

INTRODUCTION

AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER of the Great Pyramid, on the eastern edge of the Western Field at Giza, stands the complex of mastabas of the Senedjemib family which contains the well-known tombs of Senedjemib Inti (G 2370) and his son Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378), who served kings Izezi and Unis respectively as viziers and chief architects (frontispiece A, pl. 1a). In 1842 to 1843 Lepsius excavated these two tombs, made plans, and copied their reliefs and inscriptions.¹ During the spring of 1850, the Reverend Johann Rudolph Theophilus Lieder re-excavated the two tombs and, together with his wife Alice, made a number of squeezes of the reliefs which are now the property of the Griffith Institute, Oxford.² Seven months later, Mariette made plans of the tombs and copied certain of their inscriptions.³ About 1901, Reisner heard that the villagers of Kafr el-Haram at the foot of the pyramids had conducted illicit excavations at the place and removed some stones.⁴ In the intervening years, sand had drifted over the site and, when Reisner began work in October 1912, all that was visible of the Senedjemib Complex was a double mound rising above the surrounding debris (pl. 1b).⁵

Reisner cleared the site between October 25, 1912 and January 27, 1913 and discovered that the two tombs of Inti and Mehi were only part of a great complex of tombs erected around a stone paved court approached by a sloping ramp leading up to the west from the pyramid plateau (figs. 2, 3). Between Inti's and Mehi's tombs, Reisner uncovered a third tomb, that of Khnumenti (G 2374), another son of Senedjemib Inti, who appears to have carried on his father's duties under Teti.⁶ Two other large mastabas opened on the paved court of the complex, but both had been destroyed nearly to their foundations. One of these was the tomb of Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre Nekhebu (G 2381). The owner of the second (G 2385) was never identified. There were also at least five smaller offering rooms connected with the group (G 2383, 2384, 2386-a and b, 2390). Thus, all told, there were ten separate chapels set up on the pavement of the court. In addition, opposite the tomb of Nekhebu, Reisner came upon a

sloping shaft (G 2381 A) closed with a great rectangular block of limestone that protected the unviolated burial of one of the sons of Nekhebu, Mer-ptah-ankh-meryre Ptahshepses Impy.⁷

The nucleus mastaba was that of Senedjemib Inti (G 2370).⁸ This mastaba stands east of the northernmost row of mastabas of the Cemetery en Echelon with the large mastabas G 2350 and 2360 intervening (pl. 5a; fig. 1).⁹ At the time the mastaba was built, that cemetery had already grown eastwards beyond G 2360, and several smaller mastabas were overbuilt by G 2370.¹⁰ In constructing the mastaba of Inti, the eastern part of an older mud brick mastaba (G 2371) was cut away and the west wall of G 2370, constructed of great blocks of grey nummulitic limestone set in high courses and roughly dressed to a sloping surface (Masonry w), was built inside the east wall of G 2371 (pls. 81c, 82a).¹¹ The remains of walls of small blocks of grey nummulitic limestone set in correspondingly low courses to form a rough sloping surface (Masonry u) inside G 2370 at ground level (numbered G 2372 by Reisner) apparently represented the east face of G 2371, and indicated a wide recess in the middle of a north-south facade forming a portico chapel with a roof supported by pillars (figs. 2, 3, 76).¹² Still within G 2370 and parallel to the presumed face of G 2371/2372, at a distance of 60 cm, ran a north-south wall of small nummulitic limestone blocks set in low-stepped courses forming the back wall of another older mastaba (G 2373). The front part of this mastaba was destroyed by the construction of the interior chapel of Inti. A shaft immediately behind Inti's false door was ascribed to G 2373 by Reisner and lettered A (figs. 2, 3, 76).¹³ Part of a wall that probably belonged to an older mastaba was also discovered by Reisner under the floor at the western end of the pillared hall of G 2370.¹⁴ Older mud brick walls were also found at different levels under G 2378 and 2379 (pls. 102a, 104b).¹⁵

The paved court of the Senedjemib Complex is higher than the foundations of G 2370 and about 2.0 m higher than the rock east of the complex (fig. 7). The east wall of the paved area was formed by a retaining wall of heavy rubble with a batter on the east, and the sloping ramp from the floor level of the court to the lower ground led down between two low walls (pls. 3b, 4b, 6b). Along the retaining wall were five large sloping-passage tombs, G 2370 B (Senedjemib Inti) entering the wall itself, and G 2381 A (Impy), G 2382 A (Nekhebu), G 2385 A (Khnumenti?), and G 2387 A (owner of G 2385?), all to the east of the retaining wall of the platform (pl. 7b).¹⁶ These tombs, along the eastern edge of the Western Field, where the topography favors the use

¹ LD 1, pl. 23 [upper and middle]; LD 2, pls. 73-78; 3, pl. 289 [9]; Text 1, pp. 51-58; LD, *Ergänz.*, pls. xi-xxiii. Cf. Reisner, *BMFA* 11, no. 66 (1913), p. 56. Lepsius numbered the tombs 26 and 27 respectively. For an account of his stay at Giza (November 10, 1842-February 10, 1843), see Lepsius, *Letters from Egypt*, pp. 47-79.

² See Malek, *GM* 13 (1974), pp. 21-31. Malek, *ibid.*, p. 24, n. 3, notes that one of the squeezes is dated "April 8, 1850." For a biographical sketch of the Rev. Lieder, see *Who was Who in Egyptology*, p. 255.

³ Mariette, *Mastabas*, pp. 495-515.

⁴ Reisner, *BMFA* 11, no. 66 (Nov. 1913), p. 56; see below, p. 8.

⁵ Reisner, *BMFA* 11, no. 66 (Nov. 1913), p. 56.

⁶ See below, pp. 115-30.

⁷ Reisner, *BMFA* 11, no. 66 (Nov. 1913), pp. 58-59, figs. 11-16. The burial is to be included in *The Senedjemib Complex*, Pt. 2 (forthcoming).

⁸ An unpublished manuscript by George Andrew Reisner, "Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon," forms the basis of the following observations.

⁹ For the Cemetery en Echelon, see *GN* 1, pp. 13, 69, 81-2, and *passim*.

¹⁰ See Reisner, *JEA* 23 (1937), p. 260.

¹¹ On Reisner's classifications of casings, see *GN* 1, pp. xxiv, 178ff.

¹² See below, pp. 111-12.

¹³ See below, pp. 112-13.

¹⁴ *Giza Diary 1912-13*, p. 29.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 56, 68; cf. Reisner, *JEA* 23 (1937), p. 260.

¹⁶ The designation G 2387 was originally used for the north part of G 2385 and then discarded. Nevertheless, Reisner reserved the number G 2387 A for the northernmost sloping passage tomb, which he assigned to the owner of G 2385 ("List of Tomb Numbers Used in the Senedjemib Complex," p. 1).

of sloping passages from the east, are among the earliest sloping-passage burial places made in this area of the necropolis.¹⁷

The rock underlying the Senedjemib Complex had an uneven surface. Under G 2370, it lay 1.45–2.0 m below the floor and descended eastwards, sloping gently under the ramp leading up from the pyramid plateau (fig. 7). From south to north the rock rose to an east–west ridge in front of the doorway of G 2370, dipped again under the north part of the paved court, and then rose gently to the front of G 2378, whose walls were founded on rock or nearly so (figs. 5, 6). The eastern side of the knoll on which G 2378 was built had been quarried away, probably by quarrymen working on the Great Pyramid,¹⁸ and directly under the east wall of G 2378 ran a north–south scarp. Along the eastern side of the foundation platform, the rock surface descended gently to the north.

The rock surface east of the foundation platform was rough and may well have been a quarry floor. It was crossed from south to north by a drainage channel cut in the rock leading away from the northwest corner of the enclosure of the Great Pyramid (pls. 7b, 8a; figs. 2, 4). Reisner assumed it was cut and constructed in the “late Cheops period.”¹⁹ Where it passed under the enclosure wall of the pyramid, the channel was carefully roofed. A smaller channel was constructed inside the rock-cut drain with slabs on the two sides and a slab roof, bound with gypsum.²⁰ The drainage channel was 1.10 m in width and 0.55 m deep. The excavated length was 57.0 m.²¹

The drain was intended to draw off rainwater from the low ground northwest of the pyramid. The water was, in fact, a danger to the burials in the sloping passage tombs, and in two cases, G 2385 A and 2387 A, where the upper end of the sloping passage cut into the drain, the channel was blocked with masonry on both sides. In the case of the intact tomb G 2381 A, water had run in down the sloping passage and collected in the southwest corner of the chamber.

The foundation platform of the open paved court was constructed in two or three stages. Initially it extended from the south end of G 2381 to the south end of G 2385 and formed a rectangle wider (21.6 m) in front of the north half of G 2370. The court was crossed by a paved path which led from the entrance of G 2370 to the sloping ramp down to the pyramid plateau. Thereafter Inti’s sloping passage tomb (G 2370 B) was excavated under the platform, its approach constructed of rubble and masonry, the opening protected by a rubble well surmounted by masonry walls and roofed with slabs, and the platform extended eastwards by a rubble wall filled with limestone rubbish (pls. 6a–b, 7b; figs. 2, 3). Apparently at the same time, or after the burial of Inti, the platform over his burial place, including the new addition to the platform, was surrounded by a wall on all four sides (pls. 4b, 7b).

The next construction in the Senedjemib Complex was the mastaba of Senedjemib Mehi (G 2378), which stood on the north of the paved court and was entered from the south from the court (pls. 5b,

6a, 103a). The pavement of the court was extended northwards to the face of G 2378 and the sloping passage G 2378 A, under the east wall of the mastaba, made as Mehi’s burial place (figs. 3, 9).

At the time G 2378 was built, an older mastaba belonging to a man named Akhetmehu (G 2375), who had no apparent connection with the Senedjemib family, stood in the northwestern part of this area (pl. 6a; figs. 2, 3).²² The mastaba of Khnumenti (G 2374) was built between the north side of G 2370 and the southern side of the mastabas of Akhetmehu and Mehi with a strengthening of the south court wall of G 2375 (pl. 104a). The exterior north wall of G 2370 was dressed flat in Rooms I and II of the chapel of G 2374 to take the reliefs. The sloping-passage tomb G 2385 A probably belongs to mastaba G 2374.²³

Later two additions (G 2376 and 2377) to the mastaba of Mehi were built on the west and closed off all access to Akhetmehu’s chapel. G 2377 was built against the west wall of G 2378, with G 2376 built against its own west wall (pl. 104a; figs. 2, 3). The additions contained one burial shaft each. G 2376 A was found open and empty, but G 2377 A contained the skeleton of an adult female.²⁴

On the pavement of the platform on the east side of the court, north of the entrance passage to the complex, G 2384 was next built. The walls of the mastaba were poorly preserved and the plan not recoverable, but presumably it also opened on the court. Although the false door is missing, it seems likely from the evidence of the offering stone, topped with a torus moulding and cavetto cornice and provided with a carved loaf-on-mat design on its upper surface, which once stood in front of it, that G 2384, like most of the other mastabas on the platform, possessed an east–west offering room (pl. 10b; figs. 2–3).²⁵ Since G 2385 was built against its north wall, G 2384 is clearly earlier in date than the latter. It may well have belonged to the elder son of Senedjemib Mehi, likewise named Senedjemib, who is depicted in his father’s mastaba.²⁶

Next, the old platform was extended northwards north of G 2384 along the eastern side of G 2378 to near its northeast corner. The space east of the north–south scarp on which G 2378 was built was filled with clean limestone debris retained by two parallel north–south rubble walls about 4 m east of G 2378.²⁷ On this extension was constructed a large mastaba without shafts, G 2385 (pls. 4b, 6a; figs. 2–3, 9). Opening on the eastern side of the court, this northeastern mastaba was occupied by a chapel of eight rooms and two serdabs. Burial was presumably in sloping-passage tomb G 2387 A. The mastaba was unfortunately destroyed to within one or two courses of the floor, and no indication of ownership was found. Reisner thought that the proprietor of the mastaba was a son of Senedjemib Mehi²⁸

¹⁷ *GN* I, p. 151. For Reisner’s classification of shaft types, see *ibid.*, pp. xvii–xx, 85–176.

¹⁸ Reisner, “Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon,” p. 128 a.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ *Giza Diary 1912–13*, p. 53.

²¹ “Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon,” p. 127.

²² See *GN* I, p. 285; *PM* 3², p. 87. The mastaba is scheduled to be published in *The Senedjemib Complex*, Pt. 2 (forthcoming).

²³ See below, pp. 30–31, 127.

²⁴ See below, p. 131.

²⁵ In addition to the offering stone, a large stone that formed part of the north wall of the room survived. Alternatively, it is possible that G 2384 was a cruciform-shaped chapel of Reisner’s Type (7 e), consisting of an east–west offering room opening in the middle of the west wall of a north–south hall; cf. below, p. 11, n. 10.

²⁶ See below, p. 30.

²⁷ Reisner, “Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon,” p. 130 e.

²⁸ *BMFA* II, no. 66 (November, 1913), p. 62.

and, if G 2384 indeed belonged to Mehi's older son Senedjemib, it is possible that the proprietor of G 2385 was Mehi's younger son, who bore his father's "good name," Mehi. There are other candidates for the ownership of the mastaba, however, including a putative son of Khnumenti.²⁹ On the other hand, from its size the mastaba clearly belonged to an important and wealthy individual and, for this reason, the best candidate is perhaps Nekhebu's anonymous older brother who achieved the position of overseer of works under Pepy I.³⁰

Late in the reign of Pepy I, Inti's grandson(?) Nekhebu³¹ built G 2381 on the south end of the paved platform, south of the portico of G 2370, against its east facade (figs. 2–3).³² A little later an east–west serdab was built on its east side adjoining the pathway across the court which led to the sloping ramp to the pyramid plateau (pls. 8b, 9b). According to Reisner, Nekhebu was buried in sloping-passage tomb G 2382 A along the retaining wall just to the north of the sloping ramp.³³ Three other shafts, G 2381 X, Y, and Z were perhaps included within the confines of the superstructure of G 2381.

The distance from the west side of G 2384 to the east face of G 2370 was about 13.65 m. From the north side of the serdab of G 2381 to the south face of G 2378 is about 14.8 m. These measurements give an approximate area of 202 sq. m. for the great paved court of the complex in its final transformation.³⁴

Three smaller tomb chapels were also set up on the pavement of the platform. G 2383 was built against the south face of G 2378, west of the portico, and two others, G 2386–a and b, between G 2384 and the sloping entrance ramp (figs. 2–3). Reisner felt that G 2383, which contained a small false door with cavetto cornice and torus moulding dedicated to a vizier named Wer-kau-ba Iku, belonged to the owner of G 2376 or 2377, since no shaft was found in or behind the chapel.³⁵ Strudwick, however, dates Iku to the end of the Old Kingdom or later, on account of the small size of the offering room and because the insertion of the tomb among those of the Senedjemib family presumably postdated the principal interments, the latest of which (Ptahshepses Impy) in all likelihood dates to the reign of Pepy II.³⁶ If his dating is correct, as seems likely, Iku may instead have been buried in the intrusive shaft constructed in the southern half of the

serdab of G 2378.³⁷ It seems more likely anyway that G 2376 and 2377 were originally intended for members of Mehi's immediate family.

Each of the two chapels built between G 2384 and the entrance ramp leading up to the complex was provided with an (uninscribed) monolithic false door (pls. 4a, 6b, 7a). Chapel G 2386–a was entered by a narrow east–west passage from the main court of the complex and opened eastward into chapel G 2386–b (figs. 2–3).³⁸ The identical nature of the two offering places and the unusual intercommunication suggests that these were the chapels of the two brothers, Ptahshepses Impy and Sabu-ptah Ibebi.³⁹ Along the retaining wall just to the south of the ramp, Reisner found the burial of Ptahshepses Impy in sloping-passage tomb G 2381 A, which descends under ruined mastaba G 2390.⁴⁰ The burial was dated to Pepy II by a jar sealing.⁴¹ On the other side of the drainage channel leading away from the enclosure of the Great Pyramid, Reisner uncovered sloping-passage tomb G 2381 C. The similarity in plan of G 2381 C to G 2381 A suggests it contained the burial of Impy's brother Sabu-ptah Ibebi.⁴²

On the platform east of G 2381 and south of the ramp approach to the court was built the badly denuded mastaba G 2390.⁴³ Shaft G 2390 A, which was found open and plundered by Reisner, may have belonged to this mastaba. The lower part of an uninscribed monolithic false door still marks the location of what was presumably the east–west offering room of this anonymous mastaba (pls. 6b, 7a, 9b, 10a; figs. 2, 3).

Outside the complex proper, on a much lower level to the north of G 2385, was constructed the mud brick mastaba G 2379 (anonymous), and north of this was built G 2391, a small mastaba belonging to a family of priests of the Senedjemib family (fig. 2).⁴⁴ East of the two latter mastabas and east of the drainage channel leading away from the Great Pyramid were built some very late mastabas (Cemetery G 2450). Other priests and servitors of the Senedjemib family had tombs in the immediate environs to the south and west of the complex (G 2337, 2338, 2361, 2362, 2364, 2366, 2396, 5551 [= old 2347], 5554 [= old G 2357], etc.).⁴⁵ Reisner believed that the smaller mastabas of the Senedjemib Complex together with the tombs of the

²⁹ See below, pp. 31, 121.

³⁰ See below, p. 32.

³¹ See pp. 31–32 below.

³² See *GN I*, p. 266 (4); *PM 3*², pp. 89–91. The tomb is to be included in *The Senedjemib Complex*, Pt. 2 (forthcoming).

³³ It should be noted that if G 2382 A, which enters the rock north of the entrance ramp and the sloping passage tomb G 2370 B (Senedjemib Inti), quite close to G 2384, is assigned to Nekhebu, as Reisner does ("Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon," p. 128 d), no burial place remains for the anonymous owner of G 2384. Reisner, *ibid.*, p. 172, makes mention of a square "well" located within the confines of G 2384, but this well, like the masonry wall enclosing it, rested directly on the pavement of the platform and lacked any indication of a burial. It may, in fact, have been the serdab of G 2384. The difficulties associated with the identification of the burial places in the Senedjemib Complex with the owners of the tombs will be discussed further in *The Senedjemib Complex*, Pt. 2 (forthcoming).

³⁴ Reisner, "Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon," p. 130 e.

³⁵ See Brovarski, in *L'Égyptologie en 1979*, fig. 23, and *The Senedjemib Complex*, Pt. 2 (forthcoming), as well as p. 35 below.

³⁶ Strudwick, *Administration*, pp. 81 [40], 302.

³⁷ See p. 158 below.

³⁸ Reisner originally assigned the number G 2386 to the middle part of G 2385 and afterwards discarded it (see "List of Tomb Numbers Used in the Senedjemib Complex," p. 1). For ease of reference, I have given the numbers G 2386–a and b to the pair of chapels built between G 2384 and the ramp.

³⁹ For the few remaining reliefs from the serdabs of Impy and Ibebi, see *The Senedjemib Complex*, Pt. 2 (forthcoming) and below, p. 34. Reisner ("Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon," p. 173) evidently thought that the stones inscribed with the names of Impy and Ibebi derived from chapel G 2385.

⁴⁰ See above, n. 7.

⁴¹ See below, p. 34 and n. 184.

⁴² Reisner, "Description of Additions to Cemetery en Echelon," p. 170. G 2381C, like G 2381A, will be published in *The Senedjemib Complex*, Pt. 2 (forthcoming).

⁴³ The number G 2390 was never used by Reisner. I have assigned it to this badly denuded mastaba for reasons of clarity. Reisner first applied the number G 2384 to the area east of G 2381, which contained G 2390, then later decided that the area "proved not to be a mastaba" and reassigned the number G 2384 to the mastaba on the eastern side of the platform of the Senedjemib Complex between G 2386–a and b and G 2385 ("List of Tomb Numbers Used in the Senedjemib Complex," p. 1). The shafts in the former area were then numbered 2381 A, B, C, X, Y, Z. I do not know what to make of Reisner's remark, since the false door of G 2390 is still to be seen *in situ*.

⁴⁴ *PM 3*², p. 92; Brovarski, in *L'Égyptologie en 1979*, pp. 120, 121.

⁴⁵ Cf. Brovarski, in *ibid.*, pp. 120–21. These tombs are also scheduled to be published in *The Senedjemib Complex*, Pt. 2 (forthcoming).

funerary priests beside it may well be nearly the last in the Giza cemetery prior to the intrusive burials of the Saite and Roman Periods. According to him, the official cemetery fell into disuse during the time of Pepy II or his successors of the late Old Kingdom, through the dissipation of earlier endowments or their diversion to other uses.⁴⁶

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

In Room II of G 2370, Lepsius discovered a great number of mummies of the Saite Period which, according to him, were badly disturbed in Roman times, though some still rested in their sarcophagi. Many small objects, especially faience amulets of poor quality were also found,⁴⁸ while two vases of late form from G 2370 are illustrated

by him.⁴⁹ Lepsius also discovered three fragments of alabaster vessels and three faience amulets of "later date," along with other objects, in G 2378.⁵⁰ In the Roman period an inclined roadway paved with stone slabs had been laid up the mound of debris which covered the Senedjemib Complex to the top of Inti's tomb, and the pillared hall had been used as a communal or family burial place.⁵¹ Prior to that time the tombs on the east and south of the paved court of the complex had been extensively damaged and their separate stones were found scattered in confusion in the debris under the Roman period pavement.⁵²

⁴⁸ LD, *Text 1*, p. 58.

⁴⁹ Ibid., fig. on p. 58; LD 2, p. 153 [2].

⁵⁰ LD, *Text 1*, p. 54. For Giza in the Third Intermediate and Late Periods, see Zivie-Coche, *Giza au premier millénaire*. The Saite and Roman Period objects from G 2370 and 2378 will be dealt with further in *The Senedjemib Complex*, Pt. 2 (forthcoming).

⁵¹ *Giza Diary 1912-13*, pp. 40-41.

⁵² Reisner, *BMFA* 11, no. 66 (November, 1913), p. 53, fig. 3; see further below, pp. 7-8.

⁴⁶ See Reisner, *ASAE* 13 (1913), p. 250.

⁴⁷ *Giza Diary 1912-13*, p. 52; *HESP*, pp. 33, 34.

CHAPTER I: PREVIOUS WORK IN THE SENEDJEMIB COMPLEX

IN THE PANORAMIC VIEW of *LD* 1, pl. 15, the tombs of the Senedjemib Complex are nearly entirely covered by sand.¹ Lepsius removed the sand from the two mastabas of Inti and Mehi, made plans and sections of both tombs, and copied their reliefs and inscriptions.²

In 1842 to 1843, at the time Lepsius cleared G 2370, the reliefs and inscriptions of its facade and portico had pretty much the same appearance they exhibit at present (figs. 17, 18, 21, 24, 26, 28, 31).³ The roofing stones were all gone, and the uppermost stones of the portico and of the immediately adjacent facade, which bore the beginning of Senedjemib Inti's autobiographical inscriptions and his son's dedicatory inscriptions, had already been removed. Within the confines of the portico the upper parts of the large figures of the vizier on either side were missing.⁴ The cavetto-and-torus cornice and inscribed architrave had also previously been overthrown, and the columns that upheld the roof of the portico apparently carried off.⁵

In general, the relief decoration on the interior walls of the mastaba was in better condition than it is today. Both entrance thicknesses were still preserved to nearly their full height and the drum over the entrance appears to have still been in place (figs. 34, 36).⁶ In the anteroom (Room II), even though the upper course of stone of the north wall was missing and the gap plugged with debris (fig. 44),⁷ the other three walls of the room were preserved to what was essentially their full height (figs. 38, 40, 42).⁸ The door thicknesses between the anteroom and the vestibule (Room III) were likewise largely intact with three registers of estates on either side (figs. 46, 48).⁹ The right- and left-hand thicknesses between the anteroom and the pillared hall (Room V), with scenes of Inti's son Mehi in the presence of his parents, were also essentially complete (figs. 67a, 68a).¹⁰

It sounds from Lepsius's description as though the pillared hall was still mostly intact, even though the architrave between the wall and the eastern pillars of the first row was cracked, and had to be propped up.¹¹ In fact, as will be seen shortly, there is reason to doubt whether its ceiling was entirely undamaged.

The situation in Room III was quite different. Although the northern end wall of the room was preserved to its full height of six registers (fig. 56),¹² and the adjacent northern ends of the east and west long walls also remained in place (figs. 50, 52), Lepsius's plate reveals that the southern end of the west wall had collapsed.¹³ It is not certain whether the corresponding section of the east wall was in a similar state of collapse, although a remark of Mariette's implies that it was still standing in 1850, at least in part,¹⁴ and it is possible that it was simply covered up by the debris which apparently filled this end of the room to the ceiling.¹⁵ Nor is it clear why Lepsius did not bother to remove the debris from the southern end of the room. Given the fact that he could clearly see that the southern end of the west wall had collapsed, he may have felt that the rest of the east wall and the south end wall were in a similar condition and that the time and effort required to clear the remainder of the room would not be well spent. Moreover, it is evident from the plan in *LD* 1, pl. 23 (fig. 12) and his own statement to that effect that he was of the opinion that the false door occupied the south end of Room III.¹⁶ It was most probably for this reason that he did not search for an offering room beyond.

By the time the first text volume of the *Denkmaeler*, edited by Edouard Naville and others, had appeared after Lepsius's death in 1897, the Rev. Lieder had partially cleared the southern end of Room III and discovered the offering room (Room IV) with its false door.¹⁷ This new knowledge is reflected in the plan in *LD*, *Text* I, p. 55 (fig. 13). Lieder, assisted by his wife Alice, made squeezes of a portion of the north wall of Room III, of the two registers of estates on the door thicknesses between Rooms III and IV, of parts of the false door in Room IV, and of the west thickness of the doorway between Rooms II and V.¹⁸ The Lieders themselves published no account of their work. Fortunately, Mariette visited the tombs of Inti and Mehi in November 1850, seven months after the Lieder's excavations, and recorded what he saw in an appendix of *Les mastabas de l'ancien empire*. The Lieders had seemingly cleared in part the two chapels of Inti and Mehi of the sand heaped up over them by Lepsius as a protective measure at the end of his investigations,¹⁹ but from

¹ See also Lepsius's map of Giza in *LD* 1, pl. 14.

² See above, p. 1, n. 1.

³ *LD* 2, pl. 76c-d; *Text* 1, p. 56.

⁴ *Ibid.* Reisner found the block from the north side wall of the portico with the vizier's head and parts of Inscriptions A 1 and B 1 on it tumbled down and buried under sand and debris (pl. 9a-b). This block has been restored to its appropriate place on the wall and is included in pls. 18, 64a; figs. 30, 33.

⁵ See below, pp. 12-13.

⁶ *LD* 2, pl. 78b [left]; *Ergänz.*, pl. xix [right]. The profile of the block in which the drum roll is carved is readily apparent in the latter drawing, while a segment of the drum roll appears at the top of the other plate.

⁷ *LD*, *Text* 1, p. 57.

⁸ *LD* 2, pls. 77, 78b [right]; *Ergänz.*, pl. xix [left].

⁹ *LD* 2, pl. 76a-b.

¹⁰ *LD* 2, pl. 78a. Lepsius did not illustrate the right-hand thickness (below, p. 79, pl. 51b, fig. 68a), probably because it was basically a mirror image of the left thickness.

¹¹ *LD*, *Text* 1, p. 58.

¹² *LD*, *Ergänz.*, pl. xxi.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pl. xxii.

¹⁴ See below, p. 6.

¹⁵ *LD*, *Text* 1, 57. The margins of the heap of sand and debris are evident in *LD*, *Ergänz.*, pls. xxii, xxiii [c] (= figs. 50, 52b of the present volume).

¹⁶ *LD*, *Text* 1, p. 57.

¹⁷ See p. 1 above.

¹⁸ Lieder squeezes 1.1-12. The squeezes are now the property of the Griffith Institute, Oxford. Jaromír Málek has published the squeezes made by the Lieders of the estates on the left and right thicknesses between Rooms II and III in *GM* 13 (1974), pp. 21-24. Except for one problematic squeeze (1.13), all the squeezes in Oxford are cited in *PM* 3², p. 86 (13)a-b, (15-16). A possible location for the odd squeeze, which gives the titles of the deceased, is suggested below, p. 58-59.

¹⁹ Mariette, *Mastabas*, p. 496.

Mariette's description, drawings, and a sketch and plan of G 2370 made by him (figs. 14a, b),²⁰ it is apparent that even after they had finished their work, much of the mastaba, especially the rear part, was still buried under debris. Furthermore, from the sketches and notes of Mariette, it appears that the Lieders, like Lepsius before them, did not clear the rooms to floor level.²¹

Mariette provides a summary description of the entrance thicknesses of G 2370.²² His account of the scenes of Mehi before his parents on either side of the passageway to the pillared hall (Room V) is somewhat more detailed.²³ With respect to the anteroom (Room II), Mariette refers to a "scene de chasse dans les roseaux," which undoubtedly alludes to a portrayal of Inti in his papyrus skiff watching a hippopotamus hunt on its west wall, a scene which was copied by Lepsius (fig. 42).²⁴ He also refers to "diverses représentations de la vie civile" on its east wall, making specific mention of a "combat sur une barque" in the second register.²⁵ There seems little question that this is a reference to the marsh and riverine scenes reproduced by Lepsius, which include episodes of combat by boatmen (fig. 38). Oddly, Mariette makes no direct mention of the carrying chair scene on the south wall of the room or of the craft scenes on its north wall, although he does provide sketches of the estates on both sides of the passage to the vestibule along with copies of their names.²⁶

Concerning the vestibule (Room III), Mariette notes that the west wall of the chamber was destroyed, except towards the north end where the stones, while disjointed and close to falling, still retained their respective places.²⁷ Although he does not describe the decoration on these blocks, the north end of the west wall is the location of the episodes from the agricultural sequence copied by Lepsius (fig. 52b). Mariette also claims to have seen an image of the deceased with his titles before him on the south wall of the vestibule, most likely above the musicians and singers still visible in this location today (pl. 31a; fig. 52a), but whose figures he does not mention, presumably because they remained covered by sand.²⁸ Of considerable interest is his statement that a similar representation of the deceased appeared on the east wall, where no such image survives today.²⁹ Although he does not specifically refer to a second carrying chair scene that once occupied the south end of this wall, if the upper parts of the scene with the canopy over Inti were already missing, he may not have recognized the subject as such, and his "image du défunt" may actually represent Inti seated in his carrying chair. Similarly, Mariette's "personnages qui apportent des offrandes"³⁰ may have been the palanquin bearers whose feet alone still survive (pl. 30; fig. 51) or alternatively the customary attendants of the owner who would in all likelihood have been depicted higher up on the wall.³¹

At any rate, it seems clear from Mariette's account that the south wall and the southern end of the east wall of Room III stood to a greater height than at present. Hence, it is doubly to be regretted that he made no sketch of these scenes. He did sketch the personified estates on both thicknesses leading to Room IV (fig. 58).³²

As regards the offering room (Room IV), Mariette furnishes a sketch of the false door at the west end and copies of its inscriptions together with a description of the reliefs on the other walls of the room.³³ His sketch of the false door (fig. 62a) reveals that its architrave and cavetto-and-torus cornice were already missing, while the inscriptions on the jambs of the door and the torus moulding framing its sides had also suffered damage.³⁴ His description of the other walls is brief:

A droite et à gauche de cette grande stèle, le défunt est représenté assis et tourné vers l'autre bout de la chambre. Les trois parois de cette chambre sont divisées en deux grand registres horizontaux. Au registre supérieur, des tables, des tablettes disposés horizontalement sont chargés d'objets de toute nature. Au registre inférieur des personnages nombreux apportent leurs offrandes au défunt.³⁵

Nevertheless, it seems to imply that the two side walls and the eastern end wall of the offering room were still largely intact in November 1850. If correct, it furnishes in addition the information that the array of food and drink offerings which is still to be seen in part above the files of offering bearers on the reconstructed southern side wall (pl. 38; fig. 61) originally extended onto the upper parts of the eastern and northern walls above registers likewise occupied by offering bearers.³⁶

A curious feature of Mariette's sketch and plan of G 2370 is a large gap in the center of the south wall of Room IV. In the plan, the gap is shown buried under debris, but broken lines seem to indicate that Mariette considered it to be an entrance to yet another chamber on the south (fig. 14b).³⁷ In his sketch, the debris is absent and the gap in the wall is drawn as if it constituted a separate entrance to the mastaba (fig. 14a).³⁸ Photographs taken by the Harvard-Boston Expedition in 1912 show that the gap did not extend as far down as the floor, and thus could not possibly be a doorway (pl. 11a, 12a-b). If the room had been cleared to floor level by the Lieders, this would have been readily apparent. Mariette does not refer to the gap in his text, but it seems clear that the decorated blocks from this section of the south wall had previously fallen or been pulled down. The western end of the south wall remains intact down to the present day (pls. 39, 41-42) and, inasmuch as the gap shown in Mariette's plan did not include the eastern end of the south wall, it is possible that the relief decoration on the upper part of the eastern section was still intact as late as 1850.³⁹

²⁰ Ibid., pp. 496-515. The plan of G 2370 appears on *ibid.*, p. 497, and the sketch (along with G 2378) on *ibid.*, p. 499.

²¹ Ibid., pp. 508-512. Mariette specifically states (*ibid.*, p. 512) that the debris filled Room II to the height of the second course of stones.

²² Ibid., p. 512 ("Entrée F").

²³ Ibid., p. 512 ("Corridor G").

²⁴ Ibid., p. 512 ("Chambre E").

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid., pp. 510-12 ("Corridor D").

²⁷ Ibid., p. 510.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ See, e.g., below, pp. 46-48, 120-21.

³² Mariette, *Mastabas*, pp. 507-509.

³³ Ibid., pp. 505-507.

³⁴ It is possible that a portion of the architrave and moulding are to be seen in an expedition photograph (pl. 12a), lying on the fill just above the southeast corner of Room IV. The present whereabouts of this block are unknown.

³⁵ *Mastabas*, p. 507.

³⁶ For the scheme of decoration on the eastern end wall, see below, p. 70.

³⁷ Mariette, *Mastabas*, p. 497.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 499. The same feature appears in the plan of G 2370 in *LD, Text 1*, p. 55 (= fig. 13).

It seems more likely that a human agency, rather than a natural cause such as an earthquake, was responsible for the damage done to the walls of G 2370. Whereas the collapse of the southern end of the west wall of Room III or of the central part of the south wall of Room IV could conceivably have resulted from an earthquake, this can hardly have been the case with the damage done to the upper part of the false door in the latter room. As previously mentioned, Lepsius's sections of G 2370 (fig. 12) give the impression that much of the ceiling over Inti's chapel was intact at the time of his visit, yet it seems that stone-robbers would, at the very minimum, have had to remove the ceiling slabs directly over the western end of Room IV in order to remove the large stone which formed the upper part of the false door, and which otherwise would have been firmly held in place by the ceiling. If, as is likely, stone-robbers were also responsible for the collapse of the wall sections in Rooms III and IV, it is reasonable to suppose that the ceiling slabs would similarly have to have been removed over these locations in order to gain access to the walls below. Pulling down a wall with the ceiling still in place would have been a very hazardous and inadvisable operation, since the ceiling slabs would probably have followed in a precipitous fashion. Even if the blocks were pushed over or removed from above, the ceiling slabs above these areas would first have to have been removed. Additional evidence for the removal of the ceiling slabs over the south end of Room III might be the sand which Lepsius found filling the southern half of that room up to the ceiling. Moreover, the ceiling slabs would probably have to have been removed to allow the upper course of stone from the north wall of Room II to be extracted.⁴⁰ Access to any of the ceiling slabs, of course, presupposes the removal of the stone paving of the roof above, and this appears to have been the case, for no such pavement is shown in Lepsius's sections.⁴¹

From Lepsius's and Mariette's descriptions and drawings, it is thus clear that G 2370 had undergone considerable damage before 1842–43, either in antiquity or in the intervening millenia. In all likelihood, parts of the walls in Rooms III and IV had previously been removed along with sections of the roof and ceilings, especially over the southern part of the mastaba. Furthermore, the loss of the block from the top of the north wall of Room II suggests that part of the roof and ceiling over this part of the mastaba must also have been removed.

Something more can be said about the chronology of the depredations in Room IV, when Reisner's field records are taken into account. Except for a few stones left in place in the northeast corner, the paving stones of Room IV had all been pried up and carried away (fig. 3). Later, after sufficient time had passed for a layer of sand and

debris to build up on the floor of the room, the decorated blocks from the middle part of the south wall of the room were pulled or pushed down, as previously mentioned. Although a number of blocks were probably carried off at this time, especially those located near the top of the wall, for an unknown reason most of the blocks from this section were abandoned on the debris layer, where Reisner found them in 1912 (pl. 11a, 12b). If the paving stones were pried up during an initial stage of destruction, it is likely that the entire ceiling and roof over Room IV had also been removed at this time to facilitate the process, and not just the area directly over the false door.⁴² The surviving evidence from Room IV therefore seems to bear witness to the existence of at least two stages of destruction.

The identity of the culprits responsible for the depredations wrought in G 2370 is not certain. Reisner recognized an earlier and later period of destruction within the Senedjemib Complex (fig. 15a–d).⁴³ At some point in time, a hole (Hole 1) had been dug in the sloping ramp that led up from the pyramid plateau to the stone paved court of the complex. This hole was filled with dirt mixed with blocks of limestone.⁴⁴ A low mound of blackened debris and limestone blocks was formed over this.⁴⁵ Many of the blocks in the hole and the mound had decorated surfaces and clearly derived from the tombs on the east and south of the stone paved court of the complex, in particular that of Nekhebu (G 2381), which had manifestly been pulled down by stone-robbers who left numerous blocks behind. In the Roman period an inclined ramp paved with stone slabs (pls. 6b, 7a) was laid upon the mound of debris to the top of Inti's tomb and the pillared hall used as a communal burial place.⁴⁶ On account of a number of amulets found by him, a wooden mask, and other objects, Reisner dated this communal grave to about the same time as that in the Mycerinus pyramid temple, that is, to the first to second centuries A.D.⁴⁷ Reisner assumed the paved way led to the entrance of the communal grave (presumably through the roof of G 2370). The Roman ramp had in turn been broken away by a trench and a great hole (Hole 2), which was likewise filled with sand and limestone blocks.⁴⁸ According to Reisner, stones from G 2370 left on the debris before its entrance overlay the inscribed blocks from G 2381 and the other tombs (fig. 15c).⁴⁹ Reisner does not describe the stones in question in any detail, but they probably included a segment of a cavetto

³⁹ Since the food array in the upper registers of the south wall was confined to its middle and eastern parts, these must still have been at least partially visible in order for Mariette to say they appeared at the tops of all three walls, unless this was just an assumption he made on the basis of the evidence of the preserved eastern and northern walls.

⁴⁰ See above, p. 5.

⁴¹ Relatively few tombs at Giza or Saqqara have preserved any significant portion of their original paved roofs; for some that have, see Davies, *Plabhetep* 1, pls. 2, 23, 24; Junker, *Giza* 1, p. 41; 2, p. 140, fig. 14; 6, pp. 88–89, fig. 22; *GN* 1, fig. 153, pl. 8b; Weeks, *Cemetery G 6000*, fig. 2. The mastaba of Merib also retained its roof intact before Lepsius removed the chapel to Berlin; see *LD* 1, pl. 22; *PM* 3², pp. 71–72.

⁴² It would, of course, have been necessary to dismantle the pavement before the lowest course of wall blocks could be removed, for the pavement would have been laid after the latter were in place; see e.g., Clarke–Engelbach, *Ancient Egyptian Masonry*, pp. 130–31; Arnold, *Building in Egypt*, pp. 141–42.

⁴³ *Giza Diary 1912–13*, pp. 40–42. As may be seen from the redrawn figures, Reisner's plans and sections are merely rough sketches.

⁴⁴ A number of complete and fragmentary statues of Nekhebu were also found in Holes 1 and 2; see *HESP*, pp. 84–85. According to the *Giza Diary 1912–13*, p. 42, Hole 1 also produced an obelisk of Nekhebu. For all this, cf. Reisner, *BMFA* 11, no. 66 (November, 1913), pp. 53–57, figs. 4–6, and for the obelisk, see *ibid.*, fig. 6.

⁴⁵ Reisner does not specify the nature of the blackened debris, but it is possible that it represents decayed mud brick from the brick walls erected against G 2376–78 blown south by the north wind (see below, pp. 9, n. 60; 131).

⁴⁶ It is possible that the stones for the pavement of the ramp derived from the paved court of the Senedjemib Complex, although Reisner does not specifically say so. However, far more paving stones are missing from the court pavement than would be accounted for by their use in the ramp.

⁴⁷ *Giza Diary 1912–13*, pp. 40–41. For the communal grave in the Mycerinus pyramid temple, see Reisner, *Mycerinus*, pp. 19–21, 33.

⁴⁸ *Giza Diary 1912–13*, pp. 40–42.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

cornice which in all likelihood derives from G 2370 and also the great block which bears the head of the elderly Senedjemib Inti and part of Inscription B 1 (pl. 9a–b).

The archaeological evidence so far elicited thus seems to argue for at least two periods of destruction, one before the Roman Period and another after that period. A natural candidate for the earlier destruction might appear to be the Saite Period, when there was a renewed interest in the Giza plateau attested to by both the Isis temple and burials in the Eastern and Western Fields at Giza,⁵⁰ including the communal grave in the anteroom of G 2370.⁵¹ Nevertheless, it is unlikely that anyone in Dynasty 26 would have buried his relatives in G 2370 if the destruction was on-going. For that reason, it may be that the initial damage done to G 2370 and the tombs on the south and east of the paved court of the complex took place before Dynasty 26, and perhaps as early as the Ramesside Period.⁵² If part of the roof over Room II had indeed been removed at the earlier date, this would certainly have facilitated the deposition of the Saite Period mummies into that room. The same would hold true of the deposition of the Roman Period mummies in Room V, if sections of the roof over the northern part of Room II and the southeast corner of Room V had previously been removed. If they had not been removed earlier in the case of Rooms II and V, it is likely that they were removed then in preparation for these later burials. But it is again improbable that the Roman burials would have been deposited in a mastaba that was being actively dismantled.

If Reisner was correct in his observation that stones from G 2370 overlay the blocks from G 2381 and other decorated stones from the tombs on the south and east of the complex, this would suggest that the dismantling of G 2370 was indeed resumed at a point in time after the Roman Period ramp was built. This inference may derive support from the fact that no decorated blocks from the walls of G 2370 appear to have been found in either Hole 1 or 2.

Taking all the above into account, one possible scenario for the destruction perpetrated on G 2370 and the other tombs on the south and east of the paved court of the Senedjemib Complex would be the following:

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

2. In the interval between the Ramesside(?) and Saite periods, a thick layer of wind-blown sand accumulated in Room IV and in the southern part of Room III. During the same interval, a low mound

of blackened debris built up over the blocks abandoned in the court by the original plunderers.

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

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

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

6. Subsequently, additional wind-blown sand accumulating through the gaps in the roof of G 2370 and through its entrance built up on the floors of its rooms and in particular covered over the abandoned blocks in Rooms III and IV.⁵³

As to exactly when the later stage of destruction represented by no. 5 above may have taken place, it is impossible to say with any certainty. Reisner noted considerable damage to the Mycerinus pyramid temple by Arab quarrymen from the eleventh to the thirteenth century A.D.,⁵⁴ and it is possible that the later destruction occurred at this time. But it should be emphasized that no independent evidence from the Senedjemib Complex itself supports this conjecture.

Between 1850, when the Rev. Lieder and his wife re-excavated the mastaba of Inti, and 1912, the year Reisner began his work in the Senedjemib Complex, while the tomb presumably lay open and unguarded, extensive additional damage occurred to the reliefs in G 2370 that had been copied by Lepsius and described or sketched by Mariette. Reisner remembered hearing, about 1901, rumors of illicit excavations conducted by the villagers of Kafr el-Haram in the Senedjemib Complex.⁵⁵ Definitive evidence that the Senedjemib Complex was indeed being plundered by dealers in antiquities at about this time exists, for the west end of the north wall of the offering room of Senedjemib Mehi was purchased by Edward E. Ayer on behalf of the Field Museum of Natural History in Spring, 1898.⁵⁶

Two Harvard–Boston Expedition photographs vividly attest to the condition of the southern part of the mastaba in 1912 (pls. 11–12). The greater part of the decorated area of the south, west, and east walls of Room II, all of which had been copied by Lepsius, had disappeared. In Room III all but the lowest portions of the scenes at the northern end of its east and west walls, and virtually the entire six

⁵³ See above, pp. 5, 6, 7, and Lepsius's sections reproduced in fig. 12.

⁵⁴ *Mycerinus*, p. 33.

⁵⁵ See above, p. 1.

⁵⁶ Field Museum accession number 31705. Ayer was a Chicago business man and first president of the (then) Field Columbian Museum. On his first trip to Egypt in Autumn 1894, Ayer approached Emil Brugsch, whom he says was director of the "Gizeh Museum," for help in assembling an Egyptian collection for the Field Museum, and Brugsch readily agreed, vetting the material purchased by Ayer in Cairo and "up the Nile" (Lockwood, *The Life of Edward E. Ayer*, pp. 193–94). Ayer made several more trips to Egypt, each time acquiring additional objects for the museum. Except for the Coptic material and a few other purchases added in subsequent years (such as the mastabas of Netjeruser and Unisankh purchased from the Egyptian government in 1909), the entire Egyptian collection was gathered by Ayer (*ibid.*, pp. 192–94). Warren R. Dawson said of Brugsch that he "left behind him an evil reputation for clandestine transactions with native antiquities dealers" (*JEA* 33 [1947], p. 70, n. 1). According to *Who was Who in Egyptology*, p. 66, Brugsch became assistant conservator in the Bulaq and Cairo Museums under Maspero in 1881, and Keeper in the Cairo Museum in 1883.

⁵⁰ See Zivie-Coche, *Giza au premier millénaire*, pp. 89–266 and *passim*.

⁵¹ See above, p. 4.

⁵² Hölscher, *Grabdenkm. Chephren*, p. 67, attributes the removal of the hard stone from the Mycerinus pyramid temple to the time of Ramses II. Petrie (*Memphis* 1, p. 6) also asserts that it was Ramses II who brought pyramid casing stones of red granite for reuse in the West Hall of the Ptah temple at Memphis, as well as a block with part of a procession of offering bearers from an Old Kingdom tomb, an entire doorway from the sun-temple of Neuserre at Abu Gurob, a lintel of king Teti, and parts of two Old Kingdom lotus bud capitals (*ibid.*, and pl. 3).

registers of the north wall, likewise copied by Lepsius, had been carried off, along with most of the southern wall. Blocks had been removed as well from the upper parts of all three sets of door thicknesses. Reisner actually found the large block with the drum roll from the entrance of G 2370 resting on the debris that filled the southeast corner of Room II (pls. 11b, 12a).

According to Mariette, as we have already seen, the offering room of G 2370 (Room IV), appears to have been largely intact in 1850, except for the gap in the decoration in the middle of the south wall and for the top of the false door. By 1912, however, the decorated blocks from the eastern end of the south wall had entirely disappeared; none of them were found in the accumulated debris on the floor by Reisner. After the fallen blocks found by Reisner on the floor of the room had been restored to their original positions in the middle of the wall, a gap in excess of 1.53 m was left at the eastern end of the wall. If, on the basis of Mariette's testimony, the east end of the south wall was indeed still intact in 1850, as the two entrance thicknesses of the room to the fifth course of masonry clearly were on the evidence of the Mariette sketches and Leider squeezes, then the east end of the south wall and the decorated blocks from the door thicknesses must have been carried off between 1850 and 1912. The same would be true of the upper portion of the east wall and the north wall, east of the entrance.

Furthermore, by 1912, seventeen large slabs had been removed from the middle and southern rows of slabs that formed the ceiling of the pillared hall, Room V (pl. 51a). As previously mentioned, however, certain of the slabs in the southeast corner of the hall may have been removed in antiquity.

When Lepsius excavated the mastaba of Senedjemib Mehi, he found that the entire roof was missing and that the uppermost courses of stones had been removed (fig. 95c).⁵⁷ The mastaba must have remained uncovered for a considerable period of time, for the surviving reliefs, especially those closest to the tops of the walls, were badly weathered. In 1850, the Lieders cleared the mastaba and made a number of squeezes.⁵⁸ Later that same year Mariette described the tomb and provided two sketch plans. In addition, he planned and drew the false door, providing hand copies of its inscriptions, sketched the thicknesses with the figures of agricultural estates between Rooms II and III, and drew the seated figure of Mehi at table on the north wall of the offering room.⁵⁹

The number of registers with relief decoration actually lost from the top of the walls of the portico and interior rooms of the chapel of G 2378 before 1842–43 varied in number from one to three. The only wall preserved to what was essentially its full height was the west wall of the east–west anteroom (Room II) with its agricultural and offering scenes in six registers (fig. 112). The reliefs that were most extensively damaged were those on the east walls of Rooms II (fig. 118a–b) and III, which were exposed directly to the sand blown into the cemetery from the southwest and west, but the eastern ends of the north and south walls of the latter room were also badly eroded.⁶⁰

Like the mastaba of Inti, Mehi's mastaba suffered further damage at the hands of stone-robbers after 1850. In Room II, only two registers remain of the four seen by Lepsius on the south wall west of the entrance, and the figure of Mehi is gone above the waist (pl. 113; figs. 110, 111). The topmost register and portions of the two below are missing from the west wall (pl. 114a–b; fig. 113). At the west end of the north wall, although the scene is still largely intact, the figures of Mehi and his family (fig. 114) have undergone further erosion (pl. 115; fig. 115). Already in Lepsius's day, the first register and most of the second register of the agricultural and marsh activities represented on the other three-quarters of the wall had disappeared (fig. 114). Today the entire upper part of the wall is missing, and only a small section of the fifth register and the figures of some of the offering bearers in the sixth register survive (pls. 116, 117a; fig. 115). In 1842–43 three of an original six registers of craft scenes on the east wall survived (fig. 116a, b); today the decoration is completely spalled away. As for the south wall, east of the entrance, the three lowest registers were essentially complete in Lepsius's time, while the two registers above bore traces of singers, musicians, and dancers (fig. 118a, b). Today the upper two registers together with two blocks from the third register, including one bearing Mehi's head and names, are gone (pls. 118, 119a–b; fig. 119). In Lepsius's day, the door thicknesses between the anteroom and the offering room (Room III) each bore two registers of estates (figs. 120a, 123). At present both registers on the right (east) thickness are lost, while only the last four estates in the bottom register of the left (west) thickness survive (pl. 120; fig. 119). On both long walls of Room III, Lepsius's drawings show figures of Mehi seated at table and facing the door with files of offering bearers approaching him, food and drink offerings piled up, and offering vessels on low tables before him. On the south wall, parts of three registers were preserved, or four, if one takes into account an isolated block from that register with titles above Mehi's head (fig. 124). Today, the entire third register as seen in Lepsius's plate and the isolated block with the titles are lost (fig. 125).⁶¹ The table scene on the north wall was better preserved (fig. 128) and, probably as a result, was removed and, as previously mentioned, ultimately made its way to Chicago (pl. 122). Today, except for damage done during the removal of the table scene, the remainder of the north wall is in pretty much the same condition as when it was seen by Lepsius (pls. 123, 124a–b; fig. 129).

Many of the decorated blocks from the mastabas of Inti and Mehi were undoubtedly carried off in antiquity or more recent epochs to secure building stone for local use or were reduced to lime in kilns for use as mortar and plaster.⁶² Since none of the missing blocks from either of the mastabas which were drawn by Lepsius has been identified at Giza or in museums or private collections, it is likely that this was their fate as well.

⁵⁷ *LD, Text 1*, p. 51.

⁵⁸ *Lieder squeezes 2.1–4*; see *PM 3*², pp. 88 (7); 89 (10–11).

⁵⁹ *Mastabas*, pp. 500–504.

⁶⁰ See below, pp. 147, 153, 157. According to Reisner (*GN 1*, p. 15), the sand blows into the cemetery from the southwest and west, rarely from the north, but once in the cemetery, it is driven southwards by the frequent north winds.

⁶¹ There are traces of several offering bearers in the fourth register on the eastern half of this wall which were not drawn by Lepsius; see fig. 125.

⁶² Compare Breasted's remarks in *Mereruka 1*, p. xii.

Lepsius, the Lieders, and Mariette evidently were not aware of the existence of the mastaba of Khnumenti or the other ruined mas-

tabas of the Senedjemib Complex, so we know nothing of their condition before they were uncovered by Reisner in 1912–13.