The Great Western Cemetery (GWC) at Giza lies west of the Pyramid of Cheops and north of the Pyramid of Chephren on a low rock terrace partially covered by wind-blowen sand (fig. 1, pl. 65).1 Begun early in the reign of Cheops as a burial place for lesser nobility and members of his court, it grew in fairly regular fashion with mastabas lying in orderly arrangement along “streets” running from north to south and “avenues” from east to west. The cemetery continued to be used until the end of the Old Kingdom some four hundred years later and, as space became less readily available, this regular plan was ignored and later tombs and mastabas were constructed wherever openings could be found. The result of this development was a complex arrangement of mortuary structures consisting of an early group of eighty-nine regularly spaced mastabas forming four “nucleus cemeteries,” and a later mixture of several hundred structures ranging from the smallest and most unimpressive shaft graves to stone buildings of considerable size. The number, size, and quality of these mastabas, their importance to a study of the Fourth and Fifth Dynasties, and the likelihood that they contained attractive objects and well-decorated wall surfaces, made them, in the eyes of Egyptologists at the beginning of this century, highly desirable subjects for excavation.

In November 1902, representatives of the Turin Museum, the Sieglin Expedition of the University of Leipzig, and the Hearst Egyptian Expedition of the University of California, each of which had been granted permits by the Egyptian government to excavate at Giza, met at Mena House to determine what areas of the necropolis should be assigned to each group. With most of the Giza Plateau there was little problem, and a division of the site amongst the chief area in which all were interested was the Great Western Cemetery,” and M. Maspero, Director-General of the Antiquities Department, had instructed the three groups to find some way to divide the GWC “amicably.”2 Randomly drawing lots (Mrs. Reisner drew slips of paper from a hat), the Italian group, under Professor Schiaparelli, was given the northern third of the cemetery; the German group under Professor Stein dorff was given the middle third; and the Americans, under Professor Reisner, received the southern third; and the Americans, under Professor Reisner, received the southern third of the cemetery in 1903–04, clearing west of mastaba G 3000, an area he used as a test to determine the course of future work at the site. (Shortly after this work had begun, the sponsorship of Reisner’s project was transferred from the University of California and the Hearst family to the Boston Museum of Fine Arts and Harvard University.)3

After a delay of several years, owing to pressures of work in other areas, Reisner returned to the northern section in 1911 and continued there for two further seasons. In 1913, he shifted his attention to the southern third of the GWC (the former Italian concession), and spent there three seasons clearing first its western, then its eastern end. He returned there in 1925 (working from November 18 to December 28) and cleared an area even farther to the west, beyond the original Italian concession, in an unassigned section of the GWC, which he designated Cemetery G 6000, and which is the subject of this report (fig. 2). This was the last full season of work Reisner conducted in the GWC. The next fifteen years saw his staff transferred to other parts of the Necropolis, and only occasional sondages were made in the GWC after that, to clarify points for the architect or to facilitate the work of the expedition photographer. After eight seasons of work in the GWC and, in all, nearly twenty seasons at Giza, the outbreak of the Second World War brought the Harvard-Boston Expedition to an end in 1939. Three years later, in 1942, Reisner died.

1. A brief description of the area may be found in Reisner, Giza Necropolis I, 188f, where he calls the GWC the “Western Field.” See also Parthey, III, 98.
2. Reisner, Giza Necropolis I, 23.
3. The publications of these various expeditions are outlined in Reisner, Giza Necropolis I and are most are noted in our bibliography. See especially: Junker, Giza; Hassan, Giza; E. Curto, Gli Scavi Italiani a el-Ghiza, 1903 (Rome, 1983); F. Ballerini, Notizia degli Scavi della Missione Archeologica Italiana in Egitto, Anno 1903 (Rome, 1983).
4. In 1911, the German concession was transferred to the Othlo- reichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften and the Pelizaeus Museum of Hildesheim, and was directed by Hermann Junker.
of Fine Arts.\(^5\) The first volume of the Giza expedition’s final report was Reisner’s Development of the Egyptian Tomb Down to the Accession of Cheops, published in 1936.\(^6\) That work had begun as an introductory chapter to his expedition report, but grew well beyond that. In it, Reisner sought to trace the history of Egyptian mortuary architecture prior to that found at Giza. The study was to serve as a background for the expedition reports to follow. At the time, Reisner anticipated that those reports would appear in two volumes, one on the history of the Giza Necropolis, one detailing the construction and decoration of its mastabas.

In 1942, A History of the Giza Necropolis volume I, appeared, but it reflected a change in the organization of the publications. The volume dealt at length with the techniques and types of construction found in the eighty-nine mastabas comprising the nucleus cemeteries, gave a brief history of previous work at Giza, and described in outline the types of decoration found in some of the mortuary structures.\(^7\) A series of appendices described in greater detail the mastabas of cemeteries 1200, 2100, and 4000. Thus, this work of some five hundred pages concentrated on the construction details of many (but by no means all) of the Giza mastabas dug by Harvard-Boston, including some of those in the original concession (the northern third of the GWC), but it paid virtually no attention to such significant non-architectural features as tomb decoration and contents.\(^8\)

Reisner stated in Giza Necropolis I that at least three further volumes in the series were planned, and that they would treat these other subjects. Volume II would deal with the funerary equipment found in the tombs; volume III with the chronology of the GWC and with the histories of the families buried there; volume IV with tombs and mastabas not described in volume I. In each volume, a series of appendices would describe in detail the individual structures. None of these later volumes appeared, of course, although much of the statuary and several of the relief scenes from the Necropolis were described by Reisner’s assistant, William Stevenson Smith, in his History of Egyptian Sculpture and Painting in the Old Kingdom.

Following Reisner’s death, Smith had planned to undertake the publication of the Giza material. But numerous and heavy commitments made this impossible, and his untimely death in 1969 saw little additional material in print. Recently, however, the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (MFA), under the direction of Professor William Kelly Simpson, has undertaken an ambitious and long-range plan to publish Reisner’s Giza materials, together with complete drawings and photographs of the decorated mastabas. So far, four volumes have appeared, and several others are in preparation. They are the companion volumes to the present study, and collectively form the Giza Mastabas series.\(^9\)

Shortly before his death, Smith and I met in Boston. I had expressed interest in publishing some of Reisner’s materials, and Smith was aware of my interest in making available scenes from the Giza Necropolis of daily life and materials relevant to the study of Old Kingdom Egyptian society. He was aware of the special relevance the complex of mastabas in Reisner’s Cemetery G 6000 had for these subjects, and felt strongly that their great interest and fragile condition made them primary candidates for such a publication project, a conclusion with which I fully concurred.

Smith and I spent more than a week in the Museum of Fine Arts, going over Reisner’s collections of notes and photos, and he turned over to me a complete set of Cemetery G 6000 material. A visit to the GWC the following year, and a study of Reisner’s notebooks (none of them at that point in any organized form), made it obvious that a reclaing of the cemetery would be needed in order to complete the architectural drawings of the mastabas in the G 6000 complex. Further, the drawings of the relief decoration in LD (the only drawings of the decoration in G 6000 that were at all reliable), were neither complete nor, in many instances, correct. The mastaba of Shepseskafankh (G 6040) had not been copied at all, and LD sometimes ignored entire walls in each of the other principal structures. The notes on the tomb paintings made by Reisner and Smith were also cursory. For example, they had made almost no drawings at all of the wall decoration, and only a few observations—scattered handwritten comments on representational peculiarities in a few of the major scenes—had been made by Smith. (The absence of more detailed drawings and commentary may be explained by Smith’s belief that, of all the parts of the GWC, Cemetery G 6000 was deserving of a major epigraphic commitment more ambitious than his museum duties would allow.)\(^10\)

Clearly, an extensive project of epigraphic recording was needed if the G 6000 mastabas were to be properly published. Each of the decorated walls in the four major

---


6. In addition to Reisner’s brief history of the Giza Necropolis in Egyptologie en 1979, see the comments in Dows Dunham, The Egyptian Department and Excavations (Boston, 1959) and Reisner’s The Development of the Egyptian Tomb (Boston, 1972).


8. In chapter V, Reisner discussed a classification of mastaba cores; in chapter VI the types of burial shafts; in chapter VII the design of tomb-chapels; and in chapter VIII the decoration of the chapels.

9. The relief scenes in the mastaba of Iymery were very briefly outlined in Reisner, Giza Necropolis I, 363–65.


 mastabas was in need of a new and detailed examination, and this would require a full-scale expedition.

3. It was not until 1971, when I was on the faculty of the American University in Cairo, that such a major undertaking became possible. In summer that year, and again in 1972, grants from the Smithsonian Institution, awarded to the American University in Cairo through the American Research Center in Egypt, allowed us to spend three-month-long seasons clearing the G 6000 mastabas and recording their contents. Over the next several years, however, pressures of other work, and the difficulty of safely carting huge rolls of drawings around the world as I divided my time between Luxor, Cairo, and the United States, made it impossible to publish the results of this fieldwork as rapidly as I (and many others) would have liked. Not until over two decades later, the embarrassing long delay is ended, and Cemetery G 6000 is in press.

Like Reisner, I, too, had intended that this publication would be both a detailed record of the architecture, decoration, and archaeology of an Old Kingdom site, and an extensive discussion of the cultural and social milieu in which it had been constructed. Like Reisner, I, too, had a sense of necessity to alter those ambitious first plans. This volume, therefore, constitutes a descriptive, rather than an interpretive, record of a project that ultimately was begun over sixty years ago. It aims to record a field collection and laboratory testing. We hope that, at some future time, it will be the subject of a separate volume dealing in comparative fashion with the color conventions of the Necropolis as a whole.

4. Cemetery G 6000 lies in the southwesternmost section of the GWC, an area slightly more elevated than the areas to its east. In consequence of this position, blowing sand was not as severe a problem as it was in lower levels of the plateau, and at least parts of the mastabas here were visible to travellers even before the cemetery was cleared by Reisner. Graffiti on many of the upper sections of the mastaba walls indicate that the structures were visited frequently during the nineteenth century, and there are frequent references in the writings of early travellers to the relief decoration the tombs contained. This was especially true of G 6020, the mastaba of Iymery, which was one of the best-decorated of any of the Old Kingdom mastabas accessible to early travellers, and which never ceased to impress them. Its numerous scenes of craftsmen at work prompted Vyse and others after him to refer to the mastaba as the "Tomb of the Trades," a phrase by which it was known in several early publications. Many of the note-books and publications of these early visitors are referred to in Porter-Moss; they include Burton (who visited the site several times during the years 1820–39), Wilkinson (1821–55), Nestor l'Hôte (1828–29, 1838–39), Sharpe (1837–55), Rosellini (1834), Vyse (1836–38), Champollion (1844), Mariette (1850–80), Devéria (1858–66), and de Rouge (1877). It is the work of Lepsius, LD (1842–43), however, which most thoroughly and conscientiously recorded the decoration in the G 6000 mastabas; and, although his drawings are not complete and not always correct, they still remain a major source of information for walls that have suffered from deterioration and vandalism during the last century.

The reclearing of the G 6000 cemetery that we conducted in 1972 and 1973 was intended to permit a reexamination of the plans of the mastabas. The original drawings of the structures, made by Reisner's architect Alex Floroff, failed to show the individual stones of the superstructures, something we felt important to confirm the architectural history of the complex outlined by Reisner. In addition, the clearing allowed us to strengthen several badly damaged lintel blocks in the superstructures, to add protective steel grills to ceiling openings and steel doors to the mastaba entrances, and to install electric lamps in all of the roofed interior chambers. One of our ultimate goals was to leave the mastabas in a condition that would permit them to be visited by tourists without jeopardizing the safety of the ruins. In 1987, G 6010 and G 6020 became the first tombs on the Giza Plateau to be so open.

Our principal activity, however, was to prepare drawings of the decorated wall surfaces in each of the four major mastabas, G 6010, G 6020, G 6030, and G 6040. The technique we used was a simple and familiar one: tracings of the decorated surfaces were made, full-size, on sheets of a stable-based plastic drafting film by one of our artists, checked for accuracy by an Egyptologist, corrected by the artist, and checked again. Later, in the studio, these tracings were inked on normal drafting paper following standard conventions of line weight to indicate raised and sunk relief or paint, joined where necessary to provide a single plate of a scene or wall, and photographically reduced to a common scale for publication. Where necessary, the surfaces were brushed by our conservator before the drawing was done.

**Drawing scales:** The scale at which the drawings are published here is consistent for each tomb: the drawings of reliefs in Shepseskafankh and Ity are 25 percent of original size (i.e., at a scale of 1:4); those of Iymery are 18 percent of original size (1:5·55); and those of Neferbauphat are 15 percent (1:6·60).

5. The stone from which the mastabas in Cemetery G 6000 were constructed was quarried locally; it is the nummulitic limestone for which the Giza plateau is well known. Large numbers of marine fossils may be seen in the stones of the mastabas, including (in the north exterior wall of G 6020) a well-preserved tail section of the rare fossil whale "Zeuglodon" brachypondylus, about eighty centimeters long. The presence of these fossils often posed a problem for the artisans who decorated the walls of the mastabas, and frequently it was necessary for them to apply buff-colored plaster to a wall surface before carving.

The process of decorating each of the principal G 6000 mastabas in general followed the same order. First, the cut blocks were slid into place using a buff (occasionally light pink) plaster rich in calcium carbonate. This plaster was used as a lubricant to facilitate positioning the stone; in no case was it thickly enough applied to be called mortar or to serve as a binding agent. The blocks were then dressed using copper tools and some type of abrasive. The marks left by this process of smoothing may still be seen on the interior walls of G 6040. In many instances, fossils and imperfections still remained on the stone's surface, and these were covered by applying a layer of the same buff-colored plaster that had been used in the initial stages of construction. Usually, this plaster was less than a millimetre thick; but in those small areas where imperfections were pronounced, it could be fifteen millimetres or more. (The walls of chamber 3 of Neferbaotpah, constructed of exceptionally fine stone, lack this plaster altogether.) The walls in Iymery's tomb, on the other hand, often show a heavy application.

After the plaster had dried, red-ink drawings of the subjects to be carved were laid out on the wall and then frequently corrected or modified in black ink. (The grid lines that may occasionally still be seen on tomb walls, particularly those in the first chambers of Iymery, G 6020, are of later date, and were probably drawn by nineteenth century copyists seeking to make drawings of selected figures for their travel diaries.) The wall was now ready to be carved. First, the ink lines were incised with a sharp V-shaped tool that cut a groove about two millimetres wide at its top. (The east wall of Shepseskafakh, chamber 1, did not have any ink lines, and the carver seems to have drawn the figures directly with such an awl.) Next, the background was reduced with a scoop-like tool that cut away strips about four millimetres wide. The background was then polished with abrasives to produce a uniform surface. The relief figures, which now stood 1 to 1.5 millimetres above the background, were then detailed internally and their edges slightly rounded with abrasives. A thin gypsum plaster wash was then applied to the surface and the painting of the figures executed. This plaster varied from tomb to tomb; the CaSo 4H2O content, for example, measured an average of 63 percent in Neferbaotpah, 72 percent in Iymery, and 42 percent in lsty. The quality of the cutting and painting varied from tomb to tomb, that in lsty often being the most hastily and carelessly done, that in Neferbaotpah, although variable, often being the best.

6. George Reisner included several brief references to the G 6000 complex in Giza Necropolis I, and it also was briefly mentioned by William Stevenson Smith in JEGHOK. The fullest discussion of the complex, however, appeared in the BMFA nearly fifteen years after it had been excavated. The article is a fine example of Reisner's easy writing style and his ability to reconstruct ancient lives from minimal evidence. It remains a very useful study, and is reproduced here in full.

A Family of Royal Estate Stewards of Dynasty V
Reisner's Discussion of the History of Cemetery G 6000 in the Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston
Volume xxxvi (1939), 29–35

The ancient Egyptians believed that life after death went on like life on earth, but in a spirit form unseen by human eyes. When a ka entered the Westland, the domain of the dead, it was joined by other kis related to it, and in company they wandered in the happy land as glorified souls provided with all things necessary to their life after death. As the members of a family had lived together on earth, their tombs were built close to one another in order that their kis might be brought together in the life after death. One of the clearly marked family cemeteries in the Giza necropolis is that numbered G 6000. This cemetery is based on a complex of four large mastabas in which were buried Shepseskafankh and his descendants, who served the royal family of Dynasty V for a hundred years.

The four large mastabas were begun as simple rectangular blocks of masonry, but each was increased in size by additions containing exterior chapels. The nucleus block of G 6040 (Shepseskafankh) was built first. Then south of G 6040 was built the nucleus of G 6020 (his son Iymery) and east of G 6020 was built the nucleus mastaba of G 6030 (his son-in-law lsty). The first addition was built east of G 6040, then followed the addition which included G 6020 and G 6030 in one complex. Later the nucleus

13. I am indebted to Professor Phillip Gingrich of the University of Michigan for this identification.
block of G 6100 (Pahnefer-bauw) was built and its exterior chapel immediately constructed. The importance of the persons buried in these tombs is proved by the size of the mastaba. At Giza a mastaba of over 180 sq. m. in area is counted as a large one. The finished mastabas of the Shepseskaf-ankh complex range from 148 to 346 sq. m. in area.

The first member of the family who is known to us is Shepseskaf-ankh, the founder. Judging by his name we may assume he was born in the reign of Shepseskaf, last king of Dynasty IV. His boyhood passed during the reign of Woserkaal, the first king of Dynasty V. There are no exact details of his boyhood, but it was certainly in the reign of Neferirkara. He was almost sure to have attained a position of an estate steward of a son of the king. I would identify this prince with the younger son of Neferirkara, who later came to the throne as Neferirkara, sixth king of Dynasty IV. It was in his service that the chief members of the family lived on earth. The favor of Neferirkara as prince and as king brought the fortunes of the family of Shepseskaf-ankh to its climax. This favor was based on the efficiency of Shepseskaf-ankh and the training he had given his eldest son, Iymery.

Shepseskaf-ankh built his tomb at the Giza pyramids. His master Nitferirkara had married a princess descended from the royal family of Dynasty IV and she probably had inherited estates in the fields east of the pyramids. The fact that Shepseskaf-ankh elected to be buried at Giza indicates that the estates he administered were near that necropolis. As early as the reign of Nitferirkara the areas of the Western Field had been occupied, leaving little space for large mastabas or complexes of large mastabas. Shepseskaf-ankh selected a bare rock area along the western side of the old quarry called by me Schiaparelli’s quarry. He selected the best spot on this rock surface and built his mastabas to this site. The plan of his mastaba was changed at least twice. He converted his partly decorated interior offering room into a serdab and constructed an external offering tomb to which he added a vestibule and a spacious cosmoded court. He also prepared a ceremonial ramp leading up to the top of his mastabas designed for his burial procession. At the lower part of this ramp, at each end of the descent, he erected what is called “the over-steward Shepseskaf-ankh.” North of the mastaba he levied the space of large size, so that he could approach from the east, a mud-plastered pathway leading out from the old nucleus cemetery G 4000. All this was done while Shepseskaf-ankh still bore the title of “over-steward,” that is to say probably before the accension of his prince as King Neferirkara.

Neferirkara came to the throne and Shepseskaf-ankh was promoted to an over-steward of a King’s son to a palace steward of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, as proved by his titles in his son’s chapel. Early in the reign of Neferirkara the office passed to the eldest son of Shepseskaf-ankh, Iymery. By that time, the nucleus mastabas of Iymery and his wife had been built, and it was probably Iymery who built the additions to these two mastabas early in the reign of Neferirkasa. Shepseskaf-ankh lived on to nearly the end of the reign of Neferirkasa, when he was probably over seventy-five years old. He was certainly still alive when Iymery finished the decoration of his exterior chapel of these three mastabas G 6030.

Iymery followed the career of his father as was customary in ancient Egypt when a man had made a success of his profession. The greater part of Iymery’s life was spent in the service of the king of Upper and Lower Egypt. As a favorite of the king and a man having opportunities of speaking to the king, Iymery acquired other offices than his stewardship. He called himself in his chapels, “scribe of the house of records” and the “priest of Cheops.” He is also named a “servant of the king,” a title probably inherited from his unknown mother. In the chapel of his son, Pahnefer-bauw, Iymery bears additional titles “priest of Sahura, priest of Nitferirkara, priest of Neferirkasa.” Perhaps these offices, practically sinecures, were conferred by Neferirkasa after Iymery had finished the decoration of his own chapel.

In the list of the estates of his endowment in his own chapel are names connected with the names of Cheops, Shepseskaf, Sahura, and Nitferirkara, together with Shepseskaf-ankh and Iymery himself. It is obvious that both Shepseskaf-ankh and Iymery had acquired land as private possessors. The royal estates probably came into Iymery’s hands as gifts from the king, and I exclude the suggestion that they had come to him through any funerary priesthood, because he would have had only a life interest in such estates and could not include them in his own funerary endowment.

Iymery is proved to be the most prosperous man of the family by the size of his mastaba and the good reliefs decorating the three large rooms of his exterior chapel. He probably built the exterior chapel of his brother, who was also his brother-in-law, Iti, and his own decorated chapel of his own. His landed estates may have borne the cost of the construction of the mastaba and exterior chapel of his son, Pahnefer-bauw. Pahnefer-bauw lived about twenty-eight years old at the accesion of Neferirkasa and about forty-four years old when he finished the decoration of his chapel in the middle of the reign of Neferirkasa. He would have been sixty at the death of Neferirkasa, the master he had served all his life, and he may have survived that king. He probably died and was buried in G 6030, the tomb of Iymery and Wesert-ka.

Closely associated with the tomb of Iymery is that of his brother-in-law, Iti, who had married Iymery’s sister Wesert-ka. It is described in his own chapel, as “director of music of the Pharaoh, delighting his lord with good singing in the palace.” It may be concluded that Iymery and Iti were associated in the palace in the service of Neferirkasa. Iymery made a marriage between his friend Iymery and his own sister. When Iti prepared for his life after death he elected to be buried beside his friend Iymery and the family of his wife. It is probable that Iymery bore part of the cost of the G 6030, the tomb of Iymery and Wesert-ka.

The chief person of the third generation of the family was Pahnefer-bauw, buried in G 6100. Pahnefer-bauw was the eldest of the four sons of Iymery and was trained in the service in which his father and grandfather had attained distinction. His chief service title was “priest of the palace.” In the chapel of his father he appears as a young adult in four scenes and bears the titles “kinsman of the king” and “steward.” In his own chapel his titles vary from some to some and from inscription to inscription, but together they include all the chief titles ascribed to his father, “steward of the palace,” “priest of Cheops, Sahura, Neferirkara, and Neferirkasa.” Probably the offices designated by funerary priest-hoods of kings were inherited from his father Iymery. Pahnefer-bauw was a typical heir of a rich and influential family. He planned his own tomb with a chapel much larger than that of his father, and depended on his father’s support in carrying out the plan. The interior offering room was also very large and fully decorated. The plastered hall in front was partly decorated. The decoration of the corridor to the north was designed but only partly carried out.

Pahnefer-bauw was probably born before the accesion of Neferirkasa and built his mastaba with its addition in the latter
part of the reign of that king. The finishing of the decoration of his chapel was probably interrupted by the death of lympy, not distant in time from the death of the king. He would have been thirty-nine at the end of the reign of Newserra, forty-seven at the end of the reign of Menkauhor, and undoubtedly lived in the reign of Isesy.

The last member of the family whom we have been able to trace is the prince of the tomb Phah-nefer-bauw, the eldest son of Phah-nefer-bauw. In the chapel of his father he appears in three scenes and in the titles and name of Ptah-nefer-bauw were inscribed above those of Iymery. Iymery is the chief figure in an offering scene, seated in an armchair in a kiosk attended by men who are not named, but who were obviously designed as his son, his grandson, and the servants of his his. He is smelling a lotus flower held out to him by the offering formulas recited by the offerings at the doors of the chapels.

The association of the names of generations in Cemetery G 6000 was characteristic of all the family cemeteries of ancient Egypt. The purpose of the layout of the tombs in a family cemetery was to assure to its members the continuation in the life after death. All the glorified souls of the family had access to all parts of the tomb. The entrance to the chapels was never finished. Although the figure of Shepseskaf-ankh was carved on the face of a pillar, it is the whole family. The manager of the cemetery would have seen himself as a chief figure in the offering scene in which he sat in an armchair in a kiosk attended again by lympy and other members of the family. The satisfaction of the old father can be imagined at seeing the whole family assembled around him in the chapel of his son.

Lympy had much the same experience as his father in visiting the chapel of his son Phah-nefer-bauw. There again on the south wall of the offering room lympy was the chief figure in an offering scene, seated in an armchair in a kiosk attended by men who are not named, but who were obviously designed as his son, his grandson, and the servants of his his. He is smelling a lotus flower held out to him by the offering formulas recited by the offerings at the doors of the chapels.

The association of the names of generations in Cemetery G 6000 was characteristic of all the family cemeteries of ancient Egypt. The purpose of the layout of the tombs in a family cemetery was to assure to its members the continuation in the life after death. All the glorified souls of the family had access to all parts of the tomb. The entrance to the chapels was never finished. Although the figure of Shepseskaf-ankh was carved on the face of a pillar, it is the whole family. The manager of the cemetery would have seen himself as a chief figure in the offering scene in which he sat in an armchair in a kiosk attended again by lympy and other members of the family. The satisfaction of the old father can be imagined at seeing the whole family assembled around him in the chapel of his son.
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INTRODUCTION

The unknown father of Shepseskafankh may be the individual who is shown accompanying text {4.6} in Shepseskafankh’s mastaba. His name, unfortunately, has been lost.

For Wsr-t-kf as Jjmrij’s sister, see [2.117]; as Jjmrjj’s wife, see [3.2].

For Nb-mnj as Jjmrij’s brother, see [2.63];

Jjmrij is listed as the eldest son of Ṣps-kf-ṛḥ in [2.46], [2.59], and [2.136].

For Njt-kf-wḥt-hṛ as Jjmrjj’s wife, see [2.112].

The relationship between Jjmrij and Ṣm-nfr is conjectural. Ṣm-nfr is not mentioned in any G 6000 tomb. But Junker15 believed that a scene in Ṣm-nfr’s tomb (G 5080) was copied from Jjmrij, and Strudwick, 16 citing Baer,17 notes that the estate grftp-jjmrjj is referred to in Ṣm-nfr’s mastaba. It seems clear that the son of Ṣm-nfr (called the Second) was Ṣm-nfr III, and from this we may affirm that he is to be placed early in the reign of Neuserre. 18

The unnamed son of Jjmrij is to be seen in [2.62]; Ṣps-kf-ṛḥ Ṣṛj as Jjmrij’s son is listed in [2.61] and [2.113].

Nfr-bḥw-Pḥḥ is given as eldest son of Jjmrij in [2.60] and [2.116].

Ḥwṛt is listed as Nfr-bḥw-Pḥḥ’s wife in [1.20], [1.32], and [1.34].

Nfr-sḥm-Pḥḥ is listed as the eldest son of Nfr-bḥw-Pḥḥ in [1.35] and [1.47].

For Mrṯ-t-s as Jjmrij’s daughter, see [2.114] and [2.116].

For Ṣrḥ as a daughter of Jjmrij see [2.115].
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In the two chapters that follow we shall index and cross-reference the names and titles of individuals buried in Cemetery G 6000. This material is meant to facilitate the study of their occurrences and, we hope, will make it easier to locate them in the numerous wall scenes these mastabas contain. The tables may reward anyone willing to spend time tracking possible patterns in their location, order, and combination. The system of transliteration of these names and titles was chosen to facilitate cross-checking with other recently published sources. It is used here consistently, except in direct quotes from earlier records.

Part Two of this report deals with the decoration of the G 6000 mastabas. This information is based upon our reexamination of the cemetery in the early nineteen-seventies, but has been checked against the field notes of Reisner, the occasional marginal comments made to them by William Stevenson Smith, and the scattered comments of earlier visitors. Of these, LD is the most complete, and the remarks of Lepsius on the principal G 6000 mastabas are quoted in full. Only when it was necessary to justify a reconstruction or to explain some obscure feature of a relief has comparative materials from other tombs of the Old Kingdom been cited extensively. It should be noted that the mastaba of Iymery was frequently referred to by Vandier, Manuel, and reference is made to that work for its frequent discussions and additional references.

For the sake of convenience, each text occurring in G 6000 is assigned a number, which appears within { } - brackets. That number is used in Part One to identify the location of names and titles. It also occurs as part of the caption for each plate and figure.

Part Three deals with the archaeology and the architecture of G 6000. The data given there is based almost entirely on the rough drafts of a report made by Reisner on his work in G 6000, those drafts in turn having been based upon his field notes and diaries. Whenever possible, we have rechecked his statements against the original notebooks and against the re-excavated structures themselves. The measurements and calculations Reisner gave in his draft report have posed a special problem: his typed manuscript contains hundreds of typographical errors, and no number given therein could safely be assumed to be correct without verification. In some cases such verification has not been possible; such unchecked figures are queried in our text.

Of the objects described in Part Three, only those with MFA catalog numbers can be located today; the remainder are presumably in storage in small, unidentified magazines at Giza, or are lost.

All the line drawings of painted and carved scenes appearing here were made by us in the early nineteen-seventies. We have tried wherever possible, however, to include photographs of the scenes made by Reisner’s staff, rather than the photographs made more recently by our crew. The condition of the walls of these mastabas has unfortunately deteriorated in the sixty years since Reisner worked here, and in consequence his photos tend to show more clearly the subtleties of carving and painting in these important tombs than do ours. Changes in the condition of the walls may even be seen when comparing photos taken early in Reisner’s work at Giza with those taken a decade later. Architectural drawings are a combination of those made by our architects and Reisner’s. Artifact and pottery drawings are based entirely on Reisner’s studies.