from past disorder to present order recalls the emplotment of royal commemorative inscriptions".⁵⁵ The Restoration Inscription of Tutankhamun comes immediately to mind; others can be added. Granted that the praise-song in his text is embedded within a commemorative narrative, the latter may have been fictionalized in order to allow the eulogy to stand out. Other possibilities were advanced by Parkinson in the context of this papyrus account; the compound of eulogy and narrative also present in the *Sporting King* and the *Pleasures of Fishing and Fowling* was specifically brought into discussion by him.⁵⁶

But the origins of the royal eulogy still need clarification. Assmann's points concerning their early Dynasty XII context have been presented earlier although I suspect that Nebhepetre Montuhotep's Ballas Inscription as well as Inyotef II's funerary inscriptions can offer some challenges to that interpretation. Parkinson, in contrast, proposed a link of royal teachings to royal eulogistic self-descriptions that in turn were dependent upon or "ultimately modeled on non-royal biographies".⁵⁷ Our brief analysis of the Ahmose stela and other Dynasty XVIII examples of monumental texts preserving eulogies leads to a complementary though not identical conclusion. I believe that at least some of the royal eulogies preserved on royal hieroglyphic monuments (for the most part they are contained on stelae) reflect an actual performance.

Aegyptiaca 3, Jonslered [1994], pp. 151-174 and *The Reign of Ramesses IV*, Warminster [1994], p. 35; and Virginia Condon, *Seven Royal Hymns of the Ramesside Period*, MÄS 37, Munich and Berlin [1978] with Kitchen's review in: *Or* 48 [1979], pp. 417-418); *KRI VI* 332-334, 390-396 for the royal encomia; see his translation in *Poetry of Ancient Egypt*, pp. 227-240 (visit to Thebes for P. Turin Cat. 1886 = CG N. 54301 verso); *KRI VI* 68-69 (O. Turin N. 57011 recto: Susanne Bickel and Bernard Mathieu, "L'écivain Amennakht et son enseignement", *BIFAO* 93 [1993], pp. 41-43; and Kitchen, *Poetry in Ancient Egypt*, pp. 215-220); *KRI VI* 70-76 (P. Turin Cat. 1882 recto; most recently, Peden, *The Reign of Ramesses IV*, pp. 53-54 and 103-109; and Sir Alan Gardiner, "A Pharaonic Encomium (II)", *JEA* 42 [1956], pp. 8-20); *KRI VI* 227-229 (P. Chester Beatty I, verso B^{I-III} 1-33); *KRI VI* 152-154, and 373.

Additional eulogies can be marshaled to supplement this brief list. For example, those in the Late Egyptian Miscellanies come to mind, and they are especially important insofar as the method of transmission was in hieratic on papyrus. For the latter situation, see Stephen Quirke, "Archive", in: Loprieno, ed., *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, pp. 379-401.

54 See note 6 above.

55 Redford's comments cited above in note 43 are worthwhile in this context.

56 *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt*, pp. 111 and 311-312.

57 *Ibid.*, 240; compare Detlef Franke, "'Schöpfer, Schützer, Guter Hirte': Zum Königsbild des Mittleren Reiches", in: Rolf Gundlach and Christine Raedler, eds., *Selbstverständnis und Realität*, ÄAT 36/1, Wiesbaden (1997), pp. 175-209.

Others are, of course, located within a framework of an overarching format. The opening eulogy of Ramesses II in the Poem to the Battle of Kadesh is an excellent example of this. Eulogies can be found as well in the mouths of courtiers in various *Königsnovelle* texts, but whether they are “true to life” insofar as they reflect the actual words of the king’s upper echelon can be doubted. Those inscriptions are well crafted and carefully structured in arrangement, format, and focus, with the king’s specific deeds forming the purpose of the narrative.

Eulogies, then, could be employed in various settings: fictional (*Cheops and the Magicians*; *Sinuhe*), historical (*Königsnovelle*), cultic memorials (the stela of Ahmose, the Third Pylon Inscription of Amunhotep III), war records (*Kadesh Poem*), and the like. By themselves, the hieroglyphic exemplars of the New Kingdom do not regularly provide us with a definition of this presumed genre that could be used in many contexts. Ahmose stela is a very helpful case in point because it plunges the reader into a series of attributive hymns to the ruler. Only subsequently does one meet up with a propagandistic-loyalistic section in which the emphasis is upon the king’s own powers that should be recognized. Yet that portion of the monument in conjunction with the following poetical hymn to the queen mother at least alerts us to the role of both royal participants. The final cultic activities of the Pharaoh, forming a moderately sized subsection to the whole composition, does duty as the main actor in a play; this is what the stela was, after all, presenting. In other words, the lack of any specific heading, a rubric, or a title to the opening hymn of praise is not altogether crucial.

The connection between royal panegyrics and Recitations that are meant to be listened to leads us to one of the useful distinguishing characteristics that Parkinson addressed. This “praise poetry”, to use Christopher Eyre’s term, also may be found in writing in non-royal tombs.⁵⁸ If an Egyptian official presented his deeds in the context of what his ruler desired, then the situation arises concerning these eulogies. That they differ among them in orientation and structure has already been brought out in this discussion. Additional Ramesside examples will be presented below that further explore this aspect. For the moment, however, let me concentrate myself of this oral aspect of the formal encomia. In his analysis Eyre concentrated upon two inscriptions that to him exhibited this normal public aspect: the Gebal Barkal Stela of Thutmose III and the Loyalist Instruction. He pointed out the interaction between the king with his self-praise and the non-royal participants, and ended up by noting the common “rhetorical” texts of Dynasties XIX and XX that provide a large number of these composition. But even here he indicated that a final resolution concerning when royal

58 Eyre, “Is Egyptian Historical Literature ‘Historical’ or ‘Literary’?”, in: Loprieno, ed., *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, pp. 418-423.

performances took place is unclear. Moreover, as Eyre remarked, we can never be sure whether they took place on a specific occasion in front of an audience.

The key issue of actual authorship “at the point of interaction between the oral performance and the written text” remains murky. To search for antecedents within the Middle Kingdom cultic hymns of praise or those provided on non-royal stelae – for example see Louvre C 30 – may allow us to find parallels to the later eulogies.⁵⁹ On the other hand, as Eyre has indicated, a strict definition according to genre may not be appropriate. It is thus useful to remember Assmann’s “open” definition of the eulogy format where various type of oral acts could be subsumed: doxologies, aretologies, and to use his term “Gebet-Epikleses”. To him, the crux of the matter lay with the general aspect of naming (“nennen”).⁶⁰

The Ramesside examples of a later date equally reveal mixtures of performance. A stela of Ramesses IV from Abydos, reinterpreted by Francesco Tiradritti, is claimed to “be related the typical method of propaganda of the end of the New Kingdom”.⁶¹ For our purposes it suffices to state that the account is no hymn by a monument of the king’s personal relations to his god. P. Turin 1882 presents an encomium spoken by the Pharaoh in praise of Amun-Re. Perhaps it is not surprising that the praises can be set into one previously known portion in a well-known hieratic document of a historical nature. Private encomia are also extant from this period: see one Turin ostrakon in honor of Ramesses IV written by a scribe at Deir el Medineh. “The long and interesting text” of P. Turin Cat. 1882 recto is probably the best-known exemplar of a Dynasty XX eulogy, and here the historical background can be argued to be associated with the king’s accession.⁶² Ramesses IV, speaking in the first person, extols (*swšš*) his father Amun-Re just as other hymns of the same time period, almost written in hieratic, allow us to see that the so-called genre of the eulogy did not forsake this fulsome praise of the reigning Pharaoh. The use of the word “extol” immediately calls to mind the prayer of Ramesses III to Amun at Karnak that was originally recorded on a table of gold or silver, and presumably kept in safekeeping at that temple; see the opening phrase *wšš ḥknw swšš nb ntrw*.⁶³

59 For Louvre C 30: Assmann, *Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete*², pp. 464-466.

60 *Ibid.*, 58-60. For “nennen”, see as well Assmann, *Liturgische Lieder*, pp. 90-91 with note 53 (in the oldest liturgies; names in a formula).

61 “‘I Have not Diverted My Inundation’. Legitimacy and the Book of the Dead in a Stela of Ramesses IV from Abydos”, in: *L’Impero Ramesside, Vicino Oriente – Quaderno 1*, Rome (1997), pp. 193-203. His later analysis, “Lecture et sens des scènes dans les stèles royales de la XXe Dynastie”, *TdE 1* (2002), pp. 103-111, presents a more general study in which the scenes (e.g., in the lunettes) relates to the ensuing narrative below.

62 See the references in note 53 and add Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists, Annals and Day Books*, p. 192 note 203.

63 *KRI V* 221-226. The word *swšš*, “to adore” (*KRI V* 221.9/10), has been discussed by Assmann in his *Hymnen und Gebete*² as well as in *Liturgische Lieder*; add Eyre, “Is Historical Literature

But we have proceeded too far in considering the numerous other hymns and prayers of ancient Egypt and the detailed compendiums of Assmann more than suffice to resolve many of these important points. Yet before acquitting myself of the purpose of this paper let me return to the useful points concerning Ramesside eulogies on stone upon which Eyre briefly remarked.⁶⁴ As is well-known many of the monumental texts of this period include quite lengthy introductions in a eulogistic format that are connected by theme, but not obviously by style, to the ensuing historical narrative. The Battle of Kadesh Poem is the most prominent among them owing to its importance in the field. From section 7 until 24 a separate section was created, hallmarked by an introductory *ỉst* and ending with the king's cartouches, undoubtedly read in the vocative. Here, the style of presentation is quite different from the narrative per se, being oriented to the common eulogistic style of Participles Relative Forms commonly employed as developed praises to the king⁶⁵. There is little doubt that this passage was simply embedded into the whole account and thus it does not reflect an actual performance. Even more blatant an approach can be found on the various exemplars of the same monarch's First Hittite Marriage.⁶⁶ Following upon the date and five-fold titulary some lines continue with a series of epithets. But that actual lengthy encomium soon takes over, purposely introduced by *hʒty-ꜥ m mnw pn mnḥ n sꜥ pḥty n nb ḥpš* the structure of the praise is composed by small hymns of praise, each separate from the one following through the dividing "line" of cartouches. (See as well the so-called "Blessing of Ptah".)⁶⁷

This Ramesside approach to expanding the introductions to historical accounts by employing opening eulogies is no more evidence that in the series of war records left to us by Ramesses III.⁶⁸ The major historical inscriptions, that of years five, eight, and eleven are identical in structure. After the date and some introductory laudatory epithets the narrative core presents the account of the campaign, itself then followed

'Political' or 'Literary'?', in: Loprieno, ed., *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, p. 425. Old remarks of Keith C. Seele on this monument will be found in his "A Hymn to Amon-Re on a Tablet from the temple of Karnak", in: Lewis Gaster Leary, ed., *From the Pyramids to Paul. Studies in Theology, Archaeology, and Related Subjects*, New York (1935), pp. 224-241, especially page 233. Assmann, *Liturgische Lieder*, p. 118 note 20, discusses the core verb, *wʒš*.

64 "Is Historical Literature 'Political' or 'Literary'?", in: Loprieno, ed., *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, pp. 427-428.

65 For the Relative Forms in eulogies, see Assmann's comments cited in note 7 above.

66 *KRI* II 233-257.

67 *KRI* II 262-281. An extremely important commentary on this text is that of Kitchen, *Ramesside Inscriptions. Translated and Annotated. Notes and Comments* II, pp. 159-165. Note that it is always "paired off", to use Kitchen's phrase, with the First Hittite Marriage. The structure of the composition is also covered by him. Earlier, William F. Edgerton and John Wilson, *Historical Records of Ramses III*, SAOC 12, Chicago (1936), pp. 119-120, presented a historical backdrop to the origin of the text.

68 Anthony Spalinger, "A Sequence System", *RdE* 38 (1988), pp. 107-129.

by additional rhetoric in a eulogistic style. Here once more the structure of the royal encomia are at odds with the ensuing narrative. Indeed, the grammatical set-up of the historical section differs considerably from that contained in the encomia. In many ways Ramesses III's eulogies present in these war inscriptions continues a style also known from the Late Egyptian Miscellanies and, to take a case in point, those eulogies present in the Kadesh Poem and other earlier Dynasty XIX monumental texts (e.g., those of Seti I).

By and large these Ramesside eulogies are written in a more formal and classical style. It is not surprising to meet various moribund verbal formations such as the Predicative *sdm.n.f* or even a *sdm.n.f* Relative Form. The choice of vocabulary as well is more reflective of earlier times, and these "inserted" eulogies parallel to no small extent those of the XVIIIth Dynasty, thereby indicating that they were expressly composed within a formal and non-colloquial setting. Perhaps one might argue that Late Egyptian or even a "modified" version of it suitable for monumental discourse – the "Language of Tradition" – was not suitable for such encomia as it lacked the terseness of the Classical Idiom or else did not have many centuries of practice behind it.

Those Ramesside eulogies preserved on papyrus fortunately enable us to see the actual dissemination of such literary works and sometimes to hypothesize a *Sitz im Leben* for them. As often stressed here, we are always at a loss to find such historical settings for eulogies contained on stelae or in wall inscriptions. With these monumental accounts, however, it seems best to maintain that many eulogies, especially those used as introductory portions of Ramesside inscriptions such as the First Hittite Marriage, were literary creations, and owing to their pertinence to the following narrative account some of them can be placed within the historical setting of the actual written response to an event. That is to say, a certain number of these encomia were drawn up for a specific occurrence. But whether they were presented with the following historical narrative is another matter. Here, as well, we cannot be sure of their actual use. Whereas it is relatively easy to set aside the eulogy in the Kadesh Poem or even that in the account of the First Marriage Stela, other cases are not as simple to resolve. Nevertheless, I feel that these Ramesside hymns to the Pharaoh are to be placed within one genre that remained alive throughout the New Kingdom (and later).

The question of actual performance, a thorn in the side of much research dealing with ancient Egyptian literature, has a frequent theme in this discussion. It goes without saying that this problem exists as well for those eulogies of the Middle Kingdom. Assmann highlighted certain stylistic peculiarities of Dynasty XII encomia, especially their preference for the nominal phrase *N + pw*. Such passages are rare in the New Kingdom, and seem to highlight a new subsection (or verse) of the poem. To some degree he indicated the actual recitation that could have been accomplished by a

speaker using this construction, but we could say the same for the more complex usages with attributive Participles and the like. Clearly, the original *Sitz im Leben* for many of these hymns remains elusive to us. But the presence of available or even “ready-to-order” eulogies is a conclusion that warrants more study. If the author of the Kadesh Poem had at his fingertips royal eulogies that he could sift through and chose in order to provide an introduction to his lengthy war composition, and if such eulogies circulated outside of a thing elite at the court – the Late Egyptian Miscellanies tend to prove this contention –, then we must attempt or determine where, exactly, were such hymns kept.

Assmann’s preference was to assign literature to the framework of the school with the court then propagating the texts.⁶⁹ But this interpretation surely fails to take into consideration the efflorescence of culture in its multifaceted framework that is one of the hallmarks of the New Kingdom. For that reason I fail to see how his investigation holds true for the eulogies of the New Kingdom. When one was drawn up for a specific event how did the act of creation occur? The motive force was surely the pharaoh and not the school. Those two small eulogies of kings Neferhotep III and Montuhotepi dating from the Second Intermediate Period appear to be connected to some martial success of the specific ruler and not dependent upon mere “learning”. The same may be said with regard to an interesting graffito found by John Darnell at the Wadi el-Hol.⁷⁰ In the latter case not only is there a military aspect to the literary presentation, but it is readily ascertainable that we are witness to an encomium to the living Pharaoh in which the Theban ruler is praised. And even if the transference or transmutation of such hymns to a rock inscription may be considered by some to be unusual, there is little doubt that such literary presentations enjoyed a broader basis with Egyptian society than at first we would expect.⁷¹

If we adhere to the relatively narrow working definition of literature as advocated by Ludwig Morenz and Stephen Quirke, among others, these encomia ought to be excluded because there remains the problem of their demarcation from the non-literary sphere.⁷² Yet the Miscellanies contain many such hymns even though it may be argued that they had “lost” or else do not contain an original performance context. (It should be understood that I believe these Dynasty XIX texts not to be mere schoolboy compositions.)

69 Parkinson, *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt*, pp. 18, 35, and 69.

70 *Ibid.*, 61; John Coleman Darnell, “A New Middle Egyptian Literary Text from the Wadi el-Hol”, *JARCE* 34 (1997), pp. 85-100; and the translation by Kitchen, *Poetry of Ancient Egypt*, pp. 159-162.

71 Parkinson, *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt*, pp. 61 and 73.

72 *Ibid.*, pp. 29-36 and 60-61, for a useful analysis of genre, intertextuality, and literature per se.

By the New Kingdom it is probable that the texts of royal monumental inscriptions of a commemorative nature were circulated, by means of hieratic documents, through the land.⁷³ We must also keep in mind that there were temple libraries as well as palace ones, but these eulogies also belonged to the literary corpus of the Ramesside Period. But even in the Middle Kingdom literary texts could include eulogies, thereby indicating their “semi-cultic” context, although, as Parkinson has shown, the style of this period’s writing reveals an oral-performative setting. But let us not forget that there are “apparent quotations of ‘The Eloquent Peasant’” within this stela of Ahmose.⁷⁴ Indeed, as the personal library of the Deir el Medineh workman Qenherkhepeshef shows, a considerably broad-based collection of literary texts could be assembled in which Miscellany-texts (including eulogies) as well as the Kadesh Poem were found. Such cases indicate that *belles-lettres* of diverse epochs were known to the composers of these encomia.

At the risk of emphasizing too many connections between later encomia of Roman society and our Egyptian ones, it may not be out of place to review the question of orality with regard to such hymns. A recent study of Pliny’s *Panegyricus* provides a useful corollary to our analysis.⁷⁵ This individual was able to compose private speeches, later reworked for publication, as well as ones geared to an actual performance. He was furthermore not only concerned with the occasion of the oral performance but was also occupied with later recitations, circulation of the texts, and the final draft of the written version. The example of Pliny’s method of composition, the related question of the actual event of performance, and the final version may provide a useful analogy to our eulogies. We have seen that behind the final version, which usually but not always was either embedded within a framework often narrative or placed, usually at the beginning, in a context at variance to an oral presentation, must have been a prepared hieratic hymn of praise. But the extensive use to which Egyptian royal hymns of praise could be placed is at odds to the Roman method of composition, revision, and final edition. Unfortunately, we do not know the authors of these panegyrics even though their employ within the inscription can be related to the theme of that monument. See once more the Ahmose Stela. Yet the frequent lengthy encomia that are to be found in Ramesside monumental texts, plus the helpful evidence from the hieratic Late Egyptian Miscellanies, at least allows us to make the tentative

73 *Ibid.*, p. 68; see as well pages 57, 61 and 63, and 69-70.

74 Richard B. Parkinson, “The History of a Poem: Middle Kingdom Literary Manuscripts and their Reception”, in: Günter Burkard, *et al.*, eds., *Kon-Texte. Akten des Symposiums “Spurensuche – Altägypten im Spiegel seiner Texte”*, ÄAT 60, Wiesbaden (2004), p. 60, referring to Morenz, *Beiträge zur Schriftlichkeitskultur*, Wiesbaden (1996), pp. 182-183.

75 The crucial study on this matter is referred to above in note 34.

conclusion that such eulogies were preferred if not rigorously demanded by the rulers of Egypt at that time.

To place these encomia into one genre may seem hazardous, especially in the context of Parkinson's most recent formulations. Eyre, when discussing historical literature, advanced the same argument. For him, it was all too common that "A mixture of genres and an episodic structure are characteristic features of Egyptian literature".⁷⁶ Have we not seen that the eulogies could be located within a global narrative framework. Sinuhe comes automatically to mind; other examples were stressed by Parkinson. The presence of eulogies in the *Königsnovelle* corpus has been remarked upon frequently, and Eyre has seen that even the newly edited Tod Inscription of Sesostris I fits perfectly into this recognized framework. But because a royal eulogy need not be so firmly placed in space and time, it could be used for an introduction to varying royal monumental texts. I have already noted this behavior with respect to many of the Ramesside hieroglyphic texts but nonetheless did point out that some of the hymns do provide a topical link with the ensuing narrative. Nonetheless, with the *Königsnovelle* the eulogies are located within the historical narrative and placed in the mouths of various non-royal personages. It still remains that case that here an overlap between such historical inscriptions and eulogies devoid of a specific temporal and special setting occurs, thereby providing additional support to Parkinson and Eyre's comments concerning the flexible or porous boundaries of so-called genres.

I do not think we can regard the incorporation of the eulogy in Ahmose's stela as an example of fictionality although I agree with one scholar that a historical monumental inscription need not automatically indicate that a performance took place. Is the context of the Gebel Barkal Stela fiction? Its literary structure notwithstanding, and its location taken into consideration, I still feel that it records events at that site with the Pharaoh in the forefront during some type of dedication. In similar fashion, the Dedicatory Inscription of Ramesses II, clearly written by an expert, records the king's visit at Abydos and his building plans for the future. We may disagree over the veracity of this *Königsnovelle* account and in fact consider the eulogies to the monarch as creations of a literary artist, but surely this deserved skepticism need not imply that *some* paean of praise to Ramesses occurred there. After all, we are dealing with an archaic ruler-state lead by a chief who was divine and untouchable. How else could the king be addressed after he propounded his plan? (Note that such *Königsnovelle* inscriptions *never* reveal any opposition; the latter occur only within a military context.)

76 "Is Historical Literature 'Political' or 'Literary'?", in: Loprieno, ed., *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, p. 429.

The somewhat fluid boundary that exists between the eulogies *per se* and their presence within the *Königsnovelle* texts exhibits the ever-present situation that literary genres are not independent units in and among themselves. That various monumental hieroglyphic inscriptions containing far different approaches could employ eulogies as part of their presentation indicates that such hymns were both available to a master composer and able to be embedded into a historical narrative. Whereas it is the case that the Ramesside kings frequently employed such literary compositions, or at least part of them, for their introduction sections of narrative accounts, the Late Egyptian Miscellanies at least show us that quite a number, even short ones, could be written down on papyri and circulated within some elite milieu. Yet many of those monumental texts lack specificity with regard to their official setting whereas the *Königsnovelle* inscriptions reveal a definite time and place, and automatically alert us to the royal aims. I suspect that additional historical and literary research is necessary to enable us to untangle the seemingly recondite nature of these royal encomia.

Titulary

Horus:	Great of manifestations (programmic statement of king)
Two Ladies:	Complete of birth (ready for action?)
Golden Horus:	Who ties together the Two Lands (kingship; arrival to throne)
King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands:	Neb-pehety-Re (typical X-Y-Re name; stress on might)
Son of Re whom he loves:	Ahmose, who lives forever.

Eulogy

Beloved of Amun-Re, son of his body;

His heir whom he placed on his throne (additional details).

COUPLET: theological-political stress; probable setting at Karnak; additional details relating to accession.

The good (complete) god in truth, extensive of arm(s);

There is no falsehood in him.

COUPLET: truth and dominion; opens with “good god”; the second verse is short and completes the ideas.

The powerful one when he acts as Re,

Two offspring of Geb; his heir who exalts in joy.

COUPLET: conception of king; two parallel clauses (circumstantial and relative), both connected with deities but note Re; this is a theme which is then developed further on.

The (re-)incarnation of Re whom he created.

The avenger whom he placed on earth.

COUPLET: king to Re; two *s_dm.n.f* Relative Forms; the avenger theme, a strong one, is indicated in the second verse that indicates the purpose or role of the Pharaoh.

Who illuminates kingship, lord of joy;

Who places “breath” at the noses of women.

COUPLET: two Participles; concepts of joy and kingship resumed; implicit reference to king as Horus; positive attributes of ruler; the “breath of life” is indicated, a theme that is resumed two verses on; the balance is Participles + bimembral phrase/prepositional phrase; extremely unusual theme in the second verse, indicating a very high degree of beneficence.

Powerful of strength, who suppresses rebellion,
Who gives life, who establishes truth.

COUPLET: Participles again, four of them; physical power indicated, but then beneficence; negative to enemies but positive in behavior as well; alliteration in second verse.

King of kings in all foreign lands,
Sovereign, l.p.h., who subdues the two riverbanks.

COUPLET: royal living attributes stressed; traditional references to total kingship over all lands and peoples; prepositional phrase balanced by Participle; this section may belong to the next.

Great of majesty, powerful of appearances,
Among/with the bowing,
And/When their gods are under life and dominion.

TRIPLET (?): This is a difficult passage; enjambment may be present; the last verse refers to the weakness and submission of the enemies (?).

One in heaven, second on earth,
Whose splendor has engendered light.

COUPLET: Stress upon the qualities of the sun – the sun god Re; the king is his “second” in the earthly sphere; note the second verses with the Relative Form that is heavy enough to balance the Preceding two simple bimembral (adverbial) phrases.

The beloved one of Amun, who establishes offices like the Beautiful-of-Face”,
The lord of years like the majesty of Re.

COUPLET: The major three gods of all of Egypt are indicated: Amun (the first), Ptah, and Re; Amun relationship with the king is personal, whereas Ptah (referred to through his epithet) is connected to the functional duties of humankind (or the elite), and Re is logically connected to time; the second half of both verses works with a participle plus prepositional phrase (long line) and

a simple prepositional phrase (short line in antithesis); two concluding similes; *Nfr-hr* is balanced by *hm n Rc*; second word in each verse is plural; some indirect alliteration (*mn* and *nb*).

Who causes each god to “know” his shrine,
And the festival hall/court of every god.

POSSIBLE COUPLET: A sudden switch to the king’s beneficent relations to the gods of Egypt; i.e., to their cultic importance; some alliteration.

King in Pe, the ruler in Egypt,
Baulk of heaven, oar of earth,
When he has ruled what the Aten encircles.

TRIPLET: Play on the initial consonants of “p” and “t”; first verse runs from specific (age-old concept) to general whereas the second moves from the other (= above)-wordly to the “here”; the orientation of the Pharaoh is upon his role in Egypt as well; see the age-old city Pe where Horus ruled; *nswt* is more significant than *hqʿ*; the final verse “encircles” the first two; it may be fully predicative with no pluperfect tense.

The white crown and the red crown are firm on his head,
The two portions of Horus and Seth are under his command.

COUPLET: A clear indication of the power of the king’s rule; the dualities are self-evident: the insignia precede the domains on earth.

Appearing/Shining of forms in his youth,
Wondrous/Marvelous in each hour of his.

COUPLET: the main concept is still connected to time and appearance and hence to the sun; the youthful lifetime of the king is indicated; the first half of verse one is long and thus balances the second half of verse two.

Lord of the white crown, high of feathers,
The power of Wadjyt is on his face as Horus
After he has ruled his two lands.

TRIPLET (?): the final passage must be pluperfect; it concludes the passage; one might interpret the second and third line as a lengthy verse; crucial insignia of kingship; possible indirect reference to Amun at the beginning.

Sovereign, l.p.h., who takes the crowns in Chemmis,

Lord of appearance(s), Horus enduring of love.

COUPLET: an effective balancing of verse one (one long passage) and two (two short phrases); some alliteration.

To whom the southerners, northerners, easterners and westerners come,
And he remains as/the lord who established/s his two lands,
After he had seized the inheritance of he who engendered him,

TRIPLET (?): new and different style play on *mn*.

Before whom all people retreat,
After his august father has given it to him,

COUPLET: same arrangement as the previous one; the “it” is the inheritance.

And he has grasped the sun folk and seized the people
And the patricians – they given to him praise.

COUPLET: fronting at end; the “elite” in the traditional sense render praise; note the initial *iw sdm.n.f*, a fit ending to this lengthy section.

Every one says – “He is our lord!”
The Haunebu say – “We shall follow him!”
All the lands say – “We will belong to him!”

TRIPLET (?): an interjection forming a hiatus within the eulogy.

He is a king,
Whom Re caused to rule, whom Amun magnified,
They give to him the riverbanks and the flat lands together, upon which Re
shines.

COUPLET (?): note the concluding *sdm.n.f* Relative Form; I assume that the beginning N + *pw* serves as a heading.

The foreigners are coming in humility/penance
Standing at his gate.

COUPLET: If this is correct, then the idea is rendered abruptly; the concept is based on petitions of a “legal” fashion.

His slaughter is within Khenethennefer,
And his fame is within the Fenchu lands.

COUPLET: first south, then north; undefined localities in their respective *ultima thules*.

The fear of his majesty in within this land,
As Min in the year of his coming.

COUPLET: this one and the previous play emphasis upon the king's might; both may be placed together to form a single couplet.

They fetch beautiful gifts, laden with impost for the king,
When he proceeds, his archers are on his two sides as the moon in the middle of the stars.

COUPLET: the last image is quite striking; circumstantial clause with Stative.

Beautiful of bearing at going forth
Peaceful of stride, firm of soles

COUPLET: a simple one and composed of common motifs; possibly compounded together with the following verse attached.

The "support" of Re alights on him (or: upon whom the support of Re alights),
And Amun is his protection,
His August father who loves him making the road for him.

TRIPLET (?): Amun is second in order but first in importance; see the last comment. Note how long is this "quote". The two riverbanks say:

Would that we could see him!
All people filled with his love.

COUPLET with a circumstantial clause in the second verse; see the Stative; note the idea of "bodies" being filled.

Two eyes are staring at this king,
Hearts are leaping for him.

COUPLET: possibly connected with the following; the return to the eyes of mankind follows.

He is seen like Re when he rises,
As when the Aten shines, when Khepri appears in the two eyes.

COUPLET: the morning and the sun disk stressed.

His rays are in faces as Atum in the eastern heaven,
And ostriches dance in the valleys.

COUPLET: unless combined with the following two verses; morning is again indicated.

As sun's radiance shines in the middle of the day,
And all worms are heated.

COUPLET: the mover to the zenith; Stative.

The sole king whom Sothis has taught,
Who is praised by Seshat

COUPLET: probable; common alliteration; effects of the two
gods upon the ruler.

The majesty of Thoth is on his two sides
He has given to him wisdom,
He guides scribes to accounts.

TRIPLET: unless the latter two verses are joined together.

He is “Great-of-Magic”,
The possessor of love more than all kings.

COUPLET: the positive aspects of Werethekau are indicated.

And he causes hearts to give praise to him,
While hearts are joyful in bodies.

COUPLET: with the two words for hearts; joy, engendered by
the Pharaoh, is the final theme.