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The statue of Harchebi ranks among the finest works of Egyptian art in the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art in Kansas City, Missouri (Inv. 47-12). Although its inscriptions have remained almost completely unpublished, the statue has received a small amount of scholarly attention in art historical and prosopographical discussions. The statue is best known

The author would like to thank Robert Cohon, Curator of Ancient Art (Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art), for permission to publish the statue and for providing excellent photographs and information.


for the two names attributed to its owner: the traditionally Egyptian Harchebi (lit. “Horus of Chemmis”), and the nearly homophonic Greek Archibios. The sportive nickname indicates that Harchebi closely interacted with the primarily Greek-speaking administration of the Ptolemaic Period. In fact, the autobiographical inscriptions reveal that he held the important post of “prime minister” (Egyptian: snty, Greek: διοικητής), the chief administrative officer in the Lagide court.4

Until recently, few supposed that native Egyptians could have attained such an important position in the predominantly Macedonian administration of Alexandria. In an early prosopographical study of all known dioikêtai, W. Peremans noted the conspicuous paucity of Egyptian names.5 However, this preliminary survey was based entirely on Greek documents, and it has since been established that Egyptians commonly used Hellenized forms of their names for official Greek records, and vice versa.6 J. Yoyotte later deduced the equivalence of the title snty, known from Hieroglyphic and Demotic texts, and the Greek dioikêtēs, and noted the existence of two inscribed statues from the Ptolemaic Period belonging to such officials with Egyptian names, including the present object.7 Ph. Collombert subsequently discovered that Dioskurides, an apparently Greek dioikêtēs attested in many papyri, also commissioned a lengthy autobiographical text in hieroglyphs on a usurped sarcophagus that reveals he was actually half-Egyptian.8

Of the three Egyptian monuments belonging to a Ptolemaic dioikêtês, only the hieroglyphic autobiography of Dioskurides has been published so far. Unfortunately, that inscription is so difficult to read, apparently the fault of a poorly trained scribe, that it is difficult to glean much historical information from its text.9 The inscriptions on the statue of the dioikêtês Horpakhepesh (Yale Peabody Museum 264191) primarily consist of his many administrative


6 Among many relevant studies, see W. Clarysse, “Grecs et Egyptiens Éloquents: The Last Thousand Years, II, p. 1231-1250.

7 J. Yoyotte, CRAIBL, 1989, p. 73-90.

8 Ph. Collombert, CdE 75, 2000, p. 47-63; for more on this person, see J. Bingen, “P.S.A.Athen. 9 + 13 et la diocèse Dioskouridès”, CdE 82, 2007, p. 207-217.

achievements (cf. *infra*, “Harchebi’s Duties”).

The autobiography of Harchebi/Archibios thus brings a welcome new perspective on the Ptolemaic administration and relations between Greeks and indigenous Egyptians.

**Technical Description**

The statue is made of grey granite with pink and brown speckles. Its maximum dimensions are 110.5 cm (height), 43.2 cm (width), and 33 cm (depth). The subject is a traditional striding figure who wears a tripartite kilt with no pleats and an inscribed belt, holding pieces of cloth in both hands. Unfortunately, the statue is now missing its head, the middle of both arms, and the lower half of both legs. The torso shows only restrained tripartition with a faintly visible median line. Overall, the quality of workmanship is excellent, and the stone is highly polished. The tableau on the back pillar and the hieroglyphic inscriptions suggest the object came from Mendes, and the general style and quality of the piece bears comparison to several other Mendesian statues.

**Inscriptions**

**Orthography**

The quality of carving is very good and the texts are relatively straightforward. Nonetheless, like most Late Period autobiographies, the inscriptions on the Kansas City statue exhibit a number of orthographic peculiarities. Some of these are sportive writings or abbreviations common in the Graeco-Roman Period, others involve phonetic changes or unusual “group writings” of traditional Egyptian words. The most confusing spellings are the result of confusion between similar hieratic or hieroglyphic signs.

---


• Sportive (“Ptolemaic”)

\[\text{ḥh} = ii\] (col. 1); \[\text{ḥh} = ‘h’\] (col. 4);
\[\text{ḥh} = h’pi\] (col. 3); \[\text{ḥh} = rꜣwꜣwy\] (col. 4);
\[\text{ḥh} = hr-hꜣ \text{t}\] (col. 3); \[\text{ḥh} = rn \text{wr}\] (col. 4);
\[\text{ḥh} = wʃ\] (col. 4);

• Phonetic Change

\[\text{ḥh} = sr (?)\] (col. 1); \[\text{ḥh} = wʃ\] (col. 3);
\[\text{ḥh} = zꜣw\] (col. 1); \[\text{ḥh} = tnm\] (col. 4);
\[\text{ḥh} = htr.w\] (col. 1); \[\text{ḥh} = wꜣl\] (col. 4);
\[\text{ḥh} = ṭꜣw\] (col. 2); \[\text{ḥh} = mrḥ\] (col. 4);
\[\text{ḥh} = \text{tꜣmḥw (?)}\] (cols. 1 and 3); \[\text{ḥh} = \text{ṁrḥ} \text{nb}\] (col. 2);
\[\text{ḥh} = iht\] (col. 1); \[\text{ḥh} = iht \text{nb}\] (col. 2);
\[\text{ḥh} = mdw\] (col. 1); \[\text{ḥh} = \text{ḥw}\] (col. 4 bis).

• Graphic Confusion

\[\text{ḥh} \text{and } \text{ḥh} \text{for } \text{ḥh} = tꜣ-mḥw (?)\] (cols. 1 and 3);
\[\text{ḥh} \text{for } \text{ḥh} = iht \text{nb}\] (col. 2);
\[\text{ḥh} \text{for } \text{ḥh} = iht\] (col. 1);
\[\text{ḥh} \text{for } \text{ḥh} = mdw\] (col. 1);
\[\text{ḥh} \text{for } \text{ḥh} = zꜣw\] (col. 4 bis).

Belt Inscription

\[\text{ḥm-ḥhr sš-nsw.t }\text{imy-rꜣw }\text{snty}^a\]
\[\text{Ḥr-ḥbi dd.tw }\text{n=f Ṭrkḥyš}^b\]
\[\text{zꜣ: }\text{Pꜣ(-n-)Mr-ur}^c\]
\[\text{ms }\text{Tꜣ-šrt(-n-)Bṣst.t}^d\]

The priest, royal scribe, overseer of fields, dioikêtês,
Harchebi, who is called Archibios,
son of Pamnevis,
born of Senobastis.

[FIG. 3]
Notes

a. The title snty (dioïkêtês) is written here as  ][ ], and twice on the back pillar as  ][ ] and  ][ ] (cols. 2 and 3). The first orthography suggests an etymology sì2 nty, “he who is aware of (all) that exists.” The peculiar spellings on the back pillar (s(ȝ)+n+t(ȝ) = snty(y)), meanwhile, recall the traditional epithet zȝw n tȝ, “beam of the earth,” which would designate Harchebi as an administrator in charge of supporting the chôra. A similar graphic pun occurs in the demotic “Fable of the Swallow and the Sea” (lines 21-22) where the related word zȝ-n-tȝ, “shore,” is written as if it were the title snty.

Other snty-officers were also imy-ȝ nbh (“scribe of the field,” and sỉ nswt, “royal scribe,” the latter office possibly corresponding to basilikos grammateus in the Ptolemaic Period.

b. The name Harchebi (lit. “Horus (in) Chemmis”) is extremely frequent (PN I, 247; Lüddeckens, Dem. NB, 830-831). The normal equivalent in Greek would be Ἀρχῆβις (Foraboschi, Onomasticon alterum papyrologicum, p. 56), but the present example transliterates the closest authentic Greek name, Ἀρχῆβιος (var. Ἀρχῆβιος; cf. Foraboschi, loc. cit.) as Ἰρκῆς. Although similar examples of double names (Egyptian and Greek) appear on other Ptolemaic monuments, the comparison of Harchebi to Archibios is perhaps the most popular example of bilingual onomasiology.

c. For the name Pamnevis (lit. “he of the Mnevis bull”), cf. Lüddeckens, Dem. NB, p. 379; Foraboschi, Onomasticon, p. 228 (Παμνῆις); Pros. Ptol. VII, p. 24. Although no votive...
stelae for the Mnevis bull like those for the Apis or Buchis bulls survive from the Ptolemaic Period, other evidence indicates that his cult remained active.25

d. For the name Senobastis (lit. “the daughter of Baster”), cf. PN I, 368, 15; Lüddeckens, Dem. NB, p. 1095; Pros. Ptol. VII, p. 314; Foraboschi, Onomasticon, p. 293.

Back Pillar

The back pillar terminates in a trapezoidal section at the top behind the head. This area would have originally contained a winged sundisk carrying an ankh-sign, although only traces of the latter object survive.26 Beneath the sundisk is the standard label “live the Behdetite, great god, lord of heaven (‘nh Bḥdty nṯr‘z nb p.t).” The inscription is symmetric, and the determinative for p.t is split into two half-sky signs on either side of the suspended ankh-sign: Δ - 𓊁.

Beneath the trapezoidal section is a small rectangular tableau (fig.4) depicting Harchebi praising the divine triad of Mendes: Harpokrates,27 the Ram of Mendes and Hatmehyt.28 Harchebi wears a long tunic with sleeves ending above the elbow, possibly with an outer robe.29 His head is shaved and he wears what appears to be a lotus diadem popular in the Ptolemaic Period.30

Below the tableau is a four-column hieroglyphic inscription. The quality of carving is very high, and the texts are excellently preserved until a large break near the bottom. The work was mysteriously never finished, as less than half of the expected intercolumnar lines were carved.


26 Compare the similar decoration of the trapezoidal section of MMA 2002.248 (B.V. Bothmer, ESLP, pl. 72, fig. 186) and BM 1013 (E. Naville, The Shrine of Saft el Henneh and the Land of Gashen, 1887, pl. 8B); for the development of decoration in the trapezoidal section, cf. O. Perdu, RdE 49, 1998, p. 250-252.


29 Cf. A. Kamal, Sieles ptolémiques et romaines, II, CGC 21, 1905, pls. 79 (69) and 82 (101); B.V. Bothmer, ESLP, pls. 70-71; P. Munro, Die spätägyptischen Totenstelen II, ÄgForsch 25, 1973, pl. 21 (Abb. 75), 55 (fig. 180), 55 (fig. 185), 57 (fig. 195), 38 (fig. 200), 60 (fig. 206); K. Jansen-Winkeln, BRIS II, pl. 39, 46, 89. There are no traces of a belt or knot characteristic of wrap-around robes, although either of these could be hidden behind his right arm.

30 See primarily B.V. Bothmer, ESLP, p. 163, with many examples, especially the reliefs in the tomb of Petosiris, cf. also Fr. Cumont, L’Égypte des astrologues, 1937, p. 117, n. 4. Alternatively, one could compare stela Turin 1529 on which the deceased wears a fillet with an amulet of a jackal head attached to his forehead, vaguely similar in appearance to the present vignette (P. Munro, Die spätzüägyptischen Totenstelen, II, pl. 21, fig. 75; good detailed photograph in O. Perdu, “Un dieu venu de la campagne”, RdE 56, 2005, p. 139, fig. 6c.)
Text and Translation

[1] ỉry-pʿ.t ḥty-pʿ(.t)*
ḥtmtw-bity smr wʿty
ỉmy-r notwithstanding ẖ n nsw.wb m t˘-m suger (?)c
mrb ẖ n nsw.w mb-ib n bity
ṣr tpy ẖ n ṣnwy.t=f* d
ỉm ỉi ḫnt pr-nsw.wf e
(hr)-ỉtr. t s.t f m ḫnw-wr g
izio(w,w) r īw.(t)=f m-m sr.w h
ni ḫt t m hm=f i
mb-ib ẖ n nsw.w m ḫtr.w=f nb l
ṭr mr(r)=f īwty ḫst.(w)=f k
mdw ḫnʿ nsw.w m ṣw.w l
ni ḫnt [...] b
[...] [2] ỉb=f n ḫnty-Hex.t m
s nb r ḫtr.w drp mb.w-ib.w
ṣḥpr ṣṣy.t n nsw.w m ƙ. t=f o
ʿpr ḫnty.w m īht nb nfr p
di ḫw r ḫpr m=sn
ƙ. w n hr=f dje.w m-ḥt=f q
īn Nn.t ḫn mbr.t=f t
þw n ṣw=f m ḫtw t n ṣḥ b
bn=f pw tm ḫb s

s nsw.w ṣnty u ḫr[-ḥb…]* v

[ink…] [3] ṣnty
ḥṣm nsw.w swd ｚw.(w)

īw(?)= w ƙ n ṣnpt m ỉb=f i x
dr-nṭy bs ｂpi r ḫr.w=f y
swr=ī qrs.t=f m htm.wt nb nt pr=ī m wʾb.t z
ṭr=ī ḫdwaḥr=ṣ r ƙ. w t˘-m suger (?) a
īw ṭdl=ī sw mi ḫt.(w) ḫr-hc. t
dšw.l=ī ḫnsi.(t)
mb=ī glm.(t) ḫś
n-mrw.w sqc ṣnp.wt n ṣnb-w*[ab

ḥw.s ิน=m hr.t […] ac
[...] [4] ƙ. t
rdi=ī s(t) n ḫhwty
hr ṭdl=ī r mrn nn ṭnm ad
\[ di=i \text{ ph r} \cdot \cdot \cdot . \text{wy}=i \text{ r-hmt}^* \text{ pr-wnh}.t \]
\[ s.t-htp n Wp-rh.ty^* \text{ af} \]
\[ m.ht phr(y).t r \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{ w}^* \text{ ni} \cdot r\text{rq}(w) k\cdot .t \]
\[ m \text{ taw.t nb n hmuw}. \text{ ah} \]

\[ db=i \text{ w} \cdot \cdot \cdot .t r mhr^* \]
\[ mb=i \text{ gm}.t w\}
\[ hty(.w) br \text{ r} n-wr n \text{ hm}=f^* \]

\[ fr.n=i \text{ nn r} \cdot \cdot \cdot w t=\text{ t} \text{ h}r \text{ w} \cdot \cdot \cdot .t=k^* \]
\[ ntr'z' \text{ nh hry-ntr}.w^* \]
\[ di=k n=i \text{ b'} q' \text{ } \ldots \]

\[ [1] \text{ The } \text{ ỉry-p} \cdot .t \text{ and } \text{ hỳty-p} \cdot .t, \]
the royal seal-bearer, sole companion,
overseer of royal land in Lower Egypt (?),
beloved of the nsw-king, confidant of the bỉtỉ-king,
the dignitary in chief of his entourage,
who comes and goes within the palace,
beside the throne in the Great Terrace,
whose arrival is awaited among the officials,
(since) nothing is done without his knowledge,
whom the king trusts with all of his income,
who performs whatever he desires, without being opposed,
who speaks with the king in private,
without \ldots taking away \ldots \]

\[ [\ldots] [2] \text{ his heart for the one Foremost of Hesret (Thoth),} \]
who supports the troops, who feeds the guards,
who creates respect for the king through his work,
who equips the seal-bearers with all good things,
who gives in excess of what had come from them previously,
food is before him, sustenance is after him,
who brings Nenet (Abundance) into his granary,
whose speech is the decree of life,
(since) his command is to never diminish.

The dioiketês, Har[chebi…]

[I am…] [3] \text{ a dioikêtês,} \]
who serves the king and grants food offerings.

The Ram within Anpet is in my heart,
because the Inundation surges forth (to provide) for his food,
I enlarged his burial with all precious things of my estate in the embalming place (w'b.t),
I made a decree concerning this at the mounds of Lower Egypt, and I made it as it had been before.

I renovated what was destroyed, and I restored what was found missing, from the desire to multiple years for the Sole Lord.

I made the foundation for a propylon [...] [4] works,
I gave it to Thoth, because he had set my heart straight, without being led astray.
I let my activity extend to the pr-unh.t, the burial place of Wp-r bu.wy, after an extended period when no work had been completed by any type of artisan.

I replaced what had fallen into disrepair, and I restored what was found missing, inscribed with the titulary of His Majesty.

I accomplished all of this while my heart was on your path, o great living god, chief of the gods, so you might grant me a long life [...].

**Commentary**

a. The title ḫȝty-pʿ.t, “first of the elite” often replaces the traditional ḫȝty-ʿ in the Late Period.31

b. Although the title ỉmy-รก, “overseer of the field” is fairly common, especially among other snfty-officials,32 the modifier “of the king (n nsw)” is unique here, at least for the Late Period.33 The “royal land (ց b n nsw)” probably corresponds to the official category of “crown land (βασιλικὴ γῆ),” territory which the Ptolemaic government leased to royal farmers.34

---

33 The snfty dioiketes Horpakhepesh was “overseer of fields of Upper and Lower Egypt (يمي-รก w tw-ndata mwy)” (Yale Peabody Museum 264191, Back Pillar, col. 1); cf. already O. Perdu, *BeE* 49, 1998, p. 186; other officials are simply يمي-รก ū.t. Nonetheless, similar titles do exist in the New Kingdom; see el-Ayedi, *Index of Egyptian Administrative, Religious and Military Titles of the New Kingdom*, p. 3-6, especially No. 16: يمي-รก ū.t n nb-tw wwy, “Overseer of the land of the Lord of the Two Lands.”
c. J. Yooyette read this mysterious group (𓊠𓊤) as 𓊤-nw but suggested “il faut reconnaître un surnom de l’Égypte (𓊤-mrt)”.  
A. Zivie, meanwhile, compared the toponym with 𓊤-nn (𓊤𓊤𓊤𓊤) known only from a brief mention in the Mendes stela.  

In column three, Harchebi mentions a decree he issued to “the mounds of the land (𓊤-wt nw 𓊤)” which appears to be a generic designation of Egypt. Since the second example denotes a large geographical area comprising multiple “mounds,” perhaps the simplest solution is to restore 𓊤-mḥw, “Lower Egypt,” with confusion between the nw-pot and the papyrus stalk. In the flood inscription of Taharqa, the “mounds of Lower Egypt (𓊤-wt 𓊤-mḥw)” are contrasted with the “mountains of Lower Egypt (𓊤-w. 𓊤-mḥw).”

Alternatively, these could be mistakes for 𓊤-bnr, modern Matboul, slightly east of Xois in the Delta, which is once written 𓊤𓊣𓊤𓊤𓊤𓊤. The bnr-sign often alternates with similar shapes like 𓊤𓊤 and 𓊤𓊤, and thus confusion with the nw-pot is at least conceivable. Panmerit, a prominent official from Tanis, was also a priest of Amun of 𓊤-bnr, and thus Harchebi could have been active there as well.

d. G. Gorre incorrectly copied 𓊠𓊤𓊤𓊤𓊤 and translated “l’ornement de ses diocèses (šr n sntyw.f).” However, the orthography of šnywt, “entourage,” is extremely common in the Ptolemaic Period, and the specific epithet “first of the entourage (tpy n šnywt)” finds many parallels. The preceding word 𓊤 appears to write šr, “official” with š > s, based on epithets like sr tpy sr.w and sr tpy n smrw.w attested elsewhere.

---

37 For this phrase, see A. Egberts, *In Quest of Meaning* I, p. 144, n. 4, who notes that it can refer to both settlements and cemeteries; to his examples, add also *Dendara X*, 289, 9; 291, 8; 305, 12; S. Cauville, *La porte d’Isis*, 29, 3.
38 This example of 𓊤-mḥw comes from *Edfou VI*, 1, 1. For the papyrus stalk writing mḥw, see *Wh.* II, 123, 12; Fr. Daumas (ed.), *Valeurs phonétiques* II, p. 414.
39 Although the nw-pot is traditionally round, hieroglyphic examples from the Graeco-Roman period often have thinner necks and longer bodies so that they almost resemble the papyrus stalk.
41 For the example in the New Kingdom (J.C. Darnell, *The Enigmatic Netherworld Books*, p. 53 and 160), but remain somewhat uncommon in the Ptolemaic Period (H.W. Fairman, *BIFAO* 43, 1945, p. 65, note (c); Wild, *BIFAO* 54, 1954, p. 179, n. (8) and 187, n. (17)).
This epithet alludes to open access in the royal palace granted to Harchebi as dioikêtês.  

G. Gorre incorrectly copied the first group as \( \text{ḥr} \) and translated “en premier de la place (\( \text{tpy} \) \)).” While the first sign is slightly unusual, it most closely resembles \( \text{ḥr} = \text{itr}t \), and thus it should read “beside the throne (\( \text{(hr)}-\text{itr}t \) \).” A similar epithet appears on the Yale statue of the dioikêtês Horpakhepes: \( \text{ḥr} \) \( \text{ms} \) \( \text{w} \) \( \text{nm} = \text{f} \) \text{hr-tp} \( \text{t}2 \) \text{r-itr}ty \( \text{(ḥr)} \) \text{m} \text{pr-nsut}, “(my) children remaining on earth at both sides of (or: around) the throne in the Palace.” The claim to “beside the throne” bears comparison with Esun/Zenon who was an “official who stood on (the king’s) right side (\( \text{hr} \) \( \text{wm} \) \( \text{f} \)).” Alternatively, the first word could be a very simplified writing of \( \text{ḥr} \) \( \text{m} \) \( \text{ḥt} \) \( \text{t} \) \( \text{s} \) \( \text{t} \), providing the more common epithet \( \text{ḥnty-s} \text{t} \), “foremost of position,” or a confused spelling of \( \text{ḥnty-s} \text{t} \) \( \text{m} \) \( \text{ḥt} \) \( \text{t} \) \( \text{s} \), \( \text{ushy-s} \text{t} \), “broad of place.”

g. The term \( \text{ḥnty} \) \( \text{s} \) \( \text{t} \) originally “throne,” can also mean “dais” in Ptolemaic inscriptions, and the King can “appear ceremoniously in the Great Dais (\( \text{ḥnty} \) \( \text{m} \) \( \text{ḥnty} \) \( \text{s} \) \( \text{t} \) \( \text{w} \).” This group...
might write $\preceq = \text{bnt.t}$, “fourneyourt (of the palace),” a term which appears in the common epithet: who enters the palace ($\preceq \text{bnt.t}$), while the other officials (must remain) outside (‘$q \text{r bnt.t wr.w r-hz}$’). In that case, one could translate the present passage as: “beside the throne within the palace, a great one (wr) whose arrival is awaited among the officials.” Finally, this could also write $\text{wr.t (< rwd) wr(t)}$, “the great portal,” a term which elsewhere designates the Ptolemaic palace.62

h. Reading $\preceq \preceq \text{= zȝw}$, “to wait,” based on parallels in other autobiographies.63 While the $\text{sl}^{-}$-sign often has the consonantal value $s$, it can also write $\text{zȝ}$, “to protect,”64 $\preceq \preceq = \text{zȝ}$, “corral,”65 and $\preceq = \text{zȝ}$, “to protect,” derived from Thoth as $\text{sl}^{-}$, “the perceptive one.”66

d. This epithet is quite frequent for divinities and kings, but not necessarily for officials.67

i. The word $\text{htr}$ usually refers to taxes or compulsory tribute,68 and thus this epithet probably refers to Habechbi’s economic duties as $\text{dioikêtês}$ (either “whom the king trusts with all of his taxes” or “whom the king trusts (most) among his tax-collectors”).69 Amenapoyam, a Ptolemaic $\text{stratogatos}$, similarly vaunted of his zeal in collecting taxes for the treasury of Mendes.70 Nonetheless, the context suggests a more general reference to

---


61 Derchain, Les impondérables de l’hellénisation, p. 46. pl. IV, col. 1 (BM 1668); for variants, see G. Lefebvre, “Le grand prêtres d’Amon, Harmakhis, et deux reines de la XXV$^\text{e}$ dynastie”; ASAE 25, 1925, 27, line 3 (’q br mwr, smr.w r-hz); La collezione egiziana del Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli, 1989, p. 56, 3.12, col. 1 (’q r bnt.t, iw z nb m-r[awy]); O. Koefoed-Petersen, Catalogue des statues et statuesttes égyptiennes, Glyptothèque Ny Carlsberg, 1950, pl. 120, col. 1 (’q r bnt.t, z nb r-uary). Guermeur, Les cultes d’Amon hors de Thèbes, p. 221-2, col. 1: ’q r bnt.t, smr.w r-uary). In many of these examples, one might also translate ’q r bnt.t as “who enters inside (ehory1).” For similar epithets, see further L. Coulon, “Les sièges de prêtre d’époque tardive: à propos de trois documents thébains,” RDe 57, 2006, p. 8, n. M.


64 N. de G. Davies, Hibis III, pl. 33, col. 11; this reading is confirmed by the parallel in P. Harris Mag. t’ V.7 (see D. Klotz, Adoration of the Ram, p. 88, n. B and pl. 19).

65 Bucheum stela 18, line 2 (L. Goldbrunner, Buchis, 2004, pl. 9); P. Wilson, A Ptolemaic Lexikon, p. 786.

66 H. De Meulenaere, BIFAO 54, 1954, p. 75 and 81.


68 D. Warburton, State and Economy in Ancient Egypt: Fiscal Vocabulary in the New Kingdom, OBO 111, 1997, p. 263-277; G. Gorre (ibid.) translated this passage as “celui qui contente le cœur du roi avec toutes ses taxes.”

69 For the term $\text{brw}$, “tax-collectors,” see Wb. III, 201, 19, D. Meeks, AL III, 79, 2105; and J.-M. Kruchten, “Le verbe $\text{br}$ et ses dérivés jusqu’à la fin du Nouvel Empire. Sens et traduction”, AIPHOS 24, 1980, p. 44.

70 Cleveland 41.141, cols. 2-3; cf. the discussion by Chr. Zive-Coche, Tanit 3, p. 225-227.
official responsibilities,\(^7\) and one could compare Demotic: \(htr\), and Coptic: \(\varkappa\omega\eta\cdot\), “need; requirement,”\(^7\) and translate: “with all his needs.”

Alternatively, this could be the rare military title \(htr\), “cavalry officer” (< \(nty\ htr\)), a variant of the more common \(hpr-nfrw\), “director of horses.”\(^7\) However, Harchebi does not seem to have held any military positions.

**k.** Understanding: “who carries out whatever (the king) desires.”\(^7\) An exact parallel to this entire passage appears on the Mendesian statue of Amenemhet (Cleveland 1948.141, col. 2). The second epithet (“without being opposed”) usually refers to the king or deities,\(^7\) and thus Archibios assumes a certain degree of divine authority in his office.

**l.** The orthography of the first word is an interesting Mischform confusing \(\hat{\text{m}}\hat{\text{a}}\hat{\text{w}}\) = \(mdw\), “to speak,” and \(\dot{\text{d}}\dot{\text{c}}\cdot\text{r}^\prime\), “to eat; to feed.”\(^7\) Although the latter reading would provide an interesting epithet (“who dines alone with the king”), there are many examples of the phrase “who speaks with the king in private (mdw \(hn^t\ ns\\nt\ m w^t\ w^t\)).”\(^7\) A comparable orthography appears on Louvre C 317, line 10: \(mdw\) \(\{\hat{\text{m}}\hat{\text{a}}\hat{\text{w}}\}\) \(n=f\) \(ns\\nt\ m w^t\ w^t\).\(^7\) Alternatively, this could be an unusual “group writing” of \(\dot{\text{d}}\dot{\text{c}}\cdot\text{d}\) for \(\dot{\text{d}}\dot{\text{c}}\cdot\), “to speak” (cf. \(\text{infra}\), n. (s) for a similar orthography of \(\text{t}^\text{w}\).

**m.** The epithet \(\text{hn}^\text{ty-Hsr}^\text{t}\) is apparently just a general reference to Thoth,\(^7\) and not a specific allusion to Thoth of Baqiliyeh (cf. \(\text{infra}\), n. \(\alpha\) who is always designated \(\text{wp-rh}^\text{t}^\text{wy}\).\(^8\)

**n.** It is unclear why Harchebi uses the archaic term \(sk^\text{w}\), “troops.”\(^8\) The medial sign in this word derives from the usual determinatives for the word \(sk\), “lance” (\(\hat{\text{f}}\hat{\text{f}}\hat{\text{f}}\hat{\text{f}}\), \(\text{infra}\), n. (m); \(\text{Urk.}\) IV, 758, 9).

**o.** G. Gorre incorrectly copied \(\hat{\text{m}}\hat{\text{a}}\hat{\text{w}}\) instead of \(\check{\text{m}}\check{\text{a}}\check{\text{w}}\), \(\text{sbpr}^\text{t} \text{fy}^\text{t}\). This phrase recalls epithets of officials who claimed to spread fear or respect (\(\text{nrw}, \text{snd}\)) of the king, especially on expeditions

---

\(^7\) Cf. the similar epithets \(\text{mb}^\text{t}^\text{b}n\ \text{Hr}^\text{n}^\text{m}^\text{nt}^\text{c}t\ m \text{sh}^\text{b}^\text{r}^\text{w}^\text{=f}\), “confidant of Horus (var. the king) in his affairs” (J. Heise, \textit{Erinnern und Gedenken}, p. 226, C; G. Maspero, H. Gauthier, \textit{Sarcofages des époques perse et pontique}, II, p. 86). For classical examples, see J. Janssen, \textit{De traditione egyptica Autoiobiographi}, I, p. 67-68; D.M. Doxy, \textit{Egyptian Non-Royal Epitaphs}, p. 314; H. Guksch, \textit{Königsdienst}, SAGA II, 1994, p. 136-137, for the variants “confidant of the king in all his missions (\(m wp.wt=f nb\))”, “in all his plans (\(m shr=w=f nb\))”, “in all his designs (\(m sim.w=f nb\))”, or even “all things he desires (\(lft nb mrrz=f\))”; cf. Fr. Cumont, \textit{L’Egypte des astrologues}, pp. 42-43, n. 3.


\(^3\) JE 44901, line 15; G. Daressy, “Un second exemplaire du décret de l’an XXIII de Ptolémée Éphiphané”, \textit{RT}, 38, 1916, 178-179.


\(^8\) Wb. V, 514, 1-3; S. Sauneron, \textit{Les fêtes religieuses d’Esna aux derniers siècles du paganisme, Esna V}, 1962, p. 13, n. (m); P. Wilson, \textit{A Ptolemaic Lexicon}, p. 1214. The hieratic forms of the \(mdw\) and \(\dot{\text{d}}\dot{\text{c}}\cdot\text{d}^\prime\) are relatively similar in the Late Period; G. Möller, \textit{Hieratische Päläographie III}, p. 37 (391) and 43 (456).

\(^7\) For this and similar phrases, see recently O. Purdo, “Documents relatifs aux gouvernements du Delta au début de la XXVIe dynastie,” \textit{RdE} 37, 2006, p. 158-9, n. (f) (with variants and further references); J. Heise, \textit{Erinnern und Gedenken}, p. 35, n. 92, 333-334.


\(^7\) See the examples in \textit{LGG V}, p. 843-844; in the “Book of Thoth,” “he of Heres” is one of the most common names for Thoth; R. Jasnow, K.-Th. Zauzich, \textit{The Ancient Egyptian Book of Thoth}, I, 2005, p. 9-10.

\(^7\) The epithet \(\text{hn}^\text{ty-Hsr}^\text{t}\) does not occur in any of the inscriptions relating to Baqiliyeh collected by A.-P. Zivie, \textit{Hermopolis I}.


\(^8\) Wb. IV, 315, 6-7.
outside of Egypt. In the present context, Harchebi implies that he maintains the prestige of Ptolemy by supplying the military with all necessary resources.

p. Understanding for . Amenpayom of Mendes claimed that “the king loved him the most of all his seal-bearers” (mr n=f sw r hmtw w=f nb). The precise nuance of this title in the Ptolemaic Period is unclear, but it could potentially designate any administrators bearing official seals. In that case, the present epithet would characterize the dioikêtês as chief bureaucrat – in Alexandria, Mendes or elsewhere – dispatching officials throughout the chora and possibly outside of Egypt proper.

q. These phrases seem to express that Harchebi is literally surrounded by food and provisions for the country, as if he were in the middle of a procession of fecundity figures carrying produce from the fields of Egypt (cf. infra, n. (r)).

r. The goddess Nenet was a serpent goddess of abundance, just like the similarly named and more popular Renenutet. She usually appears in processions of divinities bringing agricultural produce to the temple.

s. Reading: “his speech (lit. “breath of his mouth”). The unusual “group writing” of recalls similar orthographies on the Mendes Stela (line 2): and in the name. The unusual appearance of the sail-determinative may be influenced by the tree hieroglyph, perhaps because of the similar word, “willow (tr.t)” ( ). The power to “decrease life” is usually a royal or divine prerogative, but traditional epithets often emphasize the miraculous powers of private officials’ speech.

One might compare the lofty claims of a general from the Thirtieth Dynasty:

83 G. Posener, L’Enseignement loyaliste. Sagesse égyptienne du Moyen Empire, HEO 5, 1976, p. 20, n. 3; D.M. Doxy, Egyptian Non-Royal Epithets in the Middle Kingdom, p. 73. Note also stela Louvre 359, line 4, where the General Ahmose tells the Apis bull: “I have placed fear of you in the hearts of everybody (nld n=f nd=f m b n bw nb)” (G. Posener, La première domination perse en Égypte, BE 11, 1936, p. 43, 45, n. (j); J. Vercoutter, Textes biographiques du Sérapéum de Memphis: contribution à l’étude des stèles votives du Sérapéum, BEHE 316, 1962, p. 115, n. (I)); for a similar idea, see also H.W. Fairman, “A Statue from the Karnak Cache”, JEA 20, 1934, pl. I, col. 7, with the note of H. De Meulenaere, BIFAO 61, 1962, n. (n).

84 Cleveland 1948.141, col. 2; cf. the discussion of Chr. Zivie-Coche, Tanis 3, p. 225-226, n. 1.

85 See primarily J. Yoyotte, “Quelques divinités retrouvées: Nenout, obscure collègue d’Ermouthis, et les collèges de « génies économiques »”. ACF 95, 1994-95, p. 647-648, 662-669 (to which this example should be added); LGG IV, 248; I. Guermeur, Les cultes d’Amon hors de Thèbes. Recherches de géographie religieuse, BEHE, Sciences religieuses 123, 2005, p. 84-86.

86 Wb. V, 351, 3.

87 Urb. II, 33, 9.

88 PNI, 127, 21.

89 D. Kurth, in D. Kurth (ed.), Edifu: Bericht über drei Surveys, p. 80-81, examples (z) and (al), notes several examples of confusion between the tree and sail at Edfu, suggesting an origin in the similar hieratic writings. The horizontal line on the mast appears quite often in Graeco-Roman examples of this sign; see Fr. Daumas (ed.), Valeurs phonétiques III, pp. 568-572; and see the recent discussion of F. Förster, “Klar zum Gefecht!” Zur Beschränkung des Kampfschiffes im Horusmythos von Edifu (Edfou VI, 79, 71-80, 10), SAK 34, 2006, 149-151. Note that similar variants examples occur already in the Middle Kingdom (e.g. W.K. Simpson, Terrace of the Great God at Abydos, PYPE 5, 1974, pl. 25; ANOC 16.2, line 3; J. Monnet Saleh, Les antiquités égyptiennes de Zaqyeh, 1970, p. 16-17, No. 5, line 1; references kindly noted by John C. Darnell).


91 Cf. J. Heise, Erinnerungen und Gedanken, p. 303: “who clothes a million men with his speech (snḫn ḥḥ.w m tp-y f=f)”.

92 RCA 1996.91, Back Pillar, col. 1; PM VIII, 801-727-310; the statue will be published by the author.
Moreover, the present epithet might simply imply that all of Harchebi’s conversations and decrees as dioikêtês are concerned with supporting life.

The command “not to diminish (tmḥb)”\textsuperscript{(95)} recalls the “decree of Thoth” mentioned on the Mendes stela justifying additional offerings for the Mendesian Ram: “If one were to diminish (ḥb) his (sc. the Ram of Mendes) offerings, then millions of people would inevitably perish (ir ḫb.tw pȝ.wt=f, ḫr ḫh.w ȝq(w) m rmṯ).”\textsuperscript{(96)}

For this sportive writing of the title snṭ, see \textit{supra}, Front Text, n. a.

Since Harchebi speaks in the first person in the following column, one can restore with reasonable certainty: “Har[chebi, son of Pamnevis, born of Senobastis, he says: I am…].”

The group ḫb does not appear to belong to the preceding word, and the next phrase is an adverbial sentence (“the Ram of Mendes is in my heart”), and thus it seems to be a mistake for a particle such as ḳw or ḳš. Alternatively, one could possibly translate: “who supplies the offerings of (my) father (swq ḳw wt ḳt(=l)),” alluding to the Ram of Mendes.

The toponym Anpet frequently appears as the home of the Ram(s) of Mendes, and thus here it probably refers to the temple of the living ram in Tell Rub’a.\textsuperscript{(97)} The claim to place a divinity in one’s heart is a fairly standard expression of piety.\textsuperscript{(98)}

An identical orthography occurs in a similar context in the Mendes stela (line 17; \textit{Urk}. II, 44, 12-13), where a pseudo-epigraphic decree of Thoth stresses the
exceptional nature of the Mendesian Ram when requesting additional offerings and tax-exemptions for Mendes:

hr nty b'b H'pî b.t hr p2.wt=f

“Because the Inundation (-Encoding) floods the earth bearing his offerings.”

This sentence argues that the Nile floods primarily in order to supply offerings for the Ram of Mendes,\textsuperscript{100} and thus the agricultural prosperity of Egypt is dependant on the Mendesian cult.\textsuperscript{101} Harchebi thus presents his support for the Ram of Mendes as a natural extension of his duties as dioikêtês, chief agricultural and financial minister.

z.

The slightly unconventional form of the qs-sign (-Encoding; for \textit{qrs.t})\textsuperscript{102} is apparently influenced by the hieratic.\textsuperscript{103} G. Gorre thought that Harchebi donated “toutes sortes de produits provenant de la maison de purifcation (hmt nb n tmyw w'b.t)”\textsuperscript{104} However, the w'b.t was actually the building in which sacred animals were mumified,\textsuperscript{105} not a place for producing special goods. The precious objects donated to the w'b.t could have included any number of amulets, vessels, tools and expensive oils required to mumify the sacred rams of Mendes.\textsuperscript{106} A Ptolemaic priest from Heliopolis made similar claims concerning his donations for the mumification of a Mnevis bull:\textsuperscript{107}

\textit{wr}=i m hrw nn "w m grh
hr rdl.t ibt nw w'b.t m w'l yr t=k
m st; bql(=i)
\textit{r ph}(=i) hrw n pr r p.t
\textit{iw}=i rh kw n' gm(.w) w' im sn im

Chr. Zwie-Coche, \textit{Tanis} 3, p. 101, col. 2, in the epithet \textit{b}'pî n niw.t z=f (CG 700); L. Žabkar, \textit{Hymni to Isis in Her Temple at Philae}, 1988, fig. 5, col. 4 (L. Žabkar, p. 51, read \textit{w'b}, “the pure water”).

\textsuperscript{100} Archibios uses the specific phrase “for the purpose of his offerings (rhr.w=f),” recalling an epithet of Harppokrates on the Mendes stela: “unto whom the land is given for the purpose of his offerings (rdl(.w) n=f l2 w r hr.w=f)” (Urk. II, 31, 11; and cf. \textit{Urk.} II, 43, 6).

\textsuperscript{101} This phrase is nonetheless fairly common in texts describing the Inundation; Chr. Thiers, \textit{Prolénée Philadelphie et les prêtres d’Atoum de Tjekou}, p. 36-37, n. (62).


\textsuperscript{103} Cf. D. Kurth, in D. Kurth (ed.), \textit{Edfu: Bericht über drei Surveys}, p. 76 (c) and 83 (ax).


I stayed awake all day, never sleeping at night, giving the objects necessary for the wšt to your storehouse, by providing (my own) money, until I reached the day of ascending to heaven, since I knew that none of those (items) could be found there (previously).

Harchebi specifies that his donation comes from his own estate (pr). The general Hor from Herakleopolis similarly dedicated two local gardens to the temple of Heneb to supply daily offerings, noting “I compensated their owners with property from my own estate (ṣq; n=ỉ nb.w=sn m iht m pr=ỉ).”

aa. The present confusion between pr and p is probably due to hieratic.

ab. For the idea that Egyptian officials could extend the lifetime of the ruling king through their actions, compare Lyon 1748, where the vizier Harsiese is “one who performs Maat (through which Re lives), and who (thereby) prolongs the lifetime of the lord on earth (ir mššt, ‘nb R’ im=ỉ, sq; ‘ḥw n nb hr-t p t’).” Note also that on the Mendes Stela, Ptolemy II’s reward for renovating the precinct of the Mendesian Ram is “increasing his years as king (ṣq; rnp.wt=f m nsw.t)” (line 28; Urk. II, 51, 15).

ac. For the precise nuances of ḥus, “to make (bricks) cohesive (for a foundation),” see most recently D. Meeks, Mythes et légendes du Delta, p. 132, n. 446. The propylon (mh.t) was the small gate in front of the temple, and this modest structure was one of the most popular building projects for officials to finance in the Ptolemaic Period.

ad. The first clause alludes to the common epithet, “straight of heart (mḥ.t)” while the second phrase credits Thoth for keeping Harchebi’s heart from going astray (mnm). Thoth, often called the “heart of Re,” is closely associated with the heart.
ae. The circumlocution ṛḏ ṭḫ ṭ-hmnt, “to allow/cause to reach,” is slightly awkward, but it might reflect Coptic ḫwȝ (var. ḫwȝn) implying that Harchebi went beyond his expected duties by renovating the necropolis of the neighboring town (e.g. “I let my building activity extend as far as Baqilyeh”). Alternatively, this could be the phrase ṛḏ-ḥmnt, “to bring and end to; to complete,” emphasizing that Harchebi completed works left unfinished by his predecessors.

af. As the designation “place of repose (s.t-ḥtp)” suggests, the pr-wnh.t was the sacred necropolis of the Hermopolite nome in Lower Egypt. Wp-rḥ.wy is an abbreviation of pr-Dḥwty-wp-rḥ.wy, “Domain of Thoth who Judges the Two Companions,” another name for Baqilyeh (Bʿḥ), or the entire Hermopolite nome in general. The present determinative of the toponym may have been influenced by the Mendesian priestly title and location wp-nṯr.wy.

ag. A similar use of the phrase ḫḥȝ.t (r.-)w, “an extended period of time” occurs on the naos of Saft el-Henna, where Nectanebo I commemorates restoring divine statuettes to their proper shrines: “after an extended period of time (in which) they had wandered off to foreign lands (mḥt ḫḥȝ.t ṭ.sn (n) ḫḥȝt r ḫȝs.w)”. The same expression also appears in the Suzet Canal stele of Darius I.

Kings usually claim to have performed restoration work where nothing had been done by any previous rulers since the time of the gods. Harchebi’s claim is more modest and bears comparison with a similar statement of Petosiris concerning his building activities in Hermopolis: “work had not been carried out there since the foreigners (Persians) had...”
descended upon Egypt \((mn \textit{ir.tw}) k2.t \textit{im=f dr ii h:sty.w br Km.t})\).\(^{127}\) Esnun/Gzenon of Coptos likewise claims to have reinstated festival processions of Isis “after many years of it lacking \((br-sz \textit{rnp.wt} \textit{fj}\:m \textit{gm-ws})\).\(^{128}\)

**ah.** The orthography of \(\textit{lsw.t}, \) “office,” is noteworthy \((\textit{ (?, \textit{y})})\), as it conflates the similar signs \(\textit{y}\) and \(\textit{y}\).\(^{129}\) A comparable sign occurs at Hibis: \(\textit{f}(\textit{y})\:n\:l\:l\:l\).\(^{130}\)

Harchebi appears to emphasize that he is the first official to have successfully completed building projects \((r2-c.\textit{wy}, \textit{k2.t})\)\(^{131}\) in the sacred necropolis of Baqilleyh. A passage from the Mendes stela suggests that temples and tombs easily turned into perpetual construction sites without proper supervision \((\textit{Urk. II}, 38, 4-9)\):\(^{132}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wn.in hm=f hr phr hw.t-b2.w} \\
\text{gm.n=f pr-b2 hr ir(t) k2(t) im=f (…)} \\
\text{wd.n hm=f r’rq=f m k2.t nhb}
\end{align*}
\]

*While his Majesty was touring the Temple of the Rams, he found that Ram house was still in a state of construction (…) his Majesty decreed that it be completed as a work of eternity.*

In his famous Hermopolis stela, Nectanebo I ordains the reconstruction of the temple of Nehmetaway and returns later to make sure the work has been finished. Afterwards, “his majesty rewarded the prophets and priests for having completed all works he had begun in Hesret \((\text{wnn hm=f hr di.t fj qq n hm.w-ntr.w w’b.w m r’rq k2.t nb ir.t.n=f m Hzr.t})\).\(^{133}\) Alternatively, the phrase ‘rq k2.t, “completing works,” could also refer to mumification rituals for the sacred ibises of Thoth.\(^{134}\) A royal inscription from the Serapeum, possibly from the Twenty-Ninth Dynasty, described the restoration of proper Apis burial rituals, apparently after the Persian Domination, since: “his Majesty did not see any man of the entire land who would complete this important work \((\text{n’t gmh hm=f z nb n t p n r’rq k2.t tn mnkh.t})\).\(^{135}\) Djedhor of Athribis similarly discovered that falcon mumification had been neglected in his town during the Persian Period: “Then one found numerous unburied falcons (…) I had them taken into the Wabet, and I had them (properly) interred \((\text{br.tw r=f gm.n.tw b’k.w \textit{f}j:\:iwty qrs=sn (…)} rdi=l ‘q.n=sn r ti: w’b.t, rdi=l qrs=sn)\).”\(^{136}\)

---

129 The horns on the latter sign (Gardiner Fr0) now growing longer in Graeco-Roman Period hieratic, eventually approaching the shape of the \(\text{liw-emblem} (Q44); cf. G. Möller, *Hieratische Päläographie III*, p. 13, No. 150 (particularly the P. Rhind examples, which closely resemble the orthography on the present statue). For the phrase \(\text{liw.wt nb.t hmww, “all types of craftsmen,” cf. KRI II, 331, 4.}\)
131 For the interchangeability of these two terms, see G. Vittmann, *SAK 22*, 1995, p. 306, n. 72.
132 See also A. Spalinger, *The Great Dedicatory Inscription of Rameses II*, p. 25-26, for temples literally “in a state of construction \((m r2-c. k2.t/tb2.k)\).”
134 For this sense of ‘rq k2.t, see J. Vercoutter, *MDAIK* 16, 1958, p. 334, n. (F), 345; D. Meeks, *Mythes et légendes du Delta*, p. 59, n. 75.
135 J. Vercoutter, *op. cit.*, p. 333, lines x+4-5.
ai. The phrase *wȝỉ r*, “to fall into (a negative state)” usually prefaces descriptions of temple renovations.137

aj. For this common phrase, see P. Wilson, *A Ptolemaic Lexikon*, p. 752; E. Jelinková-Reymond, *Djed-her*, p. 96, ll. 19-20; *Urk. II*, 67, 7; 68, 2 and 10.

ak. Similar claims to be on the “path” or “water” of a certain deity are extremely common in Late Period autobiographies.138

al. The epithet “great living god (*nṯr ʿȝ ʿnḫ*)” is probably an abbreviation of the fuller form “great living god of Re (*nṯr ʿȝ ʿnḫ n Rʿ*)” which usually designates the Ram of Mendes.139

Identity of the Owner / Date of the Statue

The statue belongs to Harchebi/Archibios, the son of Pamnevis and Senobastis (cf. supra, “Belt Inscription”). Although the name Harchebi is very common in Egypt, there are no further Egyptian documents of a man with the same parents. Nonetheless, it is tempting to compare a healing statue currently in Moscow (Pushkin Museum 5319), which supposedly comes from Mendes and belongs to a certain Harchebi.140 Although no patronymic is given, he holds similar titles as Harchebi/Archibios: ḣȝty-pʿ.t, ḣȝty-bṭy, *smr wʿty*, and *sš-nsw.t*. He also holds the title *wpwty-mšʿ*, “messenger of the army,” which one might compare to the claims of Harchebi/Archibios to have supplied troops and seal-bearers (col. 2).

In his groundbreaking essay on the title *snnty*, J. Yoyotte proposed identifying Harchebi/Archibios with a *dioikêtês* named Archibios (*Pros. Ptol. I, no. 20*) who served under Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II (c. 123–121 BCE), and possibly with a *hypodioikêtês* also named Archibios (*Pros. Ptol. I, no. 905*) attested several years earlier (c. 136 BCE).141 This identification is perfectly reasonable, and has been followed by must subsequent scholars.142 However, the lack of any genealogical information concerning the latter *dioikêtês* makes it impossible to confirm J. Yoyotte’s hypothesis. Ultimately, this identification hangs upon the problematic issue of the statue’s date.

B.V. Bothmer originally noted the similarities between the Kansas City statue, and two other Mendesian statues, Cleveland 48.141 and Louvre E. 15546, and suggested that all three might date to the reign of Ptolemy II.143 His main reasons revolve around his observation that

---


138 See primarily G. Vittmann, *Al-tägyptische Wegmataphorik*, p. 81, 5.76 (discussing this example).


141 J. Yoyotte, *CRAIBL* 1989, p. 82-84.


life-size private statues primarily occur under Ptolemy II and Ptolemy XII,\textsuperscript{144} and his assumption that the excellent hieroglyphs on the Cleveland statue suggest an earlier date. J. Yoyotte subsequently challenged these dating criteria, and convincingly argued that the title \textit{sn-ns\textsubscript{w}t} (συγγενὴς) attributed to Amenpayom automatically places the Cleveland statue within the second or first centuries,\textsuperscript{145} while noting that the “tracé et groupement des signes, graphies, thèmes autobiographiques” on the Mendesian statues are comparable to the inscriptions of late Ptolemaic officials from Tanis.\textsuperscript{146} More importantly, J. Yoyotte claimed that a date under Ptolemy II would make Harchebi/Archibios a near-contemporary of the famous \textit{dioikêtēs} Apollonios, “ce qui cadre fort mal avec l’image que les hellénistes peuvent tracer des positions respectives des Grecs et des autochtones à l’époque de Philadelphe,” concluding “Inimaginable sous Philadelphes, un notable indigène parvenu si haut est bien venu sous Évergète II.”\textsuperscript{147}

While J. Yoyotte was correct concerning the date of the Cleveland statue and the title \textit{sn-ns\textsubscript{w}t}, this observation is of minor importance regarding the Kansas City statue. On the one hand, both statues share certain features in common, including their size, the striding pose, the inscribed belt, and the tableau on the back pillar. Nonetheless, the two objects differ in most other details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kansas City 47-12</th>
<th>Cleveland 1948.141</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>Basalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymmetrical inscription on belt</td>
<td>Symmetrical inscription on belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrained tripartition of torso</td>
<td>Strong tripartition of torso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-pleated kilt</td>
<td>Pleated kilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-column inscription</td>
<td>Three-column inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hieroglyphs face right</td>
<td>Hieroglyphs face left\textsuperscript{148}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableau is below trapezoidal area</td>
<td>Tableau is within trapezoidal area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableau is immediately above columns of inscription</td>
<td>Tableau is above a horizontal inscription, then columns of inscription</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Artistically speaking, the two statues are quite different, and thus there is no reason to assume they came from the same studio.\textsuperscript{149} In terms of textual content, both inscriptions mention “seal-bearers” and both officials are said to “perform what (the king) desires, without being opposed,” but these are only minor similarities.

\textsuperscript{144} Explicitly stated in a discussion of other statues: B.V. Bothmer, \textit{ESLP}, p. 127-128.

\textsuperscript{145} J. Yoyotte, \textit{CRAIBL}, 1989, p. 83-84; followed by Chr. Zevie-Cocher, \textit{Tanis} 3, p. 91-93; for the latter issue, see recently L. Coulon (\textit{RdE} 52, 2001, p. 97-98) who notes that the title \textit{syngenēs} does not occur for Egyptian officials until 135 BCE, and that the title \textit{sn-ns\textsubscript{w}t} specifically designates the \textit{stratēgos} beginning in 120 BCE.

\textsuperscript{146} J. Yoyotte, \textit{CRAIBL}, 1989, p. 84; G. Gorre exaggerated J. Yoyotte’s comments, claiming that the style of the Mendesian and Tanite statues were actually “identiques” (\textit{Les relations du clergé égyptien}, p. 385, n. 1101, 392).


\textsuperscript{148} For this rare feature, see I. Guermeur, \textit{RdE} 51, 2000, 72, n. 17.

\textsuperscript{149} Suggested by B.V. Bothmer (\textit{ESLP}, p. 125); followed by J. Yoyotte, (\textit{op. cit.}, p. 83); L.M. Berman, \textit{(Cleveland Museum of Art: Catalogue of Egyptian Art}, p. 462).
In terms of social and political history, there is no reason to assume that an Egyptian dioikêtês would have been inconceivable under Ptolemy II. First of all, the prosopographical record is incomplete, and thus while Apollonios may have dominated the latter years of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (c. 259-239 BCE), documentary sources are almost completely silent concerning the dioikêtês in the first two decades of his reign (283-260 BCE).150 Furthermore, it is precisely the Mendes stela which records Ptolemy II’s preference for Egyptian officials (line 14; Urk. II, 42, 5-11):

\[ \text{iw gr } \text{hm}=\text{f } \text{tz.n}=\text{f } \text{d} \text{z.m.w}=\text{f } \text{m } \text{hwn.w } \text{nfr.w} \\
\text{m } \text{ms.w } \text{mnfyt.t nw } \text{B} \text{q.t} \\
\text{tp.w}=\text{sn } \text{m } \text{ms.w [tz]-mry} \\
\text{iw}=\text{sn } \text{m } \text{h w-ib.w n}=\text{f } \text{im} \\
\text{n } \text{z.(t)} \text{n mr(r)}=\text{f } \text{Km.t r wn.t nb } \text{bzk.n}=\text{f} \\
\text{hr } \text{si.z.n}=\text{f } \text{mnh } \text{ib}=\text{sn } \text{hr}=\text{f} \]

Moreover, his Majesty assembled his troops consisting of good youths from among children of the elite of Egypt,151 their leaders being “sons of Egypt,”152 serving as his trusted agents therein, inasmuch as he loved Egypt more than any other area he controlled,153 since he recognized how useful they were for him.

Bilingual Egyptian officials such as Harchebi/Archibios would have proved extremely valuable in the Ptolemaic Period, particularly in the administration of agricultural and economic affairs. The early Ptolemies realized this, and correspondingly employed mostly Egyptians in the office of basilikos grammateus in the third century BCE.154 If Harchebi/Archibios were

---

150 The only exception is Satyros (PP1, no. 47), possibly dioikêtês in 263 BCE (the reading is uncertain).
151 Ph. Derchain understood mnfy.t to mean “l’armée,” more specifically “les anciens mercenaires macédoniens” (“La garde ’égyptienne’ de Ptolémée II”, ZPE 65, 1986, p. 203); however, Cl. Vandersleyen had already convincingly demonstrated that the term mnfy.t often denotes a small group of Egyptian élites, from the Seventeenth Dynasty into the Ptolemaic Period (Les guerres d’Amois, fondateur de la XVIIIe dynastie, MRE t, 1971, p. 177-190).
152 Ph. Derchain translated “les premiers de celle-ci (l’armée d’Égypte) à être nés en Égypte” (tpju.sn m ms(w) (m) z mrj) (ZPE 65, 1986, p. 203), insisting on the Macedonian ethnicity of the children. However, the phrase tp.w=sn m ms.w, can hardly write “the first of them to be born”; cf. Urk. II, 129, 10 (Canopus Decree, line 7) where tp.w=sn clearly means “their leaders.” One could understand tp.w=sn m ms.w [m tz]-mry, “their leaders were (Greeks) born [in Egypt],” similar to the Demotic expression Wynn ms(.w) n Km.t, “a Greek, born in Egypt” (cf. K. Goudriaan, Ethnicity in Ptolemaic Egypt, DMAHA 5, 1988, p. 16-21), but this option requires a number of emendations. Alternatively, the phrase ms.w tz-mry could be a nationalistic designation for indigenous Egyptians, analogous to similar Semitic ethnonyms (e.g. Hebrew bene Yisrael, “children of Israel,” and Arabic ibna’ al-’Iraq, “children of Iraq”; cf. H. Wehr, Arabic-English Dictionary, 1994, p. 92-93). Otherwise, as J.Fr. Quack recently noted, it is difficult to understand “why such an act [i.e. recruiting Macedonian soldiers] would be worth mentioning, especially in a text written in the Egyptian language,” since the text otherwise celebrates royal benefactions to Egyptians and their temples (“Innovations in Ancient Garb? Hieroglyphic Texts from the Time of Ptolemy Philadelphus,” in P. McKechnie, Ph. Guillaume (ed.), Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World, Mnemosyne-Suppl. 300, 2008, p. 278).
153 For the various nuances of bzk-status, see recently J.C. Darnell, RdE 59, 2008, p. 98-101
dioikêtês under Ptolemy II, he would have been no more out of place than the Greek official Esnun/Zenon would have been in the clergies of Qus and Coptos in Upper Egypt.\(^{155}\)

Finally, J. Yoyotte’s comparison of the epigraphic style and textual content of the Kansas City statue to similar monuments from Tanis, all securely dated to the late Ptolemaic period, is unconvincing. In general, the inscriptions on the statue of Harchebi/Archibios are carefully arranged and meticulously carved, unlike the statues from Tanis.\(^{156}\) More importantly, the autobiographical inscription strongly resembles similar texts from the Thirtieth Dynasty to the early Ptolemaic Period. In particular, the emphasis on temple renovation and the reviving animal cults after a period (\(pẖry.t\)) of neglect or destruction evoke the “Restoration Period” of the fourth century BCE, in which Pharaohs and many private individuals undid sacrileges purportedly committed by the Persians.\(^{157}\) Although descriptions of temple construction also occur in the mid to late Ptolemaic Period, they are usually portrayed as additions and enlargements to existing structures, not renovations of neglected temples.

As noted above in the textual commentary, the inscription on the Kansas City statue bears several similarities to the Mendes stela of Ptolemy II. Although the recurrence of unusual orthographies may simply be coincidental (cf. \textit{supra}, notes 8 and 9), Harchebi directly quotes the Mendes stela when explaining his support for the Mendesian Ram (cf. \textit{supra}, n. y). Furthermore, Harchebi claims to have had the king’s confidence in all tax-related matters (\(hhr.w\ nb\); cf. \textit{supra}, n. j), and a large section of the Mendes stela records Ptolemy II’s tax reforms, many of which were suggested by local priests and officials from Mendes.\(^{158}\) It is thus quite tempting to see Harchebi/Archibios as one of the influential members of the indigenous elite with whom Ptolemy II consulted regarding the Delta economy and funding for Egyptian temples.\(^{159}\)

Comparison to similar sculptures does little to establish the date of the present statue. While Harchebi/Archibios shares many features in common with a famous statue of Ptolemy II (Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Egizio 22681),\(^{160}\) the modeling of the pectoral muscles more closely resemble royal statues of the mid-Ptolemaic Period (e.g. Rome, Museo Nazionale 60921),\(^{161}\) and

---

\(^{155}\) For the name and ethnicity of this prominent official who served under Ptolemy II, see most recently I. Guermeur, \textit{BIFAO} 106, 2006, p. 105, n. 2.

\(^{156}\) See Chr. Zivie-Coche, \textit{Tanis} 3, passim.

\(^{157}\) For royal inscriptions, note especially the Hermopolis stela and naos of Saft el-Henna (Nectanebo I), the Satrap stela (Ptolemy I Soter), and the numerous stelae commemorating renovations of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (e.g. Mendes, Pittom, Sais, Xois; see recently Chr. Thiers, \textit{Ptolémée Philadelphé et les prêtres de Tjékou}, p. 167-193); private inscriptions include those of Petosiris, Djedhor the Savior, and others from the Thirtieth Dynasty; see M. Chauveau, Chr. Thiers, \textit{L’Égypte en transition : des Perses aux Macédoniens}, in P. Briant, F. Joannès (ed.), \textit{La transition entre l’Empire achéménide et les royaumes hellénistiques (vers 350-300 av. J.-C.)}, 2006, p. 388-389; N. Spencer, \textit{A Naos of Nekhtshurheb from Bubastis: Religious Iconography and Temple Building in the 30th Dynasty}, BMRP 156, 2006, p. 47-52, and the autobiographical texts of Esnun/Zenon (Ptolemy II); see most recently I. Guermeur, \textit{BIFAO} 106, 2006, p. 105-110.


\(^{159}\) Note also that the temple construction at Mendes began before 273/272 BCE (Chr. Thiers, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 86), roughly fourteen years before the famous Apollo-Nikos appears as dioikêtês; for Ptolemy II’s personal interest in supporting temples and cities of Lower Egypt during this period, see Chr. Thiers, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 86-87, 162-163.

\(^{160}\) P.E. Stanwick, \textit{Portraits of the Ptolemies: Greek Kings as Egyptian Pharaohs}, 2002, p. 98 and 157, figs. 2-3 (A3).

\(^{161}\) For this statue and similar objects, see P.E. Stanwick, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 109-110, 173, figs. 61-64 (“first half of second century B.C.”); B.V. Bothmer dated the same statues to “the beginning of the second century B.C., the time of Ptolemies IV and V” (ESLP, p. 141).
the particular striding torso subject was so common that similar examples appear as late as the reign of Ptolemy XII.\textsuperscript{162} Securely dated private statues from the Ptolemaic Period are rare, and the famous examples from Tanis are completely different than the Kansas City statue. Attempts to date statues based on the orthography and carving quality of the inscriptions are equally problematic, as they generally assume that epigraphy steadily declined over the course of the Ptolemaic Period.\textsuperscript{163} Although this trend might hold true in some cases,\textsuperscript{164} scribes continued to produce excellent inscriptions well into the first century BCE,\textsuperscript{165} while certain royal inscriptions from the reign of Ptolemy II are poorly carved.\textsuperscript{166}

In the end, both dates are equally compelling. On the one hand, Harchebi’s donations to Mendes would have nicely complemented the official state-sponsored renovations of Ptolemy II in the Ram Temple, and an early date would explain the textual parallels between the Mendes stela and the present inscription.\textsuperscript{167} On the other hand, the presence of a dioikêtês named Archibios in the papyrological record makes J. Yoyotte’s original suggestion to place the statue in the reign of Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II difficult to resist. The discovery of a new inscription or papyrus mentioning Harchebi/Archibios may eventually settle this question.

### Harchebi’s Duties

Harchebi carried a limited number of titles: royal scribe (possibly basilikos grammateus), overseer of royal fields, and dioikêtês. Nonetheless, through a combination of traditional and original epithets, he manages to highlight several important duties in the Ptolemaic administration.

As dioikêtês, and possibly also as overseer of (royal) fields,\textsuperscript{168} he was responsible for “all taxes (ḥtr.w nb)” (col. 1). This vague term covers an entire range of administrative duties: regulating tax rates, meeting with officials from each nome to analyze the distribution of cultivable land, and overseeing the collection of annual taxes.\textsuperscript{169} Besides collecting money, he also ensured a steady supply of provisions and equipment for the military (sk.w, mḥ.w-ỉb.w) and itinerant administrative officials (ḥtmtŷ.w). He was primarily concerned with maximizing agricultural production (kȝ.w, ḏfȝ.w, Nn.t), all of his decrees promoted life (wḏ n ʿnḥ) and opposed cutbacks...
(tm ḫb). Because of this role, Harchebi created an original sportive writing for the title snty playing on the phrase zȝw n tȝ, literally “support beam of the earth,” apparently in reference to his control of Egypt’s cultivable land.

These few autobiographical details show that Harchebi was primarily concerned with agricultural produce in Egypt, perhaps just Lower Egypt (tȝ-ḥmḥw). One can compare this situation to the inscription of Horpakhepesh, a prominent dioikêtês who served under Ptolemy V Epiphanes. Unlike Harchebi, who was simply a ḫm-nṯr priest, Horpakhepesh held an enormous range of sacerdotal, scribal, and administrative positions throughout Egypt. In the autobiographical portion of his statue, Horpakhepesh enumerates his many duties and accomplishments, noting especially that he is (Back Pillar, col. 2): “one who cools the heart of the royal children, who pacifies the chora and Alexandria for his lord, (…) who inundates all places of the palace with food from the chora, with provisions from the Mediterranean, and marvels from distant lands, who creates cargo-ships together with their fleets for his Majesty, so that they are great and without limit.”

Horpakhepesh was thus in control of both agriculture and trade, in both Egypt and foreign lands. This difference suggests that the duties of the dioikêtês may increased over time, and thus Harchebi, who could have served under Ptolemy II (cf. supra), had less responsibilities than Horpakhepesh did in the reign of Ptolemy V.

Building Projects

Despite his minimalist priestly title, Harchebi expresses a close personal connection to the Ram of Mendes and Thoth of Lower Egyptian Hermopolis (Baqiliyeh). Like many other wealthy officials of the Ptolemaic Period, Harchebi sponsored important renovations to local cults and commemorated his euergetism on this statue and possibly on a series of stelae. His primary construction was a propylon (mh.t), possibly for the god Thoth (cols. 3-4), and he restored other structures at Lower Egyptian Hermopolis (col. 4). In addition, Harchebi supplied costly items necessary for the mumification of the sacred rams in the Wabet of Mendes at his own expense (col. 3). It is possible that he made similar donations for the ibis burials in Baqiliyeh (col. 4), although the vague terminology (ʿrq kȝ.t) makes it ambiguous whether he reinstituted a neglected animal cult or completed architectural work left unfinished by his predecessors.

As noted above, the donations to Mendes could correspond to a period of major renovations at the Ram Temple under Ptolemy II. Unfortunately, the architectural record at Baqiliyeh is basically non-existent, and the latest known activity took place under Nectanebo I and Nectanebo II. Harchebi’s allusion to “an extended period of time (phry.t r-ȝw)” of neglect at Baqiliyeh (col. 4) thus does not establish a precise date for his statue.

170 D. Klotz, M.J. Leblanc (forthcoming; cf. supra, n. 10)
171 Cf. the mention of erecting a decree/stela (wḏ) at the mounds of Lower Egypt commemorating his personal donations to Mendes (col. 3); for monuments recording private euergetism in the Ptolemaic Period, see Thiers, in Molin (ed.), Les régulations sociales dans l’Antiquité, p. 277-301 (to which this inscription should be added).
172 For Ptolemaic building activity at Mendes, see recently Leclère, Les villes de Basie Égypte I, p. 334-340.
Fig. 1a-b. Statue Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art 47-12. a. Front. b. Back.
THE STATUE OF THE DIOIKÊTÊS HARCHEBI/ARCHIBIOS (NELSON-ATKINS MUSEUM OF ART 47-12)

Fig. 2a-b. Statue Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art 47-12. a. Left profile. b. Right profile.
The Statue of the dioikêtês Harchebi/Archibios. Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art 47-12
FIG. 5b. Statue Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art 47-12, back pillar, facsimile.