

CHAPTER 2: ARCHITECTURE AND DECORATION

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

At both Saqqara and Giza this trend towards elaboration also materializes in family complexes. At Saqqara the Ptahhetep Complex comprises a series of family tombs erected around a large open court.⁷ The same is true of the Senedjemib Complex and, to a lesser degree, of the complex of Seshemnofer IV at Giza.⁸ The individual unit on which the two Giza complexes was based is the east–west offering room.⁹ In the case of both Senedjemib Inti and Seshemnofer IV, a pillared hall and other subsidiary rooms were added to this nucleus. The tomb of Inti's older contemporary, the vizier Ptahhetep I in the Ptahhetep Complex at Saqqara, is also a multi-roomed chapel based upon an east–west offering room, as is the chapel of the latter's son Akhethetep.¹⁰

The open courts of the Senedjemib and Seshemnofer complexes both preserve evidence of cult practices in the form of service equip-

ment. At the center of the court of Seshemnofer is a great, rectangular, double-ledge tank or basin of fine Tura limestone set into the pavement with plaster and measuring 2.00 x 1.20 m.¹¹ Similarly, near the center of the great stone-paved court in front of the mastaba of Senedjemib Inti was a large stone basin, measuring 85 x 53 cm, sunk into the pavement (figs. 2, 3).¹² What appears to be a second, smaller basin is visible just in front of the left-hand column base of the portico of G 2370 in Reisner's detailed plan of the Senedjemib Complex (fig. 3), but this is not otherwise referred to in the records of the Harvard–Boston Expedition. Given its location, it is possible that it belonged to the tomb of Nekhebu, whose portico opened nearby.¹³

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

West of the large basin in the center of the stone-paved court of the Senedjemib Complex, and halfway between it and the east face of G 2370, a staple stone with perforated top for tethering sacrificial animals was fixed in the pavement (pl. 10b).¹⁷ Staple stones are rarely in evidence in Old Kingdom tombs. One such stone is embedded in the floor between two pillars in the cult hall of Mereruka's mastaba close to the niche containing the statue of the vizier and the offering stone at its foot, even though Duell expressed doubt as to whether actual sacrifices took place in the mastaba itself.¹⁸ A fragment of what may have been another staple stone was found in the entrance corridor of the mastaba of Ptahhetep I, though not *in situ*.¹⁹ Alongside an I-shaped staple stone in the rock-cut chapel of Pepyankh the Middle at Meir is located what appears to be a circular basin for catching the blood of the victim.²⁰

Some six uninscribed obelisks lined the path leading to the portico of the Seshemnofer complex, and Junker was of the opinion that one pair of obelisks was to be assigned to each of the three proprietors of tombs in the complex, namely, Seshemnofer IV and his sons Tjeti and Ptahhetep.²¹ Obelisks such as these served as a symbol of resur-

¹ See, e.g., *GN I*, p. 260ff.; Baer, *Rank and Title*, p. 49; Strudwick, *Administration*, p. 30.

² *PM 3²*, pp. 265–69, plan XXXIII.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 340–42; Verner, *Ptahshepses 1*.

⁴ *PM 3²*, pp. 468–77.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 617–19 (Ihy, usurped by Idout), 623–24 (Khenut), 624–25 (Nebt), 627–29 (Nebkauhor), 629–30 (Ni-ankh-ba). The tombs of queens Khenut and Nebet have recently been published by Munro, *Unas-Friedhof 1*.

⁶ *PM 3²*, pp. 508–511 (Khentika), 511–12 (Neferseshemre Sheshi), 512–15 (Ankhmahor), 521–25 (Kagemni), 525–37 (Mereruka).

⁷ *PM 3²*, pp. 596–608. For a general plan of the complex, see Hassan, *Saqqara 3*, fig. 12.

⁸ *PM 3²*, pp. 223–28. In the case of the Seshemnofer Complex, the two mastabas of Seshemnofer and his eldest son, Tjeti, shared a central suite of rooms that included a columned portico, vestibule, open court, and pillared hall, whereas the chapels of Seshemnofer's wife and two other sons were built outside but adjacent to the central complex. For a detailed plan, see Junker, *Giza II*, fig. 49. The great complex of tombs of Shepseskaf-ankh, Iymery, Neferbaupthah, and Inti, Giza mastabas G 6010–40, certainly qualifies as a “family complex.” It is not organized around a central court, however, and for this reason and a variety of others has been excluded from the present discussion. The mastabas of the complex have recently been made available in a volume by Kent R. Weeks, *Mastabas of Cemetery G 6000*, Giza Mastabas 5 (Boston, 1994).

⁹ *HESP*, p. 200.

¹⁰ *PM 3²*, pp. 596–97, 599–600. Like the chapels of Seshemnofer IV and Tjeti, the chapel of Ptahhetep's son Akhethetep is actually of Reisner's Type (7 e) and consists of an east–west offering room opening directly from the west side of a north–south anteroom without door jambs; see *GN I*, pp. 261, 271. For the dates of Ptahhetep I and Akhethetep, see Strudwick, *Administration*, pp. 55 [2], 87 [49], 301; Harpur, *Decoration*, pp. 273, 274. Reisner's classification of chapel types is elucidated in *GN I*, pp. xxv–xxix, 184–304.

¹¹ Junker, *Giza II*, p. 106, figs. 49–50, pl. 12c, 13a.

¹² Reisner, “Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon,” p. 130.

¹³ For the tomb of Nekhebu (G 2381), see above, p. 3.

¹⁴ Junker, *Giza II*, p. 106.

¹⁵ “A History of the Giza Necropolis,” Vol. 1, pt. 2, Chap. IX, p. 83.

¹⁶ Garnot, *L'appels aux vivants*, p. 5ff.; Grieshammer, *LÄ 5* (1983), cols. 212–13; Frandsen, “Tabu,” *LÄ 6* (1985), col. 137.

¹⁷ Reisner, “Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon,” p. 130.

¹⁸ *Mereruka 1*, p. 8, n. 54; 2, pls. 124A, 126B.

¹⁹ Davies, *Ptahhetep 2*, p. 4, pl. 2.

²⁰ *Meir 4*, p. 27, pls. 1 and 25 [1].

²¹ Junker, *Giza II*, p. 110, fig. 49, pl. 14b, c.

rection.²² If obelisks stood in antiquity before the entrances to the tombs of Inti, Mehi, and Khnumenti, all trace of them has now vanished. Nevertheless, Reisner did find an obelisk inscribed with the name and titles of Nekhebu in a hole at the southern end of the court of the Senedjemib Complex,²³ and a small uninscribed obelisk remained in place beside the door of the anonymous mastaba G 2385 (fig. 3).²⁴

The increasing elaboration in tomb architecture apparent from the middle of the Fifth Dynasty not only affected the size and number of rooms but was also reflected in the character of tomb entrances. In a number of large tombs of the later Fifth Dynasty, the usual entrance recess had evolved into a wide and deep portico which was regularly fronted by square pillars at Saqqara or by columns at Abusir and at Giza.²⁵

The earliest of these columned porticos in a private tomb may be that of Rawer in the Central Field at Giza (the “Amoeba Tomb”), which was entered by means of a portico whose roof was apparently held up by columns with cylindrical shafts.²⁶ Although the actual columns are lost, their circular bases survive, and the columns themselves probably resembled the cylindrical columns with square abaci known from the side entrance to the pyramid temple of Sahure, except for the royal titulary inscribed in a vertical column on the latter.²⁷ Since Rawer’s autobiography refers to an incident which took place under Neferirkare, his tomb must belong to that reign or soon thereafter.²⁸

A short while later, both the original and the final entrance porticos in the tomb of the vizier Ptahshepses at Abusir were fronted by lotus-bud columns.²⁹ Ptahshepses became a member of the royal family upon his marriage to a daughter of Neuserre, and his tomb took over a number of features which may have been the “direct result of the favor shown by that king to his son-in-law.”³⁰ Lotus-bud columns in stone first appear in the mastaba of Ptahshepses, and it is possible that they emulate in form the papyrus-bud columns utilized throughout Neuserre’s pyramid complex.³¹

At Saqqara the tombs of Ni-anh-khnum and Khnumhotep, of Ka-em-tjenent, of Izezi-anh, of Ptahhetep I, and of Ti all have or had entrance porticos fronted by square pillars.³² The first tomb

belongs to the reign of Neuserre or Menkauhor,³³ the others were probably decorated in the reign of Izezi.³⁴ The pillars of Ptahhetep I are denuded, but the other pillars are or were inscribed with the titles and name of the tomb owner.³⁵

At Giza, besides the tomb of Rawer, the mastaba of Senedjemib Inti and the complex of Seshemnofer IV were entered through porticos.³⁶ This was probably true also of the tombs of Senedjemib Mehi and Nekhebu in the Senedjemib Complex, even though the paving of the wide and deep recess that precedes the entrance to the tomb in each case has been carried away and no traces of columns or their bases survive.³⁷ Definitely in the case of Senedjemib Inti, since the round bases of the columns survived *in situ* (figs. 2, 3), and probably also by analogy in the cases of Mehi and Nekhebu, the place of the pillars was taken by cylindrical columns. Circular column bases were also found *in situ* in the portico of Seshemnofer IV,³⁸ who appears to have been a younger contemporary of Senedjemib Mehi.³⁹

No columns or fragments thereof were actually recovered from any of the Giza tombs. Even so, an approximate idea of the nature and size of the columns may be had from the sets of column bases which were found *in situ*. It should first of all be noted that the surviving column bases from the tombs of Rawer, Senedjemib Inti, and Seshemnofer IV have rounded sides, being narrower at the top than at the bottom. For the column bases of Rawer, only the outer diameter of 90 cm is given in the publication.⁴⁰ Like Rawer’s column bases, the two bases that were set in gypsum mortar and partially concealed by the paving of Inti’s portico, are of Tura limestone (pl. 13a, b). They differ slightly in their dimensions. One base is 28 cm high, while the other measures 24 cm in height. The upper and lower diameters of the columns are respectively 64 and 74 cm and 65 and 76 cm. Since Old Kingdom columns did not reach to the very edge of the top of the base,⁴¹ the diameter of the columns was therefore probably something less than 60 cm. Seshemnofer’s columns were larger than Inti’s, the outer diameter of the bases at the rim being 1.06 m, while the diameter of the circular marks left on their tops by the columns was 75 cm.⁴²

²² See, e.g., Martin, “Obelisk,” *LÄ* 4 (1981), col. 544.

²³ See above, p. 7, n. 44.

²⁴ *Giza Diary* 1912–13, p. 57. On G 2385, see above, pp. 2–3.

²⁵ A certain number of smaller tombs at Giza have porticos of a different character than those under discussion, the architraves of which were held up by square pillars; see e.g., *GN* 1, pp. 285–86; Junker, *Giza* 9, figs. 28, 31. In the tomb of Akhetmehu (G 2375), the inscribed architrave was protected by a chamfered cornice (see Badawy, *Architecture* 1, p. 189), and this may also have been the case with others of these tombs.

²⁶ Hassan, *Giza* 1, fig. 1.

²⁷ Borchardt, *S’ashu-re* 1, pp. 24–25, 62–65, frontispiece, figs. 20, 28, 79, 118.

²⁸ Baer, *Rank and Title*, pp. 98, 292 [300]; Harpur, *Decoration*, p. 268.

²⁹ The columns in the earlier portico were six-stemmed (Verner, *Ptahshepses* 1, fig. 1; idem, *Forgotten Pharaohs*, pp. 179–80, with plan on p. 175 and fig. on p. 179) and those in the later portico eight-stemmed (Verner, *Ptahshepses* 1, p. 8, fig. 1; idem, *Forgotten Pharaohs*, p. 180, and plan on p. 175; Borchardt, *Denkm.* 1, p. 173, pl. 99 [CG 1748]).

³⁰ Verner, in *Acts of the 1st ICE*, p. 672; Strudwick, *Administration*, p. 89. Verner, *Forgotten Pharaohs*, p. 189, notes that Ptahshepses bears the title “King’s Son,” on certain of the pillars of the open court of his mastaba; he is of the opinion that Ptahshepses received this title upon his marriage to Neuserre’s daughter, Khamernebt. Thanks are due Del Nord for calling this passage to my attention.

³¹ Verner, *Forgotten Pharaohs*, p. 180; Badawy, *Architecture* 1, p. 109, fig. 76; pp. 181–83, fig. 124 [3]. Neuserre had completed the pyramid temple of his predecessor Neferirkare in brick and timber, and the roofs of its portico and court were supported by wooden columns on round limestone bases whose capitals were carved in imitation of a bound cluster of lotus stems and buds; see Borchardt, *Nefer-ir-kes-re*, pp. 20–22, figs. 15–18, 20.

³² See *PM* 3², pp. 641–44, plan LXVI; 489, plan L; 596–98, plan LX; 468–78, plan XLVIII; Mariette, *Mastabas*, pp. 189–91.

³³ See below, p. 14 and n. 70.

³⁴ Baer, *Rank and Title*, pp. 144, 294 [530]; 60, 288 [64]; 74, 290 [160]; 152, 295 [564]; Strudwick, *Administration*, pp. 87 (49); 151 (146); 158 (157); Harpur, *Decoration*, pp. 273, 276, 277.

³⁵ *Nianchchnum*, pls. 1, 2, fig. 1; Mariette, *Mastabas*, pp. 187–89; Hassan, *Saqqara* 2, p. 30, fig. 12; Steindorff, *Ti*, pl. 2; Epron, *Ti*, pls. 2 [left], 3.

³⁶ For the tombs of Nekhebu and Seshemnofer IV, see *PM* 3², pp. 89–91, plan XX–VI; 223–26, plan XXXII.

³⁷ The same set of circumstances prevails in the case of the tomb of Akhetetep at Saqqara; see Hassan, *Saqqara* 3, fig. 12; Davies, *Ptahhetep* 2, p. 3.

³⁸ Junker, *Giza* 11, p. 101.

³⁹ Baer, *Rank and Title*, pp. 126, 293 [455, 456]; 133, 293 [479]; Harpur, *Decoration*, pp. 268, 270.

⁴⁰ Hassan, *Giza* 1, p. 4.

⁴¹ See e.g., Borchardt, *Nefer-ir-kes-re*, figs. 16, 18; idem, *S’ashu-re* 1, fig. 118, pl. 9.

⁴² Junker, *Giza* 11, p. 101.

It is clear from the circular marks left on the tops of their bases that the columns of Seshemnofer IV's portico had plain, round shafts. Inti's bases lack any such markings, while Hassan's report gives no further details regarding the bases in Rawer's portico. Whereas it is possible in theory that lotus bud columns originally supported the roofs of the porticos of Rawer and Inti, as they did in the tomb of Ptahshepses at Abusir, the occurrence of floral columns in the latter tomb is apparently unique. For that reason, it is more likely that Rawer and Inti's portico, by analogy with the Seshemnofer IV portico, possessed plain circular columns. Old Kingdom columns of this sort were regularly topped by a square block or abacus on which the architrave rested,⁴³ and this was most likely also the case at Giza. Baraize, following Junker and Balcz, certainly made a similar assumption and set square abaci at the top of the columns in his reconstruction of Seshemnofer IV's portico.⁴⁴ It was presumably Baraize who likewise provided the circular concrete columns utilized in the modern reconstruction of Senedjemib Mehi's portico with square abaci.⁴⁵

At Saqqara, limited evidence survives to attest to the character of the entablature, or horizontal superstructure, that was supported by the pillars or columns at the entrance of the tombs of Ni-ankhknum and Khnumhotep, Ptahhetep I, Ka-em-tjenent, and Izezi-anekh. In each case, this evidence is confined to a large architrave inscribed with the titles and name of the owner.⁴⁶ The same is true in the case of Rawer at Giza.⁴⁷ No trace of a cornice of any sort appears to survive in any of these porticos.

At Giza, on the other hand, sufficient evidence probably exists to show that the entablatures of the porticos of the tomb of Senedjemib Inti and of the Seshemnofer Complex consisted of an architrave and a cavetto cornice with torus molding. Insofar as the Senedjemib Complex is concerned, the architraves of Inti and Mehi are extant, as is a segment of Nekhebu's architrave. The architraves of Inti and Mehi both originally comprised three discrete blocks. All three architraves were inscribed in large-scale, sunken hieroglyphs with the name and titles of their owners between border lines. The height of Inti's architrave was 55 cm, of Mehi's 48 cm, and of Nekhebu's

28.1 cm.⁴⁸ No trace remained of the architrave of Seshemnofer IV, which presumably had been removed for reuse elsewhere.⁴⁹

The Harvard–Boston Expedition found a large section of a cavetto-and-torus cornice lying on the ground in front of the entrance to the tomb of Senedjemib Inti (pl. 8b, 9a–b). Considering its find spot, it is likely that the block derived from the entablature over Inti's portico,⁵⁰ even though there is no certainty that it could not have come from the tomb of Nekhebu, whose portico opened on the south of Inti's, or have been dragged by stone-robbers across the court from Mehi's mastaba. Since it appears to have been the only such block found by Reisner in the Senedjemib Complex, it is in all probability this cornice that was utilized by Baraize in his reconstruction of the facade of Mehi's tomb.⁵¹ If it is the same block, it was subsequently cracked and one end broken off at an angle (frontispiece D; pl. 103a). The restored entablature above the entrance to Mehi's tomb totals 1.30 m in height, the height of the cornice itself being 60 cm, while the torus moulding and the plain band below were each 11 cm high and the architrave, as already noted, 48 cm in height. A plain band sometimes intervenes between the moulding and the architrave in contemporary cavetto cornices, but it is absent in others so that the torus roll sits directly on the architrave.⁵² The latter is true of the cavetto-and-torus cornice from the portico of Seshemnofer IV.⁵³ The cornices from the Senedjemib and Seshemnofer complexes are both plain and devoid of the customary decoration of cross-lashings and foliage.⁵⁴

If the restoration proposed herein of the beginning of Inscription B 1 at the top of the north wall of Inti's portico is correct, then the original height of the side walls of the portico of G 2370 would have been in the neighborhood of 4.70 m.⁵⁵ Assuming that the architrave rested on the side walls directly above the decorated area, and was surmounted by the cavetto-and-torus cornice found by Reisner in front of its portico (at present seemingly utilized in the restoration of the facade of Mehi's tomb), the total height of the facade of G 2370 would have been 6.07 m originally. Once again assuming that there were originally six short registers of marsh dwellers in front of Mehi's figure on both side walls of his portico,⁵⁶ the height of those walls to the top of the decorated area would have been close to 4.66 m. Adding to this figure the height of the restored entablature as given above, that is, 1.30 m, results in a total height for the facade of G 2378 of 5.96 m. The restored heights of the two porticos reached on quite different grounds thus appear to be complementary. The result (fig. 99b) is a much taller portico than Baraize envisioned for Seshemnofer IV (fig. 99a). On the other hand, the portico of the

⁴³ Cf. Junker, *Giza* II, p. 101 and n. 2, and see above, n. 27. Indeed, Jéquier, *Architecture*, pp. 172–73, remarks that the square abacus was, in the eyes of the Egyptians, an indispensable member of columns of all sorts.

⁴⁴ Junker, *Giza* II, pls. I, 11a.

⁴⁵ Emile Baraize succeeded Alexandre Barsanti as Director of Works of the Egyptian Antiquities Organization around 1912; for fifty years thereafter he worked on the restoration and reconstruction of a great number of buildings. At Giza he was also involved in the clearance and repair of the Sphinx (*Who was Who in Egyptology*, p. 30). He almost certainly erred in restoring the column bases as straight-sided, since the bases of Senedjemib Inti (and Seshemnofer IV) had rounded sides.

⁴⁶ Mariette, *Mastabas*, pp. 187–88, 190; Hassan, *Saqqara* 2, pp. 30–32, pl. 14A, B; *Nianchchnum*, pp. 16–18, pls. 1–2. Verner, *Forgotten Pharaohs*, p. 178, states that the columns of the final portico in Ptahshepses's tomb supported a heavy architrave on which the enormous roof slabs rested directly. It is clear from *Ti* 2, pl. 2, that the pillars in the portico of the tomb of Ti no longer support an entablature. Mariette (*Mastabas*, p. 31) provides a sketch of a Saqqara tomb, with a north facing entrance like Ti's, having a two-pillared portico and above what may be intended either as a cavetto cornice(?) which rests directly on the pillars or perhaps a chamfered cornice. It is not clear whether this represents an ideal tomb entrance or actually depicts one of the tombs excavated by him.

⁴⁷ Hassan, *Giza* I, p. 4 (1), pl. 1.

⁴⁸ For Inti's and Mehi's architraves, see below, pp. 37–38, 133. For Nekhebu's, see HU–BMFA Exp. Ph. A 5809.

⁴⁹ Junker, *Giza* II, p. 101.

⁵⁰ See above, p. 7–8.

⁵¹ Note that the cornice had been moved by September 1913 to the northern part of the court, just in front of Mehi's portico (pl. 4a–b).

⁵² E.g., Borchardt, *Ne-user-re*, fig. 43; idem, *S'ashu-re* 1, figs. 86–87; Ricke, *Harmachistempel*, pp. 24–25, fig. 14.

⁵³ Junker, *Giza* II, p. 102, fig. 50a.

⁵⁴ See, e.g., below, pp. 75, 125, 154.

⁵⁵ See below, p. 94, text fig. 2.

⁵⁶ See below, p. 134, fig. 98.

vizier Ptahshepses's tomb at Abusir originally reached a height of 8.00 m.⁵⁷

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

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

At the rear of the porticos of Senedjemib Inti and Mehi, as in that of Seshemnofer IV,⁶⁵ the tomb owner was shown in pendant scenes, accompanied by his family and retainers, engaged in sports in the marshes. The leisure time activities of spear fishing and fowling are virtually inseparable and are found in combination on the walls of many other tombs,⁶⁶ but, in these three mastabas, they are arranged as great panels flanking the entrance to the chapel.⁶⁷ Smith thought that these were the earliest examples of porticos decorated with marsh hunt scenes, but Harpur⁶⁸ points out that earlier examples are to be found at Saqqara in a tomb unknown to Smith, that of Ni-ankh-khnum and Khnumhotep,⁶⁹ dated by Moussa and Alten-

müller to the time of Neuserre and Menkauhor,⁷⁰ and in the tomb of another of Izezi's viziers, Rashepses, which belongs to the middle of Izezi's reign.⁷¹

In the tomb of Ni-ankh-Khnum and Khnumhotep, the side walls of the portico are occupied by registers of funeral scenes.⁷² Rashepses's portico was thus possibly the first entirely dedicated to marsh pursuits, but only a portion of its decoration survived. The rear (west) wall to the north of the entrance was occupied by a scene of Rashepses fowling and below by a register with a herdsman driving cattle across a stretch of water.⁷³ The northern side wall was taken up by a portrayal of the vizier in a papyrus skiff watching a hippopotamus hunt(?) with two registers of boats returning from the marshes and cattle crossing a stretch of water below.⁷⁴ Since the activities of spear fishing and fowling are virtually inseparable, it is likely that the rear wall on the south side of the entrance was occupied by a scene of Rashepses spear fishing, which did not survive.⁷⁵

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

Although the tombs of Senedjemib Inti and Mehi and that of Seshemnofer IV all bore scenes of fishing and fowling on the rear walls of their porticos, the composition of the scenes on the side walls of the porticos of Mehi and Seshemnofer is especially similar. The side walls of Mehi (pls. 106–107, 110–11; figs. 97, 105) are damaged, and only two blocks, one from either side wall, are preserved in the case of Seshemnofer.⁷⁶ Nevertheless, the surviving decoration is probably sufficient to show that large figures of the tomb owner viewing the return of the marsh dwellers originally occupied the side walls of both porticos.⁷⁷ In both porticos likewise, the standing figure of the owner was separated from the registers of marsh dwellers by a vertical band of text containing the caption to the scene, while shorter columns of text above the owner's head contained his name and titles. In addition, registers of marsh dwellers on foot bearing offerings appear to have alternated in both cases with registers of marsh dwellers in papyrus skiffs bringing marsh products. The portico of

⁵⁷ Verner, *Forgotten Pharaohs*, p. 178. According to Davies, the mastaba of Akhetetep was originally sixteen feet or more in height (*Ptahhetep* 2, p. 1).

⁵⁸ See Harpur, *Decoration*, pp. 43–58.

⁵⁹ Hassan, *Giza* 1, p. 6, fig. 1.

⁶⁰ Verner, *Ptahshepses* 1, pp. 6, 8–27, pls. 1–11, photos 2–24; idem, *Forgotten Pharaohs*, p. 180 and fig. on p. 179.

⁶¹ Hassan, *Sakkara* 2, p. 30, pl. 24C. The same is true of the portico of Akhetetep, on which see n. 10 above.

⁶² Mariette, *Mastabas*, pp. 187–89; Smith, in Reisner, *Tomb. Dev.*, p. 407.

⁶³ Mariette, *Mastabas*, pp. 190–91.

⁶⁴ *Ti* 1, pls. 4–11.

⁶⁵ Junker, *Giza* 11, pp. 140–42, fig. 60, pl. 16 [c, d].

⁶⁶ Vandier, *Manuel* 4, pp. 718–719, provides a useful discussion with references; see also Müller, *Die Ausgestaltung der Kultkammer*, pp. 79–96; Kaplony, *Meibethi*, pp. 9–20, esp. p. 9, n. 5; Van de Walle, *Nefertitenef*, p. 66; Harpur, *Decoration*, pp. 197–203 and passim.

⁶⁷ *HESP*, p. 200. In the case of Seshemnofer IV, only the bottom of the fish-spear scene from the left side of the entrance is preserved (Junker, *Giza* 11, pp. 140–42, fig. 60, pl. 16c, d).

⁶⁸ Harpur, *Decoration*, pp. 52, 193.

⁶⁹ *Nianchchnum*, pp. 55–61, figs. 5–6, pls. 4–5.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 44–45. The tomb is also assigned to the late reign of Neuserre or that of Menkauhor by Harpur (*Decoration*, p. 274).

⁷¹ Strudwick, *Administration*, p. 301, assigns Rashepses to the middle reign of Izezi and Ptahhetep I and Inti to the later part of the same reign. So too does Harpur, *Decoration*, p. 275.

⁷² *Nianchchnum*, pls. 6–15.

⁷³ *LD* 2, pl. 60 [left].

⁷⁴ *LD* 2, pl. 60 [right]; see below, p. 25 and n. 54.

⁷⁵ Although the decoration on the south wall was destroyed, it is possible that Rashepses was shown in a skiff rattling papyrus. For *zš wšd* scenes, see Vandier, *Manuel* 4, pp. 738–46; *PM* 3², pp. 355 [I [(c)], 903 [I(c)]; Harpur, *Decoration*, p. 140 [3].

⁷⁶ Junker, *Giza* 11, figs. 61, 62, pl. 18a, b.

⁷⁷ The theme is discussed by Harpur, *Decoration*, p. 153.

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

The resemblance between the two porticos is not altogether fortuitous, for the two tombs were more or less contemporary.⁷⁸ The composition of the file of officials followed by an offering bearer with a yoke over his shoulders on the north wall of room B of Seshemnofer's chapel⁷⁹ may also be compared with the similar file on the north wall of the anteroom in G 2378.⁸⁰ In addition to the yoke bearer, the figure of a scribe holding a scribal palette and papyrus roll occurs in both scenes. What is not certain is whether the similarities between the two sets of scenes was the result of one and the same group of artisans having worked on both tombs or whether the shared motifs represent another instance of scenes copied from one chapel for another person.⁸¹

Given the thematic unity and balanced design of Senedjemib Mehi's and Seshemnofer IV's porticos, it is surprising that no other known instances of the arrangement survive. Mehi's nephew(?), Nekhebu, incorporated a spear fishing scene in the decoration on the walls of his portico, but the corresponding fowling scene was evidently relegated to an interior wall of his chapel.⁸² The spear fishing scene appeared on the right-hand side wall of Nekhebu's portico,⁸³ while a carrying chair scene occupied the opposite wall.⁸⁴ Two registers of priests carrying shrines and men bearing chests on the rear wall to the left of the doorway⁸⁵ were balanced by three registers of boats on its right.⁸⁶ Nekhebu followed the decorative scheme in Inti and Mehi's porticos only to the extent that he placed his lengthy autobiographical texts on the facade to either side of the portico.⁸⁷

Nekhebu's tomb, in fact, was probably among the last to possess a large columned portico with extensive relief decoration. The disappearance of such elaborate porticos may be connected with the general decline in tomb building visible in the Memphite cemeteries after the reign of Pepy I.⁸⁸

Smith observed that the autobiographical inscription on the facade of Senedjemib Inti's chapel should be considered in connection with the similar occurrence of the autobiographical inscriptions of Rashepses and Ka-em-tjenent at Saqqara.⁸⁹ Two copies of a letter from king Izezi were inscribed along with figures of the vizier and a son on each side of the doorway leading into an open court fronting on Rashepses's tomb.⁹⁰ The blocks bearing the autobiographical inscriptions of Ka-em-tjenent were found displaced, but it has proven possible with some degree of assurance to relocate them on the

walls of his portico.⁹¹ As we have already seen, Rashepses was an older contemporary of Inti's, and probably preceded the latter in the office of vizier. Ka-em-tjenent was a prince and, since his autobiographical inscription makes mention of the vizier Rashepses, he was in all probability a son of Izezi.⁹² His tomb therefore dates to about the same time as G 2370.⁹³ Although the portico entrance to the family complex of Seshemnofer IV at Giza does not bear an autobiographical text, such a text was carved on the wall to the north of the entrance recess to his own chapel, even though it was largely destroyed when discovered.⁹⁴ Subsequently, autobiographical texts were inscribed on the vertical facades of the tombs of the viziers in the Teti cemetery at North Saqqara.⁹⁵

An earlier prototype for the occurrence of autobiographical inscriptions at tomb entrances is probably to be found in the reign of Neferirkare, in the Saqqara tomb of the vizier Washptah Izi. On both the jambs and thicknesses of the entrance to his mastaba,⁹⁶ Washptah is represented together with his sons, while over their heads is inscribed a lengthy autobiographical text.⁹⁷ The entrance to the tomb had not always been the traditional location for autobiographical texts, the earlier autobiographies of Metjen,⁹⁸ Debehen,⁹⁹ and Rawer,¹⁰⁰ for example, being inscribed on interior walls of their tombs.

The area immediately above the spear fishing and fowling scenes in both the tombs of Inti and Mehi (also Seshemnofer IV) is destroyed. In the earlier tomb of Ni-ankh-khnum and Khnumhotep at Saqqara, the panels with these scenes are surmounted by an architrave with a

⁷⁸ See *PM* 3², p. 489, plan L; Schott, in *Fragen an die altägyptische Literatur*, fig. 1.

⁷⁹ *Urk.* 1, pp. 181–86; Schott, in *Fragen an die altägyptische Literatur*, pp. 443–61.

⁸⁰ Baer, *Rank and Title*, pp. 144, 294 [530]; Harpur, *Decoration*, p. 276.

⁸¹ Junker, *Giza* II, pp. 174–76, fig. 71.

⁸² Kagemni: *Teti Cem.* 1, pp. 109–111; 2, pls. 7 [lower], 59 [2, 3]; *Urk.* 1, pp. 194–96; Edel, *Phraseologie*, pp. 68–70; idem, *MIO* 1 (1953), pp. 210–26. Ankhmahor: Badawy, *Nyhetep-Ptah and Ankhmahor*, pp. 14–15, fig. 23, pl. 34. Khenika: James, *Khenika*, pp. 36–41, pls. 1, 5–6. Similar texts are to be seen on the facade of the tomb of Nefersehempthah Sheshi (*Rue de tomb.*, pl. 77 [right]; *Urk.* 1, pp. 200–201). These texts are, in general, more conventional than earlier autobiographies and include moral encomium, as well as addresses to passers-by. Nevertheless, Kagemni's texts do incorporate an actual autobiographical section narrating the progress of his career under Unis and Teti. If the other texts were better preserved, they might also have included a curriculum vitae of the tomb owner. Hetep-her-akhti also had conventionalized autobiographical texts inscribed on each side of the entrance to his Saqqara tomb (Mohr, *Hetep-her-akhti*, figs. on pp. 34–35). Its precise date is uncertain, however; Baer (*Rank and Title*, p. 108 [357]) dates the tomb to Neuserre or later, while Harpur (*Decoration*, p. 275) assigns it to the period between Neuserre and early Izezi.

⁸³ Mariette, *Mastabas*, pp. 267–71. Borchardt, *Denkm.* 1, fig. at bottom of p. 40, evidently assumed that the blocks in Cairo derived from the "petite chambre" or niche found by Mariette. Smith, in Reisner, *Tomb Dev.*, p. 399 [No. 24: D 38] thought that the blocks came from the sides of an outer niche that possibly framed the false door, which is now in the National Museum in Copenhagen. However, the niche measures 1.30 m in depth and is 1.58 m wide, while the false door in Copenhagen is 1.84 m wide (Nielsen, *Nationalmuseets Arbejdsmark* 1993, fig. 2), and therefore cannot have fit at the back of the niche. Mariette does not actually say that the false door comes from the niche, only that it was found in the debris of the tomb. *PM* 3², p. 456, probably correctly, refers to the blocks preserved in Cairo and Aberdeen as constituting the jambs and thicknesses of a doorway. Nielsen, *Nationalmuseets Arbejdsmark* 1993, p. 43, also assumes the blocks derive from the tomb's entrance.

⁸⁴ *Urk.* 1, pp. 40–45; Breasted, *Ancient Records* 1, §§ 242–249; Roccati, *Literature*, pp. 108–111.

⁸⁵ E.g., *Urk.* 1, pp. 1–7; Goedicke, *MDAIK* 21 (1966), pp. 1–71.

⁸⁶ *Urk.* 1, pp. 18–21; Hassan, *Giza* 4, pp. 167–70, fig. 118, pl. 48.

⁸⁷ *Urk.* 1, p. 232; Hassan, *Giza* 1, pp. 15, pl. 12; 18, fig. 13, pl. 18. For a recent translation, see Allen, in *Studies in Pharaonic Religion and Society in Honor of J. Gwyn Griffiths*, pp. 14–20.

⁷⁸ See above, p. 12 and n. 39.

⁷⁹ LD, *Ergänz.*, pl. 23b (= Junker, *Giza* II, fig. 81).

⁸⁰ See below, p. 146, figs. 114, 115.

⁸¹ For such scenes, see Harpur, *Decoration*, pp. 21–31.

⁸² MFA unaccessioned. Cf. Schürmann, *Li-nefret*, figs. 7a/b, 21.

⁸³ MFA 13.4332; Smith, *BMFA* 56, no. 304 (1958), pp. 58–60, fig. 2.

⁸⁴ EG 476; for the text, see Heerma Van Voss, *Phoenix* 14 (1968), pp. 129–30, fig. 49.

⁸⁵ EG 484; a detail is reproduced in *HESP*, p. 209, fig. 80.

⁸⁶ MFA 13.4349; *ibid.*, p. 307, fig. 164; Fischer, *Egyptian Women*, p. 8, n. 63, fig. 12.

⁸⁷ *Urk.* 1, pp. 215–21; Dunham, *JEA* 24 (1938), pp. 1–8.

⁸⁸ Cf. Kanawati, *Administration*, pp. 73–74; Strudwick, *Administration*, p. 69.

⁸⁹ *HESP*, p. 200.

⁹⁰ Quibell, *Excav. Saq. (1907–1908)*, p. 24, pl. 62 (2). For the letter, see *ibid.*, pp. 79–82; *Urk.* 1, pp. 179–80.

two-way orientation of text and with standing figures of the two brothers on either end, while the space above the architrave is occupied by double representations of Ni-ankh-khnum and Khnum-hotep at table, figures of butchers at work, and food offerings.¹⁰¹

In Nekhebu's portico, as reconstructed by William Stevenson Smith, a lintel over the entrance was inscribed with an offering formula in a single line of large hieroglyphs between border lines. Over the lintel an architrave extended the entire width of the portico. It too was inscribed with an offering formula, but the hieroglyphs were larger yet.¹⁰² If decorated lintels or architraves, or any other kind of decoration, appeared above the marsh hunt scenes at the back of the porticos of Inti and Mehi (or Seshemnofer IV), no evidence for such appears to survive at present.

The offering room of G 2370 (Room IV), the mastaba of Senedjemib Inti, is the first well-dated example of an east–west offering room at Giza.¹⁰³ Long east–west offering rooms with a false door occupying the west wall, Reisner's type (7), first appear in Dynasty 5, in the pyramid temples of Sahure, Neferirkare, and Neuserre.¹⁰⁴ There was very little time lag before this type of offering room began to make its appearance in private tombs. The earliest example of the new type of offering room may be that of Persen, which dates back at least to the reign of Neferirkare, if not earlier.¹⁰⁵ The new type of offering room is most closely associated with multi-roomed mastaba chapels, however, and a new type of false door with cavetto cornice and torus moulding.¹⁰⁶ Harpur believes that the earliest example of an east–west offering room in a multi-roomed, or complex, chapel might be that of Ankhmare at Saqqara, tentatively assigned by her to the reign of Menkauhor,¹⁰⁷ or that of Ptahhetep I dated, as we have already seen, to the reign of Izezi.¹⁰⁸

Like G 2370, the principle mastabas built on the platform of the Senedjemib Complex (G 2374, 2378, 2381, 2384, 2385), all have long east–west offering rooms.¹⁰⁹ Whereas both G 2370 and G 2381 are type (7c) complex chapels based on a two-roomed nucleus comprising an east–west offering room and a north–south anteroom, G 2374, 2378, and 2385 belong to type (7d), and consist of an east–west offering room with other rooms presenting a modification of type (7c), insofar as they lack the north–south anteroom room. G 2384 was too denuded to determine anything more of its plan with certainty.¹¹⁰ Two smaller chapels, G 2386–a and b, adjacent to the entrance ramp,

which probably belonged to Inti's great-grandsons(?), Impy and Ibebi, consisted of single interconnecting east–west offering rooms equipped with the new type of false door.¹¹¹ G 2390 on the platform east of G 2381, south of the sloping ramp leading up to the complex, may also have possessed an east–west chapel, but all that remains of it are the lower part of a false door and a few stones from the north and west walls of the room. Even so, the torus moulding visible at its sides indicates that the false door was likewise of the new type with cavetto cornice.¹¹²

The majority of the east–west offering rooms in the Senedjemib Complex are entered either from a north–south anteroom by a doorway in the east end of the north wall (G 2381) or from an east–west anteroom by means of a doorway in the east end of the south wall (G 2374, 2378, 2384?, and 2385). Inti's offering room (G 2370) is distinguished from these others by the placement of the entrance just to the east of the center of the north wall. As a result this wall is divided into two sections of unequal length. Nevertheless, all of these arrangements result in a shorter entrance wall.¹¹³ An exception to the general layout is provided by the interconnecting chapels G 2386–a and b.

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

The tomb owner sits before an offering table, oriented away from his false door. A pile of food separates his table from approaching bearers, or alternatively, food is arranged above the loaves so that the subsidiary figures are brought closer to the deceased. Above, and sometimes extending beyond the pile of food, is an offering list, while further right the shorter registers are occupied by food (optional), and priests. From about V.7 onwards the latter perform rites level with the deceased's head or just above it, depending upon the height allowed for the registers below. Bearers fill the registers level with the food, oriented westward as if they are piling offerings in front of the major figure. One of these processions is often led by the deceased's son, who offers incense to his father or perhaps strangles a goose or duck as a sacrifice. Below, there is sometimes an extra register filled with bearers relating directly to the false door. In Dynasty 6 these figures are occasionally divided into two groups, the first carrying haunches and the second strangling geese as they hold them forward as an offering.¹¹⁴

Harpur supplements her discussion with a schematic diagram which is reproduced here as fig. 10.¹¹⁵

Harpur makes the additional observation that the east–west offering rooms in the multi-roomed chapels are the only type of offering room that consistently follows the pattern of reliefs in the sanctuaries of royal mortuary temples.¹¹⁶ Indeed, the north and south wall compositions in the east–west sanctuary of the pyramid temple of Pepy II, the best preserved example, are almost identical to east–west offering room scenes in multi-roomed chapels.¹¹⁷

¹⁰¹ *Nianchehnum*, pls. 1–5, figs. 4–6.

¹⁰² EG 474.

¹⁰³ GN I, pp. 260–61; Strudwick, *Administration*, p. 50.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. *Giza Necropolis* I, p. 260. Reisner believed that the east–west offering room first appeared in the outer offering-place of the pyramid temples of Dynasty 4. Stadelmann (*MDAIK* 49 [1993], pp. 259–63, fig. 1b), however, now restores a long east–west offering room with a false door at the back of the mortuary temple of the Bent Pyramid of Sneferu at Dahshur.

¹⁰⁵ Harpur, *Decoration*, p. 107. For the mastaba in question, see *PM* 3², pp. 577–78.

¹⁰⁶ GN I, pp. 260–61.

¹⁰⁷ *Decoration*, p. 273.

¹⁰⁸ Strudwick (*Administration*, pp. 135–36) dates the single roomed, east–west chapel to the mid-Fifth Dynasty, citing Sekhem-ankh-Ptah (*PM* 3², pp. 454–55), but Harpur, who thinks this chapel is hardly dissimilar architecturally from that of Persen, assigns it instead to the reigns of Izezi or Unis (*Decoration*, pp. 107, n. 70; 276).

¹⁰⁹ The only definite exception is G 2383, the small, late chapel of Wer-ka-bau Iku built against the south wall of G 2378 (see above, p. 3).

¹¹⁰ See above, p. 2 and n. 25; below, p. 19.

¹¹¹ See above, p. 3.

¹¹² See above, p. 3.

¹¹³ See Harpur, *Decoration*, p. 85.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, fig. 31.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 109.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*; see *PM* 3², p. 428 [34–35].

The culmination of the decorative program for the east–west offering rooms with long north and south walls in private chapels is to be seen in the tombs of the queens and viziers of Unis in the Unis pyramid cemetery at Saqqara¹¹⁸ and in the tombs of the high officials of the reigns of Teti and Pepy I located in the Teti pyramid cemetery at Saqqara.¹¹⁹ Earlier stages in the process of development can be traced in a number of east–west offering rooms at Saqqara, for example, those of Persen, Netjeruser, Hetep-her-akhti, and Ptahhetep I. Persen was in all likelihood a contemporary of Sahure or Neferirkare,¹²⁰ Netjeruser and Hetep-her-akhti's chapels were probably decorated in the period between Neuserre and early Izezi,¹²¹ and Ptahhetep I, as has already been stated on a number of occasions, was a close contemporary of Senedjemib Inti.

In both Persen and Hetep-her-akhti, the table scene appears on the south wall only, rather than on both long walls as later.¹²² In the case of Hetep-her-akhti, this wall is bisected horizontally, with the table scene located above, while below the deceased views farm activities.¹²³ The opposite, north wall in Hetep-her-akhti is occupied by further outdoor activities,¹²⁴ whereas in Persen it is devoted to a banquet scene with the deceased seated before registers of family members, female dancers, and agricultural estates.¹²⁵ In Netjeruser and Ptahhetep I, by comparison, table scenes appear on both the north and south walls. In Ptahhetep I only the lowest registers of the north and south walls survive.¹²⁶ However, the long walls of Netjeruser's chapel are well preserved and in content conform closely to the program of decoration for the walls of the east–west offering rooms with long north and south walls in the multiple-roomed chapels of late Dynasty 5, as defined by Harpur. On each wall appears a seated figure of the deceased at table, an offering list, food offerings, priests performing rites, and registers of men bringing offerings.¹²⁷ The better part of the extra register at the bottom of each wall in Netjeruser is filled with scenes of butchery, but a file of butchers bearing cuts of meat heads the register, the first two figures each offering a foreleg, this last a forward-looking feature. Even though a file of offering bearers largely fills the extra register on the south wall of Persen, a group of butchers is inserted at the very end of the register.¹²⁸ By contrast, in the extra register on the north wall of Persen,¹²⁹ and on both long walls in Ptahhetep I, a procession of agricultural estates approaches a seated figure of the owner.¹³⁰ In the latter case,

the procession of agricultural estates is led by a son of the owner who serves in the capacity of scribe. Otherwise, in most other respects, the south long wall in Persen, and the northern and southern long walls in Ptahhetep I, seem to conform to the common decorative scheme for the long north and south walls of east–west offering rooms in later Dynasty 5.

The extra register at the bottom of both the north and south long walls in G 2370 is occupied by bearers who seem to bring their offerings directly to the offering slab at the foot of the false door (pls. 38, 46a; figs. 61, 64). In this regard, at least, the decoration on its long walls is progressive. Still, Harpur notes that in Dynasty 6 the foremost bearers in this extra register were sometimes divided into two groups, the first carrying haunches and the second strangling geese as they held them forward as an offering. This is not the case in G 2370, where these two groups of bearers appear in separate registers. Thus, the first three bearers in the extra register on the south wall carry haunches of meat, while the five figures who strangle geese appear at the head of the procession in the short register above (pl. 38; fig. 61).¹³¹

Harpur also observes that, from about the reign of Menkauhor onwards, the priests performing rites occupy a short register on a level with the deceased's head or just above it. This is already the case in Netjeruser, and in G 2370 the figures of the priests likewise occupy the shorter register to the left or right of the offering list on a level with the head of the seated figure of Inti at table. As in a number of Dynasty 6 offering rooms, the remainder of the wall above the figures of the priests was apparently occupied by an array of food and drink offerings in narrow sub-registers.¹³² In G 2370 food and drink offerings are also to be seen in the shorter register behind the priests. As is also true of Netjeruser, in G 2370 a vertical column with the caption *shpt stpt* precedes the foremost offering bearer on the south wall.¹³³ Although the same caption continues to appear in Dynasty 6,¹³⁴ in east–west chapels at the later period the vertical column containing the caption is frequently replaced¹³⁵ or supplemented by¹³⁶ a long horizontal line (or lines) which begins with *shpt stpt* but extends the width of the register above the heads of the offering bearers.

Senedjemib Inti's offering room thus fits quite readily into the developmental sequence for the decorative scheme of chapels of type (7). It is therefore all the more curious that Senedjemib Mehi omits the extra register of offering bearers at the bottom of the wall. On the other hand, his draftsman did include the multiple serving tables and jar racks which occupy the beginning of the fourth register in the tomb of his father. In other tombs a limited number of tables

¹¹⁸ See above, p. 11 and n. 5.

¹¹⁹ *Gem-ni-kai* 2, pls. 16–29, 30[b], 33, Beiblatt 1; *Rue de tomb.*, pls. 53–63 (= Badawy, *Nyhetep-Ptah and Ankhm'ahor*, figs. 48–49); *Mereruka* 1, pls. 57–67.

¹²⁰ See above, p. 16 and n. 105.

¹²¹ Harpur, *Decoration*, p. 275. For discussions of the problems involved in dating the tomb of Netjeruser, see Baer, *Rank and Title*, p. 97 [294]; Strudwick, *Administration*, p. 114 (91). The tomb exhibits in its decoration a number of progressive features that might be expected to first appear in the tomb of a higher official such as a vizier. For the purposes of this discussion, however, we have accepted Harpur's date.

¹²² *Seven Chapels*, pl. 10 [top]; Mohr, *Hetepherakhti*, fig. 39.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 78–86, figs. 44–54.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 52–65, figs. 24–34.

¹²⁵ *PM* 3², pp. 577–78.

¹²⁶ Murray, *Saq. Mast.* 1, pls. 8–9, 12 (as Ptahhotep II); Hassan, *Saqqara* 2, pls. 39b–46.

¹²⁷ Murray, *Saq. Mast.* 1, pls. 21, 23.

¹²⁸ *Seven Chapels*, pl. 10 [top].

¹²⁹ *Seven Chapels*, pl. 10 [bottom].

¹³⁰ Murray, *Saq. Mast.* 1, pls. 9–10; Hassan, *Saqqara* 2, pls. 39 B–46.

¹³¹ For the north wall, which is less complete than the south wall, see below, pp. 76–78.

¹³² E.g., *Gem-ni-kai* 2, pls. 18, 24, 29–31; *Mereruka* 1, pl. 61; James, *Khentika*, pl. 21. In Netjeruser the food offerings appear below the feet of the priests (Murray, *Saq. Mast.* 1, pls. 21, 23).

¹³³ See below, p. 74.

¹³⁴ E.g., Altenmüller, *Mehu*, pls. 56, 64; El-Fikey, *Rē-ur*, pls. 6, 7; Säve-Söderbergh, *Hamra Dom*, pl. 19; *Meir* 5, pls. 9, 11, 33, 34.

¹³⁵ E.g., CG 1491–92; *Gem-ni-kai* 2, pls. 20–23, 27, 31–33; *Mereruka* 1, pls. 57–58, 65, 67 (multiple lines); James, *Khentika*, pl. 2.

¹³⁶ E.g., CG 1418; James, *Khentika*, pl. 20; Hassan, *Saqqara* 3, fig. 18; Lauer, *Saqqara*, color pl. XVIII; Altenmüller, *Mehu*, pls. 85, 87, 91. A similar horizontal line can also occur on the short, eastern end wall; see below, p. 127.

or racks may be placed under the offering table,¹³⁷ or a table or rack or two may be seen close to the piles of food in the registers before the deceased,¹³⁸ but such an array is otherwise rare and forms one more link in the decoration of the two tombs.¹³⁹

Two further refinements affect the extra register at the beginning of the Sixth Dynasty. First, the number of birds presented by the second group of bearers is multiplied, each offering bearer holding up as many as five birds by the neck and wings.¹⁴⁰ Second, cages with other birds appear at the feet of the figures who strangle the birds.¹⁴¹ These developments too are evident in the Senedjemib Complex. Even though the offering room of Khnumenti is largely destroyed, a long block which must belong to the extra register on its north wall shows the legs and feet of nine figures (pl. 94b; fig. 91). A cage of live birds rests on the ground in front of the seventh, eighth, and ninth figures. Since part of a cage is also visible behind the ninth figure, and a fragment preserves the central portion of an offering bearer and another cage filled with ducks, there is clear evidence for at least five such figures originally.¹⁴² Presumably, the six foremost figures carried haunches. Not infrequently, the number of bearers offering haunches and strangling geese is even, and this may have been the case in G 2374.¹⁴³

No mention has been made so far of the decoration of the east wall of the long east–west offering rooms. The offering room of Peresen possessed no east wall, since it was in the form of a deep niche, open to the corridor.¹⁴⁴ The offering room of Hetep-her-akhti is entered by a door in the middle of the east wall, but scenes of netting birds in a tree and of goats browsing occupy the lintel over the doorway, while the jambs have four registers with two offering bearers in each.¹⁴⁵ Outdoor activities still appear on the east wall of the offering room of Ptahhetep I towards the end of Dynasty 5.¹⁴⁶ Conversely, already in middle of the dynasty in the tomb of Netjeruser, outdoor activities are entirely excluded from the offering room, and the east wall is decorated with food and drink offerings over the doorway and with three registers of men escorting sacrificial animals on the jambs to either side.¹⁴⁷ The offerings thus continue the arrays of food and drink at the top of the long walls. Such an arrangement was not uncommon in Dynasty 6.¹⁴⁸

All that remains today of the relief decoration on the east wall of the offering room in G 2370 are back-to-back processions of men and animals in the lowermost register, but Mariette claims to have seen offering bearers in the lower registers of this wall and food offerings arrayed on tables in its upper register.¹⁴⁹ East–west offering rooms of Dynasty 6 often relegate the butchers, which in Netjeruser occupied the extra register at the bottom of the long walls, to the east end wall, where they commonly appear below registers of food offerings and bearers of offerings.¹⁵⁰ Except for the bottom of the wall in Inti's offering room, the east walls of the offering rooms in the other mastabas of the Senedjemib Complex are largely destroyed. Nevertheless, a fragment of relief assigned to the east wall of the offering room of G 2374 does show butchers at work with a horizontal caption above that perhaps once began with *shpt stpt* (pl. 96b).¹⁵¹

The symmetry inherent in the arrangement on the north and south long walls evidently appealed to the Egyptian sense of the aesthetic, for once the scheme was adopted, it remained the norm for east–west offering rooms throughout much of the remainder of the Sixth Dynasty. It appears not only in the multi-roomed chapels of the period, but also in a simplified format in smaller tombs both in the Memphite cemeteries¹⁵² and in the provinces.¹⁵³

Although the cavetto cornice has disappeared and the torus moulding is largely destroyed, the false door of Senedjemib Inti remains the earliest well-dated Giza example of the new type of false door with cornice and moulding that first appears at Saqqara in the early Fifth Dynasty.¹⁵⁴ All the false doors in the Senedjemib Complex for which evidence survives (G 2370, 2374, 2378, 2386–a and b, 2390) were of this new type, including the small, late false door of Wer-kabau Iku (G 2383).¹⁵⁵ As the cornice and torus were introduced in the Fifth Dynasty, the inscriptions, size, and decoration of the jambs of false doors becomes more regular.¹⁵⁶ Strudwick notes that the doors of the high officials of the reign of Izezi and later all exhibit jamb inscriptions of equal length, with a figure of the deceased at the bottom of each.¹⁵⁷ This is certainly true of the false doors of Inti, Mehi, and Khnumenti (G 2374), each of which possesses three recessed pairs of jambs.

For the most part, the surviving false doors of the Senedjemib Complex are monolithic in nature (G 2374, 2378, 2383, 2386–a and b, 2390). Senedjemib Inti's false door though differs from these others inasmuch as it is constructed of several distinct blocks. Both Inti and Mehi's false doors stand on massive blocks of limestone that functioned as offering stones.¹⁵⁸ From Lepsius's drawing, it is clear that a

¹³⁷ E.g., Murray, *Saq. Mast.* 1, pls. 29, 30; *Mereruka* 1, pls. 57–58, 65; James, *Khentika*, pls. 14, 20, 21; Simpson, *Qar and Idu*, fig. 41; El-Fikey, *Rē-uer*, pls. 6–7. In the offering room of Tjetu, three tables and a rack are set beneath the offering table; see *Teti Cem.* 1, pl. 38.

¹³⁸ E.g., Murray, *Saq. Mast.* 1, pls. 21, 23; Lythgoe–Ransom, *Perneb*, fig. 36.

¹³⁹ As Harpur (*Decoration*, p. 22) observes, other similarities include the spear fishing, fowling, and fording scenes in the porticos of G 2370 and 2378, the father–son group on the entrance thicknesses, and the agricultural estates on the inner thicknesses.

¹⁴⁰ See Brunner-Traut, *MDAIK* 15 (1957), pp. 18–32.

¹⁴¹ E.g., *Gem-ni-kai* 2, pls. 20–21, 27, 32; *Mereruka* 1, pl. 57. See also *Saqqara Tombs* 2, pl. 9, probably from the first half of the reign of Pepy I, and *Meir* 5, pls. 34, 36, from the first half of the reign of Pepy II; for the dates, see Harpur, *Decoration*, pp. 274, 280.

¹⁴² See below, p. 126.

¹⁴³ E.g., *Gem-ni-kai* 2, pls. 20–21, 27, 32; *Mereruka* 1, pl. 65; James, *Khentika*, pls. 20, 21; *Saqqara Tombs* 1, pl. 14.

¹⁴⁴ *Seven Chapels*, pp. 9, pl. 22 (27).

¹⁴⁵ Mohr, *Hetep-her-akhti*, pp. 50–52, figs. 20–23.

¹⁴⁶ Murray, *Saq. Mast.* 1, pl. 11; Hassan, *Saqqara* 2, pls. 37–39A.

¹⁴⁷ Murray, *Saq. Mast.* 1, pl. 22.

¹⁴⁸ E.g., *Gem-ni-kai* 2, pls. 25–26; James, *Khentika*, pl. 22. Exceptionally, Nefer-seshemtah has a table scene on the east wall with butchers below (*Rue de tomb.*, pl. 101).

¹⁴⁹ See above, p. 6.

¹⁵⁰ E.g., *Gem-ni-kai* 2, pls. 25, 26; James, *Khentika*, pl. 22; *Saqqara Tombs* 1, pl. 15; *PM* 3², pp. 536 (121), 621 (20). Cf. Harpur, *Decoration*, p. 107.

¹⁵¹ See p. 127 below, and cf. James, *Khentika*, pl. 22.

¹⁵² E.g., Murray, *Saq. Mast.* 1, pls. 29–30; Simpson, *Western Cemetery*, figs. 23, 24; El-Fikey, *Rē-uer*, pl. 6; Kanawati, *Excav. Saq.* 1, pls. 34, 36–7; Munro, *Unas-Friedhof* 1, pls. 26–27.

¹⁵³ E.g., *Meir* 5, pls. 33–34; Brovarski, in *Bersheh Reports* 1, p. 67.

¹⁵⁴ Strudwick, *Administration*, pp. 15, 35.

¹⁵⁵ See above, p. 3 and n. 35.

¹⁵⁶ Strudwick, *Administration*, p. 16.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁸ See below, pp. 75–76, 154–55.

cavetto cornice and torus moulding originally surmounted the offering stone of Mehi (fig. 126).¹⁵⁹ It is possible that Inti's offering stone was similarly ornamented, but the damage is too extensive to be certain (pls. 43, 46a). The tops of both slabs are very uneven, and no traces of a loaf-on-mat motif or of rectangular depressions for liquids are visible. The offering slab in G 2384 is also surmounted by a cornice and moulding (pl. 10b). In this instance, however, vestiges of a loaf-on-mat design are visible on the upper surface of the block.

In most of the other tombs of the Senedjemib Complex, the false doors rest directly on the blocks of the paving of the offering room. In the case of Khnumenti (G 2374) the rear section of the offering stone is carved from the same block as the false door itself and projects a few centimeters beyond the side mouldings (pl. 95). The front surface of this projecting element is roughly finished, and another large rectangular block with or without the customary loaf-on-a-mat carved on its upper surface was presumably set against it and plastered into place.

To the right of Inti's false door and offering stone, a large rectangular offering bench of limestone, measuring 2.06 m in length by 52 cm in width and 44 cm in height, rests against the northern wall of the room. The bench is crowned by a cavetto-and-torus cornice on its southern and eastern sides (pl. 46a). Although not confined to multiple-room chapels based on east-west offering rooms, similar benches form a standard part of the service equipment in Type 7 chapels in a number of important tombs of the very end of the Fifth Dynasty and the early Sixth Dynasty at both Giza and Saqqara.¹⁶⁰ Usually the benches are monolithic but sometimes, as here, the upper part of the bench with the cornice and moulding is cut from a single stone which rests on smaller limestone blocks.¹⁶¹ A number of the benches are inscribed along the top with the name and titles of the deceased.¹⁶² The model for this arrangement is probably the sanctuary in pyramid temples of about the same period.¹⁶³ Three other specimens are to be found within the Senedjemib Complex, in G 2378, 2384, and 2385. Senedjemib Mehi's bench, which apparently was plain and lacked a cornice (fig. 95c), measured 2.12 m in length by 47 cm in width by 45 cm in height.¹⁶⁴ Considering the situation of all these benches close to the false door and the offering stone, it seems likely that they were intended to serve some purpose in the

offering ritual; perhaps they functioned as "sideboards" on which offerings and cult paraphernalia were placed during the periodic funeral ceremonies which were performed in the chapel.¹⁶⁵

In the northeast corner of the offering room of G 2370 is a box-like structure built of three limestone slabs, two set upright on either side of a third which rests flat on the floor and has a rectangular depression or basin in its center (pl. 50a–b; fig. 3). The structure measures 139.5 cm in width by 54 cm in depth and is 75 cm high. It has no top, but a finished limestone slab, measuring 159 cm in length, rests at present alongside the south wall of the room opposite this structure (pl. 50b). Reisner makes no mention of this slab in his records and, if it served as a table top for the boxlike structure, it would have projected some 6.5 cm into the opening of the entrance to the room. On the other hand, the projection would not have served as an obstacle to free passage into the offering room, and the rectangular block may well have served that purpose.

A similar installation was discovered in the offering room of the queen's temple of Pyramid III–a at Giza.¹⁶⁶ In the northwestern corner of the room was a complete and unbroken offering table built of seven limestone slabs. The table was partially closed in front by an upright slab and had a horizontal slab set as a shelf about midway below the tops of the side and back slabs. In the top of the shelf was a small circular depression large enough to take a round-bottomed pottery bowl of medium size. Below the shelf a rectangular stone basin rested on the floor. The front of the circular depression showed signs of wear, as if the bowl had been removed and replaced numerous times.¹⁶⁷ The boxlike structure in G 2370 may have served a similar purpose. Perhaps the basin was filled on feast days with water for use in the offering ceremonies or for the ritual purification of the funerary priests, while libation vessels rested on the shelf above. Installations like Inti's are rare in private tombs, but Selim Hassan found an elevated stone basin with a rock-cut shelf projecting from the wall above in the northeast corner of the rock-cut chapel of Prince Ankhmare at Giza.¹⁶⁸

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

The mastabas of Inti and Mehi were constructed of great blocks of grey nummulitic limestone, and the reliefs in the two chapels were

¹⁵⁹ LD 2, pl. 75.

¹⁶⁰ See e.g., *Gem-ni-kai* 1, pp. 4–5, pl. 2; James, *Khentika*, p. 26, pls. 3, 17B; LD 1, pl. 22; *Text* 1, pp. 49–50; *Ergänz.*, pl. ix = Badawy, *Ni-hetep-ptah and Ankhmahor* 1, fig. 17 (Ni-hetep-ptah); *ibid.*, p. 34, pl. 60 (Ankhmahor); Murray, *Saq. Mast.* 1, p. 23, pl. 32 [bottom] (Netjeruser); Hassan, *Giza* 5, pp. 189, 271, fig. 118 (Itisen); Hassan, *Saqqara* 1, p. 52, pl. 41A (Nebkauhor); *ibid.* 2, p. 45, pls. 34B, D, 35 (Ptahhetep I). In the tomb of Ptahhetep I at Saqqara, there is a second bench set against the west wall of the pillared hall (Hassan, *Saqqara* 2, p. 38, pl. 28). This bench may have been associated with a statue naos on the opposite side of the doorway located in the middle of this wall.

¹⁶¹ In contrast, the bench of Ni-hetep-ptah (see last note) consists of a slab with a cornice and moulding running along its top set upon two upright blocks and, more properly speaking, constitutes an offering table rather than an offering bench. The same is true of an example in the two-niched rock-cut chapel of Queen Bunefer, wife of Shepseskaf(?), where the table, consisting of a slab of limestone set on four blocks of the same material is placed against the western wall in the space between the two false doors; see Hassan, *Giza* 3, p. 194, fig. 146.

¹⁶² James, *Khentika*, p. 26, pl. 17B; Hassan, *Saqqara* 2, p. 45, pl. 34B.

¹⁶³ Borchardt, *Nefer-ir-kes-re*, p. 9, pl. 10; Lauer, *Saqqara*, p. 184 (Merenre); Labrousse and Cornon, *Regards sur une pyramide*, pp. 90–91 (Pepi I).

¹⁶⁴ See LD 1, pl. 23 [upper].

¹⁶⁵ See the discussion in Hassan, *Giza* 5, pp. 188–89. The bench of Itisen actually has a circular alabaster offering table set in its upper surface (Hassan, *Giza* 5, p. 271).

¹⁶⁶ Reisner, *Mycerinus*, pp. 60–61, pl. 77a, Plan V. In two other instances of offering tables, one in an inner offering room in the same queen's temple and the other in a converted magazine of the Mycerinus Valley Temple, certain of the stone slabs were displaced or missing; *ibid.*, pp. 23–24, 61, pl. 61a, b.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 24, 60.

¹⁶⁸ Hassan, *Giza* 6, pt. 3, p. 38.

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

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

Smith says the reliefs of the Senedjemib Complex are the ordinary type of Dynasty 5, the execution being of none too good quality.¹⁷³ Elsewhere he describes the reliefs as "low with moderately good carving."¹⁷⁴ Actually, the relief is neither as low as the fine low relief of the Dynasty 4 slab-stelae¹⁷⁵ nor as high as the bold high relief that characterizes Dynasty 6 carving at Saqqara.¹⁷⁶ It might be more accurate to describe it as relief of medium height, a type of relief that was developed for carving in nummulitic stone in the first rock-cut chapels at Giza towards the end of the reign of Khafre or the beginning of the reign of Mycerinus.¹⁷⁷ Nummulitic limestone is full of little fossils, and the dressing of the surfaces was never as smooth as in white limestone.¹⁷⁸ Often the unfinished wall surfaces are rough and pitted, and it was therefore necessary to apply a coating of plaster in order to provide a smooth surface that allowed a considerable degree of finish. In some places the plaster sizing might be quite thick, in others a thinner layer of sizing served to take the paint.¹⁷⁹ The quality of nummulitic limestone utilized in the Senedjemib Complex is generally good and allowed better workmanship, so that in

most cases a relatively thin layer of sizing was required, with the result that the raised reliefs in the mastabas of the complex are largely carved in the stone with small details cut in the overlying plaster layer. This plaster coating is readily apparent in G 2370 on the south wall of the offering room (Room IV), for example. In the table scene occupying that wall, details such as the curls of the wigs of the offering bearers and the wing feathers of the bird offerings were carved in the plaster (pl. 38). Where this plaster layer has been abraded or fallen away the details have also disappeared. The loss of the plaster layer probably explains the apparent lack of details in the large seated figure of Inti at the right end of this scene (pl. 41). The stone at this end of the wall was particularly bad and plaster also had to be employed to conceal the numerous flaws and breaks in the wall surface.¹⁸⁰ The carving of the bottom of Inti's handkerchief has, in fact, been continued into a large plaster patch on his lower torso.

In a few cases in G 2370 the stone is very hard, being highly fossiliferous, with innumerable nummulites densely packed, and was extremely difficult to cut with the available copper chisels. Instances are provided by the butchery scene at the bottom of the south wall of the anteroom (Room II) and the crafts scene on the north wall of the same room, where the nummulites interfered with the carving of clear outlines (pls. 25a, 27b).¹⁸¹ Much of the pitting within the figures and hieroglyphs that interrupts their outlines probably results from the dislodging of the little fossils by the chisel, although the relief in the latter location has been exposed to weathering as well. In such cases, the whole wall or certain parts of it were probably originally covered with a thick coating of plaster to provide a smooth surface for the cutting of the reliefs.¹⁸² Where this plaster coating has fallen away in the majority of cases, the reliefs often appear unfinished.

An especially interesting example of the loss of the plaster sizing is provided by the west end of the lowest register on the north wall of the offering room of G 2370, where figures which were once executed in plaster have subsequently disappeared. Indeed, it is only by means of the faint chisel marks left behind that it is possible to tell that figures ever occupied this area of the wall (fig. 65).¹⁸³

Nummulitic limestone was sporadically utilized at Saqqara, and Margaret Murray in speaking of the Saqqara mastaba of Sekhemka very well observes:

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

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

¹⁶⁹ For the use of Tura limestone at Giza, see Cherpion, *Mastabas et hypogées*, pp. 79–80 (Criterion 60, table on pp. 202–3).

¹⁷⁰ See below, p. 30.

¹⁷¹ *GN I*, pp. 11–12.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*

¹⁷³ *HESP*, p. 211.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 200.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 159–61.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 200.

¹⁷⁷ *GN I*, pp. 245, 301; *HESP*, p. 162.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 245.

¹⁷⁹ For the sizing technique employed in the reliefs, see *GN I*, p. 245.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 200.

¹⁸¹ See below, p. 48, 52–54.

¹⁸² *HESP*, p. 200.

¹⁸³ See below, pp. 76–78.

¹⁸⁴ Murray, *Saq. Mast.* 1, p. 8.

surface. The uppermost surfaces of the important autobiographical inscriptions of Inti and the upper parts of walls in G 2378 have all been subjected to this sand-blasting effect and have suffered severely from it.

It is puzzling as to why officials of Inti and Mehi's rank and presumed wherewithal would have built mastabas of an inferior local limestone, instead of importing fine quality limestone from the Tura limestone quarries in the Mokattam hills on the east bank just a few kilometers to the south of Giza. Nevertheless, the fact is that the majority of the mastabas built at Giza in Dynasties 5–6 are decorated with reliefs executed in the local nummulitic limestone.¹⁸⁵ Of course, the Giza cemetery assumed a secondary position after Dynasty 4, and except for the tombs of a few royal children and favored courtiers in front of the Neuserre pyramid at Abusir, the most important burial places of Dynasty 5 and the first half of Dynasty 6 are to be found at North Saqqara.¹⁸⁶ The majority of the tombs built at Giza during this period were the modest tombs of funerary priests attached to local cults, who lacked the patronage and the resources to import Tura limestone, and thus perhaps had to make use of local limestone for their tombs out of necessity.¹⁸⁷ This certainly was not the case with Inti and Mehi. Inti especially appears to have been a favorite of Izezi's and, as viziers and overseers of royal works, both Inti and Mehi must have had ready access to the quarries of fine limestone at Tura. Except for his cult installations, which are of fine white limestone, the only other element of Inti's tomb made of Tura stone is his sarcophagus, which was acquired with royal approval at Mehi's request upon the death of his father.¹⁸⁸ The lack of proximity to the Tura quarries alone does not explain the paucity of fine white limestone in G 2370 and 2378. Although Tura is closer as the crow flies to Saqqara than to Giza, Giza is downstream from Tura, so that the transport of stone by boat to Giza would have been easier than fighting the current to go upstream to Saqqara. Indeed, in the relief showing the transport of Inti's sarcophagus from the Tura quarries, the cargo vessel is steered with two long rudders, indicating it was sailing downstream (pl. 80; fig. 23). Perhaps with a ready source of limestone in the immediate vicinity, even though the stone itself was of inferior quality, it was simply thought a matter of diminishing returns to go further afield to the limestone quarries at Tura. Undoubtedly, the final result, after the carved surface was washed with a thin coating of fine plaster and painted, approximated in appearance that of reliefs carved in fine white limestone.¹⁸⁹

Sunk relief was used sparingly on the walls of the Senedjemib Complex and mostly in locations on the outside of the chapels where it took advantage of the play of light and shadow,¹⁹⁰ for example, in the autobiographical inscriptions on the facade and adjacent portico walls of Inti's mastaba (pl. 58ff.) and on the facade of Nekhebu's mastaba.¹⁹¹ Likewise executed in sunk relief was the facade of Khnum-

enti's mastaba with its repeated standing figures of the owner and accompanying texts (pl. 84c). Nekhebu's architect also chose sunk relief for the large hieroglyphs of the architrave over the entrance of the latter's chapel, even though these were out of the direct sunlight, set as they were at the rear of a deep portico. In sunk relief also were the seated figures of Nekhebu at the bottom of the autobiographical inscriptions and his standing figures on the entrance thicknesses to his chapel.¹⁹² During Dynasty 5 there is evident an increased use of inscriptions in sunk relief until this technique became common for parts of the interior walls of chapels, especially the false doors.¹⁹³ This tendency is reflected in the sunk relief inscriptions on the jambs of the false doors of Inti, Mehi, and Khnumenti (pls. 43, 95, 121). The utilization of sunk relief for the offering list of Nekhebu is also in keeping with the general trend.¹⁹⁴

Due to the loss of the finished surfaces on the decorated walls throughout the Senedjemib Complex, it is difficult to gain an impression today of the original appearance of the mastaba interiors. Traces of red and yellow are still visible at the bottom of Inti's false door. Otherwise significant vestiges of color survive at only one location in G 2370. At the base of the north end of the west wall in the north-south vestibule, traces indicate the one-time presence of a black dado finished off with a border consisting of a band of yellow, 9 cm high, topped by a red band, also measuring 9 cm. The red band began 10 cm below the bottom of the scenes. Both bands were edged in black. The dado was still partly visible on the north wall of the room in Lepsius's day and is shown in his drawing (fig. 56), while a section of the border also appears in his drawing of the east wall (fig. 50).¹⁹⁵ Such a dado was traditional at the bottom of walls in Old Kingdom tomb chapels¹⁹⁶ and pyramid temples.¹⁹⁷

In Lepsius's day, the walls of the offering room in G 2378 still retained considerable traces of paint. According to Ernst Weidenbach, the partly preserved block border behind Mehi's figure in the table scene on the north wall of the room (fig. 128) was colored blue, red, green, yellow, and white.¹⁹⁸ Under the representations was a black dado surmounted by red and yellow bands outlined in black, similar to that in Inti's tomb.¹⁹⁹ In addition, Mehi's false door was painted a dark red in imitation of quartzite, while the figures, inscriptions, and cross-lashings on the torus moulding were yellow. The whole was framed by a block border consisting of rectangles painted alternately

¹⁸⁵ See GN 1, p. 37; Cherpion, *Mastabas et hypogées*, p. 79.

¹⁸⁶ HESP, p. 185.

¹⁸⁷ Two notable exceptions are the tomb of Rawer (see above) and the Iymery Complex, (see n. 8 on p. 11).

¹⁸⁸ See below, pp. 26, 108.

¹⁸⁹ For the successive stages in decorating a private tomb during the Old Kingdom—the preliminary sketch, the carving of the stone, the painting of the sculptured walls—see Williams, *Decoration of Per-neb*, p. 3ff.; HESP, pp. 244–50.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. Schäfer, *Principles*, p. 78.

¹⁹¹ See Dunham, *JEA* 24 (1938), pl. 1 [1].

¹⁹² MFA 13.4331 (= Dunham, *JEA* 24 [1938], pl. 1[1]), 13.4348, 13.4349, Cairo JE 44608. The architrave, Obj. Reg. 13–1–557, is drawn in EG 474.

¹⁹³ HESP, p. 201; Strudwick, *Administration*, pp. 24–25.

¹⁹⁴ Exp. Ph. B 1291–92.

¹⁹⁵ LD, *Ergänz.*, pls. xxi, xxii.

¹⁹⁶ It occurs, for example, in the following instances: LD 2, *Ergänz.*, pl. xlvii; *Seven Chapels*, pp. 7, 11; *Meir* 4, pp. 27, 46; 5, pp. 9, 24, 30; Abu Bakr, *Giza*, fig. 10. Exceptionally, the dado in the chapel of Persen was painted red with black and white speckles to imitate granite (*Seven Chapels*, p. 8). The black dado in the offering chamber of the vizier Mehu, surmounted by red and yellow bands edged with black is reproduced in color in Lauer, *Saqqara*, color pls. XVIII–XX. A similar arrangement was apparent in the tomb of Seshemnofer III (Junker, *Giza* 3, pls. 1–4) and also occurred in the portico chapel of Tjetu I at Giza (Simpson, *Western Cemetery*, frontispiece). More ornate than any of these is the dado in the tomb of Prince Merib which incorporates panels imitating wood grain (LD 2, pls. 19–22).

¹⁹⁷ See e.g., Borchardt, *S'ashu-re* 1, pl. 1.

¹⁹⁸ LD, Text 1, p. 54. Part of another block border is visible behind the corresponding figure of Mehi on the south wall of the offering room in LD, *Ergänz.*, pl. xv.

¹⁹⁹ LD, Text 1, p. 54.

red, blue, yellow, and green between black framing lines, while the broad area between the torus moulding and the colored border as well as the tall, narrow spaces between the border and the walls on either side were painted red (fig. 126).²⁰⁰ Although no reference is made by Weidenbach to the background color of the reliefs, presumably it would have been the usual blue-grey.²⁰¹ The overall effect must have been very much like that produced by the well preserved painted reliefs of the offering room of the vizier Mehu.²⁰²

Little evidence survives as to the treatment of the tops of the walls in chapels of the Senedjemib Complex. If the south wall of the offering room in G 2370 is preserved to essentially its full height, as appears to be the case, there would have been no room at the top for the *khoker*-frieze typical of later Old Kingdom tombs.²⁰³ On the other hand, there is in all likelihood sufficient space for the earlier conventional Old Kingdom border pattern of interpolated diagonals in paint,²⁰⁴ or less likely a border of colored rectangles.²⁰⁵ The only tomb in the complex that preserves definite evidence of the *khoker*-frieze at the tops of its walls is that of Nekhebu (G 2381).²⁰⁶

The base line of the reliefs is not completely uniform throughout the complex. In the chapel of Inti the baseline falls between 1.17 and 1.20 m from the preserved pavement of the floor, except for the boating scene on the east wall of Room II where the base line is set higher, at 1.29 m. The base line of the scenes and inscriptions on the facade falls between 1.24 and 1.30 m. The base line is considerably lower in the interior chapel of Khnumenti, varying from 1.08–1.11 m. The base line of the facade and entrance jambs of the same tomb is lower yet, being located at 99 cm for the former and 37 cm for the latter. According to measurements taken by William Stevenson Smith, the base line of the reliefs in Room II of G 2378 was 1.15 m, while the decoration on the entrance thicknesses started at 1.17 m. The reliefs on the sides and rear of the portico were again set higher than on the interior, beginning at 1.35–1.36 m in the case of the former and 1.22 m in the case of the latter.

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

Reisner thought that the sloping-passage burial places of the Senedjemib Complex were among the earliest sloping-passage type of shafts made in the Western Field at Giza.²⁰⁷ Three other mastabas located just to the south of the Senedjemib Complex, including that of Inti's putative son, Kakherptah Fetek-ti,²⁰⁸ also had Type 9 sloping-passage shafts.²⁰⁹ Seshemnofer IV, his wife Hetepheres, and his son Tjeti were all likewise buried in sloping-passage shafts.²¹⁰

Both Senedjemib Inti and Seshemnofer IV have simple offering lists painted on the walls of their burial chambers.²¹¹ Alongside an offering list on the east wall of the burial chamber of Kakherptah Fetek-ti is a depiction of the deceased seated before an offering table.²¹² Junker saw the appearance of the figure of the deceased in Fetek-ti's burial chamber as an indication of late date.²¹³ Strudwick, on the other hand, has persuasively argued that the decoration of the one wall in this instance is an example of the progression from the simple list in the burial chamber of Senedjemib Inti to the fully decorated burial chamber of Ka-em-ankh.²¹⁴

The burial chamber of Inti was irregular and probably unfinished, and was divided into two parts of unequal length. According to Reisner, it was not possible to determine whether the intention was to cut a larger chamber or to make a chamber with coffin recess on the west wall.²¹⁵ In its present condition, however, the plan resembles in appearance the somewhat later "T" shaped decorated burial chambers of the tombs of a number of Unis and Teti's officials at Saqqara, each of which has a large recess or bay in the western wall of the room to house the sarcophagus.²¹⁶ G 2370 B may well have constituted a precursor of these later chambers in this regard, just as the painted offering list on its east wall represents the earliest securely dated example of the practice of decorating the walls of the burial chamber.²¹⁷ Seshemnofer IV's only slightly later burial chamber is also "T" shaped, as is that of his son Tjeti.²¹⁸

²⁰⁷ See p. 1–2 above.

²⁰⁸ See below, p. 24–25.

²⁰⁹ *GN* 1, p. 153. For Kakherptah's shaft, see Junker, *Giza* 8, fig. 48. Another of these sloping-passage tombs belongs to the vizier Idu I Nefer (*ibid.*, fig. 30). The vizier has been assigned by Strudwick to the mid-Sixth Dynasty, perhaps to the later reign of Pepy I to early Pepy II (*Administration*, p. 68 [22]), but Harpur has dated his tomb to the reign of Teti (*Decoration*, p. 67). The third sloping-passage tomb south of the Senedjemib Complex is anonymous.

²¹⁰ Junker, *Giza* 11, figs. 52, 56, 57.

²¹¹ Seshemnofer's offering list is reproduced in *ibid.*, fig. 53, pl. 16 a. For Inti's list, see below, pp. 80–81, pl. 53a–b; fig. 71.

²¹² Junker, *Giza* 8, pp. 117–21, fig. 56, pl. 21.

²¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 3–4.

²¹⁴ *Administration*, p. 154. For the burial chamber of Ka-em-ankh, see Junker, *Giza* 4, pp. 43–96, pls. 2–17. One other burial chamber at Giza, that of Rawer III in the Central Field, had decorated walls. The extensive paintings on its east and south walls included human figures (Hassan, *Giza* 5, pp. 296–97). Rawer was a younger contemporary of Senedjemib Mehi (Strudwick, *Administration*, pp. 114 [92]; Harpur, *Decoration*, p. 268). Subsequent stages in the evolution of decorated burial chambers may be traced in the Unis, Teti, and Pepy II pyramid cemeteries at Saqqara; see most recently, Brovarski, in *For His Ka*, pp. 24–28.

²¹⁵ See below, p. 79–80.

²¹⁶ *Teti Cem.* 1, figs. 9, 12, 15; Hassan, *Saqqara* 2, p. 57.

²¹⁷ Cf. Baer, *Rank and Title*, p. 126 [455].

²¹⁸ Junker, *Giza* 11, figs. 52, 56. For earlier "T" shaped burial chambers, see e.g., Reisner, *Tomb Dev.*, fig. 105 (Medum 17); Verner, *Pyramid Schemes*, fig. 1; *idem*, *Forgotten Pharaohs*, fig. on p. 190. A detailed plan of the near contemporary (above, p. 12 and n. 34) "T" shaped burial chamber of Ti at Saqqara appears in Mariette, *Mastabas*, pp. 331–33.

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

²⁰¹ *HESP*, p. 255.

²⁰² See p. 21, n. 196.

²⁰³ The earliest example of the use of the *khoker* as a wall decoration in private tombs known to Murray (*Saq. Mast.* 1, p. 19) was in the tomb of Netjeruser (*ibid.*, pls. 21–23).

²⁰⁴ On this border pattern, see Jéquier, *Architecture*, p. 98 and n. 93; Peck, *Decorated Tombs*, p. 55. Examples are Junker, *Giza* 3, figs. 29, 30; Simpson, *Meryankh III*, figs. 4, 6; *idem*, *Western Cemetery*, pl. 38b; *Nefer and Ka-hay*, pls. 1, 5, 7, and *passim*.

²⁰⁵ Except for door frames (e.g., Simpson, *Qar and Idu*, figs. 35, 36) and thicknesses (e.g., *LD* 2, pls. 45c–d; 104c–d; *Nianchnum*, pl. 18), the block border pattern, when it appears at the tops of wall scenes in Memphite tombs, is usually coupled with interpolated diagonals (e.g., *Nianchnum*, pls. 3, 28, 31, and *passim*) or *khoker*-ornaments (e.g., Murray, *Saq. Mast.* 1, pls. 21–23). From the later Sixth Dynasty, however, it appears more frequently by itself at the top of wall scenes (Simpson, *Western Cemetery*, pl. 31; *Gebr.* 1, pls. 3ff.; *Meir* 4, pls. 7–9; 5, pls. 11–12. Cf. Peck, *Decorated Tombs*, p. 94 and n. 33).

²⁰⁶ Exp. Ph. B 1299

CHAPTER 3: SENEJEMIB INTI AND HIS FAMILY

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

The first member of the Senedjemib family known to us with any certainty, and probably the founder of its fortunes, is Senedjemib Inti, who served as vizier of Egypt under King Djedkare Izezi. Izezi was the penultimate ruler of the Fifth Dynasty, and his long reign of at least twenty-eight years¹ inaugurated a new era in the history of the Old Kingdom.²

Inti received from King Izezi three verbatim letters which were engraved on the walls of his tomb. A damaged date associated with one of these letters, on the basis of the content of the letter, which alludes to Izezi's jubilee, probably referred originally to either the sixteenth or the twenty-sixth numbering.³ In the heading of the letter Inti is addressed as vizier, a circumstance that seems to date his tenure of office to the second half of Izezi's reign. Strudwick has concluded that the presence of a cartouche of King Unis in the inscription over the head of Inti's son Mehi in the fowling scene on the west wall of the portico of Inti's tomb,⁴ implies that the latter died at the earliest at the very end of the reign of Izezi.⁵ In consequence, he takes Inti to be the latest of Izezi's viziers.⁶ That Inti was depicted on the side walls of the portico of his tomb in the very long kilt worn by elderly men in the Old Kingdom may well be an indication that he held the

vizierate in his later years,⁷ and one piece of circumstantial evidence suggests that he indeed departed this life before the end of Izezi's reign. Upon his father's death, Inti's son Senedjemib Mehi asked for and obtained from the king the boon of a limestone sarcophagus for the burial of his father. The cargo ship that transported the sarcophagus from the Tura limestone quarries was named after Izezi ("Izezi is great of strength")⁸ and, given the Egyptian sensitivity towards names and what they signified,⁹ it seems unlikely that it would have continued to bear the name of that sovereign into his successor's reign.

Inasmuch as he appears to have functioned as vizier in Izezi's later years, it is uncertain what role, if any, Inti played in the reforms of that king's reign. Nevertheless, as vizier, Inti was at the apex of the pharaonic bureaucracy. Like other viziers of his time he had authority over the principal administrative departments of the state. As "overseer of scribes of royal records," he headed the royal chancellery and directed the work of the scribes who wrote, sealed, and administered the royal writs and who handled communications with other departments.¹⁰ He was responsible for the conduct of justice and the practical running of the law courts as "overseer of the six great courts," and he may also have acted as a court of appeal.¹¹ He had overall control of public works as "overseer of all works of the king," including building projects and irrigation works, and was likewise concerned with the organization of the work forces of quarrymen, builders, craftsmen of all kinds, and agricultural laborers.¹² As "overseer of the two granaries," Inti was charged with the granary organization and the management of the grain supply, including its redistribution as wages for living officials and as offerings for deceased officials.¹³ He also directed the activities of the other great financial department as "overseer of the two treasuries." Presumably in the Old Kingdom as later, the treasury department was concerned with government expenditures and the assessment of taxes from various institutions and individuals.¹⁴ Like the granary department, the treasury department provided tomb-offerings for deceased officials, usually in the form of linen and other commodities.¹⁵ In addition, as "overseer of the two chambers of the royal regalia," Inti administered the workshops in which regalia (as well as ointments and salves) for the king's own use and for the reward of favored officials were produced.¹⁶

In his capacity of overseer of all works of the king, Senedjemib Inti undertook a number of building projects for King Izezi. Apparently early on in his years of service to that sovereign, Inti erected a Hathor chapel for the king on the grounds of the palace.¹⁷ For this, Inti evidently received royal approbation, being cleansed, anointed, and decorated in the presence of his sovereign.¹⁸ The culmination of

¹ Baer, "Egyptian Chronology," pp. 1, 8, while admitting that Izezi celebrated, or at least made preparations for a jubilee, assigns him a mere twenty-eight years and two fractional years, in keeping with the figure in the Turin Canon. According to Baer, *zp* 16 is certain (*The Abusir Papyri*, pl. 1; *Urk.* 1, p. 63), but *zp* 21 (*ibid.*, pls. 40–41) is either Izezi or Unis. On palaeographic grounds, Posener-Kriéger (*Arch-Abusir*, pp. 486–87) assigns the latter date to Izezi. If the biennial count were in effect in Izezi's reign, the last figure would be equivalent to year 41, which is in essential agreement with the forty-four years given to Izezi by Manetho, as Mm. Posener observes. Earlier, Smith (*Old Kingdom*, p. 186) allotted Izezi at least forty years on the basis of the *zp* 21 date. However, serious doubt has recently been cast on the use of the biennial system in the reign of Izezi and, for that matter, on its very existence during much of the Old Kingdom; see Spalinger, *SAK* 21 (1994), pp. 275–319, esp. pp. 299–301, 314–15, 316.

² See e.g., Helck, *Beamtentitel*, p. 136; Baer, *Rank and Title*, p. 297; Jacquet-Gordon, *Domaines*, p. 18; Kanawati, *Gov. Reforms*, p. 15; Strudwick, *Administration*, p. 307.

³ See p. 101, n. m below.

⁴ See below, pp. 30, 40.

⁵ *Administration*, p. 133 (information provided by the present writer).

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 301.

⁷ See below, pp. 38–41, pls. 13, 14, 18; figs. 17, 23, 30; text fig. 2.

⁸ See below, p. 38.

⁹ See e.g., Vernus, *L'É* 4 (1980), col. 320. Even personal (basilophoric) names might be changed at the accession of a new king; see Brovarski, in *For His Ka*, p. 37, n. 74.

¹⁰ Strudwick, *Administration*, p. 208ff.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 194, 329.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 240–50.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 264–75.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 275, 293–99.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 269–70, 293–96.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 285–86; Nord, *Serapis* 2 (1970), pp. 1–16.

¹⁷ Inscription A 1: below, pp. 90–92.

¹⁸ Inscription A 2: below, pp. 92–94.

his career, however, came towards the end of Izezi's long reign, when Inti laid out and presumably oversaw the construction of the precinct for the jubilee of the king. Two of the three verbatim letters from Izezi referred to above are devoted to the subject of the construction of this precinct and attest to the importance that Izezi assigned to his approaching jubilee.¹⁹ An alabaster vessel in the Louvre records its celebration.²⁰


As previously mentioned, upon Inti's death, his son Senedjemib Mehi obtained a limestone sarcophagus from king Izezi for his father's burial.²¹ In light of Inti's distinguished career, a limestone sarcophagus hardly seems so regal a reward. Nevertheless, wooden coffins or stone sarcophagi were evidently considered appropriate as parting gifts to deceased courtiers.²²

Reisner was of the opinion that Inti's ancestors were probably connected with the official class who enjoyed the income of the old endowments of the Fourth Dynasty and that, like all their class, they must have been buried in the Giza cemetery.²³ Such associations would go a long way to explaining why a man of Inti's prominence was buried at Giza, and not at Saqqara, nearer the pyramid of his lord. Nonetheless, Reisner himself admitted that no tomb of any of the ancestors of the family can definitely be identified at Giza. The name Senedjemib²⁴ is a relatively common one, both prior to²⁵ and after Senedjemib Inti's time.²⁶ The date of the proprietor of a mastaba uncovered by Mariette at Saqqara (B 13),²⁷ one Bebi Senedjemib, is sufficiently fluid that he could in theory have been Inti's father.²⁸ He is "overseer of works," and this office might conceivably form a link between the two officials. His eldest son was named Isy, however, and no other children are attested, so the connection is tenuous at best. Perhaps the owner of a second Saqqara mastaba (D 28) discovered by Mariette has a better claim to being Inti's male parent.²⁹ The period is about right, and even though this Senedjemib has no titles associating him with architecture or public works, he is both *imy-r3 pr-ḥsw*, "overseer of the armory," and *imy-r3 prw msw-nswt*, "overseer of the houses of the king's children."³⁰ These two titles are rarely attested for viziers, and it may be more than coincidental that Senedjemib Inti has both.³¹ It is conceivable that he came into possession of both titles as heir and successor of the proprietor

of Saqqara tomb D 28. If neither individual was Inti's father, it is possible that one or both of them should at least be counted among his forebears. Still, there is no hint here as to why Inti elected to be buried at Giza rather than at Saqqara. That King Izezi apparently did not establish an official cemetery around his pyramid at South Saqqara³² may help explain why Inti felt free to be buried elsewhere, but it does not explain his choice of Giza. What is more, neither Inti nor any other members of his family appear to have held a priesthood in the cults of the proprietors of the three Giza pyramids, a circumstance which probably explains why Shepseskaf-ankh, for example, selected the necropolis of Giza as his burial place.³³

Senedjemib Inti was married to a woman named Tjefi (*Tjfi*),³⁴ who originally appeared with her husband in the scenes of spear fishing and fowling that flank the entrance to G 2370 (pl. 16; figs. 25, 27). The only title accorded her there and on the thicknesses of the doorway to the pillared hall (figs. 67a, 68a) is "king's acquaintance."³⁵ In the last location, she appears together with her husband and the couple's son Senedjemib Mehi, the proprietor of G 2378.

Senedjemib Inti and Tjefi appear, in fact, to have had several sons. Three sons, each termed "his son of his body," were depicted on the bank behind Inti in the marsh scene on the west wall of the anteroom in G 2370 (fig. 42). Unfortunately, the scene is now largely destroyed (pl. 25b–27a; fig. 43). The captions before the figures of the three sons had apparently sustained damage before 1842–43, for Lepsius's draftsman clearly experienced difficulties in copying them. This was especially so in the case of the uppermost figure whose title and name are, as a result, virtually unreadable. In Lepsius's plate, the middle figure seemingly represented the "personal scribe of the royal records, Fetek."³⁶ It is possible that the uppermost figure also bore the same title. The title of the lowest figure is unintelligible, but the name is fairly certainly that of Khnumenti, the owner of G 2374.

As it stands, the name of the middle of the three sons , is rarely—if ever—attested in the Old Kingdom.³⁷ On the other hand, the masculine personal name *Ftk-ti*, which probably alludes to the cup bearer of the sun-god Re,³⁸ is fairly well known. It is regularly written with the terminal signs $\Delta\Theta$ or with Θ alone,³⁹ both of which were, already in the Old Kingdom, variant writings for *t*, but which could also stand for *ti* at the end of words, especially names.⁴⁰ There

¹⁹ Inscriptions B 1–2: below, pp. 94–96, 96–101.

²⁰ Louvre E. 5323; *Urk.* I, p. 57, 1–5.

²¹ See below, pp. 108–110.

²² E.g., Mariette, *Mastabas*, p. 342; *Gebr.* 2, pl. 13; *Urk.* I, p. 99, 10–14.

²³ *BMFA* II, no. 66 (November, 1913), p. 65.

²⁴ *PN* I, p. 316, 21; 2, p. 388. Although Ranke does not say so, *Sndm-ib* literally means "He who sweetens the heart." As a verb it means "make glad, please, gratify" (*Wb.* 4, p. 186, 12–17; *FCD*, p. 235). Senedjemib was presumably his "great name," as it was for Senedjemib Mehi, while *Inti* was his "good name" (below, p. 43). Inti served as both a masculine and feminine personal name in the Old Kingdom (*PN* I, p. 38, 23; 2, p. 342).

²⁵ *PN* I, 316, 21; *PM* 3², pp. 374, 966.

²⁶ Not only does Senedjemib Inti bear the name, but his eldest son was also called Senedjemib, as was the latter's son (below, pp. 135, 138, 139, 143). In addition, see e.g., *LD, Ergänzung*, pl. xiv; Junker, *Giza* 7, pp. 246–49, fig. 104, pl. 40b (by-name Inti); Goyon, *Hamm.*, p. 65, no. 20 (L); Buhl, *Mélanges Dunand* (1969), pp. 195–201, pl. 1 [left]; Hassan, *Saqqara* 3, fig. 4; Brovanski, in *L'Égyptologie en 1979*, p. 121 (by-name Inti); Leclant, *Or* 62 (1993), pl. 20, fig. 20.

²⁷ Mariette, *Mastabas*, pp. 104–106; *PM* 3², p. 451.

²⁸ Baer, *Rank and Title*, pp. 69, 289 [128]; Strudwick, *Administration*, p. 83 (43).

²⁹ Mariette, *Mastabas*, pp. 258–89; *PM* 3², p. 463.

³⁰ Harpur (*Decoration*, p. 276) places the tomb between Neuserre and Dyn. 6.

³¹ See below, p. 83, nos. 2 and 3.


³² See below, p. 29 and note 95.

³³ Pace Reisner, *BMFA* 37 (1939), p. 30. Shepseskaf-ankh, his son Iymery, and his grandson Neferbauphtah were all priests of Khufu (*ḥm-ntr Ḥwfw*); see Weeks, *Cemetery G 6000*, p. 16 [17].


³⁴ *PN* I, p. 390, 26.

³⁵ As with its masculine counterpart, the original reading of the title in question was probably originally *iry(t)-ḥt nswt*, "(female) custodian of the king's property," or the like, whereas *rh(t) nswt*, "king's acquaintance," was probably a secondary interpretation (Sethe, *Kommentar zu den Pyramidentexten*, p. 119 [PT 855 c], and Helck, *Beamtentitel*, pp. 26–28; on this question, see more recently Edel, *Qubbet el Hawa* II/1/2, pp. 91–92; Brunner, *SAK* 1 [1974], p. 55ff.; Berlev, *JEA* 60 [1974], p. 190; Martin, *MDAIK* 35 [1979], p. 217, n. 20). The reinterpretation of the masculine counterpart of the title may somehow be connected with its all but complete disappearance as a title for provincial officials after Dyn. 5 (Fischer, *Dendera*, pp. 18, 69–70; Brovanski, in *Mélanges Mokhtar*, p. 148, n. 129). For reasons of convenience, we have retained the later interpretation of the title here and throughout, for both the masculine and feminine variants.

³⁶ On the title *z3' nswt n ḥft-ḥr*, see p. 50, n. 198 below.

³⁷ A hunter in *Nianchnum*, fig. 13, is apparently called , but Moussa and Altenmüller, *ibid.*, p. 104, read the name *Ftk-ti(?)*; see also *ibid.*, p. 32 (16).

³⁸ PT 120 b, 123 g, 545 c.

is almost certainly room after  in the swamp scene in G 2370 for Θ or even $\triangle\Theta$, if written horizontally.⁴¹ Hence, there is a good possibility that the name of the middle of the three older sons was actually *Ftk-[ti]*, “Fetek-[ti].”

If this was indeed so, the son’s tomb may have been located not far from his father’s in the northeast corner of the Cemetery en Echelon.⁴² G 5560 is a medium-sized, stone built mastaba, whose interior was largely taken up by rooms.⁴³ It belonged to an individual with the “great name” of Kakherptah and the “good name” of Fetek-ti.⁴⁴ The mastaba is dated by Strudwick from early to middle Dynasty 6 and by Harpur between Teti and Merenre.⁴⁵ This span of time would not be excessive for a son of Inti’s shown as a man of mature years in his father’s mastaba (particularly if he passed away in the earlier part of the period in question), but it should be noted that Kakherptah Fetek-ti does not have the one title assigned to Fetek[-ti] in G 2370, namely, “personal scribe of royal records,” although he is an *imy-r3 zš(w)*, “overseer of scribes.”⁴⁶ Moreover, he possesses none of the titles related to public works that were held by Senedjemib Inti and Mehi or Khnumenti, and seems rather to have been concerned with provincial administration and internal colonization.⁴⁷ Nevertheless, the mastaba was badly denuded, and it is possible that the missing title appeared elsewhere on its walls. Nothing is known about the parentage of the owner from the surviving reliefs so, in theory at least, he could have been identical with Inti’s like-named son.

A number of features of Kakherptah Fetek-ti’s mastaba are suggestive of some connection between him and the Senedjemib Family. The depiction of Kakherptah before an offering table and menu list on the east wall of the burial chamber of G 5560, for example, is reminiscent of the painted menu list on the east wall of Inti’s burial chamber.⁴⁸ Moreover, Kakherptah, like Inti, Khnumenti, Mehi, and their descendants, was buried in a sloping-passage tomb.⁴⁹ It could be argued that these connecting links were merely temporal, appearing as they do in a number of more or less contemporary tombs at Giza.⁵⁰ On the other hand, considering the possible identity in names, the tie could well have been one of blood.

As noted above, the name of the son on the topmost groundline behind Inti in the marsh scene on the west wall of the anteroom of

G 2370 is unreadable. If this son was indeed *zš r nsw n hft-hr*, the space available for his name would have been appropriate to either Senedjemib or Mehi. On the other hand, if any credibility is given to the component signs of the name as copied by Lepsius, it is unlikely that either alternative originally stood in that space.⁵¹ If this was not a depiction of Senedjemib Mehi, consideration should be given to the possibility that Mehi was represented by the small figure facing Inti in the prow of his papyrus skiff, even though any identifying caption, if it once existed, was already lost by 1842–43. In spear fishing and fowling scenes, this position is frequently, though not always, reserved for the eldest son.⁵² In actual fact though the portrayal on the west wall of Room III presents a rarer type of composition in which the tomb owner, perhaps as a preliminary to spearing fish or hunting birds, stands in a skiff watching several harpooners attack a hippopotamus against the background of a papyrus thicket.⁵³ Although direct parallels are few in number, in each of the scenes in question a small figure is likewise depicted at the prow of the boat.⁵⁴ In the tombs of Ti and Idout, the figures face towards the tomb owner, but they are not captioned and for that reason probably represent attendants. In the tomb of Kagemni, the scene is largely destroyed and only the feet of the figure, which face away from the tomb owner, are visible. In the scene from the tomb of the vizier Rashepses, the small figure at the prow of the boat is identified as the tomb owner’s eldest son who, in this instance, faces away from his father. The specific parallels are thus inconclusive and do not help to resolve with any degree of certainty the identity of the figure at the prow of Inti’s boat.⁵⁵

Even if the small figure at the prow of the boat did represent a son of Inti’s, there would still be no certainty as to his identity. It may be noted that none of the three sons behind Inti is identified as “eldest son,” and this fact might imply that the figure at the prow of the boat was that of Inti’s eldest son, that is—considering that he inherited both his father’s name and office—Senedjemib Mehi.⁵⁶ On

³⁹ E.g., *LD*, *Text* 1, pp. 62, 141; Green, *PSBA* 31 (1909), pp. 251, pl. 33 (no. 11); 322, pl. 54 (no. 40); Couyat–Montet, *Hamm.*, no. 69, pl. 17; Junker, *Giza* 8, fig. 51; *Mereruka*, 1, pl. 9; *ArchAbousir*, p. 650; *PM* 3², p. 351; Bell–Johnson–Whitcomb, *JNES* 43 (1984), p. 40, fig. 9.

⁴⁰ Edel, *Qubbet el-Hawa* II/1/2, p. 57. The reading *Ftk-ti* is probably confirmed by the presence of a terminal 𓆎 in the occurrence of the name in *Mereruka* 1, pl. 9.

⁴¹ Cf. Junker, *Giza* 8, fig. 51, frg. A.

⁴² See *PM* 3², plan XVI.

⁴³ *LD* 2, pl. 78d; *LD Text* 1, pp. 62–63; Junker, *Giza* 8, pp. 108–16, figs. 47–55, pl. 19; *PM* 3², pp. 166–67.

⁴⁴ *LD Text* 1, p. 62; Junker, *Giza* 8, fig. 51. For the “great name,” see *PN* 1, p. 340, 21; 2, p. 393.

⁴⁵ *Administration*, p. 154 (150); *Decoration*, p. 271.

⁴⁶ He was also *hpr zšw r3-iḥ* (Junker, *Giza* 8, fig. 51; Fischer, *Dendera*, p. 10, n. 47); on this title see idem, *ZÄS* 105 (1978), pp. 58–59.

⁴⁷ He was *imy-r3 Inb-hd imy-r3 Iw*, “overseer of the Memphite nome and overseer of the Letopolite nome,” as well as *imy-r3 niuwt muwt nt Izzī-nfr*, “overseer of the new towns of the pyramid ‘Izezi is beautiful’” (Junker, *Giza* 8, fig. 51; Fischer, *Dendera*, p. 10, n. 47). On the “new towns,” see Hayes, *JEA* 32 (1946), p. 10; Martin–Pardey, *Provinzialverwaltung*, p. 161; Kanawati, *Gov. Reforms*, p. 161.

⁴⁸ See above, pp. 80–81.

⁴⁹ See above, p. 1.

⁵⁰ See above, p. 22.

⁵¹ After the heart-sign, which presumably represented the terminal element in the title *zš r nsw n hft-hr*, Lepsius saw a low, broad space, the mouth *r*, the half-loaf *t*, and another low broad space.

⁵² See e.g., *LD* 2, pl. 60 (eldest); De Morgan, *Dahchour 1894–1895*, pl. 24; ibid. (eldest); Petrie, *Denderah*, pl. 5; idem, *Deshasbeh*, pl. 22; *Gebr.* 1, pls. 3 (eldest), 5 (eldest); 2, pl. 5; *Seven Chapels*, pl. 6; Junker, *Giza* 4, fig. 8; Mohr, *Hetep-ber-akh-ti*, fig. 34 (eldest); Van de Walle, *Neferitnef*, pl. 1; *Nianchchnum*, figs. 5 (eldest), 6 (eldest); Kanawati, *El Hawawish* 2, fig. 18 (eldest). The son on occasion also spears fish or hunts birds or alternatively holds a spare harpoon or boomerang. Sporadically, a non-family member occupies the prow of the boat; see e.g. *Meir* 4, pl. 17; 5, pl. 24.

⁵³ For discussions, see Klebs, *AR*, pp. 37, 69–70; Säve–Söderbergh, *Hippopotamus Hunting*, pp. 12–15; Vandier, *Manuel* 4, pp. 325–26, 773–81.

⁵⁴ *LD* 2, pl. 60; *Teti Cem.* 2, pl. 53; Macramallah, *Idout*, pls. 6–7; *Ti* 2, pls. 115–19. In the first citation, the vizier Rashepses stands in a skiff looking at the papyrus thicket before him; no harpooners or hippopotamus are visible in Lepsius’s drawing, but it is likely they were originally represented, perhaps being missed by Lepsius’s artist because of damage to that area of the wall. All four scenes are close in date to the scene in G 2370; see Harpur, *Decoration*, pp. 275–77.

⁵⁵ On the basis of inscriptions accompanying the minor figures in marsh scenes, Harpur (*Decoration*, p. 141) observes that: “non-relatives are those with their heads or whole bodies turned towards the major figure, whereas known relatives on or near the skiff are either shown facing the deceased or turned away from him.” Unfortunately, this observation does not aid us in the present situation.

⁵⁶ Although Mehi is nowhere specifically identified as “eldest son” on the walls of his father’s tomb, in each case where his figure occurs, either the entire caption identifying his figure, or the beginning of the caption, where *zš.fmsw* would be expected, is destroyed; see figs. 23, 25, 27, 30, 35, 36, 67a, 68a.

the other hand, the small figure at the boat's prow is dressed in a short kilt with flaring front panel, whereas the three sons behind Inti, like their father, wear the calf-length kilt which denotes dignity and perhaps also seniority.⁵⁷ The longer kilts could thus be taken as evidence for supposing that the three sons on the bank were older than the presumed son in the boat. However, the lowermost figure appears to be that of Khnumenti, who is generally acknowledged to be a younger son of Inti, since he succeeded his brother Mehi in the vizierate. Perhaps, at this point, it is best to admit that the destruction of the wall has presented us with too many variables to reach any final conclusion concerning the identity of the figure at the prow of the boat or about the presence or absence of Senedjemib Mehi in the marsh scene. Nevertheless, it would indeed be odd if Mehi was entirely excluded from such a family scene.

Yet another son of Inti and Tjefi's, Ni-ankh-min (*Ni-ankh-Mnw*) by name,⁵⁸ is twice depicted on the walls of G 2370, once at the rear of the portico to the north of the entrance (pl. 16; figs. 26, 27) and again on the north wall of the offering room (fig. 64). In the portico, he is one of four senior officials in calf-length skirts who attend Inti on an outing in the marshes.⁵⁹ In the offering room he brings a goose towards the false door.⁶⁰ In the first location, he is entitled "lector priest," while in the latter he is both "lector [priest] and 'inspector of funerary priests'." The last title identifies Niankhmin as an official of his father's funerary establishment.⁶¹ He does not seem to have left any trace of himself outside of G 2370.

Of all of Inti's sons, Senedjemib Mehi occupied the most prominent place in his father's mastaba. His figure evidently appeared on all four walls of the portico, on both entrance thicknesses, and on either side of the entrance to the pillared hall.⁶² In addition, he perhaps headed the procession of offering bearers in the lowermost register on the south wall of the offering chamber (pls. 38, 41; fig. 61).⁶³ In Inscription C on the facade south of the portico of G 2370, Mehi says:

Then I begged from my lord that a sarcophagus [be] brought [for him] from Tura to this tomb of his, which I made for him in one year and three months, while he was in the embalming workshop in his estate which is in (the necropolis of) the pyramid "Izezi is beautiful."⁶⁴

From these words it has generally been assumed that Mehi constructed his father's tomb at Giza, after the latter's death, while his body was in the process of being embalmed.⁶⁵ Although Baer was of the opinion the tomb was erected by Mehi after his father's death, he admitted that fifteen months was an unexpectedly short time in which to construct and decorate so large and elaborate a mastaba.⁶⁶

⁵⁷ The close-cropped, wigless head and long kilt are often associated with adiposity and advanced years; see e.g., Fischer, *JNES* 18 (1959), pp. 244–55. As Fischer also notes (*ibid.*, p. 245), this type of kilt is not confined to the corpulent, aged figure.

⁵⁸ *PN* 1, p. 171, 12; 2, p. 364.

⁵⁹ See below, p. 40.

⁶⁰ See below, p. 78.

⁶¹ See pp. 87–88 below.

⁶² See n. 56.

⁶³ See below, p. 27–28.

⁶⁴ See below, p. 102.

⁶⁵ E.g., Wilson, *JNES* 6 (1947), pp. 239–40; Baer, *Rank and Title*, p. 126 [456]; Strudwick, *Administration*, p. 133.

⁶⁶ *Rank and Title*, p. 126 [456].

Strudwick, on the other hand, feels that the mention of the time stressed the speed with which the mastaba was built.⁶⁷ Reisner himself held a different opinion and thought that Mehi only finished the tomb, while "his chief work was the decoration of the chapel."⁶⁸

It is difficult to believe that a man of Inti's status and presumed wherewithal would not have prepared a final resting place for himself before his death.⁶⁹ Even given the privileges bestowed upon "the son who buried his father,"⁷⁰ the construction of an entire decorated multi-roomed mastaba for a deceased parent would represent an extraordinary display of filial devotion and a considerable outlay of wealth, especially if Mehi proceeded immediately to the construction of his own mastaba, as Reisner thought possible.⁷¹ For all these reasons, Reisner's opinion that Inti built the mastaba, whereas Mehi merely completed its decoration, deserves serious consideration.

Assuming for the moment that Mehi did, in fact, only complete his father's mastaba, just how much of the decoration could with reason be attributed to him? In Inscription C on the south facade, Mehi as speaker (*infra*) recounts the favors he elicited from the king on his father's behalf at the death of the latter and mentions in passing that he had the royal decrees verifying the arrangements for his father's funerary endowment inscribed on the walls of Inti's tomb.⁷² He goes on to say that he asked the king that a sarcophagus be brought from Tura for Inti's burial.⁷³ Since Inscription D narrates the transport of this sarcophagus from the Tura quarries to Giza, it is clearly related thematically to Inscription C, and it may be taken for granted that Mehi had it carved as well. Presumably, Inscriptions A and B were carved at the same time, since they parallel in arrangement Inscriptions C and D. In fact, all of the elements of the relief scenes on the facade of the tomb and the side walls of the portico are so carefully integrated that at first glance it might seem that they were designed as a unity and executed at one time by craftsmen in Mehi's employ after his father's death. A number of changes effectuated in the decoration of the portico and elsewhere in the tomb suggest that this was not the case, however.

⁶⁷ *Administration*, p. 133.

⁶⁸ "Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon," p. 128g. Reisner based his belief on the faulty assumption that the passage from Inscription C just quoted actually gave the date of the completion of the work on Inti's mastaba as the first year (of Unis) in the third month of the season of *akhet*.

⁶⁹ It is, of course, possible that Inti built an earlier tomb for himself at Saqqara in the cemetery that was established for the family and courtiers of King Izezi north and west of the Step Pyramid. On this possibility, see further below, p. 29.

⁷⁰ In the New Kingdom at least the possessions of the deceased were given to the person who buried him or her; see Janssen and Pestman, *JESHO* 11 (1968), pp. 137–70, and esp. pp. 164–69. The fullest evidence pertaining to the law of inheritance dates to the New Kingdom, but presumably the same principles applied at other periods. *Urk.* 1, p. 164, 1–3, is suggestive in this regard, as are the concluding phrases of the biographical inscription in the Dyn. 9 tomb of Mery-aa at Hagarsa (Kanawati, *El-Hagarsa* 3, p. 33, pl. 35) which describe the responsibilities of "a trustworthy heir, ... who buries his father." On the role of the eldest son in the Old Kingdom and its aftermath, see further *Letters to the Dead*, p. 26; Edel, *Hieroglyphische Inschriften*, pp. 62–63; *idem*, *NAWG* 6 (1987), pp. 94–103.

⁷¹ "Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon," p. 128h.

⁷² See below, pp. 101–102.

⁷³ With Reisner ("Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon," p. 128h), we assume that this is the white limestone sarcophagus now in G 2370 B, on which, see below, p. 81. Reisner concludes from this that all the structures made after the introduction of the sarcophagus into the burial chamber—including the construction of the built passage and the plugging of that passage, the well, and the roofing which protected the well, as well as the addition to the platform which enclosed the well—would have to have been made by Mehi.

Joseph Bonomi was the first to note that the figure of Mehi on the southern entrance thickness of G 2370 (pl. 19a–b; figs. 34, 35) was a secondary insertion executed by a less skilled hand than that responsible for the rest of the thickness.⁷⁴ The figure of Mehi is indeed clearly recut, as was the title in front of his face and the name “Senedjemib” over his head. This entire area is lower than the surrounding surfaces, and the background has not received a final smoothing, but still shows traces of tool marks. The surface of the raised relief figure of the son is also below the level of the surface of the original block. By contrast, the inscription in three columns above Mehi’s head is on a level with that surface and appears original. The recutting is puzzling, because the inscription appears suited to the image, terminating with the expression: “one for whom his son shall do the like.”⁷⁵ It thus seems certain that a figure of a son of Inti stood here originally. But if the figure represented Mehi, why would he have had a figure of himself and the accompanying name cut away and replaced? And if the original figure was not Mehi’s, who could it have represented?

One possibility which must at least be considered is that the figure of an older brother of Mehi’s who predeceased him was originally represented here. Still, if the figure of an older brother of Mehi’s did indeed appear on the south door jamb, it would have been a simple enough matter to replace the brother’s name(s) with his own, but Mehi evidently chose instead to cut the figure away and to replace it with a new one. One possible explanation for the recutting would be that the original figure, whether that of Mehi or an older brother, was dressed in a calf-length kilt, as on the opposite north thickness, and that Mehi wished to have this altered to the short kilt of the final version. Nevertheless, in the Saqqara tomb of Neferirtenes, usurped by Ra-em-kai, where an original portrayal of the owner as an older man in a long kilt was reduced to more slender proportions by the usurper, and the long kilt shortened accordingly, the operation was achieved by simply removing the stone around the legs.⁷⁶ The same process could easily have been followed here, but instead the entire figure was recut.⁷⁷ Perhaps the sculptor who was responsible for recarving the figure on the south entrance jamb of G 2370 simply decided, rightly or wrongly, that it was easier to recut the whole figure.

Close examination reveals that in nearly every instance where Mehi’s figure occurs on the walls of his father’s mastaba, it is in palimpsest, even though, in each instance, the location of the secondary image of Mehi is a suitable place for the figure of a son to have appeared originally.⁷⁸ This is true of the northern entrance thickness

(pl. 20b) and of both the spear fishing and fowling scenes at the back of the portico to either side of the entrance, where the figures of Mehi at the bow of his father’s papyrus skiff and the titles in two columns above his head are recut at a lower level than the original surface in a rougher style by a less accomplished hand, and are clearly distinguishable from the original figures and texts (pls. 15b, 16, 17a).⁷⁹ It is likewise true of the figures of Mehi before his parents on either entrance thickness of the pillared hall (pls. 51b, 52a).⁸⁰ It seems also to be the case on both the south and north walls of the portico, where a smaller figure was represented in the presence of a large-scale figure of Inti with close-cropped hair, a corpulent body, and ankle-length kilt (pls. 13c, 18). The smaller figure on the south portico wall is destroyed except for the legs, but the flatness of the relief and the roughly finished area around the legs are a clear indication that the figure had been recut (pl. 65). Although Lepsius saw the legs of the smaller figure on the north wall of the portico, today the legs are destroyed. Nevertheless, a roughly finished area where the figure used to be attests to recutting here as well (pl. 14).

The leftward orientation of the hieroglyphs in the four columns above the smaller figure on the north portico wall and the context of the speech leave little question that the speaker was a son of Inti. The son tells us that he begged favors from the king on behalf of his deceased father. The fourth column of the speech, which contained the titles and presumably the name of the son, is completely recut at a lower level than the preceding three lines, while the hieroglyphs in this column are in raised relief of poor quality, very much in contrast to the well-executed hieroglyphs of the preceding three columns (pls. 18, 64a).⁸¹ Although the name is now lost, the recut titles appear to be those of Mehi, beginning as they probably did with [*hstj-ꜥ*] *ꜥmsꜥ* (fig. 30; text fig. 2).⁸² The recutting of the fourth column and the substitution of Mehi’s titles, however, once again raise the possibility that the figure and titles that were cut away could have belonged to an older brother of Mehi. If so, he rather than Mehi would have been responsible for the completion of the decoration of Inti’s mastaba, including the carving of Inscriptions A–D.

Alternatively, it is possible that it was Mehi himself who had his own figure and titles recarved. If Mehi, for instance, was promoted to vizier subsequent to the initial carving of the portico reliefs, the fourth line of inscription could have been recut to reflect his new dignity. There is certainly ample room for the sequence *iry-pꜥt tꜥtytꜥ zꜥb tꜥty* in the now destroyed space at the top of the recut fourth column.⁸³ But once again this explanation by itself would not account for the recarved figure.

Before subscribing to either proposition, the possible evidence for the existence of an older brother of Mehi’s should be examined.

⁷⁴ *LD Text 1*, p. 55. See *Who was Who in Egyptology*, pp. 53–54, for a biographical sketch of this English sculptor and draughtsman of Italian descent.

⁷⁵ See below, p. 43.

⁷⁶ Fischer, *JNES* 18 (1959), p. 245.

⁷⁷ It is interesting that the figures of Seshemnofer Tjeti before his parents on the entrance thicknesses to the chapel of Seshemnofer IV also represent a secondary insertion executed by a less skilled hand than that responsible for the remainder of the scene; see Junker, *Giza II*, pp. 180–81, pl. 19 a–b.

⁷⁸ One possible exception is the foremost figure in the lowest register on the south wall of the offering room (pl. 38, 41; fig. 61). The figure here is original, but it is not certain whether or not the name is, and it is possible that Mehi usurped the figure by replacing an original name with his own “great name” Senedjemib. On the other hand, the last element in the name is not visible, and it may be that the name which appears before the figure represents a mortuary priest of Inti’s named Senedjem, on whom see below, p. 87, no. 20.

⁷⁹ See below, p. 39–40.

⁸⁰ See below, pp. 78–79.

⁸¹ See pp. 41–42 below.


⁸² See below, pp. 84 (16), 159 (14).

⁸³ For the reconstruction of the north wall of the portico, see below, p. 94, text fig. 2, and for the title sequence *iry-pꜥt tꜥtytꜥ zꜥb tꜥty*, see p. 155 below. The entire sequence *iry-pꜥt tꜥtytꜥ zꜥb tꜥty hstj-ꜥ msꜥ imy-ꜥt kꜥt nbt nt nswt* appears nowhere on the surviving walls of Mehi’s tomb nor, for that matter, in any of the other tombs of the Senedjemib Complex. The usual sequence in vizier’s titularies of the end of the Fifth Dynasty and later is *iry-pꜥt hstj-ꜥ tꜥtytꜥ zꜥb tꜥty*, and *hstj-ꜥ* rarely follows *tꜥtytꜥ zꜥb tꜥty*; exceptions are Jéquier, *Mon. fun.* 3, pp. 57, 70.

Heading the file of offering bearers in the lowermost register of the north wall of the offering room in G 2370 were two figures of whom scanty traces alone remain (figs. 64, 65).⁸⁴ The figures themselves were destroyed when the plaster in which they were carved fell away, leaving only faint chisel marks behind, but the traces are sufficient to show that both figures probably offered up forelegs of beef, as do the first three figures in the lowermost register on the opposite wall (pl. 41; fig. 61). Traces of signs before their faces indicate that the second man almost definitely was a son of Inti and that the first figure may have been as well.⁸⁵ In both instances, the names are lost, but traces of their titles survive. The first individual was evidently [*mdh*] [*nswt*] *m prwy* “[royal master] ‘builder’ in both houses (Upper and Lower Egypt),” while the second man bore the titles <*tyty*> *zsb* *tyty*, “<chief> justice and vizier.” Two sons of Inti, Mehi and Khnumenti, were viziers of Egypt in their time. Now when siblings are represented in series in Old Kingdom reliefs, it is usually the figure of the elder or eldest brother which takes priority.⁸⁶ If this rule was adhered to in the present instance, the first figure should represent Mehi and the second figure Khnumenti. On the other hand, it is generally assumed that Khnumenti was the younger of the two brothers, since he appears to have followed Mehi in the vizierate (*infra*), and yet it is the second individual here who has the higher ranking vizierial titles. If then the second figure more likely represented Mehi, could the first figure have been that of an older brother who never achieved the vizierate? It was surely not his lower ranking title⁸⁷ which assured the first figure the foremost place in the procession, so could it have been priority of birth that allotted to him a precedence in order, even though a younger brother had risen higher in the pharaonic hierarchy?

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

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

There may, of course, be an alternative explanation for the precedence of the foremost figure than the one just offered. It might, for instance, be possible to restore the kinship term immediately before his face as *sn.f*() rather than *z.f*, in which case an otherwise unattested brother of Inti’s may have been assigned precedence over Inti’s son.⁸⁸ Then again, in long east–west offering rooms like Inti’s,

a *shd hmw-k*, “inspector of funerary priests,” not infrequently heads the procession of offering bearers in the extra register at the foot of the wall.⁸⁹ Faint traces above the foremost figure’s title of [*mdh*] [*nswt*] *m prwy* in G 2370 could conceivably be restored as [*shd*] [*hmw-k*].⁹⁰ Alternatively then, the foremost figure might represent a brother of Inti’s, an inspector of funerary priests who served as head of a phyle in his funerary cult, or even a brother of the latter who functioned in that capacity.

One piece of evidence that is definitely in favor of Mehi’s having been the individual who had Inscriptions A–D carved is the occurrence of what appears to be his titles and name on a block assigned to the beginning of Inscription C (pl. 67b; fig. 20).⁹⁰ The block exhibits no erasures and, if it is correctly placed, and the careful integration of all of the texts and representations on the facade of the tomb and the side walls of the portico taken into account, it would again seem to follow that Mehi arranged for the remainder of the decoration on the portico’s wall to be carved as well.

Proceeding on the assumption that it is was Mehi who altered his own figures, it may be that more than a single reason existed for his having done so. For example, in the case of the figures at the prow of Inti’s skiff in the spear fishing and fowling scenes at the back of the portico, it is possible that the figures originally faced toward the prow of the boat, and that their direction was subsequently reversed because Mehi decided to inscribe an address to his father above each of their heads.⁹¹ On the other hand, this explanation would not be suitable in the case of the figures on the two side walls of the portico or on the two thicknesses, where the earlier figures probably already faced Inti. Similarly, if Mehi’s figure on the left (south) entrance thickness was indeed recut to shorten the kilt, this was definitely not true of the opposite thickness, where the final version of the figure is dressed in a calf-length kilt.

One other alteration to the reliefs on the north side of the portico affected the personal names terminating the columns of inscription above the head of the elderly vizier, where it is clear that both Inti’s “great” and “good” names are not original (pls. 18, 64a). Again it is not certain what necessitated the recutting. It may be that Inti here was originally identified only as “Senedjemib.” This is actually the case with the architrave (pl. 12c) and again on the west wall of the vestibule (pl. 32), where the name “Senedjemib” alone appears, and where it may reasonably be presumed to be original. Probably during the early part of Inti’s life, this served as a perfectly adequate designation for the elder Senedjemib. In his later years though, during Mehi’s professional lifetime, when there were two Senedjemibs, this perhaps was felt to no longer suffice. This would have been especially true in the context of the Senedjemib Complex, where there were at least two tombs belonging to individuals named Senedjemib opening on the stone paved court.⁹² As a result, Mehi may have ordered the alterations to be made, and had the “good name” Inti added to

⁸⁴ See below, pp. 77–78.

⁸⁵ See p. 78 below.

⁸⁶ See e.g., Fischer, *Coptite Nome*, no. 4; idem, *Varia*, p. 88, with fig. 8.

⁸⁷ See below, p. 84 (13).

⁸⁸ The segment of the long, narrow sign, which has been restored as a viper on p. 78 below and in fig. 65, actually has a square end, a feature which is not a characteristic of either the viper or the ripple of water. Nonetheless, all of these signs are only visible today as faint chisel marks.

⁸⁹ E.g., Murray, *Saq. Mast.* 1, pl. 23; James, *Khentika*, pl. 21; *Saqqara Tombs* 1, pl. 12.

⁹⁰ See below, p. 101.

⁹¹ See pp. 39, 40 below.

the “great name” Senedjemib on the north wall, if not on all the walls, of the portico. This followed the practice in Mehi’s own tomb, where the “great name,” Senedjemib, and the “good name,” Mehi, were regularly coupled.⁹³ There being insufficient space over Inti’s head for two lines of hieroglyphs on the scale of the inscription above, the two names were consequently recarved on a smaller scale.

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

In the text inscribed on the southern facade of G 2370 quoted above, Mehi states that while his father’s tomb was being prepared for his burial, his body rested “in the embalming workshop in his estate which is in (the necropolis) of the pyramid ‘Izezi is beautiful.’” There is some evidence that the mummification of private persons in the Old Kingdom took place in workshops attached to their tombs.⁹⁴ However, Inti’s embalming workshop (*w^rbt nt ꜥꜥw*) is specifically said to be located in (the necropolis of) Izezi’s pyramid (*m Nfr-Izzi*). The statement is perplexing, since, as far as we know, there was no contemporary necropolis in the vicinity of Izezi’s pyramid.⁹⁵ It is possible, of course, that Inti’s embalming workshop was located in the cemetery established for Izezi’s contemporaries to the north and west of the Step Pyramid at Saqqara.⁹⁶ In this connection, it may be noted that the tomb of the vizier Washptah Izi, situated north of the Step Pyramid, is specifically said in his autobiography to be in (the necropolis of) the pyramid of Sahure (*m H^r-bs-Sꜥꜥwrꜥ*), whereas the latter’s pyramid was located at Abusir.⁹⁷ The existence of an embalming workshop for Inti in the necropolis of Izezi’s pyramid, wherever

precisely that might be, could be taken as an indication that Inti also had a tomb in the same place. Moreover, if Inti possessed an earlier tomb elsewhere, this might be interpreted as evidence that Mehi indeed constructed his father’s Giza tomb from the beginning, upon the latter’s death. Nevertheless, Inscription C does not specifically say that Inti had a tomb (*iz*) in the necropolis of Izezi’s pyramid, but only states that his embalming workshop was located there, and it may be that he simply possessed an assigned plot therein and authorization from the king to build a tomb. This would have been a convenient place to erect a temporary embalming workshop, away from the hustle and bustle in the courtyard of Inti’s Giza tomb, where the sculptors would have been hard at work finishing its decoration.

Neither Inti’s nor Mehi’s tomb sheds light on the precise period of time that elapsed between the death of the former and the accession of the latter to the vizierate. In the two places within the portico of G 2370 where Mehi’s titulary survives, namely in the fowling scene at the rear of the portico and on its north wall, the vizierial titles do not appear, even though there is space for them in the lacunae before the extant titles. On the other hand, on the loose block assigned to the beginning of Inscription C, Mehi is *imy-rꜥ kꜥt nbt nt nswt*, not *ꜥꜥꜥꜥ ꜥꜥ ꜥꜥꜥꜥ*, and it thus seems likely he was not yet vizier at the time of his father’s death or during the intervening fifteen months while the work on his father’s tomb was underway.⁹⁸ Furthermore, although the similarities between the two tombs⁹⁹ suggest that they were designed by one architect (Reisner assumed Mehi himself was that individual¹⁰⁰), and perhaps carved by the same group of sculptors at no great remove in time from each other, they reveal nothing definite about whether work was progressing simultaneously on both tombs or whether a period of time intervened before Mehi began the construction of his own tomb.

The uppermost stones of virtually all the walls in Mehi’s mastaba had been removed before Lepsius arrived on site to copy its reliefs. Along with them disappeared most of the title sequences that presumably once appeared at the top of the walls. The architrave blocks of Mehi’s mastaba survive, however, and on them Mehi is “overseer of all works of the king,” not vizier (pl. 105a–c). Only on the false door do the vizierial titles appear (pl. 121; figs. 167–27). Thus, if the architrave inscription provides a reliable indication, Mehi appears to have been promoted to vizier in the course of the construction or decoration of G 2378.¹⁰¹ Moreover, the fact that Mehi is “honor[ed by] the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Unis” in the architrave inscription, probably indicates that he was not yet vizier at the beginning(?) of that king’s reign.

Baer and Harpur date the construction of Mehi’s tomb to the reign of Unis,¹⁰² while Strudwick assigns his tenure as vizier to the middle of Unis’s long reign of thirty years,¹⁰³ with Akhethetep and Akhethetep Hemi intervening between Mehi and his father.¹⁰⁴ To

⁹² There is a possibility that Mehi’s elder son, Senedjemib, was the proprietor of G 2384 (below, p. 30).

⁹³ See p. 155 below.

⁹⁴ Hassan, *Giza* 4, pp. 84–86; Brovarski, *Orientalia* 46 (1977), p. 110.

⁹⁵ The “tombes en four” in the immediate area of Izezi’s pyramid are of a type that is characteristic of late Dynasty 6; see Brovarski, in *For His Ka*, pp. 25–28.

⁹⁶ See Smith, in Reisner, *Tomb Dev.*, p. 407; Baer, *Rank and Title*, p. 50. One of Izezi’s queens, two of his sons, and one of his viziers, for example, were buried on the north side of the enclosure wall of the Step Pyramid, while the tomb of Izezi’s famed vizier, the sage Ptahhotep [I], was erected to the west of the Step Pyramid; see *PM* 3², pp. 488 [No. 82], 489 [No. 84], 494 [LS 14], 596 [D 62]; Baer, *Rank and Title*, p. 74 [160].

⁹⁷ *Urk.* 1, p. 44, 12; Baer, *Rank and Title*, p. 50.

⁹⁸ See above, p. 28; below, p. 102.

⁹⁹ See above, p. 18 and n. 139.

¹⁰⁰ “Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon,” p. 128h.

¹⁰¹ Compare the case of Seshemnofer III; Junker, *Giza* 3, pp. 73, 192–215, pls. 1–4; Baer, *Rank and Title*, p. 132 [478].

¹⁰² *Rank and Title*, pp. 126, 293 [456]; *Decoration*, p. 269.

¹⁰³ Smith, *Old Kingdom*, p. 188; Spalinger, *SAK* 21 (1994), pp. 301–303.

¹⁰⁴ *Administration*, pp. 134–35, 301.

some extent Strudwick's date was based on the the assumption that Mehi may have placed his name over that of an older brother in the tomb of his father.¹⁰⁵ While it seems possible from the above discussion that Mehi had an older brother, this possibility alone, as we have previously seen, does not constitute definite evidence as to whether Mehi usurped the images of this older brother on the walls of his father's mastaba or simply recarved his own figures. Nor does it really matter in the present context, for in either case we would still have no accurate means of estimating the period of time that elapsed between the initial carving and the recutting.

Mention has already been made of the badly damaged inscription over the head of the figure of Mehi in the fowling scene at the back of the portico of G 2370. A possible restoration of the inscription is: [*Tr.n.(i) n.f.nw*] *m swt Wnis*, "[It was] out of the largesse of Unis [that I did this for him]."¹⁰⁶ Due to the broken context, the nature of Unis's largesse is not apparent, especially since the gift of a sarcophagus, the establishment of Inti's tomb endowment, and the provision of landed estates that are reported in the grievously damaged Inscription C most likely took place at the end of Izezi's reign.¹⁰⁷

On his false door Mehi (*Mht*)¹⁰⁸ calls himself "one honored by Izezi, whom the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Unis remembered on account of it."¹⁰⁹ The second epithet is quite out of the ordinary, and the juxtaposition seems to suggest that Unis took account of Mehi's achievements under his predecessor Izezi. One possibility is that Unis "remembered" Mehi by appointing him to the vizierate. This interpretation gains support, albeit somewhat tenuous, from a passage in the autobiography of Sabni I at Aswan, who says: *Thr nd.t(i).(i) [...] sh3(w) irt.n.(i) in nb.(i)*, "Now when I was appointed [...], (when) what I had done was remembered by my lord."¹¹⁰

Probably still during his father's lifetime Mehi was married to the "king's daughter of his body" Khentkaus (*Hnti-kw.s*).¹¹¹ Unless she is identical with the "king's eldest daughter of his body, Khentkaus," whose tomb was found by Zaki Saad to the west of Unis's pyramid at Saqqara,¹¹² she is not known from other sources. The vizier Mereruka and the high priest of Ptah, Ptahshepses, were both married to kings' eldest daughters,¹¹³ but in both these instances the seniority of birth is clearly stated, and the lack of the qualifying word in the case of Mehi's wife probably renders her identification with the other Khentkaus unlikely.

On the west wall of the anteroom (Room II) of G 2378, Mehi and Khentkaus appear in a family group together with two sons and

a daughter (pl. 115; figs. 114, 115).¹¹⁴ The two sons were named after Mehi; the "eldest son," who is shown as an adult, was called Senedjemib, and the younger son, who is depicted as a naked child with the sidelock of youth, was called Mehi. Similarly, the daughter was named Khentkaus after her mother. Although dressed like an adult, she was perhaps a third child, since her figure is even smaller than that of her brother Mehi's.

In the family group, the elder son, Senedjemib, bears the titles "royal chamberlain in both houses (Upper and Lower Egypt) and royal master builder," while elsewhere on the walls of his father's tomb, he is "royal chamberlain and royal master builder in both houses."¹¹⁵ He may have been the owner of G 2384, on the south side of the great court, for two reasons. First, G 2384 appears to have been the next major construction in the complex built after G 2374, the tomb of Mehi's younger brother, Khnumenti.¹¹⁶ Hence sequentially it would be appropriate as the burial place of a member of the third generation of the Senedjemib family. The second piece of evidence consists of a loose stone with a fragmentary autobiographical inscription that may derive from the facade of G 2384, since it appears by its character to fit nowhere else in the complex.¹¹⁷ The context is mostly lost, but the text evidently related to the building of the speaker's tomb. That individual was apparently named Senedjemib, although only the end of the name survives (*[Snd] m-ib*). The last line refers to the brother of the owner, who is entitled "royal chamberlain, royal master builder in [both houses]." Unfortunately, his name is lost. Nevertheless, he could have been Senedjemib's younger brother, Mehi, who appears without titles in his father's tomb, at a later stage of life.

Senedjemib Mehi's younger brother, Khnumenti, was depicted in the marsh scene on the west wall of the vestibule in the tomb of Senedjemib Inti.¹¹⁸ The cartouches of Unis and Teti appear among the estate names in Khnumenti's tomb (pl. 92; fig. 87a), and Strudwick believes he possibly served both Unis and Teti as vizier.¹¹⁹ On the other hand, twice as many of the names of Khnumenti's estates are compounded with the royal name Teti than with the name Unis, and Khnumenti's other associations are with the latter sovereign. For example, a loose stone found in the offering room of G 2374 (pl. 96a; fig. 89c), which is inscribed with the vizierial titles, also indicates that Khnumenti held the highest available grade in the priestly hierarchy at Teti's pyramid, that of "inspector of priests," a title which becomes a regular prerogative of the vizier from the reign of Teti.¹²⁰ Strudwick also remarks that considering his relationship to other members of his family and probable age, it is unlikely that Khnumenti lived long into the reign of Teti. Reisner, on the other hand, thought that Khnumenti was buried late in the reign of Teti or soon thereafter.¹²¹ The burial shaft of G 2385 A, which Reisner assigned to the mastaba, actually contained a small diorite bowl inscribed for King Teti

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., pp. 134–35 (information provided by the present writer).

¹⁰⁶ See p. 40 below.

¹⁰⁷ See above, pp. 23–24.

¹⁰⁸ *PN* 1, p. 163, 23; 2, p. 63. In the case of the last citation, Ranke is incorrect in regarding Mehi as the "good name" of a certain Ptah-neb-nefret. Mehi here refers to Senedjemib Mehi, of whose funerary establishment Ptah-neb-nefret was a member; see Brovarski, in *L'Égyptologie en 1979* 2, pp. 121–22.

¹⁰⁹ The epithet *imshw br Izzt* provides another instance of *imshw* as "being honored, esteemed" during one's lifetime; cf. Fischer, *GM* 122 (1991), p. 22.

¹¹⁰ *Urk.* 1, p. 140, 2; Edel, *Älög. Gramm.* 1, § 560; Doret, *NVS*, p. 65, Ex. 102.

¹¹¹ See below, pp. 135, 136, 143. For the personal name Khentkaus, see *PN* 1, p. 273, 7; 2, p. 382. Junker (*Giza* 7, p. 70) translates the name "Die an der Spitze ihrer Ka's ist," but see James, *Khentika*, p. 11 ("Her *kas* are foremost").

¹¹² Saad, *Saqqara and Helwan*, pp. 62–66.

¹¹³ *PM* 3², pp. 464, 525. Other viziers who were married to king's daughters include Ptahshepses, Seshemnofer III, and Kagemni (ibid., pp. 153, 341, 521).

¹¹⁴ Below, pp. 143–44.

¹¹⁵ Below, pp. 138–39.

¹¹⁶ See above, p. 115.

¹¹⁷ Exp. Ph. B 7171; EG 4370. The block will be published in *The Senedjemib Complex*, Pt. 2.





¹¹⁸ See above, p. 24.

¹¹⁹ *Administration*, p. 128 [114].

¹²⁰ See below, p. 129 (21).

(pl. 101b; fig. 94a), a parting gift, perhaps, from that sovereign.¹²² In the final analysis, it may well be that Reisner was correct when he suggested the Khnumenti served with his brother under Unis and only reached the height of his career under Teti.¹²³

Reisner also observed that G 2374 is relatively smaller than either G 2370 or G 2378 and that Khnumenti “in spite of the importance of his titles was possessed of lesser means than his elder brother Mehi.”¹²⁴ The character of Khnumenti’s burial reinforces the impression of a lack of resources. Unlike Inti and Mehi, who were buried in fine stone coffins, Khnumenti’s body was evidently deposited in a simple wooden coffin set in a rectangular coffin-pit excavated in the floor of his burial chamber and roofed with multiple stone slabs.¹²⁵ Both features might be considered as indicative of a short tenure of office. Counter-balancing the impression of limited resources is the fact that the greater part of the reliefs in Khnumenti’s chapel were carved in fine limestone (even though the reliefs themselves are of generally inferior quality).¹²⁶ Moreover, Inti and Mehi are the only proprietors of tombs in the Senedjemib Complex to be provided with sarcophagi, and Khnumenti’s lack of a sarcophagus may reflect a change in burial customs rather than the nature of his financial resources.¹²⁷ Then too, it may be that Khnumenti’s seemingly limited resources may not reflect on his tenure of office at all, but relate rather to his inheritance as a younger son of Inti or to other personal factors of which we are unaware.

The name Khnumenti (*Hnm-nti*) is a relatively rare one, being attested by less than a handful of examples.¹²⁸ Even the reading of the name is contested, Ranke understanding it to be *Hnmt.j*, while Junker reads *Hnmuntj* and Baer *Hnm-nti*.¹²⁹ None of these scholars ventured an opinion as to its meaning. If  conforms to the pattern of , however, the correct reading is possibly *Ny-it.i-Hnm*, “my father belongs to Khnum.”¹³⁰ The date seems somewhat early for  to represent  as the determinative of the name,¹³¹ but might it represent the initial letter of *it* transposed for calligraphic reasons?

It is possible that other occurrences of the name postdate Inti’s son Khnumenti, and that the name became popular as a result of his tenure as vizier.¹³² Two bearers of the name, in fact, are sons of funerary priests of the Senedjemib family, who were in the habit of naming their children after their patrons.¹³³ Late in Dynasty 6 it also serves as the by-name of a certain *Hnmw*.¹³⁴

Khnumenti’s wife is not depicted in the surviving reliefs of his chapel and her name is therefore unknown. None the less, it is likely that the couple had at least one child, since part of what appears to be the figure of a young child holding a bird is preserved in front of Khnumenti in the elaborate palanquin scene in the first room of his chapel (fig. 86).¹³⁵ The hieroglyph *nh* before the figure may have belonged to his name. A photograph taken in 1930 (pl. 91) shows additional traces, including what may be part of the letter *n* centered over the *nh*-sign. The two letters could belong to a name of the pattern *n(y) + substantive + royal name/divine name*, that is, a personal name beginning *N(y)-nh-[...]*, “Life belongs to [...].”¹³⁶ In the space immediately above the name are visible clear traces of the jackal-sign, presumably representing the title *zsb*, “dignitary,” followed by what appears to be the butcher block. If the latter sign does not belong to the title *hry-hbt*, “lector priest,” it might conceivably form part of the personal name, which would then read *Ny-nh-Hrty*, “Life belongs to Kherty.” However, the god Kherty is little attested in Old Kingdom personal names,¹³⁷ although he does occur somewhat regularly in estate names of the same period.¹³⁸ If, conversely, *hry-hbt* is to be restored, the available space between the butcher block and the ripple of water only allows for a low broad or narrow sign. Options would include the *hnm-jar* or the emblem of the god Min.¹³⁹

Unfortunately, Nekhebu’s parents are not named on any of the blocks from his chapel, and his precise relationship to the Senedjemib family is unknown. Given the nature of the traces before the small child depicted in front of Khnumenti in the palanquin scene, it is unlikely that they represent Nekhebu’s court name, Mer-ptah-ankhmeryre. Nevertheless, the very fact that he was proprietor of a major tomb in what is definitely a family complex, as well as the fact that his titles are connected with public works, make some relationship very likely.¹⁴⁰ Smith speculated that Nekhebu was the son of Senedjemib Inti,¹⁴¹ but Reisner evidently believed him to be a son of Khnumenti.¹⁴² Since Nekhebu appears to have been a young man at the beginning of the reign of Pepy I, as will be seen shortly, the time differential makes it more likely that he was a son of Khnumenti.¹⁴³

¹²¹ “Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon,” p. 128 i. Reisner (ibid., pp. 128h–i) placed the birth of Inti about thirty years before the accession of Izezi, which would make Inti about fifty-eight years old at death, if the figure of twenty-eight years in the Turin Canon is used or sixty years old, if Izezi celebrated a jubilee in his thirtieth year; see above, p. 23, n. 1; below p. 101, n. m. He thought Mehi would have been about twenty-eight to thirty-eight years old at the accession of Unis; if he lived till the end of the reign of Unis, he would have been fifty-eight to sixty-eight years old at his death. Reisner concluded that Khnumenti was buried about twelve to fourteen years after the death of Mehi. If the skeleton of Inti can ultimately be identified at Giza (see Preface) and analyzed, it may prove possible to confirm or reject Reisner’s conjectures.

¹²² See below, pp. 127, 129.

¹²³ “Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon,” p. 128i.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ On coffin pits, see *GN* 1, pp. 162–63, and Reisner, “A History of the Giza Necropolis,” Vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 224–26. For Khnumenti’s burial, see below, pp. 127–28.

¹²⁶ See above, p. 20.

¹²⁷ Sloping-passage tombs G 2381 A, 2381 C, 2382 A, 2387 A, are all equipped with either coffin- or burial-pits. The coffin of Ptahshepses Impy was actually found by Reisner in the coffin-pit of G 2381 A; see below, p. 33.

¹²⁸ *PN* 1, p. 276, 19; 2, p. 383. See Junker, *Giza* 6, fig. 38b, for an official named *Hnm-ny*.

¹²⁹ *Rank and Title*, p. 118 [402].

¹³⁰ See Fischer, *Varia Nova*, p. 71.

¹³¹ Idem., *Coptite Nome*, pp. 124–25; *Dendera*, p. 239.

¹³² Harpur, *Decoration*, p. 267, dates Nisuptah Nisu, the father of one of the individuals named Khnumenti to the reign of Teti; it is possible that Nisuptah named his son after the vizier under whom he served.

¹³³ A son of Irenakhet Iri, the owner of G 2391, and a son of another Senedjemib Inti, the proprietor of G 2364, on whom see Brovarski, in: *L’Egyptologie in 1979*, p. 121, and *The Senedjemib Complex*, Pt. 2.

¹³⁴ Jéquier, *ASAE* 35 (1935), p. 145.

¹³⁵ See below, p. 121.

¹³⁶ Edel, *Altäg. Gramm.* 2, p. xlvii (§ 366); Fischer, *Varia Nova*, pp. 55–56.

¹³⁷ *PN* 1, p. 277, 3. The god is better documented in Middle Kingdom personal names; see ibid., p. 277, 9–12; 293, 2; *Inscr. Sinai* 1, nos. 39, 85, 120, 212.

¹³⁸ Jacquet-Gordon, *Domaines*, pp. 191 (43), 310 (1).

¹³⁹ Gardiner, *EG*, p. 503 [R 17], 528 [W 9].


¹⁴⁰ See Strudwick, *Administration*, p. 113.

¹⁴¹ *Old Kingdom*, p. 86.

¹⁴² *ASAE* 13 (1914), p. 249; idem, *BMFA* 11, no. 66 (1913), p. 62.

¹⁴³ Pace Brovarski, in *L’Egyptologie in 1979* 2, p. 117.

Considering the extensive damage to Khnumenti's reliefs, it is possible that Nekhebu was originally represented elsewhere on the walls of G 2374.

Like Khnumenti, the name Nekhebu (*Nhbw*) is an uncommon one.¹⁴⁴ As a substantive *nhbw* appears to mean "lamp" or "nocturnal illumination,"¹⁴⁵ and this term may well explain the origin of Nekhebu's name. Alternatively, he may have been named after Nekheb (*Nhb*), an obscure deity known from the Coffin Texts, without doubt the masculine counterpart of the divinity Nekhbet (*Nhbt*), "Fruitfulness."¹⁴⁶ Both the noun and divine names are written with the brazier determinative .

According to his autobiography, Nekhebu advanced step by step to positions of increased responsibility and power in the reign of Meryre Pepy I,¹⁴⁷ a circumstance reflected in his court name Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre (*Mr-Pth-nh-Mryr*).¹⁴⁸ Nekhebu relates that Pepy I found him as a "common builder" (*qdw n ʿst*), but conferred on him in turn, the offices of "inspector of builders" (*shd n qdw*), "overseer of builders" (*imy-r qdw*), and "superintendent of a phyle (of workmen)" (*mty n z*).¹⁴⁹ Next he became "royal master builder" (*mdh qd nswt*), and then was promoted to be "royal chamberlain and royal master builder." Finally, he was made "sole friend and royal master builder in both houses (Upper and Lower Egypt)." Previous to this, Nekhebu had served as apprentice to an older brother, as the latter rose through the same series of grades. At the start of his brother's career, Nekhebu evidently functioned as his personal scribe or secretary. When the latter was appointed inspector of builders, he carried his measuring rod (*msi*). When he was appointed "overseer of builders," Nekhebu served as his right hand man (*hmt.f*; lit. "his three").¹⁵⁰ When the brother became "royal master builder" and then "sole friend and royal master builder in both houses," Nekhebu took charge of his estate and substantially increased his holdings. Finally, when the brother became "overseer of works," Nekhebu served as his deputy. Nekhebu says he served under his brother in these various capacities for twenty years.¹⁵¹

The professional offices held by the two brothers in order of progressive importance, and also in order of their acquisition, are as follows:¹⁵²

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

¹⁴⁴ *PN* 2, p. 209, 14; 2, p. 371.

¹⁴⁵ *Wb.* 2, p. 308, 12. *ALex* 2 (1978), p. 204, cites an additional occurrence in *FECT* 3, 17 (sp 827), n. 2 (*CTVII*, 28 c).

¹⁴⁶ *ALex* 2 (1978), p. 204, citing *FECT* 2, p. 69 (sp. 422), n. 4 (*CT V* 260 c); see also *LD* 2, pl. 1401 (Berlin 1195; *Nhby*). For *Nhbt*, evidently distinct from Nekhbet, "She of El Kab," see *Wb.* 2, p. 308, 14 and 15.

¹⁴⁷ See Dunham, *JEA* 24 (1938), pp. 1–8. Nekhebu's inscriptions were published by Sethe in *Urk.* 1, pp. 215–21.

¹⁴⁸ *PN* 1, p. 156, 12 ("Ptah will, daß [König] *mrjj-r'lebt*"); 2, p. 361.

¹⁴⁹ For the organization of the crews of workers," see Roth, *Phyles*, chap. 7.

¹⁵⁰ Dunham, *JEA* 24 (1938), p. 4, translates *hnm* "companion," and refers to Sethe, *Von Zahlen und Zahlworten*, p. 120.

¹⁵¹ *Urk.* 1, pp. 216, 9–217, 3.


¹⁵² Cf. Dunham, *JEA* 24 (1938), p. 7.

4. Superintendent of a Guild

5. Royal Master Builder	Royal Master Builder
6. Royal Master Builder in Both Houses	Royal Master Builder in Both Houses
7. Overseer of all Works of the King	Overseer of Works

As Dows Dunham very well observed in his study of the inscriptions of Nekhebu in Boston and Cairo: "These records not only give us an indication of the relative grades of the various professional offices, but also tend to show that they were not, at this time, acquired purely by inheritance, but were, in part at least, the rewards of training and experience."¹⁵³

It is unfortunate that the name of the brother in Nekhebu's account is lost (or was never given). A brother named Mer-ptah-ankh-pepy (*Mr-Pth-nh-Ppy*) with the title of "senior lector priest" does appear on a block from G 2381 which preserves part of a procession of animals, but in a position subordinate to Nekhebu, so it is unlikely he is the older brother referred to in the inscription.¹⁵⁴ Nekhebu's older brother was clearly an important official who had attained the position of "overseer of works."¹⁵⁵ On that account, he may have been the owner of G 2385, one of the largest chapels in the Senedjemib Complex, but of which only the lowest, undecorated courses of stone remained.¹⁵⁶

Nekhebu's wife, Hatkau (*Hst-kyw*),¹⁵⁷ was depicted at least twice in G 2381, once in the context of a family scene¹⁵⁸ and a second time playing the harp before her husband beneath an awning at the stern of a ship.¹⁵⁹ In the last place, she is given the title "king's acquaintance." Hatkau bore at least two and probably three sons to Nekhebu. Two sons accompany their father in a scene on the right-hand wall of the portico of G 2381 that shows Nekhebu engaged in spearing fish.¹⁶⁰ In front of Nekhebu in his papyrus skiff stands a smaller figure, likewise shown spearing fish. An incomplete inscription before him gave his titles and name. "His son [whom he] loves, the sole friend and royal [master <builder>], Tj[...]" can be made out. The name is damaged, but is probably to be restored on the basis of this son's appearance in the family scene, where he is again the "royal master <builder>," but where the name appears to be Tjemat ( *Tjmsi*).¹⁶¹ The other son, who stands behind Nekhebu on a separate groundline, is "his son whom he loves, the lector priest and scribe of the house of the god's book, Sabu-ptah." In front of Nekhebu and facing him stands a third male figure, holding an extra fish spear,

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁴ MFA 13.4346.

¹⁵⁵ As Strudwick, *Administration*, pp. 221–22, points out, *imy-r kst nbt (nt) nswt* is frequently abbreviated to *imy-r kst* for reasons of space. Presumably, space was a consideration in the autobiographical inscription, and it is probably safe to assume that Nekhebu's brother also held the fuller version of the title, *imy-r kst nbt nt nswt*.


¹⁵⁶ See above, pp. 2–3.

¹⁵⁷ *PN* 1, p. 232, 24; 2, p. 375.

¹⁵⁸ MFA 13.1343.

¹⁵⁹ MFA 13.4349; see Fischer, *Egyptian Women*, p. 36, n. 63, fig. 12.

¹⁶⁰ MFA 13.4332; Smith, *BMEF* 56 (1958), pp. 58–60, fig. 2.

¹⁶¹ The name is not listed in *PN* 1, but a personal name in Hassan, *Giza* 9, figs. 32–33, pls. 31A–B, is possibly to be compared. The title is actually written , an apparent abbreviation of *mdh qd nswt* which also occurs on the serdab blocks of Nekhebu (Exp. Ph. B 1312).

and identified as: “His brother, whom he loves, the lector priest, the honored [...]” The latter is most likely identical with Nekhebu’s younger (?) brother Mer-ptah-ankh-pepy who appears on the block with the animal procession referred to above, albeit with the higher ranking title there of “senior lector priest.”¹⁶²

The autobiography of Nekhebu contains an account of three missions that he undertook on behalf of his sovereign, King Pepy I.¹⁶³ The first consisted of work on the *ka*-chapels of the king in Lower Egypt from Akhbit near Buto south to Memphis,¹⁶⁴ and included the construction of the king’s own pyramid temple.¹⁶⁵ The second mission was concerned with the digging of a canal at Akhbit itself. The third mission, this time in Upper Egypt, involved the digging of another canal at Qus. Three inscriptions in the Wadi Hammamat commemorate yet another project Nekhebu undertook at the behest of his sovereign, this one specifically dated to the latter part of Pepy I’s long reign of at least twenty-five years.¹⁶⁶ The expedition to the quarries of *bekhen*-stone took place in the year 19, on the occasion of or in preparation for the *sed*-festival of the king.¹⁶⁷ In each of the three inscriptions, it is the court name alone of Nekhebu that is utilized, but there can be little doubt that he was the “overseer of all works of the king, sole friend, royal master builder in both houses, Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre.”¹⁶⁸ Nekhebu took with him to the Wadi Hammamat his grown son Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre, who in one inscription is entitled “lector priest,” and in another “senior lector priest.”¹⁶⁹

Along the eastern edge of the Senedjemib Complex, opposite the mastaba of Nekhebu, but on a lower level, Reisner discovered an intact sloping-passage tomb, G 2381 A. In the chamber at the bottom of the inclined passage an inscribed wooden coffin containing a badly mummified body was found.¹⁷⁰ At first glance, the coffin, which is now in Boston, appears to be inscribed for two people, Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre Ptahshepses Impy and Sabu-ptah Ibebi. The presence of the two sets of names has caused some confusion,¹⁷¹ but this can be resolved by a close examination of the coffin. The coffin has on the lid two identical offering formulas, the first terminating in the

title and names of Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre Ptahshepses Impy (*Pth-šps Impy*)¹⁷² and the second ending with the titulary and names of Sabu-Ptah Ibebi (*Sbw-Pth Ibbi*).¹⁷³ The exterior east side similarly bears two identical offering formulas, the top one for the benefit of Impy, the lower one benefiting Ibebi. The exterior west side has two additional identical formulas, the top line ending with the titles and names of Impy and the lower one with those of Ibebi. The short double line of inscription on the north end is hardly legible, but probably terminated with the same two names. The south end of the coffin was destroyed. The situation is different in the interior, however. The inscriptions along the interior rim on all four sides of the coffin are for the benefit of Impy alone. On the west side a single line of offering formula ends with the titles and names of Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre Ptahshepses Impy. On the north end is a single line of inscription with an offering formula again naming Impy as beneficiary, and beneath this are the jars containing the seven sacred oils. On the east side a pair of *wedjat*-eyes is set above a schematic false door. The offering formula in a single line at the top of this side terminates in the name Mer-ptah-ankh-pepy Ptahshepses Impy. The substitution of Pepy for Meryre in this instance is noteworthy. In Impy’s case, it occurs only here, but the exchange of royal prenomen and nomen in basilophoric names is a fairly common phenomenon.¹⁷⁴ Immediately to the left of the false door is an ideographic offering list, whose signs are arranged in a vertical block, requesting “a thousand loaves of bread, a thousand jars of beer,” and so forth for “the count Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre, whose good name is Ptahshepses Impy.” Squeezed between this and the lengthy compartment offering list to the right is a column of much smaller hieroglyphs, apparently added as an afterthought, assuring the same offerings for Sabu-ptah Ibebi.¹⁷⁵ The nature of the inscriptions on the wooden coffin proved to Reisner that the burial was that of Impy, and there can be little doubt that he was right in the assumption, even though the alabaster headrest found in the coffin itself, and which supported the head of the mummy, was inscribed for Ibebi.¹⁷⁶ Drawing attention to the similarity in plan between G 2381 A and sloping passage tomb G 2381 c, close-by G 2381 A but on the other side of the drainage channel leading away from the northwest corner of the enclosure of the Great Pyramid, Reisner concluded that Ibebi was buried in G 2381 c.¹⁷⁷

The extraordinary juxtaposition of names on one and the same coffin can perhaps be explained if we assume that, on the death of his brother, Ibebi oversaw the preparations for Impy’s internment and had his own titles and names added to the coffin in commemoration. The identical nature of the two chapels G 2386-a and b and the fact that the two intercommunicated suggests that they belonged to the

¹⁶² In the Wadi Hammamat, Nekhebu’s son Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre is alternately “lector priest” and “senior lector priest” (*infra*).

¹⁶³ See Dunham, *JEA* 24 (1938), p. 1.

¹⁶⁴ On royal *ka*-chapels in the Old Kingdom, see Fischer, *AJA* 62 (1958), pp. 330–33; O’Connor, in *Followers of Horus*, pp. 90–91; Brovarski, in *For His Ka*, pp. 16–19.

¹⁶⁵ Nekhebu was *imy-rs wpt Mn-nfr-Ppy*, “overseer of commissions of the pyramid ‘Pepy is established and beautiful,’” a title he perhaps acquired in connection with the mission in Lower Egypt; see Dunham, *JEA* 24 (1938), p. 8.

¹⁶⁶ Baer, “Egyptian Chronology,” pp. 1, 8, 9; Spalinger, *SAK* 21 (1994), pp. 303–306.

¹⁶⁷ Couyat–Montet, *Hamm.*, no. 106 (= *Urk.* 1, p. 93). The other two inscriptions are Couyat–Montet, *Hamm.*, no. 60 (= *Urk.* 1, p. 94); Goyon, *Hamm.*, no. 21. On the existence of two apparent separate dates (*rnpt ht zp* 18 and *zp* 25) for the jubilee of Pepy I, and their interpretation, see most recently Spalinger, *SAK* 21 (1995), pp. 303 and n. 72, 304.

¹⁶⁸ The same sequence of titles, once in connection with the name Nekhebu, and a second time associated with the name Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre, appears in Nekhebu’s tomb at Giza; see Dunham, *JEA* 24 (1938), p. 7 (B, D).

¹⁶⁹ Couyat–Montet, *Hamm.*, no. 106; Goyon, *Hamm.*, no. 21.

¹⁷⁰ See *BMFA* 11, no. 66 (November, 1913), pp. 58–59, for Reisner’s account of the discovery. The coffin is MFA 13.3085, and is to be included in *The Senedjemib Complex*, Pt. 2.

¹⁷¹ The present author, in *L’Égyptologie en 1979* 2, pp. 115–16, misled by the alabaster headrest beneath the head of the body (*infra*), which was inscribed for Sabu-ptah Ibebi, mistakenly assigned the burial to that individual, instead of Ptahshepses Impy.

¹⁷² *Impy* (*PN* 1, p. 26, 13) not uncommonly serves as the “good name” of Ptahshepses (*Pth-šps ? Šps-Pth*): *PN* 1, p. 326, 19); e.g., Louvre A 108 (= N 113; Strudwick, *Administration*, p. 90 [53 a]); Ziegler, *Stèles, peintures et reliefs*, cat. no. 31 (= Brovarski, in *Hommages à Jean Leclant*, p. 110, fig. 6).

¹⁷³ Ranke lists *Sbw-Pth* under *pth-sbw (sb-wj-pt)* in *PN* 1, p. 141, 13. Fischer, *Orientalia* 60 (1991), p. 302, suggests *Sbw(y)-Pth*, “How bright is Ptah.” For *Ibbi*, see *PN* 1, p. 21, 8; 2, p. 339. In Mariette, *Mastabas*, pp. 375, 413, *Ibbi* is the “good name” of a *Sbw*.

¹⁷⁴ See Brovarski, in *For His Ka*, p. 37 and n. 54.

¹⁷⁵ *n imy-rs kst imshw hr ntr-š*.

¹⁷⁶ The headrest is MFA 13.2925 b (*smr w’ry, hry-tp nswt, mdh qd nswt m prwy Ibbi*).

¹⁷⁷ See above p. 3 and n. 42.

two brothers, and also attest to the close relationship between them.¹⁷⁸ The only comparable display of filial devotion known to me is the case of the two brothers, Ni-ankh-khnum and Khnumhotep, who were buried together in a single Saqqara tomb.¹⁷⁹

Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre Ptahshepses Impy and Sabu-ptah Ibebi of the coffin are generally taken to be sons of Nekhebu.¹⁸⁰ On the coffin both are designated “count, overseer of all works of the king, royal master builder in both houses, overseer of the two workshops.” On the interior north end, Impy is, in addition, “*sem*-priest, controller of every kilt, chief lector priest, and *ims*-*r*,” while Sabu-ptah Ibebi is “sole friend and lector priest” in the second line on the lid. The title of “lector priest” is also assigned Nekhebu’s son Sabu-ptah in the spear fishing scene from G 2381, and the identity of the two therefore seems likely. Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre Ptahshepses Impy, on the other hand, appears nowhere in the surviving reliefs from the mastaba of Nekhebu. By itself this does not constitute a real objection to identifying him as another son of Nekhebu, since perhaps fifty percent of those reliefs are lost, and his figure may well have appeared in one or more of the missing scenes. Moreover, in the spear fishing scene, Sabu-ptah is designated “son whom he loves,” not “eldest son.” The probability is therefore that an eldest son was depicted elsewhere in the chapel, and that Ptahshepses Impy was that son. Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre in the Wadi Hammamat is “senior lector priest” (*hry-hbt smsw*), whereas Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre Ptahshepses Impy is “chief lector priest” (*hry-hbt hry-tp*) on the coffin from G 2381 A. Nevertheless, outside the Senedjemib family, Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre is a rare name and, although not entirely beyond the bounds of probability, it seems unnecessary to postulate the existence of yet another “overseer of all works of the king, sole friend, and royal master builder in both houses” named Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre, who had a son by the same name, when Nekhebu and his son seem to fit the requirements so well.

If Impy was a teenager or young adult when he accompanied his father to the Wadi Hammamat in the nineteenth year of Pepy I, he could easily have lived on through the remaining years of Pepy I’s reign and the short reign of Merenre (six years) and on into the first half of the reign of Pepy II.¹⁸¹ In fact, an Impy with the titles “overseer of all works, master builder of the king in both houses,” in all probability our man, is depicted along with other officials in a procession in the pyramid temple of Pepy II,¹⁸² whose decoration appears to have been largely completed around years twenty to thirty of Pepy II.¹⁸³ Corroborating the pictorial testimony is a seal impression

of Pepy II found by Reisner on a domed jar stopper still in place on a two-handled vase in the burial chamber of G 2381 A.¹⁸⁴

The importance of the office of “overseer of all works of the king,” incidentally, is immediately apparent from the depiction in the pyramid temple of Pepy II, for Impy is separated by only two other officials, the “overseer of tenant-farmers of the palace” and the “overseer of Upper Egypt,” from the figure of the vizier who heads the procession.

Whereas nothing survives to indicate that Nekhebu ever held the office of vizier, evidence does exist to show that both Impy and Ibebi achieved that dignity. That evidence consists of blocks from the destroyed serdab(s) of the two brothers. Several fragments of the serdab of Ibebi are preserved in Boston. Three complete and nine incomplete representations of Ibebi together with his titles are carefully incised in registers on the surface of two adjoining blocks.¹⁸⁵ On one edge of the larger block the titles *imy-r niwt, t3ty [z3b t3ty]* are to be made out. Another block found in the debris of the open court of the Senedjemib Complex, whose present whereabouts are unknown, bears seven lightly incised figures of Impy, none of them completely preserved. Over the figures the titles *h3ty-r, t3ty z3b t3ty, imy-r z3 r nswt* appear.¹⁸⁶

Before Impy and Ibebi are added to the list of known viziers, it should be reiterated that the vizierial titles occur only on blocks from their serdab(s). Similarly, in his Meir tomb, Pepyankh Heny the Black is assigned the titles *t3ty z3b t3ty* only once, in his serdab decorated with registers of repeating figures representing statues, so like the files of statues from the serdabs of Nekhebu, Impy, and Ibebi.¹⁸⁷ It is hence legitimate to inquire whether these singular occurrences of the vizierial titles are instances of posthumous promotion of the sort known from the tomb of Djau at Deir el-Gebrawi, who begged for his father Djau Shemai a posthumous promotion from King Pepy II to the rank of *h3ty-r*.¹⁸⁸ In the succeeding First Intermediate Period, such offices which the deceased did not exercise on earth, but which he boasts of in his funerary inscriptions were referred to as *iwrt hrt-ntr*, “offices of the necropolis.”¹⁸⁹ It should be noted, however, that in the one definite instance we possess of posthumous promotions, the beneficiary, Djau Shemai, is promoted in rank and assigned the rank-indicator *h3ty-r*, but receives no new offices or titles which would imply practical duties with functional significance. Very little survives of the chapels of Impy and Ibebi and the vizierial titles perhaps also occurred on their walls.¹⁹⁰ For these reasons, it is

¹⁷⁸ See above, p. 3.

¹⁷⁹ *Nianchnum*.

¹⁸⁰ E.g., Reisner, *BMFA* 11, no. 66 (November, 1913), p. 59; Smith, *Old Kingdom*, pp. 86–87; Strudwick, *Administration*, pp. 96 [62], 130 [117]. Reisner’s reason for identifying Impy (“Im-thepy”) as a son of Nekhebu was his appearance in the swamp scene with his father; in this observation Reisner was mistaken, for it is Sabu-ptah Ibebi who appears in the swamp scene (actually the scene of spear-fishing). Baer, however, felt the individuals named on the coffin could not be the sons of Nekhebu, since the title sequences on the coffin according to him violate the sequence usual for the second half(?) of the Sixth Dynasty, and on that basis they instead would have to be at least his great-grandchildren (*Rank and Title*, pp. 96, 292 [286A–b]). As a result, he dated Impy and Ibebi after the end of the Old Kingdom.

¹⁸¹ On the lengths of the reigns of Pepy I, Merenre, and Pepy II, see Baer, “Egyptian Chronology,” pp. 1, 8, 9; Spalinger, *SAK* 21 (1994), pp. 306–307.

¹⁸² Jéquier, *Mon. fun.* 2, pl. 48. The connection was already noted by Smith, *Old Kingdom*, p. 187.

¹⁸³ Baer, *Rank and Title*, p. 62; Strudwick, *Administration*, pp. 64–65, 96.

¹⁸⁴ *GN* 2, p. 54, pl. 52 g, fig. 54.

¹⁸⁵ Exp Ph. B 1455; the adjoining blocks are illustrated in Eaton-Krauss, *Representations of Statuary*, pl. 31.

¹⁸⁶ Exp. Ph. C 5201.

¹⁸⁷ *Meir* 5, pl. 40. For the blocks from Nekhebu’s serdab, see Fischer, *JARCE* 2 (1963), pp. 21–22, frontispiece (in color), pls. 2–3.

¹⁸⁸ *Gebr.* 2, pl. 13. Helck (*Beamtentitel*, pp. 116–17, 136ff.) thought that there could be only one functioning vizier at a time and postulated the existence of “titular viziers” in an attempt to explain away the embarrassingly large number of viziers from the reign of Izezi onwards. Baer too was of the opinion that even the title of vizier could be a rank-indicator on occasion (*Rank and Title*, p. 3). Kanawati, *Gov. Reforms*, pp. 15, 34–35, 54, and passim, and Strudwick, *Administration*, pp. 322–28, have now effectively countered Helck’s arguments, postulating instead that two (sometimes three) viziers served simultaneously, either on a geographical basis, that is, one for Upper and one for Lower Egypt, or in terms of function.

¹⁸⁹ Fischer, *Dendera*, p. 145.

probably safe to add the two brothers to the list of known viziers who served Pepy II.¹⁹¹

Although the false door from the small offering room of Werkau-ba Iku (G 2383),¹⁹² built against the south face of the mastaba of Mehi is damaged, the titles *ḥḥty zsb ḥḥty* are discernable at the top of its outer jambs.¹⁹³ There is nothing in the palaeography of the inscriptions to suggest that the false door is later than the Old Kingdom, but considering the humble nature of the offering room, Iku

may have served one of the successors of Pepy II.¹⁹⁴ Taking into account the location of his tomb, Iku may well have been a descendant of the Senedjemib family, even though we are ignorant of his exact relationship. Since no shaft was found in or behind his chapel, Reisner felt he was buried in one of the successive additions (G 2376 or 2377) to the west side of the mastaba of Mehi.¹⁹⁵ It seems more likely that he was buried in an intrusive shaft constructed in the serdab of Mehi's tomb (G 2378 B).¹⁹⁶ His wife(?) Tjefreret¹⁹⁷ and a son named Iku after his father are also commemorated on the false door.

¹⁹⁰ In the case of Ibebi, two other adjoining blocks in Boston (Exp. Ph. B 1623, 1668) give his name and the titles [*ḥḥty-ḥ mḥ, imy-rs kst*].

¹⁹¹ Cf. Brovanski, in: *L'Égyptologie en 1979*, p. 118, and see Strudwick, *Administration*, pp. 96 (62), 130 (117).

¹⁹² Ranke's citation to *Wr-kw-b* in *PN I*, p. 417, 27, is our individual. In *PN I*, p. 48, 10, only feminine occurrences are cited for the name *Ikw* in the Old Kingdom, although in *PN I*, p. 417, 27, Ranke does refer to *Ikw* as the other name of *Wr-kw-b*.

¹⁹³ See the sketch in Brovanski, in *L'Égyptologie en 1979*, fig. 21.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 120, and see above, p. 3.

¹⁹⁵ But see above, p. 3.

¹⁹⁶ See below, pp. 157, 158.

¹⁹⁷ The name *Tjfrt* does not occur in *PN I-3*.

