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I

It was generally assumed that the funerary beliefs of the Ancient Egyptians had undergone significant changes under the influence of the social upheaval following the collapse of the Old Kingdom, and the so-called "democratization of the hereafter" was taken as one of the important elements of such changes.¹ This "democratization" was seen as a result of the downfall of royalty, and as the usurpation of the royal privileges for the eternal life by the nobles, who had usurped the spells of the Pyramid Texts for their Coffin Texts.

Such a traditional view has been recently challenged significantly. It has been noted that the royal offering list and some funerary rites, originally for the king, were already used by the nobles in the 5th Dynasty (abbreviated as Dyn. 5 hereafter).² This suggests that the process of "democratization" began much earlier than previously supposed. In his recent study about Middle Kingdom coffins, Willems revealed that the earliest Coffin Texts had originated in southern Upper Egypt independently from the Pyramid Texts, and that most of the Coffin Texts should be dated to the Middle Kingdom rather than to the First Intermediate Period (abbreviated as F. I. P. hereafter).³ Willems's study thus shows that the Coffin Texts should not be taken as the examples of the usurpation of royal prerogatives during the F. I. P.

These observations above seem to warrant reconsideration of the change in funerary beliefs following the Old Kingdom.⁴ This study's aim is, however, moderate. It does not aim at a comprehensive reconsideration
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of this problem, but intends to point out an aspect of such a change. In
the late Old Kingdom, particularly from the middle of Dyn. 6, many nobles
settled in the provinces and built their tombs there rather than around the
pyramid of their royal master as before, and this fact has been generally
taken to show such nobles’ stronger ties with their home nomes than with
the king, or a sign of decentralization.(5) If this interpretation is correct,
and considering the strong influence that the king exercised on the hereafter
of his people in the Old Kingdom,(6) it will be likely that some change can
be observed between the funerary beliefs expressed in the tomb inscriptions
of the Memphite necropolis around the pyramids and those of the provincial
necropolises. This study intends to show that, as a part of such a change,
local deities(7) gained certain significance as the patron deities of the deceased
in the provinces.

The existence of the local trend in the funerary belief after the F. I.
P. has been made clear through the studies of the Middle Kingdom Coffins.
It has been observed that certain spells of the Middle Kingdom Coffin Texts
appear only in certain areas, and local deities appear among the patron
deities of the deceased in those spells and in the funerary formulae on the
coffins of Dyn. 12.(8) This and the above-mentioned independent origin of
the Coffin Texts seem to prove the importance of the local funerary tradition
in the Middle Kingdom.

We intend to show that an aspect of such a local funerary belief, the
cult of local deities as the patrons of the deceased, might date back to the
period from Dyn. 6 to the F. I. P.

II

Among the formulae in the private tomb inscriptions, the \textit{im3hw}
phrases, in which the deceased are called those who are \textit{im3hw} with (\textit{im3hw}
\textit{hr}) deities, the king or the other people, might be taken as the evidence
for the relation between the deceased and their patron deities.(9) Helck
argued that this \textit{im3hw} had originally meant “being well provided with
(the tomb, mortuary offerings etc.)” and that its meaning was only later
changed to more spiritual “being respected, honoured etc.”.(10) This inter-
pretation of \textit{im3hw} seems to have been generally accepted until recently.(11)

If such an interpretation of \textit{im3hw} were right, the deities with whom
the deceased are *im3hw* could be considered as the patron deities who provide the deceased with requirements for the hereafter, through the reversion of offerings from the temples, for example. However, certain doubt about such a view was recently given by Lapp. He doubts that *im3hw* can mean "provided", on the ground of several expressions, attested after Dyn. 5, in which a certain person, for example the son of the tomb owner, is said to have built the tomb for the latter, and the phrase *r im3h · f hr · f*, or its variation follows. Helck rendered this phrase as "being based on that he (=the person who built the tomb) had been well provided (for his own tomb and offerings) by him (=the tomb owner in his life)", and interpreted the whole as showing that the one built the tomb as a return for the provision for his own burial. This interpretation, however, should be refuted on the ground of the existence of the parallel in which the widow is said to have built the tomb for her husband, and *r im3h · f hr · s* following, which should be rendered as "according to his (=husband's) honour (or, being honoured) with her (=the widow)", as Lapp noted. Thus, the phrase in question should be considered as reflecting the friendly relation between the tomb owner and the tomb builder rather than the latter's debt to the former.

Consequently, the *im3hw hr* should be treated as a rather ambiguous epithet reflecting the tomb owner's good relation with somebody, whether it's in the former's lifetime or not. It's true that most of the deities mentioned in this phrase are funerary deities as Lapp noted, and they are clearly the patrons of the deceased. However, it's also clear that the phrase *im3hw hr* preceding some deity itself, as often found in a series of the epithets and titles of the tomb owner, does not necessarily reflect the role of the deity as the patron of the deceased (i.e. to protect and support the tomb owner after his death and in the hereafter) when the deity is not generally known as a funerary one.

On the other hand, the deities appearing in the funerary formulae, consisting of the *htp-di-nswt* formula and a series of 'Bitten' following it, can be clearly considered as the patron deities of the deceased even when they are not general funerary deities. Therefore, it seems to be safer to exclude *im3hw hr+deity* phrase from our objects of investigation except when it occurs in the funerary formula.

The *htp-di-nswt* formula in the Old Kingdom, which generally takes
the form $htp\ di\ nsbt$ followed by the phrase $htp\ di#$ the name of deity, has been generally rendered as "a boon which the king gives, a boon which" deity "gives" or the like, and represents the idea that the deceased receive some favour from the king and certain deities.(20) Although such favours were probably just ideal ones in most cases, they sometimes took the form of real gifts, and funerary offerings, the burial, the funerary ritual and even the posthumous promotion of the tomb owner were shown as the royal gifts.(21) In some cases, funerary offerings were described as the gifts from the deity, and at least a part of them might be considered as real ones from the temple.(22)

The deity in this formula of the Memphite necropolis is mostly Anubis, or Osiris, while the other deity is relatively rare, and is mostly the minor funerary deity like Khenty-Amentyw,(23) or otherwise, "Great God" (ntr c3)(24) who is prominent in the following ‘Bitten’ and will be treated later.

Among ‘Bitten’, a series of wishes of the deceased, the patron deities of the deceased appear in some formulae including the most basic ones, like those which concern invocation offerings and burial. In these formulae, the deceased person wishes to receive the offerings etc., and is assured of it "with/under" (hr) or as "the honoured one with/under" (im3hw hr) or as "the possessor of honour with/under" (nb im3h hr) etc. such a patron deity. As the patron deity in such formulae in the Memphite necropolis, Great God most frequently appears, the examples of whose occurrences are shown below.

(A) The examples of the formulae about "invocation offerings" (prt-hrw)(25) with Great God.

(a) "May the voice (of invocation) be raised for her (pr nEs hrw) every day (she being) as the honoured one under Great God."(26)
(b) "May the invocation offerings be to (prt-hrw n) the honoured one under Great God <the name of the tomb owner>"(27)
(c) "The invocation offerings of (prt-hrw nt) the honoured one under Anubis, and under Great God, Lord of heaven <the titles and name of the tomb owner>."(28)

(B) The examples of the formula about burial in which Great God appears.

(a) "May he be buried (krs ti f) in the necropolis of the western desert as the possessor of honour under Great God, having been happily and greatly old."(29)
(b) "May he be buried (krs4w) in the necropolis of the western desert, having been happily and greatly old, and under Great God."(30)
(c) "May his tomb be given to him, and burial there also (rdiw n · f iz · f krs4t im · f), having been happily old, and under Great God, Lord of burial."(31)
(C) The examples of the other formulae in which Great God appears.
(a) "May he travel (hp · f) in peace under Great God, on the beautiful roads of the West on which the honoured ones (regularly) travel."(32)
(b) "May his honour be with (wn im3h · f hr) Great God."(33)
(c) "May his document (or, arm?) be accepted by (szp · ti c · f in) Great God."(34)

The other patron deities in these formulae in the Memphite necropolis are those who are generally considered as funerary deities, like Anubis, Osiris, and Ptah-Sokar, or Re, a cosmic deity, but they appear far less frequently than Great God, and furthermore, none of them appear in all the formulae above.(35) It should be also noted that Great God is the only deity occurring in the formula "May he mount up to Great God." (icr · f n ntr c3).(36)

The observations above show that, as the patron deity in the funerary formulae of the Memphite necropolis, funerary deities, Re, and Great God appear, and that Great God assumed a particularly extensive role among them. Such an importance of this deity in Residence is also attested in the threat formulae(37) from the Memphite necropolis, in which Great God often appears as the deity who passes judgement on tomb violators, or on those who enter the tomb in impurity.(38) No other deity assumes this function in the Memphite necropolis apart from ambiguous "god" (ntr).(39)

A few examples are cited below.
(D) The examples of the threat formulae from the tomb inscriptions of the Memphite necropolis, in which Great God is mentioned.
(a) "As for anyone who will enter this tomb in their impurity, and who will do evil thing against this (tomb), the judgement will be passed on them about it by Great God."(40)
(b) "Now as for anyone who will do any evil thing against this tomb, and who will enter it being impure, I will seize his neck like a goose after I have been judged with him in the council of Great God."(41)

This Great God's function of divine judge for the profit of the deceased might be considered as the former's function as the patron deity of the
latter. As for which deity was meant by “Great God”, various interpretations have been proposed, most of which consider this god as the deceased king or another deity, in this case, Osiris, or Re. Although the extensive study of Great God is out of place here, it’s probably of some use to point out that this god was given two kinds of epithet in Memphite tomb inscriptions, namely the epithets of funerary character, like “Lord of burial” (nb krs), “Lord of necropolis” (nb hrt-ntr) or “Lord of the West” (nb imnt), and the one of cosmic character, namely, “Lord of heaven” (nb pt). As the deity who is known to have all of these epithets in the mortuary context is Osiris, it’s possible that Great God is an alias of Osiris. However, one might find both Great God and Osiris in the same formula as two different gods. Perhaps Great God is a deceased king, who could be identified with Osiris, and such an interpretation seems to be supported, although not definitely, by the fact that, in the Pyramid Texts, the deceased king is called Great God to whom the epithet “Lord of heaven” is given, and assumes the role of judge in the Netherworld. If this identification is correct, it might be said that both Great God and htp-di-nswt represent the significance of royalty as the patron of the deceased, the former as the patron deity in the Netherworld, the latter as the royal funerary gift.

However, it might be sufficient to say in this context that the patron deities of the deceased in the Memphite necropolis are mainly funerary deities, and Great God, a funerary as well as cosmic deity, and that Great God seems to have been prominent as such a patron deity.

III

Although it was not until Dyn. 6 that many provincial tombs appeared, earlier burials, including those of the governors who were buried for the first time in nomes 9, 10, 15, and 20 of Upper Egypt (abbreviated as U. E. 9, 10, 15, 20 hereafter) in late Dyn. 5, have been attested.

Among these tombs, those inscribed with funerary formulae are rather rare, and as the patron deities in these formulae, only Anubis (in the htp-di-nswt formula) and Great God (in the formula about burial) are unambiguously mentioned. Although nothing definite can be said from such limited materials, the provincial patron deities in Dyn. 5 seem to have belonged to the same categories as those of the Memphite necropolis, as far as the
surviving evidence is concerned.

In Dyn. 6, particularly after the reign of Merenre, many governors and the other high officials were sent to the provinces, settled and were buried there. Many provincial tombs dating from Dyn. 6 and the F. I. P. have been attested in most Upper Egyptian nomes, and comparatively rich inscriptive materials including funerary formulae are available at least concerning Dyn. 6, although well balanced information is not available among all of these nomes. As far as the available materials are concerned, the patron deities that appear in the Memphite necropolis are also commonly mentioned in the funerary formulae from the provincial necropolises. Anubis and Osiris are commonly mentioned in the htp-di-nswt formula and in the following 'Bitten', Great God is still the most common, and the funerary deities like Osiris and Anubis are less frequent.

However, some of these formulae show that after Dyn. 6, the local deities of several nomes joined the group of the patron deities of the deceased who were buried in those nomes. The local deities mentioned in the htp-di-nswt formula are "Hathor, mistress of Dendera" from a tomb in U. E. 6, dating from the reign of Pepi II, "Thoth, foremost in Hut-ibtjet" and "Thoth who is in Hermopolis", both of whom from the tombs in U. E. 15, dated to the period from the reign of Merenre to that of Pepi II, or early Dyn. 6. The local deities who are mentioned in the 'Bitten' are as follows.

(E) "Horus, He of Edfu" (U. E. 2).
"May he travel on the beautiful roads on which the honoured ones (regularly) travel, in peace under Anubis, (and) as the one who makes peace and attains the state of honour under Osiris and under Horus, He of Edfu."

On a stela of Hw-wi from Edfu (Dyn. 6 or later).

(F) "Mont, Lord of Waset (Theban nome)" (U. E. 4).
"[May he be buried] happily [in] his tomb of the necropolis as the honoured one under Mont, Lord of Waset."

On a stela of Tbw from Dra'Abu el-Naga (the F. I. P.).

(G) "Neb-Shemau, Lord of Qus" (U. E. 5).
"May the invocation offerings be to <the titles> the honoured one under Neb-Shemau, Lord of Qus <the name of the tomb owner>."

On a stela of Htp-nb · i, probably from Naqada (Dyn. 6).

(H) "Hathor, Mistress of Dendera" (U. E. 6).
"May the invocation offerings be to (the titles) the honoured one under Hathor, Mistress of Dendera (the name of the tomb owner)."

On a stela of Mni (Dyn. 6). Hathor without any epithet is mentioned in the same type of formula on the same person's false door. "Hathor, Mistress of Dendera" also appears in this type of formula on an offering slab from Saqqara (with "Horus in Dendera", Dyn. 6) and a stela from Salamiya of U. E. 4 (Dyn. 6). The Denderite Hathor is the only local deity that has been attested as the patron deity of the deceased in the funerary formula from more than one nome throughout the Old Kingdom and the F. I. P., apart from the funerary deities often with the epithets as local deities.

Fischer revealed that the Denderite Hathor had been worshipped in Residence, Thebes, and Hemamiya beside in Dendera, in the Old Kingdom and the F. I. P. The occurrences of this goddess as the patron deity outside Dendera in Dyn. 6 might be understood as an aspect of her popularity.

(I) "The gods of Tawer (Thinite nome)" (U. E. 8).

"May the voice (of invocation) be raised for her, (namely) for the honoured one under the gods of Tawer (the epithet, titles and name of the tomb owner)."

On a stela of Cnh-n-š-Ppy from Naga el-Deir (Dyn. 6 or later).

"The gods of Tawer" are also mentioned in the same formula on two stelae from the same site, dating from the F. I. P.

(J) "Onuris, Lord of Thinis" (U. E. 8).

"May the invocation offerings be to the honoured one under Onuris, Lord of Thinis (the title, epithet and the name of the tomb owner)."

From the tomb of Mrw at Naga el-Deir (the F. I. P.).

(K) "Min, Lord of Akhmim" (U. E. 9).

"May the invocation offerings be to the honoured one under Great God, Lord of heaven, (and) under Min, Lord of Akhmim (the epithet and the name of the tomb owner)."

On a stela of Mr-niwt from Akhmim, (the end of Dyn. 6 or later).

This god is mentioned in this type of formula on another stela dating from the reign of Pepi II, and on four coffins dating from the periods after the reign of Merenre, all of which are from Akhmim. "Min" without any epithet appears in this formula on another stela from Akhmim probably dating from the end of Dyn. 6 or later.
(L) “Matyt” (U. E. 12).

“May the invocation offerings be to///to the honoured one under Osiris (and) to the honoured one under Matyt (and) to the honoured one///.”

On a false door in the tomb of Dcw/Šm3i at Deir el-Gebrawi (the reign of Pepi II).\(^{(21)}\) This goddess is also mentioned in this type of formula from the tomb of Ḥnkw in the same cemetery, which dates from the F. I. P.\(^{(22)}\)

(M) “Hathor, Mistress of Qusiya” (U. E. 14).

(a) “May the voice (of invocation) be raised for him [as] the honoured one under Hathor, Mistress of Qusiya”

On a false door in the tomb of Ḥw·n-wḥ (the reign of Pepi I).\(^{(23)}\)

(b) “May [he] be raised (si[cr·ti·f]) to Great God among the honoured ones whom Great God loves and who are honoured under Hathor, Mistress of Qusiya.”

On a lintel in the tomb of Ḥw·n-wḥ above.\(^{(24)}\)


“May the voice (of invocation) be raised for him in his tomb of the necropolis as the honoured one under the king and Great God, and as the honoured one under Thoth, Lord of Hermopolis///his (?)///.”

On a false door in the tomb of Mrw/Bbi at el-Sheikh Said, (the reign of Pepi II, or early Dyn. 6).\(^{(25)}\)

(O) “Horus, foremost in Hebenu” (U. E. 16).

“May he be buried happily in Hebenu as the honoured one under Horus, foremost in Hebenu.”

From the tomb of Ni-cnḥ-Pḥy at Zawyet el-Maiyitin (the reign of Pepi II.).\(^{(26)}\)

The above evidence shows that the local deities of at least ten Upper Egyptian nomes were among the patron deities of the deceased in the nomes where their cult centers were, in Dyn. 6 or/and the F. I. P.

However, these examples are relatively few in number, and in U. E. 5, 6, and 14~16, the local deities as the patrons are attested only in Dyn. 6, and in U. E. 4, only in the F. I. P., while the clear date is not available in U. E. 2 and 9. So far as the funerary formulae are concerned, Matyt of U. E. 12 and possibly “the gods of Tawer”\(^{(27)}\) are the only local patron deities attested throughout Dyn. 6 and the F. I. P. Although such a situation might be due to the restriction on materials, and particularly so in the cases of U. E. 2 and 16,\(^{(28)}\) it’s possible that the cults of these local patron deities
were not necessarily maintained throughout Dyn. 6 and the F. I. P., and it might be said that such cults were relatively minor in comparison to those of traditional Memphite patron deities in these provinces. The threat formulae with some deity from Dyn. 6 provincial tombs have been attested in U. E. 1, 7, 8, and 20, and Great God as the Netherworld judge is the only mentioned deity,\(^{79}\) as in the same formulae from the Memphite necropolis. This might also seem to show the same situation as that of Residence and to suggest the relative unimportance of local patron deities.

However, one of the threat formulae dated to the reign of Pepi II or later from U. E. 7, cited below, might suggest some different situation. (P) "As for anyone who will do any evil thing against [this] tomb and [this] stela of mine, [I will be judged with them] by Great God, Lord of heaven, Lord of this desert (necropolis)."\(^{80}\)

"Lord of heaven" (\(\text{nb} \ \text{pt}\)) has been commonly attested as an epithet of Great God in the Memphite and the provincial necropolises.\(^{81}\) But, "Lord of this desert (necropolis) (i. e. of Qasr es-Saiyad in U. E. 7)" (\(\text{nb} \ \text{zmyt} \ \text{tn}\)), related to a specific locality, is unique as the epithet of Great God, while the epithets with unspecific localities, like "Lord of desert (necropolis)" (\(\text{nb} \ \text{zmyt}\)) and "Lord of necropolis" (\(\text{nb} \ \text{hrt}-\text{ntr}\)) have been attested in the Memphite necropolis, and "Lord of western desert (necropolis)" (\(\text{nb} \ \text{zmyt} \ \text{imntt}\)) on a stela from U. E. 5, dated to Dyn. 6.\(^{82}\)

What is this "Great God, Lord of heaven, Lord of this desert (necropolis)"? Several interpretations might be proposed. A less likely interpretation is to take this deity as the local deity of U. E. 7,\(^{83}\) since neither of two deities known from this nome, Sobek and goddess Bat, is likely to have been called "Lord of heaven".\(^{84}\) Another possible interpretation is to take this deity as the traditional, or the Memphite Great God, but this interpretation is not free from fault, since the epithet "Lord of this desert (necropolis)", in which a specific locality is mentioned, has been unattested as the epithet of Great God. The third interpretation, which we dare to propose is to consider "Great God" here as two separate deities, namely traditional "Great God, Lord of heaven", and "Great God, Lord of this desert (necropolis)", the male local deity of U. E. 7, possibly Sobek. If this interpretation is correct, it might be said that the local deity of U. E. 7 could be important enough to be called Great God, an important patron deity, at the end of Dyn. 6. Unfortunately, no positive evidence supporting this interpretation.
Although no direct contemporary evidence has been available for such an importance of the local patron deities from the other nomes, the threat formulae dated to the F. I. P., known from U. E. 3 and 13, suggest that the local deities in those days played a prominent role in the punishment on tomb violations. Great God and his council are no longer mentioned in these formulae, but appears the local deity of the nome where the tomb was built, or where the culprit lives. In the formula from the tomb of Croty • fy at Mo’alla (U. E. 3), cited below, Hemen, the local deity of this nome is mentioned.

(Q) “As for any ruler who will rule in Mo’alla, and who will commit a bad and evil act against this wooden coffin, and against all stone monuments of this tomb, his arm shall be chopped off for Hemen at his emergence from the district, his arm shall be chopped off for Hemen at his emergence from the eastern side, his arm shall be chopped off for Hemen at his emergence from the river bank, his arm shall be chopped off for Hemen at his emergence from the body (hm), he shall be chopped off for Hemen at his emergence from the great representation (šwt c3t). Hemen will not accept what he (i. e. tomb violator) has slaughtered on the day of the body. Hemen will not accept any of his property, and his heir shall not inherit him.”

Willems argued that in this text the punishment for tomb violators is shown to have taken the form of real human sacrifice for Hemen at the festive procession. Although it might be still disputable if such a real sacrifice was offered, it’s out of question that a local deity Hemen is shown here as the deity who deeply concerns the punishment, accepting the culprit’s arm as an offering at least theoretically, while refusing the offering from the culprit begging for mercy.

The formula from the tomb of Hty at Assiut (U. E. 13) runs as follows, according to Edel’s reconstruction, after the tomb owner’s promise to help those who have respect for the tomb and its owner.

(R) “But as for any rebel and any disaffected person who will do opposite (ḫncyt), in spite of this which he has heard, his name shall not exist, he shall not be buried in the desert (necropolis), and he shall be cooked together with the criminals against whom the god has raised up obstacles. His city-god will abominate him. His city-folk will abominate him.”
Here, the “city-god” (ntr niwty), not of the tomb owner, but of the tomb violator is mentioned. This might suggest that the anticipated violators included the hostile Theban army, against whom any threat referring to the local deity of U. E. 13 should have been useless. In this case, it might be said that even the local deity of the hostile nome could be considered as the indirect patron of the deceased.

The first half of another formula from the tomb of Tf-ib·i at the same locality, which is probably against the people of the same nome, runs as follows according to Edel.

(S) “As for any overlord, any gentleman, any high official, and any citizen who will not protect this tomb and what is in it, his god will not accept his white loaf.”

“His god (ntr·f)” here, who is said to reject the culprit’s offering, is probably to be taken as the local deity of U. E. 13., on the grounds of the parallel expression in the text (Q) above.

The texts (Q)～(S) seem to suggest that local deities were considered as the chief patron deities concerned with the protection of tombs, replacing the Memphite Great God, in the F. I. P., at least in some nomes.

The observations above show that the local deities of various nomes were considered as the patrons of the deceased in Dyn. 6 and the F. I. P., and that they might have acquired the importance as chief patron deities by the F. I. P. at least in some nomes.

IV

It’s made clear from the previous chapter that the cult of the local deity as the patron of the deceased might date back to Dyn. 6, and acquire certain importance thereafter. Unfortunately, the materials are not enough to show the successive growth of this cult, and it’s possible that such a cult was ephemeral in at least some nomes. However, it should be noted that Thoth, well-known as a prominent patron deity of the deceased at U. E. 15 in the Middle Kingdom, was already known as such a patron in Dyn. 6, if not necessarily as a prominent one (See the text (N) and note (55)).

What circumstances were behind the appearance of these local patron deities? The close ties between the local deity and the provincial people
from Dyn. 6 to the F. I. P. are suggested through the tomb owner's epithets
"the praised one of (ḥsy n)" or "the honoured one under (imḥw ūr)" local
deity, in the contemporary provincial tomb inscriptions, and are more
clearly shown through the statements dating from the F. I. P. that the tomb
owner acted in accordance with the will of the local deity, rather than as
a royal official. Such a prominence of local deity, particularly in the
F. I. P., might be taken as an aspect of "decentralization", and the local
deity's prominence as the patron of the deceased is certainly to be under-
stood in these circumstances.

It has been argued that the phrase pr n i m pr i h3 n i m iz i
"I came forth from my house and I went down into my tomb." appearing
in the tomb inscriptions after the end of Dyn. 6 shows the tomb owner's
closer ties with his own individual life rather than with the kingship, on
the earth as well as in the hereafter. The appearance and prominence
of local patron deities possibly show the related idea, representing the new
local funerary belief having coexisted with the older one centering on the
kingship and Great God.
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