The Egyptian galleries as they appeared in 1907. This area now houses the Lending Collections and Photograph Sales
THE NEW EGYPTIAN GALLERIES

While the Egyptian Department’s exhibitions have occasionally been overhauled in the past, and in fact as recently as 1953, the previous reinstallations were primarily motivated by necessary reallocations of space. Our presentation has generally benefited, but modifications that might render the architectural setting more suitable for display were seldom possible. As a result, some parts of our exhibitions—such as the overpopulated Sculpture Court or the ill-lit galleries on the Fifth Avenue side—have long been earmarked for improvement. It was expected that a comprehensive plan would have been realized within ten or fifteen years, but the availability of funds bequeathed by Helen E. Folds and the necessity of replacing the floors above the Egyptian galleries have greatly advanced our hopes; this work not only provides for greater uniformity and better overhead lighting throughout the wing but also gives us an opportunity to make other architectural adjustments.

Under improved lighting and brighter surroundings, the familiar façade of the tomb of Per-nebi will be seen beyond the columns at the north end of the entrance hall, as it has been for half a century, and the gallery to the right of it will again house the prehistoric and protodynastic collections. This gallery will no longer remain the chronological excursus that it has been in the past, however; instead of resuming the sequence at its north end, we are transferring the remaining Old Kingdom material to the other side of the Per-nebi area, continuing the earlier periods along the west side. In so doing, we shall be able to bring together the major elements of four tomb chapels from Saqqara and make it possible to obtain a general impression of all of them from a single vantage point. One of these—a group of reliefs from the tomb of Kai-em-senui—has been extracted from the wall on the left of the Per-nebi area and relocated against the west wall of the adjacent room, where it takes its place as the latest member of the series. This move has enabled us to widen the door between the two rooms, emphasizing their relation as well as the direction of our chronological sequence. It has also provided a solution for one of our most difficult problems. The tomb chapel of Ra-em-kai, being much too narrow to accommodate the present-day flow of attendance, has for some years been flattened out along a wall, a great distance from the reliefs to which it properly belongs. The newly widened aperture permits us to set up three of its walls precisely as they were constructed, while its fourth wall and one side of the entrance passage, both retaining their original orientation, have been retracted to provide free access at either end. The remainder of this second Old Kingdom gallery will feature smaller portions of wall reliefs from tombs and temples, some of which have never been exhibited and others not for many years. The next room is designated for Old Kingdom sculpture in the round. Its newest feature is an improved installation of our particularly fine series of wooden statues and statuettes. Beyond the Auditorium Lounge, two further galleries present smaller Middle Kingdom material, the first devoted to the fascinating group of ancient models of daily life from the tomb of Meket-Re, the second containing sculpture and relief.

The galleries on the Fifth Avenue side will benefit particularly from better lighting, although the results will not be seen until the earlier galleries have been completed. The small first room will contain objects of the early New Kingdom, the second, of greater length, will include the Amarna and Ramesside periods, and the third is reserved for the succeeding dynasties as well as Greco-Roman
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times. The last of these brings us back to our starting point in prehistory. In the midst of this chronological circuit, the outstanding collection of Egyptian jewelry has been returned to its former location. Completely reinstalled only five years ago, this exhibition will receive improvements in its cases and their illumination.

Although the large Sculpture Court, in which the majority of our larger reliefs and statues are displayed, is at present unaffected by changes in the smaller galleries, this area will soon undergo a much more dramatic transformation than has been effected by the first phase of reconstruction. The second phase will transform the skylighted center of the hall into a room enclosed by solid walls instead of pillars, and its ungainly height will be reduced by the installation of a subsidiary skylight at the level of the present balcony railing. This simple and well-lighted space will be reserved for the important group of statues from Queen Hatshepsut’s temple at Deir el Bahri, including the well-known sphinx that now guards the approaches of our exhibition. The equally simplified peripheral corridors will contain much the same material as before, but our massive late sarcophagi will no longer encumber the confluence of doorways, stairs, and elevator at the front of the area, all the material of this period being withdrawn to the rear. In its place, two palmiform columns of the Old Kingdom are to flank the entrance of the Deir el Bahri room. In the lateral galleries the Middle Kingdom and New Kingdom material will be transposed in accordance with the scheme of the smaller galleries previously installed. The New Kingdom side will be dominated by a series of eight lion-headed Sakhmet statues ranged side by side along the east wall.
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*Associate Curator in Charge of Egyptian Art*
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Egyptian Jewelry

NORA E. SCOTT Associate Curator of Egyptian Art

During the reconstruction of the Egyptian Galleries it has fortunately been possible to keep much of the Museum’s extraordinary collection of Egyptian jewelry on display, including the “Lahun Treasure” and the “Treasure of the Three Princesses,” both world-famous. With the reopening of the Jewelry Room, it may be rewarding to examine some of the pieces that have been inaccessible and are less well known — and also to look once again at a few of our more familiar examples.

The reasons for acquiring and wearing jewelry in the Western world are many — adornment, ostentation, sentiment, as an investment, sometimes as a religious symbol. Few of us, however, would admit to putting much faith in the type of charm that dangles from our bracelets, or in the “lucky pieces” tucked away in our pockets. Nevertheless, jewelry was first worn for its amuletic value: material, design, and color were still being combined to form talismans for the Egyptian at the end of the dynastic period, as for the earliest wanderer over the desert. The prehistoric Egyptian, like other primitive people, tied various objects (whose exact significance we can only guess at) around his neck and waist, wrists and ankles, in the hope of protection from a hostile world. He felt himself surrounded by powers he did not understand. The bright daytime sky and the darkness of the night, the desert itself, the river whose inundation suddenly made the desert bloom, the sun, the moon, the wind, the spirits of the dead, the animals of the desert and of the swamps (to him another kind of people) — these were the forces with which he had to reckon. Now and then he would pick up a stone that attracted his attention; it might be blue like the sky, or green like fresh vegetation or red like blood. It might be a shiny yellow stone that didn’t break when he hit it with another but flattened and spread, and then bent, and became more and more shiny. Sometimes he found other strange stones with similar properties, especially around a campfire: perhaps if he put an unpromising lump into the fire it too would change into something shiny that one could flatten and bend. But the strange yellow stone never got dull, as the others did in time. Surely the very gods must be made of this gleaming, indestructible material.

1. Teye, Mistress of the Harem, Dynasty XVIII, about 1375 B.C. Wood, details painted and inlaid, with necklace of real beads (carnelian, gold, and blue glass). Height including base 9½ inches. Rogers Fund, 41.2.10
By the time the clay statuette in Figure 2 was made, it was realized that what were primarily talismans could also be attractive. Girls such as this knew that a line of green paint around upslanting, large black eyes not only protected them from the blazing divinity of the sun but enhanced their beauty (we still admire shadowy black eyes, though our standards of beauty may have changed in other respects). And in addition to other ornaments, the figure wears two necklaces of pretty green and red beads around her neck, for the hardest stones could now be polished and drilled for stringing. It should be understood that the Egyptians did not have access to the flashing stones we now associate with the word "jewel." The stones they considered finest were the ones we call semiprecious, which they valued for their color: turquoise, carnelian, lapis lazuli, amethyst, green feldspar, and red, green, black, and yellow jasper—all hard and difficult to work. By 4000 B.C. the Egyptians also knew how to coat the soft, whitish stone we call steatite with a clear green or blue glaze (Figure 3) and so imitate the rare turquoise and feldspar, though it would be another two thousand years before they tried to make little beads of the glaze alone without any base, and five hundred more before they realized that they had invented glass.

When dynastic history began, with the unification of Egypt about 3100 B.C., the standard of living quickly reached new heights. Nevertheless, jewelry of the oldest dynasties is rare, largely because tombs have almost always been robbed of intrinsically precious materials; the robbery often occurred directly after the funeral. The outstanding jewelry from the first two dynasties comes from the tomb of Djef, the third king of Egypt. A workman sent to clear out the tomb in the reign of Amenophis III (about 1400 B.C.) came on a body, probably that of Djef himself, and on investigation found four bracelets still in place. In his hurry to conceal his treasure he tore off wrist, wrappings, and bracelets all together, and pushed them into a hole at the top of a wall. He never recovered them, and there they remained another thirty-three centuries, until discovered by the founder of modern archaeology, Flinders Petrie. This jewelry, now in Cairo, demonstrates a mastery of such technical problems as the casting and soldering of gold, and unusual inventiveness of design and harmony of color. Our own earliest important piece is a plain gold bracelet (Figure 11) from the tomb of Khasekhemwy, the last king of Dynasty II (about 2700 B.C.), whose annals record his erection of the first stone building in history.

Jewelry of the Old Kingdom (Dynasties III-VI) is also rarely preserved, although it is widely represented on statues and reliefs. The most popular pieces, if we can trust the

---

2. Seated figure, Predynastic Period, about 3500 B.C. Unbaked clay, with painted decoration in red, green, and black representing jewelry and possibly tattooing. Height 9 inches. Rogers Fund, 07.228.71
The jewelry illustrated in this article is divided by function, and examples are arranged chronologically to show the historical development of each form.

Necklaces

3 (opposite). Beads of bone, shell, hard stone, and glazed steatite, Predynastic Period, about 4000 B.C. Largest necklace 9½ inches across. Rogers Fund, 32.2.26-28, 36-38

4. Muyet’s necklaces, Dynasty xi, about 2050 B.C. From center: Gold discs; minute beads of silver, carnelian, and green feldspar; minute beads of carnelian, and silver alternating with dark blue glass; beads of carnelian; hollow gold ball beads. Total length of ball-bead necklace 24 inches. Museum Excavations at Thebes, Rogers Fund, 22.3.320-324

5. Gold necklaces of the New Kingdom. From center: Two necklaces from the tomb of the Three Princesses, Dynasty xviii, about 1450 B.C. Plaques of the smaller engraved with figures of Maat, goddess of Truth; pendants of the larger in the form of flies (symbols of pertinacity and bravery). Outer necklace associated with Queen Tet-Wosret, who reigned for a short time at the end of Dynasty xix, about 1200 B.C. Length of outer necklace 24 inches. Fletcher Fund, 26.8.64-65; Bequest of Theodore M. Davis, 30.8.66
artists of the time, are “broad collars,” made of row upon row of cylindrical beads, often with wristlets, anklets, and shoulder straps of matching design. However, artists who were representing their clients for eternity were not interested in the latest fashions and were usually reluctant to portray them. The rich tomb owner is never shown wearing bracelets like those of Djer, nor of Queen Hetep-heres, the wife of Sneferu and mother of the builder of the Great Pyramid; the queen’s bracelets, found by the expedition of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, are heavy gold hoops with an inlaid design of brightly colored butterflies. Amulets, furthermore, are scarcely ever shown, although they were the commonest type of jewelry and existed by the thousands. Of various shapes and materials, and each with its own specific role, they were usually tied around the finger, wrist, or neck by a piece of string; the esteem in which they were held by their owners is reflected in a story that has come down to us from the age of the pyramids:

It seems that one day King Sneferu was feeling depressed, and after a hasty consultation—though not presumably with Hetep-heres—it was decided that what was needed was a picnic on the river, the rowers to be the twenty most beautiful girls that could be rounded up, draped in fishnets instead of more orthodox garments. As might have been expected, one girl, unfortunately the stroke, managed to get into a tangle, upsetting the others and dropping her “fish-shaped pendant of new turquoise” (see Figure 18) into the water in the confusion. In spite of the fact that Sneferu promised her another if she would only start rowing again, she refused, with the memorable words:

*“I want my own and not one like it.”

The exasperated monarch was forced to call in the court magician to retrieve the pendant. She must have been a very pretty girl.

Although the ancient Egyptians, like their modern descendants (and, some would claim, archaeologists as well) continued to plunder
Broad collars

6 (opposite, above). Wah's, Dynasty XI, about 2030 B.C. Cylindrical beads, leaf-shaped pendants, and counterpoises of bright greenish blue faience, on original string. 15½ inches across. Museum Excavations at Thebes, Rogers Fund, 40.3.2

7 (opposite, below). Senebtisy's, Dynasty XII, about 1980 B.C. Beads of carnelian, turquoise, faience, and faience covered with gold leaf. Counterpoises of plaster in the form of falcons' heads, covered with gold leaf; eyes of carnelian and other details of dark blue paste. 10 inches across. Museum Excavations at Lisht, Rogers Fund, 08.200.30

8. Amarna Period, late Dynasty XVIII, about 1350 B.C. Imitation, in yellow, green, red, and white and blue faience, of a garland of real flowers. 12½ inches across. Rogers Fund, 40.2.5

9. Ptolemaic Period, 332-30 B.C. Miniature of gold, inlaid with carnelian, turquoise, and lapis lazuli to represent conventionalized flowers. 4 inches across. Dick Fund, 49.121.1
the tombs of their ancestors, more examples of fine jewelry remain to us from the Middle Kingdom than from the Old, and more still from later periods. The Mediterranean world and the South were being opened up, wealth was pouring into Egypt, and kings and nobles were decking themselves and their families with golden ornaments. The Middle Kingdom jeweler maintained a standard of excellence of workmanship and design that has never been surpassed. His clientele included men as well as women, the dead as well as the living, and the gods in their temples.

The jewelry of Miuyet, Sole Favorite of the King, made in Dynasty XI (about 2050 B.C.) is a fine example of early Middle Kingdom workmanship (Figure 4). Miuyet (her name means “Kitty”) was one of six young girls (each called herself the “Sole Favorite”) from the harem of Montuhotep II who were either wives or wives-to-be of the king, and who were buried under shrines especially made for them in his temple. Miuyet, however, never reached an age when the title could have had any significance. As H. E. Winlock described the excavation of her tomb in the Museum’s Bulletin for November 1921: “When we opened the big sarcophagus (the lid must have weighed two tons) the little whitewashed wooden coffin of Miuyet lay within. . . . Inside we found a second coffin with strips of cloth covering the little mummy. There Miuyet lay upon her side with the

10. Pectoral given to Sit-Hathor-Yunet by her father, Seesostris II, whose cartouche it bears, Dynasty xi, about 1880 B.C. Gold, the front (above) inlaid with carnelian, lapis lazuli, turquoise, and garnet; the back (below) modeled and engraved with the same design. Width 3½ inches. Rogers Fund, with contribution from Henry Walters, 16.1.3

11. Khasekhmenuy’s, Dynasty 11, about 2700 B.C. Hollow gold, undecorated. Diameter 2½ inches. Gift of Egypt Exploration Fund, 01.4.2

Bracelets and anklets
eyes of her plaster mask gazing through the
eyes painted on her coffins. The coffins were
small, but the wrapped mummy with its
mask was much smaller, and as we came to
unwrap it we found that, small as it was, it
was mostly padding at head and foot to dis-
guise the tiny proportions of the pathetic
little infant within. . . . Bandage after band-
age was removed, and then suddenly there
was a glint of carnelian beads. Miuyet may
have been hastened off to the grave in what-
ever coffins could be found, but at least she
was decked out in all the finery she had worn
during her brief life.

"There was a string of great ball beads of
hollow gold; another of carnelian beads; two
necklaces of minute beads of silver, carnelian,
green feldspar, and rich blue glass; and a neck-
lace of gold disks so fine that strung on leather
bands they look like a supple tube of un-
broken gold. Removing each necklace care-
fully we were able to preserve the exact ar-
rangement of every bead [and] we recovered
all of the brilliant, joyous color scheme of the
jewelry as little Miuyet wore it four thousand
years ago." Miuyet's beads are the earliest
glass in the world that can be dated without
question.

The Estate Manager Wah may have been
a poorer relation of the Chancellor Meket-Re,
who served under both Montuhotep II and
his son Seankhkare, and whose funerary
models are among the most popular exhibits

ABOVE:
12, 13. Sit-Hathor-Yunet's, Dynasty xiii, about 1850 B.C. Above: Two pairs of
flexible bracelets, with lion amulets and tongue-and-groove clasps of gold,
and beads of turquoise, carnelian, and gold. Length 5¾ inches. Below:
Anklets of amethyst and gold. Length 13 inches. Rogers Fund, with contribution
from Henry Walters, 16.1.12-15, 16.1.7a, b
14. From the tomb of the Three Princesses, Dynasty xviii, about 1450 B.C.
Gold, with hinge and pin clasp, inscribed within: "The Good God
Men-Kheper-Re, Son of Re, Tuthmosis, Given Life Forever" (the throne
and personal names of Tuthmosis III). Diameter 2½ inches. Fletcher
Fund, 26.8.133-134

LEFT:
15. Roman Period, 1 century A.D. Gold, with hinge and pin clasp, ornamented
with figures from classical mythology flanked by crowned serpents
(probably those of Isis and Serapis). Rogers Fund, 23.2.1
in the Museum. At any rate, Wah was given a corner in Meket-Re's tomb. His mummy, found intact by our Expedition, remained so until 1936, when an X-ray examination revealed the presence of a broad collar, necklaces, bracelets, a mouse, a lizard, and a cricket, all wrapped in the bandages—the last three presumably by oversight. So Wah was unwrapped, his jewelry was removed, and his bandages (all 460 square yards of them) were replaced exactly as they had been on his body. He proved to have been a man of about thirty years of age, small, with delicate features, who suffered from a disease of the bones of the foot.

Wah's necklaces are reminiscent of those of Miuyet, but his ball beads are even larger, and are of hollow silver. His broad collar (Figure 6) is faience of an intense green-blue and, like the rest of his jewelry, is on its original string (ancient string is friable and must usually be replaced).

The most interesting piece is the scarab shown in Figure 16. Scarabs, the best-known of all Egyptian antiquities, were just coming into vogue in Wah's day. They were a combined seal and amulet, necessary to the Egyptians, who did not have locks and keys, cupboards and drawers. Their possessions were normally stored in chests, baskets, and jars, to which were tied up with cords; over the knot was a lump of clay into which the owner's private seal was impressed. These seals took a variety of forms, often animal, of which that of the scarab beetle became the most popular, as its naturally flat underside was suitable for engraving. Scarabs are never real beetles, but copies in various stones, faience, or sometimes metal, of the natural form (Figures 19, 20, 21): the expert can date a scarab by the style of its back and sides, by its inscription, and often by its material.

Wah's scarab is of a typical Middle Kingdom style, its base engraved with a design of spirals and hieroglyphs. It is exceptionally large, however, made of solid silver, and its back is unique, inlaid in pale gold with the names and titles of Wah and his patron, the Chancellor Meket-Re. The scarab shows signs of having been worn during Wah's lifetime, but for the burial it was strung up on heavy linen cord with one barrel-shaped and one cylindrical bead, to form an amulet whose exact significance we do not know.

Wah, like Miuyet, lived at Thebes, the capital of the kings of Dynasty XI. The founder of Dynasty XII, Amenemhet I, moved his seat of government to the north; his cemetery was at Lisht, where our Expedition excavated for many years. The House Mistress Senebtisy was apparently related to Amenemhet's vizier and was buried near him. She was a rich woman, and, although her tomb was small, her funerary equipment was expensive (Figure 7). But she decided to wear for her journey to the next world a simple but charming circlet of looped gold wire she had been fond of in life. It is shown (Figure 23) on a cast of a head of Queen Nefretity, and the wig is modern. Senebtisy's own wig could not be preserved, but enough was left to show that the little gold flowers, resembling daisies, were sewed to the hair at regular intervals and were worn with the circlet. The Egyptians loved flowers and, particularly in the earlier representations, were often shown with their hair held in place with twisted garlands; many later elements of design go back to these natural forms. Senebtisy's flowers, in turn, are echoed in the wig ornaments of brightly colored faience sometimes worn by ladies of the New Kingdom.

Senebtisy lived about fifty years after Wah; Princess Sit-Hathor-Yunet 130 after Senebtisy. This princess was the daughter, sister, and aunt of kings who ruled during what later generations looked back on as Egypt's golden age. Her mummy has disappeared, but
she must have been tiny, for her jewelry would have fitted Senebtisy, who was just four feet eight inches tall. She could not have been less than forty when she died, even if she were the child of her father’s old age, as her brother reigned for thirty-five years, and she lived into the reign of her nephew.

Sit-Hathor-Yunet’s jewelry (Figures 10, 12, 13, 17) is one of the glories of the Metropolitan Museum. The story of its discovery has been told many times; how it remained safely hidden in a niche in the tomb, and how the individual elements and inlays, disordered by ancient floods, were removed one by one by the English archaeologist Guy Brunton, who remained in the niche without leaving it for five days and nights, so that we know not a single fragment was lost.

The pectoral ornament (Figure 10) given her by her father, Sesostris II, is considered one of the two finest antiquities in the Egyptian collection (the other is the statue of Haremhab in the Sculpture Court), and the finest piece of jewelry to have come down from ancient Egypt. Although one of the best-known of Egyptian antiquities it never loses its fascination. Elegant in design and of superb workmanship, it bears the cartouche of Sesostris, supported by two falcons representing the sun god and by hieroglyphs reading “hundreds of thousands of years” and “life.” The base is of gold, to which are soldered fine gold wires to outline the details of the design. Each little detail is filled with a minute piece of turquoise, lapis lazuli, or carnelian, cut to exact size; the eyes of the falcons are of garnet. In all there are 372 pieces of semiprecious stone, each cut and polished separately. The details of the design are modeled and engraved on the golden back, which in its own way is as extraordinary as the brightly colored front.

Our second “treasure” (Figures 5, 14, 21, 24-27) — the most extensive find of Egyptian jewelry and related objects ever to appear on the market — was made four hundred years later, in Dynasty XVIII, for three minor wives of Tuthmosis III: Syrian girls called Merhot, Menwy, and Merty. They had been buried with their treasure about 1450 B.C., in a tomb discovered and plundered during the First World War by inhabitants of a nearby village. The circumstances of the discovery and the jewelry itself were described by Mr. Winlock in The Treasure of Three Egyptian Princesses, in 1948. By that time the Museum had been able to acquire three sets of gold, silver, glass, and fine stone tableware (the glass vessels among the earliest ever made); three sets of cosmetic jars mounted in gold; two silver and gold mirrors; three sets of funerary jewelry of gold; and jewelry worn during life —on special occasions or in the harem—most of which showed signs of use. The latter jewelry included bracelets, anklets, rings, necklaces, earrings, a circlet, a headress, parts of three broad collars, one girdle and parts of two others, and parts of two belts—all of gold embellished with brightly colored stones or glass.

These objects and a number of large stone vessels had all found their way into the hands of dealers by the early twenties and were acquired in lots. At the time of the last purchase, however, it was known that one lot had got away. This was understood to consist of many elements of jewelry, including a number of “nasturtium seed” beads packed in a cigarette box and additional gold vessels. These elements and two goblets, each of a shape not represented in the earlier purchases, were finally acquired in 1958.

When the treasure first became known it was believed to have been undisturbed until found by the villagers. Nevertheless, certain objects we should have expected to find in such a burial are missing, among them the third mirror, ritual vessels (of which we have
two handles) and other instruments used in religious ceremonies, crown pieces for two headdresses, two additional circlets, and a third belt (for which we have the clasp). These objects would have been of great intrinsic value. We cannot tell now whether all of them ever existed, whether they were stolen at the time of the funeral, or whether the man or men to whose share they fell in 1916 hammered them down to sell as gold. But it is probable that if they still survived in their original form they would have come to light by now.

Owing to the regrettable way in which the tomb was cleared it will never be possible to say with certainty how the various small elements were originally combined. Undoubtedly many are missing, lost in the darkness as the thieves were dividing their loot; a few have been dispersed among other collections. But the most difficult problems of sorting and arranging had been met by Mr. Winlock when the earlier purchase was first put on display, and many of the recently acquired pieces belong to jewelry already partially assembled by him, including the broad collars, belts, and girdles. In addition we now have another girdle, made of the gold nasturtium seeds referred to above, a second headdress, and elements presumably from the missing third one.

For the restrung collars, we have parallels in wall paintings of the period, which show that the fashion in these traditional ornaments had changed. Instead of consisting of solid rows of tubular beads as before, the smarter of the new collars were made up of elements like ours, of many forms and colors, meshing together to form an openwork design (Figure 8 is a later example of the type). The most important of the jewels, however, are the headdresses. Unlike the broad collars—unusually elaborate examples of a well-known article of dress—the headdresses are unique. Two are composed of rosettes of inlaid gold, fitted together to make long, tapering strands that in turn mesh at the sides. On one of these (Figure 25), the solid fabric thus formed is joined to a crown piece, giving the effect of a wig of gold, encrusted with glass.
Headdresses

All headdresses are shown on casts of a quartzite head of Queen Nefretity (Dynasty xviii, about 1370 B.C.), with modern wigs that illustrate ancient styles of hairdressing.

23 (opposite, above). Senebtisy's gold wire circlet and floral wig ornaments, Dynasty xiii, about 1980 B.C. Diameter of circlet 9 inches. Museum Excavations at Lisht, Rogers Fund, 07.227.6-7

24 (opposite, below). Headdress from the tomb of the Three Princesses, Dynasty xviii, about 1450 B.C. Gold, inlaid with carnelian and blue glass. Funds from the Huntley Bequest, 58.153.1-2

25. Great headdress from the tomb of the Three Princesses. 796 gold rosettes, inlaid with carnelian, blue glass, and turquoise; gold crown piece engraved with leaf designs that once alternated with inlaid leaves of glass. Length in front 14 inches. Gift of Edward S. Harkness and Henry Walters, 26.8.117
26. Gazelle circlet from the tomb of the Three Princesses. Two flexible bands of gold, joined in front and tied with a cord behind. Two gazelles’ heads are fastened to the center, flanked above and on each side by two rosettes inlaid with carnelian and blue and green glass. Length of forehead band 17 inches. Gift of George F. Baker and Mr. and Mrs. V. Everit Macy, 26.8.99

27. Detail showing the gazelles

and semiprecious stones. This headdress was part of the first purchase, and has not been altered. The recently acquired rosettes, of the same type, belong to the second, for which, unfortunately, we have no crown piece. We have therefore made it somewhat shorter and fuller (Figure 24), forming a chaplet of gold, carnelian, and turquoise-blue florets to tie on over the wig and frame the face. There is a third set of rosettes, all of the same size, but these are not sufficiently numerous to arrange.

As mentioned above, there may also have been two more gazelle-head circlets, like the one that survives (Figure 26). Similar circlets are known from wall paintings; the gazelle heads (Figure 27) replace the vulture and uraeus worn by women of royal birth.

This treasure of gold and silver and brightly colored stones, presented to three of his favorites by the greatest of the pharaohs, testifies to the wealth and sophistication of his court and forms one of the most spectacular groups of Egyptian goldsmiths’ work in existence. But though Merhet, Menwy, and Merty may not always have been conscious of it as they admired themselves in their silver mirrors with the golden handles, their great headdresses, their bracelets and anklets (so like those of the prehistoric girl), their rings, necklaces, and broad collars were all intended not only to make them even more alluring to their lord and master but to protect them from the malice of their rivals in the harem and the perils and pitfalls of everyday life, and to keep them safe from the dangers they would encounter on their journey to the hereafter.
Two Royal Monuments of the Middle Kingdom Restored

HENRY G. FISCHER Associate Curator in Charge of Egyptian Art

There is perhaps no greater curatorial pleasure than the reconstruction of a fragment that at first sight looks unpromising—for exhibition at any rate—but that ultimately proves to be of unique interest, both from a scholarly and an aesthetic point of view. Two such pleasures have fallen our lot within the past year and both of them, as it happens, concern royal monuments of the Twelfth Dynasty, dating to the mid-twentieth and mid-nineteenth centuries B.C.

The smaller and later of the two fragments is the battered upper half of a seated statuette, which, when its disguise is penetrated, is immediately recognizable as Sesostris III, the fifth ruler of his line (Figure 1). Although it is only four inches high and could not have measured more than nine inches when it was intact, the modeling of its hard green crystalline stone is extraordinarily fine. The minute detail of the intact left eye shows as much individuality as do much larger portraits of the dour-faced king (Figure 3); beneath a puckered brow his gaze is veiled by a heavy upper lid that was evidently his most salient feature, for it reappears in otherwise conventional representations in relief (Figure 5). A sagging lower lid is underscored with incised lines that radiate from the nose to indicate the folds of a deep orbital pouch. Equal care and proficiency have been devoted to the torso, which shows a remarkably subtle and plastic treatment of the pectorals of the chest, the median line of the abdomen, and the lower structure of the rib cage.

Few royal statuettes of comparable size are known to have been manufactured during the late Middle Kingdom, and the only relatively complete example (Figure 4) is of much less distinguished workmanship. It may therefore seem surprising that so rare an object has remained since 1921 among unaccessioned material found by the Egyptian Department’s excavations at Lisht. The explanation doubtless lies in the fact that, in addition to being so badly damaged, the king is disguised as a commoner. Once recognized, however, this point makes the statuette all the more interesting.

The king’s uraeus cobra has been removed from his forehead, the projecting sides and pendent lappets of his nemes-headcloth have been trimmed away to suit the shape of the “bag wig” frequently worn by private individuals of the same period, and the back of the headcloth has been leveled off, eliminating the royal pigtail that formerly projected beneath it. These deletions have now been restored in plaster to facilitate comparison of the original and later versions (Figure 2). All of the changes had been so carefully executed by the ancient craftsman that scarcely a trace of the removed parts could be detected. But, as is fortunately often the case with Egyptian
In the present case the small scale of the statuette was certainly a contributing factor, since sculpture of this size is much more frequently attested for private persons of the late Twelfth Dynasty than it is for royalty. It must also be considered that the private sculpture of the period reflects the physiognomy of the reigning king to a striking degree. And at no other period (with the possible exception of Akhenaten's reign) was the human aspect of the divine king so openly revealed. If, therefore, the reuse of a royal statue by a commoner is undeniably an extraordinary phenomenon, it is appropriate that this unique example should bear the haggard features of Sesostris III.

The line of reasoning that has just been followed assumes, of course, that the alteration occurred only a relatively short time after the sculpture was completed in its original state, and possibly before it was initially inscribed. In this event the usurpation may have been sanctioned by the king himself, perhaps after some flaw or accident had rendered the piece unacceptable for his own use.
It is at least theoretically possible, however, that its reuse is to be attributed to the Twenty-fifth Dynasty, more than one thousand years later, when the style of the Middle Kingdom was revived and closely imitated.

The second and more important of the two newly accessioned fragments (Figure 8) was presented to us last year by Dulaney Logan, of Louisville, Kentucky. Like the statuette that has just been described, it was reused for a secondary purpose, although in this case its reuse goes back no further than the beginning of our century. Originally the top of a red granite offering stand, it was built into a fountain by a previous owner of Mr. Logan’s property, Pauline Burgess, who acquired it as a gift from her friend Lisette Hast. The granite, together with a four-foot concrete column that was judged suitable to complete its length, contained a pipe and supported a modern bronze Swedish statue from whose base the water was ejected. Most of the cement around the base of the statue was removed by hand with the aid of a chisel, re-

9. Inscription on the outside of the offering stand illustrated in Figure 8
stand was supplied, or which supplied the offerings mentioned in its inscriptions.

While the restoration of the bowl presents no problems, a small portion of the edge having been preserved intact, it has been considerably more difficult to complete the lower part of the shaft with any confidence that the result is precisely like the original either in shape or in design. A general idea of the shape could be obtained from other examples, however, and enough of the design was preserved to work out a logical continuation of the rest. This being the case, it seemed a pity to exhibit a perplexing fragment when a relatively simple piece of restoration would make it comprehensible. To guard against any misapprehension, the granite pattern on the plaster has been given a decidedly lighter tone than the rest, and a white hairline defines the broken edge above it (Figure 14).

The two principal elements of the design, each occupying nearly half the area of the shaft, are the heraldic plants of Upper and Lower Egypt. A clump of papyrus emerging from rippled water is emblematic of the marshy Delta. This occurs in Egyptian art in two forms, with or without an extra pair of bent stalks terminating in buds (\( \text{\textdagger} \), \( \text{\textdaggerdbl} \)), the latter being more common in the earlier periods, although \( \text{\textdagger} \) occurs on a fragment of wall relief from a tomb near the pyramid temple of Amenemhet I (Figure 12a) and is also known from the temple of a much earlier pyramid—that of the Fifth Dynasty king Sahure (Figure 12a). The more arid region of Upper Egypt is represented by a sedgelike desert plant (\( \text{\textbullet} \)), again illustrated by an example from Sahure’s reliefs (Figure 12c). If this emblem appears in a context that requires a left-to-right or right-to-left orientation, the top ends in a simple stem which is curved forward, so that, like other hieroglyphs, its front faces the point from which it is read. The top is symmetrically reduplicated, however, when the emblem is an isolated element that can, as it were, be read in either direction.

The use of the isolated form of the Upper Egyptian plant is particularly interesting in view of the fact that the two emblems are separated by a hieroglyph (\( \text{\textdagger} \)), repeated on either side, that signifies the reverse of isolation. It represents a pair of lungs (\( \text{\textdagger} \) in ancient Egyptian) attached to an elongated windpipe, but here the sign is employed purely phonetically to express a word of similar sound meaning “unite.” The entire group therefore conveys the idea “united are the two lands of Upper and Lower Egypt.” Normally one would expect all three elements to be linked together to express the idea of “uniting” more graphically (Figure 18); apart from a very few cases from the Archaic Period there do not seem to be any exceptions to this rule among the numerous occurrences of the motif on flat surfaces. If such a link had existed in the missing area, however, one would expect the outer papyrus umbels to bend downward to meet another pair, and the space beneath the tops of the sedgelike plant would show some trace of a similar pair of flowering tendrils. In the New Kingdom the motif in question is sometimes repeated in a frieze, but each occurrence of the group remains a separate unit, with the floral emblems flanking the \( \text{\textdagger} \)-sign (Figure 17); in no case does the \( \text{\textdagger} \)-sign alternate with each of the floral emblems in turn. The presentation of the device on an offering stand is not only unique in this last respect, but

12. A, B: Heraldic plant of Lower Egypt. Dynasty v, from Ludwig Borchardt, Grabdenkmal des Königs Sahure', II (Leipzig, 1913), pl. 30; Dynasty xii, relief from Museum Excavations at Lisht, 15.3.1164.
C: Heraldic plant of Upper Egypt, Dynasty v, from Borchardt, op. cit., pl. 29

provides the only situation in which the motif completely encloses a cylindrical form. The sculptor has wisely refrained from complicating the curved design with intertwined stems and stalks, and instead has adopted a simpler scheme that contributes to the structural sense of the monument as a whole. This feeling for structure is one of the strongest points in favor of the restoration, for it is shown to the same degree in the readaptation of the otep-hieroglyph as a support for the bowl.

After the foregoing arguments had been developed, one of our several colleagues to whom the restoration had been shown was subsequently able to visit the Egyptian collections at Munich, where he came upon a very similar and more complete offering stand of the New Kingdom, dating to the later years of the Eighteenth Dynasty ruler Tuthmosis III. Allowing for stylistic differences that would be expected after an interval of five hundred years, the resemblance between the two examples is so close that it seems likely that one was copied from the other.

We are indebted to the perspicacity of Edward Terrace, of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, for making this discovery, and to Hans Wolfgang Müller, Director of Munich’s Ägyptische Staatssammlung, for providing us with detailed information in time to insert a few words about it at the very last minute. Thanks to Professor Müller, we are also able to show a photograph for comparison (Figure 16). The New Kingdom stand confirms the fact that the two heraldic plants of its Middle Kingdom antecedent were completely isolated, but suggests that the outermost parts of each plant should be moved slightly inward, so that the design is less distorted by the curved surface on which it is displayed. Furthermore, although the New Kingdom stand now measures twenty-six inches high, and thus was originally as tall as our restoration indicates, its circumference is considerably greater, resulting in a less attenuated design. Despite the fact that the tubular part of the Middle Kingdom stand is narrower in relation to its top, its proportions are not
necessarily dissimilar in other respects, in which case the proposed height might be reduced. The result of these alternatives is displayed in Figure 15. Another difference appears in the choice of materials; instead of employing the red granite of Aswan the craftsmen of Tuthmosis III elected to use the brown quartzite of Kom el Ahmar, in the vicinity of modern Cairo. No provenance is recorded for the Munich stand, which was presented by Baron Wilhelm von Bissing in 1910, but its inscription mentions a form of the god Horus who bears the epithet Khentyperiu, "Pre-eminent of Houses," and this seems to point to a local cult. At all events, there is no reason to think that it derives from the funerary temple of Tuthmosis at Thebes.

Inasmuch as the offering stand permits only one of the floral emblems to be displayed to full advantage, it is highly probable that Sesostris I dedicated a second stand that duplicated the first but was placed so as to show the opposite side, and equally probable that Tuthmosis III did the same. In both cases such a conclusion is also indicated by the sequence of hieroglyphs on the band beneath the bowl. Since the ancient Egyptians thought of south as being "in front" and north "behind," one would expect the inscription to begin above the sedgelike plant of Upper Egypt. This arrangement probably did occur on the assumed counterparts, but on both the two surviving stands it begins directly above the central papyrus stalk in the emblem of the Delta. Two or more offering stands were often placed before the offering niche in tomb chapels, or before an offering table at the foot of the niche, and in some cases the stands and table are even carved from the same block of stone. The example illustrated (Figure 19) bears the name of Sesostris III, and the inscriptions on each stand are symmetrically opposed. On freestanding examples, however, the inscriptions rarely, if ever, depart from the usual orientation, with the signs always facing right, and the same is probably true in the present case. Inasmuch as the offering niche of Amenemhet I faced

16. Offering stand of Tuthmosis III (1504-1450 B.C.). Quartzite, height as preserved 26 inches. Agyptische Staatsammlung, Munich, Glyptothek Inv. No. 31
eastward, as usual, our stand was on the right side, and the writing would therefore show the reversed orientation if it existed.

The symbolic references to Upper and Lower Egypt that the presumed pair of offering stands displayed before Amenemhet I's altar (Figure 13) are echoed by the decoration of the altar itself. The same emblems are borne upon the heads of two plump divinities personifying plenty, like those that “join the two lands” in Figure 18; each heads a procession of similar figures that include seven personifications of Upper Egyptian districts on the south side and an equal number of representations of the Delta provinces on the north. At present this monument, together with other elements from the pyramid temples at Lisht, is located against the east wall of the Sculpture Court toward the rear of the north wing, so that its geographical references have been reversed, but it will regain its bearings when the second phase of the Egyptian Department’s extensive program of reinstallation has been completed.

Now that the original appearance and location of the offering stand have been established, something remains to be said about its function. There is ample evidence that, by the time of the Twelfth Dynasty, some stands of this type received libations of water while others held coals for the burning of incense. The second function is more prevalent, however, and it is specifically attested by two Middle Kingdom examples from Dahshur, both of which are made of limestone and both of which bear an inscription around the bowl-shaped depression giving “purification by incense” to the much earlier king Sneferu (Figure 20). The coals were probably placed in a small pottery dish to avoid damage to the stone, although evidence of blackening has been noted in at least two examples, one of which shows cracking as well. On the basis of various tomb paintings such as the one illustrated in Figure 21, it has been suggested that meat and fowl were passed over incense not only as a means of purification, but also as a means of expediting the offering to its
ghostly recipient. In any case it is certain that offerings were exposed to incense and that the pair of stands in front of the slablike offering table were placed there for this purpose. The censing of the deceased himself, at his funeral and after interment, was done by hand with a small thurible held by a projecting foot or at the end of a long armlike handle. After this prelude to the symbolic meal had been accomplished, the censing of the food itself could best be effected by transferring the incense to a stationary position at convenient height, leaving both hands free for passing the various courses over the fumes. Although the only offerings that Amenemhet I now receives upon his massive altar are those carved in relief upon its surface, and though incense no longer rises from the offering stand provided by his son and successor, it is pleasant to think that these two monuments have, by an extraordinary combination of circumstances, been reunited in the Metropolitan Museum.

NOTES

1 For the usurped chapel (acc. no. 08.201.1) see William C. Hayes, Scepter of Egypt (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1953), I, p. 94; for the coffin (acc. no. 11.150.15) see ibid., p. 315, where the name of the original owner is to be corrected; for the statues (acc. nos. 22.5.1-2) see ibid., II, pp. 234-235. The altered representations of a man and woman are mentioned in Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache, LXXXVI (1961), p. 28.

2. A similar situation sometimes occurs on Middle Kingdom door lintels where the common formula “an offering that the king gives” is placed on either side of the center, each repetition continuing outward. In such cases (e.g., John Garstang, El Arabeh, pl. 8) the top of the initial sign may be reduplicated like the Upper Egyptian emblem, which it closely resembles. The normal writing is then replaced by .
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20. An inscribed offering stand of the Middle Kingdom, designed to receive incense for the cult of King Sneferu. Drawing made from Ahmed Fakhr, The Monuments of Sneferu, I (Cairo, 1959), pl. 32c

21. The censing of meat. Redrawn from Percy Newberry, Beni Hasan, I, pl. 35
1. This exquisite bust of a queen shows the sculptor's complete mastery over his material. The life-size photograph displays the almost incredible fact that the top six rows of curls just below the ear have been drilled from below with a drill about one sixty-fourth of an inch in diameter. The rest of the curls and all of the broad collar except the top row of beads remain unfinished, and red ink lines show where the remaining lines of beads on the collar were to be placed. The fact that the bust is not a normal convention in Egyptian art is commented on in the text.

The opposite face of the plaque bears a far-from-finished head of a king, 7¼ x 4 ½ inches. Rogers Fund, 07.238.2
Sculptors’ Models or Votives?

In Defense of a Scholarly Tradition

ERIC YOUNG  Assistant Curator of Egyptian Art

It is the fashion to demolish the theories of the past and to question the accepted beliefs of earlier generations of scholars. This is as it should be—the development of scholarship is like the life cycle of the butterfly: the static larval stage is passed, the dynamic winged stage is to come, and we are now in the chrysalis stage, the rebuilding of the fabric of knowledge.

Such a metamorphosis is occurring in the study of Egyptian art, archaeology, and history of the later periods, from the end of the New Kingdom to the end of the Greco-Roman Period (that is, from about 1000 B.C. to the third or fourth century A.D.), thanks to the painstaking work of a handful of scholars. Here it is necessary only to mention the names of two men: Bernard V. Bothmer of the Brooklyn Museum and Herman de Meulenaere of Brussels are compiling a monumental Corpus of Late Egyptian Sculpture, which even before final publication is changing our entire conception of the art of the last thousand years of the native Egyptian culture.

It is from time to time necessary, however, even at the risk of appearing old-fashioned, to come to the defense of older theories and to show them to be still worthy of adherence. Such, I feel, is the case with a group of limestone sculptures that date approximately to the third century B.C., during the reign of the earlier Ptolemies. These consist of small rectangular plaques with figures, or parts of figures, in low relief on one or both sides and a related series of sculptures in the round.

2. Although this figure of a queen appears finished, we know from comparing it with the bust of a queen in the preceding illustration that the locks of the wig, the feathers of the crown, and the beads of the collar remain to be carved.

The other side bears the figure of a king in a similar stage of carving and, across the corners on all three surviving edges, a number of drilled holes used in the suspension of the plaque. One of the holes is visible here in the broken area at the bottom right, 8½ x 7½ inches. Rogers Fund, 07.228.3
Three stages of work are shown by these chicks: the ink sketch, the fully finished (upper right), and the almost finished (below). The fact that the sketch was drawn on the reduced background surface and that traces of ink occur on both carved chicks shows it actually to be the latest in execution.

On the other face are two sand martins, neither completely finished. 6 x 53/4 inches. Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 11.155.11

The three chicks in Figure 3 suffer by comparison with this delicate and masterly study. So fine are the engraved lines around the beak and on the breast that no camera can do justice to them, and it is necessary to vary the direction of light constantly in order to appreciate them. The inverted L-shaped projection at the top and the rectangular block beneath the feet are commonly used devices of the sculptor to show the original surface of the plaque and hence the depth of modeling of the figure. 5 x 4 inches. Rogers Fund, 07.228.8

which together form the most common class of sculpture of the period in many collections of Egyptian art, where they are labeled, in accordance with the older theories of their use, sculptors’ models, trial pieces, or study pieces. Bernard V. Bothmer, in an article in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts Bulletin, has seen in these sculptures votive offerings deposited in temples and sacred places, but with scholarly caution he adds that some are indeed what they seem, sculptor’s models, and that each case has to be decided individually. In private conversation with the writer, although not in his published work, he has indicated that he is influenced by the existence of a very similar phenomenon in Greek art. The Greek votives in question are of two kinds—corresponding closely to the two groups of Egyptian sculptures—firstly, small terracotta plaques with painted or relief scenes, figures, dancers, satyrs, herms, and the like, and, secondly, parts of the body sculptured of limestone in relief or in the round, feet, hands, toes, fingers, mouths, eyes, breasts, and so forth. The exact purpose
5. The greatest depth of modeling of this figure is only one eighth of an inch, and it takes a strong raking light to do justice to the delicate variations of form, yet all the sculptural qualities of the bull’s figure are shown. The decay of the surface has unfortunately obscured the fine floral collar around the neck. The black ink proportion squares remain on the original surface beneath the base line of the figure. The subject may be simply the bull hieroglyph or a representation of one of the bull gods—Apis, Mnevis, or Buchis—although it bears none of the distinguishing marks of the latter. The rear face bears the unfinished portrait of a ram. 4⅜ x 6⅞ inches. Rogers Fund, 11.155.10

behind the first group of votives may be in doubt, but there is no mistaking the significance of the second group—they are individual prayers for the healing of afflictions and thanksgivings for afflictions cured, a model of the affected member being placed in one of the sanctuaries of Aesculapius.

A brief survey of the Egyptian material, of which a representative cross section is illustrated here from the Museum's own collections, will show how close are the superficial similarities to the Greek votives, but a closer consideration of certain aspects, I am convinced, will show these similarities to be fortuitous.

6. The two creatures together on their baskets form the title of the second of the king's five names, the so-called neby-name, in which the king is identified with the “two ladies”—Nehbet, the vulture goddess of Upper Egypt, and Edjo, the cobra goddess of Lower Egypt. The fine engraved detail in the feathers of the vulture and the scales of the cobra is stylized into repetitive patterns, a typical feature of these plaques, and, in contrast to certain sculptures illustrated here, is completely finished.

The other face has an unfinished study of a falcon. 5⅜ x 6⅝ inches. Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 11.155.12
The Egyptian sculptures in the round are mostly heads or busts of royal personages, with a small number of private persons or deities. There is no corresponding subject among the Greek votives. In addition to heads, however, there are numerous models of feet (Figure 13), in most cases the left, presumably because in Egyptian statuary it is the left foot that is advanced and therefore the most conspicuous, together with a sprinkling of arms, legs, and fists. These are so close to the Greek in aspect as almost to be indistinguishable, except that the Greek feet are frequently modeled completely in the round, underside as well as upper, while the Egyptian feet are modeled on a flat base, with fairly deep undercutting beneath the toes in some cases but never complete separation under the arch or elsewhere. Taken by themselves the Egyptian models of limbs could be accepted as Asclepian votives, but we have, of course, to consider them with all the related material. Among this related material are many models of animals or parts of animals, most commonly the lion, but also including the ram, bull, monkey, horse, and falcon. In the subject matter of these sculptures in the round there is little to weigh against their being votives except perhaps that the horse is not normally considered a sacred animal in Egypt.

The subject matter of the Egyptian relief plaques is far more varied, as is the case in the Greek plaques, with the difference that true groups of figures (as distinct from numbers of individual figures grouped on one plaque) almost never occur. Again royal personages predominate, heads, busts, and full-length figures, but individual hieroglyphic figures of animals and birds are almost as common, and there is also a selection of private persons, deities, sacred emblems, and parts of the body.

In many cases where only the head of an animal is shown, it is intended to represent the associated deity, a fact made evident by the addition of human shoulders to the bust, as on the head of the ram god in Figure 8, or a human wig to the mane, or an extra set of horns to the head. This would lead us to suspect divine representations in many other

8. Here, in much deeper, dramatic, yet subtle relief, with none of the fine engraved details that distinguish the hieroglyphic figures of animals and birds, is one of the masterpieces of Egyptian sculpture. The handling of the scales of the horn over the carefully modeled form alone is sufficient to denote the work of a superb artist. The addition of a human wig and shoulder shows this to be the portrait of a ram deity, not merely the animal.

The rear face has a beveled edge but is not otherwise carved. 6\(\frac{3}{4}\) x 8\(\frac{1}{2}\) inches. Gift of Edward S. Harkness, 18.9.1

animal portraits where no such anomalies are present, and Bernard V. Bothmer is undoubtedly correct in seeing in the Boston head of a cat, which forms the subject of his article on votive tablets, a portrait of the goddess Bastet. Figures, however, such as Harpocrates, Amun, Bes, Sakhmet, and Bastet, which are frequently found as votives in other media—bronce, faience, terracotta—are rare or absent among these sculptures.

So far, in discussing the subject matter of the plaques we have found nothing against their being votives. There seems no obvious reason, however, why votives should display

9. In this remarkable portrait of an owl the virtuosity of the sculptor is superbly illustrated, in design, in modeling, in precise, almost mathematically placed details, in the incredible delicacy of the incised lines, and for full measure in the complete undercutting of the beak—a rare feature in Egyptian relief and one indicative of the pervading Greek influence of the period. Yet the carving remains unfinished in so far as the vertical hatching on top of the left side of the head has not been matched on the right.

The side view of the owl shows the undercutting of the beak.

The rear face is not carved but has been hollowed out behind the head for some undetermined reason, perhaps to allow the plaque to fit snugly in the hand. 4\(\frac{3}{8}\) x 4\(\frac{1}{4}\) inches. Rogers Fund, 07.228.11

7. This piece has none of the pictorial qualities of the others illustrated here, but its unfinished state admirably demonstrates the sculptor's technique, and the incongruous lack of a head bears witness against its being intended as a votive.

The opposite face bears two separate studies of a right foot. 6\(\frac{3}{4}\) x 5 inches. Rogers Fund, 07.228.4
10. The right side of the lion is just beginning to emerge from the block as the sculptor follows the black ink sketch, faint traces of which remain at the back of the shoulders and around the legs. The incised proportion squares remain intact on this side, on the top, and on whatever parts of the original surface survive elsewhere. A slight emphasizing of the lowermost line shows the height of the base and the similar emphasis on the line giving the thickness of the "cornice" proves that this feature was not an intermediate stage in the carving of one side but part of the finished design of the whole.

The significance of this feature involves matters too unrelated to the present discussion to be dealt with in detail here. Briefly stated, it may indicate merely a teaching function for the piece, or, on the contrary, it may prove the lion to be one of a rarely surviving class of Egyptian objects, a door bolt. Perhaps, on account of the small size, we should consider it the model of a door bolt. Door bolts of bronze, wood, or stone, rectangular in section and in the form of, or decorated with, the figures of lions, were commonly used from Dynasty XIX onward to lock temple gates— an appropriate idea in view of the guardian nature of the lion in Egyptian architectural usage, as seen in the rows of sphinxes flanking temple approaches.

The head of the lion retains interesting traces of the sculptor's technique. Both the forehead and the nose are in flat planes at a very oblique angle to one another as blocked out in the first stage of carving. The forehead retains its incised axial line, which has now been redrawn in black ink and projected down over the preliminary carving of the face as far as the chin in preparation for the next stage of work. The left paw is almost finished, but the right paw has not emerged from the contours of the block.

The left side of this lion is completely blocked out and roughly modeled. The cornice-shaped projection on the back indicates the original dimensions of the block, the head alone being completely separated from its matrix. 2 3/4 x 6 1/2 inches. Bequest of W. Gedney Beatty, 41.160.103

single hieroglyphs, especially such as the owl, the quail chick, or the sand martin, whose divine associations are tenuous to say the least, in place of the commoner figures mentioned above. But there is in the subject matter of these plaques a far more serious objection to their being votives. Although the majority of the plaques display a single subject, or a single subject repeated on one or both sides, at least a third have a different subject on each side or more than one subject on one or both sides. It is difficult to accept a votive use for such plaques, especially since there is seldom any obvious connection between the separate subjects, and even allowing for our admitted ignorance of popular religious beliefs of the period it seems hardly likely that any connection did exist between, for instance, a falcon, a face, an ear, the head of a man, and an owl, as occur on one plaque in the Cairo Museum!

While the iconography of these sculptures may leave us in doubt as to their function, there are certain technical and stylistic aspects that in combination show quite unambiguously their teaching function. The most obvious and interesting aspect, both in relief and in the round, is the high proportion of unfinished work. It appears in the majority of cases that the sculpturing was carried to a point just short of completeness and then, for one reason or another, abandoned. The degree of incompleteness is often very small; the locks of a queen's wig may be partly un-
finished, or part of a broad collar (Figure 1), or the feathering of a bird (Figure 6). On the head of an owl (Figure 9) all that remains undone is the vertical hatching on top of the head at the right side to match the completed left side. In many cases the sculpturing is abandoned at a much earlier stage, and, in fact, it is possible through pieces such as these to follow every stage in the preparation of a sculptured work of art from the preliminary proportioning and draughting to the final smoothing of the modeled surface.

The most suggestive aspect of a small number of the sculptures is that the work seems deliberately incomplete, as if a master sculptor had left the piece in an unfinished state to demonstrate one of the stages through which the carving passes. The existence of plaques showing the same subject in various stages of completion emphasizes this impression (Figure 3). Indeed we might say that such sculpture is not so much in a normal unfinished state as in a deliberately contrived and artificial intermediate stage. No Egyptian work of art, if abandoned in an incomplete state, would look the way these sculptures do. The entire surface is composed of long broad chisel strokes that demonstrate the basic modeling of the subject very clearly. In a few cases, when we examine more closely, we find that these broad strokes are not chisel marks at all but are contrived facets, generally breaking the figure into a relatively small number of vertical planes. The head of a king in the round, for instance, has the face divided into seven vertical facets, three on each side and one through the nose and center of the chin (Figure 11). Within these facets the modeling of the features—eyes, nose, mouth, chin, cheeks—has been carried virtually to completion. Nothing could so clearly demonstrate the fact that such sculptures are indeed workshop models.

11. The significance of the strange facets in the modeling of this bust of a king is discussed in the text. Although the piece appears superficially unfinished, the smooth surface, from which all chisel marks have been removed, indicates that, apart from the ears, the work is completed.

The short horizontal lines mark the position, from bottom to top, of the chin, the lips, the point of the nose, the upper eyelid, the brow ridge, the headdress at the brow, and the change of angle of the headdress near the top. Their position is fixed and unvariable for this period and this class of portraiture. The head is the normal three squares in height, but its position on the grid does not conform either with Dynasty XVI practice, when one grid line passed through the hairline and one marked the shoulder line, or with Saite Period practice, when one grid line marked the upper eyelid. Height 5 3/4 inches. Rogers Fund, 07.228.6
its unfortunate tendency to clog fine lines and obscure the subtleties of carving, the very features the sculptor was attempting to emphasize.

Although decorative paint is uncommon in this group of sculptures, guide marks, both painted and incised, are very common and form a second general characteristic of the group. Such guide marks—grids for laying out the proportions of the figure according to the canon generally in use in the period (Figures 5, 10) and short lines showing the location of individual features (Figure 11)—occur not only on unfinished pieces, where they are perfectly understandable, but also on pieces both in relief and in the round that are, or appear to be, completely finished. Now, as Bernard V. Bothmer has pointed out, the presence of guide marks on a work of art “is in itself no proof that the piece in question has been used merely to train a student or serve as a model.” However the question arises as to why proportion squares or guide lines should have been incised rather than merely painted if it were the intention of the sculptor to remove them at the completion of the work. Surely the incising of such marks, besides being more arduous to execute in the beginning, would have necessitated a great deal more work to expunge in the end. They would vanish from any part of the surface that was modeled or cut away as background, but they would and often do remain on marginal and untouched surfaces. It is very rare on unfinished works of earlier periods to find incised guide lines, whereas painted lines are relatively common. The implication is that the guide lines were intentionally permanent, were in fact a part of the sculptors’ conception of the finished work. If this is so it gives unambiguous indication of the instructive purpose of these sculptures. The position of many of the guide marks throws any other interpretation out of court, for on many heads and busts in the round the lines for individual features are not only placed on the face from which the sculptor was working, where they are functional, but are repeated on the rear face of the slab from which the head protrudes, where they are not (Figure 11).

Other evidence of incompleteness is seen in the almost total absence of painted examples. Egyptian limestone sculpture was normally, indeed almost invariably, painted in the final stage, but paint, except for black or red guide marks for the sculptor or traces marking the pupil of an eye, is extremely rare on these sculptures, even if they are otherwise completely finished. Color was employed to make sculptures more lifelike in accordance with Egyptian religious and artistic conventions. Its absence in this case is presumably due to

12. The curious incompleteness of this head of a woman, lacking as it does the top of the wig, is common to many of these sculptures and gives strong indication of their being models, rather than votives. Height 8\(\frac{1}{4}\) inches. Carnarvon Collection, Gift of Edward S. Harkness, 26.7.1402
The third aspect distinctive of these sculptures and perhaps the most disturbing to one versed in Egyptian artistic conventions and modes of thought is a curious incompleteness of the subject matter itself. To the Egyptian mind the representation of an object or a person, no matter what the medium used, was equivalent to and identified with the actual object or person, provided of course that the appropriate rites and spells designed to bring that representation to life had been employed. Thus, as in primitive voodoo rites, it was only necessary to damage the representation in order to maim or kill the original. An incomplete representation of an object, whether a head, a bust, or a torso without a head, was in Egyptian eyes maimed and incapable of normal function.

This is not to say that such representations never occurred at an earlier period. They did, but only for certain very restricted functions. The carving of one or more ears on an inscribed votive stela would symbolize the function of hearing and ensure that the god listened to the accompanying prayer. The deposit of a limestone portrait head of the deceased in the tomb, a custom that had a very brief manifestation in the Fourth Dynasty so-called “reserve heads,” ensured the survival of a portrait of the person in the event that the head of the mummified body were destroyed. In the Amarna Period at the end of the Eighteenth Dynasty, we find workshop models lacking their crowns, because the crown was carved separately in another material and mortised onto the head.

The Ptolemaic heads and busts are not from composite statues, however, and their incompleteness is of a different order entirely. Most commonly they lack the upper part of the crown or headdress (Figure 12); in one type they lack the ears. In a few cases only a half of the subject is presented; the Cairo Museum has the left half of the head of a king; Jacob Hirsch once possessed a model of the head and forequarters of a standing lion; a similar model of a crouching lion is in Berlin. In relief also such incompleteness occurs; the portrait of an owl (Figure 9) lacks the lower half; the ram-headed deity (Figure 8) has only a part of his wig and a small segment of one shoulder; the torso of a man (Figure 7) lacks the head and the lower part of the legs. Such representations, if votives, could only function for the Egyptian as half an owl, a bodiless head, and a headless body. In Greek art, by contrast, such incomplete subjects are normal, not only as votives but as secular and religious portraits—the bust being a particularly common Greek sculptural form. When we consider the Egyptian pieces as sculptors’ models, however, their incompleteness is no longer disturbing, but entirely understandable. As is the case with unquestioned sculptors’ models and trial pieces of the New Kingdom Period, the apprentice sculptor concentrated his energies on those portions of the figure that he found intriguing, or most difficult, and the master sculptor demonstrated the correct way to delineate a head, or model a foot.

In view of the homogeneous nature of these sculptures and the high proportion that ex-

13. That this lively model of a foot is not an Aesculapian votive is shown by the fact that other collections possess examples in intermediate stages of carving, purposefully left unfinished, it would seem, by the sculptor. Length 7 ¼ inches. Rogers Fund, 08.202.45
14. The repertoire of sculptors' models was not restricted to figures. This model capital, finished only on the left side, retains on the top surface the black ink square, circle, and radial lines that determined the position of the sixty-four elements of the decoration. Half the capital has been sawed off and is missing. This type of composite floral capital, decorated with alternating papyrus and palmette elements, was commonly used in Dynasty XXX and the succeeding Ptolemaic Period. It may well be that this model was actually used on the building site by the sculptors. In the Museum's collection, but not illustrated here, is a similar architectural model of the decoration of a cornice.

The upper surface of the model capital shows the guide marks. Height 53¾ inches. Rogers Fund. 12.182.6

hibit in greater or lesser degree one or more of the peculiarities discussed above, there seems no other conclusion except that we have here the genus Sculptor's Model, using the term to designate all products of the workshop whose primary function was instruction. If they were used as votives, and there is clear evidence from inscriptions on certain examples and from the context in which others were found that some were so used, then this was a secondary function. A horse is a horse, whether it is an Arabian stallion or an English shire, and it is still a horse whether it is used for racing or for pulling a plow. A sculptor's model is no less a sculptor's model because a proud ex-apprentice gave his masterpiece, that is, the sculpture that entitled him to his master's status, as an ex voto to his patron deity, or because a worshiper obtained a second-hand relief portrait of a bull instead of the more normal bronze statuette to give to Apis.
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