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CONTRIBUTION TO A CONTROVERSY:
A DATE FOR THE TOMB
OF Kš(i)-m-Ánh AT GIZA*

By ALEXANDRA WOODS

The tomb of Kš(i)-m-Ánh (G 4561) in the West Field at Giza has been dated to either the Fifth or the Sixth Dynasty. The latter date raises a serious problem regarding the development of funerary beliefs and practices in the Old Kingdom. To refine the tomb’s date, the article examines a variety of evidence from Kš(i)-m-Ánh’s chapel and burial chamber as well as applying dating criteria established after recent analysis of the spear-fishing scenes in the Memphite cemeteries.

The stone-built mastaba of Kš(i)-m-Ánh (G 4561) is positioned in the West Field at Giza and consists of a corridor plus niche chapel.¹ The dating of this tomb has created some controversy in the literature, with scholars placing Kš(i)-m-Ánh either in the Fifth or the Sixth Dynasty. The issue of dating Old Kingdom tombs is of particular importance, as a ‘sound’ relative chronology is necessary to identify key developments in Egyptian funerary practices and religious ideology. The aim of the present article is to build upon the analysis included in previous studies, and to propose a date for the tomb of Kš(i)-m-Ánh by (re-)examining the following features: the location of the tomb in the G 4000 cemetery and its architectural design; certain hieroglyphic inscriptions; as well as a selection of scenes from the chapel and burial chamber. A recent analysis of Old Kingdom spear-fishing scenes has highlighted several criteria which can be confidently applied to Kš(i)-m-Ánh’s tomb at Giza to refine its date.

The dating of Kš(i)-m-Ánh’s tomb has been considered by a number of scholars. Junker was the first to suggest a date in the Sixth dynasty, which was based on the occurrence of the following details: the placement of inscriptions on the northern and southern external walls of the tomb; the architrave above the opening of the recess depicting repeated figures of the tomb owner; the false door taking up the entire west wall of the recess; the arrangement of the scenes in the chapel; the burial chamber opening from the east; and the inclusion of inscriptions and scenes of ‘daily life’ in the burial chamber.² The Sixth Dynasty date for the tomb has also been accepted by Baer, Porter and Moss, Harpur, Strudwick, Bolshakov, Lapp, Dawood, * I would like to express my thanks to Naguib Kanawati, Linda Evans, Joyce Swinton, as well as the referees for their helpful suggestions and comments on this paper.

¹ PM III/2, 131–3, plans 15, 26; H. Junker, Gíza, IV: Die Mastaba des kAjmanx (Kai-em-anch) (DAWW 71/1; Vienna, 1940), 1–43, 51–96, figs 1–11, pls 1–17; N. Kanawati, Tombs at Giza, I: Káemankh (G4561) and Seshenuefer I (G4440) (ACE Reports 16; Warminster, 2001), 13–50, pls 1–17, 25–37; H. Junker, Gíza, III: Die Mastabas der vorgeschritten V. Dynastie auf dem Westfriedhof (DAWW; Vienna, 1938), 44–5 (no. 35); id. Gíza, VI: Die Mastabas des NfR (Nefer), Kdjj (Kedjé), KhÁf (Kahjef) und die westlich anschließenden Grabanlagen (DAWW 72/1; Vienna, 1943), 228, plan after p. 273.

² Junker, Gíza IV, 1–4.
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and Altenmüller. Bolshakov prefers to date the tomb of Ki(i)-m'-nh to the end of the Sixth Dynasty, in the reign of Pepy II, based on the development of decorated burial chambers. However Reisner, Sourdive, and Kanawati propose a Fifth Dynasty date for the tomb. Reisner places the tomb after the reign of Neferirkare after examination of the architectural features and artistic representations in the chapel and burial chamber classification of the chapel type, and Kanawati suggests that Ki(i)-m'-nh’s tomb be dated to the reign of Djedkare based on a study of the architectural features and artistic representations in the chapel and burial chamber. Although Manuelian does not present a specific date for the tomb, he does state the burial chamber of Ki(i)-m'-nh was one of the earliest to be decorated.

The tomb’s location in the G4000 cemetery and its architectural design

The location and architecture is of relevance to the dating of the tomb of Ki(i)-m'-nh, as it is positioned in the Western Field, between two large Fourth Dynasty mastabas, G4560 and G4660. The tomb itself appears to have blocked the North–South street, a frequent occurrence in this section of the Giza cemetery, and the masonry of Ki(i)-m'-nh’s tomb rests against the sloping external walls of the flanking mastabas. The tomb is comprised of a single-roomed chapel, positioned in the eastern part of the mastaba mass, with a shaft cut into the floor of the chapel leading to the burial chamber. The entrance doorway is in the north wall and opens into a North–South corridor with a large offering niche at the northern end of the west wall. This chapel shape, corresponding to Reisner’s core Type 5d, is an apparent rare development of the L-shaped corridor chapel. However, this shape is also encountered in the tomb

---


5. Junker, *Giza IV*, fig. 1. Both are Reisner’s core mastaba Type 41 (Reisner, *Giza Necropolis I*, 107, 158).

6. See for example Kti, who blocked the east–west passage between G4660 and G4650 (Junker, *Giza III*, 123–45, fig. 12); Ki(i)-puw-Pth, who cut off the north–south passage between G4460 and G4460 (Junker, *Giza VI*, 220–226, fig. 87); Nfr, who blocked the blocked the north–south passage between G4760 and G4860 (Junker, *Giza VI*, 260–260, fig. 3); and Kdf, between G4760 and G4770 (Junker, *Giza VI*, 80–94, fig. 21). For a general plan see Junker, *Giza VI*, 275.


of N.y-mAa.t-Ra.w, which should be dated from Niuserre to Djedkare according to Cherpion’s criteria, and has been dated by Roth to the reign of Unis based on the depiction of the senet game in the tomb and several iconographic parallels in the tomb of Pth-htp II at Saqqara. The west wall contains two false doors, a design that is characteristic of the late Fourth to the late Fifth Dynasties at Giza. The false door in the west wall niche has a projecting lintel and two pairs of jams, with large standing figures shown on the outer jams, a feature typical to the tombs built during Dynasties Four and Five and rarely attested in the Sixth Dynasty. Most unusually, Kṣ(i)-m-’nh’s false door lacks a cavetto cornice; the inclusion of such an architectural feature is attested in elite tombs as early as Sahure and became popular from the reign of Niuserre to the end of the Old Kingdom. Finally, Kṣ(i)-m-’nh’s shaft is cut into the floor of the chapel leading to the burial chamber. Such a location for the opening is attested in rock-cut tombs at Giza dating to the Fourth Dynasty, yet it is not introduced in free-standing mastabas until the reign of Niuserre at Saqqara and Abusir and the reign of Djedkare at Giza. The burial chamber itself conforms to Reisner’s Type 4a(1), where the chamber is as tall as the length of the passage, and this is attested at Giza from the reign of Khafre through to the end of the Fifth Dynasty.

Selected wall scenes in Kṣ(i)-m-’nh’s chapel and burial chamber

Although the art in Kṣ(i)-m-’nh’s chapel and burial chamber has already been discussed by N. Kanawati, it is important to re-examine certain scenes which provide significant features to date the tomb complex. To begin with, the chairs depicted in the tomb, which are located on the entrance architrave, south wall of the offering niche, false door panel, and west wall of the corridor chapel, present valuable dating criteria. Each chair is shown with bull’s legs and a small projecting cushion without a backrest. Chairs with bull’s legs are commonly represented in tombs dating from

12 This date is based on the occurrence of: the projecting cushion on the chair without a backrest (N. Cherpion, Mastabas et hypogées d’Ancien Empire: Le problème de la datation (Brussels, 1989), 29, 31, 149–51, criterion 4); the bull’s legs on the chair (Cherpion, Mastabas et hypogées, 34, 155–9, criterion 10).
13 A. M. Roth, A Cemetery of Palace Attendants, including G 2084–2099, G 2230+2231, and G 2240 (GMAS 6; Boston, 1995), 129. The tomb is not recorded in PM, yet holds the reference number G 2097.
14 Strudwick, Administration, 15–16, 41–8; see for example, Junker, Giza III, figs 16, 27.
15 The false door corresponds to Type II.2(b) after A. Rusch, ‘Die Entwicklung der Grabsteinformen im Alten Reich’, ZÄS 58 (1923), 106–12, pl. A; J. Vandier, Manuel d’archéologie égyptienne, II/1: Les Grandes Époques: L’architecture funéraire (Paris, 1955), 397–8 (fig. 273); Strudwick, Administration, 15–16.
17 See for example D. Dunham and W. K. Simpson, The Mastaba of Queen Mersyankh III: G 7530–7540 (GMAS 1; Boston, 1974), 21, plans C and E; S. Hassan, Excavations at Giza, IV: 1932–1933 (Cairo, 1943), 149–50 (fig. 72); Hassan, Giza, IV, 183 (fig. 113).
18 Reisner, Giza Necropolis I, 133–5. See also L. Épron, Le Tombeau de Ti, I: Les approches de la chapelle (MIFAO 65; Cairo, 1939), pl. 1; M. Verner, The Excavations of the Czechoslovak Institute of Egyptology at Abusir, I: The Mastaba of Ptahshepses: Reliefs II:1 (Prague, 1977), 7 (fig. 1); Junker, Giza VI, fig. 21; H. Junker, Giza, XI: Der Friedhof südlich der Cheopspyramide, Ostteil (DOAW 74/2; Vienna, 1953), fig. 50; M. Bárta, ‘Architectural Innovations in the Development of the Non-Royal Tomb During the Reign of Nyuserre’, in P. Jánosi (ed.), Structure and Significance: Thoughts on Ancient Egyptian Architecture (DOAW 33; Vienna, 2005), 113.
19 Reisner, Giza Necropolis I, 145, 149.
20 Junker, Giza IV, figs 6–7, 9, 10a, 11; Kanawati, Giza I, pls 28–30, 32.
21 Cherpion, Mastabas et hypogées, 34, 155–9 (criterion 10).
22 Cherpion, Mastabas et hypogées, 29, 149–51 (criterion 4); J. Swinton, The Dating of the Tombs of Officials of the Old Kingdom of Egypt (MA thesis, Macquarie University; Sydney, 2001), 271–2, 446, Chart E (criterion 88).
the reign of Sneferu to Djedkare, with 137 examples currently known. Bull’s legs are rarely depicted in tombs dating to the reigns of Teti–Pepy I, with only 5 scenes exhibiting this feature. A small projecting cushion without a backrest on a chair is represented in a total of 63 tombs, which date from the reign of Sneferu to Djedkare–Unis. The number of tombs that are securely dated and represent chairs with bull’s legs as well as a small projecting cushion provides a ‘statistically significant’ result. The presence of these features in KI(i)-m-nyh’s tomb suggests a date no later than the reign of Unis. In addition, a chair with a high back and sides is depicted on the west wall of the chapel and in the burial chamber, which is a detail found in tombs dating from Sahure to Pepy I.

The west wall of KI(i)-m-nyh’s corridor chapel also represents the tomb owner and his wife seated on a chair, actively participating in a game of senet, with the adjacent motif showing two male figures playing the mehen ‘snake’ game. While the senet game is attested as early as Niuserre, the two games associated with one another are seldom depicted in the Old Kingdom, with the latest example being found in a tomb dating to the reign of Pepy I.

The top register on the west wall of KI(i)-m-nyh’s corridor chapel depicts a rare bed-making scene. While the earliest representation is encountered in the Fourth Dynasty tombs of Mr=s-anx III and Nb-m-ny.t at Giza, this motif became popular during the late Fifth and early Sixth Dynasties at Saqqara and Giza. However, the bed in KI(i)-m-nyh’s chapel features bull legs, rather than the lion legs that became common during the early Sixth Dynasty; three canopy supports rather than seven are rarely depicted in tombs dating to the reigns of Teti–Pepy I.

The tomb owner shown actively engaged in the game is extremely rare, with the only known examples originating in the tombs of KI(i)-m-nyh, N.y-Mr.t-R.w and Mrw.w-hk(i)/Mrw; see Roth, Cemetery of Palace Attendants, pl. 187; P. Duell, The Mastaba of Mereruka (OIP 31 and 39; Chicago, 1938), II, pls 171–2.

This number was compiled from the data listed in Cherpion, Mastabas et hypogéés, 155–9 (criterion 10); Swinton, The Dating of the Tombs of Officials, Table 4: 426–33 (criterion 89).

See Cherpion, Mastabas et hypogéés, 29, 31, 149–51 (criterion 4); Swinton, The Dating of the Tombs of Officials, Table 4: 426–33 (criterion 95).

R. van Walsen, Iconography of Old Kingdom Elite Tombs: Analysis and Interpretation, Theoretical and Methodological Aspects (MVEOL 35; Leiden, 2005), 41, 95.

Cherpion states that examples before and after this time period are an exception: Cherpion, Mastabas et hypogéés, 31–2, 154 (criterion 7). For the latest preserved example, see W. K. Simpson, The Mastabas of Qar and Idu: G7101 and 7102 (GMas 2; Boston, 1976), figs 16, 18a, 26b.

Junker, Giza IV, fig. 9; Kanawati, Giza I, pl. 32; T. Kendall, Passing Through the Netherworld: The Meaning and Play of Senet, an Ancient Egyptian Funerary Game (Belmont, 1978), 12–13; P. A. Piccione, ‘Mehen, Mysteries, and Resurrection from the Coiled Serpent’, JARCE 27 (1990), 43–52. The tomb owner shown actively engaged in the game is extremely rare, with the only known examples originating in the tombs of KI(i)-m-nyh, N.y-Mr.t-R.w and Mrw.w-hk(i)/Mrw; see Roth, Cemetery of Palace Attendants, pl. 187; P. Duell, The Mastaba of Mereruka (OIP 31 and 39; Chicago, 1938), II, pls 171–2.

Harpur, Decoration, 111, 254 (no. 32); E. B. Pusch, Das Senet-Brettspiel im alten Ägypten (MÄS 38; Munich, 1979), 6–40. See for example B. Vachala, Abusir, VIII: Die Reliefs aus der Ptahshepses-Mastaba in Abusir (Prague, 2004), 198–9; A. Mariette, Les mastabas de l’Ancien Empire (Paris, 1889), 404; B. van der Walle, La chapelle funéraire de Neferirenief (Brussels, 1978), 36, pl. 6; LD II, pl. 61a; Roth, Cemetery of Palace Attendants, fig. 187; S. Hassan, Excavations at Saqqara, I: The Mastaba of Neb-Kaw-Her ( Cairo, 1975), 17, 25, fig. 3.

LD II, pl. 61a; Roth, Cemetery of Palace Attendants, 131, fig. 187; Simpson, Qar and Idu, fig. 38.

Junker, Giza IV, fig. 10a; Kanawati, Giza I, pl. 32.

Dunham and Simpson, Mersyankh III, 15–16, fig. 8; LD II, pl. 14a. For a recent discussion of this motif see A. McFarlane, The Unis Cemetery at Saqqara: The Tomb of Iukaptah (ACE Reports 15; Warminster, 2000), I, 26–9.

See N. Kanawati and M. Abder-Raziq, The Unis Cemetery at Saqqara, II: The Tombs of Inyfert and Ihy (reused by Iset) (ACE Reports 19; Warminster, 2003), 22–3, pl. 43; S. Hassan, Excavations at Saqqara, III: Mastabas of Princess Hemet–R’ and Others ( Cairo, 1975), pl. 28b; Duell, Mereruka I, pls 92–3; H. Altenmüller, Die Wanddarstellungen im Grab des Mehu in Saqqara (AVDAIK 42; Mainz am Rhein, 1998), pls 52–3.
occurrence of a decorated chamber as a means to date the tomb of
of burial chambers in the Old Kingdom is rare, and previous scholars have used the
Simpson, Chnumhotep (avdaIK 21; mainz am rhein, 1977), pls 74–5; mcfarlane, II, pl. 43.
D
\(\text{A Day in the Marshes}': A Study of Old Kingdom Marsh Scenes in the Tombs of the Memphite Cemeteries (PhD thesis, Macquarie University; Sydney, 2007), I, 27–9, Table 3:3, II, Table A.
37 Junker, Giza IV, pl. 11; Kanawati, Giza I, pl. 36; Harpur, Decoration, 257 no. 5.
36 See the list of scenes in Harpur, Decoration, 335–9, Table 6.18; Altenmüller, SAK 30, 1–22; A. Woods, 'A Day in the Marshes': A Study of Old Kingdom Marsh Scenes in the Tombs of the Memphite Cemeteries (PhD thesis, Macquarie University; Sydney, 2007), I, 27–9, Table 3:3, II, Table A.
35 From the late Fifth Dynasty onwards, papyrus rattling scenes become less frequent, with only four examples attested at Giza and Saqqara.36
The last known example representing a male figure engaged in the activity dates to the reign of Djedkare–Unis and is encountered in the tombs of Išn and Ḥeḥw-šer at Giza.37 I am aware of only two Memphite examples of a papyrus rattling scene which date to the Sixth Dynasty, and both depictions are of females who are of royal lineage.38 Considering this, it would be a rather extraordinary occurrence for a papyrus rattling scene to be included in a late Sixth Dynasty tomb. In addition, \(K\(\text{i}(-i)\)-m-\(\text{n}h\)'s papyrus rattling scene shows numerous similarities with other Fourth and Fifth Dynasty examples from Giza and Saqqara. For instance, the major figure’s arm is raised above his head and holds a papyrus stalk;39 this stalk is shown with a split down the middle;40 the tomb owner wears a wrap-around kilt with a projecting point;41 one punter is depicted on the stern of the papyrus boat,42 and a wooden board is absent from the deck of the boat.43 It is important to note here that the decoration of burial chambers in the Old Kingdom is rare, and previous scholars have used the occurrence of a decorated chamber as a means to date the tomb of \(K\(\text{i}(-i)\)-m-\(\text{n}h\).
Dawood suggests the tomb be dated to the reign of Teti based on the type of granary represented in the burial chamber, which is also attested in several tombs in the Teti cemetery at Saqqara. Bolshakov in particular has argued that $K\dot{i}(z)-m-\text{nh}$’s tomb be dated to the reign of Pepy II based on the ‘logic of development of the burial chambers’ decorative system. The stages of elaboration attributed to this system include: representations in burial chambers were prohibited from the Third Dynasty to the end of the Fifth Dynasty; the depiction of inanimate objects began during the reign of Unis; depersonalised and miniaturised offering table scenes are shown during the reign of Teti; human figures are depicted in the burial chambers during the first half of the Sixth Dynasty; and the final stage inverts and transfers all topics of the chapel to the burial chamber. However, if this theory is correct one would expect human figures and other scenes shown in the chapel to be represented in the burial chambers of $K\dot{i}(z)-m-\text{nh}$’s so-called contemporaries buried in the cemetery of Pepy II at Saqqara South. By contrast, these chambers do not depict scenes of ‘daily life’, and include a palace façade/false door on the west wall with the remaining decoration consisting of piles of offerings, linen, jewellery, and granaries. In addition, the hieroglyphic signs comprised of human figures are consistently mutilated or completely absent from the inscriptions in the burial chambers located at Saqqara South. While Bolshakov notes the mutilation of signs, he does not include the burial chambers from Saqqara South as a stage of elaboration. This decision is based on the assumption that daily life scenes are absent because the ‘general impoverishment of tombs in the second half of Dynasty Six did not allow the creation of such elaborate decorations’, which does not present a particularly convincing case. As a result, I would suggest it is far more likely that $K\dot{i}(z)-m-\text{nh}$’s rattling-papyrus scene is one of the last to be decorated at Giza during the late Fifth Dynasty, along with those in the tombs of $I\text{sn}$ and $H\text{ww-wr}$.

Hieroglyphic inscriptions

The palaeography and placement of the hieroglyphic signs in the offering formula on the entrance architrave and two false doors in the chapel are characteristic of tombs

45 Bolshakov, GM 139, 17; id., Man and his Double, 117 no. 46, 119–20; id., in Fitzenreiter and Herb (eds), Dekorierte Grabanlagen, 56.
46 Bolshakov, Man and his Double, 119; id., in Fitzenreiter and Herb (eds), Dekorierte Grabanlagen, 59 n. 181.
47 For a treatment of the hieroglyphic inscriptions in these burial chambers see Bolshakov, Man and his Double, 112–20; N. Kanawati, ‘Decoration of Burial Chambers, Sarcophagi and Coffins in the Old Kingdom’, in K. Daoud, S. Bedier, and S. Abd-el-Fatah (eds), Studies in Honor of Ali Radwan (CASA 34; Cairo, 2005), II, 55–71; Lapp, Typologie der Särge und Sargkammern, 9.
48 G. Jéquier, Le monument funéraire de Pepi II (Cairo, 1936–1940), III, 57, 64, 70–3; id., Tombeaux de particuliers contemporains de Pepi II (Cairo, 1929), 14–20, 36–7, 37–40, 42–7, 48–51, 60–1, 72–4, 76, 78, 81. Human figures are rarely represented in burial chambers during the Old Kingdom, and in the following tombs: $Kt-hr-Pth/Ftk-tt$ (H. Junker, Giza, VIII: Der Ostabschnitt des Westfriedhofs, Zweiter Teil (DAWW 73/1; Vienna, 1947), 117–21, fig. 56, pl. 21); $R\cdot\text{ww-wr}$ III (Hassan, Giza V, 296–7); $Kt-irr$x (Dawood, in Pantalacci and Berger-el-Naggar (eds), Des Néferkarê aux Montouhotep, 116). The burial chamber of $K\text{r}$ at Abusir also contained several fragments depicting male figures (M. Bárta et. al., Abusir, XIII: Abusir South, II: The Tomb Complex of the Vizier Qar, his sons Qar Junior and Senedjemib, and Lykai (Prague, 2009), 114–15, pl. 20.2).
50 Bolshakov, Man and his Double, 120.
51 For a similar conclusion see Swinton, The Dating of the Tombs of Officials, 5 n. 7, 281–91, chart E 446 (criteria 102/104).
dating from the Fourth to Eighth Dynasties. Unusually, the entrance architrave shows $htp\ di\ nsw.t\ htp\ (di)\ Inp.wv$ vertically, and this presumably applies to both lines of the inscription. The phrases included on $Kt(z\ i)-m-nh$’s entrance architrave and false door are commonly found in Old Kingdom tombs, just as the offering list follows the traditional design with ninety four entries arranged in five registers. One possible dating indicator can be found in the writing of the hieroglyphic group $pr-htp$, which takes two forms in the tomb of $Kt(z\ i)-m-nh$. The first is comprised of the mace $(htp)$ being completely enclosed within the sign for house $(pr)$ $[\text{fig.}]$. Strudwick has observed that this form is first attested during the mid to late Fourth Dynasty and continued to be depicted until the reigns of Unis to Teti, when it dropped out of use. The second form of the group $[\text{fig.}]$ is also found in the Fourth Dynasty, yet it was re-introduced during the reign of Niuserre and thereafter became the standard arrangement for the group. The tomb of $Kt(z\ i)-m-nh$ represents both forms, which is similar to other mid to late Fifth Dynasty examples including $N.y-nh-Hnm.w$ and $Hnm.w-htp$ and $3h.t-htp$, and this suggests the tomb was decorated during the transitional period starting no earlier than the reigns of Niuserre and no later than that of Teti in the Sixth Dynasty. The strongest evidence suggesting a Fifth Dynasty date for the tomb is found in the hieroglyphic inscriptions on $Kt(z\ i)-m-nh$’s sarcophagus and the walls in the burial chamber. The sarcophagus uses the recumbent jackal/dog as the sign for Anubis. This is a feature only attested in decorated burial chambers and on funerary items until early in the reign of Teti, at which point the seated god determinative of Osiris and the recumbent jackal/dog determinative for Anubis were eliminated. Evidence of such a trend can be seen in the burial chambers of $Nfr-sm-R^c.wv$, $Mrr.wk(z\ i)$, $Hnt.y-kk(z\ i)$, and $Smdn.t$ in the Teti cemetery at Saqqara. In addition, from late Teti through to Pepy II the hieroglyphic signs comprised of human figures are consistently mutilated or completely absent from the inscriptions, which is a feature notably absent from $Kt(z\ i)-m-nh$’s inscriptions in the burial chamber, again suggesting that the sarcophagus and chamber was decorated no later than the reign of Unis of the Fifth Dynasty.

---

54 Barta, *Opferformel*, 9 Wish 4c, 16 Wish 4a ($kr.s(z\ i)-m\ hr.t\ nfr\ smi.t\ imnt.yt$); 9, 17, 27 Wish 5a (itrw $nfr\ tw.t$); 17, 28 Wish 12a ($hpt\ smi.t\ imnt.yt\ hr-ro$); Lapp, *Opferformel*, 41–2, § 62 ($kr.s(z\ i)$); § 71 ($hpt$); 56–8, §§ 92–5.
56 Junker, *Giza* IV, figs 9, 11; Kanawati, *Giza* I, pl. 32.
60 For a discussion and list of tombs see Kanawati, in Daoud, Bedier, and Abd-el-Fatah (eds), *Studies in Honor of Ali Radwan* II, 59–67.
The spear-fishing scene

The tomb of $Ki(z)-m-\text{nh}$ is comprised of a single-roomed chapel with the entrance doorway opening into a north-south corridor with a large offering niche at the north end of the west wall. The spear-fishing scene in question is positioned on the north wall of this offering niche, which is similar to the arrangement of marsh scenes in the entrance rooms of multi-roomed chapels. The representation of the tomb owner as the major figure in a spear-fishing and fowling scene is not common at Giza. Over 60 examples of these scene types are found in the tombs at Saqqara and date from the mid Fifth to early Sixth Dynasties. Yet there are only 8 tombs and 4 fragments known from Giza that represent the tomb owner spearing fish, and these date from the late Fifth to early Sixth Dynasties. Analysis of the spear-fishing scene in the tomb of $Ki(z)-m-\text{nh}$ and its comparison with other scenes from elite tombs in the Memphite cemeteries highlights the following features as dating criteria:

Criterion 1: The type of wig and headdress worn by the major figure $Ki(z)-m-\text{nh}$ is shown wearing a shoulder length wig covering the ear, without a headdress, which was a fashion favoured in the mid to late Fifth Dynasty marsh scenes at Saqqara and Giza and is rarely depicted in the early Sixth Dynasty. A short wig and a fillet and streamer became a standard element in elite tomb marsh scenes from the reign of Unis onwards, and these are absent from $Ki(z)-m-\text{nh}$’s tomb decoration.

62 Junker, Giza IV, fig. 8; Kanawati, Giza I, pl. 31; Harpur, Decoration, 109–10.
63 For a recent collection of Old Kingdom marsh scenes see Woods, A Day in the Marshes, I, 27–9, Table 3.3; II, Table A. See also J. Vandersleyen, Manuel d’archéologie égyptienne, IV: Bas-Reliefs et Peintures: Scènes de la vie quotidienne (Paris, 1964), 718–19; Harpur, Decoration, 335–9 Table 6.18, 355–67 Features 1–4; W. Decker and M. Herb, Bildatlas zum Sport im alten Ägypten: Corpus der bildlichen Quellen zu Leibesübungen, Spiel, Jagd, Tanz und verwandten Themen (Leiden, 1994), I, 382–426 Doc. K. 2.1–2.106; II, pls 207–42.
64 For the exceptions, see the spear-fishing scenes of $MH.w$ at Giza, Smith, BMFA 56/304, fig. 1–1a.
65 For the fillet and streamer, see Cherpin, Mastabas et hypogées, 58–59, 182, criterion 33.
Criterion 2: The type of kilt worn by the major figure

Kis-(i)-m-‘nh is depicted wearing the šndtw.t or ‘sporting’ kilt.69 This type of garment is frequently attested in royal reliefs and statuary as early as the Third Dynasty.70 However, the šndtw.t kilt is not represented in elite tombs until the reign of Djedkare, where it is found in the marsh scenes of Ršt-w-Sps at Saqqara and Iyi-nfr.t at Giza.71 While mid-Fifth Dynasty tombs at Saqqara show the major figure wearing the wrap-around kilt or a loin cloth, from Djedkare onwards the šndtw.t kilt became the standard attire worn by the major figure in spear-fishing and fowling scenes.72

Criterion 3: The position of officials or attendants in the scene

The spear-fishing scene of Kis-(i)-m-‘nh depicts 4 attendants standing on two short baselines behind the major figure, which is a detail attested in spear-fishing scenes from the reign of Niuserre.73 By contrast, from the reign of Unis onwards the major marsh compositions frequently include numerous figures standing on three, four, and even five registers behind the tomb owner, giving the impression that the scene is rather full and busy.74

Criterion 4: The dress and position of the major figure’s son

Kis-(i)-m-‘nh’s son stands on the prow of the papyrus boat naked and wears a sidelock. This positioning and adornment of the major figure’s son is only found in the marsh scenes of Mr=s-‘nh III, Ny-‘nh-Hmn.w and Hmn.w-Htp, Ny-Mr.t-Ršt.w, Sšm-nfr IV75 and šh.t-mḥ.w, which range in date from the late Fourth to the late Fifth–early Sixth Dynasties.76 The marsh scenes in the mid to late Fifth Dynasty tombs of Htp-hr-šḥ.t and Nfr-irt.n=ḥ at Saqqara also depict their son naked on the prow of the boat,77 just as Hsi’s son and Ḥw.n-ḥḥ’s granddaughter are shown wearing a sidelock.

71 LD II, pl. 60; W. Schürmann, Die Reliefs aus dem Grab des Pyramidentotengräbers II-nefret (Karlsruhe, 1985), pl. 21.
72 For example of the šndtw.t kilt in marsh scenes see van de Walle, Neferirtenef, pl. 1; Brovarski, Senedjemib Complex II, figs 26–7; Brovarski, Senedjemib Complex II, figs 102–3; W.K. Simpson, The Offering Chapel of Kayemmoferet in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (Boston, 1992), pl. A; Kanawati and Abder-Raziq, Unis Cemetery II, pl. 37b; H F. Petrie, Seven Memphite Tomb Chapels (BSEA 65; London, 1952), pl. 6; Duell, Mereruka I, pls 9, 15, 17.
73 Dunham and Simpson, Mery\\-\\-\\-ankh III, fig. 4; Moussa and Altenmüller, Nianchemnum, figs 5–6; Brovarski, Senedjemib Complex II, figs 26–7; Kanawati and Abder-Raziq, Unis Cemetery II, pl. 37b.
74 Harper, Decoration, 141. For example, Kanawati and Abder-Raziq, Unis Cemetery II, pl. 54; Munro, Unas–Friedhof, pls 10–11; Duell, Mereruka I, pl. 9; N. Kanawati and M. Abder-Raziq, The Teti Cemetery at Saqqara, V: The Tomb of Hesi (ACE Reports 13; Warminster, 1999), pls 53–4; N. Kanawati and M. Abder-Raziq, The Teti Cemetery at Saqqara, III: The Tombs of Neferechemre and Sennhuiptah (ACE Reports 11; Warminster, 1998), pl. 69; A. Woods, ‘The Composite Fishing and Fowling Scene in the Tomb of Remni at Saqqara’, BACE 17 (2006), fig. 1.
75 This scene is unique in its depiction of active figures on the prow, and may in fact show the tomb owner, his son as an active figure on the prow of the boat and a grandson, or perhaps the tomb owner, his eldest son, and youngest son: Harper, Decoration, 137.
76 See Mohr, Hetep-her-akhti, fig. 34, pl. 2; van de Walle, Neferirtenef, pl. 1.
Both tombs are dated to the reigns of late Teti to early Pepy I. Furthermore, Ki(z)-m-nh’s son also holds a spear and a bird in each hand, details that are only seen in the spear-fishing scenes of N.y-Mr.t-R.w and Hh.t-mh.w at Giza, which date to the reigns of Djedkare–Unis. As such, it seems that the representation of Ki(z)-m-nh’s son was following a fashion popular from the mid to late Fifth Dynasty.

**Criterion 5: The shape of the papyrus boat**
The spear-fishing scene in the tomb of Ki(z)-m-nh represents the stern of the boat as straight and particularly long, a shape that is different to numerous other scenes at Saqqara and Giza where the stern gradually curves upwards. Papyrus boats with a straight stern are first encountered in marsh scenes dating to the late Fifth Dynasty, particularly from the reigns of Menkauhor to Unis, and is seen in the tombs of Tr.xw-ki-Pth/Hn.w, Tiy-nfr.t/Št-n=f at Saqqara and Snḍm-ib/Mḥi at Giza.

**Criterion 6: The type of spear represented**
Ki(z)-m-nh holds a two headed bident, where one point is connected to the shaft of the spear with a second point attached at some distance above the first. The spear has no wrappings around the shaft and only depicts a single barb on each point, rather than two, which is also represented in two mid Fifth Dynasty tombs at Saqqara, namely those of N.y-z-bnm.w and Ḥmm.w-ḥḥ.t at Giza.

**Criterion 7: The papyrus umbels above the thicket**
In Ki(z)-m-nh’s scene various species of birds are shown resting within the three rows of papyrus umbels above the thicket. Birds represented resting in all the rows of umbels, rather than only the top row, are also seen in the royal temple reliefs of Userkaf and Sahure at Saqqara and Abusir, and in elite tombs during the reigns of Niuserre to Djedkare–Unis. Although the papyrus umbels in Ki(z)-m-nh’s spear-fishing scene are...
in several rows, from the reign of Unis onwards they become highly structured and compact, and birds are never shown resting within several rows of umbels.  

Criterion 8: Oxen ‘walking out of the marshes’

This activity, shown in the spear-fishing scene of K(z)-m-’nh, is rarely depicted in Old Kingdom tombs. Oxen shown ‘walking’ in the context of a marsh scene, rather than fording a body of water, are only encountered in tombs dating from Niuserre to Pepy I. Such an activity is depicted in the tombs of Iyi-nfr.t at Giza in addition to N.’nh-Hn.w and Hn.w-h-t, 3h.t-h-t, T.y, N.'y-Mr.t-R.w, R.w-špss, 3h.t-h-t, and ’nh-ns-Mr.y-R.w II at Saqqara.

Criterion 9: The orientation of the hieroglyphic inscriptions relating to the major figure

In K(z)-m-’nh’s scene, the inscriptions are shown in columns, which is not uncommon in marsh scenes in the capital cemeteries throughout the Fifth and early Sixth Dynasties. However, the inscriptions are positioned in front, above and behind the tomb owner’s head, which is only attested in the mid-Fifth Dynasty marsh scenes of N.’nh-Hn.w and Hn.w-h-t, and 3h.t-h-t at Saqqara.

Examination of K(z)-m-’nh’s spear-fishing scene has highlighted many similarities with the mid to late Fifth Dynasty tombs of Tri.n-kh-Pth, Nfr-sšm-Pth and Śhn.Iyw, N.’nh-Hn.w and Hn.w-h-t, and H-t-hr-t at Saqqara. A number of these comparable features are found in the rendering of the major figure, yet the artists who decorated K(z)-m-’nh’s spear-fishing scene appear to have also replicated even the most minor details. For example his son is shown on the prow of the boat naked and wearing a sidelock; the spear is two headed with a single barb; and cattle are represented walking out of the marshes. Since the similarities exist in both major compositional elements as well as minor details, perhaps this is an indication that K(z)-m-’nh’s artists used the earliest elite examples of the spear-fishing scene at Saqqara as a basis for the composition of this scene at Giza.

See for example Kanawati and Abder-Razig, Unis Cemetery II, pl. 37b; Petrie, Seven Memphite Tomb Chapels, pl. 6; Kanawati and Abder-Razig, Teti Cemetery III, pl. 86; Kanawati and Abder-Razig, Teti Cemetery V, pls 53–4; Kanawati and Abder-Razig, Teti Cemetery VI, pl. 50; Altenmüller, Mehu, pls 9, 11, 13; K. Myśliwiec, Saqqara, I: The Tomb of Merefnebef (Warsaw, 2004), pl. 21; Smith, BMFA 36/364, fig. 2.

See for example Kanawati and Abder-Razig, Unis Cemetery I, pl. 37b; Petrie, Seven Memphite Tomb Chapels, pl. 6; Kanawati and Abder-Razig, Teti Cemetery III, pl. 86; Kanawati and Abder-Razig, Teti Cemetery V, pls 53–4; Kanawati and Abder-Razig, Teti Cemetery VI, pl. 50; Altenmüller, Mehu, pls 9, 11, 13; Myśliwiec, Merefnebef, pl. 21.

See Schürmann, II-nfret, pl. 21; Moussa and Altenmüller, Nianchchnum, pl. 76; C. Ziegler, Le Mastaba d’Akhetetep: Une chapelle funéraire de l’Ancien Empire (Paris, 1993), 132–4; Steindorff, Ti, pl. 113; S. Hassan, Excavations at Giza, II: 1930–1931 (Cairo, 1936), fig. 236; LD II, pl. 60; Davies, Ptahhetep II, pl. 14; Leclant and Minault-Gout, Orientalia 69, 245, pl. 17.8.

See for example, Moussa and Junge, Two Tombs, pl. 12; van de Walle, Neferti-tnef, pl. 1; Brovarski, Senedjemib Complex II, fig. 42; Kanawati and Abder-Razig, Unis Cemetery II, pls 37b, 54; Kanawati and Abder-Razig, Teti Cemetery V, pl. 53; W. V. Davies, A. El-Khouli, A. B. Lloyd, and A. J. Spencer, Saqqāra Tombs, I: The Mastabas of Mereret and Wernu (ASE 36; London, 1984), pl. 5; Altenmüller, Mehu, pls 9–13.

See for example, Moussa and Junge, Two Tombs, pl. 12; ibid., pl. 6; Moussa and Altenmüller, Nianchchnum, figs 5–6, pls 4–5, 74–5; Mohr, Hetep-hr-a-hkt, fig. 34, pl. 2.

As seen in the following similarities: the angle of the spear; the type of jewelry worn by the tomb owner as well as the absence of a fillet and streamer, in preference for a shoulder length wig

Refer also to the following similarities: the dorsal fins of the two fish on the spear are shown facing the major figure; the papyrus umbels are shown with curved tops; the birds above the thicket are flying in alternate directions in each row; and the water weed is only shown under the stern of the boat.
Conclusion

In order to propose a date for the tomb of $K\hat{i}(zi)-m\text{-}'nh$ a variety of evidence from the chapel and burial chamber has been examined and compared with other examples from well- or ‘securely’ dated tombs from the Memphite region. This paper has illustrated that a large number of artistic and architectural features in the tomb of $K\hat{i}(zi)-m\text{-}'nh$ has parallels with other Fifth Dynasty examples, especially from the tombs at Saqqara. Of course, it is not surprising to find that many of the criteria listed here are attested in tombs dating to the Sixth Dynasty, since many established traditions overlap and continue in subsequent reigns. However it is important to note the first and last attestations of each detail listed in Table 1 and observe those omitted from the chapel and burial chamber. For example, the elimination and mutilation of certain hieroglyphs in the burial chamber, the major figure shown wearing a short wig and fillet and streamer in the spear-fishing scene, and the structured rows of papyrus umbels above the thicket are all absent in the tomb complex which, together with the remaining criteria that are supported by a considerable amount of data, would support a Fifth Dynasty date for the tomb. This evidence indicates that the mastaba of $K\hat{i}(zi)-m\text{-}'nh$ can be dated to Djedkare, or possibly even early in the reign of Unis prior to the introduction of specific standards in the spear-fishing scene and other motifs in the chapel. As has already been highlighted in the literature, chronology is vital to the understanding of general developments in many aspects of Egyptian culture, such as the language, scene content, architectural design, and funerary beliefs.\footnote{E. Hornung ‘Introduction’, in E. Hornung, R. Krauss, and D. Warburton (eds), Ancient Egyptian Chronology (HdO 1/83; Leiden, 2006), 1; M. Herb ‘Ikonographie—Schreiben mit Bildern: Ein Essay zur Historizität der Grabdekorationen des Alten Reiches’, in Fitzenreiter and Herb (eds), Dekorierte Grabanlagen, 131–2; Harpur, Decoration, 2, 33.} The dating of the tomb of $K\hat{i}(zi)-m\text{-}'nh$ to the reign of Pepy II has serious ramifications for the development of decorated burial chambers in the Old Kingdom, and has been dated to this reign using the ‘logic’ of development of a burial chamber’s decorative system. A main concern with this particular method is that the tomb is not considered in its whole context whereby the evidence from both the chapel and the burial chamber are analysed to propose a date. A main argument for dating the tomb of $K\hat{i}(zi)-m\text{-}'nh$ to the reign of Pepy II rests upon considering any similarities with Fifth Dynasty tombs as being coincidental and evidence of ‘archaising’, however such an interpretation is not consistent with the funerary monuments belonging to what would then be $K\hat{i}(zi)-m\text{-}'nh$’s contemporaries located in the cemetery of Pepy II at Saqqara It is hoped that the presentation of the data has indeed offered a reasonable contribution to the controversy surrounding this mastaba at Giza, and that this paper has sufficiently shown how wall scenes can be used in conjunction with the archaeological, linguistic, and architectural context to refine the date of a tomb and presents a balanced interpretation of the evidence.
Table 1 List of dating criteria applicable to Ki(z)-m-‘nh’s tomb at Giza

(The numbers below the Dynasty headings refer to the king’s reigns, after Harpur, *Decoration*, 34; … illustrates that the criterion continue briefly into the listed king’s reign; and /// indicates the criteria absent in the tomb complex).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria from Chapel and Burial Chamber</th>
<th>Fourth Dynasty</th>
<th>Fifth Dynasty</th>
<th>Sixth Dynasty</th>
<th>From –To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N–S corridor chapel with offering niche at the northern end of west wall (Reisner’s Core Type 5d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3–5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial chamber is as tall as the length of the shaft (Reisner’s Shaft Type 4 a [1])</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4–5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False door with a cavetto cornice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6–6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pr-hd</em> hieroglyphic group taking Form ‘A’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4–6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs with bull’s legs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1–6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs with a small projecting cushion without a back rest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1–5.8/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair with high back and sides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2–6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The representation of the senet game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6–6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The <em>senet</em> and <em>mehen</em> game associated with one another on the same register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.8–6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bed with bull’s legs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4–5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bed with three/four canopy supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7–5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bed has lions legs and an attendant kneeling on top</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9–6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papyrus rattling scene (male figure) in the Memphite cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4–5.8/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major figure rattling papyrus with arm raised above head and holding papyrus stalk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4/6–5.8/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major figure rattling papyrus holding the stalk that is split down the middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4/6–5.8/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major figure rattling papyrus wears a wrap-around kilt with a projecting point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6–5.8/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A punter shown on the stern of the boat in a papyrus rattling scene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4/6–5.8/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A wooden deck is absent from the papyrus boat in papyrus rattling scenes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4/6–5.8/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutilation and omission of certain hieroglyphic signs in the burial chamber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1–6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria in the Spear-fishing scene</td>
<td>Fourth Dynasty</td>
<td>Fifth Dynasty</td>
<td>Sixth Dynasty</td>
<td>From  To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The major figure wears a shoulder length wig covering the ear without a headdress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6–6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The major figure wears a short wig and a fillet and streamer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/// /// ///</td>
<td>5.9–6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. One or two registers of officials behind the major figure in a marsh scene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6–6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The major figure’s son is naked, stands on the prow of the boat and wears a sidelock in a marsh scene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4/6–6.1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The stern of the papyrus boat in a marsh scene is straight and long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7/8–6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Two headed spear with barbs and no cloth wrappings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6/7–6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Birds resting within several rows of papyrus umbels above the thicket</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Royal 5.1–2 5.5/6–5.8/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Oxen ‘walking out of the marshes’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6–6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Columns of hieroglyphs above, in front, and behind the head of the major figure in a marsh scene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6/7–5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>