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Between 1902 and 1944 Reisner uncovered nearly four hundred mastaba-tombs at Giza. The results of his excavations were published in A History of the Giza Necropolis, Vol. 1 (1942). There the tombs are discussed in exhaustive detail from every conceivable architectural and archaeological perspective. The systematic publication of the wall decorations of the tomb chapels excavated by Reisner, however, was only initiated in 1974 with the appearance of The Mastaba of Queen Meresankh III, ó7530–7540, by Downs Dunham and William Kelly Simpson.

From 1970 Professor Simpson had divided his time by agreement with Yale University between that institution of higher learning, where he was Professor of Egyptology, and the Museum of Fine Arts, where he was Curator of Egyptian and Ancient Near Eastern Art. It was at his initiative that the Giza Mastabas Project came into being, funded originally by a grant to Yale University and the University of Pennsylvania from the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the United States Department of State and subsequently the International Communications Agency (SCC 29368), as well as a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Between 1978 and 1986, despite the demands of an active curatorial department and a full-time teaching load at Yale University, Dr. Simpson completed three additional volumes in the Giza Mastabas series. They are: The Mastabas of Qar and Idu; The Mastabas of Khufu, Khafhufu I and II; Mastabas of the Western Cemetery, Part i. It was Kelly Simpson who introduced me to the methods of epigraphic work on the Giza plateau. For making me a part of the Giza Mastabas Project, I can never adequately express my debt to him.

It was during a visit to the Department of Egyptian and Ancient Near Eastern Art in the Summer of 1973 that I first met the late Downs Dunham, Curator of Egyptian Art Emeritus, who was then in the fourth quarter of an active professional life largely dedicated to making the results of the Harvard–Boston Expedition excavations in Egypt and Nubia available to a scholarly and wider audience. Mr. Dunham had been trained at Harvard University and in the field by George Reisner himself (“Papa George” as Mr. Dunham referred to him). He possessed an endless store of instructive and amusing anecdotcs about the early years of the Harvard–Boston Expedition and what it was like working with the great archaeologist. Many of these stories have made their way into his entertaining account, Recollections of an Egyptologist (1972). It was Mr. Dunham who clarified for me the intricacies of Reisner’s recording system.

A particular joy of working in the Egyptian Department in Boston in the 70s and 80s was the presence of the lamented Suzanne E. Chapman, Associate Curator of Egyptian and Ancient Near Eastern Art. Although never a member of the field staff of the Giza Mastabas Project, Suzanne probably drew and inked more illustrations for Egyptian Department publications than any other single individual. These include many of the drawings in the present volume. Sue also trained a number of the artist/epigraphers who subsequently worked on the Giza Mastabas Project.

The Giza Plateau is a very special place. Even in August—at which time the Giza Mastabas Project was often in the field owing to teaching commitments during the academic year—when the valley below can be hot and humid, there is always a steady breeze blowing across the plateau. Whatever the time of the year, few tourists or locals penetrate the streets and alleys between the seried ranks of mastabas, and a stroll along these by-ways in the quiet of a morning or in the late afternoon, transports one into the far distant past. In antiquity, of course, the cemetery reverberated with the obsequies of court and government officials and with the chanting of funerary priests performing the periodic rites on feast days. In addition, relatives and descendants made frequent visits to the tomb chapels of the dearly departed, and sometimes shared there a meal with the soul of the deceased.

For permission to pursue our work within the confines of the old Harvard–Boston concession at Giza, I would like to express my gratitude to the successive heads of the Egyptian Antiquities Organization (now the Supreme Council of Antiquities). In my time, these have included the late Dr. Shahara Adam, the late Dr. Ahmed Qadsi, the late Prof.–Dr. Sayed Tawfiq, Prof.–Dr. Mohamed Ibrahim Abu Bakr, Prof.–Dr. Mohamed Abdel-Halim Nür el-Din, and most
recently Prof. Dr. Gaballa Ali Gaballa. Thanks also go to the members of the Permanent Committee of Archaeology of the Supreme Council of Antiquities for their continuing approval of our work.

Our work on site at Giza was facilitated by a number of individuals who have gone out of their way to aid us in our endeavors and make us welcome. It is a great pleasure to acknowledge their contributions to our work. At the Giza Inspectorate the late Dr. Nassif Mohamed Hassan and Dr. Ahmed Moussa, Directors of Antiquities for Giza, were courteous and encouraging. First and foremost, however, I would like to thank my good friend Dr. Zahi Hawass. Chief Inspector at Giza, when we first met in 1975, in the intervening twenty years he has risen to be General Director of Antiquities of the Giza Pyramids and Saqqara and recently Undersecretary of State for the Giza Pyramids. His diligence, hard work, and concern for the monuments have made the Giza necropolis a great open air museum readily accessible to tens of thousands of visitors each year.

A number of other colleagues at Giza have also received us with cordiality and worked side by side with us on a daily basis. Over time several have become valued friends. In particular I want to mention Miss Amal Samuel and Mr. Mahmoud Affifi, Chief Inspectors at Giza. Among the other members of the Giza Pyramids Inspectorate, who have aided our work in a variety of ways, I would like to acknowledge in particular Messrs. Ahmed el-Haggar, Director of the Pyramids, Mansour Radwan, Senior Egyptologist, and Mohamed E. Sheha, Inspector, as well as Inspector Abdel-Qader Karanany, Tarek Mohamed Al-Awadi, Ayman Wallyy Taher, and Miss Nashwa Gaber.

A debt of thanks is due the successive directors of the Cairo office of the American Research Center in Egypt—Dr. James P. Allen, Dr. Robert Betts, and Mr. Madel Eaton—who aided our work in Egypt. In particular, it is a pleasure to acknowledge the help cheerfully and efficiently given over the years by Mrs. Amira Khettab, Secretary and now Deputy Director of the Cairo Center in processing our paperwork at Abbasiyya and assuring that all went smoothly in recording the reliefs of the Senedjemib Complex. She is now ably seconded in her work by her son, Mr. Amir H. Abdul Hamid.

Home for the Giza Mastabas Project during several field seasons, including those devoted in whole or in part to recording the reliefs in the Senedjemib Complex, was the A.R.C.E. houseboat Fostat, moored on the Nile corniche at Giza close-by Kubri el-Gama’a. Sadly, our snug and comfortable home is now gone and its place taken by a riverside casino. I would also like to acknowledge the help given in New York by Dr. Terry Wilz, until 1999 Executive Director of the American Research Center. Over a period of several seasons Catherine Cline, Manager of Research and Education Programs at the Center, has processed our applications and ensured that communications between the New York and Cairo offices went smoothly. I would like to thank too the members of the Archaeological and Research Expe-ditions Committee of the American Research Center for its continuing sponsorship.

The Giza Mastabas Project has been fortunate in the participation of several very talented epigraphers. The first of those was not an Egyptologist by training, but rather an artist (and graduate of the School of the Museum of Fine Arts), Nicholas Thayer. Through years of exposure to the monuments, Mr. Thayer ("Nicky") developed an extraordinary sensitivity to and knowledge of Egyptian art, and many of the reliefs reproduced in previous volumes of the Giza Mastabas series were copied by him. Although not actually participating in any of the field seasons when the reliefs of the Senedjemib Complex were copied, he inked many of the drawings included in the present volume.

It is largely due to the efforts of Dr. Peter Der Manuelian and Mr. Lynn H. Holden that we owe the facsimile copies of the autobiographical inscriptions of Senedjemib I Asi reproduced in the present volume, as well as numerous other drawings included herein. Both visited Giza with Kelly Simpson before me and taught me what I know today about the methods of epigraphy utilized by the Giza Mastabas Project.

The individuals comprising the staff of the Giza Mastabas Project changed in part from year to year, and I would like to acknowledge in the following lists all of the collaborators who gave valuable assistance in recording the reliefs of the Senedjemib Complex.

The majority of the reliefs on the walls of the chapels in the Senedjemib Complex were copied in the 1981 and 1982 field seasons, both under the direction of Professor Simpson. Thus, in the February–August 1981 season, the staff consisted of: William Kelly Simpson, Director, Yale University/Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Edward Brovarski, Museum of Fine Arts, epigrapher; Lynn Holden, Museum of Fine Arts, epigrapher; and Whitney M. Davis, Harvard University, epigrapher. Miss Nadia Mohamed Abdel Rahman served as the representative of the Egyptian Antiquities Organization.

The July–August 1982 staff comprised Dr. William Kelly Simpson, Director, Yale University/Museum of Fine Arts; Edward Brovarski, Museum of Fine Arts, epigrapher; Lynn Holden, Museum of Fine Arts, epigrapher; Peter Der Manuelian, Museum of Fine Arts, epigrapher; David Pendlebury, University of Pennsylvania, epigrapher; and Carter Wentworth, Museum of Fine Arts, artist. Mr. Mahmoud Affifi worked with us as Inspector for the Egyptian Antiquities Organization.

A certain amount of collation and recopying of scenes was also undertaken in subsequent seasons, and especially in the February–March 1989 field season, which was otherwise devoted to copying the great princely mastabas of the Eastern Field at Giza. The staff for that season consisted of the following: Edward Brovarski, Director, Museum of Fine Arts, David Silverman, Deputy Director, The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania; Nathalie Beaux, Paris, epigrapher; Del Nord, University of Chicago, epigrapher; Huub Pragt, Leiden University, epigrapher; Melissa Robinson, University of Pennsylvania, epigrapher/photographer; Mark Stone, Yale University, epigrapher; and Susan Weeks, American Research Center in Egypt, epigrapher/artist. Mr. Mahmoud Sherif again joined the Giza Mastabas Project as Inspector.

In December of 1991 and 1992, the present writer spent two shorter seasons at Giza collating drawings and making supplemental measurements and drawings. At that point an additional field season was added to check certain details of the drawings and the architecture of the Senedjemib Complex would have been desirable, but appeared to be out of the question because of limited financial resources and to
other circumstances beyond the writer’s control. Fortunately, a number of colleagues stepped in to help plug the gap. In November, 1993, Peter Der Manuelian very graciously interrupted his own work in Giza Cemetery 2100 to recheck certain details of the scenes and inscriptions in G 2370. He likewise took a number photographs reproduced as plates in the present volume. This seems like an appropriate place to thank him for even earlier efforts on my behalf. In 1983, while yet a graduate student at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, Dr. Manuelian drew and inked the blocks from the offering room of Senedjemib Mehi in the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago for the present volume.

During the March 1995 field season of the Saqqara Expedition of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, and the University of Pennsylvania Museum, the expedition photographer, Mr. Edward D’Angelo, kindly photographed a number of outstanding reliefs in the mastabas of Senedjemib Inti and Khnumenti for the present volume, while Dr. Rita E. Freed, with the assistance of Miss Nadia Laha, graciously kept the photographic record. At the same time, Mr. Mark Stone, an epigrapher for the Saqqara Expedition, who had worked with the Giza Mastabas Project in 1989, recorded two scenes in the mastaba of Senedjemib Inti for inclusion herein. I would like to thank all of them, but especially Dr. David P. Silverman and Dr. Freed, co-directors of the Saqqara Expedition, for allowing these expedition members time off from their own busy season to work at Giza on my behalf.

During much of the time that the Giza Mastabas Project worked in the Senedjemib Complex, the boxes which contained the apparatus for the Sound-and-Light spectacular cut across the court at a diagonal. Only in 1997, when the present volume was virtually complete, were the light boxes removed. Thanks to the initiative of Dr. Zahi Hawass the tombs of the Senedjemib Complex are now open to the public. In the summer of 1998, Peter Jánosi of the Institute for Archaeology of the University of Vienna and Cyntha Shiekuslamli of the American University in Cairo made a special visit to Giza on my behalf to examine the newly unencumbered court. I thank them whole-heartedly for their efforts. A number of photographs by Dr. Jánosi have been included as plates in the present volume. On the occasion of that visit, they also made a number of important observations on the architecture of the complex, in particular of the tomb of Khnumenti, which have likewise been incorporated in the text.

In keeping with the usual practice of the Giza Mastabas series, an effort has been made in this volume to provide a complete photographic record of the reliefs for purposes of comparison. Again because of the limited resources available to me, it was not possible to complete that record. Nonetheless, the majority of scenes are documented in line and photographs, with the exception of the south wall of the offering room of Senedjemib Mehi, G 2378.

In February and March 1999, it was possible to return to Giza with a small team in an effort to complete the recording in the Senedjemib Complex for this volume and to undertake additional recording for The Senedjemib Complex, Part 2. In addition to the writer, the staff consisted of Mr. Bradford M. Endicott, of Dedham, Massachusetts, photographer, and Mr. Stephen R. Phillips, University of Pennsylvania, epigrapher. Happily, it proved possible to include a number of the photographs taken by Mr. Endicott in the present volume. Notable are the color photographs reproduced in the Frontispiece of the burial chamber and sarcophagus of Senedjemib Inti, which had been newly uncovered by Dr. Hawass in 1997. Mr. Endicott very kindly undertook the costs of his travel and stay in Egypt, as well as the photographic expenses of the expedition.

His generosity is most kindly appreciated.

Representative of the Supreme Council of Antiquities in the February-March 1999 field season was Mr. Mohamed E. Sheha. I would like to thank him whole-heartedly for his efforts on our behalf.

I would also like to express my appreciation to two other individuals who played a part in the production of this volume. Jordi Ensign, a student at the School of the Museum of Fine Arts spent a considerable amount of time inking drawings of scenes copied in the Senedjemib Complex. Besyè Nebez, a volunteer at the Museum of Fine Arts, helped the writer in many different ways, and in particular by assembling the object lists of the different tombs published herein.

Two old friends and colleagues, James P. Allen, Associate Curator of Egyptian Art at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, and David P. Silverman, Professor of Egyptology, The University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, kindly agreed to review my translations of the important autobiographical inscriptions of Inti and of the dialogues and utterances of the workmen in the tombs of Inti, Mehi, and Khnumenti. Both have made valuable criticisms and suggestions, for which I thank them. Specific acknowledgements are made in the text, but Dr. Allen in particular generously shared with me his knowledge of Old Egyptian and helped to refine the translations of the autobiographical inscriptions more closely from the view of tense and aspect.

Thanks are also due Andrey O. Bolshakov, Curator of Egyptian Antiquities at the Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, and Leonard Lesko, Charles Edwin Wilbour Professor of Egyptology at Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island. The former very kindly arranged to have Professor Oleg Berlev’s interesting 1966 article on the Egyptian unit of value in Russian translated for me into English, while the latter drew to my attention a very interesting, unpublished Berkeley M. A. thesis on expanded verbal bases in Egyptian by a former student of his at the University of California at Berkeley, Sandra Kay Simons. In addition, Professor Lawrence Staiger of Harvard University generously provided me with a reference to an important recent article by Doug Ese and Paul K. Hopke on a special type of Syrian ware imported into Egypt in the course of the Old Kingdom, an example of which was found in the burial chamber of Senedjemib Inti.

I would also like to express my appreciation to Janice Klein, the Registrar of Anthropology at the Field Museum of Natural History for information about the purchase of FM 35795, the table scene from the north wall of the offering room of Senedjemib Mehi, which has been in Chicago since 1898. Ms. Klein was most considerate and forthcoming in this matter as in other requests over the years.

Reiser’s recording system—the Harvard–Boston Expedition Diary, Object Registers, Photograph Registers, Tomb Cards, and so forth—have been fully described by Dr. Ann Macy Roth in volume 6 of the Giza Mastabas series (1995), and there is no reason to repeat
her observations here. Something should, however, be said about the maps and plans of the Senedjemib Complex. The Senedjemib Complex is included in Reisner’s overall “Map of Cemetery on Echelon,” a detail of which (redrawn by Peter Der Manuelian) is incorporated among the figures of the present volume, along with an enlarged detail of the Senedjemib Complex itself. Reisner’s detailed Plan of the Senedjemib Complex—presumably surveyed and drawn by Alexander Flomoff, who completed so many other maps and plans of the Giza necropolis—was unfortunately never completed. Chris Dewar, a former student at the Boston Architectural College, volunteered his time to redraw the plan. In the process he inked in penciled lines on the original plan and completed some of the more obvious architectural conventions. Recently, Peter Der Manuelian has re-numbered the tombs and shafts illustrated on the plan in accordance with the numbering system used in the present volume. While it would have been desirable to draw an entirely new plan of the Senedjemib Complex, any such notion was hampered by the light boxes of the Sound-and-Light extending across the court of the complex, and by the modern concrete roofs and other additions made to the tombs of the complex. Furthermore, the necessary financial resources were simply not available to me.

Circumstances have also prevented me from checking the original squires in Oxford of selected reliefs in the tombs of Senedjemib Inti and Mehi made in 1850 by the Rev. Johann Rudolph Théophilus Leider, a German missionary in Cairo, and his wife Alice. Nevertheless, Dr. Jaromir Malek, Keeper of the Archives of the Griffith Institute, and his assistant, Miss Elizabeth Miles, went to considerable trouble to photograph the squires, which the Griffith Institute very generously made available for inclusion in the present volume.

The original plans, drawings, and sketches of the Senedjemib Complex made by Karl Richard Lepsius are today on deposit in the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaft. The majority of these were published in the different volumes of Lepsius’s Denkmäler, but some years ago Prof.-Dr. Walter-Friedrich Reineke, Dr. Jaromir Malek, Keeper of the Archives of the Griffith Institute, and his assistant, Miss Elizabeth Miles, went to considerable trouble to photograph the squires, which the Griffith Institute very generously made available for inclusion in the present volume.

The original plans, drawings, and sketches of the Senedjemib Complex made by Karl Richard Lepsius are today on deposit in the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaft. The majority of these were published in the different volumes of Lepsius’s Denkmäler, but some years ago Prof.-Dr. Walter-Friedrich Reineke, Director of the Academy, through the good offices of Peter Der Manuelian, called my attention to several unpublished drawings made by the Prussian Expedition in the tomb of Senedjemib Inti. Thanks to the kindness of Dr. Reineke, it has proven possible to reproduce two of these drawings herein. I thank him for the permission to do so. I would, moreover, like to express my appreciation to Dr. Elke Freier, assistant at the Academy, for taking the time to answer a number of inquiries about Lepsius’s drawings and records.

Further acknowledgement is due Peter Der Manuelian. As co-editor (with Kelly Simpson) of the Giza Mastaba series, he has edited, typed, designed, and produced the present volume. In addition, he dedicated considerable time and effort to reproducing Inscriptions A–D in a standard hieroglyphic font. My debt to Dr. Manuelian is much greater, however, for his interest and enthusiasm have helped to keep the present volume on track.

A word at this point about the reconstructed versions of Inscriptions A–D presented in the text figures is perhaps appropriate. Due to the use of the standard hieroglyphic font, it has not always been possible to maintain the exact spatial relationships of individual hieroglyphic signs. Where doubt exists the facsimile copy by the Giza Mastaba Project should be consulted. The same is true of the individual signs themselves which reproduce the stereotyped Middle Egyptian forms of Sir Alan H. Gardiner’s type font.

It should be mentioned that the physical descriptions and measurements of the individual mastabas throughout the present volume are virtually all Reisner’s. In most instances, the present writer has only converted his descriptions of the architecture of the tombs from the tabular form in which he presented them into complete sentences. This is especially true of the Introduction, but also of the descriptions of the individual tombs.

The present volume incorporates three of the largest tombs of the Senedjemib Complex, those of Senedjemib Inti, Senedjemib Mehi, and Khnumenti. The remaining tombs are scheduled to be published in The Senedjemib Complex, Part 2. These include the well-preserved little tomb of the judge Akhet-mehu (g 2375) and that of Senedjemib Inti’s grandson(?!), Nekhebu (g 2381). Except for one of his two important autobiographical inscriptions, which is now on view in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo, the reliefs of Nekhebu are all in storage in Boston. To be likewise contained in Part 2 is the important intact burial of Nekhebu’s son, Prahshesepes Impy, the contents of which are again largely in Boston. Presumably this volume will also include the tombs of the mortuary priests and scribes of the Senedjemib family, who erected their tombs in the immediate environs of the Senedjemib Complex.

As may be seen from the Introduction, Karl Richard Lepsius, the head of the Prussian Expedition of 1842–45, discovered a great number of mummies of Saite date in g 2370 along with other material of later date in both g 2370 and g 2378. We hope to be able to deal further with this material in The Senedjemib Complex, Part 2.

The same holds true for the skeletal remains discovered by the Harvard–Boston Expedition in the course of its excavations in the Senedjemib Complex. The skeletons of Senedjemib Inti and his great-grandson(?!), Prahshesepes Impy, in particular, were found by Reisner still resting respectively in their limestone sarcophagus and wooden coffin. In the course of writing the present volume, Peter der Manuelian made me aware that much of the skeletal material excavated by Reisner at Giza still survives in the magazines of the Supreme Council of Antiquities at that site and in the Qasr el-Aini Faculty of Medicine in Cairo, as well as in the Peabody Museum at Harvard University and in the Lowie Museum of Anthropology at the University of California at Berkeley. The skeletons of Inti and Impy have yet to be identified, but a careful analysis of the mummies might well yield important chronological and scientific insights.

During the time this volume has been in proof, it was only possible to add brief references, mostly in the footnotes, to a number of important monographs that appeared in print. One book appeared too recently to be cited even in this manner. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that the tomb of Hetzi referred to on page 103 of the present volume is now published in N. Kanawati and M. Abder-Raiziq, The Teti Cemetery at Saqqara, Vol. 5. The Tomb of Hetzi (2000). In addition, I only recently became aware of an article by Hartwig Altenmüller in SÄK 14 (1987), pp. 3–24, in which that scholar comes to a similar conclusion to mine (see page 64) regarding the meaning of the verb nír.
Without the financial support provided by several members of the Visiting Committee of the Department of Art of the Ancient World, this volume might never have appeared in print. In particular I would like to thank Mr. and Mrs. Miles Colliers of Naples, Florida, Mr. and Mrs. Gotham Cross and Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Haynes of Wellesley, Massachusetts, and Mr. and Mrs. James Vaughn of Houston, Texas, to whom the present volume is dedicated in deep appreciation for their continuing support. Significant funding was also provided by the Marilyn K. Simpson Charitable Trust through the good offices of William Kelly Simpson. Additional funding came from a number of close personal friends, Dr. Renée Gelman of Brookline, Massachusetts, Mrs. Miriam Graham of Chicago, Illinois, Mrs. Leah Kaplan of Stanford California, and Mr. Bradford M. Endicott of Dedham, Massachusetts. The first of these was also a member of the Visiting Committee of the Egyptian Department for a number of years. I hope to be able to dedicate *The Senedjemib Complex, Part 2,* to these benefactors.

My wife, Del Nord, also agreed that we would ourselves cover the costs of my expenses during the 1991, 1992, and 1999 field seasons, when financial support was not otherwise forthcoming. For her generosity I thank her. In addition, she has with great forebearance read through the manuscript of the present volume on several occasions from both an Egyptological and editorial viewpoint.

I also owe a debt of thanks to Dr. Henry G. Fischer, Curator Emeritus of Egyptian Art at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. Some years ago, before his untimely death, Edward L. B. Terrace, Associate Curator in the Department of Egyptian and Ancient Near Eastern Art at the Museum of Fine Arts, had suggested to Dr. Fischer that they collaborate on a study of the Senedjemib Complex with the ultimate aim of its publication in mind. Subsequently, Dr. Fischer relinquished his prior publication rights to me.

Finally, special thanks go to Dr. Rita E. Freed, Norma-Jean Calderwood Curator of Ancient Egyptian, Nubian, and Near Eastern Art, Art of the Ancient World at the Museum of Fine Arts, for her encouragement in the present project, as in many others. Without her on-going interest, the present volume would never have appeared in print.
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INTRODUCTION

A T THE NORTHWEST CORNER of the Great Pyramid, on the eastern edge of the Western Field at Giza, stands the complex of mastabas of the Senedjemib family which contains the well-known tombs of Senedjemib Inti (G 2370) and his son Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378), who served kings Inti and Unis respectively as viziers and chief architects (frontispiece A, pl. 12). In 1842 to 1843, Lepsius excavated these two tombs, made plans, and copied their reliefs and inscriptions. 1 During the spring of 1850, the Reverend Johann Rudolph Theophilus Lieder re-excavated the two tombs and, together with his wife Alice, made a number of squeezes of the reliefs which are now the property of the Griffith Institute, Oxford. 2 Seven months later, Mariette made plans of the tombs and copied certain of their inscriptions. 3 About 1901, Reisner heard that the villagers of Kafr el-Haram at the foot of the pyramids had conducted illicit excavations at the place and removed some stones. 4 In the intervening years, sand had drifted over the site and, when Reisner began work in October 1902, all that was visible of the Senedjemib Complex was a double mound rising above the surrounding débris (pl. 2b). 5

Reisner cleared the site between October 23, 1912 and January 27, 1913 and discovered that the two tombs of Inti and Mehi were only part of a great complex of tombs erected around a stone paved court approached by a sloping ramp leading up to the west from the pyramid plateau (figs. 2, 3). Between Inti’s and Mehi’s tombs, Reisner uncovered a third tomb, that of Khnumemti (G 2374), another son of Senedjemib Inti, who appears to have carried on his father’s duties under Teti. 6 Two other large mastabas opened on the paved court of the complex, but both had been destroyed nearly to their foundations. One of these was the tomb of Mer-prah-ankh-meryre Nekhebu (G 2381). The owner of the second (G 2385) was never identified. There were also at least five smaller offering rooms connected with the group (G 2383, 2384, 2386–a and b, 2390). Thus, all told, there were ten separate chapels set up on the pavement of the court. In addition, opposite the tomb of Nekhebu, Reisner came upon a sloping shaft (G 2385 a) closed with a great rectangular block of limestone that protected the unwieldy buried portion of one of the sons of Nekhebu, Mer-prah-ankh-meryre Prashepses Ipmy. 7

The nucleus mastaba was that of Senedjemib Inti (G 2370). 8 This mastaba stands east of the northernmost row of mastabas of the Cemetery en Echelon with the large mastabas G 2350 and 2360 intervening (pl. 54, fig. 9). At the time the mastaba was built, that cemetery had already grown eastwards beyond G 2360, and several smaller mastabas were overbuilt by G 2370. 9 In constructing the mastaba of Inti, the eastern part of an older mud brick mastaba (G 2371) was cut away and the west wall of G 2370, constructed of great blocks of grey nummulitic limestone set in high courses and roughly dressed to a sloping surface (Masonry w), was built inside the east wall of G 2371 (pls. 81, 82, 84). 10 The remains of walls of small blocks of grey nummulitic limestone set in correspondingly low courses to form a rough sloping surface (Masonry u) inside G 2370 at ground level (numbered G 2372 by Reisner) apparently represented the east face of G 2371, and indicated a wide recess in the middle of a north–south façade forming a portico chapel with a roof supported by pillars (figs. 2, 3, 76). Still within G 2370 and parallel to the presumed face of G 2373/2374, at a distance of 60 cm, ran a north–south wall of small nummulitic limestone blocks set in low-stepped courses forming the back wall of another older mastaba (G 2375). The front part of this mastaba was destroyed by the construction of the inner chapel of Inti. A shaft immediately behind Inti’s false door was ascended to G 2373 by Reisner and lettered a (figs. 2, 3, 76). 11 Part of a wall that probably belonged to an older mastaba was also discovered by Reisner under the floor at the western end of the pillared hall of G 2370. 12 Older mud brick walls were also found at different levels under G 2378 and 2379 (pls. 10a, 10b). 13

The paved court of the Senedjemib Complex is higher than the foundations of G 2370 and about 2.0 m higher than the rock east of the complex (fig. 7). The east wall of the paved area was formed by a retaining wall of heavy rubble with a batter on the east, and the sloping ramp from the floor level of the court to the lower ground led down between two low walls (pls. 2b, 4b, 6b). Along the retaining wall were five large sloping-passage tombs, G 2370–a (Senedjemib Inti) entering the wall itself, and G 2381 a (Nekhebu), G 2381 x (Khnumemti), and G 2385 a (owner of G 2385) all to the east of the retaining wall of the platform (pl. 7b). 14 These tombs, along the eastern edge of the Western Field, where the topography favors the use

1 LDI, pl. 23 (upper and middle); LDI, pls. 77–78, 9, pl. 59 (3). Text, pp. 50–51; LDI, “Excavations at Giza. Part II,” pls. 55–56. See Mack, GM 3 (1978), pp. 23–31; Mack, ibid., p. 24, n. 5, notes that one of the squares was dated “April 6, 1843.”
2 For a photographic sketch of the Rev. Lieder, see Who was Who in Egyptology, p. 215.
3 Mariette, Mastabas, pp. 495–515.
4 Reisner, BBM 1, no. 66 (Nov. 1913), p. 56; see below, p. 8.
5 Reisner, BBM 1, no. 66 (Nov. 1913), p. 56.
6 See below, pp. 121–22.
7 Reisner, BMFI 1, no. 66 (Nov. 1913), p. 56.
8 See below, pp. 121–22.
9 See Reisner, BBM 1, no. 66 (Nov. 1913), p. 56; see below, p. 8.
10 See Mack, GM 3 (1978, pp. 23–31); Mack, ibid., p. 24, n. 5, notes that one of the squares was dated “April 6, 1843.” For a photographic sketch of the Rev. Lieder, see Who was Who in Egyptology, p. 215.
11 Mariette, Mastabas, pp. 495–515.
12 Reisner, BBM 1, no. 66 (Nov. 1913), p. 56.
13 See below, pp. 121–22.
14 See below, p. 8.
15 See Reisner, BMFI 1, no. 66 (Nov. 1913), p. 56.
16 See below, p. 8.
17 See below, p. 8.
19 See Reisner, BMFI 1, no. 66 (Nov. 1913), p. 56.
20 See below, pp. 121–22.
21 See above, pp. 121–22.
22 See above, pp. 121–22.
23 See above, pp. 121–22.
of sloping passages from the east, are among the earliest sloping-passage burial places made in this area of the necropolis. The rock underlying the Senedjemib Complex had an uneven surface. Under G 2370, it lay 1.41–2.0 m below the floor and descend-
ed eastwards, sloping gently under the ramp leading up from the pyr-

amid plateau (fig. 2). From south to north the rock rose to an east-

ward ridge in front of the doorway of G 2370, dipped again under the north part of the paved court, and then rose gently to the front of G 2378, whose walls were founded on rock or nearly so (figs. 5, 6). The eastern side of the knob on which G 2378 was built had been quarried away, probably by quarrymen working on the Great Pyra-

mid, and directly under the east wall of G 2378 ran a north–south scarp. Along the eastern side of the foundation platform, the rock surface descended gently to the north.

The rock surface east of the foundation platform was rough and may well have been a quarry floor. It was crossed from south to north by a drainage channel cut in the rock leading away from the north-

west corner of the enclosure of the Great Pyramid (pls. 7b, 8b, figs. 2, 4). Reisner assumed it was cut and constructed in the “late Cheops period.” Where it passed under the enclosure wall of the pyramid, the channel was carefully roofed. A smaller channel was constructed inside the rock-cut drain with slabs on the two sides and a slab roof, bound with gypsum. The drainage channel was 1.10 m in width and 0.55 m deep. The excavated length was 17.0 m. The drain was intended to draw off rainwater from the low

ground northwest of the pyramid. The water was, in fact, a danger to the burials in the sloping passage tombs, and in two cases, the water had run in down the sloping passage and collected in the southwest corner of the chamber.

The foundation platform of the open paved court was con-

structed in two or three stages. Initially it extended from the south end of G 2378 to the south end of G 2384 and formed a rectangle wider (21.6 m) in front of the north half of G 2370. The court was crossed by a paved path which led from the entrance of G 2370 to the sloping ramp down to the pyramid plateau. Thereafter Inti’s sloping passage tomb (G 2370 a) was excavated under the platform, its approach con-

structed of rubble and masonry, the opening protected by a rubble wall surmounted by masonry walls and roofed with slabs, and the platform extended eastwards by a rubble wall filled with limestone rubble (pls. 6a–b, 7b, figs. 2, 3). Apparently at the same time, or af-


fter the burial of Inti, the platform over his burial place, including the new addition to the platform, was surrounded by a wall on all four sides (pls. 4b, 7b).

The next construction in the Senedjemib Complex was the mas-


taba of Senedjemib (G 2378), which stood on the north of the paved court and was entered from the south from the court (pls. 1b, 2b, 6a, 10a). The pavement of the court was extended northwards to the face of G 2378 and the sloping passage G 2378 a, under the east wall of the mastaba, made as Mehi’s burial place (figs. 3, 9).

At the time G 2378 was built, an older mastaba belonging to a man named Akhnetemu (G 2377), who had no apparent connection with the Senedjemib family, stood in the northwestern part of this area (pl. 6a, figs. 2, 3). The mastaba of Khnumenit (G 2374) was built between the north side of G 2370 and the southern side of the mastabas of Akhnetemu and Mehi with a strengthening of the south court wall of G 2377 (pl. 104a). The exterior north wall of G 2370 was dressed flat in Rooms I and II of the chapel of G 2374 to take the reliefs. The sloping-passage tomb G 2384 a probably belongs to mastaba G 2374.

Later two additions (G 2376 and 2377) to the mastaba of Mehi were built on the west and closed off all access to Akhnetemu’s chapel. G 2377 was built against the west wall of G 2378, with G 2376 built against its own west wall (pl. 104a, figs. 2, 3). The additions contained one burial shaft each. G 2376 a was found open and empty, but G 2377 a contained the skeleton of an adult female.

On the pavement of the platform on the east side of the court, north of the entrance passage to the complex, G 2384 was next built. The walls of the mastaba were poorly preserved and the plan not re-

coverable, but presumably it also opened on the court. Although the false door is missing, it seems likely from the evidence of the offering stone, topped with a torus moulding and cavetto cornice and provided with a carved leaf-on-mat design on its upper surface, which once stood in front of it, that G 2384, like most of the other mastabas on the platform, possessed an east–west offering room (pl. 10b, figs. 2–3). Since G 2384 was built against its north wall, G 2384 is clearly earlier in date than the latter. It may well have belonged to the elder son of Senedjemib Mehi, likewise named Senedjemib, who is depicted in his father’s mastaba.

Next, the old platform was extended northwards north of G 2384 along the eastern side of G 2378 to near its northeast corner. The space east of the north–south scarp on which G 2378 was built was filled with clean limestone debris retained by two parallel north–south rubble walls about 4 m in east of G 2378. On this extension was con-

structed a large mastaba without shafts, G 2385 (pls. 4b, 6c, figs. 2–3, 9). Opening on the eastern side of the court, this northeast-
ern mastaba was occupied by a chapel of eight rooms and two ser-

dabs. Burial was presumably in sloping-passage tomb G 2387 a. The mastaba was unfortunately destroyed to within one or two courses of the floor, and no indication of ownership was found. Reisner thought that the proprietor of the mastaba was a son of Senedjemib Mehi.
and, if it is indeed belonged to Mehi's older son Senedjemib, it is possible that the proprietor of it was Mehi's younger son, who bore his father's "good name," Mehi. There are other candidates for the ownership of the mastaba, however, including a putative son of Khnumemsu. On the other hand, from its size the mastaba clearly belonged to an important and wealthy individual and, for this reason, the best candidate is perhaps Nekhebu's anonymous older brother who achieved the position of overseer of works under Pepý I.

In the reign of Pepý I, Inti's grandson (?) Nekhebu built a sloping on the south end of the paved platform, south of the portico of g. 2370, at its east facade (figs. 2–3).[33] A little later an east–west serdab was built on its east side adjoining the pathway across the court which led to the sloping ramp to the pyramid plateau (pls. 9b, 10b). According to Reisner, Nekhebu was buried in sloping-passage tomb g. 2382 at the retaining wall just to the north of the sloping ramp.[34] Three other shafts, g. 2381, x, y, and z were perhaps included within the confines of the superstructure of g. 2381. The distance from the west side of g. 2384 to the east face of g. 2370 was about 19.65 m. From the north side of the serdab of g. 2384 to the south face of g. 2370 is about 14.8 m. These measurements give an approximate area of 202 sq. m. for the great paved court of the complex in its final transformation.[35]

Three smaller tomb chapels were also set up on the pavement of the platform. g. 2382 was built against the south face of g. 2370, west of the portico, and two others, g. 2386 and b, between g. 2384 and the sloping entrance ramp (figs. 2–3). Reisner felt that g. 2383, which contained a small false door with cavetto cornice and torus moulding dedicated to a vizier named Wer-kau-ba Iku, belonged to the owner of g. 2376 or 2377, since no shaft was found in or behind the chapel. Strudwick, however, dates Iku to the end of the Old Kingdom or later, on account of the small size of the offering room and because the insertion of the tomb among those of the Senedjemib family presumably pre-dated, on account of the small size of the offering room and because the insertion of the tomb among those of the Senedjemib family presumably pre-dated the ownership of the mastaba, however, including a putative son of Pepý's immediate family.

Each of the two chapels built between g. 2384 and the entrance ramp leading up to the complex was provided with an (uninscribed) monolithic false door (pls. 4a, 6b, 7a). Chapel g. 2386–a was entered by a narrow east–west passage from the main court of the complex and opened eastward into chapel g. 2386–b (figs. 2–3).[36] The identification of the two offering places and the unusual intercommunication suggests that these were the chapels of the two brothers, Phuabhepet Impý and Saba-PAH-Tsibe.[37] Along the retaining wall just to the south of the ramp, Reisner found the burial of Phuabhepet Impý in sloping-passage tomb g. 2381, which descends under ruined mastaba g. 2390.[38] The burial was dated to Pepý II by a jar sealing.[39] On the other side of the drainage channel leading away from the enclosure of the Great Pyramid, Reisner uncovered sloping-passage tomb g. 2381. The similarity in plan of g. 2381 to g. 2381 suggests its burial was in the vicinity of the mastaba of Impý's brother Saba-PAH-Tsibe.[40] On the platform east of g. 2381 and south of the ramp approach to the court was built the badly denuded mastaba g. 2390.[41] Shaft g. 2390, which was found open and plundered by Reisner, may have been denuded or plundered by Reisner, may have been the burial of Mehi's grandson Nekhebu.[42] On the other hand, from its size the mastaba clearly belonged to a family of priests of the Senedjemib family (fig. 3). East of the two latter mastabas and east of the drainage channel leading away from the Great Pyramid were built some very late mastabas (Cemetery g. 2450). Other priests and servitors of the Senedjemib family had tombs in the immediate environment to the south and west of the complex (g. 2357, 2358, 2361, 2362, 2364, 2366, 2396, 3531 [= old 2347], 5554 [= old 2357], etc.)[43] Reisner believed that the smaller mastabas of the Senedjemib Complex together with the tombs of the

---

37 See n. 37 below.

38 Reisner originally assigned the number g. 2380 to the middle part of g. 2384 and afterwards discarded it (see "List of Tomb Numbers Used in the Senedjemib Complex," p. 1). For ease of reference, I have given the numbers g. 2384 to 2386 to the pair of chapels built between g. 2384 and the ramp.

39 For the few remaining reliefs from the serdabs of Impý and Ibebi, see The Senedjemib Complex, Pt. 2 (forthcoming); also below, p. 24. Reisner ("Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon," p. 170) considers that the structures associated with the names of Impý and Ibebi derived from chapel g. 2390.

40 See above, n. 7.

41 See below, p. 24 and n. 21.

42 Reisner, "Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon," p. 170, assigns a similar number to the mastabas. There are a few other tombs in the eastern side of the platform of the Senedjemib Complex between g. 2381 and b and it is 2385 and the ramp. Reisner ("List of Tomb Numbers Used in the Senedjemib Complex," p. 1) states that the shafts in the Senedjemib area were then numbered 2380 and 2381 to 2385. I do not know what to make of Reisner's remarks, since the false door of g. 2390 is still to be seen (n. 26).


44 Cf. Breman, ibid., pp. 120-21. These tombs are also scheduled to be published in The Senedjemib Complex, Pt. 2 (forthcoming).
funerary priests beside it may well be nearly the last in the Giza cemetery prior to the intrusive burials of the Saite and Roman Periods. According to him, the official cemetery fell into disuse during the time of Pepy II or his successors of the late Old Kingdom, through the dissipation of earlier endowments or their diversion to other uses.46

In passing, it is perhaps germane to mention that Reisner found in front of G 2370 b and G 2382 a fragments of a number of alabaster statues of Khafre. In his opinion, the statues had been hauled there either in the Fifth or Sixth Dynasties and broken up to make the small alabaster offering dishes of which he found so many examples.47

In Room II of G 2370, Lepsius discovered a great number of mummies of the Saite Period which, according to him, were badly disturbed in Roman times, though some still rested in their sarcophagi. Many small objects, especially faience amulets of poor quality were also found,48 while two vases of late form from G 2370 are illustrated by him.49 Lepsius also discovered three fragments of alabaster vessels and three faience amulets of “later date,” along with other objects, in G 2378.50 In the Roman period an inclined roadway paved with stone slabs had been laid up the mound of debris which covered the Senedjemib Complex to the top of Inti’s tomb, and the pillared hall had been used as a communal or family burial place.51 Prior to that time the tombs on the east and south of the paved court of the complex had been extensively damaged and their separate stones were found scattered in confusion in the debris under the Roman period pavement.52

46 See Reisner, ASAE 13 (1913), p. 250.
47 Giza Diary 1912–13, p. 52; HESP, pp. 33, 34.
48 LD, Text 1, p. 58.
49 Ibid, fig. on p. 58; LD 2, p. 153 [2].
50 LD, Text 1, p. 54. For Giza in the Third Intermediate and Late Periods, see Zivie-Coche, Giza au premier millénaire. The Saite and Roman Period objects from G 2370 and 2378 will be dealt with further in The Senedjemib Complex, Pt. 2 (forthcoming).
51 Giza Diary 1912–13, pp. 40–41.
52 Reisner, BMFA 11, no. 66 (November, 1913), p. 13, fig. 3, see further below, pp. 7–8.
Chapter 1: PREVIOUS WORK IN THE SENEDJEMIB COMPLEX

In the panoramic view of L.D. I, pl. 15, the tombs of the Senedjemib Complex are nearly entirely covered by sand. Lepsius removed the sand from the two mastabas of Inti and Mehi, made plans and sections of both tombs, and copied their reliefs and inscriptions. The roof of the pillared hall (Room V), with scenes of Inti, was still preserved to nearly their full height (fig. 18). The cavetto-and-torus cornice and inscribed architrave had also previously been overthrown, and the columns that upheld the roof of the portico apparently carried off. See below, pp. 12, pl. 76a–c, 78b [right]; L.D. II, pls. 78b, 79–81; Text, p. 11. This new knowledge is reflected in the plan in L.D. Text I, p. 55 (fig. 11). Lieder, assisted by his wife Alice, made squeezes of a portion of the north wall of Room III, of the two registers of estates on the door thickness between Rooms III and IV, of parts of the false door in Room IV, and of the west thickness of the doorway between Rooms II and V. The Lieders themselves published no account of their work. Fortunately, Mariette visited the tombs of Inti and Mehi in November 1850, seven months after the Lieder's excavations, and recorded what he saw in an appendix of "Les mastabas de l'ancien empire". The Lieders had seemingly cleared in part the two chapels of Inti and Mehi of the sand heaped up over them by Lepsius as a protective measure at the end of his investigations, but from

1 See also Lepsius's map of Giza in L.D. I, pl. 14.
2 See above, p. 1, n. 1.
3 L.D. I, pl. 78b–c; Text, p. 16.
4 Ibid. Reimer found the block from the north side wall of the portico with the vizier's head and parts of Inscriptions A 1 and B 1 on it tumbling down and buried under sand and debris (pl. 18, 64a; figs. 30, 31). This block has been restored to its appropriate place on the wall and is included in pl. 48, 64a; figs. 30, 31.
5 See below, pp. 11–15.
6 L.D. II, pl. 77b [left]; Ergänz., pl. 114 [right]. The profile of the block in which the drum roll is carved is readily apparent in the latter drawing, while a segment of the drum roll appears at the top of the other plan.
7 L.D. Text I, p. 17.
8 L.D. I, pl. 77b [right]; Ergänz., pl. 114 [left].
9 L.D. I, pl. 76a–b.
10 It sounds from Lepsius's description as though the pillared hall was still mostly intact, even though the architrave between the wall and the eastern pillars of the first row was cracked, and had to be propped up. In fact, as will be seen shortly, there is reason to doubt whether its ceiling was entirely undamaged.
11 The situation in Room III was quite different. Although the northern end wall of the room was preserved to its full height of six registers (fig. 56), and the adjacent northern ends of the east and west long walls also remained in place (figs. 56, 52), Lepsius's plate reveals that the southern end of the west wall had collapsed. It is not certain whether the corresponding section of the east wall was in a similar state of collapse, although a remark of Mariette's implies that it was still standing in 1850, at least in part, and it is possible that it was simply covered up by the debris which apparently filled this end of the room to the ceiling. Nor is it clear why Lepsius did not bother to remove the debris from the southern end of the room. Given the fact that he could clearly see that the southern end of the west wall had collapsed, he may have felt that the rest of the east wall and the south end wall were in a similar condition and that the time and effort required to clear the remainder of the room would not be well spent. Moreover, it is evident from the plan in L.D. I, pl. 23 (fig. 12) and his own statement to that effect that he was of the opinion that the false door occupied the south end of Room III. It was most probably for this reason that he did not search for an offering room beyond.
12 By the time the first text volume of the Denkmäler, edited by Edouard Naville and others, had appeared after Lepsius's death in 1897, the Rev. Lieder had partially cleared the southern end of Room III and discovered the offering room (Room IV) with its false door. This new knowledge is reflected in the plan in L.D. Text I, p. 55 (fig. 11). Lieder, assisted by his wife Alice, made squeezes of a portion of the north wall of Room III, of the two registers of estates on the door thickness between Rooms III and IV, of parts of the false door in Room IV, and of the west thickness of the doorway between Rooms II and V. The Lieders themselves published no account of their work. Fortunately, Mariette visited the tombs of Inti and Mehi in November 1850, seven months after the Lieder's excavations, and recorded what he saw in an appendix of "Les mastabas de l'ancien empire". The Lieders had seemingly cleared in part the two chapels of Inti and Mehi of the sand heaped up over them by Lepsius as a protective measure at the end of his investigations, but from

13 L.D. I, pl. 78a. Lepsius did not illustrate the right-hand thickness (below, p. 79, pl. 16b, fig. 68a), probably because it was basically a mirror image of the left thickness.
14 L.D. Text I, p. 18.
16 Ibid, pl. xxi.
17 See below, p. 16.
19 L.D. Text I, p. 17.
20 See p. above.
21 Lieder, squar. 1–9. The squareae are now the property of the Griffith Institute, Oxford. Jaromír Miklík has published the squareae made by the Lieders on the east and south thicknesses between Rooms II and III in GSO 15 (1974), pp. 23–34. Except for one problematic squarea (2–9), all the squareae in Oxford are cited in J.F. p. 36 (14b–h) (15–16). A possible location for the odd squarea, which gives the infra of the decans, is suggested below, p. 95–99.
22 Mariette, Monuments, p. 491.
Mariette’s description, drawings, and a sketch and plan of G 2370 made by him (figs. 144, b).13 It is apparent that even after they had finished their work, much of the mastaba, especially the rear part, was still buried under debris. Furthermore, from the sketches and notes of Mariette, it appears that the Lieders, like Lepsius before them, did not clear the rooms to floor level.14

Mariette provides a summary description of the entrance thick-
nesses of G 2370.15 His account of the scenes of Mehi before his pat-
ents on either side of the passageway to the pillared hall (Room V) is somewhat more detailed.16 With respect to the anteroom (Room II), Mariette refers to a “scene de chasse dans les roseaux,” which un-
questionably alludes to a portrayal of Inti in his papyrus skiff watching a hippopotamus hunt on its west wall, a scene which was copied by Lepsius (fig. 42).17 He also refers to “diverses représentations de la vie civil” on its east wall, making specific mention of a “combat sur une barque” in the second register.18 There seems little question that this is a reference to the marsh and riverine scenes reproduced by Lepsius, which include episodes of combat by boatmen (fig. 38). Oddly, Mariette makes no direct mention of the carrying chair scene on the south wall of the room or of the craft scenes on its north wall, although he does provide sketches of the estates on both sides of the passage to the vestibule along with copies of their names.19

Concerning the vestibule (Room III), Mariette notes that the west wall of the chamber was destroyed, except towards the north end where the stones, while disjointed and close to falling, still re-
tained their respective places.20 Although he does not describe the decoration on these blocks, the north end of the west wall is the location of the episodes from the agricultural sequence copied by Lepsius (fig. 13b). Mariette also claims to have seen an image of the deceased with his titles before him on the south wall of the vestibule, most likely above the musicians and singers still visible in this loca-
tion today (pl. 31a; fig. 32a), but whose figures he does not mention, presumably because they remained covered by sand.21 Of consider-
able interest in his statement that a similar representation of the de-
ceased appeared on the east wall, where no such image survives to-
day.22 Although he does not specifically refer to a second carrying chair scene that once occupied the south end of this wall, if the upper parts of the scene with the canoe over Inti were already missing, he may not have recognized the subject as such, and his “image du diffus” may actually represent Inti seated in his carrying chair. Sim-
ilarly, Mariette’s “personnages qui apportent des offrandes”23 may have been the palanquin bearers whose feet alone still survive (pl. 30; fig. 52) or alternatively the customary attendants of the owner who would in all likelihood have been depicted higher up on the wall.24

At any rate, it seems clear from Mariette’s account that the south wall and the southern end of the east wall of Room III stood to a greater height than at present. Hence, it is doubly to be regretted that he made no sketch of these scenes. He did sketch the personified estates on both thicknesses leading to Room IV (fig. 37).25

As regards the offering room (Room IV), Mariette furnishes a sketch of the false door at the west end and copies of its inscriptions together with a description of the reliefs on the other walls of the room.26 His sketch of the false door (fig. 62a) reveals that its archi-
tave and cavetto-and-torus cornice were already missing, while the inscriptions on the jamb of the door and the torus moulding fram-
ing its sides had also suffered damage.27 His description of the other walls is brief:

A droite et à gauche de cette grande stèle, le défunt est représenté assis et tourné vers l’ouest, une barque. Les trois parois de cette chambre sont divisées en deus grand registres horizontaux. Au registre supérieur, des tables, des tablettes dispoisés horizontale-
ment sont chargés d’objets de toute nature. Au registre inférieur, des personnages nombreux apportent leurs offrandes au défunt.28 Nevertheless, it seems to imply that the two side walls and the eastern end wall of the offering room were still largely intact in November 1850. If correct, it furnishes in addition the information that the array of food and drink offerings which is still to be seen in part above the files of offering bearers on the reconstructed southern side wall (pl. 38; fig. 61) originally extended onto the upper parts of the eastern and northern walls above registers likewise occupied by offering bearers.29

A curious feature of Mariette’s sketch and plan of G 2370 is a large gap in the center of the south wall of Room IV. In the plan, the gap is shown buried under debris, but broken lines seem to indicate that Mariette considered it to be an entrance to yet another chamber on the south (fig. 140).30 In his sketch, the debris is absent and the gap in the wall is drawn as if it constituted a separate entrance to the mastaba (fig. 142).31 Photographs taken by the Harvard–Boston Ex-
pedition in 1921 show that the gap did not extend as far down as the floor, and thus could not possibly be a doorway (pl. 114, 122–b). If the room had been cleared to floor level by the Lieders, this would have been readily apparent. Mariette does not refer to the gap in his text, but it seems clear that the decorated blocks from this section of the south wall had previously fallen or been pulled down. The western end of the south wall remains intact down to the present day (pl. 36, 49–42) and, inasmuch as the gap shown in Mariette’s plan did not in-
clude the eastern end of the south wall, it is possible that the relief decoration on the upper part of the eastern section was still intact as late as 1850.32

13 Ibid., pp. 406–75. The plan of G 2370 appears on ibid., p. 497, and the sketch (along with G 2370 on ibid., p. 498).
14 Ibid., pp. 319–32. Mariette specifically states (ibid., p. 312) that the debris filled Room II to the height of the second course of stones.
15 Ibid., p. 312 (“Entrée F”).
16 Ibid., p. 311 (“Corridor C”).
17 Ibid., p. 311 (“Chambre E”).
18 Ibid.
19 Ibid., pp. 30–21 (“Corridor D”).
20 Ibid., p. 310.
21 Ibid.
22 Ibid.
23 Ibid.
24 Ibid.
25 Ibid.
26 Ibid., p. 399. The same feature appears in the plan of G 2370 in L. I, p. 55 (fig. 13).

31 Mariette, Mastaba, pp. 997–999.
32 Ibid., pp. 999–1001.
33 It is possible that a portion of the architecture and moulding are to be seen in an expedion photograph (pl. 124), lying on the fill just above the southwest corner of Room IV. The present whereabouts of this block are unknown.
34 Mariette, p. 997.
35 For the scheme of decoration on the eastern wall, see below, p. 71.
36 Mariette, Mastaba, p. 997.
37 Ibid., p. 399. The same feature appears in the plan of G 2370 in L. I, p. 55 (fig. 13).
It seems more likely that a human agency, rather than a natural cause such as an earthquake, was responsible for the damage done to the walls of G 2370. Whereas the collapse of the southern end of the west wall of Room III or of the central part of the south wall of Room IV could conceivably have resulted from an earthquake, this can hardly have been the case with the damage done to the upper part of the false door in the latter room. As previously mentioned, Lepsius’s sections of G 2370 (fig. 12) give the impression that much of the ceiling over Inti’s chapel was intact at the time of his visit, yet it seems that one wall work, at the very minimum, has had to remove the ceiling slabs directly over the western end of Room IV in order to remove the large stone which formed the upper part of the false door, and which otherwise would have been firmly held in place by the ceiling. If, as is likely, stone-robbers were also responsible for the collapse of the wall sections in Rooms III and IV, it is reasonable to suppose that the ceiling slabs would similarly have to have been removed over these locations in order to gain access to the walls below. Pulling down a wall with the ceiling still in place would have been a very hazardous and inadvisable operation, since the ceiling slabs would probably have followed in a precipitous fashion. Even if the blocks were pushed over or removed from above, the ceiling slabs above these areas would first have to have been removed. Additional evidence for the removal of the ceiling slabs over the south end of Room III might be the sand which Lepsius found filling the southern half of that room up to the ceiling. Moreover, the ceiling slabs would probably have to have been removed to allow the upper course of stone from the north wall of Room II to be extracted. 48 Access to any of the ceiling slabs, of course, presupposes the removal of the stone paving of the roof above, and this appears to have been the case, for no such pavement is shown in Lepsius’s sections.

From Lepsius’s and Mariette’s descriptions and drawings, it is thus clear that G 2370 had undergone considerable damage before 1843–44, either in antiquity or in the intervening millennia. In all likelihood, parts of the walls in Rooms II, III, and IV had already been removed along with sections of the roof and ceilings, especially over the southern part of the mastaba. Furthermore, the loss of the block from the top of the north wall of Room II suggests that part of the roof and ceiling over this part of the mastaba must also have been removed.

Something more can be said about the chronology of the deprivations in Room IV, when Reisner’s field records are taken into account. Except for a few stones left in place in the northeast corner, the paving stones of Room IV had all been pried up and carried away (fig. 3). Later, after sufficient time had passed for a layer of sand and debris to build up on the floor of the room, the decorated blocks from the middle part of the south wall of the room were pulled or pushed down, as previously mentioned. Although a number of blocks were probably carried off at this time, especially those located near the top of the wall, for an unknown reason most of the blocks from this section were abandoned on the debris layer, where Reisner found them in 1912 (pl. 114, 121). If the paving stones were pried up during an initial stage of destruction, it is likely that the entire ceiling and roof over Room IV had also been removed at this time to facilitate the process, and that the ceiling was removed directly over the false door. 49 The surviving evidence from Room IV therefore seems to bear witness to the existence of at least two stages of destruction.

The identity of the culprits responsible for the deprivations wrought in G 2370 is not certain. Reisner recognized an earlier and later period of destruction within the Senedjemib Complex (fig. 34a–d). 50 At some point in time, a hole (Hole 1) had been dug in the sloping ramp that led up from the pyramid plateau to the stone paved court of the complex. This hole was filled with dirt mixed with blocks of limestone. 44 A low mound of blackened debris and lime-stone blocks was formed over this. 45 Many of the blocks in the hole and the mound had decorated surfaces and clearly derived from the tombs on the east and south of the stone paved court of the complex, in particular that of Nebkhepu (G 2381), which had manifestly been pulled down by stone-robbers who left numerous blocks behind. In the Roman period an inclined ramp paved with stone slabs (pls. 6b, 7a) was laid upon the mound of debris to the top of Inti’s tomb and the pillared hall used as a communal burial place. 46 On account of a number of amulets found by him, a wooden mask, and other objects, Reisner dated this communal grave to about the same time as that in the Mycerinus pyramid temple, that is, to the first to second centuries A.D. 47 Reisner assumed the paved way led to the entrance of the communal grave (presumably through the roof of G 2370). The Roman ramp had in turn been broken away by a trench and a great hole (Hole 2), which was likewise filled with sand and limestone blocks. 48 According to Reisner, stones from G 2370 left on the debris before its entrance overlay the inscribed blocks from G 2381 and the other tombs (fig. 19c). 49 Reisner does not describe the stones in question in any detail, but they probably included a segment of a caretto
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48 It would, of course, have been necessary to dismantle the pavement before the lower course of wall blocks could be removed, for the pavement would have been laid after the latter were in place; see e.g., Clarke, Egyptian Masonry, pp. 135–36, 138; Arnold, Building in Egypt, pp. 141–42.
49 Giza Diary 1912–13, pp. 49–50. As may be seen from the redesh figure, Reisner’s plan and sections are markedly rough sketches.
50 A number of complete and fragmentary stelae of Nebkhepu were also found in Hole 1 and 2; see BMFA 2376–11, pp. 84–85. According to the Giza Diary 1912–13, p. 42, Hole 1 also produced an obelisk of Nebkhepu. For all this, cf. Reisner, BMFA 13, no. 66 (November, 1912), pp. 77–78, figs. 4, 6, and for the obelisk, see ibid., fig. 6.
51 Reisner does not specify the nature of the blackened debris, but it is possible that it represents decayed mud brick from the levant walls excavated against c. 1376–28 blower south by the north wind (see below, pp. 9, 110, 130).
52 It is possible that the stones for the pavement of the ramp derived from the paved court of the Senedjemib Complex, although Reisner does not specifically say so. However, few paving stones were missing from the court pavement than would be accounted for by their use in the ramp.
53 Giza Diary 1912–13, pp. 49–50. For the communal grave in the Mycerinus pyramid temple, see Reisner, Mycerinus, pp. 102–10, 117.
54 Giza Diary 1912–13, pp. 49–50.
concerns which in all likelihood derives from c. 2370 and also the great block which bears the head of the elderly Senedjemib Inti and part of Inscription B (pl. 9a–b).

The archaeological evidence so far elicited thus seems to argue for at least two periods of destruction, one before the Roman Period and another after that period. A natural candidate for the earlier destruction might appear to be the Saite Period, when there was a renewed interest in the Giza plateau attributed to by both the Isia temple and burials in the Eastern and Western Fields at Giza. However, it is unlikely that anyone in Dynasty 26 would have buried his relatives in c. 2370 if the destruction was ongoing. For that reason, it may be that the initial damage done to c. 2370 and the tombs on the south and east of the complex took place before Dynasty 26, and perhaps as early as the Ramesseid Period. If part of the roof over Room II had indeed been removed at the earlier date, this would certainly have facilitated the deposition of the Saite Period mummmies into that room. The same would hold true of the deposition of the Roman Period mummmies in Room V, if sections of the roof over the northern part of Room II and the southeast corner of Room V had previously been removed. If they had not been removed earlier in the case of Rooms II and V, it is likely that they were removed then in preparation for these later burials. But it is again improbable that the Roman burials would have been deposited in a mastaba that was being actively dismantled.

If Reisner was correct in his observation that stones from c. 2370 overlay the blocks from c. 2381 and other decorated stones from the tombs on the south and east of the complex, this would suggest that the dismantling of c. 2370 was indeed resumed at a point in time after the Roman Period ramp was built. This inference may derive support from the fact that no decorated blocks from the walls of c. 2370 appear to have been found in either Hole 1 or 2. Taking all the above into account, one possible scenario for the destruction perpetrated on c. 2370 and the other tombs on the south and east of the paved court of the Senedjemib Complex would be the following:

1. In the course of the Ramesseid Period, the roof and ceiling over Room IV and the southern part of Room III were removed, the paving stones of Room IV pried up, and the different stones carried off for use elsewhere. Perhaps the block with the cavetto-and-torus molding from the false door was also taken away at the same time. Concurrently, the tombs on the south and east of the paved court were pulled down and many of the blocks removed.

2. In the interval between the Ramesseid and Saite periods, a thick layer of wind-blown sand accumulated in Room IV and in the southern part of Room III. During the same interval, a low mound of blackened debris built up on the blocks abandoned in the court by the original plunderers.

3. In Dynasty 26 burials were made in Room II.

4. During the Roman Period additional burials were deposited in the pillared hall (Room V) through a hole in its roof.

5. At some point in time after the Roman Period, but before 1842–43, the middle part of the south wall of Room IV and the southern end of the west wall of Room III were demolished. In both cases, even though a number of blocks were carried off, the majority of the decorated blocks were abandoned on the layer of sand that had built up in both rooms.

6. Subsequently, additional wind-blown sand accumulating through the gaps in the roof of c. 2370 and through its entrance built up on the floors of its rooms and in particular covered over the abandoned blocks in Rooms III and IV.

As to exactly when the later stage of destruction represented by no. 5 above may have taken place, it is impossible to say with any certainty. Reisner noted considerable damage to the Mycerinus pyramid temple by Arab quarrymen from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries A.D.53 and it is possible that the later destruction occurred at this time. But it should be emphasized that no independent evidence from the Senedjemib Complex itself supports this conjecture.

Between 1850, when the Rev. Lieder and his wife re-excavated the mastaba of Inti, and 1912, the year Reisner began his work in the Senedjemib Complex, while the tomb presumably lay open and unguarded, extensive additional damage occurred to the relics in c. 2370 that had been copied by Lepsius and described or sketched by Mariette. Reisner remembered hearing, about 1901, rumors of illicit excavations conducted by the villagers of Kafr el-Haram in the Senedjemib Complex.54 Definitive evidence that the Senedjemib Complex was indeed being plundered by dealers in antiquities at about this time exists, for the west end of the north wall of the offering room of Senedjemib Mehi was purchased by Edward E. Ayer on behalf of the Field Museum of Natural History in Spring, 1886.55

Two Harvard–Boston Expedition photographs vividly attest to the condition of the southern part of the mastaba in 1912 (pls. 11–12). The greater part of the decorated area of the south, west, and east walls of Room II, all of which had been copied by Lepsius, had disappeared. In Room III all but the lowest portions of the scenes at the northern end of its east and west walls, and virtually the entire six
registers of the north wall, likewise copied by Lepsius, had been carried off, along with most of the southern wall. Blocks had been removed as well from the upper parts of all three sets of door thicknesses. Reisner actually found the large block with the drum roll from the entrance of g 2570 resting on the debris that filled the southeast corner of Room II (pls. 115, 52a).

According to Mariette, as we have already seen, the offering room of g 2570 (Room IV), appears to have been largely intact in 1850, except for the gap in the decoration in the middle of the south wall and for the top of the false door. By 1912, however, the decorated blocks from the eastern end of the south wall had entirely disappeared, none of them were found in the accumulated debris on the floor by Reisner. After the fallen blocks found by Reisner on the floor of the room had been restored to their original positions in the middle of the wall, a gap in excess of 1.5 m was left at the eastern end of the wall. If, on the basis of Mariette’s testimony, the east end of the south wall was indeed still intact in 1870, as the two entrance thicknesses of the room to the fifth course of masonry clearly were on the evidence of the Mariette sketches and Lieder squeezes, then the east end of the south wall and the decorated blocks from the door thicknesses must have been carried off between 1850 and 1912. The same would be true of the upper portion of the east wall and the north wall, east of the entrance.

Furthermore, by 1912, seventeen large slabs had been removed from the middle and southern rows of slabs that formed the ceiling of the pillared hall, Room V (pl. 52a). As previously mentioned, however, certain of the slabs in the southeast corner of the hall may have been removed in antiquity.

When Lepsius excavated the mastaba of Senedjemib Mehi, he found that the entire roof was missing and that the uppermost courses of stones had been removed (fig. 9c).77 The mastaba must have remained uncovered for a considerable period of time, for the surviving reliefs, especially those closest to the tops of the walls, were badly weathered. In 1850, the Lieders cleared the mastaba and made a number of squeezes.78 Later that same year Mariette described the tomb and provided two sketch plans. In addition, he planned and drew the false door, providing hand copies of its inscriptions, sketched the thicknesses with the figures of agricultural estates between Rooms II and III, and drew the seated figure of Mehi at table on the north wall of the offering room.79

The number of registers with relief decoration actually lost from the top of the walls of the portico and interior rooms of the chapel of g 2370 before 1842–43 varied in number from one to three. The only wall preserved to what was essentially its full height was the west wall of the east–west anteroom (Room II) with its agricultural and offering scenes in six registers (fig. 112). The reliefs that were most extensively damaged were those on the east walls of Rooms II (fig. 118a–b) and III, which were exposed directly to the sand blown into the cemetery from the southwest and west, but the eastern ends of the north and south walls of the latter room were also badly eroded.80

Like the mastaba of Inti, Mehi’s mastaba suffered further damage at the hands of stone-robbers after 1850. In Room II, only two registers remain of the four seen by Lepsius on the south wall west of the entrance, and the figure of Mehi is gone above the waist (pl. 113, figs. 110, 112). The topmost register and portions of the two below are missing from the west wall (pl. 114a–b, fig. 113). At the west end of the north wall, although the scene is still largely intact, the figures of Mehi and his family (fig. 114) have undergone further erosion (pl. 115; fig. 111). Already in Lepsius’s day, the first register and most of the second register of the agricultural and marsh activities represented on the other three-quarters of the wall had disappeared (fig. 114). Today the entire upper part of the wall is missing, and only a small section of the fifth register and the figures of some of the offering bearers in the sixth register survive (pl. 116, 117a; fig. 115). In 1842–43 three of an original six registers of craft scenes on the east wall survived (fig. 116a, b); today the decoration is completely spilled away. As for the south wall, east of the entrance, the three lowest registers were essentially complete in Lepsius’s time, while the two registers above bore traces of singers, musicians, and dancers (fig. 118a, b). Today the upper two registers together with two blocks from the third register, including one bearing Mehi’s head and names, are gone (pls. 118, 119–b; fig. 119). In Lepsius’s day, the door thicknesses between the anteroom and the offering room (Room III) each bore two registers of estates (figs. 120a, 121a). At present both registers on the right (east) thickness are lost, while only the last four estates in the bottom register of the left (west) thickness survive (pl. 120; fig. 219). On both long walls of Room III, Lepsius’s drawings show figures of Mehi seated at table and facing the door with files of offering bearers approaching him, food and drink offerings piled up, and offering vessels on low tables before him. On the south wall, parts of three registers were preserved, or four, if one takes into account an isolated block from that register with titles above Mehi’s head (fig. 114). Today, the entire third register as seen in Lepsius’s plate and the isolated block with the titles are lost (fig. 121). The table scene on the north wall was better preserved (fig. 128) and, probably as a result, was removed and, as previously mentioned, ultimately made its way to Chicago (pl. 121). Today, except for damage done during the removal of the table scene, the remainder of the north wall is in pretty much the same condition as when it was seen by Lepsius (pls. 123, 124a–b; fig. 120).

Many of the decorated blocks from the mastabas of Inti and Mehi were undoubtedly carried off in antiquity or more recent epochs to secure building stone for local use or were reduced to lime in kilns for use as mortar and plaster.81 Since none of the missing blocks from either of the mastabas which were drawn by Lepsius has been identified at Giza or in museums or private collections, it is likely that this was their fate as well.

---

77 L.I.A., Text, p. 31.
78 Lieder squeeze 5.1–4; see PM I, pp. 88 (7); 89 (10–11).
79 Mariette, pp. 251–264.
80 See below, pp. 147, 153, 157. According to Reisner (IV, p. 15), the sand blew into the cemetery from the southwest and west, rarely from the north, but once in the cemetery, it is driven southwards by the frequent north winds.
81 There are traces of several offering bearers in the fourth register on the eastern half of this wall which were not drawn by Lepsius; see fig. 113.
82 Comparé Bonnet’s remarks in Altenarch, p. 42a.
CHAPTER 2: ARCHITECTURE AND DECORATION

FROM ABOUT THE BEGINNINGS OF NITION, there is an increasing complexity evident in the internal plans of mastabas belonging to high officials.1 This complexity manifests itself toward the end of Dynasty 5 in multiple-roomed chapels like those of Rawer at Giza,2 Ptahshepses at Abusir3 or Ti at Saqqara,4 and is likewise evident in the queens’ and viziers’ tombs of the end of Dynasty 5 and the beginning of Dynasty 6 in the Unis5 and Teti6 pyramids of the latter site.

At both Saqqara and Giza this trend towards elaboration also materializes in family complexes. At Saqqara the Pyramid Complex comprises a family of tombs erected around a large open court.7 The same is true of the Seshemnoff Complex and, to a lesser degree, of the complex of Seshemnoff IV at Giza.8 The individual units on which the two-Giza complexes was based is the east-west offering room.9 In the case of both Seshemnoff Inti and Seshemnoff IV, a pillared hall and other subsidiary rooms were added to this nucleus. The tomb of Inti’s older contemporary, the vizier Pharaoh I in the Pyramid Complex at Saqqara, is also a multi-roomed chapel based upon an east-west offering room, as is the chapel of the latter’s son Akheretep.10 The open courts of the Seshemnoff and Seshemnoff complexes both preserve evidence of cult practices in the form of service equipment. At the center of the court of Seshemnoff is a great, rectangular, double-ledge tank or basin of fine Tura limestone set into the pavement with plaster and measuring 2.00 x 1.20 m.11 Similarly, near the center of the great stone-paved court in front of the mastaba of Seshemnoff Inti was a large stone basin, measuring 8.5 x 3.5 cm, sunk into the pavement (fig. 2, 3).12 What appears to be a second, smaller basin is visible just in front of the left-hand column base of the portico of G 2770 in Reisner’s detailed plan of the Seshemnoff Complex (fig. 3), but this is not otherwise referred to in the records of the Harvard–Boston Expedition. Given its location, it is possible that it belonged to the tomb of Nekhebu, whose portico opened nearby.13

Junker believed that the basin in the Seshemnoff court was utilized during the rites of purification contingent upon the mumification of the tomb owner, receiving the libations or remains thereof or of the waters of purification.14 Reisner, on the contrary, was of the opinion that the large stone basins were filled on feast days with water for the ceremonial purification of the funerary priests and other visitors.15 Such arrangement would have been essential, for we know from contemporary sources that visitors to tombs, both priests and otherwise, had of necessity to be ritually pure.16

West of the large basin in the center of the stone-paved court of the Seshemnoff Complex, and halfway between it and the east face of G 2770, a stone basin with perforated top for tithing sacrificial animals was fixed in the pavement (pl. 10b).17 Staple stones are rarely in evidence in Old Kingdom tombs. One such stone is embedded in the floor between two pillars in the cult hall of Mereruka’s mastaba close to the niche containing the statue of the vizier and the offering stone at its foot, even though Duell expressed doubt as to whether actual sacrifices took place in the mastaba itself.18 A fragment of what may have been another stone basin was found in the entrance corridor of the mastaba of Pharaoh I, though not in situ.19 Alongside an L-shaped stone basin in the rock-cut chapel of Pepyankh the Middle at Meir is located what appears to be a circular basin for catching the blood of the victim.20

Some six uninscribed obelisks lined the path leading to the portico of the Seshemnoff complex, and Junker was of the opinion that one pair of obelisks was to be assigned to each of the three proprietors of tombs in the complex, namely, Seshemnoff IV and his sons Tjeti and Pharaoh.21 Obelisks such as these served as a symbol of resur-
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1 See, e.g., GV 1, p. 160ff.; Boin, Rank and Title, p. 43; Strubwick, Administration, p. 30.
2 PM 3, pp. 181–6, pl. XXXIII.
3 Ibid., pp. 340–41; Venier, Pyramidophor 1.
5 Ibid., pp. 671–73 (fig. excavated by Keimer); 612–14 (Khem); 660–70 (Nebti); 667–70 (Nebkauhor);
6 679–80 (Nebkauhor); 660–70 (Nebti-ankh). The tombs of queens Khentka and Neferirkare have recently been published by Mannus, (Giza-Friedhof).
7 PM 3, pp. 158–311 (Khemankh); 311–19 (Akhenaten);
8 319–19 (Ragef); 275–79 (Menemen).
9 PM 4, pp. 516–618. For a general plan of the complex, see Harris, Saqqara 8, fig. 25.
10 PM 4, pp. 311–38. In the case of the Seshemnoff Complex, the two mastabas of Seshemnoff and his eldest son, Tjeti, shared a central suite of rooms that included a colonated portico, colonaded open court, and pillared hall, whereas the chapels of Seshemnoff’s nerc and two other sons were built adjacent but adjacent to the central complex. For a detailed plan, see Junker, Giza 11, fig. 40. The great complex of tombs of Shoshakshed, Ankh, Neteru, Ur and, in Giza mastaba 400, certainly qualifies as a “family complex.” It is not organized around a central court, however, and for this reason a variety of other basins has been included from the present discussion. The basins of the complex have recently been made available in a volume by Kent R. Weeks, Mastabas of Cemetery G 1111, Giza Mastaba 3 (Boston, 1994).
12 GV 1, p. 216-17, 399-400. Like the chapels of Seshemnoff IV and Tjeti, the chapel of Pharaoh I’s son Akheretep is actually in Reisner’s Types (74) and consists of an east-west offering room opening directly from the west side of a northeast-southwest annex room without door jambs; see GV 2, p. 263, fig. 275. For the date of Pharaoh I and Akheretep, see Strubwick, Administration, pp. 15 (2), 47–49, 50; Harpur, Discussion, pp. 273, 274. Reisner’s classification of chapel types is discussed in GV 2, pp. 325–34, 349–94.
13 Junker, Giza 11, p. 106, figs. 429–430, pl. 14a, 14b.
14 Reisner, “Description of Additional to Cemetery an Edouard,” p. 110.
15 For the tomb of Nakhtje (V. 23), see ibid., p. 5.
16 Junker, Giza 11, p. 106.
20 Reisner, “Description of Additional to Cemetery an Edouard,” p. 110.
21 Motyrev, p. 8, fig. 23, pl. 14b, 25.
22 Davies, Egypt, p. 42, pl. 1.
23 Meir 4, p. 27, pls. 2 and 25 [1].
24 Junker, Giza 11, p. 106, fig. 43, pl. 12b, c.
columns in stone family upon his marriage to a daughter of Neuserre, and his tomb had entrance porticos fronted by square pillars.

Ka-em-tjenent, of Izezi-ankh, of Ptahhetep I, and of Ti all have or resulted of the favor shown by that king to his son-in-law. Nevertheless, Reisner did not probe into the architectural significance of these porticos. 

At Saqqara the tombs of Ni-ankh-khnum and Khnumhotep, of Ptahshepses received this title upon his marriage to Neuserre, and his tomb was probably decorated in the reign of Izezi. The pillars of Ptahshepses are lost, their circular bases survive, and the columns themselves probably resembled the cylindrical columns with square abaci known from the side entrance to the pyramid temple of Sahure, except for the royal titulary inscribed in a vertical column on the latter. Since Rawer's autobiography refers to an incident which took place under Neferefre, his tomb must belong to that reign or soon thereafter.

A short while later, both the original and the final entrance porticos in the tombs of the vizier Phrahathep at Abusi were fronted by lotus-bud columns. Phrahathep became a member of the royal family upon his marriage to a daughter of Neuserre, and his tomb took over a number of features which may have been the "direct result of the favor shown by that king to his son-in-law." Lotus-bud columns in stone first appear in the mastaba of Phrahathep, and it is possible that they emulate in form the papyrus-bud columns utilized throughout Neuserre's pyramid complex.

At Saqqara the tombs of Ni-ankh-khnum and Khnumhotep, of Ka-em-tenment, of Izezi-ankh, of Phrahathep I, and of Ti all have or had entrance porticos fronted by square pillars. The first tomb belongs to the reign of Neuserre or Menkauhor; the others were probably decorated in the reign of Izezi. The pillars of Phrahathep I are denuded, but the other pillars are or were inscribed with the titles and name of the tomb-owner.

At Giza, besides the tomb of Rawer, the mastaba of Senedjemib Inti and the complex of Sesnémono IV were entered through porticos. This was probably true also of the tombs of Senedjemib Mehi and Neferefre in the Senedjemib Complex, even though the paving of the wide and deep recess that precedes the entrance to the tomb in each case has been carried away and no traces of columns or their bases survive. Definitely in the case of Senedjemib Inti, since the round bases of the columns survived in situ (figs. 2, 3), and probably also by analogy in the cases of Mehi and Neferefre, the place of the pillars was taken by cylindrical columns. Circular column bases were also found in situ in the portico of Sesnémono IV, who appears to have been a younger contemporary of Senedjemib Mehi.

No columns or fragments thereof were actually recovered from any of the Giza tombs. Even so, an approximate idea of the nature and size of the columns may be had from the sets of column bases which were found in situ. It should first of all be noted that the surviving column bases from the tombs of Rawer, Senedjemib Inti, and Sesnémono IV have rounded sides, being narrower at the top than at the bottom. For the column bases of Rawer, only the outer diameter of 50 cm is given in the publication. Like Rawer's column bases, the two bases that were set in gypsum mortar and partially concealed by the paving of Inti's portico, are of Tiura limestone (pl. 136, b). They differ slightly in their dimensions. One base is 28 cm high, while the other measures 24 cm in height. The upper and lower diameters of the columns are respectively 64 and 74 cm and 65 and 76 cm. Since Old Kingdom columns did not reach to the very edge of the top of the base, the diameter of the column was therefore probably something less than 60 cm. Sesnémono's columns were larger than Inti's, the outer diameter of the bases at the rim being 2.66 m, while the diameter of the circular marks left on their tops by the columns was 75 cm.

In imitation of a bound cluster of lotus stems and buds; see Borchardt, Nefer-¡r-kar-é, pp. 20–22, figs. 17–18, 21.

No base survives.
It is clear from the circular marks left on the tops of their bases that the columns of Senedjemib IV's portico had plain, round shafts. Inti's bases lack any such markings, while Hassan's report gives no further details regarding the bases in Rawer's portico. Whereas it is possible in theory that lotus bud columns originally supported the roofs of the porticos of Rawer and Inti, as they did in the tomb of Ptahshepses at Abusir, the occurrence of floral columns in the latter tomb is apparently unique. For that reason, it is more likely that Rawer and Inti's portico, by analogy with the Senedjemib IV porticoes, possessed plain circular columns. Old Kingdom columns of this sort were regularly topped by a square block or abacus on which the architrave rested, and this was most likely also the case at Giza. Baraize, following Junker and Balcz, certainly made a similar assumption and set square abacus at the top of the columns in his reconstruction of Senedjemib IV's portico. It was presumably Baraize who likewise provided the circular concrete columns utilized in the modern reconstruction of Senebdjemeb Mehi's portico with square abacs.

At Saqqara, limited evidence survives to attest to the character of the entablature, or horizontal superstructure, that was supported by the pillars or columns at the entrance of the tombs of Ni-ankh-knum and Khnum. By analogy with the Senedjemib IV porticoes, it is more likely that the block derived from the entablature over Inti's porticoes, eventually cracked and one end broken off at an angle (frontispiece D, pl. 10). The restored entablature above the entrance to Mehi's tomb is apparently unique. For that reason, it is more likely that the block derived from the entablature over Inti's porticoes, even though there is no certainty that it could not have come from the tomb of Nekebihe, whose portico opened on the south of Inti's, or have been dragged by stone-robbers across the court from Mehi's mastaba. Since it appears to have been the only such block found by Reisner in the Senedjemeb Complex, it is in all probability this cornice that was utilized by Baraize in his reconstruction of the facade of Mehi's tomb. If it is the same block, it was subsequently cracked and one end broken off at an angle (frontispiece D, pl. 10). The restored entablature above the entrance to Mehi's tomb rests on the side walls directly above the decorated area, and was surmounted by the cavetto-and-torus cornice found by Reisner in front of its portico (at present seemingly utilized in the restoration of the facade of Mehi's tomb), the total height of the facade of Mehi's tomb would have been 12.90 m originally. Once again assuming that there were originally six short registers of marash dwellers in front of Mehi's figure on both side walls of his portico, the height of those walls to the top of the decorated area would have been close to 4.60 m. Adding to this figure the height of the restored entablature as given above, that is, 1.50 m, results in a total height for the facade of c. 5.10 m. The restored heights of the two porticos remained on quite different grounds thus appear to be complementary. The result (fig. 99b) is a much taller portico than Baraize envisioned for Senedjemeb IV (fig. 99a).

For Inti's and Mehi's architraves, see below, pp. 57–58, 113. For Nekebihe's, see BMFA Exp. Ph. A 1709.

Junker, Giza II, p. 119.

Above, pp. 7–8.

Note that the cornice had been moved by Sauerbaum 1860 to the northern part of the court, just in front of Mehi's portico (pl. 44b).

E.g., Reisner, BMFA Exp. Ph. A 1709, fig. 99a; Baraize, figs. 86–87, 91; Hassan, Inscript Ronemp., pp. 24–25, fig. 14.

Junker, Giza II, p. 119, figs. 310, 311.

See, e.g., below, pp. 79, 110, 116.

Above, pp. 94, 107 fig. 2.

Above, p. 114, fig. 94.

52 The Harvard–Boston Expedition found a large section of a cavetto-and-torus cornice lying on the ground in front of the entrance to the tomb of Senedjemeb Inti (pl. 8b, 9a–b). Considering its find spot, it is likely that the block derived from the entablature over Inti's porticoes, even though there is no certainty that it could not have come from the tomb of Nekebihe, whose portico opened on the south of Inti's, or have been dragged by stone-robbers across the court from Mehi's mastaba. Since it appears to have been the only such block found by Reisner in the Senedjemeb Complex, it is in all probability this cornice that was utilized by Baraize in his reconstruction of the facade of Mehi's tomb. If it is the same block, it was subsequently cracked and one end broken off at an angle (frontispiece D, pl. 10). The restored entablature above the entrance to Mehi's tomb totally 1.30 m in height, the height of the cornice itself being 60 cm, while the torus moulding and the plain band below were each 11 cm high and the architrave, as already noted, 48 cm in height. A plain band sometimes intervenes between the moulding and the architrave in contemporary cavetto cornices, but it is absent in others so that the torus roll sits directly on the architrave. The latter is true of the cavetto-and-torus cornice from the portico of Senedjemeb IV. The cornices from the Senedjemeb and Seneshmefeb complexes are both plain and devoid of the customary decoration of cross-lashings and foliate. If the restoration proposed herein of the beginning of Inscription B 1 at the top of the north wall of Inti's portico is correct, then the original height of the side walls of the porticoes of c. 2570 would have been in the neighborhood of 4.70 m. Assuming that the architrave rested on the side walls directly above the decorated area, and was surmounted by the cavetto-and-torus cornice found by Reisner in front of its portico (at present seemingly utilized in the restoration of the facade of Mehi's tomb), the total height of the facade of c. 2570 would have been 6.07 m originally. Once again assuming that there were originally six short registers of marash dwellers in front of Mehi's figure on both side walls of his portico, the height of those walls to the top of the decorated area would have been close to 4.66 m. Adding to this figure the height of the restored entablature as given above, that is, 1.50 m, results in a total height for the facade of c. 5.16 m. The restored heights of the two porticos remained on quite different grounds thus appear to be complementary. The result (fig. 99b) is a much taller portico than Baraize envisioned for Senedjemeb IV (fig. 99a). On the other hand, the portico of the...
visier Pahyopeps's tomb at Abydos originally reached a height of 8.00 m.77

Whereas the lintel and drum of the chapel entrance in Old Kingdom tombs were frequently inscribed, only sporadically were the recessed jambs and door thicknesses decorated with texts and representations, the latter usually restricted to simple representations of the owner with or without subsidiary figures.58 In several of the portico entrances under discussion the walls are demurred below the level of decoration. In the remaining porticos, however, the walls were presumably covered with murals or less extensive relief decoration.

In the earliest of these, the tomb of Rawer in the Central Field at Giza, on each side of the main entrance was eight vertical columns of large incised hieroglyphics colored blue.59 There are no vestiges of figures of Rawer at the bottom of the columns, nor is it definite that sufficient space was available for such. In the tomb of Ptahshepet at Abu Sir, the final portico is evidently denuded below the level of the decoration, and the walls of the original portico were presumably decorated after it was converted to a columned vestibule.60 The portico walls of Pahyopeps I at Saqqara are destroyed to the level of the reliefs.61 The figurative representations in the portico of Ka-em-tenent were seemingly restricted to images of the prince and his seated wife at the bottom of the jambs of the entrance.62 No traces of figural reliefs at all survive in the portico of Prince Izezi-anub.63 Ti's portico is relatively well preserved and all three walls are covered with figures of Ti, his wife, sons, and officials viewing personified estates bringing offerings and scenes of daily life, including animal husbandry, a poultry yard, and fishing.64

At the rear of the porticoes of Senedjemib Inti and Mehi, as in that of Shehmemnep IV,59 the tomb owner was shown in pendant scenes, accompanied by his family and retainers, engaged in sports in the marshes. The leisure time activities of spear-fishing and fowling scenes, accompanied by his family and retainers, engaged in sports in the marshes. The leisure time activities of spear-fishing and fowling are virtually inseparable and are found in combination on the walls of many other tombs,65 but, in these three mastabas, they are arranged as great panels flanking the entrance to the chapel.66 Smith thought that these were the earliest examples of porticoes decorated with marsh hunt scenes, but Harpur67 points out that earlier examples are to be found at Saqqara in a tomb unknown to Smith, that of No-anhk-hnum and Khnumhotep,58 dated by Moura and Ahem-

---

71 See Harpur, Decoration, pp. 4, 5.
72 Harpur, Administration, p. 251, assigns Rashapeshes to the time of Neuserre and Menkauhor,70 and in the tomb of another of Izezi's visiers, Rashapeshes, which belongs to the middle of Izezi's reign.71

In the tomb of Ni-anhk-hnum and Khnumhotep, the side walls of the porticos are occupied by registers of funeral scenes.72 Rashapeshes's portico was thus possibly the first entirely dedicated to marsh pursuits, but only a portion of its decoration survived. The rear (west) wall to the north of the entrance was occupied by a scene of Rashapeshes fowling and below by a register with a herdman driving cattle across a stretch of water.73 Since the activities of spear-fishing and fowling are virtually inseparable, it is likely that the rear wall on the south side of the entrance was occupied by a scene of Rashapeshes spear-fishing, which did not survive.74

Since the decoration of Rashapeshes's portico was only partly preserved, the tomb of Senedjemib Mehi is the first extant example of a portico given over in its entirety to marsh pursuits, bearing as it does spear-fishing and fowling scenes on the rear wall and scenes of the owner viewing the return home of marsh dwellers with the products of their labors on the side walls. It is possible that a similar arrangement was originally intended in the case of Senedjemib Inti's portico but, if so, in the final design Inscriptions B and D replaced the superimposed registers of marsh dwellers, while a small vignette of Inti's sarcophagus being transported by ship from the Tura quarries intruded into the overall decorative scheme.

Although the tombs of Senedjemib Inti and Mehi and that of Shehmemnep IV all bore scenes of fishing and fowling on the rear walls of their porticos, the composition of the scenes on the side walls of the porticos of Mehi and Shehmemnep is especially similar. The side walls of Mehi (pls. 106–107, 110–11; figs. 97, 105) are damaged, and only two blocks, one from each side wall, are preserved in the case of Shehmemnep.75 Nevertheless, the surviving decoration is probably sufficient to show that large figures of the tomb owner viewing the return of the marsh dwellers originally occupied the side walls of both porticos.76 In both porticos likewise, the standing figure of the owner was separated from the registers of marsh dwellers by a vertical band of text containing the caption to the scene, while shorter columns of text above the owner's head contained his name and titles. In addition, registers of marsh dwellers on foot bearing offerings appear to have been alternated in both cases with registers of marsh dwellers in papyrus skiffs bringing marsh products. The portico of

---
Seshemnofer was too denuded to indicate whether, as in Mehi’s case (and Inti’s), two wide registers at the bottom of the side walls were occupied by scenes of cattle and herdsmen in boats fording streams and by homeward bound marsh dwellers.

The resemblance between the two porticos is not altogether fortuitous, for the two tombs were more or less contemporary.

The composition of the file of officials followed by an offering bearer with a yoke over his shoulders on the north wall of room B of Seshemnofer’s chapel may also be compared with the similar file on the north wall of the antechamber in c 2378.

In addition to the yoke bearers, the figure of a scribe holding a scribe palette and papyrus roll occurs in both scenes. What is not certain is whether the similarities between the two sets of scenes was the result of one and the same group of artisans having worked on both tombs or whether the shared motifs represent another instance of scenes copied from one chapel for another person.

Given the thematic unity and balanced design of Sedenjemub Mehi’s and Seshemnofer IV’s porticos, it is surprising that no other known instances of the arrangement survive.

Mehi’s nephew, Nebhepetre Nekhebu, incorporated a spear fishing scene in the decoration on the walls of his portico, but the corresponding fishing scene was evidently relegated to an interior wall of his chapel. The spear fishing scene appeared on the right-hand side wall of Nebhepetre’s portico, while a carrying chair scene occupied the opposite wall. Two registers of priests carrying shrines and men bearing chests on the rear wall to the left of the doorway were balanced by three registers of boats on its right.

Nebhepetre followed the decorative scheme in Inti and Mehi’s porticos only to the extent that he placed his lengthy autobiographical texts on the facade to either side of the portico.

Nebhepetre’s tomb, in fact, was probably among the last to possess a large columned portico with extensive relief decoration. The disappearance of such elaborate porticos may be connected with the general decline in tomb building visible in the Memphite cemeteries after the reign of Pepy II.

Smith observed that the autobiographical inscription on the facade of Sedenjemub Inti’s chapel should be considered in connection with the similar occurrence of the autobiographical inscriptions of Rashepses and Ka-em-tjenent at Saqqara.

Two copies of a letter from king Izezi were inscribed along with the autobiographical inscription on the vertical facades of the tombs of the viziers in the period between Neuserre and early Izezi. His tomb therefore dates to about the same time as c 2375.

Although the portico entrance to the family complex of Seshemnofer IV at Giza does not bear an autobiographical text, such a text was carved on the wall to the north of the entrance recess to his own chapel, even though it was largely destroyed when discovered. Subsequently, autobiographical texts were inscribed on the vertical facades of the tombs of the viziers in the Teti cemetery at North Saqqara.

An earlier prototype for the occurrence of autobiographical inscriptions at tomb entrances is probably to be found in the reign of Neferirkare, in the Saqqara tomb of the vizier Wadéhpáht. On both the jambs and thicknesses of the entrance to his mastaba, Wadéhpáht is represented together with his sons, while over their heads is inscribed a lengthy autobiographical text.

The entrance to the tomb had not always been the traditional location for autobiographical texts, the earlier autobiographies of Mejer, Déhen, and Rawer, for example, being inscribed on interior walls of their tombs.

The area immediately above the spear fishing and fowling scenes in both the tombs of Inti and Mehi (also Seshemnofer IV) is destroyed. In the earlier tomb of Ns-anikh-khnum and Khnumhotep at Saqqara, the panels with these scenes are surmounted by an architrave with a frieze of the tomb owner’s name enclosed in a cartouche.

A representative selection of autobiographical texts is to be seen on the facade of the tomb of Neferseshemptah Sheshi (Pharaoh, pp. 77), and the final section of the autobiographical text inscribed on the facade of the tomb of Hetep-her-akhti also had conventionalized autobiographical texts inscribed on each side of the entrance to his Saqqara tomb (Harpur, p. 77).

In general, these texts are, in general, more conventional than earlier autobiographies and include moral encomium, as well as addresses to passers-by. Nevertheless, Kármán’s texts do incorporate an actual autobiographical section narrating the provenance of his career under Usir and Teti. If the other texts were better preserved, they might also have included a curriculum vitae of the tomb owner. Hetep-her-akhti also had conventionalized autobiographical texts inscribed on each side of the entrance to his Saqqara tomb (Harpur, pp. 77).

In general, these texts are, in general, more conventional than earlier autobiographies and include moral encomium, as well as addresses to passers-by. Nevertheless, Kármán’s texts do incorporate an actual autobiographical section narrating the provenance of his career under Usir and Teti. If the other texts were better preserved, they might also have included a curriculum vitae of the tomb owner. Hetep-her-akhti also had conventionalized autobiographical texts inscribed on each side of the entrance to his Saqqara tomb (Harpur, pp. 77).

In general, these texts are, in general, more conventional than earlier autobiographies and include moral encomium, as well as addresses to passers-by. Nevertheless, Kármán’s texts do incorporate an actual autobiographical section narrating the provenance of his career under Usir and Teti. If the other texts were better preserved, they might also have included a curriculum vitae of the tomb owner. Hetep-her-akhti also had conventionalized autobiographical texts inscribed on each side of the entrance to his Saqqara tomb (Harpur, pp. 77).
two-way orientation of text and with standing figures of the two brothers on either end, while the space above the architrave is occupied by double representations of Ni-ankh-khnum and Khnum-hotep at table, figures of butchers at work, and food offerings.

In Nekheb’s portico, as reconstructed by William Stevenson Smith, a lintel over the entrance was inscribed with an offering formula in a single line of large hieroglyphs between border lines. Over the lintel an architrave extended the entire width of the portico. It too was inscribed with an offering formula, but the hieroglyphs were larger and more elaborate. The architraves, or any other kind of decoration, appeared above the masts seen at the back of the portico of Inti and Mehi (or Sehemesnefer IV). No evidence for such appears to survive at present.

The offering room of g 2370 (Room IV), the mastaba of Senedjemib I, is the first well-dated example of an east–west offering room at Giza. Long east–west offering rooms with a false door occupying the west wall, Reisner’s type (7), first appear in Dynasty 5, in the pyramid temples of Sahupe, Neferirkare, and Nesiwetakht. There was very little time lag before this type of offering room began to make its appearance in private tombs. The earliest example of the new type of offering room may be that of Persen, which dates back at least to the reign of Nefertikare, if not earlier. The new type of offering room is most closely associated with multi-roomed mastaba chapels, however, and a new type of false door with cavetto cornice and torus moulding. Harpur believes that the earliest example of an east–west offering room in a multi-roomed, or complex, chapel might be that of Ahkhemirea at Saqqara, tentatively assigned by her to the reign of Menkauhor, or that of Phahket I dated, as we have already seen, to the reign of Izaa.

Like g 2370, the principle mastabas built on the platform of the Senedjemib Complex (g 2374, 2378, 2381, 2384, 2385), all have long east–west offering rooms. Whereas both g 2370 and g 2384 are type (7c) complex chapels based on a two-roomed nucleus comprising an east–west offering room and a north–south anteroom, g 2374, 2378, and 2384 belong to type (7d), and consist of an east–west offering room with other rooms presenting a modification of type (7c), insofar as they lack the north–south anteroom room. g 2384 was too denuded to determine anything more of its plan with certainty. Two smaller chapels, g 2386a and b, adjacent to the entrance ramp, which probably belonged to Inti’s great-grandsons (?), Impy and Ihebi, consisted of single interconnecting east–west offering rooms equipped with the new type of false door. g 2380 on the platform east of g 2381, south of the sloping ramp leading up to the complex, may also have possessed an east–west chapel, but all that remains of it are the lower part of a false door and a few stones from the north and west walls of the room. Even so, the torus moulding visible at its sides indicates that the false door was likewise of the new type with cavetto cornice.

The majority of the east–west offering rooms in the Senedjemib Complex are entered either from a north–south anteroom by a doorway in the east end of the north wall (g 2388) or from an east–west anteroom by means of a doorway in the east end of the south wall (g 2374, 2378, 2384?, and 2385). Inti’s offering room (g 2376) is distinguished from these others by the placement of the entrance just to the east of the center of the north wall. As a result this wall is divided into two sections of unequal length. Nevertheless, all of these arrangements result in a shorter entrance wall. An exception to the general layout is provided by the interconnecting chapels g 2386a and b.

Harpur has analyzed the program of decoration on the walls of the east–west offering rooms with long north and south walls entered from the north or south in the multiple-roomed chapels of late Dynasty 5 and Dynasty 6 in very concise terms.

The tomb owner sits before an offering table, oriented away from his false door. A pile of food separates his table from approaching bearers, or alternatively, food is arranged along the lower leves so that the subsidiary figures are brought closer to the deceased. Above, and sometimes extending beyond the pile of food, is an offering list, while further right the shorter registers are occupied by food (optional), and priests. From about V.7 onwards the latter perform rites level with the deceased’s head or just above it, depending upon the height allowed for the registers below. Bearers fill the registers level with the food, oriented westward as if they are piling offerings in front of the major figure. One of these processions is often led by the deceased’s son, who offers incense to his father or perhaps strangles a goose or duck as a sacrifice. Below, there is sometimes an extra register filled with bearers relating directly to the false door. In Dynasty 6 these figures are occasionally divided into two groups, the first carrying baunchea and the second strangle grown as they hold them forward as an offering.

Harpur supplements her discussion with a schematic diagram which is reproduced here as Fig. 10.

Harpur makes the additional observation that the east–west offering rooms in the multi-roomed chapels are the only type of offering room that consistently follows the pattern of reliefs in the sanctuaries of royal mortuary temples. Indeed, the north and south wall compositions in the east–west sanctuary of the pyramid temple of Pepy II, the best preserved example, are almost identical to east–west offering room scenes in multi-roomed chapels.
The culmination of the decorative program for the east–west offering rooms with long north and south walls in private chapels is to be seen in the tombs of the queens and viziers of Unis in the Unis pyramid cemetery at Saqqara125 and in the tombs of the high officials of the reigns of Teti and Pepy I located in the Teti pyramid cemetery at Saqqara.126 Earlier stages in the process of development can be traced in a number of east–west offering rooms at Saqqara, for example, those of Persen, Hetep-her-akhti, and Phahhetep I.120 Persen was at Saqqara.119 Earlier stages in the process of development can be traced by further outdoor activities,124 whereas in Persen it is devoted to a banquet scene with the deceased seated before registers of family members, female dancers, and agricultural estates.125 In Netjeruser and Phahhetep I, by comparison, table scenes appear on both the north and south walls. In Phahhetep I only the lowest registers of the north and south walls survive.118 However, the long walls of Netjeruser’s chapel are well preserved and in content conform closely to the program of decoration for the walls of the east–west offering rooms with long north and south walls in the multiple-roomed chapels of late Dynasty 5, as defined by Harpur. On each wall appears a seated figure of the deceased at a table, an offering list, food offerings, priests performing rites, and registers of men bringing offerings.127 The better part of the extra register at the bottom of each wall in Netjeruser is filled with scenes of butchery, but a file of butchers bearing cuts of meat heads the register, the first two figures each of whom wears a full-length tunic, has a rather forward-looking feature. Even though a file of offering bearers largely fills the extra register on the south wall of Persen, a group of butchers is inserted at the very end of the register.128 By contrast, in the extra register on the north wall of Persen,129 and on both long walls in Phahhetep I, a procession of agricultural estates approaches a seated figure of the owner.130 In the latter case, the procession of agricultural estates is led by a son of the owner who serves in the capacity of scribe. Otherwise, in most other respects, the south long wall in Persen, and the northern and southern long walls in Phahhetep I, seem to conform to the common decorative scheme for the long north and south walls of east–west offering rooms in later Dynasty 9.

The extra register at the bottom of both the north and south long walls in g 2370 is occupied by butchers who seem to bring their offerings directly to the offering slab at the foot of the false door (pl. 38, fig. 63). In this regard, at least, the decoration on its long walls is progressive. Still, Harpur notes that in Dynasty 6 the foremost bearers in this extra register were sometimes divided into two groups, the first carrying haunches and the second strangling geese as they held them forward as an offering. This is not the case in g 2370, where these two groups of bearers appear in separate registers. Thus, the first three bearers in the extra register on the south wall carry haunches of meat, while the five figures who strangle geese appear at the head of the procession in the short register above (pl. 38, fig. 63).131 Harpur also observes that, from about the reign of Menkaubor onwards, the priests performing rites occupy a short register on a level with the deceased’s head or just above it. This is already the case in Netjeruser, and in g 2370 the figures of the priests likewise occupy the shorter register to the left or right of the offering list on a level with the head of the seated figure of Ini at table. As in a number of Dynasty 6 offering rooms, the remainder of the wall above the figures of the priests was apparently occupied by an array of food and drink offerings in narrow sub-registers.132 In g 2370 food and drink offerings are also to be seen in the shorter register behind the priests. As is also true of Netjeruser, in g 2370 a vertical column with the caption sipte sipte precedes the foremost offering bearer on the south wall.133 Although the same caption continues to appear in Dynasty 6,134 in east–west chapels at the later period the vertical column containing the caption is frequently replaced135 or supplemented by136 a long horizontal line (or lines) which begins with sipte sipte but extends the width of the register above the heads of the offering bearers. Senedjem Ini’s offering room thus fits quite readily into the developmental sequence for the decorative scheme of chapels of type (7). It is therefore all the more curious that Senedjem Mehi omits the extra register of offering bearers at the bottom of the wall. On the other hand, his draftsman did include the multiple serving tables and jars which occur the beginning of the fourth register in the tomb of his father. In other tombs a limited number of tables
or racks may be placed under the offering table,147 or a table or rack or two may be seen close to the piles of food in the registers before the deceased,148 but such an array is otherwise rare and forms one more link in the decoration of the two tombs.149

Two further refinements affect the extra register at the beginning of the Sixth Dynasty. First, the number of birds presented by the second group of bearers is multiplied, each offering bearer holding up as many as five birds by the neck and wings.144 Second, cages with other birds appear at the feet of the figures who strangle the birds.143 These developments too are evident in the Senedjemib Complex. Even though the offering room of Khnunemti is largely destroyed, a long block which must belong to the extra register on its north wall shows the legs and feet of nine figures (pl. 94b, fig. 91). A cage of five birds rests on the ground in front of the seventh, eighth, and ninth figures. Since part of a cage is also visible behind the ninth figure, and a fragment preserves the central portion of an offering bearer and another cage filled with ducks, there is clear evidence for at least five such figures originally.144

Presumably, the six foremost figures carried haunches. Not infrequently, the number of bearers offering haunches and strangling geese is even, and this may have been the case in G 2374.143

No mention has been made so far of the decoration of the east wall of the long east–west offering rooms. The offering room of Per-nesen possessed no east wall, since it was in the form of a deep niche, open to the corridor.144 The offering room of Hetep-her-akhti is even more possessed no east wall, since it was in the form of a deep niche, open to the corridor.144 The offering room of Hetep-her-akhti is even more, and this may have been the case in G 2374.143

Although the cavetto cornice has disappeared and the torus moulding is largely destroyed, the false door of Senedjemib Inti remains the earliest well-dated Giza example of the new type of false door with cornice and moulding that first appears at Saqqara in the early Fifth Dynasty.150 All the false doors in the Senedjemib Complex for which evidence survives (G 2370, 2374, 2378, 2386–a and b, 2396) were of this new type, including the small, late false door of Wer-ka-bau Iku (G 3238).151 As the cornice and torus were introduced in the Fifth Dynasty, the inscriptions, size, and decoration of the jambs of false doors becomes more regular.152 Strudwick notes that the doors of the high officials of the reign of Izezi and later all exhibit jamb inscriptions of equal length, with a figure of the deceased at the bottom of each.153 This is certainly true of the false doors of Inti, Mehi, and Khnunemti (G 2374), each of which possesses three recessed pairs of jambs.

For the most part, the surviving false doors of the Senedjemib Complex are monolithic in nature (G 2374, 2378, 2386–a and b, 2390). Senedjemib Inti’s false door though differs from these others inasmuch as it is constructed of several distinct blocks. Both Inti and Mehi’s false doors stand on massive blocks of limestone that functioned as offering stones.154 From Lepsius’s drawing, it is clear that a...
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are visible. The offering slab in traces of a loaf-on-mat motif or of rectangular depressions for liquids are visible. The offering slab in c. 2370 is also surmounted by a cor-nice and moulding (pl. 108). In this instance, however, vestiges of a loaf-on-mat design are visible on the upper surface of the block.

In most of the other tombs of the Senedjemib Complex, the false door is set in front of the block around the pavers of the offering room. In the case of Khuenamen (c. 2174), the rear section of the of-fering stone is carved from the same block as the false door itself and projects a few centimeters beyond the side mouldings (pl. 99). The front surface of this projecting element is roughly finished, and another large rectangular block with or without the customary loaf-on-a-mat carved on its upper surface was presumably set against it and plastered into place.

To the right of Inti's false door and offering stone, a large rect-angular offering bench of limestone, measuring 2.06 m in length by 53 cm in width and 44 cm in height, rests against the northern wall of the room. The bench is crowned by a cavetto-and-torus cornice on its southern and eastern sides (pl. 46a). Although not confined to multiple-room chapels based on east-west offering rooms, similar benches form a standard part of the service equipment in Type 7 chapels in a number of important tombs of the very end of the Fifth Dynasty and the early Sixth Dynasty at both Giza and Saqqara. Usually the benches are monolithic but sometimes, as here, the upper part of the bench with the cornice and moulding is cut from a single stone which rests on smaller limestone blocks. A number of the benches are inscribed along the top with the name and titles of all these benches close to the false door and the offering stone, it seems likely that they were intended to serve some purpose in the offering ritual, perhaps they functioned as "sideboards" on which offerings and cult paraphernalia were placed during the periodic funeral ceremonies which were performed in the chapel.

In the northeast corner of the offering room of c. 2370 is a box-like structure built of three limestone slabs, two set upright on either side of a third which rests flat on the floor and has a rectangular de-pression or basin in its center (pl. 104–b, fig. 3). The structure measures 139.5 cm in width by 54 cm in depth and is 75 cm high. It has no top, but a finished limestone slab, measuring 159 cm in length, rests at present alongside the south wall of the room opposite this structure (pl. 105). Reisner makes no mention of this slab in his records and, if it served as a table top for the boxlike structure, it would have projected some 6.5 cm into the opening of the entrance to the room. On the other hand, the projection would not have served as an obstacle to free passage into the offering room, and the rectangular block may well have served that purpose.

A similar installation was discovered in the offering room of the queen's temple of Pyramid III–a at Giza. In the northwestern cor-nor of the room was a complete and unbroken offering table built of seven limestone slabs. The table was partially closed in front by an upright slab and had a horizontal table top as a shelf about midway be-low the tops of the side and back slabs. In the top of the shelf was a small circular depression large enough to take a round-bottomed pottery bowl of medium size. Below the shelf a rectangular stone basin rested on the floor. The front of the circular depression showed signs of wear, as if the bowl had been removed and replaced numerous times. The boxlike structure in c. 2370 may have served a sim-ilar purpose. Perhaps the basin was filled on feast days with water for use in the offering ceremonies or for the ritual purification of the fu-nerary priests, while libation vessels rested on the shelf above. Installations like Inti's are rare in private tombs, but Selim Hassan found an elevated stone basin with a rock-cut shelf projecting from the wall above in the northeastern corner of the rock-cut chapel of Prince Aahkhi-ma-re at Giza.

In the northwest corner of the north–south vestibule of c. 2370 evidence survives for another cult installation, of which three slabs of limestone alone remain in place (pl. 34a). Two slabs are set upright against the west and north walls and a third slab, which rests flat on the floor, placed snugly against them. If another slab is restored on the south side and a horizontal slab set on it, the resultant construct-ion is a table like that in the southeast corner of Room IV, albeit without the basin below. On this reconstructed table the funerary priests may have set cult objects, while they burned incense and made offering before the serdab slots during the regular offering cer-e monies.

The mastabas of Inti and Mehi were constructed of great blocks of grey nummulitic limestone, and the reliefs in the two chapels were
carved in this stone. Only the offering bench and other cult installations in Inti’s mastaba and the offering bench in Mehi’s are of fine white limestone, presumably from the Tura quarries.169 The south walls of Rooms I and II in g 2374 were also the cut-back exterior north wall of g 2370, so the funeral and agricultural scenes of Khnumemi (figs. 83, 88) were similarly carved in nummulitic limestone. The other walls in g 2374, however, were lined with fine Tura limestone, and the false door seemingly cut from a single block of the same stone. The reliefs of the destroyed mastaba of Nekhebu (g 2381) appear to have been entirely carved in fine white limestone. As far as can be ascertained from its denuded remains, g 2385 was likewise built of blocks of the same fine stone. g 2384 is nearly totally destroyed, but a block with an autobiographical inscription which seems to derive from the façade of this mastaba suggests that it too was constructed of Tura limestone.170 The offering bench in its chapel is also cut from a single large block of white limestone. g 2386–a and b, north of the access ramp to the court of the complex, and g 2390 on the south of the ramp, are also badly denuded. The uninscribed monolithic false doors in these three mastabas are of nummulitic limestone, however.

The nummulitic limestone used in the tombs of Inti and Mehi was apparently local stone, cut from one of the quarries along the edges of the main promontory at Giza or on its top.171 The coarse nummulitic limestone at Giza is of two varieties, a softer yellow-drab stone and a harder grey stone.172 As previously mentioned, the stone utilized in g 2370 and 2378 is of the harder grey variety.

Smith says the reliefs of the Senedjemib Complex are the ordinary type of Dynasty 5, the execution being of none too good quality.173 Elsewhere he describes the reliefs as “low with moderately good carving.”174 Actually, the relief is neither as low as the fine low relief of the Dynasty 4 slab-stela175 nor as high as the bold high relief that characterizes Dynasty 6 carving at Saqqara.176 It might be more accurate to describe it as relief of medium height, a type of relief that was developed for carving in nummulitic stone in the first nick-chapel period at Giza towards the end of the reign of Khafre or the beginning of the reign of Mycerinus.177 Nummulitic limestone is full of little fossils, and the dressing of the surfaces was never as smooth as in its white limestone.178 Often the unfinished wall surfaces are rough and pitted, and it was therefore necessary to apply a coating of plaster in order to provide a smooth surface that allowed a considerable degree of finish. In some places the plaster sizing might be quite thick, in others a thinner layer of sizing served to take the paint.179 The quality of nummulitic limestone utilized in the Senedjemib Complex is generally good and allowed better workmanship, so that in most cases a relatively thin layer of sizing was required, with the result that the raised reliefs in the mastabas of the complex are largely carved in the stone with small details cut in the overlying plaster layer. This plaster coating is readily apparent in g 2370 on the south wall of the offering room (Room IV), for instance. In the table scene occupying that wall, details such as the curls of the wigs of the offering bearers and the wing feathers of the bird offerings were carved in the plaster (pl. 38). Where this plaster layer has been abraded or fallen away the details have also disappeared. The loss of the plaster layer probably explains the apparent lack of details in the large seated figure of Inti at the right end of this scene (pl. 44). The stone at this end of the wall was particularly bad and plaster also had to be employed to conceal the numerous flaws and breaks in the wall surface.180 The carving of the bottom of Inti’s handkerchief has, in fact, been continued into a large plaster patch on his lower torso.

In a few cases in g 2370 the stone is very hard, bring highly fissilferous, with innumerable nummulities densely packed, and was extremely difficult to cut with the available copper chisels. Instances are provided by the butchery scene at the bottom of the south wall of the anteroom (Room II) and the crafts scene on the north wall of the same room, where the nummulities interfered with the carving of clear outlines (pls. 35a, 27b).181 Much of the sitting within the figures and hieroglyphs that interrupts their outlines probably results from the dislodging of the little fossils by the chisel, although the relief in the latter location has been exposed to weathering as well. In such cases, the whole wall or certain parts of it were probably originally covered with a thick coating of plaster to provide a smooth surface for the cutting of the relief.182 Where this plaster coating has fallen away in the majority of cases, the reliefs often appear unfinished.

An especially interesting example of the loss of the plaster sizing is provided by the west end of the lowest register on the north wall of the offering room of g 2370, where figures which were once executed in plaster have subsequently disappeared. Indeed, it is only by means of the faint chisel marks left behind that it is possible to tell that figures ever occupied this area of the wall (fig. 61).183 Nummulitic limestone was sporadically utilized at Saqqara, and Margaret Murray in speaking of the Saqqara mastaba of Sekhemka very well observes:

“The stone of the west wall is a nummulitic limestone, full of little fossils which fall out where the stone is worn, leaving a hollow, some of the edges of which are so sharp as to make it difficult to determine whether it is a natural hollow or part of an incised hieroglyph. When two or three little fossils, which are close together, happen to fall out, a ridge is left which is soon worn away by the action of the sand, and thus the surface is defined more quickly than is the case with ordinary limestone.”184

Murray’s words apply only too readily to the relief scenes in the mastabas of Inti and Mehi, especially where they have been exposed to the strong winds which blow across the Giza plateau, picking up sand and delivering it with devastating force against any exposed

---

169 For the use of Tura limestone at Giza, see Cherpion, Monument aux hypothèses, pp. 79–80 (Criterion 60, table on pp. 202–3).
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171 GVN 7, p. 81–82.
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173 HESP, p. 211.
174 Ibid., p. 200.
175 Ibid., p. 199–61.
176 Ibid., p. 200.
177 GVN, pp. 244, 307; HESP, p. 162.
178 Ibid., p. 149.
179 For the sizing technique employed in the reliefs, see GVN, p. 145.
surface. The uppermost surfaces of the important autobiographical inscriptions of Inti and the upper parts of walls in G 2370 have all been subjected to this sand-blasting effect and have suffered severely from it.

It is puzzling as to why officials of Inti and Mehi’s rank and presumed whereabouts would have built mastabas of an inferior local limestone, instead of importing fine quality limestone from the Tura limestone quarries in the Mokattam hills on the east bank just a few kilometers to the south of Giza. Nevertheless, the fact is that the majority of the mastabas built at Giza in Dynasties 5–6 are decorated with inscriptions executed in the local nummulitic limestone. Of course, the Giza cemetery assumed a secondary position after Dynasty 4, and except for the tombs of a few royal children and favored courtiers in front of the Neuserre pyramid at Abusir, the most important burial places of Dynasty 5 and the first half of Dynasty 6 are to be found at North Saqqara. The majority of the tombs built at Giza during this period were the modest tombs of funerary priests attached to local cults, who lacked the patronage and the resources to import Tura limestone, and thus perhaps had to make use of local limestone for their tombs out of necessity. This certainly was not the case with Inti and Mehi. Inti especially appears to have been a favorite of Iziris’s and, as viziers and overseers of royal works, both Inti and Mehi must have had ready access to the quarries of fine limestone at Tura. Except for his cult installations, which are of fine white limestone, the only other element of Inti’s tomb made of Tura stone is his sarcophagus, which was acquired with royal approval at Mehi’s request upon the death of his father. The lack of proximity to the Tura quarries alone does not explain the paucity of fine white limestone in G 2370 and 2378. Although Tura is closer as the crow flies to Saqqara than to Giza, Giza is downstream from Tura, so that the transport of stone by boat to Giza would have been easier than fighting the current to go upstream to Saqqara. Indeed, in the relief showing the transport of Inti’s sarcophagus from the Tura quarries, the cargo vessel is steered with two long rudders, indicating it was sailing downstream (pl. 84g, fig. 23). Perhaps with a ready source of limestone in the immediate vicinity, even though the stone itself was of inferior quality, it was simply thought a matter of diminishing returns to go further afield to the limestone quarries at Tura. Undoubtedly, the final result, after the carved surface was washed with a thin coating of fine plaster and paint, approximated in appearance that of reliefs carved in fine white limestone.

Sunk relief was used sparingly on the walls of the Senedjemib Complex and mostly in locations on the outside of the chapels where it took advantage of the play of light and shadow, for example, in the autobiographical inscriptions on the facade and adjacent portico of Inti’s mastaba (pl. 81f) and on the facade of Nekhebu’s mastaba. Likewise executed in sunk relief was the facade of Khnumeti’s mastaba with its repeated standing figures of the owner and accompanying texts (pl. 84c). Nekhebu’s architect also chose sunk relief for the large hieroglyphs of the architrave over the entrance of the latter’s chapel, even though these were out of the direct sunlight, set as they were at the rear of a deep portico. In sunk relief also were the seated figures of Nekhebu at the bottom of the autobiographical inscriptions and his standing figures on the entrance thicknesses to his chapel. During Dynasty 4 there is evident an increased use of inscriptions in sunk relief until this technique became common for parts of the interior walls of chapels, especially the false doors. This tendency is reflected in the sunk relief inscriptions on the jambs of the false doors of Inti, Mehi, and Khnumetit (pls. 41, 91, 122). The utilization of sunk relief for the offering list of Nekhebu is also in keeping with the general trend.

Due to the loss of the finished surfaces on the decorated walls throughout the Senedjemib Complex, it is difficult to gain an impression today of the original appearance of the mastaba interiors. Traces of red and yellow are still visible at the bottom of Inti’s false door. Otherwise significant vestiges of color survive at only one location in G 2370. At the base of the north end of the west wall in the north–south vestibule, traces indicate the one-time presence of a black dado finished off with a border consisting of a band of yellow, 9 cm high, topped by a red band, also measuring 9 cm. The red band began 10 cm below the bottom of the scenes. Both bands were edged in black. The dado was still partly visible on the north wall of the room in Lepsius’s day and is shown in his drawing (fig. 56), while a section of the border also appears in his drawing of the east wall (fig. 50). Such a dado was traditional at the bottom of walls in Old Kingdom tomb chapels and pyramid temples.

In Lepsius’s day, the walls of the offering room in G 2378 still retained considerable traces of paint. According to Ernst Weidenbach, the partly preserved block border behind Mehi’s figure in the table scene on the north wall of the room (fig. 128) was colored blue, red, green, yellow, and white. Under the representations was a black dado surmounted by red and yellow bands outlined in black, similar to that in Inti’s tomb. In addition, Mehi’s false door was painted a dark red in imitation of quartzite, while the figures, inscriptions, and cross-lashing on the torso moulading were yellow. The whole was framed by a block border consisting of rectangles painted alternately dark red and imitation of quartzite.

186 Due to the loss of the finished surfaces on the decorated walls throughout the Senedjemib Complex, it is difficult to gain an impression today of the original appearance of the mastaba interiors. Traces of red and yellow are still visible at the bottom of Inti’s false door. Otherwise significant vestiges of color survive at only one location in G 2370. At the base of the north end of the west wall in the north–south vestibule, traces indicate the one-time presence of a black dado finished off with a border consisting of a band of yellow, 9 cm high, topped by a red band, also measuring 9 cm. The red band began 10 cm below the bottom of the scenes. Both bands were edged in black. The dado was still partly visible on the north wall of the room in Lepsius’s day and is shown in his drawing (fig. 56), while a section of the border also appears in his drawing of the east wall (fig. 50). Such a dado was traditional at the bottom of walls in Old Kingdom tomb chapels and pyramid temples.

187 In Lepsius’s day, the walls of the offering room in G 2378 still retained considerable traces of paint. According to Ernst Weidenbach, the partly preserved block border behind Mehi’s figure in the table scene on the north wall of the room (fig. 128) was colored blue, red, green, yellow, and white. Under the representations was a black dado surmounted by red and yellow bands outlined in black, similar to that in Inti’s tomb. In addition, Mehi’s false door was painted a dark red in imitation of quartzite, while the figures, inscriptions, and cross-lashing on the torso moulading were yellow. The whole was framed by a block border consisting of rectangles painted alternately
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The burial chamber of Inti was irregular and probably unfinished, and was divided into two parts of unequal length. According to Reinsier, it was not possible to determine whether the intention was to cut a larger chamber or to make a chamber with coffin recess on the west wall. In its present condition, however, the plan resembles in appearance the somewhat later "T" shaped decorated burial chambers of the tombs of a number of Unis and Teti's officials at Saqqara, each of which has a large recess or bay in the western wall of the room to house the sarcophagus. The "T" shaped decoration tomb south of the Senedjemib Complex is anonymous.

The burial chamber of Inti had decorated walls, the entrance thicknesses started at 1.17 m, while the decoration on the entrance thicknesses started at 1.17 m. The reliefs on the sides and rear of the portico were again set higher than on the interior, beginning at 1.35–1.36 m in the case of the former and 1.32 m in the case of the latter.

We have previously remarked on a number of features that the mastaba complex of Seshemnofer IV shares with tombs of the mastaba complex of Seshemnofer IV shares with tombs of the Senedjemib Complex. A few additional features are worthy of notice.

Red, blue, yellow, and green between black framing lines, while the broad area between the torus moulding and the colored border as well as the tall, narrow spaces between the border and the walls on either side were painted red (fig. 126). Although no reference is made by Weidenbach to the background color of the reliefs, presumably it would have been the usual blue-grey. The overall effect must have been very much like that produced by the well-preserved painted reliefs of the offering room of the vizier Mekhu.  

Little evidence survives as to the treatment of the tops of the walls and chapels of the Senedjemib Complex. If the south wall of the offering room in G 2370 is preserved to essentially its full height, as appears to be the case, there would have been no room at the top for the kheker-frize typical of later Old Kingdom tombs. On the other hand, there is no all likelihood sufficient space for the earlier conventional Old Kingdom border pattern of interlaced diagonals in paint, or less likely a border of colored rectangles. The only tomb in the complex that preserves definite evidence of the kheker-frize at the tops of its walls is that of Nechebu (G 2381).  

The base line of the reliefs is not completely uniform throughout the complex. In the chapel of Inti the baseline falls between 1.17 and 1.20 m from the preserved pavement of the floor, except for the boating scene on the east wall of Room II where the base line is set higher, at 1.20 m. The base line of the facades and entrance jambs of the same tomb is lower yet, being located at 0.99 cm for the former and 0.37 cm for the latter. The base line of the facade and entrance jambs of the same tomb is 1.24–1.30 m. The base line is considerably lower on the interior chapel of Khnumet, varying from 0.98–1.11 m. The base line of the facade and entrance jambs of the same tomb is 1.24–1.30 m. The base line is considerably lower on the interior chapel of Khnumet, varying from 0.98–1.11 m. The base line of the facade and entrance jambs of the same tomb is lower yet, being located at 0.99 cm for the former and 0.37 cm for the latter. According to measurements taken by William Stevenson Smith, the base line of the reliefs in Room II of G 2378 was 1.15 m, while the decoration on the entrance thicknesses started at 1.17 m. The reliefs on the sides and rear of the portico were again set higher than on the interior, beginning at 1.35–1.36 m in the case of the former and 1.32 m in the case of the latter.

We have previously remarked on a number of features that the mastaba complex of Seshemnofer IV shares with tombs of the Senedjemib Complex. A few additional features are worthy of notice.

Reinsier thought that the sloping-passage burial places of the Senedjemib Complex were among the earliest sloping-passage type of shafts made in the Western Field at Giza. Three other mastabas located just to the south of the Senedjemib Complex, including that of Inti's Putative son, Kakhepera-Fehek-iti, also had Type 9 sloping-passage shafts. Seshemnofer IV, his wife Herepheres, and his son Tjeti were all likewise buried in sloping-passage shafts. Both Senedjemib Inti and Seshemnofer IV have simple offering lists painted on the walls of their burial chambers. Alongside an offering list on the east wall of the burial chamber of Kakhepera-Fehek-iti is a depiction of the deceased seated before an offering table. Junker saw the appearance of the figure of the deceased in Fehek-iti's burial chamber as an indication of late date. Strudwick, on the other hand, has persuasively argued that the decoration of the one wall in this instance is an example of the progression from the simple list in the burial chamber of Senedjemib Inti to the fully decorated burial chamber of Ka-em-ankh.  

The burial chamber of Inti was irregular and probably unfinished, and was divided into two parts of unequal length. According to Reinsier, it was not possible to determine whether the intention was to cut a larger chamber or to make a chamber with coffin recess on the west wall. In its present condition, however, the plan resembles in appearance the somewhat later "T" shaped decorated burial chambers of the tombs of a number of Unis and Teti's officials at Saqqara, each of which has a large recess or bay in the western wall of the room to house the sarcophagus. The "T" shaped decoration tomb south of the Senedjemib Complex is anonymous.  

Junker, Giza iv, figs. 15, 17.  

Seshemnofer's offering list is reproduced in ibid., fig. 14, pl. 6. For Inti's list, see below, pp. 10–11, pls. 50–51, fig. 7.  
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Raweir was a younger son of his tomb to the reign of Tjeti (Junker, Giza v, p. 25). The sloping-passage tomb south of the Senedjemib Complex is anonymous.  

Junker, Giza v, fig. 1; ibid., fig. 49, pl. 23. Subsequent stages in the evolution of decorated burial chambers may be traced in the Unis, Teti and Titi pyramid cemeteries at Saqqara, see most recently, Bravsink, in Vet El-Kh. 4, pp. 14–19.
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For the burial chamber of Seshemnofer-ankh, see Junker, Giza iv, pp. 43–47, pls. 50–51. One other burial chamber at Giza, that of Raweir III in the Central Field, had decorated walls. The extensive paintings on its east and south walls included human figures (Hassan, Giza, pp. 256–277). Raweir was a younger son of his tomb to the reign of Tjeti (Junker, Giza v, p. 25). The sloping-passage tomb south of the Senedjemib Complex is anonymous.  
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Raweir was a younger son of his tomb to the reign of Tjeti (Junker, Giza v, p. 25). The sloping-passage tomb south of the Senedjemib Complex is anonymous.  
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Junker, Giza ii, figs. 32, 36. For earlier "T" shaped burial chambers, see e.g., Reinsier, Titi Disc., fig. 135 (Medum 172); Verner, Padiophes, fig. 1, idem, Foramen Pediophos, fig. 3, p. 90. A detailed plan of the near contemporary (above, p. 14 and n. 34) "T" shaped burial chamber of Ti at Saqqara appears in Marten, Malzacher, pp. 130–135.
CHAPTER 3: SENEDJEMIB INTI AND HIS FAMILY

The Senedjemib Complex offers an unique opportunity for reconstructing the careers and fortunes of four generations of royal viziers and architects in the time of Kings Izezi to Pepy II, whose reign span one hundred and fifty years of Egyptian history towards the end of the Old Kingdom.

The first member of the Senedjemib family known to us with any certainty, and probably the founder of its fortunes, is Senedjemib Inti, who served as vizier of Egypt under King Djedkare Izezi. Izezi was the penultimate ruler of the Fifth Dynasty, and his long reign of at least twenty-eight years inaugurated a new era in the history of the Old Kingdom.3 Inti received from King Izezi three verbatim letters which were engraved on the walls of his tomb. A damaged date associated with at least twenty-eight years inaugurated a new era in the history of the Old Kingdom.4 In the heading of the letter Inti is addressed as vizier, a circumstance that seems to date his tenure of office to the second half of Izezi’s reign. Strubwick has concluded that the presence of a cartouche of King Unis in the inscription over the head of Inti’s son Meh in the fowling scene on the west wall of the portico of Inti’s tomb,5 implies that the latter died at the earliest at the very end of the reign of Izezi.6 In consequence, he takes Inti to be the latest of Izezi’s viziers.7 That Inti was depicted on the side walls of the portico of his tomb in the very long kilt worn by elderly men in the Old Kingdom may well be an indication that he held the vizierate in his later years,8 and one piece of circumstantial evidence suggests that he indeed departed this life before the end of Izezi’s reign. Upon his father’s death, Inti’s son Senedjemib Mehi asked for and obtained from the king the boon of a limestone sarcophagus for the burial of his father. The cargo ship that transported the sarcophagus from the Tura limestone quarries was named after Izezi (“Izezi is great of strength”)9 and, given the Egyptian sensitivities towards names and what they signified,10 it seems unlikely that it would have continued to bear the name of that sovereign into his successor’s reign.

Inasmuch as he appears to have functioned as vizier in Izezi’s later years, it is uncertain what role, if any, Inti played in the reforms of that king’s reign. Nevertheless, as vizier, Inti was at the apex of the pharaonic bureaucracy. Like other viziers of his time he had authority over the principal administrative departments of the state. As “overseer of the two granaries,” Inti was charged with the granary organization and the management of the grain supply, including its redistribution as wages for living officials and as offerings for deceased officials.11 He also directed the activities of the other great financial department as “overseer of the two treasures.” Presumably in the Old Kingdom as later, the treasury department was concerned with government expenditures and the assessment of taxes from various institutions and individuals.12 Like the granary department, the treasury department provided tomb-offerings for deceased officials, usually in the form of linen and other commodities.13 In addition, as “overseer of the two chambers of the royal regalia,” Inti administered the workshops in which regalia (as well as ointments and salves) for the king’s own use and for the reward of favored officials were produced.14 In his capacity of overseer of all works of the king, Senedjemib Inti undertook a number of building projects for King Izezi. Apparently early on in his years of service to that sovereign, Inti erected a Hathor chapel for the king on the grounds of the palace.15 For this, Inti evidently received royal approbation, being cleansed, anointed, and decorated in the presence of his sovereign.16 The culmination of

3 Barta, “Egyptian Chronology,” pp. 7, 8, while admitting that Izezi celebrated, or at least made preparations for a jubilee, assigns him a bare twenty-eight years and two fractional years, in keeping with the figure in the Turin Canon. According to Barta, pp. 8, 13, Inti was vizier of Egypt under King Djedkare Izezi. Izezi was the penultimate ruler of the Fifth Dynasty, and his long reign of at least twenty-eight years inaugurated a new era in the history of the Old Kingdom.
4 In the heading of the letter Inti is addressed as vizier, a circumstance that seems to date his tenure of office to the second half of Izezi’s reign. Strubwick has concluded that the presence of a cartouche of King Unis in the inscription over the head of Inti’s son Meh in the fowling scene on the west wall of the portico of Inti’s tomb, implies that the latter died at the earliest at the very end of the reign of Izezi. In consequence, he takes Inti to be the latest of Izezi’s viziers. That Inti was depicted on the side walls of the portico of his tomb in the very long kilt worn by elderly men in the Old Kingdom may well be an indication that he held the vizierate in his later years, and one piece of circumstantial evidence suggests that he indeed departed this life before the end of Izezi’s reign. Upon his father’s death, Inti’s son Senedjemib Mehi asked for and obtained from the king the boon of a limestone sarcophagus for the burial of his father. The cargo ship that transported the sarcophagus from the Tura limestone quarries was named after Izezi (“Izezi is great of strength”) and, given the Egyptian sensitivities towards names and what they signified, it seems unlikely that it would have continued to bear the name of that sovereign into his successor’s reign.
5 Inasmuch as he appears to have functioned as vizier in Izezi’s later years, it is uncertain what role, if any, Inti played in the reforms of that king’s reign. Nevertheless, as vizier, Inti was at the apex of the pharaonic bureaucracy. Like other viziers of his time he had authority over the principal administrative departments of the state. As “overseer of the two granaries,” Inti was charged with the granary organization and the management of the grain supply, including its redistribution as wages for living officials and as offerings for deceased officials. He also directed the activities of the other great financial department as “overseer of the two treasures.” Presumably in the Old Kingdom as later, the treasury department was concerned with government expenditures and the assessment of taxes from various institutions and individuals. Like the granary department, the treasury department provided tomb-offerings for deceased officials, usually in the form of linen and other commodities. In addition, as “overseer of the two chambers of the royal regalia,” Inti administered the workshops in which regalia (as well as ointments and salves) for the king’s own use and for the reward of favored officials were produced. In his capacity of overseer of all works of the king, Senedjemib Inti undertook a number of building projects for King Izezi. Apparently early on in his years of service to that sovereign, Inti erected a Hathor chapel for the king on the grounds of the palace. For this, Inti evidently received royal approbation, being cleansed, anointed, and decorated in the presence of his sovereign. The culmination of

6 See below, pp. 38–40.
7 See below, pp. 38–40.
8 See below, pp. 38–40.
9 See below, pp. 38–40.
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29 See below, pp. 38–40.
his career, however, came towards the end of Izezi’s long reign, when Inti laid out and presumably oversaw the construction of the precinct for the jubilee of the king. Two of the three verbatim letters from Izezi referred to above are devoted to the subject of the construction of this precinct and attest to the importance that Izezi assigned to his approaching jubilee. An alabaster vessel in the Louvre records its celebration.30

As previously mentioned, upon Inti’s death, his son Senedjemib Mehi obtained a limestone sarcophagus from King Izezi, for his father, in 2374 B.C.13 The tomb of this precinct is often referred to in the Old Kingdom as “the tomb of Inti, his son Senedjemib Mehi.” The tomb of Senedjemib Mehi was destroyed in 1842.34

Reiser was of the opinion that Inti’s ancestors were probably connected with the official class who enjoyed the income of the old endowments of the Fourth Dynasty and that, like all their class, they must have been buried in the Giza cemetery.33 Such associations would go a long way to explaining why a man of Inti’s prominence was buried at Giza, and not at Saqqara, nearer the pyramid of his lord. Nonetheless, Reiser himself admitted that no tomb of any of the ancestors of the family can definitely be identified at Giza. The name Senedjemib32 is a relatively common one, both prior to31 and after Senedjemib Inti’s time.32 The date of the proprietor of a mastaba uncovered by Mariette at Saqqara (B 13),35 one Behi Senedjemib Inti, is sufficient fluid that he could in theory have been Inti’s father.36 He is “overseer of works,” and this office might conceivably form a link between the two officials. His eldest son was named Izy, however, and no other children are attested, so the connection is tenuous at best. Perhaps the owner of a second Saqqara mastaba (D 28) discovered by Mariette has a better claim to being Inti’s male parent.37 The period is about eight, and even though this Senedjemib has no titles associating him with architecture or public works, he is both ithyphallic, “overseer of the army,” and ithyphallic, “overseer of the king’s chamber.”38 These two titles are rarely attested for viziers, and it may be more than coincidental that Senedjemib Inti has both.39 It is conceivable that he came into possession of both titles as heir and successor of the proprietor of Saqqara tomb D 28. If neither individual was Inti’s father, it is possible that one or both of them should at least be counted among his forebears. Still, there is no hint here as to why Inti elected to be buried at Giza rather than at Saqqara. That King Izezi apparently did not establish an official cemetery around his pyramid at South Saqqara40 may help explain why Inti felt free to be buried elsewhere, but it does not explain his choice of Giza. What is more, neither Inti nor any other members of his family appear to have held a priesthood in the cults of the proprietors of the three Giza pyramids, a circumstance which probably explains their selection, for example, of the necropolis of Giza as his burial place.41

Senedjemib Inti was married to a woman named Tje (f),42 who originally appeared with her husband in the scenes of spear fishing and fishing that flank the entrance to G 2370 (pl. 16, figs. 21, 27). The only title accorded her there and on the thicknesses of the doorway to the pillared hall (figs. 67a, 68a) is “king’s acquaintance.”43 In the last location, she appears together with her husband and the couple’s son Senedjemib Mehi, the proprietor of G 2378.

Senedjemib Inti and Tje refer, in fact, to have had several sons. Three sons, each termed “the son of his body,” were depicted on the bank behind Inti in the marasch scene on the west wall of the anteroom in G 2370 (fig. 42). Unfortunately, the scene is now largely destroyed (pl. 25b–27a; fig. 43). The captions before the figures of the three sons had apparently sustained damage before 1842–44, for Lepsius’s draftsman clearly experienced difficulties in copying them. This was especially so in the case of the uppermost figure whose title and name are, as a result, virtually unreadable. In Lepsius’s plate, the middle figure seemingly represented the “personal scribe of the royal records. Erker.44 It is possible that the uppermost figure also bore the same title. The title of the lower figure is unintelligible, but the name is fairly certain that of Khnumuem, the owner of G 3374.

As it stands, the name of the middle of the three sons, Senedjemib, is rarely— if ever— attested in the Old Kingdom.45 On the other hand, the masculine personal name Fkt fkt, which probably alludes to the cup bearer of the sun-god Re,46 is fairly well known. It is regularly written with the terminal signs g. 6 or with 6 alone34, both of which were, already in the Old Kingdom, variant writings for t, but which could also stand for t at the end of words, especially names.47 There

---

30 Inscription R 1–3, below, pp. 94–95, 96–101.
31 Laouere E. 552, Usf. t. 975, 976.
33 E.g., Mariette, Mastabes, p. 342; Gebe. t. 21, Usf. t. 99, 10–14.
35 JEA, p. 366, 121, t. 2, p. 388. Although Ranke does not say so, Single obliquely means “who oversaw the army.” As a title it means “made glads, places, gardens” (R, p. 4, p. 127, 15; NG 230). Senedjemib was presumably his “great name,” as it was for Senedjemib Mehi, while Inti was his “good name” (below, p. 43). Inti served both as a masculine and feminine patron name in the Old Kingdom (JEA t. 95, 96, 10, p. 54–96).
36 JEA t. 96, 96, 10, p. 55–96.
37 JEA t. 96, 96, 10, p. 55–96.
38 JEA t. 96, 96, 10, p. 55–96.
39 JEA t. 96, 96, 10, p. 55–96.
40 JEA t. 96, 96, 10, p. 55–96.
41 JEA t. 96, 96, 10, p. 55–96.
42 As with its masculine counterpart, the original reading of the title in question was probably originally 7739 instead of “female” custodian of the king’s property,” or the like, whereas 8729 “male” king’s acquaintance,” was probably a secondary interpretation (Sachs, Kommentar zu den Pyramidentexten, p. 219 [PT 875, 1] and Helck, Rekonstruktionen p. 186–188; on this question, see more recently Elke, Quellen der Isis 14, pp. 49–51; Reisner, SAK II, 1935, p. 237, n. 120). The interpretation of the masculine counterpart of the title may somehow be connected with its all but complete disappearance as a title for provincial officials after Dyn. 5 (Fischer, “Dendera Inschriften,” p. 185, 69–70, 71; Bruns, in Melanges Platon, 192, n. 170). For reasons of convenience, we have retained the later interpretation of the title here and throughout, for both the masculine and feminine variants.
43 On the title 276 at 29, 29, at 2370, as well as at 2370, 2370 and 2370. See below, p. 29 and note 97.
44 As a reference in Nandebast, fig. 13, it appears called “Nandebast” but Mousa and Ahmenniker, ibid., p. 244, read the name “Nandebast” (as above, p. 11); see also ibid., p. 11 (16).
45 For the title of the deceased, see 29, 29, 29, above, p. 29, 29, 29. See below, p. 29, 29, 29.
46 See below, p. 29, 29, 29.
is almost certainly after the second in the swamp scene in g 2370 for 0 or even ©, if written horizontally. Hence, there is a good possibility that the name of the middle of the three elder sons was actually Fik-em." "Fetek-ti."23

If this was indeed so, the son's tomb may have been located not far from his father's in the northeast corner of the Cemetery on Echelon.46 g 1560 is a medium-sized, stone built mastaba, whose interior was largely taken up by rooms.47 It belonged to an individual with the "great name" of Kakherptah and the "good name" of Ferek-ti.48 The tomb is dated by Strickwick from early to middle Dynasty 6 and by Harpur between Teti and Merenre.49 This span of time would not be excessive for a son of Inti shown as a man of mature years in his father's mastaba (particularly if he passed away in the earlier part of the period in question), but it should be noted that Kakherptah Ferek-ti does not have the one title assigned to Ferek-ti in g 2370, namely, "personal scribe of royal records," although he is an iym-n a ll-n, "overseer of scribes." Moreover, he possesses none of the titles related to public works that were held by Senedjemib Inti and Mehi or Khnumemi, and seems rather to have been concerned with provincial administration and internal colonization.49 Nevertheless, the mastaba was badly denuded, and it is possible that the missing title appeared elsewhere on its walls. Nothing is known about the parentage of the owner from the surviving reliefs so, in the absence of any clue, it could have been identical with Inti's like-named son.50

A number of features of Kakherptah Ferek-ti's mastaba are suggestive of some connection between him and the Senedjemib Family. The depiction of Kakherptah before an offering table and menu list on the east wall of the burial chamber of g 1560, for example, is reminiscent of the painted menu list on the east wall of Inti's burial chamber.51 Moreover, Kakherptah, like Inti, Khnumemi, Mehi, and their descendants, was buried in a sloping-passage tomb.52 It could be argued that these connecting links were merely temporal, appearing as they do in a number of more or less contemporary tombs at Giza.53 On the other hand, considering the possible identity in names, the tie could well have been one of blood.

As noted above, the name of the son on the topmost groundline behind Inti in the marsh scene on the west wall of the antechamber of g 2370 is unreadable. If this son was indeed al m n y sh-f, the space available for his name would have been appropriate to either Senedjemib or Mehi. On the other hand, if any credibility is given to the component signs of the name as copied by Lepsius, it is unlikely that either alternative originally stood in that space.54 If this was not a depiction of Senedjemih Mehi, consideration should be given to the possibility that Mehi was represented by the small figure facing Inti in the prows of his papyrus skiff, even though any identifying caption, if it once existed, was already lost by 1842–43. In spear fishing and bowing scenes, this position is frequently, though not always, reserved for the eldest son.55 In actual fact though the portrayal on the west wall of Room III presents a rare type of composition in which the tomb owner, perhaps as a preliminary to spearing fish or hunting birds, stands in a skiff watching several harpooners attack a hippopotamus against the background of a papyrus thicket.56 Although direct parallels are few in number, in each of the scenes in question a small figure is likewise depicted at the prow of the boat.57 In the tombs of Ti and Idu, the figures face towards the tomb owner, but they are not captioned and for that reason probably represent attendants. In the tomb of Kagemni, the scene is largely destroyed and only the feet of the figure, which face away from the tomb owner, are visible. In the scene from the tomb of the vizier Rahepes, the small figure at the prow of the boat is identified as the tomb owner's eldest son who, in this instance, faces away from his father. The specific parallels are thus inconclusive and do not help to resolve with any degree of certainty the identity of the figure at the prow of Inti's boat.58 Even if the small figure at the prow of the boat did represent a son of Inti's, there would still be no certainty as to his identity. It may be noted that none of the three sons behind Inti is identified as "eldest son," and this fact might imply that the figure at the prow of the boat was that of Inti's eldest son, that is—considering that he inherited both his father's name and office—Senedjemib Mehi.59 On

23 After the heart-sign, which presumably represented the terminal element in the title of a vizier (e.g., Lepsius saw a low, broad mound, the mound, the half-boat, and another low broad space.

24 See E.g., D. Litt. Texts, pp. 61, 65, Green, PIR A 19 (1925), pp. 511, pl. 12 (no. 10), pl. 12 (no. 40), Grenier-Moreau, Histoire, no. 69, pl. 17; Junker, Giza I, fig. 10; Morewedge, i, pl. 9, Archilocus, p. 193; PM IV, p. 172; Bob-Johnston-Whitcomb, JNES 2, fig. 89. See above, p. 19.


27 D. Litt. Texts, p. 1; Junker, Giza I, fig. 5. For the "great name," see PM IV, p. 166, n. 319.


29 He was also depicted in yellow (Junker, Giza I, fig. 31, Fischer, Denkden, p. 11, n. 47); on this text see below, ZS 55 (1976), pp. 58–59.

30 He was also depicted in red (below) as "overseer of the Memphis nome and overseer of the Memphis nome, as well as in the vizier's house and near Ptah." "overseer of the new town of the great temple (in its beautiful)" (Junker, Giza I, fig. 31, Fischer, Denkden, p. 11, n. 47). On the "new town," see Hans, JNES 32 (1933), p. 155; Max-Nebeke, Prosopographie, p. 816; Kees, Art, p. 166.

31 See above, pp. 80–81.

32 See above, p. 5.

33 See above, p. 12.

34 After the heart-sign, which presumably represented the terminal element in the title of a vizier (e.g., Lepsius saw a low, broad mound, the mound, the half-boat, and another low broad space.

35 See, e.g., D. Litt. Texts, pp. 62–65 (editors), De Morgan, Deltion 1884–1899, pl. 14; ibid. (editors), Petrie, Deltion, pl. 9 (editors), Dubois, pl. 12, Gebel, pl. 5 (editor), (editors), (editors), pl. 7, Seven Chapels, pl. 6 (editors), Junker, Giza I, fig. 4, Mehi, Haap-Haarshubti, pl. 54 (editor), Van der Walle, Nederzettingen pl. 4, Nederzettingen figs. 1 (editor), (editors), Kavaunou, El Helweh 12, fig. 19 (editors). The son on occasion also spear fish or hunt birds or alternately holds a spear harpoon or bowing spear. Occasionally, a non-family member occupies the prow of the boat; see e.g. Men I, pl. 17, pl. 14.


37 D. Litt. Texts, pl. 60; Tom Cosm. 1, pl. 7; Macnattanak, ibid., p. 6–7, T. I, p. 155–157.

38 In the first citation, the vizier Rahepes stands in a skiff looking at the papyrus thicket before him; no harpooners or hippopotamuses are visible in Lepsius's drawing, but is likely that they were originally represented, perhaps being raised by Lepsius's artist because of damage to that area of the wall. All four scenes are close in date to the scene in g 2370; see Harpur, Descriptions, pp. 177–77.

39 On the basis of inscriptions accompanying the minor figures in marsh scenes, Harpur (Description, p. 141) observes that "non-relatives are those whose heads or whole bodies are turned towards the larger figure, whereas known relatives or those near the skiff are either shown facing the deceased or turned away from him." Unfortunately, this observation does not aid us in the present situation.

40 Although Mehi is nowhere specifically identified as "eldest son" on the walls of his father's tomb, in each case where his figure occurs, either the entire caption identifying his figure, or the beginning of the caption, where it would be expected, is destroyed; see figs. 12, 13, 17, 19, 31, 34, 36, 41.
the other hand, the small figure at the boat’s prow is dressed in a short kilt with flaring front panel, whereas the three sons behind Inti, like their father, wear the calf-length kilt which denotes dignity and perhaps also seniority.57 The longer kilts could thus be taken as evidence for supposing that the three sons on the bank were older than the presumed son in the boat. However, the lowermost figure appears to be that of Khunamenti, who is generally acknowledged to be a younger son of Inti, since he succeeded his brother Mehi in the vizierate. Perhaps, at this point, it is best to admit that the destruction of the wall has presented us with too many variables to reach any final conclusion concerning the identity of the figure at the prow of the boat or about the presence or absence of Senedjemib Mehi in the marsh scene. Nevertheless, it would indeed be odd if Mehi was entirely excluded from such a family scene.

Yet another son of Inti and Tytfa, Ni-an3t-mi-n (Nt-nbt-Mrta) by name,58 is twice depicted on the walls of g. 2370, once at the rear of the portico to the north of the entrance (pl. 16, figs. 26, 27) and again on the north wall of the offering room (fig. 64). In the portico, he is one of four senior officials in calf-length skirts who attend Inti on an outing in the marshes.59 In the offering room he brings a goose towards the false face.60 In the first location, he is entitled “lector priest,” while in the latter he is both “lector [priest]” and “inspector of funerary priests.”61 The last title identifies Niankhem as an official of his father’s funerary establishment.62 He does not seem to have left any trace of himself outside of g. 2370.

Of all of Inti’s sons, Senedjemib Mehi occupied the most prominent place in his father’s mastaba. His figure evidently appeared on all four walls of the portico, on both entrance thicknesses, and on either side of the entrance to the pillared hall.63 In addition, he perhaps headed the procession of offering bearers in the lowest register on the south wall of the offering chamber (pls. 38, 41, fig. 61).64 In Inscription C on the facade south of the portico of g. 2370, Mehi says:

Then I begged from my lord that a sarcophagus [be] brought [for him] from Tura to this tomb of his, which I made for him in one year and three months, while he was in the embalming workshop in his exercise which is in (the necropolis of) the pyramid. “Inti is beautiful.”65

From these words it has generally been assumed that Mehi constructed his father’s tomb at Giza, after the latter’s death, while his body was in the process of being embalmed.66 Although Baer was of the opinion the tomb was erected by Mehi after his father’s death, he admitted that fifteen months was an unexpectedly short time in which to construct and decorate so large and elaborate a mastaba.67

64 See below, p. 102.
63; idem, Letters to the Dead, p. 128h.
62 The close-cropped, wigless head and long kilt are often associated with adiposity and perhaps also with age or about the presence or absence of Senedjemib Mehi in the marsh scene.
61 After the New Kingdom, seniority at least was included in the normal progression of a newly appointed official.
60 Strudwick, on the other hand, feels that the mention of the time spent embalming the body was in the process of being embalmed.65 Although Baer was of the opinion that the passage from Inscription C just quoted actually gave the date of the completion of the work on Inti’s mastaba at the first year (of Unis) in the third month of the season of akhet.
69 From these words it has generally been assumed that Mehi constructed his father’s tomb at Giza, after the latter’s death, while his body was in the process of being embalmed. Although Baer was of the opinion the tomb was erected by Mehi after his father’s death, he admitted that fifteen months was an unexpectedly short time in which to construct and decorate so large and elaborate a mastaba.
70 Steindorff, JNES 6 (1947), pp. 133–40; Baer, Rank and Title, p. 186 (1946);
68 Strudwick, in his Deeds, p. 128h (1946), we assume that this is the white limestone sarcophagus now in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo, on which, see below, p. 112. Reisner concludes from this that all the structures made after the introduction of the sarcophagus into the burial-chamber—excluding the construction of the burial passageway and the placing of that passageway, the wad, and the roofing which protected the well, as well as the addition to the platform which enclosed the well—would have to have been made by Mehi.
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Joseph Bonomi was the first to note that the figure of Mehi on the southern entrance thickness of c. 2570 (pl. 39a–b, figs. 34, 35) was a secondary insertion executed by a less skilled hand than that responsible for the rest of the thickness. The figure of Mehi is indeed clearly recut, as was the title in front of his face and the name “Senedjemib” over his head. This entire area is lower than the surrounding surfaces, and the background has not received a final smoothing, but still shows traces of tool marks. The surface of the raised relief figure of the son is also below the level of the surface of the original block. By contrast, the inscription in three columns above Mehi’s head is on a level with that surface and appears original. The recutting is puzzling, because the inscription appears suited to the image, terminating with the expression: “one for whom his son shall do the like.” Thus it seems certain that a figure of a son of Inti stood here originally. But if the figure represented Mehi, why would he have had a figure of himself and the accompanying name cut away and replaced? And if the original figure was not Mehi’s, who could it have represented?

One possibility which must at least be considered is that the figure of an older brother of Mehi’s who predeceased him was originally represented here. Still, if the figure of an older brother of Mehi’s did indeed appear on the south door jamb, it would have been a simple enough matter to replace the brother’s name(s) with his own, but Mehi evidently chose instead to cut the figure away and to replace it with a new one. One possible explanation for the recutting would be that the original figure, whether that of Mehi or an older brother, was dressed in a calf-length kilt, as on the opposite north thickness, and that Mehi wished to have this altered to the short kilt of the final version. Nevertheless, in the Saaqara tomb of Neferirenes, usurped by Ra-em-kai, where an original portrayal of the owner as an older man in a long kilt was reduced to a smaller thickness by a less accomplished hand, and are clearly distinguishable from the original figures and texts (pls. 115, 16, 178). It is likewise true of the figures of Mehi before his parents on either entrance thickness of the pillared hall (pls. 51b, 51a). It seems also to be the case on both the south and north walls of the portico, where a smaller figure was represented in the presence of a large-scale figure of Inti with close-cropped hair, a copious beard, and ankle-length kilt (pls. 131, 18). The smaller figure on the south portico wall is destroyed except for the legs, but the flawless of the relief and the roughly finished area around the legs are a clear indication that the figure had been recut (pl. 65). Although Lepsius saw the legs of the smaller figure on the north wall of the portico, today the legs are destroyed. Nevertheless, a roughly finished area where the figure used to be appears at recutting here as well (pl. 14).

The leftward orientation of the hieroglyphs in the four columns above the smaller figure on the north portico wall and the context of the speech leave little question that the speaker was a son of Inti. The son tells us that he begged favors from the king on behalf of his deceased father. The fourth column of the speech, which contained the titles and presumably the name of the son, is completely recut at a lower level than the preceding three lines, while the hieroglyphs in this column are in raised relief of poor quality, very much in contrast to the well-executed hieroglyphs of the preceding three columns (pls. 16, 64a). Although the name is now lost, the recut titles appear to be those of Mehi, beginning as they probably did with [ḥty-] nefr “net” (fig. 10, text fig. 2). The recutting of the fourth column and the substitution of Mehi’s titles, however, once again raise the possibility that the figure and titles that were cut away could have belonged to an older brother of Mehi. If so, he rather than Mehi would have been responsible for the completion of the decoration of Inti’s mastaba, including the carving of Inscriptions A–D.

Alternatively, it is possible that it was Mehi himself who had his own figure and titles recarved. If Mehi, for instance, was promoted to viceroy subsequent to the initial carving of the portico reliefs, the fourth line of inscription could have been recut to reflect his new dignity. There is certainly ample room for the sequence ḫty-p’t ḫty ḫty ḫty ḫty ḫty in the now destroyed space at the top of the recut fourth column.93 But once again this explanation by itself would not account for the recarved figure.

Before subscribing to either proposition, the possible evidence for the existence of an older brother of Mehi’s should be examined.
Heading the file of offering bearers in the lowest register of the north wall of the offering room in c 2370 were two figures of whom scanty traces alone remain (figs. 64, 65). The figures themselves were destroyed when the plaster in which they were carved fell away, leaving only faint chisel marks behind, but the traces are sufficient to show that both figures probably offered up forelegs of beef, as do the first three figures in the lowest register on the opposite wall (pl. 41; fig. 61). Traces of signs before their faces indicate that the second man almost definitely was a son of Inti and that the first figure may have been as well. In both instances, the names are lost, but traces of their titles survive. The first individual was evidently [mib] ‘qd’ (‘royal master’ ‘builder’ in both houses (Upper and Lower Egypt)), while the second man bore the titles ‘nyny’ zib mry, “chief justice and vizier.” Two sons of Inti, Mehi and Khnumenti, were viziers of Egypt in their time. Now when siblings are represented in series in Old Kingdom reliefs, it is usually the figure of the elder or eldest brother which takes priority. If this rule was adhered to in the present instance, the first figure should represent Mehi and the second figure Khnumenti. On the other hand, it is generally assumed that Khnumenti was the younger of the two brothers, since he appears to have followed Mehi in the vizierate (pl. 78). If then the second figure more likely represented Mehi, could the first figure have been that of an older brother who never achieved the vizierate? It was surely not his lower ranking title which assured the boy vizierial titles. If then the second figure more likely represented Mehi, could the first figure have been that of an older brother who never achieved the vizierate? It was surely not his lower ranking title which assured the foremost place in the procession, so could it have been that alma of birth that preceded him a precedence in order, even though a younger brother had risen higher in the pharaonic hierarchy?

Unfortunately, if this was indeed the figure of an older brother of Mehi’s, we are ignorant of his identity. It is possible, but not certain, that his was the topmost figure represented behind Inti in the swamp scene on the west wall of the vestibule of c 2370 or the smaller figure at the point of Inti’s skiff in the same scene. It seems that Niankh-min, at least, may be excluded as a candidate for the lowermost register on the north wall of the offering room he occurs as the third figure in the procession with a bird in his arms.

If the first figure was indeed that of an older brother of Mehi’s, could his figure have preceded Mehi’s anywhere else on the walls of Inti’s mastaba? In answer, it must be admitted that the recarved reliefs themselves yield no specific evidence as to the presence of earlier representations of an older brother. If his figure preceded Mehi’s anywhere else in c 2370, the deep recarving of the reliefs effectively eradicated any trace of his titles and name.

There may, of course, be an alternative explanation for the precedence of the foremost figure than the one just offered. It might, for instance, be possible to restore the knisha term immediately before his face as an snds nsm, rather than asf, in which case an otherwise unattested brother of Inti’s may have been assigned precedence over Inti’s son. Then again, in long east–west offering rooms like Inti’s, a snds nsm, “inspector of funerary priests,” not infrequently heads the procession of offering bearers in the extra register at the foot of the wall. Faint traces above the foremost figure’s title of [mib] ‘qd’ [nyny] m pryw in c 2370 could conceivably be restored as [sufs] ‘nyny’ [Coptite Nome], alternately then, the foremost figure might represent a brother of Inti’s, an inspector of funerary priests who served as head of a phyle in his funerary cult, or even a brother of the latter who functioned in that capacity.

One piece of evidence that is definitely in favor of Mehi’s having been the individual who had Inscriptions A–D carved is the occurrence of what appears to be his titles and name on a block assigned to the beginning of Inscription C (pl. 67b, fig. 20). The block exhibits no erasures and, if it is correctly placed, and the careful integration of all of the texts and representations on the facade of the tomb and the side walls of the portico taken into account, it would again seem to follow that Mehi arranged for the remainder of the decoration on the portico’s wall to be carved as well.

Proceeding on the assumption that it was Mehi who altered his own figures, it may be that more than a single reason existed for his having done so. For example, in the case of the figures at the prow of Inti’s skiff in the spear fishing and fowling scenes at the back of the portico, it is possible that the figures originally faced toward the prow of the boat, and that their direction was subsequently reversed because Mehi decided to inscribe an address to his father above each of their heads. On the other hand, this explanation would not be suitable in the case of the figures on the two side walls of the portico or on the two thicknesses, where the earlier figures probably already faced Inti. Similarly, if Mehi’s figure on the left (south) entrance thickness was indeed recut to shorten the kil, this was definitely not true of the opposite thickness, where the final version of the figure is dressed in a calf-length kilt.

One other alteration to the reliefs on the north side of the portico affected the personal names terminating the columns of inscription above the head of the elderly vizier, where it is clear that both Inti’s “great” and “good” names are not original (pls. 18, 64a). Again it is not certain what necessitated the recutting. It may be that Inti here was originally identified only as “Senedjemib.” This is actually the case with the architrave (pl. 12)) and again on the west wall of the vestibule (pl. 31), where the name “Senedjemib” alone appears, and where it may reasonably be presumed to be original. Probably during the early part of Inti’s life, this served as a perfectly adequate designation for the elder Senedjemib. In his later years though, during Mehi’s professional lifetime, when there were two Senedjemibs, this perhaps was felt to no longer suffice. This would have been especially true in the context of the Senedjemib Complex, where there were at least two tombs belonging to individuals named Senedjemib opening on the stone paved court. As a result, Mehi may have ordered the alterations to be made, and had the “good name” Inti added to
the “great name” Senedjemib on the north wall, if not on all the walls, of the portico. This followed the practice in Mehi’s own tomb, where the “great name,” Senedjemib, and the “good name,” Mehi, were regularly coupled.98 There being insufficient space over Inti’s head for two lines of hieroglyphs on the scale of the inscription above, the two names were consequently recarved on a smaller scale.

If Mehi indeed recarved his father’s names on the north wall of the portico, this might imply that the raised relief decoration on the north wall, and by extension the other walls of the portico, was part of the original decoration of the tomb of Inti. What then is to be made of the seemingly careful integration of these scenes and the autobiographical inscriptions? The simplest explanation, and the one that seems best in accord with the observations previously made, is that Inti himself had the raised relief scenes on all four walls of the portico carved. At his death the facade of the mastaba on either side of the portico and the immediately adjacent side walls remained blank. Here Mehi had carved the account of Inti’s award ceremony and the three letters from King Izezi (Inscriptions A–B) as well as his own dedicatory inscriptions (Inscription C–D). At the same time, and for a variety of reasons, he had his own representations recarved throughout the mastaba and his father’s name recarved on the north portico wall and perhaps elsewhere in the portico as well. Since the areas where they were carved were previously blank, the sunken hieroglyphs of Inscriptions B and D were actually cut on the same level as the original raised reliefs on the north and south portico walls, thus contributing to a harmonious whole.

In the text inscribed on the southern facade of g 2370 quoted above, Mehi states that while his father’s tomb was being prepared for his burial, his body rested in the embalming workshop in his estate which is in (the necropolis) of the pyramid “Izezi is beautiful.” There is some evidence that the mummiﬁcation of private persons in the Old Kingdom took place in workshops attached to their tombs.99 However, Inti’s embalming workshop (wetr nut fiout) is speciﬁcally said to be located in (the necropolis of) Izezi’s pyramid (n Npt–Izezi). The statement is perplexing, since, as far as we know, there was no contemporary necropolis in the vicinity of Izezi’s pyramid.100 It is possible, of course, that Inti’s embalming workshop was located in the cemetery established for Izezi’s contemporaries to the north and west of the Step Pyramid at Saqqara.101 In this connection, it may be noted that the tomb of the vizier Wadjetpa fiyi, situated north of the Step Pyramid, is speciﬁcally said in his autobiography to be in (the necropolis of) the pyramid of Sahuire (n Hpt–Is–Sahuir), whereas the latter’s pyramid was located at Abusi.102 The existence of an embalming workshop for Inti in the necropolis of Izezi’s pyramid, wherever precisely that might be, could be taken as an indication that Inti also had a tomb in the same place. Moreover, if Inti possessed an earlier tomb elsewhere, this might be interpreted as evidence that Mehi indeed constructed his father’s Giza tomb from the beginning, upon the latter’s death. Nevertheless, Inscription C does not speciﬁcally say that Inti had a tomb (nzi) in the necropolis of Izezi’s pyramid, but only states that his embalming workshop was located there, and it may be that he simply possessed an assigned plot therein and authorization from the king to build a tomb. This would have been a convenient place to erect a temporary embalming workshop, away from the hustle and bustle in the courtyard of Inti’s Giza tomb, where the sculptors would have been hard at work ﬁnishing its decoration.

Neither Inti’s nor Mehi’s tomb sheds light on the precise period of time that elapsed between the death of the former and the accession of the latter to the vizariate. In the two places within the portico of g 2370 where Mehi’s titulary survives, namely in the bowing scene at the rear of the portico and on its north wall, the vizerial titles do not appear, even though there is space for them in the lacunae before the extant titles. On the other hand, on the loose block assigned to the beginning of Inscription C, Mehi is intyw fi ni btr ntw nzt, not ntyy sib btr, and it thus seems likely he was not yet vizier at the time of his father’s death or during the intervening ﬁfteen months while the work on his father’s tomb was underway.103 Furthermore, although the similarities between the two tombs104 suggest that they were designed by one architect (Reiwer assumed Mehi himself was that individual105), and perhaps carved by the same group of sculptors at no great remove in time from each other, they reveal nothing deﬁnite about whether work was progressing simultaneously on both tombs or whether a period of time intervened before Mehi began the construction of his own tomb.

The uppermost stones of virtually all the walls in Mehi’s mastaba had been removed before Lepsius arrived on site to copy its reliefs. Along with them disappeared most of the title sequences that (presumably once appeared at the top of the walls. The architrave blocks of Mehi’s mastaba survive, however, and on them Mehi is “overseer of all works of the king,” not vizier (pl. 101a–c). Only on the false door do the vizierial titles appear (pl. 122; ﬁgs. 167–237). Thus, if the architrave inscription provides a reliable indication, Mehi appears to have been promoted to vizier in the course of the construction or decoration of g 2378.106 Moreover, the fact that Mehi is “honor[ed] by the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Unis” in the architrave inscription, probably indicates that he was not yet vizier at the beginning(? of that king’s reign. Bae and Harpur date the construction of Mehi’s tomb to the reign of Unis,107 while Strudwick assigns his tenure as vizier to the middle of Unis’s long reign of thirty years,108 with Akhetetep and Akhetetep Hemi intervening between Mehi and his father.109 To
some extent Strudwick’s date was based on the assumption that Mehi may have placed his name over that of an older brother in the tomb of his father.103 While it seems possible from the above discussion that Mehi had an older brother, this possibility alone, as we have previously seen, does not constitute definite evidence as to whether Mehi usurped the images of this older brother on the walls of his father’s mastaba or simply recarved his own figures. Nor does it really matter in the present context, for in either case we would still have no accurate means of estimating the period of time that elapsed between the initial carving and the recarving.

Mention has already been made of the badly damaged inscription over the head of the figure of Mehi in the bowling scene at the back of the portico of G 2370. A possible restoration of the inscription is: [I. n. (u.) f. men] m nes Ws. “It was” out of the largeess of Unis (that I did this for him).104 Due to the broken context, the nature of Unis’s largesse is not apparent, especially since the gift of a sarcophagus, the establishment of Inti’s tomb endowment, and the provision of landed estates that are reported in the gravely damaged Inscription C most likely took place at the end of Unis’s reign.105

On his false door Mehi (Mh)106 calls himself “one honored by Izezi, whom the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Unis remembered on account of li.”107 The second epithet is quite out of the ordinary, and the juxtaposition seems to suggest that Unis took account of Mehi’s achievements under his predecessor Izezi. One possibility is that Unis “remembered” Mehi by appointing him to the vizierate. This interpretation gains support, albeit somewhat tenuous, from a passage in the autobiography of Sannu I at Awan, who says: [I. h. t. m. t. n. u. (u.) n. s. n. n. t. (d.)]. “Now when I was appointed [ ... ], (when) what I had done was remembered by my lord.”108

Probably still during his father’s lifetime Mehi was married to the “king’s daughter of his body” Khentkaus (Hnt-kw.111.112). Unless the name is identical with the “king’s eldest daughter of his body, Khentkaus, whose tomb was found by Zahi Saad to the west of Unis’s pyramid at Saqqara,”113 she is not known from other sources. The vizier Mereruka and the high priest of Ptah, Ptahshepses, were both married to kings’ eldest daughters;114 but in both these instances the seminility of birth is clearly stated, and the lack of the qualifying word in the case of Mehi’s wife probably renders her identification with the other Khentkaus unlikely.

On the west wall of the anteroom (Room II) of G 2378, Mehi and Khentkaus appear in a family group together with two sons and a daughter (pl. 113; figs. 214, 215).115 Two sons were named after Mehi; the “eldest son,” who is shown as an adult, was called Senedjemib, and the younger son, who is depicted as a naked child with the sidelock of youth, was called Mehi. Similarly, the daughter was named Khentkaus after her mother. Although dressed like an adult, she was perhaps a third child, since her figure is even smaller than that of her brother Mehi’s.

In the family group, the elder son, Senedjemib, bears the titles “royal chamberlain in both houses (Upper and Lower Egypt) and royal master builder,” while elsewhere on the walls of the king’s tomb, he is “royal chamberlain and royal master builder in both houses.”116 He may have been the owner of G 2384, on the south side of the great court, for two reasons. First, G 2384 appears to have been the next major construction in the complex built after G 2374, the tomb of Mehi’s younger brother, Khnumenti.117 Hence sequentially it would be appropriate as the burial place of a member of the third generation of the Senedjemib family. The second piece of evidence consists of a loose stone with a fragmentary autobiographical inscription that may derive from the facade of G 2384, since it appears by its character to fit nowhere else in the complex.118 The context is mostly lost, but the text evidently related to the building of the speaker’s tomb. That individual was apparently named Senedjemib, although only the end of the name survives ([Sndjmn]-i.119 The last line refers to the brother of the owner, who is entitled “royal chamberlain, royal master builder in both houses.”120 On the other hand, twice as many of the names of Khnumenti’s estates are compounded with the royal name Ten than with the name Unis, and Khnumenti’s other associations are with the latter sovereign. For example, a loose stone found in the offering room of G 2374 (pl. 96a; fig. 89c), which is inscribed with the vizierial titles, also indicates that Khnumenti held the highest available grade in the priestly hierarchy at Teti’s pyramid, that of “inspector of priests,” a title which becomes a regular prerogative of the vizier from the reign of Teti.121 Strudwick also remarks that considering his relationship to other members of his family and probable age, it is unlikely that Khnumenti lived long into the reign of Teti. Reisner, on the other hand, thought that Khnumenti was buried late in the reign of Teti or soon thereafter.122 The burial shaft of G 2384, which Reisner assigned to the mastaba, actually contained a small diorite bowl inscribed for King Teti

103 Ibid., pp. 154-55 (information provided by the present writer).
104 See above, pp. 35-34.
105 See above, pp. 35-34.
106 PV I, p. 165, 151, 2, p. 63. In the case of the last citation, Rankin is incorrect in regarding Mehi as the “good name” of a certain Prkh-nb-ntr. Mehi here refers to Senedjemib Mehi, of whose funerary establishment Prkh-nb-ntr was a member; see Brunnink, in E. Meister, G 2378, p. 95.
107 This interpretation gains support, albeit somewhat tenuous, from a passage in the autobiography of Sannu I at Awan, who says: [I. h. t. m. t. n. u. (u.) n. s. n. n. t. (d.)]. “Now when I was appointed [ ... ], (when) what I had done was remembered by my lord.”108
108 Probably still during his father’s lifetime Mehi was married to the “king’s daughter of his body” Khentkaus (Hnt-kw.i.111.112). Unless the name is identical with the “king’s eldest daughter of his body, Khentkaus, whose tomb was found by Zahi Saad to the west of Unis’s pyramid at Saqqara,”113 she is not known from other sources. The vizier Mereruka and the high priest of Ptah, Ptahshepses, were both married to kings’ eldest daughters;114 but in both these instances the seminility of birth is clearly stated, and the lack of the qualifying word in the case of Mehi’s wife probably renders her identification with the other Khentkaus unlikely.
109 On the west wall of the anteroom (Room II) of G 2378, Mehi and Khentkaus appear in a family group together with two sons and a daughter (pl. 113; figs. 214, 215).115 Two sons were named after Mehi; the “eldest son,” who is shown as an adult, was called Senedjemib, and the younger son, who is depicted as a naked child with the sidelock of youth, was called Mehi. Similarly, the daughter was named Khentkaus after her mother. Although dressed like an adult, she was perhaps a third child, since her figure is even smaller than that of her brother Mehi’s.

In the family group, the elder son, Senedjemib, bears the titles “royal chamberlain in both houses (Upper and Lower Egypt) and royal master builder,” while elsewhere on the walls of the king’s tomb, he is “royal chamberlain and royal master builder in both houses.”116 He may have been the owner of G 2384, on the south side of the great court, for two reasons. First, G 2384 appears to have been the next major construction in the complex built after G 2374, the tomb of Mehi’s younger brother, Khnumenti.117 Hence sequentially it would be appropriate as the burial place of a member of the third generation of the Senedjemib family. The second piece of evidence consists of a loose stone with a fragmentary autobiographical inscription that may derive from the facade of G 2384, since it appears by its character to fit nowhere else in the complex.118 The context is mostly lost, but the text evidently related to the building of the speaker’s tomb. That individual was apparently named Senedjemib, although only the end of the name survives ([Sndjmn]-i.119 The last line refers to the brother of the owner, who is entitled “royal chamberlain, royal master builder in both houses.”120 On the other hand, twice as many of the names of Khnumenti’s estates are compounded with the royal name Ten than with the name Unis, and Khnumenti’s other associations are with the latter sovereign. For example, a loose stone found in the offering room of G 2374 (pl. 96a; fig. 89c), which is inscribed with the vizierial titles, also indicates that Khnumenti held the highest available grade in the priestly hierarchy at Teti’s pyramid, that of “inspector of priests,” a title which becomes a regular prerogative of the vizier from the reign of Teti.121 Strudwick also remarks that considering his relationship to other members of his family and probable age, it is unlikely that Khnumenti lived long into the reign of Teti. Reisner, on the other hand, thought that Khnumenti was buried late in the reign of Teti or soon thereafter.122 The burial shaft of G 2384, which Reisner assigned to the mastaba, actually contained a small diorite bowl inscribed for King Teti
It is possible that other occurrences of the name postdate Inti’s son Khnumenti, and that the name became popular as a result of his tenure as vizier.112 Two bearers of the name, in fact, are sons of funerary priests of the Senedjemib family, who were in the habit of naming their children after their patrons.113 Late in Dynasty 6 it also serves as the by-name of a certain Ḫenmut.114

Khnumenti’s wife is not depicted in the surviving reliefs of his chapel and her name is therefore unknown. None the less, it is likely that the couple had at least one child, since part of what appears to be the figure of a young child holding a bird is preserved in front of Khnumenti in the elaborate palanquin scene in the first room of his chapel (fig. 86).115 The hieroglyph Ḫb before the figure may have belonged to his name. A photograph taken in 1930 (pl. 93) shows additional traces, including what may be part of the letter x between the Ḫb-signs. The two letters could belong to a name of the pattern Ḫb–ḫt, a substantive + royal name/divine name, that is, a personal name beginning Nḫb–ḥt, perhaps, ‘Life belongs to …’.116 In the space immediately above the name are visible clear traces of the jackal-sign, presumably representing the title tḥḥ, ‘dignitary,’ followed by what appears to be the butcher block. If the latter sign does not belong to the name Ḫb–ḥt, ‘lector priest,’ it might conceivably form part of the personal name, which would then read Nḫb–ḥt-tḥḥ, ‘Life belongs to Kherty.’ However, the god Kherty is little attested in Old Kingdom personal names,117 although he does occur somewhat more regularly in estate names of the same period.118 If, conversely, Ḫb–ḥt ‘life’ is to be restored, the available space between the butcher block and the ripple of water only allows for a low broad or narrow sign. Options would include the Ḫmt-sign or the emblem of the god Min.119

Unfortunately, Nekhebu’s parents are not named on any of the blocks from his chapel, and his precise relationship to the Senedjemib family is unknown. Given the nature of the traces before the small child depicted in front of Khnumenti in the palanquin scene, it is unlikely that they represent Nekhebu’s court name, Mer-ḥt–nhḥrty. Nevertheless, the very fact that he was proprietor of a major tomb in what is definitely a family complex, as well as the fact that his titles are connected with public works, makes some relationship very likely.120 Smith speculated that Nekhebu was the son of Senedjemib Inti,121 but Reisner evidently believed him to be a son of Khnumenti.122 Since Nekhebu appears to have been a young man at the beginning of the reign of Pepy I, as will be seen shortly, the time differential makes it more likely that he was a son of Khnumenti.123
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Considering the extensive damage to Khnumenti’s reliefs, it is possible that Nehedu was originally represented elsewhere on the walls of g 2374.

Like Khnumenti, the name Nehedu (Nkhb) is an uncommon one. As a substantive nkbh appears to mean “lamp” or “nocturnal illumination,” and this term may well explain the origin of Nehedu’s name. Alternatively, he may have been named after Nehedu (Nkh), an obscure deity known from the Coffin Texts, without doubt the masculine counterpart of the divinity Nekhbet (Nkhb), “Fruitfulness.” Both the noun and divine names are written with the brazer determinative.

According to his autobiography, Nehedu advanced step by step to positions of increased responsibility and power in the reign of Merenptah Pepy I, a circumstance reflected in his court name Mer-pek-tah-meryre (Mr-Pt-h-b-MryrI). Nehedu relates that Pepy I found him as a “common builder” (qdw w nbt), but conferred on him, in turn, the offices of “inspector of builders” (shp w qdw), “overseer of builders” (nmy-n w qdw), and “superintendent of a phyle (of workmen)” (mny w n bt). Next he became “royal master builder” (mwt pd nswt), and then was promoted to be “royal chamberlain and royal master builder.” Finally, he was made “sole friend and royal master builder in both houses (Upper and Lower Egypt).” Previous to this, Nehedu had served as apprentice to an older brother, as the latter rose through the same series of grades. At the start of his brother’s career, Nehedu evidently functioned as his personal scribe or secretary. When the latter was appointed inspector of builders, he carried his measuring rod (mwt). When he was appointed “overseer of builders,” Nehedu served as his right hand man (mrfr f. lit. “his there”), which he became “royal master builder” and then “sole friend and royal master builder in both houses,” Nehedu took the estate of his father or of his brother and substantially increased his holdings. Finally, when the brother became “overseer of works,” Nehedu served as his deputy. Nehedu says he served under his brother in these various capacities for twenty years.

The professional offices held by the brothers in order of progressive importance, and also in order of their acquisition, are as follows:

Nehedu Brother

1. Common Builder
2. Inspector of Builders
3. Overseer of Builders

4. Superintendent of a Guild
5. Superintendant of a Phyle
6. Royal Master Builder in Both Houses
7. Overseer of all Works of the King

As Dows Dunham very well observed in his study of the inscriptions of Nehedu in Boston and Cairo: “These records not only give us an indication of the relative grades of the various professional offices, but also tend to show that they were not, at this time, acquired purely by inheritance, but were, in part at least, the rewards of training and experience.”

It is unfortunate that the name of the brother in Nehedu’s account is lost (or was never given). A brother named Mer-pek-tah-meryre-pekty (Mr-Pt-h-b-Pepy) with the title of “senior lector priest” does appear on a block from g 2381 that preserves part of a procession of animals, but in a position subordinate to Nehedu, so it is unlikely he is the older brother referred to in the inscription. Nehedu’s older brother was clearly an important official who had attained the position of “overseer of works.” On that account, he may have been the owner of g 2381, one of the largest chapels in the Senedjemib Complex, but of which only the lowest, undocumented courses of stone remained.

Nehedu’s wife, Hatkaru (Hkt-kbr), was depicted at least twice in g 2381, once in the context of a family scene and a second time playing the harp before her husband beneath an awning at the stern of a ship. In the last place, she is given the title “king’s acquaintance.” Hatkaru bore at least two and probably three sons to Nehedu. Two sons accompany their father in a scene on the right-hand wall of the portico of g 2381 that shows Nehedu engaged in spearing fish. In front of Nehedu in his papyrus skiff stands a smaller figure, likewise shown spearing fish. An incomplete inscription before him gave his titles and name: “His son whom he loves, the scribe and royal [master -builders], [Tj-]…” can be made out. The name is damaged, but is probably to be restored on the basis of this son’s appearance in the family scene, where he is again the “royal master [builders],” but where the name appears to be Tjemet (TI-em-em). The other son, who stands behind Nehedu on a separate groundline, is “his son whom he loves, the lector priest and scribe of the house of the god’s book, Saba-pa’tal.” In front of Nehedu and facing him stands a third male figure, holding an extra fish spear,
and identified as: “His brother, whom he loves, the lector priest, the honored [ . . . ]” The latter is most likely identical with Nekhebu’s younger (?) brother Mer-prah-an-kh-py who appears on the block with the animal procession referred to above, albeit with the higher ranking title there of “senior lector priest.”

The autobiography of Nekhebu contains an account of three missions that he undertook on behalf of his sovereign, King Pepy I. The first consisted of work on the 4a-chapels of the king in Lower Egypt from Akhbit near Buto south to Memphis, and included the construction of the king’s own pyramid temple. The second mission was concerned with the digging of a canal at Qas. Three inscriptions in the Wadi Hammamat commemorate yet another project Nekhebu undertook on the behalf of his sovereign, this one specifically dated to the latter part of Pepy I’s long reign of at least twenty-five years. The expedition to the quarries of baben-stone took place in the year 19, on the occasion of or in preparation for the sed-festival of the king. In each of the three inscriptions, it is the court name alone of Nekhebu that is utilized, but there can be little doubt that he was the “overseer of all works of the king, sole friend, royal master builder in both houses, Mer-prah-an-kh-meryre.” Nekhebu took with him to the Wadi Hammamat his grown son Mer-prah-an-kh-meryre, in whose inscription is entitled “lector priest,” and in another “senior lector priest.”

Along the eastern edge of the Senedjemib Complex, opposite the mastaba of Nekhebu, but on a lower level, Reisner discovered an intact sloping-passage tomb, c 2381 a. In the chamber at the bottom of the inclined passage an inscribed wooden coffin containing a badly mummified body was found. At first glance, the coffin, which is now in Boston, appears to be inscribed for two people, Mer-prah-an-kh-meryre Praphshepses Impy and Sabu-pah-ibhi. The presence of the two sets of names has caused some confusion, but this can be resolved by a close examination of the coffin. The coffin has on the lid two identical offering formulas, the first terminating in the title and names of Mer-prah-an-kh-meryre Praphshepses Impy (Pih-pa Impy) and the second ending with the titulary and names of Sabu-Pah-Ibhi (Saw-pah-Ibhi). The exterior east side similarly bears two identical offering formulas, the top one for the benefit of Impy, the lower one benefiting Ibhi. The exterior west side has two additional identical formulas, the top line ending with the titles and names of Impy and the lower one with those of Ibhi. The short double line of inscription on the north end is hardly legible, but probably terminated with the same two names. The south end of the coffin was destroyed. The situation is different in the interior, however. The inscriptions along the interior rim on all four sides of the coffin are for the benefit of Impy alone. On the west side a single line of offering formula ends with the titles and names of Mer-prah-an-kh-meryre Praphshepses Impy. On the north end is a single line of inscription with an offering formula again naming Impy as beneficiary, and beneath that the jars containing the seven sacred oils. On the east side a pair of wedjet-eyes is set above a schematic false door. The offering formula in a single line at the top of this side terminates in the name Mer-prah-an-kh-py Praphshepses Impy. The substitution of Pepy for Meryre in this instance is noteworthy. In Impy’s case, it occurs only here, but the exchange of royal prenomen and nomen in biaulophoric names is a fairly common phenomenon. Immediately to the left of the false door is an ichorographic offering list, whose signs are arranged in a vertical block, requesting “a thousand hares of bread, a thousand jars of beer,” and so forth for “the court Mer-prah-an-kh-meryre, whose good name is Praphshepses Impy.” Squeezed between this and the lengthy compartment offering list to the right is a column of much smaller hieroglyphs, apparently added as an afterthought, assuring the same offerings for Sabu-pah-Ibhi. The nature of the inscriptions on the wooden coffin proved to Reisner that the burial was that of Impy, and there can be little doubt that he was right in the assumption, even though the alabaster headrest found in the coffin itself, and which supported the head of the mummy, was inscribed for Ibhi. Drawing attention to the plan between c 2381 a and sloping passage tomb c 2381 b, close-by c 2381 a but on the other side of the drainage channel leading away from the northwest corner of the enclosure of the Great Pyramid, Reisner concluded that Ibhi was buried in c 2381 c. The extraordinary juxtaposition of names on one and the same coffin can perhaps be explained if we assume that, on the death of his brother, Ibhi oversaw the preparations for Impy’s interment and had his own titles and names added to the coffin in commemoration. The identical nature of the two letters is characteristic of a and b and the fact that the two intercommunicated suggests that they belonged to the same family of Paph shepses Impy (Pihippa Impy) and the younger (?) brother Mer-prah-an-kh-py who appears on the block with the animal procession referred to above, albeit with the higher ranking title there of “senior lector priest.”
two brothers, and also attest to the close relationship between them.178 The only comparable display of filial devotion known to me is the case of the two brothers, Ni-ankh-khemun and Khnumhotep, who were buried together in a single Saqqara tomb.179 Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre Prashhapes Impy and Sabu-ptah Ibebi of the coffin are generally taken to be sons of Nekhebu.180 On the coffin both are designated “count, overseer of all works of the king, royal master builder in both houses, overseer of the two workshops.” On the interior north end, Impy is, in addition, “serv-priest, controler of every kind, chief lector priest, and inscriber” while Sabu-ptah Ibebi is “sole friend and lector priest” in the second line on the lid. The title of “lector priest” is also assigned Nekhebu’s son Sabu-ptah in the spear fishing scene from c. 2388, and the identity of the two therefore seems likely. Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre Prashhapes Impy, on the other hand, appears nowhere in the surviving reliefs from the mastaba of Nekhebu. By itself this does not constitute a real objection to identifying him as another son of Nekhebu, since perhaps fifty percent of those reliefs are lost, and his figure may well have appeared in one or more of the missing scenes. Moreover, in the spear fishing scene, Sabu-ptah is designated “son whom he loves,” not “eldest son.” The probability is therefore that an eldest son was depicted elsewhere in the chapel, and that Prashhapes Impy was that son. Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre in the Wadi Hammamat is “senior lector priest” (fety-bt ssw) whereas Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre Prashhapes Impy is “chief lector priest” (fety-bt fty-q) on the coffin from c. 2388. Nevertheless, outside the Senedjemib family, Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre is a rare name and, although not entirely beyond the bounds of probability, it seems unnecessary to postulate the existence of yet another “ overseer of all works of the king, sole friend, and royal master builder in both houses” named Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre, who had a son by the same name, when Nekhebu and his son seem to fit the requirements so well. If Impy was a teenager or young adult when he accompanied his father to the Wadi Hammamat in the nineteenth year of Pepy I, he could easily have lived on through the remaining years of Pepy I’s reign and the short reigns of Merenre (six years) and on into the first half of the reign of Pepy II.181 In fact, an Impy with the titles “overseer of all works, master builder of the king in both houses,” in all probability our man, is depicted along with other officials in a procession in the pyramid temple of Pepy II,182 whose decoration appears to have been largely completed around years twenty to thirty of Pepy II.183 Corroborating the pictorial testimony is a seal impression of Pepy II found by Reisner on a domed jar stopper still in place on a two-handled vase in the burial chamber of c. 2388.184 The importance of the office of “ overseer of all works of the king,” incidentally, is immediately apparent from the depiction in the pyramid temple of Pepy II, for Impy is separated by only two other officials, the “ overseer of tenant-farmers of the palace” and the “ overseer of Upper Egypt,” from the figure of the vizier who heads the procession.

Whereas nothing survives to indicate that Nekhebu ever held the office of vizier, evidence does exist to show that both Impy and Ibebi achieved that dignity. That evidence consists of blocks from the destroyed serdabs of the two brothers. Several fragments of the serdab of Ibebi are preserved in Boston. Three complete and nine incomplete representations of Ibebi together with his titles are carefully inscribed in registers on the surface of two adjoining blocks.185 On one edge of the larger block the titles imp-y nswt, 185 iwm-nr nswt are to be made out. Another block found in the debris of the open court of the Senedjemib Complex, whose present whereabouts are unknown, bears seven lightly incised figures of Impy, none of them completely preserved. Over the figures the titles ipy ‘tyt, 187 iwm-nr nswt 188 are inscribed.189

Before Impy and Ibebi are added to the list of known viziers, it should be reiterated that the vizierial titles occur only on blocks from their serdabs(i). Similarly, in his Meir tomb, Pepyankh Heny the Black is assigned the titlesippy ‘nty 189 only once, in his serdab decorated with registers of repeating figures representing statues, so like the files of statues from the serdabs of Nekhebu, Impy, and Ibebi.187 It is hence legitimate to inquire whether these singular occurrences of the vizierial titles are instances of posthumous promotion of the sort known from the tomb of Djau at Deir el-Gebrawi, who begged for his father Djau Shemai a posthumous promotion from King Pepy II to the rank of ipy ‘tyt.189 In the succeeding First Intermediate Period, such offices which the deceased did not exercise on earth, but which he hoarded in his funerary inscriptions were referred to as ‘nty ‘yty tm-nr ‘nt, “offices of the necropolis.”189 It should be noted, however, that in the one definite instance we possess of posthumous promotions, the beneficiary, Djau Shemai, is promoted in rank and assigned the rank-indicator ‘nty ‘yty, but receives no new offices or titles which would imply practical duties with functional significance. Very little survives of the chapels of Impy and Ibebi and the vizierial titles perhaps also occurred on their walls.189 For these reasons, it is
probably safe to add the two brothers to the list of known viziers who served Pepy II.191

Although the false door from the small offering room of Wer-kau-ba Iku (g 2383),192 built against the south face of the mastaba of Mehi is damaged, the titles t£yty z£b †£ty are discernable at the top of its outer jambs.193 There is nothing in the palaeography of the inscriptions to suggest that the false door is later than the Old Kingdom, but considering the humble nature of the offering room, Iku may have served one of the successors of Pepy II.194 Taking into account the location of his tomb, Iku may well have been a descendant of the Senedjemib family, even though we are ignorant of his exact relationship. Since no shaft was found in or behind his chapel, Reisner felt he was buried in one of the successive additions (g 2376 or 2377) to the west side of the mastaba of Mehi.195 It seems more likely that he was buried in an intrusive shaft constructed in the serdab of Mehi’s tomb (g 2378 b).196 His wife (?) Tjefreret197 and a son named Iku after his father are also commemorated on the false door.

190 In the case of Ibebi, two other adjoining blocks in Boston (Exp. Ph. n 1624, 1648) give his name and the titles [¢£ty-™], ¡my-r£ k£t.
192 Ranke’s citation to Wr-k£w-b£ in PN 1, p. 417, 27, is our individual. In PN 1, p. 46, 10, only feminine occurrences are cited for the name of the other name of Wr-k£w-b£.
193 See the sketch in Brovarski, in: L’Egyptologie en 1979, fig. 21.
194 Cf. ibid., p. 120, and see above, p. 3.
195 But see above, p. 3.
196 See below, pp. 157, 158.
197 The name Êfrrt does not occur in PN 1–3.
198 Cf. ibid., p. 221, and see above, p. 3.
199 See below, pp. 157, 158.
200 The name Êfrrt does not occur in PN 1–3.
Chapter 4: SENEDJEMIB INTI – G 2370

The mastaba of Senedjemib Inti, Giza g 2370, was excavated by the Harvard University–Boston Museum of Fine Arts Egyptian Expedition in October and November, 1912. It comprises a complex interior chapel of type (Vc) with a colonnaded portico (I), an anteroom (II), a north–south corridor or vestibule (III), an east–west offering room (IV), and a great pillarized hall (V) (figs. 2–3). 2 The outer entrance is from the east at the north end of Room II, from which doors lead to the vestibule and the pillarized hall. Room III, entered from the east at the north end of its east wall, has a large serdab behind the west wall with two slots (Serdab I). The east–west offering room (Room IV) with a false door in the west end is entered by a doorway at the east end of its north wall from Room III. 3 The pillarized hall has a roof (preserved in part) supported by eight pillars in two east–west rows of four each. A second large serdab west of its west wall is provided with three slots (Serdab II).

The mastaba itself is of Reisner’s type VIII a (1), constructed of great slabs of grey nummulitic limestone roughly dressed to a sloping surface (Masonry w). 4 It measures 22.8 x 20.9 m with an area of 478.53 sq. m. The proportion of the length of the mastaba to the width is 13/9. The total area of Rooms I–V is 96.55 sq. m. The relation of the area of the mastaba to that of the rooms is 1/4.93. The preserved height of the mastaba is 3.50 m. 5 Of the original height, however, was probably in excess of 6.0 m. 5

Except for the great hall of pillars, virtually all the available wall surfaces in the chapel were originally decorated.

Inscriptions on facade and portico

The facade of g 2370 closest to the portico and the adjacent sides of the portico itself are covered with long inscriptions of an autobiographical or dedicatory nature (pls. 18, 58–79; figs. 17, 18–23, 28–33). On the facade to the north of the portico is an autobiographical text and a letter written by King Izezi to Senedjemib Inti on the occasion of the completion of certain architectural works (A 1–2). On the adjacent side wall of the portico stand two other letters from Izezi to Senedjemib, one seemingly dated in the second half of the reign of that sovereign, concerning engagements in structures in connection with the king’s forthcoming jubilee (B 1–2). The facade to the south of the portico and the adjacent southern side wall of the portico bear inscriptions narrating the preparation of the tomb and the establishment of its endowment (C, D). The inscriptions are translated below, pp. 89–110.

Portico

The dimensions of the portico embasures are 6.21 by 1.9 m, and the total area measures 11.88 sq. m. 6 The roof over the portico was originally supported by two columns. When Reisner excavated the tomb, the bases of the columns were still in place (fig. 3). Subsequently, they were pried up and at present rest on the ground nearby, in the area just in front of g 2374 (pl. 1b). The bases are circular with sloping sides. The upper diameter of one base is 6.4 cm, the height 28 cm, and the lower diameter 7.4 cm. 7 A ring of plaster that surrounded the northern column base below the level of the stone pavement is still in situ (pl. 13a).

An off-center circle on the top of the larger base from Inti’s portico is filled with plaster and stone chips. Two perpendicular lines on the top of this base form a cross which is intersected by the circle. The center of the circle is not the point where the lines cross, however, and most of the circle actually lies in one quadrant of the crosslines, although slightly overlapping into the other three quadrants (fig. 7b). 8 Since the off-center circle is filled with plaster and stone chips, it could not have functioned as a socket to receive a protruding boss on the underside of the column above. Circle and crosslines alike are lacking on the smaller base.

Archarite

On top of the columns rested a long inscribed architrave (pls. 12c–d; fig. 16) measuring 14 cm in height. The architrave probably consisted of three discrete blocks originally, but these were found by Reisner broken into five pieces (fig. 16). The architrave was inscribed from right to left in large, sunk relief hieroglyphs with a certain amount of interior detail. The inscription proclaimed the identity of the tomb owner: ¡my-¢t¢w t³y³² t³y³². The hereditary prince and count, judge and [vizier, overseer] of all

3 See Reisner, “Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon,” p. 150.
4 Reisner originally designated the rooms of Inti’s tomb chapel from the inside out, in keeping with the general system devised for other tombs in the Giza necropolis thus: a = offering room; b = vestibule; c = anteroom; d = pillarized hall; e = portico. A different system of lettering was originally utilized for the detailed map of the Senedjemib Complex (fig. 3), as follows: A = pillarized hall; B = anteroom; C = vestibule; D = offering room; E = portico. The latter system occasionally appears in other HU–BMFA records, especially the Photograph and Objects Register. The two different lettering systems constitute a potential source of confusion. The present system of numbering is that used by PM 9. Reisner’s designations have been changed to agree with the latter system wherever they occur on the original expedition maps, plate, etc. This holds true also for the tombs of Mekh and Khnummerti.
5 For Reisner’s classification of cores and casing types at Giza, see GN I, pp. 170–77, 224–25, 37–95, 177–85.
6 Cf. GN I, p. 164.
7 See above, p. 39.
8 GN I, p. 164.
9 Cf. above, p. 16.
10 I am grateful to Cynthia Shakedolamy for this detailed description.
works of the king, overseer of scribes of royal records, [master] of secrets of all commands of the king, and lector priest, Senedjemib.*

**Snaub Wall**

On the southern side wall of the portico stood a large, poorly figure of Inti, which is the central focus of the portico. It is shown facing outwards (east) towards a smaller figure before him, presumably that of his son Mehi (see above, pp. 26–28). The upper parts of both figures are destroyed. A roughened area around the legs of the smaller figures indicates that the figure had been recut.

Beneath the feet of the pair is a marsh scene with cattle and herdsmen crossing a stretch of water (pl. 14). A papyrus skiff at the right was occupied by three rowers and a herdsmen. Although the craft itself has disappeared, clear traces of the figures in the skiff remain. The posture of the three rowers is identical; they squat in the skiff, both arms raised before them, grasping their oars high up and lower down on the shaft. They admonish one another: "hm ftr (i.e. "deaf") ftr ftr, ftr," (the oar), "Remo," (grasp) "the oar," (comrade)! In the stem of the skiff a herdsmen stands, his right arm extended in the habitual gesture of conjuration against crocodiles. Although his figure is badly damaged, his body appears to lean forward, while the fact that his forward knee is slightly raised may indicate that he was leaning on a staff. His speech is inscribed above the heads of the swimming figures: "wds n s¢n (i.e. "dear") ftr ftr ftr, ftr mn mnw, "The channel has been prepared for you!" [the cattle]." When the crocodile's "dile (i.e. "repulsive") is repulsed," then the dead man is repulsed," says the herdsmen.9

The figures of the swimming cattle are damaged and only part of the stretch of water in which they swim survives. The register below is obliterated except for the legs and pole of a punter at the stern of a papyrus boat at the left.

Behind the son's figure is Inscription D, which relates the transport of a sarcophagus for Inti from Tur (below, pp. 108–110). Immediately beneath the inscription is a vignette (pls. 79–80; figs. 22, 23) which shows a cargo vessel together with the coffin and its lid. A single line of inscription above the vessel reads from right to left: wP fln (i.e. "the barge") respects the name of the barge whose name is "Izezi is great of strength." The cargo vessel has upright stern and stern-posts and probably had a flat bottom, slightly curved sides, and pointed ends like contemporary sea-going ships.10 The zigzag pattern at the upper edge of the hull towards the prow, which in Lepsius's day (fig. 21) ran all the way from the prow to the stern, probably represents a truss girder consisting of a rope run to and fro between two longitudinal cables to strengthen the hull.11 The ship is provided with two rudders or oar sweeps for steering.12 The sarcophagus in its rope cradle is set on a sledge on the deck of the vessel. Immediately above is written: "s¢n, "sarcophagus."13 In the right is the lid, similarly protected, and above it the word, "lid," "The three men at the prow of the barge are identified by labels over their heads as the imy-r fln, "overseer of ten men," (men),"14 the šfjr "(i.e. "ship's lieutenant," and the imy-r šn, "overseer of navigation."15 On a man at the stern of the boat the text is written imy-šn, "captain."16 Like the three men at the prow, the captain wears his own hair cut short and a belted kilt with flaring flat panel. As is also the case with the "overseer of navigation," he holds a scepter-like baton as a symbol of office.17 The two men who maneuver the great our sweeps of the boat are captives. They too are wigless, but appear to wear plain, tight-fitting kilts.

**West Wall**

At the rear of the portico, Inti is shown in pendant scenes, accompanied by family and retainers, engaged in sports in the marshes. The leisure time activities of fishing and fowling are virtually inseparable and are found in combination on the walls of many other tombs,18 but here they are arranged as great panels flanking the entrance to the chapel.19

---

9 Vandier, Manuɛl, 1, pp. 194–199.

10 Erman, R. v., p. 231, Montet, Sîves, pp. 20, 72.

11 Erman and Silverman have been incorporated into the translation of this deceptively simple passage from the Dead Letters to the Dead, p. 5, pl. 4, 5) might be expected, and this is clearly not the case after.

12 Jerome, Letters to the Dead, p. 257, 6; Erman, §§ 436, 5, p. 64; Allen, §§ 424, 5, p. 65; M. 5, p. 66; M. 6, p. 67; M. 7, p. 68; M. 8, p. 69; M. 9, p. 70.

13 Edel, §§ 2378 in ibid., pl. 12 [lower], and again in the case of the present caption, p. 2379 in ibid., pl. 13 [lower]; Montet, p. 2378 in ibid., pl. 12 (ibid., p. 107, figs. 96, 97). Suggestions by James Allen and David Manuel (pl. 80). On the signification of the cattle: see Allen, Letters to the Dead, p. 281, 4; Erman, §§ 2378 in ibid., pl. 12 [lower], and again in the case of the present caption, p. 2379 in ibid., pl. 12 (ibid., p. 107, figs. 96, 97). Suggestions by James Allen and David Manuel (pl. 80). On the signification of the cattle: see Allen, Letters to the Dead, p. 281, 4; Erman, §§ 2378 in ibid., pl. 12 [lower], and again in the case of the present caption, p. 2379 in ibid., pl. 12 (ibid., p. 107, figs. 96, 97). Suggestions by James Allen and David Manuel.

14 Vandier, Manuɛl, 1, pp. 194–199.

15 Erman, R. v., p. 231, Montet, Sîves, pp. 20, 72.

16 Jerome, Letters to the Dead, p. 257, 6; Erman, §§ 436, 5, p. 64; Allen, §§ 424, 5, p. 65; M. 5, p. 66; M. 6, p. 67; M. 7, p. 68; M. 8, p. 69; M. 9, p. 70.

17 Jerome, Letters to the Dead, p. 257, 6; Erman, §§ 436, 5, p. 64; Allen, §§ 424, 5, p. 65; M. 5, p. 66; M. 6, p. 67; M. 7, p. 68; M. 8, p. 69; M. 9, p. 70.

18 Vandier, Manuɛl, 1, pp. 194–199.

19 Landstins, Ships of the Pharaohs, pp. 60–69, especially p. 62 with fig. 186.

20 Ibid., p. 60, 61, 64–65.

21 Due to Egyptian artistic conventions, it is uncertain whether there were two or four rudders and helmsmen; see below, p. 107 and n. 16.

22 Ibid., p. 65, 66–67.

23 See Boreux, Textes et Images, p. 84.

24 Ibid., p. 107 (n. 12).

25 Ibid., p. 92 (n. 12).
South Panel. To the left of the entrance, Inti stood with his legs spread wide apart, precariously balanced in a papyrus skiff (pl. 11a; figs. 24, 25). Facing right towards a thicket of papyrus, he has transfixed two large fish, a Nile perch (Lates niloticus) and a bobby fish (Tilapia nilotica), with one cast of his bident or two-pronged fish spear. The perch and bobby are two of the biggest fish in the Nile and are as a rule depicted in this context. Although this area of the wall has sustained considerable damage, it is clear that the fish were surrounded by water which rose like a hill or column from the low rectangle that represents the water below. In point of fact, what the draftsman mistakenly interpreted as an animal is a fisherman bent sharply over at the waist and using a deep hand net to catch medium sized fish or small fry. Just visible in the photograph is the damaged figure of a hippopotamus behind and facing away from the crocodile. Identifiable among the birds nesting in the superimposed rows of papyrus blossoms above is a hoopoe (Upupa epops) at the left and what is possibly a swallow (Hirundo rustica) at the right.66

Only a few signs survive of the capture which originally occupied the space above Inti’s head and in front of his face; (i) [...] (ii) [...] (iii) [...] (iv) [...] (v) [...] (i) ‘the e-named [by] [...] (ii) [spare]jg [fish] [...] (iii) [...] 67 In all likelihood this was preceded by an overall caption to the scene in one long column coupled with a selection of Inti’s titles arranged in shorter columns (as in the north panel) and terminating with his name(s) in line 1, while line 2, just in front of his face, constituted a shorter label describing the specific activity taking place, that is, “sparring fish.” Scanty traces alone remain of the small figure of Inti’s wife, who sat in the boat at his feet and perhaps held onto his front leg to help steady him. In the caption over her head she was designated as [Intis]t mfr f/ […] ‘his [wife] whom he loves[,]’ but her name can no longer be made out. As in the adjacent north panel, the couple’s name evidently stood at the prow of the skiff, for part of his name and titles are preserved, even though his figure is destroyed. Here too, it is clear that the figure was in surcharge, for the original surface around the figure was deeply cut back and part of the left side of the papyrus thicket cut away to accommodate it (pl. 13b). Only a few disconnected signs from the two columns of text that stood above the son’s head have escaped destruction. This part of the wall was somewhat better preserved in 1931, and traces of the title mnr.f kit nfr ‘[son of the king],’ ‘overser of all works’ of [the king],’ are visible in the photograph. In a compact group between the shaft of Inti’s fish spear and the destroyed head of the son’s figure (S[N]mfl-m.b n.f ‘S[N]med[em]b, his great name’ appears. In this instance, the ‘pillar ineffectually precedes m.f. Space would allow for m.f. off Abt to follow below, as it often does in Mehi’s own tomb.68 as well as in the north panel on the other side of the entrance to the chapel of c. 1370, thus distinguishing son from father.79

Outside the boat, on three ground lines behind Inti, which presumably represented a nearby bank, at least four retainers were depicted. There were originally two retainers standing on the bottom line, but apparently only one on each of the two lines above. Their figures, names, and titles are largely destroyed. The column of text before the best preserved figure at the lower left reads from right to left: mpr-n zi.t ‘he [the]…’ the overseer of scribes ‘Akhk-em-[…]’ (fig. 11a).70 Traces suggest that the two retainers on the ground lines above wore calf-length kilts with flaring front panels, the nature of the kilts perhaps reflecting their seniority. Although only the belt and waist tie of the kilt of the first of the two retainers on the bottom line are preserved, by analogy with the north panel, all the retainers probably wore calf-length kilts. The figures of the retainers on this wall were omitted by Lepsius.

North Panel. On the right of the entrance, Inti faces left and holds aloft in his rear hand a throwstick or boomerang, which he is about to hurl at the birds in the dense papyrus thicket that forms the setting for the hunt (pl. 16, 17a; figs. 26, 27). In his front hand he grasps two herons as decoys. Both kilt and wig are better preserved here than in the adjacent panel to the south of the entrance, and it is clear that the surface of Inti’s short wig was once covered with the customary horizontal rows of overlocking locks. His jewelry evidently consisted of a beaded collar and bracelets (traces remain of one on his

67 See L.D. Elginet, pl. 17.
68 For a detailed description of the fish spear and its use, see Bats, Ancient Egyptian Fishing, pp. 124-142. Let it be noted here that the Latin terminology for a particular species of fish or fauna, once named, is not expanded with the exception of cat-fish species and in this case of uncertain identifications.
69 Bats, Ancient Egyptian Fishing, p. 147; Munster, Senez, pp. 20-21; Vandier, Manuel I, pp. 712, 713, 720; Games-Walker, Fische und Fischkulte, pp. 68-69.

71 Games-Walker, Fische und Fischkulte, p. 14; Brewer-Findiman, Fish and Fishing, pp. 68-69.
72 The following have been consulted for the identification of the fish types here and throughout the present volume: Bats, Ancient Egyptian Fishing, pp. 139-141, pl. 16; Gaillard, Recherches sur la pêche, pl. 11; Gamers-Walker, Fische und Fischkulte, pl. 9; Brewer-Findiman, Fish and Fishing, pp. 68-69.
73 On the bank, see below, p. 95 and n. 2.
74 E.g., Mohe, Henp-bahr-abbi, fig. 34; Brewer-Findiman, Fish and Fishing, pp. 68-69.
75 Helpful in the identification of the birds have been Meinechter-Hagen, Neues Bird of Egypt, vols. 1 and 2; Davies, Weltk., pp. 97-101; Ebel, NAWG 1946, p. 208ff.; and NAWG 1975, p. 92ff.; Hoffmann, Birds of Ancient Egypt.
76 Games-Walker, Fische und Fischkulte, p. 14; Brewer-Findiman, Fish and Fishing, pp. 68-69.
77 Holzmann, Der Nil, p. 16.
78 See above, p. 15 and n. 17.
79 Below, p. 115.
80 For mpr-n and mpr-t, see Serle, ZAS 17 (1922), pp. 77-78; Junker, ZAS 64 (1928), pp. 19-40; Weiske, p. 11; Fischer, Denkm., p. 197 and n. 115.
81 Friederich (Birds and Fish, pp. 1-96) has noted that 3 finely and 3 coarsely, and similar writings of other titles, are not to be regarded as abbreviations of writings such as [3] [3], but as survivals of an ancient usage in which the number of nouns was not unrepresented. This was presumably the case with mpr-n zi.t here and with other titles that occur on the walls of the Senedjemib Complex.
82 See above, p. 15 and n. 17.
83 L.D. Elginet, pl. 26. In reality, the throwstick would have been held in the proper right hand; see HESS, p. 186, fig. 4. According to Hayes, Serle I, p. 184, two boomerangs found in an Eleventh Dynasty tomb at Thebes were of the so-called “nature types.”
84 See Diers, Ancient Egyptian Paintings, vol. 1, pp. 94-95; Vandier, Manuel I, p. 747.
85 For this type of wig, see Vandier, Manuel I, p. 102; Stecklin, Tracht, pp. 86-88; Fischer, ANEG, 1930, pp. 159-160; Cherpion, Manneux et Dargatz, pp. 15-16.
Uppeared arm). He wears the garment customarily worn by the tomb owner in scenes of spear fishing and rowing. This was apparently cut from a semicircular piece of linen, the rounded ends of which were crossed in front, between which there was a trapezoidal panel with concave sides broader at the bottom than at the top. The papyrus skirt in which Inti once stood is destroyed for the most part, but its preserved stern curves gracefully upwards.44 From the label beneath his front elbow, which reads hmr$ ftm$f (r) "his wife [whom] he loves, the king's "acquaintance, Tjebh," it is clear that a small figure of Inti's spouse once sat at the bow of his boat, as in the panel to the south of the entrance. The words (1993 ed.) fty-imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, "chief justice and vizier, overseer of all works of the king," are all that remain of the long column of text in front of Inti which once served as a general caption to the scene and which was probably continued in several shorter columns with Inti's titles above his head, of which only a few disconnected signs now remain. As in the south panel also, a shorter horizontal caption in the space immediately over Inti's head probably described the specific activity taking place, that is, "throwing the boomerang."45 Standing in the place where the destroyed prow of the ship would have been is a figure of Inti and Tjebh's son, Mehi, facing right towards his parents. A tip alone remains of the boomerang that he held up to his father.46 The beginning of the text above his head is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, (2) ... (n.f.) nwt nwt Wn$ (3) thmnw-f nb-nbt r is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, "chief justice and vizier, overseer of all works of the king," are all that remain of the long column of text in front of Inti which once served as a general caption to the scene and which was probably continued in several shorter columns with Inti's titles above his head, of which only a few disconnected signs now remain. As in the south panel also, a shorter horizontal caption in the space immediately over Inti's head probably described the specific activity taking place, that is, "throwing the boomerang."45 Standing in the place where the destroyed prow of the ship would have been is a figure of Inti and Tjebh's son, Mehi, facing right towards his parents. A tip alone remains of the boomerang that he held up to his father.46 The beginning of the text above his head is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, (2) ... (n.f.) nwt nwt Wn$ (3) thmnw-f nb-nbt r is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, "chief justice and vizier, overseer of all works of the king," are all that remain of the long column of text in front of Inti which once served as a general caption to the scene and which was probably continued in several shorter columns with Inti's titles above his head, of which only a few disconnected signs now remain. As in the south panel also, a shorter horizontal caption in the space immediately over Inti's head probably described the specific activity taking place, that is, "throwing the boomerang."45 Standing in the place where the destroyed prow of the ship would have been is a figure of Inti and Tjebh's son, Mehi, facing right towards his parents. A tip alone remains of the boomerang that he held up to his father.46 The beginning of the text above his head is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, (2) ... (n.f.) nwt nwt Wn$ (3) thmnw-f nb-nbt r is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, "chief justice and vizier, overseer of all works of the king," are all that remain of the long column of text in front of Inti which once served as a general caption to the scene and which was probably continued in several shorter columns with Inti's titles above his head, of which only a few disconnected signs now remain. As in the south panel also, a shorter horizontal caption in the space immediately over Inti's head probably described the specific activity taking place, that is, "throwing the boomerang."45 Standing in the place where the destroyed prow of the ship would have been is a figure of Inti and Tjebh's son, Mehi, facing right towards his parents. A tip alone remains of the boomerang that he held up to his father.46 The beginning of the text above his head is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, (2) ... (n.f.) nwt nwt Wn$ (3) thmnw-f nb-nbt r is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, "chief justice and vizier, overseer of all works of the king," are all that remain of the long column of text in front of Inti which once served as a general caption to the scene and which was probably continued in several shorter columns with Inti's titles above his head, of which only a few disconnected signs now remain. As in the south panel also, a shorter horizontal caption in the space immediately over Inti's head probably described the specific activity taking place, that is, "throwing the boomerang."45 Standing in the place where the destroyed prow of the ship would have been is a figure of Inti and Tjebh's son, Mehi, facing right towards his parents. A tip alone remains of the boomerang that he held up to his father.46 The beginning of the text above his head is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, (2) ... (n.f.) nwt nwt Wn$ (3) thmnw-f nb-nbt r is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, "chief justice and vizier, overseer of all works of the king," are all that remain of the long column of text in front of Inti which once served as a general caption to the scene and which was probably continued in several shorter columns with Inti's titles above his head, of which only a few disconnected signs now remain. As in the south panel also, a shorter horizontal caption in the space immediately over Inti's head probably described the specific activity taking place, that is, "throwing the boomerang."45 Standing in the place where the destroyed prow of the ship would have been is a figure of Inti and Tjebh's son, Mehi, facing right towards his parents. A tip alone remains of the boomerang that he held up to his father.46 The beginning of the text above his head is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, (2) ... (n.f.) nwt nwt Wn$ (3) thmnw-f nb-nbt r is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, "chief justice and vizier, overseer of all works of the king," are all that remain of the long column of text in front of Inti which once served as a general caption to the scene and which was probably continued in several shorter columns with Inti's titles above his head, of which only a few disconnected signs now remain. As in the south panel also, a shorter horizontal caption in the space immediately over Inti's head probably described the specific activity taking place, that is, "throwing the boomerang."45 Standing in the place where the destroyed prow of the ship would have been is a figure of Inti and Tjebh's son, Mehi, facing right towards his parents. A tip alone remains of the boomerang that he held up to his father.46 The beginning of the text above his head is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, (2) ... (n.f.) nwt nwt Wn$ (3) thmnw-f nb-nbt r is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, "chief justice and vizier, overseer of all works of the king," are all that remain of the long column of text in front of Inti which once served as a general caption to the scene and which was probably continued in several shorter columns with Inti's titles above his head, of which only a few disconnected signs now remain. As in the south panel also, a shorter horizontal caption in the space immediately over Inti's head probably described the specific activity taking place, that is, "throwing the boomerang."45 Standing in the place where the destroyed prow of the ship would have been is a figure of Inti and Tjebh's son, Mehi, facing right towards his parents. A tip alone remains of the boomerang that he held up to his father.46 The beginning of the text above his head is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, (2) ... (n.f.) nwt nwt Wn$ (3) thmnw-f nb-nbt r is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, "chief justice and vizier, overseer of all works of the king," are all that remain of the long column of text in front of Inti which once served as a general caption to the scene and which was probably continued in several shorter columns with Inti's titles above his head, of which only a few disconnected signs now remain. As in the south panel also, a shorter horizontal caption in the space immediately over Inti's head probably described the specific activity taking place, that is, "throwing the boomerang."45 Standing in the place where the destroyed prow of the ship would have been is a figure of Inti and Tjebh's son, Mehi, facing right towards his parents. A tip alone remains of the boomerang that he held up to his father.46 The beginning of the text above his head is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, (2) ... (n.f.) nwt nwt Wn$ (3) thmnw-f nb-nbt r is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, "chief justice and vizier, overseer of all works of the king," are all that remain of the long column of text in front of Inti which once served as a general caption to the scene and which was probably continued in several shorter columns with Inti's titles above his head, of which only a few disconnected signs now remain. As in the south panel also, a shorter horizontal caption in the space immediately over Inti's head probably described the specific activity taking place, that is, "throwing the boomerang."45 Standing in the place where the destroyed prow of the ship would have been is a figure of Inti and Tjebh's son, Mehi, facing right towards his parents. A tip alone remains of the boomerang that he held up to his father.46 The beginning of the text above his head is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, (2) ... (n.f.) nwt nwt Wn$ (3) thmnw-f nb-nbt r is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, "chief justice and vizier, overseer of all works of the king," are all that remain of the long column of text in front of Inti which once served as a general caption to the scene and which was probably continued in several shorter columns with Inti's titles above his head, of which only a few disconnected signs now remain. As in the south panel also, a shorter horizontal caption in the space immediately over Inti's head probably described the specific activity taking place, that is, "throwing the boomerang."45 Standing in the place where the destroyed prow of the ship would have been is a figure of Inti and Tjebh's son, Mehi, facing right towards his parents. A tip alone remains of the boomerang that he held up to his father.46 The beginning of the text above his head is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, (2) ... (n.f.) nwt nwt Wn$ (3) thmnw-f nb-nbt r is lost: (1) [ ... ] imy=r-kf nbt nwt nwt, "chief justice and vizier, overseer of all works of the king," are all that remain of the long column of text in front of Inti which once served as a general caption to the scene and which was probably continued in several shorter columns with Inti's titles above his head, of which only a few disconnected signs now remain. As in the south panel also, a shorter horizontal caption in the space immediately over Inti's head probably described the specific activity taking place, that is, "throwing the boomerang."45
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Chapter 4: SENEDJEMIB INTI – g 2370

North Wall
Insofar as it is possible to tell, given the considerable damage to both
walls, the scenes on the northern side wall of the portico present a
virtual mirror image of those on the southern side (pl. 18; figs. 29,
30). Above is a corpulent figure of Inti facing outwards. Unfortunately, the upper part of the figure is damaged, so that the exact
nature of the garment Inti was wearing is not certain. It is unlikely
that it was the distinctive robe of the vizier, a long kilt overlapped in
front, reaching from the breast almost to the ankles, and held up by
a pair of straps tied behind the neck,63 since the earliest firm evidence
for this distinctive costume seems not to antedate the second half of
the Twelfth Dynasty.64 It is therefore more likely that Inti was
shown wearing (fig. 17a) the very long kilt sometimes worn by elderly
men in the Old Kingdom (fig. 79b–c). This kilt must have denoted
considerable dignity, for its wearers include viziers, overseers of Upper Egypt, and other senior officials.65 The top edge of this kilt
reached as high as the waist, while its bottom edge extended almost
to the ankles and, on occasion, was longer in front than in back, as
is the case here, curving down sharply to a point just above the toes.
The selvedge which demarcates the outer edge of the flaring front
panel in many examples of the ankle-length kilt is no longer visible,
but appears in Lepsius’s sketch of the north wall (fig. 17).
Inti’s entire body is shown in profile, as is frequently the case in
depictions of older men. Equally typical was the position of the arm
in the middle of the figure indicating that the upper half of the vizier’s body was depicted with abbreviated shoulders.66
Inti’s head and face are better preserved here than on the south
wall of the portico. His hair is cut close to the head. Above are preserved the bottom of three columns and two lines of hieroglyphs
with his titles and names, which are perhaps to be restored (text fig.
2) as follows: (1) [¡ry-p™t ¢£ty-™ t£yty z£b †£ty ¡my-r£] k£t nbt nt nswt, (2)
[¡my-r£ zßw ™ nswt ¢ry sßt£ w∂t-mdw nbt nt] nswt ¡my-r£ pr-™¢£w, (3) […
m∂¢] qd [nswt] m prwy, (4) Sn∂m-¡b rn.f [™£], (5) ⁄nt¡ rn.f [nfr], (1)
“[The hereditary prince and count, chief justice and vizier, overseer]
of all works of the king,67 (2) [overseer of scribes of royal records,
master of secrets of every command of ] the king, overseer of the armory, (3) [… royal master] builder in both houses (viz. Upper and
Lower Egypt),68 (4) Senedjemib (is) his [great] name, (5) Inti (is) his
[good] name.”69
Although the surface immediately in front of Inti’s figure is
largely destroyed at present, Lepsius saw there the legs of a smaller
figure, as on the south wall (fig. 17). Moreover, the leftward
orientation of the hieroglyphs in the four columns above the
destroyed figure and in front of Inti suggest a speech directed to the
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Erman, Life in Ancient Egypt, p. 211; Vandier, Manuel 3, p. 250.
Ibid. Many Old Kingdom viziers are depicted wearing the ordinary short kilt
which ends well above the knees; e.g., Jéquier, Mon. fun. 2, pls. 45, 48, 57;
CG 1431, 1569 A, B.
E.g., Rue de tomb., pls. 16, 17 (fig. 74b); Mereruka 2, pls. 174B, 175 (fig. 74c), 181,
185A, 187B; Meir 5, pl. 14; Badawy, Nyhetep-ptah and ™Ankhm™ahor, figs. 20–21;
Goyon, Kêmi 15 (1969), pls. 5, 7 [6, 8] (master metalworker). The ankle-length kilt
appears in statuary as well; see e.g., Jéquier, Pepi II 3, pl. 54; Kaplony, Methethi,
Nr. 12 and 14; Petersen, Medelhavsmuseet Bulletin 20 (1985), fig. on p. 20.
Harpur, Decoration, pp. 131–34.
For the sequence ¡ry-p™t ¢£ty-™ t£yty z£b †£ty ¡my-r£ k£t nbt nt nswt, see above p. 37.
For the title adjunct m pr.wy, see below, p. 84.
For the restorations in the last line, see above, p. 24, n. 24.

deceased by a left-facing figure.70 From the context, the speaker is
almost certainly Inti’s son Mehi. The fourth line of the speech is
completely recut at a lower level than the preceding three lines,
while the hieroglyphs in this column are in raised relief of poor
quality, in contrast to the well-executed hieroglyphs of the other
three columns, which still retain traces of inner detail.71 The text
perhaps read as follows: (1) [r∂¡ ¢m n nb.(¡) ßd.t(¡) n.(¡) db¢w] nb ßt£
wn.n.(¡) db¢(.¡) n ¡t(.¡) t£yty z£b [†£ty m£™], (2) [Sn∂m-¡b …]w n ßpss.f
∞r nswt r ßps.f nb n ªwrº[r.f ∞r nswt] (3) [r wr.f nb …] mn∞.k(¡) ∞r
¢m n nb(.¡) s∂m.t(¡).(¡) r ∞t nb. Îd.∞[r ¢m.f ] […], (4) […¢£ty-™]
ªm£™º ¡my-r£ k£t nbt nt nswt S[n∂m-¡b], “(1) [The Majesty of my lord
had withdrawn for me] every secret [requirement]72 which I had requested for my father,73 the chief justice [and true vizier], (2)
[Senedjemib …] because he was better regarded by the king than any
noble of his, because [he was more] ªimportantº [to the king] (3)
[than any magnate of his ….]74 I being trusted75 by the Majesty of
70

71
72

73
74

Speeches are usually oriented in the same direction as the speaker and thus proceed from the speaker to the person addressed; see Fischer, Egyptian Studies 2, pp.
49–62, especially p. 61.
See p. 27 above.
Edel’s restoration (Altäg. Gramm. 1, § 676) of [db¢]w at the beginning of the preserved section of line 2 makes good sense. The restoration that precedes this was
suggested by a text that appears on the right entrance embrasure of the mastaba
of Akhethetep in the Louvre (Ziegler, Akhethetep, pp. 107–109, 110). The inscription begins r∂¡t ¢m.f ßd n.f s£.f smr w™ty ¡m£-™ S™n∞w-Pt¢, “What his Majesty had
his son, the sole friend and ¡m£-™ Sankhu-ptah withdraw for him,” and is followed
by an itemization of the gifts awarded to Akhethetep. R∂¡ there is probably a perfective relative form followed by the subjunctive s∂m.f, whereas here it would be
an example of the indicative form of the s∂m.f with nominal subject (Doret, NVS,
pp. 25, 27) followed by the impersonal passive of the subjunctive form. The Louvre Mastaba has simply ¢m.f, whereas we have restored ¢m n nb.(¡) on the basis of
its occurrence further on in our inscription because it better fits the space requirements. The verb db¢ below and once again in Inscription C, line 26, is written in
a summary manner with the hand and tusk, but we have restored a fuller writing
of the substantive db¢w here, on the assumption that it makes a neater group than
would a shorter orthography with hand, tusk, and quail chick alone. In fact,
Wb. 5, p. 440, notes that from the Old Kingdom db¢w is seldom written ¢
2É.
Additional occurrences of the fuller spelling of db¢(w) may also be cited; e.g.,
Mereruka 2, pl. 130; Grdseloff, ASAE 51 (1951), pl. 1; Simpson, Qar and Idu,
fig. 24. For the verb ßd¡, used of that which is “taken out of” or “withdrawn from”
a storeroom, a box, or the like, see Wb. 4, p. 561, 10–12; ArchAbousir 1, p. 226, also
Kaplony, Methethi, p. 21, fig. on p. 22; p. 34, fig. on p. 32; Ziegler, Akhethetep,
pp. 111 (d), 119, 121.
Edel, Altäg. Gramm. 1, § 676.
It is not entirely certain that the damaged sign at the bottom of the line is a swallow or House Martin (Houlihan, Birds, pp. 124–26) rather than a quail chick, although the angle and elongated line of the back are in favor of the identification.
I am unable to provide a parallel for the restored passage, although the vizier
Mereruka claims: ¡nk wr n [n]swt, “I was a magnate of the king” (Urk. 1, p. 88, 15).
The walls of the Senedjemib Complex supply no clear instance of the last word at
the bottom of a column of inscription being broken up and carried over to an adjacent column. For that reason, if ªwrº[r.f ∞r nswt r wr.f nb] is indeed to be restored, it is likely that wrr.f appeared at the bottom of line 2. Likewise in favor of
the suggested restoration is the fact that the vertical lines of text comprising an individual inscription are generally of the same length and, if ∂d.∞[r ¢m.f ] is restored at the end of line 3, both the latter clause and wrr.f would terminate at the
same level. On the other hand, †£ty at the bottom of the first line does not line up
with wrr.f and ∂d.∞r ¢m.f, and this may militate against the proposed restoration.
Theoretically, it would be possible to restore m£™ after †£ty, but the title sequence
t£yty z£b †£ty m£™ is nowhere else attested for Inti, even though the latter is ¢£ty-™ m£™
on his sarcophagus (see below, pp. 81, 84). Still, m£™ was sometimes used to fill up
a space which was not large enough to take another title or to take the title which
should follow next in the sequence (James, Khentika, pp. 12–13; Brovarski, Nagaed-Dêr Inscriptions, p. 356 [a]), and it is possible that it served that function here,
especially since none of the titles that follow directly on t£yty z£b †£ty in Inti’s
known title sequences, including smr w™ty, would fit the restricted space at the
bottom of line 1. It may be noted that m£™ similarly follows on t£yty z£b †£ty at the
bottom of a text column in James, Khentika, pl. 5. For additional examples of m£™
(and m£™ m£™) as space fillers, see now Altenmüller, Mehu, pls. 77, 78.
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my lord (with the result) that I was heard in regard to every matter. Thereupon (His Majesty) said [...] [4] [...] the true [78] count and overseer of all works of the king, (Senedjemib)." Senedjemib (Mehi) here is referred to as "true count and overseer of all works of the king," as he originally was on the door thicknesses in c 2370 and consistently was in his own tomb.

Assuming that Edel's restoration of [alt=""] at the beginning of Mehi's speech is correct, and that Mehi indeed got what he petitioned for, it could well be that what Iri received from the king, like the "...[a bird] with cattle and herdsman below Senedjemib Iri, were the [alt=""] in front [alt=""] of him, "the requirements of the craft of the lector priest," that is, the equipment for the [alt=""] where his body was purified prior to mumification. It was neither unusual nor unprecedented for a king to contribute to the embalming of a favored noble. In fact, enough examples occur of such posthumous gifts as to suggest that it was accepted practice. 30

Although the arrangement of the first register of the marsh scene with cattle and herdsman below Senedjemib's feet closely parallels that in the same register on the opposite wall of the portico, the caption above the rowers in the first boat differs in a number of particulars: [alt=""], "[alt=""] and "Row of " [alt=""], [alt=""] [comrade], [alt=""] [comrade], [alt=""] [comrade], [alt=""] (it is) winding." 31 The presence of [alt=""], "[alt=""] in Lepsius' sketch (fig. 177) before the face of the standing figure with outstretched arm looking backwards in the stern of the ship is clear evidence that we have here the figure of the herdsman pronouncing the spell against crocodiles, as on the south wall of the portico.

The bottom register, while damaged, is considerably better preserved than the corresponding register on the southern wall. Parts of two papyrus scrolls are visible, each crowned by three herdmens who stand in the boats and propel them along a stretch of water."

78 The statute first m. sing. in euphonic strings enumerating the qualities of the deceased indicates a concurrent circumstance (present circumstantial); see Donet, "The Ritual of the Throne," 207-8. 79 Assuming that Edel's restoration of [alt=""] at the beginning of Mehi's speech is correct, and that Mehi indeed got what he petitioned for, it could well be that what Iri received from the king, like the "...[a bird] with cattle and herdsman below Senedjemib Iri, were the [alt=""] in front [alt=""] of him, "the requirements of the craft of the lector priest," that is, the equipment for the [alt=""] where his body was purified prior to mumification. It was neither unusual nor unprecedented for a king to contribute to the embalming of a favored noble. In fact, enough examples occur of such posthumous gifts as to suggest that it was accepted practice. 30

Although the arrangement of the first register of the marsh scene with cattle and herdsman below Senedjemib's feet closely parallels that in the same register on the opposite wall of the portico, the caption above the rowers in the first boat differs in a number of particulars: [alt=""], "[alt=""] and "Row of " [alt=""], [alt=""] [comrade], [alt=""] [comrade], [alt=""] [comrade], [alt=""] (it is) winding." 31 The presence of [alt=""], "[alt=""] in Lepsius' sketch (fig. 177) before the face of the standing figure with outstretched arm looking backwards in the stern of the ship is clear evidence that we have here the figure of the herdsman pronouncing the spell against crocodiles, as on the south wall of the portico.

The bottom register, while damaged, is considerably better preserved than the corresponding register on the southern wall. Parts of two papyrus scrolls are visible, each crowned by three herdmens who stand in the boats and propel them along a stretch of water with long poles. The upper part of the figures are destroyed, but their legs are spread wide to maintain their balance. Between the legs of the middle man in the first sketch and likewise between the legs of the first man in the other sketch are spayed rush baskets with two loop handles filled with fruit. The basket between the legs of the second man in the other sketch was probably similarly filled, but the fruit is now destroyed. The herdsman in the center of the first boat appears to wear the very short round-edged kilt with belt-sash tied behind. 32

Room II

This north–south anteroom is parallel to the facade. It measures 5.7 by 3.53 m and has an area of 19.5 sq. m. The outer entrance is from the east at the north end, whence two doors also lead to the pillared hall and the vestibule.

The entrance was evidently closed by a single-leaf wooden door. 33 The construction of the door was of the customary type with one pivot fitting into a socket in the lintel and the other revolving in a recess in the sill or in a separate pivot stone. In the present case, a rectangular recess was cut in the inner end of the lintel and a circular socket drilled in it (pl. 18b, fig. 170). The lower pivot stone was apparently made from a separate piece of stone and is now missing, though the narrow, raised baulk of stone intended to hold it in place can still be seen. This separate pivot stone probably constituted an aid by means of which the lower pivot of the door could be passed into place, once the upper pivot was engaged in its socket, and replaces the more customary method by which a groove was cut in the sill, leading down to the lower socket, to enable the door pivot to pass into its socket. This groove would then be filled in with a strip of stone after the door had been hung. 34 Both the upper socket recess and the lower pivot stone were probably fitted with a block of wood with a corresponding hole in it through which the upper and lower pivots passed. 35 The wood blocks may have reduced the amount of wear and tear the wooden pivots would have been subject to had they rotated solely within a stone socket.

In the undecorated area at the bottom of the north wall of the wall, the room against which the door leaf closing the entrance would have rested when open, a square niche is located at a height of about 61 cm and at a distance of about 12 cm from the inner end of the north doorway thickness (pl. 21a). This niche measures approximately 18 cm in height, 12 cm in width, and 11 cm in depth. Bissing found similar niches in the tomb of the vizier Kagemni at Saqqara, and connected these with an apparatus by means of which the door might be sealed when closed. Bissing's niches, however, were
always located on the side of the doorway opposite the door hinge. By damage to the end of the wall almost directly opposite the aforementioned niche in g 2370 conceals in part a second niche (pl. 21b) which may have served a similar purpose to the niches discussed by the German scholar.

Doorway Thicknesses The door thicknesses once again were essentially mirror images of one another. On either side of the entry passage, Inti faces out of the tomb (east) towards a smaller figure of his son Meh. Both thicknesses were in better condition when seen by Lepsius.

Left (south) thickness. On the left thickness Inti holds a walking stick with his right hand in front and a scepter in his hanging left hand (pls. 19a-b, 20a, figs. 54, 55). The figure is now lost from the waist up, but it is clear from Lepsius’s drawing that he originally wore his own close-cropped hair, a beaded collar, and a leopard skin vestment over a kilt with a flaring front panel. As is appropriate for a mature individual, the kilt is calf-length. Inti’s scepter passes behind his body, as is to be expected in a figure facing left, and both hands are correctly drawn for a figure thus oriented. An unusual, though not unparalleled, feature is the belt that encircles the leopard skin at the waist in Lepsius’s drawing.

Lepsius copied four damaged columns of texts above Inti’s head. These are lost today, but were oriented in the same direction as his figure: (1) [Htp-dj-wetw … prt-br-w t st. (2) the […] m prwy, (3) im3-nb lwyt. (4) im3-nb prwy-hg. (5) “A boon that the king gives . . . of invocation offerings/belonging to” (6) the […] in both houses (Upper and Lower Egypt), (7) overseer of the two granaries, (8) overseer of the beginning of each column is missing, for the content is ex-, short kilt favored for depictions of younger men. The signs in the beaded collar around his neck. Unlike the former, he is attired in the hand (pls. 19, 20. Cf. Borchardt, Manuel, p. 90. 2374 (below, p. 129 [4]). In general the details of Inti’s costume appear to be fairly well represented in Lepsius’s copy, in particular the horizontal rows of over-lapping cuffs on the short wig and the leopard skin with claws at the ends of the paws, as well as the animal’s head set askew just above the belt and waist tie. On the other hand, the shoulder knot with dangling ends is awkwardly rendered. Inti wore a beaded collar and held a staff and scepter. The incomplete inscription reading from right to left above his head is plausibly to be restored as follows: [im3-nb] for *Sn∂m-¡b [the one honored] by the great god, Senedjemib [the Elder], whose good name is Inti.

As on the southern thickness, Meh stood facing his father, with hands hanging empty at his sides. He was wigless and his calf-length kilt had a flaring front panel. The damaged lines of text above his head faced left and perhaps once read: [heq-f mɔt] mɔy-ḏf.f (k) *Sn∂m-¡b, “the true [count, beloved] of his lord, Senedjemib.” Presumably, the space above was occupied by columns of text, as on the southern thickness.

Once again clear evidence of recutting survives. The raised relief figure of the son is obviously on a lower level than that of the surrounding surface and the background has never been finished. Moreover, the lower part of Inti’s staff is noticeably shallower than it is above, this part evidently having been cut away so that Meh’s right foot

87 Bisson, Gouverneur, i, pp. 1-3, fig. 1.
88 LRTA, pl. 79, l.h. [left].
89 For restored hands in Old Kingdom tombs, see especially HEDP, pp. 274-75.
91 Assuming per true is correctly restored, it must undoubtably have been pres-

ed by true and possibly a coordinated phrase naming Anubis or Osiris.
92 The title preceding *sqdy nb in line 1 was determined by the house sign. Of those titles lined by WR 274. 156, which precede *sqdy only *sqdy-šnIr.13 The re-

verse house determinative. This is not a title recorded for Inti elsewhere in his tomb although Rhumane is in *sqdy-šnIr in g 2370 (above, pl. 19a [4]).
93 See Vandier, Manuel, p. 90.
94 The raised relief figure of the son has been recut, as has the title in front of his face and the name above his head (pl. 20a-b). The entire area is lower than that of the surrounding surface, while the background has not received a final smoothing and still shows traces of tool marks. By contrast, the inscription in three columns above his head appears to be original, since the hieroglyphs have been carved on the same level as Inti’s figure.

Right (north) thickness. The short columns of text that, on the pattern of the left thickness, presumably appeared above Inti’s figure at the top of this wall, had already spilled away by Lepsius’s day (fig. 36). The upper two-thirds of the wall is now missing along with the upper part of Inti’s body and the head of the son (pl. 20b, fig. 37). In general the details of Inti’s costume appear to fairly well represented in Lepsius’s copy, in particular the horizontal rows of over-lapping cuffs on the short wig and the leopard skin with claws at the ends of the paws, as well as the animal’s head set askew just above the belt and waist tie. Inti wore a beaded collar and held a staff and scepter. The incomplete inscription reading from right to left above his head is plausibly to be restored as follows: [im3-nb] for *Sn∂m-¡b [the one honored] by the great god, Senedjemib [the Elder], whose good name is Inti.

As on the southern thickness, Meh stood facing his father, with hands hanging empty at his sides. He was wigless and his calf-length kilt had a flaring front panel. The damaged lines of text above his head faced left and perhaps once read: [heq-f mɔt] mɔy-ḏf.f (k) *Sn∂m-¡b, “the true [count, beloved] of his lord, Senedjemib.” Presumably, the space above was occupied by columns of text, as on the southern thickness.

Once again clear evidence of recutting survives. The raised relief figure of the son is obviously on a lower level than that of the surrounding surface and the background has never been finished. Moreover, the lower part of Inti’s staff is noticeably shallower than it is above, this part evidently having been cut away so that Meh’s right foot

95 Lepsius copied four damaged columns of texts above Inti’s head.
96 See Vandier, Manuel, p. 90.
97 See Staehelin, RE, vol. 4, p. 319. 2374 (below, p. 129 [4]).
98 See Vandier, Manuel, p. 90.
99 Lepsius shows a tall, narrow space after the name

of the one honored by the great god, Senedjemib [the Elder], whose good name is Inti.

The upper two-thirds of the wall is now missing along with the upper part of Inti’s body and the head of the son (pl. 20b, fig. 37). In general the details of Inti’s costume appear to fairly well represented in Lepsius’s copy, in particular the horizontal rows of over-lapping cuffs on the short wig and the leopard skin with claws at the ends of the paws, as well as the animal’s head set askew just above the belt and waist tie. Inti wore a beaded collar and held a staff and scepter. The incomplete inscription reading from right to left above his head is plausibly to be restored as follows: [im3-nb] for *Sn∂m-¡b [the one honored] by the great god, Senedjemib [the Elder], whose good name is Inti.

As on the southern thickness, Meh stood facing his father, with hands hanging empty at his sides. He was wigless and his calf-length kilt had a flaring front panel. The damaged lines of text above his head faced left and perhaps once read: [heq-f mɔt] mɔy-ḏf.f (k) *Sn∂m-¡b, “the true [count, beloved] of his lord, Senedjemib.” Presumably, the space above was occupied by columns of text, as on the southern thickness.

Once again clear evidence of recutting survives. The raised relief figure of the son is obviously on a lower level than that of the surrounding surface and the background has never been finished. Moreover, the lower part of Inti’s staff is noticeably shallower than it is above, this part evidently having been cut away so that Meh’s right foot

94 Zt 60/6; “draft, sketch,” is unknown to WR, but appears again in Tino Cuffie, 49, pl. 4, and possibly also occurred in Lepsius, Mon., figs. 105, 107, 109, 111, 274, pl. 79, fig. 37. For a late occurrence, see IG I3, f. 177. Glaubinger from Draft of Medinet, p. 105, l. 1. Borchardt can make out in pl. 106 the middle of g 468 and below it the phonic determinative, which is due to the stem-meaning of g 468. “go round” (Gardiner, EFG, p. 110 [W 142]. See also fig. 2. 14, and p. 2. 14), and to the sides of the brickmaker’s mallet (Finder, Calligraphy, p. 32). These vertical and vertical, and it does not flow at the base like the walking stick. It should be noted that the sign faces back-wards, as it also does in spate in fig. 39.
95 Ead., Aigypt., 2. 176.
96 See Breasted, Ancient Records, i, pp. 177, and cf. Ead., Aigypt., 1, 5, 176; idem, Pharaonic, § 10. The orthography of the verb suggests it is a perfect or the im-

100 See Vandier, Manuel, p. 90.
102 LEP, Erg., pl. 8 [eight].
104 Lepsius shows a tall, narrow space after the name “Senedjemib” with possible poss-

Inscription 8, see below, p. 129 [4]. In the present case, Meh’s “lord” is probably his father rather than the king.
mighet be inserted. Conversely, the tip of the flaring front panel of Melch's skirt is actually carved over the staff and is thus at a higher level than the rest of his figure.

East wall

The scene on the east wall consisted of four registers of riverine and marsh scenes: papyrus plucking, the transport of papyrus bundles, the manufacture of papyrus boats, boatmen jousting, and scenes of navigation (pl. 22, 24b, figs. 38, 39). Even though it has deteriorated since Lepsius's time, this is the best preserved of the walls in G 2370 that were seen by him.

First Register: The greater part of the topmost register has been destroyed since Lepsius visited Giza. In his drawing (fig. 38), a man at the far right of the register facing right, feet firmly planted, exerted himself to pull up a stalk from a thicket of papyrus with both hands. Over his head was the legend sfb g, “plucking papyrus.” Although it is impossible to be certain, since his figure is now lost, it looks as if he had an unusual growth of hair on the back of the head. This may also have been true of the man behind him, the last individual in a file of four papyrus carriers proceeding towards the left. The other individuals in this register all appear to have had their hair cut.

The four papyrus carriers transported great bundles of stalks on their backs for use in the construction of the papyrus skiffs. The last of the four stood erect under his load and turned his head and the upper part of his body back towards the worker plucking papyrus. The first three papyrus carriers were shown in a progressively more erect posture from near to front, almost in cinematographic fashion, as if they represented one individual shown in three consecutive movements. The second and third figures staggered and bent under the weight of their loads. The action of each was identified as dp g, “hauling papyrus.” The first carrier, whose figure was rendered entirely in profile, leaned slightly forward and pulled on the rope binding his bundle of stalks with both hands. Unlike his fellows, the second carrier bore his burden with the umbilus at the bottom. Only the lower legs and feet of the first carrier, together with the chop under one end of the right-hand papyrus skiff, survive today.

The entire left half of the register was given over to the manufacture of papyrus boats. Six men working on two different skiffs were occupied in binding together the thick bundles of papyrus from which they were made. The men pull vigorously on ropes and spare coils above at their disposal. The short line of inscription over the men in the boat at the right is perhaps to be restored: dp s mfl, “[binding] papyrus boats.” Although it does not appear in Reisner’s photographs (pl. 22), the block with the figures of the three men working on the left-hand skiff has been restored to its original position on the wall and is included in fig. 39.

Second Register: Four papyrus skiffs were engaged in a tournament. The skiffs were painted off and their crews evenly matched, three men in each of the craft at the right and four men apiece in each of the skiffs at the left. Today the crews of the right-hand pair of boats are largely destroyed. The goal of the tournament was evidently to plunge the rival crew into the water (represented by a narrow rectangle) by means of the long, forked poles with which they are equipped. The lead man in one of the skiffs at the left has lost his balance and struggles to hang onto its prow. With his left hand he grabs the front leg of the second man in his boat. His opponent at the prow of the other skiff kneels to help him balance and to deliver a stinging overhead blow to his prostrate rival, but the blow is blocked with his pole by the second boatman. A large basket of fruit with a bouquet of lilies placed on top was set at the prow of one of the right-hand pair of boats, while piles of fruit occupy the spaces between the wide-spread legs of two of its crew. A similar basket and piles of fruit are set between the legs of the men in the other right-hand boat, and piles of fruit are also to be seen in the left-hand pair of skiffs. The size and shape of the fruit between the legs of the men in one of the two preserved boats, as seen in fig. 39, are suggestive of two different types of figs.

The garments of the marsh dwellers are typical of those worn by laborers of all classes and will recur repeatedly in the discussion below. A few words on this subject may therefore not be out of order at this point. It is unfortunate that the clothing of the subordinate figures in G 2370 and other tombs of the Senedjemib Complex is, in general, not very well preserved. For that reason better preserved examples of the same garments from other Old Kingdom tombs are reproduced in fig. 75 for purposes of comparison.

The man plucking papyrus at the far right of the first register, possibly two of the men working on papyrus skiffs at the opposite end of the same register, and the jousting boatmen in the register below appear to be clad only in a belt-sash tied at their backs. Belt-sashes like these may be tied in front (fig. 75a) or behind (fig. 75b) or the loose ends may dangle both in front and behind (fig. 75c). The sash by itself is worn by craftsmen, agricultural workers, marsh dwellers, including fishermen and fowlers, and hunters.

101 LID, Egypiz, pl. 18.
102 For details of the papyrus harvest, see Vandier, Manuel II, p. 425.
103 Montet, Sénou, p. 74. The actual arrangement of signs in the first word is in fact the sign for tobacco according to the principles enunciated by Gardiner in “The Hieroglyphs of the New Empire” (JEA, 1936) and Ortiz (1938, 58, 90–97).
104 Marsh-dwellers with a long growth of hair at the back of the head are not common before the New Kingdom; see Davies, Papyrus I, pp. 73–77.
106 Montet, Sénou, p. 74.
107 WB 4, p. 16, 17; d. Monnet, Sénou, p. 79; Boeux, Necropole, pp. 177–87.
Belt-sashes are also worn in combination with a very short, round-edged kilt made from a semicircular piece of cloth. When coupled with the very-short round-edged kilt, the belt-sash may once again be tied either in front or behind (figs. 74d-f). Two of the workers working on the papyrus skiffs at the left side of the first register appear to have worn such round-edged kilts with the knot of the belt-sash at the back. The round-edged kilt and belt-sash combination is worn by much the same categories of workers as the simple belt-sash at the back. The round-edged kilt and belt-sash combination is worn by much the same categories of workers as the simple belt-sash at the back. The round-edged kilt and belt-sash combination is worn by much the same categories of workers as the simple belt-sash at the back.

One of the skiff builders appears to have worn the belt-sash (tied behind) in combination with a plain, short, kilt. Parallels are not lacking (fig. 75b), but the belt-sash may also be worn with a folded kilt with overlap (fig. 74f).

Two of the workers busy transporting bundles of papyrus wear another type of laborers garment, a long belt-sash whose loose ends hang down in front. Intact examples of this garment are preserved in a scene in the chapel of Khnumemi, and the garment is discussed under that heading.

Third Register. This register was made twice the height of the other registers in order to accommodate the raised sails of the ships. Three blunt-ended craft sail upriver with the prevailing north wind. All three ships are on the starboard tack with belaying sail. These are flat-bottomed ships, each with the mast placed well forward and a deckhouse aft of midship. In the first and second ships the deckhouse canopy extends over the foredeck, whereas the third ship has an open verandah or bay in the stern. The deckhouses evidently consisted of matwork awnings over a wooden frame. All three ships are fitted with two steering oars or rudders.

In the first ship, the rowers ship their oars as three sailors standing upon the framework of the deckhouse haul on the halyards to hoist the sail. At the bow a pilot keeps watch, while a sailor at the stern handles the braces, and a steersman (this combination is destroyed) maneuvers one of two oars. The figure in a
call-length kilt and leaning upon a staff before the awning of the deckhouse in two of the ships probably represents Lent himself.

On the second ship the mast is lashed to a heavy pole or knee whose lower part is obscured by a bulwark. The pilot in the bow steadies himself by hanging onto the foretree. He looks backwards, in the same direction that the three sailors standing on the foredeck and the two beneath the deckhouse canopy are facing. The sailors are probably relaying the pilot’s instructions to the two steersmen who would have stood at the stern of the vessel (traces of one of their figures survive). The heads of the rowers are visible above the bulwark that would have supported the oars, even though the bulwark itself is destroyed except for a short section on the foredeck.

The third ship is the least well preserved of the three. Nevertheless two figures are visible at the bow, the first holding onto the foretree and the second perhaps the pilot with his sounding pole. Traces of four sailors are visible behind these two men, while at the stern of the boat two steersmen turn the oars.

All of the captions to the scene face right. Over the head of the man handling the braces in the first ship, three damaged columns of text perhaps read: (1) [ṣs £wr m–w]-hr t£ wr nfr ð, nfr ð. (2) ‘Come about to starboard’[300] (2) [in front of you] [300] It is the right moment! (3) You are paying attention to the braces’[300] A narrow space separates the last column of text from the next, which evidently contains the commands of the pilot at the bow of the second boat, as he guides his craft: [ṣs £wr m–w]-hr ð-[bš·st], ‘Make to port,’[300] ‘the fairyway is in front of you’[300] Above the man at the braces in this boat are two columns of text: (1) [ṣs £wr m–w]-hr t£ wr nfr ð, nfr ð. (2) ‘[Be]ze’[300] every wind […] every […] (2) The wind is favorable behind you. A second caption of two columns stands above the head of the pilot and his assistant in the last boat: (1) [ṣs £wr imy w]-imy w t£ wr nfr ð. (2) ‘Fist board’[300]
towards the west at (2) this very moment so that we may fare well!\(^\text{138}\)

**Fourth Register.** On the return journey, three ships are rowed with the current both to increase the vessel’s speed and to assist in steering. To avoid the effect of the adverse wind, the masts have been removed and presumably stowed on the deck.\(^\text{139}\) The procession of ships travels to the left, in the opposite direction from the sailing ships in the register above. In actual fact, located as they are on the east wall of Room II, these ships face north, as if traveling downstream, just as the sailing ships face south or upstream. The pilot in the first two ships here, and probably originally also in the third, stands at the bow with a long recording pole in one hand and guides his craft. In the first and last ships he has a companion, who glances over his shoulder in the first instance, presumably to pass on the observations of the pilot to the steersmen at the oarswheels. The man standing facing right on the forecastle of the first ship, and holding a scepter-like baton, may be its captain.\(^\text{140}\) The rowers in the first ship, eighteen in number originally, are visible except for their legs. Arms bent at the elbow, they grasp the shafts of the oars, their bodies leaning slightly backwards at the end of the stroke. Even though they appear to sit on crossboards the height of the gunwale, in actuality they probably sat at deck height with the deck beams as thwart.\(^\text{141}\) The oars have long, pointed blades and would have been fastened to the gunwale with slings and securing lines.\(^\text{142}\) Most of the slings were still visible in 1930 (pl. 24b). Both rudders and helmsmen are represented on the port side, but due to the nature of Egyptian artistic conventions, it is uncertain whether there were two or four rudders and helmsmen.\(^\text{143}\) A rope runs along the shafts of the rudders of the first ship and was presumably tied at the neck of the blade. Also visible in the 1930 photograph are two rectangles fore and aft, beneath the feet on one of the helmsmen and the assistant to the bow watch, which probably represented the ends of transverse beams.\(^\text{144}\) In the middle of the forward annex of the deckhouse of the first ship a papyrus bud capital supports the roof.\(^\text{145}\) Above the boat a line of hieroglyphs (pl. 24b) informs us that its occupants constitute part of the retinue of the vizier: [n\(^\text{fer} \) sqdwt nfr t \(\sqrt{\text{ty}} \) t\(\text{y} \) t\(\text{y} \) t\(\text{y} \) t\(\text{y} \) t\(\text{y} \) t\(\text{y} \)] \([\text{[and vizier Senedjemib]}\).\(^\text{146}\)

Unlike the first craft, which is blunt-ended, the hulls of the other two ships have rounded ends. A platform protrudes over the stern of the better preserved of the ships. Models show that even these rounded-end ships were flat-bottomed with angular bilges and slightly rounded sides, while the round ends are transoms with a rounded transition to the flat bottom.\(^\text{147}\)

The rowers in the second craft lean sharply backwards and thus are shown at a different moment of the stroke than the rowers in the first ship. The short superscription, reading right to left, is as follows: updet aft r wrr wvm ykopt (\(\text{[and vizier Senedjemib]}\). The last boat is poorly preserved. The deckhouse has extensions over the foredeck and stern and a papyrus bud capital to support the roof of the forward annex. In front of the pilot is a short column of inscription which is perhaps to be restored: \([\text{[and vizier Senedjemib]}\).\(^\text{148}\)

**South Wall**

Of five registers copied by Lepsius (fig. 40),\(^\text{149}\) only part of the left-hand two-thirds of the fourth and fifth registers are preserved today (pl. 24a, fig. 40). The upper part of the wall originally showed Ini borne in a palanquin and accompanied by officials and servants carrying personal equipment, while below statues were dragged on sledges and butchers were shown at work.

**First Register.** The palanquin or carrying chair was a symbol of high social rank and importance,\(^\text{150}\) and the motif of the tomb owner borne in a palanquin or carrying chair is found in the mastabas of a number of high officials of the Old Kingdom.\(^\text{151}\) Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that the use of a carrying chair was a prerogative granted to the king, who also appointed noble youths of the resi-
dence to carry it. The men were divided into two groups, regularly spaced along the length of the poles, so that the forward figure was partially overlapped by those behind. Since this is the only example of a palanquin scene in which the porters are not equal in number, and there was sufficient space at the head of the first file, it seems likely, even though the hand of the first preserved figure appears to cup the end of the pole, that Lepusis either inadvertently omitted the first porter or that his figure had previously been destroyed. In the event, Senedjemib would have been borne aloft by a total of twenty-eight porters, more than the number assigned to any personage other than the high granary official Ankhamkhe, who has a like number. Walking alongside the palanquin was a sunshade bearer and two of the vizier’s hunting dogs. Attired like the porters, the sunshade bearer was wigless and wore a long belt-sash whose loose ends hung down in front. The abbrevi- garded garment is regularly worn by all sorts of laborers, including porters of carrying chairs. In the case of the porters and the sunshade bearer, Lepusis’s artist has drawn the garment as though it were worn over a kilt. This combination does not seem to appear otherwise in other Old Kingdom reliefs.

The sunshade consisted of a piece of cloth stretched over a pair of criss-crossed sticks supported by a pole attached at the point of intersection. A flap hung freely on one side. The border may represent the edge of the cloth rolled inward or a wooden frame around the crosspieces. The sunshade projected into the top register in order to shade Inti’s eyes. Beneath the flap was a short horizontal line of text, the speech perhaps of the porters just below: ‘I am [the sunshade bearer]’. ‘Go please, O happy one’. Inti’s dogs, with erect, pointed ears, narrow flanks, and relatively short curled tail, resemble the Sudanese Basenji.

Third Register. Nine attendants walked to the left. They wore their own close-cut hair and the long belt-sash with pendant ends. The right arm of the first man hung down with hand open, while his left arm was bent at the elbow and the hand clenched on his chest. The right arm of the next figure was destroyed but his clenched left hand was visible. The third man held two sticks(?) over his shoulder. What look like a pair of sticks are held over the shoulder or in the armpits of various laborers in several Old Kingdom reliefs. One Old Kingdom relief shows the vizier sitting on the floor of the carrying chair (presumably on a cushion) with his knees drawn up before him. Lepusis’s draftsman mis- interpreted the form of the fly whisk made of three fox skins which the vizier held over his left shoulder. As is customary in such scenes, the vizier probably held a short stick or baton before him in his de- serted right hand. He was wigless and wore a beaded collar. The arms of the first visible porter were destroyed but his clenched left hand was visible. Unlike Nefer-seshem-sekhut, who wore the long kilt favored for the representation of older men, the other two attendants had short, belted kilts with flaring front panels. The heads of all three individuals were destroyed.

Second Register. Even though the porters in contextuality would have been arrayed in two rows, each row having charge of one of the carry- ing poles, the ancient artist only depicted a single row of bearers,

References are to be found in Vandier, Manuel 4, p. 513 n. 3 (‘chaise longue’), to which should be added Simpson, in Fi Elnar Eldig, fig. 5, idem, Qar and lidt, fig. 37, pl. 108 fig. 98, pl. 116 (Vandier no. XXVIII), Naucratis, pl. 615; Verban, Paletumov, pl. 132; Weeks, Egypt Cod. Omnon, fig. 32, pl. 20 (Vandier no. XVI), Borchardt, Cemetery of Palaces, Abounds, fig. 190, for discussion, see Borchardt, AR, p. 18; Junker, Giza V, p. 216–17; Vandier, Manuel 4, pp. 316–19; Weeks, JEAL 45 (1953), pp. 8–11. See now also Brovarski, in MiE, fig. 5, Naucratis, pl. 615; Weeks, Egypt Cod. Omnon, fig. 32, with Borchardt, Deux, t. pl. 501 (LG 1926) and Mari, p. 312.


See, for example, the scene of Khnumenti in a carrying chair discussed below, pp. 316–17. The banquet appears in a variety of different contexts where the owner is shown seated and probably substitutes for the more cumbersome scepter as a symbol of authority; see Fischer, MMN (1875), pp. 18–20.

For other examples of scenes that depict an action which occurred simultaneously in several registers, see above, the text, Smith, HESP, p. 147.

Cf. Junker, Giza IV, p. 87; pl. 28; Fischer, Verban, p. 39 fig. 8. In the tomb of Nefer- hierxorak (Weeks, Cemetery of Omnon, fig. 17), an official is shown with a wand in the form of a human hand from a case like the cher. In the chapel of Mentuhotep I.D. pl. 41 a similar figure is labeled “ Sacred Wand” (Weeks, t. p. 3, 8). See now Fischer, Verban Nova, p. 239 and n. 461.

See above, p. 16 and n. 17.
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generally straight and not wavy as in the present case. The next three individuals raised one hand or two to help steady their burdens. The head of the fourth man was destroyed and the rectangular box he carried damaged. The two attendants immediately behind him bore two cavetto-corniced chests on their shoulders, the first one square, the other oblong. The position of the arms and hands of the seventh man suggest that he likewise carried a box or chest, despite the fact that its outline was omitted by Lepsius’s draftsman. The eighth man balanced a plain rectangular box on his shoulder with his raised right hand, while a wickerwork frail dangled by a cord from his right elbow.723 His other hand hung drenched behind. The last man appears to have lstly slightly forward, as if the cloth sack he carried slung over his shoulder with his left hand contained something heavy. His right hand hung free in front.

**Fourth Register.** The transport of two life-size standing statues of the vizier was shown in symmetrical scenes. As noted above, the lower left two-thirds of the register survives today. According to Lepsius, both statues had heads at their sides and were attired in plain, tight-fitting, belted kilts. In fact, traces visible today indicate that the left-hand statue wore a short kilt with flaring front panel. It apparently also had a shoulder-length wig, while the other statue was wigless. A detail not apparent in Lepsius’s drawing is the pendant tail of a hoop and skin vestment between the legs of the statue on the right. The statues stood inside two cavetto-corniced shrines with open doors. So that the statues might be seen, the shrines were represented full front.724 The heavy shrines were set on sledges and pulled by four statues stood inside two cavetto-corniced shrines with open doors. They were probably alike were wigless and wore plain, tight-fitting, belted kilts. Two were already destroyed by the time of his visit. Haulers and thurifers of the hand which held up the incense burner, and presumably these to the left arm of the thurifer on the right as well as his other forearm and the hand held up the incense burner, and presumably these already destroyed by the time of his visit. Haulers and thurifers alike were wigless and wore plain, tight-fitting, belted kilts. Two short legends were inscribed over the scenes. They were probably identical and are possibly to be restored: “Also × × ṯw tpj ḫp ḫy ṯnhḏk, “escorting a statue of the chief justice and vizier Senedjemib.”

In the previous registers Inti in the palmquen and his entourage faced left, as though the procession were leaving the tomb on some errand. The action in this register proceeds into the tomb, the direction of the procession which escorted any statues to be deposited in the two serdabs behind the west walls of Rooms III and V would have taken.725

**Fifth Register.** Three groups of butchers and their assistants appear with an equal number of sacrificial animals thrown on the ground.726 Since the right third of this register is destroyed, the last group on the right is known only from Lepsius. In each instance, the animal had three legs tightly bound, immobilizing it. The butcher in the first group at the left bends over to the right with a knife in his right hand to cut off a foreleg at the joint. His left hand pushes against the foreleg to ease his task. His assistant at the right faces in the opposite direction and seizes the leg with both hands as he pulls it upright. Although Lepsius has omitted the detail, he places his right foot on the horns of the animal to obtain leverage or to immobilize its head. The tail of the animal is raised and bears the air.727 The group in the middle differs in a number of particulars from that at the left. For example, the butcher positions his knee midway up the foreleg, as if to section the leg by cutting, while his other hand pushes against the leg above. His assistant kneels on the victim, whose tail is curled around its rump. The tail of the ox in the last group at the right was either erroneously omitted by Lepsius’s draftsman or had been destroyed, but otherwise the arrangement of the group resembles closely that of the left-hand group of butchers.

Lepsius shows one of the butchers and all three of their assistants dressed in belt-sashes tied at the back.728 The butchers in the middle and right-hand groups look to be wearing the short kilt usual in such scenes, although the kilt of the latter butcher has an overlap.729 From traces visible today, however, it seems clear that the butcher in the left-hand group, in actual fact, wore a short kilt rather than the abbreviated garment drawn by Lepsius’s draftsman. It is possible that the draftsman misinterpreted a whetstone that was tucked into the butcher’s belt, as is often the case in such scenes, as a belt-sash tied behind the back of this individual. The draftsman has in fact correctly indicated a section of the cord attached to the whetstone hanging down at the back of the butcher in the middle group.730 Other traces visible today suggest that the figure of the assistant in the left-hand group wore the very short round-edged kilt. No trace of a belt-sash survives, but it is possible that he originally had such a sash tied around his waist.731 Considering how common this combination is, it is possible that the other two assistants were indeed dressed like the first. All the men in this register had their hair cut close to their heads.

The speeches above the heads of each group of butchers were separated by vertical dividers. They proceed as usual from the speaker
towards the person who is addressed.\textsuperscript{183} The butcher in the group at
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Viewing 195 the hinterlands and every good thing con-

The figures of three other sons stood facing right on baselines one
above the other at the stern of the craft. All three were wigless and
dressed in calf-length kilt with flowing front panel. Any identifying
caption that may have existed was destroyed before Lepsius’s visit.
The figure possibly represented a son of Inti.\textsuperscript{191}

The butcher in the right-hand group appears to have said: \textit{mk mn}
\textit{mk mn∞t ¢nk m ™n∞, “Get a good grip on your life!”} The latter replies: \textit{iryc (i) rz k rz nb}, \textit{“I will act with a view to what you will praise more than anything!”}\textsuperscript{184} To \textit{rk nb nb ybr}, \textit{“Pull hard, commander!”} 185 says the next butcher to his assistant. The laster’s reply is damaged, but Erman thought it might have read
mk mn∞, “See, the haunch is in my hand.”\textsuperscript{184} The butcher in the right-hand group above has said: \textit{mk mf r∞c∞ o nrb llk∞ “Hold on so that it (the knife) may slaughter the young-go of yr!”}\textsuperscript{185} His assistant all likelihood replied: \textit{tr(j) [n]y[r], “I shall do (it), [a]com[trade]!}\textsuperscript{185}

At first glance, the lowermost registers of the south wall seem to be
devoted to subjects unrelated to that of the three registers above, that
is, to the transport of statues to the tomb and the slaughter of
sacrificial animals.\textsuperscript{186} Nevertheless, both Junker and Wild have dis-
discussed scenes where the “living,” tomb owner is depicted together
with his statues on the occasion of the actual transport of the statues
to the tomb.\textsuperscript{187} This representation may constitute yet another oc-
currence of this genre of scenes. Moreover, once the statues of the
tomb owner were removed from their sledges, food offerings, includ-
ing offerings of meat, were made to them.\textsuperscript{188} The bottom register
here perhaps represent a preliminary stage in that ritual, the animals
being slaughtered prior to the arrival of the statues. If so, this would
probably certainly help to explain the juxtaposition of the otherwise seemingly
unrelated scenes on this wall.

West Wall

The west wall of Room II was largely intact when Lepsius saw it in
1843–45 (fig. 42).\textsuperscript{190} By 1912, when Reisner cleared the mastaba, the
scene was destroyed except for the very bottom (pls. 25b–27a, fig. 43).

\textsuperscript{180} See above, p. 41, n. 70.

\textsuperscript{181} According to James, Albouche, p. 31 (15), lb nb(an) “by your life,” probably means literally “May you be fresh in lifet;” e. Millet, MDÆK (1975), p. 60; Simpson, Selekt-wad-nb, p. 24, Erman, Rohde, p. 8 (5/2), on the other hand, translates, “was du kannst,” and Seeth, in Murray, Say
what, p. 33 (12), “in those cases,” “in your case.”

\textsuperscript{182} Gunn, Bowd, pp. 1–10, takes it as an idiom meaning “to act with a view to,” “to aim at,” literally “to act towards,” and believes it here be an example of the

\textsuperscript{183} As an idiom meaning “I will [do] according to what you will approve of.”

\textsuperscript{184} Edel, Ägypt. Grenz. s, p. 734, on the other hand, thinks it here to be an example of the the preposition \textit{an} and translates the entire expression: “ich bin dann de
 Neither, Inscriptions of the Year, s, 451, however, is of the opinion that \textit{steb f} means only “until he has heard,” and that other seeming instances of \textit{steb f} with the meaning “so that he will hear” instead represent the intensive with suppositional subject. \textit{Steb f} in the latter case would mean something like “I will act according to your favoring.”

\textsuperscript{185} Erman, Rohde, p. 12.

\textsuperscript{186} Ibid. For son, “qeh (of os or man), “haunch, upper hind leg (of ox),” see WB 2, p. 68 (6-11); AEO, p. 44 f., 44b, p. 422.

\textsuperscript{187} Cf. Montet, Altes (1937), p. 98, Edel, Ägypt. Grenz. s, p. 734. The translation assumes that either there was space under the letter \textit{r} the the \textit{b} of \textit{bub} which was already destroyed when Lepsius visited Giza or that his draftsman omitted the letter

\textsuperscript{188} Lepsius’s draftsman apparently reversed the direction of the eye in \textit{zkt}

\textsuperscript{189} For more transport, cf. Klüte, Holzg, p. 42; Montet, Sahis, pp. 98-99; Eton-Kraus, Repräsentationen von Statuari, pp. 43-47.


\textsuperscript{180} Ibid., pp. 71–73, 175, cat. nos. 138-191; see also below, p. 511.

\textsuperscript{182} LIFS, pl. 77.

\textsuperscript{183} Säo-Sidebergh, Hippopotamus Hunting, p. 12.

\textsuperscript{184} See above, p. 41 and ss.

\textsuperscript{185} As he probably represents an example of the circumstantial \textit{an} used in leg-
ends to describe a concurrent action, for which see Polotsky, Tese, p. 5, n. 8; Dem, NIV, p. 16. Properly speaking, the legend should be translated “the hereditary
prince and owner … [Senedjemib] as he raises the number and every good thing consisting of the activity of the fields.” For practical reasons having to do
with the length of the inscription and the numbering of the lines, we have con-
vencionally translated the legend as “Viewing … [Senedjemib].” The same practice is in general followed throughout the present volume.

\textsuperscript{186} Lepsius’s artist thought he saw a squatting human figure instead of the wall deter-
inizations of \textit{ydr} (Ydr); he also drew the top two of those paired short strokes com-
prising the stela name in the final title as though they were two earth-signs (N

\textsuperscript{187} See pp. 35-46 above.
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In the middle of the wall Inti stood facing right in a papyrus skiff watching a hippopotamus hunt. Behind him in five registers at the left, episodes from life in the marshes were depicted, including the rearing of cattle, the preparation of food, and the manufacture of mats by herdsmen. In contrast to the New Kingdom, when the tomb owner takes an active part in the hippopotamus hunt, in the Old Kingdom he is content to stand in his boat and observe it, while the animal is attacked by several harpooners simultaneously.\textsuperscript{189} This type of scene is relatively rare in the Old Kingdom, and the parallels are all close in time.\textsuperscript{184}

Inti held a long walking stick at a diagonal with his left hand in front and a handkerchief in his right hand hanging behind. He was

\textsuperscript{180} See above, p. 41, n. 70.

\textsuperscript{181} As he probably represents an example of the circumstantial \textit{an} used in leg-
ends to describe a concurrent action, for which see Polotsky, Tese, p. 5, n. 8; Dem, NIV, p. 16. Properly speaking, the legend should be translated “the hereditary
prince and owner … [Senedjemib] as he raises the number and every good thing consisting of the activity of the fields.” For practical reasons having to do
with the length of the inscription and the numbering of the lines, we have con-
vencionally translated the legend as “Viewing … [Senedjemib].” The same practice is in general followed throughout the present volume.

\textsuperscript{182} Lepsius’s artist thought he saw a squatting human figure instead of the wall deter-
inizations of \textit{ydr} (Ydr); he also drew the top two of those paired short strokes com-
prising the stela name in the final title as though they were two earth-signs (N

\textsuperscript{183} See pp. 35-46 above.
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directly. The middle figure apparently represented as fn [r s fi t njet n nb j]; lo Fek-[i], “his bodily son, the scribe of royal records of the presence,” Fekef-[i].

The bottom figure belonged to as fn [h s f [ ... Hmun-nfd], “his bodily son, [...] Khenenmut[ti].” This last named individual, the owner of p 2374 (below, pp. 153–50), was vizier and overseer of all works of the king under King Teri.

The prow and stern of Inti’s papyrus boat were lifted well clear of the water with the stern more elevated than the prow. It was bound around the hull and was reinforced with rope along the upper edge of the body.203 Boats analogous to this, made from conical bundles of reeds laid side by side and lashed together at intervals, were used until recently in Nubia.

The papyrus thicker in front of Inti’s boat abounded with wild life. A genet and an ichneumon climbed papyrus stalks in intent on robbing the bird nests above. A single fledgling was still to be seen on the lower of the two nests, but Lepsius’s draftsman has shown the upper nest as if it were empty, and presumably the figures of other fledglings in the lower nest and all of the baby birds in the upper nest had been destroyed by them. Lepsius’s draftsman actually indicated the damage to the lower nest as a blank area in the midst of the papyrus stems. Over the thicket fluttered several species of birds and two butterflies. Several of the birds were damaged and the representations on the whole are unidentifiable, but included are what was probably a duck next to the butterfly in the third row from the top and a lapwing (Vanellus vanellus)204 on the right in the same row, as well as another lapwing and a hoopoe at the left of the bottom row. The two harpooners in the midst of the dense thicket wore their own hair cut close to the head and belt-sashes tied behind. They faced right and with their right hands hunted home the harpoons at their prey in the water below, while in their left hands they held coiled a rope tied to the harpoon shaft near the bottom.205 Their prey in the water below, while in their left hands they held a spitted bird over a low brazier, the coals of which were kept hot, and roasted it. The man on the left baked what was evidently a rounded loaf on a bed of coal and hot ashes in a brazier, and likewise the man on the right, his bodily son, who grasped the overseer’s wrist characteristically held by the overseer) and shows the herdsman grasping the overseer’s wrist instead. Both the overseer and the standing herdsman were wigged, and both probably wore plain, belted kilts, even though the line at the bottom of the overseer’s kilt was evidently not seen by Lepsius’s artist. Behind the attendant and facing towards the overseer sat a pet dog with narrow flank and erect pointed ears. The presence of the isolated hieroglyph motif, “herdsman,” behind Nedjem and separated from his caption by a divider, may indicate the presence of a destroyed figure at the far left. Admittedly, the available space is limited, but a satisfactory alternative does not present itself.

The right half of the register was divided horizontally into two subregisters. On the left of the lower subregister a cook facing left roasted a spitted bird over a low brazier, the coals of which were kept aflame by the action of the wicker fan in his right hand.206 To the right was a group consisting of two more herdsmen sitting facing to face on the ground. The man on the left baked what was evidently a rounded loaf on a bed of coal and hot ashes in a brazier, and likewise kept the fire alight by fanning. The short label before his face reads...
from right to left and is probably to be restored: ʿupelta, "baking (dough)." 160 From the position of the arms of the man on the right, it seems likely that he plunged both hands into a pot at his feet from which he would have extracted the dough, even though the pot itself was destroyed. Although the traces of signs as copied by Lepsius's draftsman do not entirely conform, parallels to the scene suggest that the legend reading from left to right before his face is probably to be restored: [ʿap] ʿupelta, ["kneading"] (dough foot) šeabuš. 161 All three individuals in this bottom subregister sat on the ground with both legs raised before them, but the legs of the man at the right are not as tightly drawn up as in the other two cases. All three men were wigless and perhaps naked, since Lepsius's artist has indicated the private parts of the man on the right.

In the upper subregister a meal for the herdsmen was set out. The subregister was badly damaged but the three tall objects at the left probably represented sealed beer jars on stands. To the right of the lacuna was a conical basket and still further to the right possibly the legend reading from left to right before his face is probably to be restored: ʿsqnš, "twisting papyrus mats." 166 Beneath the caption a narrow rectangle without inner detail was depicted; from parallels it seems that it represented a mat with papyrus fibers laid out upon it. 167 Behind the man at the right were piled a number of utilitarian articles presumably made from papyrus or of rushes: a life-preserver or swimming float, an oblong bag with loop handles (only one is preserved), and a splayed, two-handled basket (with a lid). 168 The left-hand group of herdsmen were occupied in cleaning a finished mat with brushes of vegetable fiber doubled into half their length and lashed together at the doubled end. 169 The caption between the two men, reading right to left, is: ʿsqnš, "cleaning a mat." 170

The friezes of objects in the subregister above was once again badly damaged. A bassa-jar, that is, a shoulderared jar with concave lower part and flaring foot, 171 and what are probably bread loaves of different shapes are discernible. The whole probably constituted additional provisions for the workers.

Fifth Register. Only the very bottom of this register is preserved today. At the right a long-horned cow stood facing right. Facing in the opposite direction, a herdman, who was perhaps dressed in a plain kilt of which a belt alone is an indication, knelt with his buttocks resting on his heels and milked the cow. A large bowl was set on the ground below the cow’s udder to catch the milk. Usually in

160 On brushes in general, see Reisner, MDAE II (1923), pp. 102–107 and figs. 19–20; Vandier, Menès II, p. 16. Fans of similar shape appear among the objects represented on Middle Kingdom coffins (Kraft, Frises d’Égypte, pp. 264–267; see also Fischer, MM II (1975), p. 155, n. 9, fig. 5; Thompson, RCÉ II (1957), p. 80–81) and it seems probable in our case to represent the present example as a fingerboard.

161 Montet, Sénénret, pp. 110–112. Lepsius’s artist misinterpreted the "sand" as a crocodile (fig. 34). The loaves are sometimes shown baking on the coals or in the ashes of a fire (e.g., LDA II, pl. 46; Hassan, Gîte 7, fig. 22(9); van der Waal, Néfrém I, p. 69; fig. 12; pl. 27; 2 pl. 27; Neumann, p. 2, pl. 79; and WB II, p. 255, 11. actually transliterated ḫn, "pith"; in der Asche backen. LDA II, pl. 46, instead shows the loaves on a table on top of a footed brazier or table. Usually, several loaves are depicted, and the present scene is unique in showing only one loaf. On ḫn, see further Samaha, BIFAO 43 (1940), p. 22, n. 8; van der Waal, Néfrém II, p. 65, 1, 233; Verhoeven, Goldis, Richters, Duchêne, pp. 74ff., 205, 206, 217, 218–221. See the Old Kingdom papyrus of Middle Egyptian ḫn (WB II, p. 106, 107; 107; 112; 113, n. 2; Allen, Influences of the Vv 7: 73; Montet, Sénénret, pp. 110–112, transliteration bẖ n “dough,” but Edel, Quellen 17, 3, 211 (10); Edel remarks that if the leaf were made has been easily translatable into modern food, probably of a type of bread. ḫn is usually decorated with three small, round circles, and if the references in the preceding notes are examined, it will be seen that the leaves themselves generally have a round or oval shape. On ḫn, see also Verhoeven, Goldis, Richters, Duchêne, pp. 74ff., 206; 217, 218–221.


163 WB I, p. 184, 5:4–5:5; Montet, Sénénret, p. 97

Third Register. On the right a cow turned her head backwards towards her sucking calf. Lepsius omitted a rear leg which would probably have been lifted so that the calf might better nurse. 164 At the left were the overlapping figures of two recumbent long-horned bulls or cows. Three older calves, one standing and two lying down, were placed on separate groundlines in the field of the register above.

Fourth Register. This register was also bisected by a horizontal groundline. In the lower portion of the register two groups of herdsmen sat face to face on the ground. All four individuals had their legs drawn up before them, and they appear to have been wigless and naked. The papyrus plant (Cyperus Papyrus) was used by the ancient Egyptians for numerous purposes, including the manufacture of mats, 165 and the two men at the right were shown twining or plaiting papyrus fibers into mats. Between them was a caption in two lines reading from right to left: šn Ḫwtq ("twisting papyrus mats.
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milking scenes the cow’s hind legs are bound. If this had also been the case here, the rope binding was evidently lost when the mortuary fall out from the bed between joint to two blocks at this point, as is clearly indicated in Lepsius’s drawing. The caption over the cow’s back reads *dr šr*
  *drawing milk.*

Looking on at the left an overseer leant on a long staff in a relaxed pose, one hand on top of the staff and the other extended along its shaft. He was weigless and wore a short kilt with flaring front. A calf behind him awaited its turn at its mother’sudder. Above the calf’s short text in two columns was inscribed, it read from right to left, but damage obscures its meaning: *dw šut in […] m; “Placing the calf in the […]”.*

**North Wall**

The decoration on the north wall originally comprised five registers of craftspeople working. By the time of Lepsius’s visit the first register and the better part of the second were already lost (fig. 44). By 1932, only two registers and part of a third remained (pl. 27b, fig. 41).

First Register. Destroyed.

Second Register. Only the bottom left half of this register with the lower part of six figures survived in 1843–45. At the far left appeared a group composed of a standing figure facing right and at its feet and facing it, two other figures, one behind the other, in the ordinary sitting position for men with one leg doubled under and the other leg raised. Closer to the middle of the register a second group can be made out which appears to have consisted of a second standing figure facing right, heel raised and weight resting on his front foot as though leaning forward, and of two more figures sitting face to face. The only vestiges of costume remaining are traces of belts around the waists of the seated figures. Considering that the registers below were occupied with the “production of funerary equipment essential to the proper burial of the tomb owner and for his continued existence in the next life,” it seems plausible that the destroyed top register and the present register were given over to the same theme. If this was indeed the case, the standing figure at the far left of the register and the seated figures at its feet might well represent a painter and an assistant putting the finishing touches on a statue. Although no base is indicated for the striding figure in Lepsius’s plate, the statue base is sometimes omitted from depictions of statues in workshop scenes. The second group could have been working on another statue or alternately adding the finishing touches to another item of funerary equipment, the standing figure leaning over the head of the other figures in order to reach the object being worked on. Craftspeople working on wooden statues were not infrequently segregated from the sculptors who made statues of stone and, if the above identification of the activities taking place in this register is correct, it may well be that artisans represented here were indeed working on wooden statues, while the activities of the sculptors in stone were relegated to the fourth and fifth registers where they are associated with the dril-ling of stone vases.

Third Register. The manufacture of wooden furniture was shown. The first group at the left consisted of carpenters or joiners in the process of making a bed. The carpenter on the left facing right held a mortising chisel in his left hand which he struck on the handle with a club-shaped mallet held in his other hand. The label above reads: *sh 7mp in fšf,* “mortising a bed by a carpenter.” His partner on the other side of the bed faced left and was evidently at work with an axe. Even though Lepsius’s artist has omitted the axe blade, this is what the label over his head (determined with an axe) seems to indi-cate: *m.-ny, “fashioning (with an axe).”* The caption over the head and before the face of the man who approached the pair carrying a rectangular object tells us what he was up to: *int nrt in fšf,* “bringing a board by a carpenter.”

The second group of carpenters was also at work on a bed. The carpenter at the left of the bed facing right held a long, handled implement in his right hand whose other end apparently rested in the palm of his left hand. The damaged label above his head is unintelli-gible as it stands and, while it is clearly necessary to emend it, the original reading is not at all certain. One possibility is: *šnty šta in *šty,* “sharpening ‘the adze’ by a polisher.” The man on the
right of the bed facing left seemingly dressed the surface of the bed by means of a rounded stone rubber which he manipulated with both hands. Above him was probably written: wfl[a]t fi feet, “polishing a b[ed] by a carpenter.”647 Polishing or sanding in ancient Egypt was done with pieces of fine-grained sandstone.648 The next figure to the right brought another board. The legend over his head is again unintelligible, except for the first word: nst, “board.”649

The last two men in the register both faced towards the right. The left-hand figure may have been sawing wood tied in an upright position in an alluvial soil (?) pit.650 Saw and sawyer’s post are no longer visible in Lepsius’s drawing but the disposition of the arms is suggestive, even though Lepsius’s artist does not appear to have the position of the hands quite right. Parallels suggest that the sawyer actually held the handle of the saw in his right hand and pressed down on the blade from above with his other hand in order to increase the cutting power.645 The last figure cut a board from the top downward with a pull-saw using both hands. Since the cutting edge of the teeth in Egyptian saws was set away from the handle, and the saw functioned only when drawn backwards, his characteristic pose with both hands placed on the handle of the saw indicates he is pulling back the saw.645 The abbreviated-shoulder pose here as elsewhere allowed for the representation of arm movement in front of the body.650 The rope with which the wood is tied in place is carefully indicated, but Lepsius’s artist has done less well by the saw. Egyptian saws had large, fairly wide blades and the ends were rounded and quite broad.644 Here the saw is thin in parallel sides and the characteristic wooden handle, which curved downwards, is omitted. The captions above the two sawyers are badly damaged. The signs above the head of the right-hand sawyer is perhaps to be read wet(?) “sawing.”650 The saw and the adze just behind the head of the other man probably represent the determinatives of the word fish, “carpenter,” as in the other two occurrences of the word in this register. All of the carpenters had their hair cut short. All that Lepsius shows of their clothing are a number of belts or belt knots.

Fourth Register. Due to the loss of a block from the left side of this register, a kneeling figure seen by Lepsius is no longer extant. Three other figures facing right are partially preserved today, although their heads are missing. Damage to the wall obscures the nature of their task. The pose of the man at the left seems to have approximated the attitude of the center figure, who stands and bends forward at the waist. He holds what is obviously a tool of some kind in his right hand and places his other, open hand upon the object on which they are working. Insomuch as the third man apparently sits on and straddles its end, it is possible that they are rough dressing a log with axes, giving it the required shape or profile.646 Since it is raised off the ground, the log presumably rested on chocks or forked rests,647 and one side of such a chock is perhaps indicated by the vertical line directly behind the foot of the middle figure. Above the head of this man Lepsius saw the word (determined with an axe?) nfr, “smoothing (with an axe)?.” Although the hemline of his garment is missing, the belt is preserved, so the middle man at least appears to have worn a plain, tight-fitting kilt.

Fifth Register. Except for the upper part of the standing figure at the far left, which was on the same block as the kneeling figure in the previous one and as a consequence is now lost, this register is in much the same condition as when Lepsius saw it. It is clear from the latter’s plate that this figure was working on a statue before him, having one or both arms extended at shoulder-height towards the statue. Precisely what he was doing is not apparent, since whatever he held in his hand(s) had been previously destroyed along with the caption, except for the word nst, “statue,” directly over the statue’s head. A life-size seated statue with a shoulder-length wig appears to have been represented.650

On the right side of the register facing left a craftsman drills out the interior of a spheroidal stone jar with barrel-lug(?) handles and a flat base.648 He stands at his task and his tool is a shaft-drill which was probably composed of a tree stem with a handle formed by a natural or artificial bend, below which two heavy stones or counterweights were lashed. In the case of the actual tool a stone bit of some form would have been fixed in a cleft or fork at the bottom of the shaft. The far hand of the craftsman grasps the top of the stick while his near hand turns it, apparently by pushing on the weights. In this manner, the swing of the arm was converted into rotary motion.650

642 Sliwa, Nefer and Ka-hay, p. 302; Kanawati, Khawwed, pl. 129; El-Khouli and Kanawati, El-Hawaweesh 1, fig. 19.
643 Lucas, Materials, p. 441; Sliwa, Woodworking, fig. 15.
644 For illustrations of the Egyptian “saw,” see Sliwa, Woodworking, fig. 15.
645 Ibid., pp. 57–58. Examples include: LDT, pl. 48; cf. Ahud, pl. 106; Pehin, Denkhath, pl. 32; Nifri and Re-hay, pls. 24–25; Natschwenhem, pl. 63; Kanawati, El-Hawaweesh 1, fig. 19.
646 Lucas, Materials, p. 441; Sliwa, Woodworking, p. 48, fig. 4. The captions over two men sawing wooden planks in Mer 3, p. 57, pl. 18, confirm the pictorial evidence from the reliefs.
647 Harpur, Decoration, p. 151.
648 Sliwa, Woodworking, p. 35, fig. 2. For actual specimens or models, see e.g., Emery, AAE 31 (1930), pp. 225–227; Windisch, Mode of Daily Life, fig. 63; Hayes, Spheroids, p. 228, fig. 200.
649 IB, 5, p. 156, n. 21; Monnet, S尼斯, p. 302; Denkhath, Woodworking, p. 115. In this case the two first signs would be reversed and would represent another example of the kind of graphic transposition of signs already noted above, pp. 18, n. 11; 44, n. 109. Cf. JT, II, pl. 175.

Chapter 4: SENEDJEMIB INTI – G 2370

sent the determinatives of the word fish, “carpenter,” as in the other two occurrences of the word in this register. All of the carpenters had their hair cut short. All that Lepsius shows of their clothing are a number of belts or belt knots.
Hands are clenched with no attributes evident. The mallet wielded by the sculptors, like that used by one of the carpenters in the third register above, is slender and elongated. The chisel is of the lighter type used for finishing off operations with the cutting edge of the blade a little wider than the rest. The use of mallet and chisel suggests that the statue represents a wooden original. The legend above the statue reads [ḥr ṯt], “[ca]rving the statue.” The sculptor behind the statue bears the title ḫw-m nṯn(w)-kȝw (gw[ttyw]), “overseer of sculptors.” Like the sculptor at the far left of the register, he wears his own close-cut hair and a calf-length kilt, the latter probably indicative of age or seniority. The sculptor working on the statue’s front is also wigless, but by way of contrast wears a short kilt with flaring front panel.

The life-size standing statue facing left on the left side of the register and the sculptor working on it are badly damaged. In Lepsius’s day the torso and front arm of the statue were still visible. This statue likewise depicted a standing male figure on a low base facing to the left, arms held at the sides, but in this instance presumably with both hands hanging open, or so the surviving left hand seems to indicate.

Like the first statue it probably had a short wig. In Lepsius’s drawing the arms of the sculptor, held parallel and loosely bent at the elbow, are extended towards the statue, but no tools are visible and his activity uncertain.

### Room III

Room III is entered from the east at the north end of the east wall. The room measures 4.72 x 1.15 m and has an area of 7.32 sq. m. The proportion of the length to the width is 1.67:1. Inasmuch as a serdab (Serdab II) with two slots was placed behind its west wall, this north–south chamber probably served as a secondary offering place. Reiser was perhaps misled by the damaged condition of the wall adjacent to the serdab slots, for he incorrectly stated that there were two niches in the west wall of the room.

In 1844–45, when Lepsius visited Giza, the northern end of Room III was still largely intact. In addition to the entrance thickness, the Prussian savant copied parts of six registers of a presentation scene with the bringing of animals at the northern end of the east wall and extending over the doorway. He likewise drew portions of six registers depicting agricultural activities on the northern end of the opposite (west) wall, and on the adjacent north...
wall copied six registers with scenes of viticulture and the brewing of beer. No Lepsius drawings exist of the southern end of the room, and its condition of the south wall and the southern ends of the east and west long walls at that time is not entirely certain.\footnote{273} By 1912, when Reisner cleared the mastaba, Room III was largely demoulded of reliefs (pls. 21a–21a). The relief scenes on the upper parts of the east, west, and north walls of Room III, which Lepsius had drawn, were mostly gone, having been removed by stone robbers.\footnote{274} Except for an isolated block with the figure of a funerary priest carrying a haunch, belonging to the lowest register of the west wall still in place in the northwest corner of the room, the west wall was stripped bare to below the line of the relief, while only the lowest portion of the wall scenes was still in position on the other walls. Fortunately, Reisner found numerous sculptured blocks from the south end of the west wall as well as a few blocks from the east wall tumbled down and buried in the accumulated debris on its floor, and he and William Stevenson Smith were able to largely reconstruct the southern end of the west wall from these loose blocks.

### Door Thicknesses

When they were copied by Lepsius, the wall thicknesses with figures of personified estates on either side of the doorway between Rooms II and III were evidently preserved to their full height (figs. 46, 47).\footnote{277} They were still intact when Mariette sketched them in 1850.\footnote{278} By 1912, however, stone robbers had removed all but the lowest portions of the reliefs on the left (south) thickness and left only a small section of the procession depicted on the right (north) thickness (pls. 28a, 29; figs. 47, 49).

A procession of thirty offering bearers who represented the various agricultural estates of Inti’s mortuary endowment originally decorated the doorway thicknesses.\footnote{279} Fifteen estates were represented in an antithetical arrangement on either side, evenly distributed in three registers. The personifications were all female and were shown progressing into Room III. Each was dressed in a tight-fitting shift held in position by shoulder straps and had a beaded collar and a long wig with a lapper falling over the neck shoulder and hanging down to the level of the top of the dress.\footnote{280} In each instance, the hem of the dress slanted from front to back.

### Left (south) thickness

Of the fifteen personified estates shown walking to the right on the south thickness, only the lower parts of the five figures and of the estate names in the bottom register are preserved today (pl. 28b; fig. 47). Originally, each estate raised a hand to help steady the basket of offerings balanced on her head, while the other hand, with two exceptions, hung at the side and held either another offering or the lead rope of a sacrificial animal (fig. 46).\footnote{281} In the first and third registers it was the left arm that was consistently upraised. In the second register only the first woman raised her left arm, while her companions raised their right arms. The variation almost certainly reflects a conscious attempt on the part of the artist to vary a potentially monotonous composition, as do the two other exceptions to the general rule. The first of these is the third estate in the second register, who held a bird to her chest with her right hand. The second involves the second estate in the third register, who carried two papyrus stems over her right shoulder with her right hand. As drawn by Lepsius, the animals led by two of the women are undistinguishable, but the last (in the bottom register) survives today and is clearly a calf. The contents of the baskets were vaster, but were too summarily rendered by Lepsius to allow their identification with any degree of certainty, although the offerings apparently included bread, fruit, and vegetables. The estate names are compounded with the names of three Fifth Dynasty kings, Neuserre, Menkauhor Ikauhor, and Djedkare Isaei. On the basis of Lepsius’s drawings and sketches of the procession and of Mariette’s copies, the estate were (from right to left and top to bottom) as follows.\footnote{282}

1. Woman carrying basket(?) on head and bird in hanging right hand: **\{hot . . . . \}mr \*nfr** \{ . . . \}. **\{The estate of \}** named the ‘gods’ love . . . \} \footnote{283}
2. Woman carrying hemispherical basket (contents destroyed) on head and brace of birds in hanging right hand: **nfr \*hj** \{ . . . \}. **The catch of fish** \{ . . . \} is rich.
3. Woman carrying hemispherical basket on head and in hanging right hand: **\{ . . . \} \*r \{ . . . \} \*t \{ke \} . . . \} \footnote{284}
4. Woman carrying conical basket on head and bird in hanging right hand: **mr \{ . . . \} \*f2 \{ . . . \} \*t \{ . . . \} desires that Isesi live.”
5. Woman carrying conical basket on head and milk jar(?) in hanging right hand: **mr \{ . . . \} \*f2 \{ . . . \} \*t \{ . . . \} Isesi live.”
6. Woman carrying conical basket on head and bird in hanging right hand: **fnt \{ . . . \} \*nfr** \{ . . . \}. **The estate of Ikauhor (named) \} \footnote{285}
7. Woman carrying hemispherical basket on head and milk jar(?) in hanging left hand: **nfr \*hj2 \{ . . . \} \*t \{ke \} Isesi live.”
8. Woman carrying conical basket on head and holding bird against chest in left hand: **mtjn \{ . . . \} \*t \{ . . . \} The track of Isesi.”

---

\footnote{273}{See above, pp. 1–6.}
\footnote{274}{See above, pp. 9–10.}
\footnote{275}{Mariette, Maraba, pp. 120–121.}
\footnote{276}{On Old Kingdom mortuary estates, see the in-depth study by Jacques-Gorden, Les noms des demeures funéraires sous l’Ancien Empire égyptien.}
\footnote{277}{For this type of tripartite or lappet wig in three dimensional art, see Vandier, Manuel d’archéologie égyptienne, pl. 104; 205-206; Staudlin, Hieroglyphische Texte, pp. 180–81; Fischer, JÄÄ 2 (1965), pp. 27–28.}
\footnote{278}{Several near-contemporary occurrences of the oblique hieroglyph in LDi, pls. 46, 47, 74d (= 12278; see below, pl. 112; fig. 10b); 80; Page-Fesq, Palmyreph, pl. 37; Davies, Palmyreph, pls. 10, 13; Seiner, Quelques, pl. 70; Balatry, Nyetep-Path and Sebastos-Neb, pl. 22; van de Walle, Infertetep, pls. 14–19. An earlier, Fourth Dynasty example is LDi, pl. 15.}
9. Woman carrying hemispherical basket on head and leading ruminant (oryx?) on rope held in left hand: *mnu s‐Dḥ-³t-nr*, “The mnu-vessel of Djedefare.”

10. Woman carrying conical basket on head and a small box on cord283 in hanging left hand: *šfḥ nfr ntr nrt*. “The heron flies up(?)”284.

11. Woman carrying conical basket on head and an ill-defined object in hanging right hand: *shf b ntr s* w nfr. “The estate of lesu (named) perfect of favors is lesu.”

12. Woman carrying conical basket on head and papyrus stems over shoulder in right hand: *šfḥ Sḏt ntr*. “Sebash makes lesu live.”

13. Woman carrying hemispherical basket on head and leading calf on rope held in right hand: [...]. *šf ḫ sḏm ntr [...]. “[…] life […]. Lesu.”285, 286.

14. Woman carrying conical basket on head and bunch of lotus flowers in hanging right hand: *šfḥ nfr ntr s*. “The ka of lesu is foremost.”

15. Woman carrying conical basket on head and wickerwork flag in hanging right hand: *šfḥ [šf]w [šf]w s*. “Perfect of [appearances] is [lesu].”

**Right (north) thickness.** Of the fifteen personified estates shown walking to the left on the north thickness in Lepsius’s drawing (fig. 48), only two figures and part of a third at the lower right survive today (pl. 29, fig. 49). On the right thickness, each estate was identified simply as *šfḥ b Sḏm ntr*, “the estate of the ka of Senedjemib.” The inscription in a short column before the last figure in the bottom register is preserved along with part of the inscription before the penultimate figure, which looks as though it was wilfully damaged by human agency. Once again the estates carried conical or hemispherical baskets on their heads. In the first and second registers the right arm was raised to steady the basket. In the bottom register, all five women have the left arm upraised. In the case of the last figure, however, the artist varied the composition by having this arm cross over her body (hiding the right shoulder in the process). Two of the estates held a brace of birds by the wing in their hanging left hands. Others also carried birds, but in a manner different from their counterparts; thus two estates have their arms bent at the elbow and hold the bird in their clenched right hand against their chests, whereas another holds a larger bird in her hanging front hand. Several estates held vessels on cords in their hanging hands. One has a single papyrus stem over her shoulder, while another held a stem or bundle of stems of a different kind. The first four estates in the first register and the first estate in the second register held ill-defined objects in the hand hanging at their sides. The contents of the baskets are again too summarily rendered to identify.

**East Wall.** The decoration on the east wall originally consisted of a developed presentation scene with a figure of Inti at the south end of the wall viewing herdsmen bringing files of animals for inspection and village headmen rendering accounts in six registers. Lepsius copied parts of the registers at the north end of this wall (fig. 50).286 Today only portions of the fifth and sixth registers as seen by Lepsius are still in place (pl. 30, fig. 51). When Reisner cleared Room III to the floor, however, he discovered that the lower portion of the sixth register was preserved along the entire length of the wall. In addition, a loose block found by Reisner joins the sixth register towards the middle of the wall, and contributes to an understanding of its original appearance. Generally in presentation scenes a standing or seated figure of the owner is shown inspecting the advancing files.287 Exceptionally in the present instance, Inti was carried in a palanquin (destroyed). The closest parallel seems to be at Meir, where Pepysankh Heny the Black is shown sitting in a carrying chair set on the ground, as he oversees the execution of the impat of bulls and all kinds of small cattle.288

**First Register:** Above the door two herdsmen seated on the ground each faced left towards a recumbent ox.289 Each man had one leg folded under him and the other raised. The figure of the ox at the left was largely destroyed, but the better preserved group at the right indicates that this was probably a scene of force-feeding animals to fatten them before slaughter.290 Lepsius shows the man’s right hand on the muzzle of the ox, but parallels in other tombs make it likely that the hand was held to or even in the animal’s mouth forcing it to swallow a ball of food or fodder.291 Frequently, the herdsmen force open the animal’s mouth with a rope tied to its lower jaw but, even though the men’s left hands were in the correct position in the present scene, the rope has been omitted. The herdsmen are wigless like their fellows in this and the other registers on this wall, and a left at the waist of each is probably indicative of some sort of garment.

Further to the right are traces of what was probably the tail end of a procession of cattle being led toward Inti.292 The herdsmen at

---

283 *šf* means “stem of a plant, a cord, a rope.”
284 Lepsius, *Pl. 28*, fig. 49, p. 602. The bird is not drawn in the correct position, with its head down and its body raised. Frequent examples of force-feeding animals may be seen in the tombs of Meir: *cf.* W. BLACKMAN, *JEA* 19 (1933), pp. 161-162, figs. 19, 20, 21.
285 Lepsius, *Pl. 29*, fig. 49, p. 603. The lower register is not preserved, but the inscription to the right of the third estate suggests that the estate of Lesu was the foremost.
286 Lepsius shows the door to the north, as it is in the present state. However, Reisner found that the lower portion of the sixth register was preserved in situ, and a fragment of the inscription was still attached to the wall. See the notes in Reisner’s *JHS* 30 (1934), pp. 31-32.
287 Lepsius, *Pl. 29*, fig. 49, p. 603. The estate of Lesu is foremost.
288 Lepsius, *Pl. 28*, fig. 49, p. 603.
289 Lepsius, *Pl. 28*, fig. 49, p. 603. The estate of Lesu is foremost.
290 Lepsius, *Pl. 28*, fig. 49, p. 603. The estate of Lesu is foremost.
the rear of the procession appears to have walked alongside the last ox, of which traces only remain. He rested his forward hand on the rump of the ox which preceded him and his other arm hung free. The foreparts of the animal were destroyed. Since his arms were lost, the attitude of the man walking in front of the ox is unclear. There would have been ample room for several other animals and herdsmen between his figure and the palaquin scene at the south end of the wall.

Second Register: Village herdsmen were ushered into Horti’s presence to render accounts.395 Two attendants at the right forced one of the herdsmen to prostrate himself.396 The foremost attendant walked to the right but turned his upper body around and with one hand pushed down the shoulder of the herdman. Simultaneously, the second attendant placed both hands against the man’s back and shoved in order to force him into a full or half-kneeling position. The herdman glanced back at the latter and raised his right arm in supplication. At the very edge of the block to the right what was probably the extended rear leg of another herdman was to be seen. Behind this group two other herdsmen in the ordinary male seated position faced right. The first held his left fist against his chest in a respectful gesture but his other arm was destroyed. The right arm of the second man hung down between his knees, as he grasped his left shoulder and placed his right hand on a tall slender object (an elongated case?) behind him, while his left arm hung by his side.397 Belts were visible at their waists. All that remained of the horizontal caption that ran across the register at the top were the word Ti-nubia, “the Delta,” and an isolated house-sign at the far left.398

Third Register: The first of five preserved figures of male offering bearers walking to the right carried a large bird, possibly a goose, in both arms in front. The next bearer held a bird by the wings in each hand. The small cages slung from the yoke over the shoulders of the third individual probably held young animals whose heads protruded through the wicker at the top, even though Lepsius’s draftsman has drawn the heads as loops.399 The fourth man carried a calf across his shoulders. The last bearer had a hedgehog in a wicker cage399 on his shoulders. The left end of this register was divided in two horizontal sections. At the far left what was probably the head of the bull appears to have walked alongside the last bearer.397 At the very edge of the block to the right what was probably the part of another herdsman who faced forward was visible. The left end of this register was divided in two hori-

Fourth Register: All that remained of a file of desert animals proceeding to the right are a red deer and a gazelle preceded by her young.399 The last herdman in the procession placed a guiding hand on the back and rump of the deer. The man at the gazelle’s head walked backwards and led it by the muzzle and horn. The animal was captioned in gis, “a thousand gazelles,” an indication that she symbolized stores of others of her kind. At the right edge of the register part of the figure of another herdman who faced forward was visible.

Fifth Register: The left end of this register was divided in two horizontally and various species of birds were depicted in the two sub-registers. In bird files the birds normally follow one another by order of size, and it would be expected that the smaller birds still remaining in the two sub-registers were preceded by other, larger species.399 The bodies of the birds in the lower of the two sub-registers are preserved today, although their heads are missing, and the loose block found by Reisner with parts of the fifth and sixth registers, which has been restored to its place on the east wall, shows one of the larger birds, presumably a goose. Its figure probably occupied the full height of the fifth register. Bird files are nearly always headed by cranes,399 and what may be part of the rear leg of a crane appears at the right edge of the isolated block. There hardly seems to have been sufficient room in the space remaining before Horti’s carrying chair for a file of cranes, but there was room perhaps for an artfully arranged grouping of cranes.

Above the birds appeared their names preceded by the hieroglyph hs, “a thousand,” even though each species was once again represented by a single individual. Commencing with the bird in the upper subregister at the right and ending with the bird at the lower left, they were respectively: (1) zt, “pintail duck” (Anas acuta); (2) j-ḥ₇-bt, a type of duck; (3) name lost; (4) wtnw, “European coot” (Fulica atra); (5) ḫ-h₂-bt, an unidentified goose or duck; (6) uniden-

Sixth Register: In Lepsius’s drawing all that remains of the lowest register on the east wall is a spirited rendering of a prize bull with a rope collar tossing his head in defiance. The mouth of the bull was open and its tongue protruded. Before its face were the words nfr-ḥn, “a gift,”395 and above its back was written mnt ntw, “young stable ox.”399 Although Reisner found the block with the head of the bull in 1930, it was never restored to its appropriate position on the wall, and its present whereabouts are unknown.399

As previously mentioned, Reisner’s clearance of Room III revealed that the bottom of this register was preserved along the entire

396 See Brünner, Lust, 6 (1976), col. 178(a).
397 Cf. Vandier, Manuel 1, fig. 153 (5). Similar gestures are discussed by Müller, MMAKR 57 (1977), pp. 301–308.
398 See Ts’i, pl. 67, and see above, p. 47 and n. 160. See now see Fischer, Vesta Nub., p. 230.
399 For examples of the captions accompanying such scenes, see Montet, Scènes, pp. 143, 147–148.
400 This detail is relatively rare, but Vandier, Manuel 1, p. 43(e), provides both a discussion and reference. For yoke-bearers in Old Kingdom offering scenes, see Harr (below), p. 144 and n. 126.
401 See Duerr zu Hülshoff, Der Igel, pp. 83–90, and especially p. 84, no. 31, and fig. 10.
403 The drawing in fig. 31 is made from Exp. Ph. 6 602a.
suggest the herdsman wore a long belt-sash with pendant ends hanging down in front. The man with folded arms preceding him is dressed in the mat kilt with unfolded fringed part hanging down in front that is often adopted by village headmen or the official in charge of the herd or of the herdsmen. The surface of the wall is worn at this point, but he may have held his left shoulder with his right hand and grasped his right forearm with his left hand in a gesture of respect or greeting. The title before him is also damaged and the reading not entirely certain, but he may have been an ˌimy-rȝ’t.snw, “overseer of stalls.” Since six legs and parts of two more are preserved, it is likely that the figures of two overlapping oxen continued the procession to the right. The figure of the herdsmen in front of these two oxen is lost for sake of the bottom of his front leg. Before him was another long-horned ox, whose head and legs alone survive. Heading the procession is the badly damaged figure of another herdsmen who carries what was probably a bundle of fodder under his front arm. This last individual evidently stood face to face with the first of the attendants marching in front of Inti’s palanquin.

The right half of the wall was originally occupied by a depiction of Inti in a palanquin carried on the shoulders of sixteen porters (only the eight porters in the closest row being depicted). This was indeed a carrying chair scene is apparent not only from the spacing of the men’s legs, set close together and advancing in unison to the left, but also from the presence of the monkey between them, since the space between the two groups of porters is often occupied by the owner’s pets. Considering the space devoted to it, this must have been an elaborate rendering, but only the legs and feet of the porters and attendants are preserved. Three attendants walked to the right angles so as to show the front of the body of the instrument, but here the base of the harp is shown in profile. The third musician blows into a transverse flute held at an angle across his body. The hieroglyphic legend above his head is perhaps to be restored: [stg] [s] [m], “[singing to the harp].” The next man faces the singer as do the figures behind him. His instrument is largely obliterated, but it is possible that he, like the third musician, played on a bow harp, in which case the damaged columns of text between them may have applied to both musicians. It perhaps read: [wgr-n b-t], “playing on the harp.” On occasion the lower part of the harp is represented as if they were sharing in the feast. Harpur has noted that the various scenes on the short south wall to the right of the entrance to Room IV is the bottom of the lowest register with the figures of a singer and three instrumentalists (pl. 31a, fig. 524). The knee of one the three individuals is destroyed, but the others sit on the ground in the ordinary posture for men with one leg doubled under and the other leg up. All four are wigless and probably wore kilts, even though the belt of the last man at the right has been destroyed and he appears to be naked as a result. The singer, seated on the left side of the register facing right, accompanies his song with stylized hand gestures. Above his raised left hand is the single letter ẖ, but the damaged caption is perhaps be restored: [ḥt s] n ṭ [ḥ], “[singing to the harp]”. This last individual evidently stood face to face with the first of the attendants marching in front of Inti’s palanquin.

All that remains today of the decoration on the short south wall to the right of the entrance to Room IV is the bottom of the lowest register with the figures of a singer and three instrumentalists (pl. 31a, fig. 524). The knee of one of the three individuals is destroyed, but the others sit on the ground in the ordinary posture for men with one leg doubled under and the other leg up. All four are wigless and probably wore kilts, even though the belt of the last man at the right has been destroyed and he appears to be naked as a result. The singer, seated on the left side of the register facing right, accompanies his song with stylized hand gestures. Above his raised left hand is the single letter ẖ, but the damaged caption is perhaps be restored: [ḥt s] n ṭ [ḥ], “[singing to the harp]”. This last individual evidently stood face to face with the first of the attendants marching in front of Inti’s palanquin.

Suden Wall

All that remains today of the decoration on the short south wall to the right of the entrance to Room IV is the bottom of the lowest register with the figures of a singer and three instrumentalists (pl. 31a, fig. 524). The knee of one of the three individuals is destroyed, but the others sit on the ground in the ordinary posture for men with one leg doubled under and the other leg up. All four are wigless and probably wore kilts, even though the belt of the last man at the right has been destroyed and he appears to be naked as a result. The singer, seated on the left side of the register facing right, accompanies his song with stylized hand gestures. Above his raised left hand is the single letter ẖ, but the damaged caption is perhaps be restored: [ḥt s] n ṭ [ḥ], “[singing to the harp]”. This last individual evidently stood face to face with the first of the attendants marching in front of Inti’s palanquin.

All that remains today of the decoration on the short south wall to the right of the entrance to Room IV is the bottom of the lowest register with the figures of a singer and three instrumentalists (pl. 31a, fig. 524). The knee of one of the three individuals is destroyed, but the others sit on the ground in the ordinary posture for men with one leg doubled under and the other leg up. All four are wigless and probably wore kilts, even though the belt of the last man at the right has been destroyed and he appears to be naked as a result. The singer, seated on the left side of the register facing right, accompanies his song with stylized hand gestures. Above his raised left hand is the single letter ẖ, but the damaged caption is perhaps be restored: [ḥt s] n ṭ [ḥ], “[singing to the harp]”. This last individual evidently stood face to face with the first of the attendants marching in front of Inti’s palanquin.

All that remains today of the decoration on the short south wall to the right of the entrance to Room IV is the bottom of the lowest register with the figures of a singer and three instrumentalists (pl. 31a, fig. 524). The knee of one of the three individuals is destroyed, but the others sit on the ground in the ordinary posture for men with one leg doubled under and the other leg up. All four are wigless and probably wore kilts, even though the belt of the last man at the right has been destroyed and he appears to be naked as a result. The singer, seated on the left side of the register facing right, accompanies his song with stylized hand gestures. Above his raised left hand is the single letter ẖ, but the damaged caption is perhaps be restored: [ḥt s] n ṭ [ḥ], “[singing to the harp]”. This last individual evidently stood face to face with the first of the attendants marching in front of Inti’s palanquin.
Since they appear to fit nowhere else on the walls of G 2370, it is possible that four partial columns of titles followed by the name Senedjemib preserved in a squeeze made by Alice and Rudolph Theosphiux Lieder, and said to be from the tomb of Inti, belonged to this wall (pl. 16b).328 Due to the poor technical quality of the squeeze and the fact that the signs were subsequently outlined in pencil by the Lieders themselves or another person insufficiently acquainted with hieroglyphs, thereby obscuring further the already damaged signs, the original contents of the columns are difficult to make out.329 Inssofar as they can be comprehended, the signs appear to read: (1) [wo]rks...m££ ∞t nb(t) nfr(t); (2) ...m££ ∞t nb(t) nfr(t); (3) [wo]rks...m££ ∞t nb(t) nfr(t); (4) [wo]rks...m££ ∞t nb(t).

The two aforementioned serdab slots open in the fifth and sixth registers, where the name...; (2) [overseer] of all the...; (3) Señedjem-ib. The Lieder squeeze is a negative impression and the signs, like Inti's figure, would therefore originally have faced left, with his back to the wall.330

West Wall

The northern third of this wall was copied by Lepsius (fig. 52a), as...l by stone-robbers.332 Reisner found tumbled blocks from the south-eastern sections of the wall in the debris on the floor of Room III, and he and William Stevenson Smith were able to reassemble these portions of the wall in a photographic montage (pl. 32). At present the actual blocks have been restored to the wall with the exception of the block with Inti's head and shoulders and the two adjoining stones with the fish net and the upper parts of the figures bearing fish on poles, which have been mistakenly set in concrete high up on the east wall of Room IV. In addition, an isolated block from the agricultural sequence is now in Boston.333 All these blocks have been restored to their appropriate positions in pl. 32 and fig. 53. The two aforementioned serdab slots open in the fifth and sixth registers, being interposed relief towards either end of the wall.

A large figure of Inti stands at the left (south) end of the wall viewing the activities taking place in the six registers before him. In mastabas of the Old Kingdom agricultural scenes are frequently placed below marsh pursuits.334 This was indeed the case at the southern end of the west wall, where a scene of fishing with a dragnet occupied the top three registers directly before Inti's face, while agriculture activities filled up most of the rest of the wall, being interrupted only by a short offering procession at the south end of the fifth register, by figures of officiants in the lowest register on either side of the serdab slots, and by a barchery scene beneath Inti's feet.

The mid-part of Inti's figure is missing, but it is clear from what remains that he leant on a long staff. Although this was intended as a more relaxed pose, both of his feet are placed flat on the ground. He is garbed in a shoulder-length wig, a chin beard, and a mid-calf kilt. Two long columns of text in front of his face were originally continued above his head in four short columns and terminated in a single horizontal line. Taking the caption to the swamp scene on the west wall of Room II (fig. 42) as a model, the shorter caption here is possibly to be restored: [rnt sf m nswt] sib(2) m kis nfr...; "[Viewing every good thing] consisting of the works of the fields." The sequence of titles commenced at the head of the next column, but the titles preceding [m££ ...m££ ∞t nb(t) nfr(t), "[overseer] of all works of the king," are lost. There does not appear to be sufficient space for the sequence m££ ∞t nb(t) m nfr...; "hereditary prince and count, judge and vizier," which preceded that title on the west wall of Room II, and it is possible that 1995 zp-g3y alone headed the title string as it does on the innermost jambs of Inti's false door (pls. 44–45; fig. 63). The scribal palette at the bottom of the third column perhaps formed part of the title frg sib, "controller of scribes."335 The fourth column ends with what are presumably the terminal paired house-signs of m££ qd m nswt m prwy, "overseer of builders in both houses (Upper and Lower Egypt)," while the penultimate column terminates in nswt, which could be the final word in Inti's title of frg sib nswt m prwy, "master of secrets of the commands of the king."336 The tall, narrow signs at the bottom of the last column may represent npr, in which case insnsu for npr, "honored by the great god," may have stood here and immediately preceded the name Sndm-ib, "Senedjemib," which was written horizontally above Inti's head.

First Register: The entire register is missing except for a loose block with part of a dragnet scene which evidently belongs at its southern end.337 Dragnets were sometimes worked from boats but here it seems that the fishermen stood on the river bank.338 Only the damaged figures of four haulers from the left hand crew are preserved. These four men face right towards the lost figures of the fishermen who hauled on the right-hand cable by which the net was dragged in. The figure of the first hauler on the right in the surviving crew is the most severely damaged, but he may have been shown standing on one leg, the other leg being bent across the first.339 The second hauler from the right grasps the cable with one hand in front and the other hand behind and leans forward so as to apply the full weight of his body to the rope. The feet of all four haulers are destroyed, but the second hauler may have had his front foot placed flat on the ground and his rear foot raised on the toes.340 The third individual again leans forward and grasps the cable with his two hands before him, while his front foot may have been raised off the ground.341 The lower part of the body of the last man at the left is destroyed, but from the broad set of his shoulders it seems that he had both feet firmly planted on the ground. No details of hair or clothing survive. The net itself probably filled the entire left side of the second register. The top and bottom of the remaining section of the net are

---
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parallel and the end pointed. The triangular floats (blocks of wood?) on the upper line of the net were tied down by cords crossed over them at right angles and tied under the net rope. The bottom line of the net is weighted with sinkers so that the net hung vertically in the water. The strikers or weights here provide little detail; actual examples are made of stone, notched at the middle for cross lashings.

Nearly every major species of fish which lived in the Nile is trapped in the net. From left to right and from top to bottom are shown: an Oxyrhynchus fish (Oxyrhynchus), an eel, a belti fish, a catfish (Symodonidae), a moonfish, a Nile perch, a mullet, another catfish (Symodonidae belted), a puffer fish, a third catfish (S. hantsode), an unidentified species of fish, a Nile perch, and another belti (fornet destroyed).

The ancient Egyptian dragnet, as most commonly represented, required eight or ten men to haul it home. In the dragnet scene on the chapel walls of Inti’s son Mehi, for example, there are two groups of five haulers each, including the commonly repeated figures of the haulers at the ends of the net, each bending forward at the waist to gather up the ropes (pl. 116, figs. 114, 115). In the space between the two crews in Mehi’s chapel is represented the figure of an overseer holding a large catfish by the head and testing its freshness by raising its fin. Even if Inti’s scene similarly incorporated ten haulers and an overseer, there would still have been space between the last hauler of the destroyed right-hand crew and the man directing the workers who gather flax in the first register at the right in Lepsius’s drawing of a number of other workers, perhaps the fieldhands who bound the stalks of flax into sheaves at the edge of the field.

Scenes of cutting grain and pulling up flax are often closely associated in mastabas of the Old Kingdom. In the present instance, they were separated by sowing and ploughing sequences in the second register. The flax harvesters, as may be seen from Lepsius’s drawing, were nine in number. The arms of six of the harvesters were nearly parallel and loosely bent at the elbows as they leant over to pull up a handful of flax stalks by the roots. Since this part of the wall was already damaged by Lepsius’s time, it is impossible to determine with any certainty what the harvesters who stood erect were doing. From the traces, it is possible that the middle of the three standing harvesters was raising his left arm in a gesture of address and calling out to attract the attention of the harvester standing at the right. The latter may have turned his head back to look at the former, at the same time raising his (nearly destroyed) right arm in acknowledgment. The standing harvester at the left may have been removing a weed or straggly stalk from his bundle of flax. The overseer on the edge of the field at the far left stood facing right, left hand clearly raised in a gesture of address as he directed the efforts of the workers. His staff was apparently held loosely in his right hand with the other end resting on the ground. Any speeches or captions that may have existed were lost because of the extensive damage to the upper right-hand side of the register.

All of the men, including the overseer, had their hair cut short. Usually the field workers in agricultural scenes are clothed, even if scantily so. In point of fact, belts may be seen round the waists of several of the harvesters in Lepsius’s drawing, while the last man at the left seems to have had a piece of cloth hanging from his belt in back. This suggests that he, and possibly his co-workers as well, wore either the belt-sash with the ends tucked up behind or alternately this simple piece of apparel combined with the very short, semicircular kilt.

**Second Register.** The right part of this register as copied by Lepsius preserves the beginning of the traditional agricultural cycle. Only rarely is the entire composition, which commences with the sowing of seed and concludes with the storage of grain in granaries, shown. In the present case, at the right end of the register, a flock of four sheep moving towards the right were preceded by four field hands. The latter faced the sheep and walked backwards. Their bodies were bent forward, arms brought together and loosely bent at the elbows, and in their hands they held what were probably bushels of fodder intended to coax the animals to move in the desired direction. Although represented all in a row, in real life the field hands would probably have been standing beside each other. In the majority of scenes a sower (or sowers) with a seedbag carried over one shoulder or hung round the neck precedes the sheep and sows grain broadcast for the sheep to trample into the earth. Sometimes the sower turns and offers the sheep a handful of seed or herbage. Here the figure of the sower was omitted and his role of coaxer assumed by the four field hands. The flock of sheep was depicted as an orderly group of four animals, their figures overlapping, the arrangement evidently unbroken by any of the variations that often occur. They were probably of the long-legged breed with horizontal horns, but their horns were not visible due to the poor preservation of this area of the register. Behind the sheep, three identical, slightly overlapping figures drove them forward. The three figures were shown running and carried sticks before them, but the whips which they undoubtedly held aloft in their other hands were destroyed along with the tops of their heads. A pair of oxen, a driver, and a ploughman followed,
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but the figure of the ploughman and the better part of his plough were already lost when Lepsius copied the wall. The driver placed one hand on the back of one of the animals and presumably raised a stick above his head with the other hand to drive them forward. Both the stick and his head were once again lost. The pole of the plough, which would have been fastened by a rope to a simple yoke lashed to the horns of the animals, is visible in part behind the legs of the driver in Lepsius’s drawing. All the field hands in this register appear to be naked but this was probably due to the state of preservation of the wall.

Third Register. At the left end of the register the fish hung by cords from poles carried on the shoulders of fishermen who walk to the left and present their catch to Inti. Although the carrying poles look like one long continuous pole, the artist perhaps meant to show three pairs of fishermen who carried two large fish on individual poles between them. A man with a fish (an Oryzochinus, Mommykan nůmennu) dangling from his left hand evidently brought up the rear of the procession. A number of blocks are missing from the wall at this point with the result that the lower parts of the fishermen and their catch, as well as the front arm and leg and upper part of the body of the man with the dangling fish, are lost. So too are the upper portions of the figures at the edge of the field behind him. Likewise missing is the bottom of the column of inscription before the first fisherman who provided the caption to the scene. Possibly iv(w) m [∂t∂], “what is brought from [the countryside],” is to be restored.365 The right hand of this register was occupied by a portrayal of the grain harvest. Eight reapers bent forward to cut the grain. Most of the figures were missing their heads. If Lepsius is to be trusted, in each case the left hand was outstretched to grasp a bunch of grain, while the right hand held the sickle, regardless of whether the reaper faced left or right. Thus, in all real life, the sickle of the workers facing left was partially hidden by the stems, while the sickle of those who faced right was shown in front of the stems. In the case of the former the sickle curved upwards, but in the latter it curved downwards.360 The sickles are short-handled with a body fairly wide. The sickle curved upwards, but in the case of the latter it curved downwards.362 For the ancient Egyptian plow, see Vandier, Decoration, pl. 17, fig. 75g.

T races suggest that this third reaper is the same one who appears at the right evidently worked in pairs. The third from the right was partially hidden by the stems, while the sickle of those who faced right was shown in front of the stems. In the case of the former the sickle curved upwards, but in the latter it curved downwards.363 The sickles are short-handled with a body fairly wide. The sickle curved upwards, but in the case of the latter it curved downwards.364 The sickle of the final reaper at the left swung inwards to cut the grain close to the ground, leaving the stubble still standing, while the arm with the severed sheaf swung across his body to throw the sheaf on the ground.361

Over his head was a damaged hieroglyphic legend, the beginning traces of which appear to suit ḫyb, “reaping.”367 Behind this reaper the lower part of another standing figure was to be seen.

The grain harvest is continued at the left on a block of the reconstructed wall not seen by Lepsius. Unfortunately, the upper parts of the figures and any legends which may have occurred were on the missing block(s) above. The first man on the right bends forward to the right, his arms nearly parallel and loosely bent at the elbows in front of him, and tries to seize hold of one of the frightened quail that bolt from cover in the grain.363 He appears to carry the same semicircular kilt with trapezoidal front panel that is worn by several of the donkey drovers in the two registers below. The next figure to the left stands with his left hand extended. The hand is open and, for that reason, it is unlikely that it was originally intended to hold anything as an afterthought.

360 See above, p. 47, and fig. 77g.

365 For the ancient Egyptian plow, see Vandier, Manuel 6, p. 78.

366 For the ancient Egyptian plow, see Vandier, Decoration, pp. 174–178.

367 For the ancient Egyptian plow, see Vandier, Manuel 6, p. 78.
The other hand is not visible and presumably was raised above the level of his waist. Behind him at the edge of the field stand a flute-player and an overseer. The flute-player probably also wore a semicircular kilt with trapezoidal front panel, even though the rounded edge of the kilt is no longer to be seen. He faces left and has both feet flat on the ground. The long transverse flute he played crossed his body at an angle and reaches to his knees. He holds the flute in his left hand near its lower end, while his right hand grasps the flute slightly higher up. A flute player, accompanied once by a singer, encourages the workers with his tune in a number of Old Kingdom tombs.374

The overseer leans on a long walking stick. His left hand is extended along its shaft, and his other hand presumably rested on its top. Although his figure is thrown forward, his feet are close together and flat on the ground, as is also the case with the large figure of Inti at the southern end of the wall. He is dressed in a short kilt with flaring front panel.

**Fourth Register.** At the left end of the register, just in front of Inti, are the overlapping legs of four men running to the left. A long lacuna intervenes before a second group of men is seen running to the right, driving a herd of donkeys before them. These are the donkeys which, relieved of their load of grain near the thrashing floor, are being driven back for more by their drovers.375 At present the donkeys are missing their heads and the rest of the register to the right is also lost, except for the bottom of the legs of field hands and the lower parts of the rope-net sacks that they filled with sheaves of grain. Fortunately, the remainder of the register, including the heads of the donkeys, was copied by Lepsius.

The quadrille pattern at the right end of the register in Lepsius’s plate undoubtedly represents sheaves of grain stacked up at the edge of the field.376 Immediately to the left were three groups of field hands engaged in binding the sheaves and putting them into rope-net sacks. This scene has been discussed by both Junker and Vandier.377 The right- and left-hand groups consisted each of a pair of field hands standing face-to-face, whereas the middle group comprised three field hands. According to Vandier, the man on the right in the right-hand group least forward to the left and held a bunch of stems between his outstretched hands, while his companion also least forward and bound the stems with a cord held in his other hand, meanwhile providing support for the stems with his open right hand. Over the field hands in the middle group also intercedes before a second group of men is seen running to the left side of the sack is omitted. Even though the rest of the scene in MI 2370 is largely destroyed today, both legs of this figure are preserved. His front foot was indeed placed flat on the ground, as Lepsius indicated, but his figure seems so far forward that his rear leg was raised on its toes to compensate. His words were recorded in the short text before his face: ni mh, “Tell (it) at once.”378 The man on the other side of the sack responded: ti (i) r f.st, “I will act with a view to what you will praise.”379

The last group of field hands on the left stood on either side of a sack filled with sheaves, each pressing one foot on the sack and pulling on the rope that passed through the loops at its top in order to close it. Like the middle group, the composition of this group is closely paralleled in the Louvre mastaba of Inti’s older contemporary Akhethetep, albeit in a mirror image.380 The figure on the left side of the sack in MI 2370 bends forward to the right with his arms hanging down. On the basis of the parallel in the Louvre mastaba, it is clear that he thrust his left hand into the sack and held one of its loop handles in his other hand. The sack was large and evidently extended as far as the field hand on the right who observed essentially the same attitude, although he leant only slightly forward. As these two men held the sack open, the man in the middle bent over to the left to place the sheaf that he held in his hands into the sack. This individual evidently wore a belt-sash tied at his back. In Lepsius’s drawing the rear leg of the man holding up the left side of the sack is omitted. Although his figure is thrown forward, his feet were close together and flat on the ground, as is also the case with the large figure of Inti at the southern end of the wall. He is dressed in a short kilt with flaring front panel.

The three field hands in the middle group also filled a large rope-net sack with sheaves.381 The composition of this group is closely paralleled in the Louvre mastaba of Inti’s older contemporary Akhethetep, albeit in a mirror image.382 The figure on the left side of the sack in MI 2370 bends forward to the right with his arms hanging down. On the basis of the parallel in the Louvre mastaba, it is clear that he thrust his left hand into the sack and held one of its loop handles in his other hand. The sack was large and evidently extended as far as the field hand on the right who observed essentially the same attitude, although he leant only slightly forward. As these two men held the sack open, the man in the middle bent over to the left to place the sheaf that he held in his hands into the sack. This individual evidently wore a belt-sash tied at his back. In Lepsius’s drawing the rear leg of the man holding up the left side of the sack is omitted. Even though the rest of the scene in MI 2370 is largely destroyed today, both legs of this figure are preserved. His front foot was indeed placed flat on the ground, as Lepsius indicated, but his figure is seen so far forward that his rear leg was raised on its toes to compensate. His words were recorded in the short text before his face: ni mh, “Tell (it) at once.”383 The man on the other side of the sack responded: ni mh [s]r f.st, “I will act with a view to what you will praise.”384

For a detailed representation of a rope-net basket like this, see Mariette, Décorations, pls. 119, 206, emended the three strokes seen by Lepsius under the field hands. According to Vandier, the man on the right is first drover from the rest. This individual places his head of his companion: ni mh [s]r f.st, “I will act with a view to what you will praise.”385

Immediately behind the left-hand group of field hands, on a section of the wall preserved today, appear the heads and forelegs of the donkeys being driven to the right by the drovers. Running with raised sticks, five of the drovers move together in a compact group. To relieve the potential monotony of the repetition of forms the artist separated the first drover from the rest. This individual places his front foot firmly on the ground, twists his upper body around in a sweeping arm movement, and aims a sharp blow at the donkeys with a stick held firmly in both hands. His rear leg and foot overlap the front leg of the man behind, as his own front leg and foot is overlapped
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by the leg of the last donkey, the overlap constituting a simple artistic device for tying the groups together. The lead drover is also distinguished by his garment. The field hands running in a group wear a semicircular kilt with trapezoidal front panel,\(^\text{398}\) whereas he wears the very short, round-edged kilt with belt-sash tied at the front.\(^\text{399}\) Above the heads and backs of the donkeys was a legend in three short lines, reading from right to left: \textit{sh(t) [in] mf³f} \textit{mt p-št tnt (w) m m mn ūw, \textit{“Driving back”(?) the donkeys} [\textit{m} y] \textit{the laborers}].\(^\text{400}\) of the estate, they have been brought away from conducting it (viz. the grain).\(^\text{398}\)

Fifth Register. A procession of laden donkeys and drovers proceeding to the left occupies the better part of the section of this register located between the serdab slots. Except for the front part of the last donkey and his burden, the right end of the register had largely been destroyed by 1842–43. The broken block on which the body of the donkey was carved is now lost and only his head and the lower portions of two of his legs survive on the edge of the adjacent block. Lepsius did not draw the lead donkey in the file, although he sketched the sack on its back and an attendant walking at its side. The wavy diagonal line in his drawing presumably represents the unexcavated earth fill in the southern part of Room III which evidently covered most of the donkey’s body.\(^\text{399}\)

Walking alongside the last donkey was a drover, whose figure had been lost before 1842–43, but whose feet are still visible today. The brief legend, reading from right to left over the head of the donkey: \textit{m “Don’t hurry”}.

Haste has already caused the lead to shift on the back of the third donkey in the file. It waits with lowered head while three drovers worry the load back into place. The drover at the donkey’s tail seems to swing the edge of the rope-net sack with both hands and pulls it back into place. The man in the middle raises his hands as if he held onto a loop at the top of the sack and one of its component ropes. The drover at the donkey’s head bends over to the right and perhaps held on to the front edge of the sack with his lost left hand. His left shoulder and his face are also destroyed, and only the tip of the stick he appears to have held in his left hand survives. With his right hand, he pats the donkey reassuringly on the neck. The caption over his head reads from right to left: \textit{m “tell” \textit{mt b} \\textit{kt lh} \\textit{do, “Do not let him kick”}}. Both this animal and the lead donkey in the file have saddle cloths on their backs to reduce the chaffing from the heavy rope sacks. What are probably the traces of a saddle cloth are also visible on the third donkey. The drover behind the lead donkey grasps his own shoulder with his left hand and strikes the animal on the rump with a stick held in his other hand. The utterance written from right to left in front of his face is damaged but is probably to be restored: \textit{“Gdl!”}.

The man walking alongside the donkey holds a stick in his left hand and perhaps held onto the side of the sack with his other (destroyed) hand.

Further to the left a field hand tosses a sheaf on top of a stack of grain. He leans backward as he does so and the weight of his body rests on his raised rear foot. His raised arms cross over his slightly tilted body as if to swing the sheaf backwards and upwards in one continuous movement.\(^\text{399}\) The caption before him reads: \textit{pt³t \textit{br} \textit{s}p, “throwing grain”}.\(^\text{401}\) The individual sheaves which make up the stack are indicated by incised lines. The left end of the block on which this scene was carved is lost together with the left side of the stack. The scene of tossing sheaves usually consists of a symmetrical pair of sheaf throwers, one on each side of the stack, but single throwers are sometimes depicted, as appears to have been the case here.\(^\text{402}\)

Two adjacent blocks to the left of the grain stack bear the lower parts of three human figures. All that remains of the first figure to the left of the stack are parts of two feet facing right firmly planted on

\(^{398}\) The semicircular kilt may be the same garment as the round-edged kilt distinguished only by the addition of a front panel for the sake of modesty. It is also related to the garment that is worn by the tomb owner in scenes of spear fishing and rowing, for which see above, p. 49 and n. 43.

\(^{399}\) See above, p. 49 and fig. 176.

\(^{400}\) See Munster, Sêtô, p. 108, fig. 91; Sanf, p. 22; cf. Wb. 5, p. 31: n. 46.

\(^{401}\) Allen understands this caption quite differently. He thinks that the first word is like \textit{ml niš}, used here with ironic intent. See p. 40 and n. 43, but whose feet are still visible today.

\(^{402}\) See Murray, JEA 3, pp. 401, 15; Janssen, Scepter IV 1 (1977), p. 35, 17. A common utterance in threshing scenes is \textit{“Watch (what you are doing)!”}.
the ground and the bottom of his staff. The staff nonetheless implies that he was an overseer supervising the activities on the threshing floor. The legs and feet of the two figures behind him face in the opposite direction. All that survives of the figure at the left edge of the block are a rear leg and foot. A similar arrangement is seen in the mastaba of Mereruka, where an attendant stands behind the overseer leaning on his staff and holds the latter's sandals, while three men walking to the left carry offerings to the tomb owner, including the first fruits of the harvest.410

If the two men behind the overseer indeed bore offerings, then they probably represent the end of a procession that began on the opposite side of the southern serdab slot with the figures of four more offering bearers. The best preserved of these figures is the foremost who proffers to Ini a goose held by the neck and wings. Over the goose are the words: *fn mn š. k.* k; “This is [for] your *h3*.” The bearer behind holds a brace of ducks by the wings in his right hand. Except for part of the line of his chest and his legs, the rest of his figure is lost, and only the legs and feet of the two men who followed survive.

The heads of all of the individuals in this register, offering bearers and field hands alike, are close-cropped and wigless. Except for waisbands, only in the case of the thief thrower and the fifth drover do any details of clothing survive. Both of these individuals wear the semicircular kilt with trapezoidal front panel.

A few details bear witness to the finished state of the original carving on this wall. These include the interior markings of the plant(?) and of the hieroglyph of the human face in the capitation over the man throwing sheaves onto the stack, the fringes of the blanket on the back of the second donkey, the hair in the mane of the third donkey, and sections of the twisted double strands along the sides of the rope-net sacks on the backs of both donkeys.

*Sixth Register.* The activity on the threshing floor is depicted in the space between the two serdab slots.404 The action again proceeds from right to left. The circular threshing floor is represented as a rectangle above the baseline. Three field hands and a group of ten donkeys are shown kneel-deep among the sheaves. The five donkeys in the center face right with the first overlapped by the second, the second by the third and so forth, with a complete figure at the end of the line.405 Two donkeys lower their heads to take a mouthful of the mixed grain and straw, while a third raises his head and brays his displeasure at the field hands brandishing sticks. The figure of one of the donkeys is turned in the opposite direction, both to diversify the arrangement and to indicate their circular motion on the threshing floor. The two field hands on the right of the threshing floor brandish sticks above their heads to keep the donkeys on the floor moving. The second man says to one of the animals, perhaps the braying donkey: *š.o k mn k; “Hey you, watch (what you are doing)!“*406 His companion, who holds a stick poised above the ramp of the last donkey, places his left hand on the head of the one donkey who is out of step with his fellows and exclamations: *š.o b.k im mn.* “Get back among them!”407 All three field hands wear a folded kilt with overlap and in one case a dangling belt tie.

Further to the left, a group of women are winnowing the threshed grain in order to separate the seed from the chaff. Dressed in long, right-fitting dresses with oblique hems held up by shoulder straps, three of the women wear kirecheifs gathered back behind the neck and tied with a strip of cloth to keep the seed cases and other debris out of their hair, while the fourth evidently had only the headband cloth.408 The woman on the right handles a sieve with which she sifts the threshed grain, while the seed falls to the ground. The legend before her face is now largely destroyed but can be restored from parallels: *fū fū, “sieve[ing] barley.”409* The pair of winnowers in the middle bend forward and downward to pick-up the mixed seed and chaff with palm fiber brooms and toss it up to let the action of the air clean it.410 The legend over the head of the woman on the right is: *š.int, “broom-winnowing of barley.”411* The column of text before the left-hand woman is badly damaged and only a few signs can be made out. From traces visible in the photograph, however, it is possible that the column terminated in *š.int.* The last winnower at the left scoops up the grain with a pair of winnowing scoops and lets the wind blow away the chaff and dust while the grain falls to the ground.412 Over her upraised arms traces of the component signs of *š.int, “scoop-winnowing,” can also be made out in pl. 32.413

Behind this woman, a field hand armed with a three-pronged pitchfork pitches the mixed grain and straw from a stack in the form of a truncated pyramid onto the winnowing floor. The operation is shown out of sequence, but the pitchfork has taken a substantial bite out of the side of the stack closest to the winnowers.414 In front of the field hand’s face and over the stack is a short caption: *š.š, “separating the barley.”415* At the far left is another stack, which undoubtedly represents the winnowed grain. Both of the stacks, like the stack deterministic of the verb *š.š,* are decorated with papyrus umbels at the corners.416 In addition, a beer jar on a tall stand is set out at the foot of the left-hand stack. Similar stands with food or drink appear near the threshing floor in a number of Old Kingdom harvest scenes.417 The assumption is often made that these represent offers to the snake goddess and patroness of the harvest, Renenutet, at the completion

---

407 For the activities of piling sheaves, threshing, and winnowing, see Harper, *Deco-*

408 Idem, 2, pp. 168–69.
409 See *HES* pp. 335–36.
414 For a detailed depiction of a winnowing broom to be seen in Simpson, *Sethos-emb-bash* pl. 1, see note 159 above.
415 For a drawing of such a sieve in plan, see Montet, *Egypt’s Golden Age*, pp. 118–19.
416 For examples of winnowing scoops, see M. Schäfer, *Priestergräber*, pp. 175, fig. 18; Penz, *Tools and Weapons*, p. 54, *Egypt* Golden Age, pp. 40–42, cat. no. 16.
418 In a number of tombs the man with the pitchfork and the indented pile of grain and straw are shown in the proper sequence; see e.g., L.2 2, pl. 46, 47; Murray, *Two Craftsmen* 4, pl. 46; *Two Craftsmen* 4, pl. 17; Simpson, *Sethos-emb-bash* pl. 16; *Egypt’s Golden Age*, pl. F.
of the harvest cycle,489 despite the fact that the goddess herself is not depicted, whereas she is in New Kingdom scenes of the harvest.490

The legend above the beer jar in the present scene, b£t, "an offering (of bread and beer)," perhaps lends support to the view that these are not merely victuals for the field hands.487

The field hands are actually shown in the process of attaching the handle and a cover with the same form.491 His right arm is outstretched and he is about to lift the cover to release the purifying and revivifying incense smoke.488 Although the right upper edge of the block on which his figure is carved is broken away, the presence of the word nß in front of the deceased is a good indication that the caption sdr spt, "burning incense,"492 originally stood in the first column of text before this thurifer, as it did before the thurifer alongside the southern serdab slot. Due to damage, it is difficult to make anything definite out of the traces inscribed in front of the thurifer’s face and extending above his head. Nevertheless, they perhaps belonged to a title or titles, as is the case with the other thurifer, and it is just possible that here too they read zbb sn‡ pr, "dignitary and elder of the porch,"486 or zn† sm‡ pr, "Tjesnesptah," also inscribed in smaller and rougher signs than the original caption, was squeezed into the available space between his body and the word nß.493 Titles and name alike were hence probably later additions.

In the offering chamber of the tomb of Iset’s near contemporary at Saqqara, a pair of thurifers is located to either side of three individual serdab slots in its west wall.495 There does not appear to be room for the figure of another thurifer to the right of the southern serdab slot, and it is impossible to be certain whether or not the same arrangement recurs on either side of the northern serdab slot in G 3270 because of damage to the slot and the adjacent wall surfaces, and only the head, shoulders, and the upper part of the arms of the man opposite Tjesnesptah on the right side of the southern serdab slot are preserved. From the disposition of his arms he could have held up a censer. On the other hand, he may have been shown presenting a bird, with his straight outstretched hand holding the neck and his other hand the wings. In fact, just such an arrangement—

The workers on the threshing floor or the winnowers are never shown helping one another to rake up grain. In addition, sometimes interrupt their labors to drink from a jar or eat a meal486
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The thurifer on the left of the serdab slot at the south end of the wall raises the lid of his censer in order to release the incense smoke. The text before him is in palimpsest (fig. 55). The words khp qrij were carved in raised relief of a similar height and quality to that of the rest of the wall, and are clearly original. Subsequently, the title and name of the stf ḫrs nṯ rf Sḏḏm, "personal scribe of royal records, Senejem" was added.435 The title was carved right over the sign of the censer (khp)436 and the name once again squeezed into the blank space between the body of the thurifer and the word (qrij). The signs of the addition are incised in relief, but of inferior quality, like the labels identifying the figures of the other officiants on either side of the northern serdab slot. Both title and name were then apparently recarved, in the case of the title probably more than once, perhaps because the sculptor had made an inadvertent omission or was dissatisfied with the original arrangement of the signs.

It was not at all unusual for funerary priests to add their names and titles to the initially anonymous figures of officials or offering bearers at a date subsequent to the completion of the original decoration of a tomb. It is, of course, possible that these additions were made with the knowledge and consent of the tomb owner before his death, after the arrangements for his funerary cult were finalized. On the other hand, funerary priests who served cults that lasted for several generations might also wish to be commemorated.437 Further examples of both practices are evident in the decoration of the offering room of k 2370.

Three groups of butchers and their assistants originally occupied the remainder of the register to the left of the southern serdab slot. In order to immobilize the head of the dying ox, the butcher’s assistant on the right in the first group places one foot on its head and lays hold of both its horns. His figure is weighty like those of his companions. Unlike the other figures, his garment is preserved; he wears the semicircular kilt with trapezoidal front panel. The butcher in the middle of the group stands facing right towards the previous individual, the lower part of his figure being hidden behind the ox. As the caption above indicates, he is dm ḫ, ‘sharpening a knife.’438 The knife is held in the left hand and the whetstone, which would have been secured by a leather thong whose other end was tied to one edge of his kilt, is held in the right hand.439 His other assistant leans slightly backwards to the left and pulls hard on the end of a rope whose other end presumably secured the animal’s legs. Before his face is written: qdb, “binding.”440

The next group also consists of three individuals. The semicircular limestone was intractable here, and the scene was undoubtedly finished in plaster which has fallen away in the intervening millennia. The details of the figures are lost as a result, though their outlines are visible. The butcher on the right stoops over to the left. His arms hang down in front of him and he is perhaps about to sever one of the animal’s legs. The legend above reads either sq, “cutting off,” or, if the damaged sign that follows was the foreleg of an ox, st pr ḫp, “cutting off the foreleg.”441 The two butcher’s assistants appear to be struggling with another leg. Enough remains of the caption between them to see that the signs read from right to left.

The left end of the block on which the third group of butchers is drawn is broken off and lost, and only part of the right-hand figure survives. His back is shown in profile and he evidently held both arms in front of him; perhaps he grasped a foreleg of a third animal and pulled it upright.442

The serdab behind the west wall of Room III measures 1.0 by 4.45 meters. Its height is 1.92 meters. It had been broken into by means of large holes battered through the north and south slots. Inside was found part of a base with the toes of an intrusive statue of Nekhesu, whose seat and legs were discovered in debris in Room III, and whose upper body and head were found in g 2381, Hole 1.443 The cult installation in the northwest corner of the room has already been described in some detail.444

North Wall

Of the scenes on the short north wall recorded by Lepsius (fig. 56), only the bottom right corner is still in place (pl. 3; fig. 57).445 Originally, its six registers were devoted to the picking of fruit and the gathering, treading, and pressing of grapes, activities which would have taken place toward the end of the summer,446 and, in the lower registers, to bread making and the brewing of beer.

First Register. This register was already badly deteriorated in Lepsius’ day. The figures in this, in the second register, and at the right side of the third register have been identified as men bringing baskets of grapes.447 This does not account for the pair of tall, round-topped objects in the center of the register, however. Since fruit picking scenes are sometimes associated with vintage sequences,448 like those depicted below, it seems more likely that the first register contained a depiction of fruit picking and that the round-topped objects represent two fruit trees. The activity of the three men would then be explained: they were picking fruit from the branches of the trees (a third tree to be restored at the far right). The picker on the right and the picker at the left both carried loaded baskets on one shoulder, which they each supported with a raised hand. According to Lepsius’ copy, the middle picker lacked a basket, but it is possible that

435 See above, p. 48.
436 See above, p. 31.
437 See above, p. 110.
438 For the censer sign, see Gardiner, EG, p. 501 (B.5); Bruneau, NAWG 1, no. 5, pp. 79–80; Fischer, Calligraphy, p. 57.
439 See Jéquier, Mon. fun. 2, pp. 27–28, for numerous examples of officials who preserved their names at a later date, even usurping the place of earlier officials. Cf. Fischer, ArchA 10 (1965), p. 5.
440 Ennau, Roden, p. 19; Monnet, Scènes, pp. 117, 118.
441 See above, p. 40 and n. 160.
442 WP, 3, p. 11; Monnet, Scènes, pp. 153, 154.
443 Sp. WP, 4, p. 156; –, Monnet, Scènes, p. 166.
444 See above, p(838,947),(950,991)
445 Oly. Reg., p. 28; see HESP, p. 84 (s).
446 See n. 39.
447 Cf. Mon. Scènes, pl. xxx.
448 Mt. Lyc., Materials, p. 10.
449 HARP, DISCUSSION, p. 511. To the citations in PM 17, pp. 351 (1) (c) and 307 (3) (b), is to be added another fruit picking scene from the Saqqara tomb of PD-akh-ken name now in Berlin: see Agneskoga, Museum Berlin, p. 35, no. 239 (Berlin 306). This scene is joined at the right by another block now at public auction which completes the caption on dib nḥw nṯ ḫsr the tree at the right edge of the Berlin block; see Egyptian Antiquities, no. 171. Harpur, DISCUSSION, p. 24, cites two prominent examples of fruit gathering and fig picking in the chapels of ḫr and Djes at Dzr el-Gebrani (Gebr. 5, pl. 6; 2, pl. 17). The fruit picking scene in the tomb of Iawy is now published in Weeks, Cemetery G, no. 46, pl. 21 a–b.

440 First Register.

444 HARP, DISCUSSION, p. 511. To the citations in PM 17, pp. 351 (1) (c) and 307 (3) (b), is to be added another fruit picking scene from the Saqqara tomb of PD-akh-ken name now in Berlin: see Agneskoga, Museum Berlin, p. 35, no. 239 (Berlin 306). This scene is joined at the right by another block now at public auction which completes the caption on dib nḥw nṯ ḫsr the tree at the right edge of the Berlin block; see Egyptian Antiquities, no. 171. Harpur, DISCUSSION, p. 24, cites two prominent examples of fruit gathering and fig picking in the chapels of ḫr and Djes at Dzr el-Gebrani (Gebr. 5, pl. 6; 2, pl. 17). The fruit picking scene in the tomb of Iawy is now published in Weeks, Cemetery G, no. 46, pl. 21 a–b.
he held a smaller basket with his right hand, as is sometimes the case in fruit-picking scenes. The middle and right-hand pickers face right, whereas the left-hand picker walked to the left, away from the trees, but turned back to pluck one final fruit. At the left end of the register another man, with arms largely destroyed, proceeded to the left. Apart from a scene in the Giza chapel of Iamy, all known depictions of fruit picking at the Memphite cemeteries occur in Saqqara tombs. If we are correct in identifying the activity in the first register as fruit picking, this is a second example of the genre from Giza.

**Second Register:** A vintage sequence was depicted in this and the succeeding registers. In this register six men carried conical baskets of grapes to the pressing vat shown below. Two of the men carried two baskets of grapes apiece on their shoulders, whereas the other bearers had only a single basket each. Each basket was supported with a raised hand. The fourth and fifth men in line turned back to speak to the bearer at the rear of the procession.

At first glance it seems that the vineyard with the vines supported on trellises and with laborers picking grapes, the most significant element of the vintage along with the pressing, was omitted from the present portrayal. Nevertheless, Lepsius says that in all the vintage scenes known to her, there is room enough to have included the picking. She does not specify where the vineyard stood in the present scene, but the only possible space seems to be the damaged area at the left end of the topmost register. Usually, the trellises on which the vines are trained are quite low and the pickers have to kneel in order to reach the clusters of grapes. Nevertheless, in certain scenes, the forked pole supports are taller than usual and the pickers stand at their task. It may therefore be that the man facing left at the left end of the topmost register was actually shown picking grapes from a trellis which had been destroyed before Lepsius copied this wall. If so, there is room for a kneeling figure to his right. It should be noted though that the mastaba of Mereruka provides one definite example of the omission of grape picking from vintage episodes.

**Third Register:** The two men on the right were engaged in conversation as they awaited their turn to empty their baskets of grapes into the large vat until no more juice could be extracted. Those on either end held onto the pole framework erected above the vat so as to steady themselves. The top of the pole on the left side of the vat is destroyed, but the right-hand pole may have been shaped like the so-called “tent-pole” columns. The treaders placed their arms around each other’s waists to prevent a tumble in the slippery residue of stalks, skins, and pits. They raised and lowered their feet in time to the clacking of the sticks beat by two men seated on a circle of hard-packed earth to the left. In similar vignettes in the tombs of Mereruka and Neferefre at Saqqara, a caption over the musicians reads: “Work down!” Sometimes the treaders wear a special kilt with a downward triangular extension, but in the present case they appear to be dressed only in belts with dangling ties.

**Fourth Register:** A group of four men at the left twisted poles attached to either end of a cloth sack in opposite directions in order to squeeze the remaining juice out of the pulp and skin of the crushed grapes into the large vat set below. The twisting was hard work and one worker on either side added the weight of his body to the effort by standing on one end of the poles. The worker on the left says to his counterpart on the other side of the vat “work!” “Press down!” Losing here is the man who is frequently shown suspended in mid-air above the twisted sack and who keeps the poles apart with his outstretched arms and legs. The two workers on the left side of the sack-press are agile and wear plain belted kilts whose edges have separated on account of their wide stance. Their comrades on the right also have close-cropped hair and were presumably dressed in the same sort of kilts, although the belts alone survive. Further to the right two workers decant the must, or juice, from the treading or the pressing of the grapes from small jars into five large pottery amphorae to ferment. The last man on the right may have been similarly engaged or may have been sealing the wine jars. A damaged caption before him preserved only the last two letters of the word “wine.”

**Fifth Register:** In this and the bottom register baking and brewing were depicted, bread making being a preliminary step in the brewing process. On the right side of the register a pair of scribes was seated on the ground before a granary consisting of two rows of domed structures with knobbed tops, the small silos in which grain, dried fruit, and other commodities were kept. They adopted the ordinary
nary posture for Egyptian men when seated, with one leg doubled under and the other knee up, and were presumably engaged in recording the contents of the silos on writing boards. Their writing cases rested on the ground before them, and scribal paraphernalia was set up on top of these. A brief line of text reading from right to left over the writing case of the scribe in front of the lower row of storehouses identified him as at the lower, "scribe of the granary."464 The scribe before the upper row of granaries was also captioned, but only the letter made was of the short text above his scribal case. Over the bottom row of storehouses the lotus-leaf sign for a "thous-

sand" alternated with stacks of and designations for grain, but the only names preserved are ite, "barley of Upper Egypt," and n(a)n, "barley of Lower Egypt."465 Over the upper row of storehouses the designation fl(1), as in an yet unidentified grain used in the fabrication of beer, perhaps a variety of barley, alone surviveth.466

The scene on the left side of this register represents the end results of the process of brewing, whose initial stages were perhaps depicted in the destroyed left-hand portion of the register immediately below. The fermented beer was first decanted into jars, and then, although the details are unclear, the jars probably stoppered with cone-shaped clay stoppers477 and imprinted with a cylinder seal.468 In a subregister above a variety of vessels were laid out; from right to left a depression so that the ground meal falls directly on the earth.472

Sixth Register. In spite of the fact that only a small part of the bottom of this register still survives, a number of details are evident to-day that were omitted by Lepsius’s draftsman. At the right end of the register in Lepsius’s drawing, a woman knelt on the ground and leant forward and widely spaced. In Lepsius’s drawing the figure appears to

woman’s girdle. As female laborers often do, she wore a tight-fitting dress girded by a belt-sash and held up by tapering shoulder straps (only one strap was visible, since her figure was drawn in profile).473 The head-kerschief over her hair, tightly gathered at the nape of the neck, was of the sort sometimes worn by agricultural laborers.474 In both Lepsius’s drawing and the squeez, the caption above the head of the woman is nft; there is space for a terminal -t under the coesia, however, and presumably it originally read nft, "grinding."475

The activity of the woman who sat with knees drawn up facing the woman at the queue is not clear from Lepsius’s plate, but our drawing shows flour being sifted through a deep sieve into a shallow tray. The caption recorded by Lepsius and the Lepsius can, as a result, be restored with some confidence: s diwâ(y) in nft, "sifting."476 The female miller.477 The two women facing each other grinding grain and sifting flour are, in fact, a stock motif in Old Kingdom scenes of baking and brewing.478 Further to the left a third woman squatting on the ground facing right tended the fire under a stack of bread moulds. Curiously, Lepsius’s artist drew only the central part of the stack with the outline of some of the moulds and the spaces between others. The two moulds at the base of the pile are visible in our drawing. The woman’s task was identified by the caption over her head: qir tbd, “heating the bread moulds.”480 Once the moulds were sufficiently hot, they were removed from the fire, the dough poured into them and allowed to bake by means of the pre-

baked clay.481 In Lepsius’s plate and in the drawing the woman’s figure is preserved, and she is shown with her right hand raised to shield her face and eyes from the fire, while her open left hand is extended to the moulds.482 In our drawing, it can be seen that she actually holds a stick in her left hand to poke the coals of the fire, while her right hand hangs down in a fist behind her. Both the woman sifting grain and her companion tending the bread moulds perhaps had a head covering like the woman grinding grain.

Today only the feet of the next figure to the left are preserved. Originally this figure bent over at the waist with arms held forward and widely spaced. In Lepsius’s drawing the figure appears to

464 For this title, see PM 5, p. 351 [757].
465 See and note: WB 4, p. 476, b–477, 7; PCl, p. 32; Müller-Willemsen, V 3 (1987), pp. 39–40; of the opusum of fl(1)."flasty barley," and (a)n, "flasty barley," represent a 2–6-row barley, respectively, for which, see Garner, Flora, pp. 358–359. However, the scribe above the woman notes probably refers to the geographical origin of the grain rather than any botanical differences continuous to land supply (Domestic Plants and Animals, p. 117).
467 For the different types of clay stoppers, see, Elephantine Period, pp. 211–12.
468 Compare the sequence of operations in 271, pl. 66.
469 See Baka, MAIDK 3 (1950), pp. 106–107 and fig. 42.
470 For the flour vases, see Baka, MAIDK 3 (1950), pp. 105 and fig. 32; 4 (1953), pp. 216–217 and fig. 39. The different kind of vases appearing in Old Kingdom wares in general, see Vandier, Manf 4, pp. 144–177, figs. 47–51.
be that of a man with close-cropped hair, but the partially preserved caption, […] in mfn, seems rather to identify this individual as a “female miller.” Although female workers sometimes have close-cut hair like their male counterparts, it is more likely that this woman wore a head-kerchief like her companions, the ends of which were not seen by Lepsius’s artist. She probably also wore the tight-fitting dress with belt-sash and shoulder straps, but only the part of the sash around her waist survived. The disposition of her arms and a segment of a curved line at her feet, which perhaps belonged to a large vat set on the ground before her, suggest that she might have been mixing dough to fill the heated mould. Usually, the men or women who mix the dough face towards the woman tending the fire, but there is at least one exception to the general rule. If she was indeed mixing dough, there is sufficient space in the destroyed area at the left for the figure of a worker strains the half-liquid mash through a sieve into a vat in order to start the fermentation process for beer, as well as for a second individual lining the beer jars with clay.

Room IV
Room IV is an east–west offering room. It measures 2.05 meters wide and 6.39 meters long and has an area of 13.02 square meters. The proportion of the length to the width is 1:0.32. The reconstructed height of the south wall is about 3.55 m (11.65 ft.). The room is located a boxlike structure built of three limestone slabs with a rectangular depression or basin underneath (pl. 50a). At the foot of the false door and extending across the entire width of the room is an uninscribed limestone offering stone, approximately 20 cm in height. The top of the slab is very rough and uneven, and there are no traces of the loaf-on-mat motif or of rectangular depressions for liquids visible on its top. In front of the false door and offering stone, and abutting against the latter at a right angle, is a large rectangular offering bench of limestone which has already been described. Built against the northern wall of the room, this bench is crowned by a cavetto-and-torus cornice on its southern and eastern sides (pl. 46b). In the southeast corner of the room is located a box-like structure built of three limestone slabs with a rectangular depression or basin underneath (pl. 50a-b).

Door Thicknesses
Like the passageway between Rooms II and III, the thicknesses of the passage between Room III and IV bore personifications of the agricultural estates belonging to Inti’s funerary endowment. Today the walls are denuded to the third course of masonry and only the lower portions of the bottom registers remain with the legs and feet of the estates and the animals they were leading, all facing into Room IV, as if they were entering into it (pls. 34b, 35c; fig. 59a–b). A few hieroglyphs from the estate names also survive. Sketches of the thicknesses, drawings of a few details, and copies of the estate names made by Mariette utilized these and her own personal copies of the few signs remaining in her study of funerary estates in the Old Kingdom. The Rev. Lieder and his wife Alice made paper squeezes of the thicknesses, and these were utilized by Jaromir Malek to correct the names of certain of the estates in an article published in 1974. Mariette copied the thicknesses when they were preserved to the height of two registers. As in the passageway between Rooms II and III, there were presumably three registers of estates originally. Mariette’s sketches of the thicknesses (fig. 58) are very approximate and misleading on a number of counts. Ten female figures are shown on either thickness, five in each register, carrying in baskets on their heads the produce of the estates whose names were inscribed before them. In the sketches, each figure raises a front hand to help balance her burden, while the other hand hangs empty behind. It is clear even from Mariette’s larger scale renderings of a few representative estates that this was not always the case. The first figure in the upper register of the left thickness, for example, actually raised her rear hand to steady her basket and held stems of papyrus in her other hand. In addition, the three figures on the left thickness has a hemispherical basket on her head on one page, but is shown with a conical basket on another.

The paper squeezes made by the Lieders convey a clearer picture of the appearance of the two thicknesses (pls. 32a-b, 36a-b). Unfortunately, folds and tears in the squeezes, as well as their relatively poor technical quality, obscure some of the details. Furthermore, either the Lieders themselves or a third party once again outlined the figures and hieroglyphs in pencil and did not always do so with accuracy.

Each estate apparently wore a right-fitting shift held in place by tapering shoulder straps, a beaded collar, and a long wig with a tassel falling over the near shoulder and hanging down to the level of the top of the dress. As on the thicknesses between Rooms II and III, the hems of the dresses slant from front to back (except perhaps the last estate on the right). The estate names incorporate the cartouches of six Fifth Dynasty rulers: Uzerkaf, Sahure, Neferefrerê (Kakai), Neuserre (Iuni), Menkauraht (Ikuhot), and Izi. With few excep-
tions, the transliterations and translations of the estate names follow:
Jacquet-Gordon and Mâlek.

Left (east) thickness

1. Woman carrying a conical basket on her head and papyrus stalks in her left hand and in crook of left arm: but Ini: iṣet Kibti, “The estate of Kibti (named) the iṣet of Kibti.”
2. Woman carrying a crescent-shaped basket on a pad on her head: [...] Ini, “[...] Izezi.”
3. Woman carrying a hemispherical basket on her head and leading an oryx on a rope: wsr Ini, “Dominion belongs to Izezi.”
4. Woman carrying a crescent-shaped basket on a pad on her head: wsr Ini: khâkhur is abundant.”
5. Woman carrying a conical basket on her head: i ḥhbu ṣebw-er, “Libation basin of Sahure.”
6. Woman carrying a conical basket on her head: but ḫw-er: “The estate of Kâkai (named) [...] Baster.”
7. Woman carrying a hemispherical basket on a pad on her head and leading a calf on a rope. Mr [...] ḫw-er, “[...] loves Iaḥuhot.”
8. Woman carrying a conical basket on her head and holding a bird by the wings against her body: [...] ḫw- [...] er, “[...] of power is [...]”.
9. Woman carrying a hemispherical basket on her head and leading a calf on a rope: wsr ḫw-Kibti, “Strong of power is Kâkai.”
10. Woman carrying a conical basket on her head and holding two birds in her hanging rear hand: ḫprw Ini, “The offerings of Ini.”

Right (west) thickness

1. Woman carrying a hemispherical basket on a pad on her head and a goose on her forward arm. but Ini: srw ḫw-er, “The estate of Izezi (named) work of the command of Izezi.”
2. Woman carrying a conical basket on her head: but Ini: mr Bstt ḫw-er, “The estate of Izezi (named) Bastet wishes that Izezi lives.”
3. Woman carrying a hemispherical basket on a pad on her head: [...] ṣebw-er, “[...] Sahure.”
4. Woman carrying a conical basket on her head: [...] Wsr-kr, “[...] Userkaf.”
5. Woman carrying a crescent-shaped basket on a pad on her head: Destroyed except for traces of the ḫw-sign.
6. Woman carrying a crescent-shaped basket on a pad on her head: but Ini: wsr Ini, “The estate of Izezi (named) Hours perpetuates Izezi.”
7. Woman carrying hemispherical basket on her head and leading an oryx on a rope: Destroyed except for the city-determinative and traces of a preceding sign.
8. Woman carrying a conical basket on her head: ḫprw Ini, “The offerings of Izezi.”
9. Woman carrying a hemispherical basket on a pad on her head and leading a gazelle on a rope: mr ḫw-er, “Izezi is one who loves life.”
10. Woman carrying conical basket on her head and holding a wick-erwork frail in her hanging rear hand: wsrw “[...] [...] [...] is one who perpetuates.”

East Wall

Only the bottom of the lowest register is preserved (pl. 36c–37b; fig. 63). The figures present an essentially balanced composition. On either side a bull walks away from the center. Each bull is preceded by a herdswoman who perhaps led it by a short rope tied around the jaw and simultaneously placed his other hand on the rump of the animal before him to hurry it along. The elements of the register are not entirely equal, however, for the bull to the immediate left of the central axis has its own attendant walking by its rump on the far side, whereas the bull to its right lacks an attendant. Furthermore, the man who stands facing his fellows at the left end of the register is not mirrored by a figure at the right end. Instead his figure is offset by that of a calf and an attendant who leads it by means of a rope tied to a foreleg. The two opposing files of men and animals were probably perceived as bringing up the tail ends of the processions of offering bearers on the north and south long walls.

Mariette claims to have seen offering bearers in the lower registers of this wall and offerings arrayed on tables in its upper registers. It is therefore possible that the missing registers of offering bearers above were divided in a manner similar to the lowest registers with half of the offering bearers marching left and half right.

South Wall

The wall is occupied by a traditional table scene with a compartmental offering-list above, by files of men in rows transporting offerings, and by priests performing the mortuary rites (pl. 38; fig. 61). At the right end of the wall Izezi is seated behind an offering table, his back to the west wall and the false door, facing left toward the priests and offeringbearers depicted before him and also toward any earthly visitor to enter the room (pls. 39–41). He extends his right hand to the bread offerings on the table, while the other hand, clenched in his left, claps the bread offerings together with his right hand in offering gestures. The elements of the offering-list above were divided in a manner similar to the lowest registers with half of the offeringbearers marching left and half right.498

496 Jacques-Gordon, Domaines, p. 266, reads ḥwt Kēkē: mr ḫw-er, “The estate of Kēkē (named) Mr ḫw-er.”
497 Jacques-Gordon, Domaines, p. 250 (19), and Mâlek, GM 5 (1974), p. 12 (19) read the names... ḫw-er: “Strong of power is Kâkai.” In perpetuating? I kâkâ and wsr w tsa respectively. Might this not instead be a toponymy contracted on the pattern of the personal names discussed above, p. 10.
499 See above, p. 6.
500 See above, p. 10.
lap, holds a folded cloth which probably served as a napkin.501 As is usual, the right hand is incorrectly rendered, the back of the hand being shown, rather than the palm of the hand, with the fingers partly in profile carving over at the top, and the thumb in profile carving up from below. Inti wears a short wig reaching to the nape of the neck. Traces of the usual pattern of horizontal rows of overlapping locks were still visible at the back of his head in 1931 (pl. 40).502 A segment of a curve line indicates that he wore a beaded collar, but the hemline of his short kilt is no longer evident. Inti sits on an animal-legged stool whose lion's feet are set on bearded drums and the fostrum-shaped stone supports which kept furniture away from the damp floor and crawling insects.503 The beading, or superimposed series of small half-round moldings, is still visible on one of the drums. The side-rail of the stool terminates at the rear in a papyrus flower ornament, and the seat is provided with a low cushion that slopes gradually from back to front. The stool rests on a low rectangle which probably represents a reed mat drawn as if seen from above.504

Above his head, Inti's name and titles are given in seven badly damaged columns of hieroglyphs which perhaps read as follows: (1) [ey-hst bkt]-u 3ry 3r-yt n-bt n-mt[n]; (2) [ey-hst bkt]-u nnt-yt n-bt n-mt[n]; (3) [ey-hst bkt]-u nnt-yt n-bt n-mt[n] n [ ... ]; (4) [ey-hst bkt]-u nnt-yt n-bt n-mt[n]; (5) [ey-hst bkt]-u nnt-yt n-bt n-mt[n]; (6) [ey-hst bkt]-u nnt-yt n-bt n-mt[n] n [ ... ]; (7) [ey-hst bkt]-u nnt-yt n-bt n-mt[n]; (8) [ey-hst bkt]-u nnt-yt n-bt n-mt[n].

501 See e.g., Hassan, BIFAO 10 (1975), pp. 168–171.
502 See above, p. 60 and fig. 36.
503 For the restoration, see above, pp. 37, 49.
504 For this type of wig, see above, p. 39 and n. 42.
505 See above, pp. 37, 49, and fig. 16, and below, p. 84 (16).
506 Such lists have been studied in depth by Hassan (ibid., Chap. 2, esp. pp. 47–51). The mat pattern was rarely, if ever, carved in the Old Kingdom. On this feature, see also, Schefold, Principles, p. 168.
507 Fischer, BIFAO 10 (1975), pp. 61, 87–88.
508 For the translation, see above, pp. 37, 41.
509 Such lists consist of twenty-three compartments each, and Row D twenty-two compartments. The compartments in Row C are narrower, and it is likely that it originally consisted of twenty-five compartments. About half the entries are missing but can be restored with reasonable certainty by comparison with other offering lists, including one on the east wall of Inti's own burial chamber.509 Additional signs, now lost, are visible in a hori-
501 See Fischer, AMI 17 (1975), pp. 9–12.
502 BIFAO, p. 286.
503 For this type of wig, see above, p. 37 and n. 42.
505 Chepion, Matases et hypogées, p. 40 (Criterion 15). The mat pattern was rarely, if ever, carved in the Old Kingdom. On this feature, see also, Schefold, Principles, p. 168.
506 For the restoration, see above, pp. 37, 41, and fig. 36, and below, p. 84 (16).
507 See below, p. 14 (4).
508 For the title adjunction nnt-yt-n-bt, see Gunn, in Test Cow, t. i, p. 80 (56). Such lists have been studied in depth by Hassan (ibid., p. 37, 38, and Barta (Offert.) - 1.
509 Such lists have been studied in depth by Hassan (ibid., Chap. 2, esp. pp. 47–51).
503 Chepion, Matases et hypogées, p. 51.
504 No—and, for whom they were intended. A noteworthy feature of the list is the substitution of standing figures performing rites for the more usual kneeling figures in the bottom compartments in most of the first row. A number of these figures are lost and the upper parts of the others are missing (along with the names of the entries above), but it is likely that the first
eighteenth compartments were originally affected. The first and sixteenth compartments actually contain a pair of kneeling and standing figures performing the rites of *zet* and *qeb tuwy* respectively. Item (18), *fms*, is lost, but would appropriately be determined by a man sitting on his heels. The first eighteen items of the great ritual offering list are in fact those which constituted the preliminaries or opening rites to the funerary meal, and it may be for this reason that the figures were thus distinguished. The usual kneeling figures presumably commenced thereafter. Certainly, items (22–23) at the end of the first row are determined with kneeling figures. Parallels are provided by offering lists in a number of tombs of late Fifth or early Sixth Dynasty date. In the case of the present list the standing determinatives of numbers (1), (3), and (4) are sufficiently well preserved to aid in the identification of the lost entries above.

Offering List

Row A:

(1) [1] "[Liberation of water, one]"
(2) [1] "[Incense on the fire, one]"
(3) [1] "[Festival ointment, one jar]"
(4) [1] "[Bread, one jar]"
(5) [1] "[Ointment, one jar]"
(6) [1] "[Bag of green eye paint, two]"
(7) [1] "[Bag of black eye paint, two]"
(8) [1] "[Cloth, two pieces]"
(9) [1] "[Liberation and two pellets of nectar]"
(10) [1] "[Offering table, one]"
(11) [1] "[Offering of the king, two]"
(12) [1] "[Offering of the broad court, two]"
(13) [1] "[Set down, one]"
(14) [1] "[Repast, a 1-loaf and jug, each one]"
(15) [1] "[Barley bread (!), one]"
(16) [1] "[Baked bread (!), one]"
(17) [1] "[Wine, two]"
(18) [1] "[Narren, two (portions)]"
(19) [1] "[Repast, a 1-loaf and jug, each one]"
(20) [1] "[Water, two]"
(21) [1] "[Water, two portions]"
(22) [1] "[Narren, two (portions)]"

Row B:

(23) [1] "[Serving of 1-loaf, one portion]"
(24) [1] "[Repast, a 1-loaf and jug, each one]"
(25) [1] "[Narren, two (portions)]"
(26) [1] "[Wine, two]"
(27) [1] "[Wine, two portions]"
(28) [1] "[Repast, a 1-loaf and jug, each one]"
(29) [1] "[Barley bread (!), one]"
(30) [1] "[Baked bread (!), one]"
(31) [1] "[Baked bread (!), one]"
(32) [1] "[Baked bread (!), two]"
(33) [1] "[Barley bread (!), two]"
(34) [1] "[Barley bread (!), four]"
(35) [1] "[Barley bread (!), four]"
(36) [1] "[Bag of green eye paint, two]"
(37) [1] "[Bag of black eye paint, two]"
(38) [1] "[Cloth, two pieces]"
(39) [1] "[Liberation and two pellets of nectar]"
(40) [1] "[Offering table, one]"
(41) [1] "[Offering of the king, two]"
(42) [1] "[Offering of the broad court, two]"
(43) [1] "[Set down, one]"
(44) [1] "[Repast, a 1-loaf and jug, each one]"
(45) [1] "[Barley bread (!), one]"
(46) [1] "[Baked bread (!), one]"
(47) [1] "[Wine, two]"
(48) [1] "[Wine, two portions]"
(49) [1] "[Repast, a 1-loaf and jug, each one]"
(50) [1] "[Water, two]"
(51) [1] "[Water, two portions]"
(52) [1] "[Narren, two (portions)]"
(53) [1] "[Repast, a 1-loaf and jug, each one]"
(54) [1] "[Wine, two]"

Row C:

(55) [1] "[Kidney, one]"
(56) [1] "[Inos-cut of meat, one]"
(57) [1] "[Ribs, four]"
(58) [1] "[Bread, one]"
(59) [1] "[Lover, one]"
(60) [1] "[Spleen, one]"
(61) [1] "[Flesh, one]"
(62) [1] "[Bread, one]"
(63) [1] "[Bread, two]"
(64) [1] "[Inos-cut of meat, two]"
(65) [1] "[Ribs, two]"
(66) [1] "[Bread, one]"
(67) [1] "[Inos-cut of meat, two]"
(68) [1] "[Ribs, two]"
(69) [1] "[Inos-cut of meat, two]"
(70) [1] "[Repast, a 1-loaf and jug, each one]"
(71) [1] "[Barley bread (!), one]"
(72) [1] "[Baked bread (!), two]"
(73) [1] "[Wine, two]"
(74) [1] "[Wine, two portions]"
(75) [1] "[Bread, one]"
(76) [1] "[Wine, two]"
(77) [1] "[Bread, two]"
(78) [1] "[Wine, two]"

Row D:

(79) [1] "[Wine, two]"
(80) [1] "[Wine, two]"
(81) [1] "[Wine, two]"

Footnotes:

1. See Barra, Opleider, p. 69.
2. E.g., Hassan, *Osiris*, fig. 231; Simpson, *Qeb and bty*, fig. 41. In a limited number of other tombs the figures of the efficients appear on a small scale at a focus immediately below the offering list; *Quarrante Tombs*, pl. 52; Peters, 1972, nos. 5–36, nos. 1 (Niet-Ahmed).
(86) [life bsh. 2] [‘White 6-row barley’; two]
(87) [life wjt. 1] [‘Grown 6-row barley’; two]
(88) [3 val. 2] [‘Parched’ wheat; two]
(89) [3 ge. 2] [‘Parched barley’; two]
(90) [sobw. 2] [‘Baked loaves’; two]
(91) [3 nbk. 2] [‘Honey’; two]
(92) [sesh nbk. 2] [‘Cake of naub-fruit’; two]
(93) [wfl. 2] [‘Earth all’months’; two]
(94) [5 nbk. bus. 1] [Every sweet fruit; one]
(95) [ypt nbk. 2] [All yeasts; offerings; one]
(96) [ydt nbk. 2] [All offerings; one]
(97) [gty. 1] [‘Half loaves’, one]
(98) [gsfl wh] [‘The best of the offering tab[le; one’]
(99) [gty. 1] [‘Choice joints’, one]

Comments

For this entry and the three following, compare the offering list in Inti’s burial chamber, pl. 15, fig. 71.


For the translation “a leaf and ‘gfu’” see Fischer, Versus, pp. 26–27. The abbreviated writing of (93) most likely occurred here as well.

Junker, Giza 1, p. 94; Fischer, GMBÖ 41 (1964), p. 4. n. 17; ibidem, Versus, p. 17, n. 44.

Caminos, 1–2, Maso, p. 425.

See Wild, in BIFAO 64 (1965), p. 206, with notes 1 and 2.

Barta, Opferformel, p. 49 and n. 7.

The order of the normal list of food items is that of the offering list in Inti’s burial chamber. For the identification of the individual species, see Vandier, Manual 5, pp. 403–414; Beansteen, GiCE 2, pp. 206.

James, Khonsu, p. 64 (54); Fischer, Versus, p. 17.

On the ‘sobw’, see Montet du Buisson, Nouveaux dossier, pp. 33, 35, and 177; Davies, PICTP 2, pl. 75, fig. 122.

Balassi, Agapiotta Gerasimos, Flos, pp. 50, 94; Fund. The Gift of Osiris 1, p. 796.

Edel, Quivert der Hausu II, p. 21 (10).


Edel, Quivert der Hausu III, p. 122–123.

Emsay, Renkew, p. 9.


Contemporary offering lists frequently determine both with three jars [eg., 731 Edel, Quivert der Hausu III, p. 120; James, Khonsu, pl. 30. Here the three jars have instead been placed in the small compartment that contains the pictorial determinative of the two.

First and Second Registers. A space at the top of the wall approximating in height two of the registers below was divided horizontally into three sub-registers entirely filled with an array of food and drink offerings piled on tables, stands, and trays or contained in a variety of receptacles. If the wall is preserved to its full height here, as seems likely, the plain, narrow band between the top register and the ceiling may have borne the earlier conventional Old Kingdom border pattern of interposed diagonals in paint or less likely a border of colored rectangles.153

Third Register. On a level with Inti’s head six funerary priests perform ritual acts.154 The two-fold aim of these funerary rites was, firstly, the transmission of food offerings and, secondly, the “spiritualization” of the deceased by the recitation of spells to render him an effective blessed spirit.155 The combined rite performed by the foremost pair of officiants constitutes the introduction to the service. The first priest kneels, both hands palm down before him with finger tips resting on a mound of sand.156 The second stands behind him and pours a stream of water and nard, a cleansing soda used anciently in place of soap157 from a tall, spouted zneb-jar over the first priest’s head and onto his hands.158 The caption under the raised arms of the standing man identifies him as the frp ntw mdj-m s3t-m (hdw-b FCD I, 7), controller of necklace-stringers and supervisor of funerary priests, Ma3n(j)’159. In other depictions the water falling directly upon the hands of the kneeling man indicates that this is the rite of hand-washing or purification with which every feast began.160 A belt around the waist of the kneeling man indicates that he was clothed, but the hem of his garment is not visible. The standing figure wore a folded, belted kite, the overlap being visible in part in pl. 38. Both officiants have short wigs with horizontal rows of locks from crown to base.

The next officiant stands (his head is missing in the gap between stones) and elevates a double-lobed censer whose lid he holds firmly in place while the incense smoke accumulates. The label under his arms reads: kpb ntw, “burning incense.”161 Elsewhere the thurifer is shown at different stages of the action: holding up the bottom part of the censer and throwing grains of charcoal into it, poking the embers to encourage combustion, or raising the cover either straight up or at an angle to direct the incense smoke towards the deceased.162

Even though the figure of the fourth officiant from the right has been chiselled away almost completely, the manner in which the erasure was executed has left a negative impression163 which shows that he probably originally stood with forward arm raised to the level of his face in a gesture of invocation or address.164 Beneath his arm is inscribed: wdt flk, “presenting offerings.”165 The consecration of food offerings for the deceased is generally in the province of the lector priest who, wearing a shoulder-length wig, a ceremonial beard and a beard of the standing man identifies him as the first priest kneels, both hands palm down before him with finger tips resting on a mound of sand.156 The second stands behind him and pours a stream of water and nard, a cleansing soda used anciently in place of soap157 from a tall, spouted zneb-jar over the first priest’s head and onto his hands.158 The caption under the raised arms of the standing man identifies him as the frp ntw mdj-m s3t-m (hdw-b FCD I, 7), controller of necklace-stringers and supervisor of funerary priests, Ma3n(j)’159. In other depictions the water falling directly upon the hands of the kneeling man indicates that this is the rite of hand-washing or purification with which every feast began.160 A belt around the waist of the kneeling man indicates that he was clothed, but the hem of his garment is not visible. The standing figure wore a folded, belted kite, the overlap being visible in part in pl. 38. Both officiants have short wigs with horizontal rows of locks from crown to base.

The next officiant stands (his head is missing in the gap between stones) and elevates a double-lobed censer whose lid he holds firmly in place while the incense smoke accumulates. The label under his arms reads: kpb ntw, “burning incense.”161 Elsewhere the thurifer is shown at different stages of the action: holding up the bottom part of the censer and throwing grains of charcoal into it, poking the embers to encourage combustion, or raising the cover either straight up or at an angle to direct the incense smoke towards the deceased.162

Even though the figure of the fourth officiant from the right has been chiselled away almost completely, the manner in which the erasure was executed has left a negative impression163 which shows that he probably originally stood with forward arm raised to the level of his face in a gesture of invocation or address.164 Beneath his arm is inscribed: wdt flk, “presenting offerings.”165 The consecration of food offerings for the deceased is generally in the province of the lector priest who, wearing a shoulder-length wig, a ceremonial beard and a sash across his chest, makes the gesture of invocation and carries a papyrus roll in his other hand.166 Nevertheless, on occasion the individual performing the rite of wdt flk does wear a short wig and lacks the sash.167 It is impossible here, because of the damage, to tell whether the effaced figure wore a sash, but he appears to have worn worn


155 Cf. Hassan, Giza IV, pp. 88–94.

156 Hayez, Seigneur p. 283.

157 The zneb-jar is discussed by Montet du Buisson, Nouveaux dossier, pp. 116–117; Jansen, Prises d’Objets, p. 316; and Hendrickx, in Millet’s Memoire, p. 114, n. 49.

158 For the first and last names, see below, p. 86 (16).

159 See e.g., Gardiner, JEA 24 (1938), p. 86–87; Hassan, Giza IV, pp. 66–68; Mereuha, p. 97; Vandier, Manual 4, p. 197 (4), fig. 30.

160 See above, p. 15.

161 See above, section 2, pp. 40–41.


163 WB. p. 150, 7; Junker, Giza 3, p. 63, 4; p. 110, 11; idem, Manual 4, p. 110 (47).

164 See e.g., Williams, Dissertationes Opfer-wil. pl. 51, Simpson, Qar and Idu, figs. 4–9.

165 E.g., Junker, Giza 4, p. 77; Hassan, Giza IV, fig. 213, pl. 50 (c. LD 8, pl. 33); Simpson, Knaoph fig. 31, pl. 10.
a short wig and conceivably carried a papyrus roll in his hanging right hand. The reason for the erasure of this figure, as well as for that of the foremost offering bearer in the register below, is not readily apparent. Possibly the ancient sculptor wished to change some aspect of their appearance, and hence cut away the original raised figures with the intention of recarving them in a new layer of plaster. However, if his aim was to transform the figure into a lector priest, it would hardly have been necessary to efface the entire figure; all that would have been required was to add a sash and recut the wig. What is presumably an erasure of the like character occurs on the north wall of the offering room of Pahhetep I in the Unis pyramid cemetary at Saqara, where the figure of an officiant was once again chiselled almost completely away. Although it is impossible to identify the motivation behind this latter erasure, it was clearly the artist’s intention to put another figure in its place, for the dark red flesh color of a figure, which had been painted in, is still visible.

The lector priest, the fifth figure from the right, stands and holds up in both hands before him an unrolled papyrus. Before his face is written: šdt zß, "reading the document aloud." A caption just below the papyrus places its recitation in its ritual context: šib in bry-bly, "spiritualizing by the lector priest." He wears a folded kilt with overlap and dangling belt tie. His shoulder-length wig lacks the customary pattern of strands of hair but, as is the case with the last officiant and many of the offering bearers below, the details may have been carved in plaster which has subsequently fallen away. On his chin is a short beard.

The last officiant walks to the left trailing a bundle of grasess or reeds behind him, but turns his head and looks back at his fellows. Although the label before his face is damaged, there is little evidence that this is the rite of ins⁻fin, "removing the footprints," the last act in the sequence of ceremonies, a terminal rite of prophylactic nature performed so that an offering room or sanctuary would be purified and rendered inaccessible to evil spirits. He is dressed in a short wig without the overlapping pattern of locks and a folded kilt with overlap. The artist has incorrectly reversed the kilt of the face is written: šdt zß, "reading the document aloud." A caption just below the papyrus places its recitation in its ritual context: šib in bry-bly, "spiritualizing by the lector priest." He wears a folded kilt with overlap and dangling belt tie. His shoulder-length wig lacks the customary pattern of strands of hair but, as is the case with the last officiant and many of the offering bearers below, the details may have been carved in plaster which has subsequently fallen away. On his chin is a short beard.

The last officiant walks to the left trailing a bundle of grasess or reeds behind him, but turns his head and looks back at his fellows. Although the label before his face is damaged, there is little evidence that this is the rite of ins⁻fin, "removing the footprints," the last act in the sequence of ceremonies, a terminal rite of prophylactic nature performed so that an offering room or sanctuary would be purified and rendered inaccessible to evil spirits. He is dressed in a short wig without the overlapping pattern of locks and a folded kilt with overlap. The artist has incorrectly reversed the kilt of the face is written: šdt zß, "reading the document aloud." A caption just below the papyrus places its recitation in its ritual context: šib in bry-bly, "spiritualizing by the lector priest." He wears a folded kilt with overlap and dangling belt tie. His shoulder-length wig lacks the customary pattern of strands of hair but, as is the case with the last officiant and many of the offering bearers below, the details may have been carved in plaster which has subsequently fallen away. On his chin is a short beard.

The last officiant walks to the left trailing a bundle of grasess or reeds behind him, but turns his head and looks back at his fellows. Although the label before his face is damaged, there is little evidence that this is the rite of ins⁻fin, "removing the footprints," the last act in the sequence of ceremonies, a terminal rite of prophylactic nature performed so that an offering room or sanctuary would be purified and rendered inaccessible to evil spirits. He is dressed in a short wig without the overlapping pattern of locks and a folded kilt with overlap. The artist has incorrectly reversed the kilt of the face is written: šdt zß, "reading the document aloud." A caption just below the papyrus places its recitation in its ritual context: šib in bry-bly, "spiritualizing by the lector priest." He wears a folded kilt with overlap and dangling belt tie. His shoulder-length wig lacks the customary pattern of strands of hair but, as is the case with the last officiant and many of the offering bearers below, the details may have been carved in plaster which has subsequently fallen away. On his chin is a short beard.

The last officiant walks to the left trailing a bundle of grasess or reeds behind him, but turns his head and looks back at his fellows. Although the label before his face is damaged, there is little evidence that this is the rite of ins⁻fin, "removing the footprints," the last act in the sequence of ceremonies, a terminal rite of prophylactic nature performed so that an offering room or sanctuary would be purified and rendered inaccessible to evil spirits. He is dressed in a short wig without the overlapping pattern of locks and a folded kilt with overlap. The artist has incorrectly reversed the kilt of the face is written: šdt zß, "reading the document aloud." A caption just below the papyrus places its recitation in its ritual context: šib in bry-bly, "spiritualizing by the lector priest." He wears a folded kilt with overlap and dangling belt tie. His shoulder-length wig lacks the customary pattern of strands of hair but, as is the case with the last officiant and many of the offering bearers below, the details may have been carved in plaster which has subsequently fallen away. On his chin is a short beard.

The last officiant walks to the left trailing a bundle of grasess or reeds behind him, but turns his head and looks back at his fellows. Although the label before his face is damaged, there is little evidence that this is the rite of ins⁻fin, "removing the footprints," the last act in the sequence of ceremonies, a terminal rite of prophylactic nature performed so that an offering room or sanctuary would be purified and rendered inaccessible to evil spirits. He is dressed in a short wig without the overlapping pattern of locks and a folded kilt with overlap. The artist has incorrectly reversed the kilt of the face is written: šdt zß, "reading the document aloud." A caption just below the papyrus places its recitation in its ritual context: šib in bry-bly, "spiritualizing by the lector priest." He wears a folded kilt with overlap and dangling belt tie. His shoulder-length wig lacks the customary pattern of strands of hair but, as is the case with the last officiant and many of the offering bearers below, the details may have been carved in plaster which has subsequently fallen away. On his chin is a short beard.

The last officiant walks to the left trailing a bundle of grasess or reeds behind him, but turns his head and looks back at his fellows. Although the label before his face is damaged, there is little evidence that this is the rite of ins⁻fin, "removing the footprints," the last act in the sequence of ceremonies, a terminal rite of prophylactic nature performed so that an offering room or sanctuary would be purified and rendered inaccessible to evil spirits. He is dressed in a short wig without the overlapping pattern of locks and a folded kilt with overlap. The artist has incorrectly reversed the kilt of the face is written: šdt zß, "reading the document aloud." A caption just below the papyrus places its recitation in its ritual context: šib in bry-bly, "spiritualizing by the lector priest." He wears a folded kilt with overlap and dangling belt tie. His shoulder-length wig lacks the customary pattern of strands of hair but, as is the case with the last officiant and many of the offering bearers below, the details may have been carved in plaster which has subsequently fallen away. On his chin is a short beard.
Man presenting a duck held up by the neck and wings.

Man presenting a pintail duck held up by the neck and wings.

Man carrying doves in a cage and a tray loaded with different kinds of bread.

Man carrying braces of birds of two different species by the wings.

Man (head and shoulders destroyed) carrying a boat-shaped basket filled with assorted offerings and a wicker frail on a cord.

Figure of offering bearers largely destroyed.

Sixth Register. The offering bearers in this register appear to bring their offerings directly to the offering slab at the foot of the false door.

Man presenting an ox’s foreleg; [...] Sntbf² š`k “[...] Senedjemib.”

Man presenting an ox’s foreleg; [...].[Sup] Ankh-im-tjenent.

Man holding a goose in his arms;[Sub] š∂f bknw-nk [ng]-m-∂∂m-nk, “Dignitary and [over]seer of [scribes], inspector of funerary priests, [Ankh]-em-tjenent.”

Man presenting an ox’s foreleg; š∂f bknw-nk [...], “in[pector of ka-priests, [...].”

Man holding a goose in his arms; š∂f bknw-nk Hmt-md’t(y), “Dignitary and scribe, inspector of funerary [priests], Hem[akh]-[n]t.”

Man carrying two braces of ducks; [...] š∂f bknw-nk Nkn, “[...], inspector of funerary priests, Nekn.”

Man holding a goose in his arms; at pr nphf-np š`p, “scribe of the register of the divine book, Iry.”

Man holding a brace of ducks before his face and a brace of smaller birds (doves?) in his hanging right hand; imw.(en) š∂tš m[ew]-šw bknw-nk Iry, “over[see]r of [scribes] of funerary priests, Iry.”

Man holding a bird in his arms; [...] ±N(y)+,-ptb [...], “[Nt]-ptb.”

Man carrying a tray loaded with assorted offerings and a duck; [...] m²-tšš bknw-nk ±N(y)+,-ptb; [Sup]š[ew]m[rw]š n(t)-[ew]-šw bknw-nk [str], “[Super]intendent of funerary priests.”

Man carrying two trays loaded with assorted offerings; traces of a name survive.

Man holding a brace of birds and leading a young gazelle on a rope; traces of a name survive (fig. 156c).

Man carrying a tray of breads and holding a bundle of papyruses; [...] Rw∂³-k£ “[...], Rw∂³-k£.”

Man carrying a tray with assorted offerings and holding a brace of birds by the wings; at pr m[phf]-nt bknw-nk K÷-m-pnt, “Scribe of the register of divine [books] and funerary priest, Ka-em-tjenent.”

Man holding up a brace of birds by the wings and leading a young antelope on a rope; m[d][t]-f bknw-nk Qv, “brother of his estate and funerary priest, Qv.”

Man carrying a crescent-shaped basket loaded with assorted offerings and holding a brace of birds by the wings, m[d][t]-f bknw-nk Ñw, “brother of his estate and funerary priest, Tjw.”

Man carrying a calf across his shoulders; [m]³f ±h, Ily, “controller” of the kitchen, Ily.

Man carrying a goose in his arms.

Man carrying a tray loaded with assorted offerings and a pot or jar(?).

Man carrying a bird by the wings and a wicker frail.

Man carrying a tray loaded with assorted offerings and a bird by the wings.

Man carrying an antelope across his shoulders.

Man (largely destroyed) holding a bouquet of lotus before his face.

Man (largely destroyed) leading a young ibex on a rope.

At this point there is a gap in the wall some 1.14 m in width before the southeast corner of the room is reached (pl. 50a). Only two courses remain at the bottom of the wall.

West Wall

The false door that fills the west wall of Room IV (pls. 42–44; figs. 62a, 61) measures 2.01 meters in width, while the preserved height is 2.90 meters. The architrave has vanished along with the cavello cornice that once topped the door, and the torus moulding which framed it is largely destroyed except at the bottom of the sides. The damage to the torus moulding and adjacent areas of the false door was probably the result of blows sustained when the architrave block or blocks from the side walls were pushed over by stone-robbers. Additional damage to the surface of the false door is likely due to wind-driven sand.

The inscriptions and representations on the false door were all executed in sunk relief with some internal detail. The usual decoration of diagonal lashings and cross-lashings was not carved, but was instead presumably completed in paint. There are still extensive traces

156 See below, p. 156, no. 373.
157 A son of the owner not infrequently heads a procession of offering bearers on the walls of Old Kingdom offering rooms; see e.g., Davies, Puebla 9, pl. 24, 14; Murray, sq. Man 5, pl. 23, 10; Simpson, Western Cemetery, figs. 74, 14. For this reason, this individual could represent Inti’s son Senedjemib Mehi (see above, p. 77, n. 9). The wall surface here is very hard and any indication of Bluaton (and related?) could have been cut in plaster which has since fallen away.
158 See below, p. 111 [7].
of red paint visible at the bottom of the jambs, and a few traces of yellow paint remain in the small figures of Inti (pl. 44).

The two inner jambs of the false door and the two middle jambs as well were cut from a single large stone (fig. 62h).159 The right-hand outer jamb together with the torus moulding and the recess thickness, are carved from two large upright slabs.159

This method of construction is of some interest, since properly speaking the central niche and the two jambs on either side of it represent the vertical elements of the traditional false door, whereas the other four, taller jambs belong to the frame.159 The large scale of the false door may help explain why it was constructed in this fashion. From Mariette's sketch, it seems that the architrave of the door consisted of another large stone (fig. 62a).159 Presumably, the torus moulding and cavetto cornice that surmounted the door were carved in the same monolith.

The architrave of the false door was still preserved in 1850. Thanks to squeezes of the architrave made by the Lieders (pl. 43–c), it is possible to reconstruct the text it bore in part: ḫy ḫm mw ḫy ḫm ftn ftn jw nswt ḫy ḫm mw ḫm ḫy ḫm jw nswt ḫy ḫm jw nswt (unpublished).160

The innermost pair are not only shorter than the others but thickness, reaching to the architrave, and are of approximately the same width. The outermost pair are only not shorter than the others but narrower as well. The jamb inscriptions, however, are of equal width and, with the exception of minor variation at the bottom of the middle jambs, the corresponding pairs of jambs appear to have been alike in content, the hieroglyphs to the left and right placed symmetrically, so that they are mirror images of each other. The hieroglyphs on the jambs are large, averaging 7.5 centimeters in height.

The inscriptions on the innermost jambs are the most seriously damaged. What survives is perhaps to be restored: ḫy ḫm jw nswt ḫy ḫm jw nswt ḫy ḫm jw nswt ḫy ḫm jw nswt ḫy ḫm jw nswt ḫy ḫm jw nswt ḫy ḫm jw nswt (unpublished).161

The order of the sign sequence is not effortlessly reconstructed; see e. g., Ibid., pl. 16; James, Atenhela, pp. 35, 39; Altenmüller, Mon., pp. 75, 95.

The name is unexpected in this state of preservation as it is today. In a photograph taken in 1913 (pl. 45), the words ṣḥn-mḥḥ ṣḥn-mḥḥ ṣḥn-mḥḥ ṣḥn-mḥḥ ṣḥn-mḥḥ ṣḥn-mḥḥ ṣḥn-mḥḥ ṣḥn-mḥḥ ṣḥn-mḥḥ ṣḥn-mḥḥ ṣḥn-mḥḥ (unpublished).163

The order of ḫy ḫm jw nswt ḫy ḫm jw in the sequence is reconstructed, see below, p. 49 (a)

If the restoration is correct perhaps in [sn]m ḫḥ (unpublished) it is to be restored.

Lieder squeeze 1.4–6.3

Lieder squeeze 1.7.
unfinished (pls. 46a–cf, fig. 64). For instance, the sculptor had begun to clear away the background around the seated figure of Inti at the left (west) end of the wall (pl. 46b), the outlines of the body and limbs having been cut free for the most part and the contours partly rounded. Certain internal details, such as the fingers of the right hand, the belt, and segments of the upper and lower edges of the beaded collar, were also carved. Due to the intractability of the nummulitic limestone at this spot, the head is in one plane, however, and his feet are visible only as chisel marks in the stone. Several of the hieroglyphs in the columns above his head were also left incomplete. So too was the pedestal of the offering table, even though the carving of the twenty conventionalized loaves and the right edge of the table top had been initiated. Undoubtedly, much of this was completed in plaster, like the offerings heaped up to the right of the table, which were cut in a coat of plaster that now has largely flaked away (pls. 47–48).

In the lowermost register the sculptor had started to cut away the background around the back and legs of the foremost figure at the far left of the file of offering bearers, but the front part of the figure had not been freed entirely from the wall. The next seven offering bearers are all sharply outlined in one plane but, even though the background has been removed, the wall surface is still rough and pitted. In the case of the succeeding figures (the last three are only partly preserved) the cutting of the inner details and the modelling of the forms seems to have been confined to the upper body and limbs, the head, and the offerings, whereas the lower torso and legs were left in a sharp-edged, one plane relief. Similarly, while the lower part of the wall surface here is rough and pitted, sections of the upper part of the wall have been smoothed. The upper parts of the three most nearly complete figures in this register and the bodies of the two in the register above (except for their heads) were executed in a single block of better quality limestone.

In contrast to the south wall, Inti’s titles were originally inscribed in six columns above his head. These are badly obliterated today and all that can be made out are [ḥr–ʾḥḥ Âḥr š₃w rḥḥb, “lector priest] and controller of every scribe,” at the bottom of the first column and [ḥr] š₃w rḥḥb […, “master” of secrets of […] in the corresponding part of the second column. What appears to be the porter’s kniḥ (U)j (of ḫs–ḥḥb) occurs at the bottom of the fourth column. Although the beginning of the name is destroyed, [šṣm-hḥ, “Senedjemib”] was written in a horizontal line reading from right to left over Inti’s head and below the last four columns. Immediately to the right an offering list was inscribed, as on the opposite wall, but only traces of the outlines of the compartments survive.

To the right of the half-loaves on the table, eight jar racks in two rows, holding jars and bottles of beverages and lotus blossoms in vases, were originally depicted. Of the eight jar racks, six and parts of two more survive. The jars are slender-shouldered and have short necks and flat rims. At least three of the tall storage jars bear basket-work flaps and two have long spouts. One of the bottles has a rilled neck and one of the jars may have a collar neck. Even though the majority of the jars and bottles are stopped, several function as flower vases. The racks constitute one of the points of departure from the decorative scheme of the southern wall. On that wall the place of two of the jar racks is taken by tables with paired basins and ewers. Of the offerings and offering-bearers in front of Inti, only portions of the fifth and sixth registers survive down to the present, although vestiges of offering bearers were still be seen in 1930 in the fourth register above (pl. 48). In addition, two fragmentary blocks with parts of bearers and their offerings may belong on grounds of style and scale to this part of the wall or to the section of the north wall to the east of the doorway, but cannot be assigned with any assurance to their original position (pl. 46c–d, fig. 64).565

Fifth Register. To the right of the largely destroyed heap of offerings in front of the offering table are the figures of four men facing left and presenting birds (geese and ducks) held up by the neck and wing. Of a fifth individual only part of the front leg and foot and of the rear foot are preserved. If the pattern of the south wall was replicated, he too held up a bird and was succeeded by bearers of offerings. A short text before the legs of the first man identifies him as [ḥr] š₃w [rḥḥb], “[his son] of his body, the <chief> justice and vizier, […]” 566 Of the identifying label before the second man only the initial letter of his name remains.

Sixth Register. As on the south wall, this entire register, which extended the length of the wall beneath the main scene, was occupied by bearers of offerings. Seventeen figures are preserved in whole or in part. Moreover, at the far left end of the register faintly visible chisel marks attest to the existence of other figures. Presumably, these figures and their identifying captions were originally carved in plaster, which has subsequently fallen away leaving only the faintly visible marks. Two curved lines suggest that the first of the figures held up an ox’s foreleg like his counterpart on the south wall. Over the traces of the foreleg is a short, largely obliterated inscription in one line reading from left to right: […] f “his […]” Beneath the traces of the foreleg another short line of text is most likely to be restored: […] ḫḥy “he is bayn” m pry “[…] royal master” “builder” in both houses (Upper and Lower Egypt). The phrase m pry, unlike the other traces, is in raised relief, an indication that the rest of the area had also once been so carved. On the south wall, three individuals presenting forelegs and a man with a goose in his arms head the file of offering bearers. The man with the goose in his arms also appears on this wall, but there appears to be sufficient space at the left end of the register to find in him for only two foreleg bearers, rather than three, as on the south wall, plus the same brief vertical caption that introduces the bearers on the south wall (ŋp ṣpt, “brining choice viands”) (fig. 65).

All traces of the second foreleg bearer have disappeared except for a caption reading left to right: […] a ḫḥy “he is bayn” m pry “[…]” “[his son] of his body, the <chief> justice and vizier, […]”567

564 In pl. 47, the block with the racks is positioned too far to the left. At present it occupies its correct position, as may be seen in fig. 64.

565 On the identity of these two figures, see above, p. 28.

566 Of the identifying label before the second man only the initial letter of his name remains.

567 On the identity of these two figures, see above, p. 28.

Chapter 4: Senedjemib Inti — © 2370
Presumably, his name originally followed in a vertical column in front of his figure. On the basis of this caption, it is possible that the caption before the first foreleg bearer is to be restored as "[z] [f] [n] [h] [f] [m]. A vertical column of inscription in front of the third (first preserved) figure with the goose in his arms reads: "z [f] [n] [h] [f] [m] [b] [n] [m] [b] - Ny-hk-Mn, "his son, the lector (priest) and "inspector of funerary priests," Ni-ankh-min." This last individual, Inti’s son Ni-ankh-min, was also represented in the portico north of the entrance.556

Behind these figures are sixteen other men carrying offerings. The first man has two bracelets of birds; the second holds a bird in his arms; the third carries papyrus stems. The fourth man holds two trays aloft loaded with assorted offerings, the first tray being largely obliterated. The fifth man holds a bird in his arms; the sixth carries three birds and a cage(?); whose contents have been destroyed; the seventh has a bracelet(?) of pental dial columns and a bouquet of lotus(!). The eighth man carries aloft a tray with assorted offerings and papyrus stems over his shoulders; the ninth has a duck in his arms; the tenth carries aloft a tray with bread and a lettuce(?) on it and holds birds in his other hand; and the eleventh bears a young animal across his shoulders. The twelfth has a tray laden with assorted offerings and a bird(!), while the thirteenth also carries a tray laden with offerings. The next three figures are largely destroyed, but the fourteenth has a crescent-shaped basket of offerings, row mostly destroyed, and a brace of birds. The offerings of the fifteenth man are lost, but the last man may have carried a bouquet of lotus.

North Wall, East of Entrance

The procession of offering bearers continued on the north wall to the east of the entrance (pls. 49a-b, fig. 66). The lower legs and feet of seven figures remain. Only in the case of the fifth figure from the left does any trace of an offering, probably the bottom of a wickerwork frieze, survive.

Room V

Room V, an east–west pillared hall, measures 5.77 by 10.7 m and has an area of 59.60 sq. m.573 The stone heavy roofing of the hall was carried on two massive east–west architraves which crossed the room in five spans with the aid of eight pillars (pl. 51a). The pillars were square and rested on square bases. When Lepsius excavated the man prwy nswt ftrry flry cibfl s¢∂ by ftrry h¢m±fl¢ ®æbt flry-¢bt ™ nswt flry-¢bt (2) [mθfl] gph (3) wmt (4) prwy (4–5); Sn∂m-bh, “chief justice and vizier, overseer of all the works of the king, overseer of scribes of royal records, lector priest, (2) royal [master] (3) builder (4) in both houses (Upper and Lower Egypt),” Sn∂m-bh.575 Lepsius shows no dividing lines between the short columns, and it is not certain that they ever existed.

Door Thicknesses

On both sides of the entrance to Room V were representations of Inti, accompanied by his wife, both turned towards the doorway, with a figure of their son, Senedjemib Mehi, facing them. When Lepsius copied them, the decoration on the thicknesses was still largely complete. Today the upper parts of both scenes are missing.

Left (west) thickness. Inti stood, holding a staff with his right hand at a diagonal before him and with his hanging left hand grasping a scepter (pl. 51a, fig. 67a, b).574 The scepter passes behind his figure and for that reason may not have been seen by Lepsius’s draftsman who omitted it entirely. Inti was wigless and wore a bearded collar and a mid-calf skirt with a flaring front. Before him was a long column of text which continued in four short columns above his head. Today only the bottom of the long column of text survives. The signs faced left and read: (1) ft prwy nswt flry 20 nshm n frwy tmt n grfl 572. By the time Reisner cleared the pillared hall in November, 1912, whereas the architrave resting on the northern row of pillars was still intact, only the central part of the southern architrave was still in place (fig. 3). Eleven intact roofing blocks from the northern architrave, three blocks spanned between the two architraves, and two blocks rested on the southern architrave. Assuming the other roofing slabs were of approximately equal size, there would originally have been thirty-three slabs. The height of the hall of pillars from floor to ceiling is 3.25 m, the height of the base being 0.20 m, the height of the pillars 2.80 m, and the height of the architrave 0.35 m. According to Reisner, the height of the roof was 2.74 m thick, but it stands to reason that this figure includes the rabbid fill between the ceiling and the roof. Behind the west wall of the hall is a large serdab (Serdab I) connected with it by three slots. The serdab is a north–south room measuring 1.14 by 3.93 m with a total area of 5.95 sq. m. The height, 2.70 m, was the same as the height from the floor to the bottom of the architrave in the pillared hall. The three slot-windows open in the hall in the fifth course of masonry (above 1.5 m). The serdab was found empty with a robber’s hole penetrating laterally from the hall and with a roofing slab removed from the south end of the room. A needless model shoulder jar of copper was found in the hole.575

Except for the door thicknesses, there are no reliefs or inscriptions on any of the walls of the pillared hall. Indeed, the surface of the walls has been left rough, so that the uninscribed state may have been intentional.575

573 Senedjemib Complex, Part 1. 78
568 See above, p. 15. 569 Same text and caption before the third foreleg bearer is to be restored as [z] [f] [n] [h] [f] [m]. The second figure in the title [mθfl] gph (3) wmt (4) prwy (4–5); Sn∂m-bh, “chief justice and vizier, overseer of all the works of the king, overseer of scribes of royal records, lector priest, (2) royal [master] (3) builder (4) in both houses (Upper and Lower Egypt),” Sn∂m-bh.575 Lepsius shows no dividing lines between the short columns, and it is not certain that they ever existed.

574 See Lepsius, Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon, pp. 130.
575 In his copies of wall reliefs made in the Senedjemib Complex, Lepsius’s draftsman consistently misinterprets the two component signs of wmt as the title n(w)fl gph (3) wmt, 20 nshm n frwy tmt n grfl. But see Lepsius, pl. 12. 576 Reisner, p. 172, 2. 577 See above, p. 15.
near shoulder and hanging down on the chest, a beaded collar, and a long, tight-fitting dress with tapering shoulder straps (only one is visible). Both the upper border of her collar and the hemline of her dress were omitted by Lepsius, even though the latter is clearly visible today. Over her head in two short columns was the following caption: (1) hot-f ¬m[r], (2) nbt骂r net [b], (3) “his wife whom he loves, (2) the king’s acquaintance, Tjef.”

Mehi stood deferentially in the presence of his parents, hands hanging open at his sides with palms down.577 Already in Lepsius’s day his head and upper torso were destroyed along with the first of the two columns of hieroglyphs located above his head. The signs faced right and read: (1) [...], (2) “hot-f ¬m[r],” “one honored by his lord.” Before his face was his name: Sn∂m-¡b, “Senedjemib.”

Right (east) thickness. The scene on the other side of the entrance (pl. 5b, fig. 68b) was entirely similar to that on the left thickness, except that Inti’s sceptor passes in front of his body, as is customary for figures facing right. It was probably because the right thickness was a virtual duplicate of the other that Lepsius did not publish the sketch that he had, in fact, made. That sketch is included here for figures facing right. It was probably because the right thickness (pl. 51b; fig. 68b) was entirely similar to that on the left thickness, Right (east) thickness.

578 Of type 5 a(3), it has part was lined with rubble for a distance of 2.9 m, after which it was finished. It was then subsequently built within this and plugged with long blocks to foil any would-be robbers.580 Only the ends of the highest and the lowest of the plug-stones could be seen. The sloping mastaba passage built into the rock-cut passage had a horizontal opening measuring 3.6 by 1.75 m and a horizontal length of 6.85 m. The inclined length measured 8.65 m on the floor and 4.35 m on the right roof. A section perpendicular to the passage was 175 m wide and 1.65 to 1.5 m high. Reisner observed that the inclined shaft was cut very large to admit the sarcophagus. The smaller mastaba passage was divided into two parts of unequal length. The less displaced. The robbers had dug down through this well, and the two sides and top was filled with a packing of rubble and mud. It was through this packing that the robbers penetrated the burial chamber. The angle of inclination to the horizontal was 35° 17’. After the construction of the built passage, the opening of the rock-cut shaft was continued upwards by a wall of rubble standing on the edge of the rock cutting and measuring 2.35 m high. This rubble wall ran east to the opening of the built shaft where the sides and roof of the passage were built of extra large blocks. The rubble wall was 4.3 m long and the outer 2.5 m was also capped by heavy blocks. This wall over the opening of the sloping passage was roofed at the level of the court with large north-south slabs of which two were found more or less displaced. The robbers had dug down through this wall, and Reisner was unable to determine for certain how it had been filled. The white limestone sarcophagus had clearly been introduced before the construction of the built passage.

The burial chamber was irregular and probably unfinished. It was divided into two parts of unequal length. The less finished eastern part measures 5.7 by 1.8–2.6 m and 2.0 meters in height. The western part measures 3.75 by 1.6 m in width and 2.15 meters in height. The area was 16.52 sq. m and the capacity 33.84 cu. m. Reisner was initially uncertain whether the intention was to cut a larger chamber or to make a chamber with a sarcophagus recess on

Shaft G 2370 b
The actual burial of Inti was in g 2370 b, a sloping passage tomb of type 5 b (fig. 70) entering the eastern edge of the platform of the Senedjemib Complex higher up than the adjoining sloping passage tombs of the complex, in the floor of the second rock scarph (pl. 6a–b, 7a–4a; figs. 2–3, 7).585 The rock-cut sloping passage had a horizontal opening measuring 3.6 by 1.75 m and a horizontal length of 6.85 m. The inclined length measured 8.65 m on the floor and 4.35 m on the right roof. A section perpendicular to the passage was 175 m wide and 1.65 to 1.5 m high. Reisner observed that the inclined shaft was cut very large to admit the sarcophagus. The smaller mastaba passage was then subsequently built within this and plugged with long blocks to foil any would-be robbers.585 Only the ends of the highest and the lowest of the plug-stones could be seen. The sloping mastaba passage built into the rock-cut passage had a horizontal length of 6.95 m and an inclined length of 8.65 m on the floor and 7.9 m on the roof. The section of the built passage perpendicular to the slope was 33 m wide and 0.7 m high. The space between the roofing slabs of the built passage and the roof of the rock passage was 0.8 to 1.0 m. The spaces between the built passage and the natural rock on the two sides and top was filled with a packing of rubble and mud.

It was through this packing that the robbers penetrated the burial chamber. The angle of inclination to the horizontal was 35° 17’. After the construction of the built passage, the opening of the rock-cut shaft was continued upwards by a wall of rubble standing on the edge of the rock cutting and measuring 2.35 m high. This rubble wall ran east to the opening of the built shaft where the sides and roof of the passage were built of extra large blocks. The rubble wall was 4.3 m long and the outer 2.5 m was also capped by heavy blocks. This wall over the opening of the sloping passage was roofed at the level of the court with large north-south slabs of which two were found more or less displaced. The robbers had dug down through this wall, and Reisner was unable to determine for certain how it had been filled. The white limestone sarcophagus had clearly been introduced before the construction of the built passage.

The burial chamber was irregular and probably unfinished. It was divided into two parts of unequal length. The less finished eastern part measures 5.7 by 1.8–2.6 m and 2.0 meters in height. The western part measures 3.75 by 1.6 m in width and 2.15 meters in height. The area was 16.52 sq. m and the capacity 33.84 cu. m. Reisner was initially uncertain whether the intention was to cut a larger chamber or to make a chamber with a sarcophagus recess on...
the west wall, but ultimately included G 2370 B among the large chambers with a coffin-recess.\textsuperscript{80} Even in its unfinished state, the plan resembles in appearance the “T” shaped decorated burial chambers of Unis and Tjen’s vizier’s tombs at Saqqara, which have a large recess or bay in the western wall of the room to accommodate the sarcophagus.\textsuperscript{81} These slightly later burial chambers were provided with a kind of shelf at the back of the recess on which the lid of the sarcophagus appears to have rested until the interior wooden cof

... and for some reason it was omitted from the ground plan of the burial chamber, but it appears in the section of G 2370 B (fig. 70).

The east wall of the chamber north of the entrance was plastered and painted in black with a compartment offering list (pl. 138a–b; fig. 70). If the draftsman followed the ordinary procedure and ruled out the large rectangle reserved for the offering list into compartments of equal size, it would have been a fairly straightforward matter to reconstruct the missing entries. This does not appear to have been the case, however.

Two compartments are clearly missing at the beginning of each of the first four rows. When the two items preceding the surviving items in Rows A and B are restored on the basis of the standard Sixth Dynasty lists, this seems to show that the first two rows contained seventeen entries each. Row E ends with \textit{bt adw(t) bort}, item 88 in Barta’s listing.\textsuperscript{82} Had the remainder of the entries followed standard usage, this would mean that fifty-four items remained to be distributed in Rows C to E, that is, eighteen rather than seventeen entries per row, assuming that the distribution of the items was uniform. This would also mean that a certain number of the compartments in Rows C to E were smaller than the compartments in other rows. This assumption has been made in the reconstructed list that follows, even though the preserved compartments in Rows C and D and the first and last compartments in Row E are the same size as the compartments in Rows A and B. In fact, even though it is impossible to be certain because its outlines are incomplete, the penultimate compartment in Row E with the entry \textit{srb}, “earth almonds,” does look as if it was originally smaller than the other surviving compartments.

\textbf{Offering List}

\textbf{Row A:}

(1) [\textit{pr} st. 1] “List of water, one”
(2) [\textit{mr} st. 1] “Incense (on) the fire, one”
(3) st-dh, 1 “Festival ointment, one (jar)”
(4) \textit{bnw}, 1 “Bakhoor-oil, one (jar)”
(5) \textit{fj}, 1 “Of-ointment, one (jar)”
(6) \textit{nnw}, 1 “Ny-fn-w, one (jar)”
(7) t\textit{msrw}, 1 “Tmsrw-ointment, one (jar)”\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{80} “Description of Additions to Canopus as Edhellen,” p. 113; GN 3, p. 115.
\textsuperscript{81} See p. 24 above.
\textsuperscript{82} Ten Corn. 1, pp. 16–17, figs. 9; 18–19, fig. 11; 25–22, fig. 10; Hassan, Saqqara I, p. 57.
\textsuperscript{83} Barta, Oxyrhynch., pp. 47–50.
(66) in a "Greylag goose, one"
(67) "Goat, one, White-fronted goose, one"
(68) at a "Pintail duck"
(69) in a "Greylag goose."
(70) [note: 1] "[Pigeons, one]"
(71) [note: 1] "[Fish, one, two]"
(72) [note: 2] "[Fish, bread, two]"
(73) [note: 2] "[Fish, bread, two]"
(74) [note: 2] "[Fish, bread, two]"
(75) [note: 2] "[Fish, bread, two]"
(76) [note: 2] "[Fish, bread, two]"
(77) [note: 2] "[Fish, bread, two]"
(78) [note: 2] "[Fish, bread, two]"

Similarly, (a) is written across the two columns and once again pertains to food: a loaf and a jug of black drink, two.

...the single entry d is written twice. In the lists, how- ever, and it is difficult to imagine what other item could have occurred here.

.....in the lists, how-ever, and it is difficult to imagine what other item could have occurred here.

6. a large fragment of an ovoid jar was found inside the sarcophagus. In the burial chamber were found fragments of at least eight similar jars, a two-handled jar of foreign origin, five mud jar stoppers, two coarse bowl stands, and a fragment of white plaster with hieroglyphs in black ink, probably from the offering list on the east wall of the chamber.6b

The sarcophagus was covered with a layer of fine white plaster and bore two short inscriptions in black painted sunk relief.6c

Outside on the east facing eight (north) was inscribed the following: beg- t en Isti 1972 sfd 25¥ Senjæl fis-brj-pu new Isti. "The true count Isti; the chief justice and vizier Seneqdjemib, the royal chamberlain Isti" (frontspace F, pl. 95c). On the inside, east of the head, facing left, was the following inscription: Senjæl fis-brj, "Seneqdjemib Isti" (pl. 148).

In the coffin, "a pathetic blackened figure," the mummy of Inti himself, lay in an extended position on the back with limbs wrapped separately (pls. 54a, 55).6d

A large fragment of an ovoid jar was found inside the sarcophagus. In the burial chamber were found fragments of at least eight similar jars, a two-handled jar of foreign origin, five mud jar stoppers, two coarse bowl stands, and a fragment of white plaster with hieroglyphs in black ink, probably from the offering list on the east wall of the chamber.6d

The two-handled vessel proved to be a Syrian oil jar with a flat bottom, well-formed neck and roll rim, and combed decoration (pl. 17a, fig. 73). Combed MetallicWare of this sort provides direct evidence of the flourishing trade between Egypt and Byblos during the Early Bronze Age.6e

Broken and incomplete, it bore a cylindrical seal impression on the shoulder of the jar (pl. 57b, fig. 73). According to Smith, the design of the seal accords well with the suggested Syrian source of these jars.6f

586 Reiser, "A History of the Gia Necropolis," p. 29, n. 617, 618. Reiser notes that describes in detail the exact character of the lid of Inti's sarcophagus. The drawing in fig. 70 makes it look completely flat, but the scene against Reiser's statement to the contrary in ibid., p. 211. In Miller's case, we are fortunate to possess a photograph of the sarcophagus (pl. 13), which is likewise of Type (g), see below, p. 127. For a summary of Reiser's sarcophagus types, see Barta, I, p. 5 (1986), cols. 479–77.


588 Idem., JARP 11, no. 66 (November, 1957), p. 58. The number "206," a number on a piece of paper visible in the sarcophagus in pl. 13a is prone to error, that designation at no time having been assigned to Inti's burial chamber; cf. Gia. Revi's Diary, p. 65.

589 See the List of Objects, below, p. 81.


Shaft G 2370 X
Situated at the northwest corner of G 2370 is an intrusive shaft labeled X. A plan of the shaft without measurements or scale (fig. 69) and two photographs, one of the shaft itself and one of the burial exist. The shaft is of type 6 A (x) with a long chamber parallel to the east side. It descends into the rock and is lined with mud brick above (pl. 8a). A note on the tomb card states that the mud brick was plastered. The female skeleton from this burial (pl. 81b) is on de-

Register of Objects—G 2370
For pottery types, see Reisner-Smith, GN's, pp. 60–89. For stone vessel types, see ibid., pp. 90–102.

G 2370, from top of mastaba on west
11–9–12 Fragment of relief with parts of offering bearing, limestone, h. 36 cm, w. 25.5 cm, th. 2.5 cm. (pl. 46c fig. 64a). In Boston. Assigned to G 2370, Room IV, north wall; see above, p. 77. Exp. Ph. A 7925 b1/11

G 2370, in sand along north wall of Hall of Pillars
11–11–14 Amulet, standing figure of Bastet on footplate, eyelet on back of head, blue faience, h. 6.3 cm. Not drawn. Not photographed
12–11–44 Cylinder head, blue-green faience, 1st cent. A.D., l. 0.13 cm. Not drawn. Not photographed

G 2370, high up in sand about 30 cm south of entrance to Room II
12–11–15 Misc. lot of antiquities accompanied by frags. of modern English newspaper, rags and frags. of a match box. (pl. 56a). Probably a dealer's cache. Exp. Ph. A 7926

G 2370, found in serdab I
11–11–20 Model neckless shoulder jar, copper, h. 6.5 cm, diam. 3.5 cm (pl. 96f fig. 72). The jar was found within the plundered hole broken into the serdab. Exp. Ph. A 9975 1/3

G 2370, in serdab II
12–11–46 Two frags. of a seated statue of a man, lst.: a) lower body; right hand clenched on knee, left open, palms down; b) torso and base; latter inscribed on top: (1) on right (signs face right) 0.04976 or 0.04975 or 0.04974 or 0.04973; (2) 0.04976 or 0.04975 or 0.04974 or 0.04973. (pl. 82a). A fig. was found in front of the serdab, fig. b in the

The usual scale of the drawings on the tomb cards of the subsidiary shafts in the Senedjem Complex is 1:50. A ref. Cremation of Palace Attendants, p. 4.
complete, cylinder seal impression on shoulder of jar with figures of couchant lions, h. 69.0 cm, diam. mouth 13 cm, diam. body 31.6 cm (pl. 57a, b; fig. 73). See GN 3, p. 76, fig. 96, pl. 32 a, b; Smith, Interconnections, p. 9, figs. 2–5.

595 – 2. Two course bowl stands, RW, h. 22.6 cm, diam. 15.2 cm (fig. 75). Not photographed.

595 – 3. Fig. of white plaster with hieroglyphs in black ink, l. 6.6 cm, w. 6.3 cm, th. 1.0 cm (fig. 75). Probably from offering list on east wall of chamber. Not photographed.

**Chapter 4: SENEDJEMIB INTI – 6 2370**

**TITLES OF SENEDJEMIB INTI**

In his volume on Old Kingdom administration, Strudwick has examined at length a group of the highest civil administrative titles of the Old Kingdom which encompass important areas of the administration: the legal system, the scribal bureaucracy, the organization of labor, and the granaries and treasuries.399 As the highest ranking officer in the pharaonic administration, the vizier held either the principal title or subordinate ones (in the case of labor or scribal and legal administration) in each administrative area or department.344 Strudwick has examined his role in minute detail, and there is no need to repeat his conclusions here.399 Instead, we shall touch upon a few specific aspects of the titularies of Inti here and of his sons Mehi and Khnumenti below.

With the exception of nos. 2, 3, 8, 9, and 17, most of the titles borne by Senedjemib Inti are those characteristic for viziers after the reign of Neferirkare or once again after the end of the Fifth Dynasty, and are either honorary or subordinate ones (in the case of labor or scribal and legal administration) in each administrative area or department.344 The titles are listed in alphabetical order.

1. **imy-ı n ayty [bk3] nwst** “overseer of the two chambers of royal regalia”

2. **imy-ı pr-∫frw** “overseer of the armory”

3. **imyı prw ’ nswt** “overseer of the houses of the king’s children”

4. **imyı prwr [bk3] nswt** “overseer of the two treasuries”

5. **imyı htw- ∫frw** “overseer of the six great (law) courts”

6. **imy-ı bkr nswt** “overseer of royal regalia”

7. **imyı bku [w] (u) / (u) nswt** “overseer of scribes of royal records”

8. **imyı nswt md(w) n ns bkw** “overseer of every department of the residence”

9. **imyıs snfr [nbh]** “overseer of (all) that is judged”

10. **imyı lwty** “overseer of the two granaries”

11. **imyı bkt nb [w] nswt** “overseer of all works of the king”

12. **bty-ı Pr** “hereditary prince”

13. **mwh f prw m prw** “royal master builder in both houses (Upper and Lower Egypt)”

14. **bty-ı”** “count”

15. **bty-ı” mtr** “true count”

16. **br3-nw whot-mw (tub) nswt** “master of secrets of (every) command of the king”

17. **bty t [w] (röw)** “controller of (all) scribes”

18. **br3-hhr** “lector priest”

19. **br3-fr nswt** “royal chamberlain”

20. **smr wtr** “sole friend”

21. **mpty sb ṣnty** “chief justice and vizier”

No. 1 is most frequently held either by viziers or imy-ı prwr -bk3 of holders of both titles.397 Thus, the ayty [bk3] nwst appear to have formed an independent department, but one very closely linked to the treasury.398 They were concerned principally with the king’s crowns, vestments, personal adornment, and ointments.399

No. 2. The title imyı pr-∫frw, and the presumably higher-ranking imy-ı prwr -bk3, occur only sporadically in the titularies of viziers.399 Helck saw a link between the treasury, granary, and the pr-∫frw,401 whereas Strudwick thinks that the pr-∫frw was closely associated with the treasury, perhaps because the provision of weapons would be made from the national expenditure.402 Although it is true that the administration of the armory was sometimes entrusted to treasury overseers,403 they seem to have been outnumbered in the aggregate by overseers of works, officials with legal or scribal titles, and even imy-ı of officials.404

No. 3 was commonly held by individuals concerned with the administration of the royal estates (htw- ∫frw),405 but also by an official with legal functions, another with an important scribal office, and a steward and overseer of funerary priests of a king’s daughter.406 Inti is apparently the only vizier to have claimed this title.

Although no. 6 was held by a number of king’s personal attendants (imyıs snfr [nbh], imyı lwty, and so forth)407 and treasury overseers408 in the course of the Fourth and Fifth Dynasties, it

---

393 See ibid., pp. 326–327.
394 Ibid., pp. 316–326.
395 Ibid., pp. 163–166.
396 Noel, Senjes (1970), pp. 1–16. For the translation of ḫw-bn in this context and also that of title No. 6 as “regnalia,” see Fischer, Vierzehn Nomen, pp. 14, 30, and passim.
400 Mariette, Mastabas, pp. 82–83, Ten Giza, 1, p. 136 (77); Junker, Giza 3, p. 104. Senedjemib Mehi has the latter title, see p. 115 below.
401 Bonnet and others, p. 65.
402 Administrative, p. 284.
403 E.g., GN 3, p. 421. Smith, AFD 4 (1944), figs. 5–8; Ziegler, Soko, peintures et inscriptions, p. 268 (350, fig. 44).
404 E.g., L.D. 2, p. 57; Mariette, Mastabas, pp. 214–215; Junker, Giza 6, figs. 83–84, PM 10, 87; Badawy, Nyhetep-Ptah and Tjaatdeed, figs. 3–5, 10, 14.
405 E.g., Junker, Giza 3, figs. 17–20; Abu Bakeh, Giza, p. 34, figs. 30–31, pl. 20 A; PM 7, p. 260 (Cleveland 64.91); Weeks, Costume Egypt, fig. 10.
406 Mariette, Mastabas, pp. 186, 213, Junker, Giza 5, figs. 14–16.
appears to have been a prerogative of the vizier at the end of the Fifth and beginning of the Sixth Dynasties. Since Senedjemib Mehi also has this title.

A regular component in vizier’s titularies from the early Fifth Dynasty to the early reigns of Pepy II, from the reign of Tetti no. 7 may have become the preserve of the vizier alone. There was a close connection between this title and both legal (imy–rs bt nb) and public work titles (imy–rs bt nb t fau) in his career, the vizier Kagemni served as any and all of the departments of the central government. The chambers of the royal regalia (nbt nt flnw) in his career, the vizier Kagemni served as any and all of the departments of the central government. The title was held sporadically by viziers after the reign of Izezi, but also by an overseer of all (judicial) hearings.

No. 8. The sut nb t fau occur in a variety of contexts which make it clear that the two granaries (nbt nt flnw) were all subsumed under this expression. Indeed, it is probable that the term referred to any and all of the departments of the central government. The title nb t fau only appear sporadically in titles, however. At one stage in his career, the vizier Kagemu served as imy–rs n sut nb t fau, and that of the king’s secrets in all the departments of the interior and exterior.

No. 9. Fischer has demonstrated that Guinmi’s translation “overseer” of all (judicial) hearing” is not tenable and proposes instead the rendering “overseer of all that is judged.” The title was held sporadically by viziers after the reign of Izezi, but also by an overseer of Upper Egypt.

No. 10. Helck saw mff as an older version of imy–rs. Mff, “master,” is commonly used of carpenters, sculptors, and builders.

Since both Nekhebu and his anonymous older brother held title no. 13 before being promoted to imy–rs bt nb t fau, “overseer of all works (of the king),” it is likely that mff–gd nwt n prw was inferior in status to the former title. The title is not a regular component in vizier’s titularies, and probably was prominent in the titularies of the members of the Senedjemib family who reached the vizierate (Senedjemib Inti and Mehi, Khnumenti, Phraheseps Impy, and Sabu–ptah Ibeb) because of their previous association with building and public works.

The adverbial phrase m prw forms a regular adjunct to mff–gd nwt in the inscriptions of the Senedjemib family. Wb. 1, p. 342, 8–9, defines prw as “both administrations.” A title of the owner of a Saqqara tomb, imy–rs zsw wt n prw Min–Smw’ Snw, “overseer of scribes of fields in both houses of Lower and Upper Egypt,” implies that the phrase denoted authority in both halves of the country and that the two administrations were, in actual fact, Upper and Lower Egypt.

Two titles, nos. 15 and 19, appear only on the sarcophagus that Mehi obtained on his father’s behalf from the king. Mehi regularly adds m to his own title of “count,” whereas mff–g unaccompanied by this epithet consistently appears on the walls of c. 2370. It is therefore likely that mff–mwt was a dignity assigned retrospectively to Inti on the sarcophagus.

No. 16. Strudwick notes that this title occurs more frequently with imy–rs zsw t (n) nswt than with the holders of imy–rs bt nb t fau, and suggests that it was in some way associated with the responsibilities of imy–rs zsw t (n) nswt. Since the latter title was involved with record keeping, the function of the bry–clt n nswt m swt nb t fau may have been as well. The connection between the two functions is further emphasized by the title m prw wt n nswt n s mpw nwt n w∂t-mdw nbt nt, borne by the vizier Meheruka.

No. 17. Htp zsw (nsw) is not ordinarily held by viziers, although it was borne by non-viziers who, like the vizier, held the title mff–g unaccompanied by this epithet, and also on occasion formed part of the titulary of granary officials.

No. 19. No. 15, like no. 13, is only attested on Inti’s sarcophagus. Since mff–mwt was an honorific commonly assigned to viziers, it is, of course, possible that the title appeared in the damaged or destroyed portions of Inti’s tomb. The title also features prominently in the titularies of non-viziers, and Strudwick wonders whether “this title is not in some manner related to features of the career of a vizier in the period before he was promoted, as it bears no relation to the other common vizieral honorifics.” On the other hand, insofar as the...
title implies access to the king’s person; it is perfectly appropriate for viziers.634

No. 22, literally probably “he-of-the-curtain/screen, dignitary, and vizier,”641 is conventionally translated “chief justice and vizier” throughout the present volume; cf. Wente, Letters, nos. 2–4 and passim.

In general terms, it may be said that Inti’s titulary reflects the trends apparent in other vizierial titulatures of the reign of Izezi.635 The honorific content of his titulary (nos. 12, 14–15, 19, 26) is far less extensive than is the case with the Fifth Dynasty viziers Washiphat and Pahosephes or for the Sixth Dynasty viziers who follow Inti.637 Except for No. 18, it is also lacking in the religious titles which fell into disuse after the early Fifth Dynasty, but which were revived and to some extent supplemented in the later Fifth and early Sixth Dynasties.638 Similarly, Inti held no office at the royal pyramids. This is not unexpected, for even though it was Izezi who changed the organization of the royal pyramid temples from priest of the king to priest of the pyramid,639 it was not until the early reign of Unis that these new-style royal priesthoods appeared in the titulatures of men of higher rank, including the viziers.640

**Dependents of Senedjemib Inti**

1. *Iunu* (PN 1, p. 25, 144, 11). One of five individuals who staff a goose for Inti’s funerary banquet on the south wall of the offering room. Beneath the bird is written his name preceded by the title ′m∞t ¢mw-k£, “supervisor of funerary priests.” Although fallen away at present, traces of the title ′m∞t-∞r z¢w, “overseer of scribes,” are visible in the space before his face in pl. 58.

2. *Try* (PN 1, p. 41, 6, II, p. 541).642 On the south wall of the offering room, Iry carries a goose towards the false door. The title before his face is *zß pr-m∂£t n†r*, “scribe of the house of the god’s (viz. the king’s) book.”643

The basic meaning of *m∂£t* is “papyrus roll,” but the word also is attested with the extended meanings of “book, letter, dispatch, transcript, report, register,” and the like.644 *Pr-m∂£t* is “library; archives.”645 At Edfu the *pr-m∂£t* is a small room at the back of the entrance to the vestibule.646

In ancient Egypt no hard and fast distinction was made between the scribe and the painter. Both could be designated *zß*, even though the term for a particular type of painter, the *zß qdwt*, “outline draftsman” also existed.647 In tomb scenes, individuals entitled *zß* are sometimes shown painting statues.648 While in one of the rock tombs at Mein, the *hry-fht zß pr-m∂£t n†r pr-™£*, “lector priest and scribe of the house of the god’s book of the palace,” Ihy-em-sa-peedy, paints an elaborate shrine and puts the finishing touches on a wooden statue of an important local official.649 A *zß pr-m∂£t n†r pr-™£* and *zß qdwt* named Seni decorated two tombs at Abydos.650 Given this and other evidence, it may be that the “scribes of the house of the god’s book” also had access to “typographical drawings or representations of cultically effective statuary and cult objects, and perhaps even of total representations of scenes for temples and tombs.”651

3. *Hyp* (PN 1, p. 44, 22).652 He is both a *hm-bt*, “funerary priest,” of Inti and *imp-n∞ z¢w* [wrb], “overseer of ‘scribes of iu‘d’[okh].”653 Two other offering bearers on the south wall have the same name.

4. *Hyp*: The title of this man, who carries a calf across his back in the bottom register on the south wall of the offering room, was evidently *hry-fht zß “controller of the kitchen.”654 The role of the *hry-fht* is clarified by his depiction in a number of daily life scenes. In the chapel of Payunaph Heryib at Mein, for instance, several *hry-fht* preside over the dismemberment of oxen, while another individual with the same title supervises the cleaning and cooking of fowl, himself hanging up cuts of meat in the outdoor booth [*zß*] where the cooking was done.655 In a second tomb at the same site, belonging to Niankh-pepy the Black, two other *hry-fht* roast fowl over charcoal braziers in the same sort of open bough.656 The *hry-fht* was thus the director of the outdoor booth or kitchen where food was prepared.

5. *Hyp*: This individual, who is distinct from the last, appears in the fourth register on the south wall with the title *hm-bt*, “[funerary] priest.”

6. *Tazâ-h³f* (PN 1, p. 45, 22). With the title *hry-fht*, “lector priest,” he is shown as an attendant in the fowling scene at the rear of the portico. In the table scene on the north wall of the offering room, he strangles a goose before Inti.

Of the more than twenty dependents of Inti depicted on the walls of g 3370, Lazzibah is one of the few about whom anything is known from other sources. Inserted between the tombs of Rawer II (e 5470) and Djatry (g 5570) in the Western Field at Gizah and built against the face of the latter is a small, stone-built mastaba which belong to the Hathor priestess and king’s acquaintance, Hêstî.657 On a fragmentary architrave, which presumably surmounted its entrance, Khenet, seated at the left, was approached by at least two children.658 The first of these was a *zu-me sm–w hry-fht Tazâ-h³f*, “her eldest son and lector priest, Lazzibah.” The rarity of the name almost certainly assures that this is the same person.659

7. *[shû]-n∞ d-wdr* (PN 1, p. 64, 10, 2, p. 346).660 “Leben [der Lebendige] is der gen–wity.”661 The name of the individual, who

---

634 For the connotation of the title, see Gunn, JEAS 27 (1946), p. 145.
635 Hélck, Baoumontet, pp. 16, 26; Spencer, Temple, pp. 216–17.
636 See Strudwick, Administration, p. 320, for a list of viziers and the specific entries by name and, ibid., pp. 317–79, for their titles.
637 Cf. ibid., pp. 211–12.
638 Ibid., pp. 311, 316–17.
639 Beatt, Room and Title, p. 107.
640 Gardiner, Administration, p. 327.
641 Additional citations: Murray, Index, pl. 4.
642 Hélck, Baoumontet, p. 76; cf. PM I, p. 914 [748, 752].
647 WB 2, p. 187; FCG 2, p. 89; Canaan, E-G, Msc., p. 53; Fischer, JNES 48 (1939), p. 250 (1).
648 For the conservation of the title, see Gunn, JEAS 27 (1946), p. 145.
649 Ibid., p. 69 and indices X, XIII, and XIV, on pp. 53–55.
650 Albright, JB 1, p. 11, 92.
651 Kanawati, El Hawawish, pl. 8, 2; pl. 87.
653 Additional citations: Murray, Index, pl. 4.
654 Hélck, Baoumontet, p. 76; PM IV, p. 954 [457].
655 WB 2, p. 446, 455; Hélck, Baoumontet, pp. 35, 81.
656 Mere 4, pl. 9.
657 Ibid., p. 4, pl. 19.
658 Junker, Giza 7, pp. 246–47.
659 Ibid., fig. 302.
660 PM I, p. 166, comes to the same conclusion.
appears in the second position in the bottom register of the south wall of the offering room, is damaged. Nevertheless, the placement of the owl suggests that it was balanced by a tall sign to the right with both centered on the c, which most likely belongs to Ptah. Like the first two officials, he offers a foreleg of beef to Inti. His title is given as sbi bmu-ks, "inspector of funerary priests."

8. "ub-m-[...]. Three of the four attendants shown behind Inti in the spear fishing scene at the rear of the portico have lost their names and titles. The fourth official is an imp-ir zisw, "overseer of scribes," but only traces of his name survive (fig. 134a). It is possible that he is identical with the last individual.

9. Wm-t' (PN1, p. 64, 10). What seems to be the component signs of this name, preceded by even fainter traces that may read zib [...] bmu-ks, "dignitary [...] and funerary priest," are visible in pl 38.660 His is the last (partially) preserved figure in the file of offering bearers in the fourth register on the southern wall of the offering room. A zib zib by this name, who appears on the false door of his father, Snefru, the proprietor of Giza tomb G 2523, could theoretically be the same individual.

10. Mrw(?) One of the priests performing the funerary rites before Inti's face on the south wall of the offering room, this man is both lrg ntw nsw, "director of necklace-stringers,"664 and imp-ir bmu(?)-ks, "supervisor of funerary priests." A parallel to the first title appears on a statue base from Saqqara.665 Sit ntw also occurs as an element in a number of other titles.666

The name is damaged and only the first two signs are clear. Ranko offers two possibilities. The first, Mrw(?) (PN1, p. 146, 22) is the nn sf of an offering bearer in the tomb of Akhethetep.667 The second, Mrw(?) (PN1, p. 146, 23) is known as a feminine name in a Middle Kingdom stela, CG 2307. In fact, what may be traces of a final m are visible in pl 38. A third possibility that seems excluded by lack of space is dth m.666

11. Nfr-bk-Tnpe (not in PN). This individual holds up a branch towards the front of the procession of offering bearers in the fourth register on the south wall of the offering room. In contrast to the title(s) which preceded them, the component signs of his name were rendered in paint alone. The entire caption has disappeared today, but the name is clearly visible in pl 38. His title is to be made out at the end of the horizontal line that contained the titles, and the spacing of the signs suggests that this could have been preceded by shd.

The name does not appear to be attested elsewhere.

12. Nfr-bk (PN1, p. 173, 14, "der zu Phath Gehörige"). The eighth figure in the procession of offering bearers in the lowest register appears on the south wall of the offering room. The terminal sign is to be seen in pl 38b. No traces of a title or titles remain.

13. ‘N ‘k-b-R (PN1, p. 186, 1, "der (mein?) Herr ist Re"). Although Nb-R occurs as the Horus name of one of the early kings of Dynasty 2,668 it is not otherwise attested as a personal name during the Old Kingdom. The bearer of the name in the present context strangles a goose before Inti in the fifth register on the south wall of the offering room.

14. Nfr-bk-nfr-ns (PN1, p. 198, 9). The title of this man, the ninth offering bearer in the procession in the bottom register on the south wall of the offering room, is damaged. The arrangement of the terminal signs of the name suggest the restoration Nfr-bk-nfr-ns, since sbf-sr, "fair of face," is a common attribute of Ptah in the Old Kingdom (ibid.) and later. The restoration of the first element in his title, [b] nfr-[b] bmu-[b]-ks, is less certain.

15. Nfr-sib (PN1, p. 200, 11, 2, p. 370). With the titles zib imp-ir zisw, "dignitary and overseer of scribes," this official walks behind the palanquin of Inti on the south wall of the anteroom. He is distinguished from the other officials depicted on this wall by his garment, a calf-length kilt.668 His title and costume imply that he was a person of some importance, at least in the retinue of Inti, but he does not appear to be known from other sources. Zib here and elsewhere is probably a rank title.669

16. ‘Nm (not in PN). Although unattested elsewhere, the name seems certain. Fifth in the lowest procession of offering bearers on the south wall of the offering room, he is designated sbi bmu-ks.

17. Nfrm. (PN1, p. 215, 8, 2, p. 372). Reclining against a wicker backrest in the march scene on the west wall of the anteroom, he looks on as herdsmen prepare a meal. His title is damaged but could have been either lrg or lrg lrg. Both alternatives are otherwise attested.670 Junker translates the name "Der Süße."671

18. Rd–kh (PN1, p. 321, 21, "stark ist mein kh"). The titles of this offering bearer, the eleventh represented in the extra register on the south wall of the offering room, are lost.

19. Hm–shy (PN1, p. 239, 17, "Der Diener des ḫt"").672 One of four senior officials represented behind Inti in the fishing scene at the rear of the portico. On the south wall of the offering chamber, he appears again as the third of four inspectors of funerary priests who carry offerings towards the false door. In the first location, his titulary is damaged and only bmu-ks at the end of the column is readily visible. In the offering chamber, he is zib zib sbi bmu-ks, "dignitary and scribe, inspector of funerary priests," and traces suggest that the same sequence should be restored in the portico.673 Hm–shy also appears in the tomb of Senedjem Meh.674

662 Fischer, Totenmenschen, p. 74, translates the name "Life (or zib: my life) is in the "stars of heaven.")
663 On the last element in the name, see above, pp. 154–55.
664 PM 3, p. 68. The sign appears in Exp. Ph. A 185). On the date of the tomb, see HES, p. 79.
666 Martin, Hinweise, p. 8, nos. 81–82, pl. 35.
667 LIT, pl. 61; Ros–dwt, 2, pl. 6; PM 3, p. 754. For st, "stringers," see Mif 5, p. 36, pl. 17; Nianchchnum, pl. 6.
668 Davies, Ptolemaic Rev. 2, pl. 21.
669 PM 5, p. 97 (195).
670 Smith, Old Kingdom, pp. 30–31.
671 See p. 14 above.
673 E.g., JNES 20, pp. 308, 307, 48; Baydar, Nyhetsgab–Ptah and Akhethetep, fig. 35.
675 Additional citations: Murray, Index, pl. 1.
676 For zib zib, see Junker, Giza 7, p. 179; Fischer, JNES 18 (1939), p. 219 (3); PM 5, p. 314 (195).
20. Snfkn (PN 7, p. 126). With the title at(13) sn n hft-br, he is shown burning incense to the left of the southern serdab slot in the west wall of the vestibule. It is tempting to identify him with the owner of Giza mastaba G.2370, a zl(13) sfr fc hft-br and zl(13) n n bmsw-ks, named Snfkn-Inti.541 G.2370 is located in the first avenue west of the Senedjemib Complex, and it is likely that this Senedjemib Inti, like at least one other individual who built his tomb against the large mastaba G.2360,679 served the Senedjemib family as a funerary priest. No trace is visible of a heart-sign at the end of the name in G.2370 (fig. 5). A subsequent recutting of the inscription may have obliterated the sign.

21. Qr (PN 1, p. 33 s., “die Tatsche,” 2, p. 391). With the titles sn mf bms-wt, “brother of his estate and funerary priest,” this individual brings offerings on the south wall of the offering room. The role of the sn-mf has been the subject of considerable discussion.684 The name is a relatively common one in the Old Kingdom.685

22. Ki-misz (PN 7, p. 150, 1, “mein [or in (4-7)”). The titles zl(3) mufj, snf, bms-wt, “acrole of the house of the god[s] [book] and funerary priest,” serve to identify this offering bearer, who appears in the bottom register on the south wall of the offering room.

23. Jw (PN 1, p. 394, 12, 2, p. 400). Like no. 19, also an offering bearer, this man is sn df f and bms-wt. The name occurs sporadically in the Old Kingdom, but none of its other bearers has a very good claim to being identical with the present individual.686 The girdle knot ideogram is missing from the present spelling of the name.

24. Jw-n-Pbh (not in PN). This functionary elevates a censer on the left side of the northern serdab slot in the west wall of the vestibule. The name is perhaps a relative pf of the divine name Ptah can be made out in the damaged space before his face and over his head.687 If so, consideration should be given to the possibility that this individual was identical with the last, there being ample space for the folded cloth s after the terminal signs of the latter’s name.

25. Jw-n-Pbh (not in PN). This functionary elevates a censer on the left side of the northern serdab slot in the west wall of the vestibule. The name occurs sporadically in the Old Kingdom, but none of its other bearers has a very good claim to being identical with the present individual.688 The girdle knot ideogram is missing from the present spelling of the name.

26. Name illegible. Two vertical signs only remain of the name of the tenth offering bearer in the bottom register on the south wall of the offering room. The title is lost.

27. Name illegible (see fig. 13c). The title of this individual, who holds a brace of birds and leads a young gazelle on a rope in the bottom register on the south wall of the offering room, is once again lost.

28. Name lost. Although the name of the foremost functionary who strangles a goose on the right of the serdab slot in the west wall of the vestibule is lost in the robber’s hole along with the lower part of his figure, the titles sfr zl(2) survive in the space before his face.

29. Name lost. The foremost figure (erased) in the procession of offering bearers in the fourth register on the south wall of the offering room. Even though his name is lost, the title J/Pn bms-wt, “inspector of funerary priests,” is clear.

30. Name lost. The third figure in the file of offering bearers in the bottom register on the south wall of the offering room. The figure that immediately precedes the present man and the two that follow each bear the title shb bms-wt, and the position of the present individual in the file as well as the folded cloth s that is all that survives of his title suggest that he may likewise have been an inspector of funerary priests.

Due to the falling away of the plaster layer in which they were carved, many of the figures on the south wall of Inti’s offering room have lost their titles, their names, or both. Nonetheless, at least four individuals on the south wall of the offering room (nos. 7, 16, 19, 29) and Inti’s son Ni-ankh-min on its north wall definitely have the title shb bms-wt, “inspector of funerary priests.” This circumstance suggests that the personnel of Inti’s cult were organized into phyles, even though no direct mention of phyle by names survives. Further, if two other individuals on the south wall (nos. 11 and 30) also had the same title originally, as has been suggested, this would constitute evidence that the more elaborate form of phyle organization with the customary five phyle separated into two divisions was in operation in this tomb.689 Since the names and titles of the majority of the offering bearers on the long walls of the room appear to have formed part of its original decorative scheme, Inti’s phyle system presumably constituted part of the original arrangements for his mortuary cult.

The shb bms-wt were actually first in authority in the phyle organization, being superior to the imin-br bms-wt and the zlw n zsr.690 At least two imin-br bms-wt are also depicted on the south wall (nos. 1 and 10, possibly also 14). This is the only other evidence that attests to the character of the phyle organization on the walls of G.2370, although additional evidence is forthcoming from the tombs.

See above, p. 61.

4. For the phyle subdivisions in mortuary cults, see Roth, Phyle, pp. 77–79, 89–99, and passim. For the more elaborate type of organization in private mortuary cults, see ibid., pp. 90 (262), 92 (305), 97 (337), 103, 105, 107 (352), 109.

5. Pach, Roth, Phyle, p. 98 (12).

of the funerary priests erected in the vicinity of the Senedjemib Complex.687

687 See Bravarski, in L’Égyptologie en 1979, p. 121, and above, pp. 3–4.
CHAPTER 5:
SENEDJEMIB INTI – G 2370
TRANSLATION OF INSCRIPTIONS A–D

The autobiographical inscriptions of Senedjemib Inti are carved in sunk relief of good quality on the facade of G 2370 to either side of the portico and on the adjacent north and south side walls of the portico. They were first copied by Lepsius and the Prussian Expedition (figs. 18, 21, 28, 31). It was apparently Reisner who designated the inscriptions A–D. The latter’s own copies of the texts (figs. 19, 22, 29, 32) appear to have been made by inking photographs taken by the Harvard–Boston Expedition. Sethe included his own hand copies of the texts in *Urkunden des Alten Reiches*. The inscriptions were copied anew by the Giza Mastabas Project in 1981 and 1982.

The inscriptions on the north wall of the portico and the adjacent facade recount episodes of Inti’s career under King Izezi. Three verbatim letters from the king are included. Inscription A 1 is a first person narrative in which Inti tells how he was rewarded by the king at an impromptu ceremony held on the palace grounds. Inscription A 2, the first of Izezi’s letters to Inti, relates to a chapel dedicated to the goddess Hathor that Inti was in the process of erecting (or at least decorating) within the palace precinct. Inscription B 1 provides the background for another building project that Inti undertook for Izezi in conjunction with the approaching royal jubilee, while in B 2 Izezi expresses his satisfaction with Inti’s plans for the project and promotes him to the position of overseer of all works of the king.

King Izezi evidently enjoyed letter-writing, for he also addressed a personal missive to Inti’s older contemporary, the vizier Rashepses. It is not entirely clear if this was a personal quirk on Izezi’s part or a regular tool of the pharaonic bureaucracy, for we also possess a letter of Sethe that the work he undertook on his father’s tomb took a total of fifteen months. Inscription D details the transport of the sarcophagus from the Tura quarries to Izezi’s Giza tomb.

In the course of collating Senedjemib Inti’s inscriptions for the second edition of *Urkunden des Alten Reiches*, Sethe had access to the photographs taken by the Harvard–Boston Expedition and to copies of the texts made by Reisner. The handwritten notes in Boston seemingly represent his comments made on the basis of these photographs and Reisner’s copies. Although Reisner’s original copies are no longer extant, it is clear from Sethe’s notes that Reisner’s final copy of the texts incorporated several of Sethe’s own readings. Conversely, Sethe incorporated certain of Reisner’s readings into his published version of the texts.

2. In the discussion of the individual inscriptions that follow, under the heading “Present volume,” the copies of Lepsius, Reisner, and the Giza Mastabas Project are distinguished in parenthesis by the letters R. and GMP respectively.
3. These photographs represent only a selection of the numerous photographs taken by the Harvard–Boston Expedition under different lighting conditions over the course of time.
4. See ibid., p. 19, 26. For the first edition Sethe had recourse solely to Lepsius’s publications and the original drawings in Berlin; see ibid., p. 29, 4–7.

on behalf of their royal master. They also lent a certain authority to the “verbal self-presentation” of the autobiographies.

Inscriptions C and D on the facade immediately to the south of the portico and the adjacent south portico wall are again in the first person, but the narrator has changed, and here Inti’s son, Senedjemib Mehi, recounts his benefactions on his father’s behalf upon the death of the latter. The first part of Inscription C evidently recorded the establishment of Inti’s mortuary endowment in considerable detail. It is most unfortunate that its fragmentary condition renders the account obscure, for the content in part appears to be unique. In the second part of the inscription, Mehi states that he had the decrees pertaining to his father’s mortuary endowment inscribed on the walls of the latter’s tomb and that he, moreover, had requested a sarcophagus from the king for the burial of his father. In passing, he mentions that the work he undertook on his father’s tomb took a total of fifteen months. Inscription D details the transport of the sarcophagus from the Tura quarries to Izezi’s Giza tomb.
That Reisner utilized photographs made by the Harvard-Boston Expedition in arriving at his final copies of Inscriptions A-D is clear from the fact that both prints and certain of the original glass plates bear his penciled or inked markings. Nowhere is it specifically stated that he collated his copies against the originals, but it is diffi-
cult to believe that a scholar who spent so much of his professional life at Giza would not have taken the opportunity to do so.

The conventions employed in the following translations require some explanation. Brackets [ ] indicate when a word or phrase missing in the text has been restored. When a word or phrase is uncertain or imperfectly understood, half-brackets { } are employed. Curly brackets { } indicate a letter, word or phrase visible in the Harvard-Boston Expedition photographs or copied by Lepsius or Reisner but since destroyed. Angle brackets < > are used for words erroneously commented on throughout this volume.

It may be added that the references to publications, translations, and so forth under the individual entries are selective and could be readily extended.

**Inscription A**

Inscriptions A 1 and 2 are inscribed on the facade of the mastaba to the north of the portico. The titulary of Senedjemib Inti introduces an autobiographical text (A 1) which is followed by a letter written to the Boston Expedition in arriving at His Majesty concerning it. (9) I was esteemed, trusted, and beloved by Izezi more than any peer of mine. (12) Because I was esteemed, trusted, and beloved by Izezi, I was esteemed by Izezi more than any peer of mine as [master of secrets] of His Majesty and as favorite of His Majesty in everything (8) which His Majesty wanted done. (and) during which time His Majesty was praising [me] for [every work] which His Majesty had ordered to be done, because I used to act according to the wishes of His Majesty regarding it. (9) Izezi gave to me a [necklace] of malachite (8) […] His Majesty, while he was in the registry office,2 and I happened to be (10) in attendance on the grounds of the palace (8). His Majesty had it tied around my neck […] (His Majesty had) me anointed with unguent, (11) and had my hair washed in order to praise me (14) for everything {which I had done} 
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Monate, 3 Tage (alt) ist meine substantive meaning patterned on that which appears on the jambs of the false door of horizontal lines of titles. If so, §§.Sm3-tb Ìn.tn fšr×, an arrangement patterned on that which appears on the jambs of the false door of Mehì (pl. 12; figs. 126, 127) would fit the available space. Such a column would fall outside the (restored) margins of the inscriptions, however, and the omission may simply represent an error on the part of the ancient draftsmen.

As William Stevenson Smith observed (JNES 21 [1972], p. 123), Gudehoff misinterpreted the statement of the length of time, expressed in the form of the number of years, months, and days during which Senedjemìt Ìntì served under Izezi, as a date in year 5 of that king (ASAE 43 [1943], p. 59).

Edél (MIO 1 [1935], p. 215 [7]), who thought min (= men) to be a substantive meaning “honon,” translated the passage: “‡4 Jahre, 3 Monate, 5 Tage (alt) ist meine srn bei Ìntì; ich ziehe ich bin angesehen bei Ìntì (mehr als irgendeiner meinigenlichen),” or again “meine Ehrung bei Ìntì hat die zeitliche Ausdehnung von fünf Jahren u.w.,” and more freely “meine Ehrung bei Ìntì wälzt bereits fünf Jahre u.w.” The translation of min as “honor” does not appear to have gained wide acceptance, however. The same may be said of Goodc̃k’s proposed translation of min as “companion, attaché” (RdE 11 [1957], pp. 63–68).

Pace Edél (Alätg. Gramm. 2, §§ 813–51), Satzinger (MDAIK 12 [1969], pp. 102–103), and Oüng (Or qh [1977], pp. 286–80), Donet (ANVS, p. 35, n. 102), argues that the particle sfr in narrative texts from the Old Kingdom always introduces circumstantial clauses linked in meaning with what precedes them. On this passage, see ibd., p. 111, Ex. 207. James Allen has suggested translating sfr in the present context as “during which time.”

If Ìntì rewarded Senedjemì with a sfr in (§§.Sm3-tb Ìn.tn fšr×) wfr sgb×. The determinative of ìn is a cord of rope or cord (Sign List V 1), and ìn probably had the primary meaning of “thread,” “string,” or “cord.” In the tomb of Pepeyankì Henì the Black (Aker 5, pp. 314–16, pls. 16–17), dwarfs are shown “swinging thread (sfr) for stringing beads.” The word perhaps only secondarily came to mean “necklace,” that is, a string of beads worn around the neck as an ornament. The determinative of ìn in the “Louvre Matasha” (Ziegler, Akhethetep, p. 127, l13) shows a string of beads and a pendant amulet of oval shape with five oval projections, the projection at the top evidently pierced for stringing. The amulet may represent a turtle (see e.g., Fischer, Turul, pp. 25–30, figs. 17–18, pl. 17, and frontispiece). Senedjemìt’s necklace was made of wfr sgb×, while Akhethetep’s was of wfr sgb× and a second, unidentified material (Ziegler, Akhethetep, p. 113 [1]). Wfr sgb× in most cases refers to malachite, but perhaps also included any green stone for which no more specific term existed, including green Jasper, beryl, felspar, and other stones of similar color (Harris, Minerals, pp. 210–13). Wfr sgb× seemingly corresponds to the variety of malachite obtained from the deserts to the east of the Nile Valley, as opposed to wfr štfr from Sinai (ibid., pp. 102–103). Akhethetep also received his necklace as a gift from the king.

For ìn, “registry office,” C. Breasted, Ancient Record 1, pp. 270; Ward, Or-11 [1981], p. 392; G. Goedicke, Royal Palace, p. 547; Roccati, Littérature, p. 124. This office appears only here and, in the absence of parallels, it would tempting, but for the presence of the book roll determinative, to understand ìn to be the term for “activity” (Gardiner, PSBA 34 [1932], p. 261, n. 14; Finchow, ZAS 79 [1914], pp. 96–97; Fischer, Varié, pp. 14) and to render sfr mì sfr, “as while he was at work.”


The meaning of ìn is discussed in note b to Inscription B 2 below.

For sfr, see WR. 4, p. 310, n. 15; The verb occurs in a passage in the Pyramid Texts (PT 123,747d: sfr.mì Sfr fr× fr×, “he has cleansed his fingernails and toenails.” In a letter of Middle Kingdom date published by Gudehoff, ìn is used in a house (ibid. JEA 35 [1949], pp. 60–61, pl. 25). The determinative of sfr in the present text is damaged, but is unlikely to be x as Sethe suggested (Urk. 1, p. 60, n. 20).

Gudehoff (JEA 35 [1949], pp. 61–62), restored “inspector [of the bakers] of the palace,” while Roccati (Littérature, p. 124) has “le supérieur des [employés] du grand palais.” By “employés,” hpr-tp, is perhaps intended. The badly damaged partial parallel in the biog- raphy of Washprì (Urk. 1, p. 43, 9–11) suggests that it was instead an “inspector [of the hairdressers] of the palace” who underook Ìntì’s grooming. For the title of hpr-tp in pt-šr, see PM 3, pp. 902, 933 [186], and for hairdressers in general, see Speidel, Frieze.

Visible in the middle of the long lacuna after hpr-t bsr in pt-šr in a photograph taken in 1913 are the signs “×.×.×.×.×.×.×.×.” Both Reimer and Sethe included these in their copies of Inscription A 1. It is difficult to know what to make of them. Roccati translates “supérieur ...,” and thus evidently takes the signs to represent the designation hpr-f, for which see Quagebeur, Form und Masur 2, pp. 568–77. Other than its employment to designate a monarch (see e.g., Fischer, Dendera, pp. 74–76), hpr-f, “overlord, superior, chief,” or like forms a component in only a limited number of titles. If, in the present context, it forms the element in a first title, then hpr-t bsr, “overlord of linen” (PM 3, pp. 923, 935 [382]; Fischer, Varia Nova, p. 218) or hpr-t xbn, “overlord of the wardrobe” (PM 3, pp. 923, 935 [38]) or hpr-t bsr, “chief lector priest” (ibid., p. 998, 931 [41]) is to be restored. Both titles are on occasion found in the titles of royal hairdressers, the first (Mariette, Matasha, pp. 312, 390; Lythgoe–Ransome, Pernef, figs. 34, 35; Hassan, Gize 1, pp. 6, 7, 9, 29) perhaps somewhat more frequently than the latter (Mariette, Matasha, p. 300; Hassan, Gize 4, fig. 113). Whether either dignity was theirs by virtue of the fact that certain of the same indi-
Present volume: figs. 28 (L), 29 (R), 30 (GMP); text figure 2; Inscription A 2

In this inscription, the arrangement of the title like (Mariette, p. 933 [299]). The availability of space, however, would require an arrangement of the title like (Mariette, Masabeh, pp. 294, 300; Hassan, Giza 1, p. 29, fig. 266) or (Hassan, Giza 4, fig. 195).

All this, of course, presupposes that db [db in pr-ː] is correctly restored in the first place. Even so, there may be other possibilities here I have not envisaged, and it is with some reticence that the proposed restoration is included in text fig. 1. a * For the restoration, cf. Ubk 1, p. 60, n. d.

a D[pr (w) n] apparently alludes to the fact that the ancient Egyptians wrote with a reed held between the thumb and index finger of the right hand. Only rarely is the writing implement actually carved in line 13. There is insufficient room for the proposed translation in its entirety, but ḫ ṣρ alone fits the lacuna and, as Allen notes, gives a reflection of ḫ ṣρ. b James Allen suggests restoring n ḫ ṣm ḫ ṣu after (ṣn n/l) and before ṣn ṣm in line 13. There is insufficient room for the proposed translation in its entirety, but ḫ ṣm alone fits the lacuna and, as Allen notes, gives a reflection of ḫ ṣm (ὑσν ἦ: ὅ) above.

Transcription

(1) Royal decree to the chief justice and vizier, overseer of scribes of royal records, (2) and overseer of all works of the king which is on the grounds of the palace. Can I have been correctly info[m]ed? Do[n]t let it be said that it is a matter of (just) gratifying Izizzi Let My Majesty know the truth about it immediately. (And if it is) yet to happen, you are (6) one who says what Izizzi likes (better than) any official who has (ever) come into being in this land. (7) [Inasmuch as] My Majesty knows that every ship is (on an even kɛd). (8) [If you] say in what way [you are one who is] very [valuable] for me. The speaking of the overseer of all works of the king is ‘pleasing to me’ (8). It is an informing of Izizzi very correctly. If only [you] could co[m]e to me, [since] you do (this sort of) thing because of ‘it’ (g) in the best manner. You have performed innumerable deeds, (in such a way) that [My Majesty] should love you, and assuredly you know that I do love you.

Comments

a As Fischer observes (Reviews, pp. 58–59), the dative n is regularly omitted in Old Kingdom writings of ḫw nṣw (ṇ), the reversal of the phrase sufficing to convey the idea of the dative.

b So Wente; Roccati has “la réduction.” Presumably, qd (Ubk 1, p. 73, 11–12; AEO s. v. FCD, p. 387) is meant in both cases. The spelling ḥw ḫw nṣw (ṇ) (Jenner, Mon. fun. 3, p. 74, fig. 173) corresponds fairly well to the traces visible in pl. 62.

Roccati and Wente may well be correct in translating ḥw “inscription” and “incipitional/decorsational” respectively. On the other hand, it should be remembered that the verb ḥw means equally “to write,” “draw,” and “paint” (Ubk 1, p. 476, 7–53; FCD, p. 246), so that the substantive ḥw in the present context could refer both to representational and inscriptional decoration.

3 On the mer-chaplés of Hathor, see especially Bart, ZAS 110 (1988), pp. 98–102. Kings Snesnufer, Usertaf, Sahure, Menkaure, Izezi, Unis, Teri, Pepy I, and Pepy II are all known to have possessed such cult places. Both men and women served as priests of Hathor in the mer-chapel, but the supervisors were men. Two male “inspectors of priests of the mer-chapel” are known, as well as an “inspector of priests of Hathor of the “Great” phyle of the mer-chapel of Sahure.” Few texts have anything substantive to say about the mer-chaplés themselves. An entry in the Paleo Stone makes mention of “the fashioning and opening the mouth of an electrum statue of (the god) Ṭḥy, escorting (to) the mer-chapel of Snesnufer of the nbt-shrine of Hathor” in the first year of Neferytari (Ubk 1, p. 247, 15–16). The passage perhaps provides an indication that King Snesnufer constructed a mer-chapel within the confines of the well-known temple of Hathor.
Hatḥor in a southern suburb of Memphis (Brow, Or 46 [1977], p. 215). A Fifth Dynasty priest was ‘overshadowed by the (ancient) procession of the nēb-shrine of Hathor,’ possibly the same Memphite sanctuary, although his other titles connect him with the pyramid and sun-temple of Userkaf (PM 5, p. 578). On the other hand, the title of a contemporary of Pešu II, ‘priestess of Hathor in the nēb-chapel of the goddess of Pepy,’ appears to locate a nēb-chapel of that sovereign in the throne room of the palace; see Wb. 5, p. 537; Reisner, GN 1, pl. 6b. Išaši-[fr] was ‘priest of the nēb-chapel of Meiyre of the n-w.[I]’ (Mat. Mast., p. 458), while the nēb-chapel which Išu built for Izezi was located for in pe-[r-], ‘on the grounds of the palace.’ For the name, see Inscription B 2, n. b, and on the vexed question of the nature of the n-w., see Goodrick, Königl. Dokumente, pp. 69–71; Kaplon, Radiologien, pp. 318–319; Archäobücher, p. 612 ff.; Stadelmann, Bulletin du Commissaire, pp. 165–166.

With a few exceptions, I have followed James Allen closely in his rendering of columns 4–9. He analyzes mtr in line 4 as an adjectival predicate (Edd., Altäg. Gramm. 2, § 995) and sfin in its subject. SFIN-fi, literally ‘sweeten the heart,’ can mean ‘gladden (the heart),’ please, gratify,’ see Wb. 4, p. 106, 12–17; FCDD, p. 253; Wente, Letters, p. 19. In the present context, Allen thinks sfin must be a variant of the more common (and later) swdp fi, ‘make sound the heart,’ that is, ‘inform’ (Wb. 4, p. 80, 7–18), although it is difficult, as he remarks, to render swdp fi literally in English as ‘inform’ in the succeeding sentence, even though it has the same meaning in both instances. As observed by Silverman (Interrogative Constructions, pp. 88–89), in iw makes the sentence a question, while rv converts it to a rhetorical question with an expected response of ‘yes’ (ibid., pp. 88–93). On this sentence and what follows, cf. Edd., Altäg. Gramm. 2, § 491 ff. Silverman, Interrogative Constructions, p. 28, Ex. 34, Ex. 2, Wente, Letters, p. 19.

Allen notes that in here makes the nominal bsw nb sfin fi n ḫzet the object of the infinitive dāl. This construction in turn serves as the object of iw, the sfin fi negative verb ist plus the negatival complement wnn.

Senedjemib’s name, of course, means ‘He who sweetens the heart,’ or the like, and Breasted suggested (Ancient Records 1, p. 122, n. 5) that Izezi is punning on the vestr’s name. Be that as it may, it should be noted that the same expression is used by Išu in his letter to the vizier Rashepses (Urkh. 1, p. 179, 14).

If Lepsius has br-[y]-, but it is clear from pl. 63 b that Reisner and Serhe’s br-[y]- is correct. Lepsius’s second reed leaf actually belongs to the non-extinct particle in at the beginning of the next sentence.

A numeral phrase (now fallen away) in the stone beneath the beetle probably explains the asymmetrical arrangement of bpr; see pl. 63 b.

Edd. (Altäg. Gramm. 2, § 893) emends iw n n (.) and understands the following verb sw as an imperative ‘hearty!’ He translates the entire passage: ‘Kommen doch zu mir! Ede, so dass(oc) ausgeführt wird!’ Similarly, Roccati has ‘Viens donc chez moi, hâte-toi à faire cela!’ In discussing this passage, however, Silverman (Interrogative Constructions, p. 89, n. 351) observes that Edd.’s suggestion involves an otherwise poorly attested imperative of the verb it. Moreover, he notes, bsw usually occurs before a nominal subject in a participial statement introduced by non-interrogative iw (PT 71 a, c, PT 113 d, and CT II 166 b) or before a nominal subject in anticipatory emphasis followed by the sfin fi form of the verb, with non-interrogative iw at the head of the whole expression (CT IV 333 e), neither of which happens to be the case here. However, Silverman also provides two examples of bsw after iw in two clear questions (Hekanakhte, II, no. 42; Hieratische Papyeon III, pl. VI, Str C3); and a third example (Roccati, FEA 14 [1968], pl. 4, 7) in which bsw follows iw directly (as is the case in the present passage), but whose meaning is ambiguous.

In the Old Kingdom letter published by Roccati, Silverman thinks it unlikely that, if the passage is understood as a question, it is a rhetorical one with an expected answer of ‘yes.’ If there is an expected response at all, one of ‘no’ would be anticipated. In the present context, if the passage is understood as a rhetorical question, the expected response would be ‘yes.’

Allen remarks that these two passages can indeed be taken as two separate sentences (which, grammatically, they are anyway): ‘Is it yet to happen? You are one…’ but he thinks they work better together in English, for in, ‘…’ see Silverman, Interrogative Constructions, pp. 105–106. Allen takes iw spr bpr as the subjective (prospective) counterpart of iw (f) spr bpr, without an expressed subject.

The translation of the idiom brw nb nb sfin fi is Wente’s. Roccati, Littérature, p. 214, has: ‘Or ma Majesté sait que tout bateau est sur sa perfection.’ However, sfin fi mean ‘ground level; base, zero line’ (Carter, FEA 4 [1919], p. 110, n. 1; Arnold, Building in Egypt, pp. 16–18), and the sense of the passage seems to be that Izezi knows that Inti’s perspicacity will serve him well, just as he knows with certainty that a boat rides level on the water.

The translation here reflects Wente’s. There is only room in the constricted space below the w, behind the w of iw, and above the back of the swallow or House Martin (Houlbou, Birds, pp. 124–125) of iw for one tall sign. That sign is largely destroyed, but the seated ‘man of rank’ hieroglyph fits the context and just possibly the space as well. Traces that may represent the top of the head and the base of the sign are visible in the stone.

Wor […] wer n mi must be a nominal sentence with a missing adjective (Edd., Altäg. Gramm. 2, § 943). Allen further observes that this must be an indirect question, for if there were a direct question (‘By what means do I know you are one who is very […] for me?’), the nominal sentence would be subordinated by n (ibid., § 1077). For an example of such a direct question, he cites CT II, 216–216a.

For iw, ‘be pleased,’ see Wb. 5, p. 258–259; FCDD, p. 295. The usual arrangement of the component signs of iw is sw or sr (Wb. 5, pp. 258–259), but the placement of the two bread signs and the size and shape of the lacuna here presupposes an arrangement like wsw. The partial parallel to this passage in the autobiography of the vizier Rashepses reads ntw n (.) dāl r fr sbi et (Urkh. 1, p. 179, 18; Edd., Altäg. Gramm. 1, § 698). Allen sees brw nb bpr sfin fi as an example of a dāl-clause before a main clause (see e.g., ibid. 2, § 1050), and would translate: ‘And since My Majesty (therefore) knows that every ship is on an even keel, the speaking of the overseer of all works of the king is “pleasing” to me.’ As he notes, dāl should be an infinitive, dāl fi, ‘your speaking,’ rather than dāl b, ‘what you say,’ a relative sfin fi, because it is missing a final t.
On the north wall of the portico stand two other letters from Izezi to
Inscription B. The relationship between the

(4) translates the

of the decorated area of the wall was thus something like 3.45 m originally. Since the baseline of the relief of the north wall of the portico lies between 1.20 and 1.26 m above the pavement, the total height of the wall would have been in the neighborhood of 4.70 m.

Inscription B 1
Publication: LD 2, p. 76f, Urk. 1, p. 61, 17–62, 12.
Present volume: figs. 28 (L), 29 (R), 30 (GMP); text figure 2; pl. 64a–66a
Translations: Beaeast, Ancient Records 1, § 272; Roccacci, Littérature, § 94; Wente, Letters, no. 5
Translations of individual passages: Helck, Bezeugungspf., p. 137, n. 29; Edel, Gramm. NVS, 1, 716; edel, §§ 859, 853, 878; Silverman, Interscopic Constructions, p. 98, Ex. 15; Stadelmann, in Bulletin du Centrea, p. 138, Stroudwick, Administration, p. 241 (2–4); Duesen, NVS, p. 81, Ex. 186; 95, Ex. 168
Commentary: Schott, Fragen an die Altiyptische Literatur, p. 459.

Transcription
(1) [waf nwt] (2) [kōp 2y 3by 3by] (3) [imp- r zdr w nwnt] (4) [imp- n mrt nt nwnt] (5) [Snjd-nb urw] (6) [wst n nk n tk tt ntw ntw] (7) [… tk tw dw k] (8) [… tk tw dw] (9) [.. tk tw dw] (10) [… tk tw dw] (11) [… tk tw dw] (12) [… tk tw dw] (13) [… tk tw dw] (14) [… tk tw dw] (15) [… tk tw dw] (16) [… tk tw dw] (17) [… tk tw dw] (18) [… tk tw dw] (19) [… tk tw dw] (20) [… tk tw dw]

Translation
(1) [royal decree to (2) the chief justice and vizier, (3) overseer of royal document scribes, (4) overseer of all works of the king, (5) Senedjemib the Elder. (6) Note has been taken of the contents of this letter of yours which you [sent] to the king (6) to the council chamber in order to inform My Majesty that an order of the King was brought to you regarding… and you say] (10) [to My Majesty that you are going to lay out] (11) according to what was said in the [court council] (12) that the construction work in the court council in your absence, (13) and you say to My Majesty you are going to […] (14) the jubilee festival. My Majesty has wished to hear this (15) of yours very much (16) … and I will not discomfit you. (17) The Assyrian will not put you in [the hand of your opponent] for any reason (18) […] (19) [for whom My Majesty will do] anything about which My Majesty learns, (20) because the ‘oversight of all works of the king’ is mentioned (21) (in the text) every day. (22) It is because [beli] has given you to me! (23) [that I] assuredly (24) [that I] am. (25)
**Chapter 5: SENEDEMB INTI – c 3750 TRANSLATION OF INSCRIPTIONS A-D**

As James Allen observes, and as may be seen from the Pyramid Text references just cited, br.g in Old Egyptian appears in the idioms would be, "put (someone) on (his) side," and zi3 br.g, "raise (some-one) from (his) side." Given the broken context, it is not clear which of the two idioms stood here originally but, as Allen also notes, this and the succeeding sentence appear to constitute promises of the king's protection (or at least of his continued esteem). The later idiom rid br.g, "lay low, fell (an enemy)?" (FCD, pp. 155, 293), suggested to me the translation proposed here. Allen, on the other hand, favors a participial rendering of the passage: "There is no one who will put you on your side."

For the -y ending in the 1st pers. sing. of the anomalous verbs in the regular conjugation, see Edel, Alfrag, Gramm. 1, § 472c; Allen, IPPIT. § 44f.

Allen has suggested the restoration m [*n + brg] k in the damaged portion of line 8 before the large lacuna in the middle of the inscription. Reisner thought he saw *n but, in actual fact, there is insufficient room for the suggested restoration in the space between the *m and *k, whereas m [*n brg] k does fit the available space. Furthermore, its component signs more readily correspond to the faint traces visible today. The unnamed "enemy" may have been a rival at court who had presented an alternative proposal for the building project under discussion. Hfbr has been translated "opponent" because "enemy" seems unnecessarily harsh given the context. In fact, hbr is used of persons who litigate against one in the court of the magistrates; see Letters to the Dead, pp. 20–21. Allen's understanding of n ifn as future (Edel, Alfrag. Gramm. 2, § 1075), instead of past, also yields a better sense here.

The first sign clearly visible after the lacuna in line 8 is the fullers' club. Alongside this sign, both Reisner and Sethe thought they saw the word brgb followed by a rd-basket. The bread loaf of brg is definitely visible in pi 64b and the placenta(?) perhaps to be made out. Directly over these two signs Reisner thought he could see a Serek and above that a short horizontal line segment. Sethe thought that the serek was instead probably a ripple of water. The area is, in fact, badly pitted and damaged, and the grouping unconventional. Both scholars then read serek, the folded cloth and bread loaf of which are visible in the plate and possibly also the mouth and placenta(?). What follows is once again badly damaged. Both Reisner and Sethe thought they saw a second, damaged fullers' club on the left and followed by this r ntr. Faint vestiges in the photograph which might conceivably be interpreted as the fullers' club are not centered on the two vertical signs in the columns immediately above, however, and this calls the existence of the sign into doubt. Nothing is visible in the space immediately to the right of the club. The two bread loaves of ntr are still to be made out, and there are traces which conceivably represent both the r-mouth and the ripple of water above these.

On the other hand, the putative mouth-sign is set too high to allow sufficient room for the second fullers' club between it and the folded cloth s of serek.

It should be apparent from these remarks how very tentative any translation of the passage must be. Nonetheless, Reisner presumably had the advantage of viewing the wall when its inscriptions were better preserved, and we have simply followed his version of the text.

*Comments*

a For the reconstruction, see Uerk 1, p. 138, f: Wenke, Letters, p. 19.

In the second letter from King Izezi, Senebedjem is so addressed. In the third letter, the order of the titles "overseer of scribes of royal records" and "overseer of all works of the king" is reversed. Either alternative is possible here. For the epithet ◊ after the personal name Senebedjem, see below, Inscription B 2, n. k.

b The phrases in bold type represent the additions made to Inscription B 1 from the corner block now in Boston whose two inscribed faces join both inscriptions A 1 and B 1 at the top.

c For tat, "cabinet, council chamber" see Roscati, Lintentexte, p. 206. An officer of the royal household (z£ stp nfr, try-mqy n apz; try nfršt n stp nfr wdt) had the title htm-nfr ḫr ḫnty tat ura, "priest of Horus (the king?) who presides over the pure tat-chamber" (Hassan, Giza 6, vol. 1, p. 181, pl. 81 A). A second functionary about whom nothing more is known was ḫr ḫnty tat šfr, "scribe of the secret tat-chamber" (Kaplny, Bullengel, p. 457, pl. 114 (26)). It is possible that both the "pure" and the "secret" chamber are identical with the tat-referred to by King Izezi. The identification is less likely in the case of the "great chamber" mentioned in the title ḥnty tat šfr n šst, which belongs to an individual who holds tax payers into the presence of officials in the tomb of Mereruka (Mereruka 1, p. 36), but what is presumably the same place-name appears in a title evinced by numerous examples, snow tat, "elder of the tat-chamber" (Helck, Beamtentitel, p. 38), and in a second title known from four occurrences, ḫnty šst n tat, "supervisor of those who are within the tat-chamber" (Fischer, Varia, p. 16; idem, Varia Novae, p. 237). Given Insti's connection with construction works and the context of Izezi's letters, Helck's observation that snow tat is in the (earlier) Old Kingdom a rank title of building overseers is of some interest (Beamtentitel, p. 38–39). On the other hand, it appears in none of the titulatures of the Senebedjem family, and the association may have been discontinued by this time.

d For the reconstruction, see Edel, Alfrag, Gramm. 2, § 1025.

e On tat see Inscription B 2, n. b.

f Goelet, Royal Palace 2, pp. 442–70, and JARCE 13 (1966), pp. 85–98, should be consulted for the nature and function of the sp- as Goelet renders sp-pr as "escort, body-guard," but Gauthier's translation of "court council" (Teti Com. 1, p. 110, n. 2), in the sense of the body of persons who make up the retinue or council of a ruler, perhaps better summarizes the nature of the duties of those officials who are associated with the sp- as (see Goelet, Royal Palace 2, pp. 438–46). Those duties included both attendance on the person of the sovereign and participation in the decision-making process (ibid., pp. 414–415, 458–470).

g For the compound preposition m-brg, see Gardiner, EGE, § 178. Although the passage is damaged, it seems that Ini was not present at court when the original plans for laying out the grounds for Izezi's jubilee celebrations were settled upon.

h ḫr gš rather than gš-ḏ as in Inscription A, line 9; see PT 1002 b, 1003 b; 1878 c; 2185 b. Gardiner (EG, § 178) gives br-ḏ as a preposition meaning "beside," but according to Edel (Alfrag, Gramm. 2, § 865) only ḫr-ḏ is known in Old Egyptian.

i For the reconstruction, see Uerk 1, p. 138, f: Wenke, Letters, p. 19.
Allen offers a different translation from my own. He notes that the key is the verb w∂, which can mean both "announce" and "make known" (WB 4, p. 199, 2). According to him the former would fit with what seems to precede, the latter with what seems to follow. He finds the latter slightly easier grammatically, in which case he thinks my restoration of [sete] makes sense. But he takes exception to it, since he feels what is wanted is a verb like "assign" or "command." He opts for w∂ because of its use in column 6. He points out that r-ntt cannot mean "because," since it is used to introduce the object of a speech, and then not apparently till Middle Egyptian. He observes further that if the second fullers' club is correct, it is needs a sign next to it, in order to state the bundle of plant in question. Following Sethe and Reisner, they opt for an imperfective active particle modifying (my-r-ntt) to sete, in the common sense of "to do a job." They read it as follows:

\[\text{Today they are nearly completely obliterated. Although there are some traces which might conceivably represent the eye of the plant, it needs a sign next to it, in order to state the bundle of plant in question.} \]

The signs following the lacuna in the middle of line 9 and the beginning of line 10, even though it is unsubstantiated by any actual traces.

The signs following the lacuna in the middle of line 9 were either already destroyed or badly damaged in 1933 (pls. 42b, 65). Today they are nearly completely obliterated. Although there are traces visible in the photographs which might possibly be construed to read [j]t/dl m n.f, what appear to be vestiges of other signs cast the reading into doubt. Whereas the vip is clear, the signs that follow are conducive of a different interpretation. There was probably not room for a reed leaf before the owl, which is largely visible. The ring-stand or butcher's block (not a stool of reed matting) is relatively certain and the mouth alongside it is definite, but the same cannot be said for the word nswt. The loop of the mark-leg in a is not to be seen as it is the better part of the reed shelter. The letter n, which both Reisner and Sethe thought to see above the latter sign, is not at all evident. Moreover, the putative leaf t beneath the reed shelter is excessively small and is probably simply a hole in the stone. The mouth that follows is clear though, and there are also traces of the figure of a quail chick on the left of the space below and just possibly of a circular sign over the back of the chick. If these observations are correct, the damaged signs may resolve into the phrase nswt m n.f, because, by night and by day. In fact, even though no trace remains of the night determinative, what Reisner and Sethe saw as the top of the sun-plant in nswt actually looks more like the uppermost loop of the twisted flax whisk, the final radical in gbr. According to WB 4, p. 184, 4, the earliest occurrence of the adverbial phrase (nswt) m n.f could be restored to the Second Intermediate Period. Nevertheless, it actually appears in late Dynasty 5 in an abbreviated writing on a block from the tomb of the chief metal worker Smenkhurban Intew (James, Corpus, p. 14, no. 38, pl. 105). And it is most probably to be restored in the following passage from the autobiography of Prince Ka-em-tjenent:...

Inscription B 2

**Publication:** Litt. 2, p. 765; Litt. 1, pp. 62, 14–63, 11

**Present volume:** figs. 28 (L), 29 (R), 30 (GMP); text figure 2; pls. 65–666


**Translations of individual passages:** Eichler, Altagr., Gramm. 1, §§ 103, 161 a, 54, 458, 457, 454, 713, 1065, 2162, 2231; Silverman, Intercurrent Constructions, p. 91, Ex. 11; Studdl, in: Bulletin du Centenaire, p. 118, Studnick, Administration, pp. 235, 248 (4); Dorey, NVS, p. 50, Ex. 74, 13, Ex. 160, 103, Ex. 184; Goeter, Royal Papyrus, p. 231

Having survived a sudden squall on the Nile, Izezi says:

\[
\text{in(f)} \text{ mr nqht Re m 5 "It was like the voyage of Re on the great lake" (Urk. t. p. 183, 9; Goedic, Royal Palace, pp. 545–47; Schott, in Fragen zur ägyptologischen Literatur, p. 450, fig. 5.)}
\]

On the other hand, there seems to be little question that I also encompassed the ‘garden’ or ‘plantation of trees’ which surrounded this pool. It is graphically illustrated by yet another offering basin which exhibits at each corner of the basin’s rim the word ‘sycamore tree’ (Fischer, MDAIK 47 (1991), pp. 125–30). Tomb biographies of Old Kingdom and later date sometimes claim that the deceased had excavated a pool (1) and planted trees, especially sycamore-figs, on its banks (Urk. t. p. 121, 15–16; Kanawati, El Hawawish 6, p. 49, fig. 20c, pls. 3b, 8c; CG 20539, 45600; cf. Edel, Phnomologie, § 4). Considering that the tomb owner may simultaneously refer to the construction of a house (e.g., Urk. t. p. 121, 15–16), it is possible that the références to the biographies is a household garden, like Meketre’s with a pool in the center and sycamore trees on its margins (Winlock, Models of Daily Life, pp. 17–19, pls. 9–11, figs. 56–58). Merjen’s country garden (1), in addition to shade and fruit trees, incorporated an orchard and a vineyard (Urk. t. p. 4, 10–14).

\[\text{S} \] was also applied to “market gardens” or “plantations.” Such plantations were probably situated along the Nile levees or on high ground on the edge of the cultivated area which were out of reach of the annual inundation and therefore required artificial irrigation, or were alternately located on low lands which were protected from flooding (see Butzer, Early Hydraulic Civilization, p. 47; Kees, Ancient Egypt, pp. 70–71, 110). One such plantation is depicted in the tomb of the two brothers, Ni-ankh-Khnum and Khnumhotep at Saqqara (Nianchchnum, pp. 76–77, fig. 8, pl. 20). At the left-hand end of the bottom register on the north wall of the “Torraum,” two gardeners tend a plot of lettuces and onions. Over the head of the right-hand gardener, who waters the lettuces by means of two pottery jugs slung on a yoke, appears the legend na am htp lr (1) pr-pst in house, “watering the beds in the plantation of the estate of the gardener.” At the right side of the register a similar bed of garlic, lettuces, and onions is cultivated by other gardeners. To help retain the water so laboriously transported, the plantations were divided into square, earth-bordered plots; the outlines of the squares are omitted in Meroeia, pls. 20–21. In cases where a crop like papyrus required extensive irrigation, the plots could be kept filled with water (Edel, in NAWG 1986, p. 126, fig. 41). Between the vegetable beds in the “Tomb of the Two Brothers” is just such a plot of papyrus which is captioned: 1 n yw m n (1) pr-pst. “The plot of the birds and of the papyrus of the estate.” The thickets was a home to ducks and other wild fowl which, startled by the gardeners harvesting lotuses, take flight. Adjacent to the papyrus thicket and the vegetable gardens an orchard and vineyard are laid out.

A personification of a plantation attached to a funerary estate is to be found in the Sixth Dynasty tomb of the vizier Ankhepsuat (Badawy, Nyhetep-psz and Ankhepsout, fig. 37, pl. 49; Fischer, MDAIK 47 (1991), p. 150). The figure heads a file of attendants bringing offerings to the tomb owner, but has a separate caption: 1 n sda hm n (1) ‘f.’ “The bringing of gifts by a plantation of his estate.”
gifts include lettuce and onions (the vegetables shown cultivated in Ni-ankh-Khnum’s and Khnumhotep’s garden plots), a wickerwork frail of figs(?), the fig being a tree commonly grown in Egyptian orchards, and wild fowl like those rising from the two brother’s papyrus thicket.

Neuserre’s sod-festival rites seem to have included a water procession or processions (Bissing-KeKe, Re-Heiligtau 2, pl. 15 [38]; pls. 9 [39], 10 [398, 208–204]). This episode (or episodes) is lost or was not depicted in other surviving representations of the sod-festival, but in the portrayal of the jubilee rites of Amenhotep III in the tomb of Kheruef at Thebes, that king and Queen Tiye are shown in the night bark of the sun, which is towed by attendants across a stretch of water (Khnumoff, pp. 33–45, pls. 44–46). Since Amenhotep III’s first jubilee was celebrated in accordance with writings of old (Wente, in Wilson Studies, p. 86), the portrayal in Kheruef may be an indication that water processions also formed part of earlier jubilee celebrations. Thus, on the basis of the Neuserre scenes and the later evidence from the tomb of Kheruef, it would be possible to conclude that the construction for king Izezi by Senedjemib was a lake intended for a ritual journey or journeys by boat. That a “lake” or “basin” was intended by I in the present passage has, in fact, been the generally accepted interpretation (e.g., Breasted, Ancient Records 1, §§ 268, 273; Roccaii, Littérature, §§ 93).

In Inscription B, line 6, Izezi refers to the planning for a 97i that is very probably identical with the 97i a 97m n f n Izezi u ba-bu-“i” referred to here. The expression utilized is i n I. WB. 1, p. 108, 11, states that i n I can refer to the laying out of either a garden or a pool. Nevertheless, a closer examination of the textual evidence seems to indicate that a pool or the like (97i) is generally “excavated” or “dug” (ibid. Uk. 1, p. 121, 11; CG 20539, 45600 [v. Eddow, Pharaologie, § 45 B]; Birnboim 2, pl. 21, 13; Bos, Stele egiziane 3, cat. no. 15; Kanawati, El Hauwani 6, p. 49, fig. 102, pls. 18, 46), whereas a garden or plantation (97i) is “bad out” (97i) (Uk. 1, p. 92, Ex. 160; Wente, Third Dynasty, p. 33). We know in the case of Djoser that the Step Pyramid Complex provided the deceased king with the setting necessary for repeating in his after-life his jubilee ceremony (e.g., Edwards, Hypothes, p. 44). If the similarity in measurements is more than coincidental, it may be that Senedjemib erected a similar precinct, albeit one made from more perishable materials, for king Izezi’s sod-festival.

The hieroglyphs within the 98f-enclosure are damaged and, in the course of computing, may take under different lighting conditions (pls. 65, 66b, 67a), I have come to believe the outlines of the upper sign within the enclosure are less definite than is actually shown in the copy made by the Giza Mastabas Project (fig. 30). Although the lower signs does appear to represent the cup (W 16), the nature of the upper sign is uncertain. Sethe’s published transcription has “ирует”, but in his unpublished notes in Boston the upper sign resembles more the foreleg of an ox. Goelet (Royal Palace, p. 312 [c]) suggests that the word is “ирует”, the cup (WB. 1, p. 138, 13–17), or “ирует”, “cup” (WB. 2, p. 102, 321, may have been intended. He then draws a possible connection between “ирует”, a particle, and “ируют”, “house of the cup(?)”, mentioned in PT 334 A. 1. Goelet concludes, however, that the reading of the place-name is uncertain, pr-“卉, house of the bc” being an optional or even preferable reading (ibid., pp. 235–237). Moreover, a “卉-noc is not otherwise attested.

Several scholars have taken the upper sign within the enclosure to represent the hieroglyph of the collar of beads and have read or considered reading the group as “卉-noc, that is, “Harmh,” the alabaster quarter in Upper Egyptian nome 14 (Roccia, Littérature, p. 126) or as the “House of Gold,” the sculptor’s workshop where sacred statues were made (Dore, NYS, p. 92, Ex. 160; Wente, Letters,
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p. 40, n. 1): As ill preserved as are the outlines of the sign, however, they seem to preclude the collar of beads from consideration.

Even though damage to the upper sign makes it difficult to identify with certainty what was actually represented, the cup serves as a phonogram or a phonetic determinative for $N$, $\phi$, $\omega$, $\delta$, and $\beta$, and as such should provide some clue as to the word intended (Gardiner, EG, p. 328 [W 10]). It is tempting to read the group as $\omega-\beta$, “broad court, hall” (WB 1, pp. 366-67; cf. Wente, Letters, p. 19). Eichler, SAK II, (1991), p. 147, this architectural term being especially appealing in the present context because the building in the corner of the $\omega-\beta$-ideogram is commonly an $\phi$, a structure which is referred to by Izezi immediately thereafter (see note d). Nevertheless, the feminine ending is usually included in the writing of $\omega-\beta$, and regularly appears within the enclosure, thus:

An alternative possibility for the reading of the signs within the $\omega-\beta$-enclosure that deserves consideration is $\phi(\phi)$, “breath” (WB 4, p. 228, 14-48). As a matter of fact, $\omega$, the forearm ideogram or determinative in $\omega$ var. $\omega$ mb., “cubit” (Gardiner, EG, p. 455 [D 48]), also occurs as the determinative of $\omega$ $\delta$, “breath,” and $\omega$, “length” in at least one Old Kingdom inscription (WB 1, p. 120b, 4-1), and it is conceivable that in Incription B 2 the forearm with the palm of the hand downwards was placed above the cup for calligraphic reasons, $\omega$ being more pleasing visually than $\omega$. The resultant designation might then read $\omega-\beta(\phi)-\beta$, “broad court.” On the other hand, it is possible that the sign of the enclosure with the building in one of its lower corners, the usual writing for $\omega-\beta$, is not actually to be read in the present case, but serves rather as an ideogram, and that the entire group is to be read simply $\omega$, “broad court.” In like manner, $\omega-\beta$ is sometimes written $\omega$ $\delta$ or $\omega$ $\delta$ in the Middle Kingdom and later (Spencer, Egyptian Temple, pp. 75, 79).

Since $\omega-\beta$ is seemingly the standard designation for a “broad court” (ibid., pp. 71-80), it is unclear why it should be necessary to have two terms with apparently identical meaning. Nevertheless, the propri- etor of a 5th Dynasty tomb in the Central Field at Giza is $\omega$ $\delta$ $\beta$ $\phi$ (Hassan, Giza 7, fig. 72). A king’s son and chief lector priest, whose name is damaged, but which may reasonably be restored as $\phi\phi\phi\phi$ (š-mf-š), his tomb is assigned to the period between Neuserre and Unis by Harpur (Decorations, p. 270). The title is dam- aged and the second sign in the word $\phi\phi\phi\phi$ destroyed, but the restoration seems certain, since the cup appears within the bartellated enclosure determinative. The title is in fact listed in PM I, pp. 933, 938 [934] and translated as “overseer of the broad hall.” The earliest instance of a written phrase for $\phi\phi\phi\phi$ appears to be $\phi\phi\phi\phi$ in the Abusir papyri (Abb. Sir Papyri, pl. 12 A/B, 11; cf. Spencer, Egyptian Temple, pp. 71-72) of late Dynasty 5-6 date (Archaeoum 2, pp. 483-91). As may be seen from note f below, $\phi\phi\phi\phi$, “breath,” appears to be older than $\omega-\beta$, “broad court,” but it is possible that $\phi\phi\phi\phi$ is likewise the earlier of the two words for “broad hall, court.” I am unable to pro- vide any corroborative evidence for this conjecture. Still, if Simons (Expanded Verbal Base, pp. 20-26) is correct and $\omega-\beta$ is a verb with an initially weak $\delta$ derived from a biliteral simplex $\delta$, it is possible that a similar relationship existed between the two substantives $\phi\phi\phi\phi$ and $\omega-\beta$. The situation is further complicated by the existence of yet another term, $\phi\phi\phi\phi$, which WB 4, p. 239, defines as “breiter Raum, Hof,” and which has been further investigated by Hayes (JEA 52 [1966], p. 8), Goedicke (König: Dokumente, pp. 199, 247), and Fischer (MIO 7 [1960], pp. 304-10, idem, Or 30 [1966], pp. 170-75).

In this connection, it is also of interest to note the occurrence of a damaged title in the tomb of Prince Bahat at Giza, c. 7701-25, which incorporates the following hieroglyph: $\omega$. The location of the cup in the center of the open area of the enclosure, without an accompanying letter $\beta$, would seem to favor the reading $\phi\phi\phi\phi$, rather than $\phi\phi\phi\phi$ or $\omega-\beta$. At this stage, however, our digression has taken us rather far afield, especially as the identification of the upper sign within the enclosure is in doubt. The suggestion that the architectural term under discussion reads $\phi\phi\phi\phi$ would inspire more confidence if a trace of the upper arm of the forearm with the palm of the hand downwards was actually visible within the enclosure where it might be expected. On the other hand, it may simply have been worn away.

A less tenable option is that the damaged sign within the enclosure represents the clenched fist $\omega$ $\delta$ (D 49), which serves as a determinative of $\phi\phi\phi\phi$ in PT 6724 as well as later (WB 3, pp. 466, 14; 467-73). This would more readily fit within the confines of the eroded hole that represents the upper sign and might conceivably function here as a phonogram in combination with the cup.

In Bissing–Kees, Re–Heiligtum 2, pl. 1 [a], Neuserre is depicted inspecting the building of the “keeper” or “palace” constructed especially for the jubilee ceremonies ($\delta$ $\phi$ $\phi$–$\phi$) of “the lotus d of Izezi.” (ibid., p. 1). Here the king would rest and change costume and regalia between the various ritual performances (ibid., pl. 9, 13, 18, 39, 22, 2, pl. 1; cf. Goeler, Royal Palace, p. 400). The “$\delta$ $\phi$ $\phi$–$\phi$” also occurs in the Abusir papyri in connection with Horus and Seth (Abb. Sir Papyri, pl. 88 B; cf. Goeler, Royal Palace, p. 267). As Goeler (ibid., p. 385) observes, the “$\phi$ was one of the most important structures, if not the most important structure, to be associated with the $\omega$-festival. The $\phi$ would have been located within a broad-court, like the small square building near the northeastern gate of the Shunet el-Zebib (Abysos), pl. 6), which it probably resembled. An interesting feature shared by the square building at Abydos and the palace (also designated “$\phi$–$\phi$”) in the Neuserre reliefs (Bissing–Kees, Re–Heiligtum 2, pls. 9 [26], 12 [22]; pl. 1 [102]) is an indirect axis approach, which would screen the activities within from profane view. Indeed, like the Djoser complex, the Shunet el-Zebib and the other Dynasty 1 and 2 enclosures at Abydos (see O’Connor, JARCE 26 [1989], pp. 31-85) may well have been the locale for the earthly and otherworldly jubilee ceremonies of their builders.

Albeit damaged, the constituent signs of $\delta$–$\phi$ are still legible. Sethe thought he could see the upper part of the double kiosk serving as the determinative of the word, and traces thereof are visible in pl. 66b, even though the sign is largely destroyed today. A number of commentators have been misled by Sethe’s copy of the signs follow- ing Izezi’s cartouche ($\phi\phi\phi\phi$) and have seen therein the name of a palace or pavilion called “Nebhet” or “le lotus d’Izezi” (Breasted, Ancient Records 1, p. 275; Archaeoum 2, 620; Roccati, Littorina, p. 126), although Wente (Letters, p. 85) has actually read “the jubilee palace of ‘Lotus-of-Azezi.’” For $\delta$ $\phi$, “lotus flower, bud,” see WB 2, p. 924, 2-3.
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Reisner construed the $r$ with $u$ rather than $ib$u, reading $r$ [see] $u$ instead of $ib$u, $u$ [ib]u ("Translation of Doerway Inscriptions of Senedjemib," p. 4), whereas it actually follows $u$ in one of the three texts just cited (b), presumably with the meaning "by" (see Gardiner, EG, p. 199). In texts (a) and (c), the dimensions follow immediately upon the object measured and stand in a genitival relationship to it, whether direct (a) or indirect (c), while $sw$ and $ib$u (and probably originally $w$ as well in (b)) are relegated to prepositional clauses following the dimension. In (b) the first dimension follows in an indirect genitival relationship, but the other two dimensions are preceded by the prep- osition $r$. The numbers in the present inscription are arranged in an especially compact fashion, more like the arrangement in (a) than that in (b) or (c). Examples (a) and (b) make it clear that the word for "breadth" is $ib$u, not $sw$ (cf. Wh. 4, p. 228, 14-48). If Reisner was correct about the presence of a large letter $r$ at the head of line 5, it presumably applied to both measurements, and was thus to be read twice; cf. Wente, Letters, p. 59.

The dimensions themselves are not absolutely certain. Sehe and Reisner both evidently understood the length and breadth to be respectively 1,000 cubits and 440 cubits, and this seems to be the most straightforward rendering, even though it might be possible to divide the numerals in some other fashion (see Stadelmann, Bulletin du Grégoire, 1915, p. 198). Sethe thought that space existed beneath the surviving figure 440 for other numerals (Urk., p. 65, 2). It is doubtful, however, whether any additional numerals could have fitted into the very restricted space available.

At the head of the column, Reisner felt certain that he could make out the letter $r$; see Urk., p. 65, n. 2. As Sehe notes, however, the mouth-sign was not visible in the photographs. After the mouth, Reisner restored $w$ as "length," and $sw$, "breadth." The mouth-sign is indeed no longer discernable, and what follows is in a lacuna, except for traces of the spinal cord issuing from both ends of the sub-backbone and a stroke below. The system of recording measurements is subject to some variation in the Old Kingdom, as the following examples (from the tombs of Meqtm, Debehen, and Uni the Elder):

(a) Metjem: $\frac{\text{length}}{\text{breadth}}$

(b) Debehen: $\frac{\text{length}}{\text{breadth}}$

(c) Uni the Elder: $\frac{\text{length}}{\text{breadth}}$

In (b) the well in (b) are relegated to prepositional clauses following the

For the translation of $\text{breadth}$. See Silverman, "Interrogative Constructions," p. 98, Ex. 15; Doret, NYS, p. 103, Ex. 184.

There is a substantial space after the eye of the second occurrence of the verb $\text{breadth}$. In his notes in Boston, Sethe evidently thought he could make out the bottom of a milk-jug (mt) on the left of the gap and traces of a tall, narrow sign on the right. Following this he thought he saw definite traces of the letter $w$. He suggested "gathen als Belohnung (oder gemaf) dessen, was du kannst" as a possible translation. I see nothing which might represent the letter $w$ in the area in question in pl. 66b, but I do believe I can see clear traces of a $\text{breadth}$ at the left of the damaged area below the eye.

My own original translation, "I am doing great things on your behalf in order that [what you] 'desire' [might] best [be] accomplished," followed that of Roccati and Wente, but restored $mr$ ($\text{breadth}$), a presumed $\text{mouth}$. A relative form in the lacuna after $mr$ ($\text{breadth}$) in the second clause. Pepy II in fact says something very similar to "Hathkaf in Urk., p. 12, 1-2.

The translation actually utilized here was suggested by James Allen, who takes $mr$ as a subjectless passive $\text{mouth}$. After (Edel, Altg. Gramm. 2, p. 952). For the sense of $mr$, Allen cites ibid. 1, p. 67. He also notes that $\text{mouth}$ fits the available space better than $\text{breadth}$.

In either case, the $mr$ tentatively restored by Reisner in the lacuna is excluded from consideration.

Both Reisner and Sethe (Urk., p. 63, 8) saw an arm holding a scepter or other object. Albeit damaged, it is likely that the object held was actually an "$\text{mouth}"-scepter (see pls. 65, 66a). If so, the ideogram may represent the verb $bsp$, "govern, control, administer, direct; act as controller." (Wh. 3, p. 328, 1-20; FCD, p. 196.) The form of the $bsp$-determinative exhibits considerable variety in the Old Kingdom, sometimes resembling the $\text{mouth}$-arm (PT 1143a$^g$; 1159c$^g$, 1224a$^g$; CG 678, 1374c$^g$, CG 1411) or the $\text{mouth}$-arm with the upper arm bent at an acute angle (PT 1204c$^g$, 2049$^g$), as is the case in the present instance, or sometimes the standard Middle Egyptian form of the sign (PT 1143a$^g$, 1159c$^g$, 1224a$^g$). In Urk. 1, p. 255, 15; 21, 15 = Dunham, JEA 14 (1928), p. 2). For the verbal construction involved, see Edel, Altg. Gramm. 2, p. 902. Since the meaning "act as director" is not definitely attested before Dyn. XI (FCD, p. 196), it might be better to translate $mr$ $\text{mouth}$ here as "you have directed."

Inti is entitled $\text{mouth}$. A similar ideogram of the same form is already in the address to the letter. James Allen sees nothing unusual about this and emphasizes the deontic future value of $\text{mouth}$. (See Vermès, Future at Issue, pp. 5-18), which seems to preclude translating $\text{mouth}$. The inference to be drawn from all this is that Inti had been appointed chief justice and vizier before being made "overseer of all works of the king."

This is the only place in his surviving inscriptions that Inti is definitely referred to as Senedjemib the Elder. Nevertheless, sufficient space exists after the name Senedjemib for the sign of the aged man leaning on a staff in line 1 of the present text, and the ephebet
as, "the Elder," has been accordingly restored. For the phonetic value of the bent man (Sign List A 19) in the Old Kingdom, see Fischer, Varia, pp. 87–88.

1 Serhe has i Sfnw-wb mrw nsw-m (i) tu b(-m-r). In fact, clear traces reveal the presence of the particle b(w) instead of b(-m-r).

88 The season, month, and day remain clear, but the year date is entirely destroyed. It was seriously damaged already in 1930–31, when photographed by the Harvard–Boston Expedition (pls. 61, 66b). Reisner thought grounds existed for reading ngr-st wp (cf. Serhe in his unpublished notes in Boston originally favored the reading ngr?) but, in the second edition of Urk. 1, he read [z]f, albeit admitting with Reisner that [j]f was also possible. Serhe’s uncertainty reflects the damaged state of the wall.

Five of the six strokes of the year date are probably to be made out in pl. 66b. Centered over the three topmost strokes is a faint outline which could conceivably represent the hobble-sign for ten in pl. 66b. Centered over the three topmost strokes is a faintly damaged state of the wall.

In this connection, it is also worth recalling that Pepy I appears to have celebrated his jubilee as early as year 19 (see Spalinger, SAK 1 (1994), p. 303, n. 72. So, it is not out of the question that Izezi held his around year 16.

Inscription C

Publication: L.D. 2, p. 766; Urk. 1, pp. 63, 64–65, 9

Present publication: figs. 18 (12), 23 (8), 20 (GMP); text figure 3b; pls. 67b–74b

Translations: Breasted, Ancient Records 1, § 274; Roccati, Littetura, § 96

Translations of Individual Passages: Pirenne, Histoire 2, p. 328, n. 1; HESP p. 316; Wilson, JNÉ 6 (1947), p. 239; Junker, Gilat 3, p. 161; Edel, Ältest. Gramm. 1, § 48, 164; 2, §§ 897, 917, 947, 946; Brouvorski, Or 1977, p. 120; Doret, A.N., n. 168; p. 64, Ex. 100; n. 1777; p. 106, Ex. 194

Commentary: Pirenne, Histoire 2, p. 328; Drenkhahn, Handarb. 1, p. 70; Schott, in: Fragen an die ägyptologische Literatur, p. 460.

Even though Serhe does not provide a schematic diagram of Inscription C, as he does in the case of Inscription D (Urk. 1, p. 66), his copy of the text in Urk. 1, pp. 63–65, and the accompanying notes indicate that he understood the inscription to be laid out in the fashion shown in text figure 3a. My own understanding of the manner in which the text was arranged is represented by text figure 3b. There appear to have originally been seven vertical lines at the top of the preserved section of the wall (§7 to §11), but the upper part of these lines are now lost and the remaining part considerably mutilated. Horizontal line (14a) was a through-going line occupying the entire width of Inscription C beneath lines (7) to (13), and was not divided into two lines (7/13) as Serhe thought. Lines (15) and (16) are vertical and descend the height of the wall between horizontal line (14a) and the two horizontal lines (14b) and (15a) at the bottom of the wall. Serhe’s horizontal lines (13) and (14) never actually existed, that scholar having misconstrued the tops of columns (13) to (14) as independent horizontal lines of text. In fact, traces of the line dividers between columns (13) to (14) are faintly visible in the expedition photographs and scholars survive today. Reisner was evidently of like opinion, although in his unpublished (and incomplete) translation of the text, he left open the possibility that line (12) ran across the whole width of the inscription including lines (13) and (16). Still, in the photographs the vertical dividing line at the left of line (16) clearly proceeds up beyond the bottom of line (12). It is curious that neither of the through-going lines (14a) or (15a) are demarcated at the bottom by a curved line, but the same is true of horizontal lines (18) and (23) at the bottom of the wall.

An inscribed block with six horizontal lines of text from the court of the Senedjemib Complex, known only from a photograph, in all likelihood belongs at the top of Inscription C (pl. 67b). There is no direct join, but neither does there appear to be a suitable alternative location for it at the top of any of the other walls of the facade or portico. In addition, the right edge appears to be finished, as would be appropriate for a block in this position. The block evidently preserves at its beginning the titulary of Senedjemib Mehi, the title (by-)m-”mr in particular being associated with him, and the name Senedjemib actually surviving. The titulary of a vizier, presumably his father Inti, then follows. Mehi’s name and titles at the head of the inscription form an appropriate introduction to Inscription C, since what follows recounts his benefactions on his father’s behalf. If the inscribed block is correctly placed, and the assumption made that both inscriptions were of equal height, the six lines of text at its top would balance the six horizontal lines of (partially restored) titulary at the top of Inscription A on the facade to the other side of the portico. Such a nearly identical arrangement would undoubtedly have appealed to the ancient Egyptian’s “instinctive preference for balanced symmetrical composition” (Schäfer, Principles, p. 246). It would also leave ample room for the now lost beginning of the narrative portion of Inscription C which was contained in vertical lines (7–13). It may also be noted that the six horizontal lines of text likewise lack dividing lines.

Transcription

(1) (by-)m-”mr wn b-s (2) (by-)m-”mr wn m-h nswt-”mr nb (3) i hzt nb wnw (4) s nswt nb (5) s nswt nb (6) s m-nw”mr nb (7) s nswt nb (8) s m-nw”mr nb (9) s nswt nb (10) s nswt nb (11) s m-nw”mr nb (12) s nswt nb (13) s m-nw”mr nb (14) s nswt nb (15) s m-nw”mr nb (16) s nswt nb (17) s m-nw”mr nb (18) s nswt nb (19) s m-nw”mr nb (20) s nswt nb (21) s m-nw”mr nb (22) s nswt nb (23) s m-nw”mr nb (24) s nswt nb (25) s m-nw”mr nb


89 See above, p. 14; below, p. 159 (14).
After 4’d day in the middle of line (5), the context seems to require some such phrase as has been restored in the lacunae at the end of this line and the beginning of the next. As Fischer has noted in ZAŠ 105 [1978], pp. 50–51, Old Kingdom dedications follow two basic patterns: 1) in NN is n.f (nn…); “It is NN who acted for him (or ‘made this’)…” and 2) it.n.i (nn…), NN “… I acted (or ‘made this’) for NN…” Although in would fit the gap at the beginning of line (5) just as well as isy-y, the first formula seems precluded by the occurrence of dfr, whereas examples of the second formula regularly introduce the statement with the name of the donor and dfr or dfr.s.

2 Wat is otherwise unattested before the Middle Kingdom (Wk 4, pp. 63, 22–63, 5; FCD, p. 216). Nevertheless, the verb-stem ws is well known in Old Egyptian (Wk 1, p. 262, 7, 9; Rank, PN 1, p. 74, 10–15). If Lepsius’ copy is to be relied upon the proposition m preceded swat far the bottom of the first preserved column. Otherwise, some phrase such as tw nk sm fh wsat f is possibly to be restored; cf. Unk t, p. 43, 6.

3 In his unpublished notes in Boston, Sethe thought he could make out the vertical text (shown at right) in the penultimate line in the upper section. His published copy, however, has as copy is to be relied upon the preposition m which corresponds more closely to the traces actually preserved today or visible in the photographs. The identity of the sign which Sethe took to be a is very much in doubt, however.

4 As noted above, Sethe apparently did not recognize that horizontal line (4a) extended over vertical lines (5) to (21) and instead thought it.n.f at the beginning of the through-going line to be followed directly by wsat fr the head of the first tall column (5a). For the restoration proposed here, cf. Unk 1, p. 232, 14.

5 Reisen and Sethe both thought they could see the top loop of the twisted wick-hieroglyph immediately after the courtier determinative of or, and consequently restored bṣr. Traces visible in pl. 69 suggest that what they actually saw was the head of the second of three courtier figures that served as a designation of the plural. If this is indeed the case, then sufficient space existed after the courtiers for bṣr, even though no traces of the conjunction are visible in the lacuna, and both scholars believed they saw other traces there which would argue against such a restoration. It can be said in favor of the restoration proposed here that wsat bṣr fits the available space closely.

6 Three of the six strokes and the terminal – t of it, “six,” seem relatively certain. In contrast to the numbers 1 and 2, the numbers 3–9 stand before the plural of the substantive enumerated (Edel, Ältesten, 1, § 395). The – ending of it here should indicate that the lost word which followed was a feminine noun or possibly a feminine
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collective. That word, however, is determined by three seated men, while the relative clause that immediately succeeds is introduced by niw, the masculine plural relative adjective (ibid., § 1053). One would expect a plural feminine noun to be followed by ntw, while the relative clause that immediately succeeds is introduced by fi. Thus, perhaps the simplest solution here is to restore a feminine collective. Of the alternatives that come most readily to mind, pr-∂t provides another example of a feminine collective which is modified by both a feminine and a masculine adjective ( foll. . . . [ mulheres não può pr.d9]).

Thus, the lack of concordance between the number which precedes and the relative adjective that follows is disconcerting. On the other hand, Edel does provide another example of a feminine collective which is modified by both a feminine and a masculine adjective ([ . . . ] [ mulher não pode pr.d9]).

As appealing as the suggestion is, Wb., 5, p. 589, 7, says that the omission of the r before n.f is common only from Dynasty 18, and especially in Late Egyptian and thereafter, whereas earlier occurrences of this feature are sporadic. In fact, the only earlier occurrence cited is CG 20577, a stele which apparently belongs to the end of Dynasty 13 (Franke, Personennamen, no. 43). Allen adds a number of Coffin Texts citations in which dr alternates with r-∂t, certain of which date to the early Middle Kingdom; CT 5, p. 359b, 4, pp. 122e, 142f, 7, p. 369d. Nevertheless, Old Kingdom examples of the omission are seemingly lacking. Moreover, this would be the only instance in Inscriptions A-D where a word at the bottom of one column would be continued at the top of the next column (see above, p. 41, n. 74). In addition, the title in the tomb of Hezi, which is written horizontally, likewise terminates with pr, not (r)-∂t.

There are a number of serious spacing problems involving the upper part of line (16). To begin with, the r-mouth [see note h] and the eye of r(∂t)/n.f at the beginning of the line exhibit a leftward shift. In the space to the right of the eye, Sethe thought he saw a [ ] and Reisner a tall sign with a trisected top. While such a sign would indeed account for the shift of the eye, it is clear from pls. 69–70 that what the two scholars actually saw was a crack in the stone. James Allen asks why, if the crack is ancient, the scribe did not fill it with plaster and carve the signs as normal. I can provide no real answer to this, other than to say that he manifestly did not.

Reisner also thought he saw traces of fr n.f below the eye, but the putative signs actually fall in a hole in the stone. Even so, the available space between the eye and the next preserved sign seems overly large for the terminal of the infinitive alone. For that reason, n.f, which appears to fit the context, has been restored.

The crux of this passage hinges on the identification and interpretation of the sign that precedes niwet and here again below. The first occurrence is damaged but the second example (d, below) is intact. The sign resembles closely in form Sign List V 37.

Gardner was of the opinion that Sign List V 37 represented a "bandage(?)" (EG, p. 527). Griffith thought it rather to be a bowl tied over and sealed at the top and perhaps somehow connected with the preservation of meat in jars (Griffith, Inscriptions, p. 41, pl. 9, fig. 181; ibid., p. 46 [iv.13 note, add.]). More recently, Staatelin (Tisch, pp. 58–59) identifies the sign with the shield-shaped element that dangles from the loose ends of the knot at the shoulder of panther skin vestments; cf. Fischer, Virus Noxe, pp. 216–19. As a matter of fact, the form of the id-sign exhibits considerable variation over

---
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the passage of time (a–f). Edel saw a resemblance between the lower
(a)  b  c  d  e  
(b)  f  g  h  i  
(c)  j  k  l  m  
(d)  n  o  p  q  
(e)  r  s  t  u  
part of variant (f) and Sign List V 33. Since the latter sign
appears to be the same but provided with a carrying strap. The projection in
front of the lower part of (f), which appears as a pair of projections in
the more detailed example of the same sign (e), may be compared to
the projection at the back of our intact example (d), as well as to
those at the front of what Edel takes to be the oldest form of the sign
(a), even though the latter seems in part to have been assimilated to
detailed examples of the heart-sign (Fischer, Verzse Novus, p. 137). If
Edel is correct in his identification of variant (f) as a bundle of linen
with a carrying strap, example (d) and variants (b–c) might well rep-
resent bundles of linen without the carrying strap but with indica-
tions instead of the knot or the loose end(s) of the knotted cloth,
especially since the characteristic features of the late Old Kingdom
and early Middle Kingdom variants (g–i) are the vertical line(s) and/or
the tassles (a) at the top which could indicate the knotted string. On
the other hand, Graffin’s Dyn. 12 example (m), which derives from
the tomb of Djehutyhotep at El Bersheh, is painted red with a beige
tie and could indeed represent a red pottery bowl tied over with a
strip of linen and sealed. A second example from the tomb of
Djehutyhotep and later variants of the sign omit the vertical line(s)
(n–o). The New Kingdom sign (i) is painted blue with a red projec-
tion, whereas one would expect it to be white if a linen bundle was
intended. As indicated also by variant (m), however, the sign may
well have been reinterpreted with the passage of time. Interestingly,
our sign (d) most closely resembles the standard New Kingdom sign
(q), but then a Dyn. 13 variant (o) likewise resembles the later New
Kingdom version of the sign. Sign List V 37 serves, according to Gardiner, as the determina-
tive in idb, “bandage,” or “bind,” and as a phonogram or phonetic
determinative for (ibid., p. 239–30) argued that idb in the medical texts meant “stitch,
suture,” rather than “bandage, bind” (WR t. p. 154, 18), but Gardiner
retained the former meaning in AEO 2, p. 260*. The corresponding
substantive, whether translated “stitch, suture” (Breasted, Edu Smith
Pap., p. 519) or “bandage” (WR t. p. 154, 17; AEO 2, p. 260*) also
appears in the medical papyri. All these words proceed from a root
idb, “to tie, bind together,” and Gardiner was of the opinion that the sign
idb was first used as a determinative for idb, “bandage,” being
only subsequently transferred, apparently for purely phonetic rea-
sons, to idb, “bandage” (AEO 2, p. 260*; Ward, Four Homographic Roots,
p. 167–68). Be that as it may, the label idb over a belt-knot depicted
in the object frieze on the side of a Middle Kingdom coffin in Cairo
serves to confirm the basic meaning of the verb, since a belt-knot is
that which “ties” or “fastens” a belt around the waist.15 That meaning
also finds confirmation in the fact that the sign in question is also
used on occasion to determine the word “of “combine, ensemble.”
(Urk. 4, p. 1229, 9, Ward, Four Homographic Roots, p. 168.)
In addition to the above, a sign (g–f) that is generally read id(w) appears in two edicts of Pepy II for the Min temple at Coptos
(Grécie, Königliche Monumente, figs. 8, 9), where it usually occurs in
the plural. Weill translated the word as “dépendance” (Dictionnaire
égyptien, p. 24) and Gardiner as “domains” (PSBA 34 (1921), p. 261*),
whereas Goedicke (ibid., pp. 26, 97) sees in id(w) a precise legal
form of possession which can be translated in English by “holding” or
“property.” Ward likewise derives this word, which appears with
out accompanying phonograms and usually in the plural, from idb, “tie, bind together,” since a land-holding is “bound up” as a unit
of property by legal ownership (Ward, Four Homographic Roots, p. 168).
Unfortunately, none of these meanings appears to precisely fit the
present context.

Rocca (Littérature, p. 126, n. d) reads the sign in the Senedjem-
i inscription as “paiment.” His translation, however, is apparently
based on a supposed resemblance between V 37 and a hieratic sign
studied by Berlev which determines the word id(w), “unit of value,
money.” (Heiliges, Schriftwesen 7, 1966, op. cit., p. 15) Berlev is of the
opinion that the correct transcription of that sign is not idb, but idb.
The latter sign according to him does not represent “bandages,” but
rather is the result of a misinterpretation of the sign for vulva idb (ibid., p. 27). Jansen (Commodity Prices, p. 102, n. 8) remarks that
Berlev cannot explain why idb, usually idb, should have the phonetic
value !. Nonetheless, signs quite like (i), (a) and (o), do determine a
homophonic word (ibid., n. 6), and (t) is known from the Mid-
Kingdom title to mean “(a)of store.” (ANOC 1543, Ward, Four Homographic Roots, p. 167; idem, Index of Titles, nos. 381, 382, 418; Fischer, Egyptian Titles, pts. 2–3, fasc. 1, no. 381; Patch, Reflections of
Greatness, cat. no. 18). More to the point perhaps is that idb in the Old Kingdom is not determined by idb, but rather by the sign for metal (idb, (Hölscher, Grabdenkmal des Chephren, p. 111, fig. 164 =
Urk. 1, p. 157, 16–18) or the cup (idb, Hölscher, Rechtszeichen, pl. 17 b), a circumstance which probably renders the reading id(w)
unlikely in the present context.

15 The same word may appear in PT Utterance 57M in the pyramid of Queen Neit;
see FPT t. p. 13 and n. 12, p. 2; Sudanich, Textb., p. 59.
Alternatively, our word might derive from the homophonous verb id(y), "to withhold from, to keep away" (WB 1, p. 3.14; 1 FCD, p. 36; Edel, in: Phön. Studies, pp. 86–87). Edel (ibid.; see also van den Boom, Duties of the Vizier, pp. 116–17) thinks the latter verb a rare allograph of the 2-rad. verb dr(y), "to expel, repulse," etc. (WB 5, pp. 473–74). Id(y) in this sense does not appear before the New Kingdom, but a nomen actionis from this verb, id(y) "punishment, repression, suppression," or the like occurs as early as in the Pyramid Texts (WB 1, p. 115; 1 FCD, p. 36; Edel, in: Phön. Studies, pp. 86–87; van den Boom, Duties of the Vizier, pp. 116–17).

In the final analysis, it is perhaps best to turn to the content of the passage in Inscription C itself. The sense of the passage seems to be that the id(y) of the time-service (wmr) was apportioned from the "god's offerings," that is, the "income" that Memphis ("the Wall") derived from the yield of the harvest throughout the land. In other words, id(y) perhaps represents an allotment, a distribution, a portion, a share, or the like, of that income. Whether id(y) can itself be suitably translated "income, revenue," (cf. Roeder's "paiment") needs further investigation.

For wmr, "time-service, duty," see WB 1, p. 37, 3–5; 1 FCD, p. 61; and especially Glauss, in: Tei Com. 2, p. 110. In the context of the Coptos decrees, where wmr is contrasted with mdw, Goedicke translates wmr as "Pflichtarbeit," that is, "compulsory labor," and mdw as "Steuer," that is, "tax, duty." (Königl. Dokumente, pp. 87, 98 [18]). Perhaps Goedicke's translation of mdw as "(special) corvée" vis-à-vis wmr ("regular labour") comes closer to the mark in regard to the latter term (PSBA 34 [1912], p. 261). Wmr is used of the service performed by magistrates (Meir 4, p. 24, pl. 4) and craftsmen (Hassen, Giza IV, p. 168, fig. 118; Doreau, AVERS, p. 48, Ex. 60; Jansen, TAD, Wörterbuch, p. 370, and al.); the service rendered by lector priests (Edel, Phrasenologie, § 24) and funerary priests (Goedicke, Redaktionsprinzipien, pp. 75, pl. 8, 89, pl. 9).

Roeder has "que lui avait confié son père." Allen, on the other hand, would restore the entire passage as follows: "Ê$ Ê$ (ï). Ê$ " which is one that my father claimed in its entirety." He remarks that it is impossible to read ñ(ñ) mdw n.f, "which his father confided to him," citing Edel, Altag. Gramm. 2, § 2577 bb, as his authority. In addition, the n has to be a preposition ("of, of) of predication,") not a complement of mdw, the literal meaning of the clause being "for which my father spoke." (ibid., he notes, is well attested in the sense of "claim" (WB 1, p. 179. Allen, IVPT, p. 582). Mdw, a relative s.n.m.n and dr(y) are all masculine because they refer to id(y).

Allen thinks the restoration of the scattered man in (it) would account for the shift of the broad loaf, but he feels that the grouping is really tight, and wonders what is wrong with Reisner's stroke, which would also explain the shift. The surface in this area was badly abraded; there are some faint marks and scratches that Reisner could conceivably have interpreted as a stroke, but there is no real evidence that a stroke ever actually existed. Moreover, although ñ(ñ) mdw is well attested as a writing for "father" in Old Egyptian (e.g., Urk 1, pp. 9, 14, 15, 46, 47, cf. WB 1, p. 141; Edel, Altag. Gramm. 1, § 733), I am unable to provide a contemporary parallel for ñ(ñ). Indeed, while the stroke was sometimes used in the Pyramid Texts to replace human figures that were regarded as magically dangerous (see e.g., Gardiner, EG, p. 155 [Z 3]), in above ground inscriptions there is no evidence of it for ñ(ñ) before the Middle Kingdom (ibid., § 34).

The spacing of the dr-bundle also creates a problem, since the shift to the right demands a sign at the left, and Allen would restore another stroke to the left here. Although a stroke after dr would explain the rightwards shift, it nonetheless seems contrary to the usage of Old Egyptian (Edel, Altag. Gramm. 1, §§ 66–68), the employment of the stroke as a space filler being rather a feature of texts of the First Intermediate Period and thereafter (Couyat-Montet, Hamamat, pp. 13–44; Schenkel, Frasi, § 14–14). Again, however, I am unable to account for the shift, unless it resulted from the presence of a nummular which has now fallen out. There is, in fact, a deep hole to the left of the dr-sign which could conceivably have contained such a fossel.

Reisner thought he saw both the r-month and the rpm-bundlem near the bundle, but no such traces are visible in this badly damaged area in the photographs. According to his notes in Boston, Serhe did not see the two signs, even though he included them in his published copy along with a note citing Reisner and questioning whether they actually existed. In fact, rpm, "originally, long ago," is apparently not attested before the Middle Kingdom (WB 5, p. 154, 6fF.). Even without the stroke, Allen's restoration of (ñ) dr(y) would have been appropriate here, if not for the reasons already given in note (i). However, the preposition dr-bk in its adverbial usage with the meaning "former, previously" (Edel, Altag. Gramm. 2, § 721, 781), provides a satisfactory alternative from the point of view of meaning, and likewise fills the available space.

Allen construes it here as a passive sdm f.im a temporal clause; see Edel, Altag. Gramm. 1, § 494.

Reisner thought he could make out the word dr(y), "sculptor," at the bottom of the line. Serhe read the same traces as kr t. The mutilated state of this area of the wall renders hazardous any attempt at a reading.

The name of Izezi's pyramid is off center. It is possible that the column was split here and that other signs originally stood in the space to the right.

The 2-signs seen by Serhe and Reisner at the top of the column is visible in the photographs and just possibly directly beneath it the letter r. After a gap and the name of Izezi's pyramid, Serhe has ñ(ñ) ñ(ñ) dwn, which Roeder translates: "Le grand du temple qui est à la place de l'autre." On the basis of the photographs, it is not certain the 3-column ever existed. Furthermore, the use of ḫ with the meaning "chief of" is not attested for the Old Kingdom (WB 1, p. 165, t–2). ḫ(y) could well represent a verbal form as a personal name, an alternative we have opted for here with the possible and likewise damaged parallel of CG 1453 (= Urk 1, p. 86, 13) in mind. In his unpublished notes Serhe thought he saw ñ(ñ) ñ(ñ) under but-ḥi and over ḫ(y). Reisner appears to have followed him in this. Although there are traces of signs visible, they do not necessarily resolve themselves into the
group seen by Sethe. The latter evidently had second thoughts, for the signs do not appear in his published copy. In fact, I believe I can make out a loaf \( b \) below the front edge of the btw-sign in a 1951 photograph (pl. 64) as well as traces which could represent the house-determinative of btw-š. If so, a reasonable option would be to restore the demonstrative pronoun \( t \) in the space thereafter. Considering the \( y \)-ending, \( t y \) might well represent the possessive relative form discussed by Gunn, Studien, p. 1ff., both in the present case and CG 1433. Moreover, traces of a feminine \( t y \) are very likely visible after the \( y \)-in pl. \( 69. \) Of course, the bottom of the column is very broken and btw-š [\( {11} y t y ] \) may not be the only possible restoration.

At any rate, given the context, btw-š here in all probability refers to Inti's tomb (Blackman, JEA 1 [1916], pp. 210–14; WB 1, p. 5, 14–15; Foiro-Marocchetti, GIM 144 [1957], p. 49). It might also be possible to read btw-š as "agricultural estate" (WB 3, p. 16–17), and Inti in fact possessed several such estates. The availability of space after btw-š, however, seems to exclude a plural writing of the term (e.g., Busing, Gurn-un-kt 1, p. 17 (g3); Davies, Pubblican, pl. 205; CG 1492; Dunham, JEA 24 [1958], pl. 2; Goedicke, Königliche Dokumente, fig. 28). It is even less likely that a royal ka-chapel is referred to (see above, p. 31 and n. 164).

\footnote{Roccati's transcription of his lines 19–21 is shown at right. Roccati translates the relevant portion of the text: "(Le grand du temple du dieü ... Ici, j'ai trouvé auprès de lui avec un vêtement, qu'on m'apparait à son sujet ... parce que le chargé de ce village, nommémont tel et tel[3]."

Roccati's rendering has the advantage of yielding a coherent translation. As previously mentioned, however, Sethe was mistaken in treating the bottom of columns (17) through (21) as an independent line of text.

Roccati has evidently taken the damaged bird in column (22) to represent the black ibis, that is, the gbšr-bird, rather than the crested ibis and emended Sethe's \( s²r \) to \( s\>[s²r] \) (G 28). The more upright posture of the bird favors the crested ibis \( s\>[s²r] \) (G 25) although, given the state of the wall at this point, this is not absolutely certain. Reisner actually thought he saw the tu-idogram, but Sethe with Lepsius's copy and the Harvard–Boston Expedition photographs before him corrected Reisner in this regard. Clear traces of a bird exist at present followed by a lacuna. The possibility that part of a viper is to be made out at the bottom of the lacuna has prompted the restoration of \( \bar{w}n.f. \) If the trace is spurious, one alternative would be to restore \( \bar{d}d \) after \( \bar{s} \) on the pattern of \( \bar{d}d\bar{k} \), p. 47, 6, and to read: "My speaking was beneficial to him ... \( t \)."

Reisner's copy shows the sign of the loop of rope \( \bar{s} \) after \( \bar{s} \). Sethe likewise has the looped rope. A close examination of the damage in this area makes it unlikely that any determinative at all survived. Moreover, in the Old Kingdom \( s\>[s²r] \) is determined with the bar \( s\>[s²r] \), or its equivalent \( s\>[\bar{s}²r] \) (Gardiner, BIFAO 30 [1931], pp. 77–78). If \( \bar{s} \) was indeed determined by \( s\>[\bar{s}²r] \), there would probably have been room beneath this sign for a n-basket.
which has a suggestive shape, as a viper. Tiers above the letter \( \text{t} \) are likewise suggestive of the mouth or the human eye, and it is on this basis that \( \text{d}_{\text{in}} \) (\( \text{t} \) for \( \text{d} \)) has been restored.

* For \( \text{qf}t \) at 15, see Breasted, Ancient Records 1, § 274; Schott, WZKM 15 (1937), p. 178; FCD, p. 96; Breasted, Listebtu, § 56. The present example is apparently the only known occurrence of the term. According to Schott, \( \text{qf}t \) is determined by a cylinder seal (found in front) without the usual bead-necklace. The commentators appear to be unanimous in reading 15, even though the word is written with the fore-arm and hand holding a rounded leaf (\( \text{d}_{\text{in}} \)), which usually represents phonetic mi (Gardiner, EG, p. 454 [D 98]; Seehe, Verbo1, 2, § 138).

An 16 was a formal written document authorizing someone to do something, that is, a ‘warrant’; or conversely a ‘writ’, prohibiting the performance of some action (see e.g., Kanawati, El Hauwuwi-6, p. 49, fig. 23c, pl. 1b, 81; Gunn, JEA 14, 1928, p. 31 [1]; Wilson, JNES 13 (1954), p. 254; Goedicke, JNES 15 (1956), pp. 29–30; Berz, ZAS 93 (1966), pp. 6–7; Goedicke, Königl. Dokumente, p. 28 (12); Theodorides, AIDM 3 (1973), p. 78, n. 85; Aschheim1, p. 479; Strudwick, Administration, p. 210).

Restoring a second man determinative after the woman sign on the pattern of \( \text{d}_{\text{in}} \) and \( \text{d}_{\text{in}} \) (JNES 1, pp. 2, 10, 3). Admittedly, when a noun denoting human being is a class-name including both sexes, the usual practice during the later Old Kingdom is to use the group \( \text{d}_{\text{in}} \) (Faulkner, Planid and Dual, pp. 31–36). In such cases, the determinative is regularly followed by the adjective \( \text{n} \) (JNES 1, pp. 129, 110, 91, 204, 19, 224, 12; 28; 2). In fact, \( \text{d}_{\text{in}} \) originally stood in the stem after the surviving determinatives.

\( \text{Zf} \) in \( \text{al-qd} \), lit. ‘drawn in a preliminary sketch’, occurs on the left jamb of the entrance to \( \text{Z} \) in 2370 (above, p. 43 and n. 94). The proposed restoration fits the space requirements better than a possible alternative in JNES 1, p. 44, 6. see in by gb 18 (\( \text{rst} \)) 18 in as for 18. On the latter passage, see Edel, Ältest. Gramm. 1, § 708.

* Wilson’s remark (JNES 6 [1947], p. 239, n. 26) that the verb \( \text{br} \) means basically ‘to make distant’, and thus could hardly mean ‘carved’? as suggested by Smith (JNES 2, p. 56) is perhaps too categorical. In the present context is, after all, something done by a sculptor (\( \text{sd} \)), and Breasted (Ancient Records 1, § 273) similarly suggested ‘engraved’. Wilson’s translation, ‘‘when they were removed,’’ perhaps hints at a solution, since \( \text{br} \), a causative use of \( \text{rbr} \), is well attested with the meaning ‘to remove, take away’ (Wb. 4, pp. 219, 9–220, 12), and what a sculptor does in executing sunk relief is ‘‘to remove’’ the stone from within a hollowed-out area below the surface plane. Alternatively, \( \text{br} \) might be considered a causative of \( \text{br} \), ‘‘prepare, make ready,’’ but the latter verb is apparently unattested before the New Kingdom (Wb. 3, pp. 146–47, 91; FCD, p. 176). The 3rd pers. pl. suffix pronoun \( \text{mr} \) is no longer visible today, except possibly for a depression that may represent a trace of the letter \( \text{m} \), but Seehe and Reisner thought they saw clear traces of both letters. Dorer, NVS, p. 96, no. 1877, understands \( \text{br} \) (\( \text{m} \)) in 106 to be an instance of the passive \( \text{qtm} \) (\( \text{m} \)) used in a past circumstantial clause, that is, ‘‘after they (the decrees) had been engraved!’’ by the sculptor. If the restoration suggested in n. w. is correct, however, the decrees could not have been engraved before being drawn on the facade and portal of Inti’s tomb.

Wilson (JNES 6 [1947], p. 239, n. 26) found it difficult to conceive of the word \( \text{dr} \), ‘‘speak,’’ except as part of an emphasizing participial construction. Separating the word sculptor from \( \text{br} \), he translates: ‘‘It was the sculptor who spoke as head of the gang’’ as appointed in the palace.’’ (Listebtu, p. 127) has: ‘‘... ils furent gravés!’’ par le sculpteur, étant dir au chef du Cabinet... étant poli(?) au Palais.’’ Wilson and Roccanti had only Sethe’s published copy to go by which has: \( \text{br} \). Sethe’s unpublished notes on file in Boston clearly show the group \( \text{br} \) after \( \text{d} \) and Reisner originally had \( \text{br} \), but changed this in his final copy to reflect Sethe’s improved reading. Sethe evidently had second thoughts, however, for in his published copy he appears to have interpreted the stroke under the \( \text{br} \) as the top of the \( \text{d} \). After a close examination of the photographs, I believe what Reiser and Sethe saw as the letter \( n \) is simply damage to the stone. The presence of the letter \( t \) under the \( \text{d} \) seems to exclude both ‘‘head of the gang’’ and ‘‘chef du Cabinet’’ from consideration, since ‘‘head, chief,’’ is \( \text{br} \) by \( \text{br} \) (Wb. 3, p. 40, 6–21, not \( \text{br} \).

Having said as much, it is not easy to find a suitable alternative translation. The presence of the letter \( t \) also seems to preclude the compound preposition \( \text{br} \text{tp} \), ‘‘over, upon, on behalf of’’ (Edel, older Gramm. 2, § 880). Contextually, \( \text{br} \text{tp} \), ‘‘utterance’’ (Wb. 5, p. 287, 13–16) is possible, but is apparently otherwise unattested before the Middle Kingdom, the corresponding Old Kingdom form evidently being \( \text{tp} \text{sr} \) (Smith, JEA 28 (1942), p. 38 (d); Aschheim1, pp. 467, 470; Edel, ZAS 105 (1979), p. 107). \( \text{tp} \text{sr} \) is another possibility and has the advantage of being known from the Old Kingdom (Wb. 5, p. 250, 6; Bissing, Gen-s-m-khu i, pp. 15–16, pl. 12; Verner, Papyrologies, p. 9, pl. 51, Inscr. no. 143). Assuming it is identical with the later \( \text{tp} \text{sr} \) ‘‘interruption of the royal diety’’ (Wb. 5, p. 288, 2–289, 22), it allows a viable solution.

The compound preposition \( \text{br} \text{tp} \), ‘‘in the sight of, before,’’ is not known till later (Wb. 3, pp. 118–119; Edel, Ältest. Gramm. 2, § 807; Littfre, Gramm., § 178) but, as James Allen points out, for here is the primary object of \( \text{mr} \).

Allen has also suggested the restoration of if \( \text{mr} \) after \( \text{tp} \) and before \( \text{mr} \).

Breasted (Ancient Records 1, § 274) thought that the mortuary priests were ‘‘divided into phylai.’’ The reading may fit the context, but there is insufficient room for three phyley signs before the beginning of the next sentence.

2 The ripple-of-water sign substitutes erroneously for the doorbell in if. Possibly the draftsman who copied the original decree onto the wall mistook a badly drawn hieratic \( \text{if} \) for \( \text{if} \). See Goedicke, Old Hieratic Paleography pp. 26 a–b (N 31), 29 a–b (O 34).


10 The \( \text{hdw} \text{mr} \), the ‘‘aftermath of attending,’’ is discussed by Edel, ZAS 96 (1969), pp. 4–6. For \( \text{hdw} \), to ‘‘attend (to),’’ ‘‘wait upon,’’ ‘‘oversee,’’ see Inscription A, note i. The \( \text{hdw} \text{mr} \) is represented in
the tomb of Qe at Giza (c. 7100 BCE); see Simpson, Qe and Ide, p. 6, pl. 24. The modifying phrase ne #nfr may allude to the long period of time required for the embalming process in the Old Kingdom. In the case of Queen Meresankh III, 273 or 274 days elapsed between the time of death and burial (Dunham and Simpson, Meresankh III, p. 8, pl. 2a, b, fig. 2), that is, in the neighborhood of nine months, whereas Senedjemib Inti’s body remained in the waḥet for fifteen months, albeit under special circumstances. Yet another example of the term a’w or #nfr is to be seen in Gebe 1, pl. 14, where metalworkers are depicted smelting metal for funerary equipment destined for the embalming workshop; see Edel, ZAS 96 (1960), p. 5.
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Inscriptions A-D

Translation

Commentary

The present text is more circumstantial than Uni the Elder’s, and the extent to which the two were parallel is unclear. Nevertheless, the inscription on a loose block found in the court of the Senedjemib Complex, which on stylistic and contextual grounds probably belongs to Inscription D, but which is known only from a Harvard-Boston Expedition photograph (pl. 7b), indicates that Uni’s text probably does furnish a valid model for the lost portion of line (2a) here. The identity of the first sign at the bottom right edge of the aforementioned block is not absolutely certain, but it more likely represents a damaged fire-drill (U 29), as suggested by Peter Der Manuelian, than the walking-stick (S 43). Moreover, the bird-sign that follows is probably a vulture rather than an owl. Proceeding on the assumption that the identification of the two signs is correct, the inscription on the block, which is set in bold type in the above transcription, would then read: reh in nn nq s w r, “The Majesty of my lord had […] ferry over.”

In Uni’s autobiographical inscription, Pepy I directed a “seal-bearer of the god together with the bureaucrats of a ship-master (pr ur wš) under his command” to cross the river together with a ship’s crew in order to bring a sarcophagus back from the Tura quarries. This was only appropriate, as the finpy was a functionary responsible for official travel by boat; see e.g. Junker, Giza 1, p. 12; Falkhory, ASPR 38 (1938), p. 38; Wilson, JNES 3 (1944), p. 204 and n. 18; Helck, Beantwortet, pp. 99, 104, and for the reading of the title, Fischer, Wie sie waren, pp. 19-22. The command staff sent to fetch Senedjemib Inti’s sarcophagus appears to have differed in composition: To begin with, the occurrence of the demonstrative adjective pr after m-nfr in lines (5) and (6) clearly refers back to an earlier mention of the “troops.” Since “troops” in the Old Kingdom and later were normally under the command of an Qw-r m-nfr, and insinuch as the
latter official was not infrequently put in charge of quarrying or mining expeditions (see e.g., Faulkner, _JEA_ 39 [1953], pp. 33–34; Eichler, _Expeditionenwesen_, p. 234ff.), an “overseer of troops” might well have been sent to Tura to bring a coffin back for Inti. The _imy-n rrw_, “overseer of officials,” mentioned in line (8) of the present inscription was in all probability also a member of the command staff of the quarrying expedition sent to Tura on Inti’s behalf.

If the calculation of the height of the decorated sidewalls of the portion of c 2370 presented under Inscription B 1 above is accurate, something more than half of the height of Inscription D is missing. Presumably a clause of purpose identical or similar to that in Uni’s autography, _t int grtz pš n m-rw_, “to bring back this sarcophagus from Tura,” followed the mention of the officials sent by Lekyi to Tura in Inti’s text. At this point, however, the usefulness of Uni’s autography as a model causes, for it continues _œm.n.f wš n hµnw_. “It (viz. the coffin) came in his charge in a great cargo boat of the Residence,” and there is insufficient space for this at the end of column (2) in Inti’s text after the mention of the personnel who were sent to Tura and before the adverbial clause _m n [u] hµnw_. Furthermore, the return of Inti’s sarcophagus from Tura is seemingly narrated further along in Inscription D.

The orthography of _m t n_ lines (5–8) is unusually full and is unlikely to have been repeated in a writing of _imy-n m t n_. After a number of attempts, the restoration offered in text fig. 4 appeared to best fit the space requirements, especially if the apparent parallel in Uni’s autography is indeed relevant. For the spelling of _imy-n m t n_ utilized in the reconstructed text, see e.g., the Sixth Dynasty letter of protest to a receiver of a vizier contained in _pCairo JE 4683_ (Güsem, _ÄSÄE_ 22 [1953], pl. 1/1a; Gardiner, _JEA_ 31 [1947], p. 75; Cederloff, _ÄSÄE_ 28 [1948], pp. 505–12). Of the three seated men of the determinative of plurality, only one is completely preserved, but the circular outline to the upper right of the surviving determinative and the horizontal line to the left possibly represent the head of one seated man and the line of another.  

6 Sethe restored two seated men after _imy-n rrw_, whereas Reisner repeated thecourtier determinative _mr twz_ more after the pattern of Inscription C, line (5). When set one above the other in our facsimile copy, as Reisner has done in his hand copy, the figure of the last courtier intrudes into horizontal line (4) below. If the latter two determinatives are set side by side, they fail to reach down as far as the bottom of line (3). On the other hand, the repeated generic determinative of the three seated men fits the lacuna admirably. The title _imy-n rrw_ is generally written without determinatives (compare _e.g._, _Sina Insc., nos. 13, 16, 17_, and _Gyous, Hamm., no. 56_) and, if this were the case here, another official designation could have followed immediately on this title, although it is difficult to imagine what title might fit into the limited space available. _Hµmt-nr_ would do so, if followed by the seated man determinative but, as expedition leader, the “seal-bearer of the god” might be expected to precede, not follow, the _imy-n rrw_, see e.g., Eichler, _Expeditionenwesen_, p. 234ff. Although _rrw_ is evidently spelled differently in Inscription C (line (5)), an orthography like that with the courtier-sign and three seated men as an indication of the plural, such as restored here, appears, for example, on the facade of c 2374 (pl. 84c; fig. 80).

7 Breasted has “Everything was done by these sailors,” and Roccazi similarly “et chose tout faire par ces matelots.” Edel considers a defective writing for the preposition _in_, “by, through,” but it does occur more than once ( _Älbg. Gramm._ 2, § 736), so Breasted and Roccazi’s treatment is certainly possible. Leopelt mistakenly thought that the three ideograms of _m t n_ hold oars. He was followed in this by Sethe, but the kneeling men are, in actual fact, equipped with bows and arrows, as Reisner has seen. After _mr _w∂ in line (26), Reisner and Sethe restored _w∂ n(r).t(¡)_. Apparently, neither scholar saw a second riddle of water which is clearly visible in pls. 76, 77, and 79. James Allen explains [ _id._ ] as the relative _sbn n.f with _w∂ n(r).t(¡)_ as its circumstantial complement; cf. Edel, _Älbg. Gramm._ 2, § 676–77.

8 Before _bf_ at the head of the preserved portion of this line, Reisner thought he could make out an “_n_-column and Sethe a _z_-bolt. All that actually remains at present is a segment of a horizontal line.

9 _R-w_ in the Old Kingdom is ordinarily determined by the hill-country sign ( _Zibeleus, Stratlangen_, p. 153). In Inscription C, line (27), it has the additional determinative of the city-sign. What follows _R-w_ here is damaged, but Reisner thought he could make out the hill-country and city signs, whereas Sethe saw three horizontal lines in the lacuna before the determinatives. There is extensive damage to the wall surface at this point, and Sethe may have been misled by shadows cast by the edges of the breaks.

10 The object in the hand is destroyed at present. In his published copy, Sethe has _m _ w∂. In his unpublished notes on file in Boston, on the other hand, he writes “_z Kammers_ oder _m_ _w∂, ’Bert? ’” and has added alongside _w∂_: “ _Wohl so!”_ The forearms with hand holding a rounded leaf _m _ usually represents phonetic _m_ (see Inscription C, _n._ _u_. above). Nevertheless, in the Old Kingdom, the same sign does on occasion serve as a substitute for _m_, a forearm with hand holding a bowl, the ideogram or determinative for _bf_ “bowl” (“ _present_” (Gardiner, _EG_, p. 454 [D 39]; see _e.g._ L.D. 2, pl. 12c = _Haus- sicher_, _Giza I_, fig. 38, _PF_ 278 B; Dunham and Simpson, _Merneith III_, fig. 9). It is less likely that the group under discussion is to be read _?, “room,” even though _m _ does seem to substitute for _m_ in Inscription C, line (23).

It is not entirely certain to what _bf_ “bed” ( _Wb._ 3, pp. 103, 141–142, 310, _FCD_, p. 173) might refer, however. Unlike Khnumhotep’s burial chamber ( _above_, p. 127), c 1370 _b_ is not provided with a coffin pit which might warrant the nomenclature. Could the term refer to the “cradle” or framework of latticings (and bars?) that holds the sarcophagus secure on its sledge aboard the transport vessel in the vignette at the bottom of Inscription D ( _pl_. 79, _80a_)?

11 Sethe states the number of days can only be five _m l n_ or seven _m l n_. Given the placement of the surviving stroke after the determinative of _bf_ ( _pl_. 76, 77).

12 For the expression _m l n_ ( _l n_)( _l n_), literally “going and coming,” that is, a round-trip, see Fischer, _JEA_ 61 (1975), p. 35 (2). Fischer observes that the omission of the feminine ending from the two in-finitives is comparable to _m l n_ _m l l n_ ( _l l n_), for which, see Edel, _Älbg. Gramm._ 1, §§ 688, 691, and Gardiner, _EG_, § 239.

13 Whatever the officials and the troops under their charge were “doing” or “making,” its object was clearly to inform the king about...
the progress being made in transporting Inti's sarcophagus. It is logical, as in the case of Harkhuf (Urk. 1, p. 128, 5–9) and Sabni I (Urk. 1, p. 136, 9–11), that they were sending dispatches and, inasmuch as they were doing this "every day," it is also likely that the word was plural. A full writing of mḥwt similar to (a) below, from PT 451 h, would fill the lacuna at the head of line (x + 17) completely, if the first three signs were written one above the other, as in (b). The signs that precede and follow, are arranged much more compactly, however, and a writing of mḥwt used by Sabni I that does without phonograms save for the feminine ending (c), should also be taken into consideration. The restoration of either (a) or (c) would leave a short gap before the surviving signs at the end of the line which, in the case of the latter, an abbreviated writing of the adverbial phrase m fr-t-brw, "in the course of the day," such as has been restored in text fig. 4, would fit both spatially and contextually. The latter option was selected largely because mḥwt tends not to be spelled out in Old Kingdom narrative texts. Harkhuf, for example, writes mḥwt and Inti himself has mḥwt in line 3 of Inscription A 2. For variant writings of m fr-t-brw (r™ nb) see the following occurrences, all of which are cited by Fischer, MMJ 12 (1977), p. 8, n. 39; Davies, Ptahhetep 1, pl. 18 (433) and 2, pl. 17, probably the same); Rue de tomb., pls. 52, 58, 61, 63; GN 1, pl. 65b; Urk. 1, p. 37; 14; Funker, Girsu 11, fig. 76. Nevertheless, the possibility cannot be entirely excluded that a fuller writing like (a) or (b), followed directly by the adverbial r™ nb, originally stood in the lacuna here.

Sethe restores "spr. f m st.f" in the last line. In actual fact, his restoration falls short of filling the available space. Roccati has "que ce sarcophage [arrivait] pour son [repos] à sa place." Assumedly spr.(y), a third person singular Old Perfective, is intended by "arrivait."
Chapter 6: ANONYMOUS TOMBS G 2371–73

We have already touched on the fact that Reisner found older mastaba walls beneath G 2370, the tomb of Se-nedjemib Asi (figs. 2, 3).¹ The older tombs in question are the following.

Anonymous—G 2371/2372

G 2371 was a filled mud brick mastaba with mud brick or rubble compartment walls built on an independent site east of G 2365 (pls. 80b, 81c, 82a).² Part of the mastaba had been cut away to admit the back wall of G 2370. Still under the back part of G 2370, but farther east, Reisner found at ground level against a mud brick construction the remains of a casing (numbered G 2372) of small blocks of grey nummulitic limestone set in correspondingly low courses to form a rough sloping surface (Masonry u) (pls. 81c, 82a).³ Reisner was of the opinion that these remains indicated a wide recess in the middle of a north–south facade forming a portico chapel probably with a roof supported by pillars, like G 2375 and G 2414.⁴ Of Reisner’s type (1), it lacked a court and opened directly on a street of tombs.⁵ The north end of the recess was preserved and, farther south, two stones of the west wall of the recess-portico (figs. 2, 3). The length of the west wall of the recess was at least 6.0 m. No niche was preserved.

Reisner showed considerable uncertainty as to whether or not the remains of the walls numbered G 2372 formed the east face of G 2371. He originally believed G 2371 to be an independent structure whose front wall had been destroyed by the insertion of the back wall of G 2370, and conjectured that the mastaba was probably of type X e (1), that is, a mud brick mastaba with an open-air corridor chapel, without niches preserved, of type 9 (d).⁶ The remaining structure was 2.50 meters in height and would have measured 22.65 x 8.02 m. The chamber itself was roofed with stone slabs. It measured 1.0 by 0.7 m and was 1.0 m in height. Its area was 0.7 sq. m; the capacity 0.7 cu. m. The chamber was found open. Within a body lay on its left side with the legs contracted and the heels drawn up to the pelvis.

Four shafts were irregularly placed within the confines of G 2371. Shaft a, the chief shaft, lay in the axis north of the middle of the mastaba within the second compartment from the north. It was an older shaft of type 11 c in its south end underneath the rubble cross wall that separated the fourth and fifth compartments. c, a shaft of type 8, was in the axis in the south end, while d was an intrusive shaft southwest of a. Shaft d does not appear in the plan of the northern part of the Cemetery en Echelon (fig. 2), in which shafts a–c are all identified, but it may be the additional, unlabeled shaft(?) shown on the sketch plan (fig. 76) between shafts a and c. The latter shaft is certainly south of and also a little west of shaft a. Reisner notes that plunderers hunting the statue chamber had dug down in the area of shafts a and c to the burial chamber of the latter and torn up its roof (pl. 81c).⁷

No further details are available concerning G 2371 a–d, and no plans of the shafts or chambers have been identified. The expedition records do, however, make reference to several large, rough flaring flat-bottomed bowls, or bread moulds, that were placed rim down in the fill of the second compartment from the north (fig. 79a).⁸ The bowls also appear in a photograph (pl. 80b). Along the face of the north wall of G 2371 are four intrusive shafts, x, y, z, and w, from east to west (fig. 29).⁹

The intrusive shaft x (fig. 77a) was of type 8 b(2) with a chamber at right angles to the north side of the shaft. Its dimensions were 0.85 by 1.0 m. The shaft was lined with rubble and mud brick to a height of 2.0 m and the chamber sunk an additional 1.1 m in the rock. The chamber itself was roofed with stone slabs. It measured 1.0 by 0.7 m and was 1.0 m in height. Its area was 0.7 sq. m; the capacity 0.7 cu. m. The chamber was found open. Within a body lay on its left side with the legs contracted and the heels drawn up to the pelvis.

Shaft y (fig. 77b) was of type 6 a(3) with a long chamber parallel to the east side of the shaft. The shaft measured 0.88 by 0.91 m. Cut 1.16 m into the bedrock, it was lined with mud brick for 1.35 m above. The tomb card for G 2371 x adds the information that the brick was mud plastered and lime watered with the straw showing through. The entrance opened near the middle of the chamber, which measured 1.13 by 0.6 m and had a height of 0.88 m. The area of the chamber was 0.73 sq. m; the capacity 0.64 cu. m. It was open when excavated and the body lay on its left side with the legs contracted and the heels drawn up to the pelvis. The head was on a higher level than the pelvis. The skeleton from G 2371 x is male and is on deposit in the Peabody Museum, Harvard University, where it has the number 14–2–19529 H 199 SK.

1 See above, p. 1.
3 See ibid., p. 126.
4 G 2370 and 2372 are included with other portico chapels of Reisner’s type (1) in GN 1, pp. 266–88. On G 2359, see also Fred van de Velde, “The Supplemental Complex,” p. 197.
6 See Reisner, “Catalogue of G 2371 , x and y c. 8 b(2) but no door jambs are visible on the plan,” cf. GN 1, pp. 266–88.
7 Ibid., p. 133.
8 See Diary 1912–1913, p. 10.
9 Ibid., p. 132.
10 Reisner, “Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon,” p. 133.
Also of type 6 a(3), shaft 2 (fig. 77c) measured 0.82 by 0.9 m. It was lined with mud brick on three sides to a height of 1.4 m and descended for a distance of 1.32 m into the rock (pl. 83a). The tomb card for G 2371 b indicates the presence of a "construction trench" around three sides of the pit, measuring 15 cm in width and 14 cm in depth. The chamber opened on the west and measured 1.1 x 0.54 m with a height of 0.72 m, an area of 0.59 sq. m, and a capacity of 0.42 cu. m. The blocking, which had been broken open, was of type V e(2), that is, it consisted of exterior leaning masonry resting on the shaft side above the doorway and bound with mud.14 Once again the body lay on the left side with the legs contracted and the heels drawn up to the pelvis (pl. 83b).

Shaft v (fig. 78a) measured 0.71 by 0.72 m. Of type 8 a(1), the shaft and chamber were dug in the sand and constructed of mud brick (pl. 83c), the chamber being roofed with stone slabs. The shaft was 1.68 m high. The chamber was parallel to the west side of the shaft and had a false door jamb on one side of the doorway. It measured 1.5 x 0.7 m and had a height of 0.54 m. The area was 1.05 sq. m and the capacity 0.56 cu. m. According to the tomb card, the mud brick of the chamber was lime watered. The type V e(2) blocking was intact and consisted of slabs resting on horizontal courses of stone leaning on the side of the shaft above the doorway (pl. 83c). According to Reisner's description, the body was half contracted, on the left side with legs bent at the knees, that is, half extended, but had fallen over.15 Nonetheless, the description does not appear to correspond to the sketch on the tomb card (fig. 78a).

Intrusive shaft w was located against the south face of G 2371, east of the small mastaba G 2359. Perhaps it represents a variation of Reisner's Type 8, being intruded in a sand-filled corridor as it was.16 As may be seen from the plan (fig. 78b), the shaft and chamber were partly constructed of masonry and partly cut in the rock. The chamber, which had a long north–south axis, opened on the south side of the shaft and was without connecting passage or doorjamb. A portion of the shaft was excavated in the bedrock to a level below that of the floor of the burial chamber. The burial chamber was apparently found open and empty.

Register of Objects—G 2371

G 2371, outside north wall

12–23–34 Model bronze's var from a servant statue, held in bottom for forming to separate base, outside painted red, top white, bottom not painted, rim chipped, H. 46 cm, diam. 4.4 cm. (pl. 81f; fig. 79a). Exp. Ph. A 997 2/1

G 2371, upper debris

12–23–35 Thirty or so molds from a jar bored with a tubular drill, slab, H. 5.5 cm, diam. 3.5 cm. (pl. 82g; fig. 79a). Exp. Ph. A 997 2/1

G 2371, second compartment from north

Not registered. Several large, rough, flaring flat-bottomed bowls, or bread moulds, placed rim down in the fill, type OK F-XXV. (pl. 82a; fig. 79a). Cf. Jaquet-Gordon, in Studien zur altest. Keramik fig. 3 (no. 5).

Anonymous—G 2373

On ground level under G 2370, parallel to the presumed face of G 2371/2372, at a distance of 60 cm, runs a north–south wall of small blocks of grey nummulitic limestone set in low-stepped courses (Masonry 2) forming the back wall of an older mastaba (pl. 82c, 82a; figs. 2, 3).17 This wall was visible for a length of around 10.5 meters. The front part of the mastaba was destroyed by the construction of Rooms II–IV of G 2370. In the filling of G 2370 a group of ten to fifteen shoulder jars filled with plaster was discovered (fig. 79a).18

A shaft immediately behind the false door of Room III of G 2370 was ascribed by Reisner to G 2373, and lettered a.17 This shaft (fig. 78c) measures 1.3 by 1.05 m. It descends 3.2 meters in the rock and is lined with mud brick for 3.5 m. The chamber of type c (3) opens on the east and has two door-jambs between the shaft and the chamber, each 0.2 m wide. The door-jambs opened near the middle of the chamber, which measured 1.3 x 0.55 m with a height of 0.8 m. The area was 0.72 sq. m, the capacity 0.57 cu. m. Reisner specifically states that the shaft was found open and empty.19 This is puzzling, as a skeleton in the Hearst Museum at Berkeley is said to be from G 2373,20 but the plan and section also show the chamber as empty.

From the debris between G 2372 and 2373 comes a black granite fragment consisting of the head and shoulders of a male statue (pl. 84a, b). The statue had been made into a stone hammer and was battered by use. Smith thought the face exhibited "a rather sullen expression," and compared it to the heads of the seated statue of Akhet-mery-neit and the faces of the standing figures of Pahunpet and Pen-mers, all of which date to the end of Dynasty 5.21 The latter in their physiognomy preshow the new conventional rendering of the face characteristic of the Nebheiu group of the reign of Pepy II, what Edna R. Russman has conventionally labelled a "Second Style" in Old Kingdom art.22 Smith comments, however, that the black granite fragment follows more closely the usual convention of Dynasty 5 with less exaggeration of the eyes and nose. The black granite head originally had a full wig, but this had been cut away between the base of the wig and the shoulders, when the piece was converted for use as a hammer. Smith considered the fragment to be unfinished, and further thought it might possibly be as early as the end of Dynasty 5 in date, if it had been thrown out of G 2370 itself. On the other hand, if it formed part of the original equipment of G 2371/2372 or 2373.

41 See Reisner, "Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon," p. 134.
42 Gez Diary 1912–1913, p. 31. The height of one of the posts is said to be 30 cm.
43 This shaft was originally assigned the number G 2370 b by Reisner, but the designation was changed when he decided that the burial place belonged to the older mastaba, G 2373. The original designation appears both in the Geo Reis Diary, pp. 73–74, and in the Object Register under number 337–344, for which see below. On the original tomb card, G 2370 c had been crossed out and G 2373 a substituted.
44 "Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon," p. 135.
45 Spectrum no. 227, acc. no. 482.
47 HESP, pp. 84–85.
converted into a hammer at the time Inti’s stone masons usurped these tombs, it would be older yet.

Register of Objects—G 2372–2373

G 2372–73, debris between
12–13–72 MFA 15.3339. Hammer, black granite, made from a statue, h. 24 cm. (pl. 84a, b). See AEMP p. 85. Exp. Ph. c 3377–78

G 2373, filling
Not registered. Ten to fifteen shoulder jars, filled with plaster, h. 10 cm, type A–II b. Not photographed. (fig. 79a). Cf. GN 2, p. 69, fig. 81

G 2373 a (= old 2370 c), pit
31–7–44 Fig. of relief with parts of two male figures, h. 30 cm, w. 10 cm, th. 17 cm. (pl. 46d; fig. 64. Exp. Ph. c 13643. In Boston. Assigned to G 2370, Rm. IV, north wall; see above, p. 77
Chapter 7: KHNUMENTI — G 2374

The mastaba was excavated by the Harvard–Boston Expedition on November 16, again on November 28 to 29, and on December 6 of 1912. Shaft A was cleared on January 16–27, 1913. Shaft G 2374 A, the probable burial place of Khnumenti, was cleared between December 10 and 12, 1912.

As previously mentioned, G 2374 was inserted between the north side of G 2370 and the south side of G 2375, 2376, 2377, and 2378 (pl. 94a), and was probably the next mastaba built in the Senedjemib Complex after that of Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378). Two walls were constructed closing off the resultant east–west corridor, one on the west and the other on the east with a doorway opening above the south side wall.

Room II apparently consisted of slabs bedded in the south side wall. The type (7d) chapel is entered from the east at the south end of its east wall and consists of a north–south anteroom (I) connected by an east–west vestibule (II) with an east–west offering room (III). The mastaba measures 4.1 (east)–3.6 (west) by 8.5 m. The proportion of the length of the mastaba to the width is 30.22. The total area is 73.85 sq. m, while the total floor area of Rooms I–III is 59.09 sq. m. The relation of the floor area of the chapel to the area of the mastaba is 1/3.98. The height on the east is 3.05 m and on the west 3.43 m.

The roof of G 2374 entirely disappeared, but the ceiling in Room II apparently consisted of slabs bedded in the south side wall. A groove in the south wall of the room (pl. 98b, c) is well preserved. Its bottom is located at the top of the decorated wall surface at a height of 2.83 m from the preserved pavement and its top is at 3.3 m above the floor. It is thus 0.5 m in height, while its depth is 6.0 cm.

This seems rather shallow to hold the ends of the ceiling slabs, but it is difficult to imagine what else the groove might represent, especially as there is no interior wall on the south side of the room on which the slabs might rest. Room II is only 1.05 m wide, and limestone ceiling slabs in the tombs of Ni-ka-ankh and Ka-pa-inpu at Saqqara spanned comparable distances of 1.54 m (pl. 15) and 2.0 (pl. 6) respectively.6

Resting at present on the top of the south wall of G 2374 between Rooms I and II is a large block with a right-angle cut in its surface (pl. 88a, c). It seems very likely that this block is out of place, for if is moved 40 cm or so to the left, it would be in a position to form the southwest corner of Room II. The top of the right-angled cut is located at 3.45 m above the preserved pavement at the foot of the south wall. The ceiling of Room I therefore seems to have been somewhat higher than that of Room II. In the case of Room III, the side walls are largely destroyed, and it is not possible to ascertain if the ceiling was at the same height as or higher than the ceilings in the other rooms.

Unlike the mastabas of his father Inti (G 2370), his brother Mehi (G 2378), and of Nekhebu (G 2381), Khnumenti’s tomb lacked a portico. Instead the facade appears to have been crowned by a frieze inscription proclaiming the identity of the owner. A surviving block from the left end of the frieze (pl. 78a, fig. 79b) measures approximately 71.3 cm in length and 28.1 cm in height. The inscription, in large sunken hieroglyphs between incised lines, reads from right to left: [ ... imy-wn k£ k£t u-tj nwt mntw-y b-n w-nw ônmnt¡, “... over-seer of all [works] of the king, one honored by the great god, Khnumenti.”

On the facade north of the entrance are four standing figures of Khnumenti in the same attitude facing left and preceded each by a long column of inscription (pl. 84c; fig. 80). The arrangement is reminiscent of a popular type of Old Kingdom architrave with standing figures of the owner repeated, although many of these are later in date than Khnumenti. Figures and inscriptions alike are in sunk relief. The costume of the best preserved figure at the right consists of a shoulder-length wig, chin beard, beaded collar, and a short kilt with flaring front panel. He holds a long walking stick at a diagonal with his right hand in front and a scepter in his hanging left hand behind. The walking stick appears to be capped rather than knobbled. As is appropriate in a figure facing to the left, the scepter passes behind the figure and is largely hidden by the kilt.8 The other figures were apparently identical except that the first wore a leopard skin vestment, as is evident from the tail hanging down between the legs. An isolated fragment with the face, front shoulder, and arm from the first figure is in Boston and has been restored to its approximate position in fig. pl. 84c and fig. 80. There is a minimum of carving within the outlines of the figures, and details such as the beads of the collars and the spots of the leopard skin were presumably added in paint.

Insofar as they are preserved, the long columns of text read from left to right as follows: [(1) [ ... imy-wn k£ k£t u-tj nwt mntw-y b-nw ônmnt¡, “… the hereditary] prince and count, chief justice and vizier, Khnumenti; (2) [ ... mdp t³ rp] w-nw] n prwy ônmnt¡, “... royal master”/builder] in both houses (Upper and Lower Egypt), Khnumenti, (3) [ ... m³w³w³ b-nw rp] ymd] n-prw yônmnt¡, “one honored by Anubis, [ ...], Khnumenti,” (4) [ ... m³w³w³ b-nw rp] ymd] n-prw yônmnt¡, “one honored by Anubis, [ ...], Khnumenti.”

7 Cf. G 2114, pp. 287 (11), fig. 265.
8 See above, p. 43.


An autobiographical text in short columns appears to have occupied the remaining height of the wall between the frieze inscription and the heads of the four figures. Only five damaged columns remain above the last figure at the right along with an isolated sign (the cobras) over the previous figure. What can be made out is as follows: (1) [ ]...[ ][ ]...[ ]...[ ][ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[ ]...[
The hands of the helmsmen are destroyed, but the two rudders were braces or guide ropes diagonally aft to be fastened to either side of the hull. One sailor at the stern of the boat leaned backward with the effort of handling two braces in the variants was...

Is it possible that a loose stone found in the court of the Saqqara scene, however, pretty clearly...

Although the top of the mast is lost, it is clear that several stays were attached to various points on its upper part whence they ran diagonally aft to be fastened to either side of the hull. One sailor at the stern of the boat leaned backward with the effort of handling two braces or guide ropes to the stern of the boat leans backward with the effort of handling two braces in the variants was...
Fourth Register. A funeral procession conveyed the bier with the body of the deceased from his dwelling place to the bank of the Nile or to a canal nearby. The house with mourning relatives is sometimes depicted in such scenes but is lacking here.31 The bier consisted of a coffin set under a shrine-shaped canopy (largely destroyed) supported by four columns. The traces remaining suggest a similar arrangement of elements in this register and the one above. In both registers, for example, two ships tow a larger vessel. The ship towed in this register is the better preserved of the two and appears to be a funerary barque with overhanging ends constructed in imitation of a papyrus boat.32 In the center of the funeral barque in this register the coffin of the deceased rests under a shrine-shaped canopy. The two men (largely destroyed) who stand in front of and behind the canopy both face the prow. Identifying labels are destroyed, but the man immediately to the right of the coffin may be the pilot and the man behind a member of the funeral cortege. Alternately, since a lector priest and an embalmer often sit or stand in the bow or stern of the funerary barque, the two men could represent these officiants.34

The towboats in both registers are blunt-ended craft with bulwarks amidship. In the upper towboat in this register traces of what is probably a deckhouse canopy are to be seen behind the damaged figures of the oarsmen. Each of the boats evidently had seven rowers apiece. The best preserved oarsman in the lower towboat in this register extends his arms in front of him. He grasps his oar with both hands, his upper body leaning forward, legs braced, as if at the beginning of a stroke. The blade of his oar is lancet-shaped like those of the better-preserved oars in both registers. The bow watch in the lower boat stands with front arm raised and holds a sounding pole which trails behind him in the water in his other hand. His hair is close-cropped and no traces of clothing are preserved. The man behind him stands with left fist closed on his chest in a gesture of respect, while his other arm hangs at his side.35 Like his companion, he is wigless but traces suggest he wore the belt-sash with pendant ends. The stance of the rowers in the upper towboat in this register is different from that of their counterparts below, for each rower appears to rest his forward foot on the gunwale. Part of what may be the shaft of a steering oar is visible towards the stern of this boat.

Second Register. A papyrus boat36 is once again towed across a long stretch of water by two boats. Towards the center of the towed vessel an isolated leg and foot, on a horizontal line that could represent the top of a base, suggests that a statue of Khunemiti was being transported. Traces of two rowers and parts of four oars are preserved in the lower of the two towboats in this register. In the upper boat, no traces remain of the rowers or their oars, but traces of a figure at the stern of the vessel survive.

First Register. At the right end of the register a figure of Khunemiti was depicted in a kiosk. Little remains of the kiosk except for its floor and the lower part of the front. Khunemiti was shown seated on a lion-footed chair or stool whose front leg rests on a frustum-shaped support. The front of his torso and the upper section of one arm, along with the lower part of his body and both legs are still visible. From the position of the arm, it seems possible that he held a staff, though no traces of such remain. He was probably dressed in a short kilt which of part of the belt and the belt knot survive. Traces of hieroglyphs towards the front of the kiosk, on a level where his face would have been, can be restored to read [Hieroglyphs]. It is hard to restore the tomb, at which various rites were enacted and a ritual meal took place,37 the tomb itself is rarely depicted in the Old Kingdom. In the mastaba of Mereruka the entrance to his tomb appears, while in the "Tomb of the Two Brothers" at Saqqara a tomb front with elaborate palace-facade panelling and entrance portal is twice

31 It occurs in Fau de 1906, pl. 19–20; Merenak 2, pl. 193; Badawy, Nyehyp-Preh and Abufla, pls. 7, 96; Simpson, Qer and Idu, fig. 31.
32 Cf. Gelpi, 1, pl. 12; 2, pl. 7.
33 See ibid., pl. 10; Merenak 2, pl. 193; Simpson, Qer and Idu, fig. 14; 35. Reisner found a cartonnage-coffin in the Tomb of an Unnamed Official (Shaykh al-Ism, pl. 16–18); compare, for example, pl. 72; Simpson, Qer and Idu, fig. 52; Simpson, Qer and Idu, fig. 52.
34 Though no traces of such remain. He was probably dressed in a short kilt which of part of the belt and the belt knot survive. Traces of hieroglyphs towards the front of the kiosk, on a level where his face would have been, can be restored to read [Hieroglyphs]. It is hard to restore the tomb, at which various rites were enacted and a ritual meal took place,37 the tomb itself is rarely depicted in the Old Kingdom. In the mastaba of Mereruka the entrance to his tomb appears, while in the "Tomb of the Two Brothers" at Saqqara a tomb front with elaborate palace-facade panelling and entrance portal is twice
35 E.g., L.D., pl. 1006; Simpson, Qer and Idu, fig. 14; 35. See p. 57, n. 295 above.
depicted. All that remains of an interesting representation in the tomb of Teti is that of a tomb facade and entrance along with a ramp ascending to what was presumably the roof of the tomb. The damage in this instance is particularly unfortunate, since the representation, when intact, may have supplied a parallel to a well-known scene in the Fourth Dynasty tomb of Debehen at Giza. The Debehen scene is the earliest depiction of the funeral services performed at the tomb to survive. While funerary priests perform ritual acts, men with offerings ascend a ramp to the roof of the mastaba and present them to a statue of Debehen standing in a double shrine with cavetto cornices. In the double depiction of funerary priests, the statues of the deceased in their shrines are said to be set up “in front of” their tomb, but the same ritual acts are performed. By analogy with the Debehen scene and the double depiction in the “Tomb of the Two Brothers,” the seated figure in the kiosk depicted as the goal of Khnumenitu’s funerary cortège most likely represented a statue of the deceased. Certain depictions of seated statues do hold a staff in the hand as the figure of Khnumenitu in the kiosk may have done. In these depictions, the near hand that rests on the lap may be open or closed to hold a handle, a scepter. As Eaton-Krauss points out, this attitude is not known in actual statuary, though it is found in portrayals of the “living” tomb owner. As she also observes, wood is the only medium technically suitable for the arm position depicted, and the representation in G 2374 therefore may represent a wooded prototype. It seems more likely that the figure in the booth did indeed represent a statue of Khnumenitu rather than a “living” figure of the owner itself, even though in depictions of seated statues in Old Kingdom reliefs the statues generally sit on block seats or thrones, whereas the present example appears to be seated on a ordinary chair or stool with animal’s legs. A few examples of actual statues where the owner is seated on a thronomorphic chair or stool are known, however. If this was indeed a statue of Khnumenitu, priests performing the funerary ritual may have been shown in the destroyed portion of the register at the left. Further, if the misplaced block referred to above actually does form the southwest corner of the room, it is possible that its surface originally bore, in addition to the top of the kiosk, a caption to the scene.

**West Wall, South of Door**

Three registers with two offering bearers in each remain on the short west wall south of the door to Room II (pl. 95b, fig. 8a). As on the east wall opposite, the relief is of poor quality with deep lines incised around the figures and the background unevenly cut away. All six figures faced right but only the foremost figure in each register was identified by name and title. Although the second figure in each register is damaged and any details of costume lost, the foremost figure wears a folded kilt with belt and overlap, and presumably all six figures were similarly attired originally. Although all six bearers probably had their hair close-cropped, the line of the hair around the face survives only in the case of the foremost figures in the middle and lower registers. A large round hole drilled through the name of the foremost figure in the second register may represent a place where a mod- ule of flint was removed. The falling away of the plaster with which it would have been filled resulted in the loss of the first sign in his name.

**First Register.** Man holding a tray aloft with produce destroyed and an amorphous object in his hanging hand: fun-arks, “funerary priest, Sedeni.”

**Second Register.** Man holding aloft a tray laden with two filled small, flat-bottomed, flaring bowls, a triangular loaf of bread, and a lettuce, and holding a bird (largely destroyed) by the wings: fun-arks, “funerary priest, Sedeni.”

**Third Register.** Man holding aloft a tray laden with two filled small, flat-bottom, flaring bowls, a triangular loaf of bread, and a lettuce.

**Fourth Register.** Man holding aloft a tray laden with two filled small, flat-bottom, flaring bowls, a triangular loaf of bread, and a lettuce. Man holding aloft a tray on his right shoulder with part of a triangular loaf preserved.

**West Wall, North of Door**

Only a section of the lower part of the much scene in medium-high raised relief that once occupied this wall is preserved (pl. 86c; fig. 8a). The cutting away of the background was more consistent here than elsewhere in the anteroom but wide, deep chisel lines are nonetheless apparent. In the rectangle that represents a stretch of water, Nile fish and a crocodile are visible. Above to the right the very bottom of a papyrus skiff is recognizable by its cord bindings. The crocodile has its mouth agape and is in the process of devouring what appears to be, from the characteristic shape of the tail, a carp. An eel swims over the crocodile’s back towards a large fish of indeterminable species at the right. Other traces are visible to the left of the crocodile and its prey.

**North Wall**

The scene was executed in a low raised relief with more or less flat surfaces and without detailed modeling. (pl. 96b, fig. 8b). More attention appears to have been devoted to the large figure of the owner than to the subsidiary figures, the toe nails, for example, being carefully
indicated. At the left end of the wall, Khnumenit stood facing right. His legs and feet, the bottom line of a short kilt with flaring front panel, and the outline of his walking stick held at a diagonal before him are preserved. Five offering bearers with close-cropped hair and folded kilt with overlap approach from the right. The bearer at the head of the file held an offering tray aloft in front with his now destroyed right hand and a bird by the wings in his hanging left hand. The offerings on the tray consist of a triangular leaf of bread between two filled, small, flat-bottom, flaring bowls with a lettuce(?) placed on top. The second offering bearer held a bird, whose tail alone survives, in the crook of his right arm and a wickerwork staff by a cord in his left hand hanging behind. The third bearer carried a tray of offerings aloft in front and probably a young animal or other offering, now lost, in the crook of his left arm. The fourth man holds aloft a tray with his right hand and a wickerwork staff by a cord in his hanging left hand. The offerings on the tray are destroyed but, on the basis of the photograph, they evidently consisted of a triangular leaf of bread between two filled bowls with possibly a lettuce above. The last man balanced two trays on his shoulders, but the offerings on the trays are destroyed. In addition, a bunch of vegetables(?) and another of papyrus flowers hang from his elbows. Visible above the heads of the third and fourth figures in the photograph is a segment of ground line from the register above and possibly the very bottom of the foot of another figure walking to the left.

East Wall

An elaborate palanquin scene occupied this wall.48 As restored from photographs by William Stevenson Smith, the wall is shown in pl. 91 and, as copied by the Giza Marashe Project, in fig. 86. As may be seen from the modern masonry visible at the east end of the north wall in pl. 90a, the east wall has been re-erected too far to the east. The correct position is indicated by the broken line in figs. 2, 3.

Khnumenti is shown seated in his portable covered chair borne on the shoulders of twenty men. Only the lower part of the first three pairs of porters is preserved, on the end of the block which forms part of the inner entrance thickness and whose other face bears the representation of a sailing ship.49 In each pair of porters, the forward figure covers almost entirely the figure of the man behind, and only a narrow portion of the front edge of the second porter projects in front of the complete figure.49 They proceed to the right and are even spaced along the length of the carrying poles, which they grasp with both hands in front of them. Their figures occupied the entire width of the register.

The porters are wigless and wear long bel-tasshes whose loose ends hang down in front.49, 50 Well-executed examples of this garment show a loop and two ends hanging down in front (fig. 94b, 1), but it is in general drawn as if it were an apron of cloth strips (fig. 94b, 1–3).51 It is commonly worn by agricultural workers of every sort.52

The sources for fig. 94, 1–2 are the following: (a) Petrie, Memoirs, pl. 28; (b) Godlach, Re-used Blocks, figs. 1d, p. 27. (c) Simpson, Sesbenen-en-bush; pl. D; (d) Vandier, Manuel 6, p. 36. E.g., LGD 5, pl. 46; LGD 2, pl. 121; Simpson, Sesbenen-en-bush; pl. D; Ziegler, Akhet- tep, pp. 128, 129. E.g., Pape-Peters, Published, pl. 35; Nienkhonsu, figs. 18, 19. E.g., Ziegler, Akhet- tep, pl. 16; Verner, Published, pl. 11. E.g., LGD 2, pl. 45a–b; LGD 2, pl. 144; Godlach, Re-used Blocks, nos. 42, 53, 59, 61–64; Nienkhonsu, figs. 9, 10; Ziegler, Akhet- tep, pp. 158–61; Verner, Published, pl. 94. E.g., Godlach, Re-used Blocks, nos. 10–15, 30, 38. E.g., Van de Walle, Nefermehet, pl. 14, 15; Ziegler, Akhet- tep, pp. 106, 108.

The finials of these so-called “saw poles” probably represent papyrus heads, see Jenkins, “Bear Benedix the Pyramid, captives to pharaoh,” VII, 12; Brovarski, in: Jürgens, Gizeh (forthcoming). For actual examples of such poles, see Forth-Sjöqvist, Step Pyramid, pp. 12, 16, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 31, 32. Jenkins, “Bear Benedix the Pyramid,” fig. 15, pl. VII, VII, and panning.

Note: 46 The sources for fig. 94, 1–2 are the following: (a) Petrie, Memoirs, pl. 28; (b) Godlach, Re-used Blocks, figs. 1d, p. 27. (c) Simpson, Sesbenen-en-bush; pl. D; (d) Vandier, Manuel 6, p. 36. E.g., LGD 5, pl. 46; LGD 2, pl. 121; Simpson, Sesbenen-en-bush; pl. D; Ziegler, Akhet- tep, pp. 128, 129. E.g., Pape-Peters, Published, pl. 35; Nienkhonsu, figs. 18, 19. E.g., Ziegler, Akhet- tep, pl. 16; Verner, Published, pl. 11. E.g., LGD 2, pl. 45a–b; LGD 2, pl. 144; Godlach, Re-used Blocks, nos. 42, 53, 59, 61–64; Nienkhonsu, figs. 9, 10; Ziegler, Akhet- tep, pp. 158–61; Verner, Published, pl. 94. E.g., Godlach, Re-used Blocks, nos. 10–15, 30, 38. E.g., Van de Walle, Nefermehet, pl. 14, 15; Ziegler, Akhet- tep, pp. 106, 108.

The finials of these so-called “saw poles” probably represent papyrus heads, see Jenkins, “Bear Benedix the Pyramid, captives to pharaoh,” VII, 12; Brovarski, in: Jürgens, Gizeh (forthcoming). For actual examples of such poles, see Forth-Sjöqvist, Step Pyramid, pp. 12, 16, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 31, 32. Jenkins, “Bear Benedix the Pyramid,” fig. 15, pl. VII, VII, and panning.

Note: 47 See above, p. 46–47.

The finials of these so-called “saw poles” probably represent papyrus heads, see Jenkins, “Bear Benedix the Pyramid, captives to pharaoh,” VII, 12; Brovarski, in: Jürgens, Gizeh (forthcoming). For actual examples of such poles, see Forth-Sjöqvist, Step Pyramid, pp. 12, 16, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 31, 32. Jenkins, “Bear Benedix the Pyramid,” fig. 15, pl. VII, VII, and panning.

Note: 48 See above, p. 46–47.
short, thicker trunk, short bowed limbs, and large head.64 Like the other attendants he is wigless. The attendant behind him carries a vessel shaped like a bucket by its handle in his left hand and a case with a rounded cap and loop handle in the crook of his right arm. Visible inside the bucket is a pointed object. Bucket-shaped vessels are commonly carried by attendants of the tomb owner during outings, while a spoulate implement of unknown use is either placed in the bucket or held by the attendants, some of whom are identified as barbers or manicurists.65 An example in the tomb of lyre seems to show that the implement was a kind of brush made from vegetable fibers.66 Possibly the bucket contained a scented liquid and the brush was used for aspering. A bucket-shaped vessel with handle appears along with vessels of different shapes in a metagelly scene in the tomb of Ka-em-reh, and it is a logical assumption that these vessels were of metal.67 The forms does not seem to be represented in the surviving corpus of metal vessels, however.68

The last man in this register wore a belt-sash whose loose ends hung down in front and with his left hand carries by its strap a bucket-shaped vessel shaped like a bucket by its handle in his left hand and a case with a rounded cap and loop handle in the crook of his right shoulder.69 The next man carries his master's sandals in his left hand and a triangular cloth bag over his right shoulder.70 The figure of the third attendant is damaged, but enough is preserved to suggest that he had his arms folded in front of him and carried a wickerwork frail suspended on a cord around his neck. These last two figures wear the long belt-sash with pendant ends. In contrast to them and the other attendants above, the first man in this register wears a short kilt with flaring front panel, his gash presumably reflecting a superior status.

In front of the carrying chair other attendants were shown on two other groundlines. The right side of the wall is now lost, however, and only two partly preserved figures immediately in front of Khnumenti's carrying chair survive. Both face towards Khnumenti. The upper figure holds a bird in his right hand, perhaps a golden oriole considering its moderately long bill.71 A young son of the tomb owner often holds a bird in his father's presence in Old Kingdom daily life scenes,72 and it is possible an otherwise unknown son of Khnumenti's was represented here. If so, the hieroglyph 'bei' before him probably formed part of his name.73

The man on the ground line immediately below this figure, who was perhaps Khnumenti's steward, proffered a sheet of papyrus held between his two hands for examination.74 Except for the edge of the flaring front panel of his kilt and the line of his front leg, the rest of his figure is destroyed.

The lowest register of the east wall appears to be devoted to an entirely different subject: the transport of a life-size striding statue of Khnumenti to the tomb. Further investigation reveals that this is not the case. Junker and Wild have both discussed scenes where the "living" tomb owner is depicted together with his statues on the occasion of the actual transport of the statues to the tomb, and this representation, like a corresponding representation in G 2370, may constitute another instance of the genre.75

On the right side of the register, three men facing right haul on a tow rope and pull the statue in its shrine mounted on a sledge towards the left. It is clear from the photograph that the last of the haulers had passed the rope across his shoulders to prevent it from slipping. A man immediately in front of the sledge bends over to the right and pours water on the ground from a tall jar with short neck, tapering body, bulging shoulder, and rounded base.76 The stream of water is indicated by several ripples. Mixed with the dirt the water would have made a mud path to ease the passage of the sledge. In the space above the man's head is the caption: ²pt n ²m-nwt, "Receiving a statue of Khnumenti." The use of the verb ²pt in this context is exceptional, ibid., "escalating," or ²pt, "bringing," are usual, while ²pt, "towing," and ²pt, "dragging," are also attested.77 A priest on the sledge steps up on the front of the statue base to cense the statue.

The double doors of the cavetto-corniced shrine are thrown open to allow the purifying incense to reach the statue, as the priest lifts the cover of the double-bell censer with his right hand, thus directing the incense smoke to the statue's face. The life-size statue is drawn in profile with both arms held at the sides. The costume consists of a

---

64 See Daven, Medical History 31 (1989), pp. 213–276. On deposits, see ibid., and their place in ancient Egyptian society, see below, p. 158 and n. 184.
65 For LG4, pl. 41, 65; Marzouk, Man/Âme, p. 93 (CG 1903); Bissing, Genesi-Âns, pl. 21, 24 (dîd, pl. 20 [1921]). Mansfeld, pl. 1, sa, 34, 6, p. 319, 377–377; Hassan, Giza 3, fig. 146, 15 (dîd, fig. 15). Junker, Giza 4, fig. 31, 31, ibid., 32, Seven Chapels, pl. 21; Wild, 7.1, pl. 216, Verner, Pharaohs, fig. 30, Simpson, Keppehufnet, fig. 2, E, Borchardt, Cemetery of Palace Attendants, figs. 182, 185.
66 Verner, Pharaohs, fig. 32, 32.
67 Magnuson, Misc. Mus., figs. 32, 35, 37.
68 Borchardt, Die Kupfer- und Bronzegefäße Ägyptens.
69 See Schäfer, Principes, p. 93, fig. 30 (», Jfrs, fig. 8, 7.1, pl. 43, 5, pl. 22, 174; Verner, Pharaohs, pl. 5, j, Züttig, Aribnpafts, pp. 187, 188; Roth, Cemetery of Palace Attendants, fig. 161.
70 CG 2374, Borchardt, Sammen, pl. 12.
71 Two tubular leather cases for walking sticks were found by Emery in a First Dyna-Âmy tomb in Sakkara (Ämous, fig. 11 and pl. 41, no. 253, and another by Rasmou in the tomb of Queen Hetepheres I at Giza (LGIV, pp. 87, 45–47, 45). All these cases appear to have had flat caps, while the top of the case depicted in G 2374 is rounded. In 7.1, pl. 174, an attendant removes walking sticks from a long, tubular case.
72 The attendant with a linen bag and sandal is a regular member of the retinue of the tomb owner in the Old Kingdom, see Vassallo, Mental 2, p. 118 (31, pl. 33 [62–63]).
74 See above, p. 142.
75 See above, p. 149.
76 See Meier, in: Simpson Studies 2, pp. 582–588.
78 See e.g., Menten, Schm., p. 150, Barron-Kamen, Represen/Âtions/Ântiquts, pp. 42– 45. The verb here is written ²pt with the folded cloth, rather than the ²pt with the "door bolt; z, the latter being the customary earlier form of the verb (Edel, Alt.-Ägypt. Gramm., § 165). Alternatively, it may be that the ancient draftsman confused ²pt and ²pt in his mind and then transferred his error to the wall.
shoulder-length wig, beaded collar, and short kilt with a flaring front panel. A lector-priest’s sash is tied across the chest and what is apparently a papyrus roll is clasped in the left hand hanging behind.84

The presence of the sledge shows that the statue had yet to be installed in its final position in the serdab behind the west wall of Room 1.85 An unusual detail here is that of the haulers leaving backwards with their effort,86 usually the men pulling on the tow rope without visible strain in the same direction that the statue faces.87 It is unlikely that the haulers in c. 2374 could have dragged the statue very far in this fashion, and they may be shown maneuvering the statue into position as a preliminary to removing it from the sledge.

In the Old Kingdom offering ritual before a statue of the deceased, the statue itself is usually set on the ground. Bearers may approach with offerings to add to a pile already in front of the statue.88 There is no pile of offerings in c. 2374, but on the left side of the bottom register a file of four offering bearers marches to the right towards the statue. The figures of the bearers have all been subjected to a varying degree of damage, but the three better preserved figures all appear to have carried aloft with their left hand a tray laden with a triangular loaf of bread between two filled small, flat-bottomed flaring bowls, with a lettuce laid across the top.89 The first offering bearer held in addition a wicker frail on a cord and the right hand hanging behind.90 The figure of the last man is lost except for his feet.

Room II

Room II is an east–west vestibule connecting Rooms I and III. It is entered from a door at the east end and exited by a door in the west end of the north wall. It measures 1.05 x 3.72 meters, and its area is 3.91 square meters.

Outer Door Thicknesses

The thicknesses of the door from Room I were originally decorated with registers of offering bearers representing Khnumenti’s agricultural estates. The south thickness is preserved to its full height of three registers. On the north jamb opposite only the lowest part of the bottom register survives.

Left (south) thickness. The three registers each contain six striding female figures facing right (west), as if walking into Room II (pl. 92; fig. 87a). Each of the personified female estates was dressed in a long sheath dress with tapering shoulder straps and a long wig with the lappet resting on the breast. In every case the left hand is raised to steady a basket balanced on the head. In most instances the figures bear conical baskets, but six estates carry hemispherical baskets on their heads. In contrast to the other estates, the fourth, eighth, sixteenth, and eighteenth figures have covered baskets on their heads. Visible over the rims of the baskets are a variety of foodstuffs, most of which are insufficiently defined to render any attempt at identification profitable. In addition, the first estate in the top register carries a wickerwork frail on a cord in her hanging right hand, the second a bunch of papyrus flowers, the third a rush basket splayed towards the bottom by its handle, the fourth a pintail duck by the wings, the fifth a milk jar on a cord (destroyed), and the sixth once again a bunch of papyrus flowers. In the second register, the first estate holds her right arm parallel to the ground, palm up, but empty. The second figure in this register holds with her hanging right hand a jar on a cord and a duck by the wings, the third a bunch of papyrus, and the fourth a bunch of vegetables(?). The fifth again has a duck, while the sixth carried a wickerwork frail on a cord (destroyed). At the head of the third register, the first estate carries with her hanging right hand a jar on a cord, the second a brace of ducks by the wings, the third a wickerwork frail, the fourth a bouquet composed of a lotus flower and two buds, the fifth a jar on a cord. The right hand of the final estate in the procession hangs empty at her side.

The names of the estates have been published by Helen Jacquet-Gordon utilizing her personal copy of the original.91 Corrections and improved readings are minor and affect mainly numbers 2, 6, 9, 10, 11, and 13 below.

1. ḫn’t ḫḏt: mr ḫnty ḫḏ tī, “Kherty desires that Teti live, the ‘Front of the East’ nome.”
2. ṣrp ḫ’t ḫḏt: mr ḫnty ḫḏ tī, “Khnem desires that Teti live, the Eastern nome.”
3. ḫn’t ṣrḥ ḫt ḫḏ tī, “The offerings of Teti, the Mendesian nome.”
4. ṣm ṣḥw ṣn ḫt ḫḏ tī, “The coolness(?) of Teti, the Letopolite nome.”
5. ḫ UIBarButtonItem apopt ḫḏ tī, “The nourishment of Teti abundantly, the Harpoon nome, western half.”
6. ṣmk mr ṣḥ ḫḏ tī, “Seshat desires that Teti live, the Western nome.”
7. ṣn ḫḥw ṣḥ ḫḏ tī, “Horus of Tjerty desires that Teti live, the Saite nome.”
8. ṣm ṣḥ ḫḏ tī, “The offerings of Teti, the Jackal nome.”
9. ṣḥ ṣḥ ḫḏ tī, “Seshat desires that Teti live, the Heraclopolitan nome.”
10. ṣḥ ṣḥ ḫḏ tī, “Seshat desires that Teti live, the Harappan nome.”

91 Jacquet-Gordon, Domaines, pp. 310–12.
92 For the cuneiform names of the Delta in the Old Kingdom, see Fischer, JNES 19 (1951), pp. 310–12.
93 On the estate name, cf. Fischer, Viers Nosse, p. 75.
Chapter 7: Khnumenti -- g 2374

11. *Taw: S¢tp Pªt¢º Wn¡s, “Seshat makes Unis-leaves, the Jackal nome.”
12. The figure lacks a name.
13. Nfr bıt: Hn®y b¢ Wn¡s, “The b¢ of Unis is foremost, the Heracleopolitan nome.”
14. S¢: Nfr b¢ Wn¡s, “Beautiful of appearances is Unis, the Lepotepoline nome.”
15. S¢: S¢ Pªh Wn¡s, “P’ah satisfies Unis, the Lepotepoline nome.”
16. Wn¡s: m¢ Wn¡s, “Sehet desires that Unis lives, the Hare nome.”
17. The figure lacks a name.
18. The figure lacks a name.

Fischer has expressed the opinion that the occurrence of Seshat, patroness of architects, in the names of the estates located in Lower Egyptian nome 3 and Upper Egyptian nomes 15, 17, and 20, has no corresponding north door thickness, but rather a long relief.98 Only the legs and a few of the offerings carried by the six bearers originally depicted in the lowermost register survive (fig. 87b). The bearers of offerings on this thickness may well have been male, since the line which would indicate the bottom hem of the long dress customarily worn by female estates is lacking. The first offering bearer held a brace of birds in his left hand hanging behind and the second holds a jar by a cord in the corresponding hand. Since no offerings are visible in the case of the other four figures, these men probably had both arms raised, holding a tray aloft with one or both hands or possibly carrying a young animal or bird at chest height.

Inner Door Thickness

The inner, left (south) door thickness is lost to below the level of the reliefs, and it is impossible to be sure that it was once decorated. There is no corresponding north door thickness, but rather a long north wall that still bears vestiges of relief.

South Wall

Khnumenti stands at the right and faces towards the entrance. Before him appear five registers of agricultural and marsh scenes, the action in which proceeds from left to right (pls. 1, 58). As on the south wall of Room I the decoration is mostly visible as chisel lines since in which proceeds from left to right (pl. 88b; fig. 88). As on the south wall, only the legs and a few of the offerings carried by the six bearers originally depicted in the lowermost register survive (fig. 87b). The bearers of offerings on this thickness may well have been male, since the line which would indicate the bottom hem of the long dress customarily worn by female estates is lacking. The first offering bearer held a brace of birds in his left hand hanging behind and the second holds a jar by a cord in the corresponding hand. Since no offerings are visible in the case of the other four figures, these men probably had both arms raised, holding a tray aloft with one or both hands or possibly carrying a young animal or bird at chest height.

Inner Door Thickness

The inner, left (south) door thickness is lost to below the level of the reliefs, and it is impossible to be sure that it was once decorated. There is no corresponding north door thickness, but rather a long north wall that still bears vestiges of relief.

South Wall

Khnumenti stands at the right and faces towards the entrance. Before him appear five registers of agricultural and marsh scenes, the action in which proceeds from left to right (pl. 88b; fig. 88). As on the south wall of Room I the decoration is mostly visible as chisel lines since the plaster has fallen away.

Khnumenti’s face, shoulders, and shoulder-length wig are damaged but, as for the rest, it is clear that he wore a short kilt with belt, waist tie, and fringed piece hanging down in front.99 Only part of the leg and front foot remain of the figure who brought up the tail end of the procession.

Second Register: An abbreviated agricultural scene occupies this register. Of the large number of episodes that make up such scenes, only the concluding activities of reaping, transport, and piling sheaves appear in e.2374.95 The first group at the right is composed of three field hands. Two reapers bend forward to cut the grain. They grasp the sheaves high up in their left hands and hold the sickles in their right hands so that they curve upward. The man between them has his arms raised and his hands held in such a manner as to suggest that he was drinking from a jar of water, although no traces of the jar remain.94 At the left is a symmetrical group of two field hands tossing sheaves on a grain stack. Their arms cross over their slightly tilted bodies, as if to swing the sheaves back and up in a continuous movement.96 Above the stack are the words, reading from right to left: wbs

101 See above, p. 18 and n. 100.
102 Compare the extensive repertoire of agricultural scenes depicted on the west wall of the vestibule in e.2570 (above, pp. 99-105).
“Piling up the plashing floor.” The two donkeys at the left, relieved of their burden of sheaves, wait patiently in the charge of their drover. Traces suggest that this man, like the field hands stacking grain and the laborers in the field, wore a folded kilt with overlap and his own short-cropped hair.

Third Register. The better part of the register is occupied by a scene of bowlers netting water-fowl. The first man at the right wears the headman’s mast kilt. His left arm is bent at the elbow and held across his body, in what is probably a gesture of respect, while his other hand hangs at his side. A seemingly superfluous line at the bottom of his kilt may indicate that he held a stick or sceptre. The figure of the next man is largely destroyed but he evidently wore a flaring kilt. At the left end of the register a large clipnet is set out on either side of a small pool full of birds. As usual in Old Kingdom scenes of trapping birds, the net was shown as a hexagon, the shape it assumed when closed. Between the net and the two figures already described, three men stand, facing right and holding on to a rope attached to one end of the net. The arms of the second and third men overlap but otherwise the three figures show none of the variety of posture usual in such scenes. All three figures are damaged, but the outline of the best-preserved figure in the middle suggests they were napped. Between the haulers and the net is a fourth figure, probably the signalman whose job was to judge when the net was full of birds, and then to signal the haulers to close the net either by pulling a cloth held between his outstretched hands back and forth across his shoulders or by giving a simple hand signal. The upper part of his figure is destroyed, so the identification is not absolutely certain, but he is separated from the haulers by a narrow space, his hands do not appear on the rope where expected (though the rope is destroyed), and most importantly, his presence is indispensable in such scenes. The figures of the fowlers were concealed behind a stylized clump of foliage on the margin of the pool but, inasmuch as the upper part of this blind is lost, it is not clear whether a thicket of reeds or a clump of papyrus was represented. The birds which fill the pool, along with lotus buds and leaves, appear to be ducks. As usual in Old Kingdom scenes of trap- ping, the outline of the best-preserved figure in the middle suggests they were napped. Between the haulers and the net is a fourth figure, probably the signalman whose job was to judge when the net was full of birds, and then to signal the haulers to close the net either by pulling a cloth held between his outstretched hands back and forth across his shoulders or by giving a simple hand signal. The upper part of his figure is destroyed, so the identification is not absolutely certain, but he is separated from the haulers by a narrow space, his hands do not appear on the rope where expected (though the rope is destroyed), and most importantly, his presence is indispensable in such scenes. The figures of the fowlers were concealed behind a stylized clump of foliage on the margin of the pool but, inasmuch as the upper part of this blind is lost, it is not clear whether a thicket of reeds or a clump of papyrus was represented. The birds which fill the pool, along with lotus buds and leaves, appear to be ducks. As usual in Old Kingdom scenes of trapping birds, the net was shown as a hexagon, the shape it assumed when closed. Between the net and the two figures already described, three men stand, facing right and holding on to a rope attached to one end of the net. The arms of the second and third men overlap but otherwise the three figures show none of the variety of posture usual in such scenes.

Fourth Register. Boatmen are shown returning home from a day in the marshes. Three papyrus skiffs are depicted on a narrow rectangle representing a stretch of water. The ends of the skiffs bend slightly about where his hands should be), and most importantly, his presence is indispensable in such scenes. The figures of the fowlers were concealed behind a stylized clump of foliage on the margin of the pool but, inasmuch as the upper part of this blind is lost, it is not clear whether a thicket of reeds or a clump of papyrus was represented. The birds which fill the pool, along with lotus buds and leaves, appear to be ducks. As usual in Old Kingdom scenes of trapping birds, the net was shown as a hexagon, the shape it assumed when closed. Between the net and the two figures already described, three men stand, facing right and holding on to a rope attached to one end of the net. The arms of the second and third men overlap but otherwise the three figures show none of the variety of posture usual in such scenes.

Fifth Register. Herdsmen lead three bulls into Khnumenti’s presence. The first three figures have short, belted kilts, while the last herdsman also wore a kilt, but one lacking a flaring panel. All four men probably had their own hair cropped close, but the last figure is too damaged to be certain of this detail. Like the man at the head of the third register, the first man here bends his arm at the elbow and holds the forearm across his body. The second herdsman places his left hand on the rump of the first bull and leads a polled animal by a rope held in his right hand. Next comes a man with his left hand on the rump of the second animal and his right hand hanging at his side. The last man places his left hand on the rump of the horned bull which precedes him, while his other arm hangs free. Above the backs of all three animals is the label “mt nsw, ‘young stable ox.’”

West Wall. This short end wall (pl. 91a, fig. 8a) is largely destroyed. At the right are the feet of a large figure of Khnumenti oriented towards the left and the bottom of his walking stick, both in medium high relief of good quality. In the bottom register before him are traces of the figures of three offering bearers in lower relief facing right. Above the last offering bearer at the left part of two more registers are preserved. The figure of an offering bearer at the left end of each of these partially preserved registers was evidently aligned with the last figure although the first boatman in the lead boat and the second man in the last skiff turn their heads around to look at the man behind. Each boatman leans slightly backwards with knees bent and body evidently poised on the ball of the foot, so as to apply all of his weight to the pole. In each case their hands are held as if they were wielding long punting poles, but the poles themselves were never carved. Traces suggest that all the boatmen wore the very short kilt with rounded edge and belt-sash tied in front. Resting in the prow of the first skiff is a flat-topped chest on legs. The object in the stern of the second boat is not so readily identifiable. It appears to be round and has a trapezoidal projection at the top. Possibly it represents an example of the msh-game, although the game seemingly does not otherwise appear in this context. Several different objects are piled up at the stern of the last boat. Three have indistinct shapes, but the object on top of the pile is the papyrus handbinder used as a life preserver by boatmen. The presence of the chest and the board game (?) suggest that this was no ordinary scene of boatmen returning from the marshes, but rather a scene from an outing intended for Khnumenti’s amusement.
in the bottom register. In all likelihood two additional offering bearers in front of the partly preserved figures balanced the figures of the other two offering bearers in the lowermost register. The last offering bearer in the lowest register and the two corresponding offering bearers above each held a tray of offerings aloft with the right hand. Part of a vessel[10] is visible on the tray of the topmost figure: On the tray of the offering bearer in the middle is the bottom of a small, flaring bowl, while the offerings on the tray of the figure in the lower register included a triangular loaf. If the diagonal line to the right of this loaf belongs to another flaring bowl, it is possible that a triangular loaf appeared between two flaring bowls on the trays of both the middle and lowestmost offering bearers.[10] The topmost offering bearer has in addition a milk-jar hanging from his elbow on a sling, while the offering bearer in the middle has a large, filled, two-handled basket (only one handle is preserved) with a splay toward the bottom suspended by a cord from his elbow.

North Wall

The north wall (pl. 92a; fig. 89b) is lost except for part of the lowest register. The scene consisted of cattle being led to the left by attendants. The left end of the register is destroyed, and all that is preserved of the first animal are its headquarters. The wall itself ends some 27 cm to the left, and there was probably sufficient room for the figure of another herdsmen, perhaps the stall overseer, at the head of the file. Walking behind the lead animal was a herdsmen who probably placed a hand on its back. The next group on the right is similar to the first, though the animal is better preserved. The animal at the end of the file lacks an attendant, but may have been led by means of a short rope tied round its lower jaw.

Room III

This long east-west offering room (pl. 24a) is entered by a door in the east end of the south wall. The room measures 1.81 by 5.19 m and its area is 9.45 sq. m.

South Wall

Although the south wall of Room III is destroyed to below the level of the decoration, a number of fragmentary reliefs found by Reisner in the debris of 2.2574 probably derive from this wall. One fragment (pl. 36a; fig. 89c) shows at its left edge the end of a compartment list of offerings and on the right the tops of two columns of titles, all executed in a rather poor quality raised relief. The titles are as follows: (1) “[¡my-∞w] Ônm-nt†, (2) the hereditary prince and count, chief justice and vizier, overseer of...”[111] The constituent signs of the titles face left and, given the character of the decoration, a number of fragmentary reliefs found by Reisner in the debris of 2.2574 on file in Boston, and which were presumably stored at Giza, have yet to be located. The list records two more fragments of the same offering list, including one fitting on to the lower left portion of the block just described. These were apparently neither photographed nor drawn.

West Wall

The west wall of the offering room is occupied by a false door (pl. 95; fig. 90) cut from a single block of fine white limestone. Originally the door was surmounted by a cavetto cornice and enclosed in a torus moulding. At a subsequent date, the upper part of the false door with the cornice was broken away, and is now missing. The customary decoration of diagonal lashings and cross-lashings appears on a fragment of moulding preserved at the lower left. The door has three pairs of jambs of equal width, inscribed in sunk hieroglyphs for Khnumenti. Like the small sunk relief figures of the owner at the bottom of each jamb, the hieroglyphs face inward. On the false door panel is the lower part of a seated figure of Khnumenti facing right and the base of the offering table behind which he sits. Only the papyrus flower terminal of the side rail and the rear leg of the stool on a tall fulcrum-shaped support is shown, its front leg being concealed by Khnumenti’s legs.[10] Under the table at the right is a large ewer and basin. The lintel below the panel bears two horizontal lines of text. From right to left, they read: (1) hyy-p nsw t-wt m¢f nsw t-wt m pncy Hm-n-wt, (2) twr-r nsw t-wt Hm-n-wt, (1) “royal chamberlain and royal master builder in both houses, Khnumenti,” (2) one honored by the great god, Khnumenti.”

The inscriptions on the respective pairs of jambs are identical. Each jamb bears two columns of text and one short horizontal line with the name Hm-n-wt directly over the head of the standing figure at the bottom of the jamb. The figure in each instance has a shoulder-length wig, a chin beard, beaded collar, and short kilt with belt, waist tie, and flaring front panel. The hand in front holds a walking stick, knob end up, at a diagonal and the hanging rear hand a scepter. The figures are equal in height.

The tops of the two columns on the outer jambs are lost. What remains is as follows: (1) [...] twr-r nsw t-wt m¢f nsw t-wt m¢f huy-p Hm-n-wt, (2) [...].

99. See above, p. 106.
100. See above, p. 107.
102. See above, p. 106.
103. See above, p. 105.
104. See above, p. 105.
105. See above, p. 105.
106. See above, p. 105.
two granaries, master of secrets of every command of the king, beloved of his lord in his (viz. the king's) Two Lands. (1) [ . . . ] sole friend, overseer of scribes of royal records, favorite of the king in every work of his, overseer of the two treasures, one honored by the great god, lord of the west, (3) Khnumenti.116 The columns of text on the middle jambs also lack their beginning, which is perhaps to be restored as follows: (1) "Hpy–atw–pt prwy n wb hpr–n pty–pr mswt qrs.t(¡).f m hpr–n pty–pr mswt ndw ntwt (nrt) nswt, (2) [ . . . ] tnt±`f pr Wfr fswt fswt ffr frtp tp ±`fr nfrt ffr jy–pt fswt mswt ndw ntwt n twt ntwt (nrt) nswt, (3) [An offering which the king gives that he may travel on] the goodly ways of the necropolis117 on which the honored ones travel in peace with the great god,118 (namely) the royal chamberlain, staff of the people, pillar of the ktmn-folk, (1) [ . . . ] one honored [by Chisn], by the king, and by Anubi, Who-is-upon-His-Mountain, Lord of the Sacred Land, Who-is-in-Us,117 (namely) the overseer of the two workshops, overseer of the two houses of gold, master of secrets of the king, (3) Khnumenti.119 The text is complete on the two shorter, inner jambs, which extend only as far as the lintel. (1) "Hpy–atw–pt qn.(f) f m ffrp–n mswt jnnt, (2) [ . . . ] tnt±`f pr Phh 15=±ft fswt ffr wtp fswt mswt jnnt ndw ntwt n twt ntwt (nrt) nswt, (3) [An offering which the king gives that he be buried in the necropolis in the western desert, (2) the one honored by Prah, Who-is-south-of-His-Wall, the sole friend, royal chamberlain, royal master builder in both houses, (3) Khnumenti.120 Khnumenti's offering stone, the rear part of which is still in place, was 150 cm wide. This section of the stone, which is carved from the same block as the false door, projects 15 cm beyond the sur-
face of the outermost jambs and is roughly finished. Most likely another large block with the customary load-on-a-mat carved on its upper surface was set against it.

**North Wall**

Although destroyed to the first course, about a quarter of this wall is still in place at the east end (pl. 94a). A large block with the legs of offering bearers and crates of birds executed in a flat, sharp-edged relief now rests on the ground at the opposite side of the room (pl. 94b; fig. 59). Since the offering bearer face left, it is clear that this block comes from the north wall of the room. Seeing that it is smooth and finished below the feet of the offering bearer, it is also clear that the bearers of offerings comprised the bottom portion of the wall. A hori-
izontal line of drill holes visible in the photograph is witness to an attempt at some point in time to sunder the block in two.

The legs of eight offering bearers and feet of a ninth, proceeding to the left towards the lost table scene and the false door at the west end of the wall, are preserved. A cage of live birds rests on the ground in front of the seventh, eighth, and ninth figures. Since part of a cage is also visible behind the ninth figure, there was probably at least one more such figure to the right. The length of Room III is 1.59 m and the decorated block is only 2.57 m long, so less than half of the bot-
tom register is preserved. The handwritten list of fragments from G.1374 in Boston includes a fragment with the lower part of an offering bearer and another cage filled with ducks, which may have be-
longed in the bottom register further to the right, thus containing further offering bearers preceded by cages. Taking into account the decor-
ative scheme in contemporary east-west offerings rooms it may be in-
ferred that the group of six figures on the left side of the block carried 
haunches, while the group of figures to the right, with the bird cages at their feet, held up strangled geese as offerings.121

Another loose block found by Reisner shows parts of two super-
imposed registers (pl. 96a). In the lower register, the figure of a man
with feet missing faces left and holds two bouquets of papyrus and lily flowers before him in his right hand. In his left hand hanging
behind, he holds an ill-defined offering dangling from a cord. His

costume consists of a short wig with overlapping rows of curls and a
short kilt with belt, waist tie, and overlap. Since he faces left, his

**East Wall**

The east wall of the room is destroyed to the course below the bot-
tom register. A loose stone with part of a burschet scene on it found by Reisner may have belonged on the lower right side of the room, since such scenes commonly appear in bottom registers, and the bosud border on the right side of the block implies such a location (pl. 96b; fig. 91a).122 The broken area at the right of the border may represent all that remains of the projecting jamb on the east side of the doorway between Rooms II and III. As may be seen from the plan (fig. 3), both door jambs were cut in the same stone that forms the adjacent wall. Another reason for assigning the fragment to the east wall is the presence in the upper register of the partially pre-
served figure of an offering bearer walking towards the left. This is the
wrong direction for a figure on the south wall, where the move-
ment is from the right to the left, while the north wall of the room is
also excluded from consideration because it bore a procession of

---

116 The writing of prwy with the mountain determinative (N 25) on both jambs is unusual, but is attested in at least one other instance (Haman, Giza, p. 129, fig. 160, pl. 52). The orthography with the combination of hill-country and city determinatives is not uncommon from about the middle of the Fifth to the first half of the Sixth Dynasty; e.g., L D 1, pl. 52; Reisner, Mastabas, p. 297. Daven, Palaeoeb. 1, pl. 32; Molles, Hppg-her-abbst, p. 73; Badawy, Giza, fig. 93; Sappho’s Tomb, pl. 27-28.

117 For this sign and its variants, see Barta, Offertorium, pp. 17, 20, 31, 48, 60 and passim (Bost 12).

118 The writing of jy-pt is faulty, the city-determinative being omitted on both middle jambs.

119 The orthography of jy-pt with up-spade and the signs of the falcon on the divine standard from the jy-tp hieroglyph is worthy of note.

119 The writing of prwy with mountain determinative (N 25) instead of the hill-
country determinative (N 25) on both jambs is unusual, but is attested in at least one other instance (Haman, Giza, p. 129, fig. 160, pl. 52). The orthography with the combination of hill-country and city determinatives is not uncommon from about the middle of the Fifth to the first half of the Sixth Dynasty; e.g., L D 1, pl. 52; Reisner, Mastabas, p. 297. Daven, Palaeoeb. 1, pl. 32; Molles, Hppg-her-abbst, p. 73; Badawy, Giza, fig. 93; Sappho’s Tomb, pl. 27-28.

120 For this sign and its variants, see Barta, Offertorium, pp. 17, 20, 31, 48, 60 and passim (Bost 12).

121 See p. 8 above.

122 E.g., L D 1, pl. 57; Junker, Giza, fig. 37; GN 5, p. 242.

123 On the location of burschet scenes on the walls of the east-west offerings rooms in multi-chamber mastaba chapels, see Harpur, Decorations, pp. 157-168 and above, p. 48.
offering bearers in the bottom register. Furthermore, the style of the relief is inferior in quality to that on the north wall.

The relief fragment in question was identified and drawn by the Giza Mastabas Project but, as is evident from the drawing, the surface of the relief has undergone further deterioration in the intervening years since its discovery. Nevertheless, it can be seen from the photograph that the butcher in the bottom register leant to the left over the carcass of an ox. Behind him an assistant facing in the same direction carried a large basin, presumably for the blood of the sacrificed ox. Both men were dressed in short wigs and plain kilts, although in the case of the butcher, the rows of overlapping locks covering the surface of his wig had been carved. The butcher appears to have had a whetstone tucked into the back of his kilt. Above the slaughter scene ran a line of inscription of which only the end survived: [Istp ap]r . . . [ ] n=Sm [aau] Bt [qmdt, m prw. Knumenti, “Bringing choice things . . . ”] [the royal] “master” builder in both houses, Khnumenti. 103

The offering bearer in the upper register held the diminutive figure of a bull on a rope. In front of the right leg of the bearer are traces that perhaps represent another animal. As previously noted, the loose block from the north wall with the legs of the figure facing right suggests that a large figure of Khnumenti, facing right towards the offering bearers in registers before him and the butchers in the extra register below his feet, occupied the left side of this wall. 104

**Sердаб**

In the masonry behind the west wall of Room I, north of Room II, and east of Room III, is a chamber which Reisner identified as a serdab (pl. 94a), even though the upper parts of its walls are destroyed along with any serdab slots that may have existed. It measures 1.53 by 2.1 meters and has an area of 3.25 square meters.

**Associated Shafts and Burial Chambers**

**Shaft G 2374 a**

In the masonry behind the false door of Room III is shaft a, an unfinished cutting in the rock lined with masonry for a distance of about 6.6 m (fig. 93b). 105 The shaft measures 2.15 by 1.97 m, and had been cut about 6 m into the rock, when the work was abandoned. There was no chamber at its bottom and the shaft was filled with rubbish except for one long block at its lower end. The opening of the shaft at the upper end measured 1.05 by 2.2 m. The horizontal length of the sloping passage was 11.25 m; the angle of descent 28° 15’. The sloping length of the floor was 12.35 m and that of the roof 10.25 m. At the foot of the slope in the floor is a horizontal space 0.85 m wide (east–west). The upper chamber is entered near the middle of its east wall. The sloping drop from the end of the passage to the floor of the chamber is 0.8 m in height. The chamber is irregularly cut and measured 3.6 by 1.5 m with a height of 2.0 m. The area is 19.6 sq. m and the capacity 39.3 cu. m. In the southwest corner an oblong vertical shaft descends to the burial chamber. Three of its roofing slabs were found in place, while the fourth had been shaved aside (pl. 98a). The shaft to the lower chamber measures 2.55 by 1.0 m. It is 2.05 m to the roof of the lower chamber and 3.35 m to the floor. The lower chamber opens to the east of the shaft and measures 2.35 by 3.6 m. The height is 1.25 m and the area 6.6 sq. m with a capacity of 8.35 cu. m. The total floor area of the passage and lower chambers is 26.2 sq. m, and the total capacity 47.45 cu. m. A rectangular coffins pit was sunk in a bench in the floor of the lower chamber. The bench measures 2.6 by 1.5 m and is 0.1 m in height, while the pit measured 2.45 by 0.85 meters and had a depth of 0.35 meters. It was roofed over with three stone slabs, but was found open and empty.

Inscribed on the shoulder of the translucent diorite bowl found by Reisner in Khnumenti’s burial chamber (pl. 101b; fig. 94a) was a single horizontal line of inscription: ṣnwt b¡ty z£ R™ Tt¡ ™n∞ ∂t, “the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, the Son of Re, Teti, living forever.” The bowl is now in Boston.

**Shaft G 2374 b**

Of Reisner’s type 9 a (i), sloping-passage tomb g 2374 a (fig. 93g) descends from the east to terminate in a large chamber, in the floor of which a vertical shaft descends to the actual burial chamber. 106 The passage was originally plugged with stones, but was found open and filled with rubbish except for one long block at its lower end. The horizontal length of the sloping passage was 11.25 m; the angle of descent 28° 15’. The sloping length of the floor was 12.35 m and that of the roof 10.25 m. At the foot of the slope in the floor is a horizontal space 0.5 m wide (east–west). The upper chamber is entered near the middle of its east wall. The sloping drop from the end of the passage to the floor of the chamber is 0.8 m in height. The chamber is irregularly cut and measured 3.6 by 1.5 m with a height of 2.0 m. The area is 19.6 sq. m and the capacity 39.3 cu. m. In the southwest corner an oblong vertical shaft descends to the burial chamber. Three of its roofing slabs were found in place, while the fourth had been shaved aside (pl. 98b). The shaft to the lower chamber measures 2.55 by 1.0 m. It is 2.05 m to the roof of the lower chamber and 3.35 m to the floor. The lower chamber opens to the east of the shaft and measures 2.35 by 3.6 m. The height is 1.25 m and the area 6.6 sq. m with a capacity of 8.35 cu. m. The total floor area of the passage and lower chambers is 26.2 sq. m, and the total capacity 47.45 cu. m. A rectangular coffins pit was sunk in a bench in the floor of the lower chamber. The bench measures 2.6 by 1.5 m and is 0.1 m in height, while the pit measured 2.45 by 0.85 meters and had a depth of 0.35 meters. It was roofed over with three stone slabs, but was found open and empty.

From debris in the sloping passage came a number of carved limestone food cases (pls. 90a–102a). The cases consist of two parts, a lower case or receptacle and a fitting upper case or cover. The edges of the cases lack a rebate or groove and the upper case lay edge to edge on the lower cases with no evidence of fastening. Presumably they would have been tied together with cloth strips or string. The cases were originally painted yellow inside and out. In form the food cases represent pieces of meat, including ribs and the upper joint of the leg.
of an ox, treasured birds of varying sizes, and round cakes, in addition to an ovoid case which could represent either a cake or a piece of meat. Virtually identical food cases were found in a second burial chamber of the Senedjemib Complex, G 2381 Z. The hollows of the cases were large enough to have contained food offerings, and evidence from G 2381 Z, consisting of seventeen lots of animal and bird bones, suggest that they originally did.118

In addition to the bowl and the food cases, a number of miscellaneous items were found in the debris in the sloping shaft of G 2385 A. Without stating his reasons, Reisner felt that a fragmentary amulet from a statuette, a talismanic bracelet core, blue glazed faience cylinder beads found together with one blue glass(?), bead, and a wooden finger with plaster on the end were intrusive. He considered the wooden finger to be a Ptolemaic amulet.119

Register of Objects—G 2374 and G 2385 A

For stone vessel types, see GN’s, pp. 90–102.

G 2374, in upper debris

12–12–13 Fig. headrest, ab. l. 7.5 cm (pl. 110c, fig. 948). Exp. Ph. A 8941/4

G 2374, in Room II

55–50–35 Two blocks with relief decoration. (pl. 396). Exp. Ph. A 6024

G 2374 A, built into rear wall

13–4–566 Two adjoining fragments of relief showing two registers of butchers at work, the fragmentary figure of a singer, and above a half-register of food offerings. The carving is of much better quality than that visible in G 2374, and the relief presumably derives from another, earlier mastaba in the vicinity. (pl. 97a). MFA 15.2001. Exp. Ph. A 8927

G 2385 A, in debris in sloping shaft

12–12–48 Upper part of offering case in the form of a goose, lst., yellow wash inside and out, head of goose bruised, l. 35.6, w. 24 cm (pl. 92a). Exp. Ph. A 8772–4/4. Metropolitan Museum of Art 97.6.2A, by exchange; fis 12–12–48 (?); Hayes, Scepter 1, p. 115, fig. 79

12–12–47 Lower part of offering case in the form of a goose, lst., yellow wash inside and out, broken in three pieces, l. 19, w. 14.5 cm (pl. 99a). Exp. Ph. A 8772–4/3. Metropolitan Museum of Art 97.6.1B, by exchange; fis 12–12–47 (?); Hayes, Scepter 1, p. 115, fig. 79

12–12–46 Lower part of offering case in the form of a goose, lst., yellow wash inside and out, broken in four pieces, l. 26.7, w. 16.5 cm (pl. 99b). Exp. Ph. A 8772–4/2. Metropolitan Museum of Art 97.6.1A, by exchange; fis 12–12–46 (?); Hayes, Scepter 1, p. 115, fig. 79

12–12–45 Lower part of offering case in the form of a goose, lst., yellow wash inside and out, broken in six pieces, incomplete, l. 31.5, w. 11.5 cm (pl. 99c). Exp. Ph. A 8772–4/1

12–12–44 Lower part of offering case in the form of a goose, lst., yellow wash inside and out, broken in four pieces, incomplete, l. 17.5, w. 18 cm (pl. 99c). Exp. Ph. A 8772–4/3. Metropolitan Museum of Art 97.6.1A, by exchange; fis 12–12–44 (?); Hayes, Scepter 1, p. 115, fig. 79

12–12–43 Lower part of offering case in the form of a goose, lst., yellow wash inside and out, broken in four pieces, incomplete, l. 31.5, w. 25 cm (pl. 99c). Exp. Ph. A 8772–5/2. MFA 15.3487

12–12–42 Lower part of offering case in the form of a goose, lst., yellow wash inside and out, broken in four pieces, incomplete, l. 31, w. 18 cm (pl. 99c). Exp. Ph. A 8772–5/1. MFA 15.3486

12–12–41 Lower part of offering case in the form of a goose, lst., yellow wash inside and out, broken in four pieces, incomplete, l. 24.5, w. 16.5 cm (pl. 99c). Exp. Ph. A 8772–5/3. Metropolitan Museum of Art 97.6.1B, by exchange; fis 12–12–41 (?); Hayes, Scepter 1, p. 115, fig. 79

12–12–40 Lower part of offering case in the form of a goose, lst., yellow wash inside and out, broken in two pieces, l. 18, w. 9.5 cm (pl. 99c). Exp. Ph. A 8772–5/4. Metropolitan Museum of Art 97.6.1A, by exchange; fis 12–12–40 (?); Hayes, Scepter 1, p. 115, fig. 79

12–12–39 Lower part of offering case in the form of a goose, lst., yellow wash inside and out, broken in six pieces, incomplete, l. 15, w. 10.5 cm (pl. 99c). Exp. Ph. A 8772–5/5. Metropolitan Museum of Art 97.6.1A, by exchange; fis 12–12–39 (?); Hayes, Scepter 1, p. 115, fig. 79

12–12–38 Lower part of offering case in the form of a goose, lst., yellow wash inside and out, broken in four pieces, incomplete, l. 23.5, w. 18 cm (pl. 99c). Exp. Ph. A 8772–5/6. Metropolitan Museum of Art 97.6.1A, by exchange; fis 12–12–38 (?); Hayes, Scepter 1, p. 115, fig. 79

12–12–37 Lower part of offering case in the form of a goose, lst., yellow wash inside and out, broken in four pieces, incomplete, l. 25.7, w. 18 cm (pl. 99c). Exp. Ph. A 8772–5/7. Metropolitan Museum of Art 97.6.1A, by exchange; fis 12–12–37 (?); Hayes, Scepter 1, p. 115, fig. 79

12–12–36 Lower part of offering case in the form of a goose, lst., yellow wash inside and out, broken in three pieces, incomplete, l. 17.5, w. 16.5 cm (pl. 99c). Exp. Ph. A 8772–5/8. Metropolitan Museum of Art 97.6.1A, by exchange; fis 12–12–36 (?); Hayes, Scepter 1, p. 115, fig. 79

12–12–35 Lower part of offering case in the form of a goose, lst., yellow wash inside and out, broken in four pieces, incomplete, l. 20.7, w. 17 cm (pl. 99c). Exp. Ph. A 8772–5/9. Metropolitan Museum of Art 97.6.1A, by exchange; fis 12–12–35 (?); Hayes, Scepter 1, p. 115, fig. 79

12–12–34 Lower part of offering case in the form of a goose, lst., yellow wash inside and out, broken in four pieces, incomplete, l. 22, w. 17 cm (pl. 99c). Exp. Ph. A 8772–5/10. Metropolitan Museum of Art 97.6.1A, by exchange; fis 12–12–34 (?); Hayes, Scepter 1, p. 115, fig. 79

12–12–33 Lower part of offering case in the form of a goose, lst., yellow wash inside and out, broken in four pieces, incomplete, l. 19, w. 16.5 cm (pl. 99c). Exp. Ph. A 8772–5/11. Metropolitan Museum of Art 97.6.1A, by exchange; fis 12–12–33 (?); Hayes, Scepter 1, p. 115, fig. 79

12–12–32 Upper part of offering case in the form of a goose, lst., yellow wash inside and out, broken in two pieces, incomplete, l. 27, w. 18 cm (pl. 99c). Exp. Ph. A 8772–5/12

12–12–31 Metropolitan Museum of Art 97.6.4A, by exchange; fis 12–12–31 (?); Hayes, Scepter 1, p. 115, fig. 79
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>imy-hb nswt</td>
<td>favorite of the king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imy-hb nswt m isis f abt</td>
<td>favorite of the king in all works of his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imy-rwty</td>
<td>overseer of the two workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imy-rwty-sauw</td>
<td>overseer of the two houses of gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imy-rwty-bf</td>
<td>overseer of the two treasuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imy-rwty-ntwt</td>
<td>overseer of the six great (law) courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imy-rwty-skt</td>
<td>overseer of scribes of royal records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imy-rwty-sr</td>
<td>overseer of the two granaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imy-rwty-sr kbt</td>
<td>overseer of all works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imy-rwty-sr kbt nhw</td>
<td>overseer of all works of the king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ire-p't</td>
<td>hereditary prince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iry-p'H</td>
<td>believed of his lord in both his lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mdw nht</td>
<td>staff of the people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mafth qa nswt m prwy</td>
<td>royal master builder in both houses (Upper and Lower Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mpt</td>
<td>count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mry-skt nswt</td>
<td>master of secrets of every command of the king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mry-skt nswt</td>
<td>master of secrets of the king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mry-tp nswt</td>
<td>royal chamberlain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nfr wry</td>
<td>sole friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 'tš [sb lw] s-fw</td>
<td>[in]spector of [priests] of the pyramid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 ṣr nswt ∧t</td>
<td>'Enduring are the places of the Son of Re Te'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣr nswt ∧t</td>
<td>chief justice and vizier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Titles of Khnumenti (in alphabetical order)

1. iwm knmt
   "pillar of the knm family"
younger contemporary Senedjemib Mehi lacks any such title (below, p. 138).

In Khnumenti’s title, the figure of a squatting female offering bearer is appended as a determinative to the name of the pyramid. Wilke collected and discussed a number of such examples, the oldest of which involved the pyramid of Sahure, and furthermore argued that the royal pyramid was conceived as a female divinity in its own right.135 Subsequently, Gardiner confirmed Wilke’s contention.136

Unis was the first king to place \( \text{bt} \) before his personal name in a cartouche, a custom that was followed by his successors, including Teti, as is evident from the present title.137

**Dependants of Khnumenti**

The figures of three offering bearers surviving on the west wall of the anteroom to the south of the doorway to the vestibule are identified by name and title. All three are entitled \( \text{fm-k} \), “funerary priest,” and their names are as follows.

1. \( \text{Mn-} \text{fty} \) (PN 1, p. 150, 4, “es bleibt iby”). Although the name is poorly attested, an official with this name and the title \( \text{zt pr-mg} \ \text{nt pr} \) is known.138 If Harpur’s date for the latter is correct, he could conceivably be our individual.139 In the absence of a title other than \( \text{fm-k} \) in c. 2374, certainty is lacking, however.

2. \( \text{K} \) \( \text{efy} \) (PN 1, p. 341, 15 and 16). Although \( \text{K} \text{efy} \) (PN 1, p. 262, 3; 2, p. 380) cannot be entirely excluded from consideration, taking the available space into account, the more likely restoration appears to be \( \text{Kf} \), written either with the basket with handle or the embracing arms. \( \text{Kf} \), moreover, is by far the more common name.

3. \( \text{Snms} \) (PN 1, p. 316, 20). The name is not especially common.140 A like-named \( \text{zt} \ ? \ \text{ftf bt} \) seemingly appears in the tomb of Inti.141

---

135 ZAS 70 (1934), pp. 36–83.
137 See Beckerath, Königsnamen, p. 52.
138 Mariette, Mastabas, p. 54.
139 Denon, Description, p. 270. Unlike 1866.
140 See also PM 32, pp. 546, 548.
141 See p. 87 (20) above.
CHAPTER 8:
ANONYMOUS TOMBS G 2376–77

The sub-complex of Senedjemib Mehī stood on the east of G 2375. The nucleus was G 2378 on the north edge of the great court of the main complex and facing the court. As previously noted, this nucleus was built soon after G 2370 and before G 2374. At that time G 2375 was already in place with its open court and probably with its subsidiary mastaba or mastabas built in the court. The south wall of G 2378 was continued westwards to form the north side of the court of the Senedjemib Complex (pl. 102b, figs. 2, 3). The massive masonry (w masonry) of this wall actually continued 1.5 m to the east face of G 2374, where it continued for about half a meter, before changing to small blocks (u-masonry). The irregular joint between the two kinds of masonry was concealed from view by G 2374 (pl. 102b). The southwest corner of G 2378 is not indicated by a joint in the massive masonry, but west of the corner the wall is dressed to a slope which marks the face of the west wall of G 2378 which lies behind the mastony. The south wall of G 2378 was thus built for about 1.0 m west of the southwest corner of the mastaba. This wall was continued westwards with small masonry to a jut, 2.7 m from the east face of G 2374 (c. 2.2 m from the end of the massive masonry); this point is a little east of the west wall of G 2377 but has no relation to that mastaba. The jut in the masonry appears to represent the southeast corner of the court of G 2375 at 9.2 m east of the southeast corner of G 2375. This long composite east–west wall, extending from the southwest corner of G 2378 (marked by a difference in the dressing of the south face of the masonry) to the southeast corner of G 2375, was that against which the mastaba G 2374 was built (pl. 394). On the north side, the composite wall was strengthened first by masonry facing north, which entailed a widening of the south face of the masonry (w masonry) to the southeast (pl. 102c). The doorway in the eastern boundary wall of G 2375, which provided access to its court, was presumably still open at this point. At the same time or somewhat later a similar mud brick casing wall was built along the west wall of G 2378 before the construction of G 2377 and was cut by the northern stone retaining wall of G 2377 (figs. 2, 3). Reisner remarked that the addition of the mud brick walls was a most unusual procedure, but he had no ready explanation for their construction. Then G 2377 and 2376 were built as successive additions to G 2378 and were themselves casad in mud brick. They contained only one burial shaft each and neither had chapels of their own. Reisner assumed the services were held in the chapel of G 2378.

G 2376 was built against the west side of G 2377 and was of the same length (pl. 102a, 104a). It was bounded on the south by the east–west stone wall that forms the north boundary of G 2374. On the north and west the retaining wall was built of small blocks of grey nummulitic masonry set in low courses to form a rough sloping surface (u masonry) with a mud brick backing or casing on the west. The casing was continuous along the north side of G 2376 and 2377. The mastaba measured 7.65 by 7.35 m, and the area was 28.68 sq. m. It was preserved to a height of 3.20 m.

There was only one shaft, A, in the center of the mastaba (figs. 2, 3, 95a). It measured 1.77 by 1.04 m and was cut 7.8 m into the rock. Above it was lined with mud brick for 1.2 m and with masonry for 2.9 m. The total height of the lining was thus 4.1 m. The shaft was of type 6 a (1) with a long chamber parallel to the west side, opening flush with one end of the chamber. The chamber measured 1.6 by 1.2 m with a height of 1.65 m. The area was 3.02 sq. m. and the capacity 4.9 cu. m. It was found open and empty.

G 2377 was built against the west wall of G 2376 with G 2376 built against its own west wall (pl. 109b). With a retaining wall of u masonry on the north and west, the superstructure covered the mud brick casing on the west wall of G 2378 and that along the north boundary wall of the court and G 2374. The mastaba measured 7.35 by 5.15 m, and the preserved height was 2.66 m. Its area was 36.73 sq. m. Along the north wall, the mud brick casing of G 2376 was continued to the west face of G 2378.

Once again there was only one shaft, A, just north of the center of the mastaba (figs. 2, 3, 95b). It measured 1.17 by 1.04 m and was cut 4.35 m into the bedrock. Above, it was lined with mud brick to a height of 1.0 m and with five courses of masonry above that to a height of 1.85, the total lining being 2.85 m in height. Also of type 6 a (2), the shaft again had a long chamber parallel to its west side. The dimensions of the chamber were 2.5 by 1.0 m with a height of 1.38 m. The area is 2.5 sq. m. and the capacity 3.41 cu. m. The shaft was found open. The body of an adult female with the skin well preserved was found lying extended on its back, head toward the north, arms by its sides, and with the bones of the legs badly broken. The body rested on debris consisting of rubbish and large stones that filled two-thirds of the chamber (pl. 102b) and, for this reason, Reisner though it might be intrusive. In the debris of the chamber were found six small model vessels from an "Opening of the Mouth" set (pl. 102a).

Register of Objects—G 2377 A
For stone vessel types, see G 2378, pp. 90–102.

4 See G. G. Reisner, "Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon," pp. 435, 446.
5 For what follows, see Reisner, "Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon," p. 141.
6 See ibid., p. 144.
7 See Reisner, "Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon," p. 145.
8 See ibid., p. 144.
9 See Tomb Card G 2377 A.
13–4–516 Model bowl with spreading sides and plain rim, slate, h. 2.8 cm, type OK Xb (pl. 102c, 1/2). Exp. Ph. c. 3551 1/2

13–4–517 Model bowl with spreading sides and plain rim, slate, h. 2.8 cm, type OK Xb (pl. 102c, 2/4). Exp. Ph. c. 3550 2/4

13–4–518 Model ovoid jar with flaring neck and flat base, slate, h. 5.5 cm, type OK XVc (pl. 102c, 2/3). Exp. Ph. c. 3550 2/3

13–4–519 Model ovoid jar with flaring neck and flat base, quartzite, h. 5.3 cm, type OK XV c (pl. 102c, 2/5). Exp. Ph. c. 3551 2/5

13–4–520 Model bowl with spreading sides and plain rim, quartzite, h. 2.7 cm, type OK Xb (pl. 102c, 2/1). Exp. Ph. c. 3552 2/1

13–4–521 Model bowl with spreading sides and plain rim, hard grey stone, h. 2.2 cm, type OK Xb (pl. 102c, 2/6). Exp. Ph. c. 3550 2/6
Chapter 9: SENEDJEMIB MEHI – G 2378

G 2378, the mastaba of Senedjemib Mehi, eldest son of Senedjemib Inisi, sits on an independent site on the north side of the paved court of G 2370 (pl. 104a, b, figs. 2, 3, 96). According to Reisner G 2378 was built soon after G 2370 and before G 2374. At that time G 2378 was in place with its open court facing west. G 2378 was built over the eastern end of the court of G 2375. Moreover, its northern part overlay older constructions of mud brick represented by a series of rooms (pl. 104b). The mastaba received two additions on the west, G 2376 and G 2377. It was excavated by the Harvard–Boston Expedition in December, 1912.

G 2378 has a retaining wall or casing of different types of masonry and therefore belongs to Reisner’s type VIII (a) or (b). The chapel is of the multiple room type (7), and consists of a pillared portico (Room I) and two interior rooms. Room II is an east–west corridor or anteroom, south of and parallel to the east–west offering room (Room III). It has a slot with a serdab behind its west wall.

The mastaba measures 23 x 12 m and has an area of 276 sq. m. The proportion of the length of the mastaba to the width is 1:1.92. The total floor area is 34.86 sq. m; the relation of the floor area of the chapel to the area of the mastaba is 1:7.91.5

Portico

The entrance of the portico is nearly in the middle of the south facade of the mastaba, 2.75 m from the southwest corner and 3.4 m from the southeast corner (pl. 105a). The portico measures 1.8 x 5.9 m and has a total area of 10.06 sq. m. It was roofed with north–south slabs. The architrave that spanned the entrance of the portico originally comprised three discrete pieces, one of which when found was broken in two (pl. 105a–c). It has been restored to its original position. It bears the following inscription between incised border lines: š-npt k3-py'-mt ‘at ‘at šmt šmr šm...
side wall, is probably to be restored as follows: 'Enter & receive Steven-ch [en f'l Mhê]' [en 25f, "the true count [whose great name is] Senedjemîb, and whose good name is Mehi"]. "This was undoubtedly preceded by other titles and epithets inscribed in columns, but the latter are now lost along with the upper portions of the wall.

Part of the caption to the scene appears on the restored block in front of Mehi's face. With the aid of the presumably identical text on the opposite wall, it can be restored with some confidence as follows: [mî hê shäfî] fit mnhê sift intw m ptwun [mî hê šîwact, šiwt f't] «Tis- mehî» [Shqtr], "[Inspecting the work of the countryside] and every good thing which is brought from the hinterlands,[23] [from his countryside, his villages, and his estates of] "Lower Egypt" [and Upper Egypt]."

On the same wide block of stone as Mehi's head and shoulders are preserved one complete register and portions of two others which contained the figures of marsh dwellers. A block is missing from the middle section of the wall below, and the rest has sustained serious damage, but the damaged and missing sections certainly bore the lower parts of the figures at the bottom of the block and very probably an additional register of marsh dwellers. That two more marsh dwellers stood on the same ground line as Mehi and his son is indicated by clear traces. Evidence thus survives for at least five registers of marsh dwellers.

It is clear that certain of the marsh dwellers proceeded on foot, while others traveled in papyrus skiffs, and it is tempting to restore alternating registers of marsh dwellers so engaged. Support for this arrangement seems to come from the mastaba of Mehi's younger contemporary Sehemsnet IV, the decorative scheme of whose portico appears to closely parallel that of Mehi. Although two blocks alone survive from Sehemsnet's portico, one from its west and the other from its east side wall, one of these preserves parts of three contiguous registers with marsh dwellers in boats in the top and bottom registers and others on foot in the middle register.

It is not certain whether five or six registers of marsh dwellers were originally depicted on the west wall of the portico of c 2378. The present height of the reconstructed portico of c 2378 does not appear to allow for a sixth register. On the other hand, it is not clear on what grounds the modern reconstruction was made, since the walls of the portico were not preserved to their full height. The restoration of a sixth register would allow ample room for Mehi to extend his arm in the gesture of conjuration.

The frightened animal looks back imploringly at its mother. The last man at the stern of the boat kneels and pulls a caique out of the water by its fore-legs. The frightened animal looks back imploringly at its mother. The lower parts of the adult animals behind the boat are hidden in the water in which they swim. The first two cattle are polled, while the last three have long, curled horns. In two horizontal lines above

---

9 Pharaoh: Wb. 5, p. 138, 8–9; Gardiner, Wilbour, Papyrus 2, p. 26, 4, 79 ("background"); Canaan, E. X. Misc. p. 81 ("hinterlands"). For the distinction between the space, country or allodial land and the waterlogged hawadit, see Barton, Early Nubian Civilization, pp. 15–16 and passim.

10 Compare the legends assembled by Monnet, Sinus, p. 4.

11 Junker, Giza II, figs. 61 and 62.

12 See p. 13 above.


14 See above, p. 16.

15 See above, p. 18.

16 For the mint of the calf preceding a herd crossing the marshes, see Vandier, Manuel I, pp. 110–11.

17 Partially hidden figures in Old Kingdom relief are discussed by Smith, HESP, pp. 140, 147.

The upper part of the first partially preserved register of marsh dwellers on the restored block is missing, but the legs and feet of two men remain. Whatever the first offering bearer may have carried is destroyed. The second evidently held a bunch of flowers or vegetables in his left hand and a wickerwork frail suspended from a cord in his other hand. The register below is complete and shows two men in a papyrus boat. The first man proffers a goose which he holds by the neck and wings. The man behind bears down heavily on a pole thrust into the water to propel the skiff forward, his knees bending under the effort. The prow of the boat is bowed down under the weight of a large object, possibly a rush basket with a splayed bottom, but the stern curves sharply upwards. The first offering bearer in the next register holds a duck in the crook of his right arm, while his companion carries a caique. Lower Egypt figures are missing. The next register was carved on the missing block and is lost. As far as the lowest register is concerned, only traces remain of two figures on foot bearing offerings. The first man held a bunch of flowers or vegetables in his hanging right hand. The two figures appear to be on the same scale as Mehi's son. Boatmen and bearers alike appear to have been waggish. Scanty traces suggest they wore short, tight-fitting kilts.

Beneath Mehi's feet two horizontal registers extend across the width of the wall (pl. 107). In the upper of the two registers, herdsmen in papyrus skiffs and their charges are seen crossing a stretch of water. The movement is again directed inwards and the episodes depicted here and in the lower register are linked to those on the wall above by their common locale. The prow and stem of the lead boat in the upper register bend upwards in a gentle curve. This boat has a crew of three who sit on their heels as they ply their egg-shaped paddles. Over their heads is a caption in a single horizontal line: "Be nup- hur' s16g15 menw, "Row comrades, 'go slowly';", says the herdsman. The next boat is different in form from the first in that both ends are bent up and backwards, but it also has a crew of three. The first man sits back on his heels and rows with a paddle. The second stands and faces backwards. This individual wears the headman's mat kilt with an unfolded fringed part hanging down in front and extends his arm in the gesture of conjuration. The last man at the stern of the boat kneels and pulls a caique out of the water by its fore-legs. The frightened animal looks back imploringly at its mother. The lower parts of the adult animals behind the boat are hidden in the water in which they swim. The first two cattle are polled, while the last three have long, curled horns. In two horizontal lines above

---


the heads of the swimming cattle is the headman’s speech which, on the basis of a parallel on the south wall of Inti’s portico, is probably to be restored: [w-š n thu b3y] n3 h3 n3 h3 n3 (Inti) [nfr ‘a(nu)w]… [The channel has been prepared for the cattle.] When the crocodile is repulsed, then the dead man is repulsed’, says the herdsman.18

In the lower register, boatmen return home with their produce after a day in the marshes.19 They propel their boats by means of long punting poles.20 It seems from the traces that three boats were originally represented. The first man leans forward, bending both knees, and applies the force of his arms to the pole whose top he grasps with both hands. His attitude is worth noting for his body is drawn in a near approximation to true profile—the far shoulder and arm disappear behind the near shoulder and arm, even though the far hand is shown.21 On the prow at his feet is a large, two-handled spayed basket filled with some product of the marshes. The body of the next boatman is tipped back so that his face looks slightly upwards, one hand grasping the top of his pole and the other hand placed further down on his shaft. Except for the figure in the middle of the second boat, who holds a goose in both arms before him, and the man in the prow of the last boat, all the other boatmen assume a similar attitude. The boatman in the prow of the second boat, however, leans so far backwards as he applies his weight to the pole that it looks as though he is about to topple into the water. The last boatman on the prow at his feet is a large, spayed basket.

Traces in both registers suggest that the boatmen wore the belt-sash tied in front with pendant loose ends, or possibly the belt-sash coupled with the round-edged kilt, as on the opposite wall, and their own hair close-cropped.

**Norah Wall, west of entrance**

On the rear wall of the portico to either side of the entrance to the interior chapel are scenes of Mehi spear fishing and fowling.

The scene on the left of the entrance is both incomplete and badly weathered at present (pl. 108a; fig. 101). It was already so in Lepsius’s day (fig. 100).22 Mehi stands in a papyrus boat spearing fish, his wife and son accompanying him, as attendants watch from a nearby bank. The boat curves upwards at the prow, more sharply upwards at the stern. Beneath the stern a large clamp of swamp reed projects above the water.23 Mehi’s legs are widespread for balance. With both arms raised nearly symmetrically to the height of his shoulders, he holds either end of a fishing spear. Numerous parallels to the scene indicate that he was portrayed in the act of transfixing two large river fish; the back of one fish is still to be made out in the midst of the badly damaged papyrus thicket at the right.24 His dress consists of a shoulder-length wig and the semicircular kilt usual in fishing and fowling scenes, the trapezoidal front panel destroyed, but the overlapping folds, belt, and waist tie still evident.25 Above his head are the remains of a horizontal line of large hieroglyphs which probably read: […] She may be restored: [s3n.]… [Senedjem-ib, his good name]…

On a separate ground line above the curving prow of the boat stands one of Mehi’s sons. He is wigless, and it is clear from Lepsius’s drawing that he was dressed in a short kilt with flaring front panel. He apparently held a spare harpoon, blunt end up, in his left hand before him. A short column of text probably occupied the space between his figure and the papyrus thicket at the right, but all that remains are a few damaged signs giving his name, which was better preserved in Lepsius’s day: S4m-ib, ‘Senedjemb’.

Setting with both legs tucked under her at her husband’s feet is Mehi’s wife. Before her face are traces of the signs that made up her name, [H3n]… [b3w], ‘[Khen]’kau3’. It is clear from Lepsius’s copy that she held a blue lotus to her nose with her left hand, while the other hand lay open in her lap. Except for the stem the lotus is now destroyed, and her hand and head mostly lost. She wore a short wig and over it a double flower-knot diadem with long streamers, which is better preserved in Lepsius’s copy.

Behind Mehi three attendants stand on separate groundlines. The figure on the upper line is the most severely damaged of the three but, like his fellows, he was presumably wigless and wore a kilt with flaring front panel. Traces make it clear that he held something in his hanging right hand, possibly a bird. Even though his rear hand is destroyed, the foremost attendant on the lower groundline probably had both hands hanging empty at his sides, since the duck held by the second individual otherwise fills the space between the two. His title and name were inscribed in a column before him but all that remains is: [nfr ‘a(nu)w]… [personal scribe of royal records]. The last attendant also appears to have held something in his hanging right hand, perhaps a wickerwork frail, but the object itself is destroyed, even though the cord from which it hung can still be made out.

The stretch of water below the papyrus skiff teemed with aquatic life. The fish from left to right are: destroyed, destroyed, a catfish(?), destroyed, an eel, and an Oxyrhynchus fish (Mormyrus kannume). Further to the right Lepsius saw a crocodile with mouth agape waiting to devour a newborn hippopotamus calf. The motif is a popular one in the Old Kingdom.27 Only the line of the crocodile’s back and the outline of the hippopotamus cow are still visible. From the angle of its body, the fish to the right is probably a puffer fish.

At the far right a man in a papyrus boat fishes with a handnet.28 A well preserved example of the handnet in the tomb of Kagemni consists of a pair of sticks crossed and lashed near the head end to form a V with a third stick placed crosswise to act as a spreader, while

---

18 See above, p. 37. This scene for the terminal climax is noticed after n8t, and part of the letter n may be visible in the appropriate place in the photograph.
19 See above, p. 319 and n. 206.
20 See Harpur, Decorations, pp. 117–17, for the punning adopted by the boatmen.
21 Compare HEGP, pp. 209–11; Harpur, Decorations, p. 152.
22 L. E. Breasted, pl. 101(b).
23 See above, p. 40 and n. 15.
24 See above, p. 49.
25 Friedman, The Library, p. 43.
26 See above, p. 40; n. 17 above.
27 See Bates, Ancient Egyptian Fishing, pp. 144, 146; Montet, Sothis, pp. 24–26; Vandier, Manuel, 5, pp. 138–47; Brower-Friedman, Fish and Fishing, pp. 96–97; van Elsbergan, Fishers, pp. 40, 184 (163).
the projecting ends of the side were connected by a rope which formed one side of the mouth of the deep net that hung between the 

sticks. A few faint lines here indicate that the net was filled with 
small fry. As in the tomb of Kagemni, it is possible that another 

fisherman shared the boat, for other traces appear to show a fish 
cought on a line. 

North Wall, East of Entrance

On the wall to the right of the entrance, Mehi was depicted with his 
wife, sons, and attendants fowling in the marshes (pl. 109, fig. 100). 
The upper part of the wall was already destroyed in Lepsius’s day 
(fig. 100), and what survives has undergone further deterioration. 

The skiff is better preserved here than on the flanking wall. The 

stern is more elevated than the prow, and it is clearly fitted out with 
a wooden deck to protect Mehi and his wife from the water which 
would have seeped up through the bottom of such craft. A clump 
of swamp weed again fills up the stern under the seat. 

Mehi’s figure is destroyed above the waist. He stood facing left 
and would undoubtedly have held a throwstick aloft in his right 
hand and decoys in the other. He apparently wore the same semicircular 

kilt with overlap and trapezoidal front panel as in the spear fishing 
scene on the other side of the entrance, but here the garment is even 
less well preserved. In contrast to the flanking scene, his wife sits at 
the front of the deck. She has both legs tucked under her and holds 
on to Mehi’s front leg with her rear hand. Her figure is now nearly 
destroyed, but it is clear from Lepsius’s drawing that she had fresh 
flowers stuck into her hair and sniffed a blue lotus held in her other 
hand. Over her head was a short, horizontal line reading from right 
to left which contained her name, Hnt-ws-hn., “Khenertau.” Except 
for faint traces, this is lost today. 

Above the prow of the boat, a standing figure on a separate 
groundline faces the couplet and holds a throwstick in his left hand. 
The figure is badly damaged and any identifying text lost, but prob- 
ably represents one of the couplet’s sons, since a son of the owners 
of ten stands in the prow or stern of the boat in such scenes and 
holds a spear throwstick or two. Here the son actually turns 
towards his father and holds the spare boomerang out to him. 

On separate groundlines behind Mehi, Lepsius shows the dam- 
gaged figures of four attendants two by two. All that remained of the 

attendants in the upper row were their legs. The figure of the first 
man in the bottom row was better preserved and stood facing left 
with hands hanging at his sides. He was wigless and wore a kilt with 
flaring front. Part of the line of his back is all that is visible today. 

Before him was a short column of hieroglyphs which undoubtedly 

contained his title(s) and name; most was to be made out in 1842–45, 
but only a few traces of signs survive at present. The front part of the 
figure of the man behind was also preserved, as was the column of 
text before him, which can be restored with some confidence, since 
his figure appears elsewhere in Mehi’s tomb (pls. 187–89) also [Hnt-]swt, “the overseer of scribes, [Hem]-akht.” Here he wore a flaring kilt 
and probably had both hands at his sides like his fellow, even though 
the front arm and hand alone are preserved in the Lepsius drawing. 

In the midst of the papyrus thicket in front of Mehi, a hippo- 

potamus bust is depicted (pl. 108b). Two harpooners and a boatman, 
on a smaller scale than Inti and his family, occupy a papyrus skiff. 
The attitude of the harpooners, whose figures partly overlap, was 
identical: legs spread wide for balance, rear hand raised ready to cast 
a harpoon, front hand lowered. As is also the case with certain of the 
punting poles on the east wall of the portico, the harpoons them- 
selves were never carved. Neither were the lines that would have been 
attached to the harpoon points embedded beneath the skin of the 

animals, and only the first harpooner is shown with gathered retriev- 
ing lines in his front hand, whereas the other man’s front hand is 
clenched but empty. Both harpooners wear the very short, round- 
edged kilt with the loose ends of the belt-sash hanging down in front, 
but the figure of the second harpooner is damaged, so that it is 

impossible to know whether he too wore the kind of halter held up 
by a single strap that covers the upper body of the foremost man. The 
boatman in the stern raises one heel and leans on his pole to 
hold the craft steady for the harpooners. Once again his pole was not 
carved. The lower parts of the bodies of the two hippopotami which 
are the quarry of the harpooners are hidden in the water; all that projects above the surface are their gaping jaws. 

The upper part of the thicket was already destroyed by Lepsius’s 
day; and only one bird is seen at present nesting on a low lying papyrus 
umbel. A walk at the left is bent down, presumably under the weight 
of a marauder, either an ichneumon or civet cat, who climbed towards 
the nests. Part of its tail is still visible as a broken diagonal line. 

East Wall

Although there is some variation in the subsidiary figures in the reg- 
isters beneath Mehi’s feet, the scene on the upper part of the east wall 
(pls. 110, 111, fig. 105) essentially duplicated that on the west wall. 
Once again Mehi and a son stood facing outwards towards marsh 
dwellers in superimposed registers before them. The figure of the son 
and those of the two masts dwellers on the same ground line are 
badly damaged and only their legs remain. Traces of other mast 
dwellers appear on an isolated block high up on the wall (pl. 112). 

See below, pp. 146, 150. 

Called by Vandier, Manuel 4, p. 31, “a hauberk” or “breastle.” For other exam- 

ples, see 75/3, pl. 101, Two Craftsmen, fig. 2. 

For partially hidden figures in Egyptian art, see above, p. 154 and n. 10. 

See p. 48 above.
In 1842–43 the bottom of the wall, as high up as Mehi’s feet, alone remained in place (fig. 104). Two fallen blocks also copied by Lepsius, the first with the upper part of Mehi’s figure, the second the isolated block with the figures of the marsh dwellers, have subsequently been returned to the wall, albeit not quite to their original places. In fig. 105 these blocks have been restored approximately to their original positions. There is considerable damage to Mehi’s figure, so it is not certain that his costume was identical in every respect to the portrayal on the opposite wall. Nonetheless, it is clear that he once again wore a double-flower knot diadem with streamer over a short wig and carried a walking stick knob-end up at a diagonal in his front hand. Above his head appears the identifying caption: buy-er-mu ‘Sadjn-ib ra.f Myt ra safu, “The true count whose great name is Senedjemib and whose good name is Mehi.” Presumably here too, the space above would have been occupied by columns of text giving his titles and epithets. Before Mehi’s face is part of the long column of text that served as a caption to the scene. Assuming that it was identical to the column on the west wall, it probably read: [mu kš st ḫt mnh t(mnh) st(pwt) st(mnh) st(pwt) /niwstu.] “(Inspecting the work of the countryside and every good thing) which is brought from the hinterlands, from his countryside, his villages, and his estates of Lower and Upper Egypt.”

The isolated block at the top of the wall preserves most of one register and parts of two more. The traces remaining in the uppermost register are difficult to make out. From the posture of the first marsh dweller, it is likely that he knelt in and paddled a papyrus skiff. The figure of the second individual is only represented by a few surviving lines, but it is possible that he held up a goose by the neck and wings. The first marsh dweller in the middle register carries two papyrus stalks with his left hand, the arm bent at the elbow and fist closed on his chest, and a spayed basket in the hand hanging behind. The second man may have carried a small animal, since what appears to be a snout and ears (?) are to be made out at his right shoulder. Only the very top of the register below survives. It may similarly have contained two figures originally. All that is visible now is the top of the head and face of the marsh dweller at the right and part of the offering he carried.

The representations in the two broad registers underneath Mehi’s feet are badly weather worn. Enough remains though to show that the composition in both registers differs in a number of particulars from what is on the opposite wall. For example, the lead skiff in the upper register is evidently propelled by punters rather than by rowers as on the west wall. In the middle of this skiff are the legs and feet of a standing figure who may have held up an offering to Mehi in his destroyed right hand. The upper part of his figure and that of the boatman in the prow are destroyed, but a broken line suggests that his left arm hung behind. Both punters were clearly poised in a deep crouch. Presumably the man in the prow, like his fellow in the stern, held his punting pole across his chest with one hand close to his head and the other hand close to his hip. As is the case with the harpoons of the hippopotamus hunters on the north wall of the portico to the east of the entrance, the punting poles here were apparently never carved. The figures in the second skiff are badly damaged, but there appear to have been only two occupants instead of the three as on the opposite wall. Traces suggest that the first man sat on his heels, and probably rowed with a paddle. The other individual clearly stood and faced backwards. He was almost certainly the headman making the gesture of conjuration, for his spell survives in the space over the head of the swimming cattle: wh ḥw ḫw ḫw ẖnt ḫw ẖnt in ntnw, “The channel has been prepared for the cattle. “When the crocodile is repulsed, then the dead man is repulsed,” says the headman.” As on the opposite wall a group of polled and long-horned cattle swims behind the boat, but the figure of the crocodile is omitted. The calf at the rear of the file appears to be confused or distracted, for it faces in the wrong direction.

The attitudes of the boatmen in the lower register likewise differ from those in the corresponding register on the west wall. Although the figures are badly damaged, they were much better preserved in Lepsius’s day (fig. 104). The first and second men in the first papyrus skiff were punters, their knees bent, the pole held close to the top and lower down, in the case of the first man at chest height and in that of the second man close to the hip. The man at the stern faced in the opposite direction and evidently pushed on the top of his pole to propel or direct the boat. The attitudes of the boatmen in the other two skiffs show little variation and, even then, mostly in regard to how they held the poles or where they place their feet. Once again, the poles of the first three punters, and evidently also of the punter at the prow of the second skiff, were never carved, in contrast to the poles of the punters on the right side of the register. The man in the center of the second skiff held a goose or duck in both arms in front. The figure of the calf lying down between his wide-spread legs is now completely destroyed. In contrast to the west wall, Lepsius’s artist shows the boatmen in this register dressed in the round-edged kilt with the belt-sash tied behind and the private parts exposed. The catulous curve at the stern of the last boat was also seen and drawn by Lepsius. It appears to be the raised arm and back of the head of a boatman who has fallen overboard and is hauling himself out of the water. This detail and that of the calf above, neither of which are part of the standard repertoire of motifs, may represent a rare instance of an ancient artist inserting his own personality into the composition, perhaps in this instance even with comical intent.

Entrance

Both the drum and the listel over the entrance to the interior chapel were already missing when Lepsius cleared the mastaba. Flanking scenes of Mehi and his eldest son Senedjemib decorated both entrance thicknesses.

Left (west) outer thickness

The left thickness (pl. 112A, fig. 107) was in a somewhat better state of preservation when drawn by Lepsius (fig. 106). Mehi stands at the right facing onwards towards a smaller figure of a son. He holds...
a walking stick knob-end up at a diagonal in his right hand in front and a folded handkerchief in his hanging left hand behind. Over a mid-calf kilt with a flaring front panel and waist tie, he wears a leop-
ard skin. His right hand (seen from the front) holding the walking stick is correctly rendered but, as is apparent from Lepsius’s sketch, the hand holding the handkerchief was a right hand (seen from the front) attached to the left shoulder.48 Mehi’s head has been destroyed, but it is likewise clear from Lepsius’s sketch that his wig was a short one, probably worn together with a double-flower knot diadem and streamers (of which one had survived), a chin beard, and a beaded collar. Lepsius also shows bracelets on Mehi’s hanging left arm which are not anymore visible. The upper border of the leopard skin and the shoulder knot have likewise disappeared, but part of the ribbons dangle-
ning from the shoulder knot are still to be made out. There are also traces of the claws dangling from the leopard’s paws. A seemingly odd feature is the leopard’s head set on its side at waist level, but the same placement appears on the north entrance thickness of G 2370 and in a number of other instances both at Giza and Saqqara.49 Before Mehi’s face stood an inscription in four columns: (1) [. . . ] m∂¢ nswt, (2) [. . . ] m∂¢ nswt, (3) [. . . ] m∂¢ nswt, (4) [. . . ] m∂¢ nswt.50 As on the flanking wall, the outlines are clear from Lepsius 138 51 49 See above, p. 41 and n. 98.
48 See HESP, pp. 174–75.
49 See above, p. 41 and n. 48.
50 LID, Ergyte, pl. xi (lower).
51 HESP, pp. 174–75.

**Right (East) Outer Thickness**

The right thickness (pl. 12b; figs. 168, 250) has sustained considerably more damage than the left thickness.52 On the flanking wall, Mehi stands facing a smaller figure of his son. He is dressed in a leop-
ard skin worn over a flaring, calf-length kilt and holds a walking stick knob-end up at a diagonal in his left hand before him. In contrast to the flanking figure which has a short wig, he wears a shoulder-length wig and carries a scepter in his right hand instead of a handkerchief. Traces of a chin beard remain. Mehi faces right but, as on the left thickness, the artist experienced trouble in the rendering of the hands. He correctly placed a left hand (seen from the front) holding the walking stick on the left arm, but incorrectly showed the right hand, as though it were seen from the front instead of the back. In a figure facing right the scepter normally passes in front of the body, whereas in a figure facing left it usually passes behind the body.53 It is clear from Lepsius’s sketch that in the present case the scepter passed behind the body, even though Mehi faces right. The outline of the leopard skin was better preserved in 1842–43, but Lepsius’s

---

48 See HESP, pp. 174–75.
49 See above, p. 41 and n. 48.
50 LID, Ergyte, pl. xi (upper right).
51 LID, Tori, pl. 22.
52 E.g., ibid., pp. 45, 59–60.
53 LID, pl. 74 [b]; head of deceased, LID, pl. 278 [c]; see FM 3, p. 88.
54 In the detail of Mehi’s head from this wall in LID 2, pl. 293 [g], the two outer head-
sand rows of the broad collar are not indicated, but such details are also omitted from the portrait of Sn∂m-¡b and Neferefre reproduced on the same plate.
The smaller figure of the son has both hands at his sides and, although he is wigless, he is otherwise dressed in a fashion similar to his father. Over his head, in the space bordered by his father’s arm, walking stick, and kilt, was an identifying inscription, which is still largely intact: (1) [walking stick, and kilt, was an identifying inscription, which is still]

First Register: Destroyed.

Second Register: Destroyed.

Third Register. Three cranes were driven towards Mehi by a keeper. Their heads were already destroyed when Lepsius copied them, but they are readily recognizable by their long legs, the form of their bodies, and the drooping outline of their tail plumage. As is generally the case in bird processions, their species were probably given in captions over their backs, just as the smaller birds are identified in the case in bird processions, their species were probably given in captions over their backs:

Fourth Register. Three birds faced Mehi. All three were of approximately the same size but were distinguished by short captions. Over the back of the first bird was written: frior, “a thousand greylag goose (Anser anser).” Over the second bird was (Aleur albofonsorum). Over the back of the third animal frior, “a thousand white-fronted goose (Anser albofonsorum).”

Fifth Register. This register was occupied by three men struggling with an oryx. The figure of the man on the right, part of the individual directly in front of him, the better part of the caption behind them, and traces of the legs of the figure on the far left and of the oryx are all that survive today. From Lepsius’ drawing, it is clear that the oryx had all four feet firmly planted on the ground and was refusing to budge. The efforts of the men were of little avail. The two men at the left and probably placed both his hands on the animal’s neck to urge it in the right direction. The last man at the left leans backwards and most likely was shown pulling on a rope attached to one of the animal’s rear legs with his right hand, although the rope itself appears never to have been carved. Only a few traces remain of the caption written over the animal’s back: int ror mi-bip, “Bringing a young oryx.” Although only the head of the figure on the right was preserved, all the men probably had their own close-cropped natural hair and wore the belt-sash with loose ends hanging down in front.

First register has further deteriorated since Lepsius’ day. Three men struggle with a second oryx. The first man on the right facing left holds the animal’s snout and, as may be seen from Lepsius’ copy, also held onto its horns. The next man leans forward to the right and probably placed both his hands on the animal’s neck to urge it in the right direction. The last man at the left leans backwards and most likely was shown pulling on a rope attached to one of the animal’s rear legs with his right hand, although the rope itself seems never to have been carved. Only a few traces remain of the caption written over the animal’s back: int ror m£-¢∂, “Brought a young oryx.” Although only the head of the figure on the right was preserved, all the men probably had their own close-cropped natural hair and wore the belt-sash with loose ends hanging down in front.

Wet Wall

The west wall was the only one in Mehi’s tomb which appears to have been preserved to essentially its full height in 1842–43. Lepsius copied six registers, four dedicated to agricultural activities and two others occupied by offering bearers and butchers (fig. 112). The sequence of events in the first four registers appears to be from top to bottom, the reaping of grain being shown in the first register, the loading of donkeys with sheaves in the second register, the return of the donkeys in the third register, and the threshing and winnowing of the grain in the fourth register. The agricultural activities represented on this wall were continued from the adjacent north wall, where scenes of land preparation and the flour harvest were shown. At present the first register and the top of the second register are missing and, while the blocks bearing the top of the second register and the left side of the second through fourth registers are still in place, their surfaces have almost entirely spalled away (pl. 114a–b, fig. 113). Behind this wall is a rectangular serdab which communicates with Room II by a slot opening in the fourth and fifth registers at about the middle of the wall. The measurements of the serdab are 3.4 x 1.45 m, and it has an area of 4.9 sq. m and a depth of 3.50 m. At a date subsequent to its construction, the serdab was divided in two by a rubble wall, the slot filled with plaster, and an intrusive pit

57 Note that the pl. 114a–b, fig. 113. could proceed very nicely instead of following it, as it does for instance in pl. 116, fig. 114 below. Here as elsewhere Lepsius’s directions have misinterpreted the two component signs for qa in the title waat n swt m prwy as ∞rp ™¢

58 See Houlihan, Birds, p. 83.

59 For the different species of geese, see Vandier, Manuel I, pp. 401–98.


63 See Reisner, “Description of Additions to Censusry at Esedum,” p. 146.
(c 2578 b) constructed in its southern half. The plaster filled slot is visible as an irregular blank outline in pl. 1144, b and figs. 112 and 113.

First Register. This register is now lost, but it may be seen in Lepsius’s drawing that two groups of three reapers are separated by a seventh man who stands erect. The field of grain is represented by a low rectangle without interior detail. The reapers bend forward to the right and grasp a sheaf of grain in their left hands. The sickles with which they cut the grain are held curved upwards in their other hands. The man in the middle holds his hands out before him in such a fashion as to suggest that he was occupied in removing a weed or straggly stalk from a bundle of grain. The two badly damaged figures on the edge of the field to the far left possibly represent a flute player and an overseer.

In Lepsius’s drawing the standing reaper wears a very short round-edged kilt, whereas the other reapers appear to be naked except for a belt with a pendant element at the back. It is, in fact, possible that all the reapers originally wore the very short, round-edged kilt with belt-sash, a costume that is frequently adopted by field hands, here, as often, shown with the belt-sash tied behind, and that Lepsius’s draftsman has in the first case mistakenly omitted the tucked up flap and in the second case the curved edge of the kilt. He was evidently unaware of the nature of the garment, for he consistently shows the round-edged kilt without pendant loose ends both here and in the registers of agricultural workers below, whereas traces visible both then and now suggest that many of the workers were probably dressed in the round-edged kilt with the loose ends of the kilt either tied up behind or hanging down in front. Although a simple belt-sash with pendant ends tied in front or back is sometimes worn by field workers, the round-edged kilt is almost invariably worn with a belt-sash.

Second Register. A file of four donkeys loaded with panniers of grain was driven to the right by drovers and the young boys who served as their assistants. The better part of the figures of the first two donkeys visible in Lepsius’s plate, along with the drovers and their assistants, still survive, as do the forefront of the third donkey and the figure of an assistant. The taller figures of the drovers have lost their heads, however, whereas a number of the (younger and shorter) boys walking alongside the donkeys have kept theirs. The looser grain was driven to the right by drovers and the young boys who served as their assistants. The better part of the figures of the first donkey walks to the right, while the young boy marching alongside are completely lost. The (younger and shorter) boys walking alongside the donkeys have kept theirs. The sickles on the tail of the third donkey are worked on its tail, while with his other hand, as may also be seen in the earlier drawing, he probably held onto the mat blanket on the animal’s back. Just such a blanket is visible on a donkey in the register below. The young boy beside the animal stoops to the left, presumably to adjust the girth or strap that encircled its body and fastened the sacks on its back. Between the drover holding onto the donkey’s tail and the next animal is an incomplete caption: [ . . . | my s, [ . . . | that which is in the rear? ]]. It perhaps represents the speech of the young boy beside the third donkey. This animal and its drovers proceeded to the right without apparent incident. From Lepsius’s drawing, it seems that the young boy at its side steadied the load with his missing left hand. It is not clear what he might have been doing with his other hand, since his right arm below the elbow was also missing. The position seems awkward but occurs elsewhere. The drover behind this donkey, in the portion of the register that is now destroyed, had his left hand raised, perhaps to steady the load on the animal’s back. He appears to have had a stick tucked under his right arm and grasped the donkey’s tail with his right hand. Behind him were traces of a caption. The last donkey stumbled under the weight of its load. In Lepsius’s drawing its head nearly touches the ground and its front knees buckle from the weight of the burden. The young boy beside it lunged forward to grab the sacks with his left hand, as did the drover behind, who also pulled on the donkey’s tail with his other hand. His raised left hand may once have held a stick.

Third Register. On the right side of the register sheaves of grain were stacked up on the edge of the field. Lepsius drew two stacks, the left-hand stack higher than the other. It is possible that he was correct in this but, if so, the plaster in which the right-hand stack was apparently carved has fallen away, leaving only an indefinite outline. The posture adopted by the two men at the left makes their activity perfectly clear: the pair kneel on either side of a large sack filled with sheaves of grain and pull on the ropes that pass through loops at their top in order to close it. The ropes themselves though were never carved. The grain protrudes from the top of the sack, but the individual sheaves are not delineated.

---
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The middle of the register is occupied by a herd of donkeys returning from the threshing floor, where they had been relieved of their sacks of grain. Five donkeys wait to be reloaded. The complete figure of the donkey in front wears a blanket on its back. One of the animals lowers its head to browse, while another turns around and brays at the drovers who approached from the left, but whose figures are now missing. Over the backs of the donkeys is a short label reading from right to left which probably represents the speech of the first man and seemingly reads: ‘Get control, hurry!’

Four of the five drovers were drawn as a partially overlapping group. Their attitude was nearly identical with legs wide apart in a running attitude, arms bent at the elbow and swinging back and forth in keeping with their gait. Drovers usually carry sticks, but if they did so here, Lepsius’s artist has omitted them and shows their left hands open. He has omitted as well the right hands of all but the last drover, whose right hand is likewise open shown. Since he is set apart from the rest of the drovers, the man who ran in front was probably an overseer. He carried a long stick in his right hand.

Fourth Register. The threshing and winnowing floors are represented on either side of a large stack of grain. Four donkeys and two field hands were shown on a low rectangle which represented the threshing floor. The figures of donkeys and field hands are damaged and were so in 1842–43. The bottom of the register with the base line is lost in the space between blocks and only the upper line of the threshing floor is preserved. Although the field hands are shown ankle-deep in the grain on the threshing floor, the donkeys appear to stand on top of the sheaves. Three of the donkeys face right, and the foremost lowers his head to nibble at the grain. A fourth animal faces in the opposite direction. Field hands in threshing scenes generally brandish sticks to keep the animals moving, and it is possible that the smaller figure on the right of the threshing floor leaning forward to the left with both arms in front held together and loosely bent at the elbow wielded a stick held in both hands, even though Lepsius’s artist has again shown the hands open.88 The field hand on the other side of the threshing floor holds out what may be a stalk of grain with his right hand to the donkey facing left, perhaps to entice it to move in the desired direction. He raises his other hand to his mouth as though shouting to attract his comrade.89 The artist appears to have experienced some difficulty with the top of the serdab slot. The first individual holds up a goose by the neck and a pair of winnowing fans grasped in the other.84 The task of separating the wheat from the chaff was generally entrusted to women.90 Nevertheless, the piece of clothing projecting behind the waist may be an indication that this figure wore the short, round-edged kilt with front flap tucked up that has already been discussed.91 Only occasionally do women wear this distinctly masculine garment.92 Alternately it might represent the belt-sash tied at the back of the plain, short kilt occasionally worn by female workers, even though the tassel here expected in such a garment is not visible here.88

As previously mentioned, the left side of the register has suffered further deterioration since Lepsius copied the wall, and the figures of the two winnowers at the left end of the register no longer exist. Lepsius shows these figures with their own short hair, dressed in the plain, short kilts worn by male and female field hands alike.85 In his copy, however, the left-hand figure has what looks to be a pigtail at the back of the head, and it may be that this represents the ends of a cloth tied around the head to protect the hair from airborne chaff.93 Since men usually make do without a head covering of any kind, if correctly copied, this detail might indicate that this figure at least was that of a woman. The right-hand figure stood and faced right. From the position of the arms, which are brought together in front and sharply bent at the elbow, it is possible that the figure was passing grain and chaff through a sieve. The rectangular outline in front of the figure, extending from hands to ground, would then represent the sifted grains falling to the ground.94 The left-hand figure stoops over to the left. The position of the arms, which are extended horizontally in front at the height of the shoulders with the forearms bent obliquely, suggests that this figure threw wheat and chaff into the air with two pairs of winnowing fans held in the hands.

Fifth Register. A totally different subject is represented in this and the succeeding register: the slaughter of animals for the funerary meal and the opening phases of the ritual directed to the statues in the serdah. On the right side of the register, three figures face the serdah slot. The first individual holds up a goose by the neck and wings. The artist appears to have experienced some difficulty with this portrayal. In his near or left hand, the figure holds the bird by the neck just below the head, while he grasps the bird’s wings with his far hand (actually a left hand seen from the back on an arm attached to the right shoulder). Properly speaking the wings should pass behind the figure, but instead the wing tips overlap his kilt. As a result the figure’s arms appear to cross in front of his body. Before his face is the label: zib ‘inat bi ‘the dignity and elder of the
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porch." Unless it once occupied the destroyed space below the bird's tail or that over his own head, his name was omitted.

The next man holds up two pieces of cloth. Before his face and figure are inscribed a title and name: *zk f* ... *flk* ("the dignitary and ... , Khnum(Ba) sheep."). *Zk* does not usually occur alone in the Old Kingdom, being regularly paired with another, functional title as an indication of rank. 92 This is true, for example, alone in the Old Kingdom, being regularly paired with another, in the titulary of the previous individual, 97  Harpur, *See e.g., Simpson, 95  See e.g., above, p. 74. 93  See below, p. 160 (5). 92  See right and grasps the foreleg he carries over his left shoulder with both hands. A damaged caption before his face appears to read *stp*, perhaps for *up* (?), "choice cut," although Lepsius's draftsman thought he saw walking legs after the word rather than the *sp-adze. The lower part of another butcher at the right is hidden behind the body of the oryx (?). The latter individual faces left towards the preceding figures. Both hands are raised before him, and he holds a knife in his right hand, while his other hand is open and empty. The speech inscribed in the area before his face is only partially preserved today. As copied by Lepsius it reads: *um tu, "Hurry up!" At the far right, standing beside the ramp of the animal, is another assistant who faces left and holds a foreleg over his right shoulder with his right hand. In his left hand hanging behind, he holds what was probably intended for a slab of ribs on a cord. His name is *Hyuflm* (?). 98 In the second scene two butchers carve up the carcass of another animal thrown on the ground, this time with its head to the right. The butcher on the right leans over the carcass to the left. With his right hand he thrusts a knife into the animal's body, while holding its head steady with his left hand. The second butcher at the left facing right places his left foot on the animal's bound legs and sharpens his knife with a whetstone. The whetstone in parallel scenes is usually attached to the belt by a cord but no cord is visible here. 99 The speech of the second butcher began in front of his face and continued behind his head; it was still largely intact in 1842–43: *um tu w3y-fltm* *nt, "Hurry up comrades, do it!" 100 Three figures and a bound ox make up the third scene at the left. The head of the ox is once again to the right. The assistant on the right places his right foot on the head of the ox and holds onto its horns to prevent the head from moving. The butcher behind the body of the ox faces the man at its head, and once again appears to be sharpening his knife. The assistant on the left places one foot on the bound legs of the animal and leans far back to the left, as if he were pulling hard on a rope tied around the legs, though the rope itself was never carved. He says: *fr nk t3 fr um, "Do it!, make it happen, hurry." 101

Sixth Register. Three animals are butchered. The details of the scene at the right are especially difficult to make out because of the poor state of preservation of this area of the wall. A bound animal, possibly an oryx because of the long, curved horn(s) shown in profile, lies on the ground with its head to the left, while a butcher leans over it to the right. From parallels in other tombs it seems that he held a knife in his right hand with which he is about to remove its heart. 102 He simultaneously turns his head round and looks slightly upwards at the assistant behind him. 77 This latter individual stands facing right and grasps the foreleg he carries over his left shoulder with both
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102 See, e.g., HES, p. 256.
104 Harpur, *Dorothy*, p. 46, notes that the head turn is a common feature of figure portrait, but one which is only applied to deeply bending or leaning figures in the second half of the Fifth Dynasty, especially during the reigns of Niazi and Uaso. As regards butcher's names she cites our example and another in *Idiot*, pl. 20.
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hanging right hand. His short wig was covered with rows of overlapping locks of which traces still exist today. Worn over the wig was a flower-knot diadem with a long streamer which hung down over his shoulders. The streamer is still to be seen. According to Lepsius, the circle of the diadem exhibited a scale pattern between horizontal borders, which perhaps represented divinized-work.104 The leopard skin was tied at the shoulder in an elaborately knotted and belted at the waist.105 Details of the knot are visible in a photograph taken in 1930 (pl. 11). The leopard’s tail depends from the front edge of the skin. According to Lepsius’s drawing only one paw, which hung down below the hemline of the kilt between the legs in the position customarily reserved for the tail, was shown. Two claws visible today at the bottom edge of Mehi’s kilt do seem to verify the location of the paw. The positions of the paws and tail show considerable variation in Old Kingdom relief,106 and the current arrangement with the tail at the front of the vestment does find parallels.107

It may be assumed that several columns containing titles and epithets were originally inscribed over Mehi’s head, like those above his wife’s head, but these were lost even in Lepsius’s day. Only vestiges of the last signs of the identifying caption that Lepsius saw in front of Mehi’s face, and which read Mḥt nṯt ḥfs, “Mehi, his good name,” remain at present.

Standing in front of Mehi was the small figure of a son who held on to his father’s walking stick, his other hand hanging open, his head turned back towards his parents and siblings. He was wigless and wore a beaded collar and short kilt with a walking stick, his other hand hanging down. Her garment was the usual long, form-fitting dress extending from just above the ankles to just below the breasts, and held up by tapering shoulder straps. It is clear from Lepsius’s drawing that her costume also comprised a long wig with lappet falling over the near shoulder, a diadem, a beaded collar, bracelets on one arm, and anklets. The design on the diadem consisted of vertically incised lines between horizontal borders. The pattern suggests a circle of metal with inlays of colored stone.108 Lepsius thought he saw two sedj-like rosettes at the front of the diadem, and two papyrus flowers at the back. This has led to the conjecture that the two types of flowers in Khentkaus’s diadem constituted the heraldic plants of Upper and Lower Egypt. As attractive as this idea may be, it can be seen from fig. 115 that the rosettes are in fact papyrus flowers, the paired flowers corresponding to the double papyrus-flower knot on each side of an actual diadem. The artist here has chosen a less conventional way of rendering the paired flowers than is the case with Mehi’s diadem.

It may therefore be legitimately questioned whether Lepsius’s renderings of Khentkaus’s other items of personal adornment are accurate in every detail. According to his drawing, the inner row of her beaded collar consisted of drop-shaped beads109 and the outer row of circular elements. The pattern is quite out of the ordinary and the individual elements not easy to identify. Although the small rect-angles in Khentkaus’s bracelet and anklets in all likelihood represent spacers, it is difficult to satisfactorily resolve the horizontal lines into their original constituent elements.110

The inscription in three short columns over the wife’s head terminated before her face with her name and titles: (1) [at nwt n ḫfn]\(\tilde{\nu}\) (2) [hmt-nṯt ḫḥw nḥt\(\hat{\nu}\)hs] (3) [bḥwt nṯw m ḫḥw] (4) [bḥw m ḫḥw m ḫḥw] (5) [ḥḥw-lk]. (6) “[the king’s] daughter of [his] [bo]dy, (2) the priestess of Hadon, Mistress of the 5th [camont],” (3) (one honore\(\hat{\nu}\)d by the god, (4) his wife whom he loves, (5) Khentkaus.” As present only traces of lines 4 to 7 remain.

Between Mehi and Khentkaus stands another small figure, in this case that of a naked child with the sidelock of youth. The side-lock has largely disappeared, but the oval amulet pierced by a thorn-like object and suspended on a cord, which Lepsius drew not quite accurately in every detail, is still visible.111 In his left hand the boy holds a hoopoe and in the right hand another bird of indeterminate species. Young children are frequently depicted in the Old Kingdom holding a pet bird by the wing. The hoopoe was a favorite both on account of its gaily colored plumage and because it will become very tame in captivity.112 Keimer thought there was a symbolic reason for the popularity of the hoopoe in such scenes as well, namely, the affection that these birds entertain for their young and the ability of the young to recognize their parents.113 Less often children standing beside their parents carry a different kind of bird, such as a laping.114 golden oriole (Oriolus oriolus),115 dove116 or duck.117 The first word of the label above the head of the small figure is now missing: [hr] ḫḥw, “his [son] Mehi.”
Behind Khentkaus is a small standing female figure dressed like her mother in a lappet wig and right-fitting dress. She holds on to Khentkaus' leg with her left hand and her other hand hangs free. Over her head are the words \textit{a.s. Hete-bwe, “her daughter Khentkaus.”}

Presumably there were six registers of scenes depicted before Mehir originally, as on the west wall of Room II.

**First Register.** Destroyed.

**Second Register.** At the left end of the second register Lepsius saw traces that probably formed part of a vineyard scene.\textsuperscript{119} The characteristic posture of the first preserved figure at the left in all likelihood identifies him as one of the four men who twist the poles attached to the ends of a sack filled with the pulp and skin of crushed grapes in opposite directions in order to squeeze out the remaining juice. To the right were additional traces which probably represent the treading vat and part of its pole framework along with the legs of two workers who trod on the grapes in the vat.

Reisner thought that a loose block found in G 2378 (pl. 117b; fig. 111) may well have belonged to the present scene.\textsuperscript{120} If the back of the loose block (which has not been located by us) was broken off at an angle, it could well have fitted onto one of the two blocks to the right of the fragmentary scene in Lepsius' plate which had clearly lost their carved surfaces and may have been broken off in a corresponding manner. At the broken left edge of the loose block is the damaged figure of a man walking to the left and carrying a filled basket. The lower part of his figure is lost, but it is clear that he was wigless, wore a plain, right-fitting kilt, and carried some object (a waterkin?) on a cord over his right elbow. Behind him is the upper part of the figure of a worker kneeling at the foot of a trellis with both arms bent at the elbow and held parallel before him, as he picks grapes. The largely destroyed caption above the head of the man with the basket is perhaps to be restored \[\textit{[w] / $b^3$ / $w^2 / [w^3]}\]. The label over the other man apparently read \[\textit{[w] / $b^3$ / $w^2 / [w^3]} \times 2\].

**Third Register.** The entire register appears to have been devoted to a scene of trapping water-fowl.\textsuperscript{121} As the left facing right was an overseer leaning on his staff. One hand was cupped over its top and the other extended along the shaft. His forward leg was bent, the heel raised, and the weight of his body distributed between the toes of his forward foot and the flat back foot.\textsuperscript{122} A fowler approaching from the right brought a bird from the catch for his inspection. It is clear that the fowler grasped the bird by the neck with his left hand, but his other hand and arm were destroyed. The overseer evidently wore a short kilt with overlap and a belt-sash tied behind. Due to the location of the bird's wings, it is not certain whether the fowler wore the same garment or instead the round-edged kilt with the left-sash tied behind, as appears to be the case with the four haulers behind him. The haulers leaned forward to the right with arms outstretched before them, as if preparing to pull on the cable whose other end would have been attached to the clapnet further to the right. Their knees were bent and they were balanced on the balls of their feet. In front of the haulers and facing them was a standing figure, his right arm raised to the height of his shoulders and his other arm hanging down behind. Both hands were destroyed, but he was probably the signalman who indicated with a hand signal when the net was full of birds. He was presumably dressed like the haulers, but only the sash around his waist survives. All the fowlers, like the workers, offering bearers, and officials in the other registers on this wall wore their own short-cut hair.

The area between the signalman and the net was destroyed, but it probably contained a stylized clump of foliage on the margin of the pole behind which the signalman crouched until standing up to deliver his signal.\textsuperscript{123} The startled birds in the hexagonal clapnet made a futile effort to escape. On the right, one of the two stakes that fastened the clapnet to the ground was visible.

To the right of the clapnet, fowlers were shown crouting birds. A yoke-bearer on the left runs away from the trap carrying what were undoubtedly wickerwork bird cages hanging from his yoke.\textsuperscript{124} He probably held on to both ropes just above the cages to keep the yoke steady, but Lepsius's artist placed his figure so close to the man ahead that no room remained for his left forearm and hand or the cage hanging from the front of the yoke. A curved line suggests he wore the very short, round-edged kilt. The next fowler also proceeds to the right and holds two braces of birds. One of the birds in his forward hand beats its wings and tries to fly away. The last fowler, part of whose figure was destroyed, bent over to the left and added two more birds to the four already inside a wickerwork cage placed on the ground. Except for their heads and legs, the two birds behind are hidden by the two birds in front. One of the birds lowers his head as if to feed. The frets of the cage are not visible, but this is not surprising, since they were generally added in paint and are only sporadically preserved.\textsuperscript{125}

**Fourth Register.** This register contained the beginning of the agricultural sequence that was continued on the west wall of the room. Episodes of land preparation occupied the right half of the register. The upper part of the first figure at the right was lost, but he was probably a sower who scattered handfuls of seed to be covered by the plow and rodded into the soil by the hooves of the flock of sheep that would have followed.\textsuperscript{126} The ploughman bent over to the right and grasped both handles of the plow. His left foot was flat and his rear heel raised as he pushed the plough-head through the soil behind the team of oxen pulling the plough to the right.\textsuperscript{127} Over the oxen was probably written: \[\textit{[w] / $b^3$ / $w^2 / [w^3]} \times 2\] “Cultivating with [a plough].”\textsuperscript{128} All that remained of the figure behind the ploughman was a front leg overlapping the latter's rear leg. It is possible that this
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\textsuperscript{119} See above, p. 61, n. 16 above.
\textsuperscript{120} See Photographic Register, B, pl. 177 [B 1447].
\textsuperscript{121} Cf. L.3, pl. 64a.
\textsuperscript{122} See Wb. 1, p. 346; A. P. Pietsch, Pahneh, pl. 35.
\textsuperscript{123} For literature on bird trapping, see above, p. 114, n. 137.
\textsuperscript{124} On this “supporting leg and foot leg posture,” see above, p. 115, n. 133.
\textsuperscript{125} See above, p. 114.
\textsuperscript{126} On yoke-bearers in Old Kingdom relief, see HESO, p. 562; Harpur, Dissertatio, pp. 147–48, and pp. 15, 17 above.
\textsuperscript{127} E.g., L. 15, pl. 36; Hassan, Suppl. t, fig. 27; van de Walle, Informatie, pl. 4.
\textsuperscript{128} See above, p. 810.
\textsuperscript{129} Harpur, Dissertatio, p. 161.
figure represented the beater who regularly appears in such scenes gouging the oven forward with a stick held above his head or before him.132 He is usually stationed directly behind or alongside the animals but occasionally appears further back close to the ploughman.133 The flock of sheep were destroyed except for the horizontal horns of one hairy long-legged sheep or ram (Ovis longipica palamaggregata).134 The figures of the two drovers who whipped the flock forward were preserved in part. The man ran to the right (note the raised heel of the man behind) and held whips aloft in a striking position (note the missing flow traces of the legend [46 nos] 147).135 "Cultivating with a 'herd of sheep,'" were still to be seen.136

The remainder of the register was devoted to the flax harvest (pl. 116).137 Although any other indication of the field is lacking, the three field hands on the left were depicted in the act of pulling up the flax.138 The lower parts of these three figures and of the man behind them are preserved today. The first two workers bent over to the left. The first man evidently grasped bunches of flax in both hands; his companion also seems to have had both hands in front of him and was probably similarly occupied. The posture of the third man was more erect and, if Lepsius has drawn the position of his arms and hands correctly, he probably inspected a bunch of stems for weeds or scraggly stems, one of which he seems to be in the process of removing.139 As can be seen from fig. 115, Lepsius’s artist was not correct in extending the bottom of the stems as far as his foot. The next figure was that of a fieldhand who walked to the right. From the position of his rear arm which was raised behind him and bent at the elbow with the palm open, it is likely that he carried a flax bundle to the worker at the edge of the field. The latter bent over to the left and knelt on a bundle of flax stems to hold them in place as he bound them together. Over his head was written: bent mês, “pulling up flax,”140 a caption which better describes the activities of the three field hands at the far left than his own.141 The next man faced right with both arms raised in front of him and, like the third field hand, probably held a sheaf of flax in his right hand from which he removed a weed or useless stalk. Lepsius’s draftsman, however, neglected to draw in the sheaf. Since it reads deni mês142, “binding flax,” the caption before his face probably belonged to the next field hand to the right, who sat on the ground with his knees drawn up to his chest. Two spare loops of twine were set before the latter who

Fifth Register: At the left end of the register two crews of fisherman hauled on the drag ropes of a large seine net.143 Only the left-hand crew still survives. It consists of five haulers, whereas that on the right originally had six haulers. The hauler at the left in the surviving group faces away from his fellow and is charged with raising the end of the net. He bends over to the left, his arms hanging down in front, and grasps the rope with both hands. He places his right foot against the end of the net, while balancing on his left foot. The next three fishermen haul the net towards the right. The arms of the last man are spread wide apart on the drag rope which he grasps with both hands as he leans to the right and balances on the balls of his feet, as if to apply all his weight to the rope. There is some overlap in the case of the next two figures who proceed with broad strides to the right. Their arms hang down on either side of their bodies, as they grasp the rope. The man on the right turns his head back to look at the haulers behind him, while the man at the end of the rope faces his comrades. He stands with the upper part of his body bent forward and, with both arms held before him, lifts up the coiled rope-end.

According to Lepsius, the first hauler in the right-hand crew bent forward and downward to the right, simultaneously bending his forward knee so that the thigh was nearly horizontal and the foot flat, while the other leg was flung back to the rear to brace himself, the knee approaching the ground.144 He hauled on the rope with both hands close together in front of him. The next four haulers strode to the left and grasped the rope with their arms extended on either side of their bodies. Three of the men walked together in a compact group with their figures overlapping, while the hauler in front was separated from them by a narrow space. The hauler at the rear of this group appears to have used a shoulder sling attached to the drag rope. The next two haulers looked backwards, as did the man who preceded them. The man at the end of the rope had his back to his fellows. He squatted to the right and gathered up the rope with both hands close together in front of him. An overseer, the better part of whose figure is still to be seen, stood between the two crews. He faced right and held an object, which from parallels was probably a catfish (Synodontis batensoda), in his extended left hand. In better preserved scenes the overseer seizes the venomous bony spine of the ventral fin in order to remove it.145

131 Vandier, Manuel 6, p. 315. See above, p. 337, for bibliography.
132 See Montet, Sciences, pp. 116–18, for the identification of the sheep as a "upright," or more precisely "plough." Montet, Sciences, pp. 166–68, who interpreted the term as relating to length and noted that both horns, ploughs, and hocks of sheep (in Arabic) were adorned to cover over the breakage marks, believed the precise meaning to be "acoustic, "they cover over." (she weld, the stone fields).
133 See Harpur, Ornament, pp. 163–64, and figs. 113, 113–14, 113–15, 114. For the posture adopted by the beater, see d’Hulst, fig. 136.
135 See fig. 126, "Sheep of sheep, "see Montet, Sciences, p. 185 and n. 3. In Lepsius’s copy the first letter of the second resembles the headwreath (N). It.
136 See above, p. 315, n. 348, for bibliography.
137 For the posture of the flax harvesters, see Harpur, Ornament, p. 167.
138 See Vandier, Manuel 6, pp. 64–65 and fig. 41.
139 See Montet, Sciences, pp. 166–73, 187.
140 For an example of the incorrect displacement of a legend in a different context, see Mursa, pp. 11, pl. 19.
According to Lepsius, most of the haulers wore the very short kilts with rounded edge and a belt-sash. Certain among them appear to have tied the belt-sash up behind. The man at the end of the right-hand cable, according to Lepsius, was dressed instead in a folded kilt with overlap, so too may have been the man with the shoulder sling. Given the state of the wall, it is not possible in every instance to check the details of the clothing. Nevertheless, the photograph (pl. 116) seems to show, in the case of the overseer, that the loose ends of the belt-sash hung down in front.

Looking to the right in the boat beneath the haulers was a long strip with parallel top and bottom and pointed ends to which were affixed the drag ropes. The right end of the net was already destroyed in Lepsius’s day. A series of semi-circular objects along the upper line of the net may represent the floats, in spite of the fact that Old Kingdom Boats were generally conical or pyramidal in shape.\(^{144}\)

The net was filled with fish. Even though the details are not always clear from Lepsius’s drawing, there were three birds, at least one catfish, a mullet, a puffer fish, and a moonfish probably to be made out.

The right half of the register was occupied by boatmen returning from a day in the marshes.\(^{145}\) All this is lost at present. In Lepsius’s drawing the first papyrus craft at the left is largely destroyed, as is the prow of the second boat. The lashings passed around all three boats at regular intervals are plainly visible, and it is possible the upper edges of the body of the second and third boats were reinforced with rope or wood as well.\(^ {146}\) The man at the stern of the second boat sits back on his heels and guides it with his paddle. Lying in the hull of the craft is an animal, possibly an oryx, given the preserved outline of its horns. The last craft is a small papyrus raft whose front end is nearly parallel to the water. His hands appear to hang empty before the animal; the oryx is fixed clear of the water.\(^ {147}\) It is occupied by one passenger and propelled by a man with a paddle, who again sits with his legs folded beneath him. The passenger stoops over to the left until his upper body is nearly parallel to the water. His hands appear to hang empty before him, but it is possible that he bent over to pick up a handkerchief filled with fish, which had been inadvertently omitted by Lepsius’s draftsman.\(^ {148}\)

Accordance to the latter, the fisherman wore only a belt-sash. Traces in the water beneath the boat suggest lotus flowers as well as fish.

**Sixth Register.** A procession of fifteen men approached the figures of Mehi and his family. Of the first seven figures only traces remain today. Nonetheless, Lepsius’s drawing clearly indicates that the procession was headed by four officials. The first individual, who stood nearly parallel to the water, his hands appear to hang empty before his body, seems to be the overseer, as indicated in the photograph (pl. 116). The position of the hands was reversed in the case of the next official, with his right hand placed open on his chest in a gesture of respect and his left hand hanging at his side.\(^ {109}\) The last of the four officials also carried a papyrus roll with his right hand before him and a scribe’s palette under his left arm.\(^ {115}\) The short label in front of him identifies him as the *bphy-sp trnt stf-mlkh, “granary attendant, Seneqemeb.*

The next eleven men were offering bearers. The first man held two birds by the wings and papyrus stalks(?) over one shoulder. Behind his head *hm-ht, “funerary priest,” was written, but the title may actually have belonged to the next bearer to the right. The latter individual ran with a yoke from which were suspended two cages, the contents of which were no longer visible.\(^ {113}\) He had his right arm draped over the crossbar to hold it steady and had the other end of the yoke with his left hand from below.\(^ {114}\) In his right hand he held a *jrt(?) on a cord as well. Behind his head was another short label, *hm-ht Qr, “the funerary priest Qr,” which may likewise have belonged to the succeeding figure, who held up a brace of birds by the wings. The figures of the last eight offering bearers survive to a varying extent. The fourth brought papyrus stalks(?) and led a small animal, the fifth carried a goose in both arms and papyrus stalks over the elbow; the sixth holds some sort of vegetable and led a calf; the seventh evidently carried a young animal in both arms in front; the eighth held lotus flowers(?) and carried ribs(?) on a cord, while leading a small oryx; the ninth bear a large animal of indeterminate species across his shoulders; the tenth held a brace of birds by the wings and another bird in his hanging hand; and the eleventh carried a goose in both arms before him. Even though shown on the same small scale as the other animals, the oryx from its horns appears to be a mature animal. Murray opined that the Egyptians had domesticated a special breed of dwarf animals, but this is most unlikely, the smallness of the animals perhaps being due, as she had previously remarked, to a convention of art that made them slightly smaller in comparison with the human figures in order to make the latter appear more important.\(^ {115}\) Generally, animals are led by a rope, but the ropes appear never to have been carved in the present instance.

Crudely scratched into the stone before the eighth bearer are two signs which might be construed to read *rpy-n, “overseer,” followed by a trace of a vertical sign. Alternately, if the first sign were a spurrow rather than an owl, the group might be read as a personal name, *Wrt.*\(^ {116}\) The stance of the bird seems too erect for a sparrow, however.

According to Lepsius, most of the offering bearers were dressed in short, plain kilts. Still an overlap was or is visible on the kilts of the
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145 Harpur, Dissertation, p. 127, alternately suggests that the overseer is indicating the freshness of the fish by raising a fin.


147 See above, p. 154 and n. 206.


149 For the distinction between papyrus drifts and rafts, see ibid., pp. 218–19.

150 See above, pp. 151–52.

151 See p. 156 below, p. 150.

152 See p. 14 above.


154 For the running personal name *Wrt*; see PN’s, pp. 82, 83.
third, sixth, eighth, and ninth figures, and it is possible that others of the kilns originally had an overlap. The costume of the man with the yoke, a very short, round-edged kiln may have distinguished him as a laborer from the other offering bearers.172

East Wall

Three registers of craft scenes seen by Lepsius on the east wall are now entirely lost.188 Since presumably there were originally six registers of relief scenes on this wall, the topmost register seen by Lepsius was actually the fourth.

First Register: Destroyed.

Second Register: Destroyed.

Third Register: Destroyed.

Fourth Register. The sculptor’s workshop in the badly damaged fourth register is known only from the sketch in the text volume of 160 Ibid., p. 121, cat. no. 21.

157 See above p. 45 and n. 115.

Third, sixth, eighth, and ninth

Fifth Register. The operations in a metallurgical workshop were the subject of this register (fig. 118).182 On the left the crude metal is weighed in a pair of scales prior to being issued to the metal-workers for processing. Two officials supervise the weighing. The first stands on the left side of the scales and bends over to the right to examine them. Although the balance arm was horizontal, one of the pans appears to be lower than the other. Captions to similar scenes make it clear that it was the pan which held the stone weights that, as a matter of custom, was shown as heavier than the pan that held the metal.183 The speech of the first man in the space over his head draws attention to this circumstance: we see, “Look here!” On the opposite side of the scales the imty-rt […] ft, “the overseer of the […] Fdt,” sits on the ground with both legs drawn up before him, his right arm raised with the palm of the hand held open before his face, and with his other hand resting on a finished article at his feet, perhaps waiting to be weighed in its turn. His speech is largely destroyed.

In the tomb of Mereruka, it is an imty-rt pr, “overseer of the house” or “steward” who supervises the weighing out,184 but in the tomb of the vizier Mehu at Saqqara, it is an imty-rt hfyw n pr-dr, “overseer of the metal workers of the estate,” who oversees the process. Similarly, an imty-rt hfyw, “overseer of metalworkers,” holds a hand scale in the tomb of Ankhmahor.185 Either pr or hfyw would fit the lexicon in Fdt’s title.

The example in G 2375 is one of the earliest representations of an equal-arm balance on a stand, and it is all the more unfortunate that it is only known from Lepsius’s copy.186 Most Old Kingdom scenes of weighing involve a hand-held scale, but the balance-beam in the present case is suspended from the top of a stand. Of the stand-balances known from Old Kingdom relief scenes, Lepsius copied three; these include the present example (fig. 117a) and two others from the tombs of Rashepses at Saqqara (fig. 117b) and 1f-mery at Giza.187 The last is now available in a modern facsimile (fig. 117c).

Four other examples derive from the Unis causeway at Saqqara (fig. 178d);188 from the tomb of the vizier Mehu at the same site

152 For instance, both the Tumia and Akhenmûak, Nianchchnum, p. 120, n. 785. Selected parallel are LÖ 2, pl. 13 = Hassan, Giza 4, fig. 68 (trama shrine with seven-tier columns); Petrie, Deir el-Bahri, pl. 13 = Kaussen-McIntosh, Deir el-Bahri, fig. 18 (hs-trimen); Nianchchnum, pl. 64 (hs-trimen). Dresden, Handkaver, p. 71, is of the opinion that the hs-trimen is a cabinet or cabin for the transportation of statues by ship.

171 Forschung der Schmiedarbeit, see e.g., Kühtreiber, AR, pp. 14–80. Murnen, Schmiede, pp. 275–80, Dresden, Handkaver, pp. 18–42.


173 Akhenmûak, ibid., p. 9, stands the speech as follows: “Ich bin schon dabei (sic).” (The Werkbund drückt aus.) “On the verb act, ‘rend tu, to be engaged in,” see WB, 1, pp. 142–7; AKG 1 (1977), pp. 75–7; 1978b, p. 14. James Allen, however, who observes that act, ‘rend tu,’ is usually in the old perfected, thinks this could be part of any verb or noun beginning with the lasso, for example, a.kj, “up” (WB, 1, 518ff.). As for the gerund, Makler, MDAIK 7 (1977), p. 56, fig. 1, n, perhaps to be compared.

174 Murray, pl. 19–30.

175 Akhenmûak, GM 2/3 (1986), p. 11, Deh 4, plom, Mehu, pl. 42.

176 Badawy, Nympheus-Parti und Abhör einer, fig. 31. For the reading left of this stele, compare, see Dresden, Handkaver, pp. 39–47.


178 RD 2, pl. 44a.

179 Wackernagel, G ägyptisches, fig. 50.

180 Hassan, ADÄ 8 (1928), pl. 40.
ance is suspended by means of a cord from a small hook from the vertical board. The result is identical to the hand-held scales in the tombs of Ka-em-rehu, Anchmahor, and Mereruka.\(^\text{174}\) In the Unis Causwaye, the balance is operated by means of a cord from a small hook fixed in a short piece of wood projecting from the top of the stand. The plummet is hung against the vertical board. From each end of the cross beam a cord hangs which terminates in a hook from which the hemispherical scale pans are suspended. The parallelism of the plummet to the vertical board indicated whether or not the weights placed in the opposite pans were equal. Bob’s balance is similar except that the vertical board is attached to the stand by what appears to be an L-shaped piece of metal, and the hook by which the bag-shaped pans are suspended is more prominent.\(^\text{177}\) Mehuf’s balance is damaged, but it is clear that, as in both the Unis and Ibi representations, the plummet-line and bob are an integral part of the balance.\(^\text{178}\) This opens up the possibility that Lepsius’ draftsman erred in his depiction of the scale-balance in G 3378 and mistook the vertical board and the plummet fastened against it for a second upright.

Behind Ertfi appeared seven smelters. The six smelters to the right with blowpipes to their mouths knelt around a crucible. Although they are shown three to each side of the crucible, in reality they would have been evenly spaced in a circle around it. The crucible itself and the charcoal fire beneath it were destroyed by the time Lepsius drew the scene.\(^\text{179}\) The actual blowpipes probably consisted of hollow reeds, the ends of which were provided with clay tips to prevent ignition. By blowing through the reeds, the smelters forced air into the crucible, which circulated satisfactorily in the crucible, thus heating the crucible. In reality the crucible was likely heated by means of a thunder fire placed within the crucible. The long, two-part caption over their heads can be restored with some certainty thanks to parallels in other tombs. The legend over the three men at the left probably read from right to left: wst hkt wzd t h� f n m n jsw, “Smelting metal. Put (it) in at its base. [list: ‘sole of foot!’] for [that] is new metal.”\(^\text{180}\) The second phrase probably constituted an admonition by one of the smiths to another to direct a strong blast of air on the charcoal fire at the base of the crucible in order to maintain the requisite temperature. The text over the heads of the men at the right exhorted them to: [wst wzd t hfi hfi a fi a fi m hq] “[Haury up to the] beautiful appearance [which circulates satisfactorily] in the crucible,” that is, until the moment when the ore melts and takes on the brilliant color of the pure metal.\(^\text{181}\)

To the left of the metalworkers, a lone smelter sat on the ground with both legs drawn up before him. He had one end of a blowpipe in his mouth and appears to have held its end in his hand. In other metalurgical scenes where the figure of an isolated smelter occurs, the latter seems to be having a small amount of gold in a pot-tery vessel.\(^\text{182}\) There is no indication of such a vessel here, and it is possible that the smelter was instead clearing a blockage in the reed or perhaps attaching a new clay tip to it.

On the other side of the circle of metalworkers an overseer stood in a relaxed position with both feet flat on the ground leaning on his walking stick with his left hand placed on its top and his right hand further down along its shaft. It is possible that the text over the right-hand group of smelters represented his speech, since the signs terminated just in front of his face and seem to proceed from his mouth.\(^\text{183}\)

Sixth Register. In each of two narrow sub-registers at the left, separated by a vertical line from the rest of the register, a pair of dwarfs assembled beaded collars. In the Old Kingdom dwarfs served as clothiers, musicians, dancers, and keepers of pet animals,\(^\text{184}\) but they are also commonly represented in scenes of jewelry making.\(^\text{185}\) Even though Lepsius’ artist has only drawn their outline, the dwarfs probably sat on splay-leg stools.\(^\text{186}\) The stools in the lower scene were quite a bit higher than those in the upper. Each pair of dwarfs held up between them a piece of jewelry, most likely beaded collars. In the Old Kingdom dwarfs served as clothiers, musicians, dancers, and keepers of pet animals, but they were also commonly represented in scenes of jewelry making.\(^\text{185}\) Even though Lepsius’ artist has only drawn their outline, the dwarfs probably sat on splay-leg stools.\(^\text{186}\) The stools in the lower scene were quite a bit higher than those in the upper. Each pair of dwarfs held up between them a piece of jewelry, most likely beaded collars, which they were probably in the process of stringing. The middle parts of the collars rested upon low, rectangular tables provided with stools.

Above the collar in the upper sub-register, two other pieces of jewelry, from their shape either chokers, bracelets or stelas, were to be seen,
while in the space behind the left-hand dwarf two beaded collars were set out. The activities represented on a wall are usually arranged so that the end of a register coincides with a change of subject,187 and the dwarfs ordinarily would have been depicted side by side in the same register. Here, presumably for reasons of space, the draftsman chose to place the scene in two superimposed sub-registers rather than omit it entirely. It is possible that the sub-registers are related thematically to the register above, the gold smelter there perhaps serving as a component element in the collars assembled below, even though the intermittent processes of casting and beating the metal were not shown.188

The remainder of this register was taken up by a scene of the preparation and filling of beer jars. At the left two men sat on the ground facing right with their legs drawn up before them. The first man held a jar with his left hand and thrust his other hand into the jar. Over his head was written: *w.d ntw, “applying clay.”*189 It seems likely that he was doing just that, lining the interior of the jar with a fine clay in order to render it less porous.190 His companion to the right had both arms held up before him and was evidently working something between his hands, possibly clay taken from the circular mass at his feet. Once again the legend provides a clue to his activity: *nbt ntw, “kneading clay.”191* The clay was probably intended for the cone-shaped stoppers of the big beer jars that were lined up in two parallel rows before him. Most of these were already sealed. Opposite, however, a man bent over the jars to the left with both arms hanging down in front of him. Damage has obscured what he held but, if the legend above originally read *mbr ntw “the filling up of b’er,”192* as seems likely, he probably decanted beer from a small jar into an as yet unsealed beer jar before him. Behind him a damaged figure facing left adopted a similar pose. On the basis of a parallel representation in a tomb at Meir, it is possible that he was supplying the jars with their cone-shaped stoppers, although the presumed jar at his feet was also destroyed.193 Of the caption over his head traces allow no certain conclusion as to his task.

Further to the right two more individuals bent face to face to over their tasks. On account of the longer hair and the cloth band around their tasks. On account of the longer hair and the cloth band around

woman. She sat on her heels, leaned forward to the right, and had both arms extended before her. Her hands and the surrounding area were destroyed and the task she was engaged in is therefore not readily apparent. The last figure on the right sat facing left with knees drawn up, hands likewise held out in front, and grasped an ill-defined object. It is likely that the legend over the latter figure is to be restored *mbr ntw “filing flour.”*194 In the event, the figure would have been holding a sieve from which sifted flour fell. Since a group composed of face-to-face figures of two women grinding and sifting is a stock motif of baking and brewing, the figure on the left in all probability would then have been grinding grain on a quern.195 If this was indeed the case, the unintelligible legend above the head of the woman on the left should probably be emended to read: *mbr “grinding.”196*

### South Wall, East of Entrance

The south wall to the east of the entrance to Room II was occupied by a developed presentation scene in which Mehi, accompanied by his wife, surveys the bringing in of cattle and the rendering of accounts, while the couple are entertained by dancers, singers, and musicians. In 1843–45 the three lowest registers on the wall were still essentially complete (fig. 118b).197 The two registers above were badly damaged, however, and Lepsius provides only a sketch of these (fig. 118a).198 At present only the bottom two registers are still largely intact, while the upper part of Mehi’s figure is lost (pl. 118, 119a–b, fig. 119).

At the left end of the wall, Mehi sat in an armchair facing right toward the entrance. The armchair had plain side panels, the side rails terminated in papyrus flowers, and the bull’s legs rested on fur-trimmed supports.199 Mehi’s costume consisted of a shoulder-length wig which covered his ears, a chin beard, a beaded collar, and a short kilt whose flaring front panel projected stiffly upwards. His right arm was draped over the arm of the chair and his left hand outstretched to receive the document of accounts presented by the official before him.200 The legend to the scene was presumably contained in the first of several short columns of hieroglyphs which once filled the space above his head, but was lost along with any titles and epithets that followed. All that remained were two lines of hieroglyphs over the top of his head: (1) *f.j.t-“m nfr-Mehi,’ (2) *mt nfr Meh, “the true count Senedjemib,’ (3) *nfr nfr Mehi,’ “the good name is Mehi.”

Mehi’s wife sits at his feet with both legs tucked under her. As may be seen from Lepsius’s drawing, she wore the usual form-fitting garment with tapering shoulder straps, a short wig, a diadem with streamer, and a beaded collar. One hand rests open on her chest, while the other grasped Mehi’s forward leg. Over her head is
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186 See Schäfer, Principes, p. 185.
187 For these processes, see especially Schäfer, Egyptian Metalworking, pp. 37–32.
189 Montet, Scenes, p. 231; Vandier, Manuel 4, pp. 295–96; He Sek, Rep. 19, p. 16; Schäfer, Metal., p. 43, fig. 17:8–9. He suggests that the red clay without its small vessels, magical bricks, and figurines, but especially for door and box sealings; see e.g., Mogensen, Materials 4, pp. 295–96; Helck, Bier 3, p. 36; Harris, Materials, p. 13.
190 See above, p. 68 and n. 476.
191 See Montet, Scenes, pp. 294–95, on our reference and a Middle Kingdom parallel (Beez Ha; 5, pl. 17), which shows the preliminaries to pot making. Two men knead clay with their feet and a third does the same with his hands. The pair of men is captioned *fkt “encrusting alluvial clay,” and the individual figure has *hnt “kneading (material)’ (fig. 32). On the other hand, Harris, Materials, p. 290, feels that it is a material at all but must refer to “bodily fabrics,” “countentiments,” “oio-" “bone.” He suggests that it is not and that it is formed as either of the application of the dip and the smoothing of the mud. On the Beni Hasan legends, see also ibid., p. 135, and Dev. Arnold, Muda (1959), p. 4, who translates the same legends respectively “to strike the mud,” and “to strike the wedging mass.” cf. Arnold and Bourriau, eds., Introduction to Pottery, p. 75.
192 Montet, Scenes, p. 270; for parallels to this fig. see e.g., Mogensen, Manouv. 4, p. 35, fig. 13; Hassan, Giza, fig. 189; Nianchchnum, p. 75, pl. 21.
193 Albert, pl. 44.
inscribed: at svnt n(?)f [f] wn=fp, j [Hnt-knwt], “the king’s daughter of his b(0)d(0)y), his w-w, Khentkaua.”

First Register. Destroyed.

Second Register. The contents of this register and the next are known only from Lepsius’ sketch (fig. 184). Vestiges of four figures remained at the right end of this register. Although the upper parts of the first two figures on the left were destroyed, both clearly knelt on one knee with buttocks resting on their heels. The last two figures, on the other hand, sat back with both legs tucked under them, a position generally assumed by women.202 They had their right hands closed on their chests and their left hands resting palm open in their laps. Due to the extensive damage to the register the role played by these four figures is unclear.

Third Register. Lepsius copied seven incomplete standing figures, all facing left. Of the captions which once presumably appeared before each of the first five figures, only a single sign survived. Given the context, it probably represented the draftsman determinative of the verb “ib,” “dancing.”203 and, in point of fact, the front foot of each figure is poised on the toe in a dance step.204 Before the last of the standing figures at the right ib “singing,” was written.205 The penultimate figure lacked a caption, but it appeared once again in the broad lacuna between this figure and the last of the dancers, where it probably indicated the presence of a third singer whose figure was destroyed. In all likelihood ib was originally written before each of the three figures of the singers, just as ib was before those of the dancers. As Montet very well observed, the arm which determines the verb “singing and dancing” found in many Old Kingdom tombs, bare-breasted women with arms upraised, dressed in short skirts are accompanied by full-clad women who clap their hands and sing in accompaniment.206 As may be seen in Lepsius’ drawing four at least of the five dancers appear to have been dressed in short skirts. But Lepsius shows the singing women in short skirts as well, a much rarer feature.207

The upper part of the dancer’s bodies are missing, but it may be assumed that they held their arms over their heads in a circular movement, the upturned palms almost meeting.208 In the scenes of singing and dancing found in many Old Kingdom tombs, bare-breasted women with arms upraised, dressed in short skirts are accompanied by full-clad women who clap their hands and sing in accompaniment.209 As may be seen in Lepsius’ drawing four at least of the five dancers appear to have been dressed in short skirts. But Lepsius shows the singing women in short skirts as well, a much rarer feature.210

201 A Lieder squeeze (2.1) exists of the head of the wife and the text above; see PM 32, pl. 14, sq., 4.

202 See Lexov Wb. 3, p. 86, 4–5, of ibd., p. 64, 14–17; Montet, Sénou, pp. 355–66; Brunner-Trans, Ten, p. 70.

203 Larter, Ar. Eg. Danse, p. 8; Vandier, Manuel, p. 314 and n. 1. 4

204 Wb. 3, p. 164, 10–12; Montet, Sénou, pp. 377–416, 165.

205 Montet, Sénou, pp. 359–62.

206 Vandier, Manuel, p. 752.


208 Nord, in Dendahra Studies, p. 177. For an in-depth treatment of these scenes, see Brunner-Trans, Die Ten, pp. 15–18, 87–98, and for a list of occurrences at the Memphis cemeteries, see PM 5p, pp. 131–143, 305 (2 b), 307 (2 d).

209 Cf. Palma, Echochephi, pl. 12; Nariman-McFaulne, Dendahra, pl. 19.

Fourth Register. Seven musicians and singers sat on the ground in the ordinary male posture with one knee raised and the buttock resting on the heel of the other foot.210 The musician closest to Mehi leaned slightly forward with the fingers of both hands splayed on the strings of a vertical harp. Here, as in the tomb of Senedjemib Inti, the entire instrument is drawn in profile.211 Over the head of the harper and before his face ib “singing and plucking (the strings),” was inscribed.212 The figures of the next three individuals to the right are partially preserved today. The first man apparently rested both hands on his raised knee. The legend above his head, already damaged in Lepsius’ drawing and now destroyed, tells us that he was ib “singing.” The next two men were flutists. The first holds his flute at an angle across his body. His instrument is a long side-blown or transverse flute.213 Both hands are placed at the lower extremity of the flute, presumably to finger the holes located there. To the left of his head was the word ib “(playing the flute).”214 Thereafter there was probably room for the word for transverse flute, and the original caption may thus have read: ib [mtr], “(playing the transverse flute).”215 The placement of the s suggests that the initial signs of the word preceded it above, while the determinative followed it below. The companion of the flutist to the right played a shorter end-blown instrument which he held nearly parallel to the ground, while fingering its holes. The caption above his head was inexact in 1842–43 and read: ib “singing,” “playing the double clarinet.”216 His instrument probably consisted of two symmetrical tubes tied together and pierced with holes at regular intervals.217 To the right of these two musicians was a second harper who again leaned forward slightly as he plucked the strings of his harp. The caption before his face likewise reflected his activity: up “plucking (the strings).” The next man to the right was probably another singer. He extended both hands before him, but his specific role is obscured by damage to the label above: sfr […] ibÚ, “giving […] singing,”218 The last man, who was also a singer, placed one hand open on his chest, while the other rested in his lap. Over his head was written: ib “singing.”

Fifth Register. This and the bottom register contain the principal theme of this wall: the rendering of accounts, in the course of which the village headmen are interrogated and the cattle in their charge inspected.219 At the left the ib “im-py-s” “Hm-ây,” “dignitary and overseer of scribes, Hemakhti,” held out a papyrus scroll for inspection. Today his head and titulary are lost. Like the officials and village headmen who follow, Hemakhti was wigless, but unlike these
The first and second headmen was a short text, now damaged, that arms hang down in front of them, while the headman behind steadies himself with one hand placed on the ground. Over the backs of the first and second headmen was a short text, now damaged, that read from left to right: \textit{ip šepw, “examining the village headmen.} \textsuperscript{228} Two other officials bring up the rear of the procession, the first a scribe who makes notations with a reed pen held in his left hand\textsuperscript{222} on a writing board held up before him on the palm of his open right hand.\textsuperscript{223} The left arm of the last official is now destroyed, but photographs taken in 1931 (pl. 118, 119b) indicate that Lepsius’ draftsman was correct in showing him with a scribal palette or possibly a roll of papyrus tucked under this arm.\textsuperscript{224} As may still be seen, his right hand hung open at his side. Except for Hemakhti, the officials in this register all wear short kilts with flaring front panels, whereas the first village headman appears to wear a plain, tight-fitting kilt. Although only belts and waist ties are preserved in the case of the other two, it may be presumed that they too were similarly girded.

\textbf{Sixth Register.} At the left end of the register, the \textit{snw pr Pt¢-ßpss, “elder of the house, Phahsheps,” bows to Mehi and Khentkaus. Lepsius actually has \textit{Pt¢-ßpss}, but the \textit{ßp-} sign, though damaged, seems clear enough.\textsuperscript{225} Close behind him a herdsman who leads a bull by a rope held in his left hand.\textsuperscript{226} With his right hand closed on his chest in a gesture of respect, he likewise bows to the couple. Lepsius’ draftsman shows him with a bundle of fodder\textsuperscript{227} in his right hand, but the draftsman may have been misled by the stony inclusion before the man’s face.\textsuperscript{228} The bull is a prize animal and, judging from traces and parallel representations, wore a large bivalve shell on a rope collar around his neck.\textsuperscript{229} The ropes attached to its lower jaw and collar are largely lost in the spaces between the masonry joints. Further to the right another herdsman places his right hand on the back of the first bull prompting it to move forward, and leads a second bull on a rope (destroyed) with his left hand. The second bull is also fattened and had a rope collar, but this time the individual strands of rope are indicated.\textsuperscript{230} As in the case of the first bull, the leading rein and rope attached to the animal’s jaw were lost when the plaster fell out of the bedding joints. Lepsius shows a non-descript object hanging from the collar, and this bull too may have been adorned with a shell. The last animal followed without an attendant. It is largely destroyed today, but from Lepsius’ drawing it looks as though it may have worn a collar that resembled the so-called Isis-knot.\textsuperscript{231} All three animals seem to belong to the same short-legged species, since above the back of each is written \textit{rsñw, “young stallion,”}\textsuperscript{232} but the last individual unlike the other two was hornless and apparently polled.

\textbf{Room III} This east-west offering room is entered from the south, from Room II, by means of a doorway at the east end of the south wall. An elaborate false door occupies the west end of the room, while the long side walls, as is customary in long east–west offering rooms from the end of Dynasty 3, originally bore virtually identical table scenes. The room measures 2.21 x 6.75 meters, and has an area of 15.18 square meters. The proportion of the length of the room to the width is 1.03.

\textbf{Door Thicknesses} Lepsius saw and recorded two registers of female figures personifying agricultural estates on each of the door thicknesses leading to the offering room. Although he published only one drawing, that of the estates on the left thickness (fig. 120a),\textsuperscript{233} thanks to Dr. Walter-Friedrich Reincke of the Berlin Academy of Science, it has proven possible to include here Lepsius’ original drawing of the other thickness, which is now completely destroyed (fig. 123).\textsuperscript{234} In addition to the drawings, Lepsius’ hand copies of the estate names on both walls were included in the text volumes of the Denkmäler published after his death (fig. 122).\textsuperscript{235}

In 1842–43 the figures of five estates were visible in each of the two preserved registers of the left thickness (fig. 120a). Lepsius shows a blank area before the first figure in the upper register, however, and


\textsuperscript{223} For \textit{ip, “unmarried,”} used of persons, see WB, 1, p. 66, 5; FCD, p. 16.

\textsuperscript{224} The fact that this individual written with his left hand is probably to be explained by the difficulty the Egyptian artist customarily encountered when drawing a figure facing left, especially when there was a traditional reason for an object held by that figure being borne in a certain hand, see HENZ, p. 374f.

\textsuperscript{225} Vandier, Manuel I, p. 599, remarks that examples of this posture are not very numerous. Vandier is of the opinion that the scribe writes on a sheet of papyrus. Writing boards are well attested, however (see e.g., Brown, ASAE 7 (1917), pp. 10–15), and it is not easy to imagine how anyone could have written on a piece of papyrus resting on the arm and hand. On this question, see further, Maaskant, in: Summer, \textit{Gigler}, pp. 68–72.

\textsuperscript{226} See Vandier, Manuel I, p. 577 (A).

\textsuperscript{227} For \textit{P³h–s²p}, see PM IV, p. 326 (506–507). In the present instance, the poorer complement (\textit{P³h–s²p}) was either never written or was subsequently destroyed. The poorer complement is occasionally omitted in the spelling of \textit{P³h}; see e.g., ibid., p. 326, n. 4, and Fischer, \textit{JORBCE} 4 (1965), p. 13.

\textsuperscript{228} On the merit of the herdsman with a bundle of fodder, see above, p. 77 and n. 39.

\textsuperscript{229} See e.g., Davies, \textit{Ptolemais}, pp. 12, 27, 33 (3); Megaw, \textit{Mem}, figs. 8, 9, 12, 16, 20, 41. 12, 516, 410; Simpson. Western Cemetery, fig. 4.

\textsuperscript{230} For this type of rope collar, see Vandier, Manuel I, p. 54 (4).

\textsuperscript{231} Pace Vandier, Manuel I, p. 51, fig. 13. On the origin and development of the “Isis-knot,” see Fischer, MMF 1 (1972), pp. 11–15. For two Early Dynastic gold amulets of an arvaton and a bull with an ornament round their necks in the form of an “Isis knot,” see Wilkinson, Jewellery, pp. 11–16, figs. 6, 7.

\textsuperscript{232} See above, p. 77 and n. 36.

\textsuperscript{233} For this thickness, see Fischer, MMF 1 (1972), pls. 8, 9, 16.

\textsuperscript{234} Lepsius I, p. 355.

\textsuperscript{235} LIA, Text, p. 53. Macquart (Mastaba, pp. 339–354) sketched the two thicknesses and gives the damaged names of four estates from the left (west) thickness and three from the right (east).
Jacquet-Gordon thinks there may have been room for another figure at the head of the procession. Since there were traces of a figure and of an estate name in a lacuna of similar size at the head of the lower register in Lepsius’s plate, it seems likely that there were originally six estates in each register, as on the corresponding right-hand thickness. If the same scheme of decoration evident on the door thicknesses in G 2370 and 3774 was followed here, both thicknesses probably bore three registers when intact.

If Mariette’s sketch of the left thickness is to be trusted, by 1830 the figures of the first three estates in the upper register and of the first estate and part of the second estate in the lower register had already spilled away (fig. 112a). As far as the right thickness is concerned, the four estates and parts of two others seen by Lepsius in the lower register had likewise disappeared (fig. 112b). By 1931 the last four estates in the lower register on the left hand thickness (pl. 120) were all that survived of a presumed thirty-six estates originally depicted on the two thicknesses. These four estates are still extant today (fig. 120b). As Mariette remarks, the difference in preservation between the different courses of stone on either side of this one passage-way arises from the varying quality of the different stones which had been employed, but the later deterioration was undoubtedly athed by exposure to the elements.

As may be seen from Lepsius’s drawings and the figures of the four remaining estates, each estate was originally dressed in a tight-fitting dress and a lappet wig. As in G 2370, G 2374, and a number of contemporary tombs, the hems of the dresses were oblique. There was little variation in the attitudes of the figures. Each woman evidently raised her forward hand to steady the conical basket filled with produce that she carried on her head, while the rear hand hanging behind held another offering. The numismatical limestone is very intractable here, and presumably the details of the figures and the offerings were added in the coating of plaster that was customarily applied to reliefs carved in such stone. This procedure would certainly explain the unfinished appearance of the reliefs and the fact that Lepsius’s copy is not precise in every detail. The partially preserved contents of the four remaining baskets on the heads of the women at the bottom of the left thickness, for example, do not seem to correspond item by item to those sketched by him. Nonetheless, it is clear from Lepsius’s copy that the first woman in the upper register on the right (east) thickness carried in her hanging left hand a bird, while the fourth and sixth women probably held a milk jar.

Left (west) thickness (pl. 120, figs. 120a–b, 121a, 122a). Beginning with the first figure on the right of the uppermost preserved register in Lepsius’s drawing and ending with the last figure in the register below, the names of the estates are as follows: 1

1. Destroyed.
2. Traces of a cartouche.
3. Mr St T-Pot-br, “Seshat loves Ikahtor.”
4. Wh-bw-Ff-[m]-h [w'], “The splendid of […] appears in glory.”
5. §-j-[m]-h [m-], “[…].”
6. Mr Hq-lb Izzi, “Hoqa desires that Izzi live.”
7. […] zzt, “[…] Izzi.”
8. Mr St T-lou-bt, “Seshat loves Ikahtor.”
9. Wh-lw-k-d tr-[w'], “[Kak]a(houro/1) flourishes.”
10. Sst[-t-kkd], “The plantations(!) of Kakai.”
11. Wl-bis-w-kst, “The power of Kakai is strong.”
12. […] wfr “Sibw-rt, …” of “Sabure.”

Right (east) thickness (figs. 112b, 123). The cartouches and estate inscriptions on this wall appear to have been left blank.

1. Hw […] m Ir-[n]b […] “The estate of […] (named) Prah desires that […] live.”
2. Hw […] “[…] Mr lq-fw […] “The estate of […] (named) […]”.
3. Mr Rs-tb […] “Re desires that […] live.”
4. […] lw […] “[…]”.
5. […] hw[…] “[…]”.
6. A cartouche alone survives.
7. Destroyed.
8. Destroyed.
10. […] b[s] “[…] Re […]”.
11. […] i-t […] “[…]”.

The estate names on the left jamb were compounded with the names of the Fifth Dynasty kings Sahure, Neferefre, Menkauhor, and Izzi. There is no mention of an estate bearing the name of Unis, the sovereign whom Mehi served as vizier, but possibly this king’s name appeared in one of the blank cartouches or as a component in

---

1Jacquet-Gordon, Domains, pp. 198–200.
2As opposed to the published drawing which shows a circular sign after an empty cartouche followed by a long lacuna, a bull, and a circle which presumably represents the ten-sign, Lepsius’s hand copy gives the following signs after an empty cartouche: Wb. 11 (fig. 120a, 11) or possibly 1000, “true, abroad” (WR, 2, p. 299, n. 11) or possibly 100, “true, abroad” (WR, 2, p. 277, n. 10) with transparent determinative.
3Jacquet-Gordon, Domains, p. 295, remarks that the sign — is probably to be corrected to .
4The quail chick at the bottom of the cartouche does appear to be visible at the upper right hand edge of this door thickness in the photograph.
5Cf. in the tomb of Sneferu’s III, Janker, Gött., pp. 203, 246, pl. 4. Jacquet-Gordon, Domains, p. 272 (93), reads qgs, “foundation.” Although noting that the three signs in Sneferu’s III resemble the glyptic sign, Junker thinks the absence of a terminal [r] favors the reading rtr, “Die Kanai” (Tschöke). “The canals” seems a peculiar designation for an agricultural foundation, and Junker’s alabaster translation, “Teiche,” seems more to the point. In that case, the representation in question might better be taken to be a plural of “ga-ter-d, plantation,” on which word, see above, p. 97 (b). Lepsius identified the quail chick of the plural ending, which is unusually large here (in likeness to the final sign inamun商业银行), as the monogram of the three pious. What at first glance appears to be traces of the latter in the space under the quail chick is probably instead the wing tips of a bird held by the first surviving scribe.
6Jacquet-Gordon, Domains, p. 295, n. 7, believed that she saw wfr here, but our copy favors Lepsius’s original reading.
7The name of the estate termination in the figure of a bird which Jacquet-Gordon, Domains, p. 270 (94), read as wet, “swallow.”
one of the incomplete estate names. At least one of the estate names, Wahu-Modebi, and possibly another, if Wife-En-Modebi is indeed to be restored, recurs in the tomb of Mehi’s father, Inti.249

South Wall
Both lateral walls in Room III have suffered severely from weathering and the action of salts and there are large areas, especially towards the east end of these walls, where the wall surface has entirely flaked away, leaving substantial gaps in the decoration. This was already so in 1842–43, and it was presumably for this reason that Lepsius only drew the western sections of both walls.250 Nevertheless, the walls were then in considerably better condition than now, even though the top registers on both walls had previously been removed.251 Since the upper courses are gone, the original number of registers on the eastern and middle sections of the walls is not entirely certain. Still, the extra register of offering bearers seen beneath the feet of the deceased in the corresponding position in c. 1570252 is absent here, and this may be an indication that the walls were divided into five rather than six registers.

At the west end of the wall nearest the false door a large figure of Mehi seated before an offering table faced left towards the entrance of the room and the registers of offering bearers, priests, and food offerings before him (figs. 141, 125).253 His right hand reached forward towards the twenty tall half-loaves of bread set out on the offering table. Between his legs and the pedestal of the table were small piles of food and drink offerings separated the offering table from the front of the chair as though it were the customary drum tapering towards the base, but the corresponding element under the rear feet of Mehi’s feet at the lower right a tall storage jar with basket-work ornament. A cushion followed the vertical drop of the chair back. Lepsius’s artist drew the element under the lion’s feet at the front of the chair as though it were the customary drum tapering towards the base, but the corresponding element under the rear feet was drawn as if it were a four-footed shape furniture support narrower at the top than the bottom, whereas on the opposite wall both elements are wider at the bottom. In the tomb of Inti the two elements were carefully distinguished (pl. 40, fig. 61).255

Mehi was dressed in a shoulder-length wig, chin beard, broad collar, and folded kilt with (properly reversed) overlap. The individual rows of the broad collar were still visible in Lepsius’s day. All that survives of Mehi’s figure at present is his extended right arm and hand, the line of his chest, the tips of the fingers of his left hand, and part of the outline of his legs.

Over Mehi’s head were five columns of titles and epithets which terminated with his name in a single horizontal line below. At present only traces of the texts survive, but this portion of the wall was in a better state of preservation in Lepsius’s day and, with the aid of what appears to be a parallel inscription on the opposite wall, the titulary can be restored to a certain extent: (1) [imy-nil bart wht(i) ni] nswt, (2) [imy-nil bkn.bk ni saper Sfn∂m-nw, (3) imy-nil bkn.bk ni wsr mt bθt, (4) nswt (5) nswt (6) nswt (7) nswt ib]-£mr – Sfn∂m-nw; (9) [overseer of all works of] the king, (10) […] who does [what Izezi] favors, (11) […] pillar of the kmt-folk, overseer of all royal agglomera, (12) […] favorite of the king wh[ever he is], (13) […] one honored by the great god, (14) the hereditary prince and true count, Senedjemib.

Before Mehi’s face two rows of low rectangular service tables and jar racks were represented. The racks were wider than the tables and had their tops pierced to hold the vessels which rested on a shelf below.256 The tables by contrast were equipped with horizontal struts. The tops of the vessels in the upper row were already lost in 1842–43. By analogy with the north wall, a nested ewer and basin probably rested on the right end of the upper right-hand rack, although only traces of the basin remained. Set into the rack along-side of it was a group of four tall splay-footed vessels, perhaps hezett-jars. Three tall storage jars, possibly similar to those on the table at the bottom right, were set on the table at the upper left. On the table at the lower right a tall storage jar with basket-work flaps probably stood between two tall stoppered, spouted jars; the forms of the jars are better seen on the north wall. Set in the rack at the lower left was a round-bottomed bowl with a recurved rim and a (basketwork) lid on a stand between two pairs of hezett-jars.257 The blocks with the representations of the racks and tables (and figures of the priests to the left) were removed subsequent to Lepsius’s visit. A compartment offering list would undoubtedly have extended above and beyond the service tables on both long walls, but no vestiges of such remain in place. They probably had a wide as opposed to a tall format, occupying two registers in height, the remainder of which may have been taken up with food and drink offerings.

In the two lowest registers on both the north and south walls, piles of food and drink offerings separated the offering table from the approaching bearers. The offerings piled at the foot of Mehi’s table in the lowermost register on the south wall were largely destroyed by 1842–43, and today only those to the left in the upper preserved register survive.

First Register. Destroyed.

Second Register. Destroyed.

Third Register. Lepsius saw the lower parts of a kneeling and two standing figures on the far side of the tables and racks in this register.

847 See above, p. 20, and Jacques-Gordon, Donostia, p. 25.
848 LID, Text, p. 14.
849 See above, p. 20.
850 LID, Gebrist., pl. xv. Maiern, Mastaba, p. 354, provides a not wholly accurate sketch of the outline of the different blocks which make up the western half of the north wall of the room.
851 See below, p. 196.
852 See above, p. 20, n. 294.
On the north wall opposite, a kneeling man and the individual behind him perform the opening rites of the funerary ritual, and this was presumably also the case here. The third figure was in all probability that of an offering bearer, as on the opposite wall. All three figures are now lost.

Fifth Register: Two damaged figures are shown in the lowest register of the wall in Lepsius’s plate. The figure of the first man has deteriorated further but is still visible. From his attitude it is clear that he once presented a goose with the head of his straight outstretched left arm holding the neck and the right hand the wings. A few traces which probably represent the bird’s neck and tail survive. There are also vestiges remaining of another individual in front of this man who, by analogy with the corresponding figure on the north wall, probably again offered up a goose. All that remains of the inscription that once occupied the space before him are traces of the letter n. The vertical lines further to the right, again by analogy with the flanking scene, probably belong to a tail of loaf of bread. Lepsius has drawn the corresponding loaf on the north wall with vertical sides, but traces that survive today show that the loaves on both walls probably flared towards the bottom. Behind the two men who once offered up geese, traces of three offering bearers are visible. The first man held offerings aloft on trays with both hands and has onions draped over his left elbow. From the position of his arms, the second figure probably held a young animal or a bird in both arms in front; he has in addition a wickerwork frail on a cord over his right arm. The third bearer appears to have held offerings aloft on a tray with his left hand and a stalk of papyrus (!) with his right hand over his shoulder.

Insofar as it is possible to tell, all of the offering bearers in this register wore short, belted kilts. The kilt of the first damaged figure in Lepsius’s plate had an overlap, and the rest of the kilts here may have had overlaps as well.

West Wall
When Lepsius saw it, the false door which occupies the west wall of the chapel was well preserved except for the flat surface over the cavetto cornice (fig. 128). Mariette provides a sketch of the false door and the table scene on its panel together with hand copies of the texts on the jambs.166 By 1850, when Mariette sketched the false door, the cavetto cornice was largely destroyed and the text on the architrave illegible. By 1983 the texts and representations on the upper part of the door had further deteriorated (pl. 122). At present the texts on the panel, the lowest lintel, and the drum roll are all illegible, as are the figure of Mehi and the other representations on the panel. The tops of the text columns on the outer and middle jambs are likewise obliterated (fig. 127).

From Lepsius’s drawing it is clear that the false door comprised an architrave, a panel, a lintel, three pairs of jambs, and a central niche surmounted by a drum roll, the whole framed by a torus moulding with the traditional lashing and cross lashings and crowned by a cavetto cornice. The preserved height of the door in 1842–43 was 2.31 m. The jambs of the door are stepped back on three separate planes, and the surviving texts and representations are all carefully executed in sunk relief. At the time of the Prussian Expedition, there were extensive vestiges of paint visible on the door and the adjacent areas.264

As the foot of the false door was an offering stone extending across the width of the room and likewise surmounted by a torus- and cavetto cornice. Against the north wall, adjacent to the false door, stands a plain, limestone offering bench measuring 2.12 x 0.47 m. This bench appears in both Lepsius’s plan and section of the western necropolis, (namely) the true count, Senedjemib.264 According to Lepsius’s drawing Mehi sat on the left side of the panel on a low-backed chair whose animal legs rested on frustum-shaped supports and whose side-rails terminated in papyrus-flower ornaments. He wore a shoulder-length wig and short, plain kilt and ornaments. He wore a shoulder-length wig and short, plain kilt and
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166 See above, p. 47.
167 See above, p. 47. According to PMA p. 82, the text on the right jamb appears in Wilkinson MSS.xii.64 [appar.] There are also superscriptions in Oxford of the inner and outer right jambs by the Lieders, nos. 7, 8, 9.
Chapter 9: Senedjemib Mehi – g 2378

The north wall presented what was essentially a mirror image of the south wall (pl. 222–249, figs. 128–29). The western half of the wall with the figure of Mehi at table and three registers of priests and offering bearers are shown in Lepsius’s drawing, while Mariette provides a sketch of the western end of the wall.²⁶⁹ At the end of the last century several blocks with the figure of Mehi and part of the offerings, tables, and racks before him were removed from this wall. These blocks now form part of the collections of the Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, where they bear the accession number 31705 (pl. 122).²⁷⁰ The blocks in Chicago have been incorporated into our fig. 129.

Mehi wears a shoulder-length wig, chin beard, broad collar, and folded kilt with belt and overlap. As on the opposite wall, the rows of beads on the broad collar were visible in Lepsius’s day. In this instance at least, they must have been painted, for no trace of them remains on the blocks in Chicago. Mehi sits with his left hand crossed on his breast and has his open right hand extended to the offering table with conventionalized loaves of bread before him. The chair is essentially identical to that on the south wall, but the details of the legs are better preserved here, including the toes and dewclaw. A notable feature, not evident in Lepsius’s plate, is that the front legs of the chair are shown with the far leg overlapped by the near leg.²⁷²

Insoraf as it is preserved, the inscription, in five columns and a horizontal line over Mehi’s head, appears to duplicate the corresponding text on the south wall. The tops of the columns are again lost, but what remains can probably be restored as follows: (1) [...] imy-r£ rs‘ md nb nb t£y-ty, (2) [...] ins|y-r£ rs‘ mn yr nb nb t£y-ty, (3) [...] i–y nswt, (4) [...] ins|y-r£ rs‘ mn yr nb nb t£y-ty, (5) [...] ins|y-r£ rs‘ mn yr nb nb t£y-ty, (6) [...] rs‘ md nb nb t£y-ty.²⁷³ The south wall at the door, (7) [...] overeer of all [work] of the king, (8) [...] who did what Izezi favored, (9) [...]
piller of the lord of the folk, overseer of all royal regalia, ([4] ... intimate of the king) wherever he is, ([5] ... one honored) by the great god, ([6] the hereditary prince and true count, Senedjemib.)

In contrast to the twenty half-jars seen by Lepsius on the offering table on the south wall, only sixteen half-jars of bread were originally set on the offering table here. Half are lost today, and the others are missing their bases and tips; only the half-jar at the extreme right still retains almost its entire outline. The offering table too is destroyed except for traces of the bottom line of its circular plate. Where the table was set the same low rectangular service tables and jars racks that appeared on the south wall. These were largely destroyed in the process of extracting the blocks from the wall, but the near side of the rack and the table at the left are still preserved on the block. By analogy with the south wall, four tall spouted vessels were probably set into the rack alongside of it. The vessels on the table at the upper right were already destroyed in 1842, but they were probably three tall storage jars as on the south wall. Two of the three vessels that rested on the table at the bottom left survive on the block in the Field Museum. They show that Lepsius' artist has gotten the basic shape of the vessels right but erred in the details. The first vessel at the left is a tall, spouted jar with a stopper. In Lepsius' plate it is actually one of a pair of identical vessels with a vessel of different shape between. From the Chicago block it seems that the middle ves-
sel is a tall storage jar with (basketwork) flaps and a stopper.272 The destroyed jar rack at the lower right apparently held a covered round-bottomed bowl with a recurved rim set on a ring-stand flanked by two pairs of hezat-jars, an arrangement also evident on the opposite wall.

On the far side of the offering table, food and drink offerings of all kinds are piled up. In the bottom register they include an arrangement of two tall loaves of bread flaring slightly at the bottom, alternating with a sealed beer jar and a storage jar with rolled neck and basket-work flaps (both on jar stands), a covered bowl, a foreleg of beef, a calf's head, two ducks, and a deep boat-shaped basket probably filled with ribs of beef and fruit.273 Between this heap of offerings and the support of Mehi's table was an ideographic offering list, now largely destroyed: fi š t s ntr rŠ nb r∞f nbt nfrt r™ nb.274 The earliest example of the overlapping of the legs known to William Stevenson Smith was one in the tomb of Padijwe (II, Gayer-Anderson, pls. 34–35; 38–39), which proba-
bly also dates to the reign of Unis (Harp, Decoration, p. 174). Smith cited other, later examples from the tombs of Nefer-nheru-netjer at Saqqara (Denk. de sculpt., pl. 34; cf. pl. 10) and the Gozzi (1970: Simpson, Giza Mastabas 1, figs. 33 [rear legs], 41 [rear legs]). Subsequently, other examples of this feature have appeared in print in Ti, pl. 17; Vermeule, Palaeopath., pl. 16, 11, 12, 13, 49 [front and rear legs]). The last tomb was probably decorated in the period between Niacures and early Ptolemaic era (Harp., Decoration, p. 172; 1982, p. 132), which would make the occurrence there the earliest example. As an afterthought, it might be noted that the legs of the rod upon which Merenra and his wife are also drawn in this manner (Mereruka, pl. 34–35).

On the curvature flaps at the shoulders of jars, see above p. 71 and n. 116.


272 See Schaefer, Principles, pp. 183–84, fig. 81, HESD, pp. 336–37. The earliest example of the overlapping of the legs known to William Stevenson Smith was one in the tomb of Padijwe (II, Gayer-Anderson, pls. 34–35; 38–39), which proba-
bly also dates to the reign of Unis (Harp, Decoration, p. 174). Smith cited other, later examples from the tombs of Nefer-nheru-netjer at Saqqara (Denk. de sculpt., pl. 34; cf. pl. 10) and the Gozzi (1970: Simpson, Giza Mastabas 1, figs. 33 [rear legs], 41 [rear legs]). Subsequently, other examples of this feature have appeared in print in Ti, pl. 17; Vermeule, Palaeopath., pl. 16, 11, 12, 13, 49 [front and rear legs]). The last tomb was probably decorated in the period between Niacures and early Ptolemaic era (Harp., Decoration, p. 172; 1982, p. 132), which would make the occurrence there the earliest example. As an afterthought, it might be noted that the legs of the rod upon which Merenra and his wife are also drawn in this manner (Mereruka, pl. 34–35).

273 On the curvature flaps at the shoulders of jars, see above p. 71 and n. 116.

surviving offering bearers, but the offerings carried by these three men are better preserved in his drawing. The upper part of the body of the first surviving offering bearer is now entirely destroyed. According to Lepsius he held a small, ill-defined object against his chest with his left hand. The second man carried aloft a tray bearing an oblong-shaped offering with rounded ends (a loaf of bread?) and, on his other hand, a flat-bottomed bowl with recurved rim(?) and curved spout, while a papyrus stalk was draped over his right arm. Only the papyrus stalk is clearly visible today. The third man held two trays of nondescript offerings aloft (destroyed) and onions(? ) over his right elbow. The fourth man probably had both arms raised and may have carried an animal across his shoulders. Two wicker-work friezes are suspended horizontally on a single cord from his right elbow, while the "V"-shaped element overlapping the back of his figure may represent a damaged object hanging from his other elbow. The next two figures are largely destroyed, but the fifth bearer may also have held offerings aloft with his right hand.

Fifth Register. Lepsius shows the two foremost figures in this register with straight, outstretched arms. Presumably, as on the south wall, they strangled birds. Scanty traces of the birds in the hands of the first man remain today, but the second man and the bird he held are now largely destroyed. Over the heads of the figures is an inscription: fr. fi, "this is for [your] heart," was written.276 The first figure was identified as z£.f smsw by Reisner (p. 145). Considering that the serdab of Mehi is on the far side of his mastaba from the entrance to sloping passage tomb g 2378, it is uncertain whether the name is lost, Mehi’s eldest son, Senedjemib, was probably represented here.277 Behind the foremost figures are faint traces of other offering bearers, the first of whom carried lourses over his right arm.

East Wall

Lepsius apparently saw traces of an offering procession on this wall, but evidently made no attempt to copy it.278 In the bottom register of the wall an isolated block some 65 cm wide and 34 cm distant from the northeast corner of the room preserves traces of three more offering bearers (fig. 129, inset). Except for his front heel and part of his rear leg the first figure is destroyed, but he evidently held a bird by the neck with his hanging left hand. The second man carries a tray of offerings on his shoulder and probably an offering with his left hand over the other shoulder. The last man again balanced a tray of offerings on his shoulder and probably held an offering with his left hand over the other shoulder. The last man again balanced a tray of offerings on his shoulder and probably held an offering with his left hand over the other shoulder. The last man again balanced a tray of offerings on his shoulder and probably held an offering with his left hand over the other shoulder.

Associated Shafts and Burial Chambers

Two shafts were associated with mastaba g 2378: Shaft a, descending under the east wall of the mastaba, and Shaft b, an intrusive pit constructed in the southern half of the serdab of the mastaba at a date subsequent to its original construction.

276 Lepsius’s artist almost certainly erred in seeing a loaf / instead of the 2nd person mng. pronouns after the b-arm.

277 See above, p. 343.

In the northwest corner of the chamber was a block of rubble measuring 0.8 x 1.3 m. Built against the northern end of the sarcophagus at a distance of 0.85 m south of this rubble block was a second block of rubble measuring 1.2 x 1.4 m. These rubble blocks of roughly the same height as the sarcophagus had probably supported the granite lid before the burial.

The plunderers had dug their way through the mud and rubble packing above the built passage and thrown the granite lid off to the east. The plundering of the chamber was thorough, and Reisner found only a few ox-bones (pl. 126b), some alabaster model vessels, and sherds, along with a few wooden figures of kneeling prisoners with their arms bound at the elbows behind their backs.

Smith speculated that the five prisoner figures (pl. 126d, e; fig. 150b) imitated the custom of placing large, stone figures of captives in the temple of the king, such as are known from the examples of Niuserre and Pepy II. The figures were in bad condition and one was missing its head. Of the four preserved figures, three wear short wigs and the other has a sort of lappet wig.

Register of Objects—g 2378

For stone vessel types, see Reisner Register of Objects.

6. G 2378 A, in chamber
12–11–210 Five figures of prisoners, kneeling hands tied behind back; one has the head broken off, bad condition, wood, h. ca. 10 cm. (pl. 126c; fig. 150b). MFA 15.5477; Exp. Ph. 4.992 1/9
12–11–212 Two rough saucers and half of a third, alab., diam. 6.8 cm. Not illustrated
12–11–213 Model jar with spout, incomplete, alab., h. 3.4 cm, type OK XVIa (fig. 150b). Not photographed

13.3457; Exp. Ph. 44614, 44615. Not illustrated
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One canopic pits, see G 2378 A, in chamber
12–11–212 Model jar, bottom broken off, alab., h. 7 cm. (fig. 150b). Not photographed

55–7–20 Ox bones. No data. (pl. 126b)

Titles of Senedjemib Meh€

As is the case with his father and his brother Khnumenpt, the honorific and religious content of Meh€’s titulary is limited.

1. izn kmnt “pillar of the kmnt-folk”
2. imp-ib n wwt “favorite of the king”
3. imp-ib n wwt m f w(t) “favorite of the king wherever he is”
4. imp-n wty “overseer of the two workshops”
5. imp-n prwy-nw “overseer of the two armories”
6. imp-n prwy-nw “overseer of the two houses of gold”
7. imp-n hkr wwt (nb) “overseer of (all) royal regalia”
8. imp-n znw wwt “overseer of scribes of royal records”
9. imp-n kbw wwt “overseer of royal linen”
10. imp-n hntwy “overseer of the two granaries”
11. imp-n hnt w(t) wwt “overseer of all works of the king”
12. tpy-p’t “hereditary prince”
13. mprf qd wwt m prwy “royal master builder in both houses (viz. Upper and Lower Egypt)”
14. h$m-t mt “true count”
15. h$p-n mt w(t) z$t-m ñw(t) nswt “master of secrets of all commands of the king”
16. h$p-t p$t “royal chamberlain”
17. smr w’ty “sole friend”
18. tpy sh-p$t “chief justice and vizier”

No. 4. There were two w’ty, or “workshops,” in the Old Kingdom, one the workshop of the embalmers and the other that of the artisans who fashioned mobilier for the dead, including funerary equipment of all kinds, statues, and stone architectural elements, such as false doors. The title imp-n wty is a regular component in vizier’s titulatures from the reigns of Unis. Meh€ may, in fact, be the earliest vizierial holder of the title. The presumably lower ranking imp-n w’ty, “overseer of a workshop,” occurs less often in vizier’s titulatures. One of the viziers who have the lower-ranking title is imp-n w’ty as well. Neither title was the sole preserve of the viziers. The highest-ranking title was held by three treasury overseers and a
master metalworker who, like the treasury officials, was also ḫmwt-prwy nwb, “overseer of the two houses of gold,” and a high priest of Ptah (w dpr bnw “greatest of the directors of craftsmen”). It was not. Three high priests of Ptah bore the lower-ranking title, as did a master metalworker and two overseers of craftsmen, while an ḫmwt-prwy nwb was also ḫmwt-prwy nwb, “overseer of the houses of the weavers.” From the reign of Unis at least, it may be that the vizier was in overall charge of the two workshops, while the non-viziers who were ḫmwt-prwy nwb were responsible for their daily operation and production.

Strudwick notes that title No. 6 is more commonly found with ḫmwt-prwy nwb than ḫmwt-prwy nwm. Of the eighteen examples known to him, only four are not found in this combination. Two of these are probably associated with this title by virtue of their being metal-workers. Of the two other individuals, the titulary of the overseer of Upper Egypt Nkā-sū-rī is not yet completely published, so theoretically it is possible that he was also ḫmwt-prwy nwb. The second exception is Senedjemib Mehi. In this connection, Strudwick observes that Mehi is one of the few viziers to hold the title ḫmwt-prwy nwb but not ḫmwt-prwy nwb, and he wonders if the latter title did not appear in the damaged portions of the tomb. It would be surprising, however, for so important a title to be omitted from the title strings on Mehi’s false door, if he indeed possessed it. Then too, conversely, Inti is ḫmwt-prwy nwb (and ḫmwt-prwy nwb), but not ḫmwt-prwy nwb, while Khnumemu has all three titles. In all likelihood, there are principles at work here governing the inclusion or exclusion of titles that are not readily comprehensible to us.

No. 9. Mehi appears to be the only vizier to have held this treasury-related title.

No. 14. Mehi consistently adds the adjective nwt, “true, real” to his rank title of ḫmwt-ḥr. Whereas some scholars think that the use of the nwt/afer title means that the holder actually exercised the office concerned, others claim that the use of the word denotes exactly the opposite, the adjective suggesting rather that the title was merely honorary. Other titles, though not so well established, are not thought to denote an active office either. Inti is ḫmwt-prwy nwb, but in the presentation scene on the east wall of the anteroom, his title began with ḫmwt-prwy nwb, “overseer of the house,” as ḫmwt-prwy nwb, “overseer of metal-workers.”

**Dependants of Senedjemib Mehi**

1. Phb-ḥps (ḥps-ḥps) (PN 1, p. 136, 139, p. 439, 44). Even though this name was a popular one in the Old Kingdom, it is not possible to further identify our individual who, with the title ḫmwt-pr, “elder of the house,” leads a file of herdmen and men into the presence of Mehi and his wife on the south wall of the anteroom, east of the entrance.

2. Ff (PN1, p. 142, 8, 2, p. 359). Depicting overseeing the weighing of metal on the east wall of the anteroom, his title began with ḫmwt-pr. The weighing out of metal is usually supervised by an ḫmwt-pr, “overseer of the house,” as ḫmwt-hpery, “overseer of metal-workers.”

Although a Ff with the title ḫmwt-pr is known from the tomb of the king’s son of his body and general Djaty (g 7862), this individual clearly antedates our period.

3. ḫmwt-pr also appears in the tomb of Inti with the titles ḫmwt-pr ḫmwt-pr ḫmwt-pr. On the north wall of the anteroom in g 2378, he has the title ḫmwt-pr, but in the presentation scene on the south wall of the same room, east of the entrance, he is ḫmwt-pr ḫmwt-pr, “magistrate and overseer of scribes.” ḫmwt-pr is probably likewise to be restored before the title ḫmwt-pr in the fowling scene on the rear of the portico to the east of the entrance. If anything, Hemakhti occupies a more prominent role in g 2378 than in g 2370. In the portico of g 2378, as in that of g 2370, he is one of four senior officials who attend Mehi on an outing in the marshes, but on the north wall of the anteroom he heads a file of officials and offering bearers who approach Mehi and his family, while in the presentation scene on the south wall of the same room, he hands Mehi a papyrus scroll that presumably contains lists of the stocks raised on his estates.

The name is a relatively common one, but none of the bearers of the name has a very good claim to be identified with the official portrayed in Inti and Mehi’s chapels, though one among them, a ḫmwt-pr represented in tomb of Akhetetep at Saqqara occupies the right
time frame and could conceivably be our official before his promotion to \textit{imy-r\textae\textae\textae} early in the reign of Unis.\footnote{Davies, \textit{Ptahhetep} 2, pls. 24, 27.}

\textbf{4. \textit{Hefu-\textit{nh} (w) (\textit{nh}-\textit{Hefu})} (\textit{PN} 1, p. 268, 6, “Cheops lebt”).} Without title, this individual appears as a butcher’s assistant on the west wall of the anteroom.

\textbf{5. \textit{Hnm (\textit{N}-\textit{Hnm}) (\textit{N}-\textit{Hnm})) (\textit{PN} 1, pp. 479, 14, 526, 18, 2, p. 391).} The second of three officials who make offering at the serdab slot in the west wall of the anteroom, he holds up two pieces of cloth. The title \textit{hnm}, “dignitary,” in front of his face may have been followed by another short title, such as \textit{tjm-t}, “district administrator,” or a scribal title such as \textit{imy-r\textae\textae\textae}, \textit{shf \textae\textae}, or simply \textit{z\textae\textae}, all of which are regularly paired with \textit{hnm}.\footnote{Additional citations: Marty, \textit{Ined}, pl. 11; \textit{PM} 32, pp. 113, 113, 216.} A judiciary title like \textit{try N\textae\textae} would also be a possibility.\footnote{Above, p. 142, n. 96.}

The sign of the hairy long-legged ram with horizontal horns employed by itself can signify either \textit{b\textae\textae}, “ram(-god),” or \textit{\textae\textae}, “Khnum.” When unaccompanied by phonetic signs, as in the present instance, this can lead to confusion.\footnote{PM 32, p. 934 (278).}

\textbf{6. \textit{Sn\textae\textae\textae-\textit{tbn}} (\textit{PN} 1, p. 316, 21; 2, p. 388).} The fourth figure in the procession of officials on the north wall of the anteroom, he bears the title \textit{fr\textae\textae-\textae\textae \textae\textae, “subordinate of the granary.”} From the papyrus scroll in his hand and writing palette under his arm, he appears also to have been a scribe. The owner of a fragment of a false door from Saqqara is the \textit{fr\textae\textae-\textae\textae \textae\textae}, \textit{royal chamberlain},” \textit{fr\textae\textae-\textae\textae \textae\textae} is rare as an element in titles.\footnote{See Gardiner, \textit{EG}, p. 459 [E 10]; Brovarski, \textit{ASAE} 71 (1987), p. 47.}

\textbf{7. \textit{Qr} (\textit{PN} 1, p. 335, 22).} One of a file of offering bearers on the north wall of the anteroom, he is identified as a \textit{fr\textae\textae-\textae\textae \textae\textae}. Ranke gives \textit{Qr} as a variant of \textit{Qr\textae\textae\textae} (\textit{PN} 1, p. 335, 50), but whereas the latter name is attested in the Old Kingdom, Ranke provides only a Middle Kingdom reference for the former. He also saw a connection between both these names and \textit{Qr\textae\textae\textae} (see above, p. 87 [21]), which was presumably based on the sporadic occurrence of the sack or purse in all three names. Any determinative that the name \textit{Qr\textae\textae\textae} in \textit{g 2378} may have possessed was lost by 1842–43, however.

\textbf{8. Name lost.} One of three attendants depicted behind Mehi in the spear fishing scene at the rear of the portico, he bore the title \textit{z\textae\textae \textae\textae \textae\textae}.\footnote{For this title, see \textit{Teti Cem.} 1, p. 165; Helck, \textit{Beamtentitel}, p. 64 and n. 4. For other occurrences, see E. Pigeon-Peau, \textit{Ptah-\textae\textae\textae\textae}, pl. 14; Davies, \textit{Ptahhetep} 2, pl. 101; Allfer, p. 75; \textit{Rue de noub}, pl. 157; \textit{Teti Cem.} 3, pl. 65 [56]; \textit{ArchAbousir} 2, pp. 308, 596; \textit{PM} 32, p. 696 (Cleveland 64.96).}

\textbf{9. Name lost.} This anonymous \textit{zb smsw hjyt} strangles a goose on the right of the serdab slot in the west wall of the anteroom.
I. GENERAL

A

Abadryeh: 51, 101
Abdel Razik, Mahmud: 100
Abd el-Razik, Mahmud: 100
Aberdeen, Scotland: 15
Abu Gurob: 8
Abusir: 11, 12, 13, 14, 21, 29, 116
Abusir papyri: 99
Abydos: 99
address to passers-by: 15
adiposity, see corpulence, corpulent figures
aesthetic sense of ancient Egyptians: 18
Africa: 89
Akhbit: 33
Akhmim: 85
Aldred, Cyril: 143
Allen, James P.: 42, 45, 47, 49, 52, 63, 91, 92
Altenmüller, Hartwig: 14, 61, 63, 65, 74, 147
alterations in carving (see recarved reliefs): erased figures: 73, 74
long kilt altered to short kilt: 27
short wig altered to (or from) shoulder-length wig: 74
"Amoeba Tomb": 4
amulets: 4
Basket: 81
bull with "Isis knot": 151
feathers: 82
"Isis knot": 151
eyes with "Isis knot": 151
turtle: 81
ancestors of Senedjemib family: 24
animals: animal alive when foreleg cut off: 48
bones of: 128, 158
depicted in presentation scenes: 57, 138
single, symbolizing scores of others: 57
anointing with unguent: 90, 91, 98
Anubis: 76, 115, 123, 126, 154
apprenticeship, to older brother: 31, 32
architecture of mastabas, see individual entries (entrance portico, pillared hall, etc.)
architraves: 15
decorated: 15–16, 85
inscribed: 1, 12, 13, 16, 23, 29, 37–38, 135
with carved figures of owner: 25
Arnold, Dierk: 95
artistic conventions: 38, 127, 146, 148
artistic devices: for tying together groups: 65
to vary composition: 55, 56, 62
Aswan: 30
attitudes: of chief figure: abbreviated shoulder: 41
leaning on staff: flat-footed posture: 45, 59
profile posture: 47
of minor figures: abbreviated shoulder: 55
head turn: 142, 143
leaning on staff: flat-footed posture: 51, 61, 69–74
supporting leg and free leg posture: 52, 144
ordinary seated position for men: 52, 57, 58, 67–68, 130
ordinary seated position for women: 50, 150
profile posture: 44, 135
scrivener's pose: 52
squatting posture: 54
staff held loosely, resting on ground: 60
of statuary: combined frontal and profile views: 54
profile view: 132, 147
autobiographical inscriptions, location of: 15, 20, 39, 90
autobiographical inscriptions of: Khnumhotep II
Nekhebu: 15, 52
[Senedjemib (G 2384)]: 20, 70
Senedjemib Inti, see Inscriptions A–B
autobiographies, conventional: 15
award ceremony: 15, 29, 39, 90, 98
Ayert, Edward E.: 8
B
background, color of: 22
Bar, Klaus: 25, 26, 28, 51, 54, 84
bags: oblong with loop handles: 51
triangular bag: 121
Baines, John: 47
balanced composition: 69, 70
balances: equal-arm balance on a stand: 147–48
hand-held scales: 147
Balza, Heizler: 13
Baraize, Emile: 13
barley: 68
Barsami, Alexandre: 13
basket: 74
boat-shaped: 75
cancial: 51, 55, 67, 69, 122
coreid: 121
crescent-shaped: 75, 77, 78
hemispherical: 51, 55, 69, 122
spayed: 121, 122, 124, 137
spayed, with loop handles (carryall): 44, 46, 125, 155, 156
beakwork: covers for bowls: 68, 71, 153, 156
flaps on jars: 68, 71, 153, 156
Basket: amulet: 81
in crater name: 70
baxton, or stick: scepter-like baxton: 50, 46
substituting for sceptre: 47
beard, or chin beard
Beaut, Nathalie: 40, 153
bedding grooves, for ceiling slabs: 115
Boh, H.: 117
Bon Khallil: 203
hellenistic: 35
Berlev, Oleg: 104
Berlin Academy of Science: 135
Bes: 82
bident, or two-pronged fish spear, 39
bird trapping, see scenes, types of
birds, as pets: 31, 121, 143
birds, species of:
bittern: 40
crane: 57, 139
duck: 50, 143
Egyptian goose (Alopochen aegyptiaca): 40
European coot (Fulica atra): 57, 143
Golden Oriole (Oriolus oriolus): 143
goose: 57, 64
Grey Heron (Ardea cinerea): 56
Greylag goose (Anser anser): 139
heron, as decoy: 39, 136
hoopoe (Upupa epops): 39, 40, 143
House Martin (Delichon urbica): 41, 93
lapwing (Vanellus vanellus): 50, 143
pintail duck (Anas acuta): 57, 75
swallow (Hirundo rustica): 39, 41, 93
Turtle dove (Streptopelia turtur): 57, 75, 143
White-fronted goose (Anser albifrons): 139
“white” goose: 139
birling (log-rolling), in American Northwest: 44
Bissing, Friedrich Wilhelm von: 42
bivalve shell: 151
blue-grey as background color: 22
boat(s):
of Khufu: 42
papyrus raft: 50, 146
papyrus skiff: 6, 27, 28, 32, 38, 39, 42, 44, 45, 50, 119, 124, 134, 135, 136
Bent Pyramid: 16
blocking, types of: 112
blood, as offering: 127
Bolshakov, Andrey O.: 44, 118
Bonomi, Joseph: 27
boomerangs: 25, 39
Bonnet, Hans: 40
border patterns:
block border (colored rectangles): 22, 73
interpolated diagonals: 22, 73
kheker-frieze: 22
Boreux, Charles: 117
boxes and chests:
cavetto-corniced chest: 48
plain rectangular box: 48
brazier: 50, 51
bread:
baked in ashes: 51
half-loaves on offering table: 16, 70, 71, 77, 105, 126
oblong loaf: 117
oval or round flat bread: 51, 115
solid, rising leaves: 115, 116
small, triangular loaves: 115, 116
various shapes: 11
Breasted, James Henry: 95, 104, 107, 108, 109
brushes:
bird: 82
fish: 81
Omatici: 84
Obirra: 81
Brugnoch, Emil: 8
of vegetable fiber: 51
for sprinkling scented liquid?: 120
replications of: 51, 58
Bulaq Museum: 8
burial chambers:
decorated: 22, 24, 80
“T” shaped, with coffin recess: 22, 79–80
burial pits: 31
burial place, reasons for selecting: 14
burriers: 48, 49, 66, 127, 144
But: 13
butterflies: 50
Byblos: 81
C
Cairo, Egyptian Museum: 8, 31
catopics: 157
carpet: 31
carrying chair: 46, 47
high, elaborately decorated form: 47
low vaulted form: 47
preregative granted by king: 46
set on ground: 16
symbol of high social rank: 46
cases:
capped, tubular case, for walking sticks: 122
flat-topped tubular case for walking sticks: 122
tall, with floppy top: 47, 177
cattle:
confused, or distracted, calf: 117
cow milked: 51
cow serviced by bull, while angry rival looks on: 51
prize bull:
with “Isis knot”: 151
with rope collar: 57, 151
with rope collar and bivalve shell: 57
recumbent cattle: 51, 56, 137
stable: 37, 150
sucking calf: 51
long-horned, wild bull: 51
cauette-and-torus cornice, see cornices
ceiling slabs: 7, 8, 115
bedding grooves for: 115
ceintre, of “double-helmet” form: 65, 73, 121, 143
chapels:
types of:
type (7): 16, 17, 19, 155
type (7c): 16, 155
type (7d): 16, 115
type (7e): 2, 11
type (9d): 111
of “return type”?: 59
Bonnet, Hans: 40
Borrom, Charles: 177
boiling coves: 81, 112, 128, 129
boxes and chests:
cassette-corniced chest: 48
plain rectangular box: 48
bracelet: 50, 51
bread:
baked in ashes: 51
half-loaves on offering table: 16, 70, 71, 77, 105, 126
oblong loaf: 117
oval or round flat bread: 51, 115
tall, rising leaves: 115, 116
small, triangular loaves: 115, 116
various shapes: 11
Breathe, James Henry: 95, 104, 107, 108, 109
brushes:
bird: 82
fish: 81
Omatici: 84
Obirra: 81
Brugnoch, Emil: 8
of vegetable fiber: 51
for sprinkling scented liquid?: 120
replications of: 51, 58
Bulaq Museum: 8
burial chambers:
decorated: 22, 24, 80
“T” shaped, with coffin recess: 22, 79–80
burial pits: 31
burial place, reasons for selecting: 14
burriers: 48, 49, 66, 127, 144
But: 13
butterflies: 50
Byblos: 81
I. GENERAL

...
door thicknesses:
  – outer and inner: 126, 122, 125, 158
doorways, construction of: 41
  – wall notches for door battens: 138
Dorn, Eric: 91, 107
doubling of signs: 154
drainage channel of Great Pyramids: 2, 33
Drenkhahn, Rosemarie: 54
driver holes: 126
  – (drum): 2, 14
Ducros, Hippolyte: 148
dummy vessels: 82, 129
Dunham, Dows: 32
dwarf animals: 146
Dynasty 1: 99, 121
  – Dynasty 1: 99, 121
Dynasty 2: 99
  – Dynasty 4: 16, 20, 22, 85, 109, 136
Dynasty 5: 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 75, 84, 109, 126, 144, 151
Dynasty 6: 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 29, 30, 76, 84, 99, 126, 133, 136
Dynasty 11: 100
Dynasty 12: 104
Dynasty 13: 103, 104
Dynasty 18: 103
Dynasty 26: 8

E
Early Bronze Age: 81
Early Dynasty Period: 131
Eaton-Knaus, Marianne: 54, 119
Edel, Elmar: 41, 49, 95, 104, 109
Egyptian Antiquities Organization: 103
El Beresh: 104
embalming:
  – expenses shared by king: 42
  – period of: 108
embalming workshop: 26, 29, 102, 107, 108
endowment of tomb: 60, 89
enamelled, height of: 15
entrance jams:
  – decorated: 14
  – entrance porches: 1, 12, 13, 35, 37
  – decorated: 14, 57–44, 135–37
  – height of: 15, 94, 109, 154
  – modern reconstruction of: 15
  – thematic unity of decoration in: 15
entrance stairs:
  – entrance thicknesses:
    – decorated: 27, 49–44, 106–17, 137–38
  – eponyms, repeated, introduced by Imhotep: 113
Ermman, Adolp: 61
estate, personal agricultural: 30
attitudes adopted by: 55, 66, 69, 121
offerings transported by: 55
entrance thicknesses:
  – decorated: 27, 49–44, 106–17, 137–38
  – eponyms, repeated, introduced by Imhotep: 113
  – decorated: 27, 49–44, 106–17, 137–38
  – height of: 15, 94, 109, 154
  – modern reconstruction of: 15
  – thematic unity of decoration in: 15
entrance stairs:
  – entrance thicknesses:
    – decorated: 27, 49–44, 106–17, 137–38
entrances, personal agricultural:
  – attitudes adopted by: 55, 66, 69, 121
  – offerings transported by: 55
faith:
  – of copper sheet and wire: 51
  – representations of: 51
Faulkner, Raymond O.: 59
fauve:
  – civet cat, or genet (Genetta genetta): 40, 50, 136
  – donkey: 62, 63, 64
  – gazelle: 57
hedghog: 57
ichnites (Hypotis aequoroum): 40, 50, 136
oryx: 119, 141, 146
red deer: 57
sheep, long-legged with horizontal horns (Ovis longicorpal palaeoegyptiaca):
  – 61, 141, 160
femur: 115
Fenteki, cup-bearer of the sun-god: 24
Feucht, Erika: 54
Field Columbian Museum, Chicago: 8
Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago: 8
fig:
  – two types of: 44
  – wilderwork fruits as containers for: 48
filial devotion: 34
First Intermediate Period: 54, 105
Fisher, Henry George: 53, 40, 106, 121, 158
fish bearers: 59, 61
fishing, scene, types of
  – fish spear, sebident
fish, species of:
  – Belus australis: 99
  – Hils-loach (Tilapia niloica): 39, 40, 50, 146
  – catfish (Syndenton hematopterus): 39, 50, 145
  – carfish (Syndenton schall): 40, 50, 60
  – cod (Ampetila vulgaris): 40, 50, 60
  – moon fish (Callomus parvus): 40, 50, 146
  – muller (Mugil p.): 40, 50, 60, 146
  – Nile perch (Lates niloticus): 39, 50, 60
  – Oxyrhynchus fish (Menomys x.): 40, 50, 60
  – puffer fish (Tennusa fabula): 40, 50, 60, 155, 146
flax harvest: 60, 145
flint blade: 129
fly whisk, of fox skin: 47
flora:
  – lotus, evelotus
  – papyrus plant (Cyperus Papyrus): 51
  – Polyergus scutatus: 40, 10, 116
  – Paraleuros aequoroum: 2: 40
  – Petrosanum lucea: 2: 40
  – Ptilonurus fahak: 37, 98
floral filler, worn by beaumains: 153
flower: 356
food cases, or offering cases
  – food preparation:
    – bird roasted on spit: 50
    – bread baked in ashes: 50
  – force feeding of animals: 56
foundations of Senebjem Complex: 2, 3
fringe inscription: 115, 166
funereal ceremonies: 19
funerary endowment:
  – 26, 57, 58
funerary priests:
  – 3–4, 11, 21, 55, 87
  – appointment of: 101
funerary mummies:
  – 26, 40, 78
organization of: 87–88
funerary sites:
  – 128
burning incense: 65, 66, 75
consecration of food offerings: 73
hand-washing, or purification: 71, 154, 156
two-fold aim of rites: 73
furniture:
  – armchair:

166
bull-legged: 149
frustrum-shaped stone supports: 149
papyrus flower ornament of side-rails: 149
bed: 12
flat-topped chest on legs: 124
headrest: 140, 148
jar racks: 17, 18, 71, 77, 153, 155, 156
head-drums: 133
frustrum-shaped stone supports: 133, 144
low-backed chair: 134, 135
papyrus flower ornament of side-rails: 155, 156
overlapping legs: 155–156
manufacture of: 52–53
theriomorphic stool: 124
offering tables: 16, 18, 69, 70, 71, 74, 77, 133, 153, 154
splay-leg stools: 148
front leg concealed: 124
frustrum-shaped stone supports: 71, 118, 123
papyrus flower ornament of side-rails: 71, 125

G

Gardiner, Alan H.: 103

hieroglyphs:
in music directing: 48
of acknowledgement: 60
of address, or invocation: 60, 73
of conjunction against crocodiles: 58, 157
of respect: 45–46, 57, 58, 106, 124, 159, 155
of supplication: 17
grain harvest: 60, 61
granite, sarcophagus of: 157
graphic transposition of signs: 38, 44, 53, 154
granite pyramid: 1, 2, 3
drainage channel of: 2, 3
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Giza mastabas:
The Senedjemib Complex, Part 1

high priest of Ptah: 30, 159
hippopotamus: 39, 40, 50, 136
hippopotamus hunt: 14, 40, 50, 136
Horus: 70, 99
of Tjerty: 122
human-handed wand: 47
human remains:
   skeletons:
      ♂ 2370 (Senedjemib Inti): 81
      ♀ 2370 (female): 82
      ♂ 2371 (Hearst Museum): 112
      ♀ 2371 (female): 2, 133
      ♂ 2380 A (Peabody Museum): 33
   mummies:
      Roman Period: 4, 8
      Saite Period: 4, 8
Ihy, child of Hathor and Horus: 92
impost, of bulls and small animals: 56
incense: 48, 66, 73, 87
   significance of: 65
indirect axis approach: 99
Inscriptions A–D: 21, 27, 28, 89, 90–110
   Inscription A: 26, 29, 37
   Inscription A 1: 89, 92–94
   Inscription A 2: 89, 96–101
   Inscription B: 26, 29, 37
   Inscription B 1: 8, 13, 89, 94–96
   Inscription B 2: 89, 96–101
   Inscription D: 26, 29, 30, 37, 108–110, 101
   "Isis knot:" 151
   Isis Temple: 8
J
Jaqout-Gordon, Helen: 69, 122, 152
James, T. G. H.: 30, 49, 159
Janssen, Jac. J.: 104
jar sealing: 3
jar stoppers: 81
   cone-shaped: 68, 149
   domed: 34
   rounded: 71
   jewelry:
      anklets: 143
      beaded collar: 30, 40, 43, 47, 55, 69, 71, 78, 79, 105, 120, 131, 132, 135
      broad collar: 148
      bracelet: 148
      worn by man: 39, 138, 142
      worn by woman: 143
      dog collar, or choker: 148
      necklace: 90, 91, 98
      necklace with oval amulet pierced by thorn: 143
      stola: 148
jubilee:
   of King Izezi, see Kings, Djedkare Izezi
prince for: 24
vessel commemorating: 24
water procession, as episode in: 98
Junge, Friedrich: 23
Junker, Hermann: 117

K
Ka-chapels, royal: 33
Kaf el-Haram: 1, 8
Kanawati, Naguib: 34
Keimer, Ludwig: 40, 143
Kerrn, Ebba E.: 136
kheker-frieze: see border patterns
Khorsy:
   in estate names: 31, 122
   in personal names: 30
Khnum: 31, 112, 160
Kings:
   Amenhotep III: 98
   Djedkare Izezi: 1, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 29, 62, 84, 95, 97, 108, 116
   building projects of: 23, 89
   Hathor chapel of: 92, 93
   in estate names: 55, 69, 112
   in name of cargo ship: 31
   jubilee of: 23, 24, 31, 37, 89, 97, 99, 101
   letters from: 23, 24, 29, 80, 90, 93–94, 94–96, 96–101
   new-style royal priesthoods: 85
   official cemetery of: 14, 19
   prisoner names: 138
   promotes Senedjemib Inti to overseer of works: 89
   pyramid of: 24, 26, 29, 102, 105, 129
   queen of: 29
   reforms of: 29, 85
   regnal years of: 25, 31, 37, 101
   rewards Senedjemib Inti: 91
   sons of: 12, 13, 14, 15, 29
   vessel of: 24
   waters of: 29, 38, 81, 89
Djoser: 98, 99, 103
Khafre: 4, 30
Merketete I: 16, 17
   Hathor chapel of: 92
   in estate names: 55, 69, 112
   pyramid of: 129
Merenre: 35
   pyramid temple of: 18
   regnal years of: 34
Mycerinus: 7
Neferefre:
   prisoner names: 158
Neferefre Kaha:
   in estate names: 69, 152
   pyramid temple of: 16, 19
   regnal year of: 91
Neuserret I: 8, 12, 15, 17, 24, 62, 84, 99, 116
   in estate names: 55, 69
   jubilee of: 108
   prisoner names: 158
   pyramid of: 22, 109
   pyramid temple of: 16
Pepi I (Meryre):
   canals cut at Akhbit, Qus: 33
   expedition to Wadi Hammamat: 33
   Hathor chapel of: 92, 93
   jubilee of: 33
I. GENERAL

prisoner statues: 158
pyramid city of: 84
pyramid temple of: 16, 34
capitol decree: 104
Hathor chapel of: 92
letter of: 93
pyramid temple of: 16, 34
regnal years of: 34, 101
throne room of: 93
successors of: 35

Pepy II: 3, 4, 16, 22, 23, 34, 100
Coptos decree: 104
Hathor chapel of: 92
jubilee of: 101
letter of: 89
pyramid temple of: 16, 34
regnal years of: 34, 101

Ramses II: 8
Sahure: 16

Shepseskaf: 19

Sekhemkhet: 98

Sneferu: 16

Teti: 1, 8, 17, 22, 25, 31, 50, 62, 80
diorite bowl with name of: 30

Hathor chapel of: 92
in estate names: 30, 122

Unis: 1, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23, 29, 31, 62, 80, 84, 86, 99, 123, 135, 142, 156, 16, 116, 118
causeway of: 147–48
Hathor chapel of: 92
in estate names: 30
large of: 30
new-style royal priesthoods: 81
prisoner statues: 158
pyramid of: 129
queens of: 11

Userkaf: 16
Hathor chapel of: 92
in estate names: 69

Kauth, Dieter: 17

L

Late Egyptian: 103
law of inheritance: 16
letter prices:
conservation of offerings in province of: 74

measurements:
in flated: 65

system of recording: 100


man: 1

metal-workers: 107

metal-workers: 107
minor figures (select):
booster in water: 127
Scribes present: 121, 149
scribe with palette and papyrus: 11, 146, 160
scribe with papyrus in hand: 146
yoke bearer: 15, 57, 144, 146
models:
- block headrest: 129
- brewer’s vat (from servant statue): 112
- ships: 46
- tools: 53, 79, 82
- vessels: 78, 79, 82, 158, 158
- from “Opening of the Mouth” set: 131
modern preservation work: 13, 133, 134
Mohr, Herta Therese: 50
Mokattam hills: 21
monkey, as pet: 58
Montet, Pierre: 61, 117
moral encomium: 15
motifs (select):
- calf at rear of herd crossing marshes: 137
- calf preceding herd: 134
- crocodile waiting to devour newborn hippopotamus: 135
- drinking from bowl:
  - overseer: 50
  - relative of tomb owner (in skiff): 50
- field hands binding and placing sheaves in sacks: 62, 140
- field hand drinking: 123
- herdsman with bundle of fodder: 58, 142, 151
- flutist in fields: 62, 140
- reaper removing weed from bundle of grain or flax: 60, 140, 145
- tray with triangular loaf of bread between two bowls and lettuce on top: 119, 122
- women face-to-face grinding grain and sifting flour: 68
Moussa, Ahmed: 14, 65, 117
mud brick:
- debris: 7
- walls: 1, 7, 111, 135, 135
mud plaster: 111
mud slurry, to ease passage of sledge: 48, 121
mummification, of private persons: 29
Murray, Margaret: 20, 22
Muschler, R.: 40
museum accession numbers:
- Cleveland Museum 64.91: 83
- Egyptian Museum, Berlin 5/65: 66
- Egyptian Museum, Cairo:
  - Cairo JE 44026: 358
  - Cairo JE 44031: 138
  - Cairo JE 44056: 138
- CG 241: 70
- CG 4410: 17
- CG 4411: 41
- CG 4412: 108
- CG 4413: 205, 205, 105, 106
- CG 4414: 159
- CG 4415: 21
- CG 4416: 130
- CG 4417: 47
- CG 4418: A, R, 49
- CG 4486: 116
- CG 4487: 46
- CG 4488: 46
- CG 4489: 103
- CG 4490: 104
- pCairo JE 49653: 208
- Field Museum of Anthropology 51705: 8, 153
- Heavy Museum of Anthropology, Berkeley: specimen no. 5166 acc. no. 464 (skeleton, c 2373 A): 112
- Kenner Museum, Hannover 1972.59: 66
- Louvre, Paris:
A 108 (= N 213): 33
E. 1330: 24
Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York:
- 77.6.24/B: 128
- 77.6.24/AB: 128
- 77.6.24/AB: 128
- Museum of Fine Arts, Boston:
  - 15.3379: 133
  - 15.3464–70: 128
  - 15.3495: 128
- Mokattam hills: 21
monkey, as pet: 38
Montet, Pierre: 61, 117
moral encomium: 15
motifs (select):
- calf at rear of herd crossing marshes: 137
- calf preceding herd: 134
- crocodile waiting to devour newborn hippopotamus: 135
- drinking from bowl:
  - overseer: 50
  - relative of tomb owner (in skiff): 50
- field hands binding and placing sheaves in sacks: 62, 140
- field hand drinking: 123
- herdsman with bundle of fodder: 58, 142, 151
- flutist in fields: 62, 140
- reaper removing weed from bundle of grain or flax: 60, 140, 145
- tray with triangular loaf of bread between two bowls and lettuce on top: 119, 122
- women face-to-face grinding grain and sifting flour: 68
Moussa, Ahmed: 14, 65, 117
mud brick:
- debris: 7
- walls: 1, 7, 111, 135, 135
mud plaster: 111
mud slurry, to ease passage of sledge: 48, 121
mummification, of private persons: 29
Murray, Margaret: 20, 22
Muschler, R.: 40
museum accession numbers:
- Cleveland Museum 64.91: 83
- Egyptian Museum, Berlin 5/65: 66
- Egyptian Museum, Cairo:
  - Cairo JE 44026: 358
  - Cairo JE 44031: 138
  - Cairo JE 44056: 138
- CG 241: 70
- CG 4410: 17
- CG 4411: 41
- CG 4412: 108
- CG 4413: 205, 205, 105, 106
- CG 4414: 159
- CG 4415: 21
- CG 4416: 130
- CG 4417: 47
- CG 4418: A, R, 49
- CG 4486: 116
- CG 4487: 46
- CG 4488: 46
- CG 4489: 103
- CG 4490: 104
- pCairo JE 49653: 208
- Field Museum of Anthropology 51705: 8, 153
- Heavy Museum of Anthropology, Berkeley: specimen no. 5166 acc. no. 464 (skeleton, c 2373 A): 112
- Kenner Museum, Hannover 1972.59: 66
- Louvre, Paris:
nummulites: 20, 54

obelisk: 7, 11, 16
symbol of resurrection: 16–12
offering basins: 11, 18, 19, 69
offering bearers: carrying forelegs of beef: 16, 17, 18, 28, 77
holding up multiple geese: 18
inspector of priests heading file of: 28
proffering goose: 16, 17, 18, 64, 65, 77
with cages of birds at feet: 18, 126
offering benches ("sideboards"): 19, 20, 69, 154
offering (food) cases: 127–30
offering list: compartment list: 16, 17, 70, 71–72, 77, 80–81, 83, 125
figures performing rites as frieze below: 72
ideographic list: 33, 71, 76, 153, 154, 156
on side of coffin: 33
on walls of burial chambers: 22
substitution of standing for kneeling figures in: 71–72
offering ritual: 19, 122
offering room: cruciform: 2, (11)
east–west: 2, 3, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 28, 37, 69, 115, 133, 151
butchers relegated to east wall: 18, 126
decorative program of: 16, 17, 18, 126, 151, 153
in pyramid temples: 16
outdoor activities excluded from: 18
offering saucers: 82, 129
offering stone: 2, 18–19, 69, 126, 154
offerings to Renenutet: 64
of fices: acquired partly by inheritance: 34
as rewards of training and experience: 32
grades (cursus honorem) of builders’: 32
ranking of: 34
old age, conventions of: 23, 26, 27
Onuris: 82
"Opening of the Mouth" set: 131
orchards: 97
orientation: of scenes: 46, 48, 117
two-way orientation of texts: 16
Osing, Jürgen: 91
Osiris: 76, 82, 126, 155
overbuilding of mastabas: 1, 111, 112, 133
overlapping figures (lateral layering): 47, 58, 62, 65, 120, 141, 145
pack bag: 111
painting, in imitation of: granite: 21
quarries: 81
painting: in imitation of: granite: 21
qv quarrymen, see carrying-chair
Palermo Stone: 92
painted, figures in, see recarved reliefs
Papyrus Harris, citation: 98
paved court, of Senedjemib Complex: 1, 2, 3, 7
paved pathway: 1, 3
pavement:
of Roman Period ramp: 4, 7
of mastaba roofs: 7
Pepy II pyramid cemetery: 22
personality of artist: 137
personalization of plantation: 97
per: 10, 17, 18
phyles (of funerary priests), organization of: 87–88
pillared hall: 21, 78, 79
pillars: 32, 65
pitchfork: 64, 65, 146
pilaster: carving of: 20
carving and breaks: 20
details cut in: 20
falling away of: 74, 77, 78, 107, 119, 125, 140, 151, 152
figures carved in: 18, 66, 77, 107, 119, 132
sizing technique: 20
shallow layer of, to take paint: 20
yellowish-white: 135
plough: 61
plummet: 128
porters of carrying chairs: 47
number of: 47
portico, or entrance portico
Posener-Kruse, Paul: 23
positions of figures: see attitudes
posthumous promotion: 34
preservation of meat: 103
profi le, figures in: 41, 44
province: 18, 122–23
Pyramid Expedition: 89
Py: 97, 122, 126
in estate names: 122, 125, 152
temple of: 8
purification, rites of: 11
Pyramid:
collected as female divinity: 130
highest grade in priestly hierarchy of: 50
Pyramid III-a, Giza: 19
pyramid casing stones: 8
Pyramid Texts, citations: 95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 104, 105, 110
Q
quarrymen, Arabic: 8
quarry: at Giza: 10
at Wadi Hammamat: 33
queen’s tombs: 11, 19
queen’s temple (of Pyramid III-a at Giza): 19
queen’s, or scribe queen
R
rainwater: 2
Ramesside Period: 8
ramp:
entrance ramp of Senedjemib Complex: 1, 2, 3, 7
Roman Period: 7, 8
Raske, Hermann: 30, 31, 160
Re: 94, 97, 152
recumbent animals: 17, 19
recarved relief: 18
figures: 27, 38, 39, 45, 66
texts: 27, 40, 41, 45
red granite, sarcophagus of: 137
register system:
action occurring simultaneously in several:
number of: 9, 11, 41
register bisected horizontally: 31
register divided vertically: 31
subregisters: 30, 31
Reineke, Walter-Friedrich: 79, 153
Reiser, George A.: 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 14, 15, 20, 21, 24, 26, 31, 34, 37, 44, 49, 57, 59, 78, 79, 80, 89, 90, 93, 96, 100, 102, 106, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 112, 113, 128, 127, 128, 131, 137
reliefs:
  flat, sharp-edged relief: 126
more attention devoted to figure of owner: 189
poorly executed raised relief: 117, 119
re-used, from earlier mastaba: 128
stages of execution of: 27
incorporated out of Deir el-Medina: 5–6, 21
techniques of (high, medium, low): 20
uncarved elements: 56, 124, 136, 137, 142, 146

decorations of tomb owner:
brother
  holding fish spear in front of: 52
  in presentation scene before: 31
  Nõdhibu apprenticed to younger brother: 32
  daughter:
    dressed like mother: 30

son:
  daughter:
    wife:

daughter:
  height of: 78

Our
  folding cloth (S 29): 53, 56, 63, 136
  brick maker: 5, 78

Roman Period: 4, 7, 8

Rößler-Koller, Ursula: 117
rubble walls: 2, 111
rubble, limestone: 2
Russman, Edna R.: 182, 183

S
Saad, Zaki: 30
sack press: 67
sacks:
  cloth sack: 48
  rope-net sack, with loop handles: 62, 65, 64, 140
sacrificial animals: 51
saddle blanket: 63, 64, 149, 141
saddle qurb, or milestone: 68
salting commands: 43, 187
Saite Period: 4, 8
sand:
  added to grain to aid in grinding: 68
  not added to grain: 68
sand:
  wind-blown: 5, 8, 9, 14, 73
sandals: 51
sarcophagus: 4, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 30, 34, 42, 61, 67, 74, 80, 87, 97, 98, 102, 103, 108, 107, 118, 121, 123, 133, 147, 152, 161
official cemetery of King Izezi at: 24, 26, 29
official cemetery of King Taharqa at: 29
nummulitic limestone: 24
stones (versus columns): 12, 15
Turin limestone at: 22
sarcophagus: 4, 31, 32, 33, 81
as gift from king: 31, 32, 33, 24, 26, 30, 108
bread making and brewing: 55, 149
animal rearing: 14, 49, 51
animal trapping:
  with drawnet: 57, 139
  with clapnet: 50, 124, 144
  with hand net: 39, 135
  with dragnet, or seine net: 59
  with hook and line: 136
bird trapping:
  with hand net: 57, 139
bird trapping:
  with clapnet: 50, 134, 144
  with drawnet: 30
  with bucket: 58
  with scoop and net: 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 69, 66, 139, 141, 148
  carrying chair (palanquin) scene: 6, 15, 32, 46–48, 56, 18, 120–22
  combat by boatmen: 6, 44
  construction of papyrus boats: 44
  canoeing: 9, 17, 149, 150, 152
  family scene, or group: 30, 32, 78–79, 144
  bird files: 57, 139
  bird trapping:
  with clapnet: 50, 134, 144
  with drawnet: 30
  with bucket: 58
  with scoop and net: 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 69, 66, 139, 141, 148
  carrying chair (palanquin) scene: 6, 15, 32, 46–48, 56, 18, 120–22
  combat by boatmen: 6, 44
  construction of papyrus boats: 44
  canoeing: 9, 17, 149, 150, 152
  family scene, or group: 30, 32, 78–79, 144
  file of officials: 15, 146
  fencing scenes:
    with derringer, or scimitar: 59–60, 145–46
    with hand nets: 59–60, 146
    with hook and line: 136
  flagging at whipping post: 151
  food and drink offerings: 6, 7, 9, 16, 17, 18, 49, 70, 71, 74, 113, 115, 116
  force-feeding animals: 56
  funeral scenes: 14, 15, 18, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 63, 68, 124, 139–40
  fruit picking: 66–67
  funeral scenes: 10, 123–33
  preferred location of: 127
handicraft scenes: 6, 9, 10, 51, 147

The Senedjemib Complex, Part I
carrpenters’ workshop: 12-13
jewelry making: 148-49
metallurgical workshop: 147-49
sculptors workshop: 12-13, 147
headmen rendering accounts: 16, 17, 148, 150-51
hippopotamus hunt: 6, 45(7), 53, 50, 156
marsh pursuits: 6, 9, 15, 14, 99
hoard returning home: 14, 15, 144, 139, 133, 146
castle founding scenes: 14, 16, 18, 19
heralds in boats: 14, 15, 88, 41, 157
marsh scenes: 12, 25, 26, 40-41, 49-51, 186, 153
musicians and singers: 6, 58, 149-50
netting birds: 18
offering bearers: 6, 9, 11, 16, 17, 18, 18, 56, 69, 79, 74, 78, 86, 119, 120, 122, 135, 124, 127, 139, 139, 146, 135, 154, 155, 147, 137
offering scenes: 9, 63, 64, 66, 67
palaea scene: see carrying chair scene
poultry yard: 14
presentation scene: 16, 144, 158, 148-50, 159
priests carrying shrines: 11, 17
priests performing rites: 16, 48, 63-66, 70, 79-72, 74-76, 114, 115, 116
sailing ships: 15, 52, 44-49, 46-47
sacrophagi, transported: 14, 15, 18
spear fishing: 14, 16, 18, 23, 27, 32, 34, 83, 85, 131, 160
statur transport: 48, 49, 120, 121
tablet scene: 9, 33, 37, 20, 22, 70, 71, 85, 125, 123, 135, 133
vulture scene: 55-67, 144
specter-like baton, see baton
Schaefer, Heinrich: 61
Schott, Siegfried: 107
see: impressions:
of Djoser: 103
of Pepy II: 34
of Syrian origin: 85
"Second Style" in Old Kingdom sculpture: 112
seals, sealing, seal-impressions:
seal-bands: 65, 66, 67, 78, 87, 87, 127, 139
figures performing rites beside: 63-66, 142, 144, 160
seals with: 3, 31, 48, 56, 66, 78, 82, 122, 137, 139, 140, 153
blocks from s. of Ibebi: 2, 24
blocks from s. of Imty: 2, 34
blocks from s. of Nekhebu: 2, 34
decorated with figures of statues: 34
of Pepyankh Heny the Black: 34
service equipment of chapels: 11, 18, 19
service equipment of tomb complexes: 11
blood basin: 11
offering basin: 11
stapel stones: 11
Seth:
in estate names: 36, 122, 135, 134
patronymics of architects: 125
Seth: 99
Seth, Kurr: 49, 89, 91, 96, 98, 99, 100, 202, 103, 105, 106, 107, 109
seven sacred oils, on head end of coffin: 35
shaft types: 2, 79, 111, 122
shafts:
G 2376 A: 2, 138
G 2377 A: 2, 138
G 2378 B: 3, 35, 140, 137, 148
G 2380 C: 3
G 2381 V: 3
G 2382 P: 2, 128
G 2466 B III: 128
Sheikholeslami, Cynthia: 37
ships:
cargo vessel: 22, 23, 58
funeral barque: 108
papyrus craft: 22
sailing ship: 32, 44-45, 106-17
towmode: 138
shrine-shaped canopy, over coffin: 118
Shaban el-Zehini: 99
siblings represented in series: 28
séidelek of south: 143
sieve: 64, 68
silo, with knobbled tops: 67
Silberman, David P.: 45, 106
Simons, Sandra Kay: 99
Simpson, William Kelly: 49
slab-inlays: 22
sleds:
98, 38, 49, 109
lion-headed: 108
statur in shrine upon: 48, 121, 122
sleeping-passage tombs (type 3):
G 2370 A (Senedjemib Inti): 1, 4, 5, 11, 12, 26, 79, 80, 109, 127
G 2378 A (Senedjemib Mehy): 2, 127, 157-58
G 2380 (Djehy): 1, 2, 3, 31, 33, 34
G 2381 V: 3
G 2381 (Iibeh): 5, 31, 33
G 2382 (Nithkhebu): 1, 4, 31
G 2389 (Alkhnumis): 1, 2, 3, 31, 112, 127-29
G 2389 (Sonater of G 2387): 2, 11, 31
G 2390 (Ia I Nefre): 22
G 2390 (Kahlespre Anker): 22, 23
G 2391 (Seshemnefer IV, Hethpraty, Tjani),
Spaulings, Anthony J.: 25, 35
spatial relationships: 67
specific event in past life of tomb owner: 49
spell against crocodiles: 38, 40, 159, 157
Stadelmann, Rainer: 16
Stahl, Elisabeth: 103
stature-shrine: 48, 122
stature(s):
fragmentary statues: 78, 81, 112, 128
large sarcophagi statue of young adult: 137
of Aker-meru-nefr: 212
of Nekhebu: 82, 112
of Pehenpraty: 112
of Pfenmen: 112
prisoner statues: 152
seated on thronomorphic chair or stool: 219
servant statues: 112, 122
wooden stature of naked child: 157
statues, representations of: 48, 53, 14, 109, 120, 122
hauyels maneuvering: 122
sticks, held by attendants: 47
Stone, Mark C.: 65
stone sculptures: 7, 15, 75
Stroudwick, Nigel: 5, 16, 18, 22, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 32, 83, 84, 159
sunk relief: see relief, techniques
sunshade bearer: 47
sunshade: 34
surcharged figures or text, see recurring of reliefs
symmetrical arrangements: 18

I. GENERAL
T

Syria: 81, 83

Tackholm, Vivi: 40

Termuthis, see Renenutet

testamentary enactment: 107

Thebes: 98

throwstick, see boomerang

thurifer: 48, 65, 66, 73, 105, 118, 144

title(s):
as rank-indicators; 34, 671

sequences of: 34

tools, representations of:
adze: 52

chisel: 54

chocks, or forked rests: 44, 52

club-shaped mallet: 52, 54

mortising chisel: 52

shaft drill: 53

sickles: 61, 123, 140

stone rubber: 52

saw: 53

sawyer's post: 53

tubular drill: 54

whetstone: 48, 66, 142

tombs depicted: 118–119

“Tomb of the Two Brothers”: 118, 119

tomb plans, increasing complexity in: 11ff.

“tombes en four”: 29

torus moulding (see cornice):
lashings and cross-lashings of: 13, 21, 75, 125, 154

plain band between roll and architrave: 13

roll resting directly on architrave: 13, 125, 154

trays: 68, 73, 75, 78

Tura limestone quarries: 14, 20, 21, 23, 26, 38, 89, 108, 109

Unis pyramid cemetery: 11, 17, 22, 74

Upper Egypt: 33, 91

Urkunden 1, citations:
p. 2, 10: 107

p. 3, 9: 107

pp. 4, 10–14: 100

p. 9, 14; 15; 16: 105

p. 14, 10–100

p. 41, 6: 102

pp. 44–45, 16–18

p. 45, 9–10

p. 44, 6: 107

p. 44, 9–10

p. 47, 1: 105

pp. 59, 1–66, 14 (Senedjemib Inti): 90–110

p. 80, 10: 105

p. 88, 11: 46

p. 99, 10–17: 108

p. 108, 3–10

p. 108, 4–5: 99

p. 128, 5–9: 94

p. 128, 5–9: 110

p. 139, 10: 107

p. 151, 1–2: 100

p. 156, 9–11: 100

p. 160, 2: 30

p. 190, 9: 107

p. 164, 9–10

p. 179, 18: 95

pp. 179, 8–180, 10

pp. 104, 19: 107

p. 215, 14; 15: 100

pp. 215–216: 56

pp. 216, 9–14; 15: 52

p. 218, 14–16: 98

p. 247, 9–16

p. 283, 2: 107

ushebti: 82

usurpation, of tomb, with royal approval: 109

V

Vandier, Jacques: 14, 45, 50

vegetables:
garlic: 97

lettuce: 97, 98

onions: 97, 98

Vermet, Miroslav: 13

Vernus, Pascal: 49

vessels, pottery:
bowl stands: 81, 83

bread moulds: 111, 112

ovoid jars with ledge rims: 81, 82

shoulder jars, plaster-filled: 112, 113

two-handled Syrian oil jar: 81, 82

vessels, stone:
alabaster vessel of King Izezi: 24

diorite bowl: 30, 31, 79, 82, 127

jar lid: 81

vessels, representations of:
manufacture of stone vases: 33–34, 56

of metal:
 ds-jar: 148

situla, or bucket shaped vessel: 58, 121

of pottery:
beer jars: 51, 71, 149, 155, 156

bottles with short necks: 71

bowl stands: 81

bowl-table: 68

bulging flower vase: 68

ceramic and basin: 71, 75, 115, 156

flat-bottomed, flaring bowl: 119, 120

flat-bottomed bowl with recurved rim and spout: 137

fruit-jar: 73, 156

milk-jar: 122, 135, 156

neckless shoulder-jar: 68

pot, or ring stands: 71, 75, 115, 156

round-bottomed basin with recurved rim: 137

round-bottomed bowl with recurved rim: 68, 71, 115, 156

round-bottomed flower vase with scalloped rim: 68

shoulder jar with short neck and flat rim: 68, 77

straight-sided vase with scalloped rim: 68

tall, squared and-jar: 73

tall shoulder jar with short neck and round base: 121

tall storage jar:

with beaker neck: 68, 75, 77, 155, 156

with collar neck: 77, 155

with long spout: 77, 115, 156

with rilled neck: 77, 115, 156

of stone:

high-necked jar: 54

spheroidal jar with barrel lug/?) handles: 53

vineyards: 97

voineurs: 35

wight, at apex of pharaonic bureaucracy: 23, 85

letter of protest to (PCairo JE 49623): 109

married to king’s daughters: 30

offices at royal pyramids: 85

gument of 46
I. GENERAL

Senedjemib Mehi promoted to: 27, 30
serving simultaneously: 34
titulary of: 27, 85
titular viziers: 34

Wadi Hammamat:

graffiti of Pepy I: 35, 36
source of baboons: 35
walking stick (swell): 106, 155
capped: 116
knobbed end up: 43, 49, 59, 78, 120, 121, 123, 125, 157, 198, 142
wand, in form of human hand: 47
Ward, William A.: 104
“Wassnberg”: 19
water pouncer: 48, 116
wooden mask: 7
wicker:
backrest: 90, 86
bird cages: 57, 144
fan: 103
wickerwork frail: 48, 156, 141
as container for ffs: 48
horizontal or vertical: 48
multiple: 48
wite, see relations of tomb owner

wigless figures, see hair
wigs:
lack of, associated with advanced years: 26
lapper wigs: 35, 59, 78, 122, 143, 144, 156, 158
short wigs: 135, 135, 147, 124, 125, 149
short wig derived to (or from) shoulder-length wig: 74
short wig with rows of overlapping locks: 19, 43, 75, 71, 126, 127, 145
shoulder-length wig: 49, 59, 73, 116, 120, 122, 125, 135, 138, 149, 151, 153, 154
Wild, Henri: 49, 116
Wills, Cad: 150
Wilson, John A.: 107, 118
wine, estate bottled: 105
winnowing broom: 64, 141
winnowing fan: 141
winnowing scoops: 64
writing board: 68, 151
writing case: 68

Yoke bearers: see minor figures

Z
Ziegler, Christiane: 150
II. PRIVATE NAMES

A

Akhethetep (MM E 17, Louvre Mastaba): 41, 62, 91
Akhethetep (MM D 64): 11, 12, 29, 129, 159
Akhethetep Hemi (UPC): 29
Akhetmehu (Mehu-akhty?): 2, 12
Akhet-mery-nesut (g: 7218): 112
ªAnkh-em-\[…\]: 39
[Ankh-em-tjenent]: 75
Ankhmahor (TPC): 11, 15, 19, 65, 97, 150
Ankhmare (MM D 40): 16
Ankhmare (Giza, Central Field): 19
Ankhmare (g: 7837–7843): 47
Atet (Medum): 42

B

Bebi Senedjemib (MM B 13): 24
Bunefer, queen (Giza, Central Field): 19

D

Debehen (Giza, Central Field): 84, 100, 119
Djaty (g: 5370): 85
Djaty (g: 7810): 159
Djau (Deir el-Gebrawi): 34
Djau Shemai (Deir el-Gebrawi): 34
Djehutyhotep (El Bersheh): 104

F

Fe\[fi\]: 147, 150
Fetek(?): 24
Fetek-ti, son of Senedjemib Inti: 25
Fetek-ti (Kakherptah Fetek-ti): 22

H

Harkhuf (Aswan): 89, 100
Hatkau, wife of Nekhebu: 32
Hemakhti: 40, 75, 136, 146, 149, 150, 151
Hemre Izi (Deir el-Gebrawi): 150
Hetep-her akhti (MM D 60): 15, 17, 18
Hetepheres (LG 53): 22
Hetepheres I, queen (g: 7000–7010): 121
Hen (TPC): 104
H[\[…\]]: 74

I

Iamu: 74
Ibebi (Sabu-ptah Ibebi)): 3, 16, 33, 34
Ibi (Deir el-Gebrawi): 150
Idu I Nefer (g: 5550): 22
Idout (UPC); 11
Iku (Wer-kau-ba Iku): 35
Iku, son of Wer-kau-ba Iku: 35
Impy, commonly as “good name” of Ptahshepses: 33
Impy (Mer-\[prah\]-ankh-meryre Ptahshepses Impy): 3, 16, 35, 34

II. PRIVATE NAMES
II. PRIVATE NAMES

Nefermaat (Medum): 42
Neferneferuaten (UPC): 87
Neferseshemre Shehi (TPC): 24, 48, 116
Neferseshemre Sheshi (TPC): 11
Nefer-sequem-esnaat: 47
Neferti, queen (South Saqqara): 104
Nekhebu: 75
Nekhebu (Mer-ankh-meryre): 1, 3, 7, 11, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, 31, 32, 33, 66
Neterjauser (MM D 4): 8, 19, 22
Ni-ankh-ba (UPC): 11
Ni-ankh-ka (MM D 48): 115
Ni-ankh-khnum (UPC): 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 34, 65, 97
Ni-ankh-min, son of Senedjem: passim
Ni-ankh-pepy the Black (Meir): 85
Ni-hetep-ptah (g 2430): 19
Ni-ka-ankh (MM D 48): 115
Ni-ka-ankh (TPC): 119
Ni-ka-ankh (MM D 48): 115
Nisuptah Nisu (Giza): 31
Pehenptah (g 5280): 112
Penmeru (g 2187): 112
Pepyankh Heny the Black (Meir): 34, 56, 91, 118
Pepyankh Heryib ("the Middle") (Meir): 11, 85, 159
Persen (MM D 45): 16, 17, 18, 21
Ptah-neb-nefret: 30
Ptahhetep (Giza): 11
Ptahhetep I (MM D 12): 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 29
Ptahhetep II (MM D 64): 156
Ptahshepses: 151
Ptahshepses (Abusir): 11, 12, 13, 14, 85
Ptahshepses (MM C 1): 30, 31
Ptahshepses Impy (Mer-ankh-meryre): 2, 24, 26, 40, 78, 87
Qar: 75, 87, 160
Qer: 146, 160
Ra-em-kai (MM D 4): 27
Rawer ("Amarna Tomb"): 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 48
Rawa II (g 5470): 87
Rawa III (LG 54): 22
Raushapes (LS 46): 14, 16, 21, 28, 89, 95, 147
Radj/Ka: 75
Sabu-ptah (Sabu-prah Ibehi): 31, 34
Sabu-prah Ibehi, son of Nekhebu: 3, 33, 54, 84
Sankhu-prah (MM E 17): 43
Sekhem-ankh-prah (MM D 46): 16
Sekhemti (Saqqara): 20
Sekhemti Nefereheresbour (UPC): 117
Senedjem: 27, 66, 109
Senedjem 3rd: 75
Senedjeb: 146
Senedjim (MM D 48): 24
Senedjim (Senedjim Inti): passim
Senedjim (Senedjim Mehi): passim
Senedjim, son of Senedjem Mehi: 2, 3, 28, 30, 131, 137, 158, 159
Senedjim Inti (g 2364): 21
Senedjim Inti (2370): 21
Senedjim Mehi: passim
Seni (Abydos): 83
Semenmeri (TPC): 103
Semenmeri III (LG 570): 22, 29, 90, 118
Semenmeri IV (LG 571): 21, 24, 13, 14, 15, 16, 22, 27, 64, 154
Shepseskaf-ankh (g 6040): 11, 24
Smenenk-uprak Ibehi (Meir): 84
T (MM D 43): 96
Ti (MM D 22): 11, 12, 14, 22, 25, 64, 65
Tiy, queen: 96
Tjeh, wife of Senedjem Inti: 24, 16, 40, 78
Tjehirezer, wife of Wia-ka-ka-ka Itw: 31
Tjiemis, son of Nekhebu: 31
Tjenesupra: 65
Tjeru: 75
Tjeru (Semenmeri Tjeru, LG 55): 11, 22
Tjeru Khep (Abydos): 109
Tjeru Khep (Thebes): 65
Tjeru I (2364): 21
Tjuya (Thebes): 52
U
Uni the Elder (Abydos): 100, 108, 119
Unis-ankh (UPC): 8
Washptah Izi (MM D 38): 15, 29, 42, 91, 98
Wia-ka-ka-ka Itw (g 2383): 3, 16, 18
Weni: 74
Y
Yuya (Thebes): 52
III. PRIVATE NAMES IN TRANSLITERATION

N(w)-Mst (s. 2060): 87
N-t-y: 74, 86
Nw-br-w (Phb): 75, 86
Nw-int (St): 74, 75
Nwb: 75, 86
Nwm: 70, 86
Opj (s. 2061): 87
Pt-Ônm: 75, 86
Hn-br, wife of Nhy: 52
Hm-wtj, 40, 75, 87, 136, 146, 190, 199
Hs: 74
Hstj (s. 2062): 87
Hn-hs-w (Pt): 86
Hn-br., daughter of Snfm-sb Mhp: 144
Hn-br-w, king’s eldest daughter: 51
Hn-br-w, wife of Snfm-sb Mhp: 50, 135, 196, 143, 150
Hnmt(w)-jps (Sip-Ônm-brt): 144
Hm-wtj: 51
Hm-wtj: 52
Hm-wtj (s. 2065): 36, 50, 106, 121, 125, 126, 127
Hm-wtj (other): 32
Hn-wg: 51
Snu (s. 2051): 86
Snfm: 56, 87
Snfm: 50
Snfm-tj: 160
Snfm-tj: 75
Snfm-tj: 146, 160
Snfm-w (Snfm-tj): 50
Snfm-sb (Snfm-tj): 97, 41, 46
Snfm-sb (Snfm-Mhp): 41, 131, 133, 135, 154
Snfm-sb, son of Snfm-sb Mhp: 131, 139, 143
Snfm-sb (s. 2064): 87
Snfm-tj (s. 2070): 41, 42
Snfm-Mhp (s. 2078): 40, 154, 117, 129, 154
Qr: 75, 87
Qr (s. 2071): 87
Qr: 146, 160
Qr (s. 2071): 119, 190
Km-wtj: 75, 87
Hs, wife of Snfm-tj: 40, 78
Mbh, son of Nhy: 52
Hm-wtj (Pt): 87
Hm: 75, 87
Hm-wtj (Pt): 87
Hm-wtj (Pt): 87
Even if no transliteration is provided above in the text, all titles and epithets are given below in transliteration.

...
...
This index is not all inclusive. Certain common words are omitted.

In this entry, the individual entries in the various listings are not all included here.

**V. EGYPTIAN WORDS PHRASES, AND DIVINE NAMES**

*iv, *cat*, 49
*iv, *length*, 37, 99, 120
*iv, *peregrine*, *iv, *grief (*liberality*), "lagerse*, 30, 40
*gufu*, *birds*, 47
*ib, *mead*, "alleviation (?)", 149
*ib, *be benefitful*, "be useful*, "be profitable*, 102, 106
*ib, *bouts-winsnow* (*grass*), 64
*i, *burry*, 63
*ilp, *stays*, 61
*ib, *bird*, 32, 17
*irs lp ltr, *offices of the metropolis*, 14
*ilp, *element in ontray name*, 70
*ils, *tent*, *hood-net dress*, "hope-net sack*", 66
*ils lmr ts, "This is for your la*, 66, 106, 117
*ilw, *water*, 57, 114, 121
*ils, *beek*, 30
*imls, *dance*, 110
*ilw n shell*, *booth of purification*, 44
*ilp, *examine*, *person*, 122
*imls, *sheen*, 107
*ilw, *imper* *, take hold*, 148
*inslu, *honored*, *evidenced* since one's lifetime*, 30
*inslu, *chashard*, 45
*ils, *right*, 116
*ils n-end, part*, *it*, 92, 93, *it*, 102
*ilp, *parents*, *lars*, 38, 135, 136
*ilw n compound interrogative*, 45, 95
*ils, *bring*, 52, 102, 103, 199, *pull*, 49
*ills m, *bring away from* (*an activity*), 66
*ilsw m, *bring from* (**a place**), 61
*ir l inslu, *come about to starboard*, 45
*

*Enga,* *Abbads*, 115
*Enga tsp-tyo-f, *Amnibs*, *Who is Upon His Mountains*, 123
*Enga tsp-tyo f, *who to-see inslu, *Amnibs*, *Who is Upon His Mountain*, Lord of the Sacred Land, *Who is in-Us*, 128
*Enga tsp-tyo s-n, *Who proceeds over the God's Booth*, 114
*Enga tsp-tyo s-n, *who to-see inslu, *Amnibs*, *Who proceeds over the God's Booth*, *Who is in-Us*, Lord of the Sacred Land*, 76

... *inslu, *lunarsone*, 58

*ilw n murl, *I was a magnet of the *king*, 41
*ilw psu, *It is it*, 81
*ils , *make good the ways*, 46
*ils, *do*, 42, 49, *steady* (*pamper*), 63
*ilw, *imper. sing. of *n*, *bear*, 442
*ils, *act with a view to*, etc. 49
*ilw, *it be they* *, *I will act with a view to what you will praise*, etc. 43, 49
*ils, *layouts a garden*, 30, 92, 93, 98
*irs l tps, *Get back among them!*, 63, 64

*ir for inslu, *make to starboard*, 49
*ir for inslu, *make to port*, 45

*[Enga l s-n, *Who*, *It was* out of the largeese of Unis* [that I did this for him]*, 90
*inslu n, *as* *min*, *one for whom his son shall do the like*, 37, 43
*inslu n w n , *what is done for a great official*, 43
*inslu n, *wine*, 67, 144
*inslu, *mark*, 53
*ils l, *child of Hauhor and Horus*, 93
*ils, *castle*, 58, 186, 187
*ils, *vow*, 50
*ils, *grr*, 47
*ils, *tomb*, 29, 48, 120
*ils l l, *tomb of the encase*, 108
*ils, *council chamber*, 94, 95
*ils, *cave* (*of workmen*), 102, 103
*ils, *hedral*, *string*, 61
*ils n sh, *necklace*, 90, 91
*ils, *subordinating part*, 93, 106
*ils, *sin*, 102
*ils, *beek*, 64, 65
*ils, *father*, 102, 105
*ils, *tow* (*tunias*), 122
*ild, *fabric*, *wedging mass*, *small slay*, 149
*ils, *hard* (*of castle*), *block* (*of birds*), 104
*ils, *withholds*, *it*, *from*, *keep away*, 105
*ilw, *sit together*, *handaag*, *husten*, etc. 106
*ilw, *allotment*, *distribution*, *share*, etc. 102, 105
*ils, *handaag*, *Strike*, *sawt*, etc. 104
*ils, *hit-know*, 104
*ils, *do*, *dependencies*, *domains*, *property*, etc. 104
*

*inslu, *punishment*, *expression*, *suppression*, 105

*ims, *portion*, 81
*ims, *lip*, *beak*, 98
*ims, *warrant*, *write*, 102, 106
*ims, *chamber*, 103
*ims, *hit* (*of xeroxphage*), 108
*ims, *chief of*, 105
*ims, *scurfew*, 105
*ims, *throw a boomerang*, 40
*ims, *share*, 52
*ims, *type*, *lingenails*, 91
*ims, *type*, *teensails*, 91
*ims, *mungame*, 90
*ims, *roll*, *of papyrus or leather*, 106
*ims, *combine*, *enclose*, 104
*ims, *keep*, 107, 108

*ims l *hb*, *keep of the jubilee festival*, 99
*ims, *light* (*wind*), 107
*ims, *be*, *attend to*, *wait upon*, *oversees*, 90, 91, 107
*ims, *bend to*, *be engaged in*, 147
*ims l *sak*, 103
*ims, *prepare* (*a channel*), 58, 152, 157
*ims, *press down*, etc. 67, 147
*ims, *be honored*, 102
*ims, *green stone*, *malachite*, 91
*ims, *lower Egyptian malachite*, from Sinai, 91
*ims, *type*, *Upper Egyptian malachite*, 90, 91
*ims, *type*, *workshop*, 105
*ims, *type*, *user of attending*, *embalming workshop*, 129, 132, 125, 128
*ims, *beoor out* (*a stone vessel with a tubular drain*), 54
*ims, *pile up*, 132, 134
*ims, *divides*, *supposition* (*fields or goods*), 102, 105
*ims, *apportionment*, 102
*ims, *hurry*, 141, 142, 208
*ims, *time-service*, *duty*, 84, 102, 103, 105

*ims, *European cool*, 17

*ims, *be great, important*, 41
*ims, *acide*, *acide*, 148
*ims, *aiders*, 45, 92, 97, 102, *magnates*, 41
*ims, *around*, 38
V. EGYPTIAN WORDS PHRASES, AND DIVINE NAMES

aff(i), "play" (a reed instrument), 78, 73, 150
aff(i), "threshing floor," 65, 124
af(7), "go slowly," 41, 154
af(7), "slowly," 41
af(7), "be dark, sluggish," etc., 42
ak(i), "spotted jaw," 79
ah, "bears," "kitchens," 82
ahl, "herd of sheep," 141
al, "wite," "draw," "paint," 92
al, "decoration" (representational and inscriptional), 92
al m a ph, "draw in outline," "draw in a preliminary sketch," 41, 103, 157
al ra, "draft," "sketch," 42
al(p), "polish," 33
al a sou, "apple poppy," 14
al tu, "place," "position," 108, 32
al w, "regality," 92, 91
al w, "arrows?", 91
al w, "behind," 43
al(1) to frey-pit, "spiritualizing by the lexor priest," 74
al w, "barges," "cargo-vessel," 58, 103
al w ph Tri u m ph, "The barge who name is 'lens is great of strength,'" 78
al n w, "great cargo-vessel of the Residence," 108, 109
al w (a1), "dine" (flour), 68, 149
al m, "slip," "mud," "(fine grey) clay," 149
al m ak t w, "every department of the Residence," 84
al m, "contemplation," 46
al w, "honor," "pay honor to," 101, 102
al m ak t w, "inform," 49
al m b, "bread" (papyrus boats), 44
al m, "arrows," 108, 110
al m, "sly," 40
al m, "polish," 33
al m, "ground plan," 97
al m, "converse," 64, 77
al t, "interrupt," 14, 73
al t, "let 'sweeten the heart,' "gladden," "please," "gratify," 24, 92,
inform(1), 92, 93, 94
al m, "warmth," "heat," "passion," etc., 61
al m, "be warm," 61
al m ak t w, "alabaster," 41
al m, "announces," "make known," 94, 96
al m, "carve" (statue), "form," "shape," 54
al m, "hurl," "throw," 12, 132
al m, "assemble," 63
al m, "to make disease," "remove," "engrave," 102, 157
al m ak t w, "make white," "illumine," etc., 60
al m, "accurate" (clay), 149
al m, "Sothis," "counterparts," 66, 157
al m, "remember," 30
al m, "bread court," 97, 98, 99
al m, "breadth," 97, 99, 100
al m, "bread hall," "bread court," 99
al m, "bring" (mummies), 48, 121
al m, "bring together, choosing choice viands," 17, 18, 77, 127
al m, "face," "bind," 47, 48
al m, "search," 63, 122, 123, 124
al m, "沦为" (man), 51
al m, "dear" (milk), 52
al m ak t w, "thing," "action," "matter," etc., 102, 106
al m ak t w, "knead" (dough), 31
al m ak t w, "bake," 31
al m, "pluck" (the strings of a harp), 110
al m ak t w, "playing on the harp," 38
al m, "travel by boat," 46
al m ak t w, "travel downstream," 46
al m ak t w, "traveling" (metal round), 43, 46
al m, "end past," 21
al m, "cover over," "seeds," "cultivate," 145
al m ak t w (al m), "cultivate with a plough," 144
...
VI. PLACE NAMES

...
Plates
1a. View of the Western Cemetery with the tombs of the Senedjemib Complex in the present volume highlighted, looking northwest from the top of the pyramid of Khufu. 16 November 1993. Peter Der Manuelian 93.130.23

1b. General view of Western Field from the pyramid of Khafre, looking north, prior to excavation of the Senedjemib Complex. 1906. Exp. Ph. 4.6355 (4.19024)
Plate 2

2a. Western Field seen from the Great Pyramid, looking west, with the Senedjemib Complex at bottom right. 17 November 1932. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 718

2b. Senedjemib Complex from the top of northwest corner of Great Pyramid, looking northwest. 6 December 1932. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. b 1225
3a. Senedjemib Complex from the top of northwest corner of Great Pyramid, looking northwest. 11 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a. 810

3b. Senedjemib Complex from the top of northwest corner of Great Pyramid, looking northwest. 21 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a. 818
4a. Senedjemib Complex from the top of northwest corner of Great Pyramid, looking northwest. 10 September 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 1071

4b. Senedjemib Complex from the top of northwest corner of Great Pyramid, looking northwest. 10 November 1914. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 1070
5a. Middle and northern parts of Western Field, 1932, with the Senedjemib Complex at bottom right. 25 June 1932. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. x 6973

5b. Senedjemib Complex from the northwest corner of Great Pyramid, looking northwest towards the mastabas (from left to right) of Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), Khnumemit (c. 1574), and Senedjemib Mehi (c. 2378). May 1981. Lynn Holden
6a. Senedjemib Complex from the top of northwest corner of Great Pyramid, looking northwest. 16 November 1993. Peter Der Manuelian 93.131.16

6b. g 2381–82, Roman Period inclined roadway, sloping ramp of Senedjemib Complex, and g 2370 b. 20 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 1601
7a. Senedjemib Complex from east front, looking west. 13 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. b 1539

7b. Eastern side of Senedjemib Complex, looking north–northwest from tower, with c. 2581 a/c and drainage channel of Great Pyramid in middle ground. 18 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 813
8a. Eastern side of Senedjemib Complex, looking north. © 1912 a and drainage channel in foreground. 21 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 1602.

8b. Debris filling court of Senedjemib Complex and Roman pavement looking west. 4 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 792.
9a. Court of Senedjemib Complex, looking northwest from tower. 12 January 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 850

9b. Court of Senedjemib Complex, looking northwest from tower. 12 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 850
10a. Court of Senedjemib Complex, looking north from tower. 12 January 1915. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. A 847

10b. c. 2384, looking west, with stone basin and staple stone in court beyond. 7 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. A 1534
11a. Senedjemib-Inti (c. 2370), southern part, during course of excavations, looking west from tower. 13 November 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. A 712

11b. Senedjemib-Inti (c. 2370), Rooms II–III, during course of excavations, looking east. 13 November 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. A 712
12a. Senedjemib Ini (c. 2370), Rooms II–IV, during course of excavations, looking south. 9 November 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c. 3016

12b. Senedjemib Ini (c. 2370), Room IV, during course of excavations, looking west. 9 November 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c. 3015

12c. Senedjemib Ini (c. 2370), inscribed architrave block found lying in court. 2 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 5808

12d. Senedjemib Ini (c. 2370), inscribed architrave block found lying in court. 2 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. b 7170
13a. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), portico, looking southwest, with emplacement for northern column and Sound and Light Installation at left. 21 November 1993. Peter Der Manuelian 93.109.97

13b. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), displaced column bases from portico lying in front of G. 2374. 10 December 1993. Edward Brovarski

13c. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), portico, south wall. 21 November 1993. Peter Der Manuelian 93.11.05
14. Senedjemib Ini (62370), portico, south wall, lower part. 6 March 1931. HU-BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6546.
15a. Senedjemib Ini (c. 2370), general view of portico, looking west. 10 May 1997. Supreme Council of Antiquities

15b. Senedjemib Ini (c. 2370), portico, west wall, south of entrance. 21 November 1995. Peter Der Manuelian 95.101.04

15c. Senedjemib Ini (c. 2370), portico, west wall, south of entrance, northern part. 22 February 1991. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6307
Plate 16

[Image of Senedjemib Inti (c. 3170), portico, west wall, north of entrance, northern part. 4 August 1930. HU-BMFA Exp. Ph. α 5817]
Plate 17

17a. Senedjemib Inti (E 2370), portico, west wall, north of entrance, detail of middle part. 29 November 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6057

17b. Senedjemib Inti (E 2370), portico, west wall, north of entrance, detail of southern part. 28 November 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 7127
Plate 18

18. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), portico, north wall. 3 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 3815
20a. Senedjemib-Imi (I 2370), Room II, left (south) entrance thickness, upper part. 8 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. x 6340

20b. Senedjemib-Imi (I 2370), Room II, right (north) entrance thickness. 25 February 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. x 6308
21a. Senedjemib-Inti (c 2370), Room II, niche in north wall, looking northeast. 24 November 1993. Peter Der Manuelian 93.114.28

21b. Senedjemib-Inti (c 2370), Room II, hole in north end of west wall, south of entrance, looking northeast. 24 November 1993. Peter Der Manuelian 93.114.29
Plate 22

22. Sesostris I (c. 1970), Room II, east wall, northern end. 25 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. A 6125
23. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), Room II, east wall, southern end. 25 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6.416.
Plate 24

24a. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), Room II, east wall, northern end, detail. 13 November 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. b 1277

24b. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), Room II, east wall, northern end, detail. 31 July 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 7786
25a. Senedjemib Inti (c 2370), Room II, south wall. 9 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a.6371

25b. Senedjemib Inti (c 2370), Room II, west wall. 24 February 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a.6350
26a. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), Room II, west wall, south end. 15 October 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. b 7498

26b. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), Room II, west wall, south of middle. 18 October 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. b 7499

26c. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), Room II, west wall, north of middle. 19 October 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. b 7516
27a. Senedjemib Ini (c 2370), Room II, west wall, north end. 19 October 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 7377

27b. Senedjemib Ini (c 2370), Room II, north wall. 5 September 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6019
Plate 29

29. Senedjem-Ibi (c. 2370), entrance to Room III, right (north) thickness. 4 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Pl. a. 5787
Plate 30

30. Senedjemib Ini (g 2370), Room III, photographic montage of east wall (see list of plates)
Plate 31


Plate 32

32. Senedjemib Inti (62570), Room III. Photographic montage of west wall (see list of plates)
Plate 33a. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), Room III, north wall. 24 October 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. & 7910

34a. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), Room III, cult installation in northwest corner. 30 March 1995. Ed Angelo 44.1.27

34b. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), Room IV, left (east) entrance thickness. 8 March 1993. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. & 6358
Plate 35


35c. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2170 B.C.), Room IV, right (west) entrance thickness. 22 February 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. 8 7752.
Plate 36

36a. Senedjemib Inti (g 2370), Room IV, right (west) entrance thickness, upper register. Spring, 1850. Rev. Johann Rudolph Theophilus Lieder, Squeeze No. 1.3 [upper]. Griffith Institute, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford

36b. Senedjemib Inti (g 2370), Room IV, right (west) entrance thickness, lower register. Spring, 1850. Rev. Johann Rudolph Theophilus Lieder, Squeeze No. 1.3 [lower]. Griffith Institute, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford

36c. Senedjemib Inti (g 2370), Room IV, east wall, left end. 22 November 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. b 7513

36d. Senedjemib Inti (g 2370), Room IV, east wall, left end. 22 November 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. b 7513
37a. Senedjemib-Imti (c. 1570), Room IV, east wall, middle. 20 November 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. b 7511

37b. Senedjemib-Imti (c. 1570), Room IV, east wall, right end. 24 November 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 7522
Plate 38

MONTAGE PLATE HERE

need more space between the menu list blocks! But obliterated figures are supposed to line up over one another

Plate 38. Senedjemib Inti (G. 3770), Room IV, photographic montage of south wall (see list of plates)
39. Senedjemib Inti (c 2170), Room IV, south wall, western end. 7 March 1993. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. x 6342
Plate 40

40. Senedjemib-Iani (r. 2370), Room IV, south wall, western end, detail. 7 March 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6344
41. Senedjemib Iati (c. 2370), Room IV, south wall, western end. 7 March 1998. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. x 6445
Plate 42

42. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), Room IV, southwest corner. 7 March 1931. HU-BMFA Exp. Pl. 6 6145
Plate 43

43. Senedjemib Iniri (c. 2370), Room IV, false door. 10 September 1985. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. 8 1073
Plate 44

44. Senedjemib-Ishi (c. 2370 BC), Room IV, false door. 4 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. 5821


45d. Senedjemib-Imi (c. 1370), Room IV, false door, lintel. Spring, 1850. Rev. Johann Rudolph Theophilus Lieder, Squeeze No. 1.9 [upper]; 4-10 [lower]. Griffith Institute, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford
46b. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), Room IV, north wall, western end, detail. 1 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 57989

46a. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), Room IV, north and west walls, looking northwest. 7 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 5818

46c. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), Room IV, relief assigned to north wall. 16 December 1935. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 13643

46d. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), Room IV, relief assigned to north wall. 13 December 1935. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 7354 2/1

46b. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), Room IV, north wall, western end, detail. 1 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 57989
Plate 47

47. Senedjemib Inti (c. 1370), Room IV, north wall, middle. 7 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. x 5819
Plate 48

48. Senedjemib-Inti (c. 2370), Room IV, north wall, eastern end. 7 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 5830
49a. Senedjemib Inti (g 2370), Room IV, north wall, east of doorway, western half. 16 October 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. # 7503

49b. Senedjemib Inti (g 2370), Room IV, north wall, east of doorway, eastern half. 15 October 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. # 7502
50a. Senedjemib Inti (c 2370), Room IV, cult installation in northeast corner. 30 March 1995. Ed Angelo ia 1.7

50b. Senedjemib Inti (c 2370), Room IV, cult installation in northeast corner, detail. 30 March 1995. Ed Angelo ia 1.5.
51a. Senedjemib-Ismi (c. 2370), Room V, pillared hall, looking west-northwest. 13 November 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. b 1279

51b. Senedjemib-Ismi (c. 2370), Room V, right (east) entrance thickness. 25 February 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6309
Plate 52

52a. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), Room V, left (west) entrance thickness. 22 February 1930. HU-BMFA Exp. Ph. a.6510

52b. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), Room V, looking south to Room II, niches in walls. 24 November 1993. Peter Der Manuelian 93.114.30

52c. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), Room V, niche in east wall, looking southeast. 24 November 1993. Peter Der Manuelian 93.114.31
53a. Senedjemib Inti (G. 2370), burial chamber G 2370 A, painted offering list on plaster on east wall, north of entrance, looking east. 4 January 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. C 379

53b. G 2370 A, painted offering list on plaster on east wall, north of entrance, looking east. 1 July 1935. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. C 379A

Plate 54

54a. G 3370 b, body of Smedjemib Inti in sarcophagus. 4 January 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 3278

54b. G 3370 b, interior of sarcophagus, inscription in northeastern corner. 4 July 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 3277

54c. G 3370 b, inscription on east side of sarcophagus. 4 July 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 3274

54d. G 3370 b, inscription on east side of sarcophagus. 4 July 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 3275

54e. G 3370 b, inscription on east side of sarcophagus. 4 July 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 3276
Plate 55

55. O 2370 a, body of Senedjemib Inti in sarcophagus. 6 July 1935. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 7282.
Senedjemib Inti (g 2370), dealer’s cache found near doorway inside Room II. 13 November 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 716

Diorite bowl from shaft g 2370 a, 12–11–32. May–June 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 4466

Model neckless, copper shoulder jar from g 2370, Serdab 1, 12–11–20. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 997 1/1

Model alabaster cylinder jar from shaft g 2370 a, 12–11–28. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 997 1/4

Fragments of copper knives, etc. from shaft g 2370 a, 12–11–30. June 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 992 2/8

Model BrW bowl from shaft g 2370 a, 12–11–29. June 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 997 1/3

Model B-W bowl from shaft g 2370 a, 12–11–29. June 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 997 1/3
57a. Senedjemib Inti (g 2370), two–handled Syrian jar from burial chamber g 2370 b, 35–7–41. 23 December 1935. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 15649

57b. Decorated fragment of two–handled Syrian jar from burial chamber g 2370 b, 35–7–41. 11 December 1935. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 15640

57c. Nine examples of ovoid jars from burial chamber g 2370 b, 35–7–41. 28 July 1935. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 8519

Plate 58

58. Senedjemib Inti (2370), facade, north of portico, Inscription A 2 with top of A 1 at bottom. 5 August 1930. HU-BMFA Exp. Ph. a 9810
Plate 59

59. Senedjemib Inti (ca 2370), facade, north of portico, top of Inscription A 1. 3 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 5812. Inset: inscribed stone from court, joining top of inscription. 19 January 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 1669 [right]
Plate 60

60. Senedjemib-Ist (c. 2370), facade, north of portico, bottom of Inscription A 1 with top of A 2. 8 September 1955. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. # 1066
Plate 61

61. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2770), facade, north of portico, Inscription A 2 with end of Inscription A 1 at top. 3 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 5811
Plate 62

62. Senedjemib-Inti (c. 1370), facade, north of portico. Inscription A 2. 5 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. 4. 984
63a. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), facade, north of portico, Inscription A 2, top. 9 September 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 1059

63b. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), facade, north of portico, Inscription A 2, bottom. 9 September 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 1058
Plate 64

64a. Senedjemib Inti (tj 2370), portico, north wall, at right Inscription B 1, top. 1 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 7962. Inset: Senedjemib–Complex, inscribed stone from court, joining the top of the inscription. 19 January 1933. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 1668 [bottom right]

64b. Senedjemib Inti (tj 2370), portico, north wall, Inscription B 1, bottom. 1 September 1933. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 1055
65. Senedjemib Inti (629 BC), portico, north wall. Inscription B 2 with B 1 at top. 4 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. 4 5816
Plate 66

66a. Senedjemib Inti (c. 1370), portico, north wall, Inscription B 1, bottom, and B 2, top. 1 September 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 1056

66b. Senedjemib Inti (c. 1370), portico, north wall, Inscription B 2, bottom, with modern lines in ink. 26 February 1993. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6519

67b. Senedjemib Complex, inscribed stone from court, assigned to top of Inscription C. 19 January 1993. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. 8 1668 [left]
68. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), facade, south of portico, Inscription C. 22 February 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6306
Plate 69

69. Senedjemib-Inti (c. 2370), facade, south of portico, Inscription C, upper part and middle. 26 February 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Pl. a 6325
Plate 70

Plate 70

70. Senedjemib-Imy (c. 2370), facade, south of portico, Inscription C. upper part and middle. ADOX. Dr. C. Schleussner Fotowerke GmbH, Frankfurt am Main
Plate 71

71. Senedjemib-Inti (c. 2370), facade, south of portico, Inscription C, upper part. 23 February 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6934
Plate 72

Plate 72

72. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), facade, south of portico, Inscription C, middle and lower part. 1 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 3784
Plate 73

Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), facade, south of portico, Inscription C, middle part. 23 February 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6503
Plate 74

74a. Senedjemib-Inti (c. 2170), facade, south of poteis, Inscription C, lower part. 26 February 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6166

74b. Senedjemib Complex, inscribed stone from court, assigned to top of Inscription C. 10 January 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 616 (left)
Plate 75

75. Senedjemib Inti (c. 1370 BC), portico, south wall. Inscription D. 21 November 1993. Peter Der Manuelian 95.209.54
Plate 76

76. Senedjemib Istri (c 2370), portico, south wall, Inscription D. 2 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. A 6122
Plate 77

77. Senedjemib Inti (g 2370), portico, south wall, Inscription D, upper part. 2 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6540
Plate 78

78a. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), portico, south wall, Inscription D, middle part. 5 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6516.

78b. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), portico, south wall, Inscription D, lower part. 5 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6518.
Plate 79

79. Senedjemib-Inti (c. 1770), portico, south wall, Inscription D, lower part, with vignette of barge. 2 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6552
Plate 80

80a. Senedjemib-Inti (g 2370), portico, south wall, Inscription D, bottom, with vignette of barge. 1 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6524

80b. g 2374–75 and 2412–14 in foreground, with g 2370–73 and 2360–66 in background, looking south. 21 January 1935. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 865
81c. Senedjemib-Inti (g 2370), southwest corner of g 2370 x, 25 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. C 344

81a. Senedjemib-Inti (g 2370), shaft g 2370 x. 25 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. C 331

81b. Burial g 2370 x. 27 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. C 3214

81. Senedjemib-Inti (g 2370), southwest corner of g 2370, looking north from photographic tower, with front wall of g 2370–72 at left, rear wall of g 2373 at right, and shafts g 2370 x and g 2373 x in middle foreground. 11 November 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. A 703
Plate 82

82a. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), southwest corner of G 2370, looking north from photographic tower, with front wall of G 2371–72 at left, rear wall of G 2373 at right, and shafts G 2370 a and G 2373 a in middle foreground. 16 November 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 717

82b. G 2371, second compartment from north, looking west. 14 November 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 3067

82c. G 2371, second compartment from north, looking south to third compartment and burial chamber B. 14 November 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 3068
83a. g 2371 2, pit. 25 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 3215

83b. g 2371 2, burial. 27 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 3232

83c. g 2371 u, pit. 11 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 3246

83d. g 2370 serdab, and g 2372–73 beyond, looking south. 13 November 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 994 1/1

83e. g 2370 filling and g 2372–73 underneath, with broken statue in debris, looking north. 13 November 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 3052

83f. Vessel from a servant statuette, from outside north wall of g 2370, 12–13–35. June 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 994 1/1

83g. Alabaster core from upper debris of g 2370, 12–13–35. June 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 997 2/1
Plate 84

84a. Senedjemib Inti (g 2370), broken black granite statue from debris between g 2372 and 2373. 26 February 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 3377

84b. Senedjemib Inti (g 2370), broken black granite statue from debris between g 2372 and 2373. 26 February 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 3378

84c. Khnumenri (g 2374), facade, north of entrance. 26 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 5814. Inset: relief fragment from north facade. 5 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 5532
85a. Khnumemti (G 2374), inscribed architrave fragment. 26 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Pl. b 1608

85b. Khnumemti (G 2374), facade, south of entrance. 30 March 1995. Edward Angelo, EA 1/22
Plate 86

86a. Khnumenti (g 3774), outer left (south) entrance thickness. 30 March 1995. Edward Angelo, xx 2/20

86b. Khnumenti (g 3774), outer right (north) entrance thickness. 30 March 1995. Edward Angelo, xx 2/17
87a. Khnumenti (c. 2374), inscribed block from court of Senedjemib Complex assigned to inner right (north) entrance thickness. 24 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6021 [left]

87b. Khnumenti (c. 2374), relief block from inner right (north) entrance thickness. 5 September 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6014

87c. Khnumenti (c. 2374), Room I, east wall, south of entrance. 30 March 1999. Edward Angelo ea 1/32
88a. Khnumenwi (G 2374), Room I, south wall with displaced corner block, looking south. 21 November 1993. Peter Der Manuelian 93.110.09

88b. Khnumenwi (G 2374), Room II, south wall and ceiling groove, looking south. 21 November 1993. Peter Der Manuelian 93.110.10

88c. Khnumenwi (G 2374), Rooms I–II, general view, looking southeast. 21 November 1993. Peter Der Manuelian 93.110.11
89a. Khnumenti (c. 2574), Rooms I–II, detail of south wall, looking south. 21 November 1993. Peter Der Manuelian 93.110.08

89b. Khnumenti (c. 2574), Room I, west wall, south of doorway. 30 March 1995. Edward Angelo, ka 2/6

89c. Khnumenti (c. 2574), Room I, west wall, north of doorway, detail. 30 March 1995. Edward Angelo, ka 2/6

90b. Khnumenti (SU 2574), Room I, north wall. 23 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Pl. 8. 6023.
91. Khnumeniti (c. 2374). Room I, east wall, photographic montage (see list of plates)
Plate 92

92. Khnumemti (c. 2374). Room II, left door thickness. 31 July 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. 45790
93a. Khnumemi (IC 2574), Room II, west wall. 23 February 1935. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. b 7772

93b. Khnumemi (IC 2574), Room II, north wall. 30 March 1935. Edward Angelo, EA 2/14
Plate 94

94b. Khnumenti (G 2374), Room III, relief assigned to north wall. 14 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6577

94a. Khnumenti (G 2374), Room III, overview, looking north. 13 January 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. b 1646
Plate 95

95. Khnumeni (c. 2374), Room III, false door, 10 September 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 1072
96a. Khnumenti (62374), Room III, reliefs assigned to south [upper] and north [lower] walls. 3 September 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6024

96b. Khnumenti (62374), Room III, relief assigned to east wall. 4 September 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. b 7464
97a. Khnumenti (G 2374), Room III, relief built into rubble fill of west wall. PSD 15605. MFA 15.5103

97b. Sloping passage tomb G 2385 a and adjacent pits, looking west from photographic tower. 11 December 1912. HU-BMFA Exp. Ph. 4 808
Plate 98

98a. Entrance to g 2385 a, looking west, with g 2387 a at right. 11 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 1317

98b. Burial chamber g 2385 a, roofing slabs of shaft to lower burial chamber, looking west. 6 July 1935. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 7285
99a. Limestone offering cases from G. 2189 a. 22 January 1915. HU–BMFA Exp.
Ph. a 6734

99b. Limestone offering cases from G. 2189 a. 22 January 1915. HU–BMFA Exp.
Ph. a 6734

99c. Limestone offering cases from G. 2189 a. 22 January 1915. HU–BMFA Exp.
Ph. a 6755
Plate 100

100a. Limestone offering cases from g. 2394a. 23 January 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. b 1676

100b. Limestone offering cases from g. 2394a. 23 January 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. b 1677

100c. Limestone offering cases from g. 2394a. 23 January 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 1678
101a. Limestone offering cases from g 2385 a. 25 January 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. b 1679

101b. Diorite bowl with cartouche of Teti from g 2385 a. 12–12–209 / MFA 13.2452. May–June 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 4465

101c. Fragmentary headrest from g 2374. 12–11–33. June 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 997 b/4

101d. Forearm of a wooden statuette from g 2385 a, 12–12–206. June 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 992 3/3

101e. Wig fragment from g 2385 a, 12–12–23. June, 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 992 2/1

101f. Wooden finger with plaster on end from debris in g 2385 a. 12–12–309. June, 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 998 b/2

101g. Dummy alabaster shoulder jar, 12–12–207 (left), and rough offering saucer, 12–12–208 (right), from debris in g 2385 a. June, 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 996 b/2 (left) and 3/2 (right)

101h. Cylinder beads from debris of g 2385 a. 12–12–111. June, 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 991 b/9

101i. Alabaster cores (?) and mold block headrest from g 2385 a (headrest from debris), 12–12–68, 12–12–17, and 12–12–39. 15 January 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 1684 b/7, b/9, and b/10
102a. Overview of g. 2376–2378, looking south-southeast. 21 December 1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. b 1603

102b. Burial chamber g. 2377 a, burial. 21 December 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 5345

102c. Model vessels from burial chamber g. 2377 a, 13–1–566/521. 16 January 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 3351

103b. Senedjemih Medhi (g 2378), from photographic tower on g 2370, looking northeast. 12 January 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. x 848.
Plate 104

104a. Senedjemib Complex, offering rooms of G 2375 (left), north wall of G 2374 and shaft G 2376 a (right). 13 January 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 1647

104b. Senedjemib Mels (G 2378), older walls under filling, looking south. 27 December 1991. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 1609
105a. Senedjemib Mehi (q. 2378), inscribed architrave block. 2 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. A 5806

105b. Senedjemib Mehi (q. 2378), inscribed architrave block. 3 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. A 5807

105c. Senedjemib Mehi (q. 2378), inscribed architrave block. 2 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. A 5806
106. Senedjemib Mehri (2178), portico, west wall. 23 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 5868
107. Senedjemib Mehi (c. 2378), portico, west wall, lower part. 23 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 5869
108a. Senedjemib Mehi (c. 2378), portico, north wall, west of entrance. 11 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6368

108b. Senedjemib Mehi (c. 2378), portico, north wall, east of entrance, detail. 11 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 5968
Plate 109

109. Senedjemib Mehî (q 2378), portico, north wall, east of entrance. 14 March 1931. HU-BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6778 (lower section); inset: a 6379 (upper section, loose block)
110. Senedjemib Mehi (c. 3178), portico, east wall. 9 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6569
111. Senedjemib Mehi (1253BC), portico, east wall with restored block at upper right. 24 February 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6312
112a. Senedjemib Mehi (c. 2378), Room II, left (west) entrance thickness. 29 November 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6196

112b. Senedjemib Mehi (c. 2378), Room II, right (east) entrance thickness. 9 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6370
113. Senedjemib Mehli (c 1798), Room II, south wall, west of entrance. 24 February 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6555
114a. Senedjemib Mehi (c 2578), Room II, west wall, upper section. 14 March 1931. HU-BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6380

114b. Senedjemib Mehi (c 2578), Room II, west wall, lower section. 13 March 1931. HU-BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6365
115. Senedjemib-Mehi (c. 2378), Room II, north wall, western section. 4 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. x 5803
Plate 116

117a. Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378), Room II, north wall, eastern section. 4 August 1930. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. # 5801 (= PSD # 13475)

117b. Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378), Room II, loose block assigned to north wall. 23 November 1935. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. # 8547

118. Senedjemib Mehi (42378), Room II, south wall, east of entrance. 22 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. 4.6961.
119a. Senedjemib Mehi (65 3978), Room II, south wall, east of entrance, eastern section. 13 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. A 6361

119b. Senedjemib Mehi (65 3978), Room II, south wall, east of entrance, western section. 12 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. A 6364
120. Smudjem-Mehi (c. 2178), Room III, left (west) entrance thickness. 24 February 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6531
Plate 121

121. Senedjemib Mehi (c. 2178), Room III, west wall, false door. 13 September 1933. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 1077
Plate 122

122. Senedjemib Mehi (c. 2178), Room III, north wall, western section. Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, acc. no. 31705. Field Museum negative no. 68394.
135. Senenjemib Mehi (c. 2378), Room III, north wall, eastern section. 8 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6337
124a. Senedjemib Mehi (i 2378), Room III, north wall, eastern section, detail. 11 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6367

124b. Senedjemib Mehi (i 2378), Room III, north wall, eastern section, detail. 11 March 1931. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 6366
125a. Senedjemib Mebi, entrance to sloping passage

tomb G. 2378 a, looking west-southwest. 20 December
1912. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. C. 3197

125b. Senedjemib Mebi, burial chamber G. 2378 a, looking south. 8 July 1935. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. A. 7284
126a. Senedjemib Mehi, burial chamber G 2378 A, inside of sarcophagus. 8 July 1935. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. a 7285

126c. Mud plummet from G 2378, 14-38-43, June, 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. x 992 2/8

126d. Senedjemib Mehi, burial chamber G 2378 A, wooden prisoner figures. May–June 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. b 4475

126b. Senedjemib Mehi, burial chamber G 2378 A, bones of offerings in northeast corner, looking west. 8 July 1935. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 74435

126e. Senedjemib Mehi, burial chamber G 2378 A, wooden prisoner figures. May–June 1913. HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. c 4475
1. Plan of the Western Cemetery at Giza showing the Senedjemib Complex. Surveyed, drawn and traced by A. Floroff and N. Melnikoff, redrawn by Peter Der Manuelian
Plan of the Senedjemib Complex, detail from Plan of the Cemetery en Echelon, north part.
Surveyed and drawn by A. Floroff; traced by N. Melnikoff
Section S–N through the court of G 3370, looking west towards G 3370 and G 3374
6. Section N–S through the doorway of the chapel α 2378 and court of α 2370, looking east
7. Section W-E through the pillared hall of the chapel is 1150 and court of the Senedwrest Complex, looking north
8. Section S–N through offering room, vestibule, and pillared hall of the chapel c 2370, looking west
9. Section of mastaba G 2385 E–W, looking south
10. Schematic diagram of north wall of an east-west offering room after Harpur, *Decoration*, fig. 31
Genealogical table of the Senedjemib family
12. Plan and sections of G 2370; LD I, pl. 23
13. Plan of G 2370; LD, Text 1, p. 55
14a. Sketch of c. 1370 and c. 1378: Mariette, Mstahle, p. 499

14b. Plan of c. 1370: Mariette, Mstahle, p. 497
13a-d. Plan and sections of Roman Period inclined roadway and Holes 1 and 2 in court of Senedjemib Complex. Redrawn from rough sketches in the Giza Diary, November 30 and December 2, 1912 (pp. 46, 47, 49).

- **Diagram:**
  - **13a:** Plan view showing stone pavement, 2370, and 2381. Noted as a tangled mass of limestone blocks in sand.
  - **13b:** Section view focusing on later pavement and earlier hole 1, with denoted blocks.
  - **13c:** Detailed section showing stones from 2370, later destruction, and level of decay.
  - **13d:** Further detail on old debris, black debris, and limestone blocks with later pavement and hole 1.
17. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), layout of decoration on walls of portico and facade; L.D. Text, 1, p. 56
19. Senedjemib Iinti (G 2370), facade south of portico, Inscription C, after Reisner
21. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), south side of portico, Inscription D; LD 2, pl. 76e
24. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), rear wall of portico, south of entrance; L.D., Ergänz., pl. xvii
26. Senedjemib Inti (g 2370), rear wall of portico, north of entrance; *L.D. Ergänz.*, pl. xviii
28. Senedjemib Inti (g 2370), Inscriptions B 1 and 2 on north side of portico; LD 2, pl. 76f
31. Senedjemib Inti (C 2370), facade north of portico, Inscriptions A 1 and 2; LD 2, pl. 76d
34. Senedjemib Ini (c 2370), left (south) entrance thickness; LD 2, pl. 78b [left]
36. Senedjemib Inti (g 2370), right (north) entrance thickness; L.D, Ergänz., pl. xix [right]
37a. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), right (north) entrance thickness. RG 4429

37b. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), sketch plan of larger column base from portico

37c. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), schematic drawing of lintel over entrance doorway to chapel, Room II (see pl. 11b)
40. Senedjemib Ini (c. 2370), Room II, south wall; LD 2, pl. 78b [right]
44. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), Room II, north wall; LD, Ergüza, pl. xix [left]
45. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), Room II, north wall. EG 4385
47. Senebjemib Inti (c 2370), Room II, left (south) entrance thickness. KG 4392
49. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), Room II, right (north) entrance thickness. EG 4393
50. Senetjemib Ini (c 2370), Room III, east wall; L.D. Ergäzm., pl. xxiic
55. Senedjemib Inti (G 23720), Room III, west wall, detail of shr(Rife beside northern serdab slot. Drawn by Mark C. Stone
96. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), Room III, north wall; L.D. Ergïnâ, pl. xxi
57. Senedjemib Ini (c 2370), Room III, north wall. IG 4399.
58. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), Room IV, sketch of entrance thicknesses: Mariette, *Mastabas*, pp. 509 (incorrectly reversed by Mariette) and 508
59a. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), Room IV, left (east) entrance thickness. EG 4391

59b. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), Room IV, right (west) entrance thickness. EG 4380
65. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), proposed reconstruction of west end of north wall of Room IV, lowermost register
66. Senedjemib Inti (c 2370), Room IV, north wall, east of entrance. RG 4594
67a. Senedjemib Inti (Q 2370), Room V, left (west) entrance thickness; L.D 2, pl. 78a

67b. Senedjemib Inti (Q 2370), Room V, left (west) entrance thickness. EG 4426
68a. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), Room IV, right (east) entrance thickness. Redrawn from Lepsius Zeichnung Inv.-Nr. 348. Courtesy of the Archiv des Ägyptischen Wörterbuchs, Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften

68b. Senedjemib Inti (c. 2370), Room V, right (east) entrance thickness. Rg 4426
69a. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), plan and section of shaft G 2370 A

69b. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), plan and section of intrusive shaft G 2370 X
71. Senedjemib Ini (c. 2370), sloping shaft tomb 2370 A, offering list on east wall north of entrance. IG §30
72. Senedjemib Ini (G 2370). Objects from G 2370, 2370 A, and 2370 B

polished surface
74. Long kilts from Old Kingdom tombs
75. Clothing worn by laborers in scenes of daily life
76. Schematic diagram of G 2370, 2371 A-D, 2373, 2381 X, Y, Z.
77a. Shaft G 2371 X
77b. Shaft G 2371 Y
77c. Shaft G 2371 Z
79a. Objects from G 2371, G 2373 (rough sketches after object register and diary)

79b. Khnumenti (G 2374), architrave fragment

79c. Khnumenti (G 2374), facade south of entrance. EG 4701
8ta. Khnumeni (G 2374), Room I, left (south) entrance thickness. EG 4701

8tb. Khnumeni (G 2374), Room I, right (north) entrance thickness. EG 4568
82a. Khnumemi (G 2374). Room 1, inscribed block from court of Senedjemib Complex assigned to right (north) inner entrance thickness; after HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. A 6021 [left]

82b. Khnumemi (G 2374). Room 1, inner right (north) entrance thickness. EG 4359

82c. Khnumemi (G 2374). Room 1, relief on east wall, south of entrance. EG 4345
84a. Khnumenti (G 3374), Room I, west wall, south of door. EG 4372: 4546

84b. Khnumenti (G 3374), Room I, west wall, north of door. EG 4371
174. Khnumneti (c 2374). Room II, left (south) entrance thickness. IG 4176.

176. Khnumneti (c 2374). Room II, right (north) entrance thickness. IG 4565.
31. Chnoumene (c. 1374). Room III. Relief assigned to north wall. 86 4379
932a. Khnumenti (G 2374), Room III, relief assigned to east wall

932b. Khnumenti (G 2374), plan and section of G 2374 a
93. Khnumenti (G 2374), plan and sections of G 2385 A
94a. Khnumenit (G 2374), objects from G 2374 and G 2385 A

94b. Long belt-sash garments worn by laborers and porters in scenes of daily life
96. Senedjemib Mehi (g 2378), portico, west wall; L.D. Ergänz., pl. xii [lower]
marsh dwellers in boats

offering bearers

marsh dwellers in boats

offering bearers

marsh dwellers

offering bearers

98. Senedjemib Mehi (c 2378), schematic reconstruction of west wall of portico
99. Reconstructions of front elevations of tombs of Seshemnofer IV (a) and Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378) (b)
102. Senedjemib Mehi (g 2378), portico, north wall, east of entrance; L.D. Ergänz., pl. xi [upper]
103. Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378), portico, north wall, east of entrance. EG 4444
104. Senedjemib Mehi (g 2378), portico, east wall; LD, Ergänz., pl. xi [lower]
106. Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378), left (west) outer and inner entrance thicknesses; *L.D. Ergänz.*, pl. xiii [upper]
107. Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378), left (west) entrance thickness. RG 4468.
108. Senedjemib Mehi (c. 2378), right (east) outer and inner entrance thicknesses; *LD, Ergänz.*, pl. xiii [lower]
109. Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378), right (east) entrance thickness. EG 4469
110. Senedjemib Mehi (c. 2378), Room II, south wall, west of entrance; LD 2, pl. 74b
III. Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378), Room II, south wall, west of entrance. EG 4476
112. Senedjemib Mehi (g 2378), Room II, west wall; L.D 2, pl. 73 [left]
115. Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378), Room II, north wall. RG 4464, 4473-4474 and fragmentary relief with vintners assigned to north wall; after HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. 8 §147
116a. Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378), Room II, east wall; LD 1, Text, p. 52 [lower]
117. Old Kingdom stand balances
118a. Senedjemib Mehi (c 2378), Room II, south wall, east of door; LD 1, Text, p. 52 [upper]

118b. Senedjemib Mehi (c 2378), Room II, south wall, east of door; LD 2, pl. 74c
120a. Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378), Room III, left (west) entrance thickness; LD 2, pl. 74d

120b. Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378), Room III, left (west) entrance thickness. EG 4470
121. Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378), Room III, estate names on left (west) (a) and right (east) (b) entrance thicknesses; LD 1, Text, p. 53
122. Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378), Room III, left (west) (a) and right (east) (b) entrance thicknesses; Mariette, *Mastabas*, pp. 503, 504
123. Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378), Room III, right (east) entrance thickness. Lepsius Zeichnung Inv.-Nr. 354. Courtesy of the Archiv des Ägyptischen Wörterbuchs, Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften
125. Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378), Room III, south wall. EG 4500, 4497–4499
128. Senedjemib Mehi (g 3378), Room III, north wall; I.D., Ergänz., pl. xvi
129. Senedjemib Mehi (c 1578), Room III, north wall. SG 4490, 4491, 4495-4496. Inset, Room III, east wall
130a. Senedjemib Mehi (g 2378), plan and sections of sloping shaft tomb g 2378 A

130b. Senedjemib Mehi (g 2378), objects from g 2378 and g 2378 A
131. Senedjemib Inti (G 2370), corrections to figures 25(a) and 61(b, c)