

AN HONORED BURIAL FOR A FAITHFUL SERVANT:

DEUT 34:6 IN LIGHT OF HONORIFIC BURIALS IN THE ANE

MICHAEL J. CHAN AND JACOB L. WRIGHT

INTRODUCTION

In a forthcoming *JBL* article, we provide a new interpretation of the oracle to the eunuchs in Isa 56:1-8. Against the common practice of reading this oracle as a response to Deut 23:2, we compare the deity's promise to provide his faithful eunuchs with a *yād wāšēm* to Ashurbanipal's practice of commending faithful eunuchs with an honorific burial. By taking on these funerary responsibilities, Ashurbanipal thereby assumes the filial duties of a son to commemorate the name of his father (the texts are published in SAA XII.).

While researching these analogies, we realized the interpretational possibilities for another text related to honorific burial: Deuteronomy 34. In its present form, the book of Deuteronomy concludes with Moses' death and burial: *wayyāmāt šām mōšeh 'ebed haShem bē'ereš mō'āb 'al pī haShem* (Deut 34:5; cf. Num 33:38). In this paper we would like to pick up where our *JBL* article drops off, and explore the connections between Moses' burial and the ANE practice of kings attending to the interment of specially honored servants.

First, it is necessary to address the translation and interpretation of *wayyiqbōr ʾōtô* and “he buried him” (Deut 34:6). Scholars are divided on this phrase. (1) Some, like Eckart Otto, read a plural verb and seek support in the LXX, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and *Fragment Targum Neofiti* which also read a plural verb.<sup>i</sup> As such, the phrase would be rendered “they buried him” or in passive “he was buried”. (2) Others like Robert Alter, Gerhard von Rad, and the translators of the NRSV follow the MT, *Targum Onqelos* and *Targum Pseudo-Jonathani*<sup>ii</sup> by reading a singular verb, which they translate either as an implied indefinite subject (“one buried him”) or as a passive (“he was buried”).<sup>iii</sup> The problem is the direct object *ʾōtô*, “him.” (3) We agree with those scholars who accept the MT’s singular verb. However, we understand Yhwh to be the subject of that verb (see, e.g., Driver, Tigay, Christensen, and Levinson).<sup>iv</sup> *wayyiqbōr ʾōtô* in other words, should be maintained as the original reading and translated as, “He [i.e., Yhwh] buried him.”

Our reason for taking this option is that it makes best sense of the immediate context of vv. 1-6. In v. 1 Moses and Yhwh are alone on *rōʾōš hapisgāh*, where Yhwh shows Moses the entire land. Every predicate leading up to the burial of Moses in v. 6 is either attributed to Yhwh or to Moses, making it unlikely that anyone else was there to bury him. Finally, we are told in

34:6b that no *one* (*lō' yāda' īš*) knows the location of Moses' grave. No one knows its location, because there was no one around to see Moses buried.

Now this statement in v. 6b along with vv. 1-4, may well constitute the work of later readers who amplified vv. 5-6a. If the original text originally comprised only vv. 5-6a, one could compare it to the death notice of Miriam. Thus, Num 20:1b reads: "And the people dwelt at Kadesh. Miriam died there and was buried there" (*vattiqqaver sham*). This statement bears remarkable similarities to our text, all the more so if one follows some scholars, like Reinhard Kratz and myself, who postulate an original connection between Num 34:5-6 and 25:1a, a passage that stands in close proximity to the Miriam death notice. The formulation of Num 25:1a ("And Israel dwelt in Shittim") is similar to the residence notice that directly precedes the death of Miriam in Num 20:1b. It is from Shittim that Joshua sends out the spies and crosses the Jordan in Josh 2:1 and 3:1, respectively. In the compositional history of the Pentateuch, this primordial connection between Num 25:1a and Deut 34:5-6a was broken and gradually separated as generations of readers successively inserted material between these lines. Much of this material, such as Moses' speeches and the Deuteronomic code, is placed on the mouth of Moses in his final days, as he prepares for his death. The death notice in Deut 34:5-6 belongs accordingly to the oldest texts in the Pentateuch.

Now it is important to notice that the reader would not have to assume that Yhwh buries Moses before the composition of 34:1-4, 6b. *Wayyiqbor 'oto* could be translated, as some versions, with an implied impersonal subject: “they buried him” or “one buried him.” Alternatively, one could argue that the direct object *'oto* was added later and the verb was originally to be read, as in Miriam’s case, as a nifal: *wayyiqqābēr*.

Whatever the case may be, the addition of vv. 1-4, 6b clearly makes the *deity* responsible for the burial. Therefore, one would have to conclude that the much later attempt to relieve Yhwh of this responsibility, which we witness first in the versional variation, represents a secondary *interpretational* move on the part of later readers. Their reason for adopting these new readings was likely motivated by a discomfort with the anthropomorphic depiction of Yhwh personally burying Moses.<sup>v</sup> Their reinterpretation of the passage, however, conceals a profound literary and theological move of an earlier generation of readers, who present the deity honoring Moses by personally attending to his burial. The reception history of this text includes a massive amount of literature relating specifically to this issue of the deity’s involvement in Moses’s death and internment or the denials of his death in favor of some sort of ascension. Many features of this reception history, especially from the extensive midrashic literature, stand in direct continuity with the redaction of the text. While it would be fun to trace these trajectories,

the question our paper addresses is: Why did the redactors take a simple death notice and amplify in such a way that Moses does not just die “at the command of Yhwh” (*al pi yhwh*) but is also *buried by Yhwh*.

#### THE FUNERARY BACKGROUND OF DEUT 34:6

In a brief comment on Deut 34:6, Bernard Levinson notes that “Instead of Moses’ progeny assuming the important legal responsibility of caring for the dead, God undertook it personally.”<sup>vi</sup> This interpretation appeals to the duty of the *paterfamilias* to bury his ancestors, care for them in death, and ensure that their names be remembered.<sup>vii</sup> We agree with Levinson’s use of actual burial practices to illuminate this text. In our view, however, a different kind of burial practice with a different set of relational dynamics seems more compelling. Instead of a father-son relationship, we suggest a king-servant relationship.

Moses is described here as *‘ebed Yhwh* (Deut 34:5) a title that most likely represents an adaption of *‘ebed hammelek*, which is widely attested in both biblical literature and the epigraphic record from the 8<sup>th</sup> and especially 7<sup>th</sup> centuries (Oded Lipschits has a nice Hebrew article on the evidence in *Shnaton 13*).<sup>viii</sup> The title emphasizes Moses’ obedience to Yhwh, which is an important point for our interpretation. Near Eastern evidence indicates that honorific burials were one way for a king to memorialize the name of faithful royal servants. In the rest of

this paper, we examine several examples from the the kingdom of Ya'diya, ancient Egypt, and the NA empire. Our goal is not to show that Deut 34:6 is dependent on any one of these texts, but rather to show that the text is drawing a practice that was widespread in the ANE.

### **Biblical References to Royal Honored Burials**

The biblical materials themselves attest to the reality of honorific burials given to servants, officials, and leaders who exhibited loyalty to the king. On account of Joseph's faithfulness to Pharaoh (see Gen 50:4-6), Jacob is given an honorific burial procession, complete with Pharaoh's officials, dignitaries, and a military escort (Gen 50:7-9). Abner's burial, too, is marked by a great deal of royal pomp and circumstance (2 Sam 3:31-32). David even sang a lament on Abner's behalf (2 Sam 3:33-34). And after mourning, David declares that it was not just any man who had fallen, but a "commander and a great one" (שר וגדול). That Abner receives an honorific burial from the newly anointed king of Judah, naturally, only adds to the propagandistic hue of this passage, and further distances David from Abner's assassination.<sup>ix</sup>

Of course, these accounts from DtrH cannot be naively understood as historical reportage. Some of them are undoubtedly propagandistic in nature. But there is no

reason to think that they do not reflect actual social practices in which faithful servants receive honorific royal burials.

### **The Sam'alian Aramaic Inscription of Barrakab for Panamuwa II (KAI 215)**

On a dolerite statue found at Tahtali Pinari, Barrakab commemorates the great deeds of his father, Panamuwa II, who died in battle around 733-732 BCE in the service of Tiglath-pileser III.

The Sam'alian Aramaic inscription is 23 lines; however, we will restrict our analysis to lines 11-18, which concern Panamuwa's relationship to Tiglath-pileser.<sup>xi</sup>

According to Barrakab, Panamuwa was the ideal vassal king. He took hold of the hem of his lord Tiglath-pileser (KAI 215 11). The Assyrian king honored Panamuwa by placing him over other powerful kings (KAI 215 12). Panamuwa ran beside Tiglath-pileser's chariot in the emperor's conquests of the four quarters of the earth (KAI 215 12-14). Finally, while on campaign, Panamuwa showed the ultimate act of loyalty by dying in the service of his emperor (KAI 215 16). Tiglath-pileser and his entire army mourned the death of Panamuwa (KAI 215, 16-17). To honor Panamuwa, Tiglath-pileser performed a funerary rite for him (KAI 215, 17-18), erected an "image" (*mšky*) on his behalf (ln 18), and also took his corpse to Assyria for burial (KAI 215, 18). Panamuwa's honored burial is the climax of the rewards conferred upon him by

Tiglath-pileser. Panamuwa lived a life of exceptional obedience to the Assyrian king, and he was honored both in life and death.

Of course, KAI 215 differs from Deut 34 in many ways (e.g., genre, medium, etc.). And yet, the two texts share a number of interesting features. First, both texts emphasize mourning over the lost hero (Deut 34:8; KAI 215, 16-17). Second, both Moses and Panamuwa die while serving their masters—Moses, at the command of Yhwh and Panamuwa in battle. Third, as a result of their faithfulness, both Moses and Panamuwa are given honorific burials that are sanctioned by the king.

### **Egyptian Honored Burials**

Evidence for honored burials is abundant from ancient Egypt.<sup>xii</sup> Most Egyptians were responsible for the construction of their own graves or tombs, a task that many started while still alive.<sup>xiii</sup> During the Old and Middle Kingdoms (ca. 2686-2160 B.C.E. and 2055-1650 B.C.E. respectively), mummification was typically reserved for the royal family and high-ranking people.<sup>xiv</sup> Mummification and the extravagance of one's tomb, therefore, was an indication of social status.<sup>xv</sup> John Taylor notes, however, that "At this period [Old and Middle Kingdoms], mummification could be awarded by the king as a

favour in recognition of good service or an exemplary act of piety by a subordinate.”<sup>xvi</sup>

One of the most moving examples of honorific burial in Egypt comes from the autobiography of Sabni, who lived during the reign of Pepy II (ca. 2278-2184 B.C.E.).

This “autobiography” describes Sabni’s trip to Nubia to obtain the body of his father, who apparently died there while on an expedition. Upon hearing about Sabni’s recovery of his father from Nubia, the king was so taken that he gave Sabni’s father an honorary burial place in the necropolis where, according to Sabni’s account, “never was one of his rank (so) buried [before].”<sup>xvii</sup> The faithfulness of the son to the Egyptian ideal of being buried in one’s homeland seems to have evoked this generous response on the part of Pepy II.<sup>xviii</sup>

The most prominent example of an honorific burial comes from the famous Middle Kingdom masterpiece, the *Tale of Sinuhe*. The tale concludes with the claim that Senwosret I provided Sinuhe with a pyramid, funerary equipment, and priests:

A pyramid of stone was built for me, in the midst of the pyramids. The masons who construct the pyramid measured out its foundations; the draughtsman drew in it; the overseer of sculptors carved in it; the overseer of the works which are in the burial grounds busied himself with it. All the equipment to be put in a tomb

shaft—its share of these things was made. I was given funerary priests; a funerary demesne was made for me, with fields in it and a garden in its proper place, as is done for a Chief Friend. My image was overlaid with gold, and its kilt with electrum. It is his Majesty who caused this to be done. There is no other lowly man for whom the like was done. I was in the favours of the king's giving, until the day of landing came.<sup>xix</sup>

But honored burials were not limited to the Old and Middle Kingdoms. One of the more well known instances of Egyptian honorific burial is that of Nebamūn, a courageous and loyal standard-bearer who served during the reign of Rameses II (ca. 1279-1213 B.C.E.). Not only did the king take steps “to ensure that he should enjoy an honoured old age in an elegant two-storied house with an inner courtyard shaded by a palm tree,” the king also gave him the gift of *amakhou*, “An honour which entitled the holder to burial at the king's expense.”<sup>xxvii</sup> If that were not enough, these honors were bestowed on Nebamūn in the midst of a full-blown ceremonial parade.<sup>xxviii</sup>

Like Moses' burial in Deuteronomy 34, the Egyptian kings honored faithful servants by provisioning them with private tombs, funerary implements, and sometimes even personnel for the funerary cult. These burials functioned ideologically to exalt or establish the social status of the buried person.<sup>xxix</sup>

## Neo-Assyrian Land Grants to Eunuchs

Evidence from the reign of Ashurbanipal suggests that, in light of eunuchs's inability to sire sons, the king himself could attend to the burial concerns of his most loyal eunuchs (see SAA 12 nos. 25-26, 29-34).<sup>xxx</sup> Four of these tablets preserve the name and title of the grantee (nos. 25, 26, 29, 30) and two of them are given specifically to Nabû-šarru-ušur (nos. 26, 29).

With the exception of a few minor variants, these grants are identical and were probably copied from the same master.<sup>xxxi</sup> Since these grants are largely identical, we will discuss only one exemplar, no. 26, which was given by Ashurbanipal to Nabû-šarru-ušur.<sup>xxxii</sup>

Like other grants from this period, the one given to Nabû-šarru-ušur exempts him from all taxes and duties on his land and personnel.<sup>xxxiii</sup> In the grant, The grant praises Nabû-šarru-ušur, for he “from the [‘succ]ession’ to the exercise of kingship [was d]evoted to the king [his lord], who served before [me in faithfulness], and walk[ed in safety, who grew with a good repute within my palace, and kept guard over my kingship]...” (SAA 12 26 11-20). Because of Nabû-šarru-ušur’s exceptional loyalty, Ashurbanipal exempted his fields and his personnel from taxation and duties (SAA 12 26 30-r.8). Ashurbanipal then promises that when Nabû-šarru-ušur “goes to his fate” (*il-la-ku ṭa-na ṭ šim-ti*, SAA 12 26 20), they will bury him where he wishes. As the editors of SAA 12 indicate, the burial presumably occurs in the palace.<sup>xxxiv</sup> The king then

makes a number of injunctions to protect the grave of Nabû-šarru-ušur, so that he will not be disturbed (SAA 12 26 26-27). For example, the king relates a number of curses to the one who might disturb Nabû-šarru-ušur: (SAA 12 26 r.27-31). Finally, the king decrees that neither king nor prince shall change the wording of the tablet (SAA 12 26 r.32-39).

As a reward for his faithfulness to the king, Nabû-šarru-ušur, like Moses is given an honorific royal burial. In this case, his status as a eunuch increases the significance of the royal grant, for it suggests, as Radner argues, that the king is taking on the *Totenpflege* responsibilities that would normally fall upon the shoulders of a son.<sup>xxxv</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS

The texts cited here differ from one another on many counts. Some are inscribed on funerary architecture and monuments (e.g., KAI 215, the Autobiography of Sabni, etc.), while others are found on administrative tablets (the land grant of Nabû-šarru-ušur). In spite of these differences, all of these texts share an important characteristic: all of them claim that a king commemorates the faithfulness of a servant by providing him with an honorific burial. This practice was apparently widespread, for the evidence cited here is found throughout the ANE and is dispersed over several millennia.

Similar burial practices are in the background of Deuteronomy 34. However, Deuteronomy 34 is distinctive in several ways. First Moses is not honored by an earthly king but by Yhwh, a heavenly king. This feature of the report heightens Moses's stature, for he becomes the only biblical character to receive an honorific burial by God. Second, Moses' burial is not protected by curses or by a *paterfamilias*, but rather by its hidden location, which no one knows. Third, Moses's obedience goes far beyond any other servant, for he not only obeyed God in life, but also in death, for he dies at the command of his God (the so-called "kiss of death").

---

<sup>i</sup> For example, Eckhart Otto, following the LXX, Samaritan Pentateuch, and several targumic sources, reads ויקברו ("they buried") rather than the MT's ויקבר ("he buried"). He writes, "Mit der Mehrzahl der MSS des Sam. und der LXX ist der Plural zu lesen." Eckart Otto, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumrahmens* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 2000), 212.

<sup>ii</sup> The Targumim are in disagreement on this point. Both *Tg. Onq.* and *Tg. Ps.-J.*, unlike LXX, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and *Fragment Tg. Neof.*, use the singular form of the verb.

<sup>iii</sup> Alternatively, Robert Alter and the NRSV maintain the MT but read the verb as having an indefinite subject, which they then translate as a passive ("he was buried"). Robert Alter, *The Five Books of Moses: A Translation with Commentary* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2004), 1058; see also Anthony Philips, Deuteronomy (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 230-31. Gerhard von Rad's position is similar to Alter's, though he translates the verb in its indefinite form ("man begrub ihn"), than the passive, and his reasons are slightly different: "Da Moses nicht ganz ohne Begleitung den Berg bestiegen haben wird, liegt es näher, in v. 6 zu übersetzen, 'man begrub ihn,' (Jahwe war in dem vorausgehenden Satz ja auch nicht Subjekt)." Gerhard von Rad, *Das fünfte Buch Mose* (ATD 8;

---

Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), 150; see also J.G. McConville, *Deuteronomy* (Apollos Old Testament Commentary 5; Leicester: Apollos, 2002), 477.

<sup>iv</sup> S.R. Driver notes that while the Hebrew idiom “would permit the verb to be fairly represented in English by *they buried him . . .*, or *he was buried . . .*, yet, in view of clause <sup>b</sup> [i.e., 6<sup>b</sup>], the subject intended is doubtless Jehovah..” see S.R. Driver, *Deuteronomy* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1965), 423. See also A.D.H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy* (New Century Bible; London: Oliphants, 1979), 413; Jeffrey H. Tigay, *Deuteronomy* (The JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996), 338; Duane L. Christensen maintains the reading as *lectio difficilior*. See his *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12* (WBC 6B; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2002), 864; Bernard M. Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” in *The Jewish Study Bible: Jewish Publication Society: Tanakh Translation* (ed. Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 449.

<sup>v</sup> Robert Alter, e.g., expresses some discomfort with the theological implications of a grave digging deity: “The Hebrew says literally, ‘and he bud him,’ but the third-person singular verb without specified grammatical subject is not infrequently used in biblical Hebrew in place of a passive verb. Many interpreters have understood this ostensibly active verb to mean that God buried Moses. That possibility cannot be dismissed, but God’s acting as a gravedigger for Moses seems incongruous with the representation of the deity in these narratives, and thus construing the verb as a passive is more likely.” Robert Alter, *The Five Books of Moses: A Translation with Commentary* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2004), 1058.

<sup>vi</sup> Bernard M. Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” in *The Jewish Study Bible: Jewish Publication Society: Tanakh Translation* (ed. Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 449.

<sup>vii</sup> For a discussion of the Duties of a Son with respect to the cult of the ancestors, see Karel van der Toorn, *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria and Israel* (Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East 7; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), 154-55. For an alternative interpretation of the Duties of a Son, see Brian B. Schmidt, *Israel's Beneficent Dead: Ancestor Cult and Necromancy in Ancient Israelite Religion and Tradition* (FAT 11; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 59-62. For discussions of how family religion relates to burial practices and care for the ancestors in the ANE, see the following studies: Herbert Chanan Brichto, “Kin, Cult, Land and Afterlife: A Biblical Complex,” *HUCA* 44 (1973): 1-54; Akio Tsukimoto, *Untersuchungen zur Totenpflege (kispum) im alten Mesopotamien* (AOAT 216; Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1985); Gerdien Jonker, *The Topography of Remembrance: The Dead, Tradition and Collective Memory in Mesopotamia* (SHR 68; Leiden: New York, 1995).

<sup>viii</sup> Oded Lipschitz, “על ‘עבד יהוה’ ועל ‘עבד המלך’,” (ed. שרה יפת; Jerusalem:), 157-172.

<sup>ix</sup> For a discussion of David’s culpability in the death of Abner, and the various editorial devices used to cover over it, see James C. VanderKam, “Davidic complicity in the Deaths of Abner and Eshbaal: A Historical and Redactional Study,” *JBL* 99 (1980): 521-539.

---

<sup>xi</sup> According to the revised outline of the inscription proposed by Douglas Green, the relevant section is in Part 3, “Panamuwa II and the Assyrian king.” Green revises the outline of Josef Tropper (Josef Tropper, *Die Inschriften von Zincirli: Neue Edition und vergleichende Grammatik des phönizischen, sam'alischen und aramäischen Textkorpus* [Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1993], 99). See Douglas J. Green, “I Undertook Great Works,” (FAT 2.41; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 200.

<sup>xii</sup> For a detailed rendering of Egyptian understandings of death and the afterlife, Jan Assman, *Tod und Jenseits im Alten Ägypten* (München: Beck, 2001).

<sup>xiii</sup> John H. Taylor, *Death and Afterlife in Ancient Egypt* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 170. Taylor notes further, “Many persons would have begun the construction of the tomb during their lifetime with such funds as they had available, which might be the stipend received for official duties; part of these funds might be reserved to meet essential funerary expenses after death.” Ibid.

<sup>xiv</sup> All dates related to the history of Egypt are taken from Ian Shaw, *The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

<sup>xv</sup> Trigger, et al., note that the patterns of leadership and status were marked by tomb size, and that “the hierarchic scaling of tomb size symbolized and reinforced the existing patterns of leadership.” B.G. Trigger, et al., *Ancient Egypt: A Social History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 86; Wolfgang Helck, “Soziale Stellung und Grablage: (Bemerkungen zur Thebanischen Nekropole),” *JESHO* 5 (1962): 225-43; Sigrid Hodel-Hoernes, *Life and Death in Ancient Egypt: Scenes from Private Tombs in New Kingdom Thebes* (trans. D. Warburton; Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), 4.

<sup>xvi</sup> Ibid., 76.

<sup>xvii</sup> For a translation of the autobiography of Sabni, see *ARE* 1:§362-374.

<sup>xviii</sup> Concerning the Egyptian fear of dying outside of one’s homeland, Assmann notes, “Für den Ägypter ist der größte Horror, nicht in der Heimat, sondern in der Fremde bestattet zu werden. Er nennt das ‘den Schrecken der Fremde’, etwa in Inschriften, die Grabbesucher dazu bewegen sollen, ein Totengebet für den Grabherrn zu sprechen.” Assmann, *Tod und Jenseits im Alten Ägypten*, 235.

<sup>xix</sup> R.B. Parkinson, *The Tale of Sinuhe and other Ancient Egyptian Poems, 1940-1640 BC* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 42-43.

<sup>xxvii</sup> Pierre Montet, *Everyday Life in Egypt in the Days of Ramesses the Great* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1981), 224.

<sup>xxviii</sup> Ibid.

<sup>xxix</sup> Martin Fitzenreiter has done an in-depth study of 18<sup>th</sup> Dynasty (ca. 1550-1352 B.C.E.) *Beamtengräber* (officials’ graves), paying particular attention to the way in which tomb décor reflects their high social status. Particularly relevant for this study is the phenomenon of *die Verehrung des Königs*, a scene indicating the close relationship between the *Grabherr* and the king. In Fitzenreiter’s words, “Diese Szene wurde formalisiert zu einer Ikone, bei der sich der Grabherr in verehrender Pose (z.B. durch das Überreichen von Ritualsträußen) dem im Baldachin thronenden König nähert.” Martin Fitzenreiter,

---

“Totenverehrung und soziale Repräsentation im thebanischen Beamtengrab der 18. Dynastie,” *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 22 (1995): 106.

<sup>xxx</sup> See Kataja and Whiting, *Grants, Decrees and Gifts of the Neo-Assyrian Period*. For the list of relevant texts, see Radner, *Macht des Namens*, 77n358.

<sup>xxxii</sup> Kataja and Whiting, *Grants, Decrees and Gifts of the Neo-Assyrian Period*, XXVI. See also J.N. Postgate, *Neo-Assyrian Royal Grants and Decrees* (Studia Pohl: Series Maior: Dissertationes Scientificalae de Rebus Orientis Antiqui 1; Roma: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969), 34.

<sup>xxxiii</sup> This is text no. 10 in Postgate’s study, *Neo-Assyrian Royal Grants and Decrees*. See Postgate, *Neo-Assyrian Royal Grants and Decrees*.

<sup>xxxiiii</sup> Kataja and Whiting write, “In the Assurbanipal grants on the other hand it is clear that the property is already owned by the grantee and that what is being granted by the king is exemption from all taxes and dues on the land and its personnel.” See *ibid.* XXVI.

<sup>xxxv</sup> Kataja and Whiting note, “These grants contain another boon that has no precedent, and that is the right of the grantee to be buried wherever he pleases, presumably in the palace, surely signal honor.” See *ibid.*

<sup>xxxvi</sup> Radner, *Macht des Namens*, 77.