

GÖTTINGER MISZELLEN

Beiträge zur ägyptologischen Diskussion

Heft 117/118

Göttingen 1990

ISSN 0344-385 X

Herausgegeben
von Mitarbeitern des Seminars für Ägyptologie
und Koptologie der Universität Göttingen

Für dieses Heft presserechtlich verantwortlich:

Christa Müller

Druck: Alfa-Druck GmbH, Göttingen

Einzelverkaufspreis dieses Heftes im Direktbezug:
DM 8,00 zuzüglich Versandkosten

INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

Technische Hinweise	4
Vorbemerkung	5
MISZELLEN	
E. el-Banna: Une nécropole inédite d'époque archaïque découverte, près de Héliouan, au Sud du Caire	7
W.Barta: Der Palasthorustitel und seine Vorläufer in der Frühzeit	55
H.Beinlich: Spätzeitquellen zu den Gauen Unterägyptens ...	59
A.O.Bolshakov: The Ideology of the Old Kingdom Portrait ..	89
L.Bongrani Fanfoni: On a Re-employed Quartzite Block of the Pharaonic Age	143
A.Dodson: King Amenmesse at Riqqa	153
E.Doetsch-Amberger: Ein Uschebti-Aufseher	157
J.M.Galán: A Remark on Calculations of Area in the Rhind Mathematical Papyrus	161
K.Jansen-Winkel: Zu den biographischen Texten der 3. Zwischenzeit	165
F.Kammerzell: Funktion und Form. Zur Opposition von Perfekt und Pseudopartizip im Alt- und Mittelägyptischen	181
A.M. Shaheen: EB III-MB I Axe in the Egyptian Private Middle Kingdom Tombs: An Assessment	203
S.P.Vleeming: Transliterating Old Egyptian in Demotic ...	219

Andrey O. Bolshakov

***The Ideology
of the Old Kingdom Portrait***

The problems connected with representing human individuality in Egyptian art have been elaborated very long ago, essentially, throughout the history of egyptology. The spectrum of opinions here has been very wide - from unreserved acknowledgement of a number of statues as portrait masterpieces to equally unreserved denial of portrait art as such in Egypt. The co-existence of such polar viewpoints is to be explained by a complex character of the problem which at the same time possesses both aesthetical and ideological, weltanschaulich aspects. This or other phenomenon in the sphere of arts cannot be explained only by ideology, or only by the sum of skills, methods, technologies which were used by the masters, or, finally, by their experience or talent - here we have all these numerous factors closely interwoven and their resultant force is both mass work typical of each epoch and masterpieces standing out of the general number. Unfortunately, the present-day specialization of science leads to the fact that problems unitary in their essence, become split, their analysis inevitably becoming one-sided, not covering all the peculiarity of Egyptian reality. Historians of art are inclined to underestimate the significance of ideology, while those studying Weltanschauung and religion usually do not reach the artistic realization of ideas studied by them. There is no doubt that the problem of

portraiture cannot be solved without complex approach, and that developing of such approach has long become an urgent task.

At this, ideology is certain to be the starting point. It should be understood, of course, that such position does not in the least mean that the author renounces all that was said above and does not wish to regard Egyptian art as art proper, a relatively independent field of social consciousness. It is merely that fully recognizing the great significance of the artist's creative individuality we cannot but admit that in antiquity, with its especially utilitarian approach to what we now call art, any artistic creation is a functionally directed manifestation of the ideas of weltanschaulich character. In other words, it is materialization of bodiless ideas of ideal world in the world of humans, that is, as a rule, undertaken with ritual aims - in order to create objects of cult. Dealing with such materialization the artist will inevitably reveal his creative "ego", but only within the limits put by the essence of weltanschaulich ideas and requirements of the cult. Therefore, the crux of the phenomenon of Egyptian portrait can be explained only by taking ideology as a starting point and by adding to it the purely artistic aspects of the problem, but not the reverse. This is what predetermines the specificity of our work.

Neither accidental is the choice of material for the study undertaken - private monuments of the Old Kingdom: it is in them that all the ideas stand out in their purest form. Besides that, after the Old Kingdom (during the I Intermediate Period and in the Middle Kingdom) the quality of portrayal of private persons declines, primarily affecting the representation of individuality; the sculpture of the New Kingdom instead of depicting individuality prefers imitating the features of the ruling king; the Amarna portrait and the post-Amarna art influenced by it are a quite exclusive phenomenon; the problems of Saite, Ptolemaic and Roman-Egyptian portrait are also fairly specific. As to the royal sculpture, - a serious mark had been left on it by the ideas of a peculiar entity of the king (for instance, his body, in spite

of his face being individualized, is always portrayed quite conventionally), and this is why we refuse to analyse it here.

Throughout three thousand years, despite the inevitable changes in tastes and iconography, the Egyptian artists depicted humans almost in one and the same way. Men were always of powerful build, with broad shoulders and narrow hips; women ever slender, with small breasts and wasp waist. The faces of both of them possess extremely regular, by Egyptian measures, features. These are not concrete persons, but copies of ideal models, multiplied and devoid of individuality. The age of the depicted humans is also standardized. They are always shown at the prime of their youth and strength, even in cases when it is positively known that some certain man had lived till a very old age. More than that, if some scene depicts representatives of different generations, all of them have equally young appearance. At this, their youth is quite conventional: we can never tell what was that ideal age which the artist intended to show. It is only clear that it is not great.

And yet, along with a countless number of conventional images, in all the epochs there are found attempts of representing individual features and even real portraits (in sculpture).¹ Their number is small, they are exceptions to the general rule; however, their very existence is so significant that we in no way can ignore them, because in the totally ideologized art of antiquity any possibility of some phenomena usually means their necessity and cannot be explained as something accidental.

¹ Sometimes such images are called realistic /Capart, 1920; 1921; Matthieu, 1947b; and others/; this term, however, is obviously unsuitable for characterizing the monuments of extreme antiquity which did not know any "-isms". Further we shall use the terms "conventional", "idealized" and "individualized", "non-idealized" images.

ATTEMPTS OF REPRESENTING INDIVIDUALITY ON MURAL PICTURES

First of all, a question of a criterion arises on the basis of which it would be possible to speak about the fact that in some concrete cases the artist had aimed at reproducing real features. The most demonstrative results could be given by comparing the image with the mummy or with the bone remains of the person depicted. Unfortunately, such cases are not typical of the Old Kingdom as the bodies of the deceased have remained only in several decorated tombs (but see footnote 38). Useful, if ambiguous information can be found here, though. For example, the relief images and the statue of the queen $Mr(j)-s(j)-^c nh(.w)$ III lack the most characteristic feature known from her skull - the elongated occipital part of the head /Dunham, Simpson, 1974, fig.3ab, 6-7, 12, pl.17ab, 16d/. It follows that any portrayal is out of the question here. To make up for it, $H^c(j).f-hw(j).f-w(j)$ I who belonged to the same family and probably had some family likeness with $Mr(j)-s(j)-^c nh(.w)$ III was depicted with his head stretched out /Smith, 1949, pl.43a; Simpson, 1978, pl.16b, fig.27/ - this is rather an attempt of showing individuality.

Sometimes comparison of different images of one and the same person can prove useful. There are single and very rare cases of similar representation of non-standard features both in the relief and the sculpture. So, for example, a great likeness is seen in the face of $Hm(w)-jwn(w)$ on the relief fragment (Boston MFA 27.296) and on his famous statue (Pelizaeus Museum 1962) /Smith, 1949, pl.48bc/. Approximately the same likeness is also observed in the relief of Nfr (Boston MFA 07.1002) with his reserve head (Boston MFA 06.1886) /Smith, 1949, pl.48de/. Evidently, this should be understood as a result of reality being reflected by the monuments.

And still we cannot usually make such comparisons, so that in the absence of material for comparison we are forced to suppose that the appearance of non-standard features in the

image of a person denotes an attempt to show individual peculiarities. At this, of course, one should be restricted by examples of sufficiently high quality which is a guarantee that the unusual features have appeared in full accordance with the author's intention, and not as a result of his unskilfulness.

Representing the peculiarities of features on a plane was a great difficulty for the Egyptian artist because, due to the accepted profile position of the head with the en face depiction of the eye, only those peculiarities of the face could be shown which are clearly seen in profile /Smith, 1949, p.301-302/; the reliefs of Ḥm(w)-jwn(w) and Nfr are just typical by their representation of the nose, forehead and chin. We do not find any other samples as fortunate as these: the artist generally used a fairly limited number of standard ways of representation of separate parts of the face and, by varying their combinations made something like assembling a police composite drawing (identikit). The images obtained turned out to be a little different in some details, but nevertheless very similar to each other on the whole.

Thus, the faces of the relief images give us very little. The body is usually represented still more conventionally, without any attempt whatever of showing specific features. Against this background especially brightly stand out images of quite a different type, the only one in the Old Kingdom really individualized, which begin to appear as early as the very beginning of Dyn.IV, if only not at Dyn.III. They represent the figure of a man more or less stout, sometimes heavy and sometimes simply fat. Let us analyse the most typical of them.²

² Recently Harpur /1987, p.131-133, Tbl.6.9./ published a complete list of such images. It is not very convenient for our purposes because it includes quite a few cases with weakly defined features. Therefore we have to make a selection which characterizes the whole precisely enough.

1. H^c(j)-b².w-zkr/Hts, Saqqara A 2 = S 3073. Middle Dyn.III to early Dyn.IV. Representation on the false-door CG 1385 /Murray, 1905, pl.1; Borchardt, 1937, Bl.10; PM III², p.449/.
- Attitude: standing.³
 Insignia: staff (left hand) and baton (right hand).
 Garments: short.⁴
 Wig: none.⁵
 Constitution: protruding abdomen, but no general corpulence.
2. Mtn, LS 6. Early reign of Hw(j).f-w(j). Relief in the chapel, Berlin (East) 1105 /Lepsius, 1850, Bl.6; PM III², p.493/.
- Attitude: sitting at the table.
 Insignia: none.
 Garments: long.
 Wig: none.
 Constitution: protruding abdomen and pendulous breasts, but no general corpulence.
3. Hm(w)-jwn(w), G 4000. The reign of Hw(j).f-w(j). The lower part of the relief on the thickness of the entrance to the chapel, Pelizaeus Museum 2146 /Junker, 1929, Abb.23b; PM III², p.122-123/.
- Attitude: standing.
 Insignia: staff (left hand); baton may be reconstructed in the right hand.
 Garments: long.
 Wig: ? (destroyed)
 Constitution: the legs are rather corpulent, resembling the statue of the same person, Pelizaeus Museum 1962.
4. H^c(j).f-hw(j).f-w(j) I, G 7140. Late reign of Hw(j).f-w(j) /Reisner, 1942, p.115/, or later /PM III², p.188/. Relief

³ The Egyptians always represent a standing man with his left leg put forward, i.e. striding (while the legs of a woman are put together). Without regarding the problem of depicting a moving body here, that is most probably of weltanschaulich character, we use the word "standing" to denote this posture (as an opposition to the word "sitting").

⁴ To simplify the discription we call the garments higher the knees "short", and any garments covering the knees "long".

⁵ Due to the specifisity of the Egyptian system of the artistic conventionalities it is rather difficult sometimes to ascertain if the person is represented bare-headed or wearing a close fitting wig. I dare say that if the ears are not covered, the absence of a wig had been meant by the master (Harpur /1987, p.132/ holds the other opinion) - it is assumed by the depiction of the hair and the wigs in the sculpture in the round. Leaving aside the details of this rather intricate problem now, I hope to discuss the ideological meaning of presence or absence of the wig elsewhere.

near the entrance to the inner chapel /Smith, 1949, pl. 43b; Simpson, 1978, pl.16b, fig.27/.

Attitude: standing.

Insignia: staff (left hand), handkerchief (right hand).

Garments: long + panther skin.

Wig: none.

Constitution: protruding abdomen is hanging over the belt; fat breasts; neck and arms are not corpulent at all and thus seem too thin for such a body.

5. K²(.j)-w^cb(.w), relief in the chapel of his daughter, queen Mr(j)-s(j)-^cnh(.w) III, G 7530+7540 /Dunham, Simpson, 1974, fig.4; PM III², p.198/. The second year of the unnamed king, most probably of Spss-k².f /Smith, 1949, p.126/. The reign of Mn-k².w-r^c(w) /Dunham, Simpson, 1974, p.8/ seems to be an improbable date since some more late features are present /Bolshakov, 1983, p.112/.

Attitude: standing.

Insignia: staff (left hand), handkerchief (right hand).

Garments: long.

Wig: none.

Constitution: general corpulence (including the legs and arms); protruding breasts and abdomen.

6. K²(.j)-^cpr(.w), Saqqara. Early Dyn.V. Fragment of the relief (from knee to breast) from the chapel (?) /Fischer, 1959, fig.8/.

Attitude: standing (embraced by his wife).

Insignia: staff (left hand), handkerchief (right hand).

Garments: long.

Wig: ? (destroyed).

Constitution: protruding abdomen and pendulous breasts.

7. K²(.j)-h²(.j) and Nfr, Saqqara. Middle Dyn.V, probably early reign of N(j)-wsr-r^c(w). Relief on the south wall of the chapel /Moussa, Altenmüller, 1971, pl.26/.

Attitude: standing leaning on his staff.

Insignia: handkerchief (left hand), right hand on the waist

Garments: long.

Wig: none.

Constitution: protruding abdomen and fat breasts.

8. N(j)-s(w)-jr.t-nfr(.w) (?), the chapel usurped by R^c(w)-m-k²(.j), Saqqara D 3 = QS 903. Late Dyn.V. Relief on the false-door MMA 08.201.1 /Fischer, 1959, fig.10f/.

Attitude: standing.

Insignia: staff (left hand), handkerchief (right hand).

Garments: originally long; the usurper changed the representation and made the clothes short.

Wig: none.

Constitution: originally pendulous breasts and no other features of stoutness; the usurper erased the breasts and thus made the build normal.

9. Nfrj, Giza. Middle Dyn.V or later. Relief on the facade near the entrance /Abu-Bakr, 1953, fig.37/.

Attitude: standing.

Insignia: staff (left hand), baton (right hand).

Garments: short.

Wig: none.

Constitution: protruding abdomen, fat breasts, short legs.

10. $\text{H}^{\text{C}}(\text{j})\text{-f-r}^{\text{C}}(\text{w})\text{-}^{\text{C}}\text{nh}(\text{w})$, G 7948 = LG 75. Dyn.V or later /PM III², p.207/. Relief on the thickness of the entrance to the chapel /Lepsius, 1850, Bl.8/.

Attitude: standing.

Insignia: staff (left hand), baton (right hand).

Garments: long (knee-long) + panther skin.

Wig: none.

Constitution: folded abdomen and protruding breasts; proportions are ideal in other respects.

11. $\text{Mrr-w}(\text{j})\text{-k}^{\text{2}}(\text{j})/\text{Mrj}$, Saqqara. Reign of Ttj. A number of representations in several chambers; one of the best /Duell, 1938, pl.175/, similar /ibid., pl.181, 174b, 185a, 187b/.

Attitude: standing.

Insignia: staff (left hand), handkerchief (right hand).

Garments: long.

Wig: none.

Constitution: no obesity, but the figure is heavier than an ideal one.

12. $\text{Nfr-sšm-r}^{\text{C}}(\text{w})/\text{Ššj}$, Saqqara. Reign of Ttj. A number of representations on the pillars /Capart, 1907, pl.12-17/.

Attitude: standing.

Insignia: staff (left hand), baton (right hand).

Garments: long.

Wig: none.

Constitution: protruding abdomen, pendulous breasts, fat back and buttocks.

13. $\text{C}^{\text{C}}\text{nh}(\text{j})\text{-m}^{\text{C}}\text{-hr}(\text{w})/\text{Zzj}$, Saqqara. Reign of Ttj. Two representations on the thicknesses of the entrance to the mastaba /Capart, 1907, pl.23-24; Badawy, 1978, fig.24-27/.

Attitude: standing.

Insignia: staff (left hand); right arm is lowered down.

Garments: long.

Wig: none.

Constitution: folded abdomen, pendulous breasts, fat back and buttocks.

14. $\text{Hnt}(\text{j})\text{-k}^{\text{2}}(\text{j})/\text{Jhhj}$, Saqqara. Reign of Ttj. Two representations on the thicknesses of the entrance to the mastaba /James, 1953, pl.7/.

Attitude: standing.

Insignia: staff (left hand); right arm is lowered down.

Garments: long.

Wig: none.

Constitution: protruding abdomen, pendulous breasts, fat back and buttocks.

15. Nfr-sšm-ptḥ/Ššj, Saqqara. Reign of Ttj. Two representations on the thicknesses of the entrance to the mastaba. /Capart, 1907, pl.78-79/.

Attitude: standing.

Insignia: staff (left hand), right arm is lowered down.

Garments: long.

Wig: none.

Constitution: folded abdomen, pendulous breasts, fat back and buttocks.

16. Jdw, G 7102. Reign of Pjppj I. Representation on the thickness of the entrance to the chapel /Simpson, 1976, fig.34, pl.16d/.

Attitude: standing.

Insignia: staff (left hand), baton (right hand).

Garments: long.

Wig: none.

Constitution: protruding abdomen, pendulous breasts, fat back and buttocks.

17. ḥbdw, Giza. Dyn.VI /PM III², p.51/. Representations on the entrance thickness and on the pillars /Abu-Bakr, 1953, fig.51-52, 56/.

Attitude: standing.

Insignia: staff (left hand); right arm is lowered down.

Garments: long.

Wig: none.

Constitution: protruding abdomen.

18. N(j)-s(w)-jr.t/Pjppj-snb(.w), Saqqara (?). Late Old Kingdom. Two representations on the lintel, Hermitage #18125 /Landa, Lapis, 1974, pl.15/.

Attitude: standing.

Insignia: staff (left hand); right arm is lowered down.

Garments: long.

Wig: none.

Constitution: slight corpulence of abdomen and breast.⁶

Now let us arrange the main features of the images concerned into a table (Tbl.1). Their typology and development are quite obvious. A standing man is depicted (the only exception is R 2, an early sample) with a staff in his left hand (except R 2). The right hand, in early monuments, is

⁶ Hereinafter we'll refer to the numbers of the monuments according to this list, indicating them with R (= "Reliefs").

Table 1

Individualized Reliefs

	ATTITUDE		HANDS, INSIGNIA				GARMENTS			WIG	CONSTITUTION							
	STANDING	SITTING	STAFF * LEFT HAND	"HANDKERCHIEF" * LEFT HAND	"HANDKERCHIEF" * RIGHT HAND	BATON * RIGHT HAND	RIGHT ARM LOWERED DOWN	RIGHT HAND ON THE WAIST	LONG	SHORT	PANTHER SKIN	NO WIG	GENERAL CORPULENCE	PROTRUDING ABDOMEN	FOLDED ABDOMEN	PROTRUDING BREASTS	PENDULOUS BREASTS	FAT BACK AND BUTTOCKS
1	■		■			■					■							
2		■						■										
3	■		■		▨	▨			■		⊠	■	▨	▨	▨			
4	■		■		■				■	■			■			■		
5	■		■		■								■					
6	■		■		■						⊠	■	■			■		
7	■		■					■					■			■		
8	■		■		■				■								■	
9	■		■			■			■				■			■		
10	■		■							■				■		■		
11	■		■		■							■						
12	■		■			■							■				■	■
13	■		■				■							■		■	■	■
14	■		■				■						■				■	■
15	■		■				■							■		■	■	■
16	■		■			■							■			■	■	■
17	■		■				■						■					
18	■		■				■						■		■			

■	PRESENT FEATURE	⊠	RECONSTRUCTION
		▨	DESTROYED

holding a handkerchief (R 4-6, 8, 11)⁷, and in later monuments it is lowered down (R 13-15, 17-18). A baton is also often shown in it (R 1, 9-10, 12, 16). The garments are indispensably long (with the exception of the early R 1 and the rather strangely-looking in general R 9). There is no wig on the head - only short-clipped hair of his own. The two latter characteristics are especially important because they are typical of all individualized images, both on a plane and in sculpture. Unfortunately, the meaning of such iconography is still not clear, although the Egyptians were certainly aware of it - otherwise the settled correlation of a certain kind of garment with the type of human image cannot be accounted for. At present, however, it is much more important for us to reveal the meaning of the stoutness represented.

There exist two principal viewpoints concerning this problem. Junker /1948/ believed that real peculiarities of the figure were represented, Fischer /1959, p.244-245, note 26/ considered that stoutness was just a conventional designation of old age, the image of fattened man conforming with the ideal of an Egyptian official - satiety. This latter opinion seems to find confirmation in the meaning of stoutness in the images of the Middle Kingdom established by Berlev /1978, p.192-196/. At that time corpulence was a feature that showed that a servant or a courtier was content with his position; thus it was also a compliment to the master or king who keeps their servants well (it is typical that people who had nothing to do with the court, for example, nomarchs, did not represent themselves in such a way). However, this interpretation is reliable only for the Middle Kingdom, while in the Old Kingdom the situation was more complicated. So, for example, equally fattened are represented H_{pj}, the inspector of the k²-servants in the mastaba of ^cnh(.j)-m-^chr(w) /Capart, 1907, pl.35; Badawy, 1978, fig.33/ and his master himself (R 13) - stoutness proves to

⁷ This accessory is fairly enigmatic. The latest, although fantastic, work devoted to it is /Fehlig, 1986/.

be clearly not the sign of social position. So do not we really deal with representations of some real features as Junker had thought. Let us return to our table.

A number of methods of representing stoutness have clearly pronounced chronological limits. This is representation of general massiveness of the body, but without exaggeration (before the beginning of Dyn.VI - R 3, 5-7, 11), folded abdomen (from Dyn.V - R 10, 13, 15), fat back and buttocks (from the beginning of Dyn.VI - R 12-16). Representation of pendulous breasts occurs throughout the period in question, but it has quite a definite frequency - 1 time during Dyn.IV (R 2), 2 times during Dyn.V (R 6, 8), and 5 times at the beginning of Dyn.VI (R 12-16). Approximately the same picture is given by the more complete list of Harpur. It means that there existed something that could be called fashion for all these images and, consequently, they served as conventional signs. At first glance, this refutes the concept of Junker; let us, however, raise a question - what has caused the appearance of new details which, earlier, they managed to do without, and if their conventional character was initial.

It is reasonable to suppose that new characters appear as an attempt to reproduce individual features of a concrete person, and this idea does really find some confirmation. It is clearly seen from the Table that at the same time with the images fashionable for the given moment there are also found the quite unfashionable ones. For example, Mrr-w(j)-k²(.j) (R 11) is depicted without any exaggerated stoutness, with only somewhat more massive proportions, despite the fact that in the neighbouring tombs erected at the same period of time they like demonstrating the folded abdomen, pendulous breasts and fat back and seat. It should be supposed, probably, that these characters were too excessive for representing a slight stoutness of Mrr-w(j)-k²(.j) and, consequently, that his image is more or less precisely correlated with reality. The same takes place in Nfrj (R 9) and ²bdw (R 17) - their stoutness appears to have been also slight and they used a moderate method of showing it. There

is one more interesting case with the image of N(j)-s(w)-jr.t-nfr(.w) (?) (R8) - he was depicted with pendulous breasts and in long garments; R^C(w)-m-k²(.j), who had usurped his tomb had the picture of pendulous breasts destroyed and the garments shortened, thus having transferred the image into the category of conventional ones. Probably, it was necessary to do so, because this character was not inherent in R^C(w)-m-k²(.j) in his life and it had to be destroyed in his tomb as well.

Then, most probably, the new detail appeared for representing the peculiarities of constitution of a definite person. After that, this successfully found detail began to be used in other tombs, it began to be fashionable and was already turning into a conventional sign. This sign, however, was used only where it was appropriate, where it, if only partly, corresponded to reality, which gives us the right to regard all these images as individualized, and not only those where the given details appears for the first time.

At this, it is most typical that it was just stoutness that was honoured and fixed. The Egyptian official was proud of it as an evidence of his significance and flourishing, and out of all other peculiarities of his constitution he selected only this character.

There are no reasonable grounds for us to believe, following Fischer, that stoutness was the sign of old age (quite another thing is that, probably, many people who were represented stout, were already not young). The sculpture which sometimes really represented the age of the person, will show that the relation between the years of age and stoutness in Egyptian art was as non-obligatory as in life.

Thus, the Egyptian artists attempted to represent individuality on a plane image - we cannot disagree with Junker here. However, two essential refinements should be introduced to his concept. Firstly, individualization concerned only with the socially important characteristics of human appearance; secondly, individualization was performed by way of combining a rather limited set of characters more

or less precisely corresponding to reality. All this does not enable us to speak about any portrait art of the Old Kingdom reliefs.

At the end of the Old Kingdom the individualized images become degenerated, they become absolutely standard, not containing if only approximate features of a concrete person (for example /Grdseloff, 1943, fig.1/). All comes to quite conventional signs and only their iconography going back the ancient samples reminds of the origin of these images.

REPRESENTATION OF INDIVIDUALITY IN SCULPTURE ⁸

In sculpture the degree of individualization as compared with the flat image is incomparably higher, so that sometimes we come across monuments which cannot be called otherwise than portraits. And yet, conventional images predominate in sculpture too.

Three main groups of statues can be singled out by the degree of individualization.

1) Statues with strongly individual features and naturalistic representation of the body. Two inscriptions have been preserved which mention the names of such statues. A fragment of the relief from the mastaba of Smnh-w(j)-pth /Jtwš (BrM 37.25E) contains the image of a head (without wig) and shoulders in profile; the latter is the sign of its being shown as a statue. Close to it is a legend: "His great name Smnh-w(j)-pth, his young name Jtwš - the statue according to life (šzp r^cnh)" /Smith, 1949, pl.48a; PM III², p.452/. The relief of Sšm(.j)-nfr(.w) IV (Pelizaeus Museum 3190) shows censing in front of an analogous statue (without a wig, in a long girdling, with stout abdomen and breasts). The legend is as follows: "[Sta]tue according to life ([t]wtr^cnh) - sole companion Sšm(.j)-nfr(.w)" /Junker, 1951, Taf.1; 1953, Taf.22d, 23ab, Abb.89-90/. Thus, the Egyptians manifestly

⁸ The main theses of this section have been formulated as abstracts /Bolshakov, 1987b/.

singled out these statues into a special group, but their name did not become widespread.⁹

2) Statues with faces in which individuality is only slightly to be seen through the averaged standard and with quite conventional, ideal bodies.

3) Quite conventional statues representing not a concrete person, but a human being in general. These are the great majority of works of Egyptian sculpture.

Of course, a definite role is played here by the possibilities of the sculptor; it cannot be said, however, that the level of skill and belonging of the statue to this or other group do always correlate. Indeed, the most strongly individualized statues are of the highest quality, while the works of low- and middle-quality masters, as a rule, show lack of personality, but at the same time the monuments of the second and third group are often made with no lesser thoroughness than the sculpture "according to life", and the first group includes samples which clearly

⁹ The understanding of the name of the statues of this type such as "Statue nach dem Leben", "Lebenswahre Statue" was substantiated by Junker /1951, S.403-405; 1953, S.224-225/; he was supported by Matthieu /1961, p.96; Lapis, Matthieu, 1969, p.18-19/; Vandersleyen /1982, S.1079, Anm.5/, Wildung, /1982, S.117/ and others. Despite some complications connected with the treatment of the word šzp which in the sense of "statue" was definitely fixed only in the Middle Kingdom /Wb.IV, S.536/, such explanation seems to be quite possible. Fischer /1963, p.24-27/ proposed to derive šzp to the verb šzp - "receive", "take"; šzp in his treatment is statue as a receiver of offerings. He also supposed that the expression šzp r Cnḥ serves not as a description of the statue's appearance, but as a designation of its function - "in order to live". Recently this opinion was supported and strengthened by Eaton-Krauss /1984, p.85-88/. This theory is doubtlessly interesting, although not indisputable. First of all, all the statues and not only šzp.w r Cnḥ were cult objects, and we cannot define their specificity in this respect. Besides, the designation of the analogous statue of Sšm(.j)-nfr(.w) IV as twt r Cnḥ makes us question the key role of the word šzp, as twt is the most general designation of any masculine statue. Therefore we retain the understanding going back to Junker. (The author believes that a third treatment is also possible essentially different from both proposed ones which is grammatically closer to that of Junker - but its substantiation is to come in future and it is better to abstain from discussing it even as a hypothesis).

testify to the attempts of individualization which had failed because of the lack of skill in their creators. At the same time, the non-idealized statues possess a specific iconography not at all characteristic of other groups, which markedly singles them out. Thus, the solution of the problem is evidently to be sought in the sphere of weltanschaulich ideas.

The fact that some quantity of statues have been preserved which represent in a different way - conventionally and in an individualized form - one and the same person - leads us to the fairly essential conclusions. It is typical that such pairs include practically all the non-idealized statues known (their pair conventional statues have not been preserved everywhere, but in a number of cases they can be proved to have existed). Let us analyse a number of individualized statues of private persons of the Old Kingdom ¹⁰ and their corresponding conventional statues.

1. R^c(w)-ḥtp(.w), Meidum, mastaba 6. Early reign of Hw(j).f-w(j).

a) CG 3 /Borchardt, 1911, Bl.1/. Limestone, h.120 cm.

Attitude: sitting.

Garments: short.

Wig: none.

Eyes: inlaid.

Face: rather young, with the smallest details including wrinkles between the brows and near the mouth.

Constitution: ideal.

Name: present.

b) Since the tomb of R^c(w)-ḥtp(.w) was found undisturbed, it is for certain that there was no pair statue.

¹⁰ Of course, as far as works of art are concerned, the selection of monuments can be a little subjective. Nevertheless, the list does include the best samples. The famous head from the former Salt collection (Louvre N.2289)/Louvre Enc., 1935, pl.12-15/ which is not infrequently ascribed to the Old Kingdom (for example, /Smith, 1949, p.40; Matthieu, 1961, p.515, note 32/) is not considered, as, for all that, it belongs to Amarna time /Müller-Feldmann, 1938; Vandersleyen, 1975b, p.24/. Not included in the list, due to their specificity, are most individualized reserve heads and statues representing a naked man. The female statues have not been taken into account.

2. Hm(w)-jwn(w), G 4000. Reign of Hw(j).f-w(j).

- a) Pelizaeus Museum 1962 /Junker, 1929, Taf.18-23; PM III
- ²
- , p.123/. Limestone, h.156 cm.

Attitude: sitting.

Garments: short.

Wig: none.

Eyes: inlaid (lost).

Face: very characteristic, energetic in spite of obesity.

Constitution: most trustworthy features of obesity with the smallest details.

Name: present.

- b) Besides the serdab where the statue (a) was found, there was the other one /Junker, 1929, Abb.18/ being empty when discovered. Thus it is reasonable to suppose that the pair statue having approximately the same size as (a) had originally existed.

3. Cnh(.w)-h³.f, G 7510. Reign of H^c(j).f-r^c(w).

- a) Boston MFA 27.442 /Smith, 1949, pl.14, 15a; PM III
- ²
- , p.196/. Limestone, h.50 cm.

Attitude: - (the bust)¹¹

Garments: -

Wig: none.

Eyes: no inlay.

Face: the elderly face with bags under the eyes, swollen eyelids, folds on the cheeks and near the mouth, and the sensitive lips.

Constitution: strong but heavy shoulders and breast, short neck.

Name: none.

- b) The mastaba G 7510 had an exterior chapel where the Boston bust was found lying on the floor, and the interior one with an empty serdab beyond the false-door /Reisner, 1942, fig.8, 122/. On these grounds Smith /1949, p.38/ supposed that the bust was originally situated in the serdab, but his idea is to be rejected now /Bolshakov, forthcoming-a/. Thus, the serdab had to contain the pair statue of Cnh(.w)-h
- ³
- .f.

4. K^c(.j)-^cpr(.w), Saqqara C 8. Most probably Dyn.IV (dating is still uncertain, see /Vandersleyen, 1983/.

- a) "Sheikh el-Beled", CG 34 /Borchardt, 1911, Bl.9; PM III
- ²
- , p.459/. Wood, h.110 cm.

Attitude: standing.

Garments: long.

Wig: none.

Eyes: inlaid.

Face: soft face of an old man with flabby chin, plump

¹¹ The reconstruction of the original appearance of the bust see /Bolshakov, forthcoming-a/.

cheeks and small nose.

Constitution: Very trustworthy are fat neck, corpulent legs and arms. The corpulence is not unhealthy (contrary to Hm(w)-jwn(w)), though.

Name: ? (the base is lost).

- b) CG 32 /Borchardt, 1911, Bl.8; PM III², p.724/¹² Wood, h.69 cm. (the lower part is lost).

Attitude: standing:

Garments: short.

Wig: present.

Eyes: inlaid.

Face: rather individual, but much more conventional than (a); some resemblance with (a), especially in the form of the mouth is present, though. The man represented is much younger, than (a).

Constitution: ideal.

Name: ? (the base is lost).

5. K²j, Saqqara C 20. Early Dyn.V.

- a) "The Louvre Scribe", "Scribe rouge", Louvre N.2290 /Louvre Enc., 1935, pl.29-31; PM III², p.458-459/. Limestone, h.53 cm.

Attitude: squatting.

Garments: short.

Wig: none.

Eyes: inlaid.

Face: bony and wide, with flat nose, thin lips and broad chin.

Constitution: body is weak, with flacid muscles and folds on the breast and abdomen.

Name: none.

- b) Louvre A.106 /Louvre Enc., 1935, pl.32-33; PM III², p.458/¹³ Limestone, h.78 cm.

Attitude: sitting.

Garments: short.

Wig: present.

Eyes: inlaid.

Face: little, if any, resemblance with (a); at any rate the person represented is much younger.

Constitution: ideal.

Name: present.

¹² We have no direct evidence of the identity of (a) and (b), but the circumstances of their discovery make this assumption most probable.

¹³ "The Louvre Scribe" was identified as the second statue of K²j, Louvre A.106, by Capart /1921/, and his opinion was supported by Smith /in: Reisner, 1936, p.402/. Harris /1955/ and Vandier /1958, p.122/ raised an objection to the identification, but their argumentation based mainly on the stylistic analysis and ignoring the archaeological circumstances is hardly persuasive, see /Matthieu, 1961, p.516, note 41/.

6. Unknown person, Saqqara, mastaba near C 16. Early Dyn.V¹⁴

- a) "The Cairo Scribe", CG 36 /Borchardt, 1911, Bl.9; PM III², p.500/. Limestone, h.51 cm.

Attitude: squatting.

Garments: short.

Wig: present.

Eyes: inlaid.

Face: rather young, with plump cheeks and chin.

Constitution: the body is idealized, without individual features.

Name: none.

- b) CG 35 /Borchardt, 1911, Bl.9; PM III², p.500/. Limestone, h.61 cm.

Attitude: sitting.

Garments: short.

Wig: present.

Eyes: inlaid.

Face: some features (the form of the face, nose and lips) have some resemblance with (a), but they are much more conventional.

Constitution: ideal.

Name: none.

7. R^c(w)-nfr(.w), Saqqara G 5. Early Dyn.V.

- a) CG 18 /Borchardt, 1911, Bl.5; PM III², p.462/. Limestone, h.195 cm.

Attitude: standing.

Garments: long.

Wig: none.

Eyes: no inlay.

Face: the face of a mature man with a rather deep line between the base of nostrils and mouth, and with a characteristic elongated bridge of the nose.

Constitution: strong body, but with some tendency towards corpulence (abdomen and breast).

Name: present.

- b) CG 19 /Borchardt, 1911, Bl.5; PM III², p.462/. Limestone, h.180 cm.

Attitude: standing.

Garments: short.

Wig: present.

Eyes: no inlay.

Face: very individual and similar to (a), but evidently younger.¹⁵

¹⁴ Both statues were found in situ in front of the false-doors in the corridor-chapel /Capart, 1921, p.190/. Thus the identity of the person represented in both monuments is unquestionable.

¹⁵ This indubitable difference between the two statues was already mentioned by Capart /1920, p.227/, but Engelbach /1934/ supposed the faces to be absolutely identical,

Constitution: ideal.

Name: present.

8. ḥ.t(j)-ḥtp(.w) , Saqqara, near the pyramid of Wnjs. Most probably the end of Dyn.V.¹⁶

a) The largest of the statues of ḥ.t(j)-ḥtp(.w) /Zayed, 1958, pl.9-10; Batrawi, 1948, pl.2-3/. Wood, h.171 cm. (the lower part is destroyed).

Attitude: standing.

Garments: long.

Wig: none.

Eyes: no inlay.

Face: the oval of the face, the snub-nose and the mouth are very individual.

Constitution: the body is represented rather conventionally, but there are no powerful shoulders and thin waist characteristic for idealized statues; muscles are covered with a thin layer of fat.

Name: ? (the base is lost).

b-c-d-e) Four statues /Zayed, 1958, pl.9; 12-16; Batrawi, 1948, pl.2-3/. Wood, the highest of the four is smaller than (a), the lowest one is 90 cm. high.

Attitude: standing.

Garments: short.

Wigs: none.

Eyes: no inlay.

Faces: similar to one another, but having little to do with (a).

Constitution: ideal.

Name: due to imperfection of the reproductions the presence of the name is trustworthy only in one case /Zayed, 1958, pl.14/; probably the name was inscribed on the other statues as well, see /PM III², p.638/¹⁷

9. Mṯtj , Saqqara. Reign of Ttj.

a) BrM 51.1 /Brooklyn, 1956, pl.4-6; Brooklyn, 1989, pl.14; PM III², p.647/.

inequality of reception being quite subjective and due to the shadow of the wig. To prove his opinion Engelbach made a cast of the wig of (b) and fitted it on the head of the cast of (a). Difference is obvious though and is objective in character, see /Smith, 1949, p.49; Vandier, 1958, p.121-126/. Nevertheless the images of $\text{R}^{\text{C}}(\text{w})\text{-nfr(.w)}$ are the most similar among the pair statues, that is the reason of Engelbach's misunderstanding.

¹⁶ Six statues of ḥ.t(j)-ḥtp(.w) are in Cairo and are numbered JE 93168-93174, but I could not find out which number corresponds to every statue.

¹⁷ Besides the statues mentioned there is one more representing ḥ.t(j)-ḥtp(.w) naked /Zayed, 1958, pl.7/. It is not included in our list because of the specific typology, but much resemblance of its face with (a) is to be noted.

Attitude: standing.

Garments: long.

Wig: none.

Eyes: inlaid.

Face: most characteristic, with finest modelling creating an image of elderly man with sad lowered eyes.

Constitution: a meagre aged man with narrow shoulders, thin arms and a head that seems too large for his weak body.¹⁸

Name: present.

- b) Kansas City, William Rockhill Nelson Gallery of Art 51.1 /Kaplony, 1976, Abb. an S.68-70; PM III², p.647-648/. Wood, h.80 cm.

Attitude: standing.

Garments: long.

Wig: none.

Eyes: inlaid.

Face: resembling (a), but less individual.

Constitution: the body is less delicate and individual than (a).

Name: present.

- c) Boston MFA 47.1455 /Kaplony, 1976, Abb.an S.56-59; PM III², p.647/. Wood, h.80 cm.

Attitude: standing.

Garments: short.

Wig: present.

Eyes: no inlay.

Face: has some similarity with (a), but features are standartized.

Constitution: ideal.

Name: present.

- d) BrM 53.222 /Kaplony, 1976, Abb. an S.66, 68; PM III², p.647/. Wood, h.74,5 cm.

Attitude: standing.

Garments: short.

Wig: present.

Eyes: no inlay.

Face: conventional; little, if any, resemblance with (a).

Constitution: ideal.

Name: present.

- e) BrM 50.77 /Kaplony, 1976, Abb. an S.60-61; PM III², p.647//; all the Brooklyn statues are reproduced together for the first time /Brooklyn, 1989, pl.14/. Wood, h.89 cm.

¹⁸ Kaplony /1976, S.62/ supposed (a) to be the most valuable in an artistic aspect in the Old Kingdom among the wooden statues; however, the delicacy of Mttjj's body is perhaps stressed more exaggerating than the stoutness of "Sheikh el-Beled".

Attitude: standing.

Garments: short.

Wig: present.

Eyes: no inlay.

Face: most conventional of all five statues, broader than that of the four others.

Constitution: ideal.

Name: present.

10. The dwarf Hnm(w)-ḥtp(.w), Saqqara. Late Dyn.V - Dyn.VI.

a) CG 144 /Borchardt, 1911, Bl.32; PM III², p.722-723/. Limestone, h.44 cm.

Attitude: standing.

Garments: long.¹⁹

Wig: none.

Eyes: no inlay.

Face: most characteristic childish expression; unusual elongated form of the head.

Constitution: all the features of dwarfism are shown - short and fat legs, arms and neck, unhealthy general corpulence, fat rolls on the thighs.

Name: present.

b) No statue is identified as a pair to (a), but since nothing is known on the discovery circumstances of (a), the pair statue could exist.

11. The dwarf ---w(j)-snb(.w)/Snb, Giza. Late Old Kingdom.

a) JE 51280 /Junker, 1941, Vorsatzblatt; PM III², p.102-103/. Limestone, h.33 cm.

Attitude: squatting (a family group with wife and children).

Garments: short.

Wig: none.

Eyes: no inlay.

Face: very individual, with broad forehead, large eyes, nose and mouth, and powerful chin.

Constitution: characteristic features of dwarfism, but hardly the individual ones.²⁰

Name: present.

¹⁹ The kilt seems to be rather short, but for the dwarf it is long enough (knees are covered).

²⁰ Dasen /1988, p.260-268/ in her study of the medical aspect of the dwarfs' representations draws a conclusion that they show only the characteristic features of the definite diseases transformed into iconographic signs. It is true as a whole, especially if one speaks about the mural pictures, but the statues of Hnm(.w)-ḥtp(.w) and Snb are an exception, since their faces are nevertheless individual. True, the individuality is partly concealed by the general traits of dwarfism, but it is no wonder - looking at the dwarf first of all we see the features attributing him to this very group of people, and only later we recognise his personal characteristics.

- b) In the serdab southward of the false-door a wooden statue was originally situated, completely destroyed by now /Junker, 1941, S.104-105/.
- c) In the serdab southward of the chapel a base of the granite statue of Snb sitting was found /Junker, 1941, Abb.29b/. The name is present.

In the late Old Kingdom (most probably in the middle Dyn.VI) the sculptor's craftsmanship declines, and the bygone skill of individualization becomes inaccessible. Thus though the tradition of the pair statues continues, the statues "according to life" become rather standard - instead of the constitution peculiarities some conventional features of stoutness appear; the faces lose the former characterization. But sometimes the individuality shows itself through the standard features indicating that its absence in different specimens is an effect of the general decay of the artistic school, but not the result of some conceptual changes.

12. N(j)-^cnh-pjppj-km, Meir. Early reign of Pjppj II.

- a) CG 236 /Borchardt, 1911, Bl.49/. Wood, h.70 cm.

Attitude: standing.

Garments: long.

Wig: none.

Eyes: no inlay.

Face: rather distinctive, with small chin, large mouth and prominent cheek-bones.

Constitution: corpulent abdomen and a fat fold under the breasts.²¹

Name: none.

- b) CG 60 /Borchardt, 1911, Bl.15/. Wood, h.115 cm.

Attitude: standing.

Garments: short.

Wig: present.

Eyes: no inlay.

Face: conventional, but the form reminds (a) a little.

Constitution: the body is quite conventional and elongated unproportionally.

Name: present.

²¹ The characteristic features of the Middle Kingdom Meir statuettes - "short, as if flattened, heads, large mouths, thick lips, accentuated cheek-bones and especially sharply emphasized muscular system of the breast that is well-developed and separated in relief from the abdomen"/Matthieu, 1941, p.38 = 1961, p.161/ - may go back to this or some analogous specimen, but they become just a conventional sign.

13. Jstj/Ttj, Saqqara. Reign of Ppjj II or later.

- a) JE 88577 /Lauer, 1950, pl.2ab; Drioton, Lauer, 1958, pl.14/. Wood, h.42 cm. (the base is lost).

Attitude: standing.

Garments: long.

Wig: none.

Eyes: no inlay.

Face: no individual features.

Constitution: the body is shown rather conventionally, but it is softened as compared with the ideal - there are no powerful shoulders and thin waist and thighs; slight corpulence of a healthy, but not athletic man is present.

Name: ? (the base is lost).

- b) JE 88587 /Lauer, 1950, pl.2d; Drioton, Lauer, 1958, pl.15/. Wood, h.53 cm. (the base is lost).

Most features as (a).

Name: ? (the base is lost).

- c) Cairo,²² unpublished, see /Drioton, Lauer, 1958, p.219/. Wood, size unknown.

Analogous to (b), but destroyed badly.

- d) JE 88575 /Lauer, 1950, pl.1c; Drioton, Lauer, 1958, pl.8a, 9/. Wood, h.66,5 cm.

Attitude: standing.

Garments: short.

Wig: present.

Eyes: no inlay.

Face: conventional, carved according to the pattern of (a) and (b).

Constitution: ideal; shoulders are much broader and the waist is more slender than those of (a) and (b).

Name: present.

- e) JE 88576 /Lauer, 1950, pl.1b; Drioton, Lauer, 1958, pl.8a/. Wood, h.66,5 cm.

Most features as (d).

Name: present.

14. Jhjj, Saqqara, re-used Old Kingdom burial chamber just outside south enclosure wall of the Step Pyramid. Late Dyn.VI or (due to the elongated proportions) later.²³

- a) MMA 27.9.3 /Pijoan, 1945, fig.219/. Wood, size unknown.

²² The Cairo JE number is unknown to me.

²³ Twelve statues and statuettes of Jhjj were found in the burial chamber. Unfortunately the present whereabouts of only five of them is known /PM III², p.651/. Three statues are taken into account in this paper; two others, forming a pair of interest to us are in Neuchâtel, but I have not at my disposal their reproductions published in /Gabus, 1967, pl.6-7/.

Attitude: standing.
 Garments: long.
 Wig: none.
 Eyes: no inlay.
 Face: practically no individual features.
 Constitution: the body is quite conventional and elongated unproportionally.
 Name: ? (the base is lost).

- b) MMA 27.9.5 /Pijoan, 1945, fig.218/. Wood, size unknown.

Attitude: standing.
 Garments: short.
 Wig: present.
 Eyes: no inlay.
 Face: as (a).
 Constitution: waist is more slender, than that of (a).
 Name: ? (the base is lost).

- c) MMA 27.9.4. Never reproduced and no description published, see /PM III², p.651/.

15. Tttj, Saqqara, near the pyramid of Ttj. Late Dyn.VI.²⁴

- a) Boston MFA 24.606 /Peterson, 1985, fig. on p.7/. Wood, h.40,5 cm.

Attitude: standing.
 Garments: long.
 Wig: none.
 Eyes: no inlay.
 Face: no individual features.
 Constitution: no individual features, but the proportions are slightly elongated.
 Name: present.

- b) Boston MFA 24.608 /ibid., fig. on p.9/. Wood, h.40 cm.

Attitude: standing.
 Garments: long.
 Wig: present.
 Eyes: no inlay.
 Face: no individual features.
 Constitution: the proportions are a little heavier than those of (a).
 Name: present.

- c) MMA 26.2.9 /ibid., fig. on p.13, left/. Wood, size unknown.

Analogous to (b).
 Name: present.

- d) JE 49371 /ibid., fig. on p.10/. Wood, h.45 cm.

Analogous to (a), but more perfect.
 Name: none.

²⁴ Besides the eighteen statues taken into account in this paper three more Tttj's statues are kept in Cairo (no numbers, no reproductions). One of them represents him in long clothes, two others - in short, and all three - wearing a wig.

- e-f-g) Present location unknown, the only data available are given by the photographs from Gunn's collection, now at the Griffith Institute, published by Peterson /*ibid.*, fig. on p.20/. Wood, sizes unknown.
- Attitude: standing.
 Garments: long.
 Wig: none.
 Eyes: no inlay.
 Face: no individual features.
 Constitution: no individual features.
 Name: the reproduction of the bases is poor, but, as Prof. Peterson who had worked with the original Gunn's photographs kindly informed me, at least one statue is inscribed (the right one on the photo).
- h) Boston MFA 24.607 /*ibid.*, fig. on p.8/. Wood, h.52 cm.
- Attitude: standing.
 Garments: short.
 Wig: present.
 Eyes: no inlay.
 Face: no individual features.
 Constitution: ideal.
 Name: present.
- i) Neuchâtel 328 /*ibid.*, fig. on p.11/. Wood, h.52 cm.
- Most features as (h).
 Name: present.
- j) Neuchâtel 329 /*ibid.*, fig. on p.12/. Wood, h.31 cm.
- Attitude: sitting.
 Garments: short.
 Wig: present.
 Eyes: no inlay.
 Face: no individual features, but more corpulent than those of the other statues.
 Constitution: ideal. Name: present.
- k) MMA 26.2.8 /*ibid.*, fig. on p.13, left/. Wood, h.52,5 cm.
- Attitude: standing.
 Garments: short.
 Wig: present.
 Eyes: no inlay.
 Face: remote likeness to (b).
 Constitution: ideal.
 Name: present.
- l) Stockholm, Medelhavsmuseet 11411 /*ibid.*, fig. on p.14-15/. Wood, h.42,4 cm.
- Attitude: standing.
 Garments: short.
 Wig: present.
 Eyes: no inlay.
 Face: no individual features.
 Constitution: ideal.
 Name: present.

m-n) Stockholm, Medelhavsmuseet 11412-11413 /ibid., fig. on p.16-17, 18-19/. Wood, h.41,9 cm, 35,2 cm.

Analogous to (l), but of poorer quality.

Name: present.

o-p-q) Present location unknown; information as on (e)-(f)-(g) /ibid., fig. on p.21/. Wood, sizes unknown.

Attitude: standing.

Garments: short.

Wig: present.

Eyes: no inlay.

Face: no individual features.

Constitution: ideal.

Name: the reproduction of the bases is poor, but as Prof. Peterson kindly informed me, at least one statue is inscribed (the right one on the photo).

r) Boston MFA 24.605 /ibid., fig. on p.6/. Stone, h.39 cm.

Attitude: sitting.

Garments: short.

Wig: present.

Eyes: no inlay.

Face: no individual features.

Constitution: ideal.

Name: present.

16. Unknown person, Dahshur, east of the Northern pyramid of Snfr-w(j), mastaba 24. Late Dyn.VI or later.

a) CG 506 /Borchardt, 1925, Bl.86; de Morgan, 1903, pl.4, No 20/. Wood, h.23 cm.

Attitude: standing.

Garments: long.

Wig: none

Eyes: no inlay.

Face: the work is poor, but it is very possible that the sculptor tried to individualize the features.

Constitution: body is represented rather conventionally, but a fold is seen below the breasts; legs are too thick due to poor craftsmanship of the sculptor.

Name: none.

b) CG 505 /Borchardt, 1925, Bl.86; de Morgan, 1903, pl.4, No 17/. Wood, h.31 cm.

Attitude: standing.

Garments: short.

Wig: present.

Eyes: no inlay.

Face: no individual features.

Constitution: ideal.

Name: present (lost, but the preceding titles are preserved).

c) A number of quite conventional statuettes resembling (b) /de Morgan, 1903, p.20-21; PM III², p.893/. Wood. No names.

17. Nhtj, Siut, tomb 7. Dyn.X.

A. Statues from the chapel.

- a) Louvre E.11937 /Chassinat, Palanque, 1911, pl.67; Delange, 1987, p.151-153 (with a wrong date); bibliography: *ibid.*, p.151/. Wood, h.179 cm.

Attitude: standing.

Garments: long.

Wig: none.

Eyes: inlaid.

Face: typical for the Siut school, but rather individual, with broad nose and characteristic form of lips.

Constitution: the body is represented with the most possible craftsmanship for the period, but all the features of corpulence are not individual, but purely iconographic.

Name: present.

- b) Present location unknown /Chassinat, Palanque, 1911, pl.5; Capart, 1920, pl.24, top, left/. Wood, h.165 cm.

Attitude: standing.

Garments: short.

Wig: present.

Eyes: inlaid.

Face: flat, with enormous eyes; little, if any, resemblance with (a).

Constitution: ideal.

Name: present.

B. Statues from the burial chamber.²⁵

- c) /Chassinat, Palanque, 1911, pl.11-1/. Wood, h.50 cm.

Analogous to (a).

Name: none

- d) /Chassinat, Palanque, 1911, pl.11-1/. Wood, h.41 cm.

Most features as (a), but the eyes are not inlaid.

Name: none.

- e) Louvre E.12002 /Chassinat, Palanque, 1911, pl.12-3; Capart, 1920, pl.24, bottom, right; Delange, 1987, p.154-155/. Wood, h.40 cm.

Analogous to (d).

Name: none.

- f) /Chassinat, Palanque, 1911, pl.11-2/. Wood, h.29 cm.

Analogous to (d).

Name: none.

- g) Unpublished.

According to the description /Chassinat, Palanque, 1911,

²⁵ Besides the nine statues taken into account in this paper an alabaster statue of a very poor quality representing Nhtj sitting was found in the burial chamber /Chassinat, Palanque, 1911, pl.11-3/.

p.49/ the statue is analogous to (a), but no data on the eyes and the name are within the reach.

h) /Chassinat, Palanque, 1911, pl.12-1/. Wood, h.28 cm.
Most features as (b), but the eyes are partly inlaid, partly painted.
Name: none.

i) /Chassinat, Palanque, 1911, pl.12-2; Capart, 1920, pl.24, bottom, left/. Wood, h.30 cm.
Most features as (h), but the eyes are not inlaid.

18. Mrj, El-Tarif. Dyn.XI.

a) BM 37895 /British Museum, 1904, fig on p.93; 1964, fig.66; Vandersleyen, 1975a, Abb.149b/. Limestone, h.58 cm.

Attitude: sitting.

Garments: short.

Wig: none.

Eyes: no inlay.

Face: little, if any, individual features.

Constitution: conventional.

Name: present.

b) BM 37896 /British Museum, 1904, fig. on p.93; 1964, fig.66; Vandersleyen, 1975a, Abb.149a/. Limestone, h.60 cm.

Attitude: sitting (arms folded).

Garments: short ("Königsschurz").

Wig: present.

Eyes: no inlay.

Face: resembling (a).

Constitution: conventional.

Name: present.²⁶

Let us arrange the main characters of the pair statues into a table (Tbl.2). As well as in the images on a plane, the most important iconographic features are the length of the garments and presence or absence of the wig. The statue "according to life" represents a person in long clothes of this or other fashion²⁷ and without a wig. In rarest cases

²⁶ Hereinafter we'll refer to the numbers of the monuments according to this list, indicating them with St (= "Statues").

²⁷ With the exception of sitting statues (St 1a, 2a, 5a, 6a, 11a, 18a) because a sitting man in the Old Kingdom was always represented in a short garments independent of the type of sculpture (apart from the royal heb-sed statues).

Table 2

Pair Statues

X	NAME		GARMENTS		EYES		WIG		MATERIAL	
	L	C	L	C	L	C	L	C	L	C
	1	■		◇		▲		▽		■
2	■	▨	◇	▨	▲	▨	▽	▨	■	▨
3	□				△	▨	▽	▨	■	▨
4	▨	▨	◆		▲	▲	▽	▼	■	□
5	□	■	◇	◇	▲	▲	▽	▼	■	■
6	□	□	◇	◇	▲	▲	▽	▼	■	■
7	■	■	◆		△	△	▽	▼	■	■
8	▨	■	◆		△	△	▽	▽	□	□
		⋮	◇		△		▽			□
		⋮	◇		△		▽			□
9	■	■	◆		▲	△	▽	▼	□	□
	■	■	◆		▲	△	▽	▼	□	□
10	■	×	◆		△	×	▽	×	■	×
11	■	▨	◆	▨	△	▨	▽	▨	■	■
12	□	■	◆		△	△	▽	▼	□	□
13	▨	■	◆		△	△	▽	▼	□	□
	▨	■	◆		△	△	▽	▼	□	□
14	▨	▨	◆		△	△	▽	▼	□	□
15	■	■	◆		△	△	▽	▼	□	□
	■	■	◆		△	△	▽	▼	□	□
	■	■	◆		△	△	▽	▼	□	□
	■	■	◆		△	△	▽	▼	□	□
	□	■	◆		△	△	▽	▼	□	□
	■	■	◆		△	△	▽	▼	□	□
	⋮	◇		△		▽			□	
	⋮	◇		△		▽			□	

16	□	■	◆	◇	△	△	▽	▼	□	□
17A	■	■	◆	◇	▲	▲	▽	▼	□	□
17B	□	□	◆	◇	▲	▲	▽	▼	□	□
	□	□	◆	◇	△	△	▽	▼	□	□
	□		◆		△		▽		□	
	□		◆		△		▽		□	
	?		◆		?		▽		□	
18	■	■	◇	◇	△	△	▽	▼	■	■

L «STATUE NACH DEM LEBEN»

C «CONVENTIONAL STATUE»

⊙

- NAME IS PRESENT
- NO NAME
- ◆ LONG GARMENTS
- ◇ SHORT GARMENTS
- ◇⊙ SHORT GARMENTS, SITTING STATUE
- ▲ INLAID EYES
- △ NO INLAY
- ▼ WIG IS PRESENT
- ▽ NO WIG
- STONE
- WOOD
- STATUE NEVER EXISTED
- × NO INFORMATION ON THE EXISTENCE OF THE STATUE
- ▨ DESTROYED
- ? LACK OF INFORMATION

the statues "according to life" have wigs (St 6a, 15bc), and the conventional ones can do without them (St 8bcde), but at this, the pair statue of a different type possess the same feature, but not the adverse one. In other words, normal is the pair "individualized statue without a wig + conventional statue in a wig", an exception is "both statues in a wig" or "both statues without a wig", but a pair "individualized statue in a wig + conventional statue without a wig" is quite impossible. Thus, iconography is most clearly followed and departures from it are rare and their range is sufficiently limited.

Of much interest is also the attitude towards the eyes of statues which in the best samples of sculpture are made inlaid to give them more vivacity /see Matthieu, 1958/. Incrustation can be found only in statues "according to life" (St 9ab) or in both statues (St 4ab, 5ab, 6ab, 17ab, 17ch), but never in a conventional statue whose individualized pair does without incrustation. It is quite clear that this fact testifies to a special attention given to the statues "according to life"-if there had been such a possibility, the eyes of both statues were inlaid, when there was none, they confined themselves only to the eyes of the individualized statue which was thus perceived as a more vital one. These are, of course, serious characters of the pair statues, but they do not tell us anything of how this statues were understood by the Egyptians themselves.

First of all, it should be clearly decided upon if the degree of individualization of "statues according to life" allows us to speak of them as of portraits. Some of them ("The Louvre Scribe", "Sheikh el-Beled", "The Cairo Scribe", $R^C(w)\text{-htp}(.w)$, $R^C(w)\text{-nfr}(.w)$) have been already known over a century or so, and from the very moment of their discovery they began to be regarded as portraits; accordingly, such understanding spread also over the others statues of this type. Unfortunately, for a long time the term "portrait" was used quite uncritically. The turning-point in the formation and development of the problems was the appearance of a small paper by Capart /1926/ who was the first to pay attention to

the pair statues and to note some of their peculiarities both in iconography and in regard to individual features. The work by Capart gave impetus to a discussion on Egyptian portrait which unfolded during 20-40⁶ and was mainly based on the monuments of private persons of the Old Kingdom.

The reaction to the subjectivity of appraisals expressed was a sharp criticism of the opinion which recognized the portrait character of the statues in long garments. The extreme point of view was championed by Engelbach /1934/ who, on the basis of his experiment with statues of R^C(w)-nfr(.w) (see footnote 15) refused to see the difference in representing of individuality by the sculpture of two types, and Scharff /1940, S.41-42/ who, making this opinion absolute, came to a conclusion that Egyptians do not have portrait as such. In accordance with this Scharff /1939, S.491-497/ advanced a theory according to which Egyptian art is completely based on the same principles as hieroglyphic script and, consequently, operates exclusively by signs. Although this theory is basically true and has quite a few proponents /see Bianchi, 1988, p.55/, there is no doubt that it explains only the conventional images, but goes against the obvious when there is a question about the individualized images.

Junker /1951/ who has established the meaning of the name šzp/twt r^Cnh has thereby shown that the Egyptians themselves considered some of the statues to have been made "according to life", that is, representing the real features of the depicted person. Though differing from Junker's in some details, Vandier /1958, p.116-143/ and Matthieu /1961, p.80-106/ supported the essence of his idea and their works in a sense sum up the results of the discussion. However, unreservedly recognizing the statues "according to life" as being portraits, they failed to define the specificity of Egyptian portraiture.

After that the logics of science led to these problems being re-oriented towards later (Saite, Ptolemaic and Roman-Egyptian) materials, but neither here the Egyptian idea of portrait was ascertained (see the recent review /Vandersleyen,

1982/. The traditions of acknowledgement and of complete denial of portraiture in Egyptian art are co-existing up to these days, testifying thereby that there is not and cannot be any universal solution.

The main reason of this is that portraiture is a very vague idea because of a sheer impossibility to say just how precisely the image of an unknown person represents his features. In such cases, usually, the definition is of a particularly emotional character - the person is shown "just like living", his face is "clearly individual" etc. But these characters, not to mention their being purely subjective, testify only the fact of the work being that of a great master and of its being unlike the others, but they do not at all concern the main thing - the personality of the depicted human being. The mastership of the artist is the most important factor which forces one to consider some image to be a portrait; because of it the "spectator is sure of likeness, he is persuaded by the portrait itself that he sees an image of a real personality" /Žinkin, 1928, p.46/. For example, "in the absence of any other figurative document, we cannot judge of the likeness of Leonardo's portrait of Mona Lisa to the wife of the Florentine Gioconda. And nevertheless, this work is one of the greatest portraits of all European painting" /Tarabukin, 1928, p.164/.

Thus, it should be admitted that an image does not contain any objective characters of being a portrait /see Shaposhnikov, 1928, p.77/. It is no use speaking about an image being a portrait if taken by itself, apart from a spectator, but "it will become a portrait if we wish it" /ibid., p.84/. In the end important is not how much the image copies reality, but how much the spectators are ready to see a portrait in it. These rather general assumptions are to a full extent applicable to the Egyptian monuments with all their specificity. If, looking at the face of the bust of $\overset{\circ}{n}\eta(.w)-\eta^{\prime}.f$, we immediately recognize it among thousands of other statues' faces and therefore see a definite person behind it - this means that we can rightfully speak about a portrait (the conventionality of methods of the sculptor does

not play any role here and, for example, the fact that the way of representing the shape of the head used by the creator of the statue of $^c n\dot{h}(.w)-\dot{h}^? .f$ lives up to the Ptolemaic time /Bianchi, 1988, p.57-59/, does not yet mean anything).

Of course, such approach which takes account only of external likeness, or, more exactly, of a readiness to see this likeness, does not explain much in the really inexhaustable problems of portrait, however, it is quite acceptable for our purposes. Is it not true that we ourselves, the people of quite a different epoch and of another Weltanschauung, fall under the charm of these monuments, and unintentionally believe them; what then is to be said about the Egyptians for whom they had been created and to whom they were of incomparably higher significance than to us.

All the statues "according to life" of Dyn.IV-V and isolated samples of a later period of time are highly individual. He who has seen them, if only once, will remember them and will never forget the vital energy of $Hm(w)-jwn(w)$, the tired eyes of $^c n\dot{h}(.w)-\dot{h}^? .f$, keen look of $K^? j$, the imperiousness of $K^?(.j)-^c pr(.w)$, the sickness of $M\dot{t}\dot{t}j\dot{j}$. And all the same, from the middle of Dyn.VI the representation of individuality gradually comes to naught. The statues retain their former iconography, however their faces become standard, and out of constitutional peculiarities only stoutness is represented which turns into quite a conventional sign which looks rather funny - the breasts and abdomen are stout, and the arms and legs are of normal thickness. Does not this mean that in the time of flourishing of the statues "according to life" it was iconography and not individualization that was most important?

It seems that this question could receive a definitely negative answer. The decline of the level of skill in the first place, naturally, tells on the representation of individuality, so that the processes that had taken place at the end of the Old Kingdom may well be explained by purely technical reasons. In the conditions of decline iconography remains to be an only link between the new mediocre sculpture and ancient samples of highest quality; its role is great,

but it should not be exaggerated, and not everything should be accounted for by iconography alone. At this, of course, the very possibility of a change from individual features to conventional signs is an important testimonial of the Egyptian system of imitative arts²⁸ - it is impossible to object to Scharff here. Thus, although Egyptian art can very well do without individualization, there are no real arguments against the fact that some part of images can be portraits - even if by way of an exception.

Now that we have made out that we really can consider the statues "according to life" to be full-value portraits, it is necessary to make clear why their creators needed them to be portraits. We have a clue to solve this problem, and it lies, as is often the case, in the departures from the norm. The Egyptians create a mass of uniform monuments, but sometimes, departing from the norm, they "let out a secret" and unintentionally inform about the motifs which they used in creating these monuments. For the present problem such clue is the attitude towards the name of the person represented.

The fact that the absence of or levelling out the individual features in the majority of Egyptian images was compensated for by the presence of a name on them - is evident and seems to be accepted by everybody /see Attenmüller, 1980, S.560/. The Egyptian images are even called "portraits by name" (Benähmungsporträt) /ibid., S.581/, however, the meaning of this phenomenon has not been explained up to now, so that the observation on the role of a name has long ago become commonplace, not having added much to the understanding of Egyptian art.²⁹ Meanwhile, if we turn to the pair statues enumerated here, it will become clear at once that

²⁸ We have already observed similar phenomena on the materials of mural reliefs. However, there is one important difference here - transformation into a sign in sculpture occurs much more slowly, it has, to say, a higher inertia. This is explained by the fact that a flat image is by its very nature more conventional than the volumetrical one and, therefore, is originally nearer to a sign.

²⁹ For example, in the newest review on portrait only two lines are devoted to the name /Vandersleyen, 1982, S.1074/.

the attitude towards the inscription of the names of persons represented is sufficiently peculiar and not without principle.

The rule is for a name to be inscribed at the base of a statue; there exist, of course, a number of uninscribed statues, however, they are either not completed,³⁰ or are of low quality, their number increasing while their quality changes for the worse. Thus, here we are dealing with a situation quite natural and typical of the whole Egyptian sculpture in spite of its typology, when the presence or absence of a name is correlated with the quality of work. However, the best work of the Old Kingdom, the bust of $^c n h (. w) - h ^ 3 . f$ (St 3a) has not been inscribed, though fully completed.³¹ And this is not at all accidental. Turning to Tbl.2 we discover a number of pairs where the statue "according to life" is not inscribed, while on the conventional statue the name is present (St 5a, 12a, 15d, 16a); it is possible that the conventional statue of $^c n h (. w) - h ^ 3 . f$ which did not come down to us was inscribed as well, forming an analogous pair. It is typical and highly important that the contrary cases - with the inscribed individualized and uninscribed conventional statue are absent; evidently, they were impossible.

An interesting variant of this practice is given by the period of "Cheops style" which existed in Giza during the reigns of $H w (j) . f - w (j) - M n - k ^ 3 . w - r ^ c (w)$.³² The requirements of the style resulted in reducing the number of images and, accordingly, in a decrease of the number of inscriptions of the name of the master - only the slab-stela with the

³⁰ In the pair (St 6ab) the names are absent on both statues; however, the tomb of the "Cairo Scribe" was not completed, judging from the description of Maspero - the walls of the chapel were prepared for the images which were not made by some reason /Capart, 1921, p.190/. It seems likely that the sculpture too remained incomplete - the names were not inscribed.

³¹ Of course, there is no place for any inscription on the bust, but there is no name on its brick pedestal as well.

³² About it see /Junker, 1927/; the term is introduced /Bolshakov, 1982/.

"Opfertischszene" and with the name of the owner mentioned only once remained in the chapel. The risk of the slab-stela being ruined was quite real, and therefore, to compensate for it, the individualized reserve heads began to be placed in the burial chamber. The slab-stelae have really fallen to destruction in the majority of cases, as a result of which the names of only four owners of reserve heads have become known to us,³³ but we recognize them by their faces in return. We do not recognize by their faces the owners of the tombs of traditional style who had no individualized statues, but to make up for it, their names are repeatedly inscribed in the chapels.

Now the Egyptian understanding of portraits is made essentially precise. The conventional image is unsatisfactory because of the absence of personal features, and therefore it is necessarily inscribed; thereby the lack of imitative information is made up by information of a different kind. The individualized image is informationally self-sufficing and does not require any inscription to identify the represented person. It is true that for greater guarantee the statues "according to life" were inscribed too, but the exceptions from this rule prove to be more important - the best samples of individualized Old Kingdom sculpture can do without inscriptions. Unfortunately, the bases of many statues where the name was written have been lost - and if they had been preserved, the number of such exceptions might have been much greater.

This means that to an Egyptian of equal worth and right are the quite conventional image to which the name of the person is inscribed and the image extremely precisely representing the individual features and with no inscription. From our usual point of view, there is a great gap between these two types of images, however, the Egyptian "portrait by name" is not so exotic as it may seem, and the modern man did not

³³ Nfr, G 2110; Mr(j).t-(j)t(w).s, G 4140; Snfr-w(j)-snb(.w), G 4240; ³⁴h.t(j)-h̄tp(.w), G 7650 /PM III², p.72-74, 124, 125, 200-201/.

go so far away from ancient perception. A nouveau riche ordering the portraits of his never existing noble ancestors acted just "in an Egyptian manner", since the image of a person in an old-fashioned costume became a portrait because his name was written on the frame or if only implied; the fictitious nature of images and even of names does not play any role /see Shaposhnikov, 1928, p.84/. In the same "Egyptian way" a modern sculptor is acting when creating a monument to a historical person about whose appearance nothing is known - a statue of a man in a helmet and with a sword becomes the sculpture, say, of the Russian prince Alexander Nevsky only due to the inscription on the pedestal. Such "pseudoportraits" are found by us in different peoples at different historical epochs, and if now it seems to us that the "genuine" portrait is better than the portrait "by name" - that is only a result of the century-old European artistic tradition, and not some eternal and general rule.

THE WELTANSCHAULICH SENSE OF INDIVIDUALIZATION

The problem of portraiture as in general all the questions connected with representations, directly results from the idea of the k^2 . The principal explanations of this most important category of Egyptian Weltanschauung were proposed as early as about a century ago; ³⁴ despite the rational kernel contained in them, they have become outdated by the present moment, and numerous efforts of modernizing them /see reviews by Schweitzer, 1956, S.13-16; Kaplony, 1980; Bolshakov, 1987a, p.3-5/ were originally contradictory and therefore unsuccessful. The author has advanced his own theory of the k^2 , mainly

³⁴ k^2 as a "double" incarnating in the statue /Maspero, 1893a (=1878), p.7; 1893b (=1879), p.47-52; 1893c (=1870); 1893d (=1888), p.389-393; 1913; Le Page Renouf, 1878/; k^2 as "personifizierte Lebenskraft" of man /Kristensen, 1896, S.14; Erman, 1906, S.14; 1919, S.102; 1934, S.209-210/; k^2 as "Genius, Schutzgeist" of man /Steindorff, 1897, S.CXLIV-CXLV; 1911/; k^2 as an "individuality" /Wiedemann, 1895, p.11/.

based on private monuments of the Old Kingdom and although having some points of contact with the concepts of Maspero and Wiedemann, but still quite different from them. It is stated briefly in the form of an article /Bolshakov, 1987a/ and in detail in the form of a voluminous still unpublished book /Bolshakov, forthcoming-b/. Since the article published in Russian has hardly become widely known, it is reasonable to state here the main assumptions of my theory in that degree in which it is connected with the subject of the present work.

1) K² is the image of the dead person existing in the memory of the living, but objectivized, transferred from consciousness into the surrounding world and turned into an independent being. As such image is most readily formed when looking at the representation of a person, the k² comes to be connected with pictures and statues and in certain sense to be created by them /cf. Hodjash, Berlev, 1982, p.14-15/. K² is the incarnation of the main features and qualities of a concrete person as an individuality, so that after Maspero he may be called a Double, keeping in mind, of course, that in our understanding it is distinct from what the great French egyptologist had seen in the k².³⁵

2) A theory of absolute similarity between the person and the k² was advanced at one time. According to it, the k² was fully and in the finest details to conform to his "original" and, moreover, to make this likeness finally complete, it had to be supposed that the k² was changing with the years, as the person itself. "Wherever a child was born, there was born with him a double which followed him through the various stages of life; young while he was young, it came to maturity and declined when he came to maturity and declined" /Maspero, 1893d (=1888), p.389; cf. also Le Page Renouf, 1878, p.501/. This hypothesis is an artificial construction not proved by anything and most seriously objecti-

³⁵ It is quite natural that not only the dead, but also the living possess the k².w. With the latter the functions of the k² are somewhat different /see Bolshakov, forthcoming-b, Conclusion/, but at the moment it is of no importance for us.

onable, the strongest objections being the two following. Firstly, it must mean that the k² leads his eternal existence in the appearance in which the person had died, i.e. it often may mean conservation of diseases, sufferings and infirmities of old age. Such idea might be possible in peoples which did not give much attention to the life in the next world whose notions about it were gloomy and indefinite (ἄδης of the Greeks), but not in Egyptians who placed the Double just in the very centre of their picture of the world and thoroughly developed all the problems connected with him. Secondly, the indifference in rendering the individual features in the representations "creating" the Double testify to the fact that the k² cannot be an absolute copy of a person. Thus, it concerns only representing the main characteristics of the "original", but there is no question about complete copying.

3) Royal monuments show sometimes the k² standing near the king, but there are no such scenes on private monuments. A usual conclusion drawn from this fact is that it is impossible in principle to represent the k² of a private person /for example, Frankfort, 1948=1978, p.69/. This is both right and wrong at the same time. Indeed, it was only the k² of the king that was shown as an independent being standing beside his "original", which is connected with a specific character of notions of the non-human and super-human nature of the lord of Egypt. On the other hand, however, any representation is a means of providing life to the Double and in this sense it is itself qualified as a Double. That is why what we ordinarily call the representation of the master of the tomb depicts not his own appearance, but that of his Double. This rather subtle difference had remained unnoticed as, within the limits of the theory of absolute likeness such details are not essential. As Egyptian art usually represents a human being in the prime of his life, it becomes clear that the most important inherent quality of the k² is his eternal youth. The Double spends all his lifetime at an ideal age and is not subject to old age decline.³⁶

³⁶ This quality of the k² is most probably explained by

4) Much in common with the k^2 , as understood by the Egyptians, was the Name - rn. This is quite natural. A name as a way of singling out a concrete person from a mass of people turns into its indispensably unseparable characteristic and may serve as a good reminder of that person calling forth the same image as the representation does. This image is transferred by the Egyptian from the consciousness of the recollecting person into the surrounding world, so to say, is objectivized, turned into the rn-Double, analogous to the k^2 -Double. Of course, the similarity lies only in the ontological basis of the two categories - their concrete manifestations may be fairly different.

Now we are able to explain a lot of the ideological problems of the Egyptian portrait. First of all, it is the conventionalism of the overwhelming majority of representations.

A man is unable to remember anything quite precisely, for him the past (apart from some isolated emotionally coloured moments) is unavoidably covered with a misty haze. The image of a person in our memory is usually vague - we "see it on the whole", and the particulars escape from us. It means that this image is of a dual character: on the one hand, we "see" not so much the individual as a human being in general; on the other, something prompts us who that is. (In the same way we may dream of man without a face and nevertheless we recognize him at once).

The prompt lies, of course, in the name which gives us an illusion of recognition. The name and the visual image of a man do not exist in our consciousness without each other -

the fact that this notion, by the time of the Old Kingdom, had combined numerous heterogenous elements among which those connected with representations were the latest and best developed. The preceding earliest period is practically not documented, but there are some reasons to believe that originally the k^2 was connected with the placenta /see Blackman, 1946ab; Frankfort, 1948-1978, p.69-78/, which was, probably, regarded as a twin born together with the human being remaining a baby for ever. Later, the young age of this twin was transferred to the k^2 as connected with a representation /Bolshakov, forthcoming-b, Conclusion/.

their unity is indissoluble. Therefore, when we think of some one, his unavoidably vague image is immediately supplemented by the name, which gives impetus to associations and releases a lot of information concerning the given individual. At this, the image itself does not become more distinct, but it gets into a certain context which makes this image sufficient to be identified with a certain individual. Recollection is simultaneously adequate and inadequate to reality - a distinct fixation of the key moments in the memory provides its relation with reality, while the loss of some part of information combined with enormous complexity and unpredictability of associations leads to thinking it up. Our consciousness is adapted to fragmentariness and discretion of recollections so that their incompleteness does not usually cause any inconvenience, but unconsciously, we feel their vagueness.

Hence comes the specificity of the k^2 . Being an image existing in memory, it reproduces a person in a vague, uncertain way - as a human being in general, and not as a given person. In such a form the k^2 would have been quite useless for providing eternal life (for it would be nobody knows whose life), but here we are helped by the idea of the rn inseparably linked with it. The presence of the name gives birth to the rn essentially identical to the k^2 , but describing a person in a different way. Therefore when a representation is inscribed, the formed pair "representation + name" produces both the Doubles, thereby completely describing and fixing forever the person's individuality.³⁷

If this is really the case, then, in principle, any chock may serve as a statue if only it has the name of its owner inscribed on it. During the periods of decline something like this did really take place - it suffices to recall if only the great number of late ushebti-figurines, and still - the

³⁷ The joint fixation of the k^2 and the rn is a phenomenon universal to Egyptian culture. For example, it determines to a considerable degree the specificity of the hieroglyphic system of writing /see Bolshakov, 1987a p.24-25/ with which, in their turn, many other notions of weltanschaulich character are associated.

art was not ruined, which is unavoidable, if this principle would be consistently accomplished. It is partially connected with the fact that Egyptian culture (especially the classical one) is intravert, and such types of cultures are oriented on bringing any idea, any object, any work of art to unthinkable perfection. This, however, is only one aspect of the problem.

Legends on quite conventional representations making these representations most effective permitted the majority of even the wealthiest and noblest Egyptians to be content with a "portrait by name". In a conventional representation the k^3 was fixed at a young age that was natural to him giving a possibility for any old and sickly person to be given another life in most desirable condition. However, the Egyptians, as we know, were never satisfied with the degree of reliability of their preparations for eternity and they would always perfect them even though, getting at variance with the original idea.

The identity of the k^3 and the rn which provided the effectivity of the "portrait by name" did not give rise to any doubt in the ontological sense, but on the level of everyday life the striking non-conformity between the person and its conventional representation might lead to a wish for the appearance to be somehow refined. The formation of an excellent art school in the capital during the time of Dyn.IV made it possible to solve the problem with the help of "genuine" portraits which represented a person as it was in reality.³⁸

³⁸ This is astonishing, but according to measurements of bones of $^3h.t(j)-\dot{h}tp(.w)$ his height was to amount to 174,7 cm, while the height of one of his statues "according to life" (St 8a) was 175 cm, and the height of the other (see note 17) has been reconstructed by the anatomist as 175 cm /Batrawi, 1948, p.493/. In the same way, the height of the wife (?) of $^3h.t(j)-\dot{h}tp(.w)$ is reconstructed as 156,4 cm, and the height of the fragmented statue which represents her features rather individually (our list does not take account of it /see Zayed, 1958, pl. 7, 9, 11, 17; Batrawi, 1948, pl.2-3/) was to have been 156 cm /Batrawi, 1948, p.492-494/. Close to a possible height of a human being are also the statues of $R^c(w)-\dot{h}tp(.w)$ (St 1a) and of his wife Nfr.t, of $^cn\dot{h}(.w)-\dot{h}^3.f$ (St 3a) and of $R^c(w)-nfr(.w)$ (St 7a). Unfortunately, there is no possibility of comparison as the bone remains have perished.

And yet, the best of the statues "according to life" represent individual features well as those of age; a whole number of them (St 3a, 4a, 5a, 7a, 9a, 11a) shows persons of mature and old age, which clearly contradicts to the most important quality of the k³ - his youth. This is one of those unavoidable inconsistencies which constantly resulted from striving of the Egyptians for an indefinite perfection of the achieved. The point is that side by side with the statue representing an elderly man there always existed a conventional one which showed an ideal age. Thus, the statues "according to life" in no way affect the youth of the k³ and therefore can rightfully exist. The only case when the statue "according to life" had no conventional pair - R^c(w)-htp(.w) (St 1a) - is also quite understandable: R^c(w)-htp(.w), despite possessing individual features, is shown young, as he evidently had been during the time of creation of the statue, so that his real appearance did not contradict the age of his k³.

It is possible that statues of the two types had some functional differences, but unfortunately, it failed to be established so far. Matthieu /1941a, p.47-48; 1961, p.82/ supposed that material and size of a number of statues (wood, height about 1 m) are connected with the fact that during the funeral ceremony the relatives of the deceased performed a ritual over them which is well known from the pictures of the New Kingdom - they lifted them upwards several times. It would be tempting to associate this ritual with the statues "according to life", however, such supposition is contradicted by facts. If "Sheikh el-Beled" (St 4a) satisfies this hypothesis, the statue of R^c(w)-nfr(.w) (St 7a) which was standing in the same way in the chapel and which, consequently, had the same functions, is carved of stone and is almost 2 m high - it was quite obviously not lifted on the arms. Such is also the case with the statues of R^c(w)-htp(.w) and Hm(w)-jwn(w) (St 1a, 2a); if our reconstruction of the original appearance of the bust of ^cnh(.w)-h³.f (St 3a) /Bolshakov, forthcoming-a/ is rightful, then it was also impossible to move it. Moreover, pairs of statues were usually made of one material - either both of stone, or both of wood (see Tbl.2), and only in

exceptional cases, mainly given large series of wooden statuettes, the stone statuettes could appear together with them (St 15r; see also note 25 and cf. St 11abc). No functional difference is to be established between the arrangement of the pair statues as well - both of them can be placed in the serdab or in the chapel. It should not be forgotten, lastly, that the statues "according to life" form a quite insignificant percentage from the general numbers of the Old Kingdom sculpture, so that it is impossible to consider them to be an indispensable attribute of some specific rituals. Thus, their relationship with cult practice was more complicated and mediated than could be thought of.

These are, of course, problems for quite a different investigation which still remain insoluble. Though, starting from our understanding of the two types of statues, it is possible to explain the absence of mural pictures in many chapels of Dyn.IV - early Dyn.V. A classical example is the chapel of K³(.j)-^cpr(.w) (Saqqara C 8) which has only one false-door without representations and with one brief inscription: "Chief lector-priest K³(.j)-^cpr(.w)" /Murray, 1905, pl.3/. No other decoration was necessary as the chapel contained the pair of statues of K³(.j)-^cpr(.w) himself as well as the statue of his wife /Capart, 1920, p.232/. The pair of statues gave a complete information about their owner's personality and therefore it was possible to do without any mural pictures. Such was also the case with other chapels - in K³j (Saqqara C 20) and in R^c(w)-nfr(.w) (Saqqara C 5) the pairs of statues were found in situ in chapels without any wall-reliefs /Capart, 1921; Mariette, 1889, p.122-123/. Thus, pairs of statues standing in a chapel could replace all other decorations. It is typical that all these cases are dated from the time not later than the beginning of Dyn.V. Could not it be the result of influence on Saqqara of the "Cheops style" which caused the number of mural representations to be reduced, but which required them to be compensated for? In such case a number of chapels which were left without pictures could be decorated with statues that did not come down to us - the reliefs are inseparable from the wall,

while the free-standing statue is not at all fastened and is the first to perish or disappear. Probably, these chapels should be singled out into an independent type (by the way, the great likeness between the chapels of $K^p(.j)-^cpr(.w)$ and $R^c(w)-nfr(.w)$ was indicated as early as 1920 by Capart /1920, p.227-228/.

██ ██ ██

In this paper I was able to deal with only one problem connected with the ideology of the Egyptian portrait, and this immediately gave an impetus to a great number of questions which are hard for me to answer now. It is the future that will give answers to them; it will confirm or refute the concept stated here; however, their very existence gives me hope that in any case my work is not useless, for such are usually those theories which can explain everything once and for all and induce no questions.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Andrey O. Bolshakov is Curator of the Egyptian Collection, Hermitage Museum, Leningrad, USSR

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abu-Bakr, 1953

Abu-Bakr A.M. Excavations at Giza 1949-1950. Cairo, 1953.

Altenmüller, 1982

Altenmüller H. Königsplastik. - LÄ III, 1982, S.557-610.

Badawy, 1978

Badawy A. The Tomb of Nyhetep-Ptah at Giza and the Tomb of Ankhmahor at Saqqara. Berkley - Los Angeles - London, 1978.

Batrawi, 1948

Batrawi A. Report on the Anatomical Remains Recovered from the Tombs of Akhet-Hetep and Ptah-Irou-Ka, and the Comment

on the Statues of Akhet-Hetep. - *ASAE* 48 (1948), p.487-497.

Berlev, 1978

Берлев О.Д. Общественные отношения в Египте эпохи Среднего царства. Москва, 1978.

(Berlev O.D. Social Relations in Egypt of the Middle Kingdom. Moscow, 1978).

Bianchi, 1988

Bianchi R.S. The Pharaonic Art of Ptolemaic Egypt. In: Cleopatra's Egypt. Age of the Ptolemies. Mainz, 1988, p.55-80.

Blackman, 1916a

Blackman A.M. Some Remarks on an Emblem upon the Head of an Ancient Egyptian Birth-Goddess. - *JEA* 3 (1916), p.199-206.

Blackman, 1916b

Blackman A.M. The Pharaoh's Placenta and the Moon-God Khons. - *JEA* 3 (1916), p.235-249.

Bolshakov, 1982

Большаков А.О. Из истории египетской идеологии Старого царства. - *ВДИ*, 1982, № 2, с.97-101.

(Bolshakov A.O. Correlation of Chapel and Burial Chamber in Egyptian Tombs of the Old Kingdom. - *JAH*, 1982, No 2, p.97-101).

Bolshakov, 1983

Большаков А.О. Сцена драки лодочников в староегипетских гробничных изображениях. - *СЭ*, 1983, № 3, с.105-112.

(Bolshakov A.O. The Scene of the Boatmen Jousting in the Old Kingdom Tomb Representations. - *SE*, 1983, No 3, p.105-112).

Bolshakov, 1987a

Большаков А.О. Представление о Двойнике в Египте Старого царства. - *ВДИ*, 1987, № 2, с.3-36.

(Bolshakov A.O. Le rôle du Double (Ka) dans la religion égyptienne de l'Ancien Empire. - *JAH*, 1987, No 2, p.3-36).

Bolshakov, 1987b

Большаков А.О. Староегипетский портрет и староегипетское мировоззрение. - Письменные памятники и проблемы истории культуры народов Востока XXI/1 Москва, 1987, с.67-70.

(Bolshakov A.O. The Old Kingdom Portrait and the Old Kingdom Weltanschauung. - Written Monuments and Problems of Cultural History of Peoples of the East XXI/1, Moscow, 1987, p.67-70).

Bolshakov, forthcoming-a

Bolshakov A.O. What did the Bust of Ankh-haf Originally Look Like. - Forthcoming, BMFA.

Bolshakov, forthcoming-b

Большаков А.О. Очерки египетского мировоззрения в Старом царстве. Представление о Двойнике и его мире. В печати.

(Bolshakov A.O. Essays on the Egyptian Weltanschauung in the Old Kingdom. The Conception of the Double and of his World. Forthcoming, Moscow, "Nauka" Publishers).

Borchardt, 1911-1925

Borchardt L. Statuen und Statuetten von Königen und Privatleuten in Museum von Kairo (CG 1-653). Teil 1-2. Berlin, 1911-1925.

Borchardt, 1937

Borchardt L. Denkmaeler des Alten Reiches (ausser den Statuen) im Museum von Kairo (CG 1295-1541). Teil 1. Berlin, 1937.

British Museum, 1904

British Museum. A Guide to the Third and Fourth Egyptian Rooms. London, 1904.

British Museum, 1964

A General Introductory Guide to the Egyptian Collection in the British Museum.

Brooklyn, 1956

The Brooklyn Museum. Five Years of Collecting Egyptian Art. Brooklyn, NY, 1956.

Capart, 1907

Capart J. Une rue de tombeaux à Saqqarah, t.1 - Text, t.2 - Planches. Bruxelles, 1907.

Capart, 1920

Capart J. Some Remarks on Sheikh el-Beled. - JEA 6 (1920), p.225-233.

Capart, 1921

Capart J. The Name of the Scribe in the Louvre. - JEA 7 (1921), p.186-190.

Chassinat, Palanque, 1911

Chassinat É., Palanque Ch. Une campagne de fouilles dans la nécropole d'Assiout. Le Caire, 1911.

Dasen, 1988

Dasen V. Dwarfism in Egypt and Classical Antiquity: Iconography and Medical History. - MH 32 (1988), p.253-276.

Delange, 1987

Delange E. Musée du Louvre. Catalogue des statues égyptiennes du Moyen Empire. Paris, 1987.

Drioton, Lauer, 1958

Drioton Ét., Lauer J.-Ph. Un groupe de tombes à Saqqarah: Icheṭi, Nefer-khouou-ptah, Sebek-em-khent et Ânkihi. - ASAE 55 (1958), p.207-251.

Duell, 1938

[Duell P.] The Mastaba of Mereruka. Chicago, 1938.

Dunham, Simpson, 1974

Dunham D., Simpson W.K. The Mastaba of Queen Mersyankh III,

G 7530-7540. Boston, 1974 (Giza Mastabas, I).

Eaton-Krauss, 1984

Eaton-Krauss M. The Representations of Statuary in Private Tombs of the Old Kingdom. Wiesbaden, 1984.

Engelbach, 1934

Engelbach E. The Portraits of Ranufer. - Melanges Maspero I. Le Caire, 1934, p.101-103.

Erman, 1906

Erman A. Die Geschichte des Schiffbrüchigen. - ZÄSA 43 (1906), S.1-26.

Erman, 1919, 1934

Erman A. Die Religion der Ägypter, 2.Aufl., Berlin, 1919; 3.Aufl., Berlin - Leipzig, 1934.

Fehlig, 1986

Fehlig A. Das sogenannte Taschentuch in den ägyptischen Darstellungen des Alten Reiches. - SAK 13 (1986), S.55-94.

Fischer, 1959

Fischer H.G. A Scribe of the Army in the Saqqara Mastaba of the Early Fifth Dynasty. - JNES 18 (1959), p.233-272.

Fischer, 1963

Fischer H.G. Varia Aegyptiaca. - JARCE 2 (1963), p.17-51.

Frankfort, 1948=1978

Frankfort H. Kingship and the Gods. Chicago, 1948; 2 ed., Chicago, 1978.

Gabus, 1967

Gabus J. 175 ans d'ethnographie à Neuchâtel. Musée d'ethnographie de Neuchâtel du 18 juin au 31 décembre 1967. Pt.2. Neuchâtel, 1967.

Grdseloff, 1943

Grdseloff B. Deux inscriptions juridiques de l'Ancien Empire. - ASAE 42 (1943), p.25-70.

Harpur, 1987

Harpur Y. Decoration in Egyptian Tombs of the Old Kingdom. London - New York, 1987.

Harris, 1955

Harris J.R. The Name of the Scribe in the Louvre. - JEA 41 (1955), p.122-123.

Hodjash, Berlev, 1982

Hodjash S., Berlev O. The Egyptian Reliefs and Stelae in the Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow. Leningrad, 1982.

James, 1953

James T.G.H. The Mastaba of Khentika Called Ikhekhi. London, 1953.

Junker, 1927

Junker H. Die Stilwandlungen während des Alten Reichs. - ZÄSA 63 (1927), S.1-7.

Junker, 1929, 1941, 1950, 1953

Junker H. Giza I, Wien - Leipzig, 1929;
Giza V, Wien - Leipzig, 1941;
Giza IX, Wien, 1950;
Giza XI, Wien, 1953.

Junker, 1948

Junker H. Zu dem Idealbild des menschlichen Körpers in der Kunst des Alten Reiches. - AÖAW, B.84, Jrg.1947, Nr.17 (1948), S.171-181.

Junker, 1951

Junker H. Das Lebenswahre Bildnis in der Rundplastik der Alten Reichs. - AÖAW, B.87, Jrg.1950, Nr.19 (1951), S.401-406.

Kaplony, 1976

Kaplony P. Studien zum Grab des Methethi. Bern, 1976.

Kaplony, 1980

Kaplony P. Ka. - LÄ III (1980), S.275-282.

Kristensen, 1896

Kristensen W.-B. Aegypternes forestillinger om Livet efter Døden: forbindelse med guderne Ra, Osiris. Kristiania, 1896.

Landa, Lapis, 1974

Landa N., Lapis I. Egyptian Antiquities in the Hermitage. Leningrad, 1974.

Lapis, Matthieu, 1969

Лалис И.А., Маттье М.Э. Древнеегипетская скульптура в собрании Государственного Эрмитажа. Москва, 1969.
(Lapis I.A., Matthieu M.E. Ancient Egyptian Sculpture in the State Hermitage. Moscow, 1969).

Lepsius, 1850

Lepsius R. Denkmaeler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien, 2.Abt. Berlin, [circa 1850].

Lauer, 1950

Lauer J.-Ph. Découverte du serdab du chancelier Icheti à Saqqarah. - RdÉ 7 (1950), p.15-18.

Le Page Renouf, 1878

Le Page Renouf P. On the True Sense of an Important Egyptian Word. - TSBA 6 (1878), p.494-508.

Louvre Enc., 1935.

Encyclopédie photographique de l'art. Les antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Louvre. Paris, 1935.

Maspero, 1893a (=1878)

Maspero G. Une formule des stèles funéraires de la XII-e

dynastie. - ÉMAÉ I (1893), p.1-34 (= Comptes rendus du Congrès provincial des Orientalistes, Lyon, 1878, p.235-263).

Maspero, 1893b (=1879)

Maspero G. Histoire des âmes dans l'Égypte ancienne. - ÉMAÉ I (1893), p.35-52 (= Revue scientifique de la France et de l'Étranger, 2-e série, 8-e année, No 31, 1-er mars 1879, p.816-820).

Maspero, 1893c (=1870)

Maspero G. Le double et les statues prophétiques. - ÉMAÉ I (1893), p.77-91 (=Rec.Trav.1 (), p.152-160).

Maspero, 1893d (=1888)

Maspero G. Egyptian Souls and their Worlds. - ÉMAÉ I (1893), p.388-406 (= Princeton Revue, 1888, p.23-36).

Maspero, 1913

Maspero G. Le Ka des Égyptiens est-il génie ou un double. - Memnon 6 (1913), S.125-146.

Matthieu, 1941

Матве М.Э. Искусство Среднего царства. Ленинград, 1941.
(Matthieu M.E. Art of the Middle Kingdom. Leningrad, 1941).

Matthieu, 1947a

Матве М.Э. Тексты пирамид - заупокойный ритуал. - ВДИ, 1947, № 4, с.30-56.
(Matthieu M.E. The Pyramid Texts as a Funerary Ritual. - JAH, 1947, No.4, p.30-56).

Matthieu, 1947b

Матве М.Э. Роль личности художника в искусстве древнего Египта. - Труды Отдела Востока Государственного Эрмитажа Ленинград, 1947, с.5-99.
(Matthieu M.E. The Role of the Artist's Individuality in Art of Ancient Egypt. - Transactions of the Oriental Department of the State Hermitage IV, Leningrad, 1947, p.5-99).

Matthieu, 1961

Матве М.Э. Искусство древнего Египта. Ленинград - Москва, 1961
(Matthieu M.E. Art of Ancient Egypt. Leningrad - Moscow, 1961).

de Morgan, 1903

de Morgan J. Fouilles à Dahchour 1894/95. Vienna, 1903.

Moussa, Altenmüller, 1971

Moussa A., Altenmüller H. The Tomb of Nefer and Kahay. Mainz, 1971.

Müller-Feldmann, 1938

Müller-Feldmann H. Der Salt-Kopf des Louvre ein Werk der Amarnakunst. - ZÄSA 74 (1938), S.132-136.

Murray, 1905

Murray M. Saqqara Mastabas, pt.I. London, 1905.

Peterson, 1985

Peterson B. Finds from the Theteti Tomb at Saqqara. - Medelhavsmuseet, Bulletin 20 (1985), p.3-24.

Pijoan, 1945

Pijoan J. Summa artis. Historia general del arte, v.III. El arte egipcio hasta la conquista romana, 2 ed. Madrid, 1945.

Reisner, 1936

Reisner G.A. The Development of the Egyptian Tomb Down to the Accession of Cheops. Cambridge (Mass.), 1936.

Reisner, 1942

Reisner G.A. A History of the Giza Necropolis, v.I. Cambridge (Mass.), 1942.

Scharff, 1939

Scharff A. Ägypten. In: Handbuch der Archäologie, B.1, München, 1939, S.433-639.

Scharff, 1940.

Scharff A. On the Statuary of the Old Kingdom. - JEA 26 (1940), p.41-50.

Schweitzer, 1956

Schweitzer U. Das Wesen des Ka im Diesseits und Jenseits der alten Ägypter. Glückstadt - Hamburg - New York, 1956.

Shaposhnikov, 1928

Шапошников Б.В. Портрет и его оригинал. В книге: Искусство портрета, Москва, 1928, с.76-85.

(Shaposhnikov B.V. Portrait and its Original. In: Art of Portrait, Moscow, 1928, p.76-85).

Simpson, 1976

Simpson W.K. The Mastaba of Qar and Idu. Boston, 1976 (Giza Mastabas, 2).

Simpson, 1978

Simpson W.K. The Mastabas of Kawab, Khafkhufu I and II, G 7130-70, and 7150, and Subsidiary Mastabas of Street 7100. Boston, 1978 (Giza Mastabas, 3).

Smith, 1949

Smith W.S. A History of the Egyptian Sculpture and Painting in the Old Kingdom, 2 ed. London, 1949.

Smith, 1952

Smith W.S. Inscriptional Evidence for the History of the Fourth Dynasty. - JNES 11 (1952), p.113-128.

Steindorff, 1897

Steindorff G. Zur ägyptischen Religion. In: Baedeker K. Aegypten, Handbuch für Reisende, 4.Aufl., Leipzig, 1897, S.CXXXVII-CLII.

Steindorff, 1911

Steindorff G. Der Ka und die Grabstatuen. - ZÄSA, 48 (1911), S.152-159.

Tarabukin, 1928

Тарабукин Н.М. Портрет как проблема стиля. В книге: Искусство портрета, Москва, 1928, с.159-193.
(Tarabukin N.M. Portrait as a Problem of Style. In: Art of Portrait, 1928, p.159-193).

Vandersleyen, 1975a

Vandersleyen Cl. Das alte Ägypten (Propyläen Kunstgeschichte 15). Berlin, 1975.

Vandersleyen, 1975b

Vandersleyen Cl. Objectivité des portraits égyptiens. - BSFE 73 (1975), p.5-27.

Vandersleyen, 1982

Vandersleyen Cl. Porträt. - LÄ IV (1982), S.1074-1080.

Vandersleyen, 1983

Vandersleyen Cl. La date du Cheikh el-Beled. - JEA 69 (1983), p.61-65.

Vandier, 1958

Vandier J. Manuel d'archéologie égyptienne, t.III. La statue. Paris, 1958.

Wildung, 1982

Wildung D. Privatplastik. - LÄ IV (1982), S.1112-1119.

Zayed, 1958

Zayed Abd el-Hamid. Le tombeau d'Akhti-hotep à Saqqara. - ASAE 55 (1958), p.127-137.

Žinkin, 1928

Жинкин Н.И. Портретные формы. В книге: Искусство портрета, Москва, 1928, с.7-52.
(Žinkin N.I. The Forms of a Portrait. In: Art of Portrait, Moscow, 1928, p.7-52).

Brooklyn, 1989

Ancient Egyptian Art in the Brooklyn Museum. New York, 1989.

Matthieu, 1958

Матье М.Э. Древнеегипетский обряд отверзания уст и очей. В книге: Вопросы истории религии и атеизма, т.5, Москва, 1958, с.344-362.
(Matthieu M.E. Ancient Egyptian Ritual of Opening the Mouth and the Eyes. In: Problems of the History of Religion and Atheism, v.5, Moscow, 1958, p.344-362).

ABBREVIATIONS

- AÖAW Anzeiger der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse. Wien.
- ASAE Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte. Le Caire.
- BM The British Museum.
- BMFA Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts. Boston.
- Boston MFA The Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
- BrM The Brooklyn Museum.
- BSFÉ Bulletin de la Société française d'égyptologie. Paris.
- ÉMAÉ I Maspero G. Études de mythologie et d'archéologie égyptiennes, t.I. Paris, 1893.
- JAH Вестник древней истории. Москва.
(The Journal of Ancient History. Moscow).
- JARCE The Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt. Boston.
- JEA The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology. London.
- JNES The Journal of Near Eastern Studies. Chicago.
- LA Lexikon der Ägyptologie. Wiesbaden.
- Memnon Memnon. Zeitschrift für die Kunst und Kultur-Geschichte des Alten Orient. Berlin - Stuttgart - Leipzig.
- MH Medical History. London.
- MMA The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Neuchâtel Musée d'ethnographie de Neuchâtel.
- PM III² Porter B., Moss R. Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings. v.III, Memphis. 2 ed., Oxford, 1974-1981.
- RdÉ Revue d'égyptologie. Paris.
- Rec.Trav. Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiens et assyriennes. Paris.
- SAK Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur. Hamburg.
- SE Советская этнография. Москва.
(Soviet Ethnography. Moscow).
- TSBA Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology. London.
- ZÄSA Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde. Leipzig - Berlin.
- ВДИ see JAH
- СЭ see SE