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ABSTRACT
Publication of a fragment from a basalt statue of a woman, inscribed with a short Appeal to the Living and provisionally dated to the Ptolemaic Period. The article introduces its acquisition history, material features, and inscription, addressing the question of female literacy in ancient Egypt.
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1. Introduction

In this article, we present a fragment from an inscribed statue of a woman, thought to date to the Ptolemaic Period, and now in the collections of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology at University College London (LDUCE-UC60160). We provide a brief description, including the content of the remains of four lines of hieroglyphic inscription, and assess the significance of the object in relation to other statues of women. The inscriptions include part of an Appeal to the Living addressed to the women who performed music in the temple of Min. The inscription provides a rare example of an Appeal to the Living spoken by a woman, and rarer still, addressed only to other women.

Over several decades following the death of pharmaceutical magnate Henry Wellcome (1853-1936), the Wellcome Trust disposed of vast quantities of comparative material in his Medical Museum collections (Larson, 2009). In this complex process, the Trust assigned the Nile Valley archaeological material to the Egyptian Museum (as it was then called) in University College London (henceforth UCL) (For a list of main recipient collections, and further bibliography cf. https://www.egypt.swan.ac.uk/henry-wellcomes-egyptian-legacy-dulcie-engel/). Space was limited, and so a large proportion was sent on to other museums, though with the intention of keeping at UCL most of the documented finds from excavation and some other items of interest. The statue fragment published here is one of the unprovenanced objects received from the Wellcome collection.

2. Description

Dimensions: H: 17.5 cm, W: 9.0 cm, Depth: 9.7 cm

Material: basalt

Inscription 1: see Figures 5-6

Inscriptions 2-3: see Figures 7-9

Fragment from the lower half of a statue depicting a striding woman, preserving the area from upper leg to above the ankle, including part of a back-piller. The back-pillar bears two vertical lines of hieroglyphs, incomplete at the upper and lower break edge, and inscribed in light sunk relief
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(Figures 1, 5-6; Inscription 1). The body surface areas are plain, without indication of any carved line, though the light surface damage may conceal details such as fingernails or sleeve edge. The right leg is upright, and the right hand is shown palm down along the right leg above knee height (Figures 2-3). The left leg is in a forward diagonal pose, and its upper surface area is abraded. On the proper left side, between leg and edge, is a light sunk relief figure of a woman, facing left, with one hand holding up a sistrum, the other with palm up and forward in a gesture of prayer or worship (Figure 4). To the left of this figure is a short vertical line of left-facing hieroglyphs (Figures 7-8; Inscription 2), and above her head is the end of a second vertical line of right-facing hieroglyphs (Figures 7, 9; Inscription 3).

3. Acquisition History
The fragment was formerly in the Wellcome Collection, as confirmed by pencil and ink number “1345” on a paper label glued to the underside, and a separate label with the following information in pencil: “Ex Rustafjaell Coll Sotheby 19-21 Dec 1906 Lot No9”. The online museum database entry adds the identification of the first number as “Boscawen’s Cat.No.1345”; the freelance Assyriologist William St Chad Boscawen (1855–1913) (Horry, 2015, p. 107-128) made a catalogue of Egyptian antiquities acquired by Henry Wellcome from 1906 to 1912. As Ken Griffin describes in his biographical sketch of the antiquities trader and collector Robert de Rustafjaell (Griffin, 2020), agents for Henry Wellcome bought numerous lots in the 1906, 1907 and 1913 Rustafjaell auctions at Sotheby’s, including many forgeries as well as ancient objects, as noted in some entries in the sales catalogues themselves. In the 1906 catalogue, the first day included sections on “Sculpture, Stone Stelae &c.” (lots 59-80A) and “Sepulchral Statuettes, &c. in stone” (lots 81-105) (Catalogue of the Collection of Egyptian Antiquities formed in Egypt by R. de Rustafjaell, Esq., Queen's Gate which will be sold by auction by Messrs. Sotheby, Wilkinson & Hodge... on Wednesday, the 19th of December 1906, and two following days, London, 1906, pp.6-9). Most entries have descriptions that exclude an inscribed basalt fragment, by reference either to material or to the motif, but the following five entries seem possible candidates for the object:

Lot 59: “Other Fragments - Men making obeisance, Women mourners, Man holding geese, etc.; Gournbeh, etc. 4 [items]”
Lot 63: “Varied Fragments of Sandstone, etc.; a long Piece with funerary inscription (from a door jamb), included 8 [items]”
Lot 73: “A rough block of granite used as a stela; three small stone Obelisks, and other Fragments 5 [items]”
Lot 74 “Two small sandstone Stelae, with boat of Ra, etc., or man and wife facing; various Fragments of Stelae, etc. 12 [items]”
Lot 75: “Three Stelae and various fragments 12 [items]”

One feature on these pages of the 1906 sale catalogue is the prominence of Theban sites, particularly the West Bank (E.g. Catalogue of the Collection of Egyptian Antiquities formed in Egypt by R. de Rustafjaell, Esq., p.6 lots 51-57 “Deir el-Bahri”, lot 58 “Thebes and Deir el-Bahai”, lot 59 “Gournbeh, etc.”), although no place of acquisition is given for most items. This information may be a minor corroboratory piece of evidence for the question of provenance (see below).

4. Material Features:
Sabine Albersmeier (2002) has provided a full catalogue and comprehensive analysis of statues of women dated to the Ptolemaic Period. We apply her framework for investigating the Petrie Museum fragment, commenting in turn on the following aspects: size, material, form, and garment. In the subsequent sections, we assess the evidence for provenance and date, and parallels for, first, the relief figure on the proper left side, and, secondly, the inscription content.

4.1. Size
The preserved 17.5 cm height would suggest an original size in the range 50-90 cm constitutes the highest proportion of non-royal statues in the Albersmeier corpus (Albersmeier, 2002, p. 13-14).

4.2. Material
Albersmeier calculated that 22% of the statues in her catalogue, including royal and non-royal, are of basalt (Albersmeier, 2002, p. 18); among the non-royal examples, six are given as basalt, and another two as possible basalt as indicating in table 1
Table 1
Non-royal statues in basalt, in Albersmeier 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Albersmeier 2002 catalogue data</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delos A2914</td>
<td>no.47, 3rd C BC, torso: h. 25 cm</td>
<td>Delos</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hildesheim 5888</td>
<td>no.54, early 3rd C BC, head: h. 9.2 cm</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, BM 985</td>
<td>no.85, 1st C BC, torso: h. 39 cm</td>
<td>? Alexandria (ex-Harris collection)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, BM 57355</td>
<td>no.86, D30-early Ptol, head: 26.5 cm</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushkin 5356</td>
<td>no.92, D30-early Ptol, head: h. 11.5 cm</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushkin 6791b</td>
<td>no.94, diorite?, intact? h. 78.5 cm</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millet collection, Cairo</td>
<td>no.146 diorite?; siltstone?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art market</td>
<td>no.160, late 3rd C BC, torso: h. 19 cm</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Form:

The woman is depicted striding, with left leg forward, rather than with feet together. The right hand has fingers extended and palm flat against the body. From the surface loss at the corresponding area on the proper left side of the statue, it is not clear whether the left arm and hand were in the same position as the right or raised across the body either with a floral “flywhisk” or without attribute. If the left hand was also against the upper leg, the corpus provides parallels either with palm flat or with the fist clenched. In Table 2 we provide a summary of the examples in the corpus where both arms are extended along the sides of the body, with palm of both hands flat against the upper leg (Albersmeier, 2002, Tabelle 5).

Table 2
Statues of women standing with both palms flat against legs, in Albersmeier 2002 (excluding Pushkin MFA 6708, Albersmeier no.93, identifiable as statue of a queen)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Albersmeier 2002 catalogue data</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria 1332</td>
<td>no.2; pl.66c-d, D30-early Ptol, limestone</td>
<td>area of Alexandria?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria 26534</td>
<td>no.17; pl.83c-d, 1st C BC, dark granite with inclusions</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels E 3073</td>
<td>no.41; pl.69a-b, early 3rd C BC, limestone</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels E 5335</td>
<td>no.42; pl.82c-d, 1st C BC, limestone</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucharest</td>
<td>no.43; pl.20b, D30-early Ptol, siltstone</td>
<td>[Sais from inscription]</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delos A2914</td>
<td>no.47, 3rd C BC, basalt</td>
<td>Delos</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian Museum Cairo JE 37451</td>
<td>no.70; pl.67b, 68a, early 3rd C BC, limestone</td>
<td>Karnak cachette</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushkin 6791b</td>
<td>no.94, 3rd C BC, basalt (? diorite)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louvre E4893</td>
<td>no.112; pl.70b, 71a-b, late 3rd C BC, limestone</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louvre N 2456</td>
<td>120; pl.66a-b, 67a, ca. 264-3 BC, limestone</td>
<td>Serapeum, Saqqara</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna KHM 5809</td>
<td>no.141; pl.68b-d, early 3rd C BC, diorite</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art market</td>
<td>no.158, early 3rd C BC, limestone</td>
<td>[Sakhebu from inscription]</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art market</td>
<td>no.160, late 3rd C BC, basalt</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Albersmeier emphasises, citing a fundamental article by Jan Quaegebeur (1983), this position of the hands distinguishes images of women from those of men, and connects these works to a line of tradition going back to the Old Kingdom. She notes further that the form is a mark that distinguishes non-royal from royal sculpture, with just one royal example (Albersmeier, 2002, p.24 with n.121; the royal exception is cat.no.93 (Pushkin MFA 6708). The simplicity of this stance is therefore a specific choice in a creative process and is seen as necessary for achieving the eternal presence in a sacred space for the woman depicted.

4.4. Garment:

The surface of the legs is undecorated, suggesting the tight-fitting “sheath dress” garment, which Albersmeier has noted as the most widely attested garment in the corpus of Ptolemaic statues of women (Albersmeier, 2002, p.77-81).

5. Date

In the absence of further information on context, and as only the leg area survives, the diagnostic criteria are the body proportions of the legs and the hands, and the inscriptions and figures on the object. Stylistic analysis and inscriptive evidence enabled Albersmeier to observe a clear distinction between 26th Dynasty and 30th Dynasty sculpture, in depictions of both men and women, in contrast to the continuity between 30th Dynasty and early Ptolemaic Period works (Albersmeier, 2002, p.155-165 (26th - early 27th Dynasty), 165 (30th Dynasty and early Ptolemaic Period up to and including the reign of Ptolemy II (284-246 BC): “Während man Statuen der 30. von denen der 26. Dyn. meist unproblematisch abgrenzen kann ..., ist dagegen der Übergang von der 30. Dyn. zur frühptolemäischen Epoche fließend und erlaubt in vielen Fällen keine genaue zeitliche Fixierung, da diese beiden Epochen stilistisch in engem Zusammenhang stehen”). Among the items cited in our following sections, she suggests a date in the 30th Dynasty for the statue of Neferu (cat. no.43), comparing also that of Nesnethut (from Delos, cat. no.46). Albersmeier, 2002, (p. 169), noting the combination of upper horizontal and main vertical lines of inscription on the back-pillar, and contrasting the form of the shoulders and the torso with sculpture dated on inscriptive evidence to the reign of Ptolemy II (notably cat. no. 136, statue of Arsinoe II, Gregorian Egyptian Museum Vatican 22681); she observes further that all the non-royal statues that she dates to early 3rd century BC have in common the tight-fitting garment and the position of the arms to the side of the body, palms of hands flat against the upper leg (Albersmeier, 2002., pp.24-25 section 3.1.1 with Table 5, and p. 258: “In dieser Epoche zeigen die privaten Bildnisse die Frauen ausschließlich im traditionellen enganliegenden Gewand und mit den Händen flach an die Oberschenkel gelegt - die älteste Art der Darstellung von Frauen, die in Ägypten seit der Frühzeit belegt ist”). Another feature noted by Albersmeier on the sculpture of that earlier period is the length of arms and fingers (Albersmeier, 2002, p. 170 with n.81); this criterion is not so distinct on the Petrie Museum fragment. In terms of the choice of material, the few parallels for the non-royal statues of women in basalt would tend to support an earlier date within the period (Table 1).

In common with other specialists in Ptolemaic and Roman Period art (Höckmann, 2005, p. 225-228; Riggs, 2006, p.300-301), she warns of the difficulty in establishing a chronological sequence on the evidence currently available; a stylistic feature might reflect a regional tradition rather than a change over time. For the Petrie Museum fragment, a provisional date in the 4th century or first half of the 3rd century BC provides a working hypothesis, to test against the future comparative analysis of the epigraphy of the inscription and the sistrum-holding figure in relief on the side.

6. Parallels for Statues of Women with Inscriptions that Give their Words as Direct Speech:

Thirty-three of the 161 entries in the Albersmeier catalogue are non-royal statues with inscriptions (Albersmeier, 2002, sections 6.2, pp.118-144, and 6.5, pp.151-152). While most give an offering formula or an address to the woman depicted or present her name, filiation, titles and epithets, at least five bear inscriptions including words spoken by the woman depicted, as summarised below.

1. Albersmeier cat.no.17 Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria inv. no. 26543 (Albersmeier, 2002, p. 118-119, 289, pl.4a, 83c-d, 84a)
Inscription on back-pillar: “she says” followed by an address to a goddess: “O my mistress Mehyt-Tefnut daughter of Ra”.


Inscription on back-pillar: the second of the three columns contains an Appeal to the Living, of which the opening words are not preserved; the second person plural is used, without an indication of whether men or women or both are addressed.


Inscription on back-pillar, column 1: “the good sistrum-player Nesnebtuth, daughter of the Director of the Domains [...] Neit, whose mother is Tehenet; she says, O the one who goes out to the sky, who enters at the horizon, master of secrets, initiated into the Domain of the One of the Red Crown, O weaving women who tread the Domains of Neit, initiated before the great god, remember my name at [...]”

Inscription on back-pillar, column 2: “come, bow your arms to me with the offering that the king gives”; wishes for a good afterlife follow for the rest of column 2 and in column 3

Here the address is to both men and women entering the temple precinct at Sai to carry out the essential tasks in rituals: the man opening the doors to the sanctuary (On the equivalences and balance created between celestial and temple space, see Berlandini-Keller 2009, p.27-43, with p.40 n.58 on the term “opening the doors of heaven” for the ritual opening of the sanctuary doors), and the women whose active presence was necessary to the rites, and who were therefore also “initiated before the great god”. The main deity of the Domain of the One of the Red Crown was Osiris, who would presumably be “the great god” in this context (Gomaà, 1986, p.91-92).


Inscription on back-pillar, column 1: titles and epithets, starting “revered” (in feminine form), followed by wishes for divine favour, perhaps introduced by the particle “See!”

Inscription on back-pillar, column 2: epithets, titles and start of filiation of an official named Pasherentaihet

Inscription on back-pillar, column 3: damaged start, then “his mother’s name is Isetweret”; after the break between the fragments, is an Appeal to the Living addressing temple staff: “O all-priests approaching the lady of women, (O) ones who are praised by the mistress, Hathor, throughout eternity, cause my name to endure together with this image-of-the-father in the temple of Atum the great living god of Tjekem, without perishing [...]”

In this inscription, although the emphasis is on the goddess, the Appeal seems to address only the men entering the sanctuary.


Accessioned in 1825, from the collection of Edme Durand through the collector Jannier (https://collections.louvre.fr/ark:/53355/c1010017975); ascribed to Qift (Gebtyu/ Koptos) on the evidence of the inscription.

Inscription on upper face of base, around remnants of feet of statue:

Line 1: [...] Tasheretmin true of voice, she says: O every dignitary, every learned one who can explain what is opaque (?), who enters the temple of the king of the gods, and is received (?) at the hall of the divine child; (The phrasing here seems to combine “to know matters” with “to explain difficulties”, as found in expressions of advanced learning on sacred matters, cf Osing (1998, p. 68-69 note b.) citing the consecutive section headings in Papyrus Jumilhac at col.7, line 13 “knowing the names of this province” and line 23 “explaining the difficulties of the names of this province”. The scorpion hieroglyph might possibly be a delayed determinative reinforcing the verb “to explain”, from the homophonous word for “(female) scorpion”)

Line 2: who enters into the presence;

Line 3: of the god’s mother, the lady of Gebtyu; may you praise me in accordance with the breadth of the noble ka;

Line 4: in her city, the one who does what the heart of her god wishes, Tasheretemin;

Line 5: may you speak, for an excellent (saying) is not difficult for the one who says it. Ra rises, sees, and repays the one who does it; for the one who does good, he does good to him, and for the one does bad, he does the like to him.”

Here Tasheretemin addresses her Appeal to learned men (readers of hieroglyphic inscriptions)
entering the temple at Qift, for the cults of Min (“king of the gods”), Horus the divine child, and Isis (Pantalacci, 2012).

6. Among possible further instances is no.57, Egyptian Museum Cairo 5/3/25/7, at pp.123-124, with pl.6b, 83a-b, but the opening words are uncertain if tentatively read as the start of a hymn spoken by the woman depicted, “word of Shepset: praise to Amun”. No.158 also has an inscription including words interpreted as spoken by the woman depicted (Yoyotte, 1959, p.75-79)

The fragment under discussion adds to these examples an apparently exclusive focus on women, in which one woman chooses to address only other women in the Appeal to the Living in order to secure a good eternal life. This seems to go beyond the examples where a woman prays to a divine being (no.1), addresses only men (nos.4-5), addresses men and women (no.3), or does not specify whether the address is to men or women or both, at least on the preserved part of the inscription (no.2). At least one inscription (no.5) seems to focus on those who had the necessary skills to read the hieroglyphic inscription, leading us to ask whether the addresses to women also imply an advanced degree of literacy.

For ancient Egypt, the question of female literacy, like the topic of literacy in general, did not yet find a productive environment for research, given the limited explicit written evidence. Katharina Zinn recently provided useful reviews and suggestions for new approaches, including a succinct account of relevant evidence for female literacy in earlier periods, including letters between women, and, at the innermost palace circle, two examples of used writing palettes with the names of daughters of the king (Zinn, 2013, p 4100–4104; Zinn, 2018, pp.67-98). Earlier Steven Shubert had sought to open up the research into female literacy, moving away from fixed interpretations of ancient writings (Shubert, 2001, pp.55-76). Similarly, from the archaeological evidence for writing, on a wider definition of the term, Massimiliano Pinarello considered how Egyptologists may overestimate or misrecognise the aspects of ancient Egyptian writing that seem most familiar to modern audiences (Pinarello, 2015). In his review of fieldwork reports, he noted how rarely ancient Egyptian burials include writing equipment, with only fifteen sets emerging from documented excavations, and 52 assorted individual items from a variety of contexts (Pinarello, 2015, p. 28-76).

Among these, one writing palette was found in a burial at Madinat al-Ghurab, Fayoum, placed on a body identified by the excavators as female (Pinarello, 2015, p. 73, no.41, from tomb 223). Such finds and new approaches have not yet altered the standard Egyptological image of literacy as an undefined binary literate/illiterate, that is simultaneously restricted and restrictive, and solidly gendered as male.

Far more evidence becomes available for discussion of the Ptolemaic and Roman Periods, with the vast scale of finds of papyri and ostraca in demotic Egyptian and Greek. At the same time, hieroglyphs continued in use for Egyptian sacred contexts. The statue fragment under discussion may belong to this new environment of multiple languages and scripts, where it becomes more complicated to assess the likely hieroglyphic literacy of either men or women. Here it may be useful to consider the evidence for Greek literacy in Egypt during the periods of Greek-language government. In the introductory chapters to their anthology of women’s letters, Roger Bagnall and Raffaella Cribiore ask “whose voices are we hearing?” and “which women?”; they also set out to identify what is distinctively useful about letters as evidence for ancient society, arguing that the person expresses their own views even when they are dictating a letter rather than writing it themselves (Bagnall, and Cribiore, 2006, 6–9). Despite the very different context of a religious formula such as the Appeal to the Living, we might apply the same questions to the far smaller corpus of hieroglyphic inscriptions of 1st millennium BC Egyptian women. Karl Jansen-Winkeln has investigated the autobiographical inscriptions of women in that period, including some of the most remarkable compositions in the ancient Egyptian sacred script (Jansen-Winkeln, 2004, p.358-373). From comparison with autobiographical inscriptions with men, he found far less variation, with the exception of three accounts of women who had died young; for these three he suggested that the husband of the deceased would be involved in providing appropriately expressive wording. His corpus includes phrases from four of the five inscriptions cited above from Albersmeier, but his focus is on the phrases that refer back to the speaker (Jansen-Winkeln, 2004, p.367-371). An address by a woman to others potentially raises different questions for further research; would the speech
turned outward to others the Appeal, yield the same results as the inward-turned speech about the speaker, or would it show a distinctive voice, like the voice sought by Bagnall and Cribiore in the letters? In its address to women, the Petrie Museum fragment provides a particularly interesting starting-point for investigating the range of choice. Possibly new methods will emerge from the comparison with other predominantly male genres of expression such as literary narrative. In the Tale of Setne Khamwaset, Ahetweret relates her tragic life-story to Setne (Lichtheim, 1980, p. 127-132); which voice or voices do we hear in her words?

7. Conclusion

The statue fragment is an addition to the limited corpus of inscribed objects in which a woman addresses other women. The mention of the god Min suggests that it may be a further example of Ptolemaic work from the town of Qift (ancient Egyptian Gebtyu, ancient Greek Koptos). It may then have stood not far from the statue of Tasheretemin (Louvre N2540), which also gives an address to temple visitors as the direct speech of the woman, though directed at male temple staff rather than at women serving in the temple. It would be interesting to assess the geographical distribution of direct speech of women in hieroglyphic and Greek inscriptions of the Ptolemaic Period, comparing the rare examples on statues with other object types from diverse contexts, including monuments from offering-chapels and burial chambers. We hope that the publication of the fragment will stimulate new research on these points among specialists in Late Period, Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt
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Figure 1.
Back of statue LDUCE-UC60160, with two vertical lines of hieroglyphic inscription © University College London
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Figure 2.
Proper right side of statue, showing palm flat on upper leg LDUCE-UC60160 © University College London
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Figure 3.
Proper right to front view of statue LDUCE-UC60160 © University College London

Figure 4.
Proper left side of statue, with light sunk relief figure and two short vertical lines of inscription LDUCE-UC60160 © University College London
Figure 5.
Back of statue, with two vertical lines of hieroglyphic inscription, © Ibrahim Ibrahim
Figure 6.

Inscription 1 on LDUCE-UC60160 © Ibrahim Ibrahim

(line 1) ///Ist-m-3ḥ-bit (??) mfr(r) hrw ḫd=s i ḫnyt n nb ntrw ṣmfr nt////////
(line 2) ///nb=sn m ḫb(w)=f nb(w) r tr=sn ḫw=mtn n=i ntr ṣ nb ḫnk w ltd
(line 1) Isis-is-in-Chemmis(??) justified, she says: O female musicians of the lord of the gods and female singers of /*///
(line 2) ////their lord in his all his festival(s) at their seasons, may you praise the god for me every day. I am the sole one

\(^1\) PN 1, 4, 3.
Figure 7.
Proper left side of statue LDUCE-UC60160, with, at right, the figure of a woman raising a sistrum, at centre, to left of figure, Inscription 2, and at upper right Inscription 3 © Ibrahim Ibrahim
Figure 8.
Inscription 2: hieroglyphic copy, transliteration and translation

(1) \textit{ir(t) s\ddot{s}t m hr=k nfr Mnw}
(1) playing the sistrum in your beautiful presence, Min$^2$

Figure 9.
Inscription 2: hieroglyphic copy, transliteration and translation

(1) \\
(1) \textit{r irt \ddot{s}bw=f}
(1) \textit{\dddot{r}r} to perform his Purification.

\textit{LGG} III, 288$^\lambda$-290$^\lambda$