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Foreword

In 1963, some forty years ago, I initiated this series with the first publication of the Pennsylvania–Yale Expedition to Nubia at the sites of Toshka and Arminna. The next three volumes, by our former students Bruce G. Trigger and Kent R. Weeks, continued the publication of that material. With the termination of the expeditions to Nubia through the building of the High Dam at Aswan, my co-director, David B. O’Connor and I turned to our new concession at Abydos, for which six volumes in the series have so far appeared. Volumes are in preparation for both the Nubian and Abydos projects.

When in 1970 I was appointed Curator of Egyptian and Ancient Near Eastern Art at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, my predecessor, Dowse Dunham, and I initiated a new series, the Giza Matzab, published by the Museum of Fine Arts. The series has continued with several publications on the extraordinary work of George Andrew Reisner at Giza; three additional volumes by me and a volume each by Kent R. Weeks, Ann Macy Roth, and Edward Brovarski, comprising altogether seven volumes to date, with more in preparation.

The latter series is restricted to the publication of Reisner’s work, and the present volume incorporates the work of other expeditions to a large degree. For that reason Professor O’Connor and I have chosen to publish it in the Pennsylvania–Yale Series, since work at Giza over the last thirty years has included students from the University of Pennsylvania and Yale. Funding for the series has been made possible through the William K. and Marilyn M. Simpson Endowment for Egyptology at Yale University.

It is not out of place to take this opportunity to congratulate the author of this volume, not only for his scholarship and the work of inspecting all of the slab stelae first hand, with excellent drawings and photographs, but also for the design and production of a magnificent publication. I should also like to thank my two curatorial successors in Boston, Dr. Edward Brovarski and Dr. Rita Fried, as well as to acknowledge the support and friendship of my two immediate predecessors in Boston, William Stevenson Smith and Dowse Dunham.

William Kelly Simpson
Katonah, May 14, 2003
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259. One of two pages of color notations on the slab stela of Wepemnefret (g 1201) by W.S. Smith, housed in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston

Appendix 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography

260. Comparative graph of the number of words used in the Giza slab stela

261. Comparative graph of the occurrences of the “look” hieroglyph (Sign List M 1.3) in the Giza slab stela

262. Remains attached on the Giza slab stela

Appendix 3: Selected Linen Lists


264. Helwan slab of Nisa-hapi. After Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pl. 4

265. Helwan slab of Dust, After Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pl. 6

266. Helwan slab of Nefere-marri. After Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pl. 7

267. Helwan slab of Khuf-rit. After Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pl. 9

268. Helwan slab of Hek. After Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pl. 10

269. Helwan slab of Ka-khet. After Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pl. 12

270. Helwan slab of Nisa-mith. After Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pl. 34

271. Helwan slab of Shespes-kau. After Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pl. 25

272. Helwan slab of Iri. After Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pl. 31

273. Helwan slab of Bak. After Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pl. 39

274. Helwan slab of Wiamn-nuit. After Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pl. 21


276. Helwan slab of Iu-ahdjet. After Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pl. 23

277. Tablet of Sarhenen, Egyptian Museum, Cairo. After Quibell, Turin, 15802. Courtesy Museo Egizio di Torino

278. Tablet of Sibad, Egyptian Museum, Cairo. After Quibell, Turin, 15802. Courtesy Museo Egizio di Torino

279. Tablet of Saqqara tomb S 3036, pl. 139, fig. 835


281. Tablet of Djefa-nisut. After I. Woldering, “Djefajat” and Djefajat, “Djefajat,” pl. 3, pl. 139, fig. 835

282. Tablet fragment, Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 46481 = SC 125, W. S. Smith photo archive, housed in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston


285. Tablet fragment, Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 46481 = SC 125, W. S. Smith photo archive, housed in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston

286. Wepemnefret (g 1201) by W.S. Smith; housed in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston

288 Tablet of Iśari (by name), Egyptian Museum, Cairo, CG 181 After L. Borchardt, Denkmäler des Alten Reiches (CCG), p. 32, pl. 23

289 Tablet of Nfrnutu (Tutanankh), Liverpool Museum After R. Wall, Heat Hete Dynasties, p. 226

290 Tablet of Nynu (after Qubih), Archæolog Matheus, pl. 28

292 Stone-lined niche of Kha-bau-sokar, Egyptian Museum, Cairo. After M. Murray, Saqqara Mastabas, pl. 1

293 Stone-lined niche of Hathor-nefer-hetep, After Murray, Saqqara Mastabas, pl. 2

294 Ivory tablet from Step Pyramid of Sekhemkhet at Saqqara, Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 92679. After W. Helck, WZKM 54 (1957), p. 76

295 False door tablet of Metjen, Saqqara cruciform chapel. After Lepsius, Denkmaeler II, pl. 3

296 False door tablet of Nefer, Giza false door tablet from the Museo Barracco, Rome, CMB 1. After M. Murray, Saqqara Mastabas, pl. 2

297 False door tablet of Nefermaat, from Meidum, tablet from false door in the Museo Barracco, Rome, CM 1 (June 1938). HU–MFA Expedition photography, Diuhl Ahmed 8532

298 False door tablet of Nefermaat, Giza false door tablet from BM 43218. After M. Murray, Saqqara Mastabas, pl. 2

299 False door tablet of Nefermaat, Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 92679. After M. Murray, Saqqara Mastabas, pl. 2

300 False door tablet of Meretites, Giza false door tablet of Meretites, CB 2110. After S. Junker, Gîza 1, p. 186, fig. 36 (missing left-hand extension)

301 False door tablet of Meretites, Giza false door tablet from IIn; Junker, Gîza 1, p. 186, fig. 36 (missing left-hand extension)

302 False door tablet of Nefermaat, tablet from false door in the Museo Barracco, Rome, CM 1 (June 1938). HU–MFA Expedition photography, Diuhl Ahmed 8532

303 False door tablet of Nefermaat, tablet from false door in the Museo Barracco, Rome, CM 1 (June 1938). HU–MFA Expedition photography, Diuhl Ahmed 8532

304 False door tablet of Nefermaat, tablet from false door in the Museo Barracco, Rome, CM 1 (June 1938). HU–MFA Expedition photography, Diuhl Ahmed 8532

305 False door tablet of Nefermaat, tablet from false door in the Museo Barracco, Rome, CM 1 (June 1938). HU–MFA Expedition photography, Diuhl Ahmed 8532

306 False door tablet of Nefermaat, tablet from false door in the Museo Barracco, Rome, CM 1 (June 1938). HU–MFA Expedition photography, Diuhl Ahmed 8532

307 False door tablet of Nefermaat, tablet from false door in the Museo Barracco, Rome, CM 1 (June 1938). HU–MFA Expedition photography, Diuhl Ahmed 8532

308 False door tablet of Nefer, tablet from false door in the Museo Barracco, Rome, CM 1 (June 1938). HU–MFA Expedition photography, Diuhl Ahmed 8532

309 False door tablet of Nefer, tablet from false door in the Museo Barracco, Rome, CM 1 (June 1938). HU–MFA Expedition photography, Diuhl Ahmed 8532

310 False door tablet of Nefer, tablet from false door in the Museo Barracco, Rome, CM 1 (June 1938). HU–MFA Expedition photography, Diuhl Ahmed 8532

311 False door tablet of Nefer, tablet from false door in the Museo Barracco, Rome, CM 1 (June 1938). HU–MFA Expedition photography, Diuhl Ahmed 8532

312 False door tablet of Nefer, tablet from false door in the Museo Barracco, Rome, CM 1 (June 1938). HU–MFA Expedition photography, Diuhl Ahmed 8532
Preface

In the course of preparing the publication of Cemetery 2100 in the Museum of Fine Arts’s Giza Mastabas Series, I came across the fragmentary slab stela from g 2120, the tomb of Seshat-sekhentiu, that was seemingly out of all proportion with its better-known counterparts from other areas of the Western Cemetery. Cemetery 2000 also contained the mysterious empty emplacement in mastaba g 2000, belonging perhaps to Sedit, the mother of the famous Merib, whose mastaba chapel was removed to Berlin by Lepsius in 1845. And finally, there was a nameless fragment from the ruins of g 2135, now located in Vienna. In order to understand these objects better, an attempt was made to collect the evidence concerning all the Giza slab stelae. The study quickly grew too large for a mere appendix to the Cemetery 2000 publication, and so the results are presented here as a separate monograph. Since the present work is not an excavation report in the traditional sense, it was deemed appropriate to publish it separately from the MFA’s Giza Mastabas Series, which currently stands at seven volumes.

I have attempted in the case of each of the fifteen stelae surveyed here to obtain or prepare new color photography, and to produce new facsimile line drawings, experimenting with computer (vector) artwork. The result of this “digital epigraphy” is that no ink was used in the production of the primary line drawings contained in the pages below. Photographs were scanned at high resolution and then “traced” on-screen using a modified version of the Chicago House method. Collation sheets in the form of laser proofs were then produced and taken to the objects themselves for collation and correction.

In order to augment the new color photography, I have also included wherever appropriate original expedition images from the Giza excavations by Ranier and Junker from the early twentieth century. In addition to general views of the various chapel areas, which today are reburied, deteriorated, or both, there are black-and-white “traced” views of the slab stela, often showing them at earlier stages of preservation than are represented in the recent color images. Even though these older images are in black and white, remains of polychromy are sometimes visible in areas that are now devoid of color. By comparing the older photography, the new color images, and the facsimile line drawings, the reader should be able to gain a better access to the stelae than hitherto has been available.

One avenue of research that I have not been able to pursue, due to the logistics involved, is an accurate analysis of color values on those stelae that preserve a suitable amount of pigment. Nor has an investigation of the chemical composition of the pigments been undertaken. This is but one indication that the following pages, despite their attempt at thoroughness, will hardly constitute the last word on the subject of the Giza slab stelae. Moreover, at the rate that new discoveries on the Giza plateau have surfaced in recent years, one should refrain from claiming that the present corpus of slab stelae is complete. Additional finds at other sites such as Dahshur, Saqqara, or Abu Roash may also provide interesting parallels to the Giza stelae discussed here.

Although brief remarks are supplied on the archaeological context of each slab stela, I have in no way attempted a comprehensive publication of each of the tombs studied below. In fact, I would like to emphasize that a detailed study and publication of each and every major mastaba at Giza is still an outstanding desideratum. All the Giza tombs have much to tell us, regardless of the presence or absence of decorated chambers or inscribed materials. Assembling all of the diverse monuments for this collection has necessitated considerable travel, which of course means that I have relied on the assistance, hospitality, professional expertise, and kindness of a host of colleagues through the world. In several cases, I was challenged by “now-mapping,” as the data in question were in transit between special exhibitions. Thus my collations often took place far from some of the sites’ normal homesteads. Since none of this work would have been possible without the support of many friends and colleagues, I am indebted to the following individuals:

Boston

I thank Rita E. Freed, Norman J. Cadogan, Curator of Art of the Ancient World, Egyptian Section, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, for her constant support of my Giza researches over many years, and her permission to publish portions of the extensive Giza excavation archives under her care. It is to her vision and foresight that we owe the continued existence of the Giza Mastabas Series.

John Wedd, Digital Imaging Specialist, Department of Intellectual Property, MFA, photographed the three slab stelae in Boston (Meretites, Seshat-sekhentiu, and Wenshet), and created the photographic composite of the separate Seshat-sekhentiu fragments (pl. 17). He and Damon Beals of the same department, produced the high-resolution scans of most of the color images of the fifteen stelae, upon which some of my epigraphy was based. Debra Lakind, Head of Rights and Licensing, Department of Intellectual Property, MFA, facilitated the use of the numerous MFA images that appear throughout the volume. For their encouragement, good humor, and patience with an often fanatical Giza fanatic, I thank my Department colleagues at the Museum of Fine Arts: Larry Birman, Daniele Dowy, Joyce Haynes, Yonnie Markowitz, Laura Gabbyl, and Sophia Telles.

Since 2000, Giza researchers in Boston have enjoyed hitherto unparalleled digital access to the Harvard University-Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Expedition Archives. The “Giza Archives Project” owes its existence to a generous grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Although not yet available to the public at the time this volume went to press, the project is already streamlining Giza research. For making this grant possible and assisting in every way with its administration, I would like to thank my colleagues at the Mellon Foundation: Angelica Zander Rudenstein, Program Officer, Museums and Conservation, Nancy Allen, Director of Museum Relations for ArtSTOR, and Julie Douglass, Program Associate, Museums and Conservation, and at the Museum of Fine Arts: Malcolm Rogers, Ann and Graham Gund Director; Katie Grettich, Deputy Director for Curatorial Administration; Museums Mellon, Susan Morris Hillis; Director of Libraries and Archives, and Diane Flores, Mellon Research Associate. Special thanks go once again to Rita Freed for graciously opening up the Giza archives to the challenges of modernization.

1. See Chapter 2, a.i.
Photographer Brian Snyder accompanied me to Egypt in 1999 and photographed the stelae of Setji-hekenet and Ini at the Port Said National Museum (April 15), and of Kaiemah at the Cairo Museum (April 17), as well as taking numerous images at the site of Giza itself.

Cairo
Special thanks are due to Zahi Hawass, Secretary General of the Supreme Council of Antiquities, who has encouraged and supported my work at Giza for several decades. For facilitating my photography and research at the Egyptian Museum, Cairo, I thank the former directors, Mohamed el-Shiriny and Mohamed Salah, and the present director, Mamtouh El-Damaty. I am also indebted to the Curator of the Old Kingdom collections, Mahmoud El-Hawagui, as well as Consultant Curator Mai Trad.

Port Said
I benefited from very kind hospitality that allowed me complete access to the two Giza slab stelae at the Port Said National Museum, for which I thank Director Madame Nashwa Hussein, and Curator of Egyptology Madame Nagah Deyab Ali.

Giza
Work on the slab stelae took place over several seasons. With each visit, I enjoyed the company and resourcefulness of Egyptologist Inspectors and officials from the Supreme Council of Antiquities. I thank Zahi Hawass, Secretary General of the SCA, who was director of the Giza Plateau during most of my field seasons; Aaral Samael has been a constant support over many years, as have Mansur Borakli, Mahmoud AFS, and Aymen Wahby Tafari. In 2003, Giza inspector Mohamed Sadek was of great assistance during much of my work in the Western Cemetery.

Berkeley
I am grateful for assistance over two decades to Joan Knudsen, Registrar of the Phoebe A. Hearst Museum of Anthropology, home of the Giza stela database. She has collaborated with the MFA. enhancing the special bond between the two museums forged by Reinier’s excavations at Giza and elsewhere. I also thank Madeline Fang, Conservator; Barbara Tavakoli, Special Projects Coordinator; and Photographer Lee Fatheree. These individuals extended every kindness during a collation visit to Berkeley (August 12–13, 1999), and went out of their way to reconstruct the many fragments of the stela of Kanefi for new photography.

Hildesheim
From the Pelizaeus Museum, I thank former Director Arne Eggert-Schmitz and Curator Bettina Schmitz for many years of shared Giza collaboration, as well as the curatorial photography of the stela of Ini. I am also indebted to the current Director, Elani Vasiliki, for her permission to publish several images of objects under her care.

New York
For permission to illustrate so many of Photographer Bruce White’s excellent color images of the Wepemnefret, Nofretet, and Nefert stelae, originally prepared for the special exhibition, “Egyptian Art in the Age of the Pyramids” (2009–2003), I thank Dorothy Arnold, Lila Acheson Wallace Curator in Charge, Department of Egyptian Art, The Metropolitan Museum of Art. During numerous research trips to the Metropolitan Museum, she and her staff have provided invaluable assistance. I am particularly grateful for the opportunity to collaborate with the Wepemnefret database during its visit to New York. I also thank members of the Egyptian Department staff for their hospitality and assistance in answering many of my research questions: Curator James F. Allen, Catharine Roehrig, and Martha Hill; and Assistant Curator Adela Oppenheim.

Richmond
I was fortunate to be able to collate the Hildesheim data of Ini at the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond, in June 1999, during the special loan exhibition “Splendors of Ancient Egypt.” For facilitating this visit (on a weekend no less), I am indebted to Richard Fasini, Chairman of the Department of Egyptian, Classical, and Ancient Middle Eastern Art.

Vienna
I am grateful for assistance over two decades to Joan Knudsen, Registrar of the Phoebe A. Hearst Museum of Anthropology, home of the Giza stela database. She has collaborated with the MFA. enhancing the special bond between the two museums forged by Reinier’s excavations at Giza and elsewhere. I also thank Madeline Fang, Conservator; Barbara Tavakoli, Special Projects Coordinator; and Photographer Lee Fatheree. These individuals extended every kindness during a collation visit to Berkeley (August 12–13, 1999), and went out of their way to reconstruct the many fragments of the stela of Kanefi for new photography.

For permission to publish photographs of objects related to the Giza stelae, I am grateful to Meghann Herlon of the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Dietrich Wildung and Karl-Franz Prinz of the Ägyptische Museum, Berlin; and Matthias Dönhöf of the Museo Egizio di Torino. Object information was generously researched in Cairo on several occasions by both Hourig Sourouzian and Cynthia Sheldom, and I thank these colleagues for interrupting their work on my behalf.

Most of the work presented here is my own, but several colleagues generously gave of their time and digital expertise to provide drawings of archaeological plans. I am particularly grateful to Ruth Bigo of Boston for redrawing several of Reinier’s original maps by computer, and to Lisa Majerus of Vienna for supplying several of the computerized plans drawn for Peter Jánosi’s forthcoming work on Giza.

I have learned from many colleagues specializing in the Old Kingdom, and I am fortunate to count their scholarly exchanges among the most pleasant memories associated with the preparation of this volume. In particular, I am grateful to Peter Jánosi, Institut für Ägyptologie der Universität Wien, for sharing so much information and so much of his knowledge. He was particularly generous in allowing me to read his Giza in der 4. Dynastie in manuscript form. For fruitful Giza discussions, and many helpful suggestions, I am likewise indebted, in no particular order, to Mirabela–Bärte Rainer Stadlmair, Hourig Sourouzian, James F. Allen, John Baines, Henry C. Fischer, Edward Browers, and Del Nord. The last three scholars mentioned were kind enough to read through and comment on preliminary versions of the manuscript. For her sharp eye, editing skills, and patience with an impatient author, I thank my wife, to whom this volume is dedicated. Any remaining typographic or other errors are solely my own responsibility.

Finally, I am deeply obliged to William Kelly Simpson, not only for his willingness to accept the present work in the Pennsylvania-Yale publication series, but for his constant encouragement and support in all my Egyptological endeavors. I was fortunate to spend my first season at Giza under his direction in 1977, and have enjoyed working at the site ever since. May the pages below be worthy of this “master of the Giza Necropolis.”

PDM
Boston, May 20, 2003
## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAe</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca, Brüssel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BdE</td>
<td>Bibliothèque d’Étude, Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMMA</td>
<td>Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA</td>
<td>British School of Archaeology in Egypt, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>circa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire, Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÄA</td>
<td>Ägyptologische Abhandlungen, Wiesbaden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÄAT</td>
<td>Ägypten und Altes Testament, Wiesbaden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>Australian Centre for Egyptology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdOr</td>
<td>Acta Orientalia, Leiden, from Vol. 21: Copenhagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAIK</td>
<td>Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, Glückstadt, Hamburg, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAG</td>
<td>American Journal of Archaeology, Baltimore, from 1897, Norwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr</td>
<td>Analecta Orientalia, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APAW</td>
<td>Abhandlungen der preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArOr</td>
<td>Archiv Orientali, Prague and Paris, vols. 31 and 13 Stuttgart and Prague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAE</td>
<td>Annales de l’Institut des Antiquités d’Égypte, Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASE</td>
<td>Archäologische Veröffentlichungen, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Abt. Kairo, vols. 1–3, Berlin, vols. 4–7, Mainz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>Archäologische Veröffentlichungen, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Abt. Kairo, vols. 1–3, Berlin, vols. 4–7, Mainz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACE</td>
<td>Bulletin of the Australian Centre for Egyptology, Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAE</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca, Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>Bibliothèque d’Étude, Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMMA</td>
<td>Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA</td>
<td>British School of Archaeology in Egypt, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>Bulletin of the Egyptian Exploration Fund, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Egypt Exploration Society, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERA</td>
<td>Egyptian Research Account, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HÄB</td>
<td>Hildesheimer Ägyptologische Beiträge, Hildesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU–BMFA</td>
<td>Harvard University–Boston Museum of Fine Arts Egyptian Expedition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAO</td>
<td>Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNES</td>
<td>Journal of Near Eastern Studies, Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kárlí</td>
<td>Kárlí, Revue d’Hellas, 1901–1902, Caire, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>Münchner Ägyptologische Studien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDAIK</td>
<td>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, pp. 462–501, vols. 31 and 13 Stuttgart and Prague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Museum of Fine Arts, Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIFAO</td>
<td>Musées publiés par les membres de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire, Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIO</td>
<td>Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMMA</td>
<td>Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMj</td>
<td>The Metropolitan Museum Journal, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAG</td>
<td>Nachrichten von der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl., Göttingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIP</td>
<td>Oriental Institute Publications, Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td>Orientalia, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBO</td>
<td>Orbis Biblius, Orientis, Fribourg, Switzerland, and Göttingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLP</td>
<td>Orientalia Loewenius Periodica, Leuven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM</td>
<td>Peter Darmannian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>Reports of the Australian Centre for Egyptology, Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REA</td>
<td>Revue d’Égypte Orientale, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAE</td>
<td>Revue d’Égyptologie, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RadTrav</td>
<td>Revue de Travaux relatifs à la Philologie et à l’Archéologie égyptiennes, Amiens, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAK</td>
<td>Studien zur Ägyptologie, Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWWW</td>
<td>Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Vienna, and Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDAIK</td>
<td>Sondernachrichten des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abt. Kairo, Mainz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABB</td>
<td>Tübingener Ägyptologische Beiträge, Bonn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thidées</td>
<td>Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ägyptens, Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Varia Aegyptiaca, San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIO</td>
<td>Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichungen, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WVDOG</td>
<td>Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft, Berlin, Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WZKM</td>
<td>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZÄS</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde, Leipzig/Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDMG</td>
<td>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Leipzig/Wiesbaden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

When the location of the Old Kingdom pyramid complex of Cheops at Giza was determined, a number of discoveries were made that shed light on the development of the Giza necropolis. The mastabas and tombs were found to be the site of many ancient burials, and the study of these tombs has been ongoing for centuries. In recent years, there has been a renewed interest in the study of the Giza stelae, with new discoveries being made and old ones being re-evaluated. This has led to a greater understanding of the cultural and historical context of these burials.

The Giza stelae are a unique and important aspect of the Giza necropolis. They are a form of relief sculpture that was used in the Old Kingdom, and they provide valuable insights into the social and cultural practices of the time. The Giza stelae are often the only decorated or inscribed surfaces from the mastaba tombs in which they were found. They are often the only inscribed objects of any kind to derive from these tombs. The beauty of the stelae was enhanced in three cases by the preservation of much of the original color schemes, and it has been observed that there are many instances of colored surfaces in the Giza stelae.

The Giza stelae provide one of the major sources for relief decoration from the reign of Khufu. In many cases, the stelae were placed in the mastaba walls, offering a unique opportunity for a comparative study of style, layout, and inscriptions. The manner in which the group sheds light on the relationship of one nucleus compared to another is also discussed. Likewise, worth considering here are the interesting lacunae, consisting of empty stelae placements (such as Fig. 2, Fig. 7), and of tombs whose placement area was destroyed by alterations to the mastabatels (or, after Khufu’s reign. Such alterations might provide one explanation for the absence of slab stelae in the Eastern Cemetery (i.e., destruction of the stela during the connection of double mastaba). Another explanation at Giza might be due to the evidence of a private phenomenon at Giza that was never used in the “royal” Eastern Cemetery.  

1 The discovery of the Old Kingdom pyramid complex of Cheops at Giza was determined, a number of discoveries were made that shed light on the development of the Giza necropolis. The mastabas and tombs were found to be the site of many ancient burials, and the study of these tombs has been ongoing for centuries. In recent years, there has been a renewed interest in the study of the Giza stelae, with new discoveries being made and old ones being re-evaluated. This has led to a greater understanding of the cultural and historical context of these burials.

The Giza stelae are a unique and important aspect of the Giza necropolis. They are a form of relief sculpture that was used in the Old Kingdom, and they provide valuable insights into the social and cultural practices of the time. The Giza stelae are often the only decorated or inscribed surfaces from the mastaba tombs in which they were found. They are often the only inscribed objects of any kind to derive from these tombs. The beauty of the stelae was enhanced in three cases by the preservation of much of the original color schemes, and it has been observed that there are many instances of colored surfaces in the Giza stelae.

The Giza stelae provide one of the major sources for relief decoration from the reign of Khufu. In many cases, the stelae were placed in the mastaba walls, offering a unique opportunity for a comparative study of style, layout, and inscriptions. The manner in which the group sheds light on the relationship of one nucleus compared to another is also discussed. Likewise, worth considering here are the interesting lacunae, consisting of empty stelae placements (such as Fig. 2, Fig. 7), and of tombs whose placement area was destroyed by alterations to the mastabatels (or, after Khufu’s reign. Such alterations might provide one explanation for the absence of slab stelae in the Eastern Cemetery (i.e., destruction of the stela during the connection of double mastaba). Another explanation at Giza might be due to the evidence of a private phenomenon at Giza that was never used in the “royal” Eastern Cemetery.  

1 The discovery of the Old Kingdom pyramid complex of Cheops at Giza was determined, a number of discoveries were made that shed light on the development of the Giza necropolis. The mastabas and tombs were found to be the site of many ancient burials, and the study of these tombs has been ongoing for centuries. In recent years, there has been a renewed interest in the study of the Giza stelae, with new discoveries being made and old ones being re-evaluated. This has led to a greater understanding of the cultural and historical context of these burials.

The Giza stelae are a unique and important aspect of the Giza necropolis. They are a form of relief sculpture that was used in the Old Kingdom, and they provide valuable insights into the social and cultural practices of the time. The Giza stelae are often the only decorated or inscribed surfaces from the mastaba tombs in which they were found. They are often the only inscribed objects of any kind to derive from these tombs. The beauty of the stelae was enhanced in three cases by the preservation of much of the original color schemes, and it has been observed that there are many instances of colored surfaces in the Giza stelae.

The Giza stelae provide one of the major sources for relief decoration from the reign of Khufu. In many cases, the stelae were placed in the mastaba walls, offering a unique opportunity for a comparative study of style, layout, and inscriptions. The manner in which the group sheds light on the relationship of one nucleus compared to another is also discussed. Likewise, worth considering here are the interesting lacunae, consisting of empty stelae placements (such as Fig. 2, Fig. 7), and of tombs whose placement area was destroyed by alterations to the mastabatels (or, after Khufu’s reign. Such alterations might provide one explanation for the absence of slab stelae in the Eastern Cemetery (i.e., destruction of the stela during the connection of double mastaba). Another explanation at Giza might be due to the evidence of a private phenomenon at Giza that was never used in the “royal” Eastern Cemetery.
Fig. 1. General view of the Western Cemetery from the top of the pyramid of Khufu, looking west. December 27, 1993. PDM, 93.129.01
The study is divided into five chapters. The primary source material is presented in Chapter 1. The new color photography and facsimile line drawings (pls. 1–30) are collected at the very beginning of this chapter for ease of reference, since the rest of the monograph depends on these large-scale illustrations. Following these plates, the chapter proceeds in catalogue fashion to discuss each individual stela, with basic information, discovery and supplementary photography, as well as notes on decoration and archaeological context.

Chapter 2 reviews the archaeological history of the Giza stelae, most of which took place in the early decades of the twentieth century. Illustrations and charts are presented here, separating stelae according to expedition and type of data, and indicating those tombs with empty data elements. Chapter 3 then follows with a summary and selective chronological overview of scholarly literature relevant to the subject. Comparative remarks on the decorative layout of the slab stelae are reserved for Chapter 4, and Chapter 5 presents some conclusions on the relative chronology and funerary significance within the Old Kingdom repertoire.

Three appendixes follow upon the five chapters listed above. Appendices 1 and 2 focus on palaeography, with the first appendix assembling the colored Hieroglyphs from three polychrome stelae,6 and the second presenting signs in line drawing from the entire Giza stelae group. Appendix 3 provides a collection of Archaic Period and Old Kingdom monuments bearing the so-called linen list, expanding and augmenting the collection assembled by William Stevenson Smith in 1935,7 but with the addition of illustrations. Indexes of personal names, titles, Egyptian words and phrases, and a concordance of objects by museum complete the volume.

6 The stelae of Hapi (stela 1, q 310), Nefer-ikher (stela 8, q 323), and Iunu (stela B, q 420).
Fig. 3. View of Cemetery 1200 looking southeast towards the pyramid of Khufu (showing mastabas 1201-1209). December, 1906. H.U.-MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, a 13033
CHAPTER I
Catalogue of the Giza Slab Stelae

The following pages summarize in catalogue format the fifteen stelae and stela fragments that form the subject of the present work. They are discussed in order by mastaba tomb number, from lowest (g 1201) to highest (g 4860). In order to maximize the reader's ability to compare the stelae with their epigraphic facsimile drawings, all fifteen examples are grouped together on the pages immediately following in large-format color plates (left-hand page), accompanied by digital epigraphy (right-hand page) without the distraction of text or commentary. In some cases, the line drawings use color to differentiate between carved and painted decoration (see plates 2, 12, and 26) or between preserved and restored areas (see esp. plate 38).

Following upon these plates are the catalogue “entries” on each of the stelae, divided into discrete sections set off in red type:

- Tomb owner
- Provenance
- Excavation history
- Current location
- Material
- Measurements
- Selected field photography
- Translation
- Description and commentary
- Date

At the risk of redundancy but in the hope of avoiding confusion, an effort has been made to repeat tomb numbers and tomb-owner names together. Since some Giza tombs possess as many as three numbers (e.g., g 282 = XIin = g 6770), this repetition was deemed essential. Comparative discussion between different stelae is held to a minimum in the present chapter; more extensive remarks may be found below in Chapter 4.

The collection of fifteen stelae in large-format color plates and digital drawings, additional photography accompanying the translations and descriptions in this chapter, black-and-white discovery photographs, “studio” images from the early twentieth century taken at “Harvard Camp” west of the Giza Pyramids and Sphinxes, detailed views, tomb plans, and recent color photography of Giza will all intend to round out the context of the stelae from as many areas as possible. Since the condition of some of the stelae has changed between 2001 (the year the first slab stela was discovered) and the present day, these multiple illustrations should help the reader track such changes since their excavation. At this writing, several of the stela replacement areas remain buried at Giza, while it was my original intention to re-excavate these areas, primarily for purposes of photography, this task will have to be undertaken at a future time.

A few words might be added by way of orientation. Two basic stela forms may be determined at Giza, a smaller, “short form” used for nine of the fifteen preserved examples, and a wider, “long form,” with an expanded number of offerings, used for six stelae (see fig. 213). In order to enlarge the illustrations in plates 1–30 below to full page size, the short- and long-form stelae necessitated different reproduction scales. In fact, the horizontal, or “landscape” format of the slab stela determined the horizontal format of the present monograph; a vertical format would have necessitated unwanted reductions in the illustrations or constantly forced the reader to rotate the publication ninety degrees.

In order to discuss the decoration scheme used, I have divided the decorative layout of each stela into four sections (see fig. 4), and color-coded them for ease of reference and comparison. The data translations follow this order, from Sections a–d, and additional, smaller-format, colorized line drawings accompany each translation. The individual section translations are likewise keyed to align to this color coding system. The data sections are distinguished and color-coded as follows:

Section a
- The overhead identifying text, placed at the top of the stela

Section b
- The funerary ritual at the left-side seated figure (before the table of offerings towards)

Section c
- Table of offerings, located centrally

Section d
- The scene at the right, adjacent to the data

Some elements might not fit into one or another section as consistently as one might prefer. For example, the ewer and basin, often accompanied by the libating hand sign, could be associated with the seated tomb-owner (Section a), rather than with the offerings (Section c), but I have chosen the latter association in the present work. Moreover, these signs are transliterated and translated, while others in Section c, such as trussed ducks or cuts of meat on trays, are left untranslated, taken as ideographic items only.

Most of the lines of text on the stelae have not been numbered, but in the case of some of the longer inscriptions, text line and column numbers have been added to the color-coded line drawings.

Note that in some instances the modern color photograph betrays damage that has occurred since the time of excavation. Hence if the epigraphic drawings show certain details that appear now to be missing from the stela, they are based on original expedition photography (rather than the new color images) from the first decade of the twentieth century.

For an older but similar division scheme, see Vandier, Manuel 1, p. 766. For comparative remarks on the decorative program of the four sections, see Chapter 4 below.
Plate 1. Stela 1, g 3032. Photograph by Bruce White
Plate 10. Stela 5 @ 2234 Kaurnah. Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 37725 (77588)
Plate 13. Stela 7, g. 3227 Sekhi-hekenet. Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 37596 (59127); on loan to Port Said National Museum, P 4082. Photograph by Brian Snyder, 2009.
Plate 15. Stela 8: G 12381/4, Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 37727 (57127 bis); on loan to Port Said National Museum, P 4083. Photograph by Brian Snyder, 1999.
Plate 16. Stela 8: § 1235 Ini. Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 37727 (57127 bis); Port Said National Museum, P 4069
Plate 18. Stela 9 of Seshat-sekhentiu. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 06.1894
Plate 19. Stela 10: g 225 (= V1irn, g 4709) anonymous. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, AS 7799. Photograph courtesy Kunsthistorisches Museum.
Plate 20. Stela 10: 1235 (= Villers 4770). Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, ÄS 7799
Plate 23. Stela 12, § 480 Meretites. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 12.1510. Photograph by John Woolf
Plate 30. Stela 15 (4860 (© VIII)). Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, ÄS 8549.
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Slab Stela 1 (pls. 1-2)

Owner: Wp-m-nfrt, Wepemnefret

Provenance: Cemetery 1200, 1905

Excavated from the expedition of G.A. Reisner, 1905

Material: Painted limestone, raised relief carving

Measurements: h. 45.7 cm; w. 66 cm; th. 7.6 cm

Selected bibliography:
- Giza 1, p. 386, pl. 17a
- H.F. Lutz, no. 1, pl. 1
- W.S. Smith, 16 (1963), pp. 2–13 and cover (color)
- idem, pp. 160, 255–58, 268, 302, pls. 32b and A (and cf. figs. 257–59 below)
- L. Die Reliefs des Alten Reiches (Heidelberg, 1915; reprint Hildesheim, 1982), pp. 8, fig. 5, 131, fig. 104
- N. Cherpion, Mastabas et Hypogées d’Ancien Empire. Le Problème de la Datation PDM (Brussels, 1989), pl. 18 (detail)
- J. Vandier, Manuel d’Archéologie Egyptienne (Paris, 1952), p. 762 fig. 506 (drawing); Egyptian Art in the Age of the Pyramids (New York, 2009), cat. 52, pp. 245–46
- D. Arnold, When the Pyramids Were Built. Egyptian Art of the Old Kingdom in the Age of the Pyramids (New York, 2009), pls. 5–6

Translation

Section a:

1. "Commander of the king’s scribes," translation uncertain
2. "priest of Seshat, foremost of the archive(s) of the keeper of the king’s property"
3. "priest of the gods of the king’s property, overseer of fishers, priest of the northern Horus, priest of the king’s property, overseer of fishers of the great one of the Tens of Upper Egypt, heka-priest of Mahty, priest of Haqet, priest of Har, king’s son (4) Wepemnefret"
Section b:
(5) "a thousand pieces of cloth, a thousand alabaster vessels, a thousand loaves of bread, a thousand jars of beer, a thousand antelopes, a thousand oxen"

Section c:
(8) "implements for washing hands, a thousand of incense, a thousand bowls of green eye-paint, a thousand bowls of black eye-paint, a thousand containers of best ointment, a thousand jars of wine, a thousand bowls of zizyphus, green sekhet-cakes, a thousand bowls of carob beans, a thousand bowls of figs, a thousand containers of prepared grain, white sekhet-cakes, a thousand bowls of persea fruit, a thousand jars of ale, a thousand jars of milk, a thousand jars of date wine, a thousand loaves of zizyphus, and every sweet thing"

Section d:
(idmy) linen: a thousand of 4 (cubits wide), a thousand of 3 (cubits wide), a thousand of 2 (cubits wide), a thousand of 1 (cubit wide)
sesher linen: a thousand of 4 (cubits wide), a thousand of 3 (cubits wide), a thousand of 2 (cubits wide), a thousand of 1 (cubit wide)
fine linen: a thousand of 4 (cubits wide), a thousand of 3 (cubits wide), a thousand of 2 (cubits wide), a thousand of 1 (cubit wide)
aa-linen: a thousand of 100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 40 (cubits wide), a thousand of 30 (cubits wide)

Description and commentary:
The Harvard–MFA Expedition Photographic Registers for the earliest years rarely list more than a year; month and day dates are often lacking. But a letter from Reisner to Phoebe Apperson Hearst, dated to March 25, 1905, just after the letter’s visit to Harvard Camp, mentions the Wepemnefret stela as only just discovered; see below, Chapter 2. We can thus pinpoint the discovery of Wepemnefret’s slab to early March, 1905. Comboration for this fact comes from an unpublished report by Reisner housed in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, dated to December 30, 1906, and entitled “First Report of the Expedition of Harvard University and the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, 1906–7.” It notes in the caption to a photograph of the slab, “The shaft of Prince Wepemnefret. Found in March 1905. Now in San Francisco.” The chapel of Wepemnefret, however, seems to have been excavated already in 1904, to judge from photographic illustrating another (earlier) unpublished report by Reisner on the Hearst Expedition, presumably from 1904. Page 3 shows a general view of the Western Cemetery already cleared by 1904, with the monolithic false-door of Wepemnefret’s chapel clearly visible in the left background (Fig. 18). The unpublished report dated the image to May 1, 1904, but the most likely more accurate Photographic Register lists April 24, 1904.

The deceased sits on a bull-legged stool with an elaborately painted papyrus umbel terminal and long cushion, which protrudes towards the back. He wears a long, shoulder-length wig (occurring only once more in our group, in the stela of 1
2. On the choice of transliteration „idmy“ instead of „¡t¡wy“, see below, Chapter 4, discussion of Section d (linen lists).
3. On the distinction between the only signs with horizontal base versus those without, see below, Chapters 3 and 4.
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Fig. 7. Plan of the mastaba of Wepemnefret, g 1201, after Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, Map 4. Redrawn by Ruth Bigio.

Fig. 8. General view of the Western Cemetery with the excavated chapel of Wepemnefret, g 1201, indicated at left. April 24, 1904. HU-MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, a 10865.

Fig. 9. Excavated chapel of Wepemnefret, g 1201, looking west from top of g 252, South end. March, 1904. HU-MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, a 10896.
Fig. 10. Chapel of Wepemnefret, q 3201, with plaster covering over slab stela, looking southwest. March, 1905. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, s 11072.

Fig. 11. Chapel of Wepemnefret, q 3201, general view of exposed slab stela and subsequent monolithic false door, looking southwest. 1904–1905. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, s 11591.

Fig. 12. Chapel of Wepemnefret, q 3201, with slab stela exposed, looking southwest. 1905. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, s 11810.

Fig. 13. Chapel of Wepemnefret, q 3201, experimental photographic composite of recent slab stela photograph repositioned within original excavation photograph. Based on color slab stela photograph by Bruce White from 1998, and HU–MFA Expedition photograph s 11591 from 1905 (above, fig. 12). Digital composite by the author.
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Fig. 14. Four phases of chapel development of Wepemnefret, G 1201, after P. Jánosi. Drawing by Liza Majerus

Fig. 15. Chapel of Wepemnefret, G 1201, reburied with top of false door just visible, looking west. April 22, 1999. PDM, 99.3.13

The mastaba of Wepemnefret dwarfs the neighboring tombs of Cemetery 1200 and ranks, along with G 2000, G 4000, and G 2220, among the largest mastabas in the entire Western Cemetery. This one-shaft mastaba (Reisner’s type IIa)25 was originally equipped with a simple mud-brick chapel at the southern end of the east wall, for which the slab stela formed the cult focus (fig. 7). Presumably late in the reign of Khufu, subsequent alterations resulted in the walling up of the stela and the addition of a stone chapel with monolithic false door and four principal chambers completed in mud brick (fig. 34). The mastaba core was extended on the east side. Rather than remove or destroy the slab stela in the course of expanding the chapel area, the ancient artisans carefully covered the piece with a slab of lime and then filled the entire area with rubble. The monolithic false door was then set in front of it, and the stela’s magical efficacy could thus continue despite the new cult focus in the form of the false door a few meters farther south along the east wall (figs. 12–13).

Thanks to this protective covering over four and a half millennia, the stela is by far the best preserved of the entire group considered in the present study. In walling up the slab stela, Wepemnefret


17 For a jar stand of similar shape from Giza (tomb of Seni-wehem, G 2132, see below, Chapter 4, fig. 222). Additional stands were discovered in situ before the chapel offering niches of Khufu-nakht (G 1205; figs. 39–40) and Meryhetepef (G 4360; fig. 197 = Junker, Gîza 1, pl. 8b).


20 I have not been able to determine the location of this covering slab, assuming that it survived its removal intact. Undecorated though it was, it is nevertheless possible that Reisner would simply have discarded it.
set the pattern followed by several mastaba owners in the West-
ern Cemetery, such as Kaimef (q 1223), presumably Nefret-
iabet (q 1225), and Seshat-sekhentiu (q 2120), and Iunu (q 225),

Wepemnefret's situation stands a common pattern in
motion in some ways, his stela, on the other hand, is absolutely
unique in a host of others. The stela shows a number of
features that are absent from all fourteen others. It is the largest
stela of Cemetery 1200, just as the entire mastaba (q 1201)
is the largest as well (see below, Chapter 4). The twelve titles
listed vary greatly, according to the different thicknesses of
its wall paint, what is carved from what is merely painted. In pl. 2
I have tried to indicate in a schematic fashion the major
deviations in what is carved compared to what is painted,

1201
TELE
EPEMNEFRET

The stela shows a number of elements absent from all fourteen others. It is the largest stela of Cemetery 1200, just as the entire mastaba (q 1201) is the largest as well (see below, Chapter 4). The twelve titles listed vastly outnumber those carved on any of the other stelae. ... to have more in common with its archaic predecessors at other sites than with its Giza counterparts in Cemetery 1200.

The stela shows a number of elements absent from all fourteen others. It is the largest stela of Cemetery 1200, just as the entire mastaba (q 1201) is the largest as well (see below, Chapter 4). The twelve titles listed vastly outnumber those carved on any of the other stelae.

Perhaps surprising in some instances are the changes in
color scheme. The fruits or grains in the basket sign (M 39) are
green in most words, but yellow in Seshat-sekhentiu (q 2120), and Iunu (q 225), ... variations in how the linen is listed.

For example, the offering table raised off the floor, the
pattern on the bull-legged stool, alternating green and black
triangles on the lower halves of the plant stems
plant in line 3 are merely painted, not carved at all. The buds on the sprouting leaves to either side alternate in a black–red–black pattern, with the number and positioning of the buds differing dramatically between the carved and painted versions.

In the word mšff further to the left has been enlarged considerably in the painted over the carved version. The interior detailing of the quilted chis, both in Wepemnefret's name (line 4) and in the word mšff in Section c, are one pattern
in carving, another in painting. The part of the lion in
Section c in the word mšff has received a joint or bone spur in
black at the back of its forepaw, and facial whiskers absent from the carving. The horizonta crosslines on the three stools (line 4
and Section c) are sometimes carved, sometimes painted, or both, in differing numbers. The circular fruits or grains ...

Perhaps surprising in some instances are the changes in
color scheme. The fruits or grains in the basket sign (M 39) are
green in most words, but yellow in Seshat-sekhentiu (q 2120), and Iunu (q 225), where uncarved vertical separators between the
flagstaffs are absent from all but one of the other stelae.

For example, the offering table raised off the floor, the
pattern on the bull-legged stool, alternating green and black
triangles on the lower halves of the plant stems
plant in line 3 are merely painted, not carved at all. The buds on the sprouting leaves to either side alternate in a black–red–black pattern, with the number and positioning of the buds differing dramatically between the carved and painted versions.
Records are scarce on the early treatment of the stela of Wepemnefret. In 1940, William Stevenson Smith was in contact with the museum authorities in Berkeley about the possible formation of salt crystals on the surface of the relief. Nineteen years later, Bernard V. Bothmer examined the stela in “total darkness with a pocket flashlight” and discerned the presence of minute saline crystals. Correspondence between the Museum of Fine Arts and the Hearst (then Lowie) Museum in April/May, 1959, resulted in shipping the stela to Boston for conservation treatment by William Young of the MFA Conservation Laboratory. Although detailed records of his procedures are yet to surface, this period did afford Smith the opportunity for a closer examination of the stela, resulting in the article he published in Archaeology. Smith noticed a short, worn inscription on the upper edge of the stela, and wondered if a phyle name was mentioned, but K. Baer noted that it is Wepemnefret’s name. No mention of this inscription has surfaced in Reisner’s original excavation records. At the end of the 1990s the stela again received conservation attention in preparation for loan to the Old Kingdom special exhibition, “Egyptian Art in the Age of the Pyramids,” held in Paris, New York, and Toronto.

Date: Cemetery 1200 may well be the earliest of the nucleus cemeteries to the west of the Great Pyramid. Contrary to the rest of the cemetery, here the tombs developed, not from west to east, but from east to west, possibly to escape the construction chaos. Examples of incised typographic errors are not unknown in the slab stelae, and our first example occurs in line 11, in the word for “wine,” written ꞃpr instead of ꞃrp. ꞃt appears in col. 13.

Towards the very bottom of the linen list (Section d) one item shows the stßr, or 100-sign (g 1225), and two categories. It was most likely supplied in paint between the horizontals of the 1 and ꞃ signs. Note that one of the double ꞃt signs is thus reversed in every line in which it appears in the Giza stela group, with the exception of stela 15, whose linen list in toto is reversed. Note also the reversal of this sign (and both ꞃt signs) in V 4.

Historians of the Giza Slab Stele, cat. 52, and D. Arnold, When the Pyramids were Built, Egyptian Art of the Old Kingdom (New York, 1999), pp. 48–49, figs. 36–37.

30 The same reversed orientation for the sign appears within a square bolt of fringed cloth. This item also appears on the stelae of Kanefer (g 1203), Iunu (g 4150; no longer visible today; see fig. 153), and g 4860 (anonymous). Note also the reversal of this sign (and both ꞃt signs) in V 4. The ꞃt sign is reversed in every line list in which it appears in the Giza stela group, with the exception of stela 15, whose linen list in toto is reversed.
that must have surrounded the Great Pyramid well into Khufu's reign. The easternmost group, consisting of g 1201, g 1203, g 1205, and g 1225 are posted by Reisner to date to within the first five years of Khufu's reign, although Jánosi has shown that Reisner's divisions of years 5, 10, and 15 for more precise dating under Khufu are difficult to confirm at best. Graffiti from the tombs of Kanefer (g 1203) naming njw-ḥsbt ðwm zw 5(?), and Khufu-nakht (g 1205) naming ỉr-m∂dw ™prw further support the early date for this group. Wepemnefret's stela differs so markedly from those of his contemporaries that I would suggest it marks the transitional phase between cemetery decoration prior to Giza, and the new Giza paradigm as determined by Khufu. Too many features occur on Wepemnefret's stela that align him retroactively with his predecessors from Meidum, Dahshur, and Saqqara, and contrast him with his successors in the Western Cemetery. Despite Barta's arguments placing g 1203 towards the end of Dynasty 4, the tomb is more likely datable to the very earliest years following the original layout of the necropolis. A date to within Khufu's first few years for Wepemnefret's stela's emplacement fits well with the archaeological and inscriptive context.

Fig. 17. Facsimile drawing of the Wepemnefret stela from g 1201, showing major painted areas with carved areas removed.

Fig. 18. Detail of Section a of the Wepemnefret stela from g 1201. Hearst Museum of Anthropology and the Metropolitan Museum of Art. 1998.

Bruce White
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Fig. 20. The same detail as in fig. 19. Hearst Museum of Anthropology and Metropolitan Museum of Art. 1998. Bruce White

Fig. 19. Detail from the Wepemnefret stela, g 1201, showing preservation of garment polychromy. 1905. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, gr 11762

Fig. 22. Detail of Sections a and c of the Wepemnefret stela from g 1201. Hearst Museum of Anthropology and Metropolitan Museum of Art. 1998. Bruce White

Fig. 21. Detail of Section c of the Wepemnefret stela from g 1201. Hearst Museum of Anthropology and Metropolitan Museum of Art. 1998. Bruce White

Fig. 23. Detail of Section c of the Wepemnefret stela from g 1201. Hearst Museum of Anthropology and Metropolitan Museum of Art. 1998. Bruce White

Fig. 24. Detail of Sections a and c of the Wepemnefret stela from g 1201. Hearst Museum of Anthropology and Metropolitan Museum of Art. 1998. Bruce White
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Slab Stela 2 (pls. 3-4)

Owner: K£-nfr, Kanefer (1)

Provenance: Cemetery 1200: g 1203

Excavation history: Hearst Expedition, University of California, under G.A. Reisner, February-May, 1904; found “partly in chapel and partly in the walls of an intermediate pit in the chapel of 1235”

Current location: Phoebe A. Hearst Museum of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, 6-1980

Material: Limestone; raised relief carving

Measurements: h. 38 cm; w. 52.9 cm; th. 7.3 cm

Selected bibliography: PM III, p. 57; G.A. Reisner and C.S. Fisher, ASAE 13 (1914), pl. 4a; Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, p. 390, pl. 17b; W.S. Smith, Archaeology 16 (1963), p. 6, fig. 6

Translation

Section a:
(3) imy-r upyt hrwy (Kanefer) K£-nfr

“Overseer of commisions, controller of bowcase bearers, Kanefer”

Section b:
(2) nfr, nw∂w nfr, †rp nfr

“a thousand alabaster vessels,” “a thousand oxen,” “a thousand antelopes,” “a thousand geese and tjerep-

Section c:
(1) smt, ¡™ ™wy, s∞pt, ¡rp, db£, ¡ßd

“container of cool water, implements for washing hands, skin-pat-drink, wine, fig, parasfut”


This stela replaces the slab stela from tomb 247; cf. Z. Saad, “Les mesures des étoffes à l’ancien empire,” pp. 93–94. On the choice of transliteration K£-nfr instead of K£-twy, see below, Chapter 4, discussion of Section a (four linen).
It is a short-form slab stela. An interesting feature on this stela is the linen list division, where each amount is indicated within its own fringed cloth. One fringed cloth appears at the bottom of Wepemnefret’s linen list (g 1201). Several more were once visible on the stela of Khufu-nakht (g 428). But Kanefer’s stela provides the most clearly carved example.

Kanefer’s tomb is one of only three in our group to preserve a slab stela and a reserve head (see Chapter 2, fig. 175); the others are Meretites (g 4140) and Wenshet (g 4940). Kanefer’s reserve head, now in the Hearst Museum, Berkeley (acc. no. 6–19767), is included here, along with a profile drawing by Astrid Runggaldier (figs. 30–31).

A Fourth Dynasty pair statue of a Kanefer and Iy-nefret was discovered at a tomb identified as g 1203. The statue and the slab stela do bear two titles in common, but the pair statue contains several more not attested in the stela. Moreover, there is no provision in the tomb of g 1203 for a second burial. If Iy-nefret was indeed the spouse of this Kanefer, one might expect an annex and additional burial shaft to the north of the mastaba core, as is found in the cases of g 1223, g 1227, and g 1233. With very few exceptions, the slab stela tombs preserve no other inscribed objects besides the stelae themselves; the pair statue of Kanefer and Iy-nefret would constitute a major exception to this trend. Without additional evidence, then, it seems prudent to withhold identification of the Kanefer of the Louvre pair statue with the owner of g 1203.

Description and commentary: The mud-brick chapel enclosing the slab stela was a barrel-vaulted series of four or five rooms (figs. 25–29). The fragmentary stela portrays the tomb owner seated on an adult-legged stool placed upon a small, most likely vaulted from above. Only two other stelae delay the deceased in a similar fashion (g 1207, Nefer, and g 250, Seshat-sekhentiu). The papyrus umbel terminal is damaged but clearly detailed; no cushion is visible on the seat stool. Kanefer wears a short, sleeveless wig and a long, tight-fitting garment that was presumably painted to match the leopard-skin pattern still preserved on the stelae of Wepemnefret (g 1201) and Ninet-abet (g 1225). With his right hand he reaches out toward the table of bread loaves, while with his left he grasps his shoulder knot in his clenched fist. The table contains eight half-loaves on the left, but only seven half-loaves on the right. This asymmetry also occurs with seven and six half-loaves on the stela of Khufu-nakht (g 1201) and Ashen (below, Chapter 4, fig. 228). The linen list occupies the entire right third of the stela, with room for four whole falcons. In place of vertical separators for the individual compartments and quantities of linen, the list uses fringed cloths with numbers inside as natural “compartments.” There is no separation between these as they are divided each row of cloths. Kanefer’s name and titles appear in a single horizontal line over his head. Some hieroglyphs are particularly finely carved and detailed, among them the and of , with interior zigzagging lines for the former and crease lines in the palm of the latter. The jar determinative for beneath the offering table also shows an interesting swirl pattern, presumably in imitation of alabaster veining. The stela was found in 10–20 fragments, and had to be temporarily reassembled at the Hearst Museum in Berkeley for the photograph on pl. 3. It is a short-form slab stela.

An interesting feature on this stela is the linen list division, where each amount is indicated within its own fringed cloth. One fringed cloth appears at the bottom of Wepemnefret’s linen list (g 1201). Several more were once visible on the stela of Khufu-nakht (g 428). But Kanefer’s stela provides the most clearly carved example.

Kanefer’s tomb is one of only three in our group to preserve a slab stela and a reserve head (see Chapter 2, fig. 175); the others are Meretites (g 4140) and Wenshet (g 4940). Kanefer’s reserve head, now in the Hearst Museum, Berkeley (acc. no. 6–19767), is included here, along with a profile drawing by Astrid Runggaldier (figs. 30–31).

A Fourth Dynasty pair statue of a Kanefer and Iy-nefret was discovered at a tomb identified as g 1203. The statue and the slab stela do bear two titles in common, but the pair statue contains several more not attested in the stela. Moreover, there is no provision in the tomb of g 1203 for a second burial. If Iy-nefret was indeed the spouse of this Kanefer, one might expect an annex and additional burial shaft to the north of the mastaba core, as is found in the cases of g 1223, g 1227, and g 1233. With very few exceptions, the slab stela tombs preserve no other inscribed objects besides the stelae themselves; the pair statue of Kanefer and Iy-nefret would constitute a major exception to this trend. Without additional evidence, then, it seems prudent to withhold identification of the Kanefer of the Louvre pair statue with the owner of g 1203.

Due to an error in the catalogue entry for the stela of Kanefer (g 1203), naming râ-imá (now g 70), “year of the 8th occurrence,” the 3rd month of Imi, day 50,” and another from that of Khufu-nakht, naming râ-mâs (now g 149), “year of the 8th occurrence, […] month of Imi, day 50,” and another from that of Khufu-nakht, naming râ-mâs (now g 149), “year of the 8th occurrence, […] month of Imi, day 50,” and another from that of Khufu-nakht, naming râ-mâs (now g 149), “year of the 8th occurrence, […] month of Imi, day 50,” and another from that of Khufu-nakht, naming râ-mâs (now g 149), “year of the 8th occurrence, […] month of Imi, day 50,” and another from that of Khufu-nakht, naming râ-mâs (now g 149), “year of the 8th occurrence, […] month of Imi, day 50,” and another from that of Khufu-nakht, naming râ-mâs (now g 149), “year of the 8th occurrence, […] month of Imi, day 50.”
nakt (q 1203) naming Hen-m∂dew ppr seem to support the early date for the group of five earliest tombs constructed in Cemetery 1200.  

This interpretation is supported by the location of the tomb at the eastern edge of Cemetery 1200, which developed from east to west. However, our uncertainty over the regularity of the biennial census renders some of these graffiti less helpful than is often supposed.

The Kanefer block was actually discovered, not in 1904-1905 during the original excavation of the mastaba, but in 1938 by W. S. Smith "in trench dug in filling of q 1203, in search for another shaft." It is described in the Expedition’s Object Register as “38–2–5... fragment of white limestone; three worked surfaces, one smooth with inscription (date) in red ink” (see figs. 32–33). If Reisner noted that it might belong to the lining of the burial chamber.

Assigning this text to Khufu is beyond doubt, but the disturbed context is unfortunate. We might conclude that q 1203, along with its slab stela, dates to the first decade of Khufu’s reign.

---


Fig. 28. Chapel of Kanefer, g. 1203, looking southwest from the mastaba of g. 1201. April 22, 1999. PDM, 99.4.28

Fig. 29. Slab stela emplacement in g. 1203. April 22, 1999. PDM, 99.4.28

Fig. 30. Reserve head of Kanefer from g. 1203; Hearst Museum of Anthropology, Berkeley, 6–30/71. 1988. Bruce White

Fig. 31. Profile view of reserve head of Kanefer from g. 1203. Drawing by Astrid Runggaldier, 1997

Fig. 32. Block with date graffito from the mastaba of Kanefer, g. 1203. MFA 38–2–5. January 24, 2003 PDM

Fig. 33. Graffito from the mastaba of Kanefer, g. 1203, after Smith, JNES 11 (1952), p. 118, fig. 6 (MFA 38–2–5)
Slab Stela a 3 (pls. 5–6)

Owner: Hufuf-nte, Khufu-nakht

Provenance: Cemetery 1200, g 536

Excavated from history: Hearst Expedition, University of California, under G.A. Reisner, April, 1904, discovered in situ into emplacement in chapel niche

Current location: Phoebe A. Hearst Museum of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, 6–1976

Material: Painted limestone; raised relief carving

Measurements: h. 38 cm; w. 52.6 cm; th. 8.2 cm

Junker, Gîza 1, p. 28, lists the following measurements: h. 38.1 cm; w. 52.7 cm; th. 8.25 cm

PM III, p. 57; Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, pp. 393–94, pl. 18a; N. Cherpion, Mastabas et Hypogées d’Ancien Empire: Le Problème de la Datation (Brussels, 1989), pl. 27 (detail); J. Vandier, Manuel d’Archéologie Egyptienne 1 (Paris, 1950), p. 562, fig. 565

Translation

Section a

1) “Keeper of the king’s property, Khufu-nakht”

Section b

(1) “a thousand alabaster vessels, (2) a thousand oxen, a thousand antelopes, a thousand geese and tjerep-geese”

Section c

(3) “container of cool water, implements for washing hands, (4) fine linen: a thousand of 100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 80 (cubits wide), a thousand of 70 (cubits wide), a thousand of 60 (cubits wide), a thousand of 50 (cubits wide), a thousand of 40 (cubits wide)”

Section d

(5) “sea fruit, carob bean”

Translation

Section a

1) “idemy-linen: a thousand of 100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 80 (cubits wide), a thousand of 70 (cubits wide), a thousand of 60 (cubits wide), a thousand of 50 (cubits wide), a thousand of 40 (cubits wide)”

Section b

(1) “idemy-linen: a thousand of 100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 80 (cubits wide), a thousand of 70 (cubits wide), a thousand of 60 (cubits wide), a thousand of 50 (cubits wide), a thousand of 40 (cubits wide)”

Section c

(4) “vessels, implement for washing hands, purification of 4 pellets of natron, (5) incense, best ointment, green eye-paint, (6) zizyphus, wine, pears, fruit, cloth”

Section d

(1) “idemy-linen: a thousand of 100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 80 (cubits wide), a thousand of 70 (cubits wide)"
Description and commentary: A mud-brick chapel consisting of five chambers surrounded the slab stela niche in the mastaba's east wall. Two separate offering basins were found just in front of the slab stela niche (figs. 36–40). The basins are complete except for some erosion on the center right (obscuring portions of the linen list), and a deeper depression running across the top left half, although all hieroglyphs are accounted for. The deceased sits on a lion-legged stool, one of only three such examples in the slab stela group. The papyrus umbel terminal is well delineated, but no cushion appears on the seat. Khufu-nakht wears a short, valanced wig and a long, tight-fitting garment that was presumably painted to match the leopard-skin pattern still preserved on the stelae of Wepemnefret (g 1201) and Nefret-iabet (g 1225). With his right hand he reaches out toward the table of bread loaves, while with his left he grasps his shoulder in his clenched fist. Like the offering table of Kanefer (g 1203), the sliced half-loaves of bread appear asymmetrical: seven half-loaves are at the left, with only six at the right. The linen list occupies the entire right side of the stela, with room for five falcons. Khufu-nakht's name and lone title appear in a single horizontal line over his head, the rest of the central upper area is taken with the list of offerings.

Modelling is only apparent on the legs of the lion-legged stool. Traces of red coloring for Khufu-nakht's flesh tones survive on his ankles and right arm, as well as a number of hieroglyphs. A bluish green survives on several "plant signs", the eye determinatives for green and black eye-paint, and selected horizontal register lines in the linen list. The stela is a "short-form" slab stela. Vertical separators divide the width indications of the linen, but not the | signs in the bottom of each of the four linen types. Furthermore, the lowest row (|=|linen) has no completed separators at all. This is either an oversight or evidence of the incomplete nature of the carving. The cartouche of Khufu-nakht's name is the only preserved cartouche in the present stela group, and provides a terminus ante quem for the tomb.

On the quail chick (w™¢) in w™¢, "carob bean," the rear talon (pointing towards the linen list) has been added as an incised afterthought, once the talons had already been carved similar to those of an owl (|=|hieroglyph, i.e., with no rear talon). All | signs are reversed, including the nine for most of the stelae in the Giza group under discussion (see fig. 36).

Date: Both the cartouche of Khufu in the personal name and a lining block found in the shaft that names Ìr-m∂dw ™prw confirm the date for the group of earlier tombs in Cemetery 1200, a fact further supported by this Cemetery’s development from east to west. Jánosi has demonstrated that localizing the date to within Khufu’s first five years is, contrary to Reisner, next to impossible. The lack of vertical separators in the linen list might seem to be an archaic holdover that would link the stela chronologically with those of Wepem-nefret (g 1203) and Kanefer (g 1203). On the other hand, the lion-legged stool contrasts with the bull-legged stools appearing in all other Cemetery 1200 slab steles with the exception of Nefret-iabet (g 1225). A date towards the end of the first decade, or beginning of the second, of the reign of Khufu would best fit the evidence.

The other two lion-legged stools belong to Nefer (g 1207) and Seshat-sekhentiu (g 2120).


P. Jánosi, Giza in der 4. Dynastie (Vienna, forthcoming), § 2.3.4 ("Die Entwicklung der Grabfelder").
Chapter 1: Catalogue of the Giza Slab Stelae

Fig. 36. Plan of the mastaba of Khufu-nakht, g 1205, after Reisner, Giza Necropolis I, Map 4. Drawing by Ruth Bigio.

Fig. 37. Chapel area of g 1205, looking north. February, 1906. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, a 11636.

Fig. 38. Chapel area of g 1205, looking northwest. April 22, 1999. ROM, 99.5.12.

Fig. 39. Chapel area of g 1205, looking northeast. February, 1906. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, a 11636.
Fig. 40. Chapel area of g 1205, looking down (east) from top of mastaba. June, 1904. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, b 10770

Fig. 41. Slab stela in situ, looking west. April, 1904. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, c 11397

Fig. 42. Empty emplacement, looking west. April 25, 1999. PDM, 99.11.8
Chapter 1: Catalogue of the Giza Slab Stelae

Silab Stela 4 (pl. 7–8)

Owner: Nfr, Nefer (2)

Provenance: Cemetery 1200, g 207

Excavated in 1904 by the Hearst Expedition, University of California, under G.A. Reisner. Found in situ in a chapel niche.

Current Location: Phoebe A. Hearst Museum of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley. 5, 1980

Material: Painted limestone; raised relief carving

Measurements: h. 38 cm; w. 50.8 cm; th. 8.2 cm


Translation

Section a:

(1) “Acquaintance of the king, Nefer”

Section b:

(2) “a thousand alabaster vessels, a thousand pieces of cloth”

Section c:

(3) “container of cool water, implements for washing hands, purification of 3 pellets of natron, (4) purification of 1 incense pelte, (5) black eye paint, (6) zizyphus, leaf of zizyphus, pomegranate fruit, (7) canabean, green skin cases”

Translation

Section a:

(1) “Acquaintance of the king, Nefer”

Section b:

(2) “a thousand alabaster vessels, a thousand pieces of cloth”

Section c:

(3) “container of cool water, implements for washing hands, purification of 3 pellets of natron, (4) purification of 1 incense pelte, (5) black eye paint, (6) zizyphus, leaf of zizyphus, pomegranate fruit, (7) canabean, green skin cases”

Notes:

1. Reisner (pl. 1, p. 361): “The beautiful one”

2. Reisner (unpublished report on the work of the Hearst Expedition, most likely dating to 1904, p. 67, fig. 94)
The stela was set in a niche between two thick mud-brick walls, possibly the only original wall from the chapel, since the subsequent construction of 1206 forced a number of alterations (figs. 45–46).

The complete stela is the first of the group to depict a woman. Nefer (often translated Nefret) sits on a lion-legged stool with exquisitely detailed modeling and a large papyrus umbel terminal but no seat cushion (fig. 50). She, like Kanefer (g 1203; stela 2) and Seshat-sekhentiu (g 2120; see below), is placed upon a raised mat/platform, although the table before her remains on the ground line. Nefer’s right hand extends towards the offering loaves, as do the right hands of all stela owners, but her left is open against her chest. This is the customary pose for all the females in the group; even when they are <> shoulder knot, they do not grasp it with their fists as do the males. In fact, Nefer is the only female not represented with a shoulder knot. Her garment shows the customary shoulder straps that, according to Egyptian profile conventions, leave the breast exposed. She is adorned with bracelets and a long, striped, tripartite wig, which reveals a well-detailed ear. (No male tomb owners display an ear due to coverage by their wig.) Nefer’s name and single title are restricted to the area immediately above her head. The central axis is taken up with the offering list (Section c, fig. 51), and the linen list (Section d) occupies the full height of the decorated frame of the stela. Nefer and Wepemnefret (g 1203) are the only stela owners to show vertical separators between the offerings listed in Section c. Nefer’s offering table shows a symmetrical number of half-loaves, eight per side totaling sixteen. Unlike most of the table stands represented on the other stelae, hers displays the triangular opening at the very bottom of the stand, rather than some distance up from the bottom. This is paralleled by the stela of Wepemnefret (g 1203), probably Ini (g 1235), and Iunu (g 4150), although in the last two cases the owner’s foot obscures the very bottom of the stand.

The linen list (Section d) is perhaps one of the most complex of the stela group, with six ibis falcons, and no less than nine compartments in each of four linen sections. Overall, the quality of the carving is exemplary, and a large number of hieroglyphs have received intricate interior detail, often on a minute scale. Attention might be called here to the birds, the serpent, the wadjet stars, and signs. It is all the more striking, then, that the ancient craftsmen have omitted half of the ideographic offerings beneath the right-hand side of the offering table. All occurrences of the tall a are reversed (cf. fig. 262). Traces of red adorn Nefer’s shoulder straps, the nfr sign, and other hieroglyphs. Additional color traces include black and red. This number is read “two” instead of “twenty” due to the vertical linen signs with no horizontal base; cf. Posener-Krieger, RdE 29 (1977), pp. 86–96.
green (see below, Appendix 1, Color Palaeography). Finally, some plaster repairs are visible at the lower right corner of the stela, in the vertical separator line between the rightmost two signs. The stela is a short-form stela.

Fischer notes that, of all the Fourth Dynasty slab stelae, this is the only one to show a determinative at the end of the deceased’s name. The “redundant determinative” is in fact the only complete human-figure hieroglyph in the entire slab stela group (see below, Appendix 2, Palaeography).

Date: 1207 is presumed to belong to the second phase of mastabas constructed in Cemetery 1200, as this portion of the Necropolis expanded from east to west. Nefer’s slab stela should thus follow after the tombs of Wepemnefret (g 1201), Kanefer (g 1203), Khufu-nakht (g 1205), Kahan (g 1223), and Nefret-iabet (g 1225), but still date to the reign of Khufu. The second decade of that king’s reign provides the most likely date for the stela.

This plaster repair has been removed, and as of 1997 the stone is now flat in this area.

Fig. 48. Chapel niche of G 1207, with slab in situ, looking west. May, 1904. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, a 10915.

Fig. 49. Slab in situ in emplacement, looking west, April, 1904. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, a 32798 (rephotographed as b 8878, October 7, 2007).

Fig. 50. Seated figure of Nefer. 1998. Bruce White.

Fig. 51. Detail of section c: offerings. 1998. Bruce White.
Slab Stela 5 (pls. 9–10)

Owner: Km(1)-m-™¢, Kaiemah

Provenance: Cemetery 1200: g1223

Excavation History: Hearst Expedition, University of California, under G.A. Reisner, April, 1904; found in situ set into emplacement in chapel niche and walled up by later additions

Current Location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 37725 (57128), Room R42 N6

Material: Painted limestone; raised relief carving

Measurements: h. 37.8 cm; w. 52.5 cm; th. 8 cm

Selected Bibliography: PM III, p. 59; Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, pp. 399–400, pl. 39a

Translation

Section a:
(1) "my-[r]z£[(w)Ím™w, wr m∂w Ím™w, z£ nswt, Km(1)-m-™¢"
(1) "Overseer of the phyles of Upper Egypt, great one of the Tens of Upper Egypt, king's son, Kaiemah"

Section b:
(2) "mn∞t ∞£, ßs ∞£, t ∞£, ¢n˚t ∞£, k£ ∞£, nw∂w ∞£"
(2) "a thousand pieces of cloth, a thousand alabaster vessels, (3) a thousand loaves of bread, a thousand cans of beer, a thousand oxen, a thousand antelopes"

Section c:
(4) "sn†r [..."
(4) "incense, […"

Section d:
[100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 90 (cubits wide), a thousand of 80 (cubits wide), a thousand of 70 (cubits wide)]

[100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 90 (cubits wide), a thousand of 80 (cubits wide), a thousand of 70 (cubits wide)]

Description and Commentary: The original mud-brick chapel surrounding the slab stela disappeared under the expansion of the mastaba. The second phase of this tomb's evolution involved additional core masonry, the walling up of the slab stela, and the construction of a four-chambered mud-brick chapel, with a long, north-south chamber enclosing the entrance to a limestone offering niche (figs. 55–58).

Severe weathering across the central region has rendered much of the stela unreadable. The quality of the limestone must be inferior to that of several other stelae, for the piece ... probably did not come in contact with anything but sand and debris prior to excavation. Nevertheless, the top line (Section a) can be completely restored with reasonable certainty (fig. 54). Red coloring survives in a number of off places, mostly notably the sign in the linen list, the tomb-owner's face and feet, bread

1 Ranke, Ph I, p. 338.2 (My) ka is in the palace.
2 Reisner illustrated this stela in an unpublished report on the work of the Hearst Expedition, most likely belonging to 3004, p. 69, fig. 100 (housed in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston).
4 On the choice of transliteration ùdmy instead of ùt¡wy, see below, Chapter 4, discussion of Section d (linen lists).
6 Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, p. 399
Kaiemah wears a short, valanced wig and a long, tight-fitting garment that was presumably painted to match the leopard-skin pattern still preserved on the stelae of Wepemnefret (g 1201) and Nefret-iabet (g 1225). Nothing can be determined about the positioning of his hands due to the damage, but there is no reason to suspect an arrangement any different from the rest of the group of males from Cemetery 1200 (i.e., right hand reaching toward the table of bread loaves, left hand grasping his shoulder knot in his clenched fist). With this stela, the Giza group once again shows a bull-legged, rather than lion-legged, stool, in this case with a simple papyrus umbel terminal whose interior detail might have been added in paint only. Musculature on the bull legs is indicated, and may also be seen on the ankle bone of the tomb-owner’s right foot. Presumably the offering table contains a symmetrical arrangement of six half-loaves facing each other for a total of twelve. However, the leftmost half-loaf is destroyed, and cannot be confirmed. If as much of the table extends “beyond” the loaf, as does on the right hand side, then perhaps we have an asymmetrical arrangement of only five half-loaves on the left and six on the right. This asymmetry would be paralleled by the stelae of Kanefret (g 1203), Khufu-nakht (g 1205), Nefret-labet (g 1225), and Iunu (g 1415). Furthermore, the two central loaves do not align over the center of the table stand, but are skewed to the left. The ceramic stand is clearly treated as a separate element from the stone offering table on which the bread loaves are placed.

The linen list occupies the right side of the stela, with room for three falcons. But the titles of Kaiemah begin over the top of the linen list, reducing its height compared with all other stelae of Cemetery 1200 but for that of Wepemnefret (g 1201). An interesting epigraphic feature, unique in the Giza stela group, is the forked, or V-shaped, end of the three preserved “100” hieroglyphs on the linen list: . The overall carving of the stela is highly competent, but the amount of interior detail is sparing, and the layout, as much as it is preserved, is relatively simple. The stela is of the short-form type.

Date: The location of g 1223 within Cemetery 200, which developed from east to west, indicates a date most likely in the first decade of Khufu’s reign. While the slab stela does not show any of the archaic features found in the Wepemnefret stela (g 1201, stela 1 above), it aligns well chronologically with the other stelae from this part of the Cemetery (g 1203, g 1205, g 1225), showing such early Old Kingdom elements as short flaring loaves on the offering table (Section b). It is therefore assigned to the early or mid-reign of Khufu.

Loaves and the stems of the sign is usually short and valanced. Stems and a long, tight-fitting garment were presumably painted to match the leopard-skin pattern still preserved on the stelae of Wepemnefret (g 1201) and Nefret-labet (g 1225). Nothing can be determined about the positioning of his hands due to the damage, but there is no reason to suspect an arrangement any different from the rest of the group of males from Cemetery 1200 (i.e., right hand reaching toward the table of bread loaves, left hand grasping his shoulder knot in his clenched fist). With this stela, the Giza group once again shows a bull-legged, rather than lion-legged, stool, in this case with a simple papyrus umbel terminal whose interior detail might have been added in paint only. Musculature on the bull legs is indicated, and may also be seen on the ankle bone of the tomb-owner’s right foot. Presumably the offering table contains a symmetrical arrangement of six half-loaves facing each other for a total of twelve. However, the leftmost half-loaf is destroyed, and cannot be confirmed. If as much of the table extends “beyond” the loaf, as does on the right hand side, then perhaps we have an asymmetrical arrangement of only five half-loaves on the left and six on the right. This asymmetry would be paralleled by the stelae of Kanefret (g 1203), Khufu-nakht (g 1205), Nefret-labet (g 1225), and Iunu (g 1415). Furthermore, the two central loaves do not align over the center of the table stand, but are skewed to the left. The ceramic stand is clearly treated as a separate element from the stone offering table on which the bread loaves are placed.

The linen list occupies the right side of the stela, with room for three falcons. But the titles of Kaiemah begin over the top of the linen list, reducing its height compared with all other stelae of Cemetery 1200 but for that of Wepemnefret (g 1201). An interesting epigraphic feature, unique in the Giza stela group, is the forked, or V-shaped, end of the three preserved “100” hieroglyphs on the linen list: . The overall carving of the stela is highly competent, but the amount of interior detail is sparing, and the layout, as much as it is preserved, is relatively simple. The stela is of the short-form type.

Date: The location of g 1223 within Cemetery 200, which developed from east to west, indicates a date most likely in the first decade of Khufu’s reign. While the slab stela does not show any of the archaic features found in the Wepemnefret stela (g 1201, stela 1 above), it aligns well chronologically with the other stelae from this part of the Cemetery (g 1203, g 1205, g 1225), showing such early Old Kingdom elements as short flaring loaves on the offering table (Section b). It is therefore assigned to the early or mid-reign of Khufu.

Loaves and the stems of the sign is usually short and valanced. Stems and a long, tight-fitting garment were presumably painted to match the leopard-skin pattern still preserved on the stelae of Wepemnefret (g 1201) and Nefret-labet (g 1225). Nothing can be determined about the positioning of his hands due to the damage, but there is no reason to suspect an arrangement any different from the rest of the group of males from Cemetery 1200 (i.e., right hand reaching toward the table of bread loaves, left hand grasping his shoulder knot in his clenched fist). With this stela, the Giza group once again shows a bull-legged, rather than lion-legged, stool, in this case with a simple papyrus umbel terminal whose interior detail might have been added in paint only. Musculature on the bull legs is indicated, and may also be seen on the ankle bone of the tomb-owner’s right foot. Presumably the offering table contains a symmetrical arrangement of six half-loaves facing each other for a total of twelve. However, the leftmost half-loaf is destroyed, and cannot be confirmed. If as much of the table extends “beyond” the loaf, as does on the right hand side, then perhaps we have an asymmetrical arrangement of only five half-loaves on the left and six on the right. This asymmetry would be paralleled by the stelae of Kanefret (g 1203), Khufu-nakht (g 1205), Nefret-labet (g 1225), and Iunu (g 1415). Furthermore, the two central loaves do not align over the center of the table stand, but are skewed to the left. The ceramic stand is clearly treated as a separate element from the stone offering table on which the bread loaves are placed.

The linen list occupies the right side of the stela, with room for three falcons. But the titles of Kaiemah begin over the top of the linen list, reducing its height compared with all other stelae of Cemetery 1200 but for that of Wepemnefret (g 1201). An interesting epigraphic feature, unique in the Giza stela group, is the forked, or V-shaped, end of the three preserved “100” hieroglyphs on the linen list: . The overall carving of the stela is highly competent, but the amount of interior detail is sparing, and the layout, as much as it is preserved, is relatively simple. The stela is of the short-form type.

Date: The location of g 1223 within Cemetery 200, which developed from east to west, indicates a date most likely in the first decade of Khufu’s reign. While the slab stela does not show any of the archaic features found in the Wepemnefret stela (g 1201, stela 1 above), it aligns well chronologically with the other stelae from this part of the Cemetery (g 1203, g 1205, g 1225), showing such early Old Kingdom elements as short flaring loaves on the offering table (Section b). It is therefore assigned to the early or mid-reign of Khufu.
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Fig. 55. Plan of the mastaba of Kaiemah, g 1223, after Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, Map 4. Drawing by Ruth Bigio.

Fig. 56. Chapel area, with slab stela exposed, looking north. April, 1904. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, c. 30762.

Fig. 57. Chapel area, looking southwest. February, 1905. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, c. 31171.

Fig. 58. Chapel area of g 1223, looking west. February, 1905. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, c. 31170.
Fig. 58. Chapel area of g 1223, looking west. April 22, 1999. PDM, 99.4.3

Fig. 59. Slab stela in situ, looking west. April 1904. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, c. 10763

Fig. 60. Empty emplacement, looking west. April 22, 1999. PDM, 99.4.7

Fig. 61. Oblique view of the slab stela. April 17, 1999. PDM, 99.102.24
Slab Stela 6 (pls. 11–12)

Owner: Nfrt-¡£bt, Nefret-iabet

Provenance: Cemetery 1200: g1225

Excavation history: Ballard excavations, 1902, presumably in situ set into emplacement in chapel niche; collection Hirsch, then collection Sambon (and Hirsch?) then collection Curtis; acquisition by the Louvre in 1912

Current location: Musée du Louvre, Paris E 15591

Material: Limestone covered with plaster or whitewash and painted; raised relief carving

Measurements:

h. 37.7 cm; w. 52.5 cm; th. 8.3 cm

Selected bibliography:


Translation

Section a:

(1) z£t nswt, Nfrt-¡£bt (1) “King’s daughter, Nefret-iabet”

Section b:

(2) ßs mn∞t r ∞£, (3) t ¢n˚t ∞£, (4) †rp k£ nw∂w ∞£ (2) “a thousand alabaster vessels, pieces of cloth, and rogeese, (3) a thousand loaves of bread and vessels of beer, oxen, a thousand (4) rogeese, oxen, and antelopes”

Section c:

(5)˚b¢, ¡™ ™wy (6) sn†r, ¢£tt mr¢t, w£∂, msdmt, db£, ¡ßd, (7) s∞pt, ¡rp, db£, w™¢ (5) “container of cool water, implements for washing hands, (6) incense, best ointment, green eye-paint, black eye-paint, figs, pomegranate fruit, (7) sekhpet-drink, wine, zizyphus, loaf of zizyphus carob bean”

Section d:

¡dmy ßt ∞£, ps∂¡w ∞£, ∞mn¡w ∞£, sf∞¡w ∞£ “idemy-linen: a thousand of 100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 90 (cubits wide), a thousand of 80 (cubits wide), a thousand of 70 (cubits wide)”

sßr ßt ∞£, ps∂¡w ∞£, ∞mn¡w ∞£, sf∞¡w ∞£ “sesher-linen: a thousand of 100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 90 (cubits wide), a thousand of 80 (cubits wide), a thousand of 70 (cubits wide)”

™£ ßt ∞£, ∞mn¡w ∞£, sf∞¡w ∞£, s¡s¡w ∞£ “aa-linen: a thousand of 100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 80 (cubits wide), a thousand of 70 (cubits wide), a thousand of 60 (cubits wide)”

Description and commentary:

This chapel, presumably a mud-brick structure surrounding the slab stela, was enlarged after the original construction with additional core masonry.

1. Ranke, *PN* 1, p. 201.11; perhaps “The beautiful one of the east.”

2. Vandier, *Manuel* 1, p. 761 (h) stated erroneously that the stela was discovered by Reisner.

3. On the choice of transliteration ¡dmy instead of ¡t¡wy, see below, Chapter 4, discussion of Section d (linen lists).

and a monolithic false door. The remains of the original mud-brick chapel were not preserved, nor could the exact location of the slab stela emplacement be determined due to the destruction of this portion of the mastaba wall by Ballard.

Despite the lack of a controlled excavation at the time of discovery, this stela remains one of the best-preserved—and most often illustrated—of the entire group. Along with the stelae of Wepemnefret (g 1201) in Berkeley and Iunu (g 4150) in Hildesheim, the Nefret-iabet stela retains the most color of all fifteen examples. The most complete rendering of a spotted leopard-skin garment is preserved on Nefret-iabet’s figure. She also wears a choker, bracelets, anklets, and a red shoulder knot, all applied in paint only. Red guidelines still clearly outline her seated figure. A change of decoration, however, seems evident in the choice of costume. Nefret-iabet’s figure shows the shoulder strap of her dress clearly carved, but the leopard-skin garment is overlaid in paint; thus, both garments appear, and it would seem that the skin is intended to represent a second layer worn over the dress. Nefret-iabet’s hand positions are consistent with those of the other three (preserved) female figures in the Giza stelae. She reaches towards the offering table with her right hand (as do the men). Her yellow skin color is well preserved, as is her long, black, tripartite wig. Facial features are clearly delineated, and even a red-painted pupil is evident in the eye.

Nefret-iabet’s bull-legged stool is simply carved, although a minor amount of muscleature has been modeled on the legs. The cornice supports beneath the hooves are perhaps disproportionately large. The umbil decoration on the terminals was added in paint, but is barely visible today. The seat is the only one of our group to show no carved line delineating the join between leg and side rails of the stool.

The offering table most closely resembles that of Kagemni (g 1228), with rimmed ceramic stand (painted red) clearly differentiated from the stone (alabaster?) table set into it. The platform holding the half-loaves is very wide, while the arrangement shows eight half-loaves on Nefret-iabet’s side, but only seven to the right. The half-loaves are two-toned, red on the “interior” but uncolored at the “taking.”

Section c (offerings) is the only one of our corpus to set the spilled-out items off from the rest of the stela by means of both horizontal and vertical dividing lines. Outside of the offerings section, some color treatments are noteworthy. The imitation waist in front of Nefret-iabet’s face has been carved with a slender body, but subsequently widened in red paint. The š-signs are painted, not gray as on Wepemnefret’s stela (g 1201), but with red stems and yellow tops, a color combination paralleled in the Kagemni (g 1228), Setji-hekenet (g 1227) and Iunu (g 4150) stelae. Interestingly, the hand hieroglyph extending water towards Nefret-iabet’s figure is painted yellow, thus taking on gender implication, just as does the red (male) sign in front of Wepemnefret’s figure (g 1201). For a comparative color palaeography, see Appendix 1 below.

Fig. 64: The Nefret-iabet stela from g 1225. National Museum of Cairo, Museum Louvre.
Fig. 65. Plan of the mastaba of Nefret-Iabet, G 1225, after Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, Map 4. Drawing by Ruth Bigio

Fig. 66. Chapel area of G 1225, looking northwest. 1905–1906. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, b 12977

Fig. 67. Chapel area of G 1225, looking southwest. 1905. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, b 12977
of linen. Perhaps the most unusual feature of the stela is a possibly last-minute correction to the linen list. As carved, the list contains vertical separators only between the linen width indications, but not the amounts of linen (\(\leq 1,000\)) in every case. The list was subsequently corrected, however, to add additional vertical separators between the individual \(\leq\) signs. The lines show red exterior guide lines filled with yellow. One might speculate that the stela was carved in the earlier tradition of the more "archaic" stelae \(g\,1201,\,g\,1203,\,g\,1205,\,g\,2135\) and then was "modified" in line with a new tradition, represented by the rest of the stelae in our corpus. The stela is a short-form stela.

A seated female statuette now in Munich (ÄS 7155) and purported to have surfaced at the same time Montague Ballard was plundering the Western Cemetery (1902) has often been ascribed to Nefret-iabet (fig. 70).

While a Fourth Dynasty date is entirely likely for the piece, no evidence exists to provide a secure link with the owner of \(g\,1225\). The piece is uninscribed, and the stylistic attributes, such as the wig, differ markedly from the two-dimensional representation of Nefret-iabet. The statue is therefore rejected at present as clearly deriving from \(g\,1225\) until more convincing evidence should surface.

The Harvard University–Museum of Fine Arts, Boston Expedition photographic records further complicate the issue by listing a crude limestone head of a male with valanced wig as coming from this tomb (figs. 71-72). Currently located in the storeroom collection of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, the head has no number. The quality of the carving hardly aligns well with the consummate skill shown by the craftsmen of the slab stela. The face resembles the crude statues found by Reisner elsewhere in Cemetery 1200. For the present, the possibly intrusive head must await the discovery of additional documentation before a conclusive determination concerning exact provenance can be reached.

Date: As one of the earliest mastabas to be constructed in Cemetery 1200, the tomb most likely dates to the first decade of Khufu's reign. Along with the \(g\,1225\) geographical location, the slab stela displays short, flaring offering-table loaves (Section 1a), and a lack of vertical separators between items (later corrected), all of which support a date of the early to mid-reign of that king.
Fig. 70. Uninscribed female seated statuette, Munich ÄS 725. 1998. Bruce White

Fig. 71. Unnumbered male limestone head from g 1225 (front). Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. Photographed at Harvard Camp, Giza. 1905. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, c. 1925

Fig. 72. The same statue as in fig. 71 (three-quarter view). Photographed at Harvard Camp, Giza. 1905. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, c. 1925
Slab Stela 7 (pls. 14–19)

Owner: S†¡-¢knt, Setji-hekenet (5)

Provenance: Cemetery 1200: g 1227

Current location: Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 37276 (1972); currently in the Port Said National Museum, P 4082

Material: Limestone raised relief carving

Measurements: h. 37.5 cm; w. 52.5 cm; th. 7.6–7.8 cm

Selected bibliography:
- PM III, p. 60
- Reisner, polis 1, p. 408, pl. 20a
- W.S. Smith, ZÄS 71 (1935), pl. 4 (top)
- Vandier, Manuel 1, p. 38, fig. 931 (top)

Translation

Section a:
(1) r∞.t nswt, S†¡-¢knt
(1) “Acquaintance of the king, Setji-hekenet”

Section b:
(2) t ∞£, ¢n˚t ∞£, mn∞t ∞£, ßs ∞£, k£ ∞£, £pd ∞£
(2) “a thousand loaves of bread, a thousand jars of beer, (3) a thousand pieces of cloth, a thousand alabaster vessels, a thousand oxen, a thousand fowl”

Section c:
(4) xsp, tmy, ßsæt ∞£, ßt ∞£, ¡fdw ∞£, snw¡, w™ ∞£, szf ∞£
(4) “incense, implements for washing hands, best ointment, green eye-paint, black eye-paint”

Section d:
(5) ¡&my ∞£, ¡t¡wy, ¢£tt mr¢t, w£∂, msdmt
(5) “idemy - linen: a thousand of 100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 3 x 10 (cubits), a thousand of 2 x10 (cubits) and 1 x 10 (cubits), a thousand of width 10 (cubits wide), a thousand of 4 x 10 (cubits), a thousand of 2 x10 (cubits) and 1 x 10 (cubits), a thousand of width 20 (cubits wide)”

Description and commentary:

This uncased mastaba was never enlarged with a stone-chapel, but the original mud-brick chapel underwent a number of alterations, its west wall...
containing the slab stela niche was most likely the oldest, original part of the chamber. Like g 1223 (Kaiemah) and g 1225 (Nefret-iabet) further to the east, this tomb likewise received an annex, or extension of the mastaba core, to the north. In this case, an additional north chapel was added in front (east) of the annex, numbered by Reisner g 1228 (fig. 75).

The stela shows a number of features not encountered in the first six stelae of our corpus. First among them is perhaps the extent of intentional damage. Setji-hekenet’s face, more particularly her eye, nose, and mouth, as well as the three Horus falcons of the linen list, have been intentionally destroyed. There is no question of natural damage, such as from a fall from the mastaba wall, since the stela was discovered in situ in its emplacement. Any number of explanations could lie behind the destruction of her face, from dismal reminiscence of her contemporaries to more modern vandalism, but the former choice is the more likely one, due to the patina on the chisel marks. Much fresher, by contrast, are the three light-colored diagonal scratches across her breast and left arm. These must date to some time soon after the stela was removed in April, 1934, since they cannot yet be seen in photographs taken at the site of discovery (see fig. 80), but do appear on the Camp “studio” photographs taken shortly thereafter, dated simply as “1934-5” (fig. 74). It is less clear what the motivation behind destroying the three Horus falcons could be. They seem also to be destroyed on the stela of Meretites (g 4140), along with her entire horizontal band of inscription across the top of the stela (Section a), including her name. Furthermore, the stela of Seshat-sekhentiu (g 2120) bears similar damage, but does not preserve the fragment with the Horus falcons. In the latter case, Meretites and Seshat-sekhentiu, the motivation was most likely to destroy the memory of the tomb owner. In the present case, Setji-hekenet’s name is intact, and only the Horus falcons have suffered mutilation. That this part of the cemetery was abandoned after the end of the Old Kingdom further narrows our time frame for this intentional mutilation, assuming the slab stela was inaccessible some generations after the death of the tomb owner. But post-pharaonic vandalism cannot be ruled out entirely.

The slab stela is also the only monument from Cemetery 1200 to show granaries at the bottom of the linen list. In form, number, and context, these five granaries resemble most of their counterparts on the stela of Iunu (g 1208) from Cemetery 4000. Although the linen list reaches to the top of the slab decorated surface, the presence of the granaries reduces the types of different linen to just three. At left, the seated figure of Setji-hekenet differs markedly from her three female counterparts in showing extremely broad shoulders. Her torso is almost male in its bulky width, and hardly relates to the slender figures cut by Nefret (g 1207), Nefret-iabet (g 1225), and Meretites (g 4140). Her open left hand also differs somewhat from that of the other women in being cocked slightly more horizontally. Her closely fitting garment shows a shoulder knot but no shoulder strap, as seen in the stela of Nefret (g 1207) or Nefret-iabet (g 1225). Her right hand takes the standard pose, stretched forth towards the table of offering loaves. The table stand beneath the table flares dramatically, and contains an additional ridge or lip at the back that is absent from all other stelae, with one exception. Despite the lack of color, the stand is well differentiated from the stone offering table. The half-loaves of bread show the asymmetrical arrangement of five to the left, six to the right, possibly the only case where there are fewer loaves on the tomb-owner (= table’s left) side.\footnote{Assuming that the damaged stela of Kaiemah (g 1223) shows six-six, and not five-six half-loaves.}

It is less clear what the motivation behind destroying the three Horus falcons could be. They seem also to be destroyed on the stela of Meretites (g 4140), along with her entire horizontal band of inscription across the top of the stela (Section a), including her name. Furthermore, the stela of Seshat-sekhentiu (g 2120) bears similar damage, but does not preserve the fragment with the Horus falcons. In the latter case, Meretites and Seshat-sekhentiu, the motivation was most likely to destroy the memory of the tomb owner. In the present case, Setji-hekenet’s name is intact, and only the Horus falcons have suffered mutilation. That this part of the cemetery was abandoned after the end of the Old Kingdom further narrows our time frame for this intentional mutilation, assuming the slab stela was inaccessible some generations after the death of the tomb owner. But post-pharaonic vandalism cannot be ruled out entirely.

The slab stela is also the only monument from Cemetery 1200 to show granaries at the bottom of the linen list. In form, number, and context, these five granaries resemble most of their counterparts on the stela of Iunu (g 1208) from Cemetery 4000. Although the linen list reaches to the top of the slab decorated surface, the presence of the granaries reduces the types of different linen to just three. At left, the seated figure of Setji-hekenet differs markedly from her three female counterparts in showing extremely broad shoulders. Her torso is almost male in its bulky width, and hardly relates to the slender figures cut by Nefret (g 1207), Nefret-iabet (g 1225), and Meretites (g 4140). Her open left hand also differs somewhat from that of the other women in being cocked slightly more horizontally. Her closely fitting garment shows a shoulder knot but no shoulder strap, as seen in the stela of Nefret (g 1207) or Nefret-iabet (g 1225). Her right hand takes the standard pose, stretched forth towards the table of offering loaves. The table stand beneath the table flares dramatically, and contains an additional ridge or lip at the back that is absent from all other stelae, with one exception. Despite the lack of color, the stand is well differentiated from the stone offering table. The half-loaves of bread show the asymmetrical arrangement of five to the left, six to the right, possibly the only case where there are fewer loaves on the tomb-owner (= table’s left) side.\footnote{Assuming that the damaged stela of Kaiemah (g 1223) shows six-six, and not five-six half-loaves.}

The stela is also the only monument from Cemetery 1200 to show granaries at the bottom of the linen list. In form, number, and context, these five granaries resemble most of their counterparts on the stela of Iunu (g 1208) from Cemetery 4000. Although the linen list reaches to the top of the slab decorated surface, the presence of the granaries reduces the types of different linen to just three. At left, the seated figure of Setji-hekenet differs markedly from her three female counterparts in showing extremely broad shoulders. Her torso is almost male in its bulky width, and hardly relates to the slender figures cut by Nefret (g 1207), Nefret-iabet (g 1225), and Meretites (g 4140). Her open left hand also differs somewhat from that of the other women in being cocked slightly more horizontally. Her closely fitting garment shows a shoulder knot but no shoulder strap, as seen in the stela of Nefret (g 1207) or Nefret-iabet (g 1225). Her right hand takes the standard pose, stretched forth towards the table of offering loaves. The table stand beneath the table flares dramatically, and contains an additional ridge or lip at the back that is absent from all other stelae, with one exception. Despite the lack of color, the stand is well differentiated from the stone offering table. The half-loaves of bread show the asymmetrical arrangement of five to the left, six to the right, possibly the only case where there are fewer loaves on the tomb-owner (= table’s left) side.\footnote{Assuming that the damaged stela of Kaiemah (g 1223) shows six-six, and not five-six half-loaves.}
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Fig. 75. Plan of the mastaba of Setji-hekenet, g 1227, after Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, Map 4. Drawing by Ruth Bigio

Fig. 76. Chapel area of g 1227, looking north. February, 1905. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, c. 1905

Fig. 77. Chapel area with slab stela in situ, looking southwest. July, 1904. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, c. 1904

Fig. 78. Chapel area after removal of slab stela, looking southwest. Spring, 1906. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, c. 1906
towards the bottom, a feature either absent or suppressed in all the other slab stelae in the Giza group.

Setji-hekenet sits upon a full-length cushion, placed upon a bull-legged stool. The legs of the stool display considerable musculature modeling, including the curving tendon about halfway down. Two other stelae (Nefer, ¶ 2077 and Iunu, ¶ 4230) indicate this tendon. Unique to the entire group, however, is the stool’s terminal ending, not in a papyrus umbel but in a palmiform terminal. The rendering is fluted with subtle, finely modeled concavities. A contemporary parallel for the palmiform umbel is preserved on the carrying poles for the sedan chair of Hetepheres (figs. 83–84).  

Setji-hekenet shows an abbreviated linen list, with only dmy, sßr and ™£ linen, since five granaries take up the bottom of the list. The items in the trapezoidal granaries appear again in exactly the same order on the stela of Iunu (¶ 4230). The only significant difference is perhaps the nature of the final item, ¢bnnwt bread on this stela, but ∞fnnwt grain on Iunu’s granary.

Also attested on the stelae of Wepemnefret (¶ 1201), and the anonymous stela from ¶ 4860. The stela of Meretites (¶ 4140) shows merely the rounded protrusion from the cushion behind the seated figure.

Cf. Reisner and Smith, Giza Necropolis2, pls. 27a, 28c; Egyptian Art in the Age of the Pyramids (New York, 1999), pp. 225–26, cat. 31 Yl. Markowitz, J.L. Harris, and R.C. Freid, Egypt in the Age of the Pyramid, Harvard University–Museum of Fine Arts Boston Expedition (Boston, 2002), p. 50(f); N. Cherpion, Mastabas et Hypogées d’Ancien Empire, (Brussels, 1989), pp. 32–33, fig. 13, who also notes a two-dimensional example from the tomb of Kapunisut Kai (¶ 4651), ibid., pl. 30.
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Traces of red survive, primarily on the ideographic signs beneath the offering table, and on the stems of the "f" signs. The stela is of the short-form type.

Date: 1227 B.C. is presumed to belong to the second phase of mastabas constructed in Cemetery 1200, as this portion of the Necropolis expanded from east to west. Setji-hekenet’s slab stela should thus follow after the tombs of Wepemnefret (g 1201), Kanafer (g 1203), Khufu-nakht (g 1205), Kalanah (g 1209), and Nefret-iabet (g 1226), but still date to the reign of Khufu. The second decade of that king’s reign provides the most likely date for the stela.

Fig. 83. Reproduction of carrying chair of Hetepheres from g 7000 x, MFA 38.874. MFA Visual Archives, sc 122

Fig. 84. Detail of umbel from reproduction of carrying chair of Hetepheres, MFA 38.874. MFA Visual Archives, sc 122

Fig. 85. Oblique view of the Setji-hekenet stela, photographed in Port Said, April 15, 1999. PDM, 99.101.21

Fig. 86. Oblique view of the Setji-hekenet stela.
Slab Stela a 8 (pls. 15–16)

Owner: Ini, In1 (1235)

Provenance: Cemetery 1200, p. 235

Excavated by the History-Museum Expedition, University of California, under G.A. Reisner, April, 1904; found in situ and emplacement in chapel niche

Current location: Egyptian Museum Cairo JE 37727 (57127 bis); currently in the Port Said National Museum, P 4083

Material: Limestone raised relief carving

Measurements: h. 37.5 cm; w. 52.5 cm; th. 9.4–11 cm

Selected bibliography: PM III, p. 61; Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, p. 412, pl. 20b; W.S. Smith, ZÄS (bottom); Vandier, Manuel 1, p. 760, fig. 53 (bottom)

Translation

Section a

(3) “Controller of hands, keeper of the king’s property, Ini”

Section b

(2) “a thousand pieces of cloth, a thousand alabaster vessels, (3) a thousand loaves of bread, a thousand jars of beer, a thousand oxen, a thousand antelopes”

Section c

(4) “incense, implements for washing hands, two jars of best ointment, green eye-paint, black eye-paint”

Section d

“idemy, linen: a thousand of 100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 80 (cubits wide), a thousand of 70 (cubits wide), a thousand of 60 (cubits wide)”

“sesher, linen: a thousand of 100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 90 (cubits wide), a thousand of 80 (cubits wide), a thousand of 70 (cubits wide), a thousand of 60 (cubits wide)”

“sn†r, linen: a thousand of 100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 90 (cubits wide), a thousand of 80 (cubits wide), a thousand of 70 (cubits wide), a thousand of 60 (cubits wide)”

Description and commentary: The mud-brick chapel surrounding Ini’s stela emplacement was altered several times, but three or four chambers were identified at the time of excavation. The name Ini is attested on this slab stela, but none of these provides an exact match to the spelling found on this slab stela. For variations on the spelling within this tomb, compare the slab stela to the offering basin, figs. 95–97. Unless a pejorative connotation is intended here, such as “the slothful one,” “the hesitater,” (but missing the walking legs determinative), or “the liar,” the spelling is illustrated (M 13); additional parallels are listed on p. 64. For variations on the spelling within this tomb, compare the slab stela to the offering basin, figs. 95–97. Unless a pejorative connotation is intended here, such as “the slothful one,” “the hesitater,” (but missing the walking legs determinative), or “the liar,” the spelling is illustrated (M 13); additional parallels are listed on p. 64.

The Vulgaris shows projecting leaves at the stalk’s base, an archaic and Old Kingdom feature according to H.G. Fischer, Ancient Egyptian Calligraphy, 4th edition (New York, 1986), p. 33, where this sign is illustrated (M 13); additional parallels are listed on p. 64.
The stela is in near-perfect condition, although no color has survived. The most unusual feature to strike the viewer immediately is the unbalanced layout of the decoration. The placement of Ini's figure (Section b) is near the center of the slab, instead of at the far left, as with all other stelae. This leaves a considerable amount of...
Date: 41235 belongs with the later, second group of major mastabas constructed in Cemetery 3000. This cemetery developed from east to west, and the second mastaba group thus most likely dates subsequent to Khufu’s first decade. Taller offering loaves on Ini’s offering table (see below, Chapter 4, Section c) may also support a date midway through the reign of this king.

Fig. 87. Plan of the mastaba of Ini, g 1235, after Reisner, Giza Necropolis I, Map 4. Drawing by Ruth Bigio.

Fig. 88. Chapel area of g 1235, with slab stela in situ, looking northwest. April, 1904. HU-MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, 7.10921.

Fig. 89. Chapel area of g 1235, looking northwest. April 22, 1999. PDM, 99.3.32.
Fig. 90. Chapel area of g. 1235, with slab stela in situ, looking southwest. May, 1904. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, b 10758.

Fig. 91. Chapel area of g. 1235 during excavation, with slab stela and offering basin exposed, looking southwest. April, 1904. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, c 10963.

Fig. 92. Slab stela from g. 1235 as first exposed, looking west. April, 1904. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, b 10757.
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Fig. 93. Slab stela from mastaba G 1235, looking west. May, 1904. HU-MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, c. 1903.

Fig. 94. Empty emplacement, looking west. April 22, 2006. PDM, 99.3.31.

Fig. 95. Offering basin of Ini (Hearst Museum, Berkeley, 6-39780), photographed at Harvard Camp, Giza, 1905. HU-MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, c. 1905.

Fig. 96. Detail of inscription of offering basin of Ini (Hearst Museum, Berkeley, 6-39780), photographed at Harvard Camp, Giza, 1905. HU-MFA Expedition photograph, George Reisner, c. 1905.

Fig. 97. Inscription on basin of Ini, after Reisner, Giza Necropolis I, p. 452, fig. 235.

Fig. 97. Inscription on basin of Ini, after Reisner, Giza Necropolis I, p. 452, fig. 235.
Chapter 1: Catalogue of the Giza Slab Stelae

Slab Stela 9 (pls. 17–18)

Owner: S婷-t-s∞ntyw, Seshat-sekhentiu

Provenance: Cemetery 2100, 2120

Excavation history: Harvard University–Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Expedition, under G.A. Reisner, discovered in fourteen fragments, both in front of the chapel emplacement (2005–6, 2005), and west of the mastaba (March 6, 2005)

Current location: Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 06.1994

Material: Limestone raised relief carving

Measurement: h. 51.6 cm; w. 79.8 cm; th. 9.9 cm

Selected bibliography: PM III, p. 74; Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, p. 438 (also brief mentions on pp. 69, 67, 117, 306); pl. 36a, R.J. Lebbon, Corpus Antiquatum Aegyptiacarum, MFA Fasc. 2, Stelae (Mainz am Rhein, 1988), pp. 59–62

Translation

Section a

(1) S婷-t-s∞ntyw, Seshat-sekhentiu

(3) …

(4) cªn˚t ∞£, ss ∞£,

(6) “a thousand loaves of bread, a thousand jars of beer, a thousand alabaster vessels, a thousand pieces of cloth”

Section b

(9) h ∞£, lg ∞£, rd ∞£, hs ∞£,

(10) “container of cool water, implements for washing hands, natron”

Section c

(1) “…

(2) …

(3) “…” (2) “…”

(11) “…

(12) “…”

(13) “…”

Fig. 98. Colorized facsimile drawing of the Seshat-sekhentiu stela from (2) “…” (2) “…”

Notes:

1 Harris, PN I, p. 304, fig. 5, col. 2, pl. 2, 380. Could the better reading be slay- (slay-slay)? “Seshat advances me”? Cf. H.G. Fischer, “Three Old Kingdom Palmleaves in the Louvre,” ZÄS 70 (1956), pp. 130 (slay-slay).

2 Summarized in a letter from Reisner to E. Drissen, Director General of the Service des Antiquités, on March 14, 2005.

3 Or Upper Egyptian panther skin mantle; see Simpson, Giza Mastabas 1, p. 26; Fig. 22; R.J. Lebbon, Corpus Antiquatum Aegyiptiacarum, MFA Fasc. 2, Stelae (Mainz am Rhein, 1988), pl. 36a, R.J. Lebbon, Corpus Antiquatum Aegyiptiacarum, MFA Fasc. 2, Stelae (Mainz am Rhein, 1988), pp. 59–62


6 Ibid., pp. 36–37.


10 Ibid., pp. 35–36.

11 Ibid., pp. 36–37.


Dunham tried to reconstruct the area just above the tomb-owner’s head. Smith has later written at the top of this letter, “The emplacement is 38 x 58 cm. WSS.” But this cannot be accurate, for the data itself measures almost 36 cm in width alone. Our own measurements of the emplacement produced a width of 38 cm. In fact, Smith’s are the measurements for the empty emplacement in g2100. Smith was misled by the discovery of the lower left fragment of the Seshat-sekhentiu stela, containing the lion-legged stool and legs of the tomb-owner (fig. 102), on the g2100, near g2120, hence his concern with the measurements of that tomb’s empty emplacement.

In his article on the linen lists, published in 1935, he notes the fragment as if it actually derived from the emplacement of g2100, instead of from g2120. By the time of the publication of Giza Necropolis I in 1934, the fragment had been correctly reassigned to g2100, and Reisner’s publication noted that “two large fragments were found in debris east of the foundation platform of the stone chapel.”

The stela remains in this condition (in three separate pieces) in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, as of this writing.
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Fig. 100. Plan of the mastaba of Seshat-sekhentiu, g 2120, after Reisner, *Giza Necropolis* 1, Map 5. Drawing by Ruth Bigio

Fig. 101. Letter from Dows Dunham in Boston to William Stevenson Smith at Giza, concerning the reconstruction of the name and titles of Seshat-sekhentiu. January 5, 1932. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston

Fig. 102. Lower left fragment of the stela of Seshat-sekhentiu, MFA 33–2–187 (= MFA 06.1894). March 22, MFA–HU–MFA Expedition photograph, Dahi Ahmed, c 1933

Fig. 103. Fragments of the upper left portion of the stela of Seshat-sekhentiu (MFA 06.1894), MFA Visual Archives, c 1933
Fig. 104. Fragments of the stela of Seshat-sekhentiu (MFA 06.1894). 1906. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, Albert H. Lythgoe, a.527.

Fig. 105. Two additional fragments, discovered in 1938, from the stela of Seshat-sekhentiu (MFA 38–3–2, and 38–3–3=MFA 06.1894). March 16, 1938. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, Mohammedani Ibrahim, c.1411.

Fig. 106. Two fragments of inscribed red granite drum from g2120. May 16, 1939. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, Mohammedani Ibrahim, c.14340.

Fig. 107. Two fragments of inscribed red granite drum from g2120, after Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, p. 427, fig. 246.

Fig. 108. Section of the chapel area of g2120, looking west, showing the locations of the slab stela and subsequent limestone false door, after Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, p. 424, fig. 243.

Fig. 109. Two fragments of inscribed red granite drum from g2120. May 16, 1939. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, Mohammedani Ibrahim, c.14340.
Although most of the fragments were discovered in 1905–1906 (figs. 103–105), during Lythgoe’s original clearance of Cemetery 2200, three other pieces turned up subsequently. Rainier wrote to Drioton on March 14, 1938 with the following explanation in requesting permission to export additional fragments to Boston via the expedition artist Joseph Lindon Smith:

Two fragments of a slab stela broken and scattered in 1905–6, large fragments were found and assigned to the Boston Museum of Fine Arts in 1933 another fragment was found in another place and assigned to the Boston M. F.A. (fig. 102) these new fragments were found in re-examining the foundation of the chapel of g 2200 March 6, 1938 (fig. 103):
(a) White limestone in relief 25 x 25 cm
(b) 23 x 10 cm
These fragments fit on the photographs made in the Boston Museum of the fragments found in 1905–6 and 1933. For fragments now in Boston Museum, see Division List of 1906. See Division List 1933: pl. 6 f.

The mud-brick chapel area of g 2200 was replaced by a more elaborate stone chapel and partial completion of limestone casing blocks. Only scant traces of the underlying chapel survive, but a secondary series of mud-brick rooms was added slightly further to the north. The slab stela placement would have been wall up behind a series of large casing blocks, as the cult focus shifted to a monolithic false door further to the south along the east wall.

Like the stelae of Setji-hekenet (g 1227) and Meretites (g 4140), Seshat-sekhentiu’s stela has suffered intentional damage. Unlike the two former stelae, whose inscriptions have been chiseled away in specific areas, the present stela was smashed into at least fourteen fragments. These fragments were subsequently either thrown all around the mastaba or became displaced in the course of later intrusive shaft construction, followed by millennia of plundering, sanding up and reburial of the cemetry. Among the areas permanently lost are Seshat-sekhentiu’s face, and the number and layout of the iwy falcons at the top of the linen list. The remainder of the list suggests, however, that the falcons were placed at the very top of the decorated surface, not underneath the horizontal band of identifying inscriptions (section a).

Willful erasure has obliterated Seshat-sekhentiu’s administrative titles in this band of text, and his barely discernible name survives only because it was carved in a second line, just above Seshat-sekhentiu’s head. In fact, if the point of the intentional damage was indeed to obliterate Seshat-sekhentiu’s...
memory, then one has to question the literacy of the agent involved. If illiterate, he must have been told that the top line of each stela contained the name and titles, and was unaware that in this case the personal name was inscribed in a second line, just above the tomb-owner’s head. Other motivations for the erasure could include post-pharaonic vandalism, or the attempt to destroy the Horus falcons at the top of the linen list, as was done to the stelas of Setji-henenet (g 1227) and Merti-tis (g 4140). Unfortunately, the fragment containing the falcons has not survived, and so it cannot be determined if they were intentionally destroyed or not. Erasures seem to be limited in the Giza group to the three stelae mentioned here (from g 1227, g 2120, and g 4140).

Fragments of a red granite false door drum were found in the debris of the mud-brick exterior chapel east of the slab stela emplacement. These preserve additional traces of the tomb-owner’s name and titles (flry-¢bt¢ry-tp) (figs. 106–107).

Seshat-sekhentiu’s stela is one of five preserved “long-form” stelae, only two of which are preserved complete (Wepemnefret, g 1201, and Merti-tis, g 4140). The greatest affinities are with the stelae of Kaninisut (?) (g 2155) and Merti-tis (g 4140), primarily in the addition of the furniture lists to the expanded area between the offering table and the linen list. Reisner believed that no other slab stela was as large as that of Seshat-sekhentiu. He did not take into account, however, some of the fragmentary stelae that, when restored, would surpass Seshat-sekhentiu in size. The largest stela comes from g 4860 (see below, stela 15).

Seshat-sekhentiu sits on a lion-legged stool (the only one preserved in the long-form group) with a large, elaborate papyrus umbel terminal and a flaring seat cushion protruding behind. Enough of his figure survives to show his hands in the traditional arrangement, right hand extended towards the offering table, left hand grasping the shoulder knot. However, his long, straitened wig falling to his shoulders is only one of two preserved examples for the male stela owners, the other being on the Wepemnefret stela (g 1201). Despite the damage to the offering table, it is clear that the table and extend all the way up to the table top, which must have held ten half-floors, arranged symmetrically five to a side. The linen list shows a complexity not found in the other slab-stelae. Each linen section is accompanied by compartments for type plus the word of, then the sign, and finally the amounts (6). Four out of five granaries are preserved at the bottom, although the production only three can be read with certainty. At the top of the
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list, I would reconstruct four ibis falcons, but this number is based solely on proportional estimations.

Date: Of critical importance to the dating of the mastaba was Lythgoe’s discovery of a red-painted graffito with the date "num-ât-sbt 12, 2 šemu..." on the face of the large casing block just north of the monolithic false door (figs. 115–16). Assuming the biennial cattle count was still in effect in the early Fourth Dynasty, this would indicate year 23 of Khufu. It is more difficult to assess the interval between construction of the mastaba core, the multiple alterations to the chapel, and the actual installation of the slab stela. Some have chosen to date the slab stela to the reign of Khafre. However, as this graffito appears on a secondary element, the limestone block of the stone chapel that replaced the original mud-brick building, we may be fairly certain that the slab stela, walled up behind this block, predates Khufu’s twenty-third year. Taking recent arguments by P. Jánosi against completion of Western Cemetery mastabas as early as the first five years of Khufu’s reign, we may posit the installation of Seshat-sekhentiu’s slab stela somewhere between years 15–22 of Khufu.

26 Jánosi, Giza in der 4. Dynastie (Vienna forthcoming), § 2.6.2.
27 Ibid.

Fig. 115. Graffito on monolithic block from chapel of "g...", looking west. December 23, 1938. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, Mohammedani Ibrahim, b 9007

Fig. 116. Graffito inscription (in reversed orientation from that of fig. 115), after Smith, JNES 31 (1972), p. 118, fig. 6
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Slab Stele 10 (pls. 19–20)

Owner: Anonymous (gender uncertain)
Provenance: Cemetery 2100, g2135 (= VIInn = g4770)
Excavation history: German–Austrian Expedition under H. Junker, 1912–13; found in the debris east of the chapel area of g2135
Current location: Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, Inv. ÄS 7799
Material: Limestone; raised relief carving
Measurements: h. 24 cm; w. 27 cm; th. 8 cm
Selected bibliography:
PM III, p. 75, Junker, Gîza 1, pp. 229–30, fig. 53b, pl. 39; R. Hölzl, Corpus Antiquitatum Aegyptiacarum, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Wien, Lieferung 22, Reliefs und nischentabellen des Alten Reiches II/1, forthcoming

Translation

Section a:

Section b:

Section c:

Section d:

"...'...", black eye-paint, [green eye-paint?], best ointment, wine, pomegranate fruit, zizyphus"

"..." linen, (...), 2, 1 linen

"..." linen: a thousand of 4 (cubits wide), a thousand of 3 (cubits wide), a thousand of 2 (cubits wide), a thousand of 1 (cubits wide)

Section e:

"..." linen: a thousand of 100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 90 (cubits wide), a thousand of 80 (cubits wide), a thousand of 70 (cubits wide), a thousand of 60 (cubits wide)

Section f:

"..." linen: a thousand of 100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 90 (cubits wide), a thousand of 80 (cubits wide), a thousand of 70 (cubits wide), a thousand of 60 (cubits wide)

"..." linen: a thousand of 100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 90 (cubits wide), a thousand of 80 (cubits wide), a thousand of 70 (cubits wide), a thousand of 60 (cubits wide)

Description and commentary: Only the upper right-hand corner of this piece survives. Junker was unable to determine either the exact findspot for the fragment, or the emplacement area in the mastaba core wall. Recent examination of the tomb has only revealed that the area has since deteriorated further. The mud-brick chapel probably contained five chambers, with the north–south offering room possibly divided by short walls protruding east from the mastaba core (figs. 119–120). Extrapolating from the single fragment allows us to reconstruct a short-form stela that bears much in common with the north–south offering room possibly divided by short walls protruding east from the mastaba core (figs. 119–120).

1 I am grateful to R. Hölzl of the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, for providing these corrected measurements, improving on those published by Junker, Gîza 1, p. 229.
2 On the choice of transliteration ¡dmy instead of ¡t¡wy, see below, Chapter 4, discussion of Section d (linen lists).
3 This word is written ¢t on the Helwan stela from tomb 247; cf. Z. Saad, Ceiling Stelae in Second Dynasty Tombs from the Excavations at Helwan, AAW Supplement, Cahier 23/Caen, 1997, pl. 31; J. Kahl, N. Kloth, and U. Zimmermann, Die Inschriften der 3. Dynastie (Wiesbaden, 1995), p. 175 (d); however, it never appears with a.¢t on any of the Giza slab stelae. The value is most likely more than 100 or 200, but less than 1,000; cf. P. Posener-Kröger, “Les mesures des étoffes à l’ancien empire,” RdE 29 (1977), pp. 93–94.
with the stelae from Cemetery 1200. The linen list, containing four falcons (Section d), reached to the top of the decoration. The offerings of Section c are arranged just to the left of the list in vertical columns without any vertical dividing lines. This means that the identifying inscription (Section a) was a short one, possibly restricted to the area just above the head of the deceased, as with the stelae of Khufu-nakht (g 1205), Nefr (g 1207), and Nefret-sabt (g 1229). Oddly enough, however, each of these stelae utilizes some sort of dividing line, either vertical or horizontal, to separate the offerings, whereas this stela does not separate the offerings with lines to surround them with a longer horizontal band of text with the identifying inscription (Section a). The present fragment, then, seems to combine elements from both traditions.

The linen list falcons hover just above the mn∞t signs in an arrangement paralleled only on the stelae of Kanefer from g 1203 and on the anonymous stela from g 4860, although in the latter case the mn∞t signs appear in front of each (reversed) falcon rather than behind. A final element that recalls the examples from Cemetery 1200 is the absence of vertical dividers in the width and amount designations (∞£) of the linen list. Parallel stelae include Wepemnefret (g 1003), Kanefer (g 1202), and Khufu-nakht (g 1205). Nothing remains of the funerary repast (Section b) except for six left-facing and one right-facing half-loaves of bread.

From: Junker believed that g 2135 dates to the reign of Shesheskaf, but Jánosi has shown that there is no reason to posit such a late Dynasty 4 date for the tomb. The absence of vertical separators in the linen list (Section d), and the fact that these falcons hover just above the mn∞t signs in an arrangement paralleled only on the stelae of Kanefer from g 1203 and on the anonymous stela from g 4860, although in the latter case the mn∞t signs appear in front of each (reversed) falcon rather than behind. A final element that recalls the examples from Cemetery 1200 is the absence of vertical dividers in the width and amount designations (∞£) of the linen list. Parallel stelae include Wepemnefret (g 1003), Kanefer (g 1202), and Khufu-nakht (g 1205). Nothing remains of the funerary repast (Section b) except for six left-facing and one right-facing half-loaves of bread.

The absence of vertical separators in the linen list (Section d), and the tall, but still flaring, shape to the offering loaves in the table scene (Section c), all speak for an early date in the dynasty. As one of the earlier of two groups of Cemetery 2100 mastabas, g 2135, along with its companion tomb Isawer (once containing slab stelae (g 2000, Seshat-sekhentiu, mother of Merib, and g 2000 Seshat-akhentiu, stela 9 above) should be placed in the early to mid-reign of Khufu, perhaps into his second decade.
Fig. 120. Plan of mastaba G 2135, after Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, Map 5. Drawing by Ruth Bigio

Fig. 121. Chapel area of G 2135, looking west. November 20, 1993, PDM, 93.103.8
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Fig. 122. Street and chapel area east of g 225, looking south (=Junker, Giza I, pl. 31b). Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, I 5284

Fig. 123. Street and chapel area east of g 225, looking south, November 21, 1993. PDM, 93.103.07
Slab Stela II (pls. 21–22)

Owner: K£-n-nswt, Kaninisut (K£-n-nswt, Kaninisut)

Provenance: Cemetery 2100: g2155 (g2155 = VIIInn = g2155) (actual chapel of g2155, Kaninisut, was discovered on June 10, 1913, and purchased on January 27, 1914 from the Egyptian Antiquities Service)

Excavation history: German–Austrian Expedition under H. Junker, 1912–13 (actual chapel of g2155, Kaninisut, was discovered during Junker’s second campaign, and purchased on January 27, 1914 from the Egyptian Antiquities Service)

Current location: Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, Inv. ÄS 7447

Material: Limestone, raised relief carving

Measurements: h. 52 cm; w. 53 cm (as restored: c. 80 cm); th. 10 cm

Selected bibliography:
1. Junker, Gîza 1, pp. 258–59, 230, fig. 53c, pl. 29b; R. Hölzl, Reiches III, CAA Kunsthistorisches Museum, Wien, Lieferung 3 (Chicago, 1996), pp. 45–49 (item no. 13, incorrectly assigned to mastaba VIIInn = g4770, and incorrectly citing Junker, Gîza 1, pl. 37b instead of pl. 29b); idem, in E. Teeter and J. Larson, eds., Gold of Praise: Studies on Ancient Egypt in Honor of Edward F. Wente, SAOC 58 (Chicago, 1999), esp. pp. 2, n. 2 (item no. 13) (PDM 4.1, item no. 13
4. Junker, Gîza 1, pl. 29b, assumes that the sign is upside down, for . It is perhaps more likely that the tiny corner preserved is a different sign altogether.
8. Cf. Junker, Gîza 1, pl. 25b, n. 1; Brovarski, Studies in Honor of William Kelly Simpson 1, pp. 130–33, 155 (item no. 13).
12. Ibid., pp. 32–38, 49 (item no. 13).
Section d:

[...]

... a thousand [...] a thousand [...] a thousand [...] a thousand [...]

... 1000 [...] 1000 [...] 1000 [...]

... 1000 and nfr (from ikhet nbt nfrt): on right, bread, beer, 2000 and At the extreme right, a linen list, remains of two kinds of linen, but the upper one is curiously arranged with two sets of 1000 signs separated by the sub-headings. Between the tableaux and the linen list, a large compartment list occupying all the space preserved to a height a little above the base of the broad on the tablet. Two registers remain, each with a register of 1000 signs beneath: 1) (above) two garments, bed, headrest, and three boxes; 2) (below) stone vessels.

On pp. 19–20 Reisner classifies the slab stelae (see below, Chapter 4), and refers to the fragment (our fig. 125) as "stela of unknown provenience (g2155?)." Finally, in the published Giza Necropolis 1, he describes the fragments as "near g2155, two fragments, one from the top of a linen list and the other, larger, from the lower edge of the slab from the table to the right border." He does not mention these fragments in his brief summary of g2155.

Some doubt certainly remains as to a secure provenance for these fragments. I have therefore accepted Reisner's assignation here, albeit with some reservation. I base this acceptance on the assumption of Reisner's continued presence at Giza versus Junker's forced absence from the site between the time just after the discovery of these fragments (1912–13 season) until his return to Giza after World War I. In other words, Reisner's data may accurately reflect the situation as he learned it from Junker and recorded it, whereas Junker lost track of the stela's provenance due to German/Austrian "exile" from Giza between 1914 and 1925.

Fig. 125. The Kaninisut stela from g2155(?), photographed at the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, 16/7/945.

Description and commentary: In terms of establishing provenance, this is the most difficult stela of the entire group. In the original publication of the piece, Junker noted that it, along with a smaller fragment (fig. 25b), were "an abtinem. 1952-4, [g]2155 Prince Ka-nynswt: 1) A small fragment from the top with nb[s] and a hawk from the top of the linen list. 2) A large fragment of the bottom of the slab from a little to the left of the table to the right border. No remnant of figures and no indication of his titles and names. Beneath the table, ideographic list: on left, lintel, 3000, and nfr (from ishkem nfrt) 3 on right, bread, beer, 3000, and raps. At the upper right, a linen list, remains of two kinds of linen, but the upper one is curiously arranged with two sets of 1000 signs separated by the sub-headings. Between the tableaux and the linen list, a large compartment list occupying all the space preserved to a height a little above the base of the broad on the tablet. Two registers remain, each with a register of 1000 signs beneath: 1) (above) two garments, bed, headrest, and three boxes; 2) (below) stone vessels.

On pp. 33–30 Reisner classifies the slab stelae (see below, Chapter 4), and refers to the fragment (our fig. 125) as "stela of unknown provenience (g2155?)." Finally, in the published Giza Necropolis 1, he describes the fragments as "near g2155, two fragments, one from the top of a linen list and the other, larger, from the lower edge of the slab from the table to the right border." He does not mention these fragments in his brief summary of g2155.

Some doubt certainly remains as to a secure provenance for these fragments. I have therefore accepted Reisner's assignation here, albeit with some reservation. I base this acceptance on the assumption of Reisner's continued presence at Giza versus Junker's forced absence from the site between the time just after the discovery of these fragments (1912–13 season) until his return to Giza after World War I. In other words, Reisner's data may accurately reflect the situation as he learned it from Junker and recorded it, whereas Junker lost track of the stela's provenance due to German/Austrian "exile" from Giza between 1914 and 1925. 20

20. For an alternative reading, arguing for a redundant...

For an alternative reading, arguing for a redundant...
Chapter 1: Catalogue of the Giza Slab Seals
If true, this most intriguing revelation may serve to rewrite the history of the tomb of Kaninisut (g 2155), whose magnificently decorated chapel is on display in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (ÄS 8006). The mastaba would have held an emplacement for the slab stela, and then received the most elaborate and complete expansion of any tomb in the group of tombs under discussion. An annex was appended to the southern end of the core mastaba, and the new limestone chapel was broken into the interior of the superstructure. At a later time, the mastaba Kaninisut I was added to the eastern side of g 2155, utilizing the east wall of the larger tomb as the decorated west wall of the smaller one (fig. 219). All of this subsequent construction activity has obscured the area of the southern end of the core mastaba east wall. The result is present inability to determine any emplacement or former existence of a slab stela. The situation is similar to that of Nefer (g 2260), whose exterior stone chapel has covered what might once have been a slab data fragment.

In terms of the decoration of the slab stela fragment itself, there is probably little use in a stylistic comparison with Kaninisut’s chapel, for the two monuments must be quite separate chronologically. If our fragment belongs to the east of the stela in our corpus, it should date to the reign of Khufu, whereas Kaninisut’s chapel in Vienna is traditionally dated to early Dynasty 5. There are many other possible scenarios, once again assuming that we have the correct provenance for the slab stela fragment in its first place:

• the monument originally belonged to someone else in Khufu’s reign, when the slab stela was prepared, and was subsequently “usurped” by Kaninisut, who added his chapel to the mastaba and decorated it to Kaninisut’s taste.
• both slab stela fragment and decorated chapel belong to Kaninisut, and the mastaba dates not to the Dynasty 5 but to Dynasty 4, as N. Cherpion has argued.
• the fragment is an archaism and dates not to the reign of Khufu, but perhaps even into Dynasty 4, closer to the date of the chapel itself.

No determination can be made on the pose, costume, or gender of the mummified figure, and other traces survive of the offering tableau and stand, without any visible head leaves. A unique addition to the usual items listed beneath the offering table is the phrase [h a3(w) s3t(s) u3t3(w) jn t(r)] s3t(s), represented only by the top of the a3(w) sign, the nsw-hieroglyph, quail chick, and s3t basket. No other stela contains these words, and if the tab(s) text is to be read horizontally, that is, on either side of the tableau stand, the word arrangement too is unique.

Fig. 129. Additional slab stela fragment, after Junker, Gîza 2, p. 210; fig. 53k, present location not known.

This is the only slab that layers three rows together without the separation of a different type of linen. The other slabs show a specific linen type, its width in one row and then the amount in another. The Kaninisut list shows, from top to bottom, amount (3t), width and amount (3t) before switching to a new type of linen. The situation would be clarified if more of the linen list had survived above. Perhaps there was a split in an upper row between two types of linen, such as we find in the stela from g 4860, where two signs and a3t share the same row.

The mastaba belongs to the second group constructed in Cemetery 2100, and the decoration of the only slightly added chapel is clearly post-Khufu, quite possibly early Dynasty 5. The presence of two false doors in an interior chapel, which itself does not belong to the original mastaba core, points to a date posterior to Menkaure’s time. Moreover, if Kaninisut were an actual king (or Khufu), we might ask why his tomb is not located in the Eastern Cemetery. This raises the question of how many years and reigns might have passed between the completion of the slab stela and chapel’s annex. Clearly Kaninisut could not have lived from Khufu’s reign all the way into the early reigns of Dynasty 5. If the slab stela does not represent a first phase of Kaninisut’s tomb decoration, then perhaps it should be taken as an early surviving object of the presumed original owner of the mastaba, before it was finally assigned to and altered by Kaninisut. We have opted for the present to accept Kaninisut as owner of both slab stela fragment and subsequent decorated chapel, thus both must date to some time after Khufu’s reign. But the somewhat suspect nature of the stela fragment’s provenance, based solely on Rainer’s unpublished notes, may well repay further investigation at a future time.

[Expansions and footnotes]


26 Cf. the Problem of the Giza Slab Stele,” in H. Guichard and D. Rohe, eds., Stelenkunde. Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte des Alten Kaiserskönigs (Mainz am Rhein, 1989), pp. 125–34, and see below, Chapter 4, for a monograph on the stela from Holker (g 2281).


28 For the tomb of Kaninisut I, see Junker, Gîza 3, pp. 135–196.


30 Struck, Die Kunststelen des Prinzen Kaninisut, pp. 31–50; H. Satzinger, Der mumifizierte Saqqaraherren throneben (Vienna, 1989). H. Satzinger, Das Kunsthistorische Museum Wien, Die Ägyptisch-Orientalische Sammlung (Mainz am Rhein, 2000), pp. 35–47, and see below, Chapter 4, for a monograph on the stela from Holker (g 2281).

31 See P. Jánosi, Die Kunststelen des Prinzen Kaninisut (Vienna, forthcoming), §§ 2.3.3(b), 2.6.2.


33 Cherpion, Hierakonpolis und Memphis. Le Probleme de la Datation (Brussels, 1990), pp. 28–30, dates the tomb to Khufu-Geselin, which is followed by M. Baud, Famîlié Acacia (Paris, 1990), p. 489 (323).

34 See J. Junker, Das Kunst- und Schatzkabinett der Ägyptischen Abteilung des Kunsthistorischen Museums, Vienna (Vienna, 1955) = Das Kunsthistorische Museum Wien, Die Ägyptisch-Orientalische Sammlung (Mainz am Rhein, 1998), pp. 115–34, and see below, Chapter 4, for a monograph on the stela from Holker (g 2281).
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**Sa ab Stela 12 (pls. 23–24)**

**Owner:** Meretites, Manetites

**Provenance:** Cemetery 4000, g 4140

**Excavation history:** Excavated in January-February, 1922 by the Harvard University-Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Expedition, under G.A. Reisner; discovered in situ set into emplacement in chapel niche first mentioned in the Expedition Diary on January 6, 1922; photographs at Harvard Camp by April 23, 1922

**Current location:** Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 12.230

**Material:** Limestone; raised relief carving

**Measurements:** h. 10.5 cm, w. 8.8 cm

**Selected bibliography:**

**Translation**

Section a:

(1) *k3* (2) *rend* (3) *n3*r, *wzdmr* (4) *snf.*

(3) "King’s bodily daughter, Meret[ites](4)"

Section b:

(2) *snr* (4) *swt* (5) *m3nt [nswt] nfr [(m3nt)]

"[King’s] bodily daughter, Mer[et]ites"

Section c:

(6) *m3nt [nswt] zt [swt]*, *m3nt [nswt] m3nt [nswt]*, *m3nt [nswt] m3nt [nswt]*

(13) "a thousand oxen, (14) a thousand cranes, a thousand suckled cows, (15) a thousand loaves of bread, (16) a thousand jars of beer*

Section d:

(11) *wzdmr* *(mdy [3nt]) t [3nt]*, *wzdmr* *(mdy [3nt]) w [3nt]*

"King’s linen*

Section e:

(17) *khrgr * [swt]*, *khrgr * [swt]*, *khrgr * [swt]*, *khrgr * [swt]*, *khrgr * [swt]*, *khrgr * [swt]*

(18) "a thousand of 100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 80 (cubits wide), a thousand of 70 (cubits wide), a thousand of 60 (cubits wide), a thousand of 50 (cubits wide), a thousand of 40 (cubits wide)"

Section f:

(19) "a thousand of 100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 90 (cubits wide), a thousand of 80 (cubits wide), a thousand of 70 (cubits wide), a thousand of 60 (cubits wide), a thousand of 50 (cubits wide), a thousand of 40 (cubits wide)*

Fig. 100. Colorized facsimile drawing of the Meretites stela from g 4140

---

3. Several of these items are new readings, and expand upon the translations given in Leprohon, *Stelae* 1, pp. 82–83
7. "An examination of the transliteration *¡t¡wy* instead of *¡dmy* see below, Chapter 4, discussion of Section a (inner field).
Sela: Meretites G 4140

Description and commentary: The stone is complete except for the missing upper left corner, obscuring parts of the owner's name. Despite the damage to this part of the stone, sufficient traces remain nothwithstanding to reveal the honorific (?) title [nswt n]t flt≠f and the name Mrt-(¡t)≠s.

Perhaps the most unusual feature of tomb G 4300 is the fact that the mastaba core received an extension annex to allow for a second burial to the north, and the slab stela was installed, not in the original core, but in the outer wall of the extension. The only other mastaba in which the slab stela is not part of the original core construction (G 4300), whose data has unfortunately not survived. Both of these tombs are mastabas of Reisner's type III, a rare form attested elsewhere at Giza only in the twin mastaba G 7400–7420. While a mud-brick chapel was undoubtedly planned around the slab stela niche, no trace of it has survived, only the foundation of the stone chapel was discovered by Reisner.13

The only area to have suffered extensive damage besides the name in the upper left corner is the uppermost horizontal band of inscription, but this is the result of intentional destruction, for the stela's discovery in situ in its emplacement precludes the possibility of damage from vandals. It is interesting to note that rarely one, and perhaps two, motivations for the chiselling out of the signs might be at work here, not to mention a hint at the integrity of the subject of the destruction. The uppermost line of the stela actually contains three separate items: the owner's name and title at left, facing right (Section a), part of the offerings in the center, facing left (Section c), and the two falcons of the linen list at the far right (Section d). All three items have been erased. Was this an attack on the person of the owner, as is paralleled by the (like-wise long-form) stela of Seshat-sekhentiu (G 2300)? Or was it an attack against the Horus falcons represented by the linen list, as is paralleled in the stela of Setji-hekenet (G 1227)? The fact that the entire horizontal area is hacked out indicates that the iconoclast may have been unable to read the signs, and merely followed orders to obliterate the entire line. It is thus more likely his attack was personal, against Meretites herself, rather than against the god Horus, for it seems easier to assume he believed that names and titles extended across the entire horizontal width of the stela. If Horus alone was the focus of the destruction (as with Setji-hekenet's stela from G 1227), there should have been no need to extend the damage further to the left of the linen list. Unfortunately, the parallel afforded by the stela of Seshat-sekhentiu (G 2300) does not

10This number is read “four” instead of “twenty” due to the vertical linen signs with no horizontal base; cf. Posener-Kriéger, RdE 29 (1977), pp. 86–96.
12Ibid., p. 40–41: “retaining wall of large blocks of grey nummilitic limestone set in high-stepped courses and filled with gravel and rubbish, or more or less solid with massive blocks; the massive stepped core is faced with small blocks of dark limestone and the house wall with appearance to the somewhat of type Ib and IIa.”
13Ibid., p. 80–84. See also J. Janosi, Giza in the 4. Dynastie (Vienna, forthcoming), § 2.4.1 (G 4140). For more on the significance of the slab stela position in the extension of the mastaba core, see below, Chapter 4.
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Fig. 132. Plan of the mastaba of Meretites, g 4140, after Reisner, Giza Necropolis I, Map 6. Drawing by Ruth Bigio

Fig. 133. Chapel of g 4140 with slab stela in situ, looking northwest. November 20, 2013. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, Mohammed Shaduf, c. 3352

Fig. 134. Chapel of g 4140 with empty slab stela emplacement indicated, looking northwest. April 22, 1999. PDM, 99.5.33
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preserve the falcons of the linen list, so it is impossible to know if they too were erased along with Seshat-sekhentiu's upper-most horizontal line.

No other stela displays the extremely low relief prevalent on the Meretites stela. Some signs all but disappear into the stone without the benefit of strong raking light, a feature emphasized all the more by the total absence of surviving color. While the carving is extremely fine across the entire stela, the amount of interior detail on individual signs is spare indeed. Perhaps additional detail was once added in paint; the most intricately carved hieroglyphs are the tof Isis and the \( \ddagger \) sign \( \ddagger \) with \( \& \) determinative, all beneath the offering table. The latter is perhaps the item carved in the highest relief. The ceramic table stand reaches all the way to the round table holding the half-loaves of bread, which are symmetrically arranged and number six to each side. Meretites's figure occupies just less than a third of the stela's decorated surface; she appears more broad-shouldered than either Nefer (g 1207) or Nefret-iabet (g 1225), but less so than Setji-hekenet (g 1227). She sits in the same pose as all three other women (with the exception of Setji-hekenet's horizontally bent right hand), and wears the same close-fitting garment with shoulder knot. No evidence of jewelry (choker, bracelets, or anklet) is visible in the carving, but her long, tripartite wig is carefully striated and reveals a very competently modeled ear. Some damaged see the area around the chin, but the face, with its thickly lidded eye, pointed arch of eyebrows, and thickly ridged mouth, survives in perfect condition. Meretites's bull-legged stool contains a protruding cushion on the seat, a small papyrus umbel terminal in comparison to the rest of the stool, and by far the largest conical supports beneath the legs found on any of the slab stelae. Extremely wide and barely flaring, the supports dwarf the bull's hooves that rest upon them with plenty of horizontal room to spare.

The linen list contains six \( \ddagger \)my falcons, but only the scantiest of traces remain, due to the intentional destruction of the top line of the stela (see above). Beneath this type of linen, the list takes on a uniform layout with the \( \ddagger \)my, \( \ddagger \)my, and \( \ddagger \)lin- en types. At the bottom of the list, space remains for no less than seven large granaries. Although four other stelae contain
**Chapter 3: Catalogue of the Giza Slab Stelae**

Granaries. Meretites provides the only example of the rounded form (in place of the more traditional trapezoidal variety), with pointed tops, even including the identifying label of *live granary* written above them. The greatest similarity in the sequence of granary items listed exists between the Meretites stela (Fig. 4840) and the anonymous one from g 4860, although the latter reverses the orientation of the other stelae (see below, stela 38).

Of the six long-form slab stelae, g 2130, g 2230, g 4840, g 4860, and g 4880, the data of Meretites show the greatest affinity with that of Nesh-en-khentiu (g 2250), although this might be an accident of preservation. Both stelae move their offering tables further left to make room for extended lists of ideographic offerings in Section c. Both contain granaries at the bottom of their linen lists, and both have even been attacked across the top of their inscriptions. The Meretites stela differs, however, from the fragment from g 2250 and the Seshat-sekhentiu (g 2280) stela for the latter two contain furniture lists in addition to their ideographic offerings.

In explaining the unusual arrangement of two niches for the neighboring mastaba g 4900, jurist cited Meretites tomb (g 4840) and an early statement by Reisner that the latter once possessed two slab stelae. g 4410 did produce two reserve heads but, like g 4410, it contains only a single burial shaft. Nowhere does the can determine if Reisner reports the claim of two slab stelae for a single mastaba. Such mention is not made in his published Giza Necropolis I, nor does it appear in his unpublished manuscript, "The Development of the Tablet Scene," housed in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. The statement should be considered erroneous.

The tomb of Meretites is the only one of our group to preserve not one, but two reserve heads, male and female (Figs. 338-340). A skull awel, generally agreed to be that of a female. This allows us the unique opportunity to juxtapose two-dimensional images of the heads from the stela with the reserve head and the skull (Figs. 342-343). While the stela head displays a highly idealized portrait, there is little one can point to in the relief carving that is not idealized. As one might expect, an experimental superimposition of the drawings of the two faces produces a considerable misalignment. Thus, the two representations of Meretites do not display in two and three dimensions the same sort of similarities that have linked the reserve head of Nefert (g 2280) to the two-dimensional relief from his chapel's north entrance niche. The theory of other tombs to contain a reserve head and statuette or statuette fragment, another of Kanwef (g 1203), and Hek, modeled in mud instead of limestone, is probably.

**Table 3.1** Despite her royal title of king's bodily daughter, Meretites was most likely only a titular princess. Sheshu joins Wepemnefret (g 1203), Kaenmut (g 1223), Nefret-ibat (g 2259), Kaninisut (g 2283), and Nuna (g 4840) in possessing this title in honorific fashion. Reisner argued that g 4840 belonged to the group of Cemetery 4000 mastabas completed by Khufu's fifteenth year. The long-form stela, with extended offerings, is not necessarily a later form, as evidenced by the long-form stela of Wepemnefret (g 1203), which I would place among the very earliest Western Cemetery mastabas. Hanmiu's mastaba (g 4000) lies immediately west of Meretites's mastaba, and Hek even argues the two were husband and wife based on this proximity. The stela is clearly within the early group of stelae, and is probably contemporary with the earlier slabs from Cemetery 2000, and from g 2280 and g 4860. While the extremely low relief style and short, flaring offering lists (Section c) argue for a date early in Khufu's reign, the placement of the stela in the extension of mastaba indicates that it belongs to the second stage of the tomb's development. It is therefore dated from early to mid-reign of Khufu.

Cf. Smith, HESPOK, p. 27; cf. P. Jung, in Kunst des Alten Reiches (Mainz am Rhein, 1995), p. 104, pl. 36a–b; J. Assmann, in Studies in Honor of William Kelly Simpson (Boston, 1996), pp. 58, 60, fig. 7. See also on this topic, A. Stolbizer, Khufu and His Double (Oslo, 1993), p. 28. Notes on the facial features on the Giza slab stelae are provided below in Chapter 4, with Fig. 256.

Some have suggested that the reserve head from g 2280 portrays a woman, but there is no reason to identify the head with the residuary of this one-shaft mastaba. C. H. Rothig, in Egypt in Art in The Age of the Pyramids, pp. 45, 91-92, and 103-104, has argued previously that there is no evidence that this head was placed in its proper position in the mastaba. Although it is, indeed, a splendid example of the type, it appears to be a replacement head for some other mastaba. Smith conservatively places it in the group of Cemetery 4000 mastabas, while Helck, in Kunst des Alten Reiches, pp. 68–89, and especially p. 67, on this reserve head in general, (British Museum, p. 68; cf. Wente, "Inventory Offering Lists and the Nomenclature for Boxes and Chests of the Old Kingdom," in E. Westendorf, Art et Magie au temps des Pyramides. L’énigme des têtes dites "de remplacement" (Brussels, 1980), cat. 46, p. 308, pl. 23b; cf. Tefnin, in *Facial Features on the Giza Slab Stelae* (in press), fig. 256).

Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 4202; Reisner, Giza Necropolis I, pl. 194; Tefnin, at Art in Giza (pp. 97–98, pl. 9a) (1960), preferred Hemiunu (g 4000) as Meretites’s anonymous tomb. Reisner did place the head in Amide’s tomb, but there is no reason not to identify the head with the residuary of this oner mastaba. C. H. Rothig, in Egypt in Art in The Age of the Pyramids, p. 103, notes that some of the owners of reserve heads are different individuals from those eventually buried in the major nucleus cemetery mastabas at Giza. C. H. Rothig, *Königssohn,* p. 222, preferred Hemiunu (g 4000) as Ramesses husband. There these are based, however, on little more than geographical proximity between the mastabas in question.
Fig. 139. Male reserve head (MFA 13–10–70 = 24.727) from g 4140 shaft a, November 6, 1913. MFA Visual Archives, c. 1913.

Fig. 140. Female reserve head (MFA 13–11–1 = Cairo JE 46217) from g 4140 shaft A, front. September 5, 1913. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, Mohammed Shadduf, c. 1913.

Fig. 138. Detail of Meretites’s face, from her slab stela.

Fig. 141. Female reserve head (MFA 13–11–1 = Cairo JE 46217) from g 4140 shaft A, front. November 6, 1913. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, Mohammed Shadduf, c. 1913.

Fig. 142. Detail of Meretites’s face, from her slab stela.

Fig. 143. Female skull from g 4140 shaft a, front. November 7, 1913. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, Mohammed Shadduf, c. 1913.

Fig. 144. Female skull from g 4140 shaft a, profile. November 7, 1913. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, Mohammed Shadduf, c. 1913.
Slab Stela 14 (pls. 25–26)

Owner: Iunu (1)

Provenance: Cemetery 4000: g 4150 (= Is)

Exca-vation history: German-Austrian Expedition under H. Junker, discovered on January 25, 1913. Found in situ set into emplacement in chapel niche and walled up with a cover stone, behind a monolithic limestone block.

Current location: Pelizaeus-Museum, Hildesheim 2145

Material: Painted limestone, raised relief carving

Measure-ments: h. 39 cm; w. 54 cm; th. 9.3 cm

From Junker, Gîza 1, pp. 175–78, figs. 73, 75, pls. 26a–b, 27; idem, Vorbericht 1913, p. 188. On this title see the remarks by A.M. Roth, Egyptian Phyles in the Old Kingdom (Chicago, 1991), pp. 119–22, esp. p. 121, n. 8, and H.G. Fischer, Dendera in the Third Millennium B.C. (New York, 1968), p. 70, n. 283.


Translation

Section a:

(1) “Overseer of the phyles of Upper Egypt, king’s son, Iunu”

Section b:

(2) “a thousand of 100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 80 (cubits wide), a thousand of 60 (cubits wide)”

Section c:

(4) "Incense, best ointment, figs., wine. (3) Implements for washing hands"

Translation notes:

(1) Junker, Vorbericht 1913, p. 288

(2) On the nomen and surname see below, Chapter 4, discussion of Sections a (nomen) and c (surname). On the large numbers, G. Vogelsang-Eastwood, "Textiles," in P.T. Nicholson and I. Shaw, eds., Ancient Egyptian Materials and Technology (Cambridge, 2000), p. 295, notes that 845 square meters of cloth were found in the Middle Kingdom tomb of Meket-re at Thebes (H.E. Winlock, "The Mummy of Wah unwrapped," BMMA 35 [1940], p. 257), and relates the tomb to Tutankhamen’s tomb produced 400 items of clothing.


(5) "Incense, best ointment, figs., wine. (3) Implements for washing hands"

Translation notes:

(1) Junker, Gîza 1, pp. 177–78, discuss idemy and idemyt. On the choice of transliteration instead of idemyt, see below, Chapter 4, discussion of Sections a (nomen) and c (surname).

(4) Rankes, PM 1, p. 12.28, quotes Junker, Gîza 1, pp. 175–78, taking the names as short-ened form of fuller names such as kau-tawy, and relates the tomb to g 4000 as a possible family member, despite the title as mast.
Iunu’s stela is the third and final one of the Giza group whose colors survive largely intact, due to the walling up of the piece when the cult focus shifted. It thus shares several elements in common with the stelae of Wepemnefret (g 1201) and Nefret-iabet (g 1225), such as the yellow exterior border, and the thick grayish frameline around the end of the decorated surface. However, the stela has suffered more since its discovery than have the Wepemnefret and Nefret-iabet stelae, as Junker himself noted in Gîza 1.

Junker’s assistant, Paula Czermak, prepared a copy at the time of discovery, and it is upon this copy that Junker’s reconstruction drawing, showing many details that had disappeared by 1929 (the publication date of Gîza 1), is based. For this reason, I have reproduced it here (fig. 153), although several of these details have been omitted from the drawing in pl. 26 and fig. 145. Among these now faded details are the spots on the deceased’s leopard skin garment, the interior lines on the phyle signs, the fringes on the tops of the linen list items, and the horizontals on the basket determinative of db£.

Iunu wears a short, valanced wig, and sports a close-cropped beard similar to, but shorter than, that of Wepemnefret (g 1201). According to Junker, Iunu’s garment originally contained the leopard-skin spots that may still be seen on the dress of Nefret-iabet, or less clearly on that of Wepemnefret; there is no trace of them today. This might explain why one bractlet is curled on Iunu’s right hand, but not on his left: the latter was covered by the painted garment (see fig. 138). Iunu holds his shoulder knot with his left fist, with his right hand he actually touches the left-most half-leaf of bread on the offering table before him. The close juxtaposition here is matched on the stela of Nefret-iabet (g 1229), where the loaf has actually been hollowed out to make room for i.4.1.1.1.1.7., and the anonymous data from g 4860.

The stool shows bull’s feet with subtle modeling on the theriomorphic legs. The tendon on the rear leg survives in between the flaked surfaces and resembles similar tendons on the stelae of Nefret (g 1207) and Setji-hekenet (g 1227). The papyrus umbel terminal preserves some interior detail, but is left blank in the early drawing in Junker’s publication (cf. our fig. 133). Moreover, Junker indicates binding or taching on the stool rail just to the right of the umbel, but no more than one or two faint paint lines are preserved in this area today. Small conical supports are present beneath the stool’s legs; Iunu’s feet obscure the bottom of the offering table, which stands on a Still base set into a ceramic table stand whose lip is obscured by flaking on the stone. The form is best paralleled in the stelae of Kima (g 1232) and Ini (g 1238), both of whom likewise cover part of the jar stand with their feet. The half-loaves on the offering table are short and two-toned in color; they are not centered on the table, although seven appear on each "side."

The stool shows bull’s feet with subtle modeling on the theriomorphic legs. The tendon on the rear leg survives in between the flaked surfaces and resembles similar tendons on the stelae of Nefret (g 1207) and Setji-hekenet (g 1227). The papyrus umbel terminal preserves some interior detail, but is left blank in the early drawing in Junker’s publication (cf. our fig. 133). Moreover, Junker indicates binding or taching on the stool rail just to the right of the umbel, but no more than one or two faint paint lines are preserved in this area today. Small conical supports are present beneath the stool’s legs; Iunu’s feet obscure the bottom of the offering table, which stands on a Still base set into a ceramic table stand whose lip is obscured by flaking on the stone. The form is best paralleled in the stelae of Kima (g 1232) and Ini (g 1238), both of whom likewise cover part of the jar stand with their feet. The half-loaves on the offering table are short and two-toned in color; they are not centered on the table, although seven appear on each "side."

Ceiling Stelae in Second Dynasty Tombs from the Excavations at Helwan in the AGAE Supplement, Cahier 20 (Cairo, 1975), pp. 35-90, by D. Faltings, Kahl, and Zimmermann, Excavation of the 3rd Dynasty (Cairo, 1953). However, it never appears with any of the Giza slab stelae. The value is most likely more than 100 or 200, but less than 1,000; cf. P. Posener-Kriéger, "Les mesures des étoffes à l’ancien empire," pp. 93–94.


Junker, Giza I, p. 206. Iunu suggests that the reticulated design before the tablet was probably intended to become a faience disc; ibid., p. 273.

Ibid., p. 273.

This feature also appears on the stela of Wepemnefret (g 1203, one cloth only), Kefufer (g 1209), and the anonymous data from g 4860 (faded).
Iunu’s linen list is an abbreviated one, for it is pinched at both top and bottom. Above, the identifying inscription (Section a) extends across the entire surface of the stela, forcing the idwy falcons down. Below, a row of five granaries appears at the bottom of the list. The result is that only three types of linen, idwy, sỉr and ’, occur on Iunu’s stela. Surt-nfr linen is absent. All three linen types, however, are represented with vertical fringes at the tops of their “widths” boxes. This feature, absent from the stela today, was apparently clear in Junker’s day, for it has been added to his drawing (cf. fig. 153, and Gīza 1, p. 175, fig. 31). While individual items receive the vertical fringe lines on the stelae of Wepemnefret (g 9303), Kanefer (g 2003), and the anonymous g 4680, Iunu’s stela is the only example of fringes functioning as horizontal register lines just beneath each type of linen.

The idwy falcons show a little projection or hump in front on the standard platform. This is typical of the form of the standard in general (û) but is absent from all of the slab stelae with the exception of g 4860 (see below, stela 15). The 32 falcons placed beneath overhead inscriptions may also be found on the slab of Wepemnefret (g 9303), and of the anonymous owner of g 4680.
colossal falcon statue installed by Amenhotep III at Soleb (but discovered at Gebel Barkal) clearly illustrates this feature (fig. 152). An additional element on Iunu’s falcons, however, is the little platform placed on the standard upon which the falcons rest. The anonymous stela from g 4860 also shows this platform between the falcons and their standards (fig. 153).

We have already seen the five items in the trapezoidal granaries at the bottom of the list in exactly the same order on the stela of Sati-henenet (stela 7, fig. 127). The only significant difference is the presence of the final item, $\text{fnw} \text{nt}$ here but $\text{bnw} \text{nt}$ on Sati-henenet’s granary. Iunu’s use of gray color indicates that the granaries are probably mud-brick constructions; unfortunately, no other stela with granaries preserves any color.

Date: It is generally agreed that g 4150 belongs to the earliest group of mastabas constructed in Cemetery 4000. How early, and whether the tomb can be assigned to the first five years of Khufu’s reign, as Reisner argued, is less clear. But this short-form stela, with its short, flaring, offering loaves in Section c, clearly falls within the early group of Giza slab stelae, and is probably contemporary with the slabs from Cemetery 1200, and with those from g 2120 and g 2135. The early to mid-reign of Khufu is the most likely date.

For a Middle Kingdom parallel, a mirror handle showing the same form, see MFA 72.4470 (provenance not known), below, fig. 25, and Art of the Ancient Mediterranean World, Nagoya/Boston Museum of Fine Arts, April 27, 1999–March 2004 (Nagoya, 1999), pp. 72 (color plate) and 126–27, fig. 25.


P. Jánosi, Giza in der 4.Dynastie (Vienna, forthcoming), § 2.3.4, argues against our ability to determine finished constructions within Khufu’s first five years.
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Fig. 152. Soleb falcon of Amenhotep III from Gebel Barkal, MFA 23.870. MFA Visual Archives, c. 2022.

Fig. 153. The Iunu stela as illustrated by Junker, Giza 1, pl. 27.
Fig. 154. Chapel of Iunu, g.4150, experimental photographic composite of recent stela photograph repositioned within original excavation photograph. Based on color stela photograph (Pelizaeus-Museum, Hildesheim) and archival Junker Expedition photograph, Hildesheim, 529a. Digital composite by the author.
**Slab Stela a 14 (pls. 27–29)**

**Owner:** Wnßt, Wenshet (1)

**Provenance:** Cemetery 4000. q 4840 (= VIII ss)

**Excavation history:** Harvard University–Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Expedition, under G.A. Reisner, 1914; discovered on February 12, 1914 at a depth of about 6 meters in shaft g 4832

**Current location:** Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 14–2–1

**Material:** Limestone with portions covered in gypsum; raised relief carving

**Measurements:** h. 12 cm; w. 46 cm; th. 12 cm

**Selected bibliography:**

- Giza Necropolis 1, p. 500, fig. 306
- Junker, Gîza 1, pp. 249–55
- Junker, Gîza 1, p. 252, fig. 63

Two explanations for the MFA fragment are possible: it is either a slab stela fragment from an earlier phase of the tomb's construction, or it derives from the upper architrave of the north chapel's decorated false door. Junker noted: “Wenn sie nicht von dem Oberbalken der südlichen Schestür stammen kann, so steht es als Einführung, daß sie bei der ursprünglichen Anlage der Front des Tumulus gesehen hat, eventuell bei Mastaba IIB in derselben Reihe.”

Reisner noted that the “upper left-hand corner of slab-stela, set in an emplacement in the east face of the core at the south end, but Junker found no visible emplacement.”

In his unpublished manuscript entitled “The Development of the Tablet Scene,” Reisner writes: “Only a fragment of the upper left corner of the slab data was found. On this was inscribed, a [false] door of Hathor sª hsª. North false-door Wenshet.” This inscription must have formed a horizontal line which reached at least to the middle of the stela.

Translations

**Section a** (lost now) a [false] door of-below horizontal of-his-body his beloved, priestess of Hathor, mistress of the typhon, priestess of Nut, Wenshet*

*“King’s daughter of his body, beloved, priestess of Hathor, mistress of the typhon, priestess of Nut, Wenshet”

**Description and commentary:** This fragment is added to the group of slab stelae with some hesitation, for the scale of the preserved hieroglyphs at first glance seems far too large in comparison with many of the other stelae. Yet a reconstruction attempt at a long-form data would bring in greater lines in thickness of some of the larger monuments, g 4840 = VIII ss, mastaba with two chapels. The southern, normally primary chapel, consisted of a single chamber, entered from the east, with an unadorned false door. In an unfinished relief of tradition, the northern chapel appears more important, for it bore a slightly askew, but fully decorated false door, discovered by Junker on March 21, 1914. and now in Hildesheim (Inv. Nr. 2071, pls. 392–393). This door bears the same titles as are found on this fragment: above, on the lintel (horizontally above), and on the right outer jamb (horizontally Ns). Thus, no doubt exists that the same individual is the owner of both inscribed objects, regardless of their original locations. A reconstruction of individual hieroglyphs on the false door lintel and the MFA fragment reveals that the larger scale belongs to the false door.


2 K. Sethe, ed., Das Alte Reich (Mainz am Rhein, 1986), cat. 6, p. 43; Junker, Gîza 1, p. 252; fig. 63, and pl. 40b; R. Schulz and M. Seidel, eds., Das Alte Reich. The World of the Pharaohs (Cologne, 1998), p. 82, fig. 74; A. Eggebrecht, ed., Pelizaeus-Museum Hildesheim: Das Alte Ägypten (Hildesheim 1989), p. 22, fig. 16 (Mäden); H. Kähler, Splendours of Ancient Egypt (Ann Arbor, 1995), p. 31. Could the unorthodox placement of the false door indicate that it is not equal in its original placement in the tomb? Does Junker actually mean to say northern false door? It is difficult to imagine the inscribed MFA fragment as part of a monolithic yet uninscribed southern mastaba.

3 Reisner, Gîza 1, p. 500, with fig. 306.

4 Unpublished manuscript housed in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
Wenshet fragment, thickest at the top, extends to 11 or 12 cm, while the thickness of the other stelae varies between 7 and 10 cm, so once again the Wenshet fragment could be construed to fall inline with the general measurements of other stelae in our group. A hypothetical reconstruction drawing appears in fig. 158.

Portions of the fragment’s decorated surface are covered with gypsum, apparently intentionally. At my request, in February, 1998, an analysis of the relief was conducted by the Department of Objects Conservation and Scientific Research at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. This analysis produced the following conclusion:

The limestone fragment has a pinkish-white mortar on the surface of the front, top and proper right sides. Irregular application of the mortar on the front surface of the relief prevents some of the hieroglyphic characters from being discerned. To determine whether the mortar could be removed from the front surface, a sample was analyzed by Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy. The composition of the mortar was identified as gypsum, calcium sulfate... The pinkish color of the mortar was caused by the presence of iron oxide. It was concluded by Richard Newman that the gypsum is not the result of an alteration product or a burial accretion. The gypsum was intentionally applied to the stela to repair a breach in its composition (gypsum and clay), has been identified as a repair material on ancient stones. The pink coloration of the plaster, examples of which have been found in the Twelfth and Eighteenth Dynasties, is caused by the presence of iron inclusions.

If the MFA piece is thus indeed a slab stela fragment, and one belonging to g 4840, then the emplacement must have been covered, destroyed, or removed subsequently, in order to make room for extensions to the chapel. What role the inscribed false door, now in Hilisheh, played in this extension, is not clear, since it was found in the tombs of the eastern chapels, far from the traditional slab stela emplacement towards the southern end of the east wall. Perhaps the slab stela was plastered over and walled up in similar fashion to the Wepemnefret stela (g 1201, stela 1, see figs. 10–13, and the gypsum represents the remains of the covering (cf. also figs. 253–54).

Wenshet’s fragment provides one of the very few examples of a slab stela preserved along with other decorative wall surfaces, clearly belonging to the same person. Other parallels are problematic. Sethokhethnut's red granite drum fragments are very small and devoid of much context (see above, stela 5). "Kemnisut’s" fragment may not derive from g 228, or may derive from g 228 but not belong to the funerary house decorated chapel in Vienna is clearly a post-Khufu era creation (see above, stela 12). It is offering basin from g 1235 should not be considered in the same category as inscribed wall decoration. And the statues accredited to Kanfer (g 301) see above, stela 2) and Nefret-Iabet (g 325) see above, stela 6) are far from confirmed in their identification.

Shaft 994 of g 4840 produced a reserve head modeled in plaster, examples of which have been found in the Twelfth and Eighteenth Dynasties, is caused by the presence of iron inclusions.

Shaft 994 of g 4840 produced a reserve head modeled in plaster, examples of which have been found in the Twelfth and Eighteenth Dynasties, is caused by the presence of iron inclusions.

Shaft 994 of g 4840 produced a reserve head modeled in plaster, examples of which have been found in the Twelfth and Eighteenth Dynasties, is caused by the presence of iron inclusions.

Shaft 994 of g 4840 produced a reserve head modeled in plaster, examples of which have been found in the Twelfth and Eighteenth Dynasties, is caused by the presence of iron inclusions.

Shaft 994 of g 4840 produced a reserve head modeled in plaster, examples of which have been found in the Twelfth and Eighteenth Dynasties, is caused by the presence of iron inclusions.

Shaft 994 of g 4840 produced a reserve head modeled in plaster, examples of which have been found in the Twelfth and Eighteenth Dynasties, is caused by the presence of iron inclusions.
In the Leclant Festschrift, W. Helck sought to link Wenshet with individuals in Cemetery 6000, located south-west of the large mastaba of Hemiunu. But his late Old Kingdom date is ably refuted by Jánosi, while Porter–Moss lists Dynasty 5 as the date for g4840. Due to the presence of a decorated false door in the tomb, albeit in the northern niche, and the extreme eastern location of the tomb relative to the slab stela-bearing mastabas in Cemetery 4000, it seems clear that Wenshet's stela fragment dates posterior to the reign of Khufu, but not necessarily as late as Dynasty 5.

**Fig. 158. Hypothetical reconstruction of the slab stela fragment of Wenshet from g4840.**

**Fig. 159. Plan of the mastaba of Wenshet, g4840, after Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, Map 6. Drawing by Ruth Bigio.**

**Fig. 160. Northern chapel of Wenshet, g4840, looking southwest. April 22, 1999. PDM, 99.7.32.**

**Fig. 161. Shaft a, findspot of the Wenshet stela fragment, looking southwest. February 14, 1914. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, Mohammed Shadduf, c. 1955.**

---
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Fig. 162. False door of Wenshet, Pelizaeus-Museum, Hildesheim, 2971.

Fig. 163. False door of Wenshet, Pelizaeus-Museum, Hildesheim, 2971, after Junker, Gîza 1, p. 252, fig. 63, with measurements added from ibid., p. 250, fig. 62.
Slab Stela a 15 (pls. 29–30)

Owner: Anonymous

Provenance: Cemetery 4000, g 4860 (= VIIIin)

Excavation History: German–Austrian Expedition under H. Junker, second campaign, 1933 found in situ set into emplacement in chapel niche

Current Location: Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, Inv. AS 1669

Material: Limestone raised relief carving

Measurements: h. 52 cm, w. 81 cm, th. 10 cm


Translation

Section a:

(1) “scribe of the god’s book, lector priest . . .”

Section b:

(2) “a thousand loaves of bread, a thousand jars of beer, (3) a thousand vessels of alabaster, a thousand pieces of cloth”

Section c:

(4) sn†r, ¢£tt mr¢t snwt, a thousand of width , a thousand of 100 (cubits wide), a thousand of 4 x 10 (cubits wide) and 3 x 10 (cubits wide), a thousand of 2 x 10 (cubits wide) and 1 x 10 (cubits wide), a thousand of width .

Note that the three hieroglyphs for do double-duty for the green and white varieties.

The transliterations for both the four birds and four hörmed animals is based on the parallel afforded by the stela of Meretites (g 4140) and cannot otherwise be confirmed.

On the hieroglyphic transcriptions, see below, Chapter 4, discussion of Section a (linen lists).

For an internal analysis regarding the amulet underneath the hieroglyphic signs in Section a, see Junker, Giza 1, p. 187, fig. 32 = Lepsius, Denkmäler 2, pl. 25, bottom (g 5150, Seshat-hetep). See also P. Kramer, “Les masques des dieux à l’époque régnante,” IAK 29 (1977), p. 96 and Junker, Giza 1, p. 33.

On this word, see J. Wilkins, “The Old Kingdom Linen List,” 246:73 (1955), p. 108, “jewels, Giza 1, p. 246. Which is impossible that the word should read: ‘it’; the rectangular final sign is taken here as a linen determinative.

7 Note that the three hieroglyphs for do double-duty for the green and white varieties.

8 Or perhaps both signs are to be read “milky ale—two,” following H. G. Fischer, Varia Ancilia (Berlin, 1936), p. 66, 70 (cf. “stiff white linen: a thousand of width .” Based on the parallel afforded by the stela of Meretites (g 4140) and cannot otherwise be confirmed.

9 Note the additional horizontal dividers above the and signs indicating fringe, should be added to the drawing in H. Holde, Reliefs und Inschriftensteine des Alten Reiches I, p. 313. This word is written on the Helwan stela from tomb 247; cf. Z. Saad, Catalogue Slab Stelae in Second Dynasty Tombs from the Excavations at Helwan, ASAE Supplement, Cairo 21 (Cairo, 1935), pl. 31; K. Kühn, K. Krieger, and
Two types of linen have been combined in a single group; signs appear side by side in the center of the linen list. Perhaps this is reminiscent of the arrangement of Old Kingdom legal texts where repeatable phrases are understood to apply to more than one sentence. Here the widths and amounts of linen would therefore do double duty, applying to both šèw-šèw and šèw.

Four of the linen list items, in the šèw categories and designated with the šèw sign, show an extra horizontal line above the hieroglyphs. Junker's original drawing reveals the reason for this addition (p. 245, fig. 13): they indicated fringed cloth items. Invisible today, the fringes were most likely supplied in paint between the two horizontals over the signs in question. We have already seen these fringed cloths on the stelae of Wepemnefret (g 1201, one example only), Kanefer (g 2033, and funu (g 4390), no longer visible today, see fig. 136. Elsewhere at Giza, the fringed cloths are attested on the east wall linen list in the chapel of Sahem-nefert (p. 4940, Appendix 3, figs. 310–312).

At the bottom of this condensed linen list, six granaries face right along with the rest of the stela. The arrangement of items comes closest to that of Meretites (g 4140), although the “carob bean”) and shows

Fig. 165. Slab stela from g 4860. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, III 36.117

In šèw, šèw, šèw, šèw, šèw, šèw, šèw, šèw, šèw

“Upper Egyptian barley,” “Lower Egyptian barley,” “amur, matt, matt, matt,” dates

Description and commentary: This is the largest slab stela of the entire Giza group, but it is also in the worst state of preservation. Much of the surface is badly weathered, and significant areas are all but unrecognizable. Moreover, the upper left corner of the stela is missing, obscuring the seated relief of a female, administrative titles, and name. Since it was discovered in situ, this suggests that it was pried away by plunderers perhaps looking for precious materials in the core of the mastaba wall immediately behind.

By far the most striking feature of this stela, beyond its size, is the orientation of the decorative layout. This is the only stela to orient most of its inscriptions away from the deceased, that is facing right. Even the linen list is oriented to the right. An interesting exception, however, is the arrow or šèw sign (→ T 33), which follows the orientation of all the other stelae in pointing to the right, its feather to the left. Similarly, the šèw and šèw sign (→ V 3), also fails to change its orientation. It is reversed in all of the Giza slab stelae, but in this case suddenly becomes correctly oriented due to the flipped orientation of the entire linen list. Theey parallel šèw have been attested for a right-facing linen list. It is outside the group of Giza slab-stela proper: one of the false door tablets of the mastaba of Merib (g 4940, Appendix 3, figs. 310–312).

The šèw falcons have the rounded protrusion, or bump, in front, also found on the stela of funu (g 4390), and paralleled in three-dimensional sculpture by the Sähe falcon of Amenophis III from Gebel Barkal (MFA 23140), figs. 52, 170 and 258. Like funu’s falcons, they also show the triple platform placed on the standard upon which the falcons rest. The small, crude form of the falcons differs markedly from other slab-stela only the Wepemnefret stela (g 1201); falcons are similarly proportioned, but show far superior craftsmanship.

Zimmermann, Die Grabinschriften der 3. Dynastie (Wiesbaden, 1993), p. 175(d), however, it never appears with a šèw or šèw sign (→ V 3), also fails to change its orientation. It is reversed in all of the Giza slab-stela, but in this case suddenly becomes correctly oriented due to the flipped orientation of the entire linen list. Theey parallel šèw have been attested for a right-facing linen list. It is outside the group of Giza slab-stela proper: one of the false door tablets of the mastaba of Merib (g 4940, Appendix 3, figs. 310–312).

This feature is also discussed below in Chapter 4 (Section 15), fig. 136.

Like Iunu’s falcons, they also show the little platform placed on the standard upon which the falcons rest. The small, crude form of the falcons differs markedly from other slab-stela only the Wepemnefret stela (g 1201); falcons are similarly proportioned, but show far superior craftsmanship.

The arrangement of legal inscriptions, see for example, W . Helck,

Hieroglyphic Texts from Egyptian Stelae (Berlin, 1984), cover.

Markowitz, J.L. Haynes, and R.E. Freed, “Upper Egyptian barley, Lower Egyptian barley,” “amur, matt, matt, matt,” dates

Description and commentary: This is the largest slab stela of the entire Giza group, but it is also in the worst state of preservation. Much of the surface is badly weathered, and significant areas are all but unrecognizable. Moreover, the upper left corner of the stela is missing, obscuring the seated relief of a female, administrative titles, and name. Since it was discovered in situ, this suggests that it was pried away by plunderers perhaps looking for precious materials in the core of the mastaba wall immediately behind.

By far the most striking feature of this stela, beyond its size, is the orientation of the decorative layout. This is the only stela to orient most of its inscriptions away from the deceased, that is facing right. Even the linen list is oriented to the right. An interesting exception, however, is the arrow or šèw sign (→ T 33), which follows the orientation of all the other stelae in pointing to the right, its feather to the left. Similarly, the šèw and šèw sign (→ V 3), also fails to change its orientation. It is reversed in all of the Giza slab stelae, but in this case suddenly becomes correctly oriented due to the flipped orientation of the entire linen list. Theey parallel šèw have been attested for a right-facing linen list. It is outside the group of Giza slab-stela proper: one of the false door tablets of the mastaba of Merib (g 4940, Appendix 3, figs. 310–312).

The šèw falcons have the rounded protrusion, or bump, in front, also found on the stela of funu (g 4390), and paralleled in three-dimensional sculpture by the Sähe falcon of Amenophis III from Gebel Barkal (MFA 23140), figs. 52, 170 and 258. Like funu’s falcons, they also show the triple platform placed on the standard upon which the falcons rest. The small, crude form of the falcons differs markedly from other slab-stela only the Wepemnefret stela (g 1201); falcons are similarly proportioned, but show far superior craftsmanship.

Zimmermann, Die Grabinschriften der 3. Dynastie (Wiesbaden, 1993), p. 175(d), however, it never appears with a šèw or šèw sign (→ V 3), also fails to change its orientation. It is reversed in all of the Giza slab-stela, but in this case suddenly becomes correctly oriented due to the flipped orientation of the entire linen list. Theey parallel šèw have been attested for a right-facing linen list. It is outside the group of Giza slab-stela proper: one of the false door tablets of the mastaba of Merib (g 4940, Appendix 3, figs. 310–312).

Like Iunu’s falcons, they also show the little platform placed on the standard upon which the falcons rest. The small, crude form of the falcons differs markedly from other slab-stela only the Wepemnefret stela (g 1201); falcons are similarly proportioned, but show far superior craftsmanship.
The headless seated figure at the left of the stela also shows some unusual features. He rests on a full-length cushion on his bull-legged stool, a feature which occurs elsewhere in the Giza group only on the stelae of Wepemnefret (g. 1201) and Setji-hekenet (g. 1227). More striking, however, is how far forward the figure sits; all other stela owners, with the exception of Ini (g. 1235), sit further back on the stool, either directly over or very close to the rear leg. In addition, the papyrus umbel terminal seems unusually small and out of proportion with the rest of the stool, compared to the other stools we have considered. The figure extends his right hand to the offering table, just about touching the bread loaves, as do Ini (g. 1235) and Iunu (g. 420). The half-loaves themselves are arranged symmetrically over the center of the table and tall ceramic table stand, with nine half-loaves to a side. The table stand shows a rimmed base, found only on the stand of Setji-hekenet (g. 1227), where the deceased’s feet likewise obscure a portion of its base. To the right of the table, the numerous heads of fowl and livestock appear in “correct” leftward-facing orientation, despite the rightward-facing orientation of the rest of the offerings of Section c.

Conclusion: No other stela displays so many anomalies together, and reveals a style so aberrant from the rest of the Giza group. Mastabas g. 4860 and g. 4840 (Wenshet) occur in the same row.
further east, that is, closer to the so-called Cemetery en Echelon and the Great Pyramid, than any other tombs under discussion in the present volume. They are clearly outside of and later than the core mastabas of Cemetery 4000 as it was originally devised. The primary burial shaft of g4860 is apparently not contemporaneous with the construction of the mastaba core. It was left incomplete at first, only to be finished at a later time, with a burial chamber, not to the south of the shaft as was the tradition at Giza, but to the west. Furthermore, the burial chamber was not lined with limestone blocks, as was almost every other burial chamber at Giza from a tomb that contained either a slab stela or a stela emplacement. (The other exception is the tomb of Wenshet g4860, which is not without problems, due to the disturbed context and fragmentary slab stela. Owing to the anomaly of the undressed burial chamber in an unusual (westerly) location for a mastaba containing a slab stela, and the many anomalies in the decoration of the stela itself, it is likely that the final owner of g4860 and his slab stela belonged to the reign of Khufu. The slab stela is thus a—perhaps unsuccessful—archaism, created in imitation of the twenty-four early Fourth Dynasty stelae in the three core cemeteries that were then still in existence. Perhaps the false door tablet of Merib (g2100-I, fig. 169), with a similarly reversed linen list, and dating to at least the reign of Menkaure, if not Dynasty 5, provides additional support for the slab stela's assignment posterior to Khufu. While the mastaba core dates to the reign of Khufu, the final use of the tomb, including the burial shaft with chamber to the west, and the anomalous slab stela, most likely dates after the reign of that king, and possibly post-Fourth Dynasty as well.

18 Junker, Gîza 1, p. 243, fig. 38, 247. The tomb's second shaft, located in the southern half of the mastaba core, is clearly a secondary, later addition.

19 Jánosi, Giza in der 4. Dynastie, § 2.5, doubts Junker's explanation. Gîza 1, p. 247, that bad quality stone prevented the construction of this (or any) traditional southern burial chamber.


21 Cf. PM III, pp. 71–72; Reisner, Gîza 1, p. 253, n. 5; Silver, Rank and Title in the Old Kingdom (Oxford, 1977), pp. 91–92; Priese, Die Opferkammer des Merib, pp. 26–28; M. Baer, Rank und Titel im Alten Reich (Berlin, 1960), p. 37; Priese, Die Opferkammer des Merib, pp. 37, 96 [73].

22 For a different conclusion, favoring a date of Dynasty 4, see P. Piacentini, Les scribes dans la société égyptienne de l'Ancien Empire (Paris, 2002), p. 112. For another example of an “archaizing slab stela,” see the partly raised, partly sunk relief stela of Setju (MFA 13.4341), found in the fill of shaft g2352b, and most likely dating to Dynasty 6, Chapter 5 (Conclusions), fig. 296, Appendix 3 (Selected linen lists), fig. 308, and W.K. Simpson, Mastabas of the Western Cemetery, Part 3, Giza/Mastabas 4 (Boston, 2003), p. 35, pls. Gia 47, 49.
CHAPTER 2
The Archaeological History of the Giza Slab Stelae

At the outset of the twentieth century, although the great early expeditions began, the Giza Necropolis finally received a sustained, systematic approach to clearance, recording, and publication (fig. 171). The application for archaeological concessions was spurred on in part by the amateur treasure hunting at the site by such individuals as Montague Ballard, M.P. In 1902 Ballard removed Nefret-iabet’s polychrome slab stela from her mastaba (g. 225) in the far Western Cemetery. No account of his “excavation” is preserved, nor did he leave the mastaba’s exterior wall in a condition to allow determination of the slab stela’s original emplacement. It subsequently surfaced in the Hirsch, Samson, and Curtis collections, and was finally acquired by the Louvre in 1938.1 While excavating in Upper Egypt on behalf of Phoebe A. Hearst and the University of California, George Reisner complained frequently to Gaston Maspero about the damage being done to the site, but the latter replied that his hands were tied for political reasons.2 But Maspero encouraged Reisner to apply for Giza himself. Along with the Italian and German missions, Reisner’s eventual Giza excavations3 turned out to be pivotal for our understanding of the early Fourth Dynasty, and he was able to discern the existence of the earliest nucleus cemeteries 1200, 2100, and 4000 (fig. 172).

---


2 Correspondence housed in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1901.

---

Fig. 171. Overview plan of the Giza Necropolis. Drawing by Liza Majerus.
As far as the slab stelae are concerned, the critical years were 1904–05, before the termination of Mrs. Hearst’s sponsorship, and the Hearst Expedition’s metamorphosis into the Harvard University–Museum of Fine Arts, Boston Expedition. Several of the stelae from Cemetery g 1200 were discovered in situ, set into their niches at the southern end of the mastaba’s exterior.

Reisner proudly reported back to his sponsor from Giza in 1904:

Hearst Expedition
Mena House
Pyramids
Cairo.
May 31 [1904]

Dear Mrs. Hearst,

I wish merely to announce that we have found eight more painted limestone statues—four of them being very fine indeed. So our total of statues for the year is twenty-five… are two tombs with reliefs and one with paintings. Finally there are a few pieces of stone ware and other smaller objects…..

Unfortunately, the dates entered in the Expedition’s photographic register books for this period often lack month or day entries; these were routinely added after 1905–06. It is not clear whether the dates entered in the register books for the stelae from Cemetery g 1200 were later added, or whether they were taken from the original letter to Mrs. Hearst. From the excerpted letter above it is clear that the six stelae referred to must be the complete Cemetery 1200 group, minus g 1225 (Nefret-iabet), removed before Reisner arrived, and g 1201 (Wepemnefret), which is referred to in a subsequent letter of 1905. Thus the six short-form stelae must all have been discovered by the Hearst Expedition before May, 1904.

The following year Reisner left Albert M. Lythgoe in charge of moving the Expedition to the eastern side of the large, anonymous mastaba Lepsius 23 (= g 2000), but not before the famous stela of Wepemnefret emerged from behind a protective covering in g 1201. At the age of 63 Mrs. Hearst had visited the site and stayed at the Hearst (soon to be renamed Harvard) Camp in February, 1905.

Reisner wrote:

Pyramids
Cairo.
March 15 [1905]

Dear Mrs. Hearst,

With all that perversity of luck, for which “luck” is famous, the moment you leave Egypt, we begin to find things.

The “colored copy” by Davies of the Wepemnefret stela (from g 1201) referred to is preserved in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, and is the frontispiece to the present volume. The “Division list” between the Expedition and the authorities at the Egyptian Museum, Cairo, from April 11, 1905, also survives in the MFA archives.

Fig. 172. View of the Western Cemetery from three-quarters of the way up the Khufu pyramid, showing the three earliest nucleus cemeteries. December 23, 1907. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, Mohammed Ibrahim, p. 4784

3 For the division of the site among the various excavators see Reisner’s account in Giza Necropolis 1, pp. vi, 22–25, and Manuelian, “Excavating the Old Kingdom. The Giza Necropolis and Other Mastaba Fields,” in Egyptian Art in the Age of the Pyramids (New York, 1999), pp. 128–32.

6 Personal letter from G.A. Reisner to Phoebe A. Hearst, March 15, 1905, in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. Reisner also mentions his frustration in discovering the Wepemnefret stela one day too late in a letter to Mrs. Hearst’s acquaintance, Mary Laurence of San Francisco, dated April 26, 1912.
CHAPTER 2: THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL HISTORY OF THE GIZA SLAB STELAE

This year, I cannot tell what we may find, though my thought in digging a royal funerary temple was naturally to obtain royal statues and reliefs of the late 4th dynasty. But there are certain classes of objects found as yet only in this cemetery and one of which the Boston Museum has no example. The most important of these is a stela in relief of the Cheops period. I send two photographs of such stelae found for the University of California on the stela of Wepemnefret, son of Cheops. I wish very much that the Boston Museum might obtain one or two examples of these. Our work at the end of the last year was directed to clearing a supposed Cheops mastaba, in which such stelae might be found; but in every case the stela was gone, although we found the place in the wall in which they had once lain. Only after fragments were found. Only about 8 of these stelae are known, of which I have found seven. So far as the Museum is concerned every fragment left in which such stelae may be found. The Wepemnefret stela is worth about $20,000. I would advise the Museum to authorize me to continue the excavations in the Cheops cemetery in the hope of finding one or more of these stelae... 9

One other stela, from the mastaba of Mentuhotep (g490), emerged in Reisner’s concession in January–February, 1912. In all, Reisner found eight stelae between 1904 and 1906 in the nucleus Cemeteries 1200 and 2100, and two more in 1912 and 1914 respectively in Cemetery 4000. 10 The Mentuhotep stela remained the only complete example to be assigned to Boston, although fragments of two others (Seshat-sekhentiu, g2120, and Wenshet, g4840) also joined that Museum’s collection. Four stelae were assigned to Berkeley as part of the Hearst Expedition division, and three were sent to the Cairo Museum. Prior to the outbreak of World War I, Hermann Junker traded his Nubian concession with Georg Steindorff in order

the slab stelae of Kaknom (g2229), Sute-siekhentiu (g2227), and Irg (g2326), while nos. 17, 18, and 19, given to the Hearst Expedition for the University of California, Berkeley, are those of Nefert (g1207), Kanefert (g1203), and Khufu-nakht (g2120). An additional sheet, written in A.C. Mace’s hand, is marked “Objects handed over to the [Egyptian] Museum on April 12th, 1905.” It lists “from Giza... 3200.” The Wepemnefret stela was apparently a fresh discovery at this point, and not ready for submission to a division.

Hearst support for the Expedition ended on October 1, 1905. By the time Lythgoe discovered the fragments of another stela near the chapel of g2200, it was in the name of the Harvard–MFA Expedition (fig 124). 8 (This was Lythgoe’s final season with Reisner, as he departed soon thereafter for the Metropolitan Museum in New York.) In a letter to Museum of Fine Arts President of the Trustees, Gardiner M. Lane, dated December 30, 1906, Reisner described his desire to obtain a slab stela for the collection in Boston:

Fig. 173 Exceptional Hearst Expedition Division List, 1903–1904, handwritten by Reisner and approved by G. Maspero; housed in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston

7 Mace, like Lythgoe, worked with Reisner at Giza during the 1905–06 season. Cf. Reisner, Giza Hancock, p. vii, and C. Lee,... the grand piano came by camel. Arthur C. Mace, the neglected Egyptologist (Edinburgh, 1992), pp. 49–54.
8 Two additional fragments of this stela were later found in March, 1938 on the western side of g2120. These remain at this writing separate from the reconstructed stela and are omitted from early MFA studio photography of the object.
to dig at Giza (fig. 174). Working in the central strip of the Western Cemetery, south of Reisner’s concession, 11 Junker discovered six additional stelae between 3023 and 3024 within his portions of Cemeteries 4000 and 2000. Only one of Junker’s finds was complete (funerary, g 4450); two others (g 4460 and g 4560) were apparently just undecorated fragments. All were published in the first volume of his monumental Giza series. This completes the currently known group. 12 The schematic map of the major mastabas of the Western Cemetery in fig. 175 shows the locations of the tombs excavated by Reisner (red) and/or Junker (blue). Tombs containing actual stelae (in situ or not) versus those with merely empty emplacements are differentiated. The chart shows that ten tombs contained slab stelae still in situ, 13 while five contained fragments found in and around the mastabas. 14 Also indicated in fig. 175 are tombs that contained reserve heads as well as slab stelae. 15 The only anomaly worth noting is the false excavations pertaining to g 1255.

12 Although Balla left no excavation records defined, it is assumed he excavated the slab stela of Hotep-em-neb in situ in g 1422. Ten tombs with slab stelae in situ include: Wepenemwet (g 1425), Khufu-nakht (g 1205), Nefret-iabet (g 1225), Kaiemah (g 1207), Ini (g 1201), Khufu-nakht (g 1225), Sehentiu (g 1207), Wenshet (g 1225), and the anonymous owner of g 4860.
13 Fragmentary stela not found in situ include: Konak (g 1233), Sethawepet (g 1230), the anonymous owner of g 2235, Kanniba (g 1233), and Wase (g 1484).

Fig. 174. Plan of the Western Cemetery, with tombs colored according to expedition, after Reisner: Giza Necropolis I, Map 2, with additions by the author.
(Nefret-Iabet), which had lost its slab stela to Ballard's diggings prior to being assigned to Reisner's concession along with the rest of the tombs of Cemetery 1200. Today, the fifteen known slabe and stela fragments are housed in the museums of Berkeley (four), Boston (three), Cairo (three two currently on loan to the Port Said National Museum), Hildesheim (one), Paris (one), and Vienna (three).

In the course of the excavations that unearthed the fifteen slab stelae or stela fragments, a large number of tombs revealed empty slab stela emplacements, or niches prepared in the southern half of the mastabas east of the wall. Thus a total of twenty-five tombs appear to have had a slab stela, and it is to be inferred that many more did as well, but have lost their emplacements due to either accidental or accidental accidents of chapel preservation. Although the actual stela from these tombs disappeared long before the era of scientific excavation, the emplacements nevertheless have much to tell us. They have been neglected in the scholarly literature in favor of the eleven emplacements that still held actual stelae. Examination of the emplacements allows us to determine, for example, whether the stela was originally of the short-form or long-form type. The schematic map of the major mastabas of the Western Cemetery in Fig. 176 portrays the tombs containing short-form (blue outline) versus long-form (pink outline) stelae, based on either actual stela found or the dimensions of the empty emplacement. The original height of the stela is sometimes undeterminable where no upper frame or limit is visible in the mastaba core masonry; slab stelae often protruded higher than the course of limestone blocks into which they were set. However, the width of the stelae can usually be determined. Furthermore, the emplacements vary from a carefully prepared niche aligned in the course of casing stones (e.g., g 2000, Sethi, mother of Merit), to a hollowed-out depression carved into a single monolithic block (e.g., g 4560). One emplacement even preserves a large.


Fig. 175. Schematic plan of the major mastabas of the Western Cemetery showing mastabas excavated by Reisner and Junker, along with locations of slab stelae (in situ or not), empty emplacements, and reserve heads.
weathered, white limestone fragment of the original slab stela into the twenty-first century (g 4460). Traces of mortar in some of the niches would repay analysis to tell us the exact composition of the materials and binding technique of attaching the stela to the mastaba exteriors in question.

Two of the “empty emplacement” tombs appear in the Western Cemetery concession assigned to Reisner and the Harvard–MFA Expedition: g 2100 (Sedit), and g 4340; the mastaba of Wenshet (g 4840), likewise in Reisner’s concession, failed to preserve its emplacement. All of the other mastabas are located in Junker’s portion of the Western Cemetery.

The remainder of this chapter contains a short catalogue presenting the ten “empty emplacement” tombs with brief descriptions, and chapel area plans, as well as original expedition and more recent photography. Whenever possible, detail views of the empty emplacements are included. In addition to rounding out the documentation, these views are added in the hope that additional fragments once fitting into these emplacements may one day come to light and be more readily identified. This catalogue is then followed by a comprehensive chart of all twenty-five mastabas, both with and without preserved slab stelae, that are the primary focus of the present study.

Fig. 176. Schematic plan of the major mastabas of the Western Cemetery showing mastabas containing short form versus long form stelae.
Chapter 2: The Archaeological History of the Giza Slab Stelae

Owner: Sedit, Sedit(?)

Location: Cemetery 2100: g 2100

Selected bibliography: Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, pp. 418–19

Stela: Short-form (not preserved)

Emplacement measurements: h. 38 cm (upper edge indicated); w. 58 cm

Date: Original mastaba core Khufu; Sedit: mid-Dynasty 4

Remarks: Due to recent identification of the skeletal remains from g 2000 shaft as belonging to a female, for which I thank Dr. Azza Mohamed Sarry el-Din, I would assign this tomb to Merib’s mother, Sedit, known from the chapel walls of her son’s tomb next door (g 2100–I); cf. Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, p. 418; Junker, Gîza 2, pp. 122, 131ff. On Sedit herself, see Junker, Gîza 2, p. 121ff., and Schmitz, “Königssohn,” pp. 27f., 70, 106, 118, 123. W. Helck preferred to assign the tomb to Merib’s (unnamed) father, “Zur Entstehung des Westfriedhofs an der Cheops-Pyramide,” ZÄS 81 (1965), pp. 63, 65.

Fig. 177. Mastaba g 2100, with location of slab stela emplacement indicated, looking southwest. January 10, 1938. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, Mohammedani Ibrahim, a 7897

Fig. 178. Plan of mastaba g 2100, after Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, Map 5. Drawing by Ruth Bigio

Fig. 179. Mastaba g 2100 and slab stela emplacement in g 2100, looking west. November 21, 1993. PDM, 93.107.27

Fig. 180. Slab stela emplacement in g 2100, looking west. 1905–1906. HU–MFA Expedition photograph, Albert M. Lythgoe, c. 857

Fig. 181. Slab stela emplacement in g 2100, looking west. November 21, 1993. PDM, 93.107.26

Fig. 182. Plan of mastaba g 2100, after Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, Map 5. Drawing by Ruth Bigio
Slab Stela of the Giza Necropolis

Owner: Anonymous (gender?)
Location: Cemetery 4000: g 4060 (=In)
Selected bibliography: PM III, p. 24–25; Junker, Gîza 1, p. 28, 163, fig. 25, 165, fig. 36
Stela: Short-form (?) (not preserved); chapel buried as of 2003
Emplacement measurements: Junker, Gîza 1, p. 28: h. 38 cm; w. 56 cm; th. 10 cm; h. to bottom of emplacement from ground 1.77 m (Junker, Gîza 1, p. 163, fig. 25)
Date: Khufu

Fig. 182. Chapel plan of g 4160, after Janet. Drawing by Liza Majerus

Fig. 183. General view of chapel of g 4160, looking northwest. April 22, 2000. PDM, 99.5.26

Fig. 182. Chapel plan of g 4160, after Janet. Drawing by Liza Majerus
Chapter 2: The Archaeological History of the Giza Slab Stelae

Fig. 185. General view of chapel of g 4250, looking northwest. April 22, 1999. PDM, 99.6.9

Fig. 186. Slab stela emplacement in g 4250, looking west. April 22, 1999, PDM, 99.6.23

Fig. 184. Chapel plan of g 4250, after Jánosi. Drawing by Liza Majerus.

Owner: Anonymous (gender?)
Location: Cemetery 4000: g 4250 (= IIa)
Stela: Short-form (not preserved)
Emplacement measurements: h. 38 cm (outline indicated in stone/plaster); w. 53 cm; Junker, Gîza 1, p. 28: h. 38 cm; w. 53 cm; th. 10 cm
Date: Khufu
Slab Stela of the Giza Necropolis

Owner: Anonymous
Location: Cemetery 4000: g 4260 (=IIn)
Selected bibliography: PM III, p. 125; Junker, Gîza 1, p. 182, fig. 34, pl. 26

Stela: Short-form (?) (not preserved); chapel buried as of 2003
Emplacement measurements: Junker, Gîza 1, p. 28: h. 38 cm; w. 56 cm; th. 10 cm estimated w. based on Junker, Gîza 1, p. 184, fig. 35; 50–60 cm; h. to bottom of emplacement from ground 1.35 m (Junker, Gîza 1, p. 182, fig. 34)
Date: Khufu

Fig. 187. Chapel plan of g 4260, after Jánosi. Drawing by Liza Majerus
Fig. 188. General view of chapel of g 4260, looking west. April 22, 2005. PDM, 99-6.17
CHAPTER 2: THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL HISTORY OF THE GIZA SLAB STELAE

Owner: Anonymous
Location: Cemetery 4000: g 4340
Selected bibliography: PM III, p. 326; Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, pp. 471–75
Stela: Short-form (not preserved)
Emplacement measurement: h. 60 cm (top ridge indicated);
w. c. 95 cm; distance to southeast corner of mastaba 339 cm
Date: Khufu

Fig. 189. Plan of g 4340, after Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, Map G. Drawing by Ruth Bigio

Fig. 190. General view of chapel of g 4340, looking northwest. April 22, 1999. PDM, 99.7.2

Fig. 191. Slab stela emplacement in g 4340, looking west. April 22, 1999. PDM, 99.7.4
Owner: Anonymous (gender?)
Location: Cemetery 4000: g 4350 (= III 43)
Selected bibliography: PM III, p. 126; Junker, Gîza 1, p. 196, fig. 39, pl. 32b
Stela: Short-form (not preserved)
Emplacement measurements: Junker, Gîza 1, p. 28: h. 38 cm; w. 58 cm; th. 12 cm; Junker, Gîza 1, p. 196, fig. 39: h. 37 cm (top edge indicated); w. 54 cm; h. to bottom of emplacement from ground 1.05 m
Date: Khufu
Remarks: The most important feature of this tomb is that the slab stela emplacement is not set into the mastaba’s core but into the wall of the subsequent extension to the tomb. Only one other mastaba (Khemist, g 4140) shows a similar arrangement; in all other cases the slab stela is part of the original, first construction phase of the tomb. Cf. Junker, Gîza 1, p. 196, fig. 39, pl. 32b, and P. Jánosi, Gîza in der 4. Dynastie (Vienna, forthcoming), § 2.4.1

Fig. 192. Chapel plan of g 4350, after Jánosi. Drawing by Liza Majerus

Fig. 193. General view of chapel of g 4350, looking northwest. April 22, 2000. PDM, 99.6.29

Fig. 194. Slab stela emplacement in g 4350, looking west. April 22, 2000. PDM, 99.6.31
CHAPTER 2: THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL HISTORY OF THE GIZA SLAB STELAE

Owner: Mery-hetepef
Location: Cemetery 4000: g 4360 (= IIIn)

Selected bibliography: PM III, p. 127; Junker, Gîza 1, p. 200, fig. 40, pls. 8b, 32a

Stela: Long form (not preserved)
Emplacement measurements = Junker, Gîza 1, p. 28: h. 62 cm; w. 85 cm; th. 17 cm; Junker, Gîza 1, p. 200, fig. 40: h. 60 cm; w. 97 cm; th. 50 cm to front of underlying block (Junker); h. to bottom of emplacement from ground 1 m

Date: Khufu

Fig. 196. Slab stela emplacement in g 4360, looking west. April 22, 1999. PDM, 99.6.23

Fig. 197. Chapel of g 4360, looking west = Junker, Gîza 1 pl. 8b. 1912–1913. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, 2004

Fig. 198. General view of chapel of g 4360, looking northwest. April 22, 2000. PDM, 99.6.25
Owner: Anonymous (gender?)
Location: Cemetery 4000: g 4450 (= IVa)
Selected bibliography: Junker, Gîza 1, p. 206, fig. 44 (which differs from fig. 199 below); Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, p. 65
Stela: Short-form (not preserved); chapel buried as of 2003
Emplacement measurements: Junker, Gîza 1, p. 28; h. 37 cm; w. 52 cm; th. 13 cm; measurements (some estimated) from Junker, Gîza 1, p. 206, fig. 44. h. 37 cm; w. 52 cm; c. 3 m to southeast corner of mastaba; h. to bottom of emplacement from ground 11 m
Date: Khufu

Fig. 200. General view of chapel of g 4450, looking northwest. April 22, 2000. PDM, 99.7.8

Fig. 199. Chapel plan of g 4450, after Jánosi. Drawing by Liza Majerus
Owner: Anonymous (gender?)
Location: Cemetery 4000: g 4460 (= IVn)
Selected bibliography: Junker, Gîza 1, p. 204, fig. 42, pl. 31
Stela: Short-form (not preserved)
Emplacement measurements: h. 35.5 cm (top indicated); w. 38 cm; th. 13 cm; Junker, Gîza 1, p. 204, fig. 42: h. 56 cm; w. 38 cm; th. 4.15 cm; s. 10 m to southeast corner of mastaba
Date: Khufu
Remarks: Undecorated fragments of stela were still in situ in 2003.

Fig. 201. Chapel plan of g 4460, after Jánosi. Drawing by Liza Majerus.

Fig. 202. Slab stela emplacement in g 4460, looking west. April 22, 1999. PDM, 99.7.15

Fig. 203. Slab stela emplacement in g 4460, looking west. April 22, 1999. PDM, 99.7.16

Fig. 204. Chapel of g 4460, looking west = Junker, Gîza 1, p. 31a. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, 2253

Fig. 205. General view of chapel of g 4460, looking northwest. April 22, 1999. PDM, 99.7.12
SLAB STELAE OF THE GIZA NECROPOLIS

Owner: Anonymous (gender?)
Location: Cemetery 4000: g 4560 (= Vn)

Selected bibliography:
PM III, p. 131; Junker, Gîza 1, p. 209 fig. 46, pl. 36a

Stela:
Short-form (not preserved)
Emplacement measurements:
h. 42 cm (top edge indicated);
w. 58 cm; ca. 4 m to southeast corner of mastaba (Junker, Gîza 1, p. 208); 4.5 m; but ibid., p. 209 fig. 46: 4.2 m; Junker, Gîza 1, p. 28 h. 44 cm; w. 56 cm; th. 13.5 cm

Date:
Khufu

Remarks:
Fragments of stela found (Junker, Gîza 1, p. 208)

Fig. 206. Slab stela emplacement in g 4560, looking west. April 22, 1999. PDM, 99.7.22

Fig. 207. Detail view of slab stela emplacement in g 4560, looking west. April 22, 1999. PDM, 99.7.23

Fig. 208. Plan of g 4560, after Junker, Gîza 1, p. 209 fig. 46. Drawing by Ruth Bigio

Fig. 209. General view of chapel of g 4560, looking northwest. April 22, 1999. PDM, 99.7.39
The summary chart in fig. 210 below assembles for quick reference all of the mastabas mentioned above, those with preserved slab stelae—numbered (1) through (15)—and those containing empty emplacements. In each case, the appropriate measurements are included (stela and emplacement), indicating where possible the distance from the southeast corner of the mastaba to the location of the emplacement niche. The chart also provides accession numbers and very limited, primary bibliographical references. Basic totals include fifteen preserved stelae or stela fragments, and ten empty emplacements. Eighteen of the preserved stelae show the short-form, while seven show the long-form. Cemetery 2000 produced eight stelae, Cemetery 2300 one contained at least four stelae, and Cemetery 4000 thirteen. Additional research at the site should further distinguish the difference between the mastabas that clearly never contained a slab stela or stela emplacement, and those mastabas where a conclusion is no longer clear, due to either damage to the chapel area, or alterations/ expansions that have replaced or obliterated the stela.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Tomb Number</th>
<th>ref</th>
<th>Stela Measurements</th>
<th>Emplacement Measurements</th>
<th>Short/Long-Form</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Primary Bibliography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) g 1201 Wepm-nfrt</td>
<td>h. 45.7 cm</td>
<td>w. 66</td>
<td>th. 7.6</td>
<td>buried as of 2003</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, p. 386, pl. 17a; W.S. Smith, Archaeology 16 (1963), pp. 2–13; Lutz, Egyptian Tomb Stones, pl. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) g 1203 Kaisef</td>
<td>h. 38</td>
<td>w. 52.9</td>
<td>th. 7.3</td>
<td>h. unlimited (h. of neighboring block 32)</td>
<td>short-form</td>
<td>fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) g 1205 Khufu-nakht</td>
<td>h. 38</td>
<td>w. 52.6</td>
<td>th. 8.2</td>
<td>buried as of 2003</td>
<td>short-form</td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) g 1207 Nefer</td>
<td>h. 38</td>
<td>w. 50.8</td>
<td>th. 8.2</td>
<td>buried as of 2003</td>
<td>short-form</td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) g 1223 K4-m-nbt</td>
<td>h. 37.8</td>
<td>w. 52.5</td>
<td>th. 8.3</td>
<td>h. unlimited (h. of neighboring block 33)</td>
<td>short-form</td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) g 1225 Nfr-m-bkt</td>
<td>h. 37.7</td>
<td>w. 51.5</td>
<td>th. 8.3</td>
<td>undeterminable</td>
<td>short-form</td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 210: Comprehensive chart of Giza mastabas with slab stelae and/or stela emplacements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Tomb Number</th>
<th>Stela Measurements</th>
<th>Emplacement Measurements</th>
<th>Short/Long-Form</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Primary Bibliography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g 1227 Sipt-khent</td>
<td>h. 37.5 w. 52.5 th. 7.6-7.8</td>
<td>h. unlimited (h. of neighboring block 27) w. 54</td>
<td>short-form</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, p. 408, pl. 20a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 1235 Ini</td>
<td>h. 37.5 w. 52.5 th. 9.4-11</td>
<td>h. unlimited (h. of neighboring block 27) w. 54</td>
<td>short-form</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, p. 412, pl. 20b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 2100, Sd³t, Sedit</td>
<td>h. 38 (upper edge indicated) w. 58</td>
<td></td>
<td>short-form</td>
<td>stela not preserved</td>
<td>Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, Map 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 2120 SIÊN-t-sêntyw Seshat-sekhentiu</td>
<td>h. 51.6 w. 79.8 th. 9.9</td>
<td>h. unlimited (h. of neighboring blocks 59) w. 81</td>
<td>long-form</td>
<td>fragments</td>
<td>Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, p. 428; R.J. Leprohon, CAA, MFA Fasc. 2, Stelae 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 2135 (= VIInn = g 4770) Mrt-¡t≠s Meretites</td>
<td>h. 20 w. 23 th. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>undeterminable</td>
<td>one fragment (upper right)</td>
<td>Junker, Giza 1, pp. 229-30, fig. 51b, pl. 30b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 2155? (= VIInn) K£-n¡-nswt Kaninisut</td>
<td>h. 50.5 w. 81.8 th. 8.0</td>
<td>mostly buried as of 2003 h. unlimited (h. of neighboring blocks 54)</td>
<td>long-form</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, pp. 460-62, fig. 280, pl. 57a, R.J. Leprohon, CAA, MFA Fasc. 2, Stelae 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 4140 (= 3) Tomu-nunu Pelizaeus-Museum, Hildesheim, 2345</td>
<td>h. 39 w. 54 th. 9.3</td>
<td>buried as of 2003 h. from ground ca. 1.3m</td>
<td>short-form</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>Junker, Giza 1, pp. 28, 170, fig. 29, 173-75, fig. 33, pls. 26a,b, 27; Eggebrecht et al., Pelizaeus-Museum Hildesheim, pp. 22, 36 (color)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Tomb Number</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Stela Measurements</td>
<td>Emplacement Measurements</td>
<td>Short/Long-Form</td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 4160 (= In)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>data not preserved</td>
<td>buried as of 2003 h. 31 w. 31 th. 10 h. to bottom of emplacement from ground 1.77 m</td>
<td>short-form(?)</td>
<td>data not preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 4250 (= IIa)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>data not preserved</td>
<td>h. 38 (outline indicated in stone/plaster) w. 53.5 th. 10</td>
<td>short-form</td>
<td>data not preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 4260 (= IIa)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>data not preserved</td>
<td>buried as of 2003 h. 38 w. 56 th. 10 h. to bottom of emplacement from ground 1.35 m</td>
<td>short-form(?)</td>
<td>data not preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 4340</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>data not preserved</td>
<td>h. 60 (top ridge indicated) w. ca. 95 33.8 m to southeast corner of mastaba</td>
<td>short-form</td>
<td>data not preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 4350 (= IIb)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>data not preserved</td>
<td>h. 38 w. 58 th. 12 h. to bottom of emplacement from ground 1.05 m</td>
<td>short-form</td>
<td>data not preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 4360 (= IIb)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>data not preserved</td>
<td>h. 62 w. 65 th. 17 th. 30 to front of underlying block (Junker) h. to bottom of emplacement from ground 1 m</td>
<td>long-form</td>
<td>data not preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mery-khetepf</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>data not preserved</td>
<td>buried as of 2003 h. 31 w. 33 th. 11 ca. 3 m to southeast corner of mastaba h. to bottom of emplacement from ground 1.1 m</td>
<td>short-form</td>
<td>data not preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Tomb Number</td>
<td>Stela Measurements</td>
<td>Emplacement Measurements</td>
<td>Short/Long-Form</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Primary Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 4460 (= IVn)</td>
<td>? undecorated fragments of stela still in situ</td>
<td>h. 35 (top indicated) w. 53 th. 13 ca. 4.15 m to southeast corner of mastaba</td>
<td>short-form</td>
<td>stela not preserved</td>
<td>Junker, Gîza 1, pp. 28, 204, fig. 42, pl. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 4560 (= Vn)</td>
<td>? fragments of stela found</td>
<td>h. 42 (top edge indicated) w. 53 th. 33.5 ca. 4 m to southeast corner of mastaba</td>
<td>short-form</td>
<td>stela not preserved</td>
<td>Junker, Gîza 1, pp. 28, 208–209, fig. 46, pl. 34a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) g 4840 (= VIIIss)</td>
<td>Wnßt, Wenshet</td>
<td>Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 14–2–1</td>
<td>h. 12 w. 46 th. 12</td>
<td>undeterminable</td>
<td>Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, p. 500, fig. 306; Junker, Gîza 1, pp. 28, 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) g 4860 (= VIIIn)</td>
<td>Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, Inv. AS 1149</td>
<td>h. 52 w. 88 th. 30</td>
<td>buried as of 2003</td>
<td>complete except for upper left corner</td>
<td>Junker, Gîza 1, pp. 28, 242, 245 fig. 59, pl. 89, Höfler, CAA Wien Lfg. 21, pp. 314–49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 210 (continued). Comprehensive chart of Giza mastabas with slab stelae and/or stela emplacements.
CHAPTER 3
Notes on Previous Scholarly Research

T he ancient history leading up to the appearance of tomb stelae is, of course, much more complicated than the modern archaeological history discussed in the previous chapter. Many scholars have contributed fundamental studies to the development of false doors, funerary stelae, and talatat scenes with the funerary repast. This chapter, although largely static and iconographic, presents the diverse and numerous stelae from the Giza Necropolis, and suggests that Snefru, not Khufu, was the originator of the reductionist policy.

The ancient history leading up to the appearance of tomb stelae is, of course, much more complicated than the modern archaeological history discussed in the previous chapter. Many scholars have contributed fundamental studies to the development of false doors, funerary stelae, and talatat scenes with the funerary repast. This chapter, although largely static and iconographic, presents the diverse and numerous stelae from the Giza Necropolis, and suggests that Snefru, not Khufu, was the originator of the reductionist policy.
As the excavators of most of the slab stelae, G.A. Reisner and H. Junker were naturally the first to concern themselves with the problem (fig. 211). Junker’s more analytical comments on the stelae may be found primarily in his Gîza 1, pp. 23–35, Gîza 2, pp. 4–18, and Gîza 12, pp. 49–53. Reisner’s published comments may be found primarily on pp. 305–306 of his Giza Necropolis 1, but several unpublished manuscripts, housed today in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, contain additional remarks (see below, Chapters 4–5). Following upon the work of these two scholars, others have contributed important discussions, not only on the slab stelae themselves, but on the overlapping issues of the false door, the tablet scene (funerary repast), and the famous Giza reserve heads. The first substantial publication of the Hearst, and then Harvard–MFA, Expedition at Giza appeared in 1913, co-authored by Reisner and C. Fisher.15 Although the far Western Cemetery received some attention here, none of the slab stelae was illustrated. In 1917, Gardiner published the archaic round-topped stela purchased at Thebes and acquired by the Bankfield Museum, and dated it to Dynasty 2 (fig. 212).16 Junker believed that this stela derived from Abydos, while A. Scharff argued for Memphis. Vandier preferred Abydos as well, noting that the stela was purchased at Thebes. He proposed a unique compromise between the southern, round-topped, stela tradition and the northern, funerary repast, representation by dating the Bankfield stela to the reign of Peribsen and his move into the Third Intermediate.17

Focusing on private tombs at Giza in a 1928 ZÄS article, Junker argued for a formal break from developments of the preceding Dynasty at Saqqara.18 Gone were the palace facades and interior chambers, and in their place appeared slab stelae and burial chambers lined with flat limestone blocks painted in imitation of granite. The private tombs followed the lead of the royal pyramid complex in reduction and simplicity according to Junker, and the changes were related to royal power. False doors, absent at first, eventually returned (Junker cites the tomb of Iunu (g 4590)), and the explanation for the walling up of such slab stelae as those of Iunu (g 4590) and Wepemnefret (g 5230) was the eventual conversion of the offering place to a false door. Tradition, for Junker, gradually reasserted itself at Giza, primarily after the necropolis ceased to be the primary royal cemetery. Examples he cited included (g 4260), which contained a false door in the southernmost chamber and a slab stela in the connecting room in the wall of the mastaba, and the mastabas of Kaninisut I (g 4650), Merit (g 2000–1), and Nersedjerkai (g 2000–II).19 Giza was thus not helpful in dating other cemetery sites. Junker developed his thesis further with the publication of his first Gîza volume in 1929.20 Although describing the slab stelae in particular, he omitted several of the Cemetery 2100...
Giza mastaba owners were somehow forced by the court to include fewer offerings in their burials than they wanted.22 Junker compared the style of the slab stelae with objects from the immediately preceding reigns (Hetka, Ruhetep, Nebemraat, Metjet, Ashut-qa, Kha-bau-saika), and concluded that the earlier hieroglyphs were taller, thinner, and more elegant, while the Giza slab stelae signs were thicker, squatter, and less refined.23 This difference purportedly derived from the shift from verticality, found on the earlier false doors, to horizontality with the Giza slab stela form. Even the tools on which the tomb owners sat changed, from the pre-Giza thin and very stylized forms, to the heavier, wider, more modeled appearance at Giza. Furthermore, the linen lists at Giza seemed to spread out horizontally.

In 1931, Gardiner did the signs for alabaster and linen, touching also on the arrow sign (→ T 13) and the ancient and modern confusion over in and sin.24 He concluded that the arrow hieroglyph originally stood for both "arrow" and "lining" and that both were read sin, but that "arrow" later changed to sin. This led to the abandonment of the arrow sign for "lining" by Dynasty 5 with a few rare exceptions.25 Most scholars today translate the sign sin, although sin is also attested, and has been accepted in the present work (see below, Chapter 4, discussion of Section 1, the linen list, and Appendix 3 for a compilation of selected linen list parallels).

In 1932, A. Schafft took the opposite approach from Junker, claiming there was no Upper Egyptian, or Abydene, connection to the Giza slab stelae.26 He concluded that the latter evolved separately, not out of false doors; Schafft emphatically stated the discrepancy between the vertical, round-topped Upper Egyptian form and the horizontal, rectangular preference found at Giza and Saqqara in the north.27 For him, the lack of the funerary repeat or tableau scene, in the south, indicated that Gardiner’s Bankfield data originated from Saqqara, and dated to Dynasty 2. The Hiswaibean stelsa were seen as the earliest precursors of later false doors. For Schafft, the first slab scene dated to the end of Dynasty 1st Saqqara with the stela of Sahhekher (see Appendix 1, Fig. 27). These additional stelae from Dynasty 2 likewise derived from Saqqara, one of which was found in situ. At the end of Dynasty 3 and beginning of Dynasty 4, the format of false-stela stelae was incorporated into the false door, both at Saqqara (e.g., Metjet) and at Medum (e.g., Ruhetep). From here, the transition to Giza was made. Junker replied to Schafft’s interpretation in his second Giza volume in 1934.28

Examples discovered by Reisner (perhaps because they had not yet been published at that time), also showed the format stela of Sekhem-senhet (g 2380) and Menetia (g 4048). Nevertheles, he argued that the slab stela antedated the funerary repeat scene on the false door. Junker mentioned the archaic, round-topped Abydene stela and Upper Egyptian tumulus burials, versus the rectangular stela and palace facade tradition of the north, but he noted that a direct line of development was hard to follow. The Bankfield data was proof for Junker of the relationship between Abydene and Giza, and he assumed the

---

22 Ibid., pp. 27–30.
25 Ibid., p. 95.
29 Schafft cited Quibell Saqqara 2338: Quibell, Excavations at Saqqara VI, pp. 26–28. Alternatively, however, note the other Hieratic and slop-stela stelae of Shapet-developed from g 6940 (cf. Reisner, in Studies Presented to F.Ll. Griffith, pp. 360–363, and Weeks, Mastabas of Cemetery G 5500, pl. 30)
30 Giza 2, pp. 4–10.
34. Idem, p. 77.
35. Idem, p. 77.
39. Smith, 1924; repr. in 1937 by John William Pyre Rare Books, Boston, Massachusetts.
Necropolis volumes, which remained unpublished at his death in 1942. Concerning the slab stela, he wrote:

There are at least two varieties of long-term options and the offering lists which are characteristic of the offering list of the Funerary Repast scene and related to the primitive niched stones. In fact, as one can see in the main text, the stela (which is the case here) is normally set rectangular onto an Abydene round-topped form.

Vandier continued his discussion with the Giza stela, noting that the seated tomb owner’s right arm is always provided with a left hand, and that both feet are left feet, a convention that endured well into Dynasty 38. Smith related the low relief style of the slab stela with parallels from the chapels of Hemmune (g 4900), and Khenty-kau (g 2383), both dating to Khufu, and of Ankh-haf (g 7390) and Mantritas (g 7670), both dating, according to Smith, to Khafre. Fragments found at Liht but deriving from satellite pyramid吉b were also cited as parallels. Smith’s comments on the subject did not change substantially with the appearance of his second edition of History of Egyptian Sculpture and Painting in the Old Kingdom in 1943.

In 1927, Z. Saad published the group of early dynastic slab stela he excavated at Helwan, naming them “sailing stela” due to their unusual findspots towards the tops of the burial chambers. These provided some “new” predecessors for the Giza stela, widening the earlier debate about southern (Abydos) and northern (Saqqara) influence in the Giza Necropolis. However, the original context of the stela was eventually disputed (see below).

In 1932, Vandier’s fundamental review of the entire subject, “The Funerary Equipment Found in Burial Chambers,” pp. 28–36, focused on reserves heads and slab stelae. Vandier’s conclusions were based on his somewhat conditioned conclusion of “eight mastabas with reserve heads (Khufu stela) had slab stela (actual or emplacement). Fourteen of the reserve heads had no sacred head. Six mastabas with no slab stela did have reserve heads”. If these heads, nos. 23–22, incorrectly assigned by Vandier, to the seven mastabas with eight heads had no slab stela “This only two heads, one at Wenschet (with a slab stela) and one without a slab stela”.

Reisner, unpublished manuscript:

In an unpublished manuscript entitled, “Giza Necropolis Chapter XI, the funerary equipment found in burial chambers,” Vandier discussed the occurrence of slab stelae and reserve heads. The presentation of slab stelae by rank of ownership was first of royal gift at Giza, introduced by Khufu. It later, in reserve, was made by royal craftsmen to be sent to someone who already had slab stela and to someone who had not. Reisner noted that these heads were made by royal craftsmen. Slab stela were presented to favored individuals (although one was a prince) and the two known examples were made under Khafre.

E. Hassan prepared a lengthy chapter on slab stela and false doors in the 1944 volume of his ambitious Giza series. He also considered the origin of the false door, its various elements (painted showcase, niches, etc.) and argued his discussion by

dynasty. Two years later, W.S. Smith elaborated on Reisner’s remarks. He linked the Giza slab stela table scenes to earlier false doors and niche stones, noting that the seated tomb owner’s right arm is always provided with a left hand, and that both feet are left feet, a convention that endured well into Dynasty 38. Smith related the low relief style of the slab stela with parallels from the chapels of Hemmune (g 4900), and Khenty-kau (g 2383), both dating to Khufu, and of Ankh-haf (g 7390) and Mantritas (g 7670), both dating, according to Smith, to Khafre. Fragments found at Liht but deriving from satellite pyramid吉b were also cited as parallels. Smith’s comments on the subject did not change substantially with the appearance of his second edition of History of Egyptian Sculpture and Painting in the Old Kingdom in 1943.

In 1927, Z. Saad published the group of early dynastic slab stela he excavated at Helwan, naming them “sailing stela” due to their unusual findspots towards the tops of the burial chambers. These provided some “new” predecessors for the Giza stela, widening the earlier debate about southern (Abydos) and northern (Saqqara) influence in the Giza Necropolis. However, the original context of the stela was eventually disputed (see below).

In 1932, Vandier’s fundamental review of the entire subject, “The Funerary Equipment Found in Burial Chambers,” pp. 28–36, focused on reserve heads and slab stelae. Vandier’s conclusions were based on his somewhat conditioned conclusion of “eight mastabas with reserve heads (Khufu stela) had slab stela (actual or emplacement). Fourteen of the reserve heads had no sacred head. Six mastabas with no slab stela did have reserve heads”. If these heads, nos. 23–22, incorrectly assigned by Vandier, to the seven mastabas with eight heads had no slab stela “This only two heads, one at Wenschet (with a slab stela) and one without a slab stela”.

Reisner, unpublished manuscript:

In a comprehensive review of the entire subject, Vandier summarized some previous discussions, including the views of Junker and Schiff, and noted Miller’s terminology of tectonic (“standing alone”, etc.), sta-toblock, and relief (“dependent”, etc.) forms. He concluded that round, rodstated on the Giza stela of a tomb in Dynasty 2 onwards, the Memphite stela without a rectangular form, and included the funerary table scene. Function was a principal factor; for Vandier, the Abyssinian stela provided the deceased’s name, while the Memphite stela added the entire funerary ritual. Since the latter required more space for the scenes, the northern preference was for rectangular stelae. Abyssinian and Memphite stelae were thus utilized in terms of “data development. In the balance, Reisner pointed out the unique compromise experimentation in Peribsen, which reached the Nitrian area. Since the data was supposedly acquired in 1899 at Tell el-Dab’a, Vandier felt it probably did come from Abyssinia, not Memphis, but represented an attempt to graft the Memphite funerary repast scene (normally rectangular) onto an Abydene round-topped form.
In 1935, Junker published his twelfth and final Giza volume. By this time he had given up the notion of Abydene influence on the north, now that the Helwan stelae were known. Junker saw the latter as the true Giza predecessors, taking them as independent monuments. But this interpretation was later refuted by G. Haeny, who sought to prove that the Helwan stelae were inserted in false door niches, and thus were not independent monuments (see below). Haeny focussed on the Western Cemetery the following year, arguing that most of the mastabas with slab stelae belong to senior construction officials whose private initiative accounted for their mortuary complexes. He further suggested a number of familial relationships, but these were based primarily on mastaba proximity and the similarity of certain names and titles.

E.S. Smith briefly treated the slab stelae in his survey of Egyptian art and architecture, first published in 1936, noting that despite the relatively high, bold relief style of Saenmut reign, the slab stelae of the elderly members of the family and court in the Western Cemetery are carved in the very low relief employed in the royal temples and in a few badly preserved chapels like those of Harmuny and Ankh-kali. Smith looked at one stela in particular, that of Wepemnefret (G 1201), in 1936, taking a somewhat more architectural approach. He argued that in the mid-reign of Khufu the royal twin mastabas of the Eastern Cemetery were joined into the great double mastabas, with L-shaped chapels added. Then renovations began in the Western Cemetery along the same lines. It was at this point, according to Smith, that Wepenmnefret destroyed his exterior mud-brick chapel, walled up its slab door, and commenced with the construction of a new stone chapel. Smith counted twenty-four surviving slabs, of which eleven were "virtually complete." He also noted a short inscription on the upper edge of the Wepemnnefret stela (see above, stela 3). In 1935, W. Barta examined the listing of funerary gifts in general with a view to establishing chronological sequences. He followed Junker’s division of the Giza Western Cemetery into tombbuilding to Khufu, Khafre, and Menkaure, and in the offering ritual he focused on the introduction of *taw (w)", naktum, supposedly indicating the transition from Khufu to Khafre and the Mandawarun (Ye n. "backslaitt") which appears at the end of Dynasty 4. His sequence for Giza appears below:

Reign of Khufu: G 4510 (Karsut), G 4520 (anonymous), G 1201 (Karsut), G 4260 (Karsut)
Reign of Khafre: G 3255 (Khufu-makht), G 3267 (Netcher)
Reign of Menkaure: G 4810 (Wepesmekh), G 4580 (anonymous)

A novel approach to the problem from the point of view of costume was offered by E. Sayigh in 1963. Considering eleven slabs, she provided useful references to Junker’s research on the funerary meal, and argued that the need for additional offerings and larger lists were the catalysts in moving the scene of the slab stela, onto the tablets of false doors, and later onto the walls and waist walls of chapels. The theme of slab stela versus false door was taken up in great detail in an important article by Haeny in 1971. Refuting Saenmut’s interpretation of the Helwan pieces as “sailing statues,” Haeny noted the disturbed context due to plunder, and the destruction of all superstition. Many slabs were even discovered far from their original tombs. Nonetheless the three slabs were originally placed in a subterranean chamber.

Haeny believed that neither the Saqqara archaic offering statues nor the Abydene slabs provided suitable predecessors for the Giza slab stelae. The Helwan stelae left their sides free of decoration, possibly for assembling as part of false doors, while the Giza slab decoration filled the entire slab. Where many had seen the funerary repeat of the slab stelae and the accompanying offerings as eventually evolving into the false door panel, and that is related to the false door itself onto decorated chapel walls. Haeny argued for the reverse development, namely that false doors were the originally intended cult focus. For the earliest Giza mastabas, in particular, he cited the mastaba of Nefret in the Western Cemetery as that of a tomb with finished casing, exterior stone chapel, and false door (see below, Chapter 9).

The most significant analysis of the linen lists since Smith’s 1935 essay was written by P. Posener-Kriéger in 1977. Comparing the Old Kingdom linen lists with an Old Kingdom date from Saqqara, she observed that the totals of certain account columns were not figuring properly. Cubits were listed in pairs with single cubits, but ten was never listed. Posener-Kriéger realised that theory should link laying in the horizontal arrangement. The horizontal sign was interpreted as the “as” sign equal to ten cubits. Consequently, the multiplication of the various lists were present, e.g., 1 cubit x 10 cubits was 10 cubits. Once the number of verticals exceeded four or five, there was a tendency to express the total in a series of horizontal signs alone, designating tens of cubits. The question of linear versus square cubits is still problematic, for the horizontals could represent ten cubits squared. Of additional interest is the question of the proper absence of the horizontal— the vertical signs, for examples of both writings are present in the Giza slab stelae.

One of the most important Old Kingdom contributions from the 1980s was written by N. Chepion on dating criteria measured against a reference framework of tomb chapels containing royal names. This method allowed for a number of tombs to be re-dated back to early Dynasty 4, and Chepion made use of several features found on the Giza slab stelae to support her dating criteria. While the method is not without its complications, it provides a systematic approach to evaluating many of the elements found on the monuments considered in the present volume.

50 See the discussion of Haeny’s important article below, Chapter 5, along with Wallisch, Dikaiosyne-Schreiben, pp. 36-17. The Helwan objects are being studied by E.C. Köhler, cf. “Hidden Treasures in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo. The Collection of Objects from Zaki Saad’s Excavations at Helwan/Ezbet el-Walda,” in M. Eldamaty and M. Trad, eds., Palästina MuseumCollections and the World (Cairo, 2002), p. 679-90.
54 Ibid., p. 7.
55 Ibid., p. 2.
56 W. Barta, Die altägyptische Opferliste von der Frühzeit bis zur griechisch–römischen Zeit (ZHAS 3 [Berlin, 1963]), p. 3.
57 Ibid., p. 43.
58 Ibid., p. 44.
59 Barta, Die altägyptische Opferlisten, pp. 43-66.
61 Staehelin, Tracht, p. 29.
63 Ibid., p. 44.
64 Ibid., p. 45.
65 Ibid., p. 46.
66 Ibid., p. 47.
67 This is the translation preferred by Kahl, Kloth and Zimmermann, Die Inschriften der 3. Dynastie, MÄS 3 (Berlin, 1963), pp. 41f., 57, and see below, Chapter 5.
70 Ibid., p. 88.
71 Ibid., p. 92.
72 This is the translation preferred by Kahl, Kloth and Zimmermann, Die Inschriften der 3. Dynastie, MÄS 3 (Berlin, 1963), pp. 41f., 57, and see below, Chapter 5.
74 Ibid., p. 46.
75 Ibid., p. 47.
SLAB STELAE OF THE GIZA NECROPOLIS

The 1990s saw a wide range of publications on numerous aspects of mortuary equipment and tomb decoration. Considering, for example, the case of Meresankh III, 
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In 1997 J. Kahl re-examined the archaic stelae situation after considering the offering loaves of the table scene (our Section 76). Noting that the Ka-statue being forced upon the elite class of tomb owners by the king, or that the owners as individuals who died during the reign of Khufu with mastabas yet unfinished. Casing and cult focus (false door) were all still missing at time of death, mostly the old superstructure and substructure were complete. Instead of a false door, then, a sealing of the shafts was provided along with a mud-brick chapel as a sort of "emergency solution."

Jánosi noted that while the superstructure may have been incomplete in the mastabas in question, the burial chamber was always dressed and ready for the burial. He claimed in fact that no tomb with an undressed burial chamber had a slab stela. While plans may have remained to finish the tomb at a later time, the mortuary cult had to be set up as soon as possible at time of burial. This led to the construction of the mud-brick chapel with the slab stela provided from the royal workshops, as a temporary "fix" until a proper false door could be provided. What the slab stela could not replace was the

by far the larger, and hence more important, tombs. 
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In 1997 J. Kahl re-examined the archaic stelae situation after producing a "strict style" (Junker's term) of tomb decoration in early Dynasty 4. 

77

following upon a survey of the development of the major necropolises of the early Old Kingdom, and their interpretation in the scholarship literature, he concluded that the reduction to limit 10,450,69 critical element for the mortuary cult can be traced further back than Giza and the reign of Khufu to that of his father Snefru at Dahshur. The reduction focused attention on the institution of the monarchy and the visible manifestation of the funerary god, and Jánosi saw no real break between the reigns of Snefru and Khufu—that is, between Dahshur and early Giza—as far as the "strict style" was concerned.

Renewed attention on the Archaic Period has arisen in the last decade or so. The so-called "slab stela" from Hawara/ Ezbeib el-Walda are in the process of revaluation. T. Wilkerson discussed the group of twenty-five stelae published by Saad in 1965. He argued for a已经达到 the stage of slab stela 2 by 24 (1995), pp. 138–45. More recently, Kahl has begun publishing a dictionary of archaic Egyptian:
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Frühägyptisches Wörterbuch. Erste Lieferung (Vienna, forthcoming), § 4.2. I am especially indebted to the author for sharing this critical work on the Giza Necropolis with me in manuscript form.

In an invaluable Habilitation on Giza in the Fourth Dynasty, P. Jánosi has recently addressed the slab stela issue. He failed to see any evidence of the slab being forced upon the most class of tomb owners by the king, or that the owners had "made do with just a slab stela." Instead he viewed the slab stelae as individuals who died during the reign of Khufu with mastabas yet unfinished. Casing and cult focus (false

door) were all still missing at time of death, mostly the old superstructure and substructure were complete. Instead of a false door, then, a sealing of the shafts was provided along with a mud-brick chapel as a sort of "emergency solution."

Jánosi noted that while the superstructure may have been incomplete in the mastabas in question, the burial chamber was always dressed and ready for the burial. He claimed in fact that no tomb with an undressed burial chamber had a slab stela. While plans may have remained to finish the tomb at a later time, the mortuary cult had to be set up as soon as possible at time of burial. This led to the construction of the mud-brick chapel with the slab stela provided from the royal workshops, as a temporary "fix" until a proper false door could be provided. What the slab stela could not replace was the
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P. Piacentini, Les scribes dans la société égyptienne de l'Ancien Empire, with a contribution by J. Jones, in preparation.
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A. Bolshakov, Man and His Double.
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CHAPTER 3: NOTES ON PREVIOUS SCHOLARLY RESEARCH

Communicative function between living and dead normally provided by the false door. The slab stelae signaled only that a burial existed in that particular tomb, for which a mortuary ritual had been established. Since the finalized stone elements were often never added, the deceased's descendants were forced to consider these once temporary mud-brick elements as the final elements for the tombs. This would explain the countless repairs, improvements, and changes that are evident in many of these mastabas.

To summarize Jánosi's arguments, the slab stelae were the foci for the mortuary cult of people who died during Khufu's reign, while their tombs in the West Cemetery were still under construction. The burial could take place once the walls of the burial chamber were ready. The slab stela was added at the time of burial to a new, unfinished mastaba. The attempt to finalize these temporary arrangements came later, with casing and cult chapel of stone, and a false door.

The slab stelae covered up in the wall after completion, were temporary "placeholders" guaranteeing the cult, until the final elements (false door, casing)—many of which were never installed—were in place.

To the question—why not build a false door into these mastabas right from the beginning?—Jánosi replied that preparing a false door took longer than a slab stela, and that the cult was needed immediately. Furthermore, the uncased cores were in no condition to take false doors. The false door was usually added after the mastaba was cased, or at least planned to be cased, for it needed to be anchored into the casing.

For those tombs where further construction was finally carried out, Jánosi noted that the slab stela had by that time become so crucial to the cult that it could not simply be removed, destroyed, or reused without damage to the deceased. Slab stelae were walled up in four tombs (Wepem-nefer g 1201, Kaakmaa g 1223, Nefreet-ibat g 1225, and lunugi g 4200). He concluded that chapels that were later broken into the core of the tumulus for their chamber(s) could not yet have possessed a slab stela or a burial, because the alterations would have required the removal or destruction of the slab stela.

Other authors, inadvertently omitted here, have doubtless provided contributions to the slab stela debate, and the last word has clearly not been written on the subject. This impressionistic sketch of some of the more significant works may, however, serve to lead us into the next two chapters, which present comparative remarks on the slab stela decoration program (Chapter 4), and interpretive comments on the slab stela genre as a whole (Chapter 5).

86 This may also have been the intention with the stelae of Seshet-sekhentiu from G 2120 and of Wenshet from G 4840 (see above, Chapter 1, stelae 9 and 10).

87 He concluded that chapels that were later broken into the core of the tumulus for their chamber(s) could not yet have possessed a slab stela or a burial, because the alterations would have required the removal or destruction of the slab stela.

Other authors, inadvertently omitted here, have doubtless provided contributions to the slab stela debate, and the last word has clearly not been written on the subject. This impressionistic sketch of some of the more significant works may, however, serve to lead us into the next two chapters, which present comparative remarks on the slab stela decoration program (Chapter 4), and interpretive comments on the slab stela genre as a whole (Chapter 5).

86 This may also have been the intention with the stelae of Seshet-sekhentiu from G 2120 and of Wenshet from G 4840 (see above, Chapter 1, stelae 9 and 10).
**CHAPTER 4**

Comparative Remarks on Decoration and Layout

The plates and line drawings above in Chapter 1 misled the reader somewhat as far as the relative size of the fifteen slab-stelae is concerned. Fig. 221 therefore gathers all the slab and stela fragments together in one place, shown at a greatly reduced, but constant relative size. Given the great distances that lie between the stelae today, it is only through such a comparison that one is struck by the disparity between the short-form and long-form examples.

In order to separate the elements of the slab stela decoration program, I have adopted throughout this, and an earlier publication, the use of four "sections" to describe the basic elements common to all the stelae (see Chapter 1, Fig. 4), and have color-coded these elements in the individual translations above in Chapter 1 as follows:

- **Section a**: overhead identifying text, placed at the top of the stela
- **Section b**: funerary repair at the left side (seated figure before the table of offerings base)
- **Section c**: list of offerings located centrally
- **Section d**: linen list towards the right edge of the stela

In an attempt to further organize the fifteen stelae in terms of their arrangement of these sections, I had earlier proposed five separate layout pattern variations for these Sections **a, b, c, and d** above. These variations may now be modified somewhat and reduced to just four as a result of additional research. But before discussing them, we should note that Reisner himself attempted to organize and classify the slab stelae in an unpublished chapter originally planned for additional volumes of his History of the Giza Necropolis monograph series. In a manuscript entitled "The Development of the Tablet Scene," Reisner concentrated on the presence or absence of granaries and additional compartment list offerings—our short-form versus long-form stelae. His slab stela classes took the following form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Cupboard list of linen only</td>
<td>g. 1201 Wepemnefret (vertical lines: oryx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>List of garments, furniture and vessels between linen list and table</td>
<td>g. 4980 linen: horizontal lines: oryx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Linen list with granaries</td>
<td>g. 2350 Ineni: horizontal lines: oryx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Cupboard list of linen and granaries</td>
<td>g. 1940 Mendesitou, g. 1980 Anonymous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not clear why Reisner laid so much emphasis on the presence or absence of the oryx ideographic offering. He paid no heed to the relationship of our Section **a** to the rest of the stela layout, that is, the placement and extent of titles and identifying text vis à vis the representation of the tomb owner and the linen list. Moreover, his Class III contains an error, for there are no granaries on the g. 2350 fragment (stela 12).

After focusing on the granaries, Reisner went on to note that his classifications are of no help in questions of chronological development:

... It is hardly to be concluded, however, that the presence or absence of granaries has a chronological significance for the tablets or slab-stelae. The earliest of the tablets at Medum (Nefert-matni) has granaries while the later tablet of Khufu has none. The compartment lists of Khabawakhor have the granaries, but the primitive niche stones do not have them. In Cemetery 2, 1200, one of the two latest slab-stelae, Saty-Helenet, has the granaries. It is necessary to conclude that the representation of the granaries depended on the choice of the craftsmen. Thus, there is no essential difference between Class I and Class II...

This comparison makes it obvious that no chronological development can be deduced from the different classes of the slab-stelae of Giza except perhaps that Class III and IV were amplifications of Class I, based on other known forms of the tablet scene.

---

2. Ibid., p. 124, fig. 5.
4. Ibid., p. 19.
5. Ibid., p. 21.
Fig. 213. Comparison chart of all slab stelae reduced to the same relative scale
Since Reisner’s classification scheme brings us no closer to a chronological sequence for the stelae, we now return to the four pattern variations used in the present work (fig. 214). Pattern 1 is unique to the long-form stela of Wepemnefret (g 1201), for no other stela contains so many columns and lines of identifying titles (Section a). Even more striking is the fact that the Section a inscription begins further to the right than the linen list itself, another feature unique in our group of stelae. These factors, along with the position of the matriline in Cemetery 1200, may well suggest that Wepemnefret is the earliest stela of the group. We have already noted archaic parallels to this layout above in Chapter 1 (fig. 2).\(^6\) Other possible clues to archaic influence include the small size of the Ibyy falcons in the linen list, the absence of vertical separators in the “compartments” of the linen list, and the offering table with loaves raised up on a separate ground line.\(^7\) Based on the layout of the Wepemnefret stela, it is perhaps worth investigating whether the largest mastabas of each nucleus cemetery (g 1201 Wepemnefret; g 4000 Hemiunu;\(^8\) g 2220 anonymous;\(^9\) and g 7510 Ankh-haf in the Eastern Cemetery\(^10\)) were the very first

\(^6\) Cf. J. Vandier, Manuel d’Archéologie Egyptienne I, Les époques de formation (Paris, 1952), p. 759, fig. 498; R. Wolff, Das Denkmal des Setnakht aus El-Saqqarah (Le Caire, 1934), p. 226. Conversely, in its horizontal and vertical inscriptions, the layout of the Wepemnefret stela could call to mind those of the later Old Kingdom, such as that of the Inscription of King Senusret I at Thebes, 1150 BC.\(^11\) On the development in general, see H. Helck, Altägyptische Aktenkunde des 3. und 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr. (Berlin, 1974). For a suggested date for Wepemnefret late in the development of Cemetery 1200, see Strudwick, Administration, p. 37.

\(^7\) Small Ibyy falcons and an absence of vertical separators are present on a host of pre-Giza niche-stelae; for raised offering tables, see, for example, Z. Saad, Ceiling Stelae in Second Dynasty Tombs from the Excavations at Helwan (Cairo, 1957), pl. 27; idem, The Excavations at Helwan (Norman, 1969), p. 29; idem, Excavations at Sakkara (Norman, 1975), pl. 30. For a Dynasty 4 parallel from Giza, see the false door tablet of Snefru-seneb from g 4240: Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, pl. 57b.

\(^8\) Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, p. 75, n. 164; cf. A. Faudot, La tombe de Setne Khet (Cairo, 1935), p. 132, that Hemiunu’s mastaba (g 4000) already existed when the first group of Cemetery 4000 mastabas (most likely that of g 4400, g 4600, g 4860, and g 4860) were built, and Hemiunu and Hesy were recently discussed by P. Raffaelli, La tombe de la reine Ankh, Pièces de l’Exposition des Antiquités Egyptiennes au Louvre, 1936, pp. 15–16, and 241–245.

\(^9\) Despite the lack of evidence for the existence of a likely nucleus cemetery, 2100, as seen in p. 223, which was similarly “monitored” by Reisner and continued to be laid out in the same manner.

\(^10\) P. Jánosi has recently demonstrated that Ankh-haf’s mastaba most likely dates to Khufu’s reign and was among the first, not the last, to be constructed in the Eastern Cemetery. See M. Jánosi, in der 4. Dynastie (Vienna, forthcoming).
to be constructed. Furthermore, could they all originally have contained slab stelae? Alterations were later made to the interiors of \(\text{g} 4000\) and \(\text{g} 2220\), perhaps eliminating their slab stelae and emplacements.\(^2\) This would leave Wepemnefret's as the only surviving slab data among the "principal" mastabas of the three nucleus cemeteries in question.\(^2\)

Moving on to the other three patterns for the decorative layout of the slab stelae, we find they are much more uniform, and each pattern contains several examples. Pattern 2 shows the identifying text above (Section \(a\)) stretching over Sections \(b\) (funerary repast scene) and \(c\) (offerings), while the linen list (Section \(d\)) occupies the full height from the bottom to the top of the slab stela's decorative frame. Both short-form and long-form data are attested for Pattern 2. Examples include the stela of Kanefret (\(\text{g} 2003\)), Seth-kahekret (\(\text{g} 1227\)), Ini (\(\text{g} 1238\)), Seth-kahekret (\(\text{g} 1235\)), and Neferet (\(\text{g} 4400\)).

Pattern 3 reduces the identifying inscription (Section \(a\)) still further to just a very short text over the funerary repast (Section \(b\)), with the offerings (Section \(c\)) filling in the newly won space to the upper edge of the stela. Examples of Pattern 3 stelae consist of Khufu-nakht (\(\text{g} 1209\)), Nehet-ta (\(\text{g} 1207\)), Nehet-ta (\(\text{g} 1239\)), and the anonymous fragment from \(\text{g} 2236\). The stela of Nehet actually separates the offerings of Section \(c\) with vertical column dividers. All of the stela of Pattern 3 are short-form stelae.

Pattern 4 completes the group with added emphasis on the identifying inscription (Section \(a\)). This text becomes a wide horizontal band across the top, reducing the height of the linen list (Section \(d\)), for the \(\text{hdm}\) falcons are now tucked underneath the inscription of Section \(a\). In fact, one could almost add Wepemnefret to this group, were it not for the other unusual features of his slab stela's layout. The other examples of Pattern 4 stelae are Kaemah (\(\text{g} 1223\)), Ini (\(\text{g} 4400\)), and the anonymous stela from \(\text{g} 4860\). Two stela fragments that cannot be ascribed with certainty to one of the above patterns are those of Kaninisut (\(\text{g} 2155\)) and Wenshet (\(\text{g} 4840\)).

We may now proceed to a comparative discussion of the four sections of the slab stelae.

### Section A: The Identifying Inscription

The chart in fig. 216 lists all the titles preserved in the Giza stelae. An attempt is also made to group them according to their type or nature, using the following letter abbreviations: bureaucratic (B), epithet (E), geographical (G), priestly (P), and royalty-related (R):\(^14\)

According to the scheme listed above, the slab stelae owners display seven bureaucratic titles (B), possibly one epithet (E), two geographic titles (G), thirteen priestly titles (P) and three or four titles indicating royalty (R), whether actual or not. By far the largest number of titles belongs to Wepemnefret, and...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Epithet and Type</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Bearers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overseer of commissions</td>
<td>Kanefr (p. 203)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overseer of the physics of Upper Egypt</td>
<td>Iunu (p. 420); Kaisem (p. 1229)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keaper of the kings property</td>
<td>Khufu-nakht (p. 1215); Ini (p. 1219)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overseer of fishers</td>
<td>Wepemnefret (p. 1201)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commander of the kings scribes</td>
<td>Wepemnefret (p. 1201)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priestess of Hathor, mistress of the sycamore</td>
<td>Nefert (p. 1271); Nebt-iskeraten (p. 1227)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priest of Hathor, mistress of the sycamore</td>
<td>Wenshet (p. 4941)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priest of Anubis</td>
<td>Wepemnefret (p. 1201)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priest of the soul of Ini</td>
<td>Wepemnefret (p. 1201)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priest of Auset</td>
<td>Wepemnefret (p. 1201)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priestess of Hathor, mistress of the sycamore</td>
<td>Wenshet (p. 4941)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priest of the northern House</td>
<td>Wepemnefret (p. 1201)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priest of Hatchep</td>
<td>Wepemnefret (p. 1201)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priest of the throne of the archon(s) of the keeper of the kings property</td>
<td>Wepemnefret (p. 1201)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controller of haari</td>
<td>Ini (p. 1219)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controller of boatmen</td>
<td>Kanefr (p. 203)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lector priest</td>
<td>Wepemnefret (p. 1201)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chief lector priest</td>
<td>Sehatiash笏nubtu (p. 2203)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king's scribe</td>
<td>Wepemnefret (p. 1201); Kaisem (p. 1229); Ini (p. 1219)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king's daughter</td>
<td>Nefert-Ibyet (p. 1229)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bodily daughter of the king</td>
<td>Meresites (p. 4940); Wenshet (p. 4940)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 236. List of titles attested for the owners of the Giza slab stelae.

---

6. Ibid., index 1, pp. 381–382, no. 1254.
10. Ibid., index 1, pp. 381–382, no. 1254.
14. Ibid., index 1, pp. 381–382, no. 1254.
15. Ibid., pp. 407–409, no. 1257, and cf. Fischer, Via Nova, Egyptian Studies, 3, p. 35, noted, with important bibliography.
the inclusion of his twelve titles clearly indicates that there was no lack of space on the format of slab stelae for full listings of an individual's administrative duties. The much smaller numbers of titles on other slab stelae need not, therefore, reflect any kind of obligatory abbreviation of titles due to lack of space.\footnote{One often finds references in the scholarly literature to the format of the slab stela as containing insufficient space for all the items supposedly "desired" by the deceased; cf. E. Staehelin, Untersuchungen zur ägyptischen Tracht im Alten Reich, MAÄS 8 (Berlin, 1966), p. 224; J. Junker, Gîza 1, pp. 8, 29, 30. This is a modern value judgment.} Judging from both the size of his mastaba and the number of titles, there can be little doubt, then, that Wepemnefret was indeed the highest ranking and most important individual in Cemetery 200. His twelve titles compare well with some twenty-three titles listed for Hemiunu, the highest ranking individual in Cemetery 4000.\footnote{Hemiunu's titles are listed by J. Junker, Gîza 2, pp. 148–51; see also Piacentini, Les Scribes dans la société égyptienne de l'Ancien Empire 1, pp. 102–103.} As far as Cemetery 2000 is concerned, if the most important individual there was indeed the owner of g 220, neither name nor titles are preserved.\footnote{On this tomb, cf. Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, pp. 450–53.}

Determining the genealogical relationships between the various slab stela owners would be of great import as far as familial exclusivity within the three nucleus cemeteries is concerned. However, the paucity of inscriptions renders definitive connections almost impossible. The nature of the slab stela form, and the dearth of accompanying inscriptions from the mastabas in question, leaves us with little more than guess work concerning spouses and offspring. Reisner believed that nucleus Cemetery 1200, 2000, and 4000 represented three different branches of Khufu's family.\footnote{For another view, focusing instead on the "private initiative" of senior construction officials, see Helck, ZÄS 81 (1956), pp. 62–65.} We might summarize just a few genealogical suggestions by other scholars, but they rely on titles more than similar names, geographical proximity, or a shared title or two. For Cemetery 2000, Helck suggested that, based on their respective "royal" titles of a and at least, Nefret-iabet (g 1225) was the wife of Wepemnefret (g 1201).\footnote{W. Helck, "Die Datierung der Prinzessin Wnß.t," in C. Berger, G. Clerc and N. Grimal, eds., Hommages à Jean Leclant 1 (Cairo, 1994), p. 221.} He further proposed that Khufu-nakht (g 1205) might have been Wepemnefret's son, though without any particularly compelling reason. Further to the east, in Cemetery 4000, Helck posited that Meretites (g 4140) was the wife of Hemiunu (g 4000), based on the geographical proximity of their two tombs. The existence of the second (male) reserve head in Meretites' tomb, however, might cast doubt upon this
CHAPTER 4: COMPARATIVE REMARKS ON DECORATION AND LAYOUT

Finally, Helck suggested that Iunu (g 4150) in Cemetery 4000 was the successor of Kaiemah (g 2228) of Cemetery 1200, since both individuals bore the titles of imy-wr s3a.20 Juerner wondered whether Kanefer (g 1203) of Cemetery 1200 was a predecessor of the Kanefer (g 2228) of Cemetery 2000, since both men held the same titles, as does the latter Kanefer’s son Ka-sewedja (g 5340 = Lepsius 37).21 Most of these tenuous suggestions and assumptions, however, cannot be demonstrated by the archaeological evidence. The one conclusion we might draw is that none of the slab stela owners designated as “children” or “adoptive children” of the pharaoh necessarily had an actual blood relation to him. We should expect the tombs of actual royal family members to be located in the Eastern, not the Western Cemetery at Giza.22

SECTION B: THE FUNERARY REPAST SCENE

Some of the layout irregularities of the slab stela are highlighted by the treatment of the large-scale seated figures of the tomb owners. Twelve of the fifteen stela in our group preserve, at least partially, the seated figure at the lower left of the slab (fig. 217). The outer frame and border areas vary widely from stela to stela; the seated figure of Ini (g 1235), for example, appears to have too much room at his disposal. His figure almost occupies the center of the stone, leaving a large blank space and disproportionately wide vertical framing border behind him that is more than twice as thick as the border on the right-hand side of the stela. Khufu-nakht (g 2228) shows a similarly wide left border.

The orientation of each of the twelve seated figures is always the same, at the left edge of the slab facing right, along with his or her identifying inscription above (Section a). Normally, the rest of the stela, offerings, linen list, etc., face left.

20 On the two reserve heads found in g 4140, cf. Reisner, Giza Necropolis I, pls. 40c, 56a (MTA 3170); Smith, HESPOK, pl. 8a, and R. Tefnin, Art et Magie au temps des Pyramides. L’énigme des têtes dites “de remplacement” (Brussels, 1991), pp. 100–101, no. 4, pl. 5–6, nos. 15, 16; p. 114, fig. 11.
21 Helck, in Hommages Leclant 1, p. 221–22. He makes no attempt to demonstrate, however, that this title was held by only one individual at a time.
towards the deceased. The only glaring exception to the rule is the anonymous stela from g4860, where everything, from the seated male figure (Section b) to the offerings (Section c) and the linen list (Section d) is oriented to the right.24

No significant statements can be made concerning the gender of the slab stela owners. It is probably just an accident of preservation that there are nine males versus five females. We know the gender of the owners of two fragments, from the tombs of Kaninisut (g2155) and of Wenshet (g4840) by virtue of the associated inscriptions rather than preserved seated figures. The gender of only a single stela owner remains undeterminable — g2135. If we expand our sample to include the mastabas containing slab stela emplacements, many of these are, of course, undeterminable as to gender, but the tallies come to either twelve or thirteen males, six females and six undetermined (see Chapter 2, fig. 238). It is worth noting once again how, with very few exceptions, the mastabas that contained a slab stela contained nothing else inscribed.

The preserved faces of the tomb owners are placed together for comparison in fig. 219. In each case, the facial features are carefully and prominently modeled; each face shows...
a plastic eyebrow, and only Kanefer (g 1203) fails to delineate a second upper eyelid line. Even more attention seems to have been given to the four preserved female faces, including detailed ear modeling, and long-strided wigs. These images bear striking similarities to the female face on a personified estate from Khufu pyramid temple now in New York (MMA 22.1.7), and to a female offering bearer from the tomb of Ankh-haf (g 7510). It is interesting to note briefly one other type of comparison, fragmentary though the evidence is. The only example of a Gizamastaba discovered so far that includes a slab stela, a reserve head, and an actual human skull is the tomb of Meretites (g 4140; two reserve heads, and two skulls). The reader is referred to stela 12 above in Chapter 1 (figs. 138–43).

It is interesting to note briefly one other type of comparison, fragmentary though the evidence is. The only example of a Giza mastaba discovered so far that includes a slab stela, a reserve head, and an actual human skull is the tomb of Meretites (g 4140; two reserve heads, and two skulls). The reader is referred to stela 12 above in Chapter 1 (figs. 138–43).

A number of features appear on the Giza stelae that Cherpion incorporated into her system of criteria for dating Old Kingdom tombs, among them seats (including cushions, legs, floral umbels, floor supports), offering tables, bread tables.

For the reserve head (Cairo, JE 46217), see Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, p. 462, pl. 52b, and Tehfin, Art et Magie, pp. 30–31, 36, 126, 128. For the reserve head (Cairo, JE 46217), see Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, p. 462, pl. 52b, and Tehfin, Art et Magie, pp. 30–31, 36, 126, 128. For the reserve head (Cairo, JE 46217), see Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, p. 462, pl. 52b, and Tehfin, Art et Magie, pp. 30–31, 36, 126, 128. For the reserve head (Cairo, JE 46217), see Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, p. 462, pl. 52b, and Tehfin, Art et Magie, pp. 30–31, 36, 126, 128. For the reserve head (Cairo, JE 46217), see Reisner, Giza Necropolis 1, p. 462, pl. 52b, and Tehfin, Art et Magie, pp. 30–31, 36, 126, 128.
In only three examples does the outstretched hand of the stela owner come in contact with the actual bread loaves. Both Iunu (g 4150) and the owner of the left-most loaf (g 4880) touch the leftmost loaf, while in Ilni's case (g 2389), the loaf has actually been scooped out to make room for the hand. As for the loaves argues for increased size and detail as an indicator of an older date. The noticeably smaller umbels of the Giza stelae belong to Iunu (g 4140) and the anonymous (g 3127, right), see Junker, Gîza, § 1227, right) on bread baking, cf. H. Wilson, "Pot-baked bread in Ancient Egypt," JARCE 53, 1994, p. 160. 

Concerning the theriomorphic seats themselves, both bull-legged and lion-legged feet are attested since the beginning of the Old Kingdom. Cherpion notes that bull legs seem to disappear after the reign of Isesi, but in fact they are attested later, albeit rarely. Lion legs, on the other hand, continue for centuries. The bull legs thus form a marginally useful dating criterion, while lion legs do not, although the latter were apparently the rare motif of privilege early in the Old Kingdom. As for the preserved examples allow us to determine there is a decrease of bull-legged seats versus lion-legged seats, one for a woman (Nefert, g 207) and two for men (Khufu-nakht, g 205) and Sechet-shekti, g 220). Nefert and Khufu-nakht share the same title of "lady of the house." An interesting detail on the chair legs is the addition of the curving muscles "cord" halfway down the rear leg. This appears on preserved areas of only two stelae (fig. 222), one with bull legs (Sechet-shekti, g 220), the other with lion legs (Nefert, g 207). Examples are known from other reliefs at both Giza and Saqqara, and the dates range from Dynasties 5 to 10. Both Veroult and Cherpion have studied the chairs at the bottoms of the legs.

On the papyrus umbel-shaped seat terminals, Cherpion argues for increased size and detail as an indicator of an older date. The noticeably smaller umbels of the Giza stelae belong to Iunu (g 4150), Mertiades (g 4140) and the anonymous owner of g 4880, a factor which would speak for a nucleus 4800 (standing nucleus) Cemetry 2001. The data of Sechet-shekti shows the only example of a palm umbel, a feature paralleled by the royal furniture of Hatshepsut (see figs. 83–84 above, Chapter 1, fig. 40). None of the Giza stelae shows either the arciform feature of two umbels, with the seat "flipped up" in plan to form a complete visibility or the absence of a front leg, obscured by human legs of the seated figures. Only two of the stela display cushions, those of which are visible under the entire length of the deceased's posterior and thighs (Wepemnefret, g 227, g 4880), while two take the form of the "(H Hieroglyph behind the deceased (Sechet-shekti, g 230), and Mertiades, g 4940). Each type of cushion (or cushion representation) appears with both males and females. Cherpion concludes that the lack of cushion and back is primarily a Fourth Dynasty phenomenon, with the fully visible cushion appearing into the reign of Khufu, whereas the cushion visible only behind the posterior of the deceased continues to the reign of Niuserre. Only three stela, belonging to two males (Khufu, g 203), and Sechet-shekti, g 220) and one female (Nefert, g 207) display a mat underneath the entire figure and seat, resembling a raised, rectangular platform.

The offering table piled high with bread loaves most often takes the form of a circular (circular) table with base. Both the ceramic stands (complete with triangular slit towards the base) and the offerings tables accurately reflect actual examples, such as those illustrated in figs. 221 and 222. Most of the stands flare towards the bottom, while a few (g 227, h 441), show a more rigid vertical line. On approximately six stela (see fig. 223), the mid-level joins stand and table is absent, with the stand extending all the way to the rounding, attach by some sort of tanu on the bottom of the latter. Cherpion has argued (critère 24–29) that the table with a base set into an ajar stand appears from Dynasty 4 to the first half of Dynasty 5 while the table without such a base appears during all periods, and lost no value for chronological estimation. As an experiment, one might "translate" the two-dimensional scene into a modern, three-dimensional perspective, as illustrated in fig. 234.

35 Cherpion, Man and his Double in Egyptian Ideology of the Old Kingdom, p. 34 her summaries of iconographic elements provide numerous useful comparisons. Unfortunately, many of Cherpion's dating criteria are ubiquitous in ... wigs does not diminish in size until after the reign of Menkaure, well after the early period under discussion here.

Concerning the theriomorphic seats themselves, both bull-legged and lion-legged feet are attested since the beginning of the Old Kingdom. Cherpion notes that bull legs seem to disappear after the reign of Isesi, but in fact they are attested later, albeit rarely. Lion legs, on the other hand, continue for centuries. The bull legs thus form a marginally useful dating criterion, while lion legs do not, although the latter were apparently the rare motif of privilege early in the Old Kingdom. As for the preserved examples allow us to determine there is a decrease of bull-legged seats versus lion-legged seats, one for a woman (Nefert, g 207) and two for men (Khufu-nakht, g 205) and Sechet-shekti, g 220). Nefert and Khufu-nakht share the same title of "lady of the house." An interesting detail on the chair legs is the addition of the curving muscles "cord" halfway down the rear leg. This appears on preserved areas of only two stelae (fig. 222), one with bull legs (Sechet-shekti, g 220), the other with lion legs (Nefert, g 207). Examples are known from other reliefs at both Giza and Saqqara, and the dates range from Dynasties 5 to 10. Both Veroult and Cherpion have studied the chairs at the bottoms of the legs.
(1) G 1201, Wepemnefret
4–4 loaves

(2) G 1203, Kanefer
8–7 loaves

(3) G 1205, Khufu-nakht
7–6 loaves

(4) G 1207, Nefer
8–8 loaves

(5) G 1223, Kaiemah
5–6(?) loaves

(6) G 1225, Nefret-iabet
8–7 loaves

(7) G 1227, Setji-hekenet
5–6 loaves

(8) G 1235, Ini
8–8 loaves

(9) G 2120, Seshat-sekhentiu
?–5 loaves

(10) G 2135 (= VIInn), Kaninisut
?–6 loaves

(11) G 2155(?) (= VIIInn), Kaninisut
?

(12) G 4140, Meretites
6–6 loaves

(13) G 2135(?) (= VIIInn), Kaninisut
?

(14) G 4150 (= Is), Iunu
7–7 loaves

(15) G 4860 (= VIIIn), Iunu
9–9 loaves

Fig. 223. Chart of offering tables from fourteen slab Giza slab stelae.
SECTION C: THE OFFERINGS

As far as the preserved examples allow us to determine, the stela of Wepemnefret (g 1201) and Nefer (g 207) are the only ones to show a vertical arrangement of their offerings with vertical separating lines (Section c). All others either contain actual horizontal separators, or are placed in such a manner that a horizontal arrangement is implied, even if the individual word items are spelled vertically.

Some of the most elegantly detailed hieroglyphs of the Old Kingdom appear in these offering lists. With the possible exception of the legs on the tomb owner's stool, far more attention to detail was lavished on this part of the decoration program than on any other, including the actual figure of the deceased. Analysis of some of the finer examples, whether carved or painted, refutes Junker's apparent denigration of the Giza reliefs in favor of earlier relief from other sites.

More exhaustive analyses of the individual items have been made elsewhere, and the reader is referred to the palaeography at the end of the present work (Appendix 2). A color palaeography, based on the three stelae that preserve major amounts of pigment (Wepemnefret g 1201, Nefer-Iabet g 225, and Iunu g 480), is also provided below (Appendix 3).

A few items may be noted here. In particular, signs with interwoven interior elements (rope, flax, basketry containers, etc.) are exquisitely executed. The human hands display, in D-46, display an added detail of a curving line in the palm. The matrix, in M-29, shows the leaves overlapping alternately, which is consistent with the earliest Dynasty 3 and 4 forms of this hieroglyph. Later, in Dynasty 5 the leaves overlap less regularly, or may be symmetrically in the middle of the sign.

Unfortunately, we have no examples of this hieroglyph in the slab stela that might appear to date later than Khufu's reign (cf. esp. g 4860 and g 4800), Chapter 1, section 6.

The ubiquitous sign for the "1,000" (M-12) usually shows the leaf turned forward. In studying an inventory list from "Covington's Tomb" at Giza, Brownlee noted that the earliest examples of an upturned leaf sign was on the slab stela of Seshat-sekhentiu (g 225), where both variations occur on other stelae.

The upright leaf makes occasional appearances during the Old Kingdom, but later the sign turns the leaf forward almost exclusively. Despite the wide variation in the sign on the Giza slab stelas, no particular patterns or criteria appear to be forthcoming that would establish a chronological sequence.

Reversals appear in the offerings and, of course, elsewhere on the slab stelas. One might note on the Manetho data (g 4900) the decapitated bird with reversed head for (see Fig. 4). One of which is a "half-reversal" (g 4900). Numerous examples of the slab cloth sign (S 29) appear in reversal (see Appendix 2, Palaeography, Fig. 264). Two slab stelae show two signs: practically side by side but with opposing orientations (Seshat-sekhentiu, g 225, and Keninisut II, g 225, offering list, red and am.

Section c also contains certain anomalies. The slab of Nefer (g 207) fails to list any offerings (typically oxen, fowl, bread, and beer) but has the right-hand portion of the offering table, this is the most glaring element of asymmetry.
CHAPTER 4: COMPARATIVE REMARKS ON DECORATION AND LAYOUT

SECTION D: THE LINEN LIST

Junker discussed the linen list in connection with his discovery of the slab stela of Juw (q 2270) and the Ka-inisat(?) fragment from q 2270. Additional examples should be forthcoming as Z. Saad's Helwan stelae in the Cairo Museum receive new study, and new excavations at such sites as Abu't, Dahshur, Abu Roash, and even Giza produce new material. While the reader is referred to Appendix 7 for linen list parallels, we will continue with comparative notes on the individual elements, reading from the top to the bottom of the Giza lists.

Multiple readings have been suggested for the falcons on standards that appear at the top of each linen list, from to . Edel has gathered many references, chiefly in the Pyramid Texts and later linen lists, and concluded as similarity in meaning between (n†r) and (sayy).66 They seem to have melded together over the course of Dynasty 4, with sayy eventually replacing n†r, perhaps altogether. An Archaic Period or early Old Kingdom fragment in the Cairo Museum (Fig. 225) shows a damaged top row that doubles contained falcons, while in the new beneath, is written (sayy) (n†r) (n†r). On the sunk-relief, pasted falcon door tablet of Neferit of Maidum, four falcons cover the linen list, while is written (n†r) (n†r) (sayy) (sayy), is digested below to one of the four specific types of linen. The raised relief tablet from Nefermaat's shallow niche shows a similar arrangement, albeit with only three types of linen. Thus at the start of Dynasty 4 there is still some differentiation between the two groups. As early as the tomb of Rekhaf at Maidum, following directly after Nefermaat's burial, however, this distinction disappears. Rekhaf's false door tablet (British Museum 2342) shows three falcons only. None of the Giza slab stela shows, both text and falcon appear at the top of the list in each case, without any phonetic spellings. By the time of the Saqara false door tablet of Mer, most likely dating to the middle of Dynasty 4,67 we find (sayy) written out phonetically, including the phonation on the standard and , and located at the top of the linen list. Combining these evidence provided by the Rekhaf tablet, pre-dating the Giza slab stela, and the Maryt tablet, post-dating them, we may conclude that the Giza stela signs may be read as (sayy). Additional evidence from Giza is provided by the linen scene from the tomb of Khufu-khaf (q 763–780). Whether the translation of (sayy) should remain identical to (sayy), that is “royal linen” is perhaps uncertain.

Smith took the four basic headings of the lists to refer to different qualities of cloth, with the subdivisions indicating the width of the linen and the amounts to be made available (Fig. 227). In the top heading of two stelae, it is curious to find that (sayy)-falcons appear to be erased. In the stela of Merkhet (q 4400), the adjacent inscription has also been damaged, as is that of Saah-eshtu (q 2270). In the stela of the linen list...
of Setji-hekenet (g1227), the falcons are selectively destroyed, and there is also damage to the owner’s face. The stelae of Meretites and Setji-hekenet were discovered in situ, so a fall from the mastaba wall can be ruled out as the cause of the damage. The stela of Seshat-sekhentiu was discovered in fragments near its original emplacement, although the lower left piece (containing the owner’s seat) was found far away, behind the mastaba, in the street between g2100 and g2120.

Other anomalies concerning the falcons appear on the stela of Iunu (g4150) and on the anonymous stela from g4860. In these cases the falcons are set on rectangular pedestals with a rounded projection in front (see Sign List R 12û).71 An informative three-dimensional parallel of colossal proportions is available from the New Kingdom. A pair of falcon statues were erected by Amenhotep III at Soleb, and later removed to Gebel Barkal. The better-preserved statue, discovered by Reisner, is illustrated here (fig. 228, and above, figs. 152, 170), although its reconstruction is, at this writing, undergoing a rearrangement.72 The standard is further exemplified in three dimensions by a Middle Kingdom mirror with a handle based on theû sign (fig. 229).73

---

71 Cf. Junker, Gîza 1, p. 32; this feature appears on both the raised and sunk relief false door tablets of Nefermaat from Medum, cf. W.M.F. Petrie, Medum (London, 1892), pls. 16, 20; Harpur, The Tombs of Nefermaat and Rahotep at Maidum, pls. 39, fig. 43, pl. 41, and one parallel (out of three falcons absent) appears on the false door panel of Rahotep; Petrie, Medum, pl. 32 T.G.H. James, Hieroglyphic Tablets from Egyptian Stelae, in The British Museum 7 (London, 1908), pl. 12 no. 245; Harpur, The Tombs of Nefermaat and Rahotep at Maidum, pl. 75; Pedestals in underworld (the ibis standard is discussed by Fischer, Varia nova, Egyptian Studies 3, pp. 201–205, with fig. 13.

72 MMA 29.2469, D. Dunham, Theobald Temple (Boston, 1970), pp. 25, 27, fig. 30, pl. 25a, and W.A. Simpson, “A Horizon of Nefertari Statue of Amenhotep III from Bubastis,” BMFA 69 (1971), cover and pp. 152–63. The companion statue to this piece is in the collections of the Ägyptisches Museum, Berlin, Leipzec, Denkmaler 5, fig. 106 c, Taf. 5, 275.

73 Art of the Ancient Mediterranean World, April 17, 1999–March 20, 2004 (Nagoya, 1999), pp. 72 (color plate) and 178–79, cat. 57.
The numbers of falcons shown on the Giza stelae vary considerably. As a general rule, the smaller numbers may indicate a more archaic provenance (see fig. 239). Wepemnefret's three falcons are by far the smallest in the Giza stela group, and evoke the less-organized, archaic stelae of preceding dynasties. Even though Nefret-iabet (g 1225) like Wepemnefret show only three falcons, theirs are much more in keeping with the standard size favored by the majority of the stelae. But each artist or tomb-owner seems to have had the flexibility to choose between three (minimum) and six (maximum) falcons, depending on the size and contents of the rest of the linen list.

75 One of the earliest examples of (female) mummification, from the Fourth Dynasty Western Cemetery Giza mastaba g 2220 (shaft ßm™t nfr™t), was used for the individual body wrappings (figs. 231–33). A hieratic graffito contains the words on some linen used to model one of the woman's body contours. Other examples of labeled linen were found with the burial of Idu II at Giza, and with the so-called slain soldiers of Mentuhotep at Thebes. But as welcome as the recent interest in pharaonic textiles is, there is still a need to reconcile more of the textual evidence with the material remains. Our understanding of the linen lists of the Old Kingdom would greatly benefit from such an interdisciplinary approach.

In some cases the vertical separators between various elements of the linen list are omitted, calling to mind the less-ordered arrangements found in the earlier stelae from Saqqara and Helwan. The stela of Wepemnefret (g 1201) and the anonymous stela fragment from g 1203 Kanefer could this indicate a relatively early date for 2135? The stelae of Wepemnefret (g 1201) and the anonymous stela fragment from g 1203 Kanefer could this indicate a relatively early date for 2135? The stelae of Wepemnefret (g 1201) and the anonymous stela fragment from g 1203 Kanefer could this indicate a relatively early date for 2135? The stelae of Wepemnefret (g 1201) and the anonymous stela fragment from g 1203 Kanefer could this indicate a relatively early date for 2135? The stelae of Wepemnefret (g 1201) and the anonymous stela fragment from g 1203 Kanefer could this indicate a relatively early date for 2135?
of Kanefer (q 1203) and Khufu-nakht (q 1205) omit the vertical separators between the infinity plants only. The data of Kanefer (q 1203) places numbers within fringed cloths that provide a sort of natural vertical divider. These fringed cloths also appear between the data from q 4860 and once on that of Wepemnefer (q 1205). In addition, an early drawing by Junker shows fringes at the tops of horizontal dividers across all three types of linen, but no trace of these vertical lines is visible today. Elsewhere at Giza, the fringed cloths are attested on the east wall linen list in the chapel of Seshem-nefer I (fig. 234, and Appendix II, below, figs. 230–232). Note also that a correction occurred during the decoration of the stela of Nefret-iabet (q 1225), where uncarved vertical separators between the infinity signs were later uniformly added in paint. This correction almost seems to indicate that an earlier motif was now out of style and had to be corrected.

It is interesting to note that the arrow hieroglyph (→) indicating linen appears reversed (facing right) in each of the three linen lists wherever it is preserved. Still more interesting is the fact that the data from q 4860 likewise keeps this (here no longer reversed) orientation, even though the rest of its linen list uniquely faces right. In other words, the q 4860 example is the only non-reversed sign; logically, it should be the only stela to reverse the arrow to face left. Could this bean indication that this data is an archaizing throwback that has misunderstood the reversal of the other stelae and copied it literally, while reversing the rest of the decorative layout?

---

79 Junker, Gîza 1, p. 175, fig. 31.
80 See also N. Kanawati, Tombs at Giza 1, ACE Reports 16 (Warminster, 2001), pl. 43.
81 A curious parallel is offered by the false door tablet of Meretites in the Eastern Cemetery (q 7650; no relation to our Meretites of q 4140) where the infinity signs are divided into pairs by vertical separators, see above, fig. 218.
In terms of the meaning of \( G \) 1201, Wepemnefret argued that the \( sßr \) sign (T 11) was related to words such as \( zwn, z¡n, \) and eventually \( zwnw, \) "physician." Is it possible this type of linen bore some connection to medical usage before being added to the lists of burial equipment deemed essential enough to warrant representation on the slab stelae? Could the arrow \( G \) 1203, Kanefer \( ¡dmy \) and \( ¡t¡w(y), \) bore some connection to medicinal usage before being added to the lists of burial equipment deemed essential enough to warrant representation on the slab stelae? Could the arrow hieroglyph, like \( G \) also once have had a royal connotation as well? \( G \)

In terms of the confusion that has arisen over the transcription of \( sßr \) and \( ßsr \) in the research on the Four Dynasties, it is difficult to make a straightforward statement about the presence or absence of \( sßr \) signs in the lists of burial equipment. The use of \( sßr \) in the Giza slab stelae is significant in regards to the Giza linen lists. One possible explanation is that the \( sßr \) sign was used to denote the presence of linen in storage chests, as it appeared on the unfinished Dynasty 3 stela of Djefa-nisut now in Hannover (fig. 236). The second parallel dates to Dynasty 6 (Teti–Pepi I), and may be found on the south wall of the burial chamber of Ankhmahor at Saqqara. (fig. 237)

Most of the arrow signs in the Giza linen lists are relatively simple, with two parallel lines adorning the shaft between the "two" arrows; only Nefer \( G \) 1207, Ini \( G \) 4150, and \( G \) 4860 bear no interior detail. Most of the arrows show three pairs of double vertical lines adorning the shaft between the "two" arrows; only Ini \( G \) 1207, \( G \) 2135, and \( G \) 4860 bear no interior shaft detail at all.

The next linen type, \( G \) 1209, uses the column or tent-pole sign (O 29). This \( sßr \) is clearly exemplified in three dimensions contemporaneously in the bedroom canopy set of Hetepheres from Giza (figs. 236–37).

---

83 Edel cites \( sßr \) nswt, written \( sßr \), as early as the Old Kingdom, in a tomb in Kom el-Hetep, A. Mariette, Les Mastabas de l’ancien empire (Paris, 1883), p. 259 (20.25. Quay).

84 Gardiner, BIFAO 30 (1930), pp. 174–75.


A number of somewhat difficult terms appear in the Giza linen lists, and these are but a subset of those that are found in parallel lists from other sites. While these are translated above in Chapter 1, the Giza examples are gathered below for ease of reference in tabular form (Fig. 238).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slab Stela</th>
<th>Linen List Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G 1201</td>
<td>Wepemnefret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 1203</td>
<td>Kanefer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 1205</td>
<td>Khufu-nakht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 1207</td>
<td>Nefer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 1203</td>
<td>Wepemnefret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 1205</td>
<td>Khufu-nakht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 1207</td>
<td>Nefer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 1223</td>
<td>Kaemah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 1225</td>
<td>Nefret-iabet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 1227</td>
<td>Setji-hekenet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 1235</td>
<td>Ini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 2135</td>
<td>(= VIInn = g 4770) (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 2140</td>
<td>(= VIInn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 2155</td>
<td>(= VIIInn) Kaninisut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 2155?</td>
<td>(= VIIInn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 4140</td>
<td>Meretites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 4150</td>
<td>(= Is) Iunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 4860</td>
<td>(= VIIIn)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90 Many of these terms are discussed by Smith, ZÄS 71 (1935), p. 137ff. For the transliteration of szf instead of zf, see Kahl, Das System der ägyptischen Hieroglyphenschrift in der 0.–3. Dynastie, pp. 65–70.
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The individual units of cloth are indicated in several different ways. 84 We have already noted Possner-Krüger’s discovery that \( \square \) must represent 10 cubits (long) by twenty cubits (wide). 85 But none of the Granaries in the horizontal \( \square \) beneath the signs, while others show only bare \( \square \) signs marking the boundaries of their respective divisions. The Granaries showing the horizontal \( \square \) beneath their verticals (hence \( \square \)) include Setji-hekenet (g 1227), Iunu (g 4150), Meretites (g 4140), and the anonymous data (g 4900). Those Stelae showing merely bare \( \square \) signs include Wepemnefret (g 1235), Nefert (g 1225), Sahiber-sakhentiu (g 2120), anonymous (g 1125), and Khnumhotep (g 2125). The remaining Stela either do not use these signs or do not preserve them.

At the bottom of the linen lists, twice the Granary contains granaries, 86 the Granary at (g 1227) with five, Sahiber-sakhentiu (g 2120) with four, and Meretites (g 4140) with seven, Iunu (g 4150) with five—painted dark gray to indicate their mud-brick construction material—and g 4900 with six (fig. 239). Most of the granaries are trapezoidal in shape, similar to the lintel hieroglyph (O 51), 87 and showing the diagonal lines at each lower edge. 88 The exception here is found on Meretites data (g 4900), where seven granaries show the rounded form with pointed top, called either \( m \) or \( mflr \) (compare fig. 240). 89 No particular title sequences for the owners appear common to all five Granary-bearing Stelas, and we have already seen above that Roters discounted the Granaries in his unpublished manuscript as indicators of any relative chronological variation. The breakdown of the five Granary lists on the Stela base is summarized in the chart in fig. 241.

The two closest parallels among the five sets of granaries are those of Setji-hekenet (g 1227) and Iunu (g 4150). They show the same number of granaries with almost identical contents in the same order. The only discrepancies are the non-rectangular shapes in this Granary form is provided by an administrative text from Saqqara (g 3993), pl. 4, fig. 236. Wall reliefs and/or paintings of similarly shaped granaries appear in the Saqqara mastaba of El-Khokha (E 2, CG 336, Dynasty 5), Dynasty 4, Dynasty 2, and Dynasty 3, respectively (fig. 240). 92 No particular title sequences for the owners appear common to all five Granary-bearing Stelas, and we have already seen above that Roters discounted the Granaries in his unpublished manuscript as indicators of any relative chronological variation. The breakdown of the five Granary lists on the Stela base is summarized in the chart in fig. 241.

The two closest parallels among the five sets of granaries are those of Setji-hekenet (g 1227) and Iunu (g 4150). They show the same number of granaries with almost identical contents in the same order. The only discrepancies are the non-rectangular shapes...
The transposed spelling "qft" for "gft" (Setji-hekenet's fourth granary), and "bnwt" for "bnw" (bread) versus "fnnw" (grain, Iunu). The greatest anomaly is the reversed arrangement of the granaries (from right to left instead of left to right) in the anonymous stela of g.430. It is interesting to note that the theory to contain carob beans (c\$) is the rounded granary form peculiar to Meretites (g.4860). One wonders if this form of granary might have been better suited to non-cereal crops.97

Granary lists in Dynasty 4 generally contain ËmÈw, ËmÈw, bdt, zwt, b\$n, and wÈc. Nearly contemporary examples of granaries from Giza may be found on two granite sarcophagi from the Eastern Cemetery. One belongs to Minkhaf, owner of g.740–7419,99 and the other to Meresankh II, owner of g.740–7410 (fig. 242).100 Minkhaf's granaries are listed on the west side: ËmÈw, ËmÈw, bdt, zwt, b\$n, b\$n, and perhaps Ëi\$i\$i.101 Meresankh II lists on her sarcophagus' south end: ËmÈw, ËmÈw, bdt, zwt, b\$n, b\$n, and wÈc.

97 Cf. Siebels, BACE, X (2002), p. 88, noting carob beans and figs (dnw) shown in the tomb of Kagemni at Saqqara.
98 Barta, Die altägyptische Opferliste, p. 45.
100 MFA 27.441a–b; Donadoni-Roveri, I sarcofagi egizi, p. 116, pls. 30–31.
101 This word ("flour, meal") also appears on the false door tablet of Nefer from g.2110, in the Museo Barracco in Rome; cf. Reisner, Giza Necropolis, fig. 241, pl. 30; Hannig, Großes Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch–Deutsch, p. 980.
As noted above in Chapter 3, many scholars have argued that the funerary repast scene of the slab stela and the accompanying offerings eventually evolved into the false door panel, and then beyond the false door itself onto decorated chapel walls. Haeny, however, argued for the reverse development, namely that false doors were the originally intended cult focus for the earliest Giza mastabas. His primary argument rests at Giza on the mastaba of Nefer in the Western Cemetery (g 210), a tomb with finished casing, exterior stone chapel and false door:

It is true, as Haeny notes, that no joins are apparent between the exterior stone casing and the exterior stone chapel, so the chapel did not break into the casing. However, all this signifies is that Nefer's tomb certainly could once have been unfinished and contained a slab stela, only to be subsequently case and provided with an exterior chapel with a false door (and another niche at the northern end of the east wall). It therefore does not differ from other nucleus cemetery mastabas except by virtue of the completion of its casing. Moreover, the extremely constricted passage space between the front of Nefer's chapel and the back (west) wall of mastaba g 220 (Khenty-ka) — about 100 cm — was most likely not intended in the original layout of mastaba cores; it is thus additional evidence for Nefer's exterior chapel being secondary development. In fact, many of the elements of Nefer's false door tablet, housed in the Museo Barracco in Rome (CMB no. 5), might well place the chapel in the reign of Khafre, that is, somewhat later than the slab stela itself. These elements (form of the offering loaves, the expanded form of the offering lists, and the "etp d¡ nswt formula) have misled some scholars to date the piece as late as the Sixth Dynasty. In short, Haeny's argument that the current appearance of g 220 proves that the false-door—and not a slab stela—was intended as the cult focus from the beginning is not supported by the evidence. Excavation photographs taken by the Harvard–MFA Expedition show the gap between the original core stones and the casing blocks (see figs. 234–236). One wonders if a slab stela might once have been or actually could still be in...
would be in simultaneous production in various mastabas, a highly unlikely scenario. Furthermore, the introduction of additional elements to the offering ritual need not automatically signify a transition in the tradition from one ruler to the next. Bastet chronological arrangement, as far as the slab stelae are concerned, has not received acceptance in the subsequent scholarship.

In Chapter 3 above we outlined the tempting explanation by Jánosi of the Giza slab stela phenomenon as a temporary, "emergency solution," due to the death of the tomb owners in the reign of Khufu. Jánosi argued that what the slab stelae could not replace was the communication function between living and dead normally provided by the false door. The slab stelae, according to him, signified only that a burial existed in that tomb, for which a mortuary ritual had been set up. I would prefer to assign somewhat more significance to the slab stela niche and cult place. By their very nature, these cult foci, often provided with offering tables (Khufu-nakht, g 1205; Meryhetepef, g 4360), and ceramic table stands (Khufu-nakht, g 1205; Meryhetepef, g 4360), and even stairs (Kai-emin, g 1235, figs. 57–59), attest to the communicatory nature of the area.

In answer to the question why one would not simply build a false door from the start, Jánosi noted that preparing a false door took longer than a slab stela, that the cult was needed immediately, and that the unceded cons were in no condition to take a false door. We might query, however, why simple mud-brick false doors could not have sufficed in the interim? Was mud brick too low a level a solution for the elite tomb owners in question? In the case of the slab stela area itself, these individuals had no avarice to mud brick. And while prefabrication of slab stelae made ready for "emergency" use (i.e. early death) may be unlikely solution," note, however, the unusual placement of Ini's seated figure (g 1238); he sits toward the center of the stela, perhaps implying some prefabrication of design, if not simply inept layout.

Jánosi concluded that chapels that later broke into the area of the tomb chamber(s) could not yet have possessed a slab stela or a burial, because the alterations would have required the removal or destruction of the slab stela. This is, rather rigidly stated, and the argument from silence, i.e., interior chapels proving the non-existence of slab stelae, renders the situation complicated at best.

Two additional comments concerning the "emergency solution" theory are noteworthy here. The first concerns the highly problematic anonymous mastaba g 1209 in Cemetery 1000: both g 4360 (Menkaura) and g 4120 had slab stela emplacements built into their respective mastaba cores (figs. 131 and 132). This might seem to throw the sequence of events as suggested by Jánosi somewhat out of order. Instead of his sequence resembling:

1. assignment of core
2. sudden death of tomb owner
3. necessity mud-brick chapel and slab stela
4. later permanent stone alterations;

we seem to find with g 4140 (Meretites) and g 4350 the following sequence:

1. assignment of core
2. extensions to core
3. addition of slab stela emplacement.

Reisner's notes contain no mention of any attempt to examine or dismantle portions of the chapel in search of a slab stela, and the excavation diary for 1905—the excavation date for g 2110—were either never kept by Reisner (or A.M. Lythgoe, his field director at the time), or are now lost. (Correspondence between Reisner at Giza and Lythgoe's sister, Lucy, in New York, and Boston during the 1930s indicates Reisner's hope of retaining Lythgoe's notes, but Mr. Lythgoe and the Egyptologists at the Metropolitan Museum were unable to locate them.) Such a slab stela could, of course, also have been removed or destroyed during construction of the exterior chapel.

As far as Barta's dating of the slab stelae to Khufu, Khafre, and Menkaure (above, Chapter 3, p. 130), Jánosi had shown that this arrangement does not hold for a number of reasons. First of all, the major mastabas of Cemetery g 4000 do not date to three separate pharaohs, but rather to Khufu. If three separate reigns were concerned, slab stelae and decorated chapels place between the mastaba core blocks and the massive blocks of the exterior chapel and casing, perhaps plastered over and/or walled up, were the stelae of Wepwawetredjet (g 1203), Nefret-emhotep (g 1229), Satah-sakhentiu (g 2320), and Iunu (g 4380). As far as Bastet dating of the slab stela to Khufu, Khafre, and Mankaura (above, Chapter 3, p. 130), Jánosi had shown that this arrangement does not hold for a number of reasons. First of all, the major mastabas of Cemetery g 4000 do not date to three separate pharaohs, but rather to Khufu. If three separate reigns were concerned, slab stelae and decorated chapels
These two tombs thus more likely resemble a scenario whereby the slab stela was an integral—not a sudden, or emergency—part of the original mastaba planning process. Otherwise, we should be finding preparations for a monolithic false door in Meretites’s g 4350 extension, not a slab stela. We might therefore revert to the argument that mastaba cores were assigned by Khufu, mud-brick chapels and slab stelas were subsequently prepared, and stone alterations added later. This is not to say the slab stelas could not have been added at the time of burial (or immediately earlier). It may also be likely that, in each case of alterations or extensions to a mastaba or chapel, the work was carried out after the death of the tomb owner. Perhaps additional research might determine the chronology of mastaba annexes and additional shaft construction versus installation of the slab stela. Obviously, most stone chapel additions and walling-up operations took place after the installation of the slab stela. Conversely, the expansions of g 4360 and g 4380 clearly took place prior to slab stela installation, which are found in the extensions, not the original mastaba cores. But what of the construction of the annex buildings of g 1223, g 1225, and g 1227?

This might provide further refutation of Haeny’s claim that false doors were the original cult focus; see above, and Chapter 3.
Jánosi has recently provided an excellent discussion of the original layout scheme for the Giza mastabas as consisting of a single burial shaft at the northern end of the mastaba core. In some tombs, however, later received an extension to the core, primarily to allow for the addition of a second shaft. In these cases, the tomb’s primary burial may have shifted from the northern to the southern shaft, presumably to remain in closer proximity to the cult focus, at the southeastern end of the mastaba’s east wall. The chart below in fig. 250 indicates, twenty slab stela-bearing tombs are one-shaft mastabas, while five show the addition of a second shaft to the north (g 1203, g 1223, g 1227, g 4460, g 4420).

In terms of the shaft form, it should be noted that the mastaba of Sedit (g 2100) and Seshat-sekhentiu (g 2120) in Cemetery 2100 show the older form, with T-shaped plans to allow for sliding portcullis stones. This form was most likely an earlier manifestation in Dynasty 4 of other sites, such as Saqqara, but at Giza it appears only in five mastabas of Cemetery 2100: g 2100, g 2120, g 2123, and g 2135. The chart in fig. 250 outlines the one-shaft versus two-shaft mastabas among the slab-stela tombs, along with the contents of their respective burial chambers.

Based on factors discussed above, such as the development of the core cemeteries (east–west for Cemetery 1200, west–east for cemeteries 2100 and 4000), the architectural and architectural context (mastaba cores, chapel alterations, conversion from mud brick to stone, introduction of false door, additional burial shafts, and features internal to the shaft) or decoration, the shape and size of individual items such as atoned leaves, wig styles, choice of tools, use of vertical separators in the linen lists, etc., I would propose the following broad relative chronology for the fifteen Giza slab stelae, as organized below in fig. 251.

---


16 Reisner, Die Mastaba Al-Qurna, 1915, p. 208; see also fig. 250, which indicates the shafts extended to the north of the mastaba core, allowing for a second shaft to be added. This arrangement is similar to that observed in the eastern Cemetery 2100, where the primary shaft is extended to the south, before the addition of a secondary shaft to the north (see fig. 251). The chart in fig. 250 outlines the one-shaft versus two-shaft mastabas among the slab-stela tombs, along with the contents of their respective burial chambers.

Based on factors discussed above, such as the development of the core cemeteries (east–west for Cemetery 1200, west–east for cemeteries 2100 and 4000), the architectural and architectural context (mastaba cores, chapel alterations, conversion from mud brick to stone, introduction of false door, additional burial shafts, and features internal to the shaft) or decoration, the shape and size of individual items such as atoned leaves, wig styles, choice of tools, use of vertical separators in the linen lists, etc., I would propose the following broad relative chronology for the fifteen Giza slab stelae, as organized below in fig. 251.
**Chapter 5: Interpretation and Conclusions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-shaft</th>
<th>Two or more-shafts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g-4460</td>
<td>fragments of white limestone sarcophagus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g-4590</td>
<td>fragments of white limestone sarcophagus, skull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g-4940 Wenshet, n</td>
<td>no trace of sarcophagus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g-4960 (second shaft a later addition)</td>
<td>no trace of sarcophagus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*a* Reisner, *Giza Necropolis* 1, pp. 387.

*b* Ibid., pp. 400–401.


*d* Ibid., p. 495.

*e* Ibid., p. 416.

*f* Ibid., pp. 496.

*g* Ibid., p. 472.


*k* Ibid., p. 255, where no mention is made of burial chamber finds.

**Junker mentions that prior excavations by the Egyptian Antiquities Service reportedly produced an alabaster sarcophagus, but this could not be substantiated.**

---

**Fig. 250 (continued). One-shaft and two-shaft mastabas possessing slab stela or stela emplacements.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Khufu</th>
<th>Early-mid Khufu</th>
<th>Mid-Khufu</th>
<th>Post-Khufu</th>
<th>Post-Dynasty 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) g 1203 Wepemnefret</td>
<td>(one of the earliest mastabas of Cemetery 1200; archaic features; unique layout; and no vertical separators by signs in linen list; short, flaring offering loaves)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) g 1201 Kanefer</td>
<td>(one of the earliest mastabas of Cemetery 1200; no vertical separators by signs in linen list; tall, vertical offering loaves)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) g 1205 Khufu-nakht</td>
<td>(one of the earliest mastabas of Cemetery 1200; no vertical separators by signs in linen list; short, flaring offering loaves)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) g 1207 Nefr-</td>
<td>(one of the later mastabas of Cemetery 1200; elaboration of linen list; taller, vertical offering loaves)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) g 1221 Kamemah</td>
<td>(one of the earliest mastabas of Cemetery 1200; short, flaring offering loaves)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) g 1225 Khefnetabet</td>
<td>(one of the earliest mastabas of Cemetery 1200; no vertical separators by signs in linen list; later corrected; short, flaring offering loaves)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) g 1227 Sakahekinet</td>
<td>(one of the later mastabas of Cemetery 1200; short, flaring offering loaves)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) g 1235 Ini</td>
<td>(one of the later mastabas of Cemetery 1200; taller, vertical offering loaves)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) g 2120 Seshat-sekhentiu</td>
<td>(one of the earliest mastabas of Cemetery 2100; year 23/24 graffito, presumably of Khufu; short, flaring offering loaves)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) g 2135 (= VIInn = g 4770)</td>
<td>(one of the earliest mastabas of Cemetery 2100; no vertical separators by signs in linen list; short, flaring offering loaves)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 251. Fifteen Giza slab stele arranged in a relative chronology.
In the preceding discussion I have attempted to demonstrate that false doors did not precede the slab stelae at Giza, and that the stelae were part of the original Khufu-era mastabas' planning from the outset of mastaba assignment and design. For the motivation behind the Giza stelae, three possible models might clarify their role in the funerary provisions for the highest echelons of society during early Dynasty 4. The first model involves royal command, the second pure economics, and the third what I have called, for want of a better term, "non-linear reductionism."

Central organization is clearly a major theme in the early development of the Giza Necropolis and the monarchy is the natural place to assign responsibility for this innovation. The construction, decoration, and alteration attested in both the Eastern and Western Cemeteries make sense only if approached from the standpoint of "prefabricated tombs," that is, mastaba cores constructed "two-tiered" and only later assigned by the king to specific individuals who customized them according to taste, time, and means. If, as Hirth has argued, the first pharaohs of Dynasty 4 felt compelled to "downsize" the funerary equipment of courtiers and officials in order to maintain focus on and preserve the essential uniqueness of the monarchy, this would explain the comparative simplicity of the Giza mastabas compared to the tombs of their immediate predecessors. Under Khufu, decorated chambers in private mastabas disappear; false doors are scarabs, and the architecture mimics aspects of the authority of the royal mortuary complexes. Stadelmann has commented on this "stronger Stil" of the Fourth Dynasty (Junker's term), and traced it back to Dahshur labels in the reign of Snofru. The slab stelae—and the absence of any other decoration—might

---

**Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Khufu</th>
<th>Early-mid Khufu</th>
<th>Mid-Khufu</th>
<th>Post-Khufu</th>
<th>Post-Dynasty 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(28 g 2250 (= VIIIn) Qaranbaut</td>
<td>(slate to early stages of Qaranbaut decoration, or to his predecessor's fully decorated mastaba chapel, with two false doors; slate to Dynasty 3 roughly</td>
<td>(archaizing stela; unlined burial chamber located to west—not south—of shaft; unique decoration/orientation of stela taller; vertical offering base)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28 g 1490 Memitès)</td>
<td>(one of the earliest mastabas of Cemetery 4000; two Khufu relief style stela set into extension of mastaba, indicating second stage of tomb's development; short, flaring offering base)</td>
<td>(160 g 810 (= VIIIn) Wenshet</td>
<td>(only fully decorated false door to replace slab stela; eastern location of mastaba)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28 g 320) (= IIn) Iunu</td>
<td>(one of the earliest mastabas of Cemetery 4000; short, flaring offering base)</td>
<td>(16 g 4150 (= VIIIIs) Iunu</td>
<td>(eastern location of mastaba; archaizing stela; unlined burial chamber located to west—not south—of shaft; unique decoration/orientation of stela taller; vertical offering base)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Diagram:**

- Fig. 251 (continued). Fifteen Giza slab stelae arranged in a relative chronology.
represent one more attribute of the revitalized emphasis on pharaoh himself.

A second model for explaining the slab stelae, however, might relieve Snefru and Khufu of much of the responsibility for the new apparent austerity at Giza. This concerns the economics of the Giza undertaking. The simultaneous construction of the Great Pyramid itself, the pyramid temple, causeway and valley temple, boat pits, and four satellite and queen pyramids, must have taxed state resources and placed sculptors and craftsmen in high demand and short supply. Perhaps, as some have suggested, we might imagine the area surrounding what was destined to become the Great Pyramid as littered with scaffolding, ramps, and other equipment. It is then no surprise that mastaba construction commenced so far west and only reached eastward—closer to Khufu's pyramid—later in the dynasty. And if Cemetery 1200 developed first, the direction of construction from east to west—to escape the congestion of pyramid construction—becomes clear.

Under these circumstances, and with a burgeoning bureaucracy making increased demands for funerary provisions, could the number of workshops and craftsmen have failed to meet the need? Was the slab stela form a reduction to the most essential needed because of a dearth of sculptors and painters available to design and produce chapels with decorated wall surfaces? Analogous to slab stelae in place of decorated walls, we might view the reserve heads as a similar austerity measure in place of full-figured statues. Moreover, we might consider the miniature ritual vessels from Giza as taking the place of normal-sized ceramic vessels. Are all these objects to be understood as abbreviations or compromises that only disappeared, to be replaced by their fuller (and earlier) counterparts, once the strain of the royal construction project was relieved or, at least, reduced?

The third and final model overturns the modern scholarly prejudice that the Giza stelae were a necessary sacrifice imposed without (i.e., either by the king for religious-political reasons or by the economics of the time). If we assume that it was indeed every Fourth Dynasty Egyptian official's desire to provide for his mastaba with a chapel covered with relief decoration, or at the very least, more offerings than the "small" number that fit on a slab stela, we might view the reserve heads as a similar austerity measure in place of full-figured statues. Moreover, we might consider the miniature ritual vessels from Giza as taking the place of normal-sized ceramic vessels. Are all these objects to be understood as abbreviations or compromises that only disappeared, to be replaced by their fuller (and earlier) counterparts, once the strain of the royal construction project was relieved or, at least, reduced?

Two factors led to this modern conclusion: the presence of decorated chambers and longer offering lists in the period immediately prior to the Giza slab stelae, especially at Medamud, and the proliferation of chapels and decorated chambers after the reign of Khufu. But is it to be expected that the Giza stelae were a necessary sacrifice imposed without? If so, why was it necessary? Perhaps, as some have suggested, we might imagine the area surrounding what was destined to become the Great Pyramid as littered with scaffolding, ramps, and other equipment. It is then no surprise that mastaba construction commenced so far west and only reached eastward—closer to Khufu's pyramid—later in the dynasty. And if Cemetery 1200 developed first, the direction of construction from east to west—to escape the congestion of pyramid construction—becomes clear.

Under these circumstances, and with a burgeoning bureaucracy making increased demands for funerary provisions, could the number of workshops and craftsmen have failed to meet the need? Was the slab stela form a reduction to the most essential needed because of a dearth of sculptors and painters available to design and produce chapels with decorated wall surfaces? Analogous to slab stelae in place of decorated walls, we might view the reserve heads as a similar austerity measure in place of full-figured statues. Moreover, we might consider the miniature ritual vessels from Giza as taking the place of normal-sized ceramic vessels. Are all these objects to be understood as abbreviations or compromises that only disappeared, to be replaced by their fuller (and earlier) counterparts, once the strain of the royal construction project was relieved or, at least, reduced?

The third and final model overturns the modern scholarly prejudice that the Giza stelae were a necessary sacrifice imposed without (i.e., either by the king for religious-political reasons or by the economics of the time). If we assume that it was indeed every Fourth Dynasty Egyptian official's desire to provide for his mastaba with a chapel covered with relief decoration, or at the very least, more offerings than the "small" number that fit on a slab stela, we might view the reserve heads as a similar austerity measure in place of full-figured statues. Moreover, we might consider the miniature ritual vessels from Giza as taking the place of normal-sized ceramic vessels. Are all these objects to be understood as abbreviations or compromises that only disappeared, to be replaced by their fuller (and earlier) counterparts, once the strain of the royal construction project was relieved or, at least, reduced?
of Khufu. A modern Egyptological assumption on the linearity of Egyptian tomb development, and the "concept of progress" leads to the expectation that funerary complexes should become more, rather than less, elaborate over time. We may have come to expect larger settlements, increased literacy, bigger tombs, and a broader artistic repertoire, all moving in the same linear direction of ever-expanding development. This same prejudice has resulted, at the other end of ancient Egyptian history, in modern attitudes towards the Late Period as an era of decline.

We have already seen ample evidence for concomitant developments throughout archaic and Old Kingdom Egypt, from the round-topped vertical orientation of Abydene stela to their often rectangular Memphite counterparts, or the "dependent" false door panel versus the "independent" slab stela. The Giza slab stela provide an obstacle to the concept of clean linear development, for here we have greater elaboration both before and after their era. We might do well, then, to understand the slab stela, not as emergency placeholders for later false doors, or as reductionist tombstones forced upon the administrative elite against their will, but rather as an intentionally chosen form of tomb decoration, in keeping with the trends of the age. Complete in and of themselves, they did not represent a compromise, sacrifice, or a hurried solution due to untimely death, but rather provided every critical element needed to ensure the continued successful mortuary cult. Names and titles, the funerary repast, a selected offering list, and multiple varieties of funerary linen were placed at the focal point of the mastaba, superimposed in importance only by the actual subterranean burial of the body itself. These are an iconic purity and economy to the slab stela that serve their functional purpose and still provide an elite element of burial equipment. It was only in the succeeding phases of the 4th dynasty that false doors themselves in the Old Kingdom repertoire. A few archaising throwbacks at Giza, best attested by the slab stela from g 4860, several later false doors, a mastaba chapel wall, and, by Dynasty 6, the hastily prepared raised and sunk relief stone of Senjtu found reused in g 2352, inform us that later generations had not forgotten the elegance and simplicity of Khufu’s era. Indeed, they seem to have sought, however unsuccessfully, to emulate it.

28 See Haeny’s apt comments against such a misleading perspective with respect to simple and multi-niched (palace facade) tomb construction, F. A. Ricks, p. 813. However, the thrust of much of his article is to place necropolis development within a scheme of generally linear development, against Junker’s thesis that Giza marks a strong break with the past, ZÄS 63 (1928), summary on p. 31. See also remarks by S.J. Gould quoted in “The Problem of the Giza Slab Stelae,” in H. Guichard and D. Plate, eds., Stationen: Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte Ägyptens Rainer Stadelmann Gewidmet (Mainz, 1998), p. 59.

29 Cf. Bolshakov, Man and his Double, p. 38. See in particular, false door tablets in emulation of slab stelae belonging to Nefer (g 2110), Meretites (g 7650), Merib (g 2100–I), Seshemnefer I (g 4940, east wall linen list), and Senetites, wife of Seneb. Reference images of these monuments are gathered below in Appendix 3.

30 See fig. 256, and Appendix 3, fig. 314. For a recent discussion, dating the tomb-owner to Dynasty 4, see Piacentini, Les Scribes dans la société égyptienne de l’Ancien Empire 1, pp. 105–106.
Fig. 256. Archaizing Dynasty 6 "slab-stela" of Setju in raised and sunk relief, from the fill of q. 230 shaft; MFA 33491. MFA Visual Archives, c. 3000.
APPENDIX I

Color Palaeography

The palaeography chart below displays all the hieroglyphs from the three Giza slab stelae that preserve the greatest amount of pigment. These are the stelae of Wepemnefret (g 1201), Nefret-iabet (g 1225), and Iunu (g 4150), discovered by Reisner, Ballard, and Junker respectively. To create the palaeography, photographs were digitally cropped and rearranged sign by sign. To demonstrate the value of juxtaposing photographed hieroglyphs in color we might cite a single sign: the plant \( M \) displays the following polychromy across four different Giza stelae:

- Wepemnefret (g 1201): green with gray/black outlines
- Khufu-nakht (g 1205): traces of blue/green
- Nefret-iabet (g 1225): red with yellow buds
- Iunu (g 4150): red with yellow buds.

For a graph displaying the frequency of this sign across all fifteen stela and stela fragments, see below, Appendix 2, fig. 261.

Throughout his Egyptological career, W.S. Smith paid great attention to polychrome hieroglyphs, including those on the stelae presented here. Fig. 257 contains the original mockup of his color Plate A at the back of his HESPOK publication (largely based on Davies’s work), and figs. 258-59 show miscellaneous notes on the Wepemnefret hieroglyphs from one of Smith’s notebooks. Both items are stored in the archives of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. For additional remarks on color, the reader is referred to Chapter 4 above, esp. p. 152, n. 55.
APPENDIX 1 COLOR PALAEOGRAPHY

Fig. 258. One of two pages of color notations on the slab stela of Wepepm-nefert (G 1201) by W.S. Smith; housed in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
Fig. 259. One of two pages of color notations on the slab stela of Wepem-nefret (Q 1201) by W.S. Smith; housed in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
### Appendix 1 Color Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D 7</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 21</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 36</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 46</td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 58</td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 253</td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D — (20?)</td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E —</td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image22" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 4</td>
<td><img src="image23" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image24" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image25" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1: Color Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hieroglyph</th>
<th>Stela 6: G 1225, Nefret-iabet</th>
<th>Stela 13: G 4150 (= Is), Iunu</th>
<th>Stela 1: G 1201, Wepemnefret</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F 13</td>
<td><img src="F13" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 32</td>
<td><img src="F32" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 35</td>
<td><img src="F35" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 1</td>
<td><img src="G1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 5</td>
<td><img src="G5" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 7</td>
<td><img src="G7" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2 Color Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hieroglyph</th>
<th>Stela n. 2045, Aphrodisias</th>
<th>Stela n. 2046, Aphrodisias</th>
<th>Stela n. 4100, Louvre</th>
<th>Stela 13, Hildesheim 2145</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G 17</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 30</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 36</td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 38</td>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image13.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image15.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 43</td>
<td><img src="image16.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image19.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 7(?)</td>
<td><img src="image20.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image21.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image22.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image23.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1: Color Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I 9</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 12</td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13</td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 17</td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2 Color Paleography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 22</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 23</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 26</td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 28</td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 30</td>
<td><img src="image13.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image15.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 33</td>
<td><img src="image16.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 34</td>
<td><img src="image19.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image21.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 39</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 163</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 11</td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 35</td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 36</td>
<td><img src="image13.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 37–N 39</td>
<td><img src="image15.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image16.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 1</td>
<td><img src="image18.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image19.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2: Color Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O 4</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 28</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 29</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 34</td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 49</td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 3</td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 3</td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 8</td>
<td><img src="image22" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image23" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image24" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 15</td>
<td><img src="image25" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image26" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image27" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix I: Color Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R 21</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R—</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R—</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 27</td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 29</td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 114</td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 115</td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1: Color Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S 116</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 152</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 3</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 7</td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 11</td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U 36</td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 1</td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 4</td>
<td><img src="image22" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image23" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image24" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 6</td>
<td><img src="image25" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image26" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image27" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V 12</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 13</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 16</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 23</td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 28</td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 30</td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 31</td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 2</td>
<td><img src="image22" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image23" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image24" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 10</td>
<td><img src="image25" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image26" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image27" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 12</td>
<td><img src="image28" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image29" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image30" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W 16</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 18</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 21</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 22</td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 24</td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 69</td>
<td><img src="image13.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image15.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X 1</td>
<td><img src="image16.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X₂</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₂</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₃</td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z₁</td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aa₁</td>
<td><img src="image13.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image15.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image16.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image19.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image21.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image22.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image23.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image24.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image25.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image26.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image27.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix I: Color Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Offerings" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Offerings" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Offerings" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Offerings" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Offerings" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image21" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image22" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image23" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image24" alt="Offerings" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image25" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image26" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image27" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image28" alt="Offerings" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image29" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image30" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image31" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image32" alt="Offerings" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offerings</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Offerings" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offerings</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Offerings" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offerings</td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Offerings" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2
Hieroglyphic Palaeography

One of the advantages of digital epigraphy is the potential for convenient palaeographical compilations. As an experiment in "repurposing" the digital drawings presented above (Chapter 1, pls. 1–30), the following palaeography represents all hieroglyphs attested in the Giza group of fifteen slab stelae and data fragments. Unlike the color palaeography in Appendix 1, no attempt is made here to reproduce every single example of a particular sign. Only the primary diagnostic and variant forms are represented, but a number in the upper left corner of each table cell provides the occurrences of the particular sign on the data in question. The example at right indicates that on the stela of the male tomb-owner Kanefer, there is one (1) occurrence of his sign.

The chart in fig. 260 indicates the number of different words appearing on each stela. While the data are somewhat skewed, due to the fragmentary nature of some of the stelae, the long-form stelae (colored blue) nevertheless clearly demonstrate their extended vocabulary compared to their short-form counterparts (colored green). Singling out the most common hieroglyph, the "plant" (M 12), we find the distribution as presented in fig. 261, which once again differentiates between short-form and long-form stelae. And finally, fig. 262 summarizes the attested reversals found on the stelae.
## Appendix 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hieroglyph</th>
<th>Stela</th>
<th>Stela</th>
<th>Stela</th>
<th>Stela</th>
<th>Stela</th>
<th>Stela</th>
<th>Stela</th>
<th>Stela</th>
<th>Stela</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B 1</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stela 6: G 1235, As 1235</th>
<th>Stela 7: G 2120, St 5640, St 8320</th>
<th>Stela 8: G 2135 (= VIInn)</th>
<th>Stela 9: G 4140, Mrt-ãt’s, Mertites</th>
<th>Stela 10: G 4150 (= Is)</th>
<th>Stela 11: G 2155(?) (= VIIInn)</th>
<th>Stela 12: G 4840 (= VIIIss)</th>
<th>Stela 13: G 4860 (= VIIIn)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cairo, JE 37727 (57127 bis)</td>
<td>Port Said, P 4083</td>
<td>Vienna, ÄS 7929</td>
<td>Boston, MFA, 06.1894</td>
<td>Vienna, ÄS 7792</td>
<td>Vienna, ÄS 7447</td>
<td>Boston, MFA, 14–2–1</td>
<td>Hildesheim, 2145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 14: G 4840 (= VIIIss)</td>
<td>Wenshet</td>
<td>Boston, MFA, 14–2–1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Hieroglyphic Palaeography Diagram](image-url)
**Appendix 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D — (207?)</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Hieroglyph D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Hieroglyph D" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Hieroglyph D" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Hieroglyph D" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Hieroglyph D" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Hieroglyph D" /></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Hieroglyph D" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 34</td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Hieroglyph E 34" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Hieroglyph E 34" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Hieroglyph E 34" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Hieroglyph E 34" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Hieroglyph E 34" /></td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Hieroglyph E 34" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Hieroglyph E 34" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 166</td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Hieroglyph E 166" /></td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Hieroglyph E 166" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Hieroglyph E 166" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Hieroglyph E 166" /></td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Hieroglyph E 166" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Hieroglyph E 166" /></td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="Hieroglyph E 166" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E —</td>
<td><img src="image22" alt="Hieroglyph E —" /></td>
<td><img src="image23" alt="Hieroglyph E —" /></td>
<td><img src="image24" alt="Hieroglyph E —" /></td>
<td><img src="image25" alt="Hieroglyph E —" /></td>
<td><img src="image26" alt="Hieroglyph E —" /></td>
<td><img src="image27" alt="Hieroglyph E —" /></td>
<td><img src="image28" alt="Hieroglyph E —" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E —</td>
<td><img src="image29" alt="Hieroglyph E —" /></td>
<td><img src="image30" alt="Hieroglyph E —" /></td>
<td><img src="image31" alt="Hieroglyph E —" /></td>
<td><img src="image32" alt="Hieroglyph E —" /></td>
<td><img src="image33" alt="Hieroglyph E —" /></td>
<td><img src="image34" alt="Hieroglyph E —" /></td>
<td><img src="image35" alt="Hieroglyph E —" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 4</td>
<td><img src="image36" alt="Hieroglyph F 4" /></td>
<td><img src="image37" alt="Hieroglyph F 4" /></td>
<td><img src="image38" alt="Hieroglyph F 4" /></td>
<td><img src="image39" alt="Hieroglyph F 4" /></td>
<td><img src="image40" alt="Hieroglyph F 4" /></td>
<td><img src="image41" alt="Hieroglyph F 4" /></td>
<td><img src="image42" alt="Hieroglyph F 4" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 9</td>
<td><img src="image43" alt="Hieroglyph F 9" /></td>
<td><img src="image44" alt="Hieroglyph F 9" /></td>
<td><img src="image45" alt="Hieroglyph F 9" /></td>
<td><img src="image46" alt="Hieroglyph F 9" /></td>
<td><img src="image47" alt="Hieroglyph F 9" /></td>
<td><img src="image48" alt="Hieroglyph F 9" /></td>
<td><img src="image49" alt="Hieroglyph F 9" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 13</td>
<td><img src="image50" alt="Hieroglyph F 13" /></td>
<td><img src="image51" alt="Hieroglyph F 13" /></td>
<td><img src="image52" alt="Hieroglyph F 13" /></td>
<td><img src="image53" alt="Hieroglyph F 13" /></td>
<td><img src="image54" alt="Hieroglyph F 13" /></td>
<td><img src="image55" alt="Hieroglyph F 13" /></td>
<td><img src="image56" alt="Hieroglyph F 13" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 26</td>
<td><img src="image57" alt="Hieroglyph F 26" /></td>
<td><img src="image58" alt="Hieroglyph F 26" /></td>
<td><img src="image59" alt="Hieroglyph F 26" /></td>
<td><img src="image60" alt="Hieroglyph F 26" /></td>
<td><img src="image61" alt="Hieroglyph F 26" /></td>
<td><img src="image62" alt="Hieroglyph F 26" /></td>
<td><img src="image63" alt="Hieroglyph F 26" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 32</td>
<td><img src="image64" alt="Hieroglyph F 32" /></td>
<td><img src="image65" alt="Hieroglyph F 32" /></td>
<td><img src="image66" alt="Hieroglyph F 32" /></td>
<td><img src="image67" alt="Hieroglyph F 32" /></td>
<td><img src="image68" alt="Hieroglyph F 32" /></td>
<td><img src="image69" alt="Hieroglyph F 32" /></td>
<td><img src="image70" alt="Hieroglyph F 32" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 35</td>
<td><img src="image71" alt="Hieroglyph F 35" /></td>
<td><img src="image72" alt="Hieroglyph F 35" /></td>
<td><img src="image73" alt="Hieroglyph F 35" /></td>
<td><img src="image74" alt="Hieroglyph F 35" /></td>
<td><img src="image75" alt="Hieroglyph F 35" /></td>
<td><img src="image76" alt="Hieroglyph F 35" /></td>
<td><img src="image77" alt="Hieroglyph F 35" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography

Stela 8: G 1235, Ini Cairo JE 37727 (57127 bis) Port Said, P 4083

Stela 9: G 2120, Sṯ-šntyw Seshat-sekhentiu Boston, MFA, 06.1894

Stela 10: G 2135 (= VIIInn) Vienna, ÄS 7799

Stela 12: G 4140, Mrt-¡t Meretites Boston, MFA, 12.1510

Stela 13: G 4150 (= IS), Ṗwnw Iunu Hildesheim, 2145

Stela 15: G 4860 (= VIIIn) Vienna, ÄS 8459

Stela 11: G 2155(?) (= VIIInn) Kaninisut Vienna, ÄS 7447

Stela 14: G 4840 (= VIIIss) Wenshet Boston, MFA, 14–2–1
## Appendix 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography

|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|================================================|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| G 1        | ![G 1](image1)                                                | ![G 1](image2)                                  | ![G 1](image3)                                  | ![G 1](image4)                                  | ![G 1](image5)                                    | ![G 1](image6)                                                  | ![G 1](image7)                                                  |
| G 4        | ![G 4](image8)                                                | ![G 4](image9)                                  | ![G 4](image10)                                 | ![G 4](image11)                                 | ![G 4](image12)                                    | ![G 4](image13)                                                  | ![G 4](image14)                                                  |
| G 5        | ![G 5](image15)                                               | ![G 5](image16)                                  | ![G 5](image17)                                 | ![G 5](image18)                                 | ![G 5](image19)                                    | ![G 5](image20)                                                  | ![G 5](image21)                                                  |
| G 7        | ![G 7](image22)                                               | ![G 7](image23)                                  | ![G 7](image24)                                 | ![G 7](image25)                                 | ![G 7](image26)                                    | ![G 7](image27)                                                  | ![G 7](image28)                                                  |
| (reduced)  | ![G 7 reduced](image29)                                       | ![G 7 reduced](image30)                          | ![G 7 reduced](image31)                         | ![G 7 reduced](image32)                         | ![G 7 reduced](image33)                             | ![G 7 reduced](image34)                                          | ![G 7 reduced](image35)                                          |
| G 17       | ![G 17](image36)                                              | ![G 17](image37)                                 | ![G 17](image38)                                 | ![G 17](image39)                                 | ![G 17](image40)                                    | ![G 17](image41)                                                  | ![G 17](image42)                                                  |
| G 30       | ![G 30](image43)                                              | ![G 30](image44)                                 | ![G 30](image45)                                 | ![G 30](image46)                                 | ![G 30](image47)                                    | ![G 30](image48)                                                  | ![G 30](image49)                                                  |
| G 36       | ![G 36](image50)                                              | ![G 36](image51)                                 | ![G 36](image52)                                 | ![G 36](image53)                                 | ![G 36](image54)                                    | ![G 36](image55)                                                  | ![G 36](image56)                                                  |
### Appendix 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stela 6: G 1235, Fšt lb</th>
<th>Cairo JE 37727 (57127 bis) Port Said, P 4083</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stela 8: G 2120, Sṯ-šntyw</td>
<td>Boston, MFA, 06.1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 10: G 2135 (= VIIInn)</td>
<td>Vienna, ĀS 7799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 12: G 4140, Mrt-št</td>
<td>Boston, MFA, 12.1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 13: G 4150 (= VIIIš), Šwnw</td>
<td>Hildesheim, 2145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 14: G 4840 (= VIIIš), Wenshet</td>
<td>Boston, MFA, 14–2–1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 15: G 4860 (= VIIInn)</td>
<td>Vienna, ĀS 8459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 11: G 2155(?) (= VIIInn)</td>
<td>Kaninisut Vienna, ĀS 7447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

![Hieroglyphic Palaeography Chart](chart.png)
APPENDIX 2: HIEROGLYPHIC PALAEOGRAPHY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G 38</td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 40</td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 43</td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 47</td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 7(?</td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 9</td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 10</td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 1</td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3</td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="1" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stela 8: G 1235, ( \text{in} ) Cairo, JE 37727 (57127 bis)</th>
<th>Stela 9: G 2120, ( \text{in} ) Stent-sntyw, Boston, MFA, 06.1894</th>
<th>Stela 10: G 2135 (= VInn), ( \text{in} ) Vienna, ÄS 7799</th>
<th>Stela 11: G 2155(?) (= VIIInn), Kaninisut, Vienna, ÄS 7447</th>
<th>Stela 12: G 4140, ( \text{in} ) Mrt-št, Boston, MFA, 12.1510</th>
<th>Stela 13: G 4150 (= Is), ( \text{in} ) Iunu, Hildesheim, 2145</th>
<th>Stela 14: G 4840 (= VIIIss), ( \text{in} ) Wenshet, Boston, MFA, 14.2.1</th>
<th>Stela 15: G 4860 (= VIIIn), ( \text{in} ) Vienna, ÄS 8459</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Image 1]</td>
<td>[Image 2]</td>
<td>[Image 3]</td>
<td>[Image 4]</td>
<td>[Image 5]</td>
<td>[Image 6]</td>
<td>[Image 7]</td>
<td>[Image 8]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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## Appendix 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography

| Hieroglyph | Stela 1: G 1201, Wpm-nfr\[
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1</td>
<td>Berkeley, 6–19825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3</td>
<td>Berkeley, 6–19807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4</td>
<td>Berkeley, 6–19786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 5</td>
<td>Berkeley, 6–19801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 6</td>
<td>Berkeley, 6–19787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 7</td>
<td>Berkeley, 6–19776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 8</td>
<td>Berkeley, 6–19775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 12</td>
<td>Berkeley, 6–19825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13</td>
<td>Berkeley, 6–19807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 16</td>
<td>Berkeley, 6–19786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 17</td>
<td>Berkeley, 6–19801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 22</td>
<td>Berkeley, 6–19787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Plates

1. Plate 1: Hieroglyphs
2. Plate 2: Hieroglyphs
3. Plate 3: Hieroglyphs
4. Plate 4: Hieroglyphs
5. Plate 5: Hieroglyphs
6. Plate 6: Hieroglyphs
7. Plate 7: Hieroglyphs
| Stela 8: G 1235, Ini
| Cairo, JE 37727 (57127 bis) Port Said, P 4083 |
| Stela 9: G 2120, Sṯnt-sntyw
| Boston, MFA, 06.1894 |
| Stela 10: G 2135 (= VInn)
| Vienna, ÄS 7799 |
| Stela 11: G 2155(?) (= VIIIn)
| Kaninisut Vienna, ÄS 7447 |
| Stela 12: G 4140, Mrt-ḥt
| Boston, MFA, 12.1510 |
| Stela 13: G 4150 (= IS), ḫwnw
| Iunu Hildesheim, 2145 |
| Stela 14: G 4840 (= VIIIss)
| Wenshet Boston, MFA, 14–2–1 |
| Stela 15: G 4860 (= VIIIn)
| Vienna, ÄS 8459 |
### Appendix 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 23</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Hieroglyph M 23" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Hieroglyph M 23" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Hieroglyph M 23" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Hieroglyph M 23" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Hieroglyph M 23" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Hieroglyph M 23" /></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Hieroglyph M 23" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 26</td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Hieroglyph M 26" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Hieroglyph M 26" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Hieroglyph M 26" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Hieroglyph M 26" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Hieroglyph M 26" /></td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Hieroglyph M 26" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Hieroglyph M 26" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 28</td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Hieroglyph M 28" /></td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Hieroglyph M 28" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Hieroglyph M 28" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Hieroglyph M 28" /></td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Hieroglyph M 28" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Hieroglyph M 28" /></td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="Hieroglyph M 28" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 30</td>
<td><img src="image22" alt="Hieroglyph M 30" /></td>
<td><img src="image23" alt="Hieroglyph M 30" /></td>
<td><img src="image24" alt="Hieroglyph M 30" /></td>
<td><img src="image25" alt="Hieroglyph M 30" /></td>
<td><img src="image26" alt="Hieroglyph M 30" /></td>
<td><img src="image27" alt="Hieroglyph M 30" /></td>
<td><img src="image28" alt="Hieroglyph M 30" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 33</td>
<td><img src="image29" alt="Hieroglyph M 33" /></td>
<td><img src="image30" alt="Hieroglyph M 33" /></td>
<td><img src="image31" alt="Hieroglyph M 33" /></td>
<td><img src="image32" alt="Hieroglyph M 33" /></td>
<td><img src="image33" alt="Hieroglyph M 33" /></td>
<td><img src="image34" alt="Hieroglyph M 33" /></td>
<td><img src="image35" alt="Hieroglyph M 33" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 34</td>
<td><img src="image36" alt="Hieroglyph M 34" /></td>
<td><img src="image37" alt="Hieroglyph M 34" /></td>
<td><img src="image38" alt="Hieroglyph M 34" /></td>
<td><img src="image39" alt="Hieroglyph M 34" /></td>
<td><img src="image40" alt="Hieroglyph M 34" /></td>
<td><img src="image41" alt="Hieroglyph M 34" /></td>
<td><img src="image42" alt="Hieroglyph M 34" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 39</td>
<td><img src="image43" alt="Hieroglyph M 39" /></td>
<td><img src="image44" alt="Hieroglyph M 39" /></td>
<td><img src="image45" alt="Hieroglyph M 39" /></td>
<td><img src="image46" alt="Hieroglyph M 39" /></td>
<td><img src="image47" alt="Hieroglyph M 39" /></td>
<td><img src="image48" alt="Hieroglyph M 39" /></td>
<td><img src="image49" alt="Hieroglyph M 39" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 163</td>
<td><img src="image50" alt="Hieroglyph M 163" /></td>
<td><img src="image51" alt="Hieroglyph M 163" /></td>
<td><img src="image52" alt="Hieroglyph M 163" /></td>
<td><img src="image53" alt="Hieroglyph M 163" /></td>
<td><img src="image54" alt="Hieroglyph M 163" /></td>
<td><img src="image55" alt="Hieroglyph M 163" /></td>
<td><img src="image56" alt="Hieroglyph M 163" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 8: G 1235, (\text{\textsuperscript{57127}})</td>
<td>Cairo, JE 37727 (57127 bis) Port Said, P 4083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 9: G 2120, (\text{\textsuperscript{57127}})</td>
<td>S(\text{\textsuperscript{57127}})nt-sytw Boston, MFA, 06.1894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 10: G 2135 (= VII(\text{\textsuperscript{57127}}))</td>
<td>Vienna, ÄS 7799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 12: G 4140, M(\text{\textsuperscript{57127}})t-(\text{\textsuperscript{57127}})s</td>
<td>Boston, MFA, 12.1510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 13: G 4150 (= VII(\text{\textsuperscript{57127}}))</td>
<td>(\text{\textsuperscript{57127}})wnw Iunu Hildesheim, 2145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 15: G 4860 (= VII(\text{\textsuperscript{57127}}))</td>
<td>Vienna, ÄS 8459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 11: G 2155(?) (= VII(\text{\textsuperscript{57127}}))</td>
<td>Kaninisut Vienna, ÄS 7447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 14: G 4840 (= VIII(\text{\textsuperscript{57127}}))</td>
<td>Wenshet Boston, MFA, 14–2–1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N 11</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 22</td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 29</td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 35</td>
<td><img src="image22" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image23" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image24" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image25" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image26" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image27" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image28" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 36</td>
<td><img src="image29" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image30" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image31" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image32" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image33" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image34" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image35" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 37–N 39</td>
<td><img src="image36" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image37" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image38" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image39" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image40" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image41" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image42" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 41</td>
<td><img src="image43" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image44" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image45" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image46" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image47" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image48" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image49" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 1</td>
<td><img src="image50" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image51" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image52" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image53" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image54" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image55" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image56" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 4</td>
<td><img src="image57" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image58" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image59" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image60" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image61" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image62" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image63" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 10</td>
<td><img src="image64" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image65" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image66" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image67" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image68" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image69" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image70" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 11</td>
<td><img src="image71" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image72" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image73" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image74" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image75" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image76" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image77" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 28</td>
<td><img src="image78" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image79" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image80" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image81" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image82" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image83" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image84" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography

Stela 8: G 1235, Hop (I) (VIIIa)
Stela 9: G 2120, Sȝt-sȝntw (I) (VIIIa)
Stela 10: G 2135 (= VIInn) (I) (VIIIa)
Stela 12: G 4140, Mrt-št (I) (VIIIa)
Stela 13: G 4150 (= VIIIs), Šwnw (I) (VIIIa)
Stela 11: G 2155 (?) (= VIIInn) (I) (VIIIa)
Stela 14: G 4840 (= VIIIss) (I) (VIIIa)
Stela 15: G 4860 (= VIIIn) (I) (VIIIa)
### Appendix 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O 29 (reduced)</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 34</td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 49</td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 51</td>
<td><img src="image22" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image23" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image24" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image25" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image26" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image27" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image28" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 3</td>
<td><img src="image29" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image30" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image31" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image32" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image33" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image34" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image35" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 1</td>
<td><img src="image36" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image37" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image38" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image39" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image40" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image41" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image42" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 3</td>
<td><img src="image43" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image44" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image45" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image46" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image47" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image48" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image49" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 4</td>
<td><img src="image50" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image51" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image52" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image53" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image54" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image55" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image56" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q—</td>
<td><img src="image57" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image58" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image59" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image60" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image61" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image62" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image63" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 8</td>
<td><img src="image64" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image65" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image66" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image67" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image68" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image69" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image70" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 15</td>
<td><img src="image71" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image72" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image73" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image74" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image75" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image76" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image77" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stela 8: G 1235,</th>
<th>Port Said, P 4083</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stela 9: G 2120,</td>
<td>Boston, MFA, 06.1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 10: G 2135 (= VIIInn),</td>
<td>Vienna, A.S 7790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 11: G 2155(?) (= VIIInn),</td>
<td>Vienna, A.S 7447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 12: G 4140,</td>
<td>MeretitesBoston, MFA, 12.1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 13: G 4150 (= Is),</td>
<td>Hildesheim, 2145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 14: G 4840 (= VIIIss),</td>
<td>WenshetBoston, MFA, 14–2–1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 15: G 4860 (= VIIIn),</td>
<td>Vienna, A.S 8459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Hieroglyphic Palaeography Diagram]
### Appendix 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R 21</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 24</td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 25</td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 22</td>
<td><img src="image22" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image23" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image24" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image25" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image26" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image27" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image28" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 25</td>
<td><img src="image29" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image30" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image31" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image32" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image33" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image34" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image35" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 130a (N 18)</td>
<td><img src="image36" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image37" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image38" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image39" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image40" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image41" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image42" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 27</td>
<td><img src="image43" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image44" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image45" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image46" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image47" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image48" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
<td><img src="image49" alt="Hieroglyph" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: HIEROGLYPHIC PALAEOGRAPHY

Stela 8: G 1235, Cairo, JE 37727 (57127 bis) Port Said, P 4083
Stela 9: G 2120, Sénntyw Seshat-sekhentiu Boston, MFA, 06.1894
Stela 10: G 2135 (= VIIInn) Vienna, ÄS 7799
Stela 11: G 2155(?) (= VIIInn) Kaninisut Vienna, ÄS 7447
Stela 12: G 4140, Mrt-t Meraetites Boston, MFA, 12.1510
Stela 13: G 4150 (= Is), Wnwn Iunu Hildesheim, 2145
Stela 14: G 4840 (= VIIIss) Wenshet Boston, MFA, 14–2–1
Stela 15: G 4860 (= VIIIn) Vienna, ÄS 8459
## APPENDIX 2: HIEROGLYPHIC PALAEOGRAPHY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S 29</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 42</td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image13.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 114</td>
<td><img src="image15.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image16.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image19.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image21.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 115</td>
<td><img src="image22.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image23.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image24.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image25.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image26.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image27.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image28.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 116</td>
<td><img src="image29.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image30.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image31.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image32.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image33.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image34.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image35.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 117</td>
<td><img src="image36.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image37.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image38.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image39.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image40.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image41.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image42.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 152</td>
<td><img src="image43.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image44.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image45.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image46.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image47.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image48.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image49.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 3</td>
<td><img src="image50.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image51.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image52.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image53.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image54.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image55.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image56.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 7</td>
<td><img src="image57.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image58.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image59.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image60.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image61.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image62.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image63.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 11</td>
<td><img src="image64.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image65.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image66.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image67.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image68.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image69.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image70.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(reduced)*
| Stela 8: G 1235, | Ini          |
| Stela 9: G 2120, | Sṯ-t-ntyw   |
| Stela 10: G 2135 (= VIInn), | ViunuHildesheim, 2145 |
| Stela 11: G 2155(?) (= VIIInn), | MeretitesBoston, MFA, 12.1510 |
| Stela 12: G 4140, | Mrt-št        |
| Stela 13: G 4150 (= VIIIIs), | ŠnwnwIunu |
| Stela 14: G 4840 (= VIIIss), | WenshetBoston, MFA, 14–2–1 |
| Stela 15: G 4860 (= VIIIs), | Seshat-sekhentiuBoston, MFA, 06.1894 |
## Appendix 2: Hieroglyph Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T 28</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Hieroglyph T 28" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Hieroglyph T 28" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Hieroglyph T 28" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Hieroglyph T 28" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Hieroglyph T 28" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Hieroglyph T 28" /></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Hieroglyph T 28" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 34</td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Hieroglyph T 34" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Hieroglyph T 34" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Hieroglyph T 34" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Hieroglyph T 34" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Hieroglyph T 34" /></td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Hieroglyph T 34" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Hieroglyph T 34" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 35</td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Hieroglyph T 35" /></td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Hieroglyph T 35" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Hieroglyph T 35" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Hieroglyph T 35" /></td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Hieroglyph T 35" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Hieroglyph T 35" /></td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="Hieroglyph T 35" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U 1</td>
<td><img src="image22" alt="Hieroglyph U 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image23" alt="Hieroglyph U 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image24" alt="Hieroglyph U 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image25" alt="Hieroglyph U 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image26" alt="Hieroglyph U 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image27" alt="Hieroglyph U 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image28" alt="Hieroglyph U 1" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U 6</td>
<td><img src="image29" alt="Hieroglyph U 6" /></td>
<td><img src="image30" alt="Hieroglyph U 6" /></td>
<td><img src="image31" alt="Hieroglyph U 6" /></td>
<td><img src="image32" alt="Hieroglyph U 6" /></td>
<td><img src="image33" alt="Hieroglyph U 6" /></td>
<td><img src="image34" alt="Hieroglyph U 6" /></td>
<td><img src="image35" alt="Hieroglyph U 6" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U 28</td>
<td><img src="image36" alt="Hieroglyph U 28" /></td>
<td><img src="image37" alt="Hieroglyph U 28" /></td>
<td><img src="image38" alt="Hieroglyph U 28" /></td>
<td><img src="image39" alt="Hieroglyph U 28" /></td>
<td><img src="image40" alt="Hieroglyph U 28" /></td>
<td><img src="image41" alt="Hieroglyph U 28" /></td>
<td><img src="image42" alt="Hieroglyph U 28" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U 31</td>
<td><img src="image43" alt="Hieroglyph U 31" /></td>
<td><img src="image44" alt="Hieroglyph U 31" /></td>
<td><img src="image45" alt="Hieroglyph U 31" /></td>
<td><img src="image46" alt="Hieroglyph U 31" /></td>
<td><img src="image47" alt="Hieroglyph U 31" /></td>
<td><img src="image48" alt="Hieroglyph U 31" /></td>
<td><img src="image49" alt="Hieroglyph U 31" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U 33</td>
<td><img src="image50" alt="Hieroglyph U 33" /></td>
<td><img src="image51" alt="Hieroglyph U 33" /></td>
<td><img src="image52" alt="Hieroglyph U 33" /></td>
<td><img src="image53" alt="Hieroglyph U 33" /></td>
<td><img src="image54" alt="Hieroglyph U 33" /></td>
<td><img src="image55" alt="Hieroglyph U 33" /></td>
<td><img src="image56" alt="Hieroglyph U 33" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U 36</td>
<td><img src="image57" alt="Hieroglyph U 36" /></td>
<td><img src="image58" alt="Hieroglyph U 36" /></td>
<td><img src="image59" alt="Hieroglyph U 36" /></td>
<td><img src="image60" alt="Hieroglyph U 36" /></td>
<td><img src="image61" alt="Hieroglyph U 36" /></td>
<td><img src="image62" alt="Hieroglyph U 36" /></td>
<td><img src="image63" alt="Hieroglyph U 36" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 1</td>
<td><img src="image64" alt="Hieroglyph V 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image65" alt="Hieroglyph V 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image66" alt="Hieroglyph V 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image67" alt="Hieroglyph V 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image68" alt="Hieroglyph V 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image69" alt="Hieroglyph V 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image70" alt="Hieroglyph V 1" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 2</td>
<td><img src="image71" alt="Hieroglyph V 2" /></td>
<td><img src="image72" alt="Hieroglyph V 2" /></td>
<td><img src="image73" alt="Hieroglyph V 2" /></td>
<td><img src="image74" alt="Hieroglyph V 2" /></td>
<td><img src="image75" alt="Hieroglyph V 2" /></td>
<td><img src="image76" alt="Hieroglyph V 2" /></td>
<td><img src="image77" alt="Hieroglyph V 2" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 4</td>
<td><img src="image78" alt="Hieroglyph V 4" /></td>
<td><img src="image79" alt="Hieroglyph V 4" /></td>
<td><img src="image80" alt="Hieroglyph V 4" /></td>
<td><img src="image81" alt="Hieroglyph V 4" /></td>
<td><img src="image82" alt="Hieroglyph V 4" /></td>
<td><img src="image83" alt="Hieroglyph V 4" /></td>
<td><img src="image84" alt="Hieroglyph V 4" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendix 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stela 8: G 1235, ( \text{St} ) Cape, JE 37727 (57127 bis) Port Said, P 4083</th>
<th>Stela 9: G 2120, S( \text{St} )-s( n)t-s( n)y( w) ( \text{St} ) Boston, MFA, 06.1894</th>
<th>Stela 10: G 2135 (= VIIInn), ( \text{St} ) Vienna, ÄS 7799</th>
<th>Stela 11: G 2155 (= VIIInn), Kaninisut ( \text{St} ) Vienna, ÄS 7447</th>
<th>Stela 12: G 4140, M( r)t-( s) ( \text{St} ) Boston, MFA, 12.1510</th>
<th>Stela 13: G 4150 (= Is), ( \text{St} ) Iunu ( \text{St} ) Hildesheim, 2145</th>
<th>Stela 14: G 4840 (= VIIIss), Wenshet ( \text{St} ) Boston, MFA, 14–2–1</th>
<th>Stela 15: G 4860 (= VIIIn), ( \text{St} ) Vienna, ÄS 8459</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

![Hieroglyphic Palaeography Diagram](image-url)
### Appendix 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V 6</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 7</td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 10</td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 12</td>
<td><img src="image22" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image23" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image24" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image25" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image26" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image27" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image28" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 13</td>
<td><img src="image29" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image30" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image31" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image32" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image33" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image34" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image35" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 16</td>
<td><img src="image36" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image37" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image38" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image39" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image40" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image41" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image42" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 23</td>
<td><img src="image43" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image44" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image45" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image46" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image47" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image48" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image49" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 28</td>
<td><img src="image50" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image51" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image52" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image53" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image54" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image55" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image56" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 30</td>
<td><img src="image57" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image58" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image59" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image60" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image61" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image62" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image63" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: HIEROGLYPHIC PALAEOGRAPHY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stela 6: G 2115, Ineni</th>
<th>Cairo, TE 77507 (1127-1146)</th>
<th>Port Said, P 4936</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stela 11: G 2155(?)</td>
<td>Vienna, ÄS 7447</td>
<td>Kaninisut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 8: G 1235, Ini</td>
<td>Cairo, JE 37727 (57127 bis)</td>
<td>Port Said, P 4936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 9: G 2120, Sṯn̄y</td>
<td>Boston, MFA, 06.1894</td>
<td>Seshat-sekhentiu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 10: G 2135 (= VIIInn)</td>
<td>Vienna, ÄS 7447</td>
<td>Vienna, ÄS 7447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 12: G 4140, Mrt-št</td>
<td>Boston, MFA, 12.1510</td>
<td>Meretites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 13: G 4150 (= Is), Šwnw</td>
<td>Hildesheim, 2145</td>
<td>Iunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 14: G 4840 (= VIIIss), Wenshet</td>
<td>Boston, MFA, 14–2–1</td>
<td>Wenshet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 15: G 4860 (= VIIIn)</td>
<td>Vienna, ÄS 8459</td>
<td>Vienna, ÄS 8459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 2: HIEROGLYPHIC PALAEOGRAPHY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hieroglyph</th>
<th>Stela 1: G 1201, Wp-m-nfrt Berkeley, 19825</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stela 8: G 1235, Port Said, P 4083</th>
<th>Stela 9: G 2120, S técnico, Sten-stywyw</th>
<th>Stela 10: G 2135 (= VInn), Vienna, AS 7799</th>
<th>Stela 11: G 2155(?) (= VInn), Kaninisut</th>
<th>Stela 12: G 4140, Mrt-st, Boston, MFA, 12.15.10</th>
<th>Stela 13: G 4150 (= IS), X wnw, Iunu</th>
<th>Stela 15: G 4860 (= VIIIff), Vienna, AS 8459</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="vessel" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="vessel" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="vessel" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="vessel" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="vessel" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="vessel" /></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="vessel" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image8" alt="vessel" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="vessel" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="vessel" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="vessel" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="vessel" /></td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="vessel" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="vessel" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image15" alt="vessel" /></td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="vessel" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="vessel" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="vessel" /></td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="vessel" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="vessel" /></td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="vessel" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W 21</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 22</td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image13.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 24</td>
<td><img src="image15.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image16.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image19.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image21.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 62</td>
<td><img src="image22.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image23.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image24.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image25.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image26.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image27.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image28.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 69</td>
<td><img src="image29.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image30.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image31.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image32.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image33.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image34.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image35.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X 1</td>
<td><img src="image36.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image37.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image38.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image39.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image40.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image41.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image42.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X 2</td>
<td><img src="image43.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image44.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image45.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image46.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image47.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image48.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image49.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X 6</td>
<td><img src="image50.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image51.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image52.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image53.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image54.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image55.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image56.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 2</td>
<td><img src="image57.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image58.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image59.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image60.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image61.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image62.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image63.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 8: G 1235, Ini</td>
<td>Cairo, JE 37727 (57127 bis)</td>
<td>Port Said, P 4083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 9: G 2120, Sëntyw</td>
<td>Boston, MFA, 06.1894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 10: G 2135 (= VIInn)</td>
<td>Vienna, ÄS 7799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 12: G 4140, Mrt-š</td>
<td>Boston, MFA, 12.1510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 13: G 4150 (= Is), Šwnw</td>
<td>Hildesheim, 2145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 15: G 4860 (= VIIIn)</td>
<td>Vienna, ÄS 8459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 11: G 2155(?) (= VIIIss)</td>
<td>Kaninisut Vienna, ÄS 7447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 14: G 4840 (= VIIIss)</td>
<td>Wenshet Boston, MFA, 14–2–1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y 3</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 5</td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image22" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image23" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image24" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image25" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image26" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image27" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image28" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 1</td>
<td><img src="image29" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image30" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image31" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image32" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image33" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image34" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image35" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image36" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image37" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image38" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image39" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image40" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image41" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image42" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 8</td>
<td><img src="image43" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image44" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image45" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
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<td><img src="image47" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
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<td><img src="image51" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image52" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image53" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image54" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image55" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image56" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aa 1</td>
<td><img src="image57" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image58" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image59" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image60" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image61" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image62" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image63" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image64" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image65" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image66" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image67" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image68" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image69" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image70" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aa 3</td>
<td><img src="image71" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image72" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image73" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image74" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image75" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image76" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image77" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image78" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image79" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image80" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image81" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image82" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image83" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image84" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aa —</td>
<td><img src="image85" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image86" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image87" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image88" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image89" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image90" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image91" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image92" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image93" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image94" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image95" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image96" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image97" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image98" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aa 14</td>
<td><img src="image99" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image100" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image101" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image102" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image103" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image104" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image105" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image106" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image107" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image108" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image109" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image110" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image111" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image112" alt="Hieroglyph Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image113" alt="image109" /></td>
<td><img src="image114" alt="image110" /></td>
<td><img src="image115" alt="image111" /></td>
<td><img src="image116" alt="image112" /></td>
<td><img src="image117" alt="image113" /></td>
<td><img src="image118" alt="image114" /></td>
<td><img src="image119" alt="image115" /></td>
<td><img src="image120" alt="image116" /></td>
<td><img src="image121" alt="image117" /></td>
<td><img src="image122" alt="image118" /></td>
<td><img src="image123" alt="image119" /></td>
<td><img src="image124" alt="image120" /></td>
<td><img src="image125" alt="image121" /></td>
<td><img src="image126" alt="image122" /></td>
<td><img src="image127" alt="image123" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image128" alt="image110" /></td>
<td><img src="image129" alt="image111" /></td>
<td><img src="image130" alt="image112" /></td>
<td><img src="image131" alt="image113" /></td>
<td><img src="image132" alt="image114" /></td>
<td><img src="image133" alt="image115" /></td>
<td><img src="image134" alt="image116" /></td>
<td><img src="image135" alt="image117" /></td>
<td><img src="image136" alt="image118" /></td>
<td><img src="image137" alt="image119" /></td>
<td><img src="image138" alt="image120" /></td>
<td><img src="image139" alt="image121" /></td>
<td><img src="image140" alt="image122" /></td>
<td><img src="image141" alt="image123" /></td>
<td><img src="image142" alt="image124" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image143" alt="image111" /></td>
<td><img src="image144" alt="image112" /></td>
<td><img src="image145" alt="image113" /></td>
<td><img src="image146" alt="image114" /></td>
<td><img src="image147" alt="image115" /></td>
<td><img src="image148" alt="image116" /></td>
<td><img src="image149" alt="image117" /></td>
<td><img src="image150" alt="image118" /></td>
<td><img src="image151" alt="image119" /></td>
<td><img src="image152" alt="image120" /></td>
<td><img src="image153" alt="image121" /></td>
<td><img src="image154" alt="image122" /></td>
<td><img src="image155" alt="image123" /></td>
<td><img src="image156" alt="image124" /></td>
<td><img src="image157" alt="image125" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image158" alt="image112" /></td>
<td><img src="image159" alt="image113" /></td>
<td><img src="image160" alt="image114" /></td>
<td><img src="image161" alt="image115" /></td>
<td><img src="image162" alt="image116" /></td>
<td><img src="image163" alt="image117" /></td>
<td><img src="image164" alt="image118" /></td>
<td><img src="image165" alt="image119" /></td>
<td><img src="image166" alt="image120" /></td>
<td><img src="image167" alt="image121" /></td>
<td><img src="image168" alt="image122" /></td>
<td><img src="image169" alt="image123" /></td>
<td><img src="image170" alt="image124" /></td>
<td><img src="image171" alt="image125" /></td>
<td><img src="image172" alt="image126" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stela 8: G 1235,</th>
<th>Ini</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cairo, JE 37727 (57127 bis)</td>
<td>Port Said, P 4083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 9: G 2120,</td>
<td>Sțntyw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seshat-sekhentiu</td>
<td>Boston, MFA, 06.1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 10: G 2135 (= VIInn)</td>
<td>Vienna, ÄS 7799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 12: G 4140,</td>
<td>Mrt-țt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meretites</td>
<td>Boston, MFA, 12.1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 13: G 4150 (= Is),</td>
<td>țwnw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iunu</td>
<td>Hildesheim, 2145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 15: G 4860 (= VIIIn)</td>
<td>Vienna, ÄS 8459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 11: G 2155(?) (= VIIInn)</td>
<td>Kaninisut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna, ÄS 7447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 14: G 4840 (= VIIIss)</td>
<td>Wenshet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MFA, 14–2–1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hieroglyphic</th>
<th>Stela</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Berkeley, Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Uncertain
- Stela 7: G 1202, Offerings
- Stela 8: G 1204, Offerings
- Stela 9: G 1206, Offerings

#### Offerings
- Stela 10: G 1201, Offerings
- Stela 11: G 1203, Offerings
- Stela 12: G 1205, Offerings
- Stela 13: G 1207, Offerings
- Stela 14: G 1223, Offerings
- Stela 15: G 1225, Offerings
- Stela 16: G 1227, Offerings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stela 8: G 1235, ∈ Ini</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stela 9: G 2120, Sᵗ-sntenw Seshat-sekhentiu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 10: G 2135 (= VIln) Vienna, ÄS 7799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 11: G 2155(?) (= VIIlln) Kaninisut Vienna, ÄS 7447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 12: G 4140, Mrt-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 13: G 4150 (= IS), ∈ wnw Iunu Hildesheim, 2145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 14: G 4840 (= VIIIss) Wenshet Boston, MFA, 14–2–1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 15: G 4860 (= VIIlln) Vienna, ÄS 8459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offerings</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offerings</td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offerings</td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offerings</td>
<td><img src="image22" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image23" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image24" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image25" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image26" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image27" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image28" alt="Offering Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Hieroglyphic Palaeography

Stela 8: G 1235, \( \text{ Ini } \)
Cairo, JE 37727 (57127 bis)
Port Said, P 4083

Stela 9: G 2120, \( \text{ S\'en-tyiw } \)
Boston, MFA, 06.1894

Stela 10: G 2135 (= VIIInn)
Vienna, ÄS 7799

Stela 12: G 4140, \( \text{ Mrt-\( \text{ t} \) } \)
Boston, MFA, 12.1510

Stela 13: G 4150 (= Is), \( \text{ \( \text{ \( w\) } \) } \)
Hildesheim, 2145

Stela 15: G 4860 (= VIIII)),
Vienna, ÄS 8459

Stela 11: G 2155(?) (= VIIII)),
Kaninisut
Vienna, ÄS 7447

Stela 14: G 4840 (= VIII));
Wenshet
Boston, MFA, 14–2–1
APPENDIX 2: HIEROGlyphic PaLaeoGRAPHY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hieroglyph</th>
<th>Stela 1: G 1201, Wp-m-nfrt Berkeley, 6–19825</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offerings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hieroglyph</th>
<th>Stela 2: G 1203, K£-nfr Berkeley, 6–19807</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offerings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hieroglyph</th>
<th>Stela 3: G 1205, Ówfw-nḫt Khufu-nakht Berkeley, 6–19786</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offerings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hieroglyph</th>
<th>Stela 4: G 1207, Nfr Nefer Berkeley, 6–19801</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offerings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hieroglyph</th>
<th>Stela 5: G 1223, K£-m-™¢ Kaiemah Cairo, JE 37725 (57128)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offerings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hieroglyph</th>
<th>Stela 6: G 1225, Nfrt-¡£bt Nefret-iabet Paris, Louvre, E 15591</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offerings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hieroglyph</th>
<th>Stela 7: G 1227, S†¡-¢knt Setji-hekenet, Cairo, JE 37726(57127), Port Said, P 4082</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offerings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Offerings

(2) Offerings

(3) Offerings

(4) Offerings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stela 8: G 1235, Ini</th>
<th>Cairo, JE 37727 (57127 bis) Port Said, P 4083</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stela 9: G 2120, S�t-stytw Seshat-sekhentiu</td>
<td>Boston, MFA, 06.1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 10: G 2135 (= VIInn)</td>
<td>Vienna, ÄS 7799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 12: G 4140, Mrt-�t s Meretites</td>
<td>Boston, MFA 12.1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 13: G 4150 (= IS), �wnw Iunu</td>
<td>Hildesheim, 2145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 15: G 4860 (= VIIIn)</td>
<td>Vienna, ÄS 8459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 11: G 2155(?) (= VIIInn)</td>
<td>Kaninisut Vienna, ÄS 7447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stela 14: G 4840 (= VIIIss)</td>
<td>Wenshet Boston, MFA, 14–2–1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
uneker discussed the linen list in connection with his discovery of the slab stela of Iunu (g415; Junker, Gîza 1, pp. 177–78), but the most extensive attempts to interpret the linen list remain those of W.S. Smith in 1935 ("The Old Kingdom Linen List," ZÄS 71 [1935], pp. 134–49) and E. Edel in 1975 ("Beiträge zum ägyptischen Lexikon VI," ZÄS 102 [1975], pp. 13–30). See also the discussions by P. Posener-Kriéger, Les Archives du temple funéraire de Néferirkâ-Kakai 2, BdE 65/2 (Cairo, 1976), p. 341ff., with references to G. Jéquier, Frises d’objets des sarcophages du Moyen Empire (Cairo, 1921). For a recent compilation of archaic examples of the mn∞t sign, see J. Kahl, Das System der ägyptischen Hieroglyphenschrift in der 0.–3. Dynastie (Wiesbaden, 1994), p. 710ff.

Smith’s list of all monuments known to him which bore linen lists has been augmented below, with updated references and additional examples. The stelae and related monuments are presented in roughly chronological order.
APPENDIX 3 SELECTED LINEN LISTS

Fig. 267. Helwan stela of Khu-itef. Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pp. 15–17, pl. 9. Archaic Period.

Fig. 268. Helwan stela of Heken. Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pp. 17–19, pl. 10. Archaic Period.


Fig. 269. Helwan stela of Ka-khet. Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pp. 20–22, pl. 12. Archaic Period.

Fig. 271. Helwan stela of Shepses-kau. Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pp. 26–28, pl. 15. Archaic Period.

Fig. 272. Helwan stela of Irri. Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pp. 31–33, pl. 18. Archaic Period.
APPENDIX 3: SELECTED LINEN LISTS

Fig. 273. Helwan stela of Bilt. Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pp. 39–40, pl. 20. Archaic Period.

Fig. 274. Helwan stela of Wolhem-nun. Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pp. 35–37, pl. 21. Archaic Period.

Fig. 275. Helwan stela of Nisu-hedjet. Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pp. 38–39, pl. 22. Archaic Period.

Fig. 276. Helwan stela of Bu-sandjet. Saad, Ceiling Stelae, pp. 38–41, pl. 23. Archaic Period.

Fig. 277. Tablet of Sesi from Saqqara tomb 288-E. Apparently built into a mud-brick false-door; Egyptian Museum, Cairo. Quibell, Archaic Mastabas. (Cairo, 1923), p. 11 pl. 16–20; Smith, HESPOK, pl. 36 Archaic Period.

Fig. 278. Tablet of Sekhenefer from Saqqara tomb 2115 E. Egyptian Museum, Cairo. Quibell, Archaic Mastabas. (Cairo, 1923), p. 11 pl. 16–20; Smith, HESPOK, pl. 36 Archaic Period.

Fig. 279. Tablet of Sekhenefer from Saqqara tomb 2115 E. Egyptian Museum, Cairo. Quibell, Archaic Mastabas. (Cairo, 1923), p. 11 pl. 16–20; Smith, HESPOK, pl. 36 Archaic Period.
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Appendix 3: Selected Linen Lists


Fig. 286. Tablet fragment, Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 46436 = SR 15351; mentioned by Junker, Gîza 1, p. 177, gift of Aly Baghat, July 24, 1919. Archaic Period–Dynasty 3.

Fig. 287. Double stela of Nytwa and Nytneb, Saqqara; Musée du Louvre, Paris E 27157. A. Moret, Revue Egyptologique (Jan., 1919), pp. 1-5, pl. 2; C. Ziegler, Stèles, peintures et reliefs égyptiens de l'Ancien Empire (Paris, 1990), cat. 23, pp. 157-60. Dynasty 2-3.

Fig. 288. Tablet of Itisen/Ir (?)-en-sen: Cairo, CG 1391; Borchardt, Denkmäler des Alten Reiches 1 (CG), p. 52. Archaic Period–Dynasty 3.

Fig. 289. Tablet of Niankhtet/Tetenankh; Liverpool Museum, Weill, IIe et IIIe Dynasties, p. 226; Vandier, Manuel 1, p. 754, fig. 498. Archaic Period–Dynasty 3 (see also above, Chapter 4, fig. 215).
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Fig. 290. Tablet of Wep-ka(?) set over a stela drum in the mud-brick false door of a small Saqqara mastaba (not found in situ); Quibell, Archaic Mastabas, p. 10, pl. 28.1. Archaic Period–Dynasty 3.


Fig. 292. Stone-lined niche of Kha-bau-sokar; Egyptian Museum, Cairo, CG 1385. Murray, Saqqara Mastabas, pl. 2; L. Borchardt, Denkmäler des Alten Reiches 1, CG (Berlin, 1937), pp. 44–47, pl. XI; Smith, HESPOK, p. 38a (detail); Kahl, Kloth, and Zimmermann, Die Inschriften der 3. Dynastie, pp. 189–93. Dynasty 3.

Fig. 293. Stone-lined niche of Hathor-nefer-kefis, wife of Kha-bau-sokar; Egyptian Museum, Cairo, CG 1386–87. Murray, Saqqara Mastabas, pl. 2; Borchardt, Denkmäler des Alten Reiches 1, pp. 45, pl. 31; Kahl, Kloth, and Zimmermann, Die Inschriften der 3. Dynastie, pp. 184–97. Dynasty 3.

Fig. 294. Ivory tablet from Step Pyramid of Sekhemkhet at Saqqara; Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 92679. Z. Goneim, Horus Sekhem-Khet (Cairo, 1957), pl. 65b; W. Helck, “Das Kleidertäfelchen aus der Pyramid des Sekhem-Khet,” WZKM 54 (1957), p. 76; Kahl, Kloth, and Zimmermann, Die Inschriften der 3. Dynastie, p. 234. Dynasty 3, reign of Sekhemkhet.
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Fig. 295. False door tablet of Metjen from Saqqara cruciform chapel. Lepsius, Denkmaeler II, pl. 3, Dynasty 4, reign of Snefru.

Fig. 296. False door tablet of Nefermaat at Meidum, cut in the hollow niche blocking of the entrance to the stone-lined niche when the chapel was reconstructed with a mud-brick addition. Egyptian Museum, Cairo. Petrie, Medum, pl. 16; Y. Harpur, The Tombs of Nefermaat and Rahotep at Maidum (Oxford, 2001), p. 68, fig. 78; Y. Harpur, The Tombs of Nefermaat and Rahotep at Maidum, p. 109, fig. 43; M. Jørgensen, Catalogue. Egypt I (3000–1550 B.C.), Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek (Copenhagen, 1996), cat. 11, pp. 48–49, and two additional fragments, NY 896b–c, pp. 50–51. Probably Dynasty 4.

Fig. 297. False door tablet of Rahotep from Meidum stone-lined cruciform chapel. British Museum, 1242. Petrie, Medum, pl. 37; Budge, Egyptian Sculptures in the British Museum, pl. 38; James, Cairo 1, 2nd ed. (London, 1963), p. 1, pl. 11; H.S. Baker, Egyptian Furniture in the Ancient World (New York, 1966), p. 16; fig. 30. Harpur, The Tombs of Nefermaat and Rahotep, p. 116, fig. 98; pl. 73, Dynasty 4.

Fig. 298. False door tablet of Rahotep from Meidum stone-lined cruciform chapel. British Museum, 1242. Petrie, Medum, pl. 37; Budge, Egyptian Sculptures in the British Museum, pl. 38; James, Cairo 1, 2nd ed. (London, 1963), p. 1, pl. 11; H.S. Baker, Egyptian Furniture in the Ancient World (New York, 1966), p. 16; fig. 30. Harpur, The Tombs of Nefermaat and Rahotep, p. 116, fig. 98; pl. 73, Dynasty 4.

Fig. 299. False door tablet of Rahotep from Meidum stone-lined cruciform chapel; British Museum, 1242. Petrie, Medum, pl. 37; Budge, Egyptian Sculptures in the British Museum, pl. 38; James, Cairo 1, 2nd ed. (London, 1963), p. 1, pl. 11; H.S. Baker, Egyptian Furniture in the Ancient World (New York, 1966), p. 16; fig. 30. Harpur, The Tombs of Nefermaat and Rahotep, p. 116, fig. 98; pl. 73, Dynasty 4.

Fig. 300. Tablet of Igy, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen, ASI 3855a, probably from Saqqara. M. Mogenson, La Glyptothèque Ny Carlsberg (Copenhagen, 1996), cat. 11, pp. 49–50, and two additional fragments, ASI 3855b–c, pp. 49–50, probably Dynasty 4.
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SELECTED LINEN LISTS


—. Wepemnefret, g 1201; see the present study, stela 1.
—. Kanefer, g 1203; see the present study, stela 2.
—. Khufunakht, g 1205; see the present study, stela 3.
—. Reifer, g 1207; see the present study, stela 4.
—. Kalenah, g 1209; see the present study, stela 5.
—. Nibef-tabet, g 1210; see the present study, stela 6.
—. Saija-haket, g 1211; see the present study, stela 7.
—. Ini, g 1212; see the present study, stela 8.
—. SennStartTime, g 1213; see the present study, stela 9.
—. g 1214; see the present study, stela 10.
—. Sekenmut, g 1215; see the present study, stela 11.
—. Meretites, g 1217; see the present study, stela 12.
—. Ini, g 1218; see the present study, stela 13.

Fig. 302. Giza false door tablet from g 4260 = IIn. Junker, "Gîza 1," p. 186, fig. 36 (missing left-hand extension) and pl. 29a. Dynasty 4.


Fig. 306 (see below).
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Fig. 307. False door tablet of Seneb, from the Giza tomb of Seneb. Junker, Gîza 5, p. 98, fig. 27. Dynasty 4–5.

Fig. 308 (see below).


Fig. 309 (see below).
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Fig. 310. East wall of Giza chapel of Seshem-nefer I, g 4940 = LG 45. Lepsius, Denkmäler 2, pl. 28; HU–MFA Expedition photographs, March 16, 1931, Mohammedani Ibrahim, a 6386, a 6390; N. Kanawati, Tombs at Giza 1 (Warminster, 2001), pl. 43. Dynasty 5.

Fig. 311. East wall of Giza chapel of Seshem-nefer I, g 4940 = LG 45. Lepsius, Denkmäler 2, pl. 28; HU–MFA Expedition line drawing, eg 4215. Dynasty 5.

Fig. 312. East wall of Giza chapel of Seshem-nefer I, g 4940 = LG 45. Lepsius, Denkmäler 2, pl. 28. HU–MFA Expedition photographs, March 16, 1931. Dynasty 5.

Fig. 313. West wall of burial chamber of Giza tomb of Kaiemankh. Junker, Vorbericht, 1926, pl. 6; idem, Gîza 4, pl. 9. N. Kanawati, Tombs at Giza 1 (Warminster, 2001), pls. 15a, 36. Dynasty 6.

Fig. 314. Archaizing "slab stela" of Setju from g 2352 shaft; MFA 13.4341. Chapter 5, fig. 256; W.K. Simpson, Mastabas of the Western Cemetery, Giza Mastabas 4 (Boston, 2000), pl. 62 and fig. 47; R.J. Lapidge, CAA Boston 2 (Wiesbaden, 1985), pp. 93–96. Piacentini, Les Scribes dans la société égyptienne de l'Ancien Empire, pls. 105, 106. Dynasty 6.
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The number in parentheses refers to the number of times the word occurs in the data in question.

\[ \text{\texttt{Iunu},} \text{\texttt{Setji}\texttt{-hakmakat} g 1227 (3)} \]
\[ \text{\texttt{Setji},} \text{\texttt{Setji-hakmakat} g 1227 (3)} \]

The number in parentheses refers to the number of times the word occurs in the data in question.

\[ \text{\texttt{Iunu},} \text{\texttt{Setji}\texttt{-hakmakat} g 1227 (3)} \]
\[ \text{\texttt{Setji},} \text{\texttt{Setji-hakmakat} g 1227 (3)} \]
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\[ \text{\texttt{Setji},} \text{\texttt{Setji-hakmakat} g 1227 (3)} \]

The number in parentheses refers to the number of times the word occurs in the data in question.

\[ \text{\texttt{Iunu},} \text{\texttt{Setji}\texttt{-hakmakat} g 1227 (3)} \]
\[ \text{\texttt{Setji},} \text{\texttt{Setji-hakmakat} g 1227 (3)} \]

The number in parentheses refers to the number of times the word occurs in the data in question.

\[ \text{\texttt{Iunu},} \text{\texttt{Setji}\texttt{-hakmakat} g 1227 (3)} \]
\[ \text{\texttt{Setji},} \text{\texttt{Setji-hakmakat} g 1227 (3)} \]

The number in parentheses refers to the number of times the word occurs in the data in question.

\[ \text{\texttt{Iunu},} \text{\texttt{Setji}\texttt{-hakmakat} g 1227 (3)} \]
\[ \text{\texttt{Setji},} \text{\texttt{Setji-hakmakat} g 1227 (3)} \]

The number in parentheses refers to the number of times the word occurs in the data in question.

\[ \text{\texttt{Iunu},} \text{\texttt{Setji}\texttt{-hakmakat} g 1227 (3)} \]
\[ \text{\texttt{Setji},} \text{\texttt{Setji-hakmakat} g 1227 (3)} \]

The number in parentheses refers to the number of times the word occurs in the data in question.

\[ \text{\texttt{Iunu},} \text{\texttt{Setji}\texttt{-hakmakat} g 1227 (3)} \]
\[ \text{\texttt{Setji},} \text{\texttt{Setji-hakmakat} g 1227 (3)} \]

The number in parentheses refers to the number of times the word occurs in the data in question.

\[ \text{\texttt{Iunu},} \text{\texttt{Setji}\texttt{-hakmakat} g 1227 (3)} \]
\[ \text{\texttt{Setji},} \text{\texttt{Setji-hakmakat} g 1227 (3)} \]
INDEXES

in-Mnw, "Lower Egyptian barley," Setji-hekenet g 1227 (3); Seshat-sekhentiu g 230 (3); Ini g 410 (1); g 4860 (1)

ir-Sw, "Upper Egyptian barley," Setji-hekenet g 1227 (3); Manetstas g 440 (0); Ini g 430 (2); g 4860 (1)
lbny, type of linen, Wepemnefret g 1201 (3); Kanefer g 1203 (4); Khufu-nakht g 1205 (1); Nefert-labat g 1225 (3); Setji-hekenet g 1227 (4); Ini g 232 (4); g 2136 (4); Manetstas g 440 (6); Ini u g 450 (8); g 4860 (1)

lbwy, "lower Egyptian," Setji-hekenet g 1227 (3); Manetstas g 440 (0); Ini g 430 (2); g 4860 (1)

rub, "paste lands(?)" Ini g 1235 (1)

¡£¡™, "leopard skin," Kaninisut(?) g 4150 (1); g 4860 (1)

¡£tt, Upper Egyptian barley," Setji-hekenet g 1227 (3); Meretites g 4150 (1); g 4860 (1)

¡dmy, type of linen, Wepemnefret g 1201 (3); Ini g 1235 (1)

££tt, "souls," Wepemnefret g 1201 (1)

£tt, "dates," Meretites g 4140 (1); g 4860 (1)

bnrt, "malt," Setji-hekenet g 1227 (1); Meretites g 1201 (1); g 4860 (1)

msdmt, "black eye-paint," Wepemnefret g 1201 (1); Ini g 1235 (1)

bd, "natron," Khufu-nakht g 1205 (1); Nefer nakht g 1207 (1); Nefer g 1207 (1); Nefret-iabet g 1225 (1); Setji-hekenet g 1227 (3); Ini g 2135 (1); Meretites g 4140 (1); g 4860 (1)

pr-m∂£(w)t, "breakfast," Meretites g 4680 (1)

prw, "drink," Seshat-sekhentiu g 2120 (1); Meretites g 4140 (1); g 4860 (1)

nb, "antelopes," Wepemnefret g 1201 (1); Gnefer g 1207 (1); Nefret-iabet g 1225 (1); Setji-hekenet g 1227 (3); Ini g 2120 (1); Kaninisut(?) g 2155 (1)

nb, "green," Wepemnefret g 1201 (1); Ini g 1235 (2); g 4860 (1)

wpwt, "green eye-paint," Wepemnefret g 1201 (1); Khufu-nakht g 1205 (1); Khufu-nakht g 1205 (1); Ini g 1235 (1)

pzn, "pezen-bread," Meretites g 4860 (1)

nbs, "zizyphus," Wepemnefret g 1201 (1); Ini g 1235 (1); g 4860 (1)

nht, "Neith," Wenshet g 4840 (1)

nmst, "Nemset-vessel," Kaninisut(?) g 2155 (1)

nfr, "good," Kaninisut(?) g 2155 (1)

nfr, "gold," Kaninisut(?) g 2155 (1)

nfr, "gold," Wepemnefret g 4860 (1)

mmy, "bellowed," Wenshet g 4840 (1)

mwl, "patuato land(?)" Ini g 1235 (1)

mwl, "with lwn, "bait(?)" cereal," Wepemnefret g 1201 (3); Khufu-nakht g 1205 (1); Nefert-labat g 1225 (1); Setji-hekenet g 1227 (3); Ini g 2120 (1) "two jars of best ointment(?)"; Seshat-sekhentiu g 230 (3); g 2136 (4); Manetstas g 440 (6); Ini u g 450 (8); g 4860 (1)

mjl, "Mehyt," Wepemnefret g 1201 (1)

mblt, "northward," Wepemnefret g 1201 (1)

mbt, "black eye-paint," Wepemnefret g 1201 (3); Khufu-nakht g 1205 (1); Nefert-labat g 1225 (3); Setji-hekenet g 1227 (3); Ini g 2136 (4); Seshat-sekhentiu g 230 (3); g 2136 (4); Manetstas g 440 (6); g 4860 (1)

mfl, "book," g 4860 (1)

pm, "commander," Wepemnefret g 1201 (2)

x, indirect genitive, Manetstas g 440 (1); Wenshet g 4860 (1)

x, indirect genitive, Manetstas g 1201 (3); Khufu-nakht g 1205 (1); Khufu-nakht g 1205 (1); Nefert-labat g 1225 (1); Ini g 2135 (1); Ini u g 450 (1)

x, "lovey," Wepemnefret g 1201 (3); Seshat-sekhentiu g 230 (1); g 2136 (4); Manetstas g 440 (6); g 4860 (1)

x, "mistress, lady," Wenshet g 4840 (1)

x, "peal-cake," Manetstas g 440 (3)

x, "good," Kaninisut(?) g 2155 (1)

x, "fay," Wenshet g 4840 (1)

x, "fay," Wenshet g 4840 (1)

x, "fay-handled white quartzite vassel," Seshat-sekhentiu g 230 (3); g 2136 (4); Manetstas g 440 (6); g 4860 (1)

x, "Shawabes," Wepemnefret g 1201 (3); Khufu-nakht g 1205 (1); Ini g 1235 (1); Ini u g 450 (1)

x, " conformity," Wepemnefret g 1201 (1); Khufu-nakht g 1205 (1); Khufu-nakht g 1205 (1); Nefert-labat g 1225 (1); Ini g 2135 (1); Ini u g 450 (1)

x, "great," Seshat-sekhentiu g 230 (3); g 2136 (4); Manetstas g 440 (6); g 4860 (1)

x, "great," Seshat-sekhentiu g 230 (3); g 2136 (4); Manetstas g 440 (6); g 4860 (1)

x, "headrest," Seshat-sekhentiu g 230 (3); Kaninisut(?) g 2155 (1)

x, "cooking pot," Kaninisut(?) g 2155 (1)
INDEXES

a, "goose," Nefret-iabet g 220 (3); Nefret-iabet g 220 (3); Kanefer g 203 (3); Khufu-nakht g 205 (4); Nefret-iabe...
INDEXES

\[ \text{Sinw} \text{, "Upper Egypt," Wepemnefret } \text{g } 2001 \text{ (2); Kaiemah } \text{g } 1223 (2); \text{ Iunu } \text{g } 430 \text{ (2) } \]

\[ \text{Sinw-nfr, "fine linen," Wepemnefret } \text{g } 2001 \text{ (2); Kanefr } \text{g } 1207 \text{ (3); Khufu-nakht } \text{g } 1205 \text{ (3); Nefer } \text{g } 3007 \text{ (2); Kaiemah } \text{g } 1223 \text{ (3); Iunu } \text{g } 1286 \text{ (3); Sahat-skhentiu } \text{g } 2203 \text{ (3); g } 2206 \text{ (1); Manetatt } \text{g } 4340 \text{ (3); g } 4860 \text{ (3) } \]

\[ \text{Snt, "granary," Manetatt } \text{g } 4340 \text{ (3) } \]

\[ \text{st, "calcite (alabaster) vessel(s)," Wepemnefret } \text{g } 3001 \text{ (3); Kanefr } \text{g } 1207 \text{ (3); Khufu-nakht } \text{g } 1205 \text{ (1); Nefer } \text{g } 3007 \text{ (2); Kaiemah } \text{g } 1223 \text{ (3); Iunu } \text{g } 1286 \text{ (3); Sahat-skhentiu } \text{g } 2203 \text{ (3); Kanemani } \text{g } 2206 \text{ (3); Manetatt } \text{g } 4340 \text{ (3); Iunu } \text{g } 430 \text{ (1); g } 4860 \text{ (3) } \]

\[ \text{st-f, type of linen, see } \text{tb } \]

\[ \text{sb, } \text{g } 1200 \text{; Wepemnefret } \text{g } 3001 \text{ (1); Kanefr } \text{g } 1207 \text{ (3); Khufu-nakht } \text{g } 1205 \text{ (4); Nefer } \text{g } 3007 \text{ (4); Kaiemah } \text{g } 1223 \text{ (4); Nefer-liset } \text{g } 1225 \text{ (1); Sethi-hekenet } \text{g } 1227 \text{ (4); Iunu } \text{g } 1286 \text{ (5); Kanemani } \text{g } 2206 \text{ (2); Manetatt } \text{g } 4340 \text{ (4); Iunu } \text{g } 430 \text{ (2); g } 4860 \text{ (3) } \]

\[ \text{sr, "lug-handled vessel of ka-stone," Kanemani } \text{g } 2206 \text{ (1) } \]

\[ \text{gw, "half-loaf," g } 4860 \text{ (1); t, "bread," Wepemnefret } \text{g } 3001 \text{ (1); Kanefr } \text{g } 1207 \text{ (3); Nefer-liset } \text{g } 1225 \text{ (1); Sethi-hekenet } \text{g } 1227 \text{ (1); Iunu } \text{g } 1286 \text{ (1); Sahat-skhentiu } \text{g } 2203 \text{ (1); Kanemani } \text{g } 2206 \text{ (1); Manetatt } \text{g } 4340 \text{ (1); Iunu } \text{g } 430 \text{ (1); g } 4860 \text{ (1) } \]

\[ \text{sr-sr, "50," Kanefer } \text{g } 1207 \text{ (1); } \text{g } 1203 \text{ (1); } \text{g } 1201 \text{ (1); } \text{g } 1225 \text{ (1); Manetatt } \text{g } 4340 \text{ (3); g } 4860 \text{ (1) } \]

\[ \text{dbt, "fig(s)," Wepemnefret } \text{g } 1203 \text{ (1); Kaiemah } \text{g } 1225 \text{ (1); Setji-hekenet } \text{g } 1235 \text{ (1); Setji-hekenet } \text{g } 1225 \text{ (3); Ini } \text{g } 1225 \text{ (3); Meretites } \text{g } 4860 \text{ (1); Nefer } \text{g } 1207 \text{ (1); Siknisut }(?\text{)} \text{g } 4140 \text{ (1); Meretites } \text{g } 4860 \text{ (1)} } \]

\[ \text{ßnwt, "granary," Meretites } \text{g } 4140 \text{ (1); Iunu } \text{g } 1286 \text{ (1); Kanemani } \text{g } 2206 \text{ (1); Manetatt } \text{g } 4340 \text{ (1); Iunu } \text{g } 430 \text{ (1); } \text{g } 4860 \text{ (1) } \]

\[ \text{ßsr, type of linen, see } \text{tb } \]

\[ \text{ßt, "container of cool water," Kanefer } \text{g } 1207 \text{ (1); Khufu-nakht } \text{g } 1205 \text{ (1); Nefer-liset } \text{g } 1225 \text{ (1); Sahat-skhentiu } \text{g } 2203 \text{ (1); Manetatt } \text{g } 4340 \text{ (3); g } 4860 \text{ (1) } \]

\[ \text{ßt-nbs, "loaf of zizyphus," Wepemnefret } \text{g } 1201 \text{ (1); Iunu } \text{g } 1286 \text{ (1); Manetatt } \text{g } 4340 \text{ (1); Iunu } \text{g } 430 \text{ (1); } \text{g } 4860 \text{ (1) } \]

\[ \text{ßt-n¢rw, "lug-handled porphyry vessel," Seshat-sekhentiu } \text{g } 1201 \text{ (1); Iunu } \text{g } 1286 \text{ (1); Manetatt } \text{g } 4340 \text{ (1); Iunu } \text{g } 430 \text{ (1); } \text{g } 4860 \text{ (1) } \]

\[ \text{ßt-n¢, "ba-nebu-bread," Sahat-skhentiu } \text{g } 2201 \text{ (1); g } 4860 \text{ (1); } \text{g } 4860 \text{ (1); } \text{g } 4860 \text{ (1); } \text{g } 4860 \text{ (1) } \]

\[ \text{l-sr, "tablet bread," Sahat-skhentiu } \text{g } 2201 \text{ (1); g } 4860 \text{ (1); } \text{g } 4860 \text{ (1); } \text{g } 4860 \text{ (1); } \text{g } 4860 \text{ (1); } \text{g } 4860 \text{ (1) } \]

\[ \text{msw, "lug-handled porphyry vessel," Sahat-skhentiu } \text{g } 2201 \text{ (1); Kanemani } \text{g } 2206 \text{ (1); Manetatt } \text{g } 4340 \text{ (1); Iunu } \text{g } 430 \text{ (1); } \text{g } 4860 \text{ (1) } \]

\[ \text{msw, "lug-handled vessel of ka-stone," Kanemani } \text{g } 2206 \text{ (1); Manetatt } \text{g } 4340 \text{ (1); Iunu } \text{g } 430 \text{ (1); } \text{g } 4860 \text{ (1) } \]

\[ \text{msn, "tablet," Khufu-nakht } \text{g } 1205 \text{ (2); Nefer } \text{g } 3007 \text{ (2); Manetatt } \text{g } 4340 \text{ (1); Iunu } \text{g } 430 \text{ (1); } \text{g } 4860 \text{ (1) } \]

\[ \text{msw, "tablet," Sahat-skhentiu } \text{g } 2201 \text{ (1); Manetatt } \text{g } 4340 \text{ (1); Iunu } \text{g } 430 \text{ (1); } \text{g } 4860 \text{ (1) } \]

Uncertain Readings

\[ \sum_{k=1}^{n} \text{ archaic title, Wepemnefret } \text{g } 1201 \text{ (1) } \]
## Concordance of Objects by Museum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Objects</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley, Phoebe A. Hearst Museum of Anthropology</td>
<td>6–1975, reserve head from g 1225, Nefert-tabet; p. 62, figs. 71-72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>243, slab stela from g 1227, Setji-hekenet; see stela 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2972, false door from g 4840, Wadih; p. 307, figs. 362-63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung</td>
<td>1105 (with blocks numbered separately), false door tablet of Metjen from Saqqara; p. 233, fig. 295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>False door tablet from g 2100–I, Merib; p. 111, fig. 169; p. 235, figs. 30-309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.1470, falcon statue of Amenhotep III from Soleb; p. 102, fig. 152; p. 111, fig. 170; p. 155, fig. 228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.873, reproduction canopy poles from g 7000x, Hetepheres; p. 157, figs. 236-37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.874, reproduction canopy poles from g 7000x, Hetepheres; p. 157, figs. 236-37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38–2–5, block with hieratic graffiti from g 2003, Kanefer; p. 45, figs. 32-33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5887, reproduction canopic poles from g 7000 x, Hetepheres; p. 157, figs. 236-37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Museum of Fine Arts</td>
<td>129–440, New Kingdom mirror and handle; p. 155, figs. 229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36–1472.1, offering stand from g 2120, Sinawahan; p. 153, fig. 222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38–2–5, block with hieratic graffiti from g 2003, Kanefer; p. 45, figs. 32-33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.873, reproduction canopic poles from g 7000 x, Hetepheres; p. 157, figs. 236-37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek</td>
<td>8798a, tablet of Isy, p. 233, fig. 300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Museum</td>
<td>424, false door tablet of Rahotep from Meidum; p. 233, fig. 299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich, Staatliche Sammlung/Aegyptischer Kunst</td>
<td>AS 7165, uninscribed seated female statue; p. 62, fig. 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, Musée du Louvre</td>
<td>B 49, false door tablet of Mary; p. 234, fig. 301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome, Museo Bargello</td>
<td>CMB 1, false door tablet from g 230, Nefar; p. 234, fig. 303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turin, Soprintendenza al Museo delle Antichità Egitte</td>
<td>2825, Middle Kingdom model granary from Gebelion; p. 239, fig. 240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEXES

Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Ägyptisch-Orientalische Sammlung
ÄS 7447, slab stela from g 2288 (= VIIInn), Kaninisut; see stela 11
ÄS 7799, slab stela from g 2135 (= VIIInn = g 4770); see stela 10
ÄS 8006, mastaba chapel from g 2286, Kaninisut; p. 91
ÄS 8599, slab stela from g 4860 (= VIIInn); see stela 15
As the Great Pyramid of Khufu began to rise over the Giza plateau in the Fourth Dynasty (about 2585–2560 BCE), a vast cemetery dedicated to high officials and royal family members gradually surrounded the king’s royal funerary complex. Despite this impressive display of resources, the earliest Giza mastaba tombs enigmatically bear only minimal decoration: a rectangular “slab stela” set into the exterior east wall. The fifteen surviving stelae provide one of the most important sources for the study of early Old Kingdom art, religion, and history. This publication presents a fresh interpretation of the Giza stelae, with new color photography, “digital epigraphy” facsimile line drawings, new translations, original discovery photographs, and recent color images taken at the site. Appendices include both color and line drawing palaeographies of all hieroglyphs appearing on the stelae.
Slab Stelae of the Giza Necropolis

Fifteen "slab stelae" and stela fragments were found set into the exterior walls of Giza mastaba tombs in the reign of Khufu and his successors. Taken as a group, they provide one of the most important sources of Egyptian artistic and historical documents of the early Old Kingdom; several stelae even preserve remarkable amounts of color after nearly 5,000 years. This publication presents a fresh interpretation of the Giza stelae, with new color photography, "digital epigraphy" facsimile line drawings, new translations, original discovery photographs, and recent color images taken at Giza. In a departure from traditional scholarly works, the book is published in full color, with numerous charts and catalogues, information on all Giza tombs with slab stelae emplacements, the history of their excavation, previous scholarly research, and comparative and interpretive chapters. Appendices include both color and line-drawing palaeographies of all hieroglyphs appearing on the stelae, and a collection of the enigmatic "linen lists" that adorn the Giza stelae and many other Archaic and Old Kingdom monuments. Indexes complete the volume.
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