Chapter 2: ARCHITECTURE AND DECORATION

From about the reign of Neferirkare, there is an increasing complexity evident in the internal plans of mastabas belonging to high officials. This complexity manifests itself toward the end of Dynasty 5 in multiple-roomed chapels like those of Rawer at Giza, Ptahshepses at Abuš and Ti at Saqqara, and is likewise evident in the queens’ and viziers’ tombs of the end of Dynasty 5 and the beginning of Dynasty 6 in the Unis and Teti’ pyramid cemeteries at the latter site.

At both Saqqara and Giza this trend towards elaboration also materializes in family complexes. At Saqqara the Ptahhetep Complex comprises a series of family tombs erected around a large open court. The same is true of the Senedjemib Complex and, to a lesser degree, of the complex of Seshemnofer IV at Giza. At the latter site, the Ptahshepses at Abusir to high officials, and is likewise evident in evidence in Old Kingdom tombs. One such stone is embedded in the floor between two pillars in the cult hall of Mereruka’s mastaba close to the niche containing the statue of the vizier and the offering stone at its foot, even though Duell expressed doubt as to whether actual sacrifices took place in the mastaba itself. A fragment of what may have been another staple stone was found in the entrance corridor of the mastaba of Ptahhetep I, though not in situ. Alongside an L-shaped staple stone in the rock-cut chapel of Pepyankh the Middle of Mereruka is located what appears to be a circular basin for catching the blood of the victim.

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

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

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

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

Some six uninscribed obelisks lined the path leading to the portico of the Senedjemib complex, and Junker was of the opinion that one pair of obelisks was to be assigned to each of the three proprietors of tombs in the complex, namely, Seshemnofer IV and his sons Tjeti and Ptahhetep. Obelisks such as these served as a symbol of resur-
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The Senedjemib Complex, Part 1

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

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

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

At Saqqara the tombs of Ni-ankh-khnum and Khnumhotep of Ka-em-tjenent, of Izezi-ankh, of Ptahhetep I, and of Ti all have or had entrance porticos fronted by square pillars. The first tomb belonged to the reign of Neuserre or Menkaure, the others were probably decorated in the reign of Izezi. The pillars of Ptahsheps at Abusir are denuded, but the other pillars are or were inscribed with the titles and name of the tomb-owner.

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

No columns or fragments thereof were actually recovered from any of the Giza tombs. Even so, an approximate idea of the nature and size of the columns may be had from the sets of column bases which were found in situ. It should first of all be noted that the surviving column bases from the tombs of Rawer, Senedjemib Inti, and Sehenneter IV have rounded sides, being narrower at the top than at the bottom. For the column bases of Rawer, only the outer diameter of 50 cm is given in the publication. This was probably true also of the tombs of Senedjemib Inti, since the paving of Inti's portico, are of lira limestone (pl. 134, b). They differ slightly in their dimensions. One base is 28 cm high, while the other measures 24 cm in height. The upper and lower diameters of the columns are respectively 64 and 74 cm and 65 and 76 cm. Since Old Kingdom columns did not reach to the very edge of the top of the base, the diameter of the column was therefore probably something less than 60 cm. Senedjemib's columns were larger than Inti's, the outer diameter of the bases at the rim being 206 cm, while the diameter of the circular marks left on their tops by the columns was 75 cm.
It is clear from the circular marks left on the tops of their bases that the columns of Seshemnofer IV’s portico had plain, round shafts. Inti’s bases lack any such markings, while Hassan’s report gives no further details regarding the bases in Rawer’s portico. Whereat it is possible in theory that lotus bud columns originally supported the roofs of the porticoes of Rawer and Inti, as they did in the tomb of Prathephres at Abusir, the occurrence of floral columns in the latter tomb is apparently unique. For that reason, it is more likely that Rawer’s architrave rested, Baraize, following Junker and Balcz, certainly made a similar assumption and set square abaci at the top of the columns in his reconstruction of Seshemnofer IV’s portico.44 It was presumably Baraize who likewise provided the circular concrete columns utilized in the modern reconstruction of Senedjemib Mehi’s portico with square abac4.45

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

At Giza, on the other hand, sufficient evidence probably exists to show that the entablatures of the porticoes of the tomb of Sencedjemib Inti and of the Seshemnofer IV Complex consisted of an architrave and a cavetto cornice with torus moulding. Insofar as the Senedjemib Complex is concerned, the architraves of Inti and Mehi are extant, as is a segment of Nekhebu’s architrave. The architraves of Inti and Mehi both originally comprised three discrete blocks. All three blocks were once inscribed in line-scale, sunken hieroglyphs with the name and titles of their owners between border lines. The height of Inti’s architrave was 55 cm, of Mehi’s 48 cm, and of Nekhebu’s 28.3 cm.48 No trace remained of the architrave of Seshemnofer IV, which presumably had been removed for reuse elsewhere.49

The Harvard–Boston Expedition found a large section of a cavetto-and-torus cornice lying on the ground in front of the entrance to the tomb of Senedjemib Inti (pl. 8a, 9a–b). Considering its find spot, it is likely that the block derived from the entablature over Inti’s portico,50 even though there is no certainty that it could not have come from the tomb of Nekhebu, whose portico opened on the south of Inti’s, or have been dragged by stone-robbbers across the court from Mehi’s mastaba. Since it appears to have been the only such block found by Reisner in the Senedjemib Complex, it is in all probability this cornice that was utilized by Baraize in his reconstruction of the facade of Mehi’s tomb.51 If it is the same block, it was subsequently cracked and one end broken off at an angle (frontispiece D, pl. 10a).52 The restored entablature above the entrance to Mehi’s tomb totals 3.30 m in height, the height of the cornice itself being 60 cm, while the torus moulding and the plain band below were each 11 cm high and the architrave, as already noted, 48 cm in height. A plain band sometimes intervenes between the moulding and the architrave in contemporary cavetto cornices, but it is absent in others so that the torus roll sits directly on the architrave.53 The latter is true of the cavetto-and-torus cornice from the portico of Seshemnofer IV.54 The cornices from the Senedjemib and Seshemnofer complexes are both plain and devoid of the customary decoration of cross-lashings and foliage.55

If the restoration proposed herein of the beginning of Inscription B 1 at the top of the north wall of Inti’s portico is correct, then the original height of the side walls of the porticoes of c. 2570 would have been in the neighborhood of 4.70 m.56 Assuming that the architrave rested on the side walls directly above the decorated area, and was surmounted by the cavetto-and-torus cornice found by Reisner in front of its portico (at present seemingly utilized in the restoration of the facade of Mehi’s tomb), the total height of the facade of c. 2570 would have been 6.07 m originally. Once again assuming that there were originally six short registers of marsh dwellers in front of Mehi’s figure on both side walls of his portico,57 the height of those walls to the top of the decorated area would have been close to 4.66 m. Adding to this figure the height of the restored entablature as given above, that is, 1.30 m, results in a total height for the facade of c. 3.278 of 5.96 m. The restored heights of the two porticoes reached on quite different grounds thus appear to be complementary. The result (fig. 59b) is a much taller portico than Baraize envisioned for Seshemnofer IV (fig. 59a). On the other hand, the portico of the
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miller to the time of Neuserre and Menkaure, and in the tomb of another of Izzé’s viziers, Rasaheps, which belongs to the middle of Izzé’s reign.

In the tomb of Nisankh-Khnum and Khnumhotep, the side walls of the porticos are occupied by registers of funerary scenes. Rasaheps’ portico was thus possibly the first entirely dedicated to marsh pursuits, but only a portion of its decoration survived. The rear (west) wall to the north of the entrance was occupied by a scene of Rasaheps fishing and below by a register with a herdman driving cattle across a stretch of water. Since activities of spear fishing and fishing are virtually inseparable, it is likely that the rear wall on the south side of the entrance was occupied by a scene of Rasaheps spear fishing, which did not survive.

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

Although the tombs of Senedjemib Inti and Mehi and that of Sethemnofer IV all bore scenes of fishing and fishing on the rear walls of their porticos, the composition of the scenes on the side walls of the porticos of Mehi and Sethemnofer is especially similar. The side walls of Mehi (pls. 106–107, 110–11; figs. 97, 105) are damanged, and only two blocks, one from each side wall, are preserved in the case of Sethemnofer. Nevertheless, the surviving decoration is probably sufficient to show that large figures of the tomb owner viewing the return of the marsh dwellers originally occupied the side walls of both porticos. In both porticos likewise, the standing figure of the owner was separated from the registers of marsh dwellers by a vertical band of text containing the caption to the scene, while shorter columns of text above the owner’s head contained his name and titles. In addition, registers of marsh dwellers on foot bearing offerings appear to have been alternated in both cases with registers of marsh dwellers in papyrus skiffs bringing marsh products. The portico of...
Seshemnofer was too singled out to indicate whether, as in Mehi’s case (and Inti’s), two wide registers at the bottom of the side walls were occupied by scenes of cattle and herdsmen in boats fording streams and by homeward bound marsh dwellers.

The resemblance between the two portraits is not altogether fortuitous, for the two tombs were more or less contemporary. The composition of the file of officials followed by an offering bearer with a yoke over his shoulders on the north wall of room B of Seshemnofer’s chapel may also be compared with the similar file on the north wall of the antechambers in c. 2780 BC. In addition to the yoke bearers, the figure of a seated holding a scribe palette and papyrus roll occurs in both scenes. What is not certain is whether the similarities between the two sets of scenes was the result of one and the same group of artisans having worked on both tombs or whether the shared motifs represent another instance of scenes copied from one chapel for another person.

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

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

Smith observed that the autobiographical inscription on the facade of Senebemut’s Inti’s chapel should be considered in connection with the similar occurrence of the autobiographical inscriptions of Rashepses and Ka-em-tjenent at Saqqara. Two copies of a letter from king Izezi were inscribed along with Rashepses’ autobiographical text on each side of the portico. The entrance to the chapel for another person. The spear of Rashepses and Ka-em-tjenent at Saqqara. Two copies of a letter from king Izezi were inscribed along with Rashepses’ autobiographical text on each side of the portico. The entrance to the chapel for another person. The spear of Rashepses was an old-er contemporary of Inti’s, and probably preceded the latter in the office of vizier. Ka-em-tjenent was a prince and, since his autobiographical inscription makes mention of the vizier Rashepses, he was in all probability a son of Izezi. His tomb therefore dates to about the same time as c. 2750 BC. Although the portico entrance to the fac-
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An earlier prototype for the occurrence of autobiographical inscriptions on tomb entrances is probably to be found in the reign of Neferi-taui, in the Saqqara tomb of the vizier Wadhph-thut I. On both the walls of his tom-
two-way orientation of text and with standing figures of the two brothers on either end, while the space above the architecture is occupied by double representations of Ni-ankh-khnum and Khnum hotep at table, figures of butchers at work, and food offerings.102

In Nekheba’s portico, as reconstructed by William Stevenson Smith, a lintel over the entrance was inscribed with an offering formula in a single line of large hieroglyphs between border lines. Over the lintel an architecture extended the entire width of the portico. It too was inscribed with an offering formula, but the hieroglyphs were larger and served as decorated lintels or architraves, or any other kind of decoration, appeared above the marsh hunt scenes at the back of the portico of Inti and Mehi (or Sehemenof IV), no evidence for such appears to survive at present. The offering room of g 3750 (Room IV), the mastaba of Senedjemib Iinti, is the first well-dated example of an east-west offering room at Giza.103 Long east–west offering rooms with a false door occupying the west wall, Reisner’s type (?), first appear in Dynasty 5, in the pyramid temples of Sahure, Nefertkare, and Neuserre.104 There was very little time lag before this type of offering room began to make its appearance in private tombs. The earliest example of the new type of offering room may be that of Persen, which dates back at least to the reign of Menkauhor,105 or that of Ptahhetep I dated, as we have already seen, to the reign of Iac.106

Like g 3750, the principle mastaba built on the platform of the Senedjemib Complex (g 2374, 2378, 2381, 2384, 2385), all have long east–west offering rooms.107 Whereas both g 3750 and g 2381 are type (7c) complex chapels based on a two-roomed nucleus comprising an east–west offering room and a north–south anteroom, g 2374, 2378, and 2384 belong to type (7d), and consist of an east–west offering room with other rooms presenting a modification of type (7c), instead as they lack the north–south anteroom room. g 2384 was too demarcatd to determine anything more of its plan with certainty.108 Two smaller chapels, g 2386–a and b, adjacent to the entrance ramp, which probably belonged to Inti’s great-grandson(?), Impy and Ilebi, consisted of single interconnecting east–west offering rooms equipped with the new type of false door.109 g 2390 on the platform east of g 2381, south of the sloping ramp leading up to the complex, may also have possessed an east–west chapel, but all that remains of it are the lower part of a false door and a few stones from the north and west walls of the room. Even so, the torsus moulding visible at its sides indicates that the false door was likewise of the new type with cavetto cornice.110

The majority of the east–west offering rooms in the Senedjemib Complex are entered either from a north–south anteroom by a doorway in the east end of the north wall (g 2388) or from an east–west anteroom by means of a doorway in the east end of the south wall (g 2374, 2378, 2384?, and 2385). Inti’s offering room (g 2376) is distinguished from these others by the placement of the entrance just to the east of the center of the north wall. As a result this wall is divided into two sections of unequal length. Nevertheless, all of these arrangements result in a shorter entrance wall.111 An exception to the general layout is provided by the interconnecting chapels g 2386–a and b.

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

The tomb owner sits before an offering table, orientated away from his false door. A pile of food separates his table from approaching bearers, or alternatively, food is arranged above the leaves so that the subsidiary figures are brought closer to the deceased. Above, and sometimes extending beyond the pile of food, is an offering list, while further right the shorter registers are occupied by food (optional), and prayer. From about V 2 onwards the latter perform rites with the deceased’s head or just above it, depending upon the height allowed for the registers below. Bearers fill the registers with the food, oriented westward as if they are piling offerings in front of the major figure. One of these processes is often led by the deceased’s son, who offers incense to his father or perhaps strangles a goose or duck as a sacrifice. Below, there is sometimes an extra register filled with bearers relating directly to the false door. In Dynasty 6 these figures are occasionally divided into two groups, the first carrying baubles and the second strangler growing as they hold them forward as an offering.112 Harpur supplements her discussion with a schematic diagram which is reproduced here as fig. 10.113

Harpur makes the additional observation that the east–west offering rooms in the multi-roomed chapels are the only type of offering room that consistently follows the pattern of reliefs in the sanctuaries of royal mortuary temples.114 Indeed, the north and south wall compositions in the east–west sanctuary of the pyramid temple of Pepy II, the best preserved example, are almost identical to east–west offering rooms seen in multi-roomed chapels.115

102 Nîmîchehban, ph. 1–2, figs. 1–6.
103 EG 474.
104 G.3, pp. 260–61; Stadelmann, administration, p. 91.
105 Cf. Giga Neureps, t. p. 260. Reisner believed that the east–west offering room first appeared in the outer offering-place of the pyramid temple of Dynasty 4. Stadelmann (MMA R 42 [1995], pp. 259–61, fig. 16); however, now returns a long east–west offering room with a false door at the back of the mastaba temple of the Bent Pyramid of Snofru at Dahshur.
106 Harpur, Decoration, p. 107. For the mastaba in question, see PM 32, p. 428 [34–35].
107 G.3, pp. 166–68.
108 Decoration, p. 175.
109 Stadelmann (Administration, pp. 259–61) dates the single-roomed, east–west chapel to the mid–latter Dynasty, citing Sekhem-ankh-Pah (PM 5, p. 454–55), but Harpur who thinks this chapel is hardly distinctive architecturally from that of Persen, assigns it instead to the reign of Iunet or Usir (Decoration, pp. 107, n. 71; 274).
110 The only definite exception is g 3781, the small, late chapel of Wer-ka-hau Ibu built against the south wall of g 3758 (see above, p. 3).
111 See above, p. 3.
112 See above, p. 3.
113 See above, p. 3.
115 Ibid., p. 107.
116 Ibid., fig. 16.
117 Ibid., p. 109.
118 Ibid., see PM 32, p. 428 [34–35].
The culmination of the decorative program for the east–west offering rooms with long north and south walls in private chapels is to be seen in the tombs of the queens and viziers of Unis in the Unis pyramid cemetery at Saqqara\(^\text{119}\) and in the tombs of the high officials of the reigns of Teti and Pepy I located in the Teti pyramid cemetery at Saqqara.\(^\text{118}\) Earlier stages in the process of development can be traced in a number of east–west offering rooms at Saqqara, for example, those of Persen, Netjeruser, Hetep-her-akhti, and Ptahhetep I. Persen was at Saqqara.\(^\text{119}\) Earlier stages in the process of development can be traced on both long walls in Ptahhetep I, a procession of agricultural estates appears on both the north and south walls. In Ptahhetep I only the lowest registers of the north and south walls survive.\(^\text{122}\) In the shorter register to the left or right of the offering list on a level with the head of the seated figure of Ini at table. As in a number of Dynasty 6 offering rooms, the remainder of the wall above the figures of the priests was apparently occupied by an array of food and drink offerings in narrow sub-registers.\(^\text{116}\) In c 2370 food and drink offerings are also to be seen in the shorter register behind the priests. As is also true of Netjeruser, in c 2370 a vertical column with the caption *spt spt* precedes the foremost offering bearer on the south wall.\(^\text{117}\) Although the same caption continues to appear in Dynasty 6,\(^\text{118}\) in east–west chapels at the later period the vertical column containing the caption is frequently replaced\(^\text{119}\) or supplemented by a long horizontal line (or lines) which begins with *spt spt* but extends the width of the register above the heads of the offering bearers.

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

\(^{116}\) For the north wall, which is incomplete, see the south wall, see below, pp. 78–79.
\(^{117}\) E.g., Gem-ns-het 1, pl. 26–31; Gem-khu, pl. 31–32; Gem-ns-het 2, pls. 55–66, 124; Gem-ns-het 3, fig. 20. For the purposes of this discussion, however, we have accepted Harpur’s date.
\(^{118}\) See above, p. 24 and n. 100.
\(^{119}\) Harpur, Decoration, p. 277. For discussions of the problems involved in dating the tomb of Netjeruser, see Bres, Rank and Rivalry, p. 37–39(4); Steindibich, Administration, p. 24 (49). The tomb exhibits in its decoration a number of progressive features that might be exposed to first appear in the tomb of a higher official such as a vine. For the purpose of this discussion, however, we have accepted Harpur’s date.
\(^{120}\) Seven Chapels, pl. 11 (top); Mohr, Munich-Alexandria, fig. 50.
\(^{121}\) Ibid., pl. 70–71, figs. 44–45.
\(^{122}\) Ibid., pl. 83–84, fig. 54–56.
\(^{123}\) PM III, p. 177–78.
\(^{125}\) Murray, *Saq. Mast.* 1, pl. 8–9; J. Hausen, Saqqara II, pls. 380–46.
\(^{127}\) Seven Chapels, pl. 10 (bottom).
\(^{128}\) Seven Chapels, pl. 10 (bottom).
\(^{129}\) Murray, *Saq. Mast.* 1, pl. 9–10; Hausen, Saqqara II, pls. 38–46.
\(^{130}\) See above, p. 11 and n. 5.
\(^{131}\) See above, p. 16 and n. 105.
\(^{132}\) E.g., Gem-ns-het 1, pl. 28–29; Gem-ns-het 2, pl. 52–53, 58–63; Gem-khu, pls. 17–18, 65 etc. (multiple lines); Altenmüller, *Mehu*, pls. 56, 65.
\(^{133}\) E.g., Gem-ns-het 1, pl. 28–29; Gem-ns-het 2, pl. 52–53, 58–63; Gem-khu, pls. 17–18, 65 etc. (multiple lines); Altenmüller, *Mehu*, pls. 56, 65.
or racks may be placed under the offering table,\textsuperscript{147} or a table or rack or two may be seen close to the piles of food in the registers before the deceased,\textsuperscript{148} but such an array is otherwise rare and forms one more link in the decoration of the two tombs.\textsuperscript{149}

Two further refinements affect the extra register at the beginning of the Sixth Dynasty. First, the number of birds presented by the second group of bearers is multiplied, each offering bearer holding up as many as five birds by the neck and wings.\textsuperscript{144} Second, cages with other birds appear at the feet of the figures that strangle the birds.\textsuperscript{145} These developments too are evident in the Senedjemib Complex. Even though the offering room of Khnumemti is largely destroyed, a long block which must belong to the extra register on its north wall shows the legs and feet of nine figures (pl. 94b, fig. 91). A cage of five birds rests on the ground in front of the seventh, eighth, and ninth figures. Since part of a cage is also visible behind the ninth figure, and a fragment preserves the central portion of an offering bearer and another cage filled with ducks, there is clear evidence for at least five such figures originally.\textsuperscript{143} Presumably, the six foremost figures carried haunches. Not infrequently, the number of bearers offering haunches and strangling geese is even, and this may have been the case in G 5174.\textsuperscript{142}

No mention has been made so far of the decoration of the east wall of the long east–west offering rooms. The offering room of Persen possessed no east wall, since it was in the form of a deep niche, open to the corridor.\textsuperscript{141} The offering room of Hetep-her-ahtarki is entered by a door in the middle of the east wall, but scenes of netting birds in a tree and of goats browsing occupy the lintel over the door–way, while the jambs have four registers with two offering bearers in each.\textsuperscript{140} Outdoor activities still appear on the east wall of the offering room of Puthuhetep I towards the end of Dynasty 5.\textsuperscript{147} Conversely, already in middle of the dynasty in the tomb of Netjeruaset, outdoor activities are entirely excluded from the offering room, and the east wall is decorated with food and drink offerings over the doorway and with scenes of sacrificing animals on the jambs to either side.\textsuperscript{146} The offerings thus continue the arrays of food and drink at the top of the long walls. Such an arrangement was not uncommon in Dynasty 6.\textsuperscript{146}

All that remains today of the relief decoration on the east wall of the offering room in G 5170 are back-to-back processions of men and animals in the lowermost register, but Mariette claims to have seen offering bearers in the lower registers of this wall and food offerings arrayed on tables in its upper register.\textsuperscript{150} East–west offering rooms of Dynasty 6 often retain the butchers, which in Netjeruaset occupied the extra register at the bottom of the long walls, to the east end wall, where they commonly appear below registers of food offerings and bearers of offerings.\textsuperscript{151} Except for the bottom of the wall in Inti's offering room, the east walls of the offering rooms in the other mastabas of the Senedjemib Complex are largely destroyed. Nevertheless, a fragment of relief assigned to the east wall of the offering room of G 5174 does show butchers at work with a horizontal caption above that perhaps once began with djet tep (pl. 96b).\textsuperscript{152}

The symmetry inherent in the arrangement on the north and south long walls evidently appealed to the Egyptian sense of the aesthetic, for once the scheme was adopted, it remained the norm for east–west offering rooms throughout much of the remainder of the Sixth Dynasty. It appears not only in the multi–roomed chapels of the period, but also in a simplified format in smaller tombs both in the Memphite cemeteries\textsuperscript{153} and in the provinces.\textsuperscript{154}

Although the cavetto cornice has disappeared and the torus moulding is largely destroyed, the false door of Senedjemib Inti remains the earliest well–dated Giza example of the new type of false door with cornice and moulding that first appears at Saqara in the early Fifth Dynasty.\textsuperscript{155} All the false doors in the Senedjemib Complex for which evidence survives (G 2370, 2374, 2378, 2386–a and b, 2390) were of this new type, including the small, late false door of Wer–ka–bau Iku (G 2388).\textsuperscript{156} As the cornice and torus were introduced in the Fifth Dynasty, the inscriptions, size, and decoration of the jambs of false doors becomes more regular.\textsuperscript{157} Strudwick notes that the doors of the high officials of the reign of Izezi and later all exhibit jamb inscriptions of equal length, with a figure of the deceased at the bottom of each.\textsuperscript{158} This is certainly true of the false doors of Inti, Mehi, and Khnumemti (G 2374), each of which possesses three recessed pairs of jambs.

For the most part, the surviving false doors of the Senedjemib Complex are monolithic in nature (G 2374, 2378, 2386–a and b, 2390). Senedjemib Inti's false door though differs from these others inasmuch as it is constructed of several distinct blocks. Both Inti and Mehi's false doors stand on massive blocks of limestone that functioned as offering stones.\textsuperscript{159} From Lepsius's drawing, it is clear that a...
cavetto cornice and torus moulding originally surmounted the offering stone of Mehi (fig. 126).

It is possible that Inti’s offering stone was similarly ornamented, but the damage is too extensive to be certain (pls. 41, 46a). The tops of both slabs are very uneven, and no traces of a loaf-on-mat motif or of rectangular depressions for liquids are visible. The offering slab in pl. 2384 is also surmounted by a cornice and moulding (pl. 108). In this instance, however, vestiges of a loaf-on-mat design are visible on the upper surface of the block.

In most of the other tombs of the Senejedemji Complex, the false doors rest directly on the blocks of the paving of the offering room. In the case of Khnumenti (pl. 217a), the rear section of the offering stone is carved from the same block as the false door itself and projects a few centimeters beyond the side mouldings (pl. 9). The front surface of this projecting element is roughly finished, and another large rectangular block with or without the customary loaf-on-a-mat carved on its upper surface was presumably set against it and plastered into place.

To the right of Inti’s false door and offering stone, a large rectangular offering bench of limestone, measuring 2.06 m in length by 53 cm in width and 44 cm in height, rests against the northern wall of the room. The bench is crowned by a cavetto-and-torus cornice on its southern and eastern sides (pl. 446). Although not confined to multiple-room chapels based on east–west offering rooms, similar benches form a standard part of the service equipment in Type 7 chapels in a number of important tombs of the very end of the Fifth Dynasty and the early Sixth Dynasty at both Giza and Saqqara.

Usually the benches are monolithic but sometimes, as here, the upper part of the bench with the cornice and moulding is cut from a single stone which rests on smaller limestone blocks. A number of the benches are inscribed along the top with the name and titles of the deceased. The model for this arrangement is probably the sanctuary in pyramid temples of about the same period. Three other specimens are to be found within the Senejedemji Complex, in pl. 2378, 2384, and 2385; two slabs set at the sides of Senejedemji Mehi’s bench, which apparently was plain and lacked a cornice (fig. 952), measured 3.21 m in length by 47 cm in width by 45 cm in height.

Considering the situation of all these benches close to the false door and the offering stone, it seems likely that they were intended to serve some purpose in the offering ritual, perhaps they functioned as “sideboards” on which offerings and cult paraphernalia were placed during the periodic funeral ceremonies which were performed in the chapel.

In the northeast corner of the offering room of G 2370 is a box-like structure built of three limestone slabs, two set upright on either side of a third which rests flat on the floor and has a rectangular depression or basin in its center (pl. 204–5, fig. 3). The structure measures 159.5 cm in width by 14 cm in depth and is 75 cm high. It has no top, but a finished limestone slab, measuring 159 cm in length, rests at present alongside the south wall of the room opposite this structure (pl. 90b). Reisner makes no mention of this slab in his records and, if it served as a table top for the box-like structure, it would have projected some 6.5 cm into the opening of the entrance to the room. On the other hand, the projection would not have served as an obstacle to free passage into the offering room, and the rectangular block may well have served that purpose.

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

In the northwest corner of the north–south vestibule of G 2370 evidence survives for another cult installation, of which three slabs of limestone alone remain in place (pl. 344). Two slabs are set upright against the west and north walls and a third slab, which rests flat on the floor, placed snugly against them. If another slab is restored on the south side and a horizontal slab set on it, the resultant construction is a table that like in the southeast corner of Room IV, albeit without the basin below. On this reconstructed table the funerary priests may have set cult objects, while they burned incense and made offering before the serdab slots during the regular offering ceremonies.

The mastabas of Inti and Mehi were constructed of great blocks of grey nummulitic limestone, and the reliefs in the two Chapels were...
carved in this stone. Only the offering bench and other cult installa-
tions in Inti's mastaba and the offering bench in Mehi's are of fine
white limestone, presumably from the Tura quarries.\(^{69}\) The south
walls of Rooms I and II in G 2370 were also the cut-back exterior
north wall of G 2370, so the funeral and agricultural scenes of
Khnumeneb (figs. 83, 88) were similarly carved in nummulitic lime-
stone. The other walls in G 2374, however, were lined with fine Tura
limestone, and the false door seemingly cut from a single block of the
same stone. The reliefs of the destroyed mastaba of Nekhebu (G 2381)
appear to have been entirely carved in fine white limestone. As far as
can be ascertained from its denuded remains, G 2385 was likewise
built of blocks of the same fine stone. G 2384 is nearly totally de-
stroyed, but a block with an autobiographical inscription which
seems to derive from the facade of this mastaba suggests that it too
was constructed of Tura limestone.\(^{70}\) The offering bench in its chap-
el is also cut from a single large block of white limestone. G 2386–a
and b, north of the access ramp to the court of the complex, and
G 2390 on the south of the ramp, are also badly denuded. The unsin-
scribed monolithic false doors in these three mastabas are of nummu-
личic limestone, however.

The nummulitic limestone used in the tombs of Inti and Mehi
was apparently local stone, cut from one of the quarries along the
edges of the main promontory at Giza or on its top.\(^{71}\) The coarse
nummulitic limestone at Giza is of two varieties, a softer yellow-drab
stone and a harder grey stone.\(^{72}\) As previously mentioned, the stone
utilized in G 2370 and 2378 is of the harder grey variety.

Smith says the reliefs of the Senebdjemib Complex are the ordi-
nary type of Dynasty 5, the execution being of none too good
quality.\(^{73}\) Elsewhere he describes the reliefs as "low with moderately
good carving."\(^{74}\) Actually, the relief is neither as low as the fine low
relief of the Dynasty 4 slab-stelae\(^{75}\) nor as high as the bold high relief
that characterizes Dynasty 6 carving at Saqqara.\(^{76}\) It might be more
accurate to describe it as relief of medium height, a type of relief that
was developed for carving in nummulitic stone in the first rock-cut
chapels at Giza towards the end of the reign of Khafre or the begin-
nning of the reign of Mycerinus.\(^{77}\) Nummulitic limestone is full of
little fossils, and the dressing of the surfaces was never as smooth as
in white limestone.\(^{78}\) Often the unfinished wall surfaces are rough
and pitted, and it was therefore necessary to apply a coating of plaster
in order to provide a smooth surface that allowed a considerable de-
gree of finish. In some places the plaster sizing might be quite thick,
in others a thinner layer of sizing served to take the paint.\(^{79}\) The
quality of nummulitic limestone utilized in the Senebdjemib Com-
plex is generally good and allowed better workmanship, so that in
most cases a relatively thin layer of sizing was required, with the
result that the raised reliefs in the mastabas of the complex are largely
carved in the stone with small details cut in the overlying plaster layer.
This plaster coating is readily apparent in G 2370 on the south wall of
the offering room (Room IV), for example. In the table scene
occupying that wall, details such as the curls of the wigs of the offer-
ing bearers and the wing feathers of the bird offerings were carved in
the plaster (pl. 38). Where this plaster layer has been abraded or fallen
away the details have also disappeared. The loss of the plaster layer
probably explains the apparent lack of details in the large seated fig-
ure of Inti at the right end of this scene (pl. 44). The stone at this end
of the wall was particularly bad and plaster also had to be employed
to conceal the numerous flaws and breaks in the wall surface.\(^{80}\) The
carving of the bottom of Inti's handkerchief has, in fact, been con-
tinued into a large plaster patch on his lower torso.

In a few cases in G 2370 the stone is very hard, being highly fos-
siliferous, with innumerable nummulites densely packed, and was
extremely difficult to cut with the available copper chisels. Instances
are provided by the butchery scene at the bottom of the south wall
of the anteroom (Room II) and the crafts scene on the north wall of
the same room, where the nummulites interfered with the carving of
clear outlines (pls. 23a, 27b).\(^{81}\) Much of the piping within the figures
and hieroglyphs that interrupts their outlines probably results from
the dislodging of the little fossils by the chisel, although the relief in
the latter location has been exposed to weathering as well. In such
cases, the whole wall or certain parts of it were probably originally cov-
ered with a thick coating of plaster to provide a smooth surface for
the cutting of the relief.\(^{82}\) Where this plaster coating has fallen away in
the majority of cases, the reliefs often appear unfinished.

An especially interesting example of the loss of the plaster sizing
is provided by the west end of the lowest register on the north wall
of the offering room of G 2370, where figures which were once ex-
cuted in plaster have subsequently disappeared. Indeed, it is only by
means of the faint chisel marks left behind that it is possible to tell
that figures ever occupied this area of the wall (fig. 61).\(^{83}\)

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

The stone of the west wall is a nummulitic limestone, full of little
fossils which fall out where the stone is worn, leaving a hollow,
some of the edges of which are so sharp as to make it difficult to
determine whether it is a natural hollow or part of an inscribed
hieroglyph. When two or three little fossils, which are close to-
gether, happen to fall out, a ridge is left which is soon worn away
by the action of the sand, and thus the surface is defaced more
quickly than is the case with ordinary limestone.\(^{84}\)

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

69 For the use of Tura limestone at Giza, see Cherpion, Matriaux et hypogées, pp. 79–
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surface. The uppermost surfaces of the important autobiographical inscriptions of Inti and the upper parts of walls in G 2378 have all been subjected to this sand-blasting effect and have suffered severely from it.

It is puzzling as to why officials of Inti and Mehi’s rank and presumed whereabouts would have built mastabas of an inferior local limestone, instead of importing fine quality limestone from the Tura limestone quarries in the Mokattam hills on the east bank just a few kilometers to the south of Giza. Nevertheless, the fact is that the majority of the mastabas built at Giza in Dynasties 5–6 are decorated with reliefs executed in the local nummulitic limestone.194 Of course, the Giza cemetery assumed a secondary position after Dynasty 4, and except for the tombs of a few royal children and favored courtiers in front of the Neuserre pyramid at Abydos, the most important burial places of Dynasty 5 and the first half of Dynasty 6 are to be found at North Saqqara.186 The majority of the tombs built at Giza during this period were the modest tombs of funerary priests attached to local cults, who lacked the patronage and the resources to import Tura limestone for their tombs out of necessity.187 This certainly was not the case with Inti and Mehi. Inti especially appears to have been a favorite of Izi’s and, as viziers and overseers of royal works, both Inti and Mehi must have had ready access to the quarries of fine limestone at Tura. Except for his cult installations, which are of fine white limestone, the only other element of Inti’s tomb made of Tura stone is his sarcophagus, which was acquired with royal approval at Mehi’s request upon the death of his father.188 The lack of proximity to the Tura quarries alone does not explain the paucity of fine white limestone in G 2370 and 2378. Although Tura is closer as the crow flies to Saqqara than to Giza, Giza is downstream from Tura, so that the transport of stone by boat to Giza would have been easier than fighting the current to go upstream to Saqqara. Indeed, in the relief showing the transport of Inti’s sarcophagus from the Tura quarries, the cargo vessel is steered with two long rudders, indicating it was sailing downstream (pl. 84, fig. 21). Perhaps with a ready source of limestone in the immediate vicinity, even though the stone itself was of inferior quality, it was simply thought a matter of diminishing returns to go further afield to the limestone quarries at Tura. Undoubtedly, the final result, after the carved surface was washed with a thin coating of fine plaster and painted, approximated in appearance that of reliefs carved in fine white limestone.189

Sunk relief was used sparingly on the walls of the Senedjemib Complex and mostly in locations on the outside of the chapels where it took advantage of the play of light and shadow,190 for example, in the autobiographical inscriptions on the facade and adjacent portico walls of Inti’s mastaba (pl. 88f) and on the facade of Nekhebu’s mastaba.191 Likewise executed in sunk relief was the facade of Khnum-entiti’s mastaba with its repeated standing figures of the owner and accompanying texts (pl. 84c). Nekhebu’s architect also chose sunk relief for the large hieroglyphs of the architrave over the entrance of the latter’s chapel, even though these were out of the direct sunlight, set as they were at the rear of a deep portico. In sunk relief also were the seated figures of Nekhebu at the bottom of the autobiographical inscriptions and his standing figures on the entrance thicknesses to his chapel.192 During Dynasty 4 there is evident an increased use of inscriptions in sunk relief until this technique became common for parts of the interior walls of chapels, especially the false doors.193 This tendency is reflected in the sunk relief inscriptions on the jambs of the false doors of Inti, Mehi, and Khnumentesi (pls. 41, 91, 112). The utilization of sunk relief for the offering list of Nekhebu is also in keeping with the general trend.194 Due to the loss of the finished surfaces on the decorated walls throughout the Senedjemib Complex, it is difficult to gain an impression today of the original appearance of the mastaba interiors. Traces of red and yellow are still visible at the bottom of Inti’s false door. Otherwise significant vestiges of color survive at only one location in G 2378. At the base of the north end of the west wall in the northernmost vestibule, traces indicate the one-time presence of a black dado finished off with a border consisting of a band of yellow, 9 cm high, topped by a red band, also measuring 9 cm. The red band began 10 cm below the bottom of the scenes. Both bands were edged in black. The dado was still partly visible on the north wall of the room in Lepsius’s day and is shown in his drawing (fig. 56), while a section of the border also appears in his drawing of the east wall (fig. 50).195 Such a dado was traditional at the bottom of walls in Old Kingdom tomb chapels196 and pyramid temples.197

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

195 Such a dado was traditional at the bottom of walls in Old Kingdom tomb chapels and pyramid temples.
186 In Lepsius’s day, the walls of the offering room in G 2378 still retained considerable traces of paint. According to Ernst Weidenbach, the partly preserved block border behind Mehi’s figure in the table scene on the north wall of the room (fig. 128) was colored blue, red, green, yellow, and white. Under the representations was a black dado surmounted by red and yellow bands outlined in black, similar to that in Inti’s tomb. In addition, Mehi’s false door was painted a dark red in imitation of quartzite, while the figures, inscriptions, and cross-lashing on the torso moulding were yellow. The whole was framed by a block border consisting of rectangles painted alternately.
184 See EV, p. 97, Chaperon, Mauzole et hypogées, p. 79.
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186 Two notable exceptions are the tomb of Ranrau (see above) and the Imentiti Complex (see n. 8 on p. 11).
187 See below pp. 265, 266.
188 For the massive stages in decorating a private tomb during the Old Kingdom—the preliminary sketch, the carving of the stone, the painting of the sculptured walls—see Williams, Chronology of the New, p. 38. JESP, pp. 144–191.
189 Cf. Schäfer, Prinzpizale, p. 78.
190 See Dunham, IEd 14 (1948), pl. 1 [c].
red, blue, yellow, and green between black framing lines, while the broad area between the torus moulding and the colored border as well as the tall, narrow spaces between the border and the walls on either side were painted red (fig. 126).100 Although no reference is made by Weidenbach to the background color of the reliefs, presumably it would have been the usual blue-grey.101 The overall effect must have been very much like that produced by the well preserved painted reliefs of the offering room of the vizier Mehu.102

Little evidence survives as to the treatment of the tops of the walls of the chapels of the Senebdjeb Complex. If the south wall of the offering room in c 2370 b.c. is preserved essentially its full height, as appears to the case, there would have been no room at the top for the kheker-frieze typical of later Old Kingdom tombs.103 On the other hand, there is in all likelihood sufficient space for the earlier conventional Old Kingdom border pattern of interpolated diagonals in paint,104 or less likely a border of colored rectangles.105 The only tomb in the complex that preserves definite evidence of the kheker-frieze at the tops of its walls is that of Nekhebu (c 2380).106

The base line of the reliefs is not completely uniform throughout the complex. In the chapel of Inti the baseline falls between 1.17 and 1.20 m from the preserved pavement of the floor, except for the boating scene on the east wall of Room II where the base line is set higher, at 1.29 m. The base line of the scenes and inscriptions on the facade falls between 1.24 and 1.30 m. The base line is considerably lower in the interior chapel of Khnumenit, varying from 1.08–1.11 m. The base line of the facade and entrance jambs of the same tomb is lower yet, being located at 0.99 m for the former and 0.37 m for the latter. According to measurements taken by William Stevenson Smith, the base line of the reliefs in Room II of c 2378 was 1.15 m, while the decoration on the entrance thicknesses started at 1.17 m. The reliefs on the sides and rear of the portico were again set higher than on the interior, beginning at 1.35–1.36 m in the case of the former and 1.32 m in the case of the latter.

We have previously remarked on a number of features that the mastaba complex of Senebdjeb IV shares with tombs of the Senebdjeb Complex. A few additional features are worthy of notice. Reisner thought that the sloping-passage burial places of the Senebdjeb Complex were among the earliest sloping-passage type of shafts made in the Western Field at Giza.202 Three other mastabas located just to the south of the Senebdjeb Complex, including that of Inti’s putative son, Kakheperret-Fetek,203 also had Type 5 sloping-passage shafts.204 Senebdjeb IV, his wife Hertephres, and his son Tjeti were all likewise buried in sloping-passage shafts.205

Both Senebdjeb Inti and Senebdjeb IV have simple offering lists painted on the walls of their burial chambers.206 Alongside an offering list on the east wall of the burial chamber of Kakheperret-Fetek-it is a depiction of the deceased seated before an offering table.207 Junker saw the appearance of the figure of the deceased in Fetek-it’s burial chamber as an indication of late date.208 Strudwick, on the other hand, has persuasively argued that the decoration of the one wall in this instance is an example of the progression from the simple list in the burial chamber of Senebdjeb Inti to the fully decorated burial chamber of Ka-em-anhk.209

The burial chamber of Inti was irregular and probably unfinished, and was divided into two parts of unequal length. According to Reisner, it was not possible to determine whether the intention was to cut a larger chamber or to make a chamber with coffin recess on the west wall.210 In its present condition, however, the plan resembles in appearance the somewhat later “T” shaped decorated burial chambers of the tombs of a number of Unis and Teti’s officials at Saqqara, each of which has a large recess or bay in the western wall of the room to house the sarcophagus.211 c 2370 b.c. may well have constituted a precursor of these later chambers in this regard, just as the painted offering list on its east wall represents the earliest securely dated example of the practice of decorating the walls of the burial chamber.212 Senebdjeb IV’s only slightly later burial chamber is also “T” shaped, as is that of his son Tjeti.213

100 Ibid.
101 Ibid., p. 191.
102 See pl. xi, n. 256.
103 The earliest example of the use of the kheker as a wall decoration in private tombs known to Murray (Ap. Maz. 1, p. 18) was in the tomb of Nefer-ta-yse (ibid., pls. 23–24).
104 On this border pattern, see Jaquiot, Architectures, p. 98 and n. 39; Peck, Decorated Tombs, p. 15. Examples are Junker, Gepr. 3, figs. 19, 30; Simpson, Meryre II, figs. 4, p. 10; Weissenborn, Cemetery, pl. 90; Nofre and Rekha, pls. 1, 4, 7, and passim.
105 Except for door frames (e.g., Simpson, Gepr. on id., fig. 37, 30); and thicknesses (e.g., L27, pls. 40–41, 95–4; Nofre/Weissenborn, pl. 87), the black border pattern, when it appears at the tops of wall scenes in mastaba tombs, is usually coupled with interpolated diagonals (e.g., Nianchchnum, pls. 2, 38, 32, and passim) or kheker-composition (e.g., Murray, Ap. Maz. 1, pl. 21–22). From the late Fifth Dynasty, however, it appears more frequently by itself at the tops of wall scenes (Simpson, Western Cemetery, pl. 30; Gepr. 1, pl. 38; Mere IV, pls. 7–10; pl. 11–12; Cf. Peck, Decorated Tombs, p. 94 and n. 153).
106 Exp. Pls. n. 1209.
107 See, e.g., pls. 1–4 above.
109 Ibid., p. 335. For the kheker-frieze on the south wall of the mastaba of Kahun, see Murray, Gepr. 2, figs. 48, 23; cf. also Murray, Gepr. 1, pl. 19. Another of these sloping-passage tombs belongs to the vizier Idi I Nofre (ibid., fig. 36). The vizier has been assigned by Strudwick to the mid-Sixth Dynasty, perhaps to the later reign of Pepy I to early Pepy II (Administrations, p. 68 [23]), but Harper has dated his tomb to the reign of Teti (Dezernation, p. 67). The third sloping-passage tomb south of the Senebdjeb Complex is anonymous.
107 Ibid., pp. 25–26, 47. For earlier and later examples of the “T” shaped decorated burial chambers of the tombs of a number of Unis and Teti’s officials at Saqqara, see most recently, Brovarski, in For His Ka, pp. 14–15.
108 Cf. Mersyankh III, p. 185, 186. For the burial chamber of Ka-em-anhk, see Junker, Gepr. 4, pp. 43–45, 55–57. One or other burial chamber at Giza, that of Rawer III in the Central Field, had decorated walls. The extensive paintings on its east and south walls included human figures (Hassan, Giza, pp. 246–257). Rawer was a younger contemporary of Senebdjeb Mehi (Strudwick, Administrations, pp. 114 [92]; Harper, Dezernation, p. 68). Subsequent stages in the evolution of decorated burial chambers may be traced in the Unis, Teti, and Pepy II pyramid cemeteries at Saqqara; see most recently, Brovarski, in For His Ka, pp. 14–15.
109 See below, pp. 70–71.
110 Cf. Tomb 1, fig. 5, 22, 23; Hassan, Saqqara, p. 57.
111 Cf. Piank, Rank and Title, p. 115 [41].
112 For earlier “T” shaped burial chambers, see, e.g., Reisner, Tomb Dev., fig. 105 (Medum 175); Verner, Pi-Dihepshef, fig. 8; idem, For-Geten’s Palace, fig. 10 on p. 190. A detailed plan of the near contemporary (above, p. 24 and n. 34) “T” shaped burial chamber of Ti at Saqqara appears in Mariette, Mastabas, pl. 233–235.

The Senebdjeb Complex, Part 1
T he Senedjemib Complex offers an unique opportunity for reconstructing the careers and fortunes of four generations of royal viziers and architects in the time of Kings Izezi to Pepy II, whose reign span one hundred and fifty years of Egyptian history towards the end of the Old Kingdom.

The first member of the Senedjemib family known to us with any certainty, and probably the founder of its fortunes, is Senedjemib Inti, who served as vizier of Egypt under King Djedkare Izezi. Izezi was the penultimate ruler of the Fifth Dynasty, and his long reign of at least twenty-eight years inaugurated a new era in the history of the Old Kingdom. Inti received from King Izezi three verbatim letters which were engraved on the walls of his tomb. A damaged date associated with the letters alludes to Izezi’s jubilee, probably referred originally to either the sixteenth or the twenty-sixth numbering. In the heading of the letter Inti is addressed as vizier, a circumstance that seems to date his tenure of office to the second half of Izezi’s reign. Strudwick has concluded that the presence of a cartouche of King Unis in the inscription over the head of Inti’s son Mehi in the fowling scene on the west wall of the portico of Inti’s tomb, implies that the latter died at the earliest at the very end of the reign of Izezi. In consequence, he takes Inti to be the latest of Izezi’s viziers. That Inti was depicted on the side walls of the portico of his tomb in the very long kilt worn by elderly men in the Old Kingdom may well be an indication that he held the vizierate in his later years, and one piece of circumstantial evidence suggests that he indeed departed this life before the end of Izezi’s reign. Upon his father’s death, Inti’s son Senedjemib Mehi asked for and obtained from the king the boon of a limestone sarcophagus for the burial of his father. The cargo ship that transported the sarcophagus from the Tura limestone quarries was named after Izezi (“Izezi is great of strength”) and, given the Egyptian sensitivity towards names and what they signified, it seems unlikely that it would have continued to bear the name of that sovereign into his successor’s reign.

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

In his capacity of overseer of all works of the king, Senedjemib Inti undertook a number of building projects for King Izezi. Apparent early on in his years of service to that sovereign, Inti erected a Hathor chapel for the king on the grounds of the palace. For this, Inti evidently received royal approbation, being cleansed, anointed, and decorated in the presence of his sovereign. The culmination of
his career, however, came towards the end of Izezi’s long reign, when Inti laid out and presumably oversaw the construction of the precinct for the jubilee of the king. Two of the three verbatim letters from Izezi referred to above are devoted to the subject of the construction of this precinct and attest to the importance that Izezi assigned to his approaching jubilee. An alabaster vase in the Louvre records its celebration. 

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

Reseni was of the opinion that Inti’s ancestors were probably connected with the official class who enjoyed the income of the old endowments of the Fourth Dynasty and that, like all their class, they must have been buried in the Giza cemetery. Such associations would go a long way to explaining why a man of Inti’s prominence was buried at Giza, and not at Saqqara, nearer the pyramid of his lord. Nonetheless, Reseni himself admitted that no tomb of any of the ancestors of the family can definitely be identified at Giza. The name Senedjemib is a relatively common one, both prior to and after Senedjemib Inti’s time. The date of the proprietor of a mastaba uncovered by Mariette at Saqqara (B 13), of one of Inti’s distinguished ancestors, is a little before the time of Izezi’s father. He is “overseer of works,” and this office might conceivably form a link between the two officials. His eldest son was named Izezi, however, and no other children are attested, so the connection is tenuous at best. Perhaps the owner of a second Saqqara mastaba (D 28) discovered by Mariette has a better claim to being Inti’s male parent. The period is about eight, and even though this Senedjemib has no titles associating him with architecture or public works, he is both imy-pr-itu, “overseer of the armory,” and imy-sm pr mnwt, “overseer of the king’s chariots.” These two titles are rarely attested for viziers, and it may be more than coincidental that Senedjemib Inti has both. It is conceivable that he came into possession of both titles as heir and successor of the proprietor of Saqqara tomb D 28. If neither individual was Inti’s father, it is possible that one or both of them should at least be counted among his forebears. Still, there is no hint here as to why Inti elected to be buried at Giza rather than at Saqqara. That King Izezi apparently did not establish an official cemetery around his pyramid at South Saqqara may help explain why Inti felt free to be buried elsewhere, but it does not explain his choice of Giza. What is more, neither Inti nor any other members of his family appear to have held a priesthood in the cults of the proponents of the three Giza pyramids, a circumstance which probably explains why Izezi, for example, selected the necropolis of Giza as his burial place. 

Senedjemib Inti was married to a woman named Tje ( ולכן), who originally appeared with her husband in the scenes of spear fishing and rowing that flank the entrance to G 3370 (pl. 16, figs. 21, 27). The only title accorded her there and on the thicknesses of the doorway to the pillared hall (figs. 67a, 68a) is “king’s acquaintance.” In the last location, she appears together with her husband and the couple’s son Senedjemib Mehi, the proprietor of G 3378. 

Senedjemib Inti and Tje were, in fact, to have had several sons. Three sons, each termed “the son of his body,” were depicted on the bank behind Inti in the marae scene on the west wall of the antechamber in G 3370 (fig. 42). Unfortunately, the scene is now largely destroyed (pl. 2:5–27:4; fig. 43). The captions before the figures of the three sons had apparently sustained damage before 1842–43, for Lepsius’s draftsman clearly experienced difficulties in copying them. This was especially so in the case of the uppermost figure whose title and name are, as a result, virtually unreadable. In Lepsius’s plate, the middle figure seemingly represented the “personal scribe of the royal records. Ferk.” It is possible that the uppermost figure also bore the same title. The title of the lower figure is unintelligible, but the name is fairly certainly that of Khnumiuser, the owner of G 3374. As it stands, the name of the middle of the three sons is rarely—if ever—attested in the Old Kingdom. On the other hand, the masculine personal name Fkt–š, which probably alludes to the cup bearer of the sun-god Re, is fairly well known. It is regularly written with the terminal sign š–Q or with š–alone, both of which were, already in the Old Kingdom, variant writings for š, but which could also stand for š at the end of words, especially names. There is no sure clue, p. 19, and note 91. 

See below, p. 19, and note 92. 

Pace Reisner, BMFA 17 (1933), p. 38. Shepseskaf-ankh, his son Izeneny, and his grandson Nefbuahyep were all priests of Khnum (š–m-wr š–Nekh), see: WiNe, Cemetery G 60 (1959), p. 157. 

See below, pp. 19, and note 93. 

40 A banner in Nekhebetnouta, fig. 7, it normally called š–Nkt, but Moessner and Altenmüller, ibid., p. 105, read the name Fkt–š, see also ibid., p. 32 (16). 

41 PT 193, 55, 192. 

42 As with its masculine counterpart, the original reading of the title in question was probably originally š–m–w–r (š–š–Nekh), “female” counterpart of the king’s property,” or the like, whereas (š–š–m–w–r) “king’s acquaintance,” was probably a secondary in- 

43 See above, p. 19, and note 93. 

44 Senedjemib Mehi’s bark stela (PT 120 b, 123 g, 545 c) places the tomb between Neuserre and Dyn. 6. 

45 Compare Dendera, p. 193 (1970), pl. 20, fig. 20. 

46 See above, p. 19, and note 91. 

47 Senedjemib Inti and Tje appear, in fact, to have had several sons. Three sons, each termed “the son of his body,” were depicted on the bank behind Inti in the marae scene on the west wall of the antechamber in G 3370 (fig. 42). Unfortunately, the scene is now largely destroyed (pl. 2:5–27:4; fig. 43). The captions before the figures of the three sons had apparently sustained damage before 1842–43, for Lepsius’s draftsman clearly experienced difficulties in copying them. This was especially so in the case of the uppermost figure whose title and name are, as a result, virtually unreadable. In Lepsius’s plate, the middle figure seemingly represented the “personal scribe of the royal records. Ferk." It is possible that the uppermost figure also bore the same title. The title of the lower figure is unintelligible, but the name is fairly certainly that of Khnumiuser, the owner of G 3374. As it stands, the name of the middle of the three sons is rarely—if ever—attested in the Old Kingdom. On the other hand, the masculine personal name Fkt–š, which probably alludes to the cup bearer of the sun-god Re, is fairly well known. It is regularly written with the terminal sign š–Q or with š–alone, both of which were, already in the Old Kingdom, variant writings for š, but which could also stand for š at the end of words, especially names. There
is almost certainly room after room in the swamp scene in g 2370 for δ or even eδ, written horizontally.46 Hence, there is a good possibility that the name of the middle of the three elder sons was actually Fīt-ki, “Fīt-ki.”

If this was indeed so, the son’s tomb may have been located not far from his father’s in the northeast corner of the Cemetery on Echelon.47 g 1560 is a medium-sized, stone-built mastaba, whose interior was largely taken up by rooms.48 It belonged to an individual with the “great name” of Kakherptah and the “good name” of Fīt-ki. The number is dated by Steinbrück from early to middle Dynasty 6 and by Harpur between Twr and Menen.49 This span of time would not be excessive for a son of Inti shown as a man of mature years in his father’s mastaba (particularly if he passed away in the earlier part of the period in question), but it should be noted that Kakherptah Fīt-ki does not have the one title assigned to Fīt-ki in g 2370, namely, “personal scribe of royal records,” although he is an iny-nt a[t] “overseer of scribes.”46 Moreover, he possesses none of the titles related to public works that were held by Senebdjemib Inti and Mehi or Khunamenti, and seems rather to have been concerned with provincial administration and internal colonization.47 Nevertheless, the mastaba was badly denuded, and it is possible that the missing title appeared elsewhere on its walls. Nothing is known about the parentage of the owner from the surviving reliefs so, in the absence of a terminal in the occurrence of the name in any text, it is impossible to resolve with any degree of certainty the identity of the figure at the prow of Inti’s boat.50

In the tombs of Ti and Idout, the figures face towards the tomb owner, but they are not captioned and for that reason probably represent attendants. In the tomb of Kagemni, the scene is largely综合征 hunting and fowling scenes, this position is frequent, though not always, reserved for the eldest son.51 In actual fact though the portrayal on the west wall of Room III presents a rather different type of composition in which the tomb owner, perhaps a small figure looking at fish or hunting birds, stands in a skiff watching several harpooners attack a hippopotamus against the background of a papyrus thicket.52 Although direct parallels are few in number, in each of the scenes in question a small figure is likewise depicted at the prow of the boat.53 In the tombs of Ti and Idout, the figure faces towards the tomb owner, but it is not captioned and for that reason probably represents an attendant. In the tomb of Kagemni, the figure at the prow of Inti’s boat is identified as the tomb owner’s eldest son who, in this instance, faces away from his father. The specific parables are thus inconclusive and do not help to resolve the identification of the tomb owner from the surviving reliefs so, in the absence of a terminal in the occurrence of the name in any text, it is impossible to resolve with any degree of certainty the identity of the figure at the prow of Inti’s boat.54

Even if the small figure at the prow of the boat did represent a son of Inti’s, there would still be no certainty as to his identity. It may be noted that none of the three sons behind Inti is identified as “eldest son,” and this fact might imply that the figure at the prow of the boat was that of Inti’s eldest son, that is—considering that he inherited both his father’s name and office—Senebdjemib Inti.55

After the heart-signe, which presumably represented the terminal elements in the title of the son of Inti, there was a word, broad stroke, the mouth g, the half-mouth, and another long broad space.56 In the first citation, the vizier Rashepses stands in a skiff looking at the papyrus thicket before him; no harpooners or hippopotamuses are visible in Lepsius’s drawer, but it is likely that they were originally present, perhaps being raised by Lepsius’s artist because of damage to that area of the wall. All four scenes are close in date to the scene in n 1570; see Harpur, Discoveries, pp. 170–71.

19 In the tomb of Inti, the figure facing the deceased at the prow of the boat did represent a small figure looking at the papyrus thicket before him; no harpooners or hippopotamuses are visible in Lepsius’s drawer, but it is likely that they were originally present, perhaps being raised by Lepsius’s artist because of damage to that area of the wall. All four scenes are close in date to the scene in n 1570; see Harpur, Discoveries, pp. 170–71.

20 In the context of inscriptions accompanying the minor figure in march scenes, Harpur, Discoveries, p. 141, observes that “non-relatives are those with their heads or whole bodies turned towards the major figure, whereas known relatives or even the next of kin are depicted facing the deceased or turned away from him.” Unfortunately, this observation does not aid us in the present situation.

21 Although Mehi is more specifically identified as “eldest son” on the walls of his father’s tomb, in each case where his figure occurs, either the entire caption identifying his figure, or the beginning of the caption, where n n is written, is destroyed; see figs. 14, 15, 17, 25, 31, 40, 47a, 48a.
the other hand, the small figure at the boat’s prow is dressed in a short kilt with flaring front panel, whereas the three sons behind Inti, like their father, wear the calf-length kilt which denotes dignity and perhaps also seniority.73 The longer kilts could thus be taken as evidence for supposing that the three sons on the bank were older than the presumed son in the boat. However, the lowermost figure appears to be that of Khnumemti, who is generally acknowledged to be a younger son of Inti, since he succeeded his brother Mehi in the vizierate. Perhaps, at this point, it is best to admit that the destruction of the wall has presented us with too many variables to reach any final conclusion concerning the identity of the figure at the prow of the boat or about the presence or absence of Senedjemib Mehi in the marsh scene. Nevertheless, it would indeed be odd if Mehi was entirely excluded from such a family scene.

Yet another son of Inti and Ty-to’s, Ni-amk-mi-n (N/1’pt-Mn) by name,74 is twice depicted on the walls of G 2370, once at the rear of the portico to the north of the entrance (pl. 16; figs. 26, 27) and again on the north wall of the offering room (fig. 64). In the portico, he is one of four senior officials in calf-length skirts who attend Inti on an outing in the marshes.75 In the offering room he brings a goose towards the false door.76 In the first location, he is entitled “lector priest,” while in the latter he is both “lector [priest]” and “inspector of funerary furniture.”77 The last title identifies Niankhkhnum as an official of his father’s funerary establishment.78 He does not seem to have left any trace of himself outside of G 2370.

Of all of Inti’s sons, Senedjemib Mehi occupied the most prominent place in his father’s mastaba. His figure evidently appeared on all four walls of the portico, on both entrance thicknesses, and on either side of the entrance to the pillared hall.79 In addition, he perhaps headed the procession of offering bearers in the lowermost register on the south wall of the offering chamber (pls. 38, 41; fig. 65). In Inscription C on the facade south of the portico of G 2370, Mehi says:

Then I begged from my lord that a sarcophagus [be] brought [for him] from Tur to this tomb of his, which I made for him in one year and three months, while he was in the embalming workshop in his estate which is in (the necropolis of) the pyramid “Inti is beautiful.”80

From these words it has generally been assumed that Mehi constructed his father’s tomb at Giza, after the latter’s death, while his body was in the process of being embalmed.81 Although IBer was of the opinion the tomb was erected by Mehi after his father’s death, he admitted that fifteen months was an unexpectedly short time in which to construct and decorate so large and elaborate a mastaba.82

Strudwick, on the other hand, feels that the mention of the time stressed the speed with which the mastaba was built.83 Reiser himself held a different opinion and thought that Mehi only finished the tomb, while “his chief work was the decoration of the chapel.”84 It is difficult to believe that a man of Inti’s status and presumed wealth would not have prepared a final resting place for himself before his death.85 Even given the privileges bestowed upon “the son who buried his father,”86 the construction of an entire decorated multi-roomed mastaba for a deceased parent would represent an extraordinary display of filial devotion and a considerable outlay of wealth, especially if Mehi proceeded immediately to the construction of his own mastaba, as Reiser thought possible.87 For all these reasons, Reiser’s opinion that Inti built the mastaba, whereas Mehi merely completed its decoration, deserves serious consideration.

Assuming for the moment that Mehi did, in fact, only complete his father’s mastaba, just how much of the decoration could have reason be attributed to him? In Inscription C, on the south facade, Mehi as speaker (infra) recounts the favors he elicited from the king on his father’s behalf at the death of the latter and mentions in passing that he had the royal decrees verifying the arrangements for his father’s funerary endowment inscribed on the walls of Inti’s tomb.88 He goes on to say that he asked the king that a sarcophagus be brought from Tur to Inti’s burial.89 Since Inscription D narrates the transport of this sarcophagus from the Tura quarries to Giza, it is clearly related thematically to Inscription C, and it may be taken for granted that Mehi had it carved as well. Presumably, Inscriptions A and B were carved at the same time, since they parallel in arrangement Inscriptions C and D. In fact, all of the elements of the relief scenes on the facade of the tomb and the side walls of the portico are so carefully integrated that at first glance it might seem that they were designed as a unity and executed at one time by craftsmen in Mehi’s employ after his father’s death. A number of changes effectuated in the decoration of the portico and elsewhere in the tomb suggest that this was not the case, however.

83 Administration, p. 123.
84 “Description of Additions to Cemetery at Elkehdo,” p. 1128. Reiser based his belief on the faulty assumption that the passage from Inscription C just quoted actually gave the date of the completion of the work on Inti’s mastaba at the first year (of Ur) in the third month of the season of autumn.
85 As Fischer also notes (ibid., p. 245), this type of kilt is not confined to the corpulent, aged figure. And advanced years; see e.g., Fischer, JNES 6 (1947), pp. 244–71. As Fischer also notes (ibid., p. 245), this type of kilt is not confined to the corpulent, aged figure. And advanced years; see e.g., Fischer, JNES 6 (1947), pp. 244–71.
86 JNES, p. 175; 11, 16, p. 384.
87 See below, p. 410.
88 See below, p. 198.
89 See pp. 157–58 below.
90 See below, p. 178.
91 See below, p. 178.
92 See below, p. 178.
93 See below, p. 178.
94 See below, p. 178.
95 E.g., Wilson, JNES 6 (1947), pp. 133–45; Bout, Rank and Title, p. 116 (infra); Strudwick, Administration, p. 135.
96 Rank and Title, p. 116 (infra).
97 The close-cropped, wavy-head and long kilt are often associated with adulthood and advanced years; see e.g., Fischer, JNES 6 (1947), pp. 244–71. As Fischer also notes (ibid., p. 245), this type of kilt is not confined to the corpulent, aged figure.
98 JNES, p. 175; 11, 16, p. 384.
99 See below, p. 410.
100 See below, p. 198.
101 See pp. 157–58 below.
102 See below, p. 178.
103 See below, p. 178.
104 See below, p. 178.
105 See below, p. 178.
106 See below, p. 178.
107 E.g., Wilson, JNES 6 (1947), pp. 133–45; Bout, Rank and Title, p. 116 (infra); Strudwick, Administration, p. 135.
108 Bout, Rank and Title, p. 116 (infra).
Joseph Bonomi was the first to note that the figure of Mehi on the southern entrance thickness of c. 2570 (pl. 39a–b, figs. 34, 45) was a secondary insertion executed by a less skilled hand than that responsible for the rest of the thickness.74 The figure of Mehi is indeed clearly recut, as was the title in front of his face and the name “senedjemib” over his head. This entire area is lower than the surrounding surfaces, and the background has not received a final smoothing, but still shows traces of tool marks. The surface of the raised relief figure of the son is also below the level of the surface of the original block. By contrast, the inscription in three columns above Mehi’s head is on a level with that surface and appears original. The recutting is puzzling, because the inscription appears suited to the image, terminating with the expression: “one for whom his son shall do the like.”75 It thus seems certain that a figure of a son of Inti stood here originally. But if the figure represented Mehi, why would he have had a figure of himself and the accompanying name cut away and replaced? And if the original figure was not Mehi’s, who could it have represented?

One possibility which must at least be considered is that the figure of an older brother of Mehi’s who predeceased him was originally represented here. Still, if the figure of an older brother of Mehi’s did indeed appear on the south door jamb, it would have been a simple enough matter to replace the brother’s name(s) with his own, but Mehi evidently chose instead to cut the figure away and to replace it with a new one. One possible explanation for the recutting would be that the original figure, whether that of Mehi or an older brother, was dressed in a calf-length kilt, as on the opposite north thickness, and that Mehi wished to have this altered to the short kilt of the final version. Nevertheless, in the Saqqara tomb of Nefertiaren, usurped by Ra-em-kai, where an original portrayal of the owner as an older man in a long kilt was reduced to more slender proportions by the usurper, and the long kilt shortened accordingly, the operation was achieved by simply removing the stone around the legs.76 The same process could easily have been followed here, but instead the entire figure was recut.77 Perhaps the sculptor who was responsible for recutting the figure on the south entrance jamb of c. 2570 simply decided, rightly or wrongly, that it was easier to recut the whole figure.

Close examination reveals that in nearly every instance where Mehi’s figure occurs on the walls of his father’s mastaba, it is in profile, even though, in each instance, the location of the secondary image of Mehi is a suitable place for the figure of a son to have appeared originally.78 This is true of the northern entrance thickness (pl. 26b) and of both the spear-fishing and fowling scenes at the back of the portico to either side of the entrance, where the figures of Mehi at the bow of his father’s paysapski and the titles in two columns above his head are recut at a lower level than the original surface in a rougher style by a less accomplished hand, and are clearly distinguishable from the original figures and texts (pls. 15b, 16, 17a).79 It is likewise true of the figures of Mehi before his parents on either entrance thickness of the pillared hall (pls. 51b, 51a).80 It seems also to be the case on both the south and north walls of the portico, where a smaller figure was represented in the presence of a large-scale figure of Inti with close-cropped hair, a copulent body, and ankle-length kilt (pls. 31b, 18). The smaller figure on the south portico wall is destroyed except for the legs, but the bluntness of the relief and the roughly finished area around the legs are a clear indication that the figure had been recut (pl. 67). Although Lepsius saw the legs of the smaller figure on the north wall of the portico, today the legs are destroyed. Nevertheless, a roughly finished area where the figure used to be attests to recutting here as well (pl. 14).

The leftward orientation of the hieroglyphs in the four columns above the smaller figure on the north portico wall and the context of the speech leave little question that the speaker was a son of Inti. The son tells us that he begged favors from the king on behalf of his deceased father. The fourth column of the speech, which contained the titles and presumably the name of the son, is completely recut at a lower level than the preceding three lines, while the hieroglyphs in this column are in raised relief of poor quality, very much in contrast to the well-executed hieroglyphs of the preceding three columns (pls. 18, 54a).81 Although the name is now lost, the recut titles appear to be those of Mehi, beginning as they probably did with [huy–]‘mar’2).82 The recutting of the fourth column and the substitution of Mehi’s titles, however, once again raise the possibility that the figure and titles that were cut away could have belonged to an older brother of Mehi. If so, he rather than Mehi would have been responsible for the completion of the decoration of Inti’s mastaba, including the carving of Inscriptions A–D.

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

Before subscribing to either proposition, the possible evidence for the existence of an older brother of Mehi’s should be examined.
Heading the file of offering bearers in the lowermost register of the north wall of the offering room in c. 2570 were two figures of whom scanty traces alone remain (figs. 64, 65). The figures themselves were destroyed when the plaster in which they were carved fell away, leaving only faint chisel marks behind, but the traces are sufficient to show that both figures probably offered up forelimbs of beef, as do the first three figures in the lowermost register on the opposite wall (pl. 41; fig. 6). Traces of signs before their faces indicate that the second man almost definitely was a son of Inti and that the first figure may have been as well.85 In both instances, the names are lost, but traces of their titles survive. The first individual was evidently [mḥw] ṣḏ (‘royal master’ ‘builder’ in both houses (Upper and Lower Egypt)), while the second man bore the titles śḥpr ṣḏ ṣḏ, ‘chief justice and vizier.’ Two sons of Inti, Mehi and Khu- mentors, were viziers of Egypt in their time. Now when siblings are represented in series in Old Kingdom reliefs, it is usually the figure of the elder or eldest brother which takes priority.84 If this rule was adhered to in the present instance, the first figure should represent Mehi and the second figure Khu-menti. On the other hand, it is generally assumed that Khnumenti was the younger of the two brothers, since he appears to have followed Mehi in the vizierate (57b, 64). It is not certain what necessitated the recutting. It may be that Inti decided to inscribe an address to his father above each of their heads.86 On the other hand, this explanation would not be suitable in the case of the figures on the two side walls of the portico of the tomb and the side walls of the portico taken into account, it would again seem to follow that Mehi arranged for the remainder of the decoration on the portico’s wall to be carved as well. Proceeding on the assumption that it is Mehi who altered his own figures, it may be that more than a single reason existed for his having done so. For example, in the case of the figures at the prow of Inti’s skiff in the spear fishing and fowling scenes at the back of the portico, it is possible that the figures originally faced toward the prow of the boat, and that their direction was subsequently reversed because Mehi decided to inscribe an address to his father above each of their heads.87 On the other hand, this explanation would not be suitable in the case of the figures on the two side walls of the portico or on the two thicknesses, where the earlier figures probably already faced Inti. Similarly, if Mehi’s figure on the left (south) entrance thickness was indeed recut to shorten the kilt, this was definitely not true of the opposite thickness, where the final version of the figure is dressed in a calf-length kilt.

One other alteration to the reliefs on the north side of the portico affected the personal names terminating the columns of inscription above the head of the elderly vizier, where it is clear that both Inti’s “great” and “good” names are not original (pls. 18, 64a). Again it is not certain what necessitated the recutting. It may be that Inti here was originally identified only as “Senedjemib.” This is actually the case with the architrave (pl. 11c) and again on the west wall of the vestibule (pl. 31), where the name “Senedjemib” alone appears, and where it may reasonably be presumed to be original. Probably during the early part of Inti’s life, this served as a perfectly adequate designation for the elder Senedjemib. In his later years though, during Mehi’s professional lifetime, when there were two Senedjemibs, this perhaps was felt to no longer suffice. This would have been especially true in the context of the Senedjemib Complex, where there were at least two tombs belonging to individuals named Senedjemib opening on the stone paved court.88 As a result, Mehi may have ordered the alterations to be made, and had the “good name” Inti added to a nswt mḥw-ḥš, “inspector of funerary priests,” not infrequently heads the procession of offering bearers in the extra register at the foot of the wall.89 Faint traces above the foremost figure’s title of mḥḥ (‘royal master’) mḥw (‘royal master’ ‘builder’) could conceivably be restored as [mḥḥ] tḥw. Alternatively then, the foremost figure might represent a brother of Inti’s, an inspector of funerary priests who served as head of a phyle in his funerary cult, or even a brother of the latter who functioned in that capacity.

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

There may, of course, be an alternative explanation for the precedence of the foremost figure than the one just offered. It might, for instance, be possible to restore the kinship term immediately before his face as nṯr (rather than nṯr) in which case an otherwise unattested brother of Inti’s may have been assigned precedence over Inti’s son.90 Then again, in long east–west offering rooms like Inti’s, a nṯr ṣḏ, ṣḏ, “chief justice,” occurs frequently in the inscriptions, and yet it is the second individual here who has the higher rank here was originally identified only as “Senedjemib.” This is actually the case with the architrave (pl. 11c) and again on the west wall of the vestibule (pl. 31), where the name “Senedjemib” alone appears, and where it may reasonably be presumed to be original. Probably during the early part of Inti’s life, this served as a perfectly adequate designation for the elder Senedjemib. In his later years though, during Mehi’s professional lifetime, when there were two Senedjemibs, this perhaps was felt to no longer suffice. This would have been especially true in the context of the Senedjemib Complex, where there were at least two tombs belonging to individuals named Senedjemib opening on the stone paved court.87 As a result, Mehi may have ordered the alterations to be made, and had the “good name” Inti added to
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the “great name” Senedjemib on the north wall, if not on all the walls, of the portico. This followed the practice in Mehi’s own tomb, where the “great name,” Senedjemib, and the “good name,” Mehi, were regularly coupled.93 There being insufficient space over Inti’s head for two lines of hieroglyphs on the scale of the inscription above, the two names were consequently recarved on a smaller scale.

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

In the text inscribed on the southern facade of c. 2370 quoted above, Mehi states that while his father’s tomb was being prepared for his burial, his body rested “in the embalming workshop in his estate which is in (the necropolis) of the pyramid ‘Izezi is beautiful.’” There is some evidence that the mummiﬁcation of private persons in the Old Kingdom took place in workshops attached to their tombs.94 However, Inti’s embalming workshop (with or without) is speciﬁcally said to be located in (the necropolis of) Izezi’s pyramid (m Nfr-Izezi). The statement is perplexing, since, as far as we know, there was no contemporary necropolis in the vicinity of Izezi’s pyramid.95 It is possible, of course, that Inti’s embalming workshop was located in the cemetery established for Izezi’s contemporaries to the north and west of the Step Pyramid at Saqqara.96 In this connection, it may be noted that the tomb of the vizier Wadiophret, situated north of the Step Pyramid, is speciﬁcally said in his autobiography to be in (the necropolis of) the pyramid of Sahure (m Ḥfr-in-Sahu), whereas the latter’s pyramid was located at Abusir.97 The existence of an embalming workshop for Inti in the necropolis of Izezi’s pyramid, wherever precisely that might be, could be taken as an indication that Inti also had a tomb in the same place. Moreover, if Inti possessed an earlier tomb elsewhere, this might be interpreted as evidence that Mehi indeed constructed his father’s Giza tomb from the beginning, upon the latter’s death. Nevertheless, Inscription C does not speciﬁcally say that Inti had a tomb (a) in the necropolis of Izezi’s pyramid, but only states that his embalming workshop was located there, and it may be that he simply possessed an assigned plot therein and authorization from the king to build a tomb. This would have been a convenient place to erect a temporary embalming workshop, away from the hustle and bustle in the courtyard of Inti’s Giza tomb, where the sculptors would have been hard at work ﬁnishing its decoration.

Neither Inti nor Mehi’s tomb sheds light on the precise period of time that elapsed between the death of the former and the accession of the latter to the vizariate. In the two places within the portico of c. 2370 where Mehi’s titulary survives, namely in the belothing scene at the rear of the portico and on its north wall, the vizierial titles do not appear, even though there is space for them in the lacunae before the extant titles. On the other hand, on the base block assigned to the beginning of Inscription C, Mehi is ḫḥty mn ḫḥty s ftḥt mn nswt, not ḫḥty ṣḥty.98 Furthermore, although the similarities between the two tombs99 suggest that they were designed by one architect (Reisner assumed Mehi himself was that individual100), and perhaps carved by the same group of sculptors at no great remove in time from each other, they reveal nothing deﬁnite about whether work was progressing simultaneously on both tombs or whether a period of time intervened before Mehi began the construction of his own tomb.

The uppermost stones of virtually all the walls in Mehi’s mastaba had been removed before Lepsius arrived on site to copy its reliefs. Along with them disappeared most of the title sequences that (presumably once) appeared at the top of the walls. The architrave blocks of Mehi’s mastaba survive, however, and on them Mehi is “overseer of all works of the king,” not vizier (pl. 102a–c). Only on the false door do the vizierial titles appear (pl. 112; figs. 167–277). Thus, if the architrave inscription provides a reliable indication, Mehi appears to have been promoted to vizier in the course of the construction or decoration of c. 2370.101 Moreover, the fact that Mehi is “hon[o]red by” the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Unis, in the architrave inscription, probably indicates that he was not yet vizier at the beginning (?) of that king’s reign.

Bac and Harpaur date the construction of Mehi’s tomb to the reign of Unis,102 while Strudwick assigns his tenure as vizier to the middle of Unis’s long reign of thirty years,103 with Akhethetep and Akhetethep Hemi intervening between Mehi and his father.104 To
some extent Strudwick’s date was based on the the assumption that Mehi may have placed his name over that of an older brother in the tomb of his father.105 While it seems possible from the above discussion that Mehi had an older brother, this possibility alone, as we have previously seen, does not constitute definite evidence as to whether Mehi usurped the images of this older brother on the walls of his father’s mastaba or simply recarved his own figures. Nor does it really matter in the present context, for in either case we would still have no accurate means of estimating the period of time that elapsed between the initial carving and the recarving.

Mention has already been made of the badly damaged inscription over the head of the figure of Mehi in the bowling scene at the back of the portico of g 2370. A possible restoration of the inscription is: [m Büyük] n.f, m w.t Wnt; “It was” out of the largesse of Unis (that I did this for him).106 Due to the broken context, the nature of Unis’s largesse is not apparent, especially since the gift of a sarcophagus, the establishment of Inti’s tomb endowment, and the provision of landed estates that are reported in the gravely damaged Inscription C most likely took place at the end of Inti’s reign.107

On his false door Mehi (Mbut)108 calls himself “fierce honored by Izezi, whom the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Unis remembered on account of it.”109 The second epithet is quite out of the ordinary, and the juxtaposition seems to suggest that Unis took account of Mehi’s achievements under his predecessor Izezi. One possibility is that Unis “remembered” Mehi by appointing him to the vizierate. This interpretation gains support, albeit somewhat tenuous, from a passage in the autobiography of Sabni I at Aswan, who says: [m n.d.(ii)](i); [s b] (a) (l) (l) (l) (l) “When I was appointed [i ...], (when) what I had done was remembered by my lord.”110

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

On the west wall of the anteroom (Room II) of g 2378, Mehi and Khnumenti appear in a family group together with two sons and a daughter (pl. 115; figs. 214, 215).114 The two sons were named after Mehi; the “eldest son,” who is shown as an adult, was called Senedjemib, and the younger son, who is depicted as a naked child with the sidelock of youth, was called Mehi. Similarly, the daughter was named Khntenkaus after her mother. Although dressed like an adult, she was perhaps a third child, since her figure is even smaller than that of her brother Mehi’s.

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

Senedjemib Mehi’s younger brother, Khnumenti, was depicted in the march scene on the west wall of the vestibule in the tomb of Senedjemib Inti.118 The cartouches of Unis and Tet appear among the estate names in Khnumenti’s tomb (pl. 92; fig. 87a), and Strudwick believes he possibly served both Unis and Tet as vizier.119 On the other hand, twice as many of the names of Khnumenti’s estates are compounded with the royal name Tet than with the name Unis, and Khnumenti’s other associations are with the latter sovereign. For example, a loose stone found in the offering room of g 2374 (pl. 96a; fig. 89c), which is inscribed with the vizierial titles, also indicates that Khnumenti held the highest available grade in the piously hierarchy at Teti’s pyramid, that of “inspector of priests,” a title which becomes a regular prerogative of the vizier from the reign of Teti.120 Strudwick also remarks that considering his relationship to other members of his family and probable age, it is unlikely that Khnumenti lived long into the reign of Teti. Reisner, on the other hand, thought that Khnumenti was buried late in the reign of Teti or soon thereafter.121 The burial shaft of g 2384, which Reisner assigned to the mastaba, actually contained a small diorite bowl inscribed for King Teti
It is possible that other occurrences of the name postdate Inti’s son Khnumenti, and that the name became popular as a result of his tenure as vizier.122 Two bearers of the name, in fact, are sons of funerary priests of the Senedjemib family, who were in the habit of naming their children after their patrons.123 Late in Dynasty 6 it also serves as the by-name of a certain Ònm.124

Khnumenti’s wife is not depicted in the surviving reliefs of his chapel and her name is therefore unknown. None the less, it is likely that the couple had at least one child, since part of what appears to be the figure of a young child holding a bird is preserved in front of Khnumenti in the elaborate palaquin scene in the first room of his chapel (fig. 86).125 The hieroglyph ‘ḥb before the figure may have belonged to his name. A photograph taken in 1930 (pl. 97) shows additional traces, including what may be part of the letter k3, superimposed over the ‘ḥb-sign. The two letters could belong to a name of the pattern n(ḥ)b, a substantive in royal/divine name, that is, a personal name beginning N(y)-ḥb- […].” Life belongs to Kherry.” However, the god Kherry is little attested in Old Kingdom personal names,126 although he does occur somewhat more regularly in estate names of the same period.127 Conversely, ‘ḥb-life’ is to be restored, the available space between the butcher block and the ripple of water only allows for a low broad or narrow sign. Options would include the ḫmr-swt or the emblem of the god Min.128

Unfortunately, Nekhebu’s parents are not named on any of the blocks from his chapel, and his precise relationship to the Senedjemib family is unknown. Given the nature of the traces before the small child depicted in front of Khnumenti in the palaquin scene, it is unlikely that they represent Nekhebu’s court name. Mer-ḥḥ-taḥ-merywy. Nevertheless, the very fact that he was proprietor of a major tomb in what is definitely a family complex, as well as the fact that his titles are connected with public works, make some relationship very likely.129 Smith speculated that Nekhebu was the son of Senedjemib Inti,130 but Reisner evidently believed him to be a son of Khnumenti.131 Since Nekhebu appears to have been a young man at the beginning of the reign of Pepy I, as will be seen shortly, the time differential makes it more likely that he was a son of Khnumenti.132

122 “Description of Additions to Cemetery on Echelon,” p. 118; Reisner (ibid., pp. 118–119) placed the birth of Inti about thirty years before the accession of Ibi, which would make Inti about fifty-eight years old at death, if the figure of twenty-eight years in the ’Tut-an-Carved in fine stone coffins, Senedjemib’s body was evidently deposited in a simple wooden coffin set in a rectangular coffin-pit excavated in the floor of his burial chamber and roofed with multiple stone slabs. Both features might be considered as indicative of a short tenure of office. Counter-balancing the impression of limited resources is the fact that the greater part of the reliefs in Khnumenti’s chapel were carved in fine limestone (even though the reliefs themselves are of generally inferior quality).123 Moreover, Inti and Mehi are the only proprietors of tombs in the Senedjemib Complex to be provided with sarcophagi, and Khnumenti’s lack of a sarcophagus may reflect a change in burial customs rather than the nature of his financial resources.124 Then too, it may be that Khnumenti’s seemingly limited resources may not reflect on his tenure of office at all, but relate rather to his inheritance as a younger son of Inti or to other personal factors of which we are unaware.

The name Khnumenti (Ωnm-nmt)n is a relatively rare one, being attested by less than a handful of examples. Even the reading of the name is contested. Ranke understood it to be Ωnm(n), while Junker reads Ωn(n)mtw and Baer Ωn(n)mt-n(n).125 None of these scholars ventured an opinion as to its meaning. If Ωnm-nmt conforms to the pattern of Ωnm,126 however, the correct reading is possibly Ny-i-t, Ωnm, “my father belongs to Khnun.”127 The date seems somewhat early for this to represent the beginning of the name,128 but might it represent the initial letter of τομαν transposed for calligraphic reasons?

133 “Additions to Cemetery of Senedjemib Inti,” p. 118; Reisner (ibid., pp. 112–114) placed the birth of Inti about thirty years before the accession of Ibi, which would make Inti about fifty-eight years old at death, if the figure of twenty-eight years in the ’Tut-an-Carved in fine stone coffins, Senedjemib’s body was evidently deposited in a simple wooden coffin set in a rectangular coffin-pit excavated in the floor of his burial chamber and roofed with multiple stone slabs. Both features might be considered as indicative of a short tenure of office. Counter-balancing the impression of limited resources is the fact that the greater part of the reliefs in Khnumenti’s chapel were carved in fine limestone (even though the reliefs themselves are of generally inferior quality). Moreover, Inti and Mehi are the only proprietors of tombs in the Senedjemib Complex to be provided with sarcophagi, and Khnumenti’s lack of a sarcophagus may reflect a change in burial customs rather than the nature of his financial resources. Then too, it may be that Khnumenti’s seemingly limited resources may not reflect on his tenure of office at all, but relate rather to his inheritance as a younger son of Inti or to other personal factors of which we are unaware.

The name Khnumenti (Ωnm-nmt)n is a relatively rare one, being attested by less than a handful of examples. Even the reading of the name is contested. Ranke understood it to be Ωnm(n), while Junker reads Ωn(n)mtw and Baer Ωn(n)mt-n(n). None of these scholars ventured an opinion as to its meaning. If Ωnm-nmt conforms to the pattern of Ωnm, however, the correct reading is possibly Ny-i-t, Ωnm, “my father belongs to Khnun.” The date seems somewhat early for this to represent the beginning of the name, but might it represent the initial letter of τομαν transposed for calligraphic reasons?

11"Description of Additions to Cemetery on Echelon,” p. 118; Reisner (ibid., pp. 118–119) placed the birth of Inti about thirty years before the accession of Ibi, which would make Inti about fifty-eight years old at death, if the figure of twenty-eight years in the ’Tut-an-Carved in fine stone coffins, Senedjemib’s body was evidently deposited in a simple wooden coffin set in a rectangular coffin-pit excavated in the floor of his burial chamber and roofed with multiple stone slabs. Both features might be considered as indicative of a short tenure of office. Counter-balancing the impression of limited resources is the fact that the greater part of the reliefs in Khnumenti’s chapel were carved in fine limestone (even though the reliefs themselves are of generally inferior quality). Moreover, Inti and Mehi are the only proprietors of tombs in the Senedjemib Complex to be provided with sarcophagi, and Khnumenti’s lack of a sarcophagus may reflect a change in burial customs rather than the nature of his financial resources. Then too, it may be that Khnumenti’s seemingly limited resources may not reflect on his tenure of office at all, but relate rather to his inheritance as a younger son of Inti or to other personal factors of which we are unaware.

The name Khnumenti (Ωnm-nmt)n is a relatively rare one, being attested by less than a handful of examples. Even the reading of the name is contested. Ranke understood it to be Ωnm(n), while Junker reads Ωn(n)mtw and Baer Ωn(n)mt-n(n). None of these scholars ventured an opinion as to its meaning. If Ωnm-nmt conforms to the pattern of Ωnm, however, the correct reading is possibly Ny-i-t, Ωnm, “my father belongs to Khnun.” The date seems somewhat early for this to represent the beginning of the name, but might it represent the initial letter of τομαν transposed for calligraphic reasons?
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116 Shaping-pipe vendor 2364 x, 2365 x, 2384 x, 2387 x, are all equipped with such coffin-putting coffin. The coffin of Prat-pose was actually found by Reisner in the coffin-pit of 2380 x, see below, p. 32.

117 PV, p. 179, 172, p. 528. See Junker, Granit, fig. 38b, for an official named Ωn(n)mt.

118 Reisner in the coffin-pit of 2380 x, see below, p. 32.

119 See Fischer, Vesta Nova, pp. 51–56.

120 Idem., Cippus Nova, pp. 144–145; Dönhoff, p. 329.

121 Harper, Oecumen, p. 117; James Neugebauer, the father of one of the individuals named Khnumenti to the reign of Teso, it is possible that Neugebauer named his son after the vizier under whom he served.

122 A son of Brookshier B, the owner of 2350, and a son of another Senedjemib Inti, the proprietor of 12545, on whom see Borchardt, in: 123 Études en 1979, p. 212, and The Senedjemib Complex, Pt. 1, p.


124 See below, p. 113.

125 Edd., Altes, Frauen, S. 3, s. symbol (p. 261); Fischer, Vesta Nova, pp. 51–56.

126 PV, p. 177, 172, p. 527. The god is better documented in Middle Kingdom personal names; see ibid., p. 527, 528; in 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132.


129 See Strubeck, Ägypten und Äthiopien, p. 217.

130 Old Kingdom, p. 80.

131 ASAE 13 (1914), p. 249; idem., BMFA 12, no. 66 (1915), p. 61.

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

Like Khnumenti, the name Nekhebu (Nḫḥb) is an uncommon one. As a substantive nḫḥb appears to mean "lamp" or "nocturnal illumination," and this term may well explain the origin of Nekhebu's name. Alternatively, he may have been named after Nekh (Nḥḥ), an obscure deity known from the Coffin Texts, without doubt the masculine counterpart of the divinity Nekhbet (Nḥḥt), "fruitfulness." Both the noun and divine names are written with the brazer determinative.

According to his autobiography, Nekhebu advanced step by step to positions of increased responsibility and power in the reign of Pepy I, a circumstance reflected in his court name Mer-tpḥš-akhḫ-meryrese (M-E-R-P-T-PH-S-PMHR3). Nekhebu relates that Pepy I found him as a "common builder" (qdw ẖ nṯẖ, but conferred on him in turn, the offices of "inspector of builders" (ḥḏḥ ẖ qdw), "overseer of builders" (ḥmt-nṯẖ qdw), and "superintendent of a phyle of workmen") (mḥꜥ n nṯẖ). Next he became "royal master builders" (mḥꜥḏ ṣḏ nṯẖ), and then was promoted to be "royal chamberlain and royal master builder." Finally, he was made "sole friend and royal master builder in both houses (Upper and Lower Egypt)." Previous to this, Nekhebu had served as apprentice to an older brother, as the latter rose through the same series of grades. At the start of his brother's career, Nekhebu evidently functioned as his personal scribe or secretary. When the latter was appointed inspector of builders, he carried his measuring rod (ẖnṯẖ). When he was appointed "overseer of builders," Nekhebu served as his right hand man (ẖnṯẖḥ, lit. "his three"). When the brother became "royal master builders" and then "sole friend and royal master builder in both houses," Nekhebu took charge of his estate and substantially increased his holdings. Finally, when the brother became "overseer of works," Nekhebu served as his deputy. Nekhebu says he served under his brother in these various capacities for twenty years.

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

Nekhebu: Brother

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

Overseer of Builders

1. Royal Master Builder
2. Royal Master Builder
3. Superintendent of a Guild
4. Superintendant of a Guild
5. Overseer of all Works of the King
6. Overseer of all Works of the King

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

It is unfortunate that the name of the brother in Nekhebu's account is lost (or was never given). A brother named Mer-tpḥš-akhḫ-pḥy (M-E-R-P-T-PH-S-PMHR4) with the title of "senior lector priest" does appear on a block from G 2381 which preserves part of a procession of animals, but in a position subordinate to Nekhebu, so it is unlikely he is the older brother referred to in the inscription. Nekhebu's older brother was clearly an important official who had attained the position of "overseer of works." On that account, he may have been the owner of G 2381, one of the largest chapels in the Senedjem Complex, but of which only the lowest, undecorated courses of stone remained.

Nekhebu's wife, Hatchai (Hḥ-kḥw) was depicted at least twice in G 2381, once in the context of a family scene and a second time playing the harp before her husband beneath an awning at the stern of a ship. In the last place, she is given the title "King's acquaintance," Hatchai bore at least two and probably three sons to Nekhebu. Two sons accompany their father in a scene on the right-hand wall of the porthole of G 2381 that shows Nekhebu engaged in spearing fish. In front of Nekhebu in his papyrus skiff stands a smaller figure, likewise shown spearing fish. An incomplete inscription before him gave his titles and name. "His son [whom he] loves, the sole friend and royal [master <builder>], Tjem (this list is not preserved)." The other son, who stands behind Nekhebu on a separate groundline, is "his son whom he loves, the lector priest and scribe of the house of the god's book, Sabu-pḥḥ. In front of Nekhebu and facing him stands a third male figure, holding an extra fish spear,
and identified as: "His brother, whom he loves, the lector priest, the honored […]" The latter is most likely identical with Nekhebu's younger (?) brother Mer-pha-at-ankh-pepy who appears on the block with the animal procession referred to above, albeit with the higher ranking title there of "senior lector priest." 

The autobiography of Nekhebu contains an account of three missions that he undertook on behalf of his sovereign, King Pepy I.485 The first consisted of work on the 4a-chapels of the king in Lower Egypt from Akhmin near Buto south to Memphis,486 and included the construction of the king's own pyramid temple.487 The second mission was concerned with the digging of a canal at Akhlimt itself. The third mission, this time in Upper Egypt, involved the digging of another canal at Qas. Three inscriptions in the Wadi Hammamat commemorate yet another project Nekhebu undertook in the behest of his sovereign, this one specifically dated to the latter part of Pepy I's long reign of at least twenty-five years.488 The expedition to the quarries of hibben-stone took place in the year 19, on the occasion of or in preparation for the sad-festival of the king.489 In each of these three inscriptions, it is the court name alone of Nekhebu that is utilized, but there can be little doubt that he was the "overseer of all works of the king, sole friend, royal master builder in both houses, Mer-pha-at-ankh-meryre."489 Nekhebu took with him to the Wadi Hammamat his grown son Mer-pha-at-ankh-meryre, who in one inscription is entitled "lector priest," and in another "senior lector priest."

Along the eastern edge of the Senedjemib Complex, opposite the mastaba of Nekhebu, but on a lower level, Reisner discovered an intact sloping-passage tomb (g 2381) a in the chamber at the bottom of the inclined passage an inscribed wooden coffin containing a badly mummiﬁed body was found.490 At ﬁrst glance, the coffin, which is now in Boston, appears to be inscribed for two people, Mer-pha-at-ankh-meryre Phrahepes Impy and Sabu-pah ibbi. The presence of the two sets of names has caused some confusion,491 but this can be resolved by a close examination of the inscriptions. The coffin has on the lid two identical offering formulas, the first terminating in the title and names of Mer-pha-at-ankh-meryre Phrahepes Impy (Pha-kp Impy)492 and the second ending with the titulary and names of Sabu-pah IBBI (Sb-w Pt PH Hb).493 The exterior east side similarly bears two identical offering formulas, the top one for the beneﬁt of Impy, the lower one beneﬁting IBBI. The exterior west side has two additional identical formulas, the top line ending with the titles and names of Impy and the lower one with those of IBBI. The short double line of inscription on the north end is hardly legible, but probably terminated with the same two names. The south end of the coffin was destroyed. The situation is different in the interior, however. The inscriptions along the interior rim on all four sides of the coffin are for the beneﬁt of Impy alone. On the west side a single line of offering formula ends with the titles and names of Mer-pha-at-ankh-meryre Phrahepes Impy. On the north end is a single line of inscription with an offering formula again naming Impy as beneficiary, and hereath is the three jars containing the seven sacred oils. On the east side a pair of eyes is set above a schematic false door. The offering formula in a single line at the top of this side terminates in the name Mer-pha-at-ankh-pepy Phrahepes Impy. The substitution of Pepy for Meryre in this instance is noteworthy. In Impy's case, it occurred only here, but the exchange of royal prenomen and nomen in bisexual names is a fairly common phenomenon.494 Immediately to the left of the false door is an idographic offering list, whose signs are arranged in a vertical block, requesting "a thousand hares of bread, a thousand jars of beer," and so forth for "the count Mer-pha-at-ankh-meryre, whose good name is Phrahepes Impy." Squeezed between this and the lengthy compartment offering list to the right is a column of much smaller hieroglyphs, apparently added as an afterthought, assuring the same offerings for Sabu-pah IBBI.495 The nature of the inscriptions on the wooden coffin proved to Reisner that the burial was that of Impy, and there can be little doubt that he was right in the assumption, even though the alabaster headrest found in the coffin itself, and which supported the head of the mummiﬁed body, was inscribed for IBBI.496 Drawing attention to the plan between g 2381 a and b on the other side of the drainage channel leading away from the northwest corner of the enclosure of the Great Pyramid, Reisner concluded that IBBI was buried in g 2381 c.497

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

---

485 In the Wadi Hammamat, Nekhebu's son Mer-pha-at-ankh-meryre is alternately "lector priest" and "senior lector priest" (infra). See Dunham, JEA 14 (1928), p. 1.
486 In the 4a-chapels of the Old Kingdom, see Fischer, JEA 61 (1975), pp. 139–153.
488 Nekhebu was 2290–2284 Impy; "overseer of commissions of the pyramid Pepy is established and beautiful," a title he perhaps acquired in connection with the mission in Lower Egypt. See Dunham, JEA 14 (1928), p. 8.
489 For His Ka Overseer of commissions of the pyramid Pepy, infra., see Dunham, JEA 14 (1928), p. 9, 10, 11, 12.
491 For the nature of the inscriptions on the wooden coffin proved to Reisner that the burial was that of Impy, and there can be little doubt that he was right in the assumption, even though the alabaster headrest found in the coffin itself, and which supported the head of the mummiﬁed body, was inscribed for IBBI. Drawing attention to the plan between g 2381 a and b on the other side of the drainage channel leading away from the northwest corner of the enclosure of the Great Pyramid, Reisner concluded that IBBI was buried in g 2381 c.
492 The extraordinary juxtaposition of names on one and the same coffin can perhaps be explained if we assume that, on the death of his brother, IBBI overviewed the preparations for Impy's interment and had his own titles and names added to the coffin in commemoration. The identical nature of the two chapels c 2386 a and b and the fact that the two intercommunicated suggests that they belonged to the
two brothers, and also attest to the close relationship between them.178 The only comparable display of flal devotion known to me is the case of the two brothers, Ni-ankh-khnum and Khnumhotep, who were buried together in a single Saqqara tomb.179

Mer-phet-ankh-meryre Prashhepses Impy and Sabu-phet Ibebi of the coffin are generally taken to be sons of Nekhebu.180 On the coffin both are designated “count, overseer of all works of the king, royal master builder in both houses, overseer of the two workshops.” On the interior north end, Impy is, in addition, “servant-priest, control-le$r of every kilt, chief lector priest, and inscriber” while Sabu-phet Ibebi is “sole friend and lector priest” in the second line on the lid. The title of “lector priest” is also assigned Nekhebu’s son Sabu-phet in the spear fishing scene from c. 2388, and the identity of the two therefore seems likely. Mer-phet-ankh-meryre Prashhepses Impy, on the other hand, appears nowhere in the surviving reliefs from the mastaba of Nekhebu. By itself this does not constitute a real objection to identifying him as another son of Nekhebu, since perhaps fifty percent of those reliefs are lost, and his figure may well have appeared in one or more of the missing scenes. Moreover, in the spear fishing scene, Saba-phet is designated “son whom he loves,” not “eldest son.” The probability is therefore that an eldest son was depicted elsewhere in the chapel, and that Prashhepses Impy was that son. Mer-phet-ankh-meryre in the Wadi Hammamat is “senior lector priest” (fey-hbt smsw), whereas Mer-phet-ankh-meryre Prashhepses Impy is “chief lector priests” (fey-hbt feg-tp) on the coffin from c. 2388. Nevertheless, outside the Senedjemib family, Mer-phet-ankh-meryre is a rare name and, although not entirely beyond the bounds of probability, it seems unnecessary to postulate the existence of yet another “overseer of all works of the king. sole friend, and royal master builder in both houses” named Mer-phet-ankh-meryre, who had a son by the same name, when Nekhebu and his son seem to fit the requirements so well.

If Impy was a teenager or young adult when he accompanied his father to the Wadi Hammamat in the nineteenth year of Pepy I, he could easily have lived on through the remaining years of Pepy I’s reign and the short reign of Mentuhotep (six years) and on into the first half of the reign of Pepy II. In fact, an Impy with the titles “overseer of all works, master builder of the king in both houses,” in all probability our man, is depicted along with other officials in the procession in the pyramid temple of Pepy II,181 whose decoration appears to have been largely completed around years twenty to thirty of Pepy II.182 Corroborating the pictorial testimony is a seal impression of Pepy II found by Reisner on a domed jar stopper still in place on a two-handled vase in the burial chamber of c. 2388 A.184

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

Whereas nothing survives to indicate that Nekhebu ever held the office of vizier, evidence does exist to show that both Impy and Ibebi achieved that dignity. That evidence consists of blocks from the destroyed serdab(s) of the two brothers. Several fragments of the serdab of Ibebi are preserved in Boston. Three complete and nine incomplete representations of Ibebi together with his titles are carefully incised in registers on the surface of two adjoining blocks.185 On one edge of the larger block the titles impy-n‘wet, 3055 [ab ntp] are made out. Another block found in the debris of the open court of the Senedjemib Complex, whose present whereabouts are unknown, bears seven lightly incised figures of Impy, none of them completely preserved. Over the figures the titles fwy-hpt, 3055 [aqt impy-n‘wet] appear.186

Before Impy and Ibebi are added to the list of known viziers, it should be reiterated that the vizieral titles occur only on blocks from their serdab(s). Similarly, in his Meir tomb, Pepyankh Heny the Black is assigned the titles 3075 [ab ntp] only once, in his serdab decorated with registers of repeating figures representing statues, so like the files of statues from the serdabs of Nekhebu, Impy, and Ibebi.187 It is hence legitimate to inquire whether these singular occurrences of the vizieral titles are instances of posthumous promotion of the sort known from the tomb of Djau at Deir el-Gebrawi, who begged for his father Djau Shemai a posthumous promotion from King Pepy II to the rank of fwy-hpt.188 In the succeeding First Intermediate Period, such offices which the deceased did not exercise on earth, but which he boasted of in his funerary inscriptions were referred to as ierb ht-nf, “offices of the necropolis.”189 It should be noted, however, that in the one definite instance we possess of posthumous promotions, the beneficiary, Djau Shemai, is promoted in rank and assigned the rank-indicator fwy-hpt, but receives no new offices or titles which would imply practical duties with functional significance. Very little survives of the chapels of Impy and Ibebi and the vizieral titles perhaps also occurred on their walls.190 For these reasons, it is

178 See above, p. 3.
179 Nunez Debowe.

180 E.g., Reisner, BM 101, no. 64, (November, 1936), p. 13; Smith, Old Kingdom, pp. 86-87; Stroudwick, Administration, pp. 56-56 (2c), 70 (197). Reisner’s reason for identifying Impy (“Im-shpy”) as a son of Nekhebu was his appearance in the pyramid scene with his father, in that observation Reisner was mistaken, for it is Sabu-phet Impy who appears in the pyramid scene (actually the scene of spear-fish- ing). But, however, the individual named on the coffin could not be the son of Nekhebu, since the title sequence on the coffin according to him violates the sequence used for the second half(!) of the Sixth Dynasty, and on that basis they instead would have to be his great-grandchildren (Reisner and Tkale, pp. 96, 100 [286a-b]). As a result, he dated Impy and Ibebi after the end of the Old King- dom.

182 Jacques, Méroé, 2, pl. 40. The connection was already noted by Smith, Old Kingdom, p. 187.

183 Bace, Book and Title, p. 82, Stroudwick, Administration, pp. 64-64, 56.
184 GN 1, p. 14; GN 2, fig. 14.
185 Exh. Ph. 4 (1951); the adjoining blocks are illustrated in Exon-Kraus, Representa- tions of Scribes, pl. 29.
186 Exh. Ph. 5 (1952).
187 Mer-Ptah-Ankh, pl. 40. For the blocks from Nekhebu’s serdab, see Fischer, JÄAIS (1964), pp. 215-215, frontispiece (in color), pl. 2a, 2.
188 Gehner, JÄAIS (1953), p. 13; Helck (1972), pp. 176-176, 170113 thought that these could be only one functioning vizier at a time and postulated the existence of “several vi- ziers” in an attempt to explain away the alarmingly large number of viziers from the reigns of Easi nomarchs. Bace too was of the opinion that even the title of vizier could be a rank-indicator on occasion (Book and Title, p. 1). Kanawati, Ger- Refsnes, pp. 14, 14-15, 15 and 14-15, Stroudwick, Administration, pp. 515-518, have now effectively countered Helck’s arguments, postulating instead that two (sometimes three) titles served simultaneously, either as a geographical basis, that is, one for Upper and one for Lower Egypt, or in terms of function.
189 Fischer, Dendera, p. 143.
probably safe to add the two brothers to the list of known viziers who served Pepy II. 191

Although the false door from the small offering room of Werkauba Iku (g 2383), 192 built against the south face of the mastaba of Mehi is damaged, the titles texteritysyt£b †£ty are discernable at the top of its outer jambs. 193 There is nothing in the palaeography of the inscriptions to suggest that the false door is later than the Old Kingdom, but considering the humble nature of the offering room, Iku may have served one of the successors of Pepy II. 194 Taking into account the location of his tomb, Iku may well have been a descendant of the Senedjemib family, even though we are ignorant of his exact relationship. Since no shaft was found in or behind his chapel, Reisner felt he was buried in one of the successive additions (g 2376 or 2377) to the west side of the mastaba of Mehi. 195 It seems more likely that he was buried in an intrusive shaft constructed in the serdab of Mehi’s tomb (g 2378 b). 196 His wife (?) Tjefreret 197 and a son named Iku after his father are also commemorated on the false door.

190 In the case of Ibebi, two other adjoining blocks in Boston (Exp. Ph. n 1623, 1640) give his name and the titles [¢£ty-™] m£™, ¡my-r£ k£t.


192 Ranke’s citation to Wr-k£w-b£ in PN 1, p. 417, 27, is our individual. In PN 1, p. 417, 10, only feminine occurrences are cited for the name Wr in the Old Kingdom, although in PN 1, p. 427, 17, Ranke does refer to Wr as the other name of Wr-k£w-b£.

193 See the sketch in Brovarski, in: L’Egyptologie en 1979, fig. 11.

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

195 But see above, p. 3.

196 See below, pp. 157, 158.

197 The name Êfrrt does not occur in PN 1–3.

198 In the case of Ibebi, two other adjoining blocks in Boston (Exp. Ph. n 1623, 1640) give his name and the titles [¢£ty-™] m£™, ¡my-r£ k£t.


200 Ranke’s citation to Wr-k£w-b£ in PN 1, p. 417, 27, is our individual. In PN 1, p. 417, 10, only feminine occurrences are cited for the name Wr in the Old Kingdom, although in PN 1, p. 427, 17, Ranke does refer to Wr as the other name of Wr-k£w-b£.

201 See the sketch in Brovarski, in: L’Egyptologie en 1979, fig. 11.

202 Cf. ibid., p. 120, and see above, p. 3.

203 But see above, p. 3.

204 See below, pp. 157, 158.

205 The name Êfrrt does not occur in PN 1–3.