

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### Themes of the Self-Presentations of Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith

#### LITERARY ANALYSIS

The reading of Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith self-presentations is based on two levels:

1. High level represented by Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's statues, which I will address later in their artistic self-presentations.
2. Low level represented by Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentations, which were addressed to a specific audience.

Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith are each a protagonist with many self-presentations, a phenomenon very common in the self-presentations of the Late Period.<sup>799</sup> Text is an important component of their self-presentations, but the aesthetics of reading text and image are not separate since art cannot be separated from writing in ancient Egypt.<sup>800</sup> They present their self-presentations in the first person and in the hieroglyphic script. Their biographies reveal very sophisticated strings of titles and epithets with continuous syntax, and they express the growth of a sense of individuality and self-esteem. Their tone of self-esteem, a crucial characteristic of late Saite self-presentation, is highly represented in these texts. On their statues, placement of the biographies, an important element in the overall composition of the object, is highly significant and done in a proper way that highlights their impressive self-presentations. However, their biographies were not easily accessible to be read or deciphered by the public because they were mainly written on the back pillars of the statues, which were often directed toward the walls in the temples.

The self-presentations of Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith are literary pieces,<sup>801</sup> encompassing several genres and showing "interfigural"<sup>802</sup> of literary forms, making each self-presentation a "cross-genre text." They incorporate: strings of titles and

<sup>799</sup> See above.

<sup>800</sup> Baines 2007: 3; 2015.

<sup>801</sup> For more on defining literature, see, for example, Iser 1993. For ancient Egypt, see Loprieno 1996d; Strudwick 2005: 19–20, 42–46; Parkinson 2002; 2009.

<sup>802</sup> For more on this intertextual term, see Müller 1991.

epithets; self-presentation; wisdom literature;<sup>803</sup> narrative;<sup>804</sup> funerary literature; appeals to the living; and wishes for life and the afterlife.

Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's narratives, textual self-portraits, are the main vehicle through which they highlight the major events of their careers, in addition to their titles which might be called "implicit self-presentations."<sup>805</sup> Their narratives do not meet the traditional definition of narrative, which usually has beginning, middle, and end.<sup>806</sup> However, Gérard Genette defines narrative as "the representation of an event or sequence of events,"<sup>807</sup> while Gerald Prince goes as far as to define narrative as "the representation of at least one event."<sup>808</sup> Thus, Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's narratives do indeed represent true narratives. However, the text here is dense and detailed, like a short story, and not very long with as many events as a novel. Thus, it might be called "a single-event self-presentation" versus "a multi-event self-presentation," which often narrates the entire career events of the protagonist in chronological order.<sup>809</sup>

The biographies of these men do not narrate a whole career or some other aspect of a lifetime, but only a specific activity in a specific place and focus on the characterizations of the individual. Due to their commemorative nature and dedication in the temples' sacred space, they are selective and more focused on their narrated points. On Louvre A 90 of Neshor, the text takes us among the affairs that Neshor cleverly attended to at Elephantine. The text does not move from one event or activity to another or from a one place or time to another; it remains steadfastly focused in scope and limited in narration, concerned with only Elephantine and events then and there. The centrality of narrative here has two levels: primary and secondary. The primary is concerned with the major narrative such as Neshor's activities at Elephantine or at Mendes if we consider the remaining text on Mendes

<sup>803</sup> For more on wisdom literature in ancient Egypt, see, for example, Assmann 1991b. For a Late Period hieratic wisdom text (P. Brooklyn 47.218.135), see Jasnow 1992. For more on the relation between biography and "Lebenslehre," see Jansen-Winkel 2004b; Lichtheim 1983; Hoffmann and Quack 2007; Quack 2009.

<sup>804</sup> For narrative in art history, see Kemp 2003; and in ancient Egyptian art, see Gaballa 1976; Braun 2015.

<sup>805</sup> The Old Kingdom self-presentation of the chief physician Nyankhsekhmet deployed narrative; see *Urk.* I: 138–140. Quirke (1996b: 264) points out that narrative entered the world of self-presentations in the Fifth Dynasty. For more on narrativity, see Prince 1982: 148–161; 1999.

<sup>806</sup> See Guibert 2006: 32; see also Aristotle and Heath 1996. For more on narratology, see Prince 1982; Copley 2005.

<sup>807</sup> Genette 1982: 127; Rudrum 2005: 195.

<sup>808</sup> Prince 1999: 43; Rudrum 2005: 195.

<sup>809</sup> Ahmose Son-of-Ibana's self-presentation is a "multi-event self-presentation;" for his, see, for example, Lichtheim 2006b: 12–15; Schulz 1995.

Statue to be the whole narrative. As for Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentations, the primary level of narrative focuses on the principal narrative, such as Payeftjauemawyneith's activities at Abydos or at Heliopolis if we accept the existing text on statue BM EA 83 as the complete narrative. The secondary level of narrative is almost indirect, but it can be predicted through different ways such as rereading and reinterpreting the appeal to the living and the wishes sections in which Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith write their own narratives concerned with life after death, the deities of the temples, and the netherworld and its deities. Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's narratives in their self-presentations reveal their actions in an active way in many perspectives. The events are narrated by a single viewpoint, i.e., one voice dominates the scene. Therefore, I call it "a single-voice narrative" versus "a multi-voice narrative," which we commonly encounter in modern novels. The use of single viewpoint or voice is also one of the main characteristics of modern autobiography, but some self-presentations employ different viewpoints of many voices on some specific actions or events.<sup>810</sup> Here Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's narratives are composed like religious texts in which the god is usually the main actor on the scene, or like the "*Königsnovelle*"<sup>811</sup> in which the king is the main figure on the stage. Their narratives can fall under the second category, since in their texts they do not claim to act like gods.<sup>812</sup>

Although these self-presentations highlight their identities in different ways and the formation of their texts is different, they are similar in content and goal. For each man the ultimate goal beyond the writing of these self-presentations is clear in the phraseology content. For example, on Louvre A 90 Neshor addresses his speech to the triad of Elephantine: "Remember my *k3* on account of that which (I) achieved in your temple." This reveals one Neshor's principal wishes for his life after death, that these deities might remember him because of the favors he performed at their temple at Elephantine. The narrative in his other biographies is narrow and short, giving the importance to epithets that summarize his actions. When, for example, two of his epithets on the Abydos Statue and Louvre A 90 describe him as "the *jm3/hw* before the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Haaibre" and "the praised one before the Son-of-Re, Wahibre," these may refer to the fact that Neshor was favored by Apries. This statement with its implicit narrative obviously shows Neshor's position and appreciation within the state hierarchy and his intimate relationship with the crown.

<sup>810</sup> See, for example, Hoberman 2001; Black 2007.

<sup>811</sup> For more on the "*King's Novel*" and some examples, see, for instance, Loprieno 1996c; Hofmann 2004; Spalinger 2011; Enmarch 2013. See also Quack 2012, where that term is rejected.

<sup>812</sup> For acting like god in narrative, see Blumenthal 2003 on the role of Rensi as god in the *Narrative of the Eloquent Peasant*.



The self-presentations on their statues are dedicatory pieces commemorating their activities at Sais (?), Mendes, Abydos, Elephantine, Heliopolis, Memphis, Buto, and Abydos. Neshor's self-presentation on Louvre A 90 is probably a dedicatory piece at the temple of Khnum at Elephantine, while Payeftjauemawyneith's biography on Louvre A 93, a dedicatory piece at the temple of Osiris (Khentyimentt) at Abydos, takes us to the internal affairs of Abydos and the Tawer Nome, which he perspicaciously solved there. This type of biography as that of Neshor does not move from a various event or action to another or from a various place or time to another; it is very concentrated in scope and narrow in narrative: only Abydos and the Tawer Nome and its events in the period. All of Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentations were probably formed the same way. All of them are temple statues, as indeed were almost all Late Period statues.<sup>813</sup> The commemorative and dedicatory nature of their monuments immortalize textually and artistically the memory of their actions.

The distribution of Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentational statues in the temples, especially Louvre A 90 and Louvre A 93, is probably close to the Saite royal tradition. For example, when Psamtik II victoriously campaigned in Nubia over Kush, he ordered several stelae to be set up in many places in Egypt (such as at Shellâl, Karnak, and Tanis) in order to commemorate this historical event. Here Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith may do the same thing but in their own way, not exactly like that of the king; their several statues in these temples are presumably a clear indication for this trend.

Neither Neshor's nor Payeftjauemawyneith's provide us with the development in career from beginning to apex; thus, their self-presentations are not "self-fashioning."<sup>814</sup> For instance, statue Hermitage 2962 reveals Neshor's unique rank in the whole Saite Period as "overseer of the two gates of the foreign lands of the *w3d-wr*," and that may hint at one of the major and latest stages of his military career. These men wish to continue to be highly appreciated as they were in their lifetimes and to enjoy eternity in the afterlife with continuous funerary endowment in the presence of the great god. As for the rest of their self-presentations, they presumably wrote them when they reached the pinnacle of their careers. That their titles on them are similar indicates that they were probably written in one sequence of time, or in close sequences of time. Their self-presentations encompass three spheres of manifestation and interaction:

<sup>813</sup> See *ESLP*: xxxiii. However, Josephson (1997b: 2) mentions several exceptions contradicting Bothmer's view.

<sup>814</sup> For more on "self-fashioning," see, for example, Greenblatt 1980.

1. The public sphere.
2. The private sphere.
3. The god's sphere in the first life and in the afterlife (to be addressed under Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's religious beliefs, below).

The public sphere is the main domain in which they acted, achieved, and displayed their skills and good deeds. Their "public image" presents them performing publicly in texts and is elaborately represented in statues that were placed within the temple sacred spaces. Their "private image" presents them privately and expresses their piety and wishes for the afterlife. The latter image is less visible than the first, which occupies the larger portion of their self-presentations and totally dominates their statues. For example, on Louvre A 93 Payeftjauemawyneith addresses his speech to the priests whom he wishes to praise the god for him, and to everyone who will come forth from the temple to wish for him to "be in the sacred barque," and to "receive the bread of eternity at the head of the blessed dead." The narrative on BM EA 83 is brief in comparison with Payeftjauemawyneith's epithets, encapsulating his deeds. For example, when one of his epithets describes him as "the trusted one of Horus in his plans," that may imply that the king took council with Payeftjauemawyneith. This expression with its implicit narrative clearly reveals Payeftjauemawyneith's role within the royal palace and his close relationship with the king.

Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentations, with their multi-verbal statements, exemplify those of the elite members of Saite society. Neshor's self-presentation on Louvre A 90 is the most elaborate statement of his whole career and life, while his biographies on the other statues are variations exploring his individuality. While Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentation on statue BM EA 83 is the general statement of Payeftjauemawyneith's individuality, his self-presentation on Louvre A 93 is probably the closing statement of Payeftjauemawyneith's whole career and life.

## HISTORICAL ISSUES

Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentations, varied and rich in content, span the period from the reign of Psamtik II to that of Amasis, and show that they had served these kings. Their texts and statues introduce several historical and archaeological issues. However, their biographies were not composed for writing general history.<sup>815</sup> Their intention was not to record a chronological history of the

<sup>815</sup> For more on the importance of historiography in "life writing," see Bergland 2001.

period, but they focus on a selective corpus of actions of their own histories that they wanted to show us and were very proud of achieving them. Their texts write a different kind of history, what I call the “individualistic history of the individual.” The main intention of Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith was not to offer any detailed political history of the period, which can be sometimes obtained from some other Egyptian self-presentations, depending on the period and the protagonist. However, that does not negate the history of these individuals or of their societies. History can still be taken from their self-presentations. Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith, as extremely influential elite members in the late Saite Period, are mirrors of the period upon which its spirit and events are reflected. Their biographies offer a mixture of “societal history” and “individual’s history.” Despite the restrictions, each had acted in a brave manner and engaged in many activities, including courageous roles at Elephantine and the area of the First Cataract and at Abydos.

#### DATING NESHOR’S STATUES

Dating the statues of Neshor is straightforward. Hermitage 2962 dates to the reign of Psamtik II, and Louvre A 90, Sohag Statue, Abydos Statue, and Mendes Statue to that of Apries. Neshor lived at the end of middle Saite Egypt and the late Saite Period, mainly under Apries.

#### NESHOR’S ACTIVITIES AT SAIS, MENDES, ABYDOS, AND ELEPHANTINE

The historical and archaeological implications of Neshor’s self-presentations and statues are significant since he had served kings Psamtik II and Apries. Moreover, it is difficult to trace back the few archeological remains and the general statements in Neshor’s self-presentations.

Hermitage 2962 does not have narrative, and its text represents the so-called appeal to the living. Its greatest historical value likely lies in Neshor’s epithet “the great one in Netjerit” and his title “overseer of the two gates of the foreign lands of the *w3d-wr*.” Their importance comes from their unique use in Egyptian prosopography. Neshor in his self-presentation on Mendes Statue states:

“(I) finished up the chapels of the great *b3s*. Never ... (3) [under the majesty of] Horus, Wahib. It is before the lord of the Two Lands that my favors exist, as exchange for this that (I) have done. His majesty presented gifts which (he) created with (his) own arms ... (4) ... (5) on a stone stela of greywacke which was set up in the temple ...”

This self-presentation remarks that Neshor was probably sent by Apries to complete construction works (the chapels of the great *b3s*) for the deities at Mendes. Furthermore, Apries also presented gifts presumably to the deities of Mendes at the time of finishing the constructions. This royal donation event was subsequently commemorated on a stone stela of greywacke set up in a temple at that place. In addition to these pious deeds, Neshor mentions in his biography on Abydos statue:

“... (giving) (?) provisions for the herdsmen of the fowl, and food for the geese: 120 aurora, food for fattened geese (?) ...”

That is very close to his donation to the temple of Khnum at Elephantine in his biography on Louvre A 90. Since the biography does not explicitly mention it (because it is not complete), the temple that received these donations remains unknown.

The self-presentation of Neshor on Louvre A 90 is full of many activities that he undertook successfully at Elephantine and at the region of the First Cataract. Therefore, he introduces his good deeds before stating his wishes for the afterlife:

“Remember my *k3* on account of that which (I) achieved in your temple. It is with vessels of silver, numerous cattle, geese, and fowl that (I) enriched your temples. (4) It is forever and eternity that I established their rations from field(s) and their herdsmen. It is in your city that (I) fashioned their nest(s). It is in your storehouse(s), which (I) constructed anew in the great name of his majesty, that (I) gave very fine wine of the Southern-Oasis, emmer (and honey). It is in order to light the lamp(s) of the temples of your city that (I) gave castor-oil. It is (for) the holy cloth(es) of the great god (5) and his Ennead that (I) appointed weavers, maidservants, and washermen. It is in his temple that (I) built their quarters (?), so that they endure forever by the command of the great god, the lord of the Two Lands, H(a)aibre, living forever.”

The Saite remains of the temple of Khnum at Elephantine are very few. The excavator of the temple, Cornelius Von Pilgrim, has discovered blocks with reliefs belonging to the separate temple of Khnum that Psamtik II built. That temple was obviously built at the back side of the main temple; it was dismantled in the Thirtieth Dynasty when the new and larger temple was constructed. All blocks were then reused later in the foundations of the pronaos built in the Ptolemaic Period where Von



Pilgrim and his team discovered the blocks during the last years.<sup>816</sup> Therefore, “their quarters (?)” which Neshor claimed to have built are very difficult to locate. However, the image of Apries in Neshor’s self-presentation on Louvre A 90 here needs a further comment.

This self-presentation shows the role of Neshor against that revolt perpetrated by foreign mercenaries at Elephantine. Through his diplomatic activities at the region of the First Cataract, Neshor successfully overcame this rebellion. On this event Neshor states:

“(His) majesty assigned h(im) to a very great office, the office of his eldest son, the overseer of the gate of the southern foreign lands in order to repel the foreign lands of those who revolt against him. He placed fear of himself in the southern foreign lands, (2) so that they fled in their valleys because of fear of himself, without ... .. seeking what is good for his lord. (6) According as you saved me from a difficulty at the hands of the Bowmen, Bedouins, Greeks, Asiatics, and the rebels, placing ... .. into their heart(s), placing the going to Shas-Heret into their heart(s), his majesty was concerned about the vile deeds which they did. It was through (my) plan(s) that I encouraged their heart(s), not allowing that they march to Ta-Seti, and causing that they reach to the place where his majesty was. What his majesty did was ... (7) ... they/their (?).”

The reasons, details, aftermath, and consequences of this historical event remain unknown. Neshor’s self-presentation on Louvre A 90 is the only Egyptian source that sheds light on this. Alan Rowe<sup>817</sup> points out that this happened when Apries returned from his Palestinian campaign. According to Alan B. Lloyd,<sup>818</sup> this campaign was in 589 BCE. If Rowe’s opinion is valid, that means this revolt occurred at the beginning of Apries’s reign, more specifically at his regnal year 1. From this perspective, Lloyd declares that “Nesuhor emphasizes that it was he who got the king out of difficulties with his mercenaries.”<sup>819</sup> He further states that Neshor, as an army officer, was also concerned with the defense of the whole country.<sup>820</sup>

<sup>816</sup> For more on this temple stratigraphy from the New Kingdom to the Ptolemaic Period, see Von Pilgrim 2001. For the results of the early excavations at Elephantine by the Swiss-German team, see Kaiser, Grossmann, Haeny, and Jaritz 1970: 87–139. Von Pilgrim: pers. com.; 2003. For more on Elephantine of the third millennium BCE, see Raue 2008. See also Von Pilgrim 2013.

<sup>817</sup> Rowe 1938: 174.

<sup>818</sup> Lloyd 1994: 339.

<sup>819</sup> Lloyd 1994: 298. Rowe (1938: 174) and Griffiths (1955: 145) previously made the same point.

<sup>820</sup> Lloyd 1994: 333.



The only realities known of this event are that the foreign mercenaries of Apries performed some act at Elephantine against the regime (for unknown reasons) and planned to migrate farther south to the Nubian<sup>821</sup> place Shais-Heret, and that the overseer of the gate of the southern foreign lands, Neshor, succeeded in stopping them. It is notable that this event was not conducted by foreign countries against the land of Egypt, but rather by foreign mercenaries employed by Egypt within Egypt. Neshor's description of the event emphasizes his power and control, and his insistence on his own responsibility for this particular achievement.

#### DATING PAYEFTJAUEMAWYNEITH'S STATUES

The date of Payeftjauemawyneith's statues ranges from the reign of Apries and probably does not go beyond that of Amasis, living in late Saite Egypt mainly in the reign of Apries.<sup>822</sup> The date of BM EA 83 is securely fixed in the reign of Apries because of the presence of this king's cartouches. There is no cartouche on Mit Rahina 545, but based on Payeftjauemawyneith's titles on BM EA 83, Bakry assigns it, too, to the reign of Apries. That is possible but not certain. Pressl also dates Buto Statue in the reign of Apries without stating any supporting evidence.<sup>823</sup>

The date of Louvre A 93 has been much debated.<sup>824</sup> The garment that Payeftjauemawyneith wears in Louvre A 93 is called a "Persian garment"<sup>825</sup> by scholars.<sup>826</sup> For example, Bernard V. Bothmer dates this statue to post-Saite Period based on the presence of this garment, which he believes is Persian and was not worn

<sup>821</sup> The Egyptian military action of the Saïtes in Nubia was most known from the famous campaign of Psamtik II into Nubia, the major event in his short reign, which took place in his third regnal year (593 BCE) with an army of Egyptians and mercenaries under the generals Amasis and Potasimto as recorded on the king's stela from Shellal, Karnak, and Tanis; see Gozzoli 1997: 5–16. Gozzoli (1998: 46–49) furthermore explains the differences between the accounts of the Nubian campaign of Psamtik II in the southern version of the king's Shellal stela, which describes just the final battle (also inscribed at Karnak), and the northern version of the text at Tanis with its description of the complete development of the war (originally set up at Sais and Memphis) (?).

<sup>822</sup> El-Sayed (1975: 245) believes that Payeftjauemawyneith was contemporary to the reign of Psamtik I depending on BM EA 83, but he does not mention any evidence to support this assumption.

<sup>823</sup> Pressl 1996: 233. It is not known to me, however, whether, what and how the names of Apries are inscribed on Buto Statue.

<sup>824</sup> See Daressy 1900; *BAR*: 507 ff.; Posener 1947: 117–131; Jelínková-Reymond 1957: 263 ff.; Edel 1978; Spalinger 1982: 18–19 nos. 24, 25; Leahy 1988: 183–199; Ladynin 2006a; Lloyd 1988: 174, 176, 211. For more on this conflict, see Spalinger 1979. Leahy (1984a) successfully presented this argument.

<sup>825</sup> The "Persian garment" or "*kandys*" is "a full-sleeved and pleated robe reaching down to the ankles, usually worn either with a fluted crown or with a turban;" see Curtis and Tallis 2005: 264; see also Curtis 2005. Although the garment that Payeftjauemawyneith wears is long, it does not have

in Egypt before the First Persian Domination with the Twenty-seventh Dynasty.<sup>827</sup> Although Louvre A 93 and Statue Philadelphia 42-9-1 contradict his theory, he attributes the carving of these two statues to the Persian Period, arguing that the name of Amasis, which is written without any title, refers not to King Amasis but to a son of Payeftjauemawyneith with the same name,<sup>828</sup> although, as discussed previously here, Payeftjauemawyneith had no known son named Amasis. Bothmer, moreover, adds that the writing of non-royal names in a cartouche was unimaginable in the Saite Period, so he thinks that this way of writing private names was used as a symbol for resisting the Persian rule, and, as a result, this statue should be securely dated in the Persian Period.<sup>829</sup> His views are not generally accepted. De Meulenaere, for example, disagrees,<sup>830</sup> although nevertheless, he has argued that the so-called Persian garment must be dated to the beginning of the sixth century BCE.<sup>831</sup> Very recently, Jack A. Josephson expressed to me that he follows Bothmer's opinion and dates this statue early in the reign of Darius (Twenty-seventh Dynasty). He bases his opinion

sleeves, its end is not pleated, and it does not have a fringe. His headdress is also identical to those of the Saite Period. This kind of his garment is known in Egyptian art since the Middle Kingdom. Payeftjauemawyneith does not stand in the so-called Persian gesture; he stands in the traditional position of offering which is well-known in Egyptian art. Since nothing of this is present on Louvre A 93, the garment that Payeftjauemawyneith wears is not the so-called Persian garment. For some Egyptian individuals, especially from the Middle Kingdom, wearing similar garments, see the statue of Louvre E 11053 of Amenemhatânkh in Musée du Louvre and Ziegler 1997: 130; Simpson 1974: pls. 66 (ANOC 48.2-CCG 482), 69 (ANOC 51.2-CCG 427), 75 (ANOC 55.1-Louvre E 11573). *Ägypten 2000 v. Chr.* has also a good collection of statues with the same kind of garment: Amenemhet-anch p. 117 (no. 45), unknown man p. 135 (no. 61), Sebekemsaf p. 137 (no. 62), Renef-seneb-dag p. 152 (no. 74), Tetu p. 153 (no. 75), Cheper-ka-Rê-seneb p. 154 (no. 76), and Gebu p. 159 (no. 79); see Wildung et al. 2000. An example identical to the "Persian garment" was found in Egypt under the Persian domination, namely the Persian funerary stela discovered by the National Museums of Scotland expedition to Saqqara; see Manthieson et al. 1995: 23–41, especially pls. V and VI, fig. 3. The stela clearly shows this dress in a very Persian style. As for the so-called Persian gesture, Lisa Montagno Leahy believes that it may appear before the Twenty-seventh Dynasty and have Egyptian roots; see Manthieson et al. 1995: 33 (n. 38). See also the Cairo Museum Stela JE 45534, which was discovered by the University of Pennsylvania's University Museum expedition to Memphis during 1915–1923 in Schulman 1981: 103–111, esp. pl. 1. However, the pleated-end garment also appeared in Egypt on some Libyan, Kushite, and Saite monuments; see, for example, *ESLP*: 68, 76–77. See also Morkot 2014.

<sup>826</sup> However, Vittmann (1976; 2009: 97 [n. 37]) denies this argumentation.

<sup>827</sup> *ESLP*: 76.

<sup>828</sup> *ESLP*: 77.

<sup>829</sup> *ESLP*: 68.

<sup>830</sup> *ESLP*: 76.

<sup>831</sup> See Leahy 1984a: 45.

stylistically on the “pectoral” and the “tie” on the “skirt,” which “might point to that dating.” He, therefore, does not agree with Leahy’s dating (early in the reign of Amasis) and suggests that the use of the name of Amasis by Egyptian sculptors is “well-known.”<sup>832</sup>

Günther Vittmann dates this garment in the late Saite Period and suggests that it was probably as early as ca. 600 BCE; however, he proposes that it would be wisely dated as late as the early Twenty-seventh Dynasty.<sup>833</sup> Sematawyt[ay]efnakht named Wahibremer wears a similar garment in his Statue Cairo Museum prov. nr. 27/11/58/8, from the reign of Amasis,<sup>834</sup> whose name has been cut out (year 39).<sup>835</sup> According to Vittmann and Perdu, Hekat[ay]efnakht’s Statue Louvre E 25499 is another example of the so-called Persian garment in the late Saite Period.<sup>836</sup> However, as Anthony Leahy<sup>837</sup> points out, scholars date this statue in the reign of Amasis without further discussion.<sup>838</sup>

The proposed date of this statue thus ranges from the reign of Amasis to the beginning of the Persian Period. The date of Louvre A 93 should be securely fixed to the reign of Amasis for the following reasons:

1. Payeftjauemawyneith served Apries and lived under Amasis.
2. No other monuments of Payeftjauemawyneith date to the Persian Period.
3. The presence of the name of Amasis in a cartouche is clear evidence for dating.
4. This way of writing Amasis’s name (its place on the left side of the statue and its position toward the end of the self-presentation on Louvre A 93) is new. For example, the name of Amasis is not introduced as the first textual element in Payeftjauemawyneith’s self-presentation on Louvre A 93 as are the names of Apries on BM EA 83 of Payeftjauemawyneith. This may support the idea that the name of Amasis was added upon the completion of this statue. Nevertheless, the writing of the royal name of Amasis without titles does not signify neglect of that king.

<sup>832</sup> Josephson: pers. com.

<sup>833</sup> See Vittmann 2009: 97 (n. 37).

<sup>834</sup> Agut-Labordère 2013: 988.

<sup>835</sup> Bresciani 1967.

<sup>836</sup> Vittmann 2009: 97 (n. 37); see also Vandier (1964), who proposes that Hekatefnakht probably lived at the end of the Saite Period and the beginning of the First Persian Period/Twenty-seventh Dynasty (526–401 BCE).

<sup>837</sup> Leahy 1984a: 45.

<sup>838</sup> Spalinger 1977: 242; Lloyd 1994: 292; Lichtheim 2006c: 33.



5. Payeftjauemawyneith placed the name of Amasis at the end of his self-presentation so that it would be closer to the sphere of divinity, where he addresses the god with his wishes. Leahy believes that Louvre A 93 should be dated early in the reign of Amasis.<sup>839</sup> This is certainly possible, but it is still not easy to determine precisely in what part of the reign of Amasis Payeftjauemawyneith lived nor how long he lived under him. Furthermore, the date of Payeftjauemawyneith's death is unknown.
6. In Louvre A 93 the presence of Amasis is notably weak; it hardly compares with the strong presence of Apries on BM EA 83. Therefore, an evaluation of the king's presence in this text of Payeftjauemawyneith is relevant here.
7. Louvre A 93 presents Amasis in a human image, not in a divine one. Leahy believes that "the presentation of the king on Louvre A 93 is governed (at least in part) by the particular circumstances of the Apries/Amasis struggle, rather than wider kingship issues."<sup>840</sup> This argument is valid, but does not negate the growth of Payeftjauemawyneith's power in the late Saite Period.
8. The way Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentation is displayed on Louvre A 93 is highly significant. The layout and composition of the text on the back pillar and the left side of the statue are unique. The main body of the text on the back pillar (starting out with Payeftjauemawyneith's titles, epithets, and name at the beginning with a few references to an unnamed king) is striking. Payeftjauemawyneith had evidently avoided naming the king at the beginning of this text. This was perhaps due to the struggle between Apries and Amasis. Payeftjauemawyneith rather perhaps acts like a king who makes monuments and restores them for the deities and their temples. He commences his self-presentation with his titles, epithets, and name almost like a king listing his royal titulary at the outset of his dedicatory monument. The king to whom the text refers at the beginning might be Apries, while at the end, the king's name, Amasis, may have been added after completion of the statue, after his defeat of Apries and usurpation of the throne. If this is the case, Payeftjauemawyneith's titles and epithets at the beginning are probably those he held under Apries, not under Amasis. If he was still in favor in the reign of Amasis, as he was under Apries, he would presumably have created another dedicatory

<sup>839</sup> Leahy 1984a: 46.

<sup>840</sup> A. Leahy, pers. com. of June 21, 2007; 1984a: 52.



piece in the reign of Amasis.

9. Louvre A 93 commemorates the closing statement of Payeftjauemawyneith's career, but not of his life. He might well have survived into the reign of Amasis, but without holding office. We are unaware of Payeftjauemawyneith's history before Apries's reign; moreover, we do not know when exactly he held his offices under that king. During the reign of Amasis, Payeftjauemawyneith seems to appear only on a few undated funerary artifacts, perhaps due to his death early in his reign. Payeftjauemawyneith's only monument securely dated to the reign of Amasis is Louvre A 93 on which the name of Amasis occurs toward the end of the text, perhaps indicating that Payeftjauemawyneith was not appreciated by Amasis. Payeftjauemawyneith was first mentioned in the reign of Apries, to whom he was loyal. Payeftjauemawyneith, moreover, was no military man able to support Amasis or to defend Apries. I suspect, therefore, that Payeftjauemawyneith's loss of his offices under Amasis explains his disappearance from the scene after the reign of Apries. Even if he was not forcibly removed from office, he may have been in ill favor under Amasis. It should be kept in mind that Louvre A 93 is complete in comparison with BM EA 83; Amasis did not appear again on any missing part of the statue. Payeftjauemawyneith's titles on it do not relate him to Amasis. If Louvre A 93 was not dated to the transition from the reign of Apries to that of Amasis, it should be dated to the early years of Amasis. Payeftjauemawyneith may have realized that he would no longer be active in his offices or appreciated under Amasis because of his loyalty to Apries. Therefore, he may have added the name of Amasis at the end for diplomatic purposes, so as to avoid any further royal ill-favor or punishment.
10. Besides the Year One Stela of Amasis, Herodotus mentions the so-called civil war between kings Apries and Amasis,<sup>841</sup> which seems to have been more of a "struggle" between the two kings than a "civil war." Although this self-presentation dates to the reign of Amasis, it has no clear reference to the conflict between the two kings.<sup>842</sup> It seems that Payeftjauemawyneith avoided this issue and distanced himself from this tense contest. This self-presentation may perhaps indirectly be evidence of this affair. For example, his self-presentation on BM EA 83, places

<sup>841</sup> Lloyd 1988: 174, 176, 211.

<sup>842</sup> For this struggle, see, e.g., Leahy 1988; Ladynin 2006a.

the names of Apries in its frontal focal point on the naos which he carries between his hands. This indicates that Payeftjauemawyneith much valued the presence of Apries on BM EA 83. Moreover, the *njswt-bjt* and *s3-r* names of Apries are completely written and presented in honorific transposition on the front of the statue, as the central focus of the naos. This is followed by the traditional wishes and epithets for royalty. The two names of Apries introduce his self-presentation on BM EA 83.<sup>843</sup> On the contrary, the name of Amasis on Louvre A 93 is written in an abbreviated fashion without traditional royal titles, epithets, or wishes. I therefore propose that Payeftjauemawyneith was probably removed from office or fell from grace in the reign of Amasis, as stated above.

11. Unlike the naos on BM EA 83 where the names of Apries are inscribed, the naos on Louvre A 93 is left blank where usually the deity and the king's attributes are placed. Louvre A 93 starts out with the name and titles of Payeftjauemawyneith, not with those of the king or the deity. I would add that the name of Apries was not originally written on Louvre A 93 and then altered to that of Amasis. If the names of Apries had been written, they would have been placed completely in a visible place and as prominently as they were on the naos of BM EA 83. There are no traces for the erasure of the names of Apries. The back pillar text was inscribed first, and then the left side of the statue where the brief writing of the name of Amasis was added without a cartouche or royal titulary. It seems reasonable that the relationship between Amasis and Payeftjauemawyneith was not a strong one. Therefore, Payeftjauemawyneith did not place the attributes of Amasis in as favorable a position as he did those of Apries.<sup>844</sup>

<sup>843</sup> For more on this statue, see above.

<sup>844</sup> Rößler-Köhler (1991: 244–245) thinks that Payeftjauemawyneith had close connections with Amasis and enjoyed many personal favors that he received from Apries under the new king, who sent him again to create order at Abydos as a royal representative by a royal command, pointing out that Payeftjauemawyneith was trusted by Amasis. She also disagrees with Leahy (1984a: 50–52) in regard to the only occurrence of Amasis's name at the end of the text and the absence of a title in the front of his cartouche, and believes that these are not sufficient evidence to propose that the role of the king was minimized during that period.

## PAYEFTJAUEMAWYNEITH'S ACTIVITIES AT HELIOPOLIS, MEMPHIS, BUTO, AND ABYDOS

Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentation on BM EA 83 has neither a long descriptive narrative, nor is it informative. Its brief and obscure phrase "good things for this temple" may refer to Payeftjauemawyneith's actions at the temple of Atum at Heliopolis, tells us little. Miriam Lichtheim<sup>845</sup> states that on BM EA 83 Payeftjauemawyneith spoke of his role in reorganizing the temple administration at Heliopolis, although Payeftjauemawyneith's specific activities at Heliopolis are unknown.

Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentation on Mit Rahina 545 does not have narrative, but through his titles we can conclude some roles that he probably played there. His self-presentation on Buto Statue is not known to me; however his string of similar titles forms a good source for reconstructing what he probably did there.

His self-presentation on Louvre A 93 is the most detailed. Payeftjauemawyneith's numerous achievements at Abydos remain the most important among his overall deeds. This self-presentation reveals an obscure situation at the Tawer Nome in the transition from the reign of Apries to that of Amasis. That "occasional northern visitor"<sup>846</sup> was sent on a mission in order to restore the affairs of Abydos, to establish order, and to spread justice in the Tawer Nome.

By investigating the Saite addition to the temple complex at Abydos under Apries and Amasis, it becomes clearer that little has survived. Petrie found fragments of some artifacts for Amasis, which may have been the result of Payeftjauemawyneith's deeds.<sup>847</sup> Only two places can probably be recognized in order to explore Payeftjauemawyneith's building activities at Abydos: the temple of (Osiris-)Khentyimentt precinct at Kom es-Sultan at north Abydos and Umm el-Gaab in northwest Abydos.<sup>848</sup>

Payeftjauemawyneith created a granite shrine (*rꜥ-ḥḥ*) at the temple of (Osiris) Khentyimentt. The remaining granite traces dated to the reigns of Apries and Amasis might form some of that *rꜥ-ḥḥ* shrine.<sup>849</sup> The granite "*rꜥ-ḥḥ*" shrine that

<sup>845</sup> Lichtheim 2006c: 33.

<sup>846</sup> For this description, see Leahy 2007: 53 (n. 32). For more on priests and their duties, see Spencer 2010a.

<sup>847</sup> Kemp 1975: 33–34.

<sup>848</sup> For more on Kom es-Sultan and Umm el-Gaab, see Lichtheim 1988: pl. x; Wegner 2001: 7–8, Klotz 2010.

<sup>849</sup> Leahy (1984a: 47) remarks that Payeftjauemawyneith does not use "a generic term" for shrine or chapel such as *kꜣrj*. However, Spencer does not list this term in Chapter Four of her study on the terminology of shrine and chapel; see Spencer 1984: 99–146, esp. 125–130 on *kꜣrj*.



Payeftjauemawyneith built was probably the naos of which fragmentary pieces were found by Petrie at Abydos. The archeological evidence shows that the construction of the Saite temple in the Osiris precinct had been initiated during the reign of Apries and continued into that of Amasis. The foundation deposits of this temple have the names of both kings. Moreover, the cartouches of the two kings have been found on fragmentary red granite pieces from the temple.<sup>850</sup>

The *Wpg*-sanctuary that Payeftjauemawyneith built may be located in tomb O of Djer at Umm el-Gaab. Eberhard Otto equates *W-pkr* with Umm el-Gaab.<sup>851</sup> Leahy believes that *Wpg* should be also located at Umm el-Gaab.<sup>852</sup> Émile Chassinat thinks that the word *Wpg* derived from *W-pkr* "Nome of Poker."<sup>853</sup> Leahy further points out the limestone fragments bearing the cartouche of Amasis found by Emile Amélineau may refer to that sanctuary which Payeftjauemawyneith probably built of local limestone.<sup>854</sup>

Among Payeftjauemawyneith's other activities at Abydos was the creation of a garden. He refers to the garden that he established at the temple of (Osiris) Khentyimentt at Abydos thus:<sup>855</sup>

"I made for it a garden, having been planted with all fruit trees, the gardeners in it having been of foreign lands, and having been brought as captives. Thirty *hmnw*-jars of wine will be placed from (it) daily upon the altar of Khentyimentt, and offerings shall be presented from (it) in the length of eternity."

Payeftjauemawyneith also restored the House of Life at Abydos:<sup>856</sup>

"I renovated the House of Life after (it) having been ruined."

<sup>850</sup> See Leahy 1984a: 46–47. See also Marlart 2009.

<sup>851</sup> Otto 1954: 165 (n. 2); *Wb*. I: 306 (2); Lichtheim 2006c: 36 (n. 8); Leahy 1984a: 48.

<sup>852</sup> Leahy 1984a: 49; 1989b: 57–58.

<sup>853</sup> Chassinat 1966: 255–260; Leahy 1984a: 47.

<sup>854</sup> Leahy 1984a: 49–50.

<sup>855</sup> For the similarity between Louvre A 93 and Twenty-fifth Dynasty inscriptions dealing with gardens, see above. For this Saite example, see Thiers 1999: 108–109 (Doc. 2).

<sup>856</sup> For physical remains of a Ramesside House of Life, see Leblanc 2005. For more on this House of Life at Abydos, with reference to our text and to the early Ptolemaic Papyrus Salt 825 (= BM EA 10051), see Gardiner 1938: 167 ff. (No. 33); Derchain 1965; Nordh 1996: 193–194.

This renovation is a clear reference to the existence of this institution at Abydos.<sup>857</sup> Paul Ghalioungui points out that this House of Life was annexed to the Osiris temple at Abydos.<sup>858</sup> Udjahorresnet also restored the House of Life at Sais.<sup>859</sup> It seems that the restoration of the Houses of Life and other religious institutions was common in the period.

Payeftjauemawyneith further states:

“I subdued the violence (head-plunderers[??]) in Tawer ... I gave property of the processional coming out from Tawer’s desert to the temple, (which) I found in the possession of the *h3(tj)-c*,<sup>860</sup> so that the Adyene people would be buried.”

This passage may refer to a chaotic situation in the Tawer Nome, although its details are not clear. According to Payeftjauemawyneith’s text, he did his best to restore order and, if we understand it correctly, made accessible to the inhabitants of the nome something from the desert that was necessary for their burials. Payeftjauemawyneith also claims:

“I gave the ferryboat of Tawer to the temple, (which) I took away from the charge of the *h3(tj)-c*.”

The *mhnt*,<sup>861</sup> “ferryboat,” to which Payeftjauemawyneith refers had secular and religious functions. Lichtheim points out that the *mhnt* here may mean “the ferryboat tax.” However, there is no evidence to support her claim.

<sup>857</sup> In his study on the House of Life, Gardiner (1938: 165) briefly mentions Louvre A 93. Burkard (1980: 79–115) also touches upon the same House of Life at Abydos. Papyrus BM EA 10051 refers to the House of Life at Abydos, stating: *jr pr-nh wnn=f m 3bdw* “As for the House of Life, it is at Abydos;” see Gardiner 1938: 167–168.

<sup>858</sup> Ghalioungui 1973: 68.

<sup>859</sup> See Lichtheim 2006c: 39, 41 (n. 17); Posener 1936: 11; Gardiner 1938: 157–158.

<sup>860</sup> Lichtheim (2006c: 36 [n. 11]), following Kees (1934–1936: 103–104), points out that this is a reference to the transfer of income to the Osiris temple from the mayor. She further adds that Kees sees in this action “a redistribution of revenues as part of the Saite dynasty’s reorganization of landholdings.” She also states that the transferred income would be utilized for the burial expenses of the Abydene people.

<sup>861</sup> See also Gardiner 1916: 100 (n. 1). The *mhnt*-boat appears from the Old Kingdom (the self-presentation of Harkhuf, for example) through the Third Intermediate Period (the triumph stela of Piye, for example) to the Ptolemaic Period (at the temple of Edfu, for example). The title of its ferryman, *mhntj*, was mentioned in many texts, especially in Ramesside Egypt; see *Wb*. II: 133 (12–13); Jones 1988: 139–140 (41); Lichtheim 2006c: 36 (n. 12).

Payeftjauemawyneith further says:

“I guarded Tawer for its lord; I protected its entire people.”

These actions of Payeftjauemawyneith may refer to an abuse of power and social injustice perpetrated on the people of the Tawer Nome by the local mayor. Payeftjauemawyneith probably restored *mꜣꜥt*, imposed law, and overcame chaos in that nome. Payeftjauemawyneith’s actions and social-legal role can be understood as “social protection”<sup>862</sup> to the Adydene people, and could be designated as “heroic.” Payeftjauemawyneith was evidently proud of what he did there, since these actions are the focal point of his narrative in his main self-presentation on Louvre A 93. In all actions that Payeftjauemawyneith did at Abydos, he was on a priestly mission although he was not a priest.<sup>863</sup> He was probably trusted by Apries more than any other dignitary and was on a continuous process of royal restoration policy. Payeftjauemawyneith acted in a unique manner and participated in many activities, which were previously restricted to kings or royal house members, such as restoring the chaotic affairs in one of the nomes and the renovation of the god’s temple. The historical value of Payeftjauemawyneith’s self-presentations is clearly manifest.

#### VISUAL SELF-PRESENTATION

Neshor’s and Payeftjauemawyneith’s iconographical representation, a crucial element in revealing the self-presentation which they wish to project, is the high level of reading. Their inscribed statues placed in the temples are highly sophisticated pieces made for eternity, bearing elaborated iconographical self-presentations.<sup>864</sup>

Out of Neshor’s known five statues, Hermitage 2962, Abydos Statue, and Louvre A 90 are theophorous statues<sup>865</sup> that powerfully reveal the artistic form that Neshor

<sup>862</sup> On this term, but in a different context of today’s world, see Standing 2007. For more on legal and social institutions of ancient Egypt, see Lorton 2000: 345–362.

<sup>863</sup> Payeftjauemawyneith’s task at Abydos had been previously done by priests. This aspect is obvious in many priestly biographies from Ramesside Egypt; see Frood 2007: 35–116. Also, in a following period the restoration mission was conducted by a priest; see Jansen-Winkel 2005.

<sup>864</sup> For more on sculpture in ancient Egyptian art, see Hartwig 2015; and specifically on Late Period Sculpture, see Russmann 2010.

<sup>865</sup> For more on naophorous statues, see Van Dijk 1983; 1993: 113–132. On the Saite naophorous statue of Irhorudjanefu, see Edwards 1992: 43–48. See especially De Meulenare 2009, with many Saite examples, and Klotz 2014b. On the use of naophorous type, costume, and stylistic features as basis for artistic analysis, see the publication of a kneeling naophorous statue of the Saite official *P3-ḥr-ḥnsw* son of *Psmṯk* and *Ns-3rt* (Cairo Museum JE 38016) by Selim (2000). On the use of naophorous for dating, see Selim 1990. For a Twenty-second Dynasty naophorous statue, see Leahy 2006: 169–184. On a Saite naophorous statue, see Clère 1972.

selected to depict and promote his self. The upper part of Mendes Statue is not preserved enough to know its artistic type, nor is the artistic form of Sohag Statue known. Hermitage 2962 represents an incomplete standing theophorous statue depicting Neshor with his left leg advanced as he presents a long and free-standing statuette of Osiris held at knee level between his hands in front of the lower portion of his body. The head of Osiris is totally missing; the god holds in his hands his divine emblems and wears the *washt* necklace. Only the lower portion of the statue of Neshor remains, while its base is missing; the statue has an inscribed back pillar. If this statue did not come from Sais, its textual and artistic composition makes it possible to suggest that it originated from the temple of Isis at Behbeit Al-Hagara.

Mendes Statue is an upper part of a torso of a statue. The right half of the torso remains with a crack at its middle; the right arm is missing. The face of the statue is severely damaged so that it does not stand as a good clue for Neshor's facial features. The back of Neshor's wig (with a crack in the middle) and his large ears remain. A crack divides the statue from the top of the head and runs through the back pillar.

Louvre A 90 is a kneeling theophorous statue depicting Neshor carrying on his knees a base with three well-sculpted statuettes of the triad of Elephantine: Khnum, Anukis, and Satis. The three statuettes of the triad are later restorations of destroyed originals. The statue has a long inscribed back pillar. The two sides and the top of the back pillar are also inscribed. The statue's current condition shows that the base of the main statue is inscribed except at the front, while the base of the three statuettes is only inscribed on the front. The face and the hands of Neshor as well as three deities were restored; a nose, probably Greek, was added to Neshor's face.<sup>866</sup> The facial features of Neshor here are, therefore, not accurate. His current face shows him smiling,<sup>867</sup> wearing a big wig that falls behind the shoulders; his large ears stand out against the wig. The anatomical details are very visible in the area of the legs and their toes. Neshor was depicted wearing a *shendyt*, which, in strongly centralized eras, was largely restricted to kings.<sup>868</sup>

Abydos Statue represents a middle part of a kneeling theophorous statue depicting Neshor holding at his knees between his hands three seated statuettes of a

<sup>866</sup> See Ziegler (1994: 52), who believes that this restoration was done in the eighteenth century CE.

<sup>867</sup> See Bassir and Creasman 2014.

<sup>868</sup> The Saite official Wahibre also wears a *shendyt* in his statue BM EA 111. For a recent photo of this statue, see Strudwick 2006: 275.



triad, probably of Osiris, Isis, and Horus. The triad leans against the back pillar, the base of which carries their statuettes. The upper part of the three statuettes is missing. The left hand of Neshor is severely damaged. The statue has an inscribed back pillar.

The theophorous statue is the popular form with its various themes that Neshor chose to promote his self-presentation artistically. According to Robert S. Bianchi,<sup>869</sup> this statue type, mainly for non-royal use, became very common in the Nineteenth Dynasty and remained so until the end of the Ptolemaic Period.<sup>870</sup> It usually depicts a standing or kneeling male figure presenting a divine image, Osiris being the most common. Bianchi states that in the Late Period the usual material of this statue type was basalt, schist, or bronze.<sup>871</sup> This statue type was commissioned for display in temples; it, therefore, integrates the protagonist into the daily rituals performed for the deity. Mohamed Saleh and Hourig Sourouzian point out that the statue owner hoped “to participate in the offering and prayers addressed to the deity in his temple.”<sup>872</sup> Bianchi declares that “this practice may represent a usurpation of a royal prerogative.”<sup>873</sup>

Three statues of Payeftjauemawyneith out of his four are naophorous in type, again powerfully visual expressions of the manner in which Payeftjauemawyneith wished to portray and promote his self. BM EA 83 and Louvre A 93 are naophorous; Mit Rahina 545 was perhaps naophorous.<sup>874</sup> Louvre A 93 is a standing naophorous statue (and probably Mit Rahina 545); BM EA 83 is a kneeling naophorous statue.

Naophorous statues probably first appeared in the reign of Hatshepsut, i.e., Statue Cairo CG 42117 of Senenmut.<sup>875</sup> Many interpretations have been proposed in order to explain the importance of the naophorous statue.<sup>876</sup> The idea of protection

<sup>869</sup> Bianchi 1996: 860.

<sup>870</sup> However, it appeared in royal statuary from the reign of Ramesses III. See Saleh and Sourouzian 1987: no. 228.

<sup>871</sup> Bianchi 1996: 860.

<sup>872</sup> See Saleh and Sourouzian 1987: no. 228.

<sup>873</sup> Bianchi 1996: 860.

<sup>874</sup> Based on having a base and a back pillar (see Pressl 1998: 233), I think the Buto Statue probably was also naophorous in type (?).

<sup>875</sup> Van Dijk 1993: 113; Meyer 1982: 81–82, 126–128; Rogge 1992. For more on this statue, see Dorman 1988: 134–137, 192 (9); De Meuleneare 2009; Klotz 2014b.

<sup>876</sup> See, for example, Turajeff 1909; Spiegelberg 1911; Anthes 1937; Ranke 1943; Otto 1948; Bonnet 1961; Wildung 1980: 341; 1982: 1116, 1119 (n. 43); Meyer 1982: 89–93; Van Dijk 1993.

is probably the most accepted one among them.<sup>877</sup> Moreover, the naophorous statue is often provided with a statuette or an emblem of one of the deities of the dead. Therefore, it might have been intended for the benefit of its protagonist in the afterlife.<sup>878</sup> The naophorous statue<sup>879</sup> is almost a temple or tomb-like-temple statue, which may well explain why Payeftjauemawyneith chose this artistic form for his depiction in the temples.<sup>880</sup>

A naophorous statue is, as Payeftjauemawyneith's statues show, mainly composed of four elements:

- Naos: It has an emblem or a statuette of a deity with a text held between the hands by the statue owner. It is the most important element because it has the name(s) of the king (text) and the image or the emblem of the god (image), so it connects the protagonist to the divine and royal realms.
- Statue: The main visual element in self-presentation, mainly without any text except the name and the titles of its owner. It gives the audience the main impression about its protagonist.
- Base: It carries the statue with a text running on its body. It bears the titles of the individual and his or her wishes for the afterlife.
- Back pillar: The holder and the connector of the statue to the base; it provides space for the patron's narrative.

BM EA 83 shows Payeftjauemawyneith kneeling on a rounded base, wearing a pleated kilt, and presenting a naos containing the lower portion of a statuette of a deity (Osiris) (?). The statue is highly carved, showing Payeftjauemawyneith's anatomical features particularly in the area of the legs, the fingers, and the toes. On

<sup>877</sup> See Saleh and Sourouzzian (1987: no. 209), who point out that the statue owner hoped to participate in the daily and festive offerings presented to the temple deity; see also Bianchi 1996.

<sup>878</sup> See Edwards 1992.

<sup>879</sup> Among the most important contributions on the naophorous statue, its composition and text placement, are Baines 1996 and Rößler-Köhler 1989.

<sup>880</sup> Leahy (2007: 53 [n. 32]) remarks that Louvre A 93 was a temple "funerary dedicatory" statue. Bothmer (*ESLP*: xxxiii) believes that all the Late Period statues came from temples, not tombs. However, Pischikova (2008b: 194) states that the Saite Period witnessed "a revival of monumental tomb sculpture." She (2008: 195) also believes that the Late Period tomb had a "dual function," as a tomb as well as a temple.

Mit Rahina 545, Payeftjauemawyneith is probably depicted standing, wearing a pleated kilt, and probably was holding a figure of a deity (Ptah [?], now missing); the rest of the body is perfectly sculpted showing Payeftjauemawyneith's anatomical details.

Louvre A 93 represents Payeftjauemawyneith standing against a back pillar on a blank rectangular base with his left foot advanced, presenting a blank naos<sup>881</sup> with a standing statuette of Osiris, and wearing a long and tight garment with two ends tied upon his chest,<sup>882</sup> a bag wig, and around his long neck a cylinder seal<sup>883</sup> hanging at his chest, as an insignia of his multi administrative offices.<sup>884</sup> The statue is highly carved with a well polished surface. The *hrp*-naos<sup>885</sup> has two sections: the upper with a statuette of Osiris inside; the lower is a stand carved with the base and carrying the upper section. Payeftjauemawyneith is holding a naos in the form of the hieroglyphic sign *hrp* between his legs while his advanced left leg is very close to the end of the naos stand. Payeftjauemawyneith's hands are touching<sup>886</sup> gently upon the two sides of the naos. The frontal view of this statue shows that Payeftjauemawyneith's forehead is short, mostly covered underneath the bag wig falling behind his shoulders as a characteristic of the period.<sup>887</sup> His rounded face shows very different facial features,

<sup>881</sup> The use of the naos generally emphasizes "a wider cult and ritual purpose;" see Spencer and Rosenow 2006: 31–38. Payeftjauemawyneith's statues were probably cultic, benefited magically by rituals performed at the temple; see El-Sayed 1975: 133; Zivie-Coche 1991: 234; Spencer and Rosenow 2006: 31.

<sup>882</sup> Scholars think this garment was Persian: for example *ESLP*: 76–77. However, this opinion is no longer accepted by Egyptologists. For more on this issue, see above. Shubert (1993: 34) considers this "wraparound garment" an "iconographic innovation" of the reign of Amasis.

<sup>883</sup> I understand this to be a cylinder seal because it is tiny and not inscribed. For other examples with depiction of royal presentation to a divine on a pectoral, see the late Saite statue of Ahmosesaneith, Louvre E. 25390 (*ESLP*: 67–68 [No. 57], pl. 55, fig. 134) and the late Saite/early Persian statue of Ptahhotep, Brooklyn no. 37. 353 (*ESLP*: 76–77 [No. 64], pl. 60, fig. 151).

<sup>884</sup> Shubert (1993: 34) describes this pictorial element as a "little plaque hanging from a cord around the neck." He (1993: 34) further considers the depiction of this "plaque" in the reign of Amasis "an iconographic departure from the austere, idealized Saite image." Shubert (1993: 44 [n.78]) refers to another example of this plaque on the statue of Psamtik under Hathor (Egyptian Museum, Cairo, = CG 784, greywacke; 96 cm x 104 cm x 29 cm); see Borchardt 1930: 91–92; pl. 144. In fact, in this statue, Psamtik wears a cylinder seal, not a "plaque," to reflect his profession as "overseer of the seals" and "director of the palace." For a photograph of this statue and the titles of his owner, see Saleh and Sourouzzian 1987: no. 251. For more photographs of this statue, see Terrace and Fischer 1970: 165–168; Russmann 1989: 185–188; fig. 86. For more on cow statues in Saite non-royal tombs, see Pischikova 2008b.

<sup>885</sup> The *hrp*-sign here is more appropriate than *šhm*, which Bosse (1936: 39 [88], 90) suggests, since it refers to Payeftjauemawyneith's title "*hrp*-*ḥ* administrator of the palace."

<sup>886</sup> Klotz 2014b.

<sup>887</sup> See Josephson 1997: 3.



such as elongated sharp eyebrows above wide, forward-looking eyes, large ears placed against the bag wig, a triangle nose, big mouth with prominent lips with a deep furrow, and a flat and protruding chin.<sup>888</sup> Payeftjauemawyneith's facial features with a smiling face are rather closer to those of Apries, not those of Amasis.<sup>889</sup> Louvre A 93 was probably created in the royal workshop by a royal sculptor on a royal model. The similarity between Payeftjauemawyneith's facial features and those of Apries may reveal that Louvre A 93 was sculpted in the reign of Apries and when he was removed from the throne, Payeftjauemawyneith added the name of Amasis at the end of this text upon completion, as argued above.

BM EA 83 depicts Payeftjauemawyneith kneeling, while Louvre A 93 and probably Mit Rahina 545 standing; however, the artistic gesture of Payeftjauemawyneith in Buto Statue is not known. These different poses of Payeftjauemawyneith's body in his statues may refer to change in the artistic and religious terms of his self-presentation. Payeftjauemawyneith's smiling face, square in appearance, is more personalized, with many late Saite features.

All these iconographical elements complete Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentations.

## RELIGIOUS BELIEFS

The phraseology of Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentations reveals a high religious tone. Many deities are mentioned; their presence is crucial in understanding their beliefs and religious piety. The integration of these deities into their monuments and texts reflects the protagonists' deep relationship, belief, and intimacy with these important deities, who are mainly local ones of the Delta or of Upper Egypt (such as of Elephantine and Abydos) but who also have national status.

<sup>888</sup> Shubert (1993: 34) remarks that Payeftjauemawyneith's face is "idealized" without offering further explanation, points out that his eyebrows are "sharp" and "not plastic" as a characteristic of the period, without further explanation, and states that the formation of his mouth is a characteristic of the period, again without further explanation.

<sup>889</sup> See Russmann 2010; Bassir and Creasman 2014; Ashton 2014; Hartwig 2015. On the facial features of Apries in the round, see Perdu, 2012a: 190–191 (94); *PM VIII*<sup>1</sup>: 1999, 162 (no. 800–871–400); Berman and Letellier 1996: 78–89; Josephson 1992: 94, pl. 16 (c); Leahy 1984b: 74 (n. 7). For the facial features of Amasis in round, for instance, see his sphinx statue in Rome (Museo Capitolino, no. 8), and his statuette in Copenhagen (National Museum, Department of Near Eastern and Classical Antiquities, Inv. No. 3603); see Myśliwiec 1988: 50 (E. Statuary, 8), pls. LXIII, b and LXIV, a; Perdu, 2012b: 192–193 (95); *PM IV*: 47; Bosse 1936: 78 (219); Müller 1955a: 64–66; 1955b: 210, pls. XXIV, c, XXV, d, XXVIII, C; Josephson 1988: 234, pl. XXXII, 4; Priese 1991: 172–173 [103]; Ziegler 2002: 86, fig. 2, 393 (21); Wildung, Reiter, and Zorn 2010: 13–134 (3). For more on portraiture in ancient Egyptian art, see Bryan 2015.



Specific factors rule Neshor's selections of the deities to whom he shows loyalty: 1) his loyalty to the local deities of the Delta, where he was probably raised; 2) the duties of his office, which is clear when he devoted Louvre A 90 to the local triad of Elephantine; and 3) the national religious beliefs of the country, as seen in his offering of statue(s) to the Osirian triad. The last dedication is normal, since Osiris is the ruler of the world of the dead, and Neshor applied to him to enter into the afterlife.

Banebdjedet<sup>890</sup> is mentioned in Neshor's phraseology. The religious identity of this deity represents him as the worshiped *b3* of Osiris. His name means "the *b3* of the lord of Djededet," and implies the notion of the Djed pillar, the backbone of Osiris, connects him with Mendes. Banebdjedet, depicted as a ram or ram-headed man and a living "sacred ram," was given the epithets "lord of the sky" and "lord of life," echoing the titles of the sun god, Re. The wife of Banebdjedet, the goddess Hatmehyt,<sup>891</sup> is also mentioned. She was a fish-goddess worshipped in Mendes who was associated with Isis. Her name means "she who is in front of the fishes" or "foremost of the fish." She was depicted as a fish or a woman with a fish emblem on her head. While Osiris is a prominent member of the guest deities at Mendes, Osiris-Hapy to whom Neshor's phraseology refers is less important. The presence of these deities in Neshor's texts and monuments evidences the continuity of their importance in the period. For instance, the actions of Neshor at the temple of Khnum at Elephantine show the revival and increase of the local cult of Khnum at Elephantine in the late Saite Period.

On Louvre A 90, for example, Neshor addresses the deities:

"May you remember the one who puts the beauty of your temple in his heart, Neshor. The one who endures through the mouth of the citizens; (as) a reward (for) this, let my name live long in your temple, remember my *k3* after my lifetime; and let my image remain and my name be enduring on it without perishing in your temple."

Furthermore, he describes what he did at the temple of Khnum at Elephantine:

"It is in his temple that (I) built their quarters (?), so that they endure forever by the command of the great god, the lord of the Two Lands, H(a)aibre, living forever."

This phrase shows Neshor's good deeds toward the deities in addition to his role that he played in restoring the affairs of that temple, although he was not also a

<sup>890</sup> For more on this deity, see Mercatante 1995: 20. For more on *B3-nb-ddt* and his other manifestations, see Leitz et al., II: 683–685.

<sup>891</sup> See Mercatante 1995: 55. For more on *H3t-Mhjt*, see Leitz et al., V: 17–18.

priest.<sup>892</sup>

On Louvre A 93, for example, Payeftjauemawyneith wishes:

“May he give life to his son, Ahmose-Son-of-Neith, may he give what is favored in the presence of his majesty, and *jmakh* before the great god.”

Although his statue was probably set up in the temple of Khentyimentt (Osiris) at Abydos, Payeftjauemawyneith, probably a local of Sais, addresses his speeches and shows his loyalty to Neith of Sais through the name of Amasis, Ahmose-Son-of-Neith. On BM EA 83, Payeftjauemawyneith describes himself:

“he who does what the gods love, ... in their temple, he who presents their affairs to the interior of the palace.”

This shows that Payeftjauemawyneith played a great role in restoring the fortunes of the temples, although he was not also a priest. He describes what he did at the temple of Atum at Heliopolis:

“the good things for this temple.”

As for his conceptions of divinity, he states:

“god is here to answer what is done, he who does not sleep, <until> he separates [affair(s) from each other into good and into] bad.”

On Louvre A 93, he mentions one good deed, among many, toward the deity:

“I built the god’s sacred barque of cedar, (which) I found made of Nile acacia.”

The main deities mentioned, referred to, or depicted in his texts and on his monuments are Atum, Khentyimentt (Osiris), and Neith. The presence of these deities in Payeftjauemawyneith’s texts and monuments shows their importance and continuity in the period. For instance, the deeds of Payeftjauemawyneith at the temple of Khentyimentt (Osiris) at Abydos attest to the revival of the local cult of Osiris at Abydos in the late Saite Period after this temple had been neglected for a while prior to Payeftjauemawyneith’s mission.

<sup>892</sup> The same had been done by Payeftjauemawyneith at Abydos. For more on this official’s self-presentation on Louvre A 93, see above.

The religious statements and wishes of Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith show their intimacy with the divinities. This intimate relationship is well revealed through the direct and private dialog between each man and the deity. The relationship is expressed through good deeds by donating to the temple(s) or by uttering good descriptions of the divinity. The presence of divinity in the self-presentations and statues of these men is very clear. They are quite dutiful to the deities textually and artistically. They introduce the statuettes of the deities within naoi and places their statues in the temple sacred space of these deities to show their deep piety and faith in them. Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's statues extol their pious deeds to several deities, their temples, and probably to their local people and cities. Their self-presentations show that they were true believers and dutiful persons to the deities. Their beliefs encompasses two different worlds: first, the earth where they perceived faith and learned about deities and their divine world and the afterlife, and, second, the realm of the dead.

# MORAL VALUES

Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's moral values are variant, rich in content, highly significant, and well reflected in many phrases in their texts. Their morality is achieved through means that differ from the traditional way of previous periods. Their morality here comes through their courageous, pious actions, not through stating clichéd statements, as was, for instance, the case in the Old Kingdom. Moreover, their self-descriptive phrases are different from their counterparts in previous periods. Neither mentions his moral responsibility toward the middle and lower classes. For example, an Old Kingdom official says: "I gave bread to the hungry, clothes <to the naked>, I brought the boatless to land. I buried him who had no son, I made a boat for him who lacked one."<sup>893</sup> Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's deeds do not specify a specific case or somebody who is needy or in a bad condition, but they are directed toward the community as a whole, as if they compare their actions to royal deeds. In the Middle Kingdom, some officials describe themselves in association with the *rhjt* "the common people," as "*s'nh rhjt*, one who nourishes the commoners."<sup>894</sup> Though our protagonists make no mention of the *rhjt*, that should not lead us to conclude that they ignored the *rhjt*. Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith did what they believed appropriate for them according to their own understanding of the situation.<sup>895</sup> Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith presumably did that because of the

<sup>893</sup> From the Sixth Dynasty biography of Nefer-Seshem-Re called Sheshi; see Lichtheim 2006a: 17.

<sup>894</sup> See Doxey 1998: 194.

<sup>895</sup> Doxey (1998: 201) points out that these self-descriptive phrases were also less common in the Middle Kingdom.

setting of their votive statues in temples, they wanted to convince the deities to give them protection in the afterlife, and thus they stressed the benefactions they performed to the temples while alive. In a tomb or funerary stela, the speaker wishes to convince other people to give him offerings, and to that end he or she stresses his kindness to other people while alive. Perhaps Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith would have talked about the *rhjt* in the self-presentations found in their tombs.<sup>896</sup>

In Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentations, their good deeds are only narrated as the happy end of their first life. Theirs do not offer self-criticism, any misbehavior, bad deeds, or overall evaluation of their lives and careers. Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith were always looking to display an ideal image of themselves. Their self-presentations are messages addressed to the deities and the temple clergy, so that they would act goodly toward them. Stating their good deeds and moral values was the visible message and direct discourse of their self-presentations. Therefore, their morality is indirect, not apparent, as was often the case in many previous self-presentations. For example, contrary to the self-presentations of the Old Kingdom, Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith do not mention any rewards from the king or the deities. That may show their self-esteem and that they were perhaps independent. Their self-presentation comes through their deeds, not through the crown.

#### PRESERVATION OF SELF

The selves of Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith are well manifested in their self-presentations and on their statues. Among their self-presentations there are different modes of discourses; one of these is the discourse of the afterlife. Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith expressed the conceptions that they followed to preserve their selves in their texts in different ways. According to Patrick Coleman's definition, the self is as "an autonomous individual, testing rules imposed from without against a sensibility nourished from within, demanding as a matter of right to flourish in his or her own way."<sup>897</sup> In this sense, Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentations, of course, do reveal the rise of individualism as a key factor in the late Saite Period. Their self-presentations, full of the complexities of their achievements, are reflected by their free expressions of wishes for securing the afterlife. The different experiences of hierarchical offices that they held are their means of achieving remembrance of self through time.

The notions of the self in the self-presentations of Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith are highly visible. Art and language illuminate the features of

<sup>896</sup> See above.

<sup>897</sup> Coleman 2000: 3.



the preservation of their selves. These self-presentations encompass the whole range of their selves, where their selves are conceived as the foundational component in them. Historical perspective is another means by which they display their selves, and they highlight their selves in a positive way through several activities. Their self-presentations portray lives that had run enough of their courses for an ultimate significance to be assessed. In short, they reflect an emphasis on the forms of the men's selves and identity in which their selves are fully expressed. Nevertheless, Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's selves are expressions of the period that produced them. The history of these selves are briefly presented in their texts, but their whole personal history remains basically unknown.

The selves of Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith are well manifested in their self-presentations and statues. The discourse of the afterlife predominates. Through their various discourses, they present their pious proofs so that they will be rewarded by the deities in the afterlife and their afterlife and memory will be maintained by the temple clergy. In all the numerous good deeds that each recounts, Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith reflect their self-concept and their personal piety. So on Louvre A 90, Neshor narrates his role at Elephantine, extolling his distinguished achievements to the deities as well as to the king; on Statue Louvre A 93, Payeftjauemawyneith recounts his role in the Tawer Nome, extolling his distinguished achievements to the deity as well as the Abdydene people.

Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentations offer their wishful image in which they wanted to be remembered and rewarded. Survival of memory is the most important key to understanding Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentations and statues. They believed that the survival of their memory would successfully secure their afterlife. Their self-presentations do not at length speak of it due to their intensive description of all his distinguished accomplishments. However, they are cleverly introduced.

Their self-presentations encompass two issues:

1. The current issue: Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's lives on earth.
2. The wishful issue: Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's hopes to secure their afterlife.

The dominant theme of Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentations is remembrance, "remembrance" being here understood as the good deeds that should be performed by others toward them in word and action after their deaths. If one wants to activate remembrance, one should practice and repeat that for which he or she wishes to be remembered. "Practice" here means conduct physical actions and

repetition of words. Through these things, the remembrance of Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith could be achieved eternally.

In almost all their texts the men stress their own good deeds for the deities as pious works for eternity. The ultimate goal behind their several works is the enjoyment of eternity, not the expression of a relationship with royalty or the multiplication of gifts they received from the crown, as was the case in earlier Egyptian self-presentational tradition. The temple setting of all their votive statues probably accounts for this.

## CONCLUSION

Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentations represent comprehensive conceptions encompassing various levels. However, theirs do not show their transformations and self-fashionings. The self-presentations and statues of Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith reveal their selves. Their tools for promoting themselves are art, their first tool, and text, their second tool. The statue, as a precious piece of art with its obvious message, was clearly seen by everyone who enters the temples. Their self-presentations depict them textually by stating their names, titles and roles, and confirm their possession of the statues. The self-presentations are the "indirect component" which was not visible or understood by anyone who visits the temple - an element not readily accessible to everyone - and represent a high culture component not understood by all people. These self-presentations were intended for those skilled in reading the hieroglyphs, such as the temple clergy. Neshor and Payeftjauemawyneith promote themselves several times in these self-presentations, and move from descriptive statements to titles outlining their careers, and to narratives highlighting their distinguished activities. The interaction between image and text in Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentations is very clear and well employed. The presence of the divinity's name and image, and probably the names of the king, on Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's statues is a great prerogative.<sup>898</sup>

Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentations offer a dualistic view of things such as life and afterlife, royalty and nobility, and public image and private image. Their self-presentations introduce a general view of their selves through their own speech. The overall content of theirs makes it more personalized and each self-presentation has its own scope, interests, and concerns. For instance, Neshor's role at Elephantine and Payeftjauemawyneith's role at Abydos may convey royal prerogatives

<sup>898</sup> For this latter point, see Jansen-Winkel 2011; Perdu 2011–2013.

that they bestowed upon themselves to perform in a kingly manner. This also documents the growth of Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's power and obviously reflects their high level of self-independence. The high degree of independence of these two men compels us to rethink of the relationship between the late Saite kings and their high officials. However, Neshor's and Payeftjauemawyneith's self-presentations were composed with a view to the afterlife.