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I

For ancient Egyptians, the tomb was not only the dwelling of the dead, but also the place where offerings were made for the dead. The continuation of offerings was indispensable for the $k3^{(1)}$, the vital force of the tomb owner, to live in the netherworld.

However, offerings by the living could be suspended, and grave goods were vulnerable to tomb robbery. Furthermore, the mummy, the body where the $k3$ had to dwell, could be destroyed through the elements or as a consequence of tomb robbery.

The tomb relief was an important countermeasure in case of such emergencies$^{(2)}$. The inscribed offerings and figures of servants in the relief were believed to be realized or vitalized whenever the tomb owner wished, and the inscribed figure of the tomb owner could serve as the body of his $k3$, should the mummy be lost. These functions of the tomb relief were completed by accompanying inscriptions including the tomb owner's name.

However, the tomb reliefs often suffered from intentional destruction. The names and figures of tomb owners were often damaged, and such destruction was sometimes followed by the usurpation of the whole tomb.

The aim of this study is to consider the significance of the destruction of tombs, particularly the destruction of tomb reliefs, and the attitude of people toward such a problem. We mainly focus on the private tombs in the Old Kingdom, since in those tombs we can find not only good examples of aforementioned relief scenes, but also the tomb inscriptions including relatively abundant references to tomb violations.
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II

Among destructions of tomb reliefs, the damage inflicted on the figure and name of the tomb owner must have exercised the gravest influence on his/her fate.

Early examples of damage to tomb owners' figures can be found on some funerary stelae dating from the 2nd Dynasty. On one of the stelae, deep lines from cuts can be observed on the neck of the deceased's figure as if intended to sever the head\(^3\). We can also find some examples where a part of the figure, mainly its face had been chiselled out\(^4\).

The latter type of damage inflicted mainly on the face of the tomb owner's figure is also attested on a number of tomb reliefs in the Old Kingdom, particularly in the 6th Dynasty, when tomb reliefs are known to have flourished, and it is often accompanied with the erasure of the tomb owner's name\(^5\). The erasure of the name without damage to the figure of the tomb owner seems to be rare in this period except when the name is replaced by another's name\(^6\).

It's very difficult to know exactly when, and under what circumstances, such a damage was done, although the damage to the figure with the accompanying name intact could represent an example of iconoclasm made in a later period\(^7\).

However, such a damage could be caused by personal hatred towards the person represented, particularly when the erasure of the name was involved\(^8\). This is suggested in the case of the tomb relief of *Ny-cnh-Ppy* dating from the 6th Dynasty\(^9\). In this case, the upper half of the body of the tomb owner's son and probably his name and title were erased, and the following statement was inscribed by the culprit.

"You bound me up, (and) you beat my father. (But,) I am (now) satisfied, because, (now) what are you in order to escape from my hand? My father is (now) satisfied."

Drioton noticed that in this tomb the name of *Ny-cnh-Ppy* had been inscribed over another erased name, and held that he had usurped this tomb and taken revenge on his old enemy, a son of the original tomb
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Whether it was Ny-cnh-Ppy or not who actually carried out this act of revenge, this inscription does, nevertheless, demonstrate quite clearly an aspect of mentality on the part of the person who damaged the tomb relief as vent to his enmity. It’s possible that similar examples of personal enmity resulted in the damage to the names and figures of certain other tomb owners in those days.

However, the damage to the tomb owner’s name and figure could also be done as a punishment against those who had been considered criminals against royalty and fallen into disgrace. The erasure of tomb owners’ names and damage to the figures can be observed in many of the tombs of courtiers around Teti’s pyramid at Saqqara, dating from the early 6th Dynasty. This period was a politically unstable period as shown by the accession of a usurper Userkare and the following conspiracy against Pepi I. Kanawati supposed that the conspiracy against Pepi I had been attempted twice, and that those courtiers with their names and figures erased and damaged had been punished for their participation, or for their having supported Userkare. The fact that high officials like viziers Sšm-nfr and Rc-wr are included among these courtiers seems to suggest that the damage to their names and figures was done not simply from personal vengeance but by the order of the king. At least in the case of Rc-wr, it seems to be certain that he had fallen into disgrace, since his name was erased from one of the decrees of Pepi I.

However, tombs could suffer from destruction not only from hostility against the tomb owner, but also for the reuse or usurpation. In this case, tomb reliefs were mostly reused as they were, and it was a usual practice for the name and title of the original owner on the relief to be erased and replaced by those of the new owner. However, the figure of the tomb owner was not damaged, although necessary alterations were made in cases where the age or sex of the original owner and those of the new owner were inconsistent. Furthermore, it was rare for other elements on the relief to be damaged or altered in cases of reuse or usurpation.

The aim of the destruction accompanying the reuse of the tomb relief was to eliminate the memory of the original owner, avoiding damage on the function of the relief for the tomb owner. The figure of the tomb owner does not usually show any personal feature as it stands, and it’s...
not until it’s accompanied by a name that it can serve as the body for the tomb owner’s k3. Therefore, the change of the owner’s name generally sufficed for the change of the ownership.

The reuse of tombs is well attested after the 5th Dynasty, with reused objects ranging from false doors to whole tombs\(^{(23)}\). It’s disputable if all of these reused materials represent the usurpation of the property of the deceased\(^{(24)}\). However, the reuse of a whole tomb should mean that the original owner is deprived of his tomb—his dwelling as well as the place where offering is made for him—, unless an alternative is given to him. It is suggested by the fact that in a tomb inscription the tomb owner stated that he had built his tomb in “the pure place” where no other tomb had been there so that the property of the deceased might be protected\(^{(25)}\).

However, the reuse of tombs was evident even amongst those who had attained high social positions. For example, a vizier in the late 6th Dynasty \(Nb-k3w-Hr\) usurped the tomb of another vizier \(3ht-htp\) dating from the end of the 5th Dynasty\(^{(26)}\). Other usurpers even included members of royal families like a royal prince \(Rc-m-k3.i\) in the late 5th Dynasty and a princess \('Idwt\) in the 6th Dynasty\(^{(27)}\). The cause of the reuse might be sought in the usurper’s untimely death\(^{(28)}\) and the fact that throughout the Old Kingdom the riches of officials had generally decreased to such an extent that they could no longer afford to build their tombs about the end of the Old Kingdom\(^{(29)}\). In any event, the evidence suggests that the reuse of tombs was not an uncommon practice among people of means and position.

What, then, was the meaning of the damage to the tomb owner’s figure and name?

The damage to the figure was primarily caused by chiselling out its face\(^{(30)}\). This kind of damage was probably meant to deprive the deceased’s k3 of a means to live, since the face of the figure must have represented the k3’s sense, and its ability to partake of offerings, as shown by the ritual of Opening of the Mouth\(^{(31)}\). The cuts on the neck of the deceased’s figure on a stele from the 2nd Dynasty\(^{(32)}\) might have been made with the same intention.

The erasure of the name would have had far more serious implications on the destiny of the victim. To erase the name accompanying the deceased’s figure was to deprive his k3 of the body to dwell in. In cases where the deceased’s name was erased from offering formulae for him\(^{(33)}\),
he must have been deprived of those formulae with various benefits represented in them.

However, for ancient Egyptians, leaving their names on earth was not only for the clarification of ownership or identification, but also for keeping their memory on earth, and it was thought that k3 could live as long as the name remained, even if the tomb were to be lost(34). Consequently, the erasure of the deceased's name was to deprive the deceased of life after death(35). The deprivation of a criminal's name as a punishment, which is attested in some texts from both the First Intermediate Period and the Middle Kingdom(36), must have had the same purpose.

However, the damage to the figure and name was not necessarily done thoroughly, and we can find many cases where either the name or figure have remained intact somewhere in a tomb, or where traces of the name are sufficiently discernible for the original name to be restored(37). Particularly in the case of the tombs of courtiers probably punished for treason in the early 6th Dynasty, it has been pointed out that the tomb owner's name and figure were left intact at least once in each tomb, and that the damage outside the tomb is more meticulous and consistent than that of the inside, although the reasons for this are still unclear(38).

III

Tomb violation must have been felt as a serious threat to those who put themselves in the position of the tomb owners. The fact that threats (curses) against tomb violators were included in many tomb inscriptions after the end of the 4th Dynasty(39) shows that such tomb violations were extensively done in those days and posed a serious social problem.

These threat formulae, except those concerning desecration by an impure visitor(40), deal with direct damages inflicted on the funeral property, and most of them are expressed rather tersely as follows.

"(As for) anyone who will do an evil thing against this (nwy)(41), the judgement shall be passed on him by Great God."(42)

"As for anyone who will do a thing against this(43) which I made according to favour on me under my lord, the judgement shall be passed on
him in the place where judgement is passed."(44)

"It is God who will judge the one who will do a thing against it (i. e. tomb)."(45)

As these examples show, the damage on the funeral property is mostly expressed by “an evil thing (ḥt ḏw)”, or simply “a thing (ḥt)”, probably general terms for tomb ravages(46). However, in the examples where concrete expressions are adopted, only the tomb destruction is referred to, as the following examples show.

“Say ye (i. e. the living), ‘A thousand of bread, a thousand of beer to Nhḥw, honoured one!’, and may ye not quarry anything from this tomb. (Because) I (i. e. Nhḥw, tomb owner) am /// and equipped spirit (ḥḥ)(47). As for anyone who will quarry anything from this tomb, the judgement shall be made between me and them by Great God.”(48)

“Indeed, as for anyone who will do an evil thing against this(49), and who will do any destructive thing against this, and who will obliterate the writing in it, the judgement shall be passed on them about it by Great God, Lord of Judgement in the place where judgement is passed.”(50)

The expression “to quarry (ḥsn)”(51), which often takes as its object stone block or brick in the other examples of the same formula(52), probably involves quarrying of false doors or the other reliefs as well as of building materials for reuse(53). To “obliterate the writing in it (ẓīn ṣš ʾim)”(54) must involve the erasure of the tomb owner’s name in the tomb inscription. In any case, the fact that only the tomb destruction is specified among tomb violations seems to show that the damage on the tomb itself was the most serious threat for the deceased.

The tomb violator is mostly referred to in ambiguous expressions like the sḏmt·fy form often preceded by “anyone (rmt/z nb)”(55) or the second person personal pronoun(56). The following example, however, attests to the fact that violators also included those of high social positions.

“As for any dignitary, any high official, anyone who will quarry any...
stone, any brick from this tomb, the judgement shall be made between me and him by Great God. I will seize his neck like a bird's. I will cause all the living on earth to fear the spirits (\(\text{\(3\)hw}\)) being in the West distant from them."(37)

This example seems to reflect the fact that the reuse of tombs was done rather openly even by such people of high status in those days.

Now, the retaliation or punishment attested most frequently in these formulae in the Old Kingdom is the one referring to the judgement\(^{58}\), like "the judgement shall be passed on him by Great God (\(wnn\ wdcw\ mdw\ hnc\ .\ f\ in\ ntr\ c3\))"\(^{59}\), "the judgement shall be passed on him in the place where judgement is passed (\(wnn\ wdcw\ mdw\ hnc\ .\ f\ m\ bw\ nty\ wdcw\ mdw\ im\))"\(^{60}\), "the judgement shall be made between me and them (lit. I will be judged with them) by Great God (\(iw\ .\ i\ r\ wdc\ hnc\ .\ sn\ in\ ntr\ c3\))"\(^{61}\) and so on\(^{62}\). "Great God (\(ntr\ c3\))", sometimes simply "God (\(ntr\))"\(^{63}\), the judge in these cases, can probably be identified with the god Osiris, or a deceased king\(^{64}\), and the judgement mentioned here is probably the one in the netherworld\(^{65}\).

The other expressions of retaliation include "I will seize his neck like a bird's (\(iw\ .\ i\ r\ itt\ tz\ .\ f\ mr\ 3pd\))"\(^{66}\) and the assault on the culprit by a crocodile and a snake\(^{67}\). As for the former expression, it mostly follows the reference to the judgement\(^{68}\), or is accompanied with the same reference expressed in the relative past tense, as follows.

"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 that of a goose (\(s\))"\(^{69}\) after the judgement has been made between me and him in the council of Great God."\(^{70}\)

The latter expression is also found with the reference to the judgement\(^{71}\), and possibly means that the deceased transforms himself into a crocodile or a snake to exact revenge\(^{72}\).

Thus, the retaliation against tomb violators consists of the judgement in the netherworld and the revenge by the spirit of the tomb owner, possibly following the judgement. It might show some possibility that the deceased can live and have supernatural power in the netherworld even after the
damage or destruction of his tomb. The tomb owner called himself 3ḥ “spirit”, or 3ḥ יקר כפר “able and equipped spirit”, which emphasizes its supernatural power, in the tomb inscription(73), and such an expression can be found in some threat formulae against tomb violations(74). Although the deceased was considered to be made 3ḥ through the correct burial and offering ritual(75), the deceased once made 3ḥ might not necessarily have been influenced by the loss of the mummy and tomb, as a passage in the Pyramid Texts, “Spirit is bound for the sky, the corpse is bound for the earth” (3ḥ ʿיר ב ʾחצ ʿיר ʾת) perhaps suggests.

Such an idea should necessarily make the importance of tomb and mummy secondary, and reflects the reality that the tomb and mummy can not be eternally protected on earth. The fact that people of high social positions openly damaged or reused the others’ tombs, which is suggested in examples of usurpation and some threat formulae, clearly indicates such a reality. Assmann makes clear in his recent study that the threat formulae against tomb violations are ‘curses’, which take over when laws fail, and in which metaphysical agents are relied on instead of legal institutions(77). He presents the two cases where laws fail and curses take over, namely the ‘secret criminality’ and ‘the breakdown or wilful alteration of legal institutions’(78). Tomb destructions in the Old Kingdom, particularly those which were done by the influential, should come under the latter case, although Assmann does not state this but gives consideration to only later materials as examples for the latter case(79). Although private tombs were probably under the protection of laws(80), such laws could be made nominal or neglected by those people who had sufficient power in the Old Kingdom.

Such a situation clearly explains why tomb destructions were mentioned in the ‘curses’, in which the culprit is said to be judged in the court in the netherworld, not on earth. The deceased, who could not rely on jurisdiction on earth, had no other alternative but to hang his last hope on the ‘curses’ and his existence as 3ḥ, perhaps uninfluenced by the fate of his tomb and mummy.

However, even becoming 3ḥ after death could be disturbed. In a decree issued in the reign of king Dmd-ib-13wy in the First Intermediate Period, we find an article declaring that those who disobey the royal order shall not join the “spirits (3ḥw) in the necropolis”, namely the prohibition of trespasser’s burial and of the offering ritual for him(81). The same
prohibition of burial and offering must have accompanied the tomb destruction as a punishment in the early 6th Dynasty. Now, among the threat formulae against tomb violators, the following one which shows the idea of reciprocation or nemesis is found.

"As [for what ye (i.e. the descendants) do] against this\(^{(82)}\), the like shall be done against your property (\(\hat{\text{i}}\hat{\text{st}}\) (i.e. tomb)\(^{(83)}\) by your descendants.\)

This passage means that the tomb violator's tomb shall be violated likewise, while the tomb of the one who respects the other's tomb shall be respected likewise\(^{(85)}\). The following denials of tomb destructions, which accompanies the threat formulae, are probably based on such an idea.

"I made this tomb on the western side (and) in the pure place (\(\text{st} \ \text{wcbt}\))\(^{(86)}\) — There was no (other) tomb there for anybody — so that the property of the one who had gone to his \(k3\) (\(\text{zb n k3} \ . \ f\))\(^{(87)}\) might be protected. As for anyone who will enter this tomb without being pure (\(m \ \text{cbw} \ . \ \text{sn}\))\(^{(88)}\) (and) who will do an evil thing against this\(^{(89)}\), the judgement shall be passed on them by Great God.\)

"The one who does not quarry what used to be in this tomb, among anyone who goes to the west, is the beloved of the king and of Anubis, who is on the top of his mountain. As for this tomb of eternity, I made it on account of the fact that I had been happily revered under people and god. Indeed, a stone of anybody has never been brought to me for this tomb, since the judgement in the west is remembered.\)

After the threat against tomb violators in the tomb of \(\text{Cnhty} \ . \ fy\), a nomarch in the First Intermediate Period\(^{(92)}\), several reasons why such violators shall be retaliated are given, among which the following ones are included.

"..., (and) because I made this wooden coffin (?) and all stone monuments of this tomb with my own fund (\(m \ \text{kmt} \ \text{ds} \ . \ i\))\(^{(93)}\), (and) because there is neither door belonging to a stranger nor pillar belonging to
a stranger in this tomb,..."(94)

Such an idea that there should be no good reason for the tomb violation unless the tomb owner has violated another's tomb seems to have been expanded to the extent that the tomb of anyone who has done any evil can be violated in retaliation. It is suggested by the fact that the denial of any acts of evil accompany the threat against tomb violations in some tomb inscriptions, like the following one.

"(As for) anyone who will do an evil thing against this, the judgement shall be passed on him by Great God. I have never done injustice against anyone, taking advantage of my power."(95)

The following example suggests possibility that some damages should be inflicted on a tomb as a retaliation against some evil acts done by the tomb owner in his life.

"May a crocodile be against him in water, may a snake be against him on the ground, (as for) the one who will do a thing against this(96). I have never done a thing against him. It is God who will judge."(97)

Both of these examples show that tomb violations were justified, in retaliation, on the part of the deceased himself. Only those who had lived good lives and had not done any evil, namely those who had followed the principle of m3cf(98), in principle, could be protected from tomb violation, or could be given the right to avenge themselves on the culprit. This might reflect the fact that tomb reliefs could be damaged as vent to enmity or as a punishment in those days.

The threat formulae against tomb violations thus show that tomb destructions, including the destruction of tomb reliefs, could be relatively openly exercised. Although the fact that the extent of damage is not necessarily thorough in a single tomb might reflect some respect to the deceased(99), it's clear that the threat formulae could not prevent, and perhaps were not expected to prevent the act of tomb destruction itself(100). They were intended to dissuade the living from unreasonable tomb violations, on the assumption that the tomb could be relatively easily violated, and to provide
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The tomb owner with a kind of last hope through the idea of judgement and retaliation in the netherworld.

IV

For the people in the Old Kingdom, tomb destruction was a serious disaster which could befall their tombs anytime. Tomb reliefs vital for the continuation of the deceased's k3 could be damaged as vent to personal enmity or as a punishment, or could be reused even by the influential.

Under such a situation, the people were obliged to realize that tomb violations could not be prevented. In the threat formulae against tomb violations, they accepted that such violations could be neither efficiently prevented nor punished on earth, and hung their last hope on the judgement in the netherworld. It was probably a part of the background of the appearance of a new attitude toward the afterlife in some literary works composed in the First Intermediate Period or the Middle Kingdom, in which distrust of the value of tombs and burial is expressed(101), and living as a good person on earth is stressed as a prerequisite for attaining eternal life in the netherworld(102).
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E. g. El-Fikey, op. cit., pls. 5, 9.
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