



SOCIÉTÉ D'ÉGYPTOLOGIE

GENÈVE

BULLETIN N° 33

2023

The Protection of Nebet-Hetepet *The naophorous statue Chiddingstone Castle 01.0492*

David KLOTZ

Independent Scholar

Résumé

Publication d'une statue naophore de la Basse Époque appartenant à Tjanefer, dédiée à une déesse appelée « l'Or », très probablement Nebet-Hetepet. Comparaison avec des objets similaires suggère qu'elle provient d'Héliopolis de la 30^e dynastie. Les brèves inscriptions hiéroglyphiques offrent des variations originales de formules et maximes religieuses connues d'autres monuments.

Mots-clés : Statue naophore ; Basse Époque ; Héliopolis ; Nebet-Hetepet

Abstract

Publication of a Late Period naophorous statue of Tjanefer, dedicated to a goddess called “the Gold”, most likely Nebet-Hetepet. Comparison to similar objects suggest it derives from Heliopolis during Dynasty 30. The brief hieroglyphic inscriptions present original variations of religious formulae and maxims attested on other monuments.

Keywords: Naophorous statue; Late Period; Heliopolis; Nebet-Hetepet

Comment citer/How to cite

David KLOTZ, « The Protection of Nebet-Hetepet. The naophorous statue Chiddingstone Castle 01.0492 », *BSEG* 33 (2023), pp. 89-108.

doi : 10.54641/journals/bseg.2022.e1194

Publié le/Published on 04.08.2023



Délivré selon les termes de la Licence Creative Commons Attribution —
Pas d'utilisation commerciale — Pas de modification — 4.0 International

The Protection of Nebet-Hetepet

The naophorous statue Chiddingstone Castle 01.0492

David KLOTZ¹

Introduction

Several years ago I presented a new interpretation of naophorous and theophorous statues.² In the rare examples discussed there, dedicants identified themselves via texts or vignettes with Shu-Heh, the Atlantid deity who supported the sky, the solar disk, and by extension, all portable divine statues. Such priests thus emulated the Heliopolitan god, enabling them to carry the divinely-loaded shrines.

Of course that is but one connotation of the naophorous gesture. Beholders of such statues might naturally assume the sacred effigies contained within the shrines performed an apotropaic function – not unlike similar divine images on amulets, jewelry, or even body tattoos.³ Indeed, multiple inscriptions demonstrate that such priests expected divine protection from their favorite deities, in return for the pious acts the individuals performed for them; both figuratively via the gesture, and literally by supporting temples and cults during their lifetimes.⁴ The brief hieroglyphic inscription on the Late Period statue published here, almost certainly from Heliopolis, presents yet another variant of this mutually assured protection. These religious phrases offer insightful variants on similar expressions known from other Late Period monuments.

¹ Independent Scholar.

² D. KLOTZ, “Replicas of Shu: On the Theological Significance of Naophorous and Theophorous Statues”, *BIFAO* 114, 2014, pp. 291-337.

³ For divine figures and amuletic images decorating bodies of private statuary, see J.H. TAYLOR, “Figural Surface Decoration on Bronze Statuary of the Intermediate Period,” in M. HILL (ed.), *Gifts for the Gods: images from Egyptian temples*, New York and New Haven, 2007, pp. 65-83; for comparable imagery actually tattooed on ancient Egyptian skin, see A. AUSTIN, C. GOBEIL, “Embodying the Divine: A Tattooed Female Mummy from Deir el-Medina,” *BIFAO* 116, 2016, pp. 23-46.

⁴ E. OTTO, “Zur Bedeutung der ägyptischen Tempelstatue seit dem Neuen Reich”, *Orientalia* 17/4, 1948, p. 457; see also D. KLOTZ, *BIFAO* 114, 2014, pp. 292-293.

The statue in question belongs to the Denys E. Bower collection at Chiddingstone Castle, Kent (01.0492).⁵ It came to my attention in Texas while on loan at the Houston Museum of Natural Science.⁶ The object has been discussed only rarely,⁷ but was duly recorded by the specialists of Late Period monuments from the Delta (Bothmer and De Meulenaere,⁸ J.J. Clère,⁹ Yoyotte).¹⁰ Denys E. Bower (1905-1977) acquired this object from Sotheby's in 1954,¹¹ and Bothmer first recorded the statue in his original dwelling in London, before Bower purchased Chiddingstone Castle (1956).

This statue measures 23cm (height) by 13.5cm (width) by 14.5cm (depth), and is made from greywacke. It would have originally represented the subject standing behind the shrine, which must have been level with his waist.¹² Now only the naos and the figure's hands survive, suggesting the object may have been repurposed – either during antiquity or by modern art dealers – as a simple divine statue.¹³ The naos would have been supported on a narrow stand, only the top of which

⁵ For this collection, see J.S. PHILLIPS, A.M. DODSON, “Egyptian Antiquities of Chiddingstone Castle Kent, England”, *KMT* 6/1, 1995, pp. 51-61; D. KLOTZ, *BIFAO* 114, 2014, p. 312, n. 147 (with references); H.D. SCHNEIDER, “Works of Art in their Own Right: Late Eighteenth Dynasty Shabtis in Chiddingstone Castle”, in J. VAN DIJK (ed.), *Another Mouthful of Dust. Egyptological Studies in Honour of Geoffrey Thorndike Martin (OLA 246)*, 2016, pp. 481-494.

⁶ The author would like to thank Naomi Collick and the Trustees of the Bower Bequest at Chiddingstone Castle for permission to publish the object here. In addition, Tom Hardwick kindly provided photographs and details about the statue.

⁷ *PM* VIII, p. 780, 801-733-510 = Trismegistos, TM 90141; E.S. EL-BANNA, *Matériaux pour servir à l'histoire d'Héliopolis*, PhD Dissertation, EPHE V^e section, Paris 1975, pp. 418-419, Doc. BE.G.34; E.B. SIMMANCE, *Communication with the Divine in Ancient Egypt: Hearing deities, intermediary statues and sistrophores* (PhD Dissertation, University of Birmingham), 2019, <https://theses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/8888/> (accessed 27 July 2023), p. 251, 516, Fig. 107.

⁸ *Corpus of Late Egyptian Sculpture (CLES) #827*. Scans of the *CLES* records kindly provided by Kathy Zurek-Doule of the Brooklyn Museum.

⁹ Mss. of J.J. Clère in the Griffith Institute, Oxford: (<https://archive.griffith.ox.ac.uk/index.php/clere-collection>; accessed 27 July 2023): “0.5.0.1. List of sistrophorous statues, and notes on statue at Chiddingstone Castle.” Scans of these notes kindly provided by Francisco Bosch-Puche.

¹⁰ A copy of the inscription by Jean Yoyotte is preserved in the Clère Mss (preceding note), as well as an excerpt from the thesis of his student: E.S. EL-BANNA, *Matériaux pour servir à l'histoire d'Héliopolis*, PhD Dissertation, EPHE V^e section 1975, pp. 418-419, Doc. BE.G.34.

¹¹ SOTHEBY AND CO., *Ethnographical Art including works of art from Benin, Oriental Art and Antiquities (July 5-6)*, London, 1954, p. 27, No. 208 (second of two items). The statue apparently came from the collection of Sir Robert Young, a high-ranking Member of Parliament.

¹² For this statue type, see primarily H. DE MEULENAERE, “Personnages debout tenant un naos dans la statuaire de la Basse Epoque”, in W. CLAES, H. DE MEULEANERE, S. HENDRICKX (ed.), *Elkab and Beyond: Studies in Honour of Luc Limme (OLA 191)*, Leuven, 2009, pp. 223-231.

¹³ For similar examples, see D. KLOTZ, *BIFAO* 114 (2014), p. 313, with n. 152.

survives, giving the object the appearance of a sistrum.¹⁴ The entire back pillar is now completely destroyed.

Unlike many naophorous statues of the Thirtieth Dynasty and Ptolemaic Period, the human figure does not wear a long wrap-around robe. Instead, the bare knee visible on his left side (fig. 3) betrays that the subject wore a short kilt, traces of which might be identified beneath his right hand (fig. 2). Such a difference might suggest the owner wanted to emphasize military or civil duties on this particular statue, rather than any sacerdotal duties. Late Period priests frequently boasted of moving with *calm* steps (*qb-nmt.t*) while keeping their chests hidden (*štȝ-šnb.t*), epithets reflected in their tight and modest wrap-around robes.¹⁵ Contemporary generals and viziers of Dynasty 30, meanwhile, often wear nothing more than short kilts,¹⁶ while their typical epithets boast of having *broad* steps (*wsh-nmt.t*), whether unrestricted access within the royal court, or wide-ranging travels through foreign lands.¹⁷ As discussed below, the owner of the statue does not mention any titles in the brief hieroglyphic inscriptions on the front of the naos.

Inside the shrine stands a goddess who wears a thin, diaphanous dress through which her navel is visible,¹⁸ a smooth wig, a small uraeus, and an elaborate crown. The diadem is shaped just like the naos containing the goddess, resulting in a sculptural *mise en abyme*.¹⁹ Yet the smaller replica contains a different manifestation

¹⁴ H. SELIM, “A Naophorous Statue in the British Museum (EA 41517)”, *JEA* 76, 1990, p. 202.

¹⁵ For the epithets, see H. DE MEULENAERE, “Une formule des inscriptions autobiographiques de basse époque”, in O. FIRCHOW (ed.), *Ägyptologische Studien. Hermann Grapow zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*, Berlin, 1955, pp. 226-231.

¹⁶ Among many examples: J.J. CLÈRE, “Une statuette du fils aîné du roi Nectanabô,” *RdE* 6, 1951, p. 155; J. VERCOUTTER, “Les statues du général Hor, gouverneur d’Hérakléopolis, de Busiris et d’Héliopolis (Louvre A. 88, Alexandrie, s.n.),” *BIFAO* 49, 1949, Pls. I and IV; H. DE MEULENAERE, “Le Vizir Harsîésis de la 30^e Dynastie,” *MDAIK* 16, 1958, Pl. XVI; *idem*, “Une statue de prêtre héliopolitain,” *BIFAO* 61, 1962, Pl. I (a priest with civil titles); D. KLOTZ, “Two Studies on the Late Period Temples at Abydos,” *BIFAO* 110, 2010, p. 161, Fig. 7.

¹⁷ E.g. H. DE MEULENAERE, *BIFAO* 61, 1962, p. 33, col. 1.

¹⁸ Similar dresses can be found already in naophorous statues from Dynasty 26: R. EL-SAYED, *Documents relatifs à Saïs et ses divinités (BdE 69)*, Cairo, 1975, Pls. XX, XXIV, XXX; P.J. O’ROURKE, “A Late Period Naophoros from Bubastis,” *BES* 10, 1989/90, Pl. 2; J.J. CLÈRE, “Une statue naophore hathorique d’époque saïte,” *RdE* 24, 1972, Pl. 5. For examples from Dynasty 30, see also Vatican, Museo Egizio 41 (G. BOTTI, P. ROMANELLI, *Le sculture del museo gregoriano egizio*, Vatican City, 1951, Pl. 33; *cf.* J. YOYOTTE, *BIFAO* 54, 1954, pp. 94-95), JE 38016 (Dynasty 30, reign of Nectanebo II): H. SELIM, “The Naophorous Statue JE 38016 in the Cairo Museum,” *MDAIK* 56, 2000, Pl. 40a; JE 37125 (Post-Persian, Dynasty 30): <https://www.ifao.egnet.net/bases/cachette/ck809> (accessed 27 July 2023).

¹⁹ Compare a statue from Dynasty 26, where the naoform sistrum is placed within a similarly-shaped naos: Emory University Museum of Art and Archaeology, 1988.004.001 <https://collections.carlos.emory>.

of her, a rearing uraeus wearing a solar disk, and the shrine is flanked by volutes, typically associated with Bat and related goddesses.²⁰ Similar crowns adorn the heads of multiple goddesses: Nehemetaway in Hermopolis, Hathor of the Benenet (Chonsu Temple) in Thebes,²¹ and above all Hathor-Nebet-Hetepet in Heliopolis.²²

Incidentally, this is also the standard iconography for the Hathoric *shm*-sistrum (sometimes called the *bhn*),²³ a symbol closely linked with Nebet-Hetepet as the divine Hand of Re. One might consider the present naophorous statue a unique variant of the related sistrophorous sculpture,²⁴ except here the entire goddess, not just her head, is represented. Indeed, the present inscription features a textual parallel to other inscribed sistrophores (BM 1132+1225, see *infra*, text note **d**), and the goddess depicted on those objects is frequently invoked as “the Gold (*Nbw*)”, “the Golden (*Nbw.t*)”, or more specifically Hathor-Nebet-Hetepet.²⁵

This statue certainly dates to the Late Period, and a number of considerations would support dating it more precisely to Dynasty 30.²⁶ A series of comparable naophorous statues, each holding different local divinities (Atum, Re-Harakhty, Mnevis, Iusaas(?), Horus of Hetpet), are known from Heliopolis during Dynasty 30,²⁷ so the statue would complement that set of votive images. In addition, the

edu/objects/4193/naophorous-statue (accessed 27 July 2023); see also JWIS IV/2, 828-829 (60.173).

²⁰ For the headdress on sistrophores, see E.B. SIMMANCE, *Communication with the Divine in Ancient Egypt*, pp. 208-213.

²¹ D. KLOTZ, *Caesar in the City of Amun: Egyptian Temple Construction and Theology in Roman Thebes (MRE 15)*, Turnhout, 2012, p. 118.

²² J. VANDIER, “Iousâas et (Hathor)-Nébet-Hétépet,” *RdE* 16, 1957, pp. 83, Fig. 2; 93, Fig. 6; 115, Fig. 12A, 142-143, Figs. 21-22; *idem*, “Iousâas et (Hathor)-Nébet-Hétépet: deuxième article,” *RdE* 17, 1965, p. 136.

²³ D. ELWART, “Sistren als Klang des Hathorkultes”, in E. MEYER-DIETRICH (ed.), *Laut und leise: der Gebrauch von Stimme und Klang in historischen Kulturen (MHK 7)*, Bielefeld, 2011, pp. 38-40; *eadem*, “Le sistre, le son et l’image”, in Chr. ZIVIE-COCHE (ed.), *Offrandes, rites et rituels dans les temples d’époques ptolémaïque et romaine (CENIM 10)*, Montpellier, 2015, pp. 109-121, esp. 110-111.

²⁴ So already E.B. SIMMANCE, *Communication with the Divine in Ancient Egypt*, p. 251.

²⁵ E.B. SIMMANCE, *Communication with the Divine in Ancient Egypt*, p. 360 (A.12); 392 (B.9); 418 (B.51); 419 (B.53); 426 (B.63); 444 (B. 90); 445 (B.92); J.J. CLÈRE, *Les chauves d’Hathor (OLA 63)*, Leuven, 1995, pp. 12, n. 38; 188-189, n. a; 245 (s.v. *Nwb* and *Nwbt*).

²⁶ E.S. EL BANNA, *Matériaux pour servir à l’histoire d’Héliopolis (supra, n. 9)*, p. 419, dated this object roughly to the fourth to third centuries BCE. B.V. BOTHMER, *CLES #827 (supra, n. 7)*, classified this object as “Post Pers(ian)”, which would include Dynasty 29 through the early Ptolemaic Period.

²⁷ D. KLOTZ, “The Peculiar Naophorous Statuette of a Heliopolitan Priest Hannover, Kestner-Museum 1935.200.510”, *ZÄS* 139/2, 2012, pp. 143-144.

dedicant's name, Tjanefer (*infra*, text note i), his reverence for “the Gold,” and the prevalence of quasi-alphabetic spellings link him closely to the Heliopolitan elite of that particular era, a group profiled in a classic study by Jean Yoyotte.²⁸ Nonetheless, none of these arguments are conclusive, and the lack of titles for the owner prevent any definitive links to individuals known from other securely dated monuments. For this reason, although Dynasty 30 seems most likely, an earlier date in Dynasty 26 cannot be entirely ruled out, especially as more Saite monuments such as the colossal statue of Psamtek I are being uncovered in Heliopolis.²⁹

Any inscriptions that may have existed on the back pillar are now destroyed. The only surviving texts decorate the front frame of the naos. While on other statues these texts usually have two symmetric texts, mentioning separate deities or multiple epithets of one,³⁰ on this monument one continuous inscription is distributed between the two sides,³¹ beginning on the right (R) and continuing to the left (L).

Text and Translation (see fig. 4)



²⁸ J. YOYOTTE, “Prêtres et sanctuaires du nome héliopolite à la Basse Époque”, *BIFAO* 54, 1954, pp. 83-115. For other Thirtieth Dynasty works in Heliopolis, see also J. YOYOTTE, “Un nouveau souvenir de Sheshanq I et un muret héliopolitain de plus,” *RdE* 54, 2003, pp. 220-221, 235; A. ASHMAWY, M. BEIERSDORF, D. RAUE, “The Thirtieth Dynasty in the temple of Heliopolis,” *EA* 47 (2015), pp. 13-16.

²⁹ A. ASHMAWY, S. CONNOR, D. RAUE, “Psamtik I in Heliopolis,” *EA* 55, 2019, pp. 34-39.

³⁰ H. DE MEULENAERE, *BIFAO* 61, 1962, p. 30, n. 2; examples include B.V. BOTHMER, *ESLP*, Pl. 51 (123); H.S.K. BAKRY, “Two Saite statues of Samtowetefnakhte from the Delta”, *Kēmi* 20, 1970, p. 24, Fig. 14; R. EL-SAYED, *Documents relatifs à Saïs et ses divinités*, Pls. XX, XXIV; *idem*, “Un document relatif au culte dans Kher-Aha (statue Caire CG 682)”, *BIFAO* 82, 1982, p. 188, Pl. XXX; D. WILDUNG, *Imhotep und Amenhotep: Gottwerdung im alten Ägypten (MÄS 36)*, Berlin, 1977, p. 33; P. O’ROURKE, “A Late Period naophoros from Bubastis”, *BES* 10, 1989/90, pp. 118-119, 125; H. SELIM, “A Naophorous Statue in the British Museum (EA 41517)”, *JEA* 76, 1990, p. 200, Pl. XXIV; *idem*, “Three Unpublished Naophorous Statues from Cairo Museum”, *MDAIK* 60, 2004, Pl. 23.

³¹ A similar layout can be found around the naos of a statue dedicated to Imhotep: C. COZZOLINO, “Recent discoveries in Campania”, in R. PIRELLI (ed.), *Egyptological Studies for Claudio Barocas*, Naples, 1999, p. 28.

^R <i>rdi.n(=i) wi h3 Nbw.t</i>	I have placed myself around The Gold. ^(a)
<i>hnw.t(=i)</i>	O my Mistress: ^(b)
<i>z3w=t phr(.w) h3=i</i>	may your protection encircle me! ^(c)
<i>mḥ-ib=f im=t</i>	Whoever places his trust ^(d) in you:
<i>snd=f n n(i)m</i>	whom would he fear? ^(e)
<i>s3ḥ^L =f t3 m 'nd-wd3</i>	He reaches land safe and sound ^(f) .
<i>h3.t m- 't</i>	The beginning is with you,
<i>m bw nb nfr</i>	consisting of all good things;
<i>ph r im3ḥ šms=t</i>	whoever follows you ends up as a venerated one, ^(g)
<i>ḥmw ir mr=t</i>	(namely) a servant who does what you love. ^(h)
<i>im3ḥw hnw.t=f</i>	The one venerated of his mistress,
<i>T3-nfr</i>	Tjanefer. ⁽ⁱ⁾

Textual Notes

- (a) “The Gold” (or just “the Gold goddess”)³² was a standard epithet of Hathor and related goddesses throughout Egyptian history. During the Late Period, Hathor-Nebet-Hetepet of Heliopolis, the divinized hand of Re-Atum, was often invoked directly by this epithet,³³ as made explicitly clear in the Delta Mythological Papyrus.³⁴ One of the most common sacerdotal titles from Heliopolis was “servant of the Gold (*ḥm Nbw(.t)*).”³⁵

The epithet “Golden One” or “Gold” was used especially by individuals addressing their beloved goddess (e.g. Hathor, Nebet-Hetepet,

³² For the interpretation of this epithet, see D. MEEKS, *Mythes et légendes de Delta d’après le papyrus Brooklyn 47.218.84 (MIFAO 125)*, Cairo, 2006, pp. 61-62, n. 86; E. GRAEFE, “Hathor ist „(das) Gold“, die „Gold(göttin“) - nicht „die Goldene“!”, *CdE* 96, 2021, pp. 192-205.

³³ J. VANDIER, *RdE* 17, 1965, p. 128. The first element of the divine name Nebet-Hetepet is often spelled with the *nw*-hieroglyph: O. PERDU, “Le témoignage d’un dévot d’Hathor Nebet-Hetepet,” *CdE* 95, 2020, p. 33, n. b.

³⁴ D. MEEKS, *Mythes et légendes de Delta*, pp. 9-11, especially III, 8.

³⁵ J. YOYOTTE, *BIFAO* 54, 1954, pp. 97-98; H. DE MEULENAERE, *BIFAO* 61, 1962, pp. 31-34; H. SELIM, “The Naophorous Statue JE 38016 in the Cairo Museum”, *MDAIK* 56, 2000, pp. 362-363; D. HEIDEN, “Die Stele des *P3-dj-Pp*”, *SAK* 30, 2002, pp. 189, 197, n. y (= *JWIS* IV, 875, 60.243); *JWIS* IV, 858-863 (60.222).

Mut) with expressions of personal piety,³⁶ as well as in connection with beer offerings and drunkenness.³⁷ Certain texts note that shrines for local goddesses were also referred to as “the Gold” by the local population.³⁸ Compare the biography of Tathotis, a Ptolemaic follower of Hathor of Memphis,³⁹ who speaks of her close bond to the goddess as follows:

“The Gold (...) she blessed me in this moment.”⁴⁰

“The Gold listens to my voice!”⁴¹

- (b) Statue owners normally address their beloved goddess by her name or epithet, followed by the phrase “my mistress.”⁴² The specific sequence of “the Gold, my mistress” occurs on other private statues.⁴³

³⁶ E.g. J. ASSMANN, “Eine Traumoffenbarung der Göttin Hathor. Zeugnisse «Persönlicher Frömmigkeit» in thebanischen Privatgräbern der Ramessidenzeit”, *RdE* 30, 1978, p. 26, col. 1; J.J. CLÈRE, *Les chauves d’Hathor*, pp. 12, n. 38; 245 (s.v. *Nwb* and *Nwbt*); P. O’ROURKE, *BES* 10, 1989/90, p. 119, Text X; O. PERDU, “Un monument d’originalité”, *JEA* 84, 1998, pp. 130, 140, n. v; D.M. POTTER, “The Statue of a Sistrum-Player in Montrose and Her Position in an Early Ptolemaic Theban Priestly Family”, *JEA* 107, 2021, p. 253, col. 3.

³⁷ O. PERDU, *CdE* 95, 2020, pp. 32-41; see also Walters Art Museum 22.97 (*ESLP* No. 87, pp. 109-110, Pls. 82-83; L. MONTAGNO LEAHY, *Private Tomb Reliefs of the Late Period from Lower Egypt*, PhD Dissertation, Oxford, 1988 (<https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:3b3699de-8498-4021-bf5f-b35fcf1cf33c>, accessed 27 July 2023), p. 711).

³⁸ The Hermopolis stela of Nectanebo I (JE 72130) mentions that the temple of Nehemetawy was also called “the temple of the Gold (*pr nbw*)”: G. ROEDER, “Zwei hieroglyphische Inschriften aus Hermopolis (Ober-Ägypten)”, *ASAE* 52, 1954, p. 403, l. 24; a similar shrine for Nebtu-Tefnut north of Esna was named for “the great Gold”: *Esna* II, 130, 4-5; *Esna* III, 241, 11 (69). Note also that Hathor of Mefkat was referred to as “the Gold” in her local popular festivals: B. TURAJEFF, “Die naophore Statue Nr. 97 im Vatikan”, *ZÄS* 46, 1909, pp. 76-77, col. 3; S. DHENNIN, *Mefkat et la déesse Hathor: Topographie et religion dans la IIIe province de Basse Égypte (MIFAO 146)*, Cairo, 2022, pp. 127-128.

³⁹ G. VITTMANN, “Die Autobiographie der Tathotis (Stele Wien 5857)”, *SAK* 22, 1995, pp. 290, 301, n. 40.

⁴⁰ *Ibid*, p. 292, line 5.

⁴¹ *Ibid*, p. 293, line 7.

⁴² D. KLOTZ, *BIFAO* 114, 2014, p. 325, n. b; to which add J.J. CLÈRE, *RdE* 6, 1951, p. 144; O. PERDU, “Un appel à Isis (statue Londres, BM [1162])”, *CdE* 74, 1999, pp. 233-234. B6; P. VERNUS, “Un oracle d’Hathor à Dendara. À propos de l’égyptien de la deuxième phase dans les temples gréco-romains”, *BSÉG* 32, 2021, p. 96, n. h. So also in Demotic: H. KOCKELMANN, *Praising the Goddess: A Comparative and Annotated Re-Edition of Six Demotic Hymns and Praises Addressed to Isis (APF-B 15)*, Berlin, 2008, pp. 13-14, lines 2, 6, 10, 18; 14-15, note to line 2; 20, line 1; 50.

⁴³ A.M. DONADONI ROVERI, “Una statua cubo del Museo egizio di Torino”, *OA* 6, 1967, pp. 114-

For this reason, one might suggest emending the present text to: “I have placed myself behind <you> (*h3=<t>*), o Gold, my Mistress!” In that case, the first of the two *t*’s following *nbw* might have been mistakenly perturbed by the scribe.

Nonetheless, one may also compare the sistrophore of the Vizier Nespaqashuty D, which contains other parallels to the present statue (*infra*, text note **c**). On the upper surface of the statue base, Nespaqashuty addresses all passers-by:⁴⁴

<i>dw3 wī</i>	Praise me,
<i>īnk šms Nbw(.t)</i>	for I am a follower of The Gold!
<i>dw3 k3=i hr hnw.t=i</i>	Praise my Ka before my Mistress! ⁴⁵
<i>hzi sw</i>	Whoever favors it (viz. the statue)
<i>wdb=s (sw) n=f</i>	she will return (the favor) to him.

On that statue, “the Gold” is an epithet of Mehyt, also identified with Nebet-Hetepet (see *infra*, text note **d**).

- (c) In similar formulas, dedicants usually specify that they place their arms around the divinity or their naos.⁴⁶ Yet here, Tjanefer uses the first-person dependent pronoun to emphasize that he has placed his entire body behind the the shrine of Nebet-hetepet.⁴⁷ Similar phraseology involving the reflexive pronoun occurs in the so-called Saite Formula, where the statue owner appeals to the local City God: “place yourself around/behind me (*dī/īmy tw h3=i*)!”⁴⁸

115, line 4 (Mut); P.J. O’ROURKE, *BES* 10, 1989/90, p. 119, Text X (Bastet; for the reading, see D. KLOTZ, *BIFAO* 114, 2014, p. 324).

⁴⁴ BM EA 1132 + 1225 = JWIS IV, 180, 53.316.

⁴⁵ K. JANSEN-WINKELN, *Sentenzen und Maximen in den Privatinschriften der Ägyptischen Spätzeit*, Achet Schriften zur Ägyptologie B1, Berlin, 1999, p. 88 (A.4.b.24) translated the second half of this text, but mysteriously added a question mark following the preposition “vor (*hr*).” Since this is a sistrophorous statue, anybody who praises Nespaqashuty would necessarily be in the presence of his Mistress, the divine face on the sistrum.

⁴⁶ G. POSENER, *La première domination perse en Égypte* (BdE 11), Cairo, 1936, pp. 3, line 3; 5, n. f.

⁴⁷ So also on CG 672: JWIS IV, p. 487 (57.185), on the naos, col. 4; discussed by H. RANKE, “Ein spätsaitische Statue in Philadelphia”, *MDAIK* 12, 1943, p. 109.

⁴⁸ Following the analysis by D. KLOTZ, “Get thee behind me, City God! New Kingdom versions of the so-called ‘Saite Formula’”, *ZÄS* 143/2, 2016, pp. 204-213.

The result here is that Nebet-Hetepet will surround Tjanefer with protection (see text note **d**). A similar transaction is detailed on the statue Vatican Inv. 22689:⁴⁹

rdi.n=i .wy=i m hpt=k That I set my arms embracing you,
r rdi.t wnn=k was to make you exist
m z3w=i in my protection.

- (d) Given the present context and the set expression *mh-ib m NN*, “to have confidence in *NN*,”⁵⁰ it would make the most sense to emend the face sign (𓄿) for the very similar heart (𓄿).⁵¹ Multiple texts from Dynasty 26 use nearly identical phraseology, albeit in a different sequence, noting how divine protection “surround” or “encircle” (*phr*)⁵² their follower as a result of their faith in the local god or goddess (*mh-ib*):

Tjanefer*: ⁵³	
BM 1132+1225: ⁵⁴	
Edinburgh A.1956.134: ⁵⁵	
JE 65905: ⁵⁶	

⁴⁹ B. TURAJEFF, *ZÄS* 46, 1909, p. 75, cols. 1-2; photograph in E. WINTER, “„Herr der Maat“ als Selbstaussage eines Privatmannes?“, in K. ZIBELIUS-CHEN, H.-W. FISCHER-ELFERT (eds), *Von reichlich ägyptischem Verstande. Festschrift für Waltraud Guglielmi zum 65. Geburtstag*, (Philippika 11), Wiesbaden, 2006, p. 168, Abb. 1.

⁵⁰ For this theme in other Late Period biographies, compare P. VERNUS, “Une statue de Neshor surnommé Psamétik-Menkhib,” *RdE* 42, 1991, pp. 244-245, col. 2, nn. e-f; O. PERDU, “Une « autobiographie » d’Horirâa revisitée,” *RdE* 48, 1997, p. 173, n. k; K. JANSEN-WINKELN, “Beiträge zu den Privatschriften der Spätzeit,” *ZÄS* 125, 1998, pp. 1-2.

⁵¹ The same mistake is attested elsewhere: e.g. S. CAUVILLE, *Dendara. Le fonds hiéroglyphique au temps de Cléopâtre*, Paris, 2001, p. 254; D. KURTH, *Einführung ins Ptolemäische I*, Hützel, 2007, p. 179, n. 13.

⁵² For the apotropaic nuances of the verb *phr* (“encircle”, “contain”, “enchant”) see R.K. RITNER, *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice* (4th printing) (SAOC 54), Chicago, 2008, pp. 57-67.

⁵³ The two phrases are reversed here to underscore the parallelism with the other texts.

⁵⁴ JWIS IV, 180, 53.316 (Sistrophorous statue of the Vizier Nespaqashuty).

⁵⁵ JWIS IV, 489, 57.186; corrected after a photograph from the museum website: <https://www.nms.ac.uk/explore-our-collections/collection-search-results/stela/299539> (accessed 27 July 2023).

⁵⁶ JWIS IV, 785, 60.78 (right side).

rhetorical question, with *nīm*, “who” following the preposition *n*.⁶¹ Since the interrogative is properly speaking *in-m*, one could consider all three signs part of this word, similar to writings of *nnk* for *ink* (first person pronoun) common during Dynasty 30;⁶² however, the verb *snḏ* typically requires an indirect object.⁶³ This interpretation is supported by a similar passage from the tomb of Samut/Kyky (TT 409), in reference to Mut:⁶⁴

<i>ib=i mh(.w) m tzy=i</i> <i>hnw.t</i>	Since my heart is filled with my Mistress,
<i>nn snḏ=i n rmt.w</i>	I shall not be afraid of any people.

Samut goes on to extol the virtues of placing Mut in one’s heart and adopting her as a guardian, claiming that for those who trust her, not even gods or death can harm them.⁶⁵ Similarly, Tjanefer here rhetorically inquires whom should he fear, whether divinity or mortal, when he trusts in Nebet-Hetepet.

As an alternative reading, the final three signs could represent the rare verb *nnm*, “to go astray; err,” which occurs otherwise primarily in literary or funerary texts,⁶⁶ in the stative: “whoever trusts in you, their fear goes astray (i.e. disappears).” Finally, one might read the

⁶¹ Fr. NEVEU (trans. M. Cannata), *The Language of Ramesses: Late Egyptian Grammar*, Oxford and Philadelphia, 2015, pp. 233-234 (43.3.2.3.2-3). Multiple examples of *nīm* following the preposition *n* (“to whom”; “of whom” = “whose”) from the TLA: pAnastasi I, 8, 3; pLeiden I 343+345, R 3, 6 (S. BECK, *Exorcism, Illness and Demons in an Ancient Near Eastern Context. The Egyptian Magical Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345 (PALMA 18)*, Leiden, 2018, pp. 32, 34-35, line 6, 36); pMMA 36.9.21, 7, 13; 9, 1 (J.-Cl. GOYON, *Le papyrus d’Imouthès, fils de Psintaès au Metropolitan Museum of Art de New-York (Papyrus MMA 35.9.21)*, New York, 1999, pp. 34, 36, Pls. VI, VIII); M. SANDMAN, *Texts from the Time of Akhenaten (BiAeg 8)*, Brussels, 1938, p. 96, 11; pInsinger 31, 22.

⁶² K. JANSEN-WINKELN, “Drei Denkmäler mit archaisierender Orthographie”, *Orientalia* 67, 1998, p. 170; D. KURTH, *Einführung ins Ptolemäische II*, p. 610.

⁶³ *Wb.* IV, 182, 5-10; S. RÜTER, „Habt Ehrfurcht vor der Gottheit NN“. *Die snḏ-n-Hymnen in den ägyptischen Tempeln der griechisch-römischen Zeit (Die Inschriften des Tempels von Edfu - Begleitheft 2)*, Gladbeck, 2003.

⁶⁴ M. A.-Q. MUHAMMED, “Two Theban Tombs: Kyky and Bak-en-Amun,” *ASAE* 59, 1966, Pl. LI, cols. 66-67; J. ASSMANN, *Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete: übersetzt, kommentiert und eingeleitet, (OBO Sonderband)*, Fribourg and Göttingen, 1999, p. 404, No. 173, 99-100.

⁶⁵ M. A.-Q. MUHAMMED, *ASAE* 59, 1966, Pl. LI, cols. 68-75.

⁶⁶ *Wb.* II, 276, 15; R. VAN DER MOLEN, *A Hieroglyphic Dictionary of Egyptian Coffin Texts, (PdÄ 15)*, Leiden, 2000, p. 233; *CDD N 04:1*, p. 93; M. SMITH, *Papyrus Harkness (MMA 31.9.7)*, Oxford, 2005, p. 108, line 12, n. e.

goose with its alternate value *wdb*, “to turn back,”⁶⁷ thus reading: “whoever puts his trust in you, he returns back to us (*wdb=f n=n*), as he reaches land (*m s3h=f t3*) safe and sound.”

- (f) Given the brevity of this inscription, it is perhaps best to understand *s3h-t3*, “to reach land,” in its figurative sense of “to succeed” (*Wb.* IV, 20, 15). Nonetheless, similar nautical references abound in wisdom literature and expressions of personal piety, where divinities are credited for steering ships correctly, or even for rescuing the faithful from the depths of the sea.⁶⁸ For certain Egyptians, piously serving their favorite divinity (“placing them within one’s heart”) through the course of their life was compared to an aquatic journey, expressed most often with the expression “traveling upon one’s water.”⁶⁹

On the statue CG 807 from Dynasty 26, Horiraa similarly links putting his faith in Ptah with a successful, presumably metaphorical, nautical voyage:⁷⁰

<i>mḥ.n=i ib=i im=k</i>	I trusted in you in all places (...)
<i>m bw nb (...)</i>	
<i>rdi.n=k w(i) hr m3´</i>	and you set me upon a good wind,
<i>nn š3w</i>	without any shipwreck.

Just as Nebet-Hetepet dispels Tjanefer’s fear, so Somtutefnakht confidently made the overseas voyage from Persia to Egypt safe and sound, thanks to his faith in Heryshef (lines 12-14):⁷¹

<i>smd=i ḥ3s.wt w´.k(w)</i>	As I traversed foreign nations alone,
<i>d3i=i w3d-wr</i>	so I sailed across the Great Green.
<i>ni snd=i (...)</i>	I was not afraid (...)

⁶⁷ D. KURTH, *Einführung ins Ptolemäische* I, pp. 254 (90), 266, n. 344.

⁶⁸ For this theme, see J.C. DARNELL, *Theban Desert Road Survey II: The Rock Shrine of Pahu, Gebel Akhenaton, and Other Rock Inscriptions from the Western Hinterland of Qamûla*, 2013, pp. 34-36, 40-43.

⁶⁹ O. PERDU, *RdE* 36, 1985, p. 101, nn. b-c.

⁷⁰ O. PERDU, *RdE* 48, 1997, pp. 166-167, 173-174, nn. k-n; *JWIS* IV/1, 338-339 (55.110), right, 2-3.

⁷¹ *Urk.* II, 4, 11-16; O. PERDU, *RdE* 36, 1985, pp. 108-109.

(Berlin 1048), from Dynasty 26 uses the same key phrases, but in a different order:⁷⁸

<i>mw.t nṯr</i>	O Mother of God (Neith):
<i>nt(t) ir(.t) ḥ3.t</i>	it is you who makes the beginning,
<i>ph(wy) m- 't</i>	and the ending is in your hand.

In effect, the Chiddingstone Castle statue monument appears to conflate multiple religious mottos current in Late Period monuments.⁷⁹ The aforementioned statue of Ptahhotep, although only partially preserved in the relevant section, seems most likely to have originally contained the same sequence as Tjanefer (in bold), interspersed with other remarks (col. 4).⁸⁰

<i>ḥ3.t m- 'k m bw nfr</i>	The beginning is with you in goodness,
<i>nḥ.n(=i) ḥr=k</i>	I requested from you
<i>'rq(=i) pḥwy</i>	that I might achieve the end.
<i>ih dd i hr[-s3]</i>	Ah, those who will come after[wards]
	shall say:
<i>[šms nṯr r im3ḥ]</i>	['Whoever serves god will be a Venerated one!']

- (h) These are standard expressions of personal piety, but nonetheless compare the similar turn of phrase on a contemporaneous statue from Heliopolis, in which the “*servant* of The Gold” refers to Hathor-Nebet-Hepet: “I am a *venerated one* of her domain, *who does what* her Ka

⁷⁸ P. TRESSON, *Kêmi* 4, 1933, p. 132, understood this passage differently: “O Mère divine de celui qui a créé le commencement et la fin (Re), voici que (...)” Yet it was Neith herself, not her son Re, who created the universe according to Saite traditions (*cf.* the Neith cosmogony from Esna temple), and so she was frequently associated with “the beginning (*ḥ3.t*):” R. EL-SAYED, *La déesse Neith de Saïs (BdE 86)*, Cairo, 1982, I, pp. 58-61. Neith is associated directly with both the beginning and the end in the hymns *Esna* III, 212, A; 252, §§3-4; and 317, 2-3. Compare also the quotation reportedly inscribed on Neith’s statue in Saïs, which similarly expresses her control over past and future: “I am all that was, what is, and what will be” (PLUTARCH, *De Iside*, 9, 354C; J.G. GRIFFITHS, *Plutarch’s De Iside et Osiride*, Cambridge, 1970, pp. 130-131, 283-284).

⁷⁹ K. JANSEN-WINKELN, *Sentenzen und Maximen*, pp. 97-99, especially B.6.a.1-3 (*šms nṯr=f r im3ḥ*, “whoever follows his god will become a Venerated one”), B.6.a.7 (*šms ḥm=k r im3ḥ*, “whoever follows his Majesty will become a Venerated one”), and B.6.a.9 (*pḥwy nfr n šms m3'.t*, “a good ending for whoever follows Maat”).

⁸⁰ K. JANSEN-WINKELN, *Orientalia* 67, 1998, pp. 165, col.4, 167, n. 18 (for the reconstruction).

loves.⁸¹ Similarly, on a recently published statue base, the dedicant addresses Hathor-Nebet-Hetepet by calling himself “your *servant*” and tells her “I *do what* your Ka *loves* in all things.”⁸²

- (i) Tjanefer (Akkadian: *Zi-na-pa*, Greek: *Tinouphis*) was a popular name from the New Kingdom through the Ptolemaic Period.⁸³ Multiple examples are attested on Serapeum stelae from Memphis,⁸⁴ statues from Thebes,⁸⁵ a funerary ensemble from Abydos,⁸⁶ and multiple Late Period objects from Heliopolis,⁸⁷ most notably two very fine tomb reliefs.⁸⁸

It is also notable that in the frame story of the *Teaching of Ankhsheshonqy*, the titular character’s father was from Heliopolis and named Tjanefer, apparently a priest of Re just like his son, while his mother was named Sinoub (*Z3.t-nbw*, lit. “daughter of the Gold”).⁸⁹ Meanwhile a fragmentary Greek literary text (pTurner 8) features another Egyptian prophet named Tinouphis.⁹⁰ As noted in the Introduction, however,

⁸¹ H. DE MEULENAERE, *BIFAO* 61, 1962, pp. 32-33, line 2.

⁸² O. PERDU, *CdE* 95, 2020, pp. 33, 40.

⁸³ H. RANKE, *PN* I, p. 387, 9; II, p. 398; *DemNB*, p. 1350; multiple examples in *JWIS* II, p. 529; *JWIS* III, p. 615; *JWIS* IV, p. 1257. For related names, see H. DE MEULENAERE, “Deux composants ‘natalistes’ de l’anthroponymie tardive,” *BIFAO* 83, 1983, p. 107.

⁸⁴ *JWIS* II, 282 (28.30), 377 (41.14); *JWIS* III, 196 (48.137); *JWIS* IV, 100 (53.173); 922 (60.305); see also L. LIMME, “Deux stèles inédites du Sérapeum de Memphis,” *CdE* 47, 1972, pp. 90-92.

⁸⁵ M.G. RASHED, “The Morgan Library Statue of Tjanefer Son of Nespamedu (CK 971),” in C.M. ROCHELEAU, T. HARDWICK (eds), *Offerings to Maat: Essays in honor of Emily Teeter*, *CIPEG Journal* 5, 2021, p. 183: <https://doi.org/10.11588/cipeg.2021.5.84006> (accessed 27 July 2023).

⁸⁶ R. MEFFRE, “Les ouchebtis de la région thébaine à l’époque saïte: particularités locales et apports prosopographiques,” *BSFE* 203, 2020, pp. 72-74.

⁸⁷ J. YOYOTTE, *BIFAO* 54, 1954, pp. 94, 97, 111-112; *JWIS* IV, 62 (53.112), lines 23, 30; 872 (60.237); 877 (60.249); possibly also C. KARLSHAUSEN, T. DE PUTTER, “Un oursin pour le dieu. L’oursin de Tjanefer (Turin Suppl. 2761),” *RME* 1 (2017), pp. 1-12: <https://doi.org/10.29353/rime.2017.1068> (accessed 27 July 2023), although the date of that remarkable object is unknown.

⁸⁸ For the tomb reliefs of Tjanefer, see primarily L. MONTAGNO LEAHY, *Private Tomb Reliefs of the Late Period from Lower Egypt*, pp. 713-733 (Nos. 76-77), who would date them to c. 360-340 BCE.

⁸⁹ R.K. RITNER, “The Instruction of ‘Onchsheshonqy (P. British Museum 10508),” in W.K. SIMPSON (ed.), *The Literature of Ancient Egypt: an Anthology of Stories, Instructions, Stelae, Autobiographies, and Poetry*, 3rd edition, New Haven, 2003, p. 504, n. 14.

⁹⁰ S.S. STEPHENS, J.A. WINKLER (eds), *Ancient Greek Novels: the fragments*, Princeton, 1995, pp. 400-408 (“Tinouphis”); for the possible connection to Ankhsheshonqy, cf. J.Fr. QUACK, “The Interaction of Egyptian and Aramaic Literature,” in O. LIPSCHITS, G.N. KNOPPERS, M. OEMING

the general popularity of this name and the lack of any affiliations or titles for the current Tjanefer make it impossible to identify him with the owners of any other monuments.

Conclusion

The brief inscriptions on this naophorous statuette contain variations of multiple maxims and pious statements attested on other Late Period monuments. Tjanefer places his arms around his local goddess, “the Gold” (Nebet-Hetepet), in order to secure her legendary protection. She banishes his fear, assures a safe passage, and controls his entire life from beginning to venerated end. Although many texts refer to Nebet-Hetepet’s erotic role in relation to Atum, as the divinized “Hand of God,” here she performs a role as personal guardian, just like Mut (tomb of Samut/Kyky) and Isis (Demotic hymns) elsewhere. Olivier Perdu recently highlighted the fearsome qualities of Nebet-Hetepet, as expressed on a libation bowl of Montuemhat (BM EA 1292),⁹¹ appropriate for Tjanefer’s personal champion.

(eds), *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Age: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*, Winona Lake, 2011, p. 388.

⁹¹ O. PERDU, *CdE* 95, 2020, p. 38.



Fig. 1: Chiddingstone Castle 01.0492, front.
© Trustees of the Denys E. Bower Bequest



Fig. 2: Chiddingstone Castle 01.0492, right.
© Trustees of the Denys E. Bower Bequest



Fig. 3: Chiddingstone Castle 01.0492, left.
© Trustees of the Denys E. Bower Bequest



Fig. 4: Chiddingstone Castle 01.0492, front detail.
© Trustees of the Denys E. Bower Bequest