



THE MANED HIPPOPOTAMUS AT LAHUN: IDENTIFYING HOMES AND NAMES

Stephen Quirke

UCL Institute of Archaeology

Campbell Price

Manchester Museum

ABSTRACT

In 1889–1890, Flinders Petrie directed clearance of a late Middle Kingdom town site near al-Lahun to produce a plan of the buildings and a general description of Middle Kingdom material culture. The finds include a dramatic limestone image of the mixed hippopotamus-lion known in Egyptology by the Late Egyptian name Taweret “the great (female power).” This sculpture was mentioned, but not illustrated, in his excavation report and has therefore not attracted the attention of researchers. Here we assess the figure through its modern and ancient history, in the light of recent fieldwork at settlement sites contemporary with the Lahun town.

THE FIGURE IN THE MUSEUM

The hippopotamus with leonine features, standing upright on hind legs, is among the most distinctive images in ancient Egyptian religious iconography, attested from the late 3rd millennium BCE to the early 1st Millennium CE.¹ Here, we present one of the larger sculptures known from before the New Kingdom. This limestone figure was found in 1889 during the clearance for Flinders Petrie of the orthogonal town-site near al-Lahun, on the east side of Fayoum governorate in Egypt.

As registered in the Manchester Museum under inventory number 270, the figure comprises two fragments, which do not join. The larger fragment is from head to upper hind legs, 38 cm in height in its present condition, (FIGS. 1–2), and the smaller is the base, 28.1 by 23 cm, with hind paws and tail (see FIG. 7). In addition to the loss of the middle hind-leg area, the lower part of the proper right foreleg is broken

away, and the proper left foreleg is preserved only at the shoulder area. Other surface damage is most extensive around chin and front, at left side of mane, and along the edges of the back ridge. Around the forward protruding head area, the curving mane narrows at top and has deep-cut roughly parallel groove-lines on the front. Lightly incised vertical zigzags are visible on the otherwise plain proper right rear side of the mane (FIG. 3). The head is carved in bold volumes within the upward curve from neck to rounded chin under the squared front and the undulating upper profile over eye hoods to rounded nose area. For the ear details, upward diagonals are cut from the inner triangle, indicating fur lines. At the front, the proper right edge is not preserved, but the proper left area has a low rise to indicate the flaring nostril (FIG. 4). The eyes are sculpted as convex ovoid balls, as if bulging out, within deeply carved contours pointed at back and



FIGURE 1: Lahun figure Manchester Museum 270, profile facing left showing traces of red and blue pigment. Copyright Manchester Museum, University of Manchester.



FIGURE 2: Three-quarters view of larger fragment, proper right side. Copyright Manchester Museum, University of Manchester.



FIGURE 3: Head of figure, proper right side, showing incised lines behind mane. Copyright Manchester Museum, University of Manchester.



FIGURE 4: Rear view of larger fragment. Copyright Manchester Museum, University of Manchester.



FIGURE 5: Three-quarters view of larger fragment, proper left side, to edge of left hind-leg. Copyright Manchester Museum, University of Manchester.



FIGURE 6: View from above, showing detail on eye hoods of larger fragment. Copyright Manchester Museum, University of Manchester.

front; a deep cut tear-duct line towards the jaw is clearest on proper right. The eye hoods rise behind and slightly higher than the eyeballs and bear parallel incised lines to demarcate the half facing the centre of the head (FIG. 6). The mouth is depicted open, with rounded ends and an uneven grid of bared clenched teeth, conveyed by a single horizontal line intersected by short verticals. Above, a diagonal groove from the nose curves down at rear to back of mouth, as if to emphasise the snarl. Between the forelegs, pendant breasts are carved as shallow convex volumes and are joined by a horizontal line roughly parallel to the lower edge of the mane. The belly is swollen and demarcated from the upper hind-legs by an incised line. Along the damaged area towards the break, an incised line seems to run around the upper thighs and around the rear of the figure, as if demarcating its upper from lower areas. The navel area is obscured by surface loss. At the lower edge, enough remains of the upper hind-leg area to indicate that the left hind-leg continued at a slight diagonal backwards in relation to the right hind-leg (FIG. 5). Along the back of the figure, a ridge rises almost to the tip of the mane and is broken away at the lower edge slightly higher than the upper hind-leg (FIGS. 2, 4). From the side, the ridge upper part, to mid "shoulder," is gently convex, in contrast to the concave lower part. From the back, the ridge is highest at the vertical line of its centre, most clearly along the lower part. The absence of internal detail carved on the ridge planes creates a strong single outline, within which an extended T-shaped division between upper and lower and between left and right reinforces the overall sense of strength in voluminous planes. This simplicity in design stands in marked contrast to the indication of scales on the tail preserved on the smaller fragment with base, paws, and tail-end, described in the next paragraph. The incised line around the figure at thigh height might then mark the point of transition from untextured upper and scaled lower tail.

The smaller fragment comprises the remains of the roughly cuboid shallow base, preserving also both hind-leg feet and reptilian tail-end curving to the proper right of the figure and forward (Fig. 5). Each foot has three deep grooves incised from upper surface to base, which might convey the four webbed toes of a hippopotamus, or the four claws on the hind-leg of a lion, or both. The tail has narrower groove lines lengthways intersected by

transverse lines to form a schematic grid, evoking scales. The front corner of the base at right hind-leg is broken away, and the edges are chipped. The front, back and side faces of the base are finely smoothed to an even upper edge and less even lower edge. The base underside is less finished, and the upper face is slightly convex and least even in the area between the tail and paws, where the difficulty in sculpting below the figure body has left a more hatched effect. In this area, two overlapping vertical lines may have resulted from the sculpting of the figure, while the incising of the scale grid along the curve of the tail line would have produced the short thicker lines beside the tail, to rear right corner. A precise circular hole drilled into the left hind-leg, to about half its height, is presumably from earlier museum mounting of the two fragments together for display.

Traces of colour can be detected at certain areas, for which future analysis might help to distinguish between properties of the stone, ancient pigment, ancient staining, and modern pigment or staining. Provisionally, the yellow colouring in and around the tail grooves seems an effect of the limestone, rather than any added pigment. The surest indication of modern painting is on the base, where the proper right side has four lengths from a horizontal blue paint line, presumably relating to museum display, and the back face has a clear blue "7" to right of a C-shaped line, also in blue. On the main fragment, darker blue patches are visible from open mouth to edge of mane on the proper left side; a lighter blue smudge can be seen on the body area under the left foreleg (FIG. 1). In view of the modern pigment on the base, these patches seem likely to be offsets from late 19th or 20th century painting, but they could instead be original to the figure. Red pigment is visible around the incised features of the mane, ears and mouth, for example in the teeth grooves and mouth lines, the internal triangle of the ear, and in the lines incised within the mane (FIG. 1). Black material in the tear-duct from the left eye and at the corner of the right eye seems more likely to be pigment rather than soil. Under the chin, over a whiter area of the limestone (?), black traces seem to be smudging of uncertain date, rather than the result of applying black pigment to this area. There is grey at the ridge on top of the head between the eyes.

Despite the contrast between plain back ridge and tail-end grid pattern, the larger body fragment can be aligned with the paws on the base. In her

inventory of Petrie finds accessioned in the Manchester Museum, Agnes Griffith presented figure and base as parts of the same object, without hesitation:

270 (a) Upper part of figure of the hippopotamus goddess Ta-urt. Limestone; standing. Height 28.5. (b) Base; with tail and paws of the same figure. Length of base 27.5 x 23.²

Therefore it seems plausible that the two fragments are from a single object. Late Middle Kingdom scarabs offer parallels for such juxtaposition of “naturalistic” and “schematic” segments in one figure.³ Although the forelegs extend forward, there is insufficient space at the front of the base for an additional element. Therefore, the original foreleg composition can best be reconstructed either as extending down on the body or possibly as holding a motif small enough not to unbalance the careful centring of the overall weight. In contrast to these options, the forelegs are held directly to the side in the closest published parallel, a limestone image of an upright hippopotamus with crocodile down its back, from an uncertain context at the late Middle Kingdom palace site at Bubastis (see LIMESTONE STANDS WITH FIGURAL MOTIFS, below).⁴

CONTEXT AND PARALLELS

In 1889, archaeological recording techniques had not yet been standardised, and fieldwork directors in England as much as in Egypt did not regularly record either stratigraphy or the precise find-spot of individual items. In the excavation report for his second season at the Lahun town-site, Petrie began his paragraph 23 with the statement “Of stonework some curious figures have been found,” and included here the note: “A rough large figure of Taurt was found, as also a small one last year, shewing that her form was already fixed at this period.”⁵ According to this wording, the sculpture now in Manchester seems likely to be the larger figure, and so a find from the second season of work, but Petrie gives no information on provenance within the site. The report also gives no illustration and no comment on the condition of the figure and presence of the separate fragment with base and leonine hind-paws. Nor do any in the limited set of his 1889–1890 photographs show either the main figure or the base fragment.⁶ In her study of the Petrie publications, notebooks, and weekly circular

reports (“Petrie Journals”), Carla Gallorini could delineate the general area explored in each season and found further evidence for the exact find-spot of several items, but not the two figures.⁷ Indeed the “Journals” contain no certain reference at all to either “figure of Taurt.” In those circulars, Petrie reported the finds and events of the week in chronological sequence, perhaps writing up at variable intervals of between a day and a week. His reportage is often more inventory than narrative, such that any one report of a find may have no connection with the preceding and following sentences. The smaller “Taurt” from the first season might be the subject of an entry “Hippopotamus in limestone, very rude” for the week 28 April–4 May 1889 (typescript p. 108). However, Petrie also found limestone figures of hippopotami standing on all fours, such as Manchester Museum 135 (9.5 cm) and 136 (12.9 cm);⁸ his choice of “hippopotamus” rather than “Taurt” seems more likely to indicate one of those. From the second season, his wording in the 8–14 November report again seems to imply smaller figurines: “Several rough limestone figures of apes and hippopotami have been found: they are painted in red and blue. One is a hippopotamus in a boat, quite perfect. Another little figure in fine state is that of a girl playing a small harp” (1889–1890 “Journal” typescript, p. 16).

From the early 2nd millennium BCE, the closest parallels are the Bubastis figure cited above at note 4 and finds from Lisht. The preliminary report on the Bubastis figure states that it “was found in the Middle Kingdom palace,” with no mention of any associated finds. Preserved to lower leg, but without hind feet or base, at 33 cm in height this sculpture is close in scale to the Lahun example. One Lisht find is a smaller and more schematic, possibly unfinished upright hippopotamus with dorsal ridge (MMA 15.3.599, height 12.7 cm according to the online collection database, from the 1906–1907 season, context not identified). From the 1921 season, Arthur Mace published a photograph of “household gods,” in which two items may be related to the upright hippopotamus motif.⁹ At lower left is a figure with swollen belly, disk navel, and carefully outlined pendant breasts with rounded nipples. The sculpture is broken away at lower leg, and the front of the head is not preserved, so this might be a human female figure. However, the proper right side is well preserved and has a slender arm or foreleg placed vertically down along the body, recalling the

Bubastis figure. At second left above, in the photograph, a smaller sculpture is of an animal upright on hind legs, of which only the top of the proper left leg is preserved; the animal has arms to centre, and a mane with incised internal fur lines, like the Lahun image, but the snout seems narrow like that of a baboon. Unlike the Bubastis and Lahun upright maned hippopotami, this animal bears on its head a shallow cylinder. This feature introduces another object type, to which the other items on the Lisht photograph also belong: the figured offering-stand, discussed next.

LIMESTONE STANDS WITH FIGURAL MOTIFS

At Lahun, limestone artefacts of similar scale and varying precision take the form of columns or human forms. In contrast to the leonine hippopotamus figure, these objects are carved in one block with a shallow open vessel, as Petrie related in his published report on the first season of work at Lahun:

A curious piece of furniture was a limestone stand, on which offerings of bread paste were made. These stands are usually in the form of a column with a saucer-shaped hollow on the top; the columns are 18 to 21 inches high including a square base, usually with plain capital, but one has a lotus capital as at Beni Hasan (Pl.XVI). Two examples were found of these stands in the form of two men, standing back to back and supporting the cup with raised arms on their shoulders. These are rudely done, one being unfinished; and from the place of discovery may belong to the XIIIth dynasty, as the scarab of Neferhotep was found in the room with one of these. One example occurs of an arm supporting a cup, evidently intended to be built into a wall so as to project.¹⁰

According to the weekly circulars sent home during the season, the first clear example of these finds was the stand with a floral capital illustrated on plate 16 of that publication: "A pretty column of the lotus bud pattern is evidently of the XIIth dynasty, it supports a saucer (for incense?) all cut in one block of limestone, about 18 ins. high. It is a new type to me" ("Journal" 21–28 April 1889, typescript pp.105–106). The next week he reported: "A curious stand was found formed of a pair of roughly blocked

out figures back to back; I had before found most part of a similar stand with wrought figures, but rude in style. These are of XIII dyn." ("Journal" 28 April–4 May 1889, typescript p. 112).

In his published report on the second season, Petrie repeated his interpretation of the material in the vessels as bread rather than incense:

The dwarf supporting a dish (VI, 9) is remarkable, as we have no clue to the meaning of such figures in Egypt. This is one of the dish-stands, which are generally simple columns; and which, whenever they are found charged, have a cake of dough stuck in the dish. It seems reasonable to suppose that they are stands for household offerings of daily bread.¹¹

His identification would require laboratory analysis for confirmation, but use of the "dish-stands" for offerings seems plausible. Although listed under stonework, one of the stands is of clay, marl from its light colour, with two naked human figures back-to-back, elbows and knees bent, in an openwork cuboid frame.¹²

The sole reference to find-place ("room" in the first report) is too vague to assert that the objects belong in a domestic context, and so it is necessary to look for parallels from more precisely documented excavations. Limestone sculptures of this scale have been recorded from domestic contexts at Lisht and Memphis, and from funerary contexts at Tell el-Dab'a and Bubastis. At Lisht, the examples are from the late Middle Kingdom village on the south side of the pyramid of Amenemhat I. The Lisht photograph cited above (with note 9) includes examples with small monkey figure climbing a column, a human head bearing a dish, mainly broken away, and a naked male dwarf body with shallow dish. An exhibition catalogue with publication of the latter gives its height as 33 cm, confirming that these are on the same scale as the Lahun and Bubastis upright hippopotamus figures.¹³ The photograph also shows one example with the motif named in the Middle Kingdom as Aha, and after the New Kingdom as Bes, a naked frontal maned man with limbs flexed, holding a snake towards his navel in each hand. In his accompanying text, Mace gives a general account of the context for these figures within the settlement area: "In many of the houses there seems to have been a shrine, in which was placed a rough limestone

figure of the household god.”¹⁴ Felix Arnold provides more detail in his report on 1991 re-excavation of Lisht house A1.3, with a side-room at its entrance:

Religious objects, such as figures of dwarfs, hippopotami, lions and crocodiles (some examples are published in Mace [1921], fig.3) are sometimes found at Lisht in or near such side rooms, possibly indicating the existence of household shrines. The proximity to the entrance of the house may have provided a magical protection.¹⁵

At Memphis, a fragmentary example in human form, perhaps with dwarf proportions, was found in a large structure, provisionally identified as part of a large house, and dated to the late Middle Kingdom.¹⁶ At Tell el-Dab’a, in Area A/II, a late Middle Kingdom to early Second Intermediate Period cemetery and chapel field yielded three figure stands, all roughly shaped from blocks of limestone, which is not local to this region.¹⁷ One stand from a pit of stratum F or early E/3 (start of Second Intermediate Period) takes the form of a baboon holding a bowl on its head with both forelegs. Two others are in the form of naked dwarves, one in a layer of later Second Intermediate Period debris, and one at foundation level of a building in stratum F. Plausibly, the figures originally stood in cemetery chapels. Despite the mixture of Egyptian and Levantine material culture and practice at the site, the Nile Valley and Delta parallels for the forms suggest an Egyptian origin, as Irene Forstner-Müller emphasises. In a late Middle Kingdom funerary cult context, finds by Shafik Farid at the monumental tomb of the governors of Bubastis include a dwarf and monkey figure.¹⁸

As an object type, these stands differ from the Lahun and Bubastis upright hippopotamus figures in their function as supports for vessels. Their repertoire of form may not include the hippopotamus (the Lisht photograph is unclear here); clearly published examples are the naked humans with dwarf proportions (Lisht, Lahun, Bubastis, Tell el-Dab’a), baboon (Bubastis, Tell el-Dab’a), column (Lahun), column with climbing monkey (Lisht), and naked maned man wielding snakes (Lisht). A further unprovenanced example shows a pregnant woman with a snake in each hand.¹⁹ Snake-wielding leonine man and upright leonine hippopotamus appear in the same groups of figures on objects with a focus on protection of infant and mother or nurse: birth tusks,

feeding-cups, headrest, glazed steatite small box, painted long box.²⁰ Significantly for the thematic focus of expression, Bes, the later name for the leonine snake-wielding man, may be the Egyptian word for “foetus just before birth / new-born child (?).”²¹ The Lahun leonine hippopotamus figure might have been installed originally beside an anthropomorphic “dish-stand” in a household place of offerings.²² Here, its protective force may be targeted most intensely around birth, as bodily crisis of society and as drama of creation. However, it seems appropriate to follow these provisional conclusions with more open questions, focussed on the exceptional quality of this one work of sculpture.

PLACE, NAME, AND MATERIAL FORM

The scale and the soft stone of the maned hippopotamus figure from Lahun locate it within a late Middle Kingdom repertoire of personal and household protection. That general description should not obscure the highly specific ancient choices in selecting particular motifs according to scale, object-type, and material. From this period, all comparable stone figures in the 15–50 cm range seem to have a primary function of supporting a receptacle for offerings. The Bubastis upright hippopotamus sculpture (see note 4) may be the only other limestone figure of this size and quality without a vessel, though even there the upper part appears damaged on the published photograph. The Lahun figure stands on its own base, securing greater space and prominence. On other upright hippopotami in Middle Kingdom depictions, the dorsal feature rarely extends so far down. On one finely carved birth tusk, a naturalistic crocodile figure on dorsal ridge does have a tail reaching lower hind-leg, recalling the images of the upright hippopotamus constellation in astronomical ceilings of New Kingdom kings.²³ However, a tail coiling alongside the leg is unparalleled to our knowledge. Given the exceptional features of the figure, it is important to recall here the lack of information on its context. A household shrine is plausible, on the Lisht and Memphis evidence, but the Tell el-Dab’a and Bubastis dwarf stands seem to be from cemetery offering-chapels. At Lahun, the scantily recorded burial areas close to its west wall might be one site for further investigation. However, the larger figure is a find from the second season, when clearance seems to have focussed on the northern and eastern sides of the town-site, according to the research by

Carla Gallorini (see note 7). Considering the poorer preservation and recording of the east side, further possibilities of original context could include a chapel in the town. In one sense, the lack of documentary evidence for find-spot may be an advantage, if it reminds us not to solidify this chapel, domestic, and funerary contexts into mutually exclusive spheres. In the Lisht and Memphis houses, inscriptions on stelae, statues, or offering-tables appeal for the eternal offerings, in a manner that Egyptologists generally ascribe to tomb or temple, not to the house. These different architectural settings may then prompt, for their Middle Kingdom users, an intense awareness of liminal forces that can invade or defend human space. In comparative contextual analysis of ancient composite figures, David Wengrow has identified multiple modes or strategies in expression according to the different historical trajectories of particular social groups. Among these, in “protective mode,” composite figures materialise at thresholds and boundaries, as exemplified by 1st millennium BCE Assyrian images and the detailed instructions on how to produce them.²⁴ The find-spot of the Lahun figure might not be recoverable, but a different kind of context, comparative and functional, can be identified in the thematic focus of the society that produced it.

One feature shared with the limestone stands is the lack of inscription, and especially the absence of a name for the depicted image. Indeed, in the Middle Kingdom, name captions rarely accompany images of the leonine hippopotamus. The motif is widespread on the faience figurines and “birth tusks” typical of this period, but inscriptions are absent on the former object type and rare on the latter. Only two “birth tusks” have depictions of the leonine hippopotamus with captions. On a tusk found in 1997–1998 excavations at Dra Abu al-Naga, Thebes, the name is *rr* “boar,” without the feminine *-t* ending expected for *rrt* “(hippopotamus) sow.”²⁵ Masculine form is also found in both instances of a writing *irr* on the second tusk, acquired by William MacGregor at “Saoniyeh near Negadeh,” so just north of Thebes.²⁶ In her detailed assessment of Middle Kingdom sources for the hippopotamus goddess, Judith Weingarten drew attention to ambivalence in gender.²⁷ A similar phenomenon may be at work in the deity names Ip(i) and Reret, as written within Middle Kingdom personal names. A small image of upright hippopotamus with dorsal

ridge can be used as determinative or as ideogram of Ip, Ipi, and Reret.²⁸ The two names for that one image Ip(i) and Reret recall the application of two types of name in the captions on the “birth tusks”: the Saoniyeh tusk has, for example, the individual name Heqet beside the frog image at the tip, but the species name *štw* “turtle” beside the turtle behind it. The explicitly gendered *rrt* “sow” might be the species name for the motif, with Ip(i) as identifier of a more specific divine force. At the same time, the use of upright hippopotamus image as an ideogram in names (see note 28) reminds us that the figure might have had a single or dominant phonetic value well known to viewers in the immediate social context. Within a narrow time-space horizon, then, the image might have needed no caption.

The possible phonetic void and the gender ambiguity of names for the loudly snarling leonine hippopotamus are part of the background to the sculptural conception of the Lahun figure. Irene Forstner-Müller observed that the figure stands at Tell el Dab’a belong to Egyptian, rather than Levantine, material culture (above with note 17). Among other features, Bronze Age Egyptian sources attest to the idea that form emerges from within the material to which an artist gives shape, rather than being an idea applied to it. The primary evidence for this understanding of material production is found in scenes 9 and 10 of the ritual for Opening the Mouth and Eyes, as analysed by Hans-Werner Fischer-Elfert from the New Kingdom sources.²⁹ In scene 9, a man in the role called *sem*³⁰ dons a special robe to “sleep” on a special form of chair in seclusion within the Domain of Gold, a dedicated space for sculpting and ritualised activation by properly initiated “animators.”³¹ Facing the stone block to be carved, he states “he has broken me”; a second man, in the role of “he who is in the chamber,” recites behind him the phrase “my father” four times, and the *sem* is woken. In scene 10, the *sem* declares “I have seen my father in all his forms” in the presence of a group of men who hold another role, *imy-khent*. A brief sequence of their short statements follows, echoed in an accompanying set of written, apparently unspoken, acts of code-switching, somewhat reminiscent of the dual naming options for upright hippopotamus figure (see above).³² Here, the vocabulary of artistic technical sculptural procedure—drafting guidelines, draft form outlines, corrected final form outlines—is correlated with names

including insect species: spider, mantis, bee, shadow. After silently changing robes (scene 11), the *sem* then supervises the start of work by a group of sculptors (scene 12). This ritual is widely attested for formal sculpture, starting at the level of the palace and court of the king, and so it is not certain that the same ideas or procedures can be applied to other social contexts. Products such as the —to quote Petrie, “rough”—figure stands might seem to stand outside this artistic horizon. However, a top-down reading of art and iconography is not the only option for our approaches to ancient Egyptian visual products. Another possibility is to consider palatial artists as concentrating the skills from across the territory, still within a particular way of thinking about form and matter. In a spectrum from formal accuracy to rough expression, all involved might have seen their work as drawing out of a block of material the forces already materialised within it.

In shaping a maned hippopotamus, upright on hind legs, with part-scaled dorsal feature, the sculptor followed the inspiration of a model already established for several centuries at least.³³ Today, Egyptologists using European languages would identify the core of the motif with the species name applied since the ancient Greek historians, hippopotamus “river-horse.” Possibly the remarkable speed of the animal, and its galloping gait, encouraged this impression, perhaps from a distance. Yet Herodotus, or his source(s), noted other features, in particular the “mane,” which may seem curious, as the animal has especially little hair for a mammal.³⁴ Many ancient Egyptian images of the upright hippopotamus with dorsal ridge, like the Lahun figure, also have a mane, but around the face like that of a lion, rather than along the back like that of a horse. Possible the ruff-like circle around the face, and perhaps too the dorsal ridge along the back, conveyed in some way in petrified space the swiftly-passed sight of a spray of water around and behind the animal as it runs or fights in the river. Whatever the origin, whether in the meditative immersion of the *sem* or not, the mane is not the only leonine feature on this and other upright hippopotamus figures. These may have feline legs and claws, and the head may also be lion-like.³⁵ If the 1st millennium BCE Greeks saw in the animal a horse of the river, the 2nd millennium BCE Egyptians seem instead to be conveying more a river lion, at least in the liminal fissures where their lives most needed protection. An ancient Egypt-

tian term sporadically used for stone figure-carvers is *sankh* “animator.”³⁶ With the Lahun figure, in a land where rituals of opening the mouth were performed, “animators” found a surge of lethal forces in this limestone block to dramatic tangible and visual effect.

REFERENCES

- Allen, James. 2005. *The Art of Medicine in Ancient Egypt*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Altenmüller, Hartwig. 1965. *Die Apotropaia und die Götter Mittelägyptens: eine typologische und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung der sogenannten “Zaubermesser” des Mittleren Reichs*. Munich: Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität.
- Anonymous. 1922. *Catalogue of the MacGregor Collection of Egyptian Antiquities, Which Will be Sold by Auction by Messrs. Sotheby, Wilkinson and Hodge*. London: Sotheby.
- Arnold, Felix. 1996. “Settlement Remains at Lisht-North.” In Manfred Bietak (ed.), *House and Palace in Ancient Egypt*, 13–21. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Ben-Tor, Daphna. 2007. *Scarabs, Chronology, and Interconnections: Egypt and Palestine in the Second Intermediate Period*. Fribourg: Academic Press, and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- Bomhard, Anne-Sophie von. 2012. “Ciels d’Égypte. Le ‘ciel du sud’ et le ‘ciel du nord.’” *Égypte Nilotique et Méditerranéenne* 5: 73–102.
- Budka, Julia. 2010. *Bestattungsbrauch und Friedhofsstruktur im Asasif: eine Untersuchung der spätzeitlichen Befunde anhand der Ergebnisse der österreichischen Ausgrabungen in den Jahren 1969–1977*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Ceruti, Sabrina. 2017. “The Hippopotamus Goddess Carrying a Crocodile on Her Back: An Iconographic Motif Distinctive of the Late Middle Kingdom.” In Gianluca Miniaci, Marilina Betrò, and Stephen Quirke (eds.), *Company of Images: Modelling the Imaginary World of Middle Kingdom Egypt (2000–1500 BC)*, 93–123. Leuven: Peeters.
- Curto, Silvio and Alessandro Roccati (eds.). 1984. *Cairo—The Egyptian Museum: Treasures of the Pharaohs*. Milan: Mondadori.
- Dasen, Veronique. 1993. *Dwarfs in Ancient Egypt and Greece*. Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- El-Sawi, Ahmed. 1979. *Excavations at Tell Basta: Report of Seasons 1967–1971 and Catalogue of Finds*. Prague: Charles University.
- Fischer-Elfert, Hans-Werner. 1998. *Die Vision von der Statue im Stein: Studien zum altägyptischen Mundöffnungsritual*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.
- Farid, Shafik. 1964. "Preliminary Report on the Excavations of the Antiquities Department at Tell Basta (Season 1961)." *Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte* 58: 85–98.
- Forstner-Müller, Irene. 2008. *Tell el-Dab'a XVI: die Gräber des Areals A/II von Tell el-Dab'a*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Gallorini, Carla. 1998. "A Reconstruction of Petrie's Excavation at the Middle Kingdom Settlement of Kahun." In S. Quirke (ed.), *Lahun Studies*, 42–59. Reigate: SIA.
- Griffith, Agnes. 1910. *Catalogue of Egyptian Antiquities of the XII and XVIII Dynasties from Kahun, Illahun and Gurob*. Manchester: Sherratt and Hughes.
- Gundlach, Rolf. 1986. "Thoeris." In Wolfgang Helck, and Wolfhart Westendorf (eds.), *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* vol. 6, cols. 494–497. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Jeffreys, David. 2012. "Memphis in the Middle Kingdom: The Field School." *Egyptian Archaeology* 40: 5–6.
- Leitz, Christian (ed.). 2002. *Das Lexikon der ägyptischen Götter und Götterbezeichnungen*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Lieven, Alexandra von. 2007. "Im Schatten des Goldhauses: Berufsgeheimnis und Handwerkerinitiation im Alten Ägypten." *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 36: 147–155.
- Lloyd, Alan. 1976. *Herodotus Book II, Commentary* 1–98. Leiden: Brill.
- Luft, Daniela. 2009. *Das Anzünden der Fackel. Untersuchungen zu Spruch 137 des Totenbuches*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Mace, Arthur. 1921. "The Egyptian Expedition 1920–1921: I. Excavations at Lisht." *Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art* 16(2): 5–19.
- Martin, Geoffrey. 1971. *Egyptian Administrative and Private-name Seals Principally of the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period*. Oxford: Griffith Institute.
- Meeks, Dimitri. 1992. "Le nom du dieu Bès et ses implication mythologiques." In Ulrich Luft (ed.), *The Intellectual Heritage of Egypt: Studies Presented to László Kákossy*, 423–436. Budapest: Université Eötvös Loránd.
- Miniaci, Gianluca and Stephen Quirke. 2009. "Reconceiving the Tomb in the Late Middle Kingdom: The Burial of the Accountant of the Main Enclosure Neferhotep at Dra Abu al-Naga." *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* 109: 339–383.
- Mlinar, Christa. 2004. "The Scarab Workshops at Tell el-Dab'a." In Manfred Bietak, and Ernst Czerny (eds.), *Scarabs of the Second Millennium BC from Egypt, Nubia, Crete and the Levant: Chronological and Historical implications*, 107–140. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Petrie, William Matthews Flinders. 1891. *Illahun, Kahun and Gurob*. 1889–90. London: Nutt.
- Petrie, William Matthew Flinders. 1907. *Gizeh and Rifeh*. London: Quaritch.
- Polz, Daniel, Bill Gordon, Andreas Nerlich, Aldo Piccato, Ute Rummel, Anne Seiler, and Susanne Voss. 1999. "Bericht über die 6., 7. und 8. Grabungskampagne in der Nekropole von Dra' Abu el-Naga/Theben-West." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo* 55: 343–410.
- Quirke, Stephen. 2011. "Petrie's 1889 Photographs of Lahun." In Bettina Bader, David Aston, Carla Gallorini, and Paul Nicholson (eds.), *Under the Potter's Tree: Studies on Ancient Egypt Presented to Janine Bourriau on the Occasion of Her 70th Birthday*, 769–794. Peeters: Leuven.
- Ranke, Hermann. 1935. *Die ägyptischen Personennamen* I. Glückstadt: Augustin.
- Raven, Maarten. 1987. "A Puzzling Pataekos." *Oudheidkundige mededelingen uit het Rijksmuseum van Oudheden* 67: 7–19.
- Rosati, Gloria. 1988. "Le stele del Medio Regno." In Anna Maria Donadoni Roveri (ed.), *La Civiltà egizia: le credenze religiose*, 104–113. Milan: Electa.
- Ward, William. 1982. *Index of Egyptian Administrative and Religious Titles of the Middle Kingdom*. Beirut: American University of Beirut.
- Weingarten, Judith. 1991. *The Transformation of Egyptian Taweret into the Minoan Genius: A Study in Cultural Transmission in the Middle Bronze Age*. Partille: Paul Åström.
- Wengrow, David. 2014. *The Origins of Monsters: Image and Cognition in the First Age of Mechanical Reproduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

NOTES

- ¹ Gundlach 1986. For discussion, distinguishing between images with partly or entirely schematic dorsal ridge and the rarer type with living crocodile down the back, see Ceruti 2017.
- ² Griffith 1910, 31. This wording is given in the museum register, which is based directly on it.
- ³ Ben-Tor 2007, pl. 21, square head type C, with geometric conception of elements, with articulated legs of side types d5/6, more or less deeply cut, and curving to “naturalistic” effect. In contrast, other scarabs from the same period show a uniformly more geometric, less “naturalistic” conception of all body elements, with square heads and flat sides in which the legs are rendered as schematic outlines with incised herringbone design within all or part of legs. For examples with archaeological context, see Mlinar 2004 (see p. 108 fig.1 for Type 1 at Tell el-Dab’a).
- ⁴ El-Sawi 1979, 76–77, figs.177–179, reg. no. 1872.
- ⁵ Petrie 1891, 11.
- ⁶ Quirke 2011, 769–794.
- ⁷ Gallorini 1998. For this study we have rechecked in particular the weekly circular reports known as the “Petrie Journals.” In addition to photocopies of the original “Journals” in the Griffith Institute, Oxford, the archives of the Petrie Museum, UCL, include typescripts prepared in 1969 for the biography. The Petrie Museum typescript copy of the “Journals” from 1888–1889, his first season at the town-site, is kept in an envelope marked “LC (1) VII Journal 1888-1889” (LC = Leonard Cottrell, who started on the biography). The envelope is also marked in pencil “For A.P. 13 Oct 1979,” and, partly over this, in biro, “Typed by Miss Vousden, paid £10/10/0 cash 21/10/69 from FP Book Account A Petrie,” the initials being for Flinders Petrie (1853–1942) and his daughter Ann (1910–1989).
- ⁸ Griffith 1910, 21.
- ⁹ Mace 1921, 6 fig.3.
- ¹⁰ Mace 1921, 6 fig.3.
- ¹¹ Petrie 1891, 11. Petrie first uses the term “dough” for the substance in the vessels in his circular at the start of the second season: “Another stand for dough offerings, with a lump of dough on

- the top, is in the form of the deformed Ptah, with arms raised supporting the cup on his head, 15 ins. high” (“Journal” 26 September to 12 October 1889, typescript p. 2). Ten examples are illustrated in Petrie 1891, pl. 6, from drawings by his friend Flaxman Charles John Spurrell. One anthropomorphic example (pl. 6 no. 9) is shown as filled with loaf-shaped offerings; its present location is not known (Dasen 1993, 281 no. 143). Most stands with preserved upper part have floral capitals, some highly schematic (pl. 6, 1–3, 5, 7: no. 6 is apparently cylindrical or cuboid capital or base for lost upper element).
- ¹² Petrie 1891, pl. 6 no. 10, now Manchester Museum no.280 = Griffith 1910, 32; Dasen 1993, 281 no. 142.
 - ¹³ Egyptian Museum Cairo JE63866: Curto and Roccati 1984, 184 no. 61, height given as 44 cm including exhibition mount 11 cm.
 - ¹⁴ Mace 1921, 12.
 - ¹⁵ Arnold 1996, 15 n.17.
 - ¹⁶ Jeffreys 2012, 6.
 - ¹⁷ Forstner-Müller 2008, 119, pl. 22d, pl. 23.
 - ¹⁸ Farid 1964, 86.
 - ¹⁹ Raven 1987, 7–19.
 - ²⁰ Feeding-cup from Lisht, MMA 44.4.4, Allen 2005, 30–31. Headrest from Thebes, Egyptian Museum Cairo JE6143, Miniaci and Quirke 2009, 339–383. Glazed steatite box from shaft 1, square L30, Asasif, Thebes, Budka 2010, 712–713, cat. no. 872. Painted box from Rifa, Fitzwilliam Museum E.15.1907, Petrie 1907, 20–21, pl. 24. Birth tusks with both figures include the examples cited below in notes 23, 25.
 - ²¹ Meeks 1992, 423–436.
 - ²² Cf. Dasen 1993, 141: “Petrie also found two crude figures of Taweret which probably belonged in this ritual context,” with reference to the column and dwarf stands as for “household offerings,” following Petrie 1891, 11. Upright hippopotamus and stand are associated in one exceptional mid-Eighteenth Dynasty afterlife papyrus from the Memphis necropolis, the Book of the Dead for Nebseny. There, a formula for lighting a torch (called by Naville Book of the Dead chapter 137B) has an illustration of

- an upright hippopotamus with dorsal ridge and leonine limbs; identified as “Ipy mistress of protection,” she is depicted in the act of lighting a lamp on a stand. Although later, the formula has a Middle Kingdom antecedent, but there the name of the deity seems to be a female serpent force Ikhetweret; see Luft 2009, 27–28, 38–42.
- ²³ Tusk fragment Louvre E3614, part of cat. no. 127 in Altenmüller 1965. In the northern sky depictions on the burial chamber ceilings of Sety I and Ramses VI, both the dorsal ridge and the naturalistic crocodile behind it have a tail-end turning just above ground height: see von Bomhard 2012, 89 fig.10 (Sety I).
- ²⁴ Wengrow 2014, 102–103.
- ²⁵ Published by Voss in Daniel Polz et al. 1999. In the late Middle Kingdom, the upright maned hippopotamus can be the determinative for *rrt* as a deity name, e.g., and the logogram for a deity name of less certain reading, perhaps *ip*, e.g., Martin 1971, 99 no. 1273. For later use of Reret to name a deity depicted as upright hippopotamus, see Leitz 2002, 694–695.
- ²⁶ Place of acquisition is cited as Anonymous 1922, lot 715. The tusk is now National Museum, Copenhagen, no. 7795 = Altenmüller 1965, no. 50.
- ²⁷ Weingarten 1991, especially p. 5: “Breasts, if shown at all, are always pendulous (though it is uncertain if this is a sign of pregnancy or *even* of her female nature).” In her n. 13 there, Weingarten notes the androgynous images of the masculine-named Hapy “Nile Flood” as source for the swollen belly and extended breasts. In combination with gender, age may be an important referent in contemporary depictions with or without breasts, and with swollen or narrower belly.
- ²⁸ Ranke 1935, 280, 19 and 285, 20–22 citing examples with determinative of Ip, Ipi, and Ipy in the names Saip, Satip, Satipi, and Satipy on Middle Kingdom sources. Ranke 1935, 280, 19 and 285, 23 gives Middle Kingdom examples of ideogram without phonetic complements, so reading of deity name uncertain, in Sa-[Deity Name] and Sat-[Deity Name]-khered. The same upright hippopotamus hieroglyph is used as determinative of Reret in the name Satreret on stela Turin 1545, photograph published by Rosati 1988, 110 fig. 146 (final horizontal line, last sign at right).
- ²⁹ Fischer-Elfert 1998, summary at pp. 72–73.
- ³⁰ Against the rendering as “*sem*-priest,” words such as “priest” seem too generalised a term of profession to correspond adequately to such defined roles.
- ³¹ See von Lieven 2007 on the ritual links between craft and initiation. Campbell Price is preparing a separate study on the role of this institution in the transmission of forms.
- ³² Fischer-Elfert 1998, 16–25 on scene 10, with further comments on double naming at 72–73 n. 169.
- ³³ Weingarten 1991, 4 with fig.6a for late 3rd millennium BCE amulets from Upper Egypt.
- ³⁴ Herodotus, *Histories* Book II, 71: on the zoological discrepancies, see Lloyd 1976, 312–314.
- ³⁵ Cf. Weingarten 1991, 8.
- ³⁶ Two Middle Kingdom examples are cited in Ward 1982, no. 1278.