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TWO OLD KINGDOM TOMBS AT GĪZA

By Y. M. HARPUR

In the East Field at Gīza, among the burials on the fringes of the Fourth Dynasty mastabas, there are two tombs both clearly dating later than the original cemetery. These are the mastaba of ḫt (G 7391) and the rock-cut tomb of Ṧq-hr-f-ḥn(w) (G 7948 = LG 75).1 According to Badawy,2 the tomb of ḫt should be placed in the late Fourth or early Fifth Dynasty, but Mālek3 estimates that it belongs to the late Fifth. The reliefs of Ṧq-hr-f-ḥn(w) are published in Lepsius’s Denkmäler, but the tomb has never been the subject of a full report.4 Mālek5 gives the broad estimate of Fifth Dynasty or later, but Smith6 and Fischer7 both narrow this down to the first half of the dynasty.

In his publication of the tomb of ḫt, Badawy8 states that ṣḥ[h ṣrḥw Wr-[Rq-hr-f Ṣq-hr-f]-ḥn(w), who is depicted in the reliefs, possesses the same name as a son of Raḵḫaef, who also held a priesthood of the king’s pyramid and is buried in G 7948. However, there is no evidence in this tomb that its owner was one of the king’s sons—in fact, the position of his burial and relatively modest titles argue against the assumption. Badawy does not pursue the subject any further, but, by accepting that Ṣq-hr-f-ḥn(w) (G 7948) was of royal blood and implying that Ṣq-hr-f-ḥn(w) in the tomb of ḫt was not, he would apparently see no link between G 7391 and G 7948. Nevertheless, evidence in both tombs suggests that the owners were related to each other, so that their tombs should be of a fairly similar date. Apart from the large family complexes there are few Old Kingdom tombs at Gīza which can be linked by kinship; thus, the case of ḫt and Ṣq-hr-f-ḥn(w) is unusual, and merits thorough examination.

The main evidence for a connection between the two men is on the east wall of the chapel of Ṣq-hr-f-ḥn(w) (see fig. 1).9 Here, he is depicted leaning upon his staff, overlooking the work of scribes as they record an animal count. On most occasions a wife or son might be expected to accompany the deceased, but, instead, Ṣq-hr-f-ḥn(w) is with a man called ḫt, who appears equal in size, and wears the animal-skin robe of a priest. In the tomb of ḫt, a man called Ṣq-hr-f-ḥn(w) figures quite prominently in the decoration. He is shown on the inner jamb of the external false door, and probably

1 PM 113, 1, plan 18.
3 PM 113, 1, 193.
4 LD II, pl. 8–11; LD Ergänzungsbuch, 28b, c. For the remaining bibliography see PM 113, 1, 207–8.
5 PM 113, 1, 207. G. Reisner, Gīza, 1, 314, gives the estimate of Dynasty V to VI.
8 Badawy, ḫteti, 12–13 n. 55.
9 LD II, pl. 9. I would like to thank Mrs M. E. Cox for her very skillful reproduction of the major figures in this plate.
FIG. 1. East wall of the chapel of Re-hrs-f-enh (w)
again on the north wall of the chapel. The titles and relevant terms describing these names in the two tombs are as follows:

\[
\text{Rr-hr-f-\text{en}h(w)}
\]

\[
\text{snf}
\]

(G 7391, external false door)

\[
\text{smr n pr-\text{r}}
\]

(G 7948, north, south, east, and west walls)

\[
\text{shd wrbw n Wr-Rr-hr-f}
\]

(G 7391, north wall, written as \text{shd wrbw} on external false door; G 7948, north, south, east, and west walls)

\[
\text{rh nswt}
\]

(G 7391, external false door; G 7948, north, south, and west walls)

\[
\text{imy-r pr-\text{r}}
\]

(G 7391, north, south thickness of entrance, west wall)

\[
\text{ittti}
\]

\[
\text{snf n dt-f}
\]

(G 7948, east wall)

\[
\text{smr n pr-\text{r}}
\]

(G 7391, north thickness of entrance, drum of entrance, inner false-door lintel, written as \text{smr} on inner false-door drum; G 7948, east wall)

\[
\text{shd wrbw n Wr-Rr-hr-f}
\]

(G 7391, statue, written as \text{wrbw} Wr-Rr-hr-f on north thickness of entrance, written as \text{wr} on south thickness of entrance; G 7948, east wall)

\[
\text{rh nswt}
\]

(G 7391, north thickness and drum of entrance, inner false-door lintel, north wall)

\[
\text{imy-r pr-\text{r}}
\]

(G 7948, east wall)

\[
\text{ittti}
\]

\[
\text{snf n dt-f}
\]

(G 7948, east wall)

\[
\text{smr n pr-\text{r}}
\]

(G 7391, north thickness of entrance, drum of entrance, inner false-door lintel, written as \text{smr} on inner false-door drum; G 7948, east wall)

These titles raise some significant points. In his publication of the mastaba of \text{ittti}, Badawy\textsuperscript{11} identifies \text{smr n pr-\text{r}} as \text{shd n pr-\text{r}}, and comments that the use of the genitival \text{n} is exceptional. However, on the inner false-door lintel and drum, the title is written with the chisel-hieroglyph \text{\dagger} rather than the mace \text{\dagger}, and the first two signs must, therefore, read as \text{smr}, not \text{shd}.\textsuperscript{12} This is particularly well indicated by comparing the title with the writing of \text{shd wrbw Rr-hr-f-\text{en}h(w)} on the external false door of the tomb; for here the round \text{hd}-macehead is clearly visible.\textsuperscript{13} The corrected reading exactly matches the title of \text{smr n pr-\text{r}} given to \text{ittti} in the tomb of \text{Rr-hr-f-\text{en}h(w)}, and the inclusion of the genitival \text{n} in the same title of \text{Rr-hr-f-\text{en}h(w)} proves that its use, in this title at least, is not unique. On the other hand, the writing of \text{smr n pr-\text{r}} is very rare, and, apart from these examples, it does not seem to be attested in any other tomb of Old Kingdom date.

\textsuperscript{10} Badawy, \textit{Iteti}, pls. 3, 8, fig. 11. The inscription next to the figure of \text{Rr-hr-f-\text{en}h(w)} on the north wall is only executed in red paint, and the palimpsest is the result of the artist’s effort to rearrange the text vertically. The empty cartouche of the title is certainly to be filled with \text{Rr-hr-f}, since the word \text{Wr} is written, and this is part of the name of Ra\textsuperscript{*}ka\textsuperscript{-f*} pyramid. The \text{\text{en}h} sign is almost certainly part of the name of \text{Rr-hr-f-\text{en}h(w)} who is recorded elsewhere in the tomb as \text{shd wrbw}. The reading of \text{shd wrbw Wr-[Rr-hr-f Rr-hr-f]-\text{en}h(w)} is suggested by S. Curto, \textit{Gli scavi italiani a el-Ghiza 1903} (Rome, 1963), 39, and is accepted by Badawy, \textit{Iteti}, 6. Note that both write the name as \text{\text{en}h-Rr-hr-f}: cf. also C. Firth and B. Gunn, \textit{Teti Pyramid Cemeteries}, 1 (Cairo, 1926), 102.

\textsuperscript{11} Badawy, \textit{Iteti}, 4, 8, 11, pls. 7, 10, figs. 6, 10, 15; Curto, \textit{Gli scavi}, 36–8, 45 also has this reading.

\textsuperscript{12} Badawy, \textit{Iteti}, pl. 10. Note the shortening of the title on the drum. The word \text{smr} is frequently isolated in this way but \text{shd} tends to remain with part or all of its full title.

\textsuperscript{13} Badawy, \textit{Iteti}, pl. 3; Curto, \textit{Gli scavi}, pl. 7.
TWO OLD KINGDOM TOMBS

Itti possesses several titles not recorded for Rc-hc-f-cn\(h(w),\) but, since there are destroyed inscriptions in G 7948, it is possible that some of the titles of Rc-hc-f-cn\(h(w),\) are lost.\(^{14}\)

The title of imy-r; ktk ns\(w\) is recorded twice in the tomb of Itti. Curto\(^{15}\) notes it only once on the now destroyed south entrance-thickness, but Badawy\(^{16}\) identifies a second occurrence in a damaged text on the west wall. Though this is very faint, most of the title can be distinguished, and supports Curto’s earlier evidence. The writing of the text on this wall is quite unusual; for the title of imy-r; ktk ns\(w\) follows after a destroyed initial title(?) and the name of Itti, which is repeated further on in the inscription. This may suggest uncertainty on the part of the scribe, but, since the names of the tomb owner are placed symmetrically on either side of his head, their repetition was possibly for artistic effect. A somewhat similar arrangement occurs on the south wall of the tomb of Rc-hc-f-cn\(h(w)\) (LD 11, pl. 10b), where the repetition of the tomb owner’s name was certainly intended to balance the length of each column of inscription. Another unusual arrangement appears on the north entrance-thickness of the tomb of Itti, where the name of the deceased is written between his titles of smr n pr-\(c\)t and \(<shd>ywrbe n Wr-Rc-hc-f.\)\(^{17}\) It is written in exactly the same way on the east wall of the tomb of Rc-hc-f-cn\(h(w),\) again between the same two titles (LD 11, pl. 9).

Further details within the inscriptions may also connect G 7391 with G 7948, even though parallels can be found in other Old Kingdom tombs. For example, both Itti and Rc-hc-f-cn\(h(w)\) use the term z\(s\)f n h\(t\)f when describing their sons, and the postures of the children are almost identical.\(^{18}\) In addition both tomb owners not only have sons called after them, but show a marked preference for names compounded with the cartouche of Ra\(<kh\>ef.\(^{19}\) Although these names are not identical, they resemble one another closely, and show a regard for the king that is not so evident in other tombs of his priests.\(^{20}\)

Hence, on the basis of correspondences in names, titles, and their arrangement, it seems fairly certain that the inscriptions in G 7391 and G 7948 refer to the same men, named Itti and Rc-hc-f-cn\(h(w),\) who are depicted in both tombs.

\(^{14}\) There is no sure way of telling if the chapel decoration records the titles of Rc-hc-f-cn\(h(w)\) at the peak of his career, though one would expect this to be the case: cf. K. Baer, Rank and Title in the Old Kingdom (Chicago, 1960), 40-1. According to Badawy, Iteti, 1-3, some time elapsed between the date of the mastaba core of Itti, with its external false door, and the completion of his chapel. Badawy suggests that the latter may have been built by the sons of Itti after his death, when his full titulary was known, but the evidence is inconclusive.

\(^{15}\) Curto, Gli scavi, 37, fig. 6.

\(^{16}\) Badawy, Iteti, 7, pl. 9, fig. 13.

\(^{17}\) Badawy, Iteti, 4, fig. 10. Curto, Gli scavi, 37, reads the inscription from left to right, like the registers immediately below, but these two groups of signs are facing opposite directions. Despite the unusual reading, the order of titles given by Badawy is correct.

\(^{18}\) This term occurs spasmodically from Dynasty IV to VI, but the majority of examples date before mid Dynasty V. Of the numerous children who stand beside their father in Old Kingdom reliefs, less than ten show the posture used in the tombs of Itti and Rc-hc-f-cn\(h(w);\) LD 11, pl. 8a; Badawy, Iteti, fig. 13.

\(^{19}\) Rc-hc-f-cn\(h(w)\) has two sons called Rc-hc-f-cn\(h(w)\) and an eldest son called Wt\(r\)h-cn\(h(w).\) Itti has an eldest son called Itti, and two others, Wt\(r\)h-cn\(h(w)\) and Wt\(r\)h-cn\(h(w).\) Like Rc-hc-f-cn\(h(w),\) Itti may have another son named after him, who appears as a naked child on the west wall. Badawy, Iteti, 7, fig. 13, thinks that this is probably the eldest son while still young, but since the scene includes the mature figures of Wt\(r\)h-cn\(h(w)\) and Wt\(r\)h-cn\(h(w),\) the identification is questionable; Curto, Gli scavi, 38, fig. 8.

\(^{20}\) Badawy, Iteti, 11.
Whether there was any blood relationship is difficult to determine. According to the inscriptions of \textit{Rc-\textit{hr}-f-\textit{cnh}(w)}, \textit{Itti} is \textit{sn\textit{f} n\textit{ dt-f}}, 'his "brother" of his endowment(?)', \textsuperscript{21} while \textit{Itti} refers to \textit{Rc-\textit{hr}-f-\textit{cnh}(w)} as \textit{sn\textit{f}}, 'his "brother"'. \textsuperscript{22} Evidence given in the Appendix below shows that the \textit{sn\textit{ dt}} was not necessarily a real 'brother' of the deceased; for the term could be applied to other family members—or even to non-kin. In the reliefs of \textit{Ntr-wsr},\textsuperscript{23} for example, the wife of the deceased is designated \textit{snt\textit{ dt hmt-f}}, 'the "sister" of the endowment(?)', his wife', while the inscription of \textit{Pn-mrw}\textsuperscript{24} provides the clearest proof that the role could be performed by someone outside the family circle. This is also suggested in the family tomb of \textit{Nfr} and \textit{Kn-h\textit{r}-l},\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Wr-brw} and \textit{Sn-it-f\textit{ }}, whom Altenmüller identifies as brothers of \textit{Nfr}, both have false doors in the tomb, but the \textit{sn\textit{ dt Tntt} }does not, presumably because he was unrelated.

Apart from the probable example of \textit{Rc-\textit{hr}-f-\textit{cnh}(w)} and \textit{Itti}, there is no evidence in the Old Kingdom that the \textit{sn\textit{ dt}} referred to the man with whom he was linked as \textit{sn\textit{f}}. Instead, inscriptions of the \textit{sn\textit{ dt}} refer to his \textit{own} status in relation to the deceased and allude to the dead man by the pronoun \textit{f}, never \textit{sn\textit{f}};\textsuperscript{26} thus, the occurrence of \textit{sn\textit{f} Rc-\textit{hr}-f-\textit{cnh}(w)}, 'his "brother" \textit{Rc-\textit{hr}-f-\textit{cnh}(w)}', in the tomb of \textit{Itti} is more probably explained as meaning that the two were related. It is, however, possible that \textit{sn\textit{ dt}} was sometimes abbreviated to \textit{sn\textit{f}}, which could cause confusion in genealogical reconstructions. Such a case may be found in the tomb of \textit{3\textit{hlt-mrw-nswt}},\textsuperscript{27} where three men, each called \textit{sn\textit{f}}, 'his "brother"', round up supplicators before the deceased's father, and a better-dressed \textit{sn\textit{ dt}} stands in the register above. Very likely the three are \textit{s\textit{Ww dt}}, who are unrelated to the major figure and work under the direction of the fourth man. In the reliefs of \textit{Pth-\textit{htp}(w)}\textsuperscript{28} as many as eleven \textit{s\textit{Ww dt}} are depicted, and it is even more unlikely that these are all the real brothers of the deceased.

The Appendix shows that, when the \textit{sn\textit{ dt}} is represented in tomb decoration, his figure is much less important than that of the tomb owner. This is not surprising if he was an official and his designation was a legal title. However, reliefs also tend to stress the privilege of being a \textit{sn\textit{ dt}} by the prominent position and appearance of his figure in relation to others. Perhaps one of the functions of the \textit{sn\textit{ dt}} was to be responsible for

\textsuperscript{21} See Appendix.

\textsuperscript{22} G. Robins, 'The relationships specified by Egyptian kinship terms of the Middle and New Kingdoms', \textit{CdlD} 54 (1979), 197–209.


\textsuperscript{24} B. Grdseloff, 'Deux inscriptions juridiques de l'ancien empire', \textit{ASAE} 42 (1943), 39, fig. 3.

\textsuperscript{25} A. M. Moussa and H. Altenmüller, \textit{The Tomb of Nefer and Kahay} (Mainz, 1971), 16. Note that the \textit{sn\textit{ dt}} in this case was appointed despite the probability that there were other adult family members living after the death of \textit{Nfr}.

\textsuperscript{26} See, for example, \textit{Tzmw}, who refers to himself as \textit{Pth-\textit{htp}(w) sn\textit{ dt-f}}, 'his brother of the endowment(?) of \textit{Pth-\textit{htp}(w)}', Selim Hassan, \textit{Excavations at Saqqara}, III (Cairo, 1975), 9, fig. 4. Two further cases are given in nn. 35, 36.

\textsuperscript{27} W. Wreszinski, \textit{Atlas}, III, pl. 69.

\textsuperscript{28} R. F. E. Paget and A. A. Pirie, \textit{The Tomb of Ptah-hetep} (London, 1898), pls. 31–2, 34–6, 38. According to W. Helck, \textit{Wirtschaftsgeschichte des alten Ägypten im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend vor Chr.} (Leiden, 1975), 90, these men possibly divided the responsibilities of the role among themselves during the course of the year. If they were co-property owners, as Grdseloff maintained, they no doubt exercised their functions continuously (\textit{ASAE} 42 (1943), 48).
the building and decoration of the deceased’s tomb, and, if so, this was an ideal way of being commemorated, especially if he was unable to afford an impressive burial of his own. There are only two exceptions to the usual pattern of depicting the *sn ḏt*, and these are the *sn ḏn ḏ ḏt Itti*, ‘his “brother” of his endowment(?)* Itti’, in the tomb of *Rc-hr-f-cnḥ(w)* (LD 11, pl. 9), and the *sn ḏ t Nfr-hr-nmti*, ‘the “brother” of the endowment(?)* Nfr-hr-nmti*, in the tomb of *Whm-kʾ r-i*.

In both cases these men are shown the same size as the tomb owner. Among the major figures in Old Kingdom tombs only important relatives are depicted equal in size to the deceased, and rarely, if ever, are people who are not members of the nuclear family or grandparents rendered in this way. *Nfr-hr-nmti* is shown with his wife, the probable daughter of *Whm-kʾ r-i*, and is therefore likely to be the son-in-law of the deceased. Similarly, unless *Itti* was accorded an extraordinary degree of favour as a non-relative, he is probably equal in size because he is related to *Rc-hr-f-cnḥ(w)*. This assumption is also supported by the way *Rc-hr-f-cnḥ(w)* is depicted in the tomb of *Itti*; for not only is he shown on the external false door facing *rḥt ns wrt sn ḏ t Rwd* ‘the King’s acquaintance, his sister *Rwd*’, but he is probably to be identified with a man seated at an offering table, directly below a large seated figure of *Itti* (see above, n. 10). This seems to be a family scene with important figures joining *Itti* in a funerary repast. *Rwd* is also shown here, but, unlike her depiction on the external false door, she is not given the same significance as *Rc-hr-f-cnḥ(w)*, who is larger in size and has his own small offering table.

The titles of *Itti* preserved in the tomb of *Rc-hr-f-cnḥ(w)* suggest that, at some stage of his life, his rank and that of *Rc-hr-f-cnḥ(w)* were roughly equivalent, though he may have attained a higher status later in his career, perhaps after the death of *Rc-hr-f-cnḥ(w)*.

Regardless of the near equality of their priestly titles, the *sn ḏ t Itti* does not seem to have given *Rc-hr-f-cnḥ(w)* any independent honour comparable to the chapel which the *sn ḏ t*
Ny-mct-Rc built for Nfr-srs,\textsuperscript{35} or the statue dedicated by the sn dt Hhi to Ki-pw-Pth.\textsuperscript{36} Instead, Itti included Rc-hr-f-cnh(w) in his funerary scene alongside a man and woman of equal size and near equal importance, as if all three were linked in some way. The west wall in the tomb of Rc-hr-f-cnh(w) takes this a stage further (LD II, pls. 10a, 11). Here, the southern and central false doors belong to the tomb owner and his wife, but the northern one is owned by a woman called Ispt, who is depicted on the panel with her husband, Hr-mrw. This woman's name is almost identical to that of the woman sitting near Rc-hr-f-cnh(w) in the funerary scene of Itti, whose inscription is read by Badawy\textsuperscript{37} and Curto\textsuperscript{38} as rht nswt Ipt, 'the King's acquaintance, Ipt'. Despite this reading, the signs drawn by Badawy and Curto read Ispt, but it is impossible to verify this from Badawy's pl. 8.\textsuperscript{39} Given the general rules of Old Kingdom iconography, she could scarcely be the daughter of Rc-hr-f-cnh(w), but might be his sister, or—less likely—his mother.\textsuperscript{40} Should this woman be the Ispt in the tomb of Rc-hr-f-cnh(w), her husband, Hr-mrw, may be the Hr-mrw who squats directly above Rwd in the funerary scene of Itti, and the man of the same name who stands below Rc-hr-f-cnh(w) on the external false door of the tomb.\textsuperscript{41}

If these identifications are accepted, there are two possible explanations. Either people related to, or closely connected with, the sn dt Itti were given the great privilege of being commemorated in the tomb of Rc-hr-f-cnh(w) in preference to the deceased's own kin, or, more plausibly, Ispt and Hr-mrw were his sister and sister's husband, and bore the same relationship to Itti, who was the brother of Rc-hr-f-cnh(w).

Because we cannot define the range of meaning of the term sn in the Old Kingdom (see n. 22), the evidence I have given above is inconclusive; however, if these men were not brothers, the iconography of their tombs is quite exceptional. The multiple correspondences of names and titles are very strong evidence for a close connection, but, regardless of whether they were relatives or not, the reference to Itti as the sn dt of Rc-hr-f-cnh(w) places their tombs very close together in time.

Appendix

The sn dt in tomb reliefs of the Old Kingdom

(Those marked by + are recorded by M. A. Murray, \textit{Index of Names and Titles of the Old Kingdom} (London, 1908), 41.)


H. G. Fischer, 'Old Kingdom inscriptions in the Yale Gallery', \textit{MIO} 7 (1960), 301, fig. 2.

Badawy, \textit{Iteti}, 6; pl. 8, fig. 11.

Note also the difference in the reading of the middle figure's name. This man is recorded by Badawy and Curto as Nfr, but Badawy, \textit{Iteti}, fig. 11, gives the quite different name of Rd(\textdagger), which is partly visible in pl. 8. Possibly this was a brother of Rc-hr-f-cnh(w) and Itti, though his name is not mentioned again in either tomb.

In the representation of major figures, daughters are never shown equal in size to their father, whereas sisters and mothers sometimes are: cf. LD II, pl. 14 (mother and sister?), pl. 20 (mother).

Badawy, \textit{Iteti}, 2, pls. 3, 8, fig. 11.
In the opinion of Junker, *sn dt* should be interpreted as a ‘companion of the tomb’. This was a favoured person, given the privilege of being depicted near the deceased in order to share with him the offerings brought to the chapel from his funerary estate(s). According to Grdseloff, a *sn dt* acted as the deceased’s ‘co-property holder’ even during the latter’s lifetime. Thus, he was economically and morally indebted to his benefactor, and continued to be attached to him by obligation after his death. Perepelkin tries to explain the term *dt* as simply meaning ‘own’, and as being devoid of any administrative function; therefore, *sn dt* must refer to a real brother of the deceased. The manner in which the *sn dt* is distinguished from commoners in reliefs and inscriptions is considered by Perepelkin to be strong evidence of a blood relationship. Not only are *snw dt* sometimes depicted with family groups, but they also receive affectionate epithets identical to those written next to wives, daughters, and sons of the deceased. A quite different interpretation is given by Goedicke, who suggests that the *sn dt* was a man appointed to take over the affairs of the funerary endowment for the widow. In this capacity he acted as a ‘brother’, and gained from his position as well as guaranteeing the security of the woman. The funerary character of the inscription of *Tnti* on which the argument is based does not allow of more general conclusions. Helck sees the *sn dt* in fully funerary terms, as a man chosen to supervise the *hmw-kr* of the funerary estate in the absence of any suitable next-of-kin. Such a role, according to Helck, could also be undertaken by the wife or even shared by the children of the deceased.

Below is a list, with brief comments, of the *snw dt* known to me from the reliefs of the Old Kingdom, arranged according to site. Though the institution of the *sn dt* is mentioned in provincial tombs of the period, *snw dt* are never singled out and individually designated in the decoration. Evidence of this is confined to the mastabas and rock-cut tombs at Giza and Saqqâra:

**Giza**

1. *$hti-mrw-nswt* G 2184
   (Wreszinski, *Atlas*, 111, pl. 69), *imy-rt pr snf n d[t]f*, shown as a minor figure. Below him in a rendering of accounts scene are three minor figures each termed *sn f* (a possible abbreviation of *sn dt f*).

2. *Whm-k$h* D 117
   (H. Kayser, *Die Mastaba des Uhemka*, figs. on 24, 32), *rh nswt shd wbrw Nfr-hr-nmti sn dt*, shown as a major figure with his wife; *sn msf dt zhr t-md$t Snb*, shown as a minor figure heading a line of eight men. It is uncertain if the inscription should read *snw msfwf dt*.

3. *Mrw-k$i* West Field
   (H. Junker, *Giza*, ix, fig. 33), *sn dt Ny-k$i-Rc* shown last in a line of four minor figures, including a *zr f*, each of whom carries a haunch of beef to the table of *Mrw-k$i*.

4. *Ny-m$t-Rc* Central Field
   (Selim Hassan, *Giza*, 11, 205, fig. 226). A rare case of a tomb belonging to a *sn dt*. He records himself as *sn s dt* of *Nfr-srs*, for whom he built a separate chapel in his tomb. She is shown as a major figure here, but never with *Ny-m$t-Rc*. Note the professional link in their titles.
5. **Rc-hr-f-nh(w) G 7948 = LG 75**

(LD 11, pl. 9), *snf n dt f smr n pr-c; Itti shq wbrw Wr-Rc-hr-f*, shown as a major figure next to **Rc-hr-f-nh(w)** overlooking an animal count and scenes of agriculture, fishing, and fowling. Note the professional link in their titles.

6. **Hnmw-htp(w) Fakhry 4**

(Ahmed Fakhry, *Sept tombeaux à l'est de la Grande Pyramide de Guizeh* (Cairo, 1935), 13, fig. 6), *sn dt zib zh rh-nw-ds(?)*, shown as a minor figure handing a list to the tomb owner, and placed between his forward leg and staff, like a son.

7. **Ztw+ G 4710 = LG 49**

(LD Ergänzungsband, 27b), *zh sn dt Tnti*, shown as a minor figure on the thickness of the false door.

8. **Sšm-nfr I+ G 4940 = LG 45**

(LD 11, pl. 28), *hry-tp nsut Sšm-nfr sn dt*. This inscription is confusing because it runs above the figures of three men in a line of seven. It may mean that the first three minor figures, *imy-r pr Bw-nfr, Wni, and Wm-nfr*, are *swo dt* of **Sšm-nfr**. Murray lists all of the named figures, excluding the first, as *swo dt*.

9. **Tnti+ G 4920 = LG 47**

(LD 11, pls. 30, 31b), *sn dt rh nsut Tžzn*, shown as an intermediate-sized figure beside the false door; *sn l'dt ...* shown as a minor figure on the south wall, slightly larger than the figure next to him; *[snt?] dt nsut ...]* [.....], a woman shown as a minor figure on the south wall. Note that Murray only records Tžzn.

**Individuals named as sn dt in inscriptions at Giza**

1. **Pn mrw G 2197**

(B. Grdseloff, 'Deux inscriptions juridiques de l'ancien empire', *ASAE* 42 (1943), 39, fig. 3). Inscription mentions *sn dt hm-kš Nfr-htp*.

2. **Kš-pw-Pth** Found near G 1227

(H. G. Fischer, 'Old Kingdom inscriptions in the Yale Gallery', *MIO* 7 (1960), 301, fig. 2; Cairo Mus. Ent. 37716). Inscription of *sntf dt ḫšši* on the base of a statue dedicated to **Kš-pw-Pth**.

3. **Tnti**

(H. Goedicke, *Die privaten Rechtsinschriften aus dem Alten Reich*, pl. 13; Cairo Mus. 57139). Legal text of **Tnti**, mentioning the *sn dt hm-kš Kš-i-m-nfrt*.

**Saqqâra**

1. ** ihti-htp(w)+ D 64**

(N. de G. Davies, *Ptahhetep*, II, pl. 34), *mdh pr-c; wnm hrt ḫšši sn dt mryš Sšm-nfr*, shown third in a line of bearers led by *zrf smsw Pth-htp(w)* and **Pth-htp(w)** (probably *Tfw*, another *zrf*).

2. **Ppi**

(G. Jéquier, *Tombeaux des particuliers*, 101, fig. 116). Two registers each with three minor figures acting as bearers. The readings are doubtful, but behind the *zrf smsw* in the top row is...
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In the bottom row are $sn\ dt\ f\ hqt\ hwt\ sm\ w\ t\ Hnw,\ zr\ f\ mry\ f\ Hnt(?),$ and $n\ dt\ f\ Hry.$ Since the $n\ dt\ f$ appears only after $zt\ f,$ it is possible that the figures which follow are also $zt\ f,$ a designation omitted for reasons of space. The fact that $sn\ f$ is clearly written above one figure argues against the assumption that $n\ dt\ f$ reads $sn\ dt\ f.$ On the other hand, it is possible that $Hnw$ is $sn\ dt$ of $Ppl.$

3. $Ph\ n\ w\ kr\ t^*\ D\ 70 = LS\ 15$

(LD 11, pls. 46, 47), $sn\ dt\ f\ zib\ zh\ e\ nswt\ n\ hft-hr\ imy-r?\ zhw\ Kri-tzw,$ shown as a minor figure near scenes of fishing and fowling, and facing the tomb owner; $sn\ dt\ f\ mry\ f\ zib\ imy-r?\ zhw\ e\ nswt\ hft-hr\ Kri-tzw,$ squatting near the deceased below a similar figure of his son, near scenes of agriculture and recording scribes.

4. $Pth-htp(w)^+\ D\ 51$

(A. Mariette, Mastabas, 315). A man shown with the sons of the deceased called $sn\ dt\ Nfr-hr-ny-nty-hty;$ below, a woman called $snt\ dt\ Nfrt-Hw-t-Hrw,$ followed by twelve other women referred to as $ms-s.$

5. $Pth-htp(w)^+\ D\ 64$

(R. F. E. Paget and A. A. Pirie, The Tomb of Ptah-hetep, pls. 31-2, 34-6, 38). North wall: $sn\ dt\ zib\ imy-r?\ zhw\ htw\ htw\ htw\ w\ htw\ Pth-htp(w),$ $sn\ dt\ f\ mry\ f\ w\ htw\ mry\ f\ f\ htw\ Stf(?),$ $sn\ dt\ htw\ htw(w),$ $sn\ dt\ mry\ f\ Tpi.$ South wall: $sn\ dt\ mry\ f\ hty-hy(w)\ Wsh-kri.$ East wall: $imy-r?\ sn\ wt\ sn\ dt\ imy-r?\ pr\ Kri-hp,$ $imy-r?\ sn\ wt\ sn\ dt\ imy-r?\ pr\ Kri-hp$ (possibly the same man as the last, though they are shown just above each other). West wall: $sn\ dt\ zib\ zh\ htw\ htw(w)$ (possibly the same man as on the north wall), $sn\ dt\ zib\ zh\ Nfr-kw-Pth,$ $sn\ dt\ mry\ f\ htw\ hr\ nb\ f\ shd\ htw\ Tfw,$ $Wp-m-nfrt,$ $Sbk-htp(w).$ This last inscription runs above the three figures and presumably refers to them all. On the same wall is $sn\ dt\ hty-hy(w)\ Wsh-kri,$ (possibly the same man as on the south wall). All representations of the $sn\ dt$ show him as a minor figure either squatting with others before the deceased, or acting as a bearer. One ($Pth-htp(w)),$ hands him a list, while another ($Kri-hp$) leads a procession of cattle and holds a papyrus scroll.  

6. $Ny-chnh-nswt$

(W. Kaiser, Ägyptisches Museum Berlin (Berlin, 1967), 28 [237]; W. Wreszinski, Atlas, iii, pl. 54), $hm-nfr\ w\ nswt\ sn\ dt\ Ny-nmti,$ shown as a minor figure dressed in an overseer's kilt. He stands in a boat offering marsh products to the tomb owner; $hm-nfr\ w\ nswt\ sn\ dt\ Ny-nmti,$ shown as a minor figure walking away from an agricultural scene and offering a bird to the tomb owner.

7. $Ny-kzw-Pth$

(M. A. Murray, 'Some fresh inscriptions', Ancient Egypt 4 (1917), 62-3), $zh\ pr\ hft\ sn\ dt\ Pth-hy-f,$ depicted on the panel of the false door beside a slightly larger seated figure of the deceased. Note the professional link in their titles.

8. $Nfr$

(A. M. Moussa and H. Altenmüller, The Tomb of Nefer and Ka-hay 17, pl. 8), $sn\ dt\ rh\ nswt\ imy-hy\ pr-\ rz\ mr\ htw\ pr-\ rz\ Tnti,$ shown as an intermediate-sized figure holding a papyrus roll and overseeing scenes of wine making and agriculture.
9. \( Ntr-wsr^+ Di = S 901 \)

(M. A. Murray, *Saqqara Mastabas*, I, pl. 24), sn(t) \( dt hmt:f mryt:f \) \( hkr^1 \) nswt[ \( hmr^1 \) crouching at the feet of the deceased next to the false door.

10. \( Shm-k^i:i^+ \) NW of D 62

(M. A. Murray, *Saqqara Mastabas*, I, pl. 7). A line of seven officials shown as minor figures next to the false door of \( Shm-k^i:i^+ \). The first and second are entitled \( sn dt w\#b mry \ ntr M\$ty \) and \( sn dt z\#h \#h \) Ny-k\$i-cnh.

11. \( Kri-m-hzt \)

(J. Capart, *Monuments*, I, pl. 13). Inscription of the deceased’s father making his youngest(?) son, \( Htp-k^i:i \), the \( sn dt \) of his older son, \( Kri-m-hzt \). \( Htp-k^i:i \) is shown between the staff and forward leg of the large figure of \( Kri-m-hzt \), which is a usual position for a son. However, his adult status is implied by the staff which he holds. In the text he is referred to as \( sn dt \) and \( imy-r^1 \) iqdw, ‘Overseer of builders’, the latter title linking him by profession with \( Kri-m-hzt \).

12. \( Tzmw \) Found in shaft of D 65

(Selim Hassan, *Excavations at Saqqara*, III, 9, fig. 4). Lintel of \( Tzmw \), with an inscription showing that \( shd \ pr-cf \) \( Tzmw \) was \( Pth-htp(w) sn dt f. \) Possibly this refers to \( Pth-htp(w) \) II (D 64), though \( Tzmw \) is not depicted in his chapel.

13. \( Did-m-cnh \) D 11

(A. Mariette, *Mastabas*, 200). A woman seated at a small offering table on the panel of a false door, next to the larger table scene of the owner, \( Hm-mn \), son of \( Did-m-cnh \). Her inscription may read \( hmt:f \) \( z\#t \ dt \) \( Hm(t)-\#tti \). Compare this with the wife of \( Ntr-wsr \) (9), who is called \( snt dt \).

I would like to thank Dr Jaromír Málek (Topographical Bibliography) for his advice in the writing of this article, particularly in relation to the titles of \( Itti \) and the Appendix.

**Postscript**

The review of Badawy’s book by Rosemarie Drenkhahn came to my attention after the submission of this article (*Bibliothea Orientalis* 35 [1977, appeared 1979], 86–9). Drenkhahn recognizes the link between G 7391 and G 7948, but the following comments can be added:

1. Unless one is prepared to accept from the start that the two men are real brothers, \( Itti \)’s title of \( smr n pr-cf \) in the tomb of \( Rc-hc-f-cnh(w) \) is not the basic reason why an adjustment should be made to \( shd n pr-cf \) in his own tomb. There is clear proof in the inscriptions of \( Itti \) that the second title is incorrect: cf. p. 26 above.

2. The multiple correspondences of names almost certainly show that members of a single family are depicted in the two tombs, as I have attempted to demonstrate in relating the owners.

3. According to Drenkhahn, the name of \( Nfr \) occurs in both tombs (LD II, pl. 9 and Badawy, *Iteti*, pl. 3 and figs. 11 and 13); it is not clear if she follows Curto and Badawy in identifying the brother(?) of \( Itti \) as \( Nfr \), although this name appears to read \( R\#d \); cf. n. 39 above.

4. In n. 19 Drenkhahn states that Badawy fails to note that there are two people called \( Rwd \) in the decoration of \( Itti \): the sister of \( Itti \) (Badawy, *Iteti*, pl. 3) and a man in the table scene (op. cit.
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fig. 11); this second figure Drenkhahn identifies as the *hm-kr Rwd* who butchers an ox in the tomb of *Rḫ-f-ḥn(w)* (L.D II, pl. 10b). However, Badawy could be right in not making this distinction (*Iteti*, 2, 6). The person called *Rwd* in his fig. 11 is a woman and probably identical with the sister of *Ttti* already shown in pl. 3; despite her short cropped hair (not uncommon in Old Kingdom reliefs), she squats in the attitude of a female, not a male. The occurrence of *ḥr-mr(w) and Rwd* in this scene suggests that the group are kinsmen of the deceased: cf. p. 29 and n. 33 above.

5. In conclusion, Drenkhahn observes that G 7391 and G 7948 are on the edge of the East Field and should therefore date to Dynasty VI, like the similarly situated G 7101 (*Qsr*), G 7102 (*Tdw*), and G 7152 (*Shm-ḥn-Pth*). Although most of the large mastabas in the East Field belong to the Fourth Dynasty, the smaller tombs encircling them should logically date from Dynasty V onwards. In fact, being first in a line of rock-cut tombs, G 7948 could date quite early in Dynasty V, as Smith and Fischer suggest on other grounds: cf. p. 24 above.