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INTRODUCTION

Between 1974 and 1983 the Egyptian collection of The Metropolitan Museum of Art was subjected to a comprehensive review. Undertaken jointly by the departments of Egyptian Art and Objects Conservation, the investigation led to serious doubts about the authenticity of several pieces within the group popularly known as the “treasure of three Egyptian princesses” from Wady D 1 at Thebes. In order to resolve these questions, my colleagues and I scrutinized all Egyptian gold objects in the Metropolitan Museum from excavations and many excavated gold pieces in the Egyptian Museum Cairo.

The seventeen gold vessels in our Wady D 1 group caused special problems because few Egyptian vessels of precious metal have been found in modern excavations. I thus extended our corpus of comparative material to include a gold vessel in the Musée du Louvre. It has a widely accepted inscription, first published by Jean-François Champollion in 1827; furthermore, the inscription mentions “King Menkheperra” (Tuthmosis III, 1504–1450 B.C.), the Eighteenth-Dynasty ruler during whose reign the “three princesses’ treasure” had been made.

Ultimately, my colleagues and I concluded that the Louvre’s gold bowl raised too many questions to allow us to use it as a reference in our study; and in the course of preparing all Wady D 1 objects for publication, I have subsequently come to the conclusion that the Louvre’s bowl is, in all probability, a forgery of the nineteenth century A.D.

This essay compares the gold bowl to other Egyptian metalwork and examines a variety of related evidence: seventeen additional objects that are thought to name the same official it does; a Nineteenth-Dynasty tale that is thought to feature him; and a Theban tomb to which most of the small objects have been assigned by Bertha Porter and Rosalind Moss’s Topographical Bibliography. All eighteen objects came from the art market, most of them in the early nineteenth century. Only the gold bowl mentions Tuthmosis III and has an elaborate list of titles, including “general”; not all of the other small objects have the titles most often present on the eighteen: “royal scribe” (or “scribe”) and “overseer of foreign countries” (or “northern foreign countries”). Consequently, each of the seventeen items has been examined for authenticity and for a Tuthmoside date in comparison with undoubted excavated objects; in addition, each has been studied in terms of its relationship to the other objects, including the gold bowl, during both ancient and modern times. The possibility that a well-inscribed forgery could have been made in the early nineteenth century has also been explored.

What has resulted is a study of selected Tuthmoside archaeological types, foreign relations in the fifteenth century B.C., forgery, and early Egyptology. I conclude that there is an authentic group of objects, excluding the gold bowl, that belonged to an official named General Djehuty, and I hope that this essay will further both the knowledge of Egyptian objects and the appreciation of this important official of Tuthmosis III.

Champollion mentioned the gold bowl in the first catalogue of the Musée Charles X’s collection, but the first person to study it seriously was Samuel Birch, who prepared a paper on its text about 1856. Birch had seen the vessel at first hand and was immediately doubtful of
the authenticity of the text. He subjected the inscription
to a lengthy study, however, and after three months he
concluded that it was definitely confirmed by the
Annals of Tuthmosis III and “par le langage officiel de
l’époque.”

Birch’s paper inspired Théodule Devéria to look for
other monuments belonging to the original owner of the
gold bowl, and in 1857 Devéria suggested—on the ba-
sis of the name Djehuty, the title “scribe,” and other titles
or epithets that appear on some of the objects—that the
same individual had also owned the following objects:

- a heart scarab and two alabaster vessels in Leiden
  (one identified by Devéria as a cosmetic vessel and
  the other—following Conrad Leemans’s sugges-
tion of 1846—as a canopic jar)

- an alabaster vessel in the Louvre (also identified as a
  canopic jar because it “contained calcareous mate-
  rial”)

- a silver object that had been described by François
  Lenormant in the Anastasi sale catalogue as a pen-
dant to the gold bowl

Devéria’s drawing of the silver object omitted several
hieroglyphic signs; his essay presented and rejected evi-
dence for assigning additional objects inscribed with
the name Djehuty to the owner of the gold bowl; and it
pointed out that there was no clue to the location of
General Djehuty’s tomb.

In his publication of the tale of Joppa in 1879 (see be-
dow), Gaston Maspero linked the owner of all the above
objects with a titleless individual named Djehuty, who
captured the town of Joppa for “King Menkheperra”
(Mn-hpr-R, the prenomen of Tuthmosis III). Maspero
reiterated Devéria’s statements that the Louvre’s jar
and one of Leiden’s vessels were canopic vases, and he
asserted that the former came from Thebes.

Four years later Maspero published the inscriptions
on an alabaster palette and three vessels in Turin. He
referred to the various Djehutys Devéria had discussed
but did not say that the Turin items belonged to the
owner of the gold bowl. A few years later A. Fabretti, F.
Rossi, and R. V. Lanzone published the palette and the
jars in Turin (adding a fourth); they termed the objects
vases, but when Heinrich Brugsch published Maspero’s
three in 1891 he again called them canopics, although
he did improve on Maspero’s transcriptions. In 1890
Karl Wiedemann published an inscription on a dagger
in Darmstadt, connecting its owner with the Djehuty of
Joppa.

In 1898–99 the tomb (now called Theban tomb 11) of
a Djehuty who was “treasurer” and “overseer of works”
in the time of Hatshepsut–Tuthmosis III was cleared at
Thebes by the Marquess of Northampton, Wilhelm Spie-
gelberg, and Percy Newberry. Some inscriptions on
the stela in its court had been copied by C. R. Lepsius
between 1842 and 1845, but the tomb was not well
known in 1898. W. Max Müller immediately identified
this Djehuty with the hero of the tale of Joppa. However,
Spiegelberg rejected that idea in 1900: he felt that
the titles did not match, and that the name Djehuty
was too common at this period to be significant.

The gods invoked and the official titles on the Djehuty
objects published by Birch, Devéria, Maspero, Fabretti–
Rossi–Lanzone, and Brugsch were collected by Kurt
Sethe in 1909 in his Urkunden (using Devéria’s engraving
of the silver object). Sethe added the inscriptions
on four additional objects—a set of canopic jars in Flor-
ence—omitted the invocation of gods on two of the sev-
enteen objects, and differentiated this Djehuty from the
owner of tomb 11. The reference to “islands in the
midst of the great green” on the gold bowl was espe-
ially interesting to Jean Verrouet in 1956; and the title
imy-r m3t (general) that appears on the bowl, as well as
rh nswt (companion of the king) on the Darmstadt
dagger, were cited in Wolfgang Helck’s study of Middle
and New Kingdom bureaucracy in 1958. “Overseer of
northern foreign countries” was discussed as a title in
Helck’s 1962 study of foreign relations; and in 1969
Helck mentioned the bowl in his Materialien as inscrip-
tional evidence of gold, silver, and lapis coming from the
north to Egypt.

In 1959 Torgny Säve-Söderbergh published several
scenes from Theban tomb 11 and commented once
again on the question of its owner’s identification as the
General Djehuty whose name appears on the gold bowl
and as the Djehuty who figures in the tale of Joppa.
Säve-Söderbergh said that the new inscriptions shed no
further light on this problem. He did point out, how-
ever, that the name of the tomb owner had often been
chiseled out of the walls, and he connected this act with
the defacement of monuments belonging to officials
closely identified with Hatshepsut. Furthermore, he il-
ustrated two scenes where the parents of Djehuty were
named. In 1960, however, the revised first volume of
Porter–Moss’s Topographical Bibliography associated all
of the objects mentioned so far (excepting the heart
scarab, which was not included, for editorial reasons)
with the owner of tomb 11. Jean Yoyotte objected to this association in 1981, when he published the lower part of a statuette that had appeared on the Paris art market about 1975, in which the name of the mother differed from the mother’s name in tomb 11. Yoyotte also noted that the titles on the small objects were unlike those occurring in tomb 11.

In 1987 Roberto del Francia pointed out that the Djehuty canopic jars in Florence that Sethe published have been associated—at least since the days of Astorre Pellegriini—with a subterranean tomb at Saqqara cited by Giuseppe Nizzoli, the vendor of those jars. And Hans Schneider (though he cites Theban tomb 11 as provenance) has now suggested that several objects in Leiden, which have the prenomen of Tuthmosis III (“Menkheperra”) and came into Leiden’s collection with Djehuty’s jar, palette, and heart scarab from the agent Giovanni Anastasi, could also have belonged to the subject of this paper—even though they lack the name or title of any official. Moreover, in 1987, the staff of the Topographical Bibliography informed me that it now considers the owner of Theban tomb 11 and the owner of the small objects it had assigned to that tomb to be two different people; it plans to publish the small objects in its forthcoming volume Objects of Unknown Provenance.

In recent years three of Leiden’s four inscribed Djehuty objects have been published: the gold bowl was included in Boston’s “Egypt’s Golden Age” exhibition in 1982; Darmstadt published its dagger in 1984; and ten of the above objects associated with General Djehuty appeared in Hildesheim’s “Ägyptens Aufstieg zur Weltmacht” exhibition of 1987. For the first time since the days of Leemans, Birch, and Devéria, there is published descriptive information about and photographs of all but three of the eighteen objects that have been associated with “General Djehuty.”

In the following sections I will present the evidence that the tale of Joppa and related textual and archaeological information yield about the period of Tuthmosis III in the eastern Mediterranean. I will then describe the small objects that have traditionally been linked to the “overseer of [northern] foreign countries Djehuty” and review their dating, history, and probable provenance. Finally, I will consider the inscriptions in Theban tomb 11, discuss the gold bowl as a possible forgery, and present some additional items that could have belonged to this important official of Tuthmosis III.

THE TALE OF JOPPA AND RELATED EVIDENCE

The tale of Joppa, an Egyptian text long associated with the owner of the Louvre’s gold bowl, is a story preserved in a Dynasty 19 papyrus known as Papyrus Harris 500. The hero of this tale—a “Djehuty” without title—captures the town of Joppa (Jaffa/Haifa) with his troops by sending Egyptian soldiers into the town hidden in baskets. According to the account, this official served “King Menkheperra,” had the use of iw’yt (garrison troops), and was accompanied by his wife and children.

In fact, the Annals of Tuthmosis III document the campaigns that this energetic ruler made into Palestine and Syria (as far north as Carchemish) during the second half of his reign, and Joppa lay within that sphere. Little archaeological data has been published from this site, but James Weinstein has commented that the few published finds indicate destruction there would have been later than the mid-sixteenth century B.C., that is, somewhat later than at most of the other Palestinian sites. Weinstein also notes that there is little evidence of Egyptian occupation during this period in Palestine (Late Bronze I); therefore, although the presence of the hero’s family indicates that he must have been in the eastern Mediterranean for some time, the evidence as outlined by Donald Redford and Weinstein makes it seem unlikely that the tale’s hero was buried there.

Is this Djehuty the owner of any of the eighteen small objects? Their Tuthmoside date will need to be established and the evidence for provenance discussed, but one of the jars naming Djehuty in Turin (Appendix A, no. 8) does list the title “overseer of the garrison,” and other titles and epithets on the small objects are compatible with a person who had a military career. The title “overseer of (northern) foreign countries” would presumably have been given him sometime after the battle of Megiddo, the campaign in which Tuthmosis III established his empire in the eastern Mediterranean.

THE SMALL OBJECTS ASSOCIATED WITH GENERAL DJEHUTY

Descriptive details and a bibliography for the eighteen small objects associated with General Djehuty are given in Appendix A. Those objects with Arabic num-
bers have traditionally been associated with him, while those with Roman numbers are newly presented for consideration. A separate chart lists titles, epithets, and name spellings.

Sixteen of the eighteen traditional objects were acquired by consular agents or adventurers around 1825, and that provenance alone suggests a common source for them. Giuseppe Nizzoli sold four items to Florence; Bernardino Drovetti sold seven to Turin and Paris; Giovanni Anastasi sold three to Leiden, and one went to the Louvre after his death; and Jean-Baptiste de Lescluze sold one (from François Bartho) to Leiden. A summary of the available documentation for these sixteen objects as they entered the collections of Florence, Turin, Paris, and Leiden is presented in Appendix B. The seventeenth object, a dagger, was given to Darm-
stadt in 1875, and the eighteenth, a statue, appeared on the Paris art market about 1975 and is now in the British Museum.

Four canopic jars (Nizzoli to Florence, nos. 1-4, and I?)

Giuseppe Nizzoli wrote the following at the request of the Tuscan officials when he was negotiating the sale of his collection to Leopold II in 1824: "Li quattro vasi d'alabastro con testa di donna, si rinvennero tutti assieme in una camera sepolcrale sotto terra in Saccaraha, e vicini ad una mumma quasta, e colla cassa di legno in pezzi."33

The four Djehuty jars are the only human-headed canopics with blue inscriptions that were in the Nizzoli collection, and it would appear, as del Francia has pointed out, that Nizzoli was generally forthright in his statements concerning provenance: while almost all the provenances he gives are for Saqqara, he does mention sources from Thebes, Medinet Habu, Upper Egypt, the Delta, the consul Henry Salt, and "Deferder Bug";36 and he sometimes says "were found," sometimes "I found." It is true that Carlo Zardetti wrote in 1835 that Nizzoli had told him one of the Bologna reliefs today assigned to the Saqqara tomb of Horemheb came from a tomb at Thebes." But leaving the question of Nizzoli's absolute reliability aside, one has the impression that most of the Nizzoli items in Florence and Bologna came from the Memphite area.38 Saqqara, Memphis, Giza, and Abusir were probably the only sites Nizzoli was able to work in and visit regularly, and the Amenhotep/Huy objects published by my predecessor William C. Hayes form only one instance of a Memphite group shared by Nizzoli and other consular agents in 1820-22.39 Of course, Nizzoli does not claim to have found the Djehuty canopic jars, but the details he provides of their having been in a subterranean tomb at Saqqara, near a despoiled mummy whose wooden coffin was in pieces, suggest firsthand information.

The stone of all four canopic jars is a crystalline alabaster, which has occasional thin reddish veins as well as pits that are sometimes bordered by a reddish ring. The jars seem especially clean, that is, without any layer of grime on the surface either from burial or from presence in an early collection. (Del Francia told me they have not been cleaned under his directorship.) The parts have various numbers on them (from a paper label to numbers written in red paint, black ink, and pencil) as well as spots of red and gray paint.

The jars are large (average height about 41 cm.) and heavy, with thick walls and solid lids. The inscriptions are not plumb, nor are they as well carved as those on the Turin ointment jars described below; but the canopic all have the same type of inscription, and they all name "the Osiris, overseer of foreign countries, scribe, Djehuty." Typologically and technically they seem to be a set (except for one lid), and in general they parallel the jars of Maiberperi (generally assigned to the time of Amenhotep II, the son of Tuthmosis III).40

Del Francia has already noted that the lids of these jars are stylistically different; in his opinion two of them are similar and two are totally different. I believe that three of them can be accepted as Tuthmoside (Figures 1, 3, 4), but the lid on jar 2223 (Figure 5) belongs to the post-Amarna period, judging by lid shape, wig configuration, and facial features. Furthermore, the alabaster seems to be a more variegated variety, and there is much more bitumen staining on it than on other objects associated with Djehuty.

As del Francia has suggested, it is possible that Nizzoli himself inadvertently mixed up the lids, but I located a lid in the Florence storerooms which I think is a good candidate as replacement (Appendix A, no. I, Figure 2). This lid was given the number 2207 by Miglia-rini when he inventoried part of the Ricci collection in 1852-54. Del Francia points out that 1852 was the first
time Nizzoli objects (formerly exhibited in the Uffizi) and Ricci objects (formerly exhibited in Santa Caterina) were brought together, and he doubts that objects already inventoried could have been confused with objects yet to be inventoried. However, the lids assigned numbers 2222–2225 by Migliarini have other numbers on them, and lid 2207 (Figure 2, which is too big to fit the jar numbered 2207 by Migliarini) actually seems to have a penciled “2224” on it. It is of a height comparable to two of the Djehuty lids and is made of a similar stone (as far as can be determined, it is quite dirty). More telling are its triangular shape, the manner in which the face emerges from the wig, with a slight protrusion at the hairline, and the flat head, definite chin, and Tuthmoside features. Especially revealing is the rendering of the eyes. Jar lids 2224 and 2225 (Figures 3, 4) use incision more than modeling to define parts of the eyes; like 2207 (Figure 2), they have incised brows and cosmetic lines that simply stop at the outer extremities rather than ending with vertical lines. This is a small detail but an unusual one. One can also observe that jar lids 2222, 2224, 2225, and 2207 (Figures 1–4) all have straight noses (the one on 2224, Figure 4, is chipped off) and that three of the four have plastic eye accents. The lids seem to pair up (2222 with 2207, Figures 1, 2; and 2224 with 2225, Figures 3, 4), but features overlap on all four and variations can be seen on contemporary sets.41 If lid 2207 is grouped with 2222, 2224, and 2225, each jar has a well-fitting lid. Considering the diameters of the stoppers and of the jar openings, one can link the following, as illustrated in Figure 6: jar 2222 with lid 2225; jar 2223 with lid 2224; jar 2224 with lid 2222; and jar 2225 with lid 2207.

Del Francia has pointed out that the jars appear unused, but there are instances of empty canopic jars being buried with mummies.42

**Seven ointment jars** (Drovetti to Turin, nos. 5–8, and to the Louvre, no. 9; Anastasi, no. 10, and de Lescluze, no. 11, to Leiden)

Bartho stated about 1827 that Anastasi’s stone vases “came from Saqqara,” and Maspero stated in 1879 that “le catalogue de [the Drovetti collection] (no. 238)” gave the jar in the Louvre the provenance “comme trouvé à Thèbes.”43 The list Drovetti’s nephew made in Marseilles, however—the only list in the Louvre documenting the collection before it entered the museum—does not give any provenance for the jar.

The bag-shaped vases (as in Figure 7), jugs (Figures 8–11), and two-handed jars (Figure 12) are stone vessel forms known in the Tuthmoside period. Workshop scenes in the tomb of Puimara show the bag-shaped vase;“
7. Small bag-shaped ointment jar, no. 5. Turin, Cat. 3225 (photo: author)

the two-handed shape is dated by Janine Bourriau from the time of Tuthmosis III onward, and the jug form from the time of Tuthmosis III to Amenhotep III. A parallel to the jug was found in the tomb of Maiherperi.

Five of the seven Djehuty ointment jars are within one centimeter of each other in height. The sixth, a jug in Turin (no. 8, Figures 8, 9), has lost its base but could easily have been of similar height, which leaves only the small Turin bag vase (no. 5, Figure 7) as an odd size.

The inscriptions on the vessels are also similar: two columns of incised text filled with blue pigment face right, beginning with the name of a desired offering and ending with a title (or epithet) and the name of the owner. In five cases the inscriptions use a title or epithet that refers to a foreign territory: “overseer of the garrison,” “follower of the king in every foreign country,” “one who fills the heart of the king in t3–ntr” (an area to the south but also east), “two eyes of the king,” and “overseer of northern foreign countries.” (The title

8. Jug-shaped ointment jar, no. 8. Turin, Cat. 3228 (photo: author)

9. Front view of no. 8 (photo: author)
“one who is in the heart greatly of the lord of the two lands” tells us little.)

There are also differences among the vessels, however. The Louvre’s jar (no. 9, Figure 12 right) uses the title “royal scribe,” and Leiden’s bag-shaped jar from de Lescluze (no. 11, Figure 12 left) uses “overseer of northern foreign countries”; these titles do not appear on the other vessels. The de Lescluze jar has the shortest and most tightly written text of all, an inscription that begins with the names of the standard offerings. It is the only one that lacks the t and y in the spelling of the name, and is thus distinct from all the others. As for the four jars in Turin (nos. 5–8), they appear to be a set even though one is smaller, as they bear similar paleographic details and arrangement of inscription. Drovetti sold them as a group, and the two-handled jar among them does differ from the two-handled example he later sold to the Louvre: Figure 12 illustrates their differences in body shape, foot and handle detail, general proportions, and density of inscription. As for the two jugs, Leiden’s Anastasi example (no. 10, Figures 10, 11) has a higher, more slender neck, a lower-placed handle, and a more elegant shape than Turin’s Drovetti vessel (no. 8, Figures 8, 9), although the inscriptions are similar.

In conclusion, while differences occur in the seven jars, there are interlocking features and histories that suggest the jars were made for the same person but by different craftsmen.

Comparing the ointment jars to the canopic jars, one finds the same crystalline alabaster, similar carved and filled inscriptions, and similar paleographic details (the fewest appear on the de Lescluze jar). The canopics, however, have the major titles “overseer of foreign countries” and “scribe,” and the name Djehuty has a t and a y; these are features the ointment vessels do not have. I would suggest that the two groups were contem-


11. Front view of no. 10 (photo: author)
poraneous but made by different craftsmen for different purposes.

Four of the seven ointment jars have substantial amounts of resin inside; the others were certainly once filled with it. The idea that some were canopics apparently started with Leemans and continued with Devéria, Maspero, and Brugsch, until Sethe published the inscriptions of the canopics in 1909; Pellegrini’s publication of the canopics’ texts in 1898 was apparently not widely known.

**Two model palettes** (Anastasi to Leiden, no. 12, and Drovetti to Turin, no. 13)

The texts of these objects mention gods and cities, a type of information often used to establish the provenance of an object. They invoke gods of Abydos and Thebes: Turin’s palette addresses Osiris as “ruler of eternity” and Leiden’s as “foremost of the westerners” (with two tyw-birds). Leiden’s palette also has a *htp-di-nsu*-offering formula to Amunra king of the gods. These references occur on other funerary objects of the Tuthmoside period and apparently need not be taken as evidence that the palettes came from either Abydos or Thebes.54

The Leiden palette (no. 12, Figure 13) differs from the Turin example (no. 13, Figure 14) in format and style, although I have not examined it. It appears more elegant in shape and its hieroglyphs are more detailed, though in fact the Turin example is nicely made, even if the *sn*-signs are less carefully executed than the inscriptions. The Turin palette’s material and format are reminiscent of Amenhotep/Huy’s palette from the time of Amenhotep III;55 there is, however, a wooden example with a similar broad shape, which Stephen Glanville assigned to the time of Tuthmosis III or Amenhotep II.56 The Leiden example finds parallels in a wooden palette with the cartouche of Tuthmosis III from Naga ed-Deir,54 and also in a slate example that Glanville assigned to Dynasty 18.55

All three of the palettes with Huy’s name are similar to each other; Michel Dewachter tells me they may be by the same hand. Two in Cha’s tomb are basically similar, even though one has no inscription and the other is inscribed for the “overseer of the treasury, Amenmes.”55

The Turin example uses the title “royal scribe” with both “overseer of foreign countries” and “overseer of northern foreign countries.” The Leiden palette uses “royal scribe” preceded by “overseer of a part of northern foreign countries.”58

**Heart scarab necklace** (Anastasi to Leiden, no. 14)

This object is the most precious of those discussed so far. The scarab is large and heavy, the chain exceptionally long, and the object conveys an impression of importance. There are similar heart scarabs of the Tuthmoside period from the Metropolitan Museum’s excavations;59 an even longer chain than this one (1.35 m.) was found with the scarab of Ahhotep (2.01 m.).60

14. Palette, no. 13. Turin, Cat. 6227 (photo: Museo Egizio)
The name of the deceased, with a seated determinative-sign, appears only on the back of the scarab, preceded by the title “overseer of northern foreign countries.” It does not accompany chapter 30 of the Book of the Dead on the base.

**Dagger (German collection, 1875, no. 15)**

It is less certain that this object belonged to the Djehuty of the previous fourteen objects. The dagger does not bear the title “overseer of (northern) foreign countries” or “(royal) scribe”; its inscription invokes a god (Onouris) whose cult center was in the south. It does not have an early-nineteenth-century history pointing to Saqqara, as it was acquired by a person said to have formed a collection “primarily” at Thebes between 1869 and 1871. Furthermore, as Devéria, Spiegelberg,63 and Hermann Ranke64 have noted, the name Djehuty was a common one.65

However, five ointment jars do not have the titles “scribe” and “overseer of (northern) foreign countries” either, and they have an early-nineteenth-century history and stylistic similarities to two vessels that do bear those titles. Furthermore, the type of title on the dagger—“follower of his lord”66 and “brave one”—is similar to several quasi-military titles on the ointment jars: “follower of the king in every foreign country”; “overseer of the garrison”; and “two eyes of the king.” Even the traditional “companion of the king” is known for an ḫḥy-† (governor) of the oases in Dynasty 18.67

Likewise, the invocation to Onouris lord of Thinis (an Upper Egyptian city, the capital of its nome) may not prevent us from connecting the dagger to Djehuty, overseer of northern foreign countries. Wolfgang Schenkel notes that “Onouris lord of Thinis” appears in New Kingdom temple reliefs at Abydos and was especially venerated in the south. However, he also notes that Onouris was a god of hunting and combat (long worshiped in Thinis); Eric Hornung briefly notes the god’s connection with the desert and outlying regions,69 and the non-Memphite forms of two deities are invoked in two tombs at Saqqara in this period.70

As for the actual place where the dagger was acquired, Birgit Schlick-Nolte has kindly attempted to find further details about its donor, but to no avail.71 The dagger should ultimately have been deposited in a tomb, but it could have been found anywhere, even in the eastern Mediterranean area. W. M. Flinders Petrie discussed the foreign origins of this type of dagger with self handle, localizing examples with a cusp in Egypt from the beginning of Dynasty 18.72 He considered it to be of Anatolian/Caucasian origin. Perhaps Djehuty acquired the weapon abroad and had it outfitted with an Egyptian inscription, an idea of H. W. Müller, according to Nolte. Weapons were brought to Egypt in the Tuthmoside period, as shown in the tomb of Rekhmira; perhaps an analysis of this dagger’s wooden handle would shed some light on its origin.

**Part of a scribe statuette (art market, about 1975, no. 16)**

This scribe statuette (Figures 15, 16) appeared about 1975 on the Paris art market from a couple who had purchased it in Beirut. According to them, “it probably [came] from Syria as [did] most of the objects one used to find in Lebanon before the war” (personal communication). However, E. Gubel reports that “reliable” sources have stated that the statue came from a chance find at Byblos in the 1960s.73 The appearance of the object in Lebanon, its presumed original placement in a temple, and its probable invocation to Hathor lady of Byblos all indicate that it was not part of the early-nineteenth-century find in Egypt. It has the titles “overseer of northern foreign countries” and “royal scribe,” and they occur in that order, as they do on the Leiden palette.

Yoyotte connected this statuette with the fifteen objects discussed above because of the titles, but he also argued for a Dynasty 18 date in view of the presence of a back pillar and the dextrously directed signs on the papyrus. In fact, the title “overseer of the door of northern foreign countries,” which he restores from traces, may be essentially the same title as that on the Leiden palette: both imply a specific part of Ṣmaw (Syria), but perhaps also a fortress.74

Yoyotte also restored “Hathor Lady of Byblos” as the goddess invoked and assumed Djehuty to have been a resident in Byblos, where he could control and channel tribute.75 Yoyotte referred to Helck’s note that Byblos is scarcely mentioned in Tuthmoside military sources, but he saw the statue as an indication that Byblos was a tactical point for the control and concentration of tribute from Syria and as evidence that, during the reign of Tuthmosis III, northern countries were subjected—like Kush—to a regular payment and agreed to annual contributions.76 It is generally believed that Byblos had a special relationship with Egypt throughout ancient times, although there is little material contemporary with Dynasty 18 from the site so far.
Finally, Yoyotte argued that this Djehuty could not have been the owner of Theban tomb 11 because of the different types of titles and the different filiation. He read the father’s name on the statue as “the judge Amenmes,” and we see in Säve-Söderbergh’s drawing that the father in tomb 11 has the title “judge”? but not the name “Amenmes.” Further, Yoyotte read the mother’s name on the statue [Isi]-snb, while in the tomb Sethe restored “the lady of the house Ddiw” on bits of a stela,8 and Säve-Söderbergh illustrated a scene with the phrase “born of the lady of the house Ddiw, justified.”9

The inscription is typical for a scribe statue, being autobiographical and a presumed inspiration to those who would see it set up in a public place. The original owner may indeed have positioned the statuette in a shrine to Hathor at Byblos.

**Decorated silver bowl** (Anastasi, indirectly, to the Louvre, no. 17)

This object was first noted in the sale catalogue for the Anastasi collection, which was brought from Alexandria to Paris after the agent’s death in 1857. Maarten Raven states that the silver plate was definitely not part of the Anastasi collection offered to Leiden at the shipping port of Livorno in the 1820s;10 likewise, T. G. H. James says that there is no pre-1857 document in the British Museum attesting to its existence, while Schneider states that it is not mentioned in the mid-1850s offer of Anastasi to Leemans. Nevertheless, the fact that it was in Anastasi’s possession and that it has an inscription naming the “royal scribe, overseer of northern foreign countries, Djehuty” connects it to the objects numbered 1 through 14 above. As an object, however, it has no exact parallel (except for the Louvre’s gold bowl, no. 18), and must thus be studied in detail.

The object is basically flat, with a raised boss in the center surrounded by chased petals, and with repoussé friezes of tilapia-fish (moving leftward) and linked papyrus umbels (Figure 17). Between the umbels and the edge of the object is a short band of chased inscription, reading right to left. The upper surface is smooth, although the decoration of two of the umbels has been effaced. The back is corroded and pitted; it shows slight depressions of the repoussé (Figure 18). Several holes occur where at least fourteen pieces have been joined together, the holes presumably part of the object’s modern history. Although there is no X ray of the plate, it seems convincing as a corroded ancient object originally hammered out of silver.

15. Statuette, no. 16. British Museum 69863 (photo: F. Antonovich)

16. View of no. 16 (photo: British Museum)
17. Decorated silver bowl, no. 17. Louvre E 4886 (photo: Musée du Louvre)

The edge is broken but follows in three places the contour of the umbel ring; it turns up slightly at a point opposite the inscription. Because the design is centered around a boss (a feature of later bowls), and because Dynasty 18 faience bowls show tilapia, papyri, and rosettes (see below), one can imagine that this object was originally the bottom of a bowl whose approximate diameter has been preserved. No metal bowls with flat bottom and boss occur in a secure context before the time of Amenhotep III, yet all bowls of the New Kingdom with virtually flat bottoms have some type of curve as a transition between bottom and wall, and this example has such a curve.

The design and execution of the decoration are of high quality. The central boss has the “orientation point” Ali Radwan notes on copper/bronze bowls beginning in the New Kingdom, and all lines creating rosette, fish, and papyrus are carefully chased and smoothly executed (Figures 19–21).

Assuming that this was a bowl rather than a plate, we may call the boss an omphalos, a new feature in Egyptian vessels at this period. In fact, one grave in the Lower Assasif yielded an omphalos bowl and a weapon new to Egypt, so the possibility of foreign origin could also be considered for the omphalos bowl in this grave. Omphalos bowls are represented in a private tomb at Thebes in the time of Tuthmosis IV.

Whether for practicality (to help level the bowl or aid a bearer in holding it), decoration, or symbolism, the omphalos occurs on Egyptian Empire vessels that Radwan classifies for drinking; cooking (with
two handles); washing; food storage; and—in the Hatiay bowl with marsh scene, his no. 328—for "regenerative purposes." The Hatiay bowl seems to be closest to the silver bowl in type and therefore purpose (see below).

Surrounding the boss on the silver bowl are thirty-two rounded petals that, combined with the boss, create the shape of a marguerite. In decorated New Kingdom faience bowls, Christine Strauss identifies similar petals (sometimes alternately dotted) arranged around a small center as a lotus blossom seen from above. The rosette on the silver bowl seems different, however, and I believe its identity is relevant to a discussion of Newberry and Ludwig Keimer. Newberry wrote that he thought the rosette on Malkata and Amarna faience was Anthemis, while Keimer, in misinterpreting Newberry, stated his own theory about rosettes in Egypt, i.e., that Chrysanthemum coronarium Linnaeus was behind most depictions. Renate Germer has since noted that remains of Anthemis pseudocotula Boissier, widespread in Egypt today, were found in the underground chambers of the Zoser complex, while the same or a different variety (A. retusa Delile) was found in a Middle Kingdom grave at Abusir.

The rosettes that occur as flowers or decorative motifs in ancient Egypt seem stylized to me, and it is difficult to match them with actual plants. However, the composite flower with rounded petals depicted during the Eighteenth Dynasty appears to be the large-bossed flower represented on the Djehuty silver bowl, and it is closer to Anthemis than to Chrysanthemum in
19. Detail of papyrus, no. 17

20. Detail of tilapia-fish, no. 17

21. Detail of rosette, no. 17

shape. In any event, both plants became popular in Dynasty 18, and Chrysanthemum coronarium is said to have had its origin in the northernmost areas of land bordering the Mediterranean. It is assumed to have occurred as a cultivar in Upper Egypt.

Regardless of its botanical identity, there is a striking similarity between the silver bowl’s rosette and the rosettes on the bottom of silver bowls in the Tod Treasure, Middle Minoan painted pots, and Yahudiyyeh jugs (the rosettes are visible only on the exterior of the pottery vessels, of course). In other words, no matter what plant is being mimicked, the particular shape and placement of the rosettes on these vessels and on the silver bowl seem to be related in the pre-Dynasty 18 period.

Continuing to compare the decorative scheme of the silver vessel with that of faience bowls, one considers the five naturalistically formed tilapia swimming to the left around the rosette. The upper, lliplike jaw of each fish is emphasized; the snout’s profile slopes upward toward the long dorsal fin; the pectoral fin lies midway on the body, behind the C-shaped opercular bones that cover the gill; and the scales are represented by cross-hatching, the ventral fins by simple striations. Beyond this “fish ring” is a band of linked papyrus, with each of the twelve umbels linked by a common stalk marked with the ties one normally sees at the top of a column shaft to indicate binding. The umbels are splayed, and the filaments as well as the calyx leaves are rendered by parallel lines. There is some redrawing, but by and large the fish and flora are subtly executed and meticulously drawn.

If one considers the object as a whole, one finds a design that is symmetrical, tightly organized, centered around a well-formed omphalos, and (except for the inscription) highly accomplished. It is therefore surprising that no exact parallel has been found. Thus, if its date is Tuthmoside, this is the earliest decorated metal bowl known from Egypt. Radwan illustrates two metal bowls without provenance that have rosette and boss: one with surrounding herringbone ring, which he as-
signs to Dynasty 19 (his no. 333), and one with an asymmetrical frieze of birds, fish, water, and papyrus plants, which he dates to Dynasty 18/19 (his no. 334). Within the Tuthmoside period we must look for design parallels and perhaps an ultimate meaning in faience bowls and in private tombs where banquet scenes are represented.

Open faience bowls with papyrus umbels, lotuses, rosettes, and fish were popular in the first part of Dynasty 18, some of these motifs having already appeared on pottery plates of Dynasty 13 and on deep faience bowls of the Second Intermediate Period. The open faience bowls, sometimes quite large and with images of Hathor, were most popular during the early part of the dynasty, according to Angela Milward. Among those whose designs show some similarity with the Louvre plate are:

- a bowl from the MacGregor collection with four fish carrying lotus buds in their mouths and swimming to the right around a rosette
- a similar bowl in Boston with the fish swimming to the left
- a bowl with blue lotus blossoms radiating outward from a rosette, excavated in an early Dynasty 18 tomb by the Metropolitan Museum
- a bowl in Karlsruhe with fish, lotuses, papyrus, and rosette in a square

All of these have elements regularly disposed around a radius, and two of them are assigned by Milward to the middle of Dynasty 18, which she equates with the time of Tuthmosis III—Tuthmosis IV.

Passing to the final element of the decoration on the silver bowl, one comes to the papyrus umbel ring. In fact, papyri appear on the faience bowls—Strauss believes them to be a reference to Hathor—but only in a secondary role to lotuses. As for linked floral elements of any type, Howard Carter found an alabaster fragment with faience-inlaid lotuses in the tomb of Amenhotep I and suggested that it was the rim fragment of a carinated bowl. As there was Ramesside material in this tomb, however, the fragment cannot be used for dating. Clearly dated objects with linked floral chains do occur, in the tomb of Maiherperi (a wooden bracelet with linked lotuses, and a [foreign-made?] leather quiver with alternating papyri and lilies) and in the tomb of Amenhotep II (a wood-and-horn bow, bearing the name of the king, with linked papyrus and lilies or palmettes, possibly also made though not inscribed by a foreign craftsman).

Thus, while the faience bowls of the Tuthmoside period have aligned but separate flowers—and lotuses at that—linked papyri are found in Egypt on other types of objects during the time of Amenhotep II, and linked lotuses occur on the shoulders/neck of vessels during the time of Tuthmosis IV. What is more interesting is that floral elements linked in an allover pattern occur outside Egypt earlier than the time of Tuthmosis III, that is, on Middle Minoan pottery, on a seal impression from level VII at Alalakh, and on Kerma faience. Floral chains occur on a cylinder seal from Ras Shamra, and on Yahudiyeh pottery from Byblos and Cyprus.

In sum, the silver bowl would be the earliest decorated metal vessel yet known from Egypt. Unexcavated metal examples with similar decoration (though less regularly disposed and precisely drawn) or similar shape (large delineated omphalos and very flat bottom) have been placed by Radwan as somewhat later; and the linked floral chains in Egypt—whether on vessel or kiosk—are lotiform rather than papyriform. On the other hand, regularly placed tilapia and papyrus do ap-
pear on faience bowls in the Tuthmoside period, and
their naturalism on the silver bowl is not out of place then; \(^{131}\) a kiosk cornice in the time of Amenhotep II has
a frieze of lilies; \(^{132}\) rosette-centered vessels are represen-
ted in Egyptian tombs of the period; and linked flow-
ers, rosette-centered vessels, and omphaloi were known
in other parts of the ancient world before the Tuthmo-
side period, and it is well documented that contacts
with Egypt during that period were extensive.

Let us turn to the inscription on this object. Beyond
the papyrus ring there are two irregularly parallel lines
bordering a right-facing text (Figures 22–27). The be-
ginning of the lower border is preserved, and although
the first signs of the inscription are damaged, it is clear
that the entire inscription is present. Deveria’s copy
shows the first two signs complete (they are not so to-
day), and it lacks two later signs written near the upper
border \(3\) and \(\pi\), as well as the plural strokes for
“northern.” The inscription begins with the epithet
“one who greatly fills the heart of the lord of the two
lands,” continues with the epithet “praised of the good
god,” and concludes with the basic “royal scribe, over-
seer of northern foreign countries, Djehuty.” (Deveria
saw a seated determinative after the name, no doubt de-
pressions in the metallic surface, unrelated to the in-
scription.)

It is roughly this type of inscription that the ointment
jars, the dagger, and even the heart scarab have. The
first epithet is similar to the one on the Turin palette,
“one who fills the heart efficiently of the lord of the two
lands” and on Turin jar 3225, “one who is in the heart
greatly of the lord of the two lands”; the epithet “praised
of the good god” does not occur on any of the objects
described above; the spelling of “northern foreign coun-
tries” is similar to, though not exactly like, that on the
heart scarab.

The paleography of the inscription does not have the
quality of the decoration. The hieroglyphs are some-
times lightly outlined and detailed within (see parallel
strokes in the reed leaf and \(\pi\) and cross-hatching in the
twy-bird), sometimes deeply incised \(\text{ntr or h3swt}\) or
punched (plural strokes); and the plural strokes vary
from an incised square to strokes to dots. Furthermore, an ‘3 placed above n nb t3wy and an n placed above ntr nfr make the spacing of the signs uneven. Again, the tyw-bird looks like a wr, and the ibis is very crude. The name, exceptionally, has a t after the ibis and no y. And, finally, the uneven borders of the inscription do not follow the curve of the papyrus ring. I do not find the inscription very convincing and shall consider its date below.

As for the use of the silver bowl, faience examples have been found containing solid substances and were presumably placed in tombs to hold offerings. But the frequency of water and aquatic life in their decoration is notable, and Strauss may be correct in her reference to the primal water that creates life. Wall paintings show representations of flat bowls containing drink and lotuses; sometimes they appear with small pitchers of wine (or scented oil?), once with a Hathor cow and lotuses—all items associated with the rebirth of the deceased. Such must also have been the purpose of the decorated metal bowls from the grave of Hatay, the Bubastis temple hoard, and the tomb of Oundjebaounded—the latter bowl having been a present from Psousennes I.

**Decorated gold bowl** (Drovetti to the Louvre, no. 18)
The earliest reference to the gold bowl is in a letter Champollion wrote from Paris in mid-September 1827. He states that he obtained from Drovetti bijoux égyptiens d’une incroyable magnificence; des colliers, des bagues, des bracelets, des boucles d’oreille en or et enrichies d’émaux. C’est véritablement la défroque

28, 29. Gold bowl, no. 18. Louvre N 713 (photos: Bill Barrette)
d'un Pharaon, et la plupart de ces objets portent des légendes royales, comme par exemple une coupe d'or massive, ornée d'un bas-relief représentant des poissons jouant au milieu de bouquets de lotus, a été offerte au roi Moeris par le Secrétaire Royal de l'étain, de l'argent et de l'or.  

The bowl had not been mentioned the previous year when the duc de Blacas announced that France would buy the second Drovetti collection, even though five gold royal figures, fourteen rings, and other jewels were specified; nor was it inventoried by Champollion that year when he recorded 1,400 jewels and ornaments in Livorno on April 26, 1826. Drovetti arrived in France in July 1827, and according to Monique Kanawaty, he himself brought the fifty or sixty gold pieces of the collection to Paris. On October 11, 1827, when the document of sale was signed in Paris the bowl was grouped with twenty-three other gold pieces: "Quatre vingts pièces en or, dont plusieurs pièces rares et précieuses pour le travail (On a refusé quinze mille Francs de la seule coupe de Moeris): 40,000 Francs."  

The gold bowl closely resembles the silver bowl in design, although the inscription differs considerably. Further, this inscription is much more elaborate than those on any other Djehuty object. The object will therefore be examined in some detail. The gold bowl is basically pan-shaped, with vertical sides and a flat (actually very slightly convex) bottom (Figure 57). There is an omphalos in the middle of the bowl similar to the one in the silver bowl, with the point of orientation made from the top but also visible from below (Figures 28, 29). The walls are absolutely perpendicular to the base and rise to a rim that projects into the bowl; this is what is termed an "upset rim," but it is
of particularly angular form (Figures 55, 57). The vessel is remarkably sturdy although it has several flattened areas caused by pressure (Figure 29). It weighs roughly twice as much as the silver object, but it is hard to form any conclusion from this fact. 47 There is delamination on the inner surface of the walls (Figure 55), perhaps the result of creating this particular rim.

The angular shape of the bowl appears to be unique. When a gold patera was found at Ras Shamra in 1933 and assigned a date of 1450–1365 B.C. (Figure 56), C. Schaeffer, its excavator, compared it to the Djehuty gold bowl (Figure 57) and found the profiles quite different. 48 The proportions are also different: the Djehuty bowl is 17.9 cm. in diameter and 2.2 cm. high, while the Ras Shamra patera is 18.8 cm. in diameter and 3.2 cm. high. In other words, the height of the Djehuty bowl is about one-third less. At the same time, the weight of the Djehuty bowl is 371.7 grams, whereas the Ras Shamra object weighs 218, about one-third more gold having been used for Djehuty’s.

The shape of the Djehuty gold bowl resembles shallow utensils of the Archaic Period in Egypt, called pans or lids, 149 and the tray component of offering stands during the Late Period. 150 Representative profiles of New Kingdom copper/bronze bowls in Radwan’s book show, as on the Djehuty silver bowl, a curve at the point where base meets wall, even when the proportions of diameter to height are similar to those of the gold bowl (as in Radwan, no. 336). 151 There is also a gradual thickening of the rim in such bowls which allows the contents to be poured out easily. Upon consideration of these features, the gold bowl does not seem to convey a definite purpose. The short wall, the sharp angularity between floor and wall and between wall and rim, and the slightly convex floor are not functional.

The decoration of the gold bowl is much like the silver bowl’s, with an omphalos surrounded by a rosette and friezes of tilapia and umbels. But the design is more “expanded” (more space exists between the boss and the fish, less space between the umbels and the rim). There is also much more variety in the worked surfaces: the repoussé is much higher on the boss, fish, and umbels (compare Figures 30–32 [gold] with Figures 19–21 [silver]), yet the rosette petals are virtually flat. The rosette itself has fewer petals (twenty-four) but is larger (4.2 cm. in diameter on the gold, 3.1 cm. on the silver), and a zigzag border has been added beyond its edge.

The design of the gold bowl is less accomplished than the silver bowl’s. The spacing of the six tilapia swimming right is uneven, so that one fish practically runs into the fish ahead of it. There has also been a good deal of reworking to shape the heads properly and to put the eyes and mouths in the right place. There is far less control of the line than on the silver vessel (compare Figure 31 and Figure 20). And, in our examination of the bowl when it was in Boston, it was not clear that all decorative lines were traced: there were chips of metal removed around the eyes and undercut V-shaped lines, as if a burinlike instrument had been used as a tracer. For understanding the more typical chased lines, without such wide variations, two examples of excavated royal goldwork are illustrated here: the dress pattern on Tutankhamun pectoral 261 p(1) in the Cairo Museum (Figure 58), where the length of one gold fish equals the width of about two and a half columns of text; and the Cairo pectoral CG 52001 of Sesosiris II from Dahshur (Figure 59), where two-thirds the length of the fish equals the height of the falcon.

As for the style of the drawing, there is less naturalism in the gold bowl than in the silver. The outline of each fish body is more symmetrical here, without the hump on the head and without the front ventral fin integrated with the body. (The fish on the two bowls are essentially the same size, and several of the gold ones are slightly larger than the silver.) The stylized opercular bones begin immediately below the dorsal fin; the mouth is formed by a symmetrical loop, which begins at the exterior of the fish and creates a snarling expression. Scales as well as light cross-hatching cover the body.

The papyri also seem unconvincing in shape and tentative in execution (compare Figure 30 with Figure 19). Again, the design has been reworked to make the outline, and the shape of the umbel is less naturalistic than decorative, with V-shaped filaments and extra ties along the stem of the papyrus. There is a mannered spirit manifest also in the rosette’s “pinked” border, which is composed of separate multiple lines (compare Figure 32 with Figure 21), the double-decorated pattern of the fish bodies, and the double flower petals. The presentation seems both clumsy and mannered, altogether different from the evenly controlled yet natural forms on the silver bowl.

Turning now to the walls of the gold vessel, one finds the exterior surface filled with a continuous band of text reading from right to left (Figures 33–34). The signs are framed by two parallel lines, and there is a third, fugitive line between the upper border line and the top of the rim. The run-on format of the inscription itself is un-
usual if not unique in the New Kingdom. Egyptian craftsmen commonly had a point of orientation on vessels, as on many other objects. If a handle is present, for instance, the inscription is often placed opposite to and facing it; or sometimes two inscriptions are symmetrically arranged in different directions from a central point.

The inscription begins, “given through the favor of the king, the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Mn-hpr-ry” (in a cartouche). This phrase has a plural kswt (“favor”) which is paralleled in an unexcavated Tuthmoside stela from Abydos, and the duplication of “king” plus the name and title of a particular king was spotted by Birch in an inscription at Semna.

The inscription continues with three titles and an epithet that are rather high-level and occur nowhere in the objects discussed above (“hereditary noble, nomarch, god’s father, beloved of the god”). It then proceeds with two unusual epithets: “one who fills the heart of the king in every foreign country and in the islands which are in the midst of w3d-wr” (commonly understood to be the sea and here the Mediterranean) and “one who fills the storehouses with lapis lazuli, silver, and gold.” Elke Freier of the Wörterbuch staff in Berlin has confirmed that the first epithet is attested to only on this gold bowl; however, the official named User in the time of Tuthmosis III records tribute brought from “northern foreign countries of the confines of Asia and of the isles which are in w3d-wr”, thus these two areas are linked at the time of Tuthmosis III, and the only question is what “one who fills the heart of the king” means in terms of physical presence.

As for the second epithet, it is thought that a person posted abroad at this period would have had both military and trade/tribute responsibilities, and Yoyotte sees evidence of this on the scribe statuette (no. 18). With this epithet, however, we come to the probable reason Porter-Moss once linked the gold bowl and small objects associated with it to the owner of the Theban tomb 11. That official was responsible for gathering precious materials, enlarging the treasuries, and overseeing metalworking projects at Thebes during the time of Hatshepsut—Tuthmosis III. It could therefore be suggested that after his military/economic career abroad, the same official came back to Egypt for a career manag-
33–54. Gold bowl, no. 18, details of inscription, reading right to left (photos: Bill Barrette)

55. Inside of bowl, no. 18  
(photo: Bill Barrette)
ing raw materials at Thebes. We will see that the “overseer of northern foreign countries Amenmes” was buried at Thebes; and we noted invocations on several of the eighteen objects to gods associated with Abydos or Thebes. On the other hand, there is a specific statement that the canopic jars were found at Saqqara, and it is not unreasonable that a person with the title “overseer of northern foreign countries” would be buried at Saqqara. Little New Kingdom material predating Amenhotep III has been documented there,150 but Alain-Pierre Zivie has recently uncovered a tomb for a chancellor/overseer of the treasury in the Tuthmoside period,158 and tombs for two officials nearer the time of Amenhotep III—one a naval officer, and one an overseer of the granaries.159

The inscriptions of Theban 11, then, belong essentially to a man whose career was at Thebes,160 whereas the texts on the small objects and the tale of Joppa concern a person whose career was in military or trade matters outside Egypt. The most frequent titles on the small objects are variations of “overseer of foreign countries” and “scribe.”

The inscription on the gold bowl continues, “overseer of foreign countries,” “overseer of the army” (i.e., “general,” which does not occur elsewhere on Djehuty objects), “praised of the good god” (as on the silver bowl), “one whose sustenance/worth the lord of the two lands supplied,” royal scribe, Djehuty, justified.” “Northern” is not included in “overseer of foreign countries,” and this title is separated from “royal scribe.”

The titles on the gold bowl are clearly more elaborate than on any of the other objects, yet this could be expected on a sizable item that purports to be a royal gift. And in fact the titulary is not so very different from that of an official named Amenmes who must have been almost a contemporary of Djehuty and had the same responsibilities abroad that he did. We know the titles from the tomb of Amenmes at Thebes, which dates to the time of Tuthmosis III–Amenhotep II.162 Like Djehuty, he was an “overseer of northern foreign countries”—a rather rare title163 that may have begun with Djehuty164—and his titulary was similar to Djehuty’s:

military titles: “two eyes of the king in the country of Ritna”; “eyes of the king of southern Egypt, ears of the king of northern Egypt, throughout the land of wretched Ritna”; “overseer of troops” (hry pdt); “stable master” (hry ihu)

epithets: “one who fills the heart of the good god”; “beloved of his lord”; “beloved of the lord of the two lands”; “praised of the good god”

invocations: to Osiris Hekadjet; to Amun lord of the thrones of the two lands

honorifics: “prince”; “count”; “seal bearer of the king of lower Egypt”; “unique friend”

Amenmes is shown on one tomb wall presenting a bowl to a king, probably Tuthmosis III, while inhabitants of Syria bow as they present products.165 In another scene, a pine forest with a crenellated residence is the background for a chief of Rnmm bowing before the Egyptian official; other residents present objects, and Egyptians stand by with spears, axes, small shields, and scribal equipment.

The one notable phrase on the gold bowl that does not occur in Amenmes’ inscriptions is “god’s father, beloved of the god.” Henri Wild has argued that another “overseer of northern foreign countries,” Kenamun—as attested on a wooden Osiride figure said to be from Giza166—is the same man as the chief steward of Theban 93, time of Amenhotep II, at an earlier stage of his career. If this is true, one could propose in Djehuty’s case that an escalation of status came after the success at Joppa, so that he achieved the designation “god’s father,” as several viziers did at the time.167

Turning finally from the content of the inscription on the gold bowl to its execution, we notice that despite a dark gray substance and reddish “resin” in many of the signs today, they were originally hammered or impressed with some force (compare the inner surface of the wall, Figure 55, with the outer, Figure 41, 42); normally the inner surface of a vessel shows only a faint version of the exterior inscription.168 Perhaps the amount of metal displacement was caused by the thickness of the gold and the hardness of the surface against which it was worked, or by subsequent burnishing.169

The signs on the Djehuty gold bowl appear to be both chased and punched, with both square and round punches. They have a much more uniform character—and better spacing—than the signs on the silver vessel, and at first glance the paleography seems convincing: the conical loaf, first owl and sedge ☮, ◌, p, viper, second flag, hoe, whips, hearts, faces, baskets, broad collar, reed leaves, and k3-sign have details of good Egyptian epigraphy, including the “stops” at the end of a line. There is also a certain “dryness” to the style of writing, comparable to that on the Ahmose ewer (Figure 60).
Yet many of these features become less convincing upon further consideration: the conical loaf with straight
tick; the first owl with no inner detail; the beetle with
large head but no antennae; the straight-poled flags
without selvage; the archer without foreleg.

And there are some unusual features in this inscription. Although the cartouche ring is quite formally
drawn, a number of the signs have a semipaleographic
color: lion, bee, ox tongue above “foreign coun-
tries,” archer, and seated determinative. Further, the is-
land sign has two vertical strokes in it; the sign beyond
it is presumably a ḫw-jar, here as a sun disk; the pupil of
the eye is centered; the lower arm of the seated determinative
appears as a phallic.

Lengthy consideration of this inscription reveals a
considerable degree of hesitancy and clumsiness in the
signs:

front-heavy quail chicks throughout (the second of
which was read as a ḫw-bird by a colleague)
the n’s drawn like railroad ties
the first ḡw-vase with fat neck and rim
the heads of the lion and seated determinative
the third sedge, island sign, papyrus column, fire
drill, second owl, door bolt, foot, hand
the signs making ms ‘ḥrw

There is also a lack of consistency in the way the same
sign is drawn:

the two ḡw-vases, owls, quail chicks, arms, whips,
faces
the dots in “lapis,” “gold,” and “two lands”
the vertical strokes in “reward,” “islands,” “store-
houses,” “foreign countries,” k3, versus the sign
following the nw-jar

In making these observations it is important to real-
zize that the hieroglyphic bands on both silver and gold
bowls in the Louvre are roughly the same height; and the
hieroglyphs are the same height as those on the pector-
lar of Tutankhamun cited above, while they are ap-
proximately twice as high as those on the ewer from
Tanis naming Ahmose. In other words, although the
photographs of those inscriptions are greatly enlarged
here, they illustrate that quality and consistency are
present in minute details. And, while our observations
attest that variety in goldworking exists in excavated
objects—depending on scale, placement of the inscrip-
tion, originality of the inscription (note the secondary
inscription, a rewritten name, on the right side of the
Tutankhamun pectoral)—our experience also indicates
that a greater degree of surety and consistency should
be present on the gold bowl. Objects from Eighteenth-
Dynasty royal tombs do not always have good inscrip-
tions, as one can see in the “Valley of the Kings room”
in the Cairo Museum. The nonexcavated silver li-
bation jars from Wady D 1, for instance, have inscrip-
tions of medium quality for royal work (Figures 63,
64) compared with the sure writing on the gold ewer of
Ahmose excavated by Montet at Tanis (Figure 60). But
elaborate objects from Wady D 1—such as the inlaid
bracelets (Figures 61, 62)—exhibit the finest quality
workmanship and most consistent paleography, and
these inscriptions appear on inner curved walls. We
must expect high quality in an object claimed to be a
royal gift for a presumed hero from a major period of
Egyptian history—an object that uses a great deal of
gold and has an elaborate, unique design, an inscription
on an exterior surface (offering easy access for a crafts-
man), and hieroglyphic signs of considerable size.
The Djehuty canopic jars and ointment vessels, the
dagger, and the scribe statuette are all of good quality;
the heart scarab and the decoration of the silver bowl
are of high quality. All indications are thus that the bowl
should be a first-rate object, like the only other extant
decorated precious-metal vessel from a royal workshop
in Dynasty 18, the silver pomegranate vase from the
tomb of Tutankhamun. (For consistent paleography
on other types of excavated objects in this period, see
the burial shrouds of Tuthmosis III and Hatnufer
and the funerary papyrus of Cha.)

In sum, the inscription’s content is justifiable, even
“ideal,” to use Dewachter’s word. And Egyptologists
with whom I have discussed the content consistently
maintain that the text could not have been created in
1827, “not even by Champollion.” But the paleography
of the inscription does not exhibit the consistency ex-
pected on the one hand, and it has the unusual charac-
ter, on the other hand, of being more proficient than the
object on which it is placed. As there is absolutely no
way to separate the execution of this inscription from
the beating out of the bowl and its subsequent decor-
ation—the inscription was undoubtedly formed as the
last step—one is forced to consider other means to ac-
count for the inscription’s characteristics, the bowl’s
unique shape, the poor goldworking, and the frankly
unbelievable drawing of the fish.

I therefore explored the idea that the bowl might
have been made by non-Egyptians but inscribed by an
56. Patera from Ras Shamra. Louvre AO 17.208 (from: Schaeffer, *Ugaritica*, II, pl. 7)
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Egyptian (albeit one without the level of expertise expected for such an object). In this case the bowl could have been made by a Syrian and inscribed by an Egyptian, but I could find no exact parallels for the shape (straight short sides, sharp platform rim) or any parallels at all for the decoration (lack of design unity and of technical proficiency). And I believe that the Ras Shamra patera examined above (Figures 56, 66) as well as the Ras Shamra cup (Figures 65, 67) are useful for comparative purposes. While the patera was executed with areas of flat, broad, raised relief, the Ras Shamra cup (17.5 cm. in diameter and 5 cm. high) was worked with various tools to yield a rich composition with coloristic effects. It shows Syrian as opposed to Egyptian work, without the clear outlines and controlled decoration typical of Egyptian artistry as seen on Djehuty’s silver vessel. There is a more active approach here; the craftsman has created a fluid, impressionistic effect rather than arranging a group of similar forms. (One-half of the length of a gold fish would equal the horned animal’s head in Figure 67, nose to ear tip.) For instance, on the Ras Shamra cup there are multiple lines used to create the curve of a horn, but not the large pressed areas around the fish heads or back-and-forth scratching of the papyrus umbel. It shows metalworking with a unified purpose behind it, not the unskilled and lifeless presentation of forms. I find that the decoration on the Ras Shamra patera, the metal stands from Aniba, the bowl of Oundjebaounded, and the inscriptions on the metal vessels of Cha bear out these observations.

THE GOLD BOWL AS A POSSIBLE FORGERY

Could the gold bowl be modern rather than ancient? We have used excavated material to establish criteria for studying the object from every conceivable vantage point; we have weighed the evidence to find that the
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balance lies somewhere beyond the limits of probability established by excavated material and extended to non-excavated objects. We are therefore forced to consider forgery. I am aware that the discrepancies I see may not be seen by others, and that forgery studies in general are not popular (if they are pursued, they are undertaken more by museum people than by philologists). Further, I realize that most colleagues believe Egyptian forgeries were not made before the second half of the nineteenth century, assuming that there was insufficient interest before the Napoleonic campaign to warrant them and a large enough supply of genuine objects afterward to make forgery unnecessary. In this case I am aware that the inscription on the gold bowl is of some quality. However, I believe that an object can have convincing as well as damning features; and one’s judgment of an object must be based upon a wide variety of factors. Detection of a modern hand can emerge through one feature if it is telling enough, but most often it results from the compilation of many pieces of evidence. In this case, the gold bowl’s inscription is its best feature, but that feature can, at most, be one-third of its evidence. Birch tells us that he was suspicious of the bowl’s inscription when he first saw it, but that the Annals and “le langage officiel de l’époque” validated it. We can assume, however, that he did not know the silver bowl since he does not mention it, and herein lies a clue to how even this part of the gold bowl’s evidence could be wrong.

I believe that the silver bowl is an ancient fragment because, though it has no exact parallel, it conforms to what we know or can expect from excavated objects, whether they be undecorated or decorated metal examples or vessels of other materials. It and the gold bowl are associated with each other, because of the similarity of their designs, and with General Djehuty, because of the content of their inscriptions and their modern history. However, because the gold bowl is not as convincing in shape, decoration, and epigraphy as the object it is purported to be, and because it is so similar to the silver bowl, an occurrence disturbing in itself, it is possible that one is an original and the other a copy, an idea first suggested to me by Richard Stone.

The silver object may originally have had a rim with the inscription that is now on the gold bowl—the rim was damaged when found because of the cracking known to occur in the curve between wall and bottom of other silver vessels, a curve that is still slightly preserved on the silver fragment. There are cracks and losses on it today that do not appear on the Devéria drawing of about 1857; it was obviously more complete before that.

Such a rim could have carried an inscription long enough to encircle the gold bowl (whose diameter is approximately the same as that of the original silver object) and provided a copyist with models of paleographic style. It is possible that two craftsmen were involved, one who picked up some subtleties of paleography and another who did not understand the subtleties of bowl shape and rim detail on the silver vessel, or the sophisticated design of its center.

In this hypothetical situation, the forger must have had access to the silver bowl; its rim would have been free enough of corrosion to allow paleographic details to be seen and traced; and its bottom most likely would have been free of the inscription it now has, for bowls normally have inscriptions on the bottom or on the wall but not on both. And while the inscription on the floor of the silver vessel is typologically different from what I propose was once inscribed on its rim, it is so very poor paleographically and in design that I believe it to be modern, added to maintain the connection of this object with the Djehuty find. It can be compared with a retouched inscription on a wooden palette in Bologna, which entered that collection in 1831 from Nizzoli (Figures 73–75, Appendix B, no. XIII); the palette shows a Tuthmoside inscription of good quality on one side, but a reworked inscription on the other.

However, if the inscription now on the silver bowl is not ancient, how would it have come to be there in the hypothesis proposed above? One possibility is that the short and complete inscription was taken as is from a now-lost object at some point before 1857 (the bowl cannot be traced before that date in the available sources). Similar inscriptions occur on furniture, game pieces from Cha’s tomb, the Djehuty heart scarab, and mid-Dynasty 18 metal vessels (Radwan, nos. 334, 394, 405, 464: 338 is longer). A second possibility is that the inscription on the silver bowl was entirely created by someone before 1857. Such a person would have had access to (or records of) Djehuty objects and been able to extract certain phrases—making slight adjustments or mistakes in them—since the inscriptions on the known objects do not give the exact spellings or sequence of titles that appear on the silver bowl. The first epitaph, “one who fills the heart greatly of the lord of the two lands,” has its closest parallel on the Turin palette, and if that palette was the
model, one could easily postulate that the copyist mistook the chisel for the wooden column. The second epithet, “praised of the good god,” exists on the gold bowl, and therefore would have theoretically existed on the rim of the silver bowl; “royal scribe” appears on the silver bowl in the same form as on the Turin palette; and “overseer of northern foreign countries” has its closest parallel on the Leiden heart scarab, although the plural strokes for “northern” are at the end of the word rather than before the *tuw.*

Could the short inscription now on the silver bowl have been created before September 1827, when the gold bowl is first mentioned in Paris? The known objects might have been available, but someone would have to have been able to read enough ancient Egyptian to select certain phrases, and Champollion’s grammar did not appear until 1836–41 (his groundbreaking *Lettre à M. Dacier* appeared in 1822).

On the other hand, we know that Anastasi wrote to Champollion late in 1824, stating that he had used his *Précis* that year to decipher names in his collection, and he sent Champollion “more royal cartouches” in April 1826, although they were “nothing new” to Champollion. There may have been correspondence between the two, begun by the tracings that Anastasi sent in 1824, which enabled Champollion to discover the system of writing months in the three forms of Egyptian language. We also know that Champollion saw Nizzoli at Turin in June 1824 with drawings of some of Nizzoli's objects. In other words, if such men as Anastasi, Henry Salt, and William Bankes were interested in hieroglyphs and writing—following Johan Åkerblad, Antoine Silvestre de Sacy, Thomas Young, William Gell, Gustavus Seyfarth, Ippolito Rosellini, John Gardner Wilkinson, and of course Champollion—and if we have such men as Edward Lane labeling the west bank on his map of about 1826–27, can we say today that it was impossible for the inscription now on the silver bowl to have been put together from original objects by someone? Karl-Theodore Zauzich has recently discovered that the "horse trader" Giuseppe Passalacqua was translating demotic in 1836.

And while duplicity might be suspected in the making of the gold bowl (it entered the Louvre too soon after its supposed forgery for an honorable person not to have come forward), someone could have unknowingly provided a translation or inscription that would have helped a forger. Further, the inscription on the silver bowl need not have been done by the person(s) who made the gold bowl, or with intent to deceive. And, finally, the falsifications could have been done in Egypt or Europe. The real point is to decide whether anyone in 1820–27 would have been interested enough in making forgeries and as cunning as forgers are today.

Whether or not there is a large supply of genuine articles, some of us believe that as soon as there is collecting there is a market for forgeries. Alessandro Castellani wrote in 1862 that the inhabitants of Naples, helped by archaeologists, were making jewelry for visitors to Pompeii and Herculaneum early in that century; and J. P. Rossignol wrote in 1883 that the manufacturing of fakes in precious metal at Naples was recorded as early as 1761.

For Egypt one might make the case—as Baltrušaitis, Jean Leclant, and Pierre Arizzoli-Clémentel—did—that interest never died, and that vestiges of Egypt were at hand from the days of antiquity. While few traces of activity or interest are apparent in medieval times, the Renaissance awakened a desire to return to antique models. Collections were formed and publications circulated showing texts and objects dug up in Europe or brought back from the East: first by princes, cardinals, and bishops in the Renaissance, and then by officials, professionals, and businessmen in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (as Dewachter has shown). Leclant and Curto have been studying the survival of Egypt in postantique times for many years, but a staggering amount of material has recently been brought together for exhibitions in France and Italy, and colleagues in Austria, Germany, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, England, Russia, and Italy have recorded many instances of early interest in Egypt. Thus, while Napoleon’s presence in Egypt marked a greater volume of attention toward ancient Egypt, the evidence assembled shows that collecting and the appreciation of objects already existed, especially in France and Italy. Soldiers, businessmen, consular agents, and adventurers helped kings, a duke, and a pope to form public museums in the early nineteenth century, both for true interest and to heighten status. But there was much interest and considerable demand for objects before that, and not just for shawabties, the ubiquitous small servants of the dead.

Is there specific evidence for falsifications before the time of Napoleon? One should first realize that this term can be applied to objects created in the Egyptian style but not necessarily meant to deceive, as well as to copies, authentic objects enhanced by the addition of missing
parts or inscriptions, and out-and-out forgeries. Some instances of early forgeries have already been observed by scholars, and I have collected additional evidence from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

“Egyptian objects” were certainly being made in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In 1900 Pellegrini published three bronze Shawabties from the Medici collections in Florence, which he doubted; Dewachter now writes of Renaissance bronze castings. One of the bronze Medici Shawabties in Florence seems completely modern to me—and apparently to Véronique Laurent—as does a (stone) Shawabty in the Ashmolean acquired in 1635 and of course the “busto isiaco” of 1761. (The last was rather quickly denounced as a forgery on the basis of the signs on it.) Marie-Pierre
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Foissy-Aufrère recently published an inscribed canopic jar in the Musée Calvet made sometime before 1778 as a pendant for an authentic jar in the same collection.

Toward the end of the eighteenth century there was considerable interest for things Egyptian, in Rome and then in France—even reaching Russia—which resulted, for instance, in the Salle Égyptienne at the Borghese’s Villa Pinciani in Rome. Arizzoli-Clémentel has discovered fascinating documentation for the scheme of this room; decorated by Antonio Asprucci between 1778 and 1782, and published by Parisi in 1782, it was filled with statues that were sold to Napoleon in 1807 and arrived in Paris in 1808 and 1810. An Isis of alabaster and Nero antico, an Osiris of Nero antico, and an Isis of Elbian granite were made for the room by Antonio Grandjacquet, a sculptor employed by Piranesi for his speciality of working hard stones in the spirit of the antique. Arizzoli-Clémentel explains that the “antiquities” of the Borghese collection were a mixture of real objects restored (presumably in the early eighteenth century) and modern ones in Egyptian style; both were part of a larger creation which aided the contemplation of the antique. No doubt Denon’s encouragement of the Manufacture de Sévres to make an inscribed faience Shawabty in 1812 resulted from a popular taste for things Egyptian, but the technique itself could have been used to make objects claimed to be ancient.

In 1809, after Napoleon’s conquest of Egypt, Champollion prepared a list of non-Egyptian items and forgeries in Comte Anne Claude Philippe de Caylus’s Recueil d’antiquités égyptiennes. In 1825, when he catalogued the Nizzoli collection in Florence, Champollion noted that several of the inscriptions on canopic jars were new and—that according to Pellegrini—that a black obelisk there was a complete forgery. An inscribed limestone stela in Vienna, which was part of the 1821 Burghart purchase, was published by E. von Bergmann in 1892 with a question, and Helmut Satzinger now believes it to be a forgery (Figure 68). Samuel Sharpe called attention to paintings “restored by Belzoni” on a sarcophagus given to the British Museum in 1820, and Nicholas Reeves ascribes “a number of restorations” on objects acquired by the British Museum from Belzoni and Salt to their vendors. Giovanni Belzoni himself was wary of out-and-out forgeries; the painter Philippe-Joseph Machereau, according to Alphonse Karr (1808–90), made hieroglyphs on objects belonging to Vivant Denon (deceased 1825); Christian Reuven thought there
were restorations in the de Lescluze collection that he bought for Leiden in 1825,24 and Schneider has suggested that two Osiride figures were probably meant.25 In fact Gustave Flaubert (1821–80) wrote during the nineteenth century, "les antiquités: sont toujours de fabrication moderne."26 In the light of all the above evidence, one wonders why we have become so timid about questioning an object made after antiquity but before our own time.

No doubt it is partly because Achille Prisse d’Avennes wrote in 1846 that Mohammed Ali’s recent revocation of permissions to excavate (seemingly in 1835)27 had caused the Egyptian inhabitants to turn to forgeries as a means of supplying the demand;28 and because Alfred Clerc, "bibliophile,"29 wrote the next year, "il n’y a guère que trois ou quatre ans que l’on fabrique en assez grand nombre de fausses antiquités. . . . Depuis 1843 surtout, un grand nombre de Voyageurs, de Touristes . . . sont tombés comme des nuées de sauterelles sur et dans les catacombes, les hypogées, les grottes, et se sont jetés sur tout ce que les Arabes ou les fouilleurs européens autorisés par le Pacha, exhumait de reliques des Pharaons."30

But this does not mean that no forgeries were made before about 1840, as the evidence cited shows, nor is there any reason to accept the inscriptions (or objects themselves) on two obelisks brought from Egypt in 183926 and on a statuette collected between 1828 and 1833.30 Caroline Ransom Williams was asked in 1924 whether 1832 was too early a date for forgeries, even after she had gathered evidence of one; it seems that we are still reluctant to consider early dates for forgeries, no matter how many warnings nineteenth-century predecessors gave us.

Can we accept early poor shawabties as forgeries but not “beautiful” ones? We are careful to give objects the benefit of the doubt because we see objects of varying quality come from excavations, and because the accidents of excavation can keep more than one example from coming to light. But although Petrie’s typologies were based on excavated material, his corpora have not been extended; our standards for dating are not always defined; we may subconsciously defend our own countrymen, or assume (even Egyptologists!) that earlier men cannot do things as well as modern man.

Let us remember the desire for profit, the need for a steady supply of antiquities, the preference for clean, undamaged examples (even shawabties), and—as Nizzoli tells us32—for any gold treasures, since in 1822 all gold hoards were supposed to be turned over to the pasha. Ramond has shown that high-quality forgeries can be produced even when there is only a small profit to be made or a paucity of objects at hand;33 Dewachter has praised the quality of several eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century facsimiles.34 In the case of the gold bowl I propose that there was an original at hand available for tracing.

Are we able to suggest who could have participated knowingly in deceptions regarding the Djehuty objects? It is now 161 years since the gold bowl entered the Louvre, but some points are worth mentioning. Rosellini35 and Drovetti36 both had Venetian and Islamic objects in their collections, though we cannot expect anyone in the early nineteenth century to have had today’s knowledge, or even to have known when a tomb was intact37 or a findspot wrong.38 On the other hand, had the gold bowl been purchased within five to ten years of its manufacture, an honorable person would have made the error known; we must remember that the gold bowl is not mentioned in the early 1826 list from Livorno but appears first in August or September 1827 in Drovetti’s hands.

It would help if we knew the circumstances of the Djehuty find but we do not. I believe that the tomb of the “overseer of northern foreign countries Djehuty” was most likely at Saqqara because of Nizzoli’s statement and because Nizzoli, Anastasi, and Drovetti shared the Amenhotep/Huy find as well as a jewelry find at Saqqara during the same period (see below). I also believe that these two or three finds were made before August 1822, when the Nizzolis left Cairo for Europe, and after Nizzoli sold his first antiquities collection—in 1820 to Burghart for the Vienna museum, according to Amalia—and moved to Cairo.

Unfortunately, we do not know who made the Djehuty find (Nizzoli says “the jars were found,” not “I found the jars”), whether all objects were found at once, or if all objects were ever in the hands of one agent. When Nizzoli writes that he found the cubit rod of Amenhotep/Huy, we know he also got palettes, a stela, the gray pyramidion, and five alabaster jars; but he did not mention the red pyramidion, the canopic chest, and the leg of a stool that Anastasi acquired, perhaps because Anastasi’s agents had bought them after Nizzoli had left the excavations—as Amalia says such things happened—or perhaps for some other reason.

In the Djehuty case Anastasi seems to have had the finest objects (silver bowl, green heart scarab, and pos-
sibly other jewelry; see below), but Drovetti could have had precious objects other than the gold bowl, since most of the gold pieces in his Paris collection of 1827 were stolen in 1830.\textsuperscript{259} According to my theory, the only event that would have to have occurred is that the person who made the gold bowl had access to the silver vessel between its discovery and 1827. We know Anastasi had the silver bowl when he died, and he would have been capable of having the inscription added to the silver remnants at some point. Most sources on Anastasi are positive, however;\textsuperscript{260} only Hayes suggests otherwise, unfortunately not giving his source.\textsuperscript{261} He states that in 1824–25 Anastasi appears to have been engaged in endless squabbles with everybody except Nizzoli. On the other hand, Anastasi could have traded the silver bowl from one of the other principals; if broken it would not have been so valuable. Or someone could have arranged to have had the inscription added to the silver bowl at an unknown time, aware that it had a connection with the Djehuty material. Bartho possessed a Djehuty object, and he was on good terms with both Anastasi (as his agent) and with Drovetti.

Could Drovetti have been involved in deliberately making a gold version of a broken silver bowl? He had great influence with Mohammed Ali throughout his career in Egypt (1803–29); he shared in the Amenhotep/Huy find with Nizzoli and Anastasi by getting stray fragments of the cubit rod and possibly a palette;\textsuperscript{262} he must have had good connections with Bartho since he countersigned the initial agreement in the Bartho–de Lescluze transfer; he had seven of the Djehuty objects, including the most valuable one, and this he personally delivered to Champollion in Paris. Of all the consular agents he has the worst reputation, no matter how much he contributed to Egyptology by forming collections or to Egypt’s reforms by relations with Mohammed Ali. Curto describes Drovetti as having encyclopedic interests and a taste for beauty though he was protective of his power;\textsuperscript{263} and Wolfradine von Minutoli presented Drovetti in a good light.\textsuperscript{264} But, Belzoni’s (seemingly justified) ravings aside,\textsuperscript{265} Humbert wrote to Reuven about Drovetti’s tricks,\textsuperscript{266} and Hermine Hartleben’s work with Champollion’s papers caused her to describe him as “ein ebenso berechnender wie kluger Mann, der überall und immer in erster Linie an den Vorteil seiner Börse dachte”,\textsuperscript{267} Kanawaty has characterized him to me as a merchant compared to his consular successor, Jean-François Mimaut.

Of course no consular agent need have been know-ingly involved. Drovetti’s agent, Jean-Jacques Rifaud, for example—“se avido di compensi pecuniari,”\textsuperscript{268} according to Curto—published atrocious copies of Egyptian monuments yet good examples of flora;\textsuperscript{269} his original drawings or sculptures are not known, so far as I can tell. However, even Rifaud need not have been the actual craftsman of the bowl. He left Alexandria for Europe in 1826 and arrived in Paris in November 1827 after a year in Tuscany;\textsuperscript{270} if this seems grasping after straws, one might note Clerc’s 1847 statement that the finest forgeries at that time were coming to Egypt from Italy and Greece.\textsuperscript{271}

Frédéric Cailliaud was also an associate of Drovetti, and his publications show engravings with well-formed inscriptions.\textsuperscript{272} He practiced as a goldsmith in Paris before going east\textsuperscript{273} and even in Istanbul in about 1815, according to Dewachter. The Dictionnaire de Biographie notes that Cailliaud was with Drovetti at the first catastrophe in 1815, returned to France in 1819, was in Nuba in 1821, and returned to Paris to publish several works in 1822 and 1823 before resuming life in Nantes. According to Dewachter, a current French study sees Cailliaud as an honorable man, but some of his contemporaries did not. Belzoni wrote that Cailliaud mutilated sixteen blocks on Philae,\textsuperscript{274} and Giovanni d’Athanasy claimed that he had destroyed a painted tomb at Thebes.\textsuperscript{275} The story of the pipe that Cailliaud supposedly sold to Salt as an antiquity was told several times (by Belzoni,\textsuperscript{276} Count Louis Nicolas de Forbin,\textsuperscript{277} and Prisse d’Avennes\textsuperscript{278}), and Prisse’s report (not firsthand) is of interest because it links Drovetti and Cailliaud in the deception:


Of more interest to the current study, however, is a second extract from the papers of Prisse in the Biblio-
thèque nationale. It is not necessarily to be interpreted as Prisse's own observation (he arrived in Egypt in 1827\textsuperscript{279} and Drovetti left Egypt forever in 1829); possibly it was a report he had read or heard: "Drovetti et Caillaud ont abusé au contraire de la confiance du gouvernement en enlevant après la vente, les plus belles pièces de leur collection et en y substituant souvent de fausses antiquités de leur fabrique... Caillaud fit fabriquer à Paris des scarabées et autres antiquités."

Can this be dismissed? It appears to me that the more carefully and dispassionately we look into archives, the more evidence we may find on this subject of forgery,\textsuperscript{280} both before 1835 and after.\textsuperscript{281} I cannot propose who made the Djehuty find, when or how the objects were traded, or where they traveled. But the gold bowl could have been made in Egypt as early as 1820 if it was copied from the silver, and the silver inscription could have been added by a different person in Egypt or Europe by 1827—and of course up until 1857.

What about all the Egyptologists who have accepted the gold bowl? Champollion had very little time to study the bowl before it went on exhibition, being overwhelmed—according to his letter of mid-September—with the opulence of the Drovetti objects; he was also preparing for his first trip to Egypt.\textsuperscript{282} When Birch looked at the text afresh in 1857, it seemed dubious to him,\textsuperscript{283} but when he saw the similarity of its content to texts of the Eighteenth Dynasty it became part of Egyptological literature.

One wonders how critically the bowl has been examined up to now. Max Müller admired it, and since he comments on the contrast between deep repoussé and light secondary lines he may have actually examined it.\textsuperscript{284} Vernier illustrated front and back in *La Bijouterie et joaillerie égyptiennes* (plate 20) with the caption, "Cisèle... Plateau or, donné à Thouti par le roi Thotmes III."\textsuperscript{285} But the beauty of gold often blinds viewers to what has been done with it, and until quite recently low-power magnification was the only available means of examination. Then too, few Egyptian collections have had the opportunity that the Metropolitan Museum had when Lila Acheson Wallace underwrote a comprehensive review of its Egyptian collection (dating, object importance, cleaning, restoration, and authenticity). Even though the Djehuty bowl was not restudied, it was routinely used in discussions of Joppa, the Aegean, and Tutmosis III.

Still another question must be asked. If the gold bowl is not ancient, why have there not been more gold vessels made for the antiquities market? The answer may be that there never were many Egyptian gold vessels that survived into modern times that could be sources of inspiration. When seventeen gold vessels were offered to the Metropolitan Museum in the 1920s (said to be from Wady D 1 but now thought to be forgeries), there was virtually no pre-Ptolemaic comparative material beyond the following:

- fifteen silver and eight gold/electrum vessels from Bubastis split between Cairo, Berlin, and New York (the Cairo vessels had been published, not the ones in Berlin)
- the two silver Cha vessels in Turin
- a small Late Period silver situla from Abusir\textsuperscript{286}
- the five silver vessels that I believe did come from Wady D 1 but were from the art market (three libation jars, a krateriskos, and a cup)

Subsequent finds include:

- one small silver and two small gold vessels in Hetepheres's tomb\textsuperscript{287}
- a silver pomegranate and two tiny bag-shaped precious-metal models in Tutankhamun's tomb (one silver, one gold/electrum)\textsuperscript{288}
- ten silver, two gold, and two electrum vessels from royal tombs in the Sudan\textsuperscript{289}
- one cup and two small pitchers in Hatnufer's burial, of silver\textsuperscript{290}
- thirteen silver and ten gold/electrum full-size vessels in the royal tombs at Tanis\textsuperscript{291}
- a gold cosmetic dish in Sekhemkhet's pyramid\textsuperscript{292}
- three silver libation vessels in Neferuptah's tomb\textsuperscript{293}

In total I have recorded eighty-one pre-Ptolemaic silver or gold/electrum vessels with good provenance.\textsuperscript{294} Precious-metal vessels from excavations are uncommon from all ancient cultures, whether Classical, Near Eastern, or Egyptian, but gold vessels seem to be particularly rare. Of the eighty-one Egyptian items cited above, for instance, only twenty-six are gold/electrum, and only half of those are of any size. Thus can one comprehend the chances of an Egyptian gold vessel being preserved until modern times.

The gold forgeries associated with Wady D 1 were probably made after a find during World War I when archaeologists and buyers were absent from the country and there was an opportunity to augment the group with additional jewels and vessels (it seems significant that corroded silver vases were part of that original find and that the gold vases associated with it are believed to be forgeries). The Djehuty bowl seems to be another
isolated occurrence, easy enough to create if a prototype were already at hand and a certain amount of time were available between the tomb find and a presentation to the art market. There was sure to be a notable profit involved.

Some colleagues may come to different conclusions from my observations, and the fact that they can displays a central problem in authenticity studies in a field already divided into philological and archaeological areas. At the very least the gold bowl must be approached with caution. Its shape is unconvincing; its design shows lack of unity, appropriate style, or naturalistic observation; and its decoration shows lack of skill (delamination of surfaces, uneven handling of tools). All this would be admitted if the bowl were from a private workshop, but it is definitely an uncharacteristic product for a large gold object from a royal workshop in Dynasty 18, and I believe this conclusion also applies to the paleography of the inscription. We must be careful to understand that the material of the bowl itself dazzles us but that its workmanship is something to be judged independently. As such an atypical object from the market, it must not be used to authenticate any other object.

ADDITIONAL DJEHUTY OBJECTS?

Hans Schneider recently connected several additional objects with Djehuty, and I can propose others for consideration. None of them has a private name, and only some have the cartouche of Tuthmosis III, but they appeared in the consular collections that yielded the objects already discussed and all are typologically Tuthmosid. The goldworking is of high quality, which implies that—if these objects were part of the find—Djehuty's burial was far richer than the silver bowl and heart scarab alone indicate.

Gold Bracelet (Anastasi to Leiden, no. II)

Schneider suggested that the gold msktwbracelet (concave-convex-concave profile) inscribed with the name of Tuthmosis III (Mn-hpr-r) from the Anastasi collection could have belonged to Djehuty. Such bracelets are shown singly on the wrists of men (usually on the right, according to Alix Wilkinson) and were popular in the Tuthmosid period.

Two lighter-weight but larger examples, uninscribed, were also in the Anastasi collection, as well as two iw'w-armlets (vertical profile), which were normally worn as a pair on the upper arms of an official. These bracelets, ridged hoop earrings, scarab rings, and other jewelry from Anastasi could likewise have belonged to Djehuty but—unlike the inscribed msktw-bracelet above—have no precise reference to the time of Tuthmosis III.

Inlaid lotus clasp (Anastasi to Leiden, no. III)

Schneider also linked an inscribed inlaid clasp to Djehuty, again because it has an Anastasi provenance, is of high quality, and is inscribed on the back with the name of Tuthmosis III (Mn-hpr-r). He identifies the inlays as red-, blue-, and turquoise-colored glass. However, judging by the translucent quality as it appears in a photograph, the date indicated by the inscription, and comparison with objects IV and V below, I propose that the red inlay is stone, not glass.

The purpose of the clasp is unclear. One could suggest that, with a height of 8.7 cm., two removable side pieces, eight protrusions along the bottom, and an inscription on the back, the clasp was intended for a broad collar, as depicted in tombs of the period. However, since one long side is pierced with forty-four holes and the other side with thirty-two (presuming that both removable pieces in fact belong to the inlaid one), it is difficult to suggest a specific usage; the uneven numbers and the small spacing of so many holes seem to be unique. It is therefore impossible to postulate whether the ornament was meant for a man or a woman. The quality of this item and of the inscribed msktw-bracelet certainly equals that of the silver bowl and heart scarab, however.

Twenty-five inlaid mandrake/persea-fruit pendants (Anastasi to Leiden, no. IV, and the British Museum, 1839, no. V)

Leiden owns sixteen of these inlaid pendants and the British Museum owns nine. No other examples of this type of inlaid pendant are known, and all have an Anastasi provenance; thus they must have come from the same piece of jewelry, although its form is difficult to determine. Were the pendants strung in a single line, or did they make up the terminal row in a broad collar?

The date of this type of pendant is also unsure. The fruits are often represented in the Amarna period, but Keimer—judging them to be mandrakes—stated that they appear first in Egypt at the beginning of the New Kingdom. A blue glass example with the car-
touche of Tuthmosis III was found in the tomb of Tutankhamun, and actual fruits are depicted as offerings in a scene painted during the reign of Amenhotep II. Furthermore, while pendants of this shape are generally dated to the end of the dynasty, the glasses inlaid into these examples appear to be those used in the lotus clasp (no. III) and in jewelry from Wady D 1 in the Cairo and Metropolitan museums, all from the time of Tuthmosis III.

**Various broad-collar elements, pendants, and rings**

(Nizzoli to Florence, no. VI; Drovetti to the Louvre, no. VII; Anastasi to Leiden, no. VIII)

In the Nizzoli collection sold to Florence, the Drovetti collection sold to Paris, and the Anastasi collection sold to Leiden, there were gold elements whose similarity and provenance suggest that they came from a single find. Could this have been Djeuhy’s burial? Nizzoli describes the discovery of the Florence examples in “Memorie,” p. 375:

> Li due scarabei legati in oro, cocodrilli in oro, l’anello, il giglio ecc. furono cose trovate tutte attorno ad una ricca mummia, che gli Arabi barbaramente guastarono per dividere poi il guadagno. Li due scarabei suddetti, assieme ad alcuni altri che furono acquistati da Drovetti, formavano una specie di collana, unita ai cocodrilli ed altri ornamenti suddetti. L’anima umana fu rinvenuta sul petto della mummia, ed i pezzi di lancetta formavano il viso, ma l’avidità del danarco condusse gli Arabi a tutto deformare, per poter nascondere l’oro alle ricerche del Pacha, nel caso ne avesse avuta cognizione, e per poterlo vendere a comodo. Difatti si seppe poi, che molto oro che serviva a coprire quasi tutto l’esterno del corpo al disopra, fu venduto ad alcuni orefici in Cairo, che lo gettarono riducendolo in alcune verghe.

> La mummia doveva essere superba e magnifica, e chi sa quali altre cose utili a conoscere poteva contenere, ma l’assassino (dirò così) fu commesso dagli Arabi fra loro, nè vi è alcuno Europeo che possa dire di averla veduta. Tutto ciò si seppe per confessione di quegli Arabi, che non poterono avere parte nel bottino, e che per vendetta accusarono poi al Pacha il capo del villaggio con la sua comitiva, che fu poi messa sotto al bastone, e punita per la trasgressione commessa a danno degli ordini del Pacha, il quale nell’accordare il permesso de’scavi, pretendette però che appartener gli debba tutto ciò che possa formar parte di un tesoro, come oro, gioie ecc.

A second reference to the pendants is in the report Champollion sent from Livorno in 1826 describing the Drovetti objects that ultimately entered the Louvre: “On trouve également dans la collection une suite très-complète de colliers de toute espèce: 1. un, en or est formé de trente-deux pièces représentant des vases de diverses formes, des fleurs de lotus, une espèce de coquillage, des poissons et des lézards, le tout d’un fort joli travail.”

We can assume that the mummy Nizzoli described was found at Saqqara, because the Arabs took the gold to Cairo to sell, and Nizzoli—living in Cairo as far as I can reconstruct (see Appendix B)—knew details of the robbery. Of course, his shank rings with scarabs would not have been part of a necklace, but they could have been found in the vicinity of the chest; the nefrs, nefers (pezzi di lancetta) would rightly have been placed around the neck in a collar.

I have not studied the shank rings set with Hyksos scarabs (Florence, 2790–2791), nor the single scarab displayed with the group in Florence (2973); they could have been in a Dynasty 18 grave, but they have no confirmation from the Paris and Leiden groups. Nor do I consider the gold “ba”-bird (Florence, 2775) here; my initial assessment was that its date must be Late Period and that it had been mistakenly included in a group that Nizzoli bought from Arabs (also, the word granduca is written next to it in the Migliarini register). However, Nizzoli mentions an anima umana in his account, Williams noted that the soul appears in texts and vignettes in Dynasty 18, and a Late Period–type amulet does occur in the treasure of Ahotep (not from excavations, however).

The main point here is to consider whether the gold elements and pendants could be Tuthmoside; whether they came from one ornament or not is of secondary importance. The elements (that is, the individual units with rings for attachment above and below, consisting of nefers, ks-vases, drops, lilies) no doubt belonged to one or more broad collars. The nefers in Leiden and the lilies and flat-capped ks-vases in all three cities certainly seem similar, and could have been used with the drops in Florence (and Leiden?). Nefers inlaid with blue paste were found in Wady D 1, time of Tuthmosis III; they also make up a collar depicted in the tomb of Ken- amun (time of Amenhotep II, the successor of Tuthmosis III), where collars of varied elements—including lilies—are shown. There are today in total seventy-six nefers, thirty-two lilies, nineteen ks-jars with pointed caps, and twenty-four ks-jars with flat caps. Smaller items should have been near the neck or the outer edges. If all these elements were from the same
collar, it would indeed have been an opulent item of apparel; however, considering the long reign of Tuthmosis III and the depictions in the Kenamun tomb, the possibility cannot be ruled out.

As for the fish and crocodile pendants—which have only one loop for suspension, Figure 69—fish are not mentioned in Nizzoli’s account (there are none in Florence), but Champollion notes them in the group he inventoried at Livorno, and Leiden has some strung with gold drops like the ones in Florence (they are slightly shorter). The fish in Leiden and Paris are all strung by holes that go through the mouths rather than through attached or self rings. The Paris fish are shorter than the crocodiles, and the Leiden fish are longer than the Leiden drops.

Pendant amulets usually occur on individual strings, and in the first part of Dynasty 18 they can be strung by type11 or mixed with other amulets and beads of faience, glass, or stone.14 It is thus interesting to note two carnelian fish on the Leiden fish necklace; each has a ring for suspension and a different type of tail but is generally the same size as the gold examples. Combining the pendants in all three museums, there are nine gold crocodiles and eighteen gold tilapia-fish.

As for the rings with V-shaped profile in Florence and Leiden, I have found no parallel and cannot propose a function.

In conclusion, we cannot know how many items of jewelry were on the mummy Nizzoli describes. Champollion mentions thirty-six gold pendants in his group, yet there are fifty-four strung in Paris today, without any shells, and we know that some of the Louvre’s Drovetti gold was stolen in 1830. There are biconical gold beads strung with the elements in Leiden and Paris; they too could have been part of this or an associated burial.

69. Gold pendants and amulets, no. VII. Louvre N 1854, AF 2297, AF 2799 (photo: Musée du Louvre)
70. Gold chain, no. X. Louvre N 1851 (photo: Musée du Louvre)

We also do not know whether this was Djehuty’s mummy. Nizzoli would presumably have mentioned the connection with the canopic-jar burial if he had known it, but the canopic jars could have been found after the Arabs had taken the gold. The hoard of gold, as well as the heart scarab and silver plate from Djehuty’s burial, imply that the burial(s) they were from was intact until about 1820.317

However, the quantity of loose objects recovered from Amenhotep/Huy’s burial also makes that tomb a possible source for the gold pendants and rings. Nizzoli describes Huy’s tomb as a chamber beyond two long shafts; in one shaft were pieces of a palette and three alabaster vases; in the chamber there were some bones and a red granite sarcophagus with a broken lid which contained a gray granite pyramidion, a cubit rod, a palette, and scraps of vases.318 The mummy of Cha’s wife, Merit, had a faience or stone collar made up of lilies, nfr-signs
(nefers), and other elements (inscriptions in the tomb named Amenhoteb II and III),\textsuperscript{319} and a rich gold collar has been put together from elements found in Valley of the Kings 55 (Amarna Period).\textsuperscript{320}

In sum, the burials of Djehutu and Amenhoteb/Huy are the only two recognized so far substantial enough to have been the source of the gold hoard.

**Two necklaces with fish pendants** (Drovetti to the Louvre, nos. IX, X)

Before describing vessels and a palette that might have been part of Djehutu’s tomb, we should consider two further items of jewelry, although they are not fully studied. They have large, long chains like the Djehutu heart scarab and fish pendants reminiscent of the amulet pendants introduced above. Figure 70 is from Drovetti and Figures 71 and 72 may be, but the main question again is whether the items are typologically Tuthmoside.

The fish do not match the eighteen gold *tilapia* above, and each set differs from the other. Moreover, the box clasp pierced for horizontal stringing with loops at the bottom for pendants, as well as the heavy chain, recall Tanis-period jewelry.\textsuperscript{321} On the other hand, I have not noted the use of fish at Tanis; furthermore, Tutankhamun’s chains\textsuperscript{322} (thin, like many of the Tanis chains\textsuperscript{323}) have sleeves decorated with striations as on the Djehutu heart scarab as well as cloisonné lotuses. *Tilapia* are popular in Dynasty 18: they are depicted on faience bowls, the Djehutu silver bowl, and toilet spoons, and occur as fish-shaped vessels;\textsuperscript{324} they are also given as ornaments to high officials;\textsuperscript{325} and in jewelry they appear as simple pendants on amulet strings, suspended from a pectoral, or used as counterpoise tassels (in Tutankhamun’s jewelry).\textsuperscript{326}

Whether these items really go back to Djehutu is questionable: representations of broad collars with tassels in the tomb of Kenamun do not show fish, nor have I found the box clasp in Dynasty 18.

**Inscribed alabaster jars** (Anastasi, no. XI, and de Lescluze, no. XII, for Leiden)

Two crystalline alabaster jars in Leiden have the names of Tuthmosis III ("Menkhperre" and "Djehutymes"); one is a bag-shaped jar from Anastasi with the names only, and the other is a shoulder jar from de Lescluze with the names plus a *hnu*-measurement. Both are surprisingly close in size (26.7 and 26.8 cm.) to the height of the Djehutu jars in Turin (27 and 26.4 cm., one broken, one definitely smaller), Paris (26.3 cm.), and Leiden (de Lescluze 26.7 cm. and Anastasi 27.5 cm.); the pigment is blue on the first and dark gray (seemingly modern) on the second; the first has considerable resin in it, and the second is scraped.

The paleography on both is different from the ointment jars, especially on the bag-shaped example. Other alabaster Dynasty 18 vessels also exist in Leiden, as they do in Turin, Florence, and Paris.

**Inscribed wooden palette** (Nizzoli to Bologna, no. XIII)

This wooden palette in Bologna (Figures 73–75) is inscribed with the two names of Tuthmosis III and is said in *Catalogo raccolta* to have been “found in a tomb at Memphis.” A faint hieratic text on the lower part is of the period and mentions emmer wheat, according to Edward Wente.

**CONCLUSION**

Concerning the “overseer of northern foreign countries Djehutu,” we can say that at least seventeen objects came from his tomb; the gold bowl in all probability did not. The canopic jars are stylistically early, the silver bowl and the Turin palette stylistically late, and the silver bowl—though Egyptian—incorporates foreign features appropriate to the period.

Further, the Annals of Tuthmosis III, the inscriptions of Amenmes, and the archaeological evidence from Syria and Palestine give us a clearer profile of this official, the probable hero of the tale of Joppa and first holder of the title “overseer of northern foreign countries.”

It is likely that Djehutu was buried at Saqqara, and, if so, the Mission archéologique française de Saqqarah or the Egypt Exploration Society/Rijksmuseum, Leiden Expedition, may find the remains of the tomb (Nizzoli mentioned only “una camera sepolcrale sotto terra”). If they do, they may discover new information about this son of the “s3b Amenmes” and of “[the lady ’Isi]eneb.” Likewise, research in early collections and archives\textsuperscript{327} or scientific analysis may yield further information about early forgeries or the gold bowl. I am grateful to the many colleagues cited for the opportunity to investigate this complex and interesting subject.
73–75. Wooden palette, no. XIII. Bologna B 3136 (photos: author)

74. Detail of no. XIII

75. Detail of no. XIII
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136. Haremheb, Theban 78: Annilies and Artur Brack, Das Grab des Haremheb. Theban Nr. 78 (Mainz am Rhein, 1980) pl. 30; carinated bowl, note also the situla and towel.


139. Radwan, no. 328; C. C. Edgar, “The Treasure of Tell Basta,” Le Musée égyptien, recueil de monuments et de notices sur les fouilles d’Égypte, II (Ministère des travaux publics, Cairo, 1907) pl. 48; Pierre Montet, La Nécropole royale de Tanis II. Les constructions et le tombeau de Pseudoûnis à Tanis (Paris, 1951) pl. 55, but much better in Nofret, no. 67.

140. Champollion, Lettres, I, p. 421.

141. Bulletin Universel 5 [1826] no. 396; the collection had arrived in Livorno in late 1825.

142. Ibid., no. 513, pp. 380–382.

143. Epistolaria, p. 515.

144. Kanawaty, “Identification de pièces de la collection Drozveti au Musée du Louvre,” RdE 37 (1986) pp. 167, 170. Only these and the cubit rod were at the Musée Charles X for its opening in December (personal communication).


146. The large gold goblet from Tanis (Cairo JdE 83894: Montet, Tanis II, pl. 70) also has the point of orientation visible on both sides, though I did not note where the point(s) originated.

147. The specific gravity of gold to silver is roughly 2:1. But the silver plate lacks its rim, and I was unable to ascertain the thickness of the gold bowl’s floor.

148. Louvre, AO 17.208: Schaeffer, Ugaritica II, Mission de Ras Shamra, V (Paris, 1949) p. 5f. For the date of the Ras Shamra gold patera and cup, found Apr. 11, 1933, see ibid., p. viii.

149. C. Inslay Green, The Temple Furniture from the Sacred Animal Necropolis at North Saqqara, 1962–1976 (London, 1987) pp. 29–31, nos. 55–59. Each tray is 20 to 30 cm. in diameter, occurs at the top of a tall stand, and is fastened to that stand, often with yet another component in its center: the tray is not an independent container. Details of shape are not apparent in the published illustrations.

150. Even in stone or faience vases I have not been able to find such a profile. Bissing referred to a metal bowl in the Louvre with demotic inscription as a bowl similar in shape (“Brongeschale,” p. 37, n. 11); Jean-Louis de Cenival showed me Louvre, E 7702, essentially a rim with a Demotic inscription, but at the broken bottom edge there was the beginning of a curve, and I presume it would have the shape of the Late Period pans published by Green, Temple Furniture, p. 61, nos. 144–146.

152. The only comparable examples I know are on two model bowls from the burial chamber of Queen Iput, Dynasty 6, Radwan, nos. 149a and 149b. See, however, Jeffrey Spencer’s cautionary review in Bibliotheca Orientalis 42 (1985) p. 62 ff.

153. I have been informed by Enrica Leospo, for instance, that the situla of Cha (Schiaparelli, Cha, fig. 158, Radwan, no. 411) has a space of 8 cm. between the end and beginning of the inscription.

154. British Museum, A Guide to the Egyptian Galleries (Sculp


156. Theban 131; given by Vercoutter, Le monde égyptien, no. 32. Note also the 18th-Dynasty sculpture with titles “overseer of the htmw of the northern foreign countries,” and “overseer of the great htm of w3d-wr” (Jean Capart, “Mélanges, 1. Monument inédit de la Collection Ed. Fétis, à Bruxelles,” Rec. de Trai. 22 (1900) p. 105 ff. Note that Claude Vandersleyen now argues that w3d-wr is sweet water and that “the islands which are in the midst of w3d-wr” are in the Egyptian Delta. See “Le sens de Ouadj-jour,” International Congress of Egyptologists’ Abstracts of Papers (Munich, 1985), pp. 246 f.; idem, “Ouadj-jour ne signifie pas ‘mer’: qu’on se le dis!” Göttinger Misszellen 103 (1980), pp. 75–80. However, Djehuty’s title “overseer of northern foreign countries,” the inscription on and probable provenance of Djehuty’s statuette, the likelihood that he is the hero of the tale of Joppa, and the reference to filling a storehouse with lapis do indicate that he served outside Egypt.


162. No. Davies, The Tomb of Menkheperresonbe, Amenmes, and Another (London, 1933) pp. 278 f. (including p. 34 on date) pls. 32–39, 46; Porter–Moss, I (2) pt. 1, map IV. Cf. Radwan, Die Dar
tstellung des regierenden Königs und seiner Familienangehörigen in den Pri
texgrabern der 18. dynastie (Berlin, 1969) p. 110 for references.

163. Helck cites only three officials with this title besides Djehuty and Amenmes, Beziehungen (1971) p. 251: Penhet, time Tuthmosis IV–Amenhotep III, Theban 239; Khaemwasat, time Amenhotep III, two statues found at Bubastis; Penra, time Ram-


168. The inscription on the large gold basin from Tanis is exceptionally strong but crisp; see Henri Stierlin and Christiane Ziegler, *Tanis*. *Trésors des Pharaons* (Fribourg, Switzerland, 1987) figs. 51, 53. The more usual treatment is seen in figs. 50, 70.

169. My colleague J. H. Frantz has observed that the metal seems to have been placed against a hard surface such as wood, rather than a soft surface such as bitumen.

170. For good examples of this sign, see the Tutankhamun pectoral. It should be noted that the railroad-tie type can occur on inscriptions that appear to be ancient (cf. Figure 64), but it is not of good workmanship and is highly unusual.

171. Note even that the jaw of the lion was drawn with a finer tool from the rest of the sign.

172. See also the hieroglyphs on the bracelet of Ahhotep illustrated in *Nofret*, no. 28, approximately two-thirds the size of those on the gold and silver Djehuty bowls. For other good color photographs of Egyptian gold objects, see I. E. S. Edwards, *Tutankhamun: His Tomb and Its Treasures* (New York, 1976); and Stierlin, *Égypte. Des origines à l’Islam* (Paris, 1984) as well as Stierlin and Ziegler, *Tanis*.

173. Or see the dummy vessel jars from Valley of the Kings 42 in Rosemarie Drenkhahn, *Weltmacht*, no. 257, or the model brick and brick mold from a foundation deposit of Tuthmosis III at Gebelain, *Leospo in Weltmacht*, nos. 61–62.

174. The silver libation jars do have the appearance of ancient silver, and their uncleaned and unrestored state is documented in photographs of the 1920s.

175. Note the n’s in Figure 63 and the g’s and quail chicks in Figure 64. The a at the top of the second column in Figure 64 must have had the vertical ticks added as a correction, as they appear to be ancient; indeed, the rest of this inscription is not as proficient as the inscription in Figure 63, and perhaps the ticks were added as an afterthought.

176. The two border lines are 1.6 cm. apart, and the first bs is 1.2 cm. high.

177. See the photograph in Edwards, *Tutankhamun: His Tomb*, 21st page from end; a fish on the gold bowl would roughly correspond to the width of three of the cornflowers with two interspersed leaves.

178. Dows Dunham, “A Fragment from the Mummy Wrappings of Tuthmosis III,” *JEAS* 17 (1931) pl. 31, 32.

179. Schiaparelli, *Cha*, passim.

180. The closest parallels are first-millennium bowls from Nimrud (A. Layard, *A Second Series of the Monuments of Nineveh* [London, 1853] pls. 57d and 58a; and British Museum, N 47) and Assur (A. Haller, *Die Gräber und Griffe von Assur* [Berlin, 1954] p. 116, Berlin, VA 14180 from grave 38; and p. 37, Berlin, VA 15079c from grave 470). John Curtis of the British Museum reports that there is a slight outward tilt to the Nimrud bowls with no thickening at the rim. Evelyn Klengel has kindly sent photographs from the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Vorderasiatisches Museum, indicating that Berlin, VA 14180a has a slight outward tilt and a thickened rim. Berlin, VA 15079c appears from the published photo to be ca. 14 cm. in diameter and 5 cm. high with straight sides, although it is much corroded. A third Assur bowl to consider is Luscher’s Fig. 1, which he identifies as Berlin, VA 1768a. Klengel informs me that 1768a is from New Assyrian grave 690 (1st millennium b.c.); Haller, 56, without photo); the Luscher illustration looks like 14180a. I take this opportunity also to note that Luscher’s fig. 39, of stone, is Inv. 30219, 904, in the Antikenmuseum of Berlin’s Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz (thanks to information supplied by Gertrude Platz). Its dimensions are 13 cm. diam., 3.6 cm. high, and according to my examination its rim tilts outward.

181. I noted the mannered ring around the rosette of a first-millennium Luristan bowl (Glenn Markoe, *Phoenician Bowls and Silver Bowls from Cyprus and the Mediterranean* [University of California, 1983] p. 212f. “Ir9,” p. 337), and discussed the broad question with Imai, whose dissertation on first-millennium bowls forced her to consider earlier prototypes. She found the high repoussé on the Djehuty bowl more Near Eastern than Egyptian in spirit, the design inorganic, and the decoration less apt than anything she knew from the ancient world (Sept.—Oct., 1985).

182. H. Weiss, ed., *Ebla to Damascus*, no. 158; it weighs 179 g.

183. Renate Krause in *Weltmacht*, nos. 152–153. (I am preparing a study of these and other “cut-out” metal objects of the Middle–New Kingdom.)

184. I have not had the opportunity to study this bowl firsthand. Photos kindly supplied by Dieter Johannes through Rainer Stadelmann indicate an impressionistic effect to the decoration, some buckling of the gold, but no redrawing of lines.


186. We have not had the object in New York to analyze it as we have the Metropolitan Museum’s objects.
187. As in the mouth on the Mond bust, Cairo JdE 36550, which would have entered the museum in 1903 according to the lists of Bernard Bothmer in American Research Center in Egypt Newsletter no. 22 (June 30, 1956) p. 16; Maspero, Egyptian Art Studies (New York, 1913) pp. 178ff. Ahmed Fakhry wrote of hearing the story of its forgery in 1934 from Luxor men who had been involved in the deception (“For the Chapter on Forgeries,” a typescript he was preparing before his death, shown to me by Susan Weeks in 1985, courtesy of Ali Fakhry).

188. As Yoyotte explains in his “Général Djehouty,” p. 48.

189. I have never found duplicates in vessel groups, especially with such elaborate designs: decorated vessels are unique in size, shape, and design. Lenormant didn’t think of this problem when the silver plate came to light, as he adopted Champollion’s mistaken reading on the gold bowl of “tin” for “lapis” and proposed that a third bowl of tin would still come to light.

190. As in the Bubastis silver; see Edgar, “Treasure of Tell Basta,” pl. 47f.

191. Radwan, no. 329; Montet, Tanis II, p. 83, no. 775, fig. 31, pl. 55; p. 193, no. 404, fig. 39, pl. 68(b); and Schiaparelli, Cha, fig. 52 left, center, and top.

192. Edgar, “Treasure of Tell Basta,” pl. 48, and Vernier, Bijoux [CG 52001–53855] (Cairo, 1927) p. 418, CG 53263, pl. 106; Montet, Tanis II, p. 83, no. 774, fig. 30, pl. 54; p. 103, no. 403, fig. 42, pl. 69; no. 405, fig. 42, pl. 71; no. 406, pl. 71; p. 104, no. 408, fig. 39, pl. 71; no. 409, pl. 71. One of the vessels from Cha’s tomb (Radwan, no. 332) has the cartouche of the king chased into the metal, and a hieratic ink inscription, as a secondary item I believe.

193. Cf. the illustration of the carefully placed inscription on the Oundjebaounded bowl in Nofret, no. 67. I have considered whether the Djehuty silver inscription could be original, seeing a poor inscription on Turin’s Cha vessel, Supp. 8392. However, this undecorated strainer, while made of silver, is not of high quality, and the inscription does not state that it was made as a royal gift. In fact, the use of outlined parts on the Djehuty silver plate (as in the l-b-vase) combined with incised signs (as on the whip) parallels what is done on the gold bowl with the plural strokes.

194. Cristiana Morigi-Govi, director of the Museo Civico, tells me that she would not be able to propose whether the reworking was done before or after the palette entered the collection, since there are no records bearing on the matter.


196. For the difficulties a forger can have in adapting an original text to a new object, see Helen Whitehouse, “A Forgery Exposed,” Discussions in Egyptology 9 (1987) p. 64f.

197. The heart scarab was presumably in Anastasi’s June 1827 shipment and would have been purchased in Livorno Apr. 1828; the Turin palette should have been in the Accademia in Feb. 1824.

198. Champollion, Lettres, I, p. 94f.

199. Ibid., p. 326. Anastasi wrote the latter that May concerning his shipment, p. 346.

200. Ibid., p. 234.


216. Shabits, p. 7.


222. The Borgia collection today at Naples is an example, and one can find other large objects in the Égypte et Provence catalogue.

223. Florence, 4717/2502 and 4717/2503: A. Pellegrini, “Statuette funéraire,” Bessarione 4, nos. 43–44 (Jan.–Feb. 1900) p. 262, no. 268. Medici rule ended in 1743 and Maria Luisa, the last member of the family, declared the collections to be the patrimony of the Florentine people: M. Marini, Archaeological Museum Florence (Florence, 1985) p. 36.


225. Florence, 4718/298; this may be Pellegrini’s 882.


227. Moorey, Ancient Egypt.


230. See the “Atlas” figures in the Ostankino palace, and mural with an obelisk in the Hubert Robert hall at Arkhangelskoye (Valeri Turchin in... v okrestnostakh Moskvy: iz istorii russkoy usadebnoy kul’tury XVII–XIX sek. [Country Estates around Moscow] (Moscow, 1979) pls. 99, 111.


232. According to Document VI, ibid., these were made between 1779 and 1781; fig. 19 (Louvre, N. Inv. M R 1586), fig. 20 (Louvre, N. Inv. M R 1588).

233. According to Document XIV, ibid., this was made in 1781; fig. 21 (Louvre, N. Inv. M R 20 and n. cat. M A 1364 according to Arizzoli-Clémentel, but AF 6937 according to the Egyptian Department of the Louvre).


244. Shabtis, p. 11; see also Laudibus, p. 15 n. 21.

245. Leemans, pls. 12 no. 46a–e, and 23 no. 128ab.


247. Mohammed Saleh states that the Service des Antiquités was founded that year, with antiquities collected in a building in the Ezbakia, Official Catalogue, p. 9.


253. He writes that “la sûreté du trait tant dans l’iconographie que dans l’épigraphe” caused him to have great admiration for the forger (“Papyrus ... faux,” p. 164). Ahmed Fakhry tells of two sculptors at Gourna in the 1930s who made stone Osirides about a foot high for peddlers to sell to tourists at 5–10 piastres apiece (unpublished typescript).


257. As in the tomb for the nurse of Taharqa’s daughter: the early Dynasty 18 kohl pot and mirror (Guidotti, Il Nilo, nos. 170, 171) may have been heirlooms, but there is also the possibility that the tomb was not intact when found.


260. Baroness von Minutoli spoke admiringly of him (Recollections of Egypt [Philadelphia, 1827] p. 30), likewise Champollion when visiting him in Egypt (Lettres, I, p. 25). Schneider characterizes him as being on good terms with everyone, a remarkable man (Shabtis, p. 10), and tells me that there is no indication of bad character in the papers in Leiden or any information that would shed light on my investigations. Halbertsma (through Raven) reports that the Humbert papers give no unfavorable impression of Anastasi, though they give little information on him as a person, since Humbert met only Anastasi agents in Livorno and corresponded with him only after the collection was purchased.

261. Hayes, “Chief Steward Amenhotpe,” p. 14 n. 3[c].

262. Ibid., p. 15f.

263. Curto, Storia, p. 40, and personal communication.

264. Minutoli, Recollections, p. 163.


266. Schneider, private communication.


268. Curto, Storia, p. 46.

269. Dewachter suggested to me that he collected drawings from others.


271. Clerc, “Lettre de Saucy,” p. 655. One wonders whether the gold scarab he describes on p. 659 with the cartouche of Mn-br-rt could be one of these items.


278. Dewachter has supplied this quote from the unpublished papers of Prisse in the Bibliothèque nationale.


280. Work still has to be done to sort out the traditional sources: Dewachter puts Belzoni in the same class as Rifaud, though John Lewis Burckhardt called Belzoni enterprising, intelligent, high-minded, and disinterested (Burckhardt, Travels in Nubia [London, 1819] p. lxxviii).

281. Foissy-Auffèvre has discussed objects bought from the artist Lunel in 1835 (Égypte et Provence §489–490); C. R. Williams concluded in 1924 that the Menes necklace of the New-York Historical Society had been made between 1833 and 1843 (Williams, Gold and Silver Jewelry and Related Objects [New York, 1924] pp. 221–225); Reeves has told me of a completely false roll of papyrus that entered the British Museum’s Department of Oriental Books and Manuscripts in 1840. More interesting is the current discussion by Hermann Schlögl and Michel Squaitamatti on the one hand, and Geoffrey Martin with reference to Hans Schneider on the other (Schlögl–Squaitamatti, Arbeiter des Jenseits, Ägyptische Totenfiguren [Uschebtis] [Zurich, 1977] pp. 22–30 and [Zurich, 1984] pp. 34–41; Martin, “Shabtis of private persons in the Amarna Period,” MDAIK 42 [1986], especially nos. 1–3, 5, pp. 126–129, Schneider, Shabtis, I, pp. 288ff., 315 n. 135). The discussion concerns a shawabty which appeared in 1867 and is inscribed—along with three shawabties which came to light subsequently—with the so-called Aten formula. Though Martin has now shown that some of Schlögl–Squaitamatti’s arguments are invalid, in my view the delineation of the implements, the proportions of the figure, the facial expression, and the detailing of the wig of the Zurich shawabty (Martin’s no. 3) are notable, and since the only excavated, inscribed Amarna shawabty (his no. 4) does not have the Aten formula or the above-mentioned features, it cannot authenticate these items on shawabties 1–5. (A version of the Aten formula does occur on a heart scarab in Turin, which the Zurich colleagues say was in Drovetti’s collection of 1824; however, the text does not exactly parallel the other Aten formula texts, and the scarab does not have an excavated provenance. Further, while Schneider cites four excavated shawabties with hoes and baskets in front, he cites only two that apparently have the yoke on the front of the body: Chicago Ol 11749 excavated at Sedment [information supplied by Frank Yurko] and Cairo CG 42656, “from Saqqara” in 1859.) Without a corpus of excavated material, and in the presence of anomalies in several of the “Amarna” shawabties, it seems permissible to ask whether by 1867 the text on Martin’s no. 3 could not have been copied from an original shawabty (even from no. 1, also unexcavated) or put together from the inscription on another object. Excavations were begun at Amarna in 1883, but travelers record visiting the site since the 1820s (T. E. Peet and C. Leonard


283. It is interesting that Birch's obituary in 1886 called attention to "an almost unconscious faculty of discerning the true from the false"; *James, The British Museum*, p. 19.


290. Lansing and Hayes, "The Museum's Excavations," p. 28, fig. 43.


292. Zacharia Goneim, *Horus Sekhem-khet* (Cairo, 1957) p. 13, pl. 32b. Some doubt was raised at the time as to whether the object had been “planted”; I have not examined this object.


294. This does not count what is described as a thin jar cap of silver from Nagada (Petrie, *Nagada and Ballas*. 1895 [London, 1896] pp. 45, 48, pl. 65); a silver “basket” and a cartouche-shaped dish from Dahshur (Jacques de Morgan, *Fouilles à Dahshour, mars–juin 1894* [Vienna, 1895] p. 62, no. 26 [CG 53135, 7.5 cm. long], and p. 70, no. 57 [CG 53102, 5.9 cm. long]); a silver “shen”-sign from Lahun (Guy Brunton, *Lahun I, The Treasure* [London, 1920] p. 37, pl. 11). Nor can I claim to have visited all museum collections to see items from the market (see West Berlin’s silver bowl inscribed for Merenptah in Biri Fay, *Egyptian Museum Berlin*, 3rd ed. [Berlin, 1986] p. 48ff., which in my opinion is ancient) or located certain sale items (Sotheby’s London, 7/11/83, lot 177) or collection items (Henry Wallis, *Egyptian Ceramic Art, Catalogue of The MacGregor Collection of Egyptian Antiquities*, p. 69 [see also Sotheby’s London, 6/26 and 7/3/22, lots 1495-1497]). Nor do I count here the Tod Treasure vessels, or two silver bowls that Petrie dates to the Ramesside Period and says were found together at Bubasis (Petrie, *Stone and Metal Vases* [London, 1937] p. 28, nos. 30-31, pl. 40); he thought one was turned and the other cast but I have not seen them.

295. Dewachter agrees that certain signs on the gold bowl are poor (bee, eye, foot, hand, second owl) but that the bad quality of some of them doesn’t matter (island sign, seated determinative, *w3fd*, fire drill), and that the signs he considers good (sedge, *nfr*, whip, face, heart, cobra, reed leaf, ibis, flail) could not have been made by anyone other than an Egyptian. On the other hand, he doubts the inscription on the silver bowl, as well as on the Turin palette. De Cenival concedes that the signs on the gold bowl could have been made in 1827 if traced; he states that he would fear my arguments about the gold bowl were right if it had only been known since 1900, but in the end he gives the gold bowl the benefit of the doubt. As for the inscription on the silver bowl, he believes several people could have put such a text together by 1857 but does not feel that the inscriptions on it or the gold bowl are unacceptable as ancient Egyptian. Jürgen Osing wrote me that the gold bowl’s inscription and paleography compared well with Dynasty 18 texts, but I did not have a chance to discuss my observations with him.

296. As in the case Yoyotte cites, "Général Djehouty," p. 44.

297. *WB*, II, p. 150 (g).

298. *Art from Ancient Egypt*, p. 103, no. 84.


300. Leiden, 318: Leemans, p. 24, pl. 41, no. 318; Wilkinson, *Egyptian Jewellery*, pl. 24b. I measured one as 10.4 cm. maximum diameter, 4.8 cm. high, a reddish cast, and hammer marks, both edges rolled under; the other is no. 165 in Schneider, *Weltmacht*.

301. *WB*, I, p. 51 (g).

302. Leiden, 316: Leemans, p. 24; Wilkinson, *Egyptian Jewellery*, pl. 24c. The one I measured was 9.7 cm. in diameter, 1.8 cm. high, .35 cm. thick; Schäfer suggested many years ago that an example in Berlin which had been acquired at the Anastasi sale of 1857 (Goldschmiedearbeiten [Berlin, 1910] no. 59) might have belonged with the one illustrated in Leemans, but without all three armlets together and with a discrepancy in measurements (Schäfer gave Berlin’s dimensions as 10.4 cm. in diameter, 1.9 cm. wide, and .4 cm. thick) it would be difficult to judge. Two in the British Museum from Castellani measure 11.9 cm. in diameter (EA 66840-1: Hugh Tait, ed., *Seven Thousand Years of Jewellery* [London, 1986] pp. 43, 245, no. 68.


306. See the inner and outer rows of mandrakes in Tutankhamun’s collar, Saleh and Sourouzian, *Official Catalogue*, endpaper.
307. Keimer, as quoted in Bosse-Griffiths, "Mandrake," p. 67; Germer (LA, I) notes that persea fruit play a great role in ornament from the New Kingdom on.

308. Murray–Nutthall, Handlist, no. 355 u.

309. No. Davies, Ken-Amun, I, pl. 9.


311. Williams, Gold and Silver Jewelry, p. 173.

312. Aegis with feline head wearing sun disk: Ahhotep, as in Vernier, Bijoux, CG 52693, pl. 52.

313. The pointed-cap hs-vases in Leiden seem to be more delicate, though one could not make judgments unless all items were together.

314. No. Davies, Ken-Amun, I, pl. 9; these collars all appear with the traditional wsḫ and vulture collars, and the ḫḫḫ floral collars that become popular at this period: cf. No. Davies, Rekhmi-re, I, pl. 64. Note also the varied elements in Ahhotep’s collar, although we cannot be sure that all the elements were for this collar.


316. As in Passalacqua’s group, Schäfer, Goldschmiedearbeiten, no. 22; The Earl of Carnarvon and Howard Carter, Five Years’ Explorations at Thebes; a record of work done 1907–1911 (London, 1912) tomb 37, burials 50 (p. 80), 53 (p. 80), and 78 (p. 85).

317. There was not a great deal of damage to the inscribed Djehuty objects: the palettes and jugs in Turin and Leiden are broken; the lids of the ointment jars could have been of cloth.


321. Montet, Tanis II, pls. 110, 111, 134.

322. Murray–Nutthall, Handlist, nos. 256 qqq and vvv (TAA negs. 569, 858).

323. Ibid., pls. 115, 135.

324. Bourriau in Egypt’s Golden Age, no. 86.


326. Murray–Nutthall, Handlist, no. 269 iij (TAA negs. 583, 584); see Cyril Aldred, Jewels of the Pharaohs (London, 1971) pp. 220, 224, figs. 100, 108.

327. I have inquired at the Griffith Institute, Museo Archeologico in Naples, British Museum, Mendes Israel Cohen collection at Johns Hopkins, in Berlin, and in Vienna, in addition to the museums that already have Djehuty objects.
Appendix A:

THE OBJECTS ASSOCIATED WITH DJEHUTY

The bibliography here is additional to that of Porter-Moss and to that in the introduction of this essay. Items which have traditionally been associated with General Djehuty are given Arabic numbers; those newly proposed for consideration are given Roman numbers.

1. Canopic jar. Florence, 2222 (Lid, Figure 1; jar, Figure 6, left)

Acquired from Giuseppe di Nizzoli by Grand Duke Leopold II of Tuscany, Sept. 28, 1824; entered the Museo Archeologico in 1882.


Total height, 38.5 cm.; jar 29.8 cm.; lid 11.2 cm.

Banded crystalline alabaster; inscription in four columns facing right, bordered by vertical lines, the signs carved and filled with blue pigment [Egyptian blue]; jar relatively clean, a patch of bitumen (?) inside; lid with small, new chips.

Lid solid with disk-shaped recessed stopper; top of head flat, wig flared, face protruding from wig with ears incised in it. Wig line at forehead and eyes not outlined with incision although sculpturally shaped.

Invocations to Nepthys and Hapy for the Osiris, “overseer of foreign countries, scribe, Djehuty, justified.”

2. Canopic jar. Florence, 2223 (Lid, Figure 5; jar, Figure 6, right)

Same provenance as no. 1.

“Catalogo Museo Nizzoli,” p. 354; del Francia, in Weltmacht, no. 295; Catalogo della Galleria, p. 19, no. 65, cat. no. 1205; Migliarini, cat. no. 2223.

Total height, 41.2 cm.; jar 29.9 cm.; lid 13.5 cm.

Banded crystalline alabaster with some gloss; lid with red veins in stone; considerable resin soaked into lid, including where a large chip has been removed; jar has old chips at rim. Inscription as above.

Lid solid but of vertical more than flared shape; the stopper slants inward and the wig has little overhang. Wig protrudes from forehead and neck, there are hair tabs, the lappets framing the neck have curved edges. Ears well carved with pierced lobes, black pigment (?) in left one; eyes modeled but no details present (once added in paint?); mouth slightly down-turned with left corner drilled; nose tip rubbed, two small nostrils.

Invocations to Isis and Imsety for the deceased as above.

3. Canopic jar. Florence, 2224 (Lid, Figure 4; jar, Figure 6, second from right)

Same provenance as no. 1.

“Catalogo Museo Nizzoli,” p. 354; del Francia, in Weltmacht, no. 295; Catalogo della Galleria, p. 19, no. 68, cat. no. 1208; Migliarini, cat. no. 2224.

Total height, 39.7 cm.; jar 30.4 cm.; lid 11 cm.

Crystalline alabaster with a little red veining; thin layer of bitumen on bottom of jar; thin, dark ring inside; nose chipped, fresh chip on jar rim, old chips on base. Inscription as above.

Lid triangular shape though top of head more rounded than in 2222. Wig protrudes from face above forehead; ears more modeled than 2222 but still lying against wig: eye sockets, brows, upper lid, and cosmetic line outlined with incision except for ends of brows and cosmetic lines, which are left plain.

Invocations to Neith and Duamutef for the deceased as above.

4. Canopic jar. Florence, 2225 (Lid, Figure 3; jar, Figure 6, second from left)

Same provenance as no. 1.

“Catalogo Museo Nizzoli,” p. 354; del Francia, in Weltmacht, no. 295; Catalogo della Galleria, p. 19, no. 66, cat. no. 1206; Migliarini, cat. no. 2225.

Total height, 43 cm.; jar 32.3 cm.; lid 15.8 cm.

Banded crystalline alabaster with a slight polish; lid very clean, jar generally so, although stained; chips on jar base, and nose cracked. Inscription as above.

Wig line is cleanly marked with protruding surface and incision; ears and eyes as 2224.

Invocations to Serket and Kebesenuef for the deceased as above.

5. Small bag-shaped ointment jar. Turin, Cat. 3225 (Figure 7)

Acquired by Carlo Felice and the government of Piedmont from Bernardino Drovetti, Jan. 23, 1824.

Height, 21.5 cm.

Crystalline alabaster, polished, one crack but otherwise whole. About half full of brown resin, white incrustation on upper half. The inscription incised and filled with blue pigment, seemingly Egyptian blue.

Two columns of unbordered inscription with abbreviated offering text.
6. **Large bag-shaped ointment jar with lid.** Turin, Cat. 3226 (Figure 12, second from left)

Same provenance as no. 5.
“Collezione Drovetti,” p. 274, no. 80 with an *; D’Amicone, in Weltmacht, no. 293.
Height, 27 cm.
The stone and inscription as in no. 5; the lid a more banded alabaster. Jar three-quarters full of ointment, the rest coated with white incrustation.
Lid is for kohl jar and has different type of label.

7. **Two-handled ointment jar with lid.** Turin, Cat. 3227 (Figure 12, second from right)

Same provenance as no. 5.
Height, 26.4 cm.
Same material, pigment, and format of inscription as jars 5 and 6. The lid is of the same type of alabaster, fitting the opening well, with remains of plaster around join. Jar has white incrustation inside, a little loose resin in bottom. Some cracks in jar.
Vertical surface of rim has horizontal line incised around it; strap handles clearly delineated from body; protruding foot; bottom of jar has off-center concavity.

8. **Jug-shaped ointment jar.** Turin, Cat. 3228 (Figures 8, 9)

Same provenance as no. 5.
“Collezione Drovetti,” p. 274, no. 82.
Height, 22.5 cm.
Same material as in nos. 5–7, although a little more polished; stained inside; piece missing from rim near handle, bottom completely missing. Good deal of white incrustation inside, and brownish ring near top of neck. Same pigment and format of inscription.
Two cordlike ridges encircle the neck just below the rim; these extend outward to form a straplike handle opposite the inscription, curving outward at the bottom. This strap has three incised horizontal lines at the top, two at the bottom, and two vertical ones edging it in between. Break did not run parallel to rim, and wall is thin at this point.

9. **Two-handled ointment jar.** Louvre, N 1127 (Figure 12, right)

Acquired from Drovetti by Charles X of France, Oct. 24, 1827.
Manuscript packing list of Drovetti’s nephew: case 18, item 1; Champollion manuscript museum inventory no. 238: “vase with two handles with hieroglyphic inscription, sculptured in color, containing an unknown material, perfectly conserved” (both lists kindness of Kanawaty); Christophe Barbotin, in Weltmacht, no. 291.
Height, 26.3 cm.
Same material, pigment, two-columned inscription as nos. 5–8; there is a limestone plug between the straps of the proper left handle. The vessel is half filled with resin.

The jar has a ring base, the handles a pronounced square cross-section.

10. **Jug-shaped ointment jar.** Leiden, AAL 37 (Figures 10, 11)

Height, 27.5 cm.
Crystalline alabaster but with little or no polish; body filled with resin, neck encrusted with white material. Seven pieces broken out of neck and replaced; part of rim missing; new chip on foot. Pigment and two-columned inscription as nos. 7–11.
A raised band encircles the neck about a third of the way below the rim and extends to form a handle opposite the inscription. Two vertical incised lines divide the handle into three sections until they are met by four incised horizontal lines at the bottom. Projecting foot with concave base; a “C” incised in center.

11. **Bag-shaped ointment jar with lid.** Leiden, L.VIII.20 (Figure 12, left)

Acquired 1826 by Reuven from de Lescluze.
Die Egyptische oudheid, no. 68; Schneider, in Weltmacht, no. 294.
Height, 26.7 cm.
Polished crystalline alabaster, the lid quite thin and without polish. Incrustation of brown resin on entire inner surface. Lid does not seem made for jar. Signs tightly spaced, inscription on upper half of jar.

12. **Palette.** Leiden, AD 39 (Figure 13)

Same provenance as no. 10.
Art from Ancient Egypt, no. 73.
Length, 37.4 cm.
“Black homogeneous stone (schist?),” according to Raven. Photos show the object to be broken and mended near the top.
There are two drilled and incised “shen”-ringed depressions at one end for ink, and one long depression between two inward-facing columns of offering formulas. These columns are bordered by vertical lines and run all the way to the bottom of the object. In photos and in Leemans’s facsimile it appears that the depression has about five lightly drilled holes.

13. **Palette.** Turin, Cat. 6227 (Figure 14)

Same provenance as no. 5.
Length, 21.1 cm.; width, 6.5 cm.; thickness, .7 cm.
Compact alabaster, polished, some staining from resin; the bottom broken off, perhaps ca. 6 cm. longer originally. Top band of name/titles and one continuous offering formula divided into two columns bordered by vertical lines; pen area sunk, "shen"-signs incised and have traces of red paint.

14. Heart scarab. Leiden, AO la

Same provenance as no. 10.
Leemans, p. 20, pl. 35 no. 94; Devéria, "Basilicogrammate," p. 36; Maspero, "Joppé," p. 69; Sethe, Urk. IV, p. 1001 P; Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Nederlandse Musea VI (Leiden, 1981) no. 15; De Egyptische oudheid, no. 67; Schneider, in Weltmacht, no. 296.
Length of scarab including mount, 8.3 cm.; chain 1.35 m.

15. Metal dagger with wood inlaid handle. Darmstadt Hessisches Landesmuseum, A: 1,6

Acquired as a gift from Freiherr von Zitzenhofer, 1875; he is said to have formed his collection primarily at Thebes, 1869–71.
Length, 34.3 cm.

No doubt bronze, with a polished medium-brown wood handle; knothole wood according to the museum’s catalogue.

16. Lower half of a scribe statuette. British Museum, 69863 (Figures 15, 16)

Appeared on the Paris art market about 1975; in 1986 the object was sold at Christie’s London to the British Museum.
Height, 19 cm.
Black granite, sparkling in the breaks. Concretions on the surface composed of a) a thick whitish layer with sand particles, and b) a thin brown layer partially covering the white; some areas are reddish, as if of resin.
The scribe sits on the usual rounded base, right hand poised for pen; he wears a short kit knotted at the waist; the torso modeling shows two rolls of fat and a navel; a back pillar extends upward from the base. The inscription has been given by Yooyote; in my opinion the whip and ox tongue in column 2 of his copy of the back pillar inscription should be reversed so that the tongue is at the top and the whip below.

17. Decorated bowl. Louvre, E 4886 (Figures 17–27)

Acquired by Raiffe from the Anastasi sale in Paris, 1857 (lot 956); acquired by the Louvre from the Raiffe collection in 1867, lot 380.

Lenormant, Description des antiquités égyptiennes . . . composant la collection de feu M. A. Raiffe (Paris, 1867) auction at the Hôtel Drouot, Mar. 18–23, 1867.

Diameter, 16.4 × 18 cm. I measured a thickness of 1.1 mm. next to the inscription, and .9 mm. at the very edge of the object. Weight, 188 g.
Silver.
For a detailed description, see the text.

18. Decorated bowl. Louvre, N 713 (Figures 28–55, 57)

Same provenance as no. 9; Drovetti no. 260.

Diameter, 17 cm.; height, 2.2 to 2.4 cm.; weight, 371.7 g. The top edge (flattened lip) is 3.4 mm. thick, the middle of the wall, 1.1 mm. thick.
Gold.
For a detailed description, see the text.

I. Canopic jar lid. Florence, 2207 (Figure 2)

Provenance Ricci collection, according to Migliarini.
Ricci, cat. no. 59: "altro vaso della stessa forma [canopic jar] e materia [ordinary alabaster] alto in tutto soldo. 16 quattro 1" in ink, “(coperchia a faccia umana)” in pencil, and “6” in pencil; Migliarini, cat. no. 2207: “vaso funebre con coperchio a testa umana. Ricci 59.”
Height, 10.5 cm.
Crystalline alabaster, covered with dirt/grease film and some bitumen, left front; fresh chip on front edge of lid.

Lid triangular shape with flat head; eyes accented with plastic brows, cosmetic lines, and upper lids; the brows and cosmetic lines not marked off vertically (except right brow); nose straight, chin protruding, wig line at forehead protruding; ears flat against wig; nose with drilled triangles at nostril; black pigments traces on eyes and brow.
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II. Inscribed msktw-bracelet (concave-convex-concave profile). Leiden, AO 2b

Same provenance as no. 10.
Leemans, p. 24, pl. 41; De Egyptische oudheid, no. 69; Art from Ancient Egypt, no. 84.
Diameter at opening, 7.1 cm; height, 3.7 cm; Leemans's measurement of 9 is presumably the maximum diameter.
Gold.
Edges apparently rolled; inscription incised.

III. Inlaid lotus clasp. Leiden, AO 1b

Same provenance as no. 10.
Leemans, p. 25, pl. 42; De Egyptische oudheid, no. 70; Art from Ancient Egypt, no. 83.
Height, 8.7 cm; width, 8 cm; thickness, 4 cm.
Gold; inlays of lapis-, turquoise- and red-colored glass, according to Schneider.
According to Raven, the back of the central inlaid element extends beyond the top surface to the sides, and curls around to form tubes running parallel with the sides. Over these tubes slide sleeves that are open toward the central element but solid away from it. In the solid surface of the left sleeve there are 44 perforations, and in the solid surface of the right sleeve there are 32. In addition, along the bottom of the central part are 8 "irregular marks (sawn off?) [which] may indicate that there once were pendant elements attached to this edge."

IV. Sixteen inlaid mandrake/persea-fruit pendants. Leiden

Same provenance as no. 10.
Leemans, p. 20 and pl. 35, no. 95.
Average height, 2 cm. without ring; width, 1.9 cm.
Gold; according to Raven, inlays of orange stone, turquoise-colored glass, and lapis-colored glass sometimes completely faded. The cement is often reddish, perhaps from resin.
The backs of these pendants have been bent up to form a container, within which separate gold strips form cloisons for inlays; a ring is provided for suspension. The lapis-colored inlay is at the bottom (sometimes deteriorated to a colorless or amber crizzled glass); the next inlay up is turquoise-colored glass; the next a stone deteriorated in a way I have not seen except, perhaps, in the inlaid inscribed clasp (III). The topmost cloisons again have the lapis-colored, sometimes crizzled, glass. Each pendant has some type of numbering system on the back: either lines incised parallel to each other along the edge or punch marks made from the inside of the backplate.

V. Nine inlaid mandrake/persea-fruit pendants. British Museum, 3076

Purchased at the Anastasi sale of 1839.
Miriam Stead, Egyptian Life (London, 1986) fig. 52.
Height, 2.2 cm; 1.9 cm. wide, according to Carol Andrews.
Gold; inlays according to the British Museum Research Laboratory: lapis-colored glass for the lowest sections (color-
ant cobalt); turquoise-colored glass for the next highest; opaque white calcite stained by iron rust for the next highest; lapis-colored glass again at the top. Six of the pendants have punch marks in the back, according to Andrews.

VI. Broad-collar elements, pendants, and ring.
Florenc, 2929–2930 (two hs-vases with flat caps); 2931–2932 (two nfr-signs, nefers); 2933–2934 (two drops); 2935 (a lily); 2936–2937 (two crocodiles); 2788 (a castone)

Same provenance as no. 1.
Heights according to del Francia: hs-vase 1.8 cm., nefer 1.6 cm., drop 1.7 cm., lily 1.9 cm., crocodile 2 cm.; castone 2.6 to 2.8 cm.
Gold.
All pendants have separate rings for stringing top and bottom except for the crocodiles, which have one self ring at top; most pendants have air holes in the back plates. The castone has been made by taking a strip of gold foil, folding it in half lengthwise, and overlapping its ends so that the V’s angle is at the exterior and the two long edges on the interior.

VII. Broad-collar elements, pendants. Louvre, N 1834, AF 2297, AF 2799, and some apparently without number (Figure 69)

N 1834 ("de poissons, de fleurs, d’amulettes") recorded in the Livre d’Entrée of 1852–57; AF 2297 (two drops, three hs-vases with pointed caps, two hs-vases with flat caps, seven nefers) and AF 2799 (three lilies, five fish, three lizards) found without number after World War II, no doubt including Drovetti 115, 118, 121, gold lizards and fish.
Gold.
The following elements are arranged today in four strings: nine flat-capped hs-vases 1.9 cm. long; fifteen nefers, 1.65 to 1.9 cm. long; thirteen lilies, 1.97 cm. long; seven crocodiles 1.85 cm. long; ten tilapia 1.45 cm. long; all measurements according to Ziegler. The three hs-vases with pointed caps of AF 2297 do not appear in these strings.

VIII. Broad-collar elements, rings, and pendants?
Leiden, 341? (seventeen lilies in a necklace); 347 (two types of hs-vases, strung diagonally in a necklace: ten with flat caps and twelve with pointed caps); 348 (fifty-nine tête-bêche nefers in a necklace); 349 (two types of gold hs-vases in a necklace with carnelian Hathor pendant: three with flat caps and seven with pointed caps); 353 (one lily pendant in a necklace); 131–133, 135, 137–138, 140. AO 4a (eight gold fish and six gold drops in a necklace with carnelian fish and pendants): not examined. 143–147 (twelve castoni)

Same provenance as no. 10.
341: Leemans, p. 20 and pl. 35, no. 93; 347: idem, p. 19, pl. 35, no. 91; 348: idem, p. 19, no. 92; 349: idem, p. 20, pl.
IX. Two-strand necklace with fish and lotus pendants. Louvre, N 1852 (Figure 70)

Same provenance as no. 9 above.

Necklace, 49 cm. long; fish 1.3 cm. long; lotus 1.6 cm. long; box clasp 2.2 × .45 cm.
Gold; traces of inlay?

The ends of two of the small chains enclose the mouth of the fish; all attachments between chains and clasp and lotus pendant are covered by gold sleeves.

X. Chain and “clasp” with three fish pendants.
Louvre, N 1851 (Figures 71–72)

The “N” number indicates that the object was inventoried between 1852 and 1857.
Chain 74 cm. long; three fish pendants 1.65 cm. long; box clasp 2.24 × .82 × .35 cm. thick.
Gold.

The “clasp” has five holes on each side; each fish is suspended from a chain by a ring coming out of its mouth.

XI. Inscribed bag-shaped jar. Leiden, XLII 110

Same provenance as no. 10.
Leemans, p. 39, pl. 58, no. 230; B. Striker, “Egyptisch Vaatwerk,” *Oudheidkundige Mededeelingen van het Rijksmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden*, n.s. 24 (1943) pp. 78–80, 100f., figs. 30, 32, pl. 4.

Height, 26.7 cm.
Crystalline alabaster; broken through at base of neck, one piece of rim missing.

XII. Inscribed shoulder jar. Leiden, XLII 109

Same provenance as no. 11.
Leemans, p. 42, pl. 61, no. 328.
Height, 26.8 cm.
Crystalline alabaster; large piece missing from rim.

XIII. Inscribed scribe’s palette. Bologna, 3136
(Figures 73–75)

Acquired by Palagi from Nizzoli in 1831.
*Catalogo Racolta*, p. 13, no. 10; Bresciani, *Bologna*, p. 36.
Length, 37 cm.; width, 7.7 cm.; thickness, .9 cm.
Wood; black in the upper “shen”-ring, red in the lower; a red dot below the hieratic.
The “shen”-signs and the inscriptions are incised, the hieratic notations below drawn in ink. There is a depression to hold reed pens, and below the depression on the proper right side of the palette there is a slit 16.1 cm. long.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix A no.</th>
<th>1-4 canop. jams</th>
<th>5 Turin 3225 sm. jar</th>
<th>6 Turin 3226 lrg. jar</th>
<th>7 Turin 3227 jar</th>
<th>8 Turin 3228 jug</th>
<th>9 Louvres jar/hd.</th>
<th>10 Leiden jug</th>
<th>11 Leiden jar</th>
<th>12 Turin pal.</th>
<th>13 Leiden pal.</th>
<th>14 heart scarab</th>
<th>15 dagger</th>
<th>16 statuette</th>
<th>17 silver bowl</th>
<th>18 gold bowl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>object</td>
<td>Dhuty (with t and y)</td>
<td>(with m31 hryw)</td>
<td>(with seated determinative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>titles</td>
<td>imy-r h3swt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imy-r h3swt mh3t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imy-r h3swt mhtyw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imy-r n h3st mh3t (ref. Helck)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imy-r n h3st mh3t (ref. Yoyotte)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ss nsw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ss nsw m31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sms(w) nsw hr h3st nbl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sms(w) nb.f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imy-r m3'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imy-r in'yt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>irty nsw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mh w3d3 m h3b k3 nbw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rh nsw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r b't</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h3ty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it nfr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mh ib mnh n nb t3wy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mh ib3 n nb t3wy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imy ib 3 n nb t3sey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mh ib n nsw m t3 nfr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mh ib n nsw hr h3st nb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mr nfr (following it nfr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hsy n nfr nfr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mr.f (i. e., the king)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ir n nb t3wy k3.f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSCRIPTIONAL FEATURES**

**name**

Dhuty (with t and y)  
(with m31 hryw)  
(with seated determinative)

**titles**

*imy-r h3swt*  
*imy-r h3swt mh3t*  
*imy-r h3swt mhtyw*  
*imy-r n h3st mh3t (ref. Helck)*  
*imy-r n h3st mh3t (ref. Yoyotte)*  
*ss*  
*ss nsw*  
*ss nsw m31*  
*sms(w) nsw hr h3st nbl*  
*sms(w) nb.f*  
*kn*  
*imy-r m3'*  
*imy-r in'yt*  
*irty nsw*  
*mh w3d3 m h3b k3 nbw*  
*rh nsw*  
*r b't*  
*h3ty*  
*it nfr*  
*mh ib mnh n nb t3wy*  
*mh ib3 n nb t3wy*  
*imy ib 3 n nb t3sey*  
*mh ib n nsw m t3 nfr*  
*mh ib n nsw hr h3st nb*  
*mr nfr (following it nfr)*  
*hsy n nfr nfr*  
*mr.f (i. e., the king)*  
*ir n nb t3wy k3.f*
Appendix B:

HISTORY OF THE EARLY COLLECTIONS WITH REFERENCE TO DJEHUTY OBJECTS


Nizzoli objects for Vienna, Florence, and Bologna
(see nos. 1–4, I, VI, XIII):

The primary sources for information on where the Nizzoli objects originated are the Memorie of Amalia Nizzoli; the "Memorie" written by her husband, Giuseppe Nizzoli, for the Florence collection noting the provenance of certain objects (unsigned but clearly written by the excavator; published in 1880); and a Catalogo printed in Alexandria during 1827 for the Nizzoli collection that Bologna purchased in 1831 (author unstated).

According to Amalia, Giuseppe Nizzoli’s first collection was sold to "Dr. Burghart" for Vienna in 1820 (Memorie, p. 84). However, A. Dedekind states that the greater part of Vienna’s 1821 (not 1820) collection purchased from August Burghart was acquired from C. (not A.) Lebolo in Alexandria (Geschichte der Kaiserlichen Sammlung altägyptischer objecte in Wien [Vienna, 1997] p. 10f.), the other objects "presumably acquired in the antiquities trade there." Satzinger has informed me that Nizzoli’s name is not associated with any objects in the Kunsthistorisches Museum and therefore suggests that, if Amalia’s statement is correct, the objects must have been in the group acquired in the antiquities trade. Satzinger further states that there are no Djehuty objects in Vienna, and indeed Nizzoli’s first collection should have been put together while the official was in Alexandria. Bresciani has a student who has done a thesis on Nizzoli and informs me that Nizzoli was in Alexandria at least from 1817; Amalia tells us that she married him when she was fourteen, and that she moved with him to Cairo a month later, in October 1820.

The Nizzolis lived in Cairo between October 1820 and August 1822, when they left for Italy with a baby daughter and twenty-four or twenty-six cases of antiquities. They were in Italy for two and a half years, and the sale of this "second collection" of antiquities was finalized with Leopold II in mid-1824. Thereafter, the Nizzolis went back to Egypt and lived in Cairo until July 1826; then they moved to Alexandria until sometime after March of the following year, when Nizzoli left for Trieste because of ill health; Amalia followed in July. It was in 1840, thirteen years after she left Egypt and was thirty-five years of age, that Amalia wrote the preface to the Memorie that she had just written from her notes.

Giuseppe stated in his "Memorie" (p. 372), "I found the cubit rod [of Amenhotep/Huy];" and Amalia states (Memorie, p. 238) that her husband found the cubit rod some years before her stay at Saqqara.

I therefore propose that Giuseppe did his work at Saqqara between October 1820 and August 1822, when he was posted in Cairo and when his young wife had a small baby. Salt, in a letter of September 1822, mentions the recent discovery of three cubits, one of which belonged to Amenhotep (Hayes, "Chief Steward Amenhotpe," p. 15). Nizzoli mentions the khamsin, the hot desert winds usually of the spring (p. 374), but otherwise he does not date his work. It would have been during Nizzoli’s fieldwork that the canopic jars were collected from Djehuty’s tomb.

As for Amalia’s work, since her book has a chronological framework I conclude that her excavations at Saqqara took place between fall 1824 and summer 1826, when her husband, having begun new excavations at the site of his earlier work, asked her to supervise them because he could not be away from his official duties in Cairo during the week. She would have then been roughly eighteen years of age; she tells us that she lived in a nearby village with her child and a servant, sat in a tent at the work every day.
while the Arabs in her employ looked for antiquities, and went with her husband to the site on the weekends. In other words, her work at Saqqara would have had nothing to do with the Amenhotep/Huy find—contrary to Hayes (her description of a tomb on p. 244 does not correspond with the one by Giuseppe of Amenhotep/Huy’s)—nor would it have had anything to do with the Djehuty find. As for Hayes’s claim that the agents of Salt, Drovetti, and Anastasi were at Saqqara while Amalia was there, she tells us only, “and I have known, after having left the excavations, that some pieces of our property were bought by the above-named consuls” (p. 237).

Directly preceding (and used for reference in) Nizzoli’s published “Memorie” is a “Catalogo Museo Nizzoli.” This is today assumed to have been written by Nizzoli although it is unsigned; it is more descriptive of the objects than illuminating for provenance.

There are also notes of Champollion on the Nizzoli collection in Florence. Pellegrini quotes a letter written by Champollion from Bologna to Grand Duke Leopold in October 1826 saying, “le catalogue raisonné des monuments égyptiens de la Galerie de Florence que j’avais commencé l’année dernière a été terminé pendant le séjour que je viens de faire dans cette capitale” (“Autografi,” p. 27f.). Pellegrini did not find this catalogue but rather a series of 156 notecards, which he published in “Autografi” (pp. 22, 29f., 187–205; the Djehuty objects are not described). Del Francia has informed me that Champollion made notecards for the Nizzoli and Medici objects that were of importance or carried inscriptions; and he has also informed me that the Nizzoli objects were inventoried in 1828, in a manuscript catalogue that established “Catal. N.” numbers for them (Catalogo della Galleria, vol. 13). I examined this Catalogo della Galleria in 1987 and found it to be written in French and to include Greek and hieroglyphic inscriptions, references to the sons of Horus, the use of Nesniv for Netsonof/Kebesenuef, and Nizzoli’s “Memoire” numbers as well as “Catal.” numbers.

Amalia states that there were 1,400 objects in the collection sold to Florence (Memorie, p. 84).

The collection acquired by Bologna from Nizzoli was actually purchased by Palagi from the consular agent in 1831 when Giuseppe was in Trieste and the objects in Livorno (Bresciani, Bologna, p. 16; in fact Schneider, Laudibus, p. 31 n. 45, states that the collection was purchased by the Marquise Busca in Milan). There were 3,109 objects in the collection Palagi gave to Bologna, according to Curto (in Palagi, p. 377); only 885 are mentioned in the catalogue of Nizzoli objects (Catalogo Racolta), which was printed in Alexandria in 1827 when the collection was offered to the grand duke of Tuscany (it was viewed in Egypt by Champollion and Rosellini in 1828). This Catalogo Racolta is, like the “Catalogo Museo Nizzoli,” more descriptive than knowledgeable, not written in the first person, only occasionally giving an object’s provenance. Curto believed it to have been written by Nizzoli himself (in Palagi, p. 375); but catalogues were not necessarily done by the collectors (Laudibus, n. 33, for the Anastasi case; and van de Walle, Handelingen 97 [1960] p. 210, for the de Lescluze catalogue). There are indications of provenance, and the Thutmose III–inscribed palette (XIII in Appendix A) is listed as “from a tomb at Saqqara.” Whether the palette could have remained unsold for about ten years following its discovery is of course a question; it, like other Bologna objects, could have come from Amalia’s excavations or purchases of 1824–26.

Yet another source of information for Bologna’s Nizzoli objects is “Catalogo d’una Raccolta,” a listing of about seventy items. It is similarly descriptive though more abbreviated, and it uses certain terms and misspellings that appear in the Catalogo Racolta. It includes prices and was obviously drawn up in a private house; I was not able to ascertain whether all or only some of the objects mentioned there were purchased by Palagi from Nizzoli.

Drovetti objects for Turin (nos. 5–8, 13) and for the Louvre (nos. 9, 18, IX; VII and X?):

There is little firsthand information as to where Bernardino Drovetti acquired his objects, although Curto states that Thebes was his principal area of exploration, Botti having previously named Abydos, Memphis, and Tuna as sources (Storia, p. 95); Curto also noted Rifaud’s work at Tanis. Since Drovetti left no memoir, these clues for provenance come from agents (such as Rifaud) or from travelers; and early writers clearly saw Drovetti as the most widely based and powerful of the consuls.

Drovetti did have a long career in Egypt. He was named French consul in 1803, removed for political reasons in 1815, reappointed consul in 1821 and served until he left Egypt in 1829; he represented Russia during this last period. According to Curto, Drovetti began his collecting more or less in 1811, principally at Thebes by using Antonio Lebolo and Rifaud (Storia, pp. 46, 92, 95). During the period 1815–21 he resided in Egypt as a private citizen, col-
lecting antiquities and benefiting French commerce by his intimate relations with Mohammed Ali (L. A. Balboni, *Gi'italiani nella civiltà egiziana del Secolo XIX* [Alexandria, 1906] 1, pp. 231–236). He visited Nubia in 1816, Dakhla in 1818, and Siwa in 1820 (Storia [1976] pp. 45f.). In 1817–18 Count Forbin states that Drovetti was at Memphis as well as Thebes (Travel in Egypt, p. 23), and Amalia indicates that he was there later (I believe fall 1824–summer 1826 rather than October 1820–August 1822). Baroness von Minutoli mentions a “Father Ladislaus” superintending excavations for Drovetti at Abydos when the Minutolis took their trip upriver in 1821, and she relates that after their departure from Egypt (1822?) Drovetti discovered an avenue of sphinxes at Edfu (Recollections of Egypt, pp. 110, 144f.).

Drovetti offered his first “collection” to Savoy (Vittorio Emanuele I and the government of Piedmont in 1816 [Storia, p. 93]), and thereafter negotiated its sale until 1824, when Carlo Felice and the Piedmontese government purchased about 3,000 objects (ibid., p. 47) and turned them over to the university to be housed in the Accademia delle Scienze. Curto quotes G. Marro as saying that all objects were in the Palazzo of the Accademia on February 3, 1824 (ibid., p. 94).

Although Curto has undertaken a great deal of research on the history of the Drovetti collection in Turin, there are major gaps, as with the Florence and Bologna histories; the contemporary documentation is not extensive, nor does it seem consistent. While we can presume that the Nizzoli canopic jars left Alexandria in September 1822, it is more difficult to postulate when Drovetti’s objects left Egypt (owing to Drovetti’s more extensive and developed trade and to the loss of original documents).

Today there is a short list appended to the sale contract of January 23 and February 14, 1824, which was made by Giulio Cordero di San Quintino in Livorno the previous October (Epistolario, p. 740); and a catalogue of the Drovetti collection published in 1880 (“Collezione Drovetti”). Curto understands the catalogue to have been put together by Fabretti from a variety of sources (Storia, p. 93), and the preface to it (unsigned) suggests that the main source might have been a catalogue solicited by Count Balbo during the negotiations.

However, there may have been more than one catalogue. Giuseppe Botti stated (“La Collezione Drovetti e i Papiri del R. Museo Egizio di Torino,” *Rendiconti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, ser. 5, 30–31 [1921] p. 29) that the collection was in Livorno in August 1820, and Forbin wrote that Drovetti had already “shipped off for Leghorn [Livorno] no small part of his collection” in 1817/18 (Travel in Egypt, p. 72). A letter from Vidua in Turin to Drovetti [in Egypt, dated May 16, 1822], states that the long-awaited catalogue has arrived from Livorno and that he has given it to First Under Secretary of State for Internal Affairs Roger de Choloe to pass on to the king, but Vidua asks if Drovetti can send a catalogue of “the part of the collection still in Alexandria and of the recent acquisitions” (Epistolario, pp. 199–202; see also Curto, “Carlo Vidua,” pp. 31, 34). According to Curto and Donatelli, no original catalogue can be found today, though Marro indicates that he saw one earlier in this century (“Bernardino Drovetti Archeologo,” *Aegyptus* 32 [1932] p. 125). The collection was consigned in Livorno to Cordero in October 1823, and Cordero wrote in December that some of the objects in an inventory he was working with were not present, while some objects not in the inventory were present (Storia [1976] p. 96): altogether he inventoried 8,350 objects in Livorno (Epistolario, p. 291), and this number seems very high. The free port of Livorno, with houses displaying the wares of agents whose representatives were making individual lots and prices for museum representatives (Laudibus, p. 19), was a lively place; and clearly there are important documents lost from those times.

Four of the five Djehuty Turin objects are identifiable in “Collezione Drovetti,” two with an asterisk. This sign—according to a note on p. 274—means that they were added to the collection after October 1820; thus it is implied that the other three objects were in the collection before that date. Curto has noted that some objects without asterisk actually occur in the Pietro Barucchi inventory of 1814 for items then in the Museo delle Antichità (Storia [1979] p. 88); further that the Sekhmet statues and most of the papyri that came from Drovetti are not in the “Collezione Drovetti” list at all.

Champollion prepared a manuscript catalogue when he unpacked the Drovetti collection in mid-1824, but, as verified by Leospo, none of the Turin Djehuty objects are in it.

In sum, it is possible that the Djehuty objects left Egypt before 1818; and they should have been in the Accademia in February 1824; but in fact we know only that they were in Turin when Fabretti, Rossi, and Lanzone published them.

As for the Paris Drovetti collection of 1,940 objects, a statement made at the time of Anastasi’s first offering implies that there was a catalogue available (the catalogues
prepared for Anastasi were said to be better than those for Salt and Drovetti, *Laudibus*, n. 33) but, according to Kanawaty, shipping lists made in Marseilles by Drovetti’s nephew are all that are known today. A few objects landed at Marseilles in early September 1825 (Hartleben, *Champollion*, I, p. 590) and the collection was offered to France (*Bulletin Universel* 3 [1825] nos. 255, 256). Drovetti himself arrived in France in July 1827 (*Epistolario*, p. 515), and Paris by mid-August, anxious to sell the collection after at least a year of negotiations with the French (*Lettres*, I, p. 425). The agreement to cede the collection to the crown was made in Paris on October 11, and some objects were already in Paris at that time (*Epistolario*, pp. 741–743) though Kanawaty says that most objects reached the Louvre from Marseilles only in 1828 (“Musée Charles X,” p. 40).

**Anastasi objects for Leiden (nos. 10, 12, 14, II–IV, VIII, XI), the Louvre (no. 17), and the British Museum (no. V)**


Concerning the provenance of Anastasi’s objects, Reuvens had the impression that Anastasi got much more from trades than from excavation (*Laudibus*, p. 19). Van de Walle says Gérard-Henri Kerstiaers set out in June 1822 to excavate for Anastasi at Thebes (*Handelingen* 97 [1960] p. 177) ; Schneider has told me that when Bartho was in Leiden, about 1827, as Anastasi’s agent for the sale, Reuvens asked him where the objects had come from and was told that the small objects—including vases—came from Saqqara, coffins from Thebes, and the Piccinini material from Abydos.

According to Warren Dawson (“Anastasi, Sallier, and Harris and their Papyri,” *JE A* 35 [1949] p. 160), Anastasi died in Alexandria early in 1857 and the objects in his possession were packed up and sent to Paris for auction; the sale catalogue gives the dates of the auction as June 23–27. Schneider has told me that Anastasi was offering a last collection to Leiden in the mid-1850s, no doubt the objects found in Alexandria when he died.

**Bartho / de Lescluze objects for Leiden (nos. 11, XII)**

The collection the Bruges trader de Lescluze sold to Leiden in 1826 was actually the collection of the adventurer François Bartho (van de Walle, *Handelingen* 97 [1960] pp. 198ff.; idem, *Biographie*). De Lescluze and his partner, Besson, signed an agreement with Bartho and the French attaché Clairambault on April 8, 1824, in Egypt to buy the collection; Drovetti countersigned. The eleven crates of antiquities were ready to leave Alexandria at the end of 1824 (van de Walle, *Handelingen* 97 [1960] p. 200), but they only arrived in Antwerp in the spring of 1825 (*Shabtis*, p. 11).

Thomas Legh wrote of Bartho in 1813 that he was an American “who had traded many years in the Red Sea, spoke Arabic extremely well” (*Narrative of a journey in Egypt and the country beyond the cataracts* [London, 1817] p. 20); he wrote his name on the temples at Amada and Dendur that year (Dewachter, “Le Voyage Nubien du Comte Carlo Viterbo,” *Bulletin de l’Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire* 69 [1971] p. 141). Reuvens wrote more than ten years later that Bartho excavated for every major person who wanted to pay him, especially for Drovetti and Anastasi but also for smaller dealers (*Laudibus*, p. 28 n. 15). When Reuvens asked de Lescluze about the provenance of objects in the collection he was offering, de Lescluze was not forthcoming, mentioning that two of the mummies came from “the plain of mummies near the Saqqara desert,” and that a cubit came from “the ruins of Memphis” (*Handelingen* 97 [1960] p. 214 n. 140; see also *Shabtis*, p. 12). Schneider states that he worked at Thebes (ibid., p. 11).

Van de Walle says that Bartho was actually a Frenchman who had adopted American citizenship but enjoyed the protection of the Austrian consulate when the negotiations were taking place with de Lescluze. He was still friendly with Drovetti in January 1826 (*Epistolario*, p. 456) and was in Livorno for Anastasi in 1827 (*Laudibus*, p. 15), offering to excavate for Reuvens that year and the next (*Shabtis*, p. 11).
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