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THE STRIDING STATUE OF PEHENPTAH (JE 44609)

MARIANNE EATON-KRAUSS
Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Science and Humanities

Three statues inscribed for Pehenptah, scribe of royal documents, derive from the serdab of his tomb at Giza:\(^1\) a striding statue in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo, which is the subject per se of this article, a dyad in Vienna, and a triad in Boston. Each of these sculptures represents an unusual statue type.

The dyad\(^2\) depicts Pehenptah striding beside his mother Imendjefas who stands to his left, her feet together. Sculptures representing a woman with an adult son are rare. In his monograph on non-royal funerary statuary of the Old Kingdom, Anwar Shoukry mentioned neither Pehenptah's dyad nor his triad (see below), citing only a single example, in Cairo.\(^3\) Made up of CG 107+312, it was commissioned by a man for his mother and presumably intended for her tomb. A group in Hildesheim (Roemer-Pelizaeus Museum Inv. 17) is another statue depicting a woman with an adult son: the king's acquaintance Pepy is flanked by her sons, both named Rashepses, one a child and the other an adult.\(^4\) Whether the two adult male figures in CG 101, a pseudo-group,\(^5\)

---

1 G 5280 (=2320): *PM III* (2nd ed., here and below), p. 158. For the possibility that the serdab housed additional sculpture, see E. Brovarski, “A Triad for Pehenptah,” *Essays in honour of Prof. Dr. Jadwiga Lipinska* (hereafter: *Fs Lipinska*), Joanna Aksamit et al., eds. (Warsaw, 1997), pp. 264–69, and Note 46, below.


3 *Die Privatgrabstatue im Alten Reich*, SASAE 15 (Cairo, 1951), p. 149. Discussing statues depicting children with one parent, E. Feucht, *Das Kind im alten Ägypten: Die Stellung des Kindes in Familie und Gesellschaft nach altägyptischen Texten und Darstellungen* (Frankfurt and New York, 1995), pp. 406–10, does not mention the Vienna dyad; nor does she cite the triad from Pehenptah's tomb or the statue of Rawer with his parents (see infra, P. 00) when she considers statuary representing both parents with their child(ren) (*ibid.*, pp. 400–406).


5 “Pseudo-Groups,” pp. 62–63, 74 (cat. 29); contrast the description of the statue as a family group, in *Egyptian Art in the Age of the Pyramids* (exh. cat.; New York, 1999), pp. 378–79 (cat. 32). This, the
depict the spouse or son of the woman whom they flank is moot, since the inscriptions identify only the man by name and title, without indicating his relationship to her.

The triad from Pehenptah's tomb, like the Vienna dyad, represents him as a grown man together with his mother and another adult male. In my study of pseudo-groups, I suggested that the second man is also Pehenptah, adding yet another example to the genre. The statue depicts Imendjefas flanked by the virtually identical adult males, all on the same scale. An inscription identifies the man at her right whom she embraces as her son, but the label for the isolated figure to her left is not preserved.

Slawomir Rzepka initially challenged my interpretation of the triad in an article about rock-cut statuary, and subsequently in the context of his study devoted to pseudo-groups. He contends that it is "more logical" to identify the anonymous man as Pehenptah's father, a possibility which I mentioned but rejected.

In support of his claim, Rzepka compares Pehenptah's triad with a sculpture from the tomb of the royal hairdresser Rawer at Giza. The group, whose elements are now dispersed, showed Rawer accompanied by his son and daughter and flanked by his father and mother. The inscriptions on the statue base unequivocally supply the

English edition, should be consulted in preference to L'art égyptien au temps des pyramides (Paris, 1999) not only because the quality of the illustrations and the layout are superior, but also because it includes additional material and corrects errors in the French edition.

6 MFA 13.4330+13.4358: see now Brovarski, Fs Lipinska.
8 Reviewing my comments on the triad, Brovarski, Fs Lipinska, pp. 363-64 n. 11, notes that Reisner, in an unpublished ms on the Seshemnofer family in the archive of the Museum of Fine Arts, supposed that the second male figure represents Pehenptah's brother Rawer. Brovarski himself does not express a preference, concluding "the loss of the identifying inscription before the righthand figure has deprived us of certainty. . . ."
10 "The Pseudo-groups of the Old Kingdom - a New Interpretation," SAK 23 (1996), p. 344 where Rzepka seems to modify his earlier statement about Pehenptah's triad to accommodate his thesis about pseudo-groups: "I agree [with Eaton-Krauss] that we deal with the real pseudo-group, but at the same time it is the group of the tomb owner and his father."
11 PM III, pp. 265-69.
12 PM III, pp. 267-68; see, in particular, J. D. Cooney, "A Tentative Identification of Three Old Kingdom Sculptures," JEA 31 (1945), pp. 54-56. The torso of Rawer's mother, Worcester Art Museum 1934-48, was featured in the recent exhibition of Old Kingdom art, see Egyptian Art in the Age of the Pyramids, pp. 376-78. (cat. 131). As I noted, "Pseudo-Groups," p. 63 n. 39, the Harer Family Trust eventually acquired the figure of Rawer's daughter, but the son's figure has not resurfaced.
names and filiations of the figures. In my article, I remarked the significant discrepancy in scale between the figure of Rawer and those of his parents: Rawer is a full head taller than his father and mother. Their heads, now missing, reached only to the height of his shoulders. (Rawer's children are depicted conventionally as small-scaled, nude figures.) Obviously, the sculptor who designed the group used scale to distinguish between the generations. This fact, not mentioned by Rzepka, and the evidence provided by CG 150, a statue depicting a man in the company of his adult but considerably smaller-scaled son, corroborate my supposition that Pehenptah's triad with its same-scaled figures is a pseudo-group. It is less, rather than "more" logical to suppose that Pehenptah and his father would have been depicted at the same scale.

The third statue from Pehenptah's tomb (Plate 1) is perhaps the most remarkable of his sculptures: he is shown striding with his right leg advanced. By contrast to the headless group of Pehenptah with his mother and the fragmented triad, the striding statue is complete. This was probably the decisive factor in retaining it for the collection of the Egyptian Museum while the two other sculptures from the tomb left Egypt.

The unusual pose of Pehenptah's statue in Cairo has not attracted much attention. The fact that the right leg, rather than the left, is to the fore is not even mentioned in the terse text identifying the first illustration of the sculpture published by the

---

15 Illustrated approximately to scale as the frontispiece of JEA 31 (1945). The difference in size between Rawer and his parents is apparent from the statue base alone where his feet are noticably larger than theirs.
17 Nor can I follow the nuances of Rzepka's argument that pseudo-groups embody the ka-principle, with identical figures depicting more than one generation of the statue owner's family. Rzepka can cite no inscription on such statues that mentions the ka nor does his theory explain why, when texts are present, they label virtually identical figures by name and title as one and the same person.
18 I am indebted to Dr. Mohamed Saleh, former Director of the Egyptian Museum, for permission to study the statue and to take the photographs which illustrate this article. Jürgen Liepe improved upon my efforts, using computer technology to eliminate the distracting background from the negatives.
excavators.\textsuperscript{19} William Stevenson Smith simply stated that the right leg was advanced, without elaboration.\textsuperscript{20} My earlier assertion\textsuperscript{21} that it is the only Old Kingdom statue to reverse the standard striding pose is incorrect. There are in fact a few more examples. Nicholas Reeves has mentioned one of them\textsuperscript{22}: CG 128, the wooden statue of a nude boy, presumed to come from Giza and datable to the later Old Kingdom.\textsuperscript{23} Ludwig Borchardt's suggestion that the small figure derives from a group\textsuperscript{24} has been ignored in subsequent references to the sculpture. The boy's right leg is extended forward only slightly, by contrast to Pehenptah's statue which shows a normal stride.

A third Old Kingdom sculpture showing a male figure with the right leg advanced is now in Leipzig. The limestone statuette is significantly inferior in quality to CG 128 and JE 44609, Pehenptah's sculpture. It was excavated at Giza and is datable to the end of the Old Kingdom.\textsuperscript{25}

All the remaining statues known to me which show a man striding forward with his right leg are post-Old Kingdom. One example is the proper right figure in CG 392, the so-called \textit{Fischopferer} group of Amenemhet III, from the end of Dynasty XII.\textsuperscript{26} Another is the figure at the proper left in the fragmentary group JE 41642.\textsuperscript{27} The statue

\textsuperscript{20} \textit{History of Egyptian Sculpture and Painting in the Old Kingdom}, 2nd ed. (Boston and London, 1949), P. 54.
\textsuperscript{21} “Pseudo-Groups,” p. 59.
\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Statuen und Statuetten von Königen und Privatleuten I}, CCG (Berlin, 1911), p. 96 n. 2.
\textsuperscript{25} Leipzig 2466: \textit{PM}, III p. 113, adding R. Krauspe, \textit{Katalog ägyptischer Sammlungen in Leipzig I: Statuen und Statuetten} (Mainz, 1997), pp. 59–60 (cat. 110), pl. 50. Krauspe duly remarks the absence of a backpillar as well as the unusual attitude.
\textsuperscript{26} The reversal was not remarked by von Bissing in his description of the statue, \textit{Denkmäler ägyptischer Sculptur} (Munich, 1914), text to pl. 56.; contrast Evers, \textit{Staat aus dem Stein I}: 2, p. 111. D. Wildung, \textit{Sesostris und Amenemhet: Ägypten im Mittleren Reich} (Fribourg and Munich, 1984), p. 212, describes the anomaly as necessary “um trotz des Opferaufbaus das weite Ausschreiten des Opferenden sichtbar zu machen” - an explanation which cannot apply to any of the other examples of the posture discussed here.
\textsuperscript{27} \textit{PM} III, p. 866: Homemann, \textit{Types} no. 1367; see now D. Franke, “Die Hockerstatue des Sonbso-mei in Leiden und Statuen mit nach oben gerichteten Handflächen,” \textit{OMRO} 68 (1988), p. 70 (cat. 18). Franke does not mention the unusual attitude of the figure at the proper left.
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depicts a kneeling man with his hands, palms-up, on his lap, flanked by two small-
scaled striding figures. It is not securely dated within the time-span late Dynasty XVIII-
Dynasty XIX. Reeves cites the approximately contemporary group Boston MFA 00.690 from Abydos.28 Within a naos-like frame, the owner Menmaatre-em-heb strides slightly forward with his right foot; his wife stands to his left with her feet side by side.

Bernard V. Bothmer believed that the Twenty-fifth Dynasty sculpture Louvre A 49 depicting a striding man with his right foot forward was unique,29 but that is not so, as the preceeding paragraphs demonstrate. Undoubtedly, yet more examples exist. Pascal Vernus recognized that Bothmer's example, Louvre A 49, derives from a group.30 The figure stood at the proper left of a second identically-scaled adult male31 who epitomizes convention by striding forward with the left leg.

Bothmer included his comment as a footnote to remarks on the exceptional posture of CG 1040, a semi-prostrate statue of Osorkon II. The king kneels on his right knee while his left leg extends out behind him, and so "reverses the attitude of most other known sculptures of this type."32 In that context, Bothmer noted that Jacques Vandier's list of such statues showing men kneeling on the right knee, rather than left, inflates their number by including depictions of statuary in relief and painting. The representations cannot be presumed to reflect the disposition of limbs in actual statuary since the conventions for two-dimensional art dictated that the far leg be advanced, i.e., the right leg in leftwards oriented figures and the left in figures facing rightwards. For

30 P. Vernus, Athribis, BdE 74 (Cairo, 1978), pp. 63–65 (doc. 73). I am indebted to Elisabeth Delanges for providing bibliographical information on the sculpture which will be included in Oliver Perdu's forthcoming publication of Late Period statuary in the Louvre.
this reason, the earliest certain evidence for a statue showing the subject kneeling on the right knee dates to the reign of Amenhotep III, not to the reign of Tuthmosis III as Vandier supposed on the basis of a representation of statues in the paintings of Rekhmire's tomb, TT 100. In addition to a steatite statuette of Amenhotep III, mentioned by Bothmer in a postscript, there is a similarly-scaled figure in sandstone depicting the official Merymery grinding corn which shows him half-kneeling before the quern on his right knee. In a second statuette of Merymery in the same material and depicting him engaged in the same activity, he kneels on his left knee. An unfinished statuette of Akhenaten from Amarna depicts the king offering incense in a semi-prostrate pose kneeling on his right knee. Apparently this figure, along with the statuette of Amenhotep III and the representations in TT 100, influenced Emma Brunner-Traut and Hellmut Brunner to suppose that the statue from which a lifesized bust of Akhenaten in Tübingen derives showed him kneeling on his right knee, his left leg stretch out behind him. In fact, the configuration of the bust does not support the Brunners' reconstruction of the statue as a semi-prostrate figure. Four small-scaled, later examples of the genre show a king half-kneeling on his left knee; all of them come from the Karnak cachette.

Symmetry will have inspired the sculptor to show the right-leg/knee forward in the compositions of CG 392, JE 41642, Louvre A 49+Berlin 8803, and Leiden AST 30a/b; it may have been a factor in other cases. But symmetry can hardly have provided

---

32 JEA 46, p. 8.
34 AST 30a: Hornemann, Types 548.
35 Leiden AST 30b: Hornemann, Types 546; for both statuettes, see PM III, p. 705.
37 Ägyptologische Sammlung der Universität Tübingen (Mainz, 1981), pp. 35-36, with illustration of the bust (Inv. 1685) on pls. 74–77. The reconstruction drawing (unnumbered) is found on p. 35.
38 In a forthcoming study, C. E. Loeben demonstrates that the sculpture showed the king lying on his stomach, not half-kneeling.
39 CG 42142-44 (Ramesses II) and CG 42197 (Osorkon III).
40 Cf. also the symmetrical gesture of the arms in the pseudö-group JE 66620: Hassan, Giza I, pl. LXXII.
the impulse for the sculptor of Pehenptah's striding statue to depict the right leg forward, even if he had known that the statue would eventually stand at the proper left of the dyad depicting Pehenptah striding conventionally forward with his left foot beside his mother.  

All three sculptures from Pehenptah's serdab were created in the same workshop. They share the same “exaggerated modelling” of the leg muscles which Smith termed unusual in the case of the striding figure. The preserved faces of the triad and of the striding statue (Plate 2) show the same simplified, flat treatment of surface, with no hint of underlying bone- and muscle-structure. This is not a stylistic device, but rather indicative of the sculptor’s relative incompetence. The rendering of wide-open eyes and plastic brows is identical, as are the broad, straight mouths with lips of unvarying thickness. An appropriate adjective for describing the carving of these heads is clumsy.

Smith postulated a relationship between Pehenptah's statues and the sculptures of Penmeru from the serdab of G 2197; the quality of the latter is, however, better. By contrast, the similarity which Smith thought he could detect between Pehenptah's statuary and the Nekhebuw group (from G 2381) is illusory. Nekhebuw's sculptures exemplify the Second Style of Old Kingdom sculpture. Edna R. Russmann enumerated the salient features of such heads to include very large, wide-open eyes dominating a face which tapers sharply towards the chin, prominent naso-labial folds or ridges, and thick lips. These characteristics are not present in the faces of Pehenptah's statues.

---

41 See the in situ photo of the serdab, Brovarski, Fs Lipinska, pl. XLVII:2.
42 History of Egyptian Sculpture and Painting, p. 54.
43 Cf. Smith's description of the face of JE 44609, History of Egyptian Sculpture and Painting, p. 54.
44 See also Brovarski, Fs Lipinska, p. 271.
46 I exclude one head found in Pehenptah's serdab from consideration. It is illustrated by Smith, History of Egyptian Sculpture and Painting, pl. 26b, alongside the sculptures of Nekhebuw. Formerly in the Museum of Fine Arts, the head was deaccessioned in 1978 when it was acquired for a private collection; see Brovarski, Fs Lipinska, pp. 268–69 who discusses the reasons for doubting that the head once belonged to the original contents of the serdab.
Nor do the proportions of Pehenptah's torso in both his striding figures have anything in common with Second Style bodies; rather, they conform to the classical Old Kingdom standard. Pehenptah's mother is thin, disproportionately so in the triad, with spindly arms, small hands and long, thin fingers, but these features should not be construed to imply that the sculptor was working in the Second Style. They reflect instead his lack of interest, compounded by the same lack of skill evident in his inept carving of the statues' faces. If Pehenptah was a contemporary of Neuserre, the sculptor of his statuary was typical of his times at the Giza necropolis. But if his father Seshemnofer I, the owner of G 4940, was vizier during the reign of Redjedef, as Nadine Cherpion proposes, then the sculptures of Pehenptah and their creator are anomalies.

47 Cf., too, the conspicuous muscularity of Pehenptah's arms, as well as of his legs, in the dyad remarked by Jaros-Deckert and Rogge, CAA Wien 15, p. 45.
48 Cf. the similarly proportioned female figure flanked by two men in the pseudo-group CG 101 (Note 5, above), and contrast Russmann's characterization of the rendering of male bodies in the Second-Style, MDAIK 51, pp. 269–70.
50 See Russmann, MDAIK 51, p. 276.
51 Mastabas hypogées d'Ancien Empire. Le problème de la datation (Brussels, 1989), 109, 115 n. 216, 234.
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