

The unfinished statuettes of the Saïte to Roman periods, although few in number, seem to present the system of marking the principal measurements, used in the Mycerinus statues.¹ The sculptor's models of this late period, in addition to this system, show on some examples the network of 21 units incised or drawn on the back with special marks to indicate certain details; and it is quite clear that the canon was intended to be used in statues as well as in reliefs.

The measurements of the Mycerinus statues show as close an approximation to the canon of the Old Kingdom reliefs as could be expected. The large size of the feet is not out of harmony with the earlier reliefs. The small size of the head in proportion to the massive shoulders is shown by all the statues, including the small diorite statuette found at Saqqarah. The same relation between head and shoulders is seen in the statue of Rahotep from Medûm (in Cairo); and the workmanship of that statue, as well as of the Mycerinus statues, is so fine that the form given must be assumed to have been intentional. In all probability Mycerinus and Rahotep were actually distinguished by unusually heavy shoulders. Rahotep was a member of the royal family of Dynasty IV.

4. COMPARISON WITH EARLIER STATUARY

The significance of the statues of Chephren and Mycerinus in the development of Egyptian sculpture appears only when they are compared with previous works. As far as possible, like must be compared with like, figures in soft materials (limestone, wood, ivory) with one another, and similarly figures in hard materials, figures of royal persons, and figures of private persons, in each case with one another. It has been observed that technical gains in all the crafts in Egypt have been made in the service of royalty, and these gains have become available for other grades of persons only after the lapse of some time. Royal statuary is always of better quality and often of a different type from the private work of the same reign. There is also a tendency for skill to develop more rapidly in softer and more tractable materials so that a high excellence may be exhibited by limestone statues of the same class while the granite statues still present a rude and primitive appearance. In other words, in studying a formative period like that of Egyptian sculpture previous to Chephren, the development should be traced if possible in four parallel lines, (1) royal statues in soft materials, (2) royal statues in hard materials, (3) private statues in soft materials, and (4) private statues in hard materials. The separate objects used in this study should be accurately dated. But unfortunately the greater part of the early examples of private statuary have been discovered in museum collections without indication of their origin, and have been dated by their form and workmanship.

The earliest reproductions of the human figure in Egypt are the figures in mud, pottery, and ivory which have been found in private graves belonging to village communities of the Predynastic Period. These figures are rude in workmanship and uncouth in form like the figures made by primitive men in other countries and other times. Along with them must be grouped the representations of both men and animals which occur in the line drawings on pottery, and in relief on slate palettes, ivory combs, and other objects of the same period. The development of sculpture in the round is inseparably bound up with the development of drawing and of sculpture in relief. The technical processes which gave the Egyptians power over stone took their origin in the making of the stone vessels, the stone mace-heads, and the slate palettes of the earliest predynastic times, and something of the characteristic Egyptian sense of form is perceptible in all these products of the stone workers' craft. The increase of skill both in the technical processes and in the delineation of forms may be followed down into the Early Dynastic Period to the wonderful carvings on the palettes and mace-heads found at Hierakonpolis.²

(A) THE EARLY DYNASTIC SCULPTURE

The sculpture of the Early Dynastic Period is represented by a number of reliefs carved on slate palettes, mace-heads and vessels of stone, and various objects of ivory, and by figures of men and animals in ivory, stone, and faience.³ Among these are the following:

¹ Edgar, *Sculptors' Studies*, p. iii.

² Quibell and Green, *Hierakonpolis*.

³ See in general, Capart, *Primitive Art in Egypt*.

- (1) A number of ivory figures of men and women found at Hierakonpolis¹ and Abydos.²
- (2) Three limestone statues of the god Min, from Coptos.³
- (3) Two limestone statues of a kneeling man (one decayed), from Hierakonpolis.⁴
- (4) Limestone standing statue of a man, from Hierakonpolis.⁵
- (5) Limestone statuette of a squatting man (body decayed), from Hierakonpolis.⁶

A great increase of skill over the Predynastic Period is shown by all these sculptures, but especially by the smaller figures and by the reliefs which are also on a small scale in all cases. The head of the squatting statuette of limestone is quite as good as the ivory carvings and the better preserved of the two kneeling statues appears to have been of similar merit. The three statues of Min and the standing statue from Hierakonpolis are unfortunately badly preserved, but they were probably not much different in quality. The workmanship of all these figures, statues, and statuettes, although they are executed in soft materials, is far from that of Dynasty IV. In the form, especially in the faces, a human likeness has been attained of such merit that opinions have even been expressed as to the race of some of the persons represented, but the surfaces show a lack of modelling, a simplification, which, combined with the stiffness of attitude, marks them as products of a craft not far from the primitive. The reliefs show that the craftsmen of that time had the same difficulties in representing the human form in profile as the sculptors of the Old Kingdom; and that the early dynastic solution of these difficulties appears traditional in the Old Kingdom. Whenever it was possible to represent the nearer arm behind the body, the breast was represented *en face* with the rest of the figure in profile. When the hands are holding something in front of the body, the same awkward drawing of the back of the shoulder is seen as occurs in later times. The inner side of the foot is shown, two left feet or two right feet on each figure, but the hands are usually correctly drawn as right and left on each person. I would suggest that some part of the failure of the later sculptors of relief may have been due to the fixing of traditional forms at this early period when the skill of the craftsmen was not fully developed.

The attitudes of the figures in the reliefs are familiar from the Old Kingdom sculptures, but the clothing of both the king and the ordinary man are different in certain features. The statues and figures present peculiarities both in the attitudes and the clothing. The statues of Min, the kneeling statues and figures, and the ivory figures of a man clothed with a cloak, have their analogies in later times. The standing statues and figures in most cases have the arms hanging at the sides with the hands open or closed in various combinations. The males have the left foot advanced, while the females have the feet together in the usual later manner. The most notable feature of the early dynastic attitudes is the placing of the left hand and forearm in some instances on the chest in males and under the breasts in females. This position occurs in the standing limestone statue from Hierakonpolis as well as in both male and female ivory statuettes.⁷

(B) STONE STATUES OF DYNASTY III

The earliest dated stone statues now known are the following:

- (aa) Seated statue in white limestone of King Zoser, found by Mr. C. M. Firth, Chief Inspector of the Egyptian Department of Antiquities, in charge of government excavations at Saqqarah, in its original position in a *serdab* built against the Step Pyramid. This is a *ka*-statue in which the king is represented clothed in a cloak, with a divine headdress and over it the royal *nms*-headdress. The right hand is closed on the breast holding the edge of the cloak. The left hand is open palm down on the left knee. The throne has moldings on the side to represent a wooden frame.
Fragments of an alabaster statue and a black granite (?) head from same place.
- (bb) Two seated statuettes, inscribed with the name of King Khasekhem found by Mr. J. E. Quibell at Hierakonpolis,⁸ one of fine hard limestone, the other of slate. Both have the left arm across the front of the body with the clenched hand near the right elbow, while the right hand rests closed, with thumb up, on the right thigh. The throne has moldings on the side like the Zoser statue.

¹ Quibell and Green, *Hierakonpolis*, Pls. V–XII.

² Petrie, *Abydos II*, Pls. II and XIII.

³ Petrie, *Koptos*, Pls. III and IV; Capart, *Primitive Art*, Fig. 166.

⁴ Quibell and Green, *Hierakonpolis*, Pls. I and II, and p. 35.

⁵ *L. c.*, Pl. LVII and p. 15.

⁶ *L. c.*, Pl. V and p. 36.

⁷ Quibell and Green, *Hierakonpolis*, p. 16a, Pls. LVII, VIII (a man), IX (a woman); Petrie, *Abydos II*, Pl. II, 5 (a woman).

⁸ *L. c.*, Pls. XXXIX–XLI.

The workmanship of these three is royal. The modelling of the mouth is perhaps a little better than the earlier figures, but the same simplification of the surfaces is evident as before. Unfortunately the relation in time of Zoser and Khasekhem is in dispute, and the conclusions to be drawn concerning the development of sculpture in the round depend on whether Khasekhem was the predecessor of Khasekhemuwy of Dynasty II or one of the kings of Dynasty III. As will be pointed out in the chapter on stone vessels, the arts and crafts of Khasekhemuwy are intimately connected with those of Dynasty III, and the stone vessels of Khasekhem belong to this group. Whether therefore Khasekhem precedes or follows Zoser, the statues mentioned above are of the cultural group which begins with Khasekhemuwy, or perhaps with his predecessor if that predecessor was Khasekhem. Although the cultural group does not coincide exactly with a dynastic period, I have designated it Dynasty III with the understanding that this period in the history of Egyptian sculpture may include the end of Dynasty II.

Nearest to these in workmanship are the two statues of the "king's daughter," Redyzet:

- (cc) Two figures of the Princess Redyzet, a perfect seated statuette of diorite in Turin (No. 3035) and a limestone torso with head, in Brussels. These have the open left hand and fore-arm on the front of the body under the breasts while the right hand lies open on the right knee. The sides of the throne are molded to represent a wooden chair, with bent wood support around the inside of the frame.

There is no apparent difference in the quality of the two. Comparable in workmanship are the following:

- (dd) Two standing statues of Sepa and one of his wife Nesa, all three of limestone (Louvre, Nos. A 36, 37, 38). The male figures have the left foot advanced, while the female has the feet together. The woman has the left arm across the front of the body with the hand open against the right side, while the right hand hangs open against the right thigh. The man also has the right hand hanging open against the thigh and the left arm across the front of the body, but the left hand grasps a staff the end of which rests on the ground. This attitude of the man is not intended to represent the usual standing statue with the left arm outstretched grasping a staff. It is to be noted that two of the five panels of Hesy show Hesy seated or standing holding the scribe's staff against the chest, while others show him with the arm extended holding the same implement.

Sepa appears to have been a high official, not of the blood royal. The statues are probably therefore of Dynasty III, but towards the end of the Dynasty and possibly as late as the reign of Sneferuw.

In addition to these statues of better workmanship, there is a group of crude statuettes to which Professor Steindorff first called attention with the designation "archaic." Two of these represent an official named Nezemankh, identified by Weill with a man whose name and titles were read by Professor Sethe on a jar sealing from Bêt Khallâf.¹ The sealings were found by Professor Garstang in the crude-brick stairway-mastaba, K 5, along with sealings of an official of King Zoser, and are certainly dated to Dynasty III. If this very plausible identification be correct, as I believe, then the two statuettes of Nezemankh are of Dynasty III, and are the earliest dated private statues known to us. Their form and quality are therefore of the greatest importance for comparison with the other material both royal and private.

- (ee) Seated granite statuette of Nezemankh (Louvre, A. 39); hands folded in lap; sides of chair of wooden type with bent wood supports; height, 61 cm.²
 (ff) Seated black granite statuette of Nezemankh (Leyden, D 93); left hand closed on front of body; right hand closed with knuckles up, on right knee; chair with bent wood supports; height, 79 cm.³

These two exhibit the private work of Dynasty III in hard stone, while the one statue of Khasekhem, the fragments of alabaster and granite (?) of Zoser, and the diorite statue of Princess Redyzet give the royal work of the same period in hard stone. There are no essential differences in attitudes or workmanship between these two figures of Nezemankh and a number of undated statuettes of granite marked as "archaic"; and I would place the latter likewise in Dynasty III:

- (gg) Seated black granite statuette of Ankh (?) (Leyden, D 94); left hand closed on front of body; right hand open palm down on right knee; chair with bent wood supports; height, 62 cm.⁴

¹ Weill, *II^e et III^e Dynasties*, p. 181; Garstang, *Mahâsna and Bêt Khallâf*, p. 26b.

² Capart, *Rec. Mon. Egypt. I*, Pl. I.

³ *L. c.*, Pl. II.

⁴ *L. c.*, Pl. III.

- (hh) Seated red granite statuette of boat carpenter Aperankhuw (?) (British Museum, 70 a); left hand on breast grasping the handle of an adze (cf. Hesy reliefs and statue of Sepa); right hand open palm down on right knee; chair with bent wood supports; height, 66 cm.;¹ supposed to be from Giza where there are tombs of Dynasty III south of the Third Pyramid area.
- (ii) Basis of a seated red granite statuette (Cairo Museum); left arm across front of body with hand open against right side; right hand open palm down on right knee;² chair with bent wood supports on four sides.
- (jj) Seated red granite statuette of a woman (Naples Museum); left arm across front of body with hand open against right side; right hand open palm down on right knee; chair with bent wood supports; height, 44.5 cm.³
- (kk) Seated limestone statuette of a man (Berlin Museum); left arm across front of body with left hand closed on right breast; right hand on right knee but broken away with knees; chair with bent wood supports; height, 42 cm.⁴

Three others are mentioned by Weill in *II^e et III^e Dynasties*, p. 187, but I have not seen them even in photographs:

- (ll) Turin, No. 3065; Petrie's Photo. Turin, Nos. 2 and 3.
- (mm) Bologna, No. 1826; Petrie's Photo. Turin, No. 4.
- (nn) University College, London; Capart's Photo. Nos. 470 and 520.

The statuette of Akhet-a'a in Berlin, of which only the basis is preserved, is of the same general type as those just enumerated but judging from the reliefs which came from the same tomb is to be dated towards the end of Dynasty III, possibly as late as Sneferuw. In Dynasty IV, two types of relief have been found, one high and bold and the other very low and delicate, representing two schools of work probably each connected with a different locality. The Akhet-a'a reliefs are of the bold type and come from a mastaba which seems to have been close to the Amten tomb between Abusir and Saqqarah.⁵

- (oo) Basis of seated granite statuette of Akhet-a'a (Berlin Museum); left arm brought across front of body hand missing; right hand open palm down on right knee; chair with bent wood supports.⁶

Finally, there is the much discussed kneeling figure in red granite in the Cairo Museum, which has the names of Hetepsekhemuwy, Nebra, and Neterymuw inscribed on the back of the right shoulder:

- (pp) Kneeling statuette of a man in red granite (Cairo Museum); hands open palms down on knees; height, 39 cm.; found in 1888 at Mitrahineh (in Ptah Temple?).⁷

Professor Borchardt reads the name doubtfully *Hetep-di-ef*. The man represented was probably a funerary priest of the three kings of Dynasty II whose names are on the shoulder. The inscription proves that the statuette is later in date than any of these kings, but nothing more. The workmanship and the style of the hieroglyphics cannot in my opinion be used as proof of any more exact dating than the period of Dynasty III (including the end of Dynasty II).

The form of chair with bent wood supports occurs in the Nezemankh statuettes and, as Professor Steindorff has pointed out, is represented on the walls of the tombs of Medûm of the time of Sneferuw or of Cheops. The plain wooden throne is shown by the royal statues of Zoser and Khasekhem, and later by the statuette of Amten. Thus in Dynasty III, the plain frame seems to be used for kings and the bent wood frame for persons of lesser station in life.

Making due allowance for the obduracy of the material and the station of persons represented by the "archaic" statuettes, and noting the differences of workmanship in these figures, they are of the quality and the forms which might be expected in the period of the royal works of Zoser and Khasekhem. In Dynasty V, examples are known of granite statues which, differing in attitudes, are as rude and simple in modelling as the earlier statuettes. The differences in execution of the "archaic" statuettes manifestly imply that several different sculptors were active. But the similarities of attitude⁸ and of chair

¹ Weill, *II^e et III^e Dynasties*, p. 255 and Pl. I.

³ Capart, *l. c.*, II, Pl. LI.

⁵ For the Amten statuette see next section.

⁷ Borchardt, *Cat. Gen., Statuen*, No. 1.

² Borchardt, *Cat. Gen., Statuen*, No. 2.

⁴ Steindorff, *Zeitschrift für Aegyptische Sprache*, 1920, p. 26.

⁶ Weill, *l. c.*, Pl. VI.

⁸ The left arm on the front of the body with the hand on the breast or the right side of the body is characteristic. One figure in the Cairo Museum (No. 176) dated by Professor Borchardt to Dynasty IV has this attitude. It is certainly not "archaic."

indicate that all were products of one school and of one period; and the obvious conclusion is that the majority, probably all of them, were made in Dynasty III.

(C) FIGURES OF THE EARLY PART OF DYNASTY IV

I have already mentioned the statues of Princess Redyzet, of Sepa, Nesa, and Akheta'a as being possibly as late as the time of Sneferuw, the first king of Dynasty IV. The next dated piece is the ivory statuette of Cheops found by Professor Petrie in the temple of Abydos. The Harvard-Boston Expedition has found fragments of small alabaster statues inscribed with the name of Cheops, but not large enough to determine the attitudes or the workmanship. Three other figures have been found which are of the reign of either Sneferuw or Cheops:

- (i) Granite seated statuette of Amten (Berlin, No. 1106); right hand closed on breast; left hand open palm down on left knee; chair with plain wooden frame like the Zoser and the Khasekhem statues, and inscribed on sides and back; found by Lepsius in the *serdab* of the Amten tomb between Abusir and Saqqarah. Now in Berlin.¹
- (ii) Limestone seated statue of Prince Rahotep (Cairo Museum); hands as Amten statuette, right closed on breast, left open on knee; plain block throne without molding; found in the *serdab* of tomb at Medûm with the following statue.
- (iii) Limestone seated statue of Nofret, wife of Rahotep (Cairo Museum); arms folded under her tunic with the right hand only visible resting open palm inwards under the left breast; plain block throne without molding; found with the statue of Rahotep.
- (iv) Seated ivory figure of Cheops; crown of Lower Egypt on the head; right hand clasped on breast holding whip; left hand open palm down on left knee; plain block throne.² Now in Cairo.

Mention must also be made of the standing statue of a woman found in the Galarza tomb at Giza and probably representing the mother of Chephren, although the other statues in the tomb were of the Chephren types.

- (v) Standing limestone statue of the mother (?) of Chephren (Cairo Museum); clothed in a curious pleated robe which passes twice around the body; right hand exposed rests on the chest above the breast instead of below; left arm hangs at the side, with the hand open palm inwards against the left hip.³

The most instructive of these figures are the two statues of Rahotep and Nofret, which after the time of Cheops would probably have been joined in a group. The excellence of their modelling is no doubt due to the softness of the material, but it foreshadows the workmanship in hard stone of the time of Chephren and Mycerinus.

The attitudes of all these are characterized by the position of the right hand on the breast while the left rests open on the knee. The first instance which we have of this position is in the limestone statue of Zoser of Dynasty III. But the examples seem to show that the attitude was that generally used in seated male statues in the early part of Dynasty IV.

5. THE ATTITUDES OF STATUES AND STATUETTES

(A) THE STANDING AND SEATED FIGURES OF MYCERINUS

The Mycerinus statues and statuettes include two standing figures of the king,⁴ one standing figure of the queen (?), 21 seated figures of the king, one pair statue with standing figures of the king and queen, and five triads of the king, Hathor and a deity representing one of the nomes of Egypt. The standing figures of the king in the porphyry statuette (No. 40), in the ivory statuette, and usually in the groups, have the left foot advanced and the arms hanging with the hands closed at the hips.⁵ No. 41, a woman, has the feet together, but the queen in the pair statue and the goddess in the triads have the left foot slightly advanced. The seated figures of the king all have the arms bent at the elbows with the left hand flat, palm down on the left thigh, and the right hand closed, resting thumb up on the right thigh,

¹ Lepsius, *Denkmäler*, II, 120, *Text I*, p. 144.

³ Daressy, *Annales X*, p. 43 and a plate.

⁵ The wooden statue (No. 44) had the left arm bent.

² Petrie, *Abydos II*, Pl. XIII.

⁴ Or three, if the wooden statue was standing.

holding the "handkerchief." The pair statue shows the queen with her right arm around the king and her left hand on his left arm; while the six examples of the nome groups present at least five different attitudes in the groups:

- 9.¹ Hathor seated, embracing the king in the attitude of the queen in the pair statue except that he stands on her left; the Hare-nome stands free on the right of Hathor.
10. Hathor on the right, king in middle, and the Theban nome on the left; all stand free with left foot advanced; the two males have the hands closed, while the hands of Hathor are open with the palms against the hips.
11. Hathor on the right with her left arm behind the king and her left hand clasping his left upper arm; the king in the middle with hanging arms and closed hands; the Jackal-nome on the left, with her right arm about the king symmetrical with the left arm and hand of Hathor; the two goddesses have the free arm hanging with a seal in the hand.
12. Hathor on the right with her left hand clasping the right hand of the king and her right hand closed on her hip; the king in the middle, clasping the left hand of Hathor with his right and having the left hand closed on his hip; on the left, the nome of Diospolis parva stands free with closed hands.
13. Hathor on right clasping king's left hand as in No. 12; king in middle as in No. 12; but nome-god (male) on left hand has his left arm behind the king with his left hand clasping top of king's right shoulder.
14. Hathor probably seated in the middle like No. 9, and a male figure stands on her left, but the group is too fragmentary to permit the fixing of the attitudes.

(B) OTHER ROYAL STATUES OF DYNASTIES IV TO VI

The royal statues of Dynasties IV to VI which may be compared with these Mycerinus statues include:

- (a) Seated ivory figure of Cheops found in the temple of Abydos.²
- (b) Seven seated statues of Chephren, five of diorite, one of slate, and one of alabaster; six were found in the Sphinx Temple and one in the temple of Ptah at Mitrahineh.³
- (c) Fragment of a standing slate statue of Chephren, about life-size, from Sphinx Temple.⁴
- (d) Pair statue of Bast and Chephren, diorite, incomplete, from Sphinx Temple; both seated; Bast has her left hand open on her thigh, and the right arm was probably around the king, who sits on her right. Height, 53 cm.⁵
- (e) Seated diorite statuette of Mycerinus, from Ptah Temple at Mitrahineh; height, 55 cm.⁶
- (f) Seven badly preserved limestone statues of the family of Chephren from the Galarza tomb at Giza.⁷
- (g) Seated alabaster statuette of an unnamed king (perhaps Dedefra), from the Ptah Temple at Mitrahineh. Height, 64 cm.⁸
- (h) Seated granite statuette of Neweserra (Dynasty V) from the Ptah Temple at Mitrahineh.⁹
- (i) Lower part of standing granite statue of Neweserra, with the right hand closed on hip and the left arm probably on breast, found in the lake at Karnak by Legrain;¹⁰ height, 61 cm. Of dark stone.
- (j) Seated alabaster statue of Menkauwhor (Dynasty V), wrapped in *heb-sed* garment, from the Ptah Temple at Mitrahineh; height, 48 cm.¹¹
- (k) Basis of a seated statuette of Pepy (Dynasty VI) bought at Kom-el-Ahmar; grey stone; height, 26 cm.¹²
- (l) Standing copper pair of Pepy I and his son, from Hierakonpolis; the king a little more than life-size; right hand closed at right hip, left extended holding staff; prince with both hands closed at hips.¹³

With two exceptions, the alabaster statue of Menkauwhor (*j*) and the copper statue of Pepy I (*l*), these royal figures show the same attitude as the Mycerinus statues. The variation in the Menkauwhor statue is due to the fact that he is represented in the garment of the *heb-sed* festival. The Pepy statue is of metal and presents a tradition derived from sculpture in wood, not stone.¹⁴

¹ See list on p. 109.

³ Borchardt, *Cat. Gen., Statuen*, Nos. 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, and 41.

⁵ *L. c.*, No. 11.

⁷ Daressy, *Annales*, X, pp. 41-49.

⁹ *L. c.*, No. 38.

¹¹ Borchardt, *l. c.*, No. 40.

¹³ Quibell, *Hierakonpolis, II*, Pl. L.

² Petrie, *Abydos II*, Pl. XIII.

⁴ *L. c.*, No. 16.

⁶ *L. c.*, No. 42.

⁸ Borchardt, i, No. 39.

¹⁰ Legrain, *Cat. Gen., Statues*, No. 42003.

¹² *L. c.*, No. 43.

¹⁴ The upper part of an alabaster statue published by Professor Petrie in *Ancient Egypt*, 1923, Part I, is not included in the above list of royal statues. It is not of the workmanship of the statues of Dynasty IV and is certainly not a portrait of Mycerinus, as any one will perceive who compares it with our plates. The absence of the uraeus, the nondescript feathered garment on the back, the careful sparing of the face from damage, all raise grave suspicions of the genuineness of the piece. Personally I am of the opinion that the piece is a modern forgery. Professor Petrie refrains from informing us when and where it was purchased or by whom.

(C) ATTITUDES IN PRIVATE STATUES OF DYNASTIES V AND VI

The seated attitude and the standing attitude are usual in the stone statues and statuettes of Dynasties V and VI. The chief variation is in the attitude of the seated figure and consists in turning the closed right hand over so that the knuckles are upward. In Borchardt's catalogue of the statues in the Cairo Museum, 61 Old Kingdom figures have the traditional attitude while 36 present the variation just mentioned. The standing attitude is almost universal in stone figures (34 single and 10 in groups), while the attitude of the Pepy statue is traditional in wooden figures (9 examples). In the group attitudes of the Old Kingdom there is a great variation. The attitude of the slate pair is repeated by two groups in the Cairo Museum.¹ Of the twelve other groups, many similarities may be observed in the attitudes of the triads, Nos. 9-14, and other similarities may well have been represented in the triads which have been destroyed.² Thus it may be said in general that the attitudes of the Mycerinus and the Chephren statues were the prevailing traditional types for royal persons and subjects used by the sculptors of Dynasties V and VI.

(D) CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER OF ATTITUDES USED BY EGYPTIAN SCULPTORS

The figures and statues cited in this and the preceding section show clearly that three different positions of the hands and arms were traditional at three different periods:

- (1) The *left* hand on the front of the body is characteristic of all the so-called "archaic" statues which date from Dynasty III and probably as late as the reign of Sneferuw. This was one of the attitudes of the ivory figures of the Early Dynastic Period, the true archaic period.
- (2) The *right* hand on the front of the body is characteristic of Cheops statues and was probably the tradition during his reign.³
- (3) The right hand closed on the right knee of the seated statue with the left hand open on the left knee first appears in the royal statues of Chephren. The standing statue of the same period had the arms hanging and the hands closed at the hips, thumb forward.

The wooden statues of Dynasties V and VI often followed the traditional standing and seated attitudes in stone.⁴ But these are to be regarded as mere substitutes for stone statues, and the special attitude in wood of the standing statue of a man was that of the Sheikh-el-Beled. There are at least nine examples of this attitude among the statues of the Cairo Museum and many others are known. The wooden statues of women and children did not differ in attitude from the stone statues.

(E) INFLUENCE OF THE STATUES OF CHEPHREN AND MYCERINUS ON PRIVATE STATUES OF DYNASTIES V AND VI

There are 100 seated figures of men in the Cairo Museum of the Old Kingdom, including those in groups. Of these, 60 follow the traditional Chephren position and 36 present only a slight variation in the position of the closed right hand, which is turned palm down instead of with the thumb up. Of these 36, at least 31 were from Saqqarah and are to be dated to Dynasty V. I suggest that they were made by one sculptor or a small group of sculptors who lived at Memphis and had adopted this slight variation from the Giza tradition. The Giza tradition was probably the official tradition, as the only royal statue of Dynasty V, that of Neweserra (*h*, above), presents the Chephren attitude. After deducting these two groups, the 60 of the Giza school and the 36 of the Saqqarah school, only four of the 100 statues remain which present other variations. In two of these it is the left hand which is closed on the knee and in two (one of them from Abydos) both hands are closed.⁵ The male standing figures and the seated female single figures present almost no variations. Two of the single standing statues of women have the left foot slightly advanced like the queen in the Mycerinus slate pair; and one female in a standing pair statue with a man has her hands closed at her side like her male companion.⁶

¹ Borchardt, *l. c.*, Nos. 105 and 151.

² See Borchardt, *l. c.*, Nos. 6, 22, 101, 151, 158, 55, 89, 125, 84, 95, 100, 105, 107, 123. It is to be noted that in No. 107, the man standing holds with his left hand the right elbow of the seated woman, his mother.

³ The statue of Zoser found by Mr. C. M. Firth at the Step Pyramid in 1924 shows this same attitude in Dynasty III.

⁴ See Borchardt, *l. c.*, Nos. 148 and 380, seated; Nos. 125, 155, and 270 standing.

⁵ See Borchardt, *l. c.*, Nos. 64, 87, 102, and 219.

⁶ See *l. c.*, Nos. 271, 274, and 275.

(F) SUMMARY

The present evidence is fairly clear. Two of the dated pieces, those of Nezemankh and of King Khasekhem, have wooden chairs and the left arm in front of the body but are of very different workmanship. That of Zoser, having also a wooden chair, has the right arm in front of the body. The Khasekhem and Zoser figures present the royal work of Dynasty III, and the Nezemankh statuettes the private work of the same period. There is no good reason for dating any of the other archaic statuettes previous to this period. It is quite possible that no hard stone statuettes, royal or private, were made before Dynasty III, or at any rate before the last two reigns of Dynasty II, but the evidence does not force that conclusion. The royal statues of Dynasty III (Zoser and Khasekhem) show that a few royal craftsmen had already attained the power of carving very good and probably fairly life-like portraits. It is to be presumed that they made figures of almost all of the kings of that dynasty. The lesser craftsmen, taking granite as their favorite material, met the demand of the official class with a much ruder product, which imitated the attitudes and the forms of the royal statuettes. The statues of Redyzet and Sepa on the other hand are of a much more tractable material (limestone) and are probably from the end of the dynasty or from the time of Sneferuw.¹ The next step is presented by the limestone statues of Prince Rahotep and his wife Nofert, who were of the family of Sneferuw but were probably interred in the reign of Cheops, which exhibit many of the high qualities of Egyptian sculpture at its best.

The craftsmen of the time of Cheops, and perhaps a little earlier, gave their seated statues a new form, so that clearly in that time the archaic tradition was not felt to be binding. As far as our present evidence goes, it was the sculptor or the group of sculptors who worked for Chephren and then for Mycerinus, who found a form more acceptable to the Egyptian court of that day as conveying the correct impression of royalty. Chephren, for whom the first work was executed by this new school, had 22 or 23 life-size statues in his Valley Temple alone, and probably as many more in his Pyramid Temple, while the many fragments of smaller statues indicate a total of between 100 and 200. Mycerinus had perhaps even more. The triads alone must have numbered 42. Thus between 200 and 400 statues and statuettes, mostly of alabaster and diorite, were carved, probably by a single generation of sculptors. These craftsmen must have had a large number of apprentices, who would become master sculptors in the course of such abundant employment. Thus Dynasty V opened with a numerous school of sculptors trained in the workshops of Chephren and Mycerinus. At the same time the development of stone architecture during the building of the pyramids of Dynasty IV led to an extensive exploitation of the quarries, especially of the beds of fine white limestone at Turah, and had produced improved methods of cutting stone and created a great body of expert quarrymen and transport workers. For all practical purposes, the pyramid workshops were great schools of the crafts and laid the foundations for the development of sculpture and architecture in the following periods.

The creation of a large body of sculptors and the provision of the soft white limestone of Turah, reduced the cost of making statues and created all the circumstances which permitted, almost forced, the great expansion of Egyptian sculpture in Dynasties V and VI. Every great official at Giza and Saqqarah had his life-size portrait statues placed in his tomb, and practically every minor official managed to obtain statues of some sort. Farther away from the capital city, statues and statuettes occur infrequently. Never again were so many statues made in any period of Egyptian art, and never again were statues within the reach of persons of moderate means. The sculptors naturally copied the forms of their masters, the creators of the statues of Chephren and Mycerinus, and except for the one slight innovation of the craftsmen of Saqqarah, these forms became the traditions of Egypt of the Old Kingdom.

It is curious that so few of the statues of the kings of Dynasty V have been found. The *serdabs* of the pyramid temples of Abusir must have contained numbers of statues. The German expedition which excavated the pyramids at Abusir found only one small fragment, the mouth of a nearly life-size and beautifully modelled statue in alabaster in the Sun Temple of Weserkaf, but discovered five statue-

¹ It was the use of the soft fine-grained Turah limestone, which permitted the expansion of Egyptian sculpture in Dynasty V, after the great activity in hard stone in Dynasty IV.

niches in each of the pyramid temples as well as storerooms with wide floor areas. These temples, like the pyramid temple of Chephren, had been inwardly greatly destroyed, and the statues which they once contained, had been exposed to the destructive inclinations of the local inhabitants for thousands of years. Thus, the few examples of royal statues of this period come from elsewhere.¹

In later times, after the Old Kingdom, the attitude of the standing statue persisted to the very end as the predominating type. The seated statues of the Middle Kingdom and the New Kingdom generally followed the Saqqarah variation with the right hand turned down. Other forms were also introduced, and the pages of catalogues, such as Legrain's great find at Karnak, present a variety of attitudes in contrast to the almost monotonous material of Borchardt's catalogue of the statues of the Old Kingdom.

6. THE COLORING OF THE MYCERINUS STATUES

The traces left on the statues of Mycerinus, in particular on the slate pair and the triads, prove that all his statues were painted or intended to be painted in the ordinary conventional colors of the Old Kingdom private statues. The best examples of this coloring are perhaps the statues of Rahotep and his wife, Nofert, from Medûm, and now in the Cairo Museum.² When the coloring was perfect, the material of which the statue was made was of course indistinguishable, and the examples of limestone statues show that the finer modelling was slightly obscured. From a modern artistic point of view the coloring of ancient statues seems a denial of artistic appreciation, and there is no doubt that artistic appreciation was not considered in the intent of the sculptor. He was a realist producing a practical implement, according to the ideas of the time, for securing a satisfactory future life to the man portrayed. The portrait must be a replica of the man in order properly to serve his spirit after death. For that purpose the color was essential, and, if it was laid on with an elementary sense of the use of paint, at any rate it supplied those qualities which, to the Egyptian eye and mind, were necessary to complete an image of the man or woman. A few of the statues were placed in the open rooms of the temple, but most of them were interned in cells in the masonry, never to be seen after they were set in place.

7. COMPARISON OF THE PORTRAITS OF MYCERINUS AND CHEPHREN

The statues Nos. 1, 9-12, 17, 18, and 22 offer eight portraits of Mycerinus for comparison. The identification of all of them is certain. Six directly by inscriptions, No. 22 by its attribution to the inscribed basis No. 19, and No. 17, the slate pair, by its unfinished condition and its provenience. In addition to these eight, the youthful head is possibly also a portrait of Mycerinus, belonging to inscribed basis No. 21. The head of the small diorite statuette found at Memphis and those of the statuettes of the Mycerinus Valley Temple, are of secondary importance.

Of the queen of Mycerinus, Khamerernebt II, the face in the slate pair is the only one which is actually a portrait. But in all periods, the Egyptian craftsmen represented the faces of the gods and goddesses in the likeness of the king, "the good god" who ruled Egypt, and his queen. Thus the face of the Theban nome in triad No. 10 is similar to the face of Mycerinus in the same triad, and the faces of the goddess Hathor and the female nomes are patently the face of the queen in the slate pair. Thus in reality the seven faces of the goddesses and nomes in the four triads may be counted as portraits of the queen.

The first point which strikes the attention is that no two of the principal portraits of Mycerinus are exact duplicates. The three large alabaster statues, Nos. 1, 18, and 22, present a certain general resemblance, especially about the mouth with its full and slightly drooping lower lip; but the face is wider and more rounded in No. 1 than in No. 18, and in No. 22, it is almost corpulent. The four faces of the king in the triads, which are smaller but vary little in size, also differ from one another, although all have the drooping lower lip, the round nose, and the bulging eyes of Mycerinus. The face in the triad of the Hare-nome, No. 9, is nearly like that of the great alabaster statue, No. 1; but the other three have lines

¹ The seated statue of Neweserra, Cairo Museum, No. 38; the seated *heb-sed* statue of Menkauwhor, Cairo, No. 40; and the lower part of the statue of Neweserra, Cairo, No. 420003. There are also several statuettes dedicated by kings of the Middle Kingdom, which bear the names of kings of Dynasty V.

² Borchardt, *l. c.*, Nos. 3 and 4.

or modelling about the mouth and a higher arching of the eyebrows, which give those faces a leaner and more severe expression. Now the face of the king in the slate pair is of the severe type of the three triads Nos. 10–12 and is most nearly like that of No. 12; and all these five examples of the leaner type of face have the drooping underlip, the rounded nose, and the bulging eyes of the other portraits. The conclusion seems obvious to me that the portraits of Mycerinus present two versions of the king's face, such as would be most plausibly ascribed to two different sculptors. I designate hereafter the two versions of the face and the two sculptors by the letters A (the severe type) and B (the softer rounded type).

Now the examples of type B in the alabaster statues Nos. 1, 18, and 22 present minor variations as noted above, and the same may be said of the examples of type A in the slate triads and the pair statue. The variations in the examples of B, if the youthful head, No. 23, be taken as a portrait of Mycerinus, would seem to present the face of the king in four different stages of his life from youth to full maturity (35–40 years old). But the variations in the examples of B seem to favor another explanation. The alabaster statue, No. 18, was manifestly not far advanced in state VII, when it was hastily polished and inscribed merely with the name of the king. The only alabaster head which was completely finished was No. 22. It seems therefore that the variations in type B were partly due to the unfinished condition of the statues. In general the variations in both groups appear to me to be due to the different degrees of care which were devoted to the working up of the details in state VII. In the case of type A, I suspect that the triads lacked the touch of the master, at any rate in the case of triad No. 10.

The portrait of Chephren is now known from five faces, the face of the Great Sphinx, that of the famous diorite statue, the smaller face of the slate statue (Borchardt's No. 15), the quarter-size face of the alabaster statue from Memphis (Borchardt's No. 41), and probably the diorite face from the Siglin Excavations at the Second Pyramid (*Chephren*, Blatt XIV). Other fragments from the Siglin excavations and from those of the Harvard-Boston expedition are probably also parts of the face of Chephren statuettes. These faces of Chephren present a family resemblance to the faces of Mycerinus as does also the face of the Chephren queen (Siglin fragment No. 56) to the queen of Mycerinus; and I have no doubt that Chephren was the father of Mycerinus and his queen (Khamerernebtly I) the mother of the queen of Mycerinus (Khamerernebtly II). But the faces of the two kings have distinct differences, for the faces of Chephren have higher cheek bones and more slender jaws.

Now the portraits of Chephren show again two versions of the face differentiated like the two versions of the face of Mycerinus. The larger statues, the Sphinx, the great diorite statue, and the slate statue, present the lean severe face of type A of Mycerinus while the alabaster statue and the diorite head (Siglin fragment No. 1) have the softer contours of type B. Yet the examples of both types of the Chephren portrait differ from the examples of the corresponding types of Mycerinus. It may be added that these differences are not caused by the varying qualities of the stones of which the statues were made, as both style A and style B occur in the same three stones, alabaster, diorite, and slate, although style B occurs more often in alabaster in the Mycerinus statues. Thus the examination of the Chephren portraits strengthens the conclusion that the two styles A and B arose from the individual characteristics of two different sculptors and leads to the further deduction that these two sculptors, or at least they and their pupils, worked for both Chephren and Mycerinus.

I would assign to sculptor A, the creator of the more severe type of portrait, the following works:

1. The Great Sphinx, cut in the natural nummulitic limestone.
2. The famous diorite statue of Chephren found in the Chephren Valley Temple and now in the Cairo Museum.
3. The slate statue of Chephren, found with No. 2.
4. Various fragments from Chephren pyramid temple,¹ No. 7 of alabaster, and perhaps No. 2 of hard stone. Also alabaster fragments found by the Harvard-Boston Expedition in workshops in the great cemetery, associated with fragments bearing the name of Chephren.
5. The beautiful slate pair of Mycerinus and the queen, No. 17, in my list.
6. Mycerinus triad, No. 10, slate.
7. Mycerinus triad, No. 11, slate.
8. Mycerinus triad, No. 12, slate.

¹ See Borchardt in Hoelscher, *Chephren*, pp. 92–104.

Perhaps by apprentices of A:

9. The very small head in pink limestone from Chephren pyramid temple.¹
10. The Mycerinus statuette, No. 37, fine hard white-veined red stone.

To sculptor B, whose works are softer and more delicately modelled, I would assign the following:

1. The alabaster statue of Chephren, found at Memphis.
2. The Siglin head, probably Chephren, diorite.²
3. Various fragments of the Siglin Expedition, probably Chephren.³
4. The great statue of Mycerinus, No. 1, alabaster.
5. The complete statue of Mycerinus, No. 18 (in Cairo), alabaster.
6. The finished statue, Nos. 19+22, of Mycerinus, alabaster.
7. The youthful head of Mycerinus or Shepseskaf, No. 23, alabaster.
8. The Mycerinus triad, No. 9, slate.

Perhaps by his apprentices:

9. The small statuette of Mycerinus from Memphis, diorite.
10. The unfinished statuettes of Mycerinus, Nos. 32, 35, 36, and perhaps the whole series Nos. 25-31, all of diorite.

Thus in the reign of Chephren, the larger statues of the king known to us are by sculptor A, while in the reign of Mycerinus, the larger statues, except the slate pair which is less than life-size, are by sculptor B. It may perhaps be concluded that sculptor A was the elder and was chief sculptor in the time of Chephren, that the great activity of sculptor B was in the reign of Mycerinus; but the examples of statues preserved to us are only a small part of the large number made for these two kings.

Unfortunately no stone statue of Sneferuw or of Cheops has been yet brought to light to enable us to carry the history of the statuary of this great period a step further back. The fragments found by M. Chassinat at Abu Roash show, I think, that one at least of the same men worked for Radedef as for Chephren and Mycerinus. The statues of Prince Rahotep and his wife Nofert from Medûm are in limestone, a much more tractable material than the slate, alabaster, and diorite of the Chephren and Mycerinus statues. Nevertheless they were probably the work of the royal sculptor of the time of Cheops and as far as can now be seen should represent the style of the immediate predecessor of sculptors A and B. It is possible that the first statues of great excellence in hard materials were made by this predecessor; but if not, the art of the delicate modelling of hard-stone portraits was created by one of the two Chephren sculptors, probably by A.

The most striking result of the above examination of the portraits of Chephren and Mycerinus is the conclusion that sculptor A carved three of the greatest known works of Egyptian art:

The Great Sphinx.

The famous Chephren statue in diorite.

The beautiful slate pair of Mycerinus and Queen Khamerernebtj II.

As manifested by these works, this nameless sculptor A was a very great and courageous artist who probably exercised a decisive influence on Egyptian sculpture in this period. The sculptor B, his pupil or his rival whichever he may have been, was perhaps a greater craftsman even than A. The wonderful modelling of the faces in his alabaster statues of Mycerinus surpasses that of the faces carved by A, and his treatment of the muscles, tendons, and patella in the knees of the large alabaster statue of Mycerinus (No. 1) is unexampled in the history of Egyptian art. Judging solely by the material now available, sculptor A appears to me to be a roadbreaker, not so much an idealist as the creator of the formula of a type of face which influenced all his work. Sculptor B, in spite of the softness and plasticity of his work, was a realist, striving for a life-like portrait of the face he was reproducing. Whatever may have gone before them, these two men were without doubt the teachers of the swarm of sculptors in the round who flourished in Dynasty V, and were responsible for the great expansion of Egyptian statuary which followed immediately on their activity under Chephren and Mycerinus.

¹ See Borchardt, *l. c.*, No. 3.

² See Borchardt, *l. c.*, No. 1.

³ See Borchardt, *l. c.*, No. 5, diorite, and No. 8, alabaster.