

CHAPTER VI

INDIVIDUAL FINDS

A. Statue Fragments of the Old Kingdom

By

Ludwig Borchardt

In the year 1898 I tried to prove in a longer essay¹ that the statues found by Mariette in the Valley Temple of the Funerary Monument of Chephren of this king were not of his time, but of the Egyptian Renaissance period, which stemmed from the epoch of the intentional imitation of the art of the Old Kingdom. As could be expected, this assertion, which delivered 'a rude shock to our prejudices'² did not remain uncontested. Various people³ occupied themselves with this question, in connection with which they were not always able to preserve the calm which one hopes might be maintained in academic discourses. Some of them came to a conclusion which rejected my assertion completely, others were unsure, and held only one of the rows of statues to be of an earlier date, even though I had shown that both of these which could be distinguished by their material could also not possibly be separated in time (from one another). However, nobody has examined this case again in any detail. Another dismissed the inscriptions as being unimportant for art historical researches, and yet another openly declared himself to be incompetent in this field, and so forth.

Since the appearance of my article in 1898, I have not left the question raised there out of my scrutiny, and have noted any newly arising comparative facts which might be used for comparisons. The material for comparison has indeed grown since then to such an extent that today the situation has gained a very different appearance. Therefore, the opportunity to express myself on this subject here once again was very welcome to me.

We begin with the inscriptions of the statues which

(skip to p. 90:)

Concerning the dress of the king,⁴ I had at the time emphasized several things, without however putting particular emphasis on the dating because of

lacking objects for comparison, - except for one point. There were apart from the missing stripes of the headdress, perhaps replaced with paint, the following.

1. The flatly attached uraeus,
2. the shape of the beard,
3. the makeup stripes.

Of these the makeup stripes theory (Footnote 3) did not hold up any more after the finds in Hierakonpolis in 1898. The flat uraeus (Footnote 1) I found in 1899 on a head undoubtedly belonging to the Old Kingdom.⁵ And the strange beard with a pointed profile was typical for the Mycerinus portraits found from 1907 onwards.

With this today almost all former doubts are settled, and the few which are still outstanding will surely be resolved in the future because, through the excavations of the von Sieglin Expedition, a new fact has been uncovered, which makes it impossible to take the Chephren statues to be works of a later epoch.

For the excavation (by Uvo Hölscher for the von Sieglin Expedition) has proved, apart from the imprints of the statues in the old pavement⁶ - which may not be decisive yet for sceptics, - that the Valley Temple had been robbed already very early on of its granite façade. And its front, destroyed in this way, had already been walled up before the New Kingdom, and that before that, high over the old level, houses had been erected. So the Valley Temple was therefore inaccessible during the only time which could have been considered for the renewal of the statues, at least from the east front, where both of the main entrances are located. Also the back exit which led to the Causeway and the actual Funerary Temple was at the time not practicable; because it shows the same destruction as the east façade and had been even more exposed to sanding up and being covered by rubble. If this exit had at any time been the main entrance of the Valley Temple, as it was between the times of the excavations of Mariette and von Sieglin, then it would have been restored first. However, we could not find even the least traces of any restorative work there. We can therefore say with confidence that the Valley Temple had not been accessible from a time before the New Kingdom up to Mariette's days, and probably was not even visible. It is therefore out of the question that the statues found there during the first excavation are of a younger date than the New Kingdom. Renovations in the old style are however not known before the New Kingdom, therefore the statues are works of the builders of the Funerary Monument.

My earlier essay was therefore amiss, but not ineffective. It has after all forced quite a few colleagues to have a closer look at sculptures than had been customary up to that time.

Mariette's people found the remains of 9 more or less complete statues of Chephren in the Valley Temple of his Funerary Monument. The von Sieglin Expedition established the locations for 23 statues and four sphinxes in and at the Valley Temple, and in addition assured the places for at least a further 14

statues in the actual Funerary Temple. These 41 statues can, however, only have made up a small part of the amount of statues which had been erected here, because the excavation has unearthed hundreds of fragments of statues in all dimensions and in the most diverse materials, from a soft alabaster to a harder metamorphic schist, up to diorite or even basalt. The temple must have been full of statues to the point of being tasteless.

¹ *Zeitschrift für Ägypt. Sprache.*, Vol. 36, pp. 1 ff.

² Griffith in *Arch. Rep.*, 1897/8, p. 44.

³ Apostolides, *Défense de l'authenticité de la statue de Kafra contre les attaques de la critique moderne* in *Bulletin de l'Institut Eg.*, 1899, p. 170; Daressy, *L'Antiquité des statues de Chefren*, *op. cit.*, 1900, p. 6; von Bissing, in von Bissing-Bruckmann, *Denkmäler ägyptischer Skulptur, Erläuterung zu Bl.*, pp. 9 and 10; Spiegelberg, *Kunstgeschichte*, pp. 24 ff.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 11 ff.

⁵ See *Ä.Z.*, Volume 41, p. 62.

⁶ For whoever would like to try to assign to the statues again their old places according to these imprints, I give here the measurements of the imprints for the pieces found in the Cairo Museum [very long details omitted ...]