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Nefertkauw, the eldest daughter of Sneferuw.

Von GEORGE REISNER.

Hierzu die Tafeln II und III.

Prof. SETHE in Vol. 50, page 57, of this journal, printed an article entitled, “Das Fehlen des Begriffes der Blutschande bei den alten Ägyptern”, in which he concluded that Prince Neferma’at (of Giza) was the son of Sneferuw and his eldest daughter, Nefertkauw. The conclusion was based on an emendation of the text above the false door in the tomb of Sneferuwhkaf at Giza to read: “The king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Sneferuw; his eldest daughter, Nefertkauw; their son, Neferma’at; his son, Sneferuwhkaf”. The conclusion is maintained in a further article, “Zum Inzest des Sneferu” in Vol. 54, p. 54.

During the month of February 1926, the Harvard-Boston Expedition excavated the area which contains the tomb of Sneferuwhkaf. From the secret tomb of Hetepheres southwards runs the great street which we call “Queens Street” which separates the mastabas of the sons and daughters of Cheops from the pyramids of his queens. The three small pyramids and the northernmost row of mastabas were built by Cheops and bear the name of one of the working crews found in the king’s pyramid. The casings of the royal mastabas in the second row and southwards were constructed in the time of Chephren. On the eastern side of Queens’ Street, against the southern end of mastaba G 7130+7140 (Khufuwhkaf I), is built the smaller mastaba of another “king’s son, Khufuwhkaf” who lived in Dyn. V and was a son or grandson of the elder Prince of the same name. Opposite this later structure on the western side of Queens’ Street, stands a large well-constructed mastaba of typical masonry of Dyn. IV, which although it has both an interior and an exterior chapel of fine white limestone is not of the same size nor of quite so good work as the mastabas of the northern row of the main cemetery. This mastaba (G 7050) is in a line with the three small pyramids but set back with its western face a meter or so west of the face of the Pyr. G I-c just as G I-c (Henutsen and Temple of Isis of the Pyramids) is set back behind the line of G I-b and G I-a which are on one line. Behind G 7050, is a slightly longer mastaba structurally connected with
it, which is the mastaba of Prince Neferma’at (G 7060); and behind that again is the mastaba of Sneferuwkhaf (G 7070) in which is the inscription used by Prof. SETHE. In the tomb of Neferma’at is a similar inscription (Taf. II, 1 u. 2).

The question at issue is really whether the inscribed signs nswt bjtj Snfrw: s3 t-f smst Nfrt-k3w: s5 n-s Nfr-nm3’t permit a grammatically correct translation as they stand. That point is definitely decided by a third inscription which was on a lintel over the entrance to the chapel of Sneferuwkhaf (G 7070). The stone had been cast down by plunderers and was found by us in the sand in front of the doorway (see Taf. III, 3). The phrase in question reads on that lintel, as follows: nswt bjtj Snfrw: s3 t-f smst Nfrt-k3w: s5 n-s Nfrm3’t” etc. “The king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Sneferuw: his eldest daughter (is) Nefertkauw; her son is Neferma’at”, etc. The other formula with the words s3 n-s obviously has the same significance. The inscription given in LEPSIUS is reproduced in Taf. III, 4, and shows the fine workmanship of the relief. The second inscription above the false door in the tomb of Neferma’at is of the same workmanship but is nearly obliterated from long exposure. Mr. GREENLEES succeeded in copying it by candlelight at night and it varies slightly in the grouping of the signs: . In inscriptions of this excellence, the presumption is against scribal errors of the kind assumed by Prof. SETHE especially when there are two variant writings both giving the same order of signs. In all three cases, the meaning is: “Nefertkauw was the eldest daughter of Sneferuw and had a son (named) Neferma’at. His son was Sneferuwkhaf” etc. Thus whoever the father of Neferma’at may have been, he was not Sneferuw.

In the tomb of Sneferuwkhaf, Neferma’at appears in two inscriptions and as ; while Sneferuwkhaf has in the new inscription (second line) the titles . In his own tomb, Neferma’at bears the title of king’s son.

I think there can be no doubt that the easternmost mastaba of this group of three connected mastabas is the tomb of Nefertkauw. Unfortunately the two chapels of that mastaba (G 7050) were destroyed so that only a few small fragments of relief were found, and we have no insciptional evidence. There was only one burial pit, the southern pit which is ordinarily the man’s pit; but in several mastabas of the later part of this cemetery, the use of the pits departs from custom. In G 7430+7440, the tomb of Prince Minkhaf, the man’s pit and the man’s chapel are in the northern part and the wife’s pit appears to be that in the floor of the chapel, while the southern pit belongs to a son of Minkhaf. In G 7350 which is the mastaba of a queen of Egypt, the southern chapel (interior chapel) and the southern pit belonged to the queen and the northern pit and niche to a man (her son ?). G 7050 which I would also assign to a queen (Nefertkauw) is similar to the other queen’s mastaba, G 7350, but has only one burial pit, the southern one. Unfortunately again, the burial pit of G 7050 had been cleared out in the Saite or Ptolemaic period and reused for burials of that period.

The rock-foundation of Queens’ Street slopes gently down to the south to a point past the middle of pyramid G I-c and then sharply to a point about two meters lower. In order to level up the street floor in front of this pyramid, a retaining wall was built from east to west across the street and along the southern side of pyramid G I-c and the interior filled with rubbish to the level of the base of the pyramid. The three mastabas of the Nefertkauw group were built immediately south of this retaining wall, while the later mastaba G 7150 (Khufuwkhaf II) was built over the retaining wall. The mastaba which I assign to Nefertkauw (G 7050) was evidently placed to make a fourth in the line of the tombs of the queens of Cheops, but as an addition. The three mastabas are certainly part of the early additions made to the royal cemetery of Cheops and by inference
their owners belonged to the royal family. Nefertkauw as a daughter of Sneferuw would naturally have been married to her brother Cheops. Her son Neferma’at bears the title of “king’s son”; and the natural inference is that he was a son of Cheops. His son, Sneferuwkaf, is also once called “king’s son” although at the most a grandson of a king. A few other cases are known in Dyn. IV of grandsons who called themselves “king’s son”, notably the two sons of Prince Khufuwkaf I (G 7130 + 7140) while the relationship of Khufuwkaf II to the family is unclear. The probability seems to be that Nefertkauw was married to Cheops, that Neferma’at was a son and Sneferuwkaf a grandson of Cheops. The family might be reconstructed by assuming the marriage of Nefertkauw to a private man who is buried elsewhere; but the separate burial of wives unless they were queens, is unknown to me. We have one example of a king’s granddaughter who claims the title of “king’s daughter of his body”, namely Meresankh III. She was a daughter of Kawa’ab eldest son of Cheops and his sister Hetep-heres II, but her mother married King Radedef and Meresankh derived her title from her step-father. She was probably a babe in arms in the harem of Radedef or may have been born after the marriage of her mother to her step-father. As everyone knows the significance of the titles of the Old Kingdom is by no means clear. The situation at the end of Dyn. IV and during Dyn. V appears to resemble that in Egypt a few years ago when his Majesty King Fuad I found it necessary to fix by decree the relationship of those who were entitled to be called “prince” or “princess” and to create the rank of “nabeel” for other descendants of the family of Mohammed Ali, many of whom were then using the higher title.

Kulttopographische und mythologische Beiträge.

VON HERMANN KEEES.


Der allenthalben in Ägypten erstaunlich früh einsetzende Synkretismus, der von sich aus bestrebt ist, durch Schaffung von möglichst breit aufgebauten Systemen Ortsgötttern Allgemeingeltung zu sichern oder wenigstens den Anspruch darauf zumalenden, kommt vielfach dem Wunsch der staatlichen Autorität entgegen: Auch diese muß im eigenen Interesse bestrebt sein, die Zwiespältigkeit im Lande, die sich zeitweise bis zur offenen Fehde steigert, ständig aber von gegenseitiger Rivalität und Eifersüchtetlei zugunsten des eigenen Ortsgottes angefacht ist, zuzudecken und unter ein System zu strecken, das möglichst vielseitigen Ansprüchen genügt. Daß davon im wesentlichen zunächst

1) Dies Gegenspiel hat bereits LEFÉBURE als Abschluß seiner Arbeit „Les Dieux du type rat“ Sphinx VII S. 56 treffend gekennzeichnet: „on discerne bien à presque toutes les époques deux actions contraires dans presque tous les noms, l’intolérance locale d’une part, et la pacification gouvernementale de l’autre“. 13*
3. The new inscription of Sneferuwkhaf on the lintel in the street, G 7070.

4. The inscription of Sneferuwkhaf over the niche in G 7070; looking west.
1. General view of southern part of cem G 7000 showing situation of group of three mastabas; from SE corner of Cheops pyramid looking down towards the Sphinx.

2. View of three mastabas, G 7050, 7060, and 7070, looking down to south from pyramid G 1—c.