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CHAPTER XIV

THE OLD KINGDOM IN EGYPT AND THE BEGINNING OF THE FIRST INTERMEDIATE PERIOD

I. THE THIRD DYNASTY

Early in the Third Dynasty, King Djoser employed the genius of his architect Imhotep to erect the first great building of stone, the Step Pyramid at Saqqara. The name Djoser, written in a cartouche, has not been found in an inscription of the Old Kingdom. On his own monuments the king writes his Horus-name, Netjerykhet. There is no doubt that these two names refer to the same man. The wall scribblings of the Eighteenth Dynasty visitors to the Step Pyramid refer to the temple of Djoser and both names occur, together with the name of Imhotep, in the Ptolemaic inscription, on the Island of Siheil near the First Cataract. The legendary character of Imhotep, who was revered centuries after his death as a demi-god, the builder of the temple of Edfu, the wise chancellor, architect and physician of Djoser, has now acquired reality through the discovery of his name on a statue-base of Netjerykhet in the excavations of the Step Pyramid. It is curious that modern research should, within a short space of time, have established the identity of both the wise men of whom centuries later the harper of King Inyotef sings: 'I have heard the sayings of Imhotep and Hordeedef with whose words men speak so often. What are their habitations now? Their walls are destroyed, their habitations are no more, as if they had never been.' The tomb of Hordeedef, with the inscriptions in its chapel maliciously erased but still partly readable was found at Giza, east of the pyramid of his father Cheops, at a time when the excavation of the elaborate series of structures erected at Saqqara by Imhotep was still in progress.

Netjerykhet Djoser remains the dominant figure in this period, but it can no longer be maintained confidently that he was the

\[1 \] §vi, 18, 31; §1, 2, passim; 30, 19; 31, 11.  
\[2 \] §1, 31, passim.  
\[3 \] §1, 8, pl. 58.  
\[4 \] §vi, 6, 132; 18, 467; §1, 20 192.  
founder of the dynasty. He is connected with Khasekhemwy, the last king of the Second Dynasty, through Queen Nymaathap who has generally been accepted as the wife of Khasekhemwy and the mother of Djoser. It must be admitted that here and in other cases later in the Old Kingdom we do not understand clearly the factors governing a change of dynasty, although we follow the division into groups of kings which is indicated in the dynastic lists of the Ptolemaic writer Manetho. It now seems likely that Netjerykhet Djoser was preceded by Sanakhte as the first king of the Third Dynasty. It has been suggested that Sanakhte may have been an elder brother of Netjerykhet and that he began the flat-topped structure which was later developed into the Step Pyramid. It is also thought that Djoser may have buried Sanakhte in the most important of the galleries entered by eleven shafts which were cut in the rock on the east side of that building during an early stage of its construction. Six of these galleries were intended for the storage of equipment and two of them were completely filled with stone vessels, many of which bore inscriptions of kings of the First and Second Dynasties. None of these vessels, nor any of the stone vessel-fragments from the main part of the pyramid substructure, bore the names of Netjerykhet or Sanakhte. A mud sealing of Netjerykhet and one of Khasekhemwy were found in one of the eastern galleries, and a stone bowl with the name of Khasekhemwy came from the apartments under the southern enclosure wall. A handsome porphyry jar bore an inscription of the latter's predecessor, Khasekhem, which resembled the inscription on one of the jars which he had dedicated in the temple at Hierakonpolis.

The impression of a seal of an official of Netjerykhet, possibly Imhotep, was rolled out along the plaster between the blocks of masonry lining gallery III, the proposed burial-place of Sanakhte. This evidence establishes that work was executed in these galleries by Djoser. Later tunnelling by thieves makes it impossible to be certain, however, whether gallery III could have been reached from gallery I which was the only one accessible by a supplementary sloping tunnel from outside the completed structure. All eleven shafts were blocked by the later stages of work on the pyramid. It should be remembered, also, that the only burial which has survived in the tombs I to V was that of a young boy and that the two well-preserved stone coffins and fragments of others from these galleries seem to have been intended for small
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1 §1, 18, 376; 19, 17.
2 §1, 8, pls. 88–9; 17, vol. III, 6, 15, 20–2, 74, pl. xix, vol. iv, pl. 3, 19.
persons, either women or children. It is therefore questionable whether Sanakhte was buried here.

Sanakhte has been equated with Nebka whose name precedes that of Djoser in two of the three lists of kings (the Turin Canon and the list in the Abydos Temple of Sethos I) compiled in the Nineteenth Dynasty. The third list, inscribed on the wall of a tomb at Saqqara and now in the Cairo Museum, omits the name. Unhappily little is preserved of the Third Dynasty section of royal annals inscribed on the Palermo Stone and its related fragments. Since this list was prepared in the Fifth Dynasty, it might have provided valuable evidence from records set down at a time nearer to the period in question. A recent reconstruction of the Annals attributes to Nebka the partly preserved portion of a reign in Register 5, hitherto assumed to be that of Khasekhemwy because of the mention of a copper statue of that king. However, the year after the eighth biennial count, which was the last complete year of the reign, is not easy to adjust to the nineteen years given to Nebka in the Turin Canon. One hesitates to accept without doubt such a long lapse of time between the death of Khasekhemwy and the accession of Djoser in view of the apparently close association between these two kings. Certainly the Turin Canon figure of twenty-seven years for Khasekhemwy cannot be made to agree with this portion of the Annals. It seems wiser in these circumstances to question this figure, as well as the nineteen years given to Nebka, and to accept the earlier theory that the Palermo Stone contains a record of the last years of Khasekhemwy and five years of a following reign which should be that of Nebka. The Cairo Stone no. 1 of the Annals, which continues (after a break) the records of the Palermo Stone, is almost entirely effaced in Register 5. No indication remains of the names of the kings or the lengths of their reigns. It is also far from certain that the reign of Sneferu occupied the whole of Register 6; nor does much survive of the records of Cheops and Redjedef which appear below this register on Cairo Stones nos. 1 and 3. The important fragments, Cairo nos. 2 and 4, deal also

1 §1, 17, vol. 1, 46 ff.
2 G, 3; 5; 9; 15; 39, passim.
3 G, 17, 80. See Plate Vol.
4 On a fragment assigned to this reign at University College, London, the first and second count are recorded in successive years. This would appear to make the year after the eighth count fifteen but the final incomplete year must be added and allowance made for the fact that under Djer and Semerkhet no census was taken in the accession year. Thus the reign may have lasted seventeen years or even eighteen if, as in the reign which follows in Register 5, no count was made until the third regnal year. It is clear that much uncertainty is involved in making such restorations.
with the reigns of Sneferu and Cheops but they come from a slightly different version of the Annals inscribed on a thicker slab of stone. Some measure of the difficulties involved in attempting to evaluate this tantalizing evidence can be understood if it is realized that a former reconstruction\(^1\) gave 544 years for the First and Second Dynasties, assigning the whole of Register 5 to the Second Dynasty, while the most recent study of the Annals suggests a length of only 369 years for the first three dynasties, including 295 years\(^2\) for the First and Second Dynasties and 74 years for the Third Dynasty. The last figure, however, is derived from the Turin Canon with little substantiation from the Annals. As stated above, the part of Register 5 generally attributed to the last king of the Second Dynasty is in this case assigned to the Third Dynasty.\(^3\)

As will be shown later, Nebka is mentioned in the second half of the Third Dynasty in the chapel of Akhetaa. An estate is named after him in the Fifth Dynasty funerary temple of King Nyuserre. However, his most important appearance is in the Westcar Papyrus where he follows Djoser. In view of various disagreements between the later King Lists it is tempting to accept the evidence of this papyrus and to place Nebka between Djoser and Sneferu.\(^4\) Written in the form of a popular tale which dates from the Hyksos Period, this entertaining series of anecdotes is peopled with characters who are known to have lived in the Old Kingdom. It contains much which can be accepted as historical fact and it will be necessary to draw upon it repeatedly in dealing with the otherwise scantily known events of the Fourth Dynasty. Nevertheless, the recent discovery at Saqqara of a new Step Pyramid belonging to an unsuspected successor of Djoser named Sekhemkhet makes it imperative to consider again the whole problem of the succession of the kings of the Third Dynasty.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the Egyptians of the Old Kingdom were extremely laconic in recording historical events in their monumental inscriptions. The disappearance of the greater part of the daily records and correspondence written on papyrus leaves us largely dependent upon statements of family
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\(^1\) G, 3, pls. i–iii.

\(^2\) G, 17, 78–83.

\(^3\) Chapter vi, §1, gives 416 years for the first two dynasties and again makes the length of the Third Dynasty seventy-four years, this being the total length of the five individual reigns in the Turin Canon. The question arises whether this estimate allows a sufficient span of time for such an important formative period in Egyptian history. At least one Third Dynasty king, Nebkare, is omitted from this list.

\(^4\) §1, 32, 518; §vi, 24, 31, note 3; §vi, 5, passim; 6, 36; §iii, 6, 79.
THE THIRD DYNASTY

relationships and the names and titles of officials and members of the royal household. Biographical material and royal inscriptions became more frequent as the Old Kingdom advanced. In the Fourth Dynasty the evidence available allows of little more than the possibility of reconstructing the intricate framework of relationships between the descendants of Sneferu. At a later stage in the present account it will be necessary to attempt this reconstruction, as briefly as possible, in order to lend some further semblance of life to the people whose buildings and extraordinary portraits have survived so miraculously. Something of their daily life can be understood from their personal belongings and from the pictures on the walls of their tomb-chapels. In very few cases, however, is any information given about the political events of the time.

In the Third Dynasty there is an even greater paucity of inscriptive material. Most of the names of members of the court are lacking; some uncertainty remains whether all the names of the kings have been recovered and whether those known have been correctly attached to their monuments. There is far from complete agreement concerning the length of the dynasty. In spite of the fact already mentioned that the lengths of the reigns preserved for the five kings listed in the Turin Canon add up to seventy-four years, it is difficult not to believe that at least a hundred years should be allowed for a period so important for the political and cultural experimentation which reached its culmination in the Fourth Dynasty. Moreover, it would seem likely that one king at least should be added to account for the Nebkare whose name appears, with another less easy to decipher, on the quarry-marks in the great rock cutting for the unfinished pyramid of Zawiye el-Aryān. A fact which must also be borne in mind is that the outlines of two large enclosures, which may have belonged to kings of the Third Dynasty, can be seen under the sand and debris to the west of Djoser's Step Pyramid at Saqqara. At the point where Nebkare's name would be expected to occur in the Turin Canon (and where it does appear before the last king of the Dynasty, Huni, in the Saqqara List) is a 'name' Hudjefa. It has been argued that this 'name' and another, Sedjes, in the Abydos list were derived from a word for 'lacuna' in an old papyrus which was misunderstood by the compiler of the Turin Canon. One might well wonder whether a break in an early record might not have included the name of more than one king.

1 G, 9, 23-5. 2 §1, 3 (1912), 61, 62; cf. also 3 (1906), 266-80. 3 §1, 13, pls. 1, 11; §VI, 24, 32, note 5. 4 G, 17, 14; §1, 12, 50.
If Sanakhte is really the Horus-name of Nebka, and if he was also the king who began the construction of the building later incorporated into the Step Pyramid of his younger brother Djoser, it is difficult not to doubt the figure of nineteen years given to each in the Turin Canon. The remarkable architectural achievement of Djoser and Imhotep, as well as the lasting memory which they left in the minds of later Egyptians, would seem to imply a longer reign for Djoser than for Sanakhte, at least in the present state of our knowledge of the latter’s monuments which seem very scanty. Similarly, the impression is gained that Djoser’s successors were not able to carry to completion the great building schemes which they began in imitation of his imposing tomb. The last king, Huni, as we shall see, is a shadowy figure, even the reading of whose name is disputed. The investigation of the monuments of the other kings has either been left incomplete or else not carried out under ideal conditions. Nevertheless, until further excavation can be done, we might perhaps accept as a working hypothesis the succession of kings: Sanakhte (Nebka), Netjerykhet (Djoser), Sekhemkhet, Khaba (Layer Pyramid at Zäwiyet el-Āryān), Nebkare² (Unfinished Pyramid at Zäwiyet el-Āryān) and Huni.

One of these kings, or another with a Horus-name still unknown, must have had the personal name Teti. He is named after Bedjaw (the first king of the Second Dynasty in the Abydos List)³ in a list of kings which continues with Redjedef, Chephren, Sahure and Neferirkare on a writing board found in the burial chamber of a Fifth Dynasty tomb at Giza. A relief from a Rames-side chapel at Saqqara shows seated figures of three kings: Djosernub, Teti and Userkaf,⁵ whereas a statue of the Persian Period⁶ belonged to a man who held priesthoods of the kings Netjerykhet Djoser, Djoser Teti and Teti, as well as Imhotep. The implication is that Teti should be the king following Sekhemkhet but this is far from certain.

The inscriptions on jar-sealings of the kings who bore the Horus-names Sanakhte, Netjerykhet, Sekhemkhet and Khaba resemble each other in style. Those of Sanakhte and Netjerykhet Djoser were found in Upper Egypt at Beit Khallāf, a short distance north of Abydos, in neighbouring tombs (K₁, K₂) which must belong closely together in time. Sealings of Sanakhte were
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¹ §1, 11, 18. ² See page 6, n. 3 above (Ed.). ³ See Plate Vol. Helck questioned the existence of this king, arguing that his name was derived from a scribal error. G, 17, 12. ⁴ See Plate Vol. G, 38, 113; §vi, 23, 358. ⁵ §1, 10, 41. ⁶ §1, 7, 114.
also found in a pottery deposit north of the funerary temple of Djoser at the Step Pyramid.\textsuperscript{1} The three kings Sanakhte, Netjerykhet, and Sekhemkhet carved similar monuments on the face of the rocks at the Wādi Maghāra in the Sinai Peninsula.\textsuperscript{2} Each king is shown raising his mace above a prostrate bedawin chieftain. The cutting is rather roughly done, as in all these rock carvings, but in the case of a second figure of Sanakhte standing before a shrine (which has been removed to the Cairo Museum) better workmanship is displayed. The face presents a strong family likeness to the heads of Djoser on the carved panels of the blue-tiled galleries in the Step Pyramid complex.\textsuperscript{3}

The relief of Sekhemkhet was until a few years ago thought to be the work of the First Dynasty king Semerkhet, due to a similarity between the hieroglyphic signs in their names. It was only with the discovery of the name on jar-sealings in his tomb at Saqqara that the work of the hitherto unrecognized Sekhemkhet could be dated correctly. The elimination of Semerkhet's name in Sinai leaves no evidence for the working of the turquoise mines in the First Dynasty. The copper which would seem more important to us today was apparently not obtained from this particular region, nor in the neighbourhood of the nearby temple-site of Serābīt el-Khādim. Ancient copper workings are known in the Sinai Peninsula but it is not certain at what date this mining was initiated, nor whether it was undertaken under Egyptian supervision.\textsuperscript{4} However, it would now appear that Egypt began to be particularly interested in this area at the beginning of the Third Dynasty.

As we have seen, the association of the names of Netjerykhet and Khasekhemwy with that of Queen Nymaathap suggests that this queen was the mother of the first king and the wife of the second. If Sanakhte was also a son of Nymaathap we can understand that his younger brother might appear to follow closely after Khasekhemwy, although this theory hardly helps to clarify the reason for a change of dynasty. Nymaathap is called 'Mother of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt' on a mud jar-sealing found with others bearing the name of Netjerykhet in the large brick tomb of an official of this reign at Beit Khallaf (K1). This tomb and its neighbour (K2) which contained sealings

\textsuperscript{1} For these Third Dynasty sealings, including those of Queen Nymaathap, see §I, 13, 14; 33, 73–92, 140; 9, 11, pls. ix, x, xix; 8, 141; 17, vol. I, 5; 24, pl. 24; 27, vol. II, pl. lixx.
\textsuperscript{3} §VI, 23, 132.
of Sanakhte were once mistakenly thought to have been built for these kings. Two smaller tombs (K₃, K₄), subsidiaries to the mastaba K₁, also had jar-sealings of Netjerykhet, as did another tomb (K₅) some distance away. In K₅ there was also a jar-sealing of a man named Nedjemankh who was probably its owner as well as being represented by two fine seated statues of hard stone in Paris and Leiden.¹ The jar-sealing of Queen Nymaathap which was found in the burial apartment of King Khasekhemwy at Abydos names her as ‘Mother of the king’s children’. Some generations later at Saqqara, in the reign of Sneferu, it is stipulated in the chapel of Metjen that he is to receive 100 loaves daily from the Ka-house of the ‘Mother of the king’s children’ Queen Nymaathap.² The food would presumably have been transferred to Metjen’s tomb after it had served its purpose in the queen’s offering rites. This explanation implies that the chapel of Nymaathap was nearby and that she had been buried at Saqqara. If so, her burial near Djoser would strengthen the impression that she was his mother and possibly the mother of Sanakhte.

Queen Nymaathap may have been one of the three ladies of Djoser’s family who appear on one of the precious fragments of relief from a small shrine at Heliopolis which are now preserved in the Turin Museum.³ Her name is lost, but she appears to be called wrt hts, a title held only by very great ladies of the Old Kingdom. On another fragment this title is given to Hetephernebty.⁴ It is not clear if the object above the hieroglyphs of the title is the bulbous end of a wand carried by the king who probably stood in front of a smaller figure of the lady. It is certainly not the piece of meat shown on an earlier copy which omitted part of the title below and led to an interpretation of the whole as ‘Great Heiress’.⁵ On the little relief with the three ladies, Hetephernebty sits with the Princess Intkaes beside Djoser’s feet and the nameless woman clasps his ankle from her position behind it. Hetephernebty is here called ‘Beholder of Horus’, a title evidently related to the more familiar one ‘Beholder of Horus and Seth’ which was known already in the First Dynasty in the reign of Djer and Den⁶ and was later given to queens in the Fourth Dynasty. Intkaes and Hetephernebty are named again on some forty conical stones shaped like offering stands, the pieces of which were re-used in the walls around the

¹ §Ⅰ, 33, 180; §Ⅵ, 23, 16; 24, 37. ² G, 41, 4 (line 9); 3, 77.
³ §Ⅵ, 23, 132 ff., fig. 48; cf. also §Ⅵ, 24, 35; §Ⅰ, 34, 9–26.
⁴ §Ⅵ, 23, 136, fig. 52.
⁵ §Ⅰ, 34, 11 (fragment 11); 17, vol. II, 188.
⁶ §Ⅰ, 24, pl. xxvii.
great court of the Djoser pyramid, as well as on about sixty fragments of round-topped stelae which were found in the court of Djoser's serdab. They are thought to have been used originally as markers to delimit the area of the temple when it was being planned and would indicate that these two ladies were particularly important at the beginning of the reign. The Heliopolis shrine should also, then, have been built shortly after Djoser's accession to the throne. It has been suggested that the two ladies were either daughters of Khasekhemwy or of Djoser's predecessor Sanakhte. One might speculate that the chief queen of Khasekhemwy had borne only daughters and the sons of a secondary queen Nymaathap consequently came to the throne. This might explain the kind of dynastic change which seems to occur at the end of the Third Dynasty. It would account for the titles of Nymaathap, as well as the importance of Intkaes and Hetephernebt. The latter would appear to be a queen, probably of Djoser, while the third nameless lady on the Heliopolis shrine might either be Nymaathap or the widow of Sanakhte.

The monuments of the reign of Djoser present an extraordinarily clear picture of a civilization approaching maturity which displays a freshness and vigour that is still slightly barbaric. The Step Pyramid complex, the contemporaneous tomb of Hesyre and the rare statues and reliefs which can be assigned to the period or a little later, all show boldness of conception accompanied by experimentation with materials. The contemporary visitor must have been pleasantly awe-struck by the shining white-cased surfaces of the Step Pyramid towering above the panelled limestone enclosure wall with its great dummy gates. Entering through the tall, narrow colonnade, he must have marvelled at the clever imitation in stone of structures which had hitherto been familiar to him built of wood and light materials. All the details were here even to the fences, the log roofs, the light fluted columns, the simulation of papyrus, reed and other plant forms, and wooden doors carved as though swung open on their sockets. Had he been able to penetrate into the underground galleries he would have found wall-surfaces covered with blue-green faience tiles to imitate mat-hangings or screens which framed panels of fine, low-relief carving.

The funerary priest entering the chapel of Hesyre's tomb met a blaze of colour where variegated mat patterns painted on the panelled mud-brick wall replaced the blue tiles of the king's tomb but similarly framed the low carving of the wooden panels
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1 §1, 17, vol. II, 187.  
2 §1, 18, 376; 19, 17.  
3 §1, 25, passim.
that stood in the back of each offering niche. On the opposite wall of the long corridor, Hesyre's funerary furniture was depicted in painting with the same realistic intention which is reflected in the stone imitation of architectural details at the Step Pyramid. Weathering of the outer corridor had left only the carefully painted legs of men and cattle, with a crocodile waiting at a ford, to show that here was also one of the earliest scenes from life, such as are found again at the beginning of the Fourth Dynasty in the Maidūm chapels. It might be well to remember in looking at the wooden panels of Hesyre, as they now stand in the Cairo Museum, that their delicate low reliefs must have been somewhat obscured by the gay but garish setting in which they originally stood. In the work of the Third Dynasty one senses that the consciousness of his new-found technical facility spurred the craftsman toward attempting things which would have been more soberly discarded at a later time. One is reminded of the exuberance with which the early dynastic vase-maker played with his material as though it were clay and not stone.

The fact that the stone funerary architecture of the Fourth Dynasty did not imitate construction which had been developed in lighter materials need not mean that domestic and public buildings did not continue to employ the style of building common in the Third Dynasty and which is reflected in the Step Pyramid complex. The contrast which is usually drawn between the Chephren temple beside the Sphinx at Giza and the Djoser temple suggests a prevailing heavy monumentality in the Fourth Dynasty and stresses a lightness of spirit in the Third Dynasty. While this evaluation is generally true such a comparison exaggerates the impression that the Fourth Dynasty building presented only simple granite forms with unrelieved surfaces. It also neglects the fact that the forms of the Djoser temple are not a new development in themselves but a facsimile in stone, so to speak, of an existing architecture. It should be remembered that, with the exception of the small and perhaps incomplete temple at Maidūm and the temples of the Bent Pyramid at Dahshūr, evidence is still lacking as to the character of other buildings of the Third Dynasty and the early Fourth Dynasty. There are certain indications that the material was richer and more varied than is generally admitted. At the end of the Second Dynasty, we know that Khasekhemwy had employed a large granite door-jamb sculptured with reliefs in the temple at Hierakonpolis. In the Pyramid-Temple of Cheops, at least the

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1}§vi, 23, 131.}\]
walls of the colonnade around the court were decorated with limestone reliefs and such reliefs were probably also used in the temple of Chephren.\(^1\) We know now, moreover, that such decoration had appeared earlier in the Valley Temple of the Bent Pyramid of Sneferu at Dahshûr.\(^2\) Polygonal columns did not disappear with the reign of Djoser but were found in at least one Fourth Dynasty prince's chapel at Giza.\(^3\) Unfortunately we do not know whether any of the buildings had been completed inside the large area of the enclosing wall around the newly discovered pyramid of Sekhemkhet at Saqqara. The pyramid had certainly not been finished but the excavations had to be discontinued when only a small part of the site had been explored.\(^4\) It is not clear what state of construction had been reached in building a temple at the Layer Pyramid of Zâwiyet el-Aryân; nor was any clearance made at what appeared to be the site of its valley temple.\(^5\) Further investigation in the area of the unfinished pyramid some distance away at this same site, as well as the exploration of the enclosures out to the west of the pyramids of Djoser and Sekhemkhet at Saqqara, may yet give us further information about the architecture of the Third Dynasty.

In the Fourth Dynasty we find a facility in the handling of stone masonry which is based on the experience gained in the preceding period. Imhotep's achievement lay both in evolving a new architectural form in the Step Pyramid and in the development of the technique of building in stone. He did not invent stone architecture which we now know had advanced considerably even in the First Dynasty. The decision to build a high structure around the original flat-topped mastaba (an Arabic term applied to tombs which resemble a mud-brick bench) inspired new methods of construction. Instead of the horizontal courses in the first building, the layers of masonry added to form the successive steps were laid in leaning courses so that the pressure was exerted inwards. Evidently this was intended to ensure stability in a structure that was rising to a height hitherto unknown and which must have seemed a daring attempt to reach up into the sky. Towards the end of the project there was a tendency to replace the small blocks with rather larger ones. Sekhemkhet clearly employed larger masonry construction in the fine stretch of panelled wall which so much resembles that of Djoser's enclosure.\(^6\) This masonry and the fact that Sekhemkhet had to be content with a less advantageous site for his unfinished step pyramid are two

\(^1\) §vi, 24, 54–6.
\(^2\) §ii, 11, passim.
\(^3\) §vi, 24, 53.
\(^4\) §i, 13, passim.
\(^5\) §i, 28, 56.
\(^6\) §i, 13.
of the reasons for believing that it was built after Djoser’s monument. The underground galleries of Sekhemkhet resemble in plan those of the Layer Pyramid assigned to Khaba at Zawiya el-Aryān. The superstructure of the latter, like the work which had been completed above ground for Sekhemkhet, follows the method of construction used in Djoser’s Step Pyramid. The same system of layers of tilted courses of masonry is found again in the Maidūm Pyramid which was probably built by Huni, the last king of the Dynasty, and in the Bent Pyramid at Dahshūr.

The name of Khaba was found on eight stone bowls in a Third Dynasty tomb beside the Layer Pyramid at Zawiya el-Aryān. The name occurs also on a seal impression from Hierakonpolis and upon two stone bowls, one found in the provincial cemetery of Naga ed-Deir and the other in the excavation of the Fifth Dynasty pyramid of King Sahure. Khaba is otherwise unknown, unless he is the Teti of the Royal Lists and the Giza writing board. His inscriptions appear to be the only royal examples of the Third Dynasty which have survived on stone vessels. A few with the name of Sneferu are known but inscribed stone vessels are rare in the Old Kingdom. They increase in frequency with the reign of Unas and in the Sixth Dynasty. We shall see that a considerable proportion of these vessels were found abroad at Byblos on the Syrian coast and in the Sudan at Kerma. With the invention of the potter’s wheel, the production of fine pottery from the Second Dynasty onwards reduced the output of the makers of stone vessels. This development is clearly to be seen in the rougher workmanship of the examples from the magazines of the temple of Mycerinus towards the end of the Fourth Dynasty, and the small number of pieces found in the private tombs at Giza. The handsome vessels of the first two dynasties had evidently been stored as part of the royal treasure and were drawn upon by Djoser for his funerary equipment. These heirlooms continued to be prized in the later Old Kingdom. It seems curious, however, that no stone vessels from a Third or Fourth Dynasty pyramid have been found inscribed with the name of the royal owner of the tomb.

The huge limestone and granite blocks at the bottom of the rock-cut pit of the second, unfinished pyramid at Zawiya el-Aryān bore a number of rough, semi-cursive inscriptions. One of these reads ‘Lord of the Two Lands, Nebkare’.

1 §vi, 24, 31, pl. 21 (A).
2 §i, 116; 28, 54; 33, 92; §iii, 8, vol. 1, 114.
3 §ii, 38, 90 ff.
4 §i, 3 (1912), 61, 62.
limestone blocks from the filling of the pit were also marked with a royal name in a cartouche which ends in \(ka\) but begins with a sign which has proved difficult to decipher. Neither Neferka nor Nebka is entirely convincing for the reading of the name in this cartouche.\(^1\) The owner, nevertheless, would seem to be the Nebkare who precedes Huni in the Saqqara List. We can hardly accept the reading of the name as Nebka if we follow present opinion, which identifies this king with Sanakhte, the first king of the Third Dynasty. If however the name on the blocks is to be read Neferka it might possibly suggest that Neferkare replaced Nebkare in the Abydos List through some confusion in the mind of the scribe. It should be noted that King Nebkare is omitted in the Turin Canon.\(^2\)

In our previous discussion of Sanakhte it was not mentioned that Sethe had recognized the name Nebka in a cartouche combined with the Horus-name Sanakhte on a mud jar-sealing from Beit Khallāf.\(^3\) This identification has been questioned in recent years, largely because of doubt whether the cartouche was in use before the Fourth Dynasty. Huni, however, employed the cartouche at the end of the Third Dynasty, and on the blocks at Zāwiyet el-Aryān the name which it surrounds is unlike that known for any king who followed Sneferu. On this ground, at least, the possibility should not be dismissed that the Beit Khallāf sealing supports the suggestion that Nebka is to be identified with Sanakhte and is unrelated to Nebkare. It certainly seems unsafe to assume that the occurrence of the cartouche at Zāwiyet el-Aryān provides evidence for a later dating of the unfinished pyramid of Nebkare. The fact that Nebkare employed very large stone blocks and that the plan of his great excavation with its open sloping passage from the north resembles the cutting for the substructure on Redjedef’s pyramid at Abu Rawāsh, has been taken to mean that the work at Zāwiyet el-Aryān was executed in the Fourth Dynasty.\(^4\) On the other hand the oval coffin pit sunk in the granite floor, with a heavy lid of the same shape, is of a type otherwise unknown and suggests a transitional form that might occur towards the end of the Third Dynasty before the rectangular, monolithic hard stone coffin had been adopted for kings.

We have seen that the tendency of the time was towards the

---

2 The name is also omitted from the list of kings in this book (Ed.).
3 §1, 9, 25, pl. xix.
4 §1, 18, 368, 378.
use of larger stones. There is nothing to indicate the kind of masonry or the type of construction that was planned for the superstructure of the Zāwiyet el-Aryān tomb. Large blocks of granite had already been used for Djoser’s burial chamber, which was also of an unusual type, like a sarcophagus constructed from many pieces of stone. The similar chamber under the southern enclosure wall seems to have been intended for the vital organs which were removed from the body and buried separately. Later in the Old Kingdom these organs were wrapped in packages and stored in the four compartments of a canopic chest which was placed in the same chamber with the coffin. The alabaster chest of Queen Hetepheres, the mother of Cheops, contained such packages. They were much shrivelled, but still lay in a small quantity of the preservative liquid which had surprisingly survived, no doubt owing to the exclusion of air from the sealed rock niche of a chamber a hundred feet below the surface of the Giza plateau.¹

The great open excavation at Zāwiyet el-Aryān is extraordinarily impressive but baffling, like the chamber of Sekhemkhet with its empty alabaster coffin, the apparently unused galleries of Khabe, or the complex interior of the Bent Pyramid at Dahshūr. Nebkare’s pit had been partially filled with limestone blocks thrown in haphazardly above the granite pavement. This fact seems to indicate that a burial had been made and measures taken to protect it, but the oval sarcophagus, even though its lid was still in place, proved to be empty. If the site was visited later in connexion with the funerary cult it might possibly account for a schist plaque with the cartouche of the Fourth Dynasty king Redjedef which was found in what were taken to be workmen’s huts nearby.²

If we dissociate Nebka from the unfinished pyramid at Zāwiyet el-Aryān, which in the past has been attributed to him, and accept him as the first king of the Third Dynasty with the Horus-name Sanakhte, then the temple bearing his name which was served by his priest Akhetaa in the second half of the Dynasty must have been founded some fifty years earlier than the pyramid. Akhetaa built a tomb in the northern cemetery at Saqqara, the site of which has never been identified. The chapel was at least partially lined with stone. The door jambs and part of the offering niche have survived, as well as a seated statue of the owner.³ Like the chapels in the brick mastaba of Khabausokar and his wife Hathorneferhethopes, it seems to form a transitional step between the painted brick corridor of Djoser’s official Hesyre and the stone-

¹ §Ⅱ, 39, 21, pl. 44. ² §Ⅰ, 3 (1906), 259, 261. ³ §Ⅰ, 32, 518.
lined cruciform chapels of the end of the reign of Huni and the
time of Sneferu.\textsuperscript{1}

One monument contemporaneous with King Huni has sur-
vived. This is a peculiarly shaped conical piece of red granite
with an inscription on the rectangular end.\textsuperscript{2} It was found at
Elephantine and thought by Borchardt to have formed part of
the early fortification of that island on the old border between
Egypt and Nubia.\textsuperscript{3} The inscription records the founding of
a building, possibly this fortress, and twice gives a cartouche
with the king’s name, the reading of which has been much
discussed.\textsuperscript{4} The same writing of the name appears again in the
designation of a piece of property in the chapel which Metjen
built at Saqqara early in the Fourth Dynasty, as well as on the
Palermo Stone in an endowment established for Huni by Neferir-
kare in the Fifth Dynasty.\textsuperscript{5} Metjen’s administration of a property
of King Huni finds a parallel in his contemporary, Pehernefer,
who was in charge of an estate of Queen Meresankh. This lady
must be the queen whose name has been read by Černý on the
Cairo Fragment no. 1 of the Palermo Stone Annals.\textsuperscript{6} She appears
there as the mother of Sneferu and therefore probably the wife of
Huni, the last king of the Third Dynasty named in the Turin
Canon and the Saqqara List. The Middle Kingdom Papyrus
Prisse in the admonitions to an unknown vizier, Kagemni, ends
with the statement that Huni died and was succeeded by Sneferu.\textsuperscript{7}
Now that it is known that the South Stone (Bent) Pyramid at
Dahshūr was built by Sneferu, it seems likely that the Maidūm
Pyramid was largely the work of his predecessor. We shall have
to consider this question further in connexion with the problem of
Sneferu’s two pyramids at Dahshūr.

Chances of preservation have deprived us of the names of the
princes of the Third Dynasty. Nevertheless there are certain
indications that the process of centralization which resulted in
a court such as that of Cheops was not yet completed. The absolute
power of the king at Memphis in the Fourth Dynasty was
maintained by the distribution of high offices among the members
of the monarch’s immediate family and the concentration of the
highest administrative duties in the person of a vizier who was
closely related by blood ties to the king. However, the greatest

\textsuperscript{1} §vi, 24, 36.
\textsuperscript{2} Cairo 411556. Knowledge of this present location is due to Labib Habachi.
\textsuperscript{3} §i, 5, 41, n. 4. \textsuperscript{4} §i, 6, 12; 11, 18.
\textsuperscript{5} G, 41, 2, 248; §i, 6, 12. \textsuperscript{6} §11, 16, 118; 22, 63; 39, 6.
\textsuperscript{6} §vi, 6, 66; 8, 71.
man of the reign of Djoser, Imhotep, was neither the son of a king nor a vizier, although he is called 'King's Sealer', or Chancellor, which was one of the titles later associated with that of the vizier. He was also called 'Hereditary Prince' which, like the titles of 'Count' and 'Guardian of Nekhen' borne by Nedjemankh in the same reign, later came to be a kind of honorary epithet of the princes of the Fourth Dynasty. These titles, as well as others, are thought to be vestiges of a hereditary nobility which had existed in early times. The impression gained is that this old nobility still retained a more prominent place at court in the time of Djoser than it did in later times.

Although the position of the vizier assumed a new and vital importance at the beginning of the Fourth Dynasty we have evidently been mistaken in thinking that the office was first established in the reign of Sneferu. A man named Menka has the titles 'He-of-the-Curtain', 'Judge' and 'Vizier' on two fragments of stone vessels from the great store placed in the galleries under Djoser's Step Pyramid. This official would seem to have lived at least as early as the Second Dynasty.

It is obvious that much has yet to be learned about the administration of the country in the Third Dynasty. It does not seem to be entirely by chance, however, that the few people whom we know, such as Imhotep, Hesyre, Nedjemankh, Khabausokar, Akhetaa, and the ship-builder Bedjmes, were all active, practical men who laid particular emphasis upon their connexion with public works and the crafts. The Old Kingdom does not appear to have known a rigid caste-system based on birth. Innate ability and the favour of the king were the determining factors in a man's career. Perhaps the need for able men, for example for the great projects of the Third Dynasty, made advancement easier than in the Fourth Dynasty when the highest favours of the king were reserved for the members of his own family.

II. THE FOURTH DYNASTY

According to the Prisse Papyrus, Sneferu ascended to the throne after the death of Huni. The Turin Canon assigns a length of twenty-four years to his reign. A quarry mark on the casing of the North Stone Pyramid at Dahshūr is dated to the sixteenth

1 The better preserved inscription, of which I. E. S. Edwards supplied me with a copy, is unpublished. A second example published in *Ann. Serv.* 34 (1934), pl. 111 (repeated in G, 43, vol. 1, 947, fig. 623) was recognized by H. Goedicke.

2 §1, 33, *passim*; §vi, 24, 35–8.
occasion (of the count), while the Maidūm Pyramid had several marks of the seventeenth.\footnote{§II, 28, 89. For the Maidūm and Dahshūr Pyramids, see G, 43, vol. ii, 3.} It now seems fairly clear that there prevailed throughout the Old Kingdom a method of reckoning by a cattle-count taken every second year and that the figures in these dates refer to the occasion of this count.\footnote{G, ii, 11.} The annals mentioned in the preceding section show that the record of a biennial royal tour of inspection by river called a 'Following of Horus' (šmsw Hr) was kept in the First Dynasty, although omitted for at least twelve years in the reign of Anedjib. Towards the end of the Second Dynasty a biennial count was added. This was subject to some irregularity, since the first two counts were made in successive years in the reign attributed generally to Khasekhemwy. A more troublesome example of irregularity appears in the reign of Sneferu, when cattle are first mentioned as the subject of the census. The year after a count of cattle is mentioned fairly frequently in the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties, as well as twice in the reign of Shepseskaš towards the end of the Fourth Dynasty.\footnote{§II, 36, 278; G, 41, 160; §II, 43, 116, fig. 4.} Only statements of the year of the count have survived from the reigns of Sneferu, Cheops and Redjedef and it has been questioned whether we can depend upon a regular count having been taken every alternate year before the Fifth Dynasty, or indeed whether it was ever regularly maintained on a biennial basis.\footnote{G, 17, 53.} However, a year after the fourth count and one after the fifth are found on three limestone ostraca which were placed in two of three adjoining graves which had been added intrusively in the old First Dynasty cemetery at Helwān. No king’s name is mentioned, but another ostracon from what seemed to be the earliest grave in the group is dated to the first count of Chephren. A fourth grave, unrelated to the others, contained an ostracon with the fifth count of an unnamed king written in a very similar semi-cursive script.\footnote{§II, 43, 123, n. 11; cf. Zaki Saad, Suppl. Ann. Serv., Cahier 3 (1947), 105-7, pl. xlii, xliii.} This evidence suggests that a biennial count was kept in the reign of Chephren.

In fact the usual expression šst sp ‘occasion’ implies the existence of the ordinary cattle census in the Fourth Dynasty. In spite of some possible inconsistencies we shall certainly come nearer to the correct regnal year by doubling the figure stated than by taking it at its face value as has sometimes been done in the past. Since we cannot be certain that the first count was never
made in the accession year, one year will be subtracted from the number when mentioned in the following pages to allow for this possibility, always with the consciousness that we may be a few years in error. In the case of Sneferu the Annals indicate that no census was taken in the year after the sixth count, but the seventh and eighth came in successive years. This may mean that the biennial count was maintained until year 13 (year after sixth occasion) and that an annual count was then taken until the end of the reign. The seventeenth occasion would thus be the twenty-third year of the reign. This explanation agrees well with the twenty-four year reign given in the Turin Canon. A maximum date of year 32 would be reached if the count reverted to the biennial system after the eighth year. Similarly, the sixteenth occasion could be either the twenty-second or the thirtieth year, preferably the twenty-second. These two dates are the highest recovered for Sneferu, the seventeenth cattle count presumably recording the work done late in his reign in completing Huni’s pyramid at Maidûm. It may be supposed that a biennial count was made under Huni and that if the seventeenth occasion were to refer to his reign our estimate of its length would have to be doubled to thirty-four (or thirty-three) years. This does not agree with the Turin Canon which credits Huni, like Sneferu, with twenty-four years.

The name of Sneferu, in a cartouche, has been found inside the so-called Bent Pyramid (or South Stone Pyramid) at Dahshûr and with his Horus-name Nebmaat amongst the marks of builders or quarrymen on the stones of the exterior. The same Horus-name has also been discovered with a new date of the fifteenth occasion (of the count) on the masonry of the North Stone Pyramid at Dahshûr.¹ Sneferu’s name also appears on the walls of the valley temple of the Bent Pyramid and on the round-topped stelae set up in the chapel at the base of his pyramid and in front of the subsidiary pyramid. Another pair of round-topped stelae stood at the foot of the causeway by the valley temple.² No trace seems to exist now of the valley temple of the northern of the two pyramids, but some fifty years ago its ruins were said to be visible and in them was found a decree of Phisps I concerned with the two pyramids called ‘Kha Sneferu’.³ It has long been known that in the Fifth Dynasty a certain Ankhmâre prepared a tomb for his father Duare east of the Bent Pyramid. The father

¹ §II, 39, 1. By error §II, 43, 124 omits to mention that the king’s name was at the north-east corner, the date at the south-west corner of the pyramid.
² §II, 11, 515, 566, 573, pl. III.
³ §II, 3, 1; G, 41, 209.
was overseer of the two pyramids, but his son was only overseer of
the ‘Southern Pyramid’. By this description he would seem to
mean the Bent Pyramid, which is certainly in that geographical
relationship to the North Stone Pyramid at Dahshûr. Two
statues of Duare have now been found in Sneferu’s valley temple.\(^1\)
The pyramid is named again on a fine round-topped stela of the
time of Sneferu found in the entrance corridor of the valley
temple of the Bent Pyramid. Here the pyramid is called ‘Kha
Sneferu khenty’ instead of ‘Kha Sneferu resy’ as on the stela of
Ankhmare. It is tempting to see in ‘khenty’ a parallel word for
‘southern’, and also to interpret the triangular sign which deter-
minal the whole as an early hieroglyph for pyramid devised at a
time when the shape of the pyramid itself was in the process of
development.\(^2\)

The round-topped stela bearing the name ‘Kha Sneferu khenty’
imitates the form of the royal stelae at Dahshûr and the two
uninscribed stones long known in the courtyard of the small
temple at the base of the Maidûm Pyramid. It belonged to an
important person, Prince Netjeraperef who, in addition to being
priest of Sneferu’s pyramid, was also ‘Overseer of Inspectors’
in the Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Nomes of Upper Egypt, a title
also held by Metjen in this reign in connexion with the Sixth
and Seventeenth Nomes of Upper Egypt.\(^3\) The relief is cut in the
same heavy bold style as that of the figures personifying Sneferu’s
landed properties which line the walls of this corridor. Each group
is headed by the emblem of the province in which the property
was situated, the whole forming an important early list of the
Egyptian nomes which is unfortunately incomplete.\(^4\) The style
of these reliefs was already known from the private chapels of the
period but had not previously been found in a royal monument.
It is to be seen again in the fine portrait of Sneferu on the surviving
stela of the pair which originally stood in front of the subsidiary
pyramid. It prevails in the other representations of the king in
association with various gods which adorned the square columns
of the portico at the back of the court of the valley temple. Simi-
larly carved inscriptions framed the six niches sheltered by this
portico. The niches were intended for statues attached to the
back wall representing Sneferu. Parts of two of these statues
were recovered to complete our impression of this remarkable
monument.\(^5\)

\(^1\) \$ii, 26, 189; 11, 589, pl. xxiiA.
\(^2\) \$ii, 11, 591, pl. xxi.
\(^3\) G, 41, 2, 3; G, 4, 77, 78; G, 18, 81, 82; \$v, 3.
\(^4\) \$ii, 11, 577-583, pls. viii-x.
\(^5\) Ibid. 583-8, 610-23, pls. xi-xix.
It seems very unlikely that Sneferu could have built three pyramids, but that at Maidûm, nearly thirty miles south of Dahshûr, was undoubtedly thought to belong to him by later visitors who left graffiti on the walls of its temple. The stepped structure at Maidûm, which in its final stage was cased like a true pyramid, is earlier in type than either of the two Dahshûr pyramids. If Sneferu completed a pyramid which had nearly been finished by his predecessor Huni it might provide an explanation for the association of his name with Maidûm. The quarry marks *ht sp* 15 and 17, which were found on casing stones in the debris of the outer facing of the pyramid, may well belong to work which was carried out under Sneferu towards the end of his reign altering Huni’s building into the shape of a true pyramid. This shape had been achieved for the first time in the North Stone Pyramid at Dahshûr. The southern pyramid there appears to have been planned as a true pyramid, but the angle was changed when the structure had reached a considerable height. This change may have been intended to lessen the superincumbent weight when an ominous fault appeared in the corbelling of the upper chamber. Certainly the interior of the northern pyramid was designed on simpler lines with no attempt at imitating the breath-taking effect of the square corbel vault of the lower apartment in the Bent Pyramid. Both the nature of the provisions made for burial in these two structures and the question which pyramid served as the tomb of Sneferu remain in doubt.

It is now evident that it is the name of the mother and not the wife of Sneferu, Queen Meresankh, which occurs with that of her son in one of the Eighteenth Dynasty graffitis in the temple.\(^1\) A statue placed there long after the temple was built mentions the gods which are in Djed Sneferu.\(^2\) This is the place to which Prince Hordedef was sent to fetch the magician Djedi in the tale of the Westcar Papyrus. It was probably in the neighbourhood of Maidûm and could have contributed to the association of Sneferu’s name with that site. It may also be deduced that the princes buried at Maidûm belonged to the family of his predecessor since, as was long ago noted, Sneferu’s family and funerary priests were buried at Dahshûr.

Sneferu married a princess named Hetepheres who bore the title of ‘Daughter of the God’, and it is evident that she represented the direct inheritance of the line of the blood royal. Sneferu’s mother, Queen Meresankh, whose name has been found on Fragment no. 1 of the Cairo inscriptions related to the

\(^1\) §11, 33, 40.  
\(^2\) Ibid.
Palermo Stone, would appear to have been a minor queen of Huni, but one who was in a position of such favour that she could place her son on the throne. As Mother of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt she was certainly one of the great ladies of the time, as is attested by the number of women who continued to be named after her. If we accept the length of reigns given by the Turin Canon, it would appear that Sneferu’s marriage to Hetepheres did not occur at the time of his accession to the throne but earlier, during the reign of his predecessor. This inference is to be drawn from the fact that their son Cheops must have been a man beyond his early twenties when he succeeded to the throne in order to have two middle-aged sons at the end of his twenty-three year reign. Prince Khufukhaf appears in the chapel of a tomb finished in the last year of his father’s reign, both as a young man with his mother and again as a fat older man.1 The Crown Prince Kawab, who must have died at about the same time as his father, is pictured similarly as a portly man of middle age, in the tomb of his daughter Queen Mersankh III.2 If it be assumed that Sneferu was about eighteen years of age when his eldest son was born he could have married Hetepheres in the middle of the reign of Huni in order to establish his claim to the succession. Perhaps the occasion for this marriage was the death of the fully grown man whose body was found in the great mastaba no. 17 at Maidûm; obviously this mastaba was the first concern of the builders after the construction of the pyramid was well advanced.3 His name is lost—only the preliminary drawings could dimly be perceived when the chapel was first excavated4 but there is every indication that he could have been a crown prince.

Since both Huni and Sneferu appear to have occupied the throne for twenty-four years, Cheops would have been eighteen in the first decade of his father’s reign. At this time he seems to have taken as wives the ladies who later became his queens and were buried at Giza. Meritites bore to him his eldest son Kawab. It may be that her position as Crown Princess during a considerable part of the reign accounts for the unusual use of a queen’s title connected with Sneferu which appears on her Giza stela. Khufukhaf was the son of a minor wife, Henutsen. Both sons would have been at least forty when Cheops died at the end of his reign of twenty-three years. Cheops may have been about thirty-five at his accession and nearing sixty when he died.

1 §vi, 23, pls. 43, 44.  
2 §vi, 24, pl. 46.  
3 §ii, 34, 4, pl. xi.  
4 §ii, 27, 72.
Meritites, who survived him into the reign of Chephren, need not have been much more than sixty-five at her death.

The legitimate heir to the throne appears to have been the eldest son of the chief queen who was of the direct line of the blood royal. We know of several ‘eldest sons’ of a king who were evidently children of minor queens and these men seem to have been specially favoured for their loyalty to relatives who came to the throne. Sneferu’s son Kanefer became vizier, lived well into the reign of Cheops (if not longer) and was buried at Dahshûr by a son who seems to have been named after Cheops’ eldest son Kawab. The Vizier and Eldest Son of the King, Nefermaat, had a son, Hemiunu, who was a grown man of perhaps eighteen with important titles when his father completed the decoration of his own tomb at Maidûm. Hemiunu became vizier and was given the courtesy title of ‘Prince’. Like Kawab and Khufukhaf he is represented as a fat man of advanced years in a statue of exceptional realism which must have been made when his tomb at Giza was nearing completion in the year 19 (ḥst 5 p 10) of Cheops. If he were forty at the time, it is more likely that his father, Nefermaat, was a son of Huni rather than of Sneferu. Nefermaat was granted a funerary property with a name compounded with that of Sneferu but this need mean no more than that he received it from the king he was serving as vizier.

Nefermaat would appear to have been somewhat older than Kanefer and he probably preceded him in the office of vizier, which under Sneferu formed an important new force in the centralization of the government. Kanefer could then have followed Nefermaat in the office during the latter half of the reign of Sneferu, handing it on to Nefermaat’s son, Hemiunu, who served as vizier during the early part of the reign of Cheops. We know of another ‘Eldest Son of the King’, Ankhhaf, a vizier who probably served under Chephren but who seems to have been another child of a minor queen of Sneferu. He was the owner of the second largest mastaba at Giza and his features are portrayed in the remarkable red bust now in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. There are thus indications that Sneferu’s policy, which was followed by his successors, was not only to administer the country directly through the members of his immediate family, but to maintain the loyalty of able princes, whose birth might make them aspire to the throne, by rewarding them with the vizierate.

---

2 G, 19, vol. i, 148-161; §1, 32, 520. See Plate Vol.
3 §11, 39, 11; §vi, 24, 62, pl. 44A.
The Annals of Sneferu on the Palermo Stone and Cairo Fragment no. 4 record expeditions against the Nubians and Libyans with a resulting booty of prisoners and cattle. They also mention the building of great ships of cedar and some other coniferous wood, and the bringing of forty ship-loads of cedar, some of which was used for the doors of a palace.¹ Logs of this wood were built into the upper chamber of the Bent Pyramid at Dahshūr.² Sea trade with Byblos, the port on the Syrian coast from which this timber was obtained, had been established early. A fragment of a stone bowl with the name of Khasekhemwy, the last king of the Second Dynasty, was found there.³ It is not clear how far Sneferu’s raid went towards subduing Nubia, but his son Cheops made use of the diorite quarries which lie in the desert to the north-west of Abu Simbel. Cheops’ successor Redjedef left his name there, as did the Fifth Dynasty Kings Sahure and Isesi.⁴ It is from these quarries that the stone came for the well-known statues of the fourth king of the Fourth Dynasty, Chephren. The land south of Aswān must have been well controlled to enable such expeditions to be carried out across the waterless tract, a distance of some fifty miles from the river. In Wādī Maghāra on the Peninsula of Sinai, a rock-carving shows Sneferu striking down a local chieftain. Sanakhte, Djoser and Sekhemkhet in the Third Dynasty, as well as Sneferu’s successor Cheops, undertook similar raids⁵ to establish Egypt’s authority over the turquoise mines, but it does not seem to have been necessary to repeat this show of force until the time of Sahure in the Fifth Dynasty.

There was no regular army or navy in the Old Kingdom. Men were levied and vessels commandeered as the need arose. A title which may be rendered approximately by ‘General’ or ‘Commander’ was borne by men who undertook other duties which we should term civilian. The war-like raids in the Old Kingdom were partly to protect the frontiers but were more often connected with mining operations or with exploration in connexion with foreign trade. The personnel involved was that trained in quarrying and construction operations and in the transport of stone which had developed skilled boat-crews and well-organized labour gangs. The leaders of these operations were ‘charged with the king’s commissions’ and dealt with foreigners as ‘interpreters’. The highest title in this category seems to have been the ‘Chancellor of the God’,⁶ that is of the king. All these enterprises were

¹ G, 4, 66; 39, 30; 41, 236-7. ² §11, 511. ³ G, 7, vol. 1, 26. ⁴ §iv, 17, 9; §iv, 9, 65; 18, 369. ⁵ G, 12, pls. i-iv. ⁶ G, 18, 92 ff.; 21, 120.
probably grouped under the 'Overseer of all the King's Works', an important title held usually by the vizier himself together with his other administrative and judicial functions.

The Westcar Papyrus recounts an attractive story in which Sneferu plays a part.\(^1\) The bored king is pictured as wandering through the palace until the magician Djadjaemankh suggests that he should seek diversion in a boat on the lake in the gardens. One of the beautiful girls, who have been dressed in nets to row the boat, loses her hair-ornament and, before the boat can continue, the magician is required to turn back the waters to reveal the ornament, a malachite fish-pendant lying on a potsherd at the bottom of the lake.

We can imagine this palace of Sneferu fitted out with furniture like the gold-cased pieces bearing his name which were placed in the tomb of his wife Hetepheres.\(^2\) Cheops completed the burial equipment of his mother, who outlived her husband, and buried her in a tomb which was probably at Dahshûr. About the fifteenth year of his reign, Cheops learned that thieves had entered the tomb of Hetepheres. He ordered the burial to be transferred to a new secret tomb at Giza, without apparently realizing that his mother's body had been removed from the alabaster sarcophagus and destroyed. The coffin, which had been chipped by the thieves in prizing off the lid but was otherwise unharmed, was let down a hundred-foot shaft east of the Great Pyramid. With it were placed the queen's carrying-chair, her gold-cased bed and canopy, an arm-chair, gold toilet implements, pottery, linen and other objects. Only the silver bracelets, inlaid with butterflies in gaily coloured stones, survived from her plundered jewellery, and of her mortal remains nothing but the contents of the alabaster canopic chest, which was carefully sealed up in a niche in the wall. The costly materials and refinement of design of these beautiful objects give us a startling glimpse of the wealth and good taste of the time. There is the same sense of form and clean line which is embodied in the reliefs, the portrait sculpture and the funerary architecture of the period.

The literature of the Middle Kingdom sheds a most favourable light on Sneferu and the good old days of his reign. Again, the Westcar Papyrus, as Posener has pointed out,\(^3\) displays deft touches by which the genial character of Sneferu is contrasted with the autocratic nature of Cheops. Whether this bears any relation to actual fact or not, it represents a tradition voiced by Herodotus in the fifth century B.C., who records that the Egyptians

\(^1\) §vi, 6, 38. \(^2\) §11, 39, passim. \(^3\) §vi, 17, 10–13, 29–36.
detested Cheops and Chephren in his time. No doubt the contemporaries of Herodotus were influenced in their ideas by the magnitude of the task of building the Giza Pyramids. However, there may have survived some recollection of the lamentations of the time after the collapse of the Old Kingdom when men bewailed the uselessness of great tombs which could not protect the bodies of the kings buried in them.

The Horus Medjedu, Khufu, is generally known by the Greek name used by Manetho, Cheops, as also are his successors Chephren (Khafre) and Mycerinus (Menkaure). Several inscriptions refer to him only by his golden Horus-name which is written with two Horus falcons above a gold collar. This famous builder of the Great Pyramid at Giza had absolute control over a unified country with a perfected administration which made full use of the productivity of the land. Egypt's wealth has always been mainly agricultural. The condition of crops, flocks and herds depended upon irrigation which required wise planning and vigilant control to produce the best results. Even then, the traditional seven years' famine of the time of Djoser,\(^1\) and the starving men and women depicted at the end of the Fifth Dynasty in the reliefs of King Unas,\(^2\) indicate what could happen as a result of a series of bad Niles. Egypt suffered no outside interference which could not have been easily dealt with by an occasional military raid to keep order among the nomad tribes along the border. As in the case of Cheops' predecessors we have no clear picture of how he employed his power and wealth in public works throughout the country. A ruined dam near Cairo\(^3\) and a temple on the edge of the Faiyum\(^4\) are in fact the only constructions of a non-funerary character which can be attributed with any probability to the Fourth Dynasty. However, Cheops' enterprises in the valley are reflected in the way in which the resources of the country were brought to bear upon his grandiose plan for a city of the dead for his family and court around the Great Pyramid. West of the pyramid are three early family cemeteries laid out in regular rows of tombs, at least some of which seem to have been constructed for the older members of the Cheops family. East of the pyramid were prepared the burial places of the king's favourite children, in close proximity to their respective mothers who occupied the three small queens' pyramids.\(^5\)

\(^1\) §I, 31, 11.  
\(^2\) §III, 12, 45; 30, 29; §VI, 24, 75, pl. 48 B.  
\(^3\) §II, 31, 33.  
\(^4\) §II, 13, 31; 29, 1.  
The titles of the men and women buried in this necropolis shed some light on the administration of the country, the temple services and the etiquette of the court. The biography of Metjen and the very full titles of Pehernefer at Saqqara\(^1\) provide a picture of the administration of town and farm lands in the time of Sneferu, particularly in the Delta where many of the vast properties of the crown lay. At Giza not only can we see how the high administrative offices were centred in the hands of the vizier supported by other princes close to the king's person, but we can also form an idea of the duties of the less exalted officials, like a certain Nefer who served the treasury which provided storehouses for arms, grain, cloth and like products of the country.\(^2\) These men held some ancient titles which had by then acquired an honorary significance and they performed personal service to the king, undertaking various household duties in the palace. Chief among the religious titles connected with the various gods were the High Priesthoods of Re at Heliopolis and of Ptah of Memphis. The control of funerary endowments, with the lands attached to them, looms up large in contrast with other administrative duties of a purely secular nature. The care of the great cemeteries around the pyramids presented judicial, supply and related problems similar to the government of the towns in the cultivated land.

The chief queen of Cheops appears to have been the Meritites whose name was found on a fragment of relief in the chapel of the Crown Prince Kawab. She should have been buried in the northernmost, and first constructed, of the three queens' pyramids, but no name was recovered from the destroyed chapel. The mastaba east of this pyramid belonged to Kawab; it was the earliest of the tombs of the children of Cheops to be built in the Eastern Cemetery. Unfortunately we do not know where at Giza Mariette found the now-vanished stela of a Queen Meritites who had the title \textit{wrt his} in connexion with both Sneferu and Cheops and was honoured before Chephren. There are indications, however, that the stela may have come from the mastaba of Kawab and his wife Hetepheres II, both of whom were probably children of Meritites. It seems that Meritites was the chief queen of Cheops, whatever relationship she may have borne to the other two kings.\(^3\) She was evidently not the mother of Chephren since she did not have the title of 'Mother of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt', although Chephren is named on the Mariette stela, and she must have lived into his reign.

\(^1\) G, 4, 76; 41, 1; §II, 22, 63. \(^2\) §II, 38, 422. \(^3\) §II, 39, 6.
popularity of the names Meresankh, Hetepheres and Meritites among the ladies of the Fourth Dynasty is most easily explained by supposing that they were borne by three great queens, the wives respectively of Huni, Sneferu and Cheops.

Reisner concluded that the middle queen's pyramid at Giza belonged to the mother of a secondary branch of the family headed by King Redjedef. The queen's name is not preserved although her titles have survived on fragments of the reliefs in her chapel. We must give up the idea that she was of Libyan origin, an attractive theory which was based on the supposed blond hair of Hetepheres II, who was then thought to be her daughter. It is now evident that the yellow wig is part of a costume worn by other great ladies and it is probable that Hetepheres II, like her husband Kawab, was a child of the chief queen Meritites.¹

The southernmost pyramid, like the other two, is not identified by a contemporary inscription. However, its chapel was enlarged in the Twenty-First Dynasty into a temple of Isis, Mistress of the Pyramid, somehow associated with its original owner, Queen Henutsen.² This lady was thought by that time to be a daughter of Cheops but was most probably his third queen and the mother of Prince Khufukhaf, in whose chapel nearby a queen is represented.³ It is conceivable that Chephren was her son and a younger brother of Khufukhaf. Still a third son may have been Prince Minkhaf who seems to have served Chephren as vizier after Ankhaf and before Nefermaat.⁴ The last named vizier was the son of a lady named Nefertkau who was probably buried in a mastaba south of the third queen’s pyramid adjoining the tombs of Nefermaat and her grandson Sneferukhaf who refer to her as the eldest daughter of Sneferu. Her mother was probably a minor queen and it is unlikely that she was herself a wife of Cheops.

In the tomb east of that of Prince Kawab was buried Prince Hordedef, the wise man of later tradition who has already been mentioned in connexion with Imhotep and Djoser. He was supposed to have discovered in the temple of Thoth at Hermopolis certain spells of the Book of the Dead written in letters of lapis lazuli. A fragment of his precepts has survived. It is characteristic that, in the practical way of the Old Kingdom, he should have advised his son to build well for the future and to provide his house in the cemetery, whereas later scribes, in praising Hordedef

¹ Ibid. 4, 7, figs. 4, 9. See Plate Vol. 4, 7, figs. 4, 9. See Plate Vol.
² §ii, 6, 7; G, 4, 83.
³ §vi, 23, pl. 44 b.
⁴ §i, 39, 7, 8, 11; cf. Reisner, Z.A. 64 (1929), 97.
and Imhotep, say that writing endures and that a book is more useful than strong buildings, a funerary chapel or a monument.\footnote{§vi, 3, 8.} In the Westcar Papyrus, Hordedef appears as the sponsor for the magician Djedi. After Djedi had exhibited his magical tricks and prophesied to Cheops that there would be no change of dynasty until his son and his son’s son had succeeded him upon the throne, the king commanded that the magician be taken to the household of Hordedef.\footnote{§vi, 6, 40.}

It is to be noted that this prophecy of the Westcar Papyrus takes into account only the main line of kings: Cheops, Chephren and Mycerinus. It disregards Redjedef, Shepseskaf and two unknown names in the breaks of the list in the Turin Canon. Manetho seems to supply names to fill these gaps: Bicheris and Thamphthis. However, a rock inscription in the Wādi Hammāmāt, plausibly assigned to a Middle Kingdom date, now adds to our perplexity. In a row of cartouches appear the names of Cheops, Redjedef, Chephren, Hordedef and Baufre.\footnote{§ii, 8, 41.} The last is certainly the Baufre, a son of Cheops and brother of Hordedef, mentioned in the Westcar Papyrus. It has seemed reasonable to assign to him the mastaba (7320) of a prince whose name is lost which adjoins that of Hordedef on the east at Giza. Neither of these men is known as a king and such a royal status for Hordedef seems impossible. He is mentioned twice at Giza towards the end of the Old Kingdom without the titles of a king, although a cult was established for him as in the case of the Vizier Kagemni at Saqqara. A man in the Western Cemetery calls himself ‘Honoured before Hordedef’ and another who built his small tomb in the street beside the wise man’s mastaba is represented on his stela with his hands raised in prayer and with the phrase above: ‘Adoring Hordedef’.\footnote{§ii, 14, 35; G, 19, vol. iii, 26; §ii, 39, 8.}

The inscriptions of Cheops’ grand-daughter, Queen Meresankh III,\footnote{§ii, 37, 64.} suggest that dissension split the royal family when the builder of the Great Pyramid died. Work ceased on the mastabas of several of the princes at Giza and someone maliciously erased the decorations of Hordedef’s chapel, although his name and titles can still be read with difficulty. Meresankh’s father, the Crown Prince Kawab, died and her mother, Hetepheres II, became the wife of Redjedef who ascended the throne. Redjedef has long been viewed as a usurper. It would indeed seem that Hordedef, or one of the other princes in the northern line of great
twin-mastabas, had, as probable sons of the chief queen Meritites, a better right to succeed to the throne. However, the evidence is so scanty that we can only speculate as to the course of events at the end of the reign of Cheops. We do know now that Redjedef must have carried out the funeral ceremonies of Cheops as would have been expected of a son and successor. His name appears on one of the roofing blocks of the rock-cut excavation for the wooden funerary barque recently discovered south of the Great Pyramid. The date of the eleventh occasion (year 21) on one of these great stones would presumably mean that it had either been quarried or prepared for its place a year or two before the death of Cheops since the year would be improbably high for Redjedef.

The Turin Canon records a reign of eight years for Redjedef whose Horus-name was Kheper. He turned to Abu Rawash, a few miles north of Giza, and there began to build a pyramid on a high promontory of the desert edge. Little is left of this construction except a huge excavation for the burial apartments within an outcrop of stone left by the quarrymen as a beginning of the superstructure. There are indications that the pyramid was to have been encased with granite. Traces of a brick temple were found on the east face and a fragment of a granite column inscribed with the king's name. Other granite columns seem to have been carried off and used in the Coptic convent of Nahinya to the north of Abu Rawash. It would appear from the description that these round granite shafts imply that something like the palm columns used in the temples of the Fifth Dynasty was anticipated at Abu Rawash. An excavation for a sun-boat was made south of the temple and the establishment of a royal funerary cult is indicated by the smashed fragments of royal statues found scattered everywhere in this area. The name of the chief queen of Redjedef, Khentetenka, was recovered from these fragments.

Parts of the statues of three princes and two princesses were found in one of the mud-brick rooms. From the fact that the three princes are all called 'eldest son of the King' it would appear that Redjedef had other wives besides Khentetenka and Hetepheres II. One prince was named Baka and it has been suggested that he might have become the Bakare whose brief reign has been tentatively inserted between Chephren and Mycerinus, but this name is known only in the form of Bicheris as given by Manetho. The princess Neferhetepes has been plausibly identified with a queen mentioned early in the Fifth Dynasty and the suggestion made that she became the mother of King Userkaf.  

1 §11, 5, 53–7; G, 43, vol. ii, 86.  
2 §11, 15, 53, 64.
The condition of the pyramid at Abu Rawāsh and the wanton damage inflicted upon Redjedef’s statues would accord with the conclusion that the reign was short and came to an abrupt end. The opposing party, which was supported by the two surviving princes Ankhaf and Minkaf, as well as Nefermaat, the son of Sneferu’s daughter, the princess Nefertkau, brought Chephren to the throne. Other members of the family of Cheops outlived the reign of Redjedef. Queen Meritites, the chief queen of Cheops, may have been in disgrace. She omits the name of Redjedef from her stela. Hetepheres II, now the widow of both the Crown Prince Kawab and King Redjedef, made her peace with Chephren, to whom she married her daughter Meresankh III. The direct descent of the blood royal would have come down to Meresankh through her grandmother Meritites and her mother Hetepheres II whom Redjedef probably married for this reason. Perhaps no son was born of this union and the sons of Khentetenka or other wives of Redjedef seem to have fared badly if they survived his reign. Hetepheres II lived on into the last reign of the dynasty.

The Horus Userib, Khafre (Chephren), constructed a funerary monument only a little smaller than the pyramid of Cheops.¹ The mortuary temple at its eastern base was connected by a covered causeway with a valley temple at the edge of the cultivation. The granite hall of the valley temple with its great simple square columns is wonderfully impressive, as is the severe granite façade marked by deep entrance embrasures flanked by inscriptions. The diorite statues from this temple and those from the Third Pyramid at Giza built by his successor Mycerinus form the basis of our knowledge of the royal sculpture of the Old Kingdom. The most spectacular achievement of Chephren’s craftsmen was, however, the Great Sphinx which is carved from an outcrop of rock beside the causeway leading up to the pyramid temple.

The length of Chephren’s reign cannot be exactly determined, but it appears to have been about twenty-five years. Two mastabas, which seem certainly to be of this reign in the cemetery east of the Cheops Pyramid, give the years 25 (ḥ3t 4 13), 23 (ḥ3t 4 12) and 13 (ḥ3t 4 7).² It is not certain whether his son Nekaure made his will, which is dated year 23 (ḥ3t 4 12), in the reign of his father or his brother Mycerinus.³

Chephren made no attempt to lay out such a family cemetery as that of Cheops. His queens and their children were buried in rock-cut tombs in the sloping ground to the east of his pyramid.

to the south of its causeway. Some members of the court utilized
the unfinished cores of mastabas in the Western Cemetery of
Cheops, and others, like Hetepheres II and a certain Akhethotep,
constructed new tombs in the Eastern Cemetery which continued
the lines of tombs laid out in the reign of Cheops. Meresankh III
was buried early in the reign of Shepseskaf in a beautifully
sculptured and painted rock-cut tomb which her mother,
Hetepheres II, had prepared under her own unused mastaba.1
Chephren’s chief queen, Khamerernebty I, excavated a large
tomb for herself in the quarry east of her husband’s pyramid.
Inscriptions in this tomb mention her daughter, Khamerernebty II,
who became the chief wife of Mycerinus.2 Two other queens of
Chephren, Hedjhekenu and Per(senti?) are represented in the
rock-cut tombs of their sons Prince Sekhemkare and Prince
Nekaure. Near them were buried Nebemakhet, the son of
Meresankh III, Chephren’s daughter Queen Rekhetre, a Princess
Hemetre and a number of other princes.3

The present arrangement of the fragments of the Turin Canon
allows space for two kings of the Fourth Dynasty whose names
do not appear upon the monuments. They may have been
Manetho’s kings Bicheris and Thamphthis, who, Reisner
suggested, might represent otherwise unrecorded Egyptian royal
names: Bakare and Dedefphtah. If it is accepted that by Ratoisis
Manetho meant Redjedef and that Sebekheres stands for
Shepseskaf, this suggestion would give an agreement between
Manetho and the Turin Canon for eight kings of the Fourth
Dynasty. The Saqqara List appears to have had nine kings. The
Turin, Saqqara and Abydos Lists accept Redjedef as a king of the
main family line but the Abydos table omits the other two
kings named by Manetho while Saqqara evidently placed them
with another nameless king at the end of the list. The Turin
Canon apparently lists Bicheris as no. 5 and Thamphthis as no. 8,
as Reisner observed when he placed Bakare after Chephren
because he was unwilling to believe that Shepseskaf could have
ruled eighteen years, which he would prefer to assign to My-
cerinus.4 It now appears that twenty-eight is a more probable
figure in the Turin Canon for Mycerinus. It can be reconciled
with the lives of various people which overlap several reigns in
the Fourth Dynasty and early Fifth Dynasty. It would however

1 See Plate Vol.
2 §§ii, 7, 41; 36, 247 ff. 38, 152, 236; §§vi, 23, 41.
4 §§i, 36, 246.
be necessary to extend the life span of Meresankh III to sixty-one years, beyond the fifty to fifty-five years that Douglas Derry suggested after examining her skeleton.

If we accept the interpolation of a king, represented by Manetho’s Bicheris, between Chephren and Mycerinus, we need not allow much intervening time for this reign, perhaps only a few months. No evidence from the monuments suggests a break in the line of the dynasty: Mycerinus appears to succeed Chephren. Chephren’s eldest daughter, Khamerernebty II, became the chief queen of Mycerinus and is represented with him in the beautiful Boston slate pair-statue from his valley temple.¹ She is also shown in the tomb of their son Prince Khunere, who stands beside her, pictured as a small, naked boy holding a bird. Khunere also appears as a grown man on an adjoining wall, and in a yellow limestone statuette in Boston which shows him as a seated scribe.² He seems however to have died before the end of his father’s reign, since, as the eldest son of the chief queen, he ought otherwise to have succeeded to the throne.

Chephren’s son, Sekhemkare, records that he was honoured by Chephren, Mycerinus, Shepseskaf, Userkaf and Sahure, omitting the possible usurpers Bicheris and Thamphthis.³ Meresankh III continued at court into the reign of Shepseskaf. An official named Netjerpunesut remained in favour under Redjedef, Chephren, Mycerinus, Shepseskaf, Userkaf and Sahure.⁴ Another official named Ptahshepses, who lived into the reign of Nyuserre and became High Priest of Ptah, was brought up in the households of Mycerinus and Shepseskaf and married Maatkha, the eldest daughter of the latter king.⁵ Nothing in his biographical inscription suggests a period of protracted strife resulting from the usurpation of Thamphthis or that the land was disturbed by the change of dynasty which must have occurred between the end of the reign of Shepseskaf and the accession of Userkaf. Nor is there any indication of the part that Queen Khentkaues played in this change of dynasty, although she seems to have formed the connexion between the royal house of the Fourth Dynasty and the succeeding dynasty.

Mycerinus (Menkaure, with the Horus-name Kaykhet) built a pyramid which was much smaller than the two great monuments of his predecessors,⁶ but he had begun to case it in costly granite

¹ §vi, 24, pl. 44b. ² §vi, 23, pl. 10c, 30c, fig. 253 (cf. Bull.M.F.A. 32 (1934), 11, fig. 10).
from Aswān. The work of casing the walls of the mortuary temple with hard stone was not finished when the king died. His successor, Shepseskaf, who was probably his son although he does not appear to have been a child of the chief queen Kha- merernebty II, added finishing details in mud-brick and constructed a valley temple completely in this material. In the year after the first cattle count, that is the second or third year of his reign, Shepseskaf set up a decree in the portico of the pyramid temple dedicating the building as a monument which he had made for Mycerinus.\(^1\)

King Shepseskaf had the Horus-name Shepsesykhet. The Turin Canon allows him four years. In this time he would have had to complete his father’s funerary temples and construct for himself the so-called Mastabat Fara‘ūn, half-way between Saqqara and Dahshūr.\(^2\) The form of this tomb differs from the pyramids of the other kings of the Fourth Dynasty. It was a rectangular mastaba construction with a rounded top and vertical end-pieces which gave it the form of the usual stone sarcophagus. Inside, the burial apartments were lined with granite. The heavy masonry and sound workmanship betoken work in the best Fourth Dynasty traditions. Nearly all the masonry of the temple has been plundered. The niched outer court and vaulted causeway were hastily finished in brick, probably after the death of the king. The monument was identified by a statue fragment bearing a broken cartouche. A stela dating from later in the Old Kingdom, which was found in the neighbourhood, indicated that a funerary cult of Shepseskaf existed there. Very few people are known who were connected with this funerary cult but an occasional private name is compounded with that of Shepseskaf.

One important person who undertook the funerary service of Shepseskaf was the Queen Bunefer buried in a rock-cut tomb at Giza beside the much discussed monument of Queen Khenkauæs, which lies to the north of the causeway of Mycerinus, not far from his valley temple. Although it is more usual for a princess to serve the funerary cult of her father than it is for a queen to assume similar responsibilities towards her dead husband, the inscriptions in Bunefer’s tomb seem to imply that she was the wife of Shepseskaf.\(^3\) There is no better indication that the family of the Fourth Dynasty had come to the end of its power than that the son of Bunefer, an unimportant judge, did not bear the title of ‘Prince’.

\(^1\) §II, 36, 278.  
\(^2\) G, 43, vol. ii; 89; §VI, 2, 142.  
\(^3\) G, 16, vol. iii (1931–2), 176.
The evidence for the relationships of the various royal personages at the end of the dynasty and at the beginning of the Fifth Dynasty is obscure, but it is possible that Userkaf, the first king of the Fifth Dynasty, was the son of Neferhetepes, the daughter of King Redjedef whose statue was found in his temple at Abu Rawash.\textsuperscript{1} She would then be the same person as Queen Neferhetepes mentioned in the tomb of a certain Persen who was buried a short distance to the south of the Pyramid of Userkaf at Saqqara. It was confirmed in the time of Userkaf’s successor, Sahure, that certain offerings endowed by Neferhetepes in the temple of Ptah at Memphis should be brought to supply the funerary needs of Persen. It has been argued that these offerings would probably be brought first to the tomb of the queen herself and then transferred for the needs of a secondary beneficiary to a tomb which should lie nearby. The suggestion, then, seems plausible that Neferhetepes was the mother of Userkaf and buried in the small pyramid south of that king’s tomb. The identification with the daughter of Redjedef is strengthened by the fact that Persen possessed an estate of Redjedef which he might well have received from the queen.

Userkaf, then, can have been a descendant of the secondary branch of the Cheops family. It seems possible that, in founding a new dynasty, he strengthened his position by marrying Khentkaues who was descended from the main branch of the old family and was probably a daughter of Mycerinus. Ever since the so-called ‘Unfinished Pyramid’ at Giza was identified as the tomb of this lady it has been evident that she formed a connecting link between the Fourth and Fifth Dynasties. The building is now recognized to be not a pyramid but a sarcophagus-shaped construction, something like that of Shepseskaf, set upon a base of natural rock which was smoothed down and faced with limestone. The queen’s chief title was interpreted to mean that she was called ‘King of Upper and Lower Egypt’ as well as ‘Mother of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt’. However, the other proposed reading: ‘Mother of two Kings of Upper and Lower Egypt’ would appear the more probable one.\textsuperscript{2} In addition, her other titles resemble those borne by Queen Nymaathap and Hetepheres I, indicating that she, like those other two great ladies, played an important role in the change of dynasty.

The name of Queen Khentkaues was found at Abusir in connexion with the pyramid of Neferirkare. That she was his mother is indicated by a fragment of one of the Abusir Papyri which

\textsuperscript{1} §II, 15, 53, 64.  \textsuperscript{2} G, 16, vol. iv (1932–3), 1; §II, 4, 209; 23, 139.
contain accounts of the temple evidently prepared later in the Fifth Dynasty.\(^1\) It has however been suspected rightly that there were two queens named Khentkaues connected with Neferirkare. An unpublished block at Saqqara, which seems to have been brought anciently from his Abusir funerary temple, confirms this deduction. It shows the titles of a queen ‘Beholder of Horus [and Seth], \textit{wrt hs}, Great of favour, King’s Wife’. These were evidently over a figure of the lady who, like the ‘eldest [king’s son] Renefer’ standing above her, followed the partly preserved figure of King Neferirkare. The wife of the king, then, had the same name as his mother. The two followers of Userkaf appear to have been brothers both from the manner in which Neferirkare is shown in Sahure’s temple reliefs and from the fact that Sahure’s chief queen was named Neferethanebty and therefore could not have been the mother of Neferirkare.\(^2\)

It would seem that the elder Khentkaues was the wife of Userkaf and the mother of the two kings Sahure and Neferirkare. Her funerary monument could have been completed at Giza in the reign of Neferirkare (although it might have been commenced much earlier), at a time when the inscriptions would name her as the mother of two kings. No explanation of the position of Khentkaues can be made to fit exactly with the tale in the Westcar Papyrus, which makes the wife of a simple priest of Re the mother of the first three kings of the Fifth Dynasty: Userkaf, Sahure and Neferirkare.\(^3\) Nevertheless the story evidently reflects elements of the true facts. The tomb of Khentkaues at Giza may have stimulated the growth of another legend which made a beautiful woman, Nitocris according to Manetho and Rhodopis in the version of Herodotus, the builder of the Third Pyramid. The tradition, imperfectly handed down, of a queen’s tomb of unusual form could easily have been associated in Greek times with one of the three famous pyramids at Giza.

\textbf{III. THE FIFTH DYNASTY}

The Westcar Papyrus legend, which makes the first three kings of the Fifth Dynasty the offspring of the god Re, evidently clothes in the magical embellishments of a folk story the actual fact of the predominance of a state cult of the Heliopolitan sun god in the Fifth Dynasty. Chephren in the preceding dynasty had already adopted the title ‘Son of Re’ but the epithet becomes a regular

\(^1\) \S\text{II, 16, 116; III, 10, 43.} \\
\(^2\) \S\text{III, 8, vol. II, 90, pl. 17, 116, pl. 48.} \\
\(^3\) \S\text{VI, 6, 43–5.}
part of the titulary of kings only in the Fifth Dynasty. The records of temple building and endowments on the Palermo Stone show a special preference for the cults of Re and Hathor. Above all, Userkaf introduced a special sun-temple in the western necropolis with a masonry obelisk on a platform, evidently in imitation of the Benben stone which was the central element of the structure of the temple of Re at Heliopolis. Although the names of such sun-temples are known for at least six kings of the Fifth Dynasty, only two have actually been discovered. That of Userkaf was identified by a preliminary survey which has been followed recently by more thorough investigation. The sun temple of Nyuserre was completely excavated.¹

Userkaf had the Horus-name Irmaat. His pyramid lies close to the north-east corner of the Step Pyramid at Saqqara. On the east side of the pyramid stood only a small chapel for the food offerings supplied to the dead king, while to the south of the pyramid was a large building which seems to correspond with the portion of the funerary temple which ordinarily lay outside the enclosure wall and which contained the king’s statues and served for the worship of the deified king. The plan is closer to that of Cheops and Mycerinus than it is to the Pyramid Temple of Chephren.² The court was surrounded by square granite columns, which also stood in the portico of the central sanctuary on the south, now walled off from the court and separated from the pyramid. Reliefs covered the walls of the court behind the colonnade. Like the magnificent head of a colossal statue found in the temple and a smaller head wearing the red crown recovered from the sun temple,³ they belong to the finest tradition of Fourth Dynasty sculpture.

Little is known about Userkaf’s reign, which lasted for seven years according to the Turin Canon. One of the rare signs of royal activity in the Theban district in the Old Kingdom is evinced by a square granite column bearing his name which was laid in the floor of the later temple at Tōd, a short distance south of Luxor.⁴ A marble cup inscribed with the name of the sun temple of Userkaf was found on the island of Cythera off the tip of the Peloponnesus.⁵ How this small object could have travelled so far poses a problem. Vercoutter has shown that it is unlikely that the Aegean or its inhabitants were meant by the term ‘Haunebut’ in the Pyramid Texts or in inscriptions of the time.

---

¹ §iii, 20, 104; 8, vol. 1, 149; 2; 3; 4, passim; G, 43, vol. ii, 582.
³ §vi, 14, 87, pl. vii.
⁴ §iii, 5, 61.
⁵ §iii, 13, 349; 27, 55.
of Cheops and Sahure. He also questions contacts with Crete which have been claimed for the Old Kingdom.\(^1\) On the other hand, the expansion of royal trade by land and sea which we begin to see more clearly in the Fifth Dynasty would suggest that the period from Sneferu to Phiops II would have been a more propitious time for Egypt to become aware of the Aegean world than the impoverished days of political discontent in the First Intermediate Period which Vercoutter suggests. We should, at any rate, take into account this small piece of evidence from the reign of Userkaf in considering the growing number of instances of Egypt’s contacts abroad. Userkaf’s name has not been found at the Syrian port of Byblos. It is probably due purely to accidents of survival that after Khashekhemwy no king’s name is certainly attested until Mycerinus from the inscriptions on broken stone vessels. However, the name of Chephren is found on a cylinder seal. Khufu (Cheops) was not usually written like his Horus-name, Medjedu, in a frame, and for this reason a fragment with the name so written must be regarded as doubtful. Similarly, the fact that Kakai was not the Horus-name of Neferirkare makes the identification of his name within a frame in a partly preserved inscription highly problematical. It is not until the reigns of Nyuserre and Isesi that we can be certain of the occurrence of royal names which continue with Unas, Teti, Phiops I and Phiops II, omitting Merenre. Since Cheops had the same Golden Horus-name as Sahure we are again doubtful of the ownership of an axe-blade found at the mouth of the river Adonis.\(^2\)

A Nykaankh, who appears as a court official on one of the unpublished reliefs of the temple of Userkaf, may be the same person as Nykaankh whose tomb is known at Tihna in Middle Egypt, near the modern town of El-Minya. Whether or not this identification is correct, the Tihna inscription shows that Userkaf continued to favour those who had served faithfully under the preceding dynasty. He confirmed for the family of Nykaankh both a service in the priesthood of Hathor of Tihna and the related endowment which had been granted to a certain Khenuka by Mycerinus.\(^3\) Khenuka appears to have been the father of Nykaankh. His own rock-cut tomb, which bears a

\(^1\) G, 45; 46; _passim_. See, however, the titulary of Sahure on gold sheet panels reported from Dorak near the Sea of Marmora (_Illus. Ldn News_, 28 November 1959, p. 754).


\(^3\) §iii, 16, 67; G, 41, 24; G, 4, 99.
striking resemblance to the tombs of Chephren’s family at Giza, is larger and better decorated than any of the other tombs at Tihna. This family’s fortunes appear to have dwindled as the Fifth Dynasty advanced; the cemetery at Zawiya el-Maiyit contains the tombs of the later notables of the Sixteenth Nome. However, at Tihna, as well as at Sheikh Sa‘id and El-Hammämiya, we begin to see the growing importance of the provincial families which was to increase greatly in the Sixth Dynasty.

Sahure succeeded Userkaf on the throne and is stated by the Turin Canon to have reigned twelve years. However, since the Palermo Stone gives a year after his seventh cattle-count it would appear that he reigned at least fourteen years. His Horus-name was Nebkha.

Sahure began the royal cemetery at Abusir, a short distance to the north of Saqqara, where his successors Neferirkare, Neferefre and Nyuserre followed him in building their pyramids. Although the pyramids from this reign onwards did not embody the same solid construction with heavy materials as had been employed, to some extent, even to the time of Userkaf, the temple had reached a developed form which was to be continued with little variation until the end of the Old Kingdom. The inner temple, with its offering chamber and false-door at the base of the pyramid, served for the cult of the food-offerings for the dead king. It, together with a small ritual pyramid, lay within the enclosure wall of the pyramid, while the great court and outer corridors of the temple formed the more public portion of the complex. A covered causeway connected the mortuary temple with a small valley temple which formed an entrance portico and was provided with a landing stage. The great court was surrounded with a row of granite columns with palm (Sahure) or papyrus-bud (Nyuserre) capitals. Although badly smashed, the wall decorations of these temples have preserved a wide range of scenes which show the public life of the king and his association with various gods.

On the south wall of Sahure’s court was pictured Seshat, the Goddess of Writing, recording the numbers of sheep, goats and cattle captured in a raid on the Libyan tribes of the Western Desert. The wife and children of the enemy ruler were shown with their names written above them. Originally there was also a large figure of the king in the act of brandishing his mace above a group of Libyans whom he grasped by the hair. This variation in depicting the king’s dominance over his foreign enemies, which
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in the Sinai rock-carvings was applied to a single bedawin chieftain, appeared also in a parallel scene on the north wall with reference to Egypt's Asiatic neighbours in the north-east. A fragment of relief with several tethered bears from the Syrian mountains and tall-necked jars each with one handle, such as were found in the tomb of Queen Hetepheres and other Fourth Dynasty tombs at Giza, suggests that the booty in this case was the result of state-manipulated foreign trade rather than actual conquest. That this scene is a characteristic piece of Egyptian exaggeration is supported by the sea-going vessels shown manned by Egyptians on the east wall of the corridor behind the court. They contain bearded foreigners who are in this case not bound prisoners but visitors who raise their arms in praise of the king. Evidently we have here the return of one of the trading expeditions which, as we know, were continually being made to Byblos for the much-prized cedar wood. The Palermo Stone mentions in this reign produce brought from the 'Turquoise Land' in Sinai and from Punt on the Somali Coast. At the Wadi Maghara in Sinai, Sahure has left the memorial of an expedition to pacify the local nomads. A stela with his name was also found at the old Fourth Dynasty diorite quarries in the desert west of Abu Simbel.

We have already anticipated the fact that Sahure was succeeded by his brother Kakai (Neferirkare) who bore the Horus-name Userkhau. This king did not live to complete his pyramid temples which were finished by his successors Neferefre and Nyuserre. The latter appropriated whatever had been completed of the valley temple and built it into his own structure. The length of the reign of Neferirkare is missing in the Turin Canon, but we have the year after his fifth cattle-count on the Palermo Stone, which would indicate that he remained on the throne at least ten years.

Little evidence has survived concerning the political events of this reign but, just as the wall-reliefs of the funerary temples of Userkaf and Sahure have shown an expansion of pictorial record
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which is reflected in the chapels of the people of the court, as the Fifth Dynasty advanced there is a considerable increase in written documentation. The Royal Annals of the Palermo Stone and its related fragments were inscribed in this reign, or at least soon afterwards. Important fragmentary papyri, although prepared towards the end of the dynasty, deal with accounts connected with the administration of the funerary temple of Neferirkare. Symptomatic of this tendency towards fuller record are the almost encyclopaedic lists of the names of animals, birds and plants in the remarkable representation of the activities of the different seasons of the year which appear a few years after Neferirkare’s death in the sun temple of Nyuserre. These lists may themselves derive from an earlier version.

In the funerary chapels of the period, small biographical details light up the daily life of the court with an occasional revealing flash. Rewer in his Giza tomb tells us how he was accompanying Neferirkare in his capacity as Sem-priest in the course of a ceremony, when the king struck him accidentally upon the leg with his staff. The king hastened to assure him that he must not regard this action as a blow but as an honour.

In another case it is not exactly clear what kind of mishap occurred to the Vizier Washptah, who seems to have been conducting Neferirkare through a new building. The court physician was called and writings consulted but in the end the vizier died. The tactful apology of the king and his concern for the stricken vizier lighten the impression of stiff court ceremonial produced by the lines of bowing courtiers in the temple-reliefs or by a statement of the High Priest of Memphis, Ptahshepses. This official, who was the son-in-law of Shepseskaf, records that as a special favour he was allowed to kiss the king’s foot rather than prostrate himself upon the ground.

The two immediate successors of Neferirkare have made little impression upon history. The name of Shepseseskare is known from the Saqqara List, but he appears to have left no monuments. However, it has been fairly well established that he also used the cartouche name Isi which occurs in the names of a number of persons and funerary estates, and that his Horus-name was Sekhemkhau. The Turin Canon apparently credits him with a reign of seven years. He was followed by Neferefre (Nefer-
khare) who had the Horus-name Neferkha. This king built a sun-temple and may have begun the pyramid which lies unfinished beside that of Neferirkare at Abusir. A break in the Turin Canon has deprived us of both his name and the length of his reign. He was succeeded by the important ruler Nyuserre who built the third pyramid at Abusir which has preserved interesting, but damaged, vestiges of its temples and reliefs. The name of the chief queen of Nyuserre was Reputneb. Three daughters and a son-in-law are buried near his pyramid. As in the case of Sahure, a large number of the names of this king's courtiers are preserved in the temple-reliefs. The best known of these is a man named Ti whose fine tomb has long been familiar to every visitor to Saqqara.

It has generally been assumed that the Horus Isetibtowy, Ini (Nyuserre) had a long reign of over thirty years. No dated monument approaches this figure and the damaged Turin Canon indicates only that the number of years was higher than ten. In the absence of contrary evidence a long reign can be accepted, but reliance should not be placed upon the celebration of the Sed-festival which Nyuserre has extensively represented in his sun-temple. This feast has been interpreted as occurring at thirty year intervals to mark the jubilee of the king's accession to the throne, but there are indications that kings with reigns shorter than thirty years celebrated Sed-festivals in the Old Kingdom. It is clear that we still lack evidence for the factors which governed the recurrence of the Heb Sed.

Scenes of the ceremonial sacrifices of foreign chieftains now become a regular part of the decoration of the king's funerary temple. Nyuserre, like Sahure, is represented sometimes as a griffon, sometimes as a sphinx, trampling upon his enemies. A statue of a bound prisoner, resembling those in the later temples of Isesi and Phiops II, was found in his mortuary temple. The king left a rock-carving recording his visit to the Wadi Maghāra in Sinai which, as in the case of Sahure and earlier kings, shows him triumphantly striking down a local chieftain.

Menkauhor (Akauhor), who succeeded Nyuserre, has left little record except for a rock-inscription at Sinai. His Horus-
name was Menkhau. The Turin Canon assigns him an eight-year reign. The names of his pyramid and sun-temple are known, although neither has been discovered. Since there is a reference to his pyramid in the Dahshur decree of Phiops I, it has been thought that it was in the neighbourhood of the pyramids of Sneferu. A small alabaster seated figure of the king in Cairo was found at Memphis and shows him wearing the cloak usually associated with the Sed-festival.

Menkauhor was succeeded by Isesi (Djedkare) who seems to have had an even longer reign than the twenty-eight years allotted to him in the Turin Canon. His Horus-name was Djedkhau. It has been established that the account books of the temple of Neferirkare (that is, the Abusir papyri) belong to this reign, although their entries may continue into the early years of his successor. These papyrus fragments, as yet incompletely published, give the fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth and twentieth (or twenty-first) cattle-counts of Isesi, which would indicate a reign of at least thirty-nine years for this king. An alabaster vase in the Louvre records the celebration of his first Heb Sed. There are records of expeditions in Isesi’s reign at the Wādi Maghāra, one dated in the year after his third cattle-count and a second in the ninth (year 17). A letter to Isesi’s Vizier Senedjemib Inti is dated probably in the year 31 (hit sp 16?).

Inti was thus serving as vizier towards the end of the reign of Isesi. His son, Mehy, completed his father’s tomb, very probably in the reign of Unas the next king. He served as vizier to Unas and carried on his father’s duties as Overseer of all the King’s Works, acting probably with his brother, Khnumty, who continued under Teti, the first king of the Sixth Dynasty. Nekhebu, who was probably the son of Mehy, mentions in his biographical inscription that he served a considerable apprenticeship under his brother whose name has not been preserved. These two men, therefore, succeeded their father Mehy in the Office of Public Works, although not in the vizierate. Nekhebu, under his second name Meryremerptahankh, appears as leader of an expedition to the Wādi Hammāmāt stone quarries in the thirty-sixth year of Phiops I. He is accompanied by a grown-up son of
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the same name whose intact burial chamber was found at Giza. The son’s other name was Impy and he is evidently the Overseer of all the King’s Works, Impy, who appears in the temple reliefs of Phiops II. We can thus follow the careers of several generations of master builders in the inscriptions of their family tomb at Giza. The grandfather, Inti, mentions various structures which he planned for the court and reproduces two letters in which King Isesi expressed his pleasure in the work. Nekhebu undertook the construction of canals and devoted six years to a monument at Heliopolis for Phiops I. Mehy describes and pictures the bringing of a limestone sarcophagus for his father from the Tura quarries. This scene provides a parallel to the reliefs in the causeway of Unas’ pyramid which show the transport of granite from Aswān for that king’s temple. Similarly, the offering lists painted for the first time on the walls of Inti’s burial chamber probably reflect the use of the much more elaborate and exclusively royal texts on the walls of the burial apartments of Unas. Pyramid Texts were not yet employed by that king’s predecessor Isesi.

Several viziers, in addition to Inti, are known from the reign of Isesi. One, Shepsesre, records a letter from the king in his tomb. He has been singed out as perhaps the earliest holder of the office of Governor of Upper Egypt which was created for the better control of the southern provinces and seems to have been the step in an official’s career before attaining the vizierate. It has been noted that none of the viziers of the Fifth Dynasty was a prince and that this fact, coupled with the growing concern to strengthen the government’s position in the south, indicates a certain weakening of centralized control which in the Fourth Dynasty had been tightly in the hands of the king’s immediate family.

Isesi made use of the diorite quarries in the desert west of Lower Nubia and his name has been found, probably in connexion with one of these expeditions, on the rocks at Tomās in the river valley more than half-way between Aswān and Wādi Halfa. His Chancellor Baurdjeded brought back a dancing dwarf from Punt, and at Byblos part of an alabaster vase inscribed with the king’s name (Djedkare) was found. A number of people connected with the reign of Isesi built their tombs along the north side of the enclosure wall of the Step Pyramid at Saqqara. These people include the Vizier Shepsesre,
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two princes, Isesiankh and Kaemtjenent, and a Queen Meresankh who was probably the mother of these two princes and the wife of Isesi. The king’s pyramid has been identified as the first monument of a group, a short distance south of Saqqara, which later included the pyramids of Phops I and Merenre of the Sixth Dynasty. The excavated material has not yet been published. Although the temple was badly destroyed, it seems to have resembled those of Unas and of the kings of the Sixth Dynasty. There were excellent but very fragmentary reliefs and some very remarkable pieces of sculpture in white limestone including figures of bound prisoners, a sphinx, recumbent calves and a lion which formed some sort of a support. Although only the name Djedkare was found in this temple, the name of the pyramid is compounded with that of Djedkare and Isesi interchangeably, and there need be no doubt that they both apply to this king.

Isesi was succeeded by the Horus Wadjtowy, Unas, the last king of the Fifth Dynasty, who had a long reign of thirty years according to the Turin Canon. The chambers and passages inside his pyramid at Saqqara are covered for the first time with long columns of blue incised inscriptions intended to aid the king in the other world. These are known as the Pyramid Texts and they became a regular feature of the tombs of the Sixth Dynasty kings. The complex, with its covered causeway and terraced valley entrance-portico, resembles the temples of the Fifth Dynasty, although the mortuary temple has assumed a more symmetrical and compact plan which was to be followed in the Sixth Dynasty.

The chief queen of Unas was named Nebet. She was buried in a mastaba to the east of the pyramid, adjoining that of another queen called Khentu. Nebet’s son, Unasankh, was buried nearby, as was the Vizier Iynefert. A second vizier, Seshatsehemesnefer, represented in an, as yet, unpublished relief from the pyramid causeway, is probably the official whose tomb Mariette found long ago in the northern cemetery at Saqqara (no. E 11).

Unas carved a monument on the Island of Elephantine which seems to imply that he visited the southern border, perhaps to receive the Nubian chieftains as was later done by Merenre. In his reliefs, the king pictures ships coming from the quarries at Aswān loaded with the granite columns for his temple. A rare southern animal, the giraffe, is shown on a block which is pos-
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sibly part of a precious series of scenes appearing on other fragments which represent the seasons of the year, like those in Berlin from the sun temple of Nyuserre.

Bearded Asiatics are shown in large ships, perhaps returning from a trading expedition as in the Sahure reliefs. This scene reminds us that stone vase-fragments with the name of Unas were found at Byblos. For the first time a battle scene appears. Egyptians armed with bows and daggers attack bearded foreigners in hand to hand combat. Later, in the Sixth Dynasty, a rock-cut tomb at Dishāsha, south of the entrance to the Faiyūm, shows the confusion around a bearded chief who sits within his fortified enclosure awaiting its fall to the attacking Egyptians. While this event seems to have occurred on the north-east of Egypt’s frontier, another Sixth Dynasty scene in a Saqqara tomb represents a similar attack with a scaling ladder upon a Libyan stronghold into which the inhabitants have herded their cattle.

The Unas reliefs contrast an emaciated group of men and women in a time of famine with men bartering produce in the market place, craftsmen at work on rich metal objects and the long lines of people bearing food offerings who personify the estates endowed for the king’s eternal nourishment. The variety of subject matter displayed in these reliefs typifies the prodigality with which the craftsmen of the Fifth Dynasty have portrayed the life of their time. Although the simple chapels of princes even at the beginning of the Fourth Dynasty give delightful glimpses of daily life, as in the scenes of children playing with animals, and bird-trappers with the famous geese at Maidūm, these informal touches were enormously increased as the Old Kingdom advanced. Just as the inscriptions become more communicative by the insertion of brief biographical texts among the lists of titles, so the wall decorations of the private tombs show men at work in the shops and fields, the life of the river and the swamps, and the pastimes of the upper classes.

IV. THE SIXTH DYNASTY

As in the case of preceding dynastic changes we cannot understand clearly what were the events which brought King Teti to the throne. His Horus-name is Seheteptowy and no second
throne name in a cartouche is known for him. The titles of his wife, Queen Iput, who was also the mother of Phops I indicate that, like certain other great ladies, she carried the blood royal over into the new dynasty. Whether she was the daughter of Unas is not certain, although it would seem probable. The transition to a new reign does not seem to have left any particular mark. Two of the men who appear in unpublished portions of the Causeway leading to the Unas Pyramid seem to be the same as two persons whom we find associated with Teti. Isesikha appears on a fragment of relief from Teti’s temple as High Priest of Heliopolis, while Neferseshemptah built a fine tomb to the north of Teti’s pyramid and adopted a second name which incorporated that of the new king. The Vizier Kagemni, a child in the reign of Iseesi, became an official under Unas and came into high favour at court in Teti’s reign.

The new king built his pyramid some distance to the northeast of that of Userkaf on the edge of the desert plateau at Saqqara. Nearby he constructed pyramids for his chief queen, Iput, and a second queen Khuit. A third queen, Sesheshet, appears on a small piece of the king’s very fragmentary temple reliefs. She seems to have belonged to an older generation since the wives of a number of court officials were named after her. Unfortunately it is not possible to identify the person represented by the plaster death-mask found in the Teti temple.

Teti’s name occurs on stone vase fragments found at Byblos. An alabaster jar of this king shows a female personification of Punt. It comes from Reisner’s excavation of a provincial tomb at Naga ed-Deir and is in the collection of the University of California at Berkeley; the lid is inscribed with the titulary of Unas. A record of one of Teti’s missions to the south seems to appear among the names of the officials at Tomās in Nubia.

Teti set up a decree in the temple of Abydos establishing certain exemptions in regard to the temple lands. The year after the sixth cattle-count of Teti, recorded in a rock-inscription at the Het-nub alabaster quarries, would suggest that he reigned for at least twelve years. He was followed, according to the Abydos List, by a king named Userkare whose identi-
sification with the king Iti who left an inscription in the Wādi Hammāmāt rests on too slender grounds to be acceptable.¹ The monuments indicate that the real successor of Teti was Phiops I, the son of queen Iput, whom Phiops mentions in a decree concerning her ka-chapel in the temple of Koptos.² Userkare seems to have had an ephemeral reign. If Phiops were a child when his father died, it may have been that Userkare briefly occupied the throne while Iput was acting as regent for her son.

At the beginning of his reign Phiops I called himself Nefersahor, but later changed this to Meryre. His Horus-name was Merytowy. He had a long reign which is documented by a number of records from his later years. An inscription in the Het-nub quarries was cut in the time of his twenty-fifth cattle-count (year 49)³ and he may have dated his reign from the death of his father, Teti, ignoring Userkare. One of his early expeditions left three inscriptions with his name Nefersahor on the rocks at Tomās in Nubia⁴ and at the Wādi Maghāra Phiops is shown vanquishing the Asiatics of Sinai in the year after the eighteenth cattle-count (year 36). In the same year a descendant of the Giza Senedjemib family who has already been mentioned (p. 44), Meryremerptahankh, left a record at the Hammāmāt quarries⁵ in which he is represented with a grown son of the same name. Both inscriptions mention the king’s first Sed-festival. We have already mentioned the Dahshūr decree in the year 41 (HAt sp 21) in which Phiops I was concerned with protecting the endowments of the two pyramids of Sneferu.⁶ In the Delta, at Bubastis, a badly damaged temple of the king has been cleared.⁷ Phiops I constructed his pyramid near that of Isesi, a short distance south of Saqqara.⁸ The temple has not been excavated, as in the case of his successor Merenre whose tomb is close by, although both pyramids have been opened and their texts copied.

A stela found at Abydos represents two queens of Phiops I who, most confusingly, bear the same name: Meryreankhnes.⁹ The inscription tells us that one of these women was the mother of Phiops’ successor, Merenre, and the other the mother of Phiops II. They are shown with their brother Djau who became vizier. The ladies are mentioned again with Djau in a decree concerning their statues which was set up in the temple of Abydos by Phiops II. Here they are called the mothers of Merenre and Phiops II again and with the names of the two kings’ pyramids
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combined with their cartouches. The titles of the father and mother of Djau and his sisters indicate that they were not of royal birth but belonged to the provincial nobility of the Thinite Nome. Merenre appointed one of the family, a certain Ibi who was perhaps the son of Djau, as Governor of the Province of the Cerastes Mountain (the Twelfth Nome of Upper Egypt). There in the cliffs of Deir el-Gabrāwī the family cut their tombs during the following reigns. Evidently Phiops I made a political marriage which secured the allegiance of a powerful provincial family.

Uni, on his monument at Abydos, recounts that as a youth he served in minor offices under Teti. He became a judge under Phiops I and was firmly established at court. He was particularly proud of having been summoned by the king to conduct alone an inquiry against a queen who is not named but is referred to by her title *wrḫ hts*. Naturally one suspects that this putting aside of the chief queen was immediately connected with the marriage to the mother of Merenre. In view of the extreme youth of Phiops II at his accession, Phiops I probably married the second sister very late in his reign. The name Meryrankhnes was presumably given to each wife at the time of her marriage.

Uni also organized an expedition against the nomads of the north-east. He recruited an army from all parts of Egypt and from the Nubian tribes in the south. It is evidently Nubian mercenaries of this kind who are the subject of clauses in the Dahshur decree of Phiops I which restrict their privileges. In spite of Uni’s hymn of victory upon the return of the army, an uprising necessitated a second raid on the ‘sand dwellers’. This was followed by a campaign into southern Palestine which involved the transport of troops by ship to a place called Antelope Nose which is thought to be the promontory of Mount Carmel.

There are two indications that towards the end of his reign Phiops I may have associated with himself as co-regent his son Merenre (who was also called Antyemsaf, with the Horus-name Ankhkhau). One is a gold skirt-pendant in Cairo which bears the names and titles of the two kings. The other is the Hieraconpolis copper statue-group which shows Phiops I with a smaller figure beside him that probably represents Merenre. There are two dated inscriptions known from the reign of Merenre, one at the Het-nub alabaster quarries, which is damaged but appears to be dated in the year after his fifth cattle-count (year 10), and the
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other at the First Cataract in the year of his fifth count (year 9). The latter inscription of the year 9 records the occasion when the king received the Nubian chieftains on the southern border. If Merenre had been serving as co-regent with his father it is unlikely that he would have dated such a monument until after his accession to the throne, although he might well have begun counting the years of his reign from the time when he became co-regent. A state visit to inspect the southern border soon after his father's death would seem a reasonable action to take upon becoming sole ruler. Merenre may thus have become co-regent in the fortieth year of his father's reign and the fourteen years usually restored in the Turin Canon for his own reign would include this co-regency and the five years that he reigned alone. It seems absurd to suggest a co-regency with the infant Phiops II at the end of the reign of his brother Merenre but a cylinder seal of an official with both their names enclosed in a double Horus-frame is difficult to explain in any other way.

It has been stated that Merenre was only a youth when he died. The sarcophagus in his pyramid contained a well-preserved body of a young man of medium height still wearing the adolescent side-lock of hair. Elliot Smith was convinced that this mummy was prepared in the fashion of the Eighteenth Dynasty and could not be earlier, concluding that it was an intrusive burial. The wrappings had been torn from the body. Since pieces of the linen bandages and parts of the bodies of Unas, Teti and Phiops I still survived when their pyramids were opened perhaps the evidence with regard to the body from Merenre's pyramid should be re-examined.

The government's interest in the south, symbolized by the occasion when the Nubian chiefs assembled to kiss the ground before Merenre, is evidenced in other ways. Uni continued in service under Merenre and made two expeditions to the First Cataract to fetch a sarcophagus and bring stone for the king's pyramid. During the first of these trips he spent a year cutting five canals and building transport ships while the granite was being quarried. We also find Harkhuf established as Governor of Elephantine and commencing the trading expeditions in the south which he describes in his rock-cut tomb in the cliffs opposite Aswân. These long trips were made partly by river and partly by donkey caravan to bring back incense, ivory, ebony, oil and
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panther skins, all products much prized in Egypt. It has been noted that gold is not yet mentioned and it is probable that it could still be mined in sufficient quantity in the desert east of Koptos. Although it has been questioned whether these expeditions could have reached so far into the south,\(^1\) broken alabaster vases with the names of Phiops I, Merenre and Phiops II have been found at Kerma in the Sudan, and Reisner believed that an Egyptian trading post was already established there in the Sixth Dynasty.\(^2\)

Merenre’s name does not occur in Sinai or at Byblos, although numerous broken stone vessels with the names of Phiops I and Phiops II have been found at the Syrian port.\(^3\) One of the expedition leaders at Aswān, whose tomb cannot be dated precisely to a reign in the Sixth Dynasty, refers in such a way to voyages to Byblos and Punt\(^4\) as to suggest that they occurred regularly in the Sixth Dynasty.

Uni, the trusted official of Phiops I, Djau, the brother of his two queens, and Harkhuf, the Nomarch of Elephantine, seem to have been the chief supporters of the throne during the reign of Merenre. Uni, as Governor of Upper Egypt, was given special powers over all twenty-two Upper Egyptian nomes. This title was held by nomarchs whose jurisdiction does not seem to have extended beyond their provinces. Uni’s unusual position was repeated in the case of Shemay in the Eighth Dynasty who, before becoming vizier, is mentioned as controlling the twenty-two Upper Egyptian nomes when he was Governor of Upper Egypt.\(^5\) An additional curb seems to have been placed on certain local families who had come to consider the position of nomarch as an hereditary right. Qar was sent to Edfū under Merenre as nomarch and Governor of Upper Egypt,\(^6\) while the control of the Seventh (Thinite) Nome was extended to the Twelfth when Ibi, a relative and probably the son of the Vizier Djau, was made governor of both provinces. Ibi and his son and grandson held the title of Governor of Upper Egypt, as did Harkhuf at Aswān.\(^7\) In spite of the signs of growing wealth and power at such provincial centres as Cusae (Meir), it was upon the men who conducted its foreign trade, the nomarchs of Elephantine, that the government chiefly relied until the end of the Sixth Dynasty.

Phiops II (Neferkare; Horus-name Netjerkhau) seems to have been the child of his father’s old age. Manetho tells us that he

\(^{1}\) §iv, 17, 36, 106.

\(^{2}\) §iv, 16.


\(^{4}\) G, 41, 140.

\(^{5}\) §v, 4, 3.

\(^{6}\) G, 41, 252.

\(^{7}\) Ibid. 120, 142, 145.
came to the throne at the age of six and lived to be one hundred. The king's well-known letter to Harkhuf shows the delighted pleasure of a child in the gift of a dancing dwarf which was being brought to him by the caravan leader,¹ a marvel which had not been seen since the time of his ancestor Isesi. Manetho's reign of ninety-four years for Phiops II has been generally accepted and we know of another centenarian of the time in Pepiankh of Meir.² The fiftieth cattle-count (year 99) was formerly believed to be inscribed on a badly weathered decree set up by Phiops in the temple of Mycerinus but upon re-examination it would appear that the thirty-first count is the more probable reading (year 61).³ The highest dates are the somewhat doubtful year 65 (het sp 33?) of a decree in the chapel of Queen Udjebten,⁴ and the year after the thirty-first count (year 62) at the Het-nub quarries.⁵ The king certainly had a very long reign and celebrated a second Sed-festival. The Turin Canon gives a broken figure of at least ninety years to support Manetho's statement.

The magnificent funerary monument of Phiops II, which is comparable in size, quality of decoration, and display of the power of the royal house with that of the Fifth Dynasty king, Sahure, gives no indication of the collapse which was to come.⁶ Nevertheless the long reign spelled the end of the Old Kingdom. The growth of the provincial nobility in Upper Egypt coincided with a gradual equalization of wealth. What had once been crown-lands were broken into smaller and smaller units through a widening circle of inheritance. The immense constructions undertaken at royal expense and the innumerable funerary endowments exempt from taxation had exhausted the king's resources. The diminished power of the royal family makes itself sharply felt at the close of the reign.

Phiops II continued the foreign trade of his predecessors, the expeditions to the Sinai mines and the quarrying operations. There are perhaps some indications of increased restlessness abroad. Hekayeb⁷ had to be sent out from Aswān to put down the Nubians in the south where an inter-tribal disturbance had nearly interfered with Harkhuf's third expedition. Sabni⁸ tells us in his tomb at Aswān that he hurried forth to recover the body of his father who had been killed on a caravan trip. Hekayeb made a similar trip to the Red Sea to bring back the body of an officer

¹ G, 4, 161. ² §iv, 2, vol. iv, 24. ³ Further study makes this reading virtually certain as against the thirty-fifth count §11, 43, 113, fig. 1; see Plate Vol. ⁴ G, 4, 163. ⁵ §iv, 9. ⁶ G, 2, pl. xii. ⁷ Ibid. 166.
whose party had been attacked by nomads while building ships for an expedition to Punt.

A long succession of some eight or ten men followed Djau in the vizierate, two of whom, at about the middle of the reign, are shown leading processions of courtiers in a room of the funerary temple. Three queens, Neith, Iput and Udjebten, were buried in pyramids beside that of the king. From a decree set up in the chapel of Queen Neith in the accession year of an unknown successor of Phiops II, and from the other inscriptions in her chapel, we learn that Neith was the eldest daughter of Phiops I and Meryreankhnes, the mother of Merenre. A fourth queen of Phiops II was named Pepiankhnes. Her coffin, which had originally been prepared for some other purpose in the reign of Phiops I, has been found together with fragments of a false door which indicate that she was the mother of a king Neferkare who is now thought to have been the first king of the Seventh Dynasty. The name of his pyramid differs from that of Phiops II who, as we have seen, was also called Neferkare. Phiops II is followed in the Abydos List by a Merenre who was also called Antyemsañ and must not be confused with the earlier and more important Merenre. The name is broken off in the Turin Canon, where the length of reign is given as one year. This Merenre is evidently the eldest surviving son of Phiops II, Antyemsañ, who is mentioned on a stela found near the chapel of Queen Neith. His name can now be read on the badly worn decree of Phiops II in Boston which is concerned with the pyramid town of Mycerinus at Giza.

With Merenre Antyemsañ II we have evidently reached the troubled time known as the First Intermediate Period but two kings who follow in the Abydos List have also been assigned to Dynasty VI. The name of Netjerykare may have occupied the next broken space in the Turin Canon which continues with a Nitocris who is thought to be the Menkare of the Abydos List. The suggestion that this identity can be supported by a royal cartouche in an inscription in Queen Neith's chapel is not borne out by close examination on the spot. The hieroglyphs were damaged but probably formed the name of Neferkare (Phiops II). A vertical sign not apparent in the published photographs seems to be nfr and precludes reading Menkare. There is thus not sufficient evidence to associate Neith with that Nitocris to whom we have seen later legend ascribed the building
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of the Third Pyramid at Giza. It is a pity, for it seemed a happy idea to bring the name Nitocris of the Turin Canon and Manetho’s account of an Old Kingdom queen into conjunction with the wife of the last great king of the time. Around her chapel have survived the few vestiges of contemporaneous record that exist at present for the end of the Sixth Dynasty.

V. THE SEVENTH AND EIGHTH DYNASTIES

Manetho’s statement that the Seventh Dynasty consisted of seventy kings who ruled for seventy days has usually been interpreted as representing a brief period of strife which left no record for later times. The Turin Canon has only preserved the length of reign and no name for any king of the Sixth Dynasty, except the last ruler Nitocris. A new placing of the fragment containing the names of Nitocris and three followers, the last of which is Ibi of the Eighth Dynasty, now allows for two blank spaces between Ibi and the summary of kings who ruled after Menes at the beginning of the First Dynasty. Dr W. C. Hayes has equated these kings with five of the Abydos List (nos. 51–5). With the addition of Abydos no. 56, he suggests that they formed six rulers of the Eighth Dynasty. The Turin Canon omits no. 56 and nine kings of the Abydos List (nos. 42–50) which Hayes would assign to the Seventh Dynasty. His chronological table allows twenty-one years for the time between the end of the Sixth Dynasty and the beginning of the Ninth Dynasty, eight years for the Seventh Dynasty and thirteen years for the Eighth Dynasty. In the past, some forty or fifty years have been assigned to the Eighth Dynasty and the Seventh Dynasty has been disregarded as ephemeral. It must be remembered that most of these kings are known only from the Abydos List; it is one of the darkest periods of Egyptian history, when contemporaneous records are at an absolute minimum.

We have seen that the name of the first king of the Seventh Dynasty (according to this new arrangement), Neferkare II, was recovered from the fragments of a stela found in one of the rooms of the chapel of Queen Iput, which adjoined the pyramid of Queen Neith beside the tomb of their husband Phiops II. King Kakare Ibi of the Eighth Dynasty is also known from a monument in the Memphite region. He built a small pyramid not far from that of Phiops II. This pyramid contained the usual Pyramid Texts in the burial chamber, thus continuing the tradi-

\[1\] §iv, 10, 53.
tion established at the end of the Fifth Dynasty. However, the pyramid had not been cased with stone and was not provided with a mortuary chapel. The unfinished character of the structure, which is the only building known at present from this period, again testifies to the unstable character of the royal house.1

In Upper Egypt a series of decrees found in the Temple of Koptos were long thought to provide evidence for a local dynasty at that place. It now seems clear that these decrees were issued by the last kings of the Eighth Dynasty at Memphis2 to two powerful men at Koptos, Shemay and his son Idi, who in turn held successively the offices of Nomarch of Koptos, Governor of Upper Egypt and Vizier. Shemay married the eldest daughter of Neferkauhor, the fifth and penultimate king of the Eighth Dynasty. This family at Koptos would thus have formed the chief support of the weak kings at Memphis, and it was under the last of these, the Horus Demedjibtowy, that Heracleopolis revolted successfully and brought the Old Kingdom to an end. As in the case of a dynasty of Koptos there is insufficient evidence to support the proposal that an Upper Egyptian dynasty centred at Abydos is indicated by the names of kings given only in the Abydos List.3 In connexion with the cemetery of Abydos, where the monuments of the family of the Vizier Djau and his two sisters were set up in the Sixth Dynasty and where the temple of Khentiamentiu–Osiris had contained the decrees of the Memphite rulers of the later Old Kingdom, we must remember that there was another important cemetery in the Thinite nome. This was at Naga ed-Deir downstream from Abydos and Beit Khallâf and on the east bank of the Nile across the river from Girga near which was probably the site of the old city of This, the capital of the province. In the Sixth Dynasty, from the time of Merenre into the first part of the reign of Piops II, this province had been governed from Deir el-Gabrâwi in the Twelfth Nome by Ibi and his two sons whom Merenre had put in control of both the Seventh and Twelfth Nomes. It has been pointed out that this was made easier by the fact that Uni was controlling the south as Governor of Upper Egypt from This which served as his base. In the Fifth Dynasty and again in the Sixth Dynasty, after the régime of Ibi’s successors, officials are now known who were nomarchs of This but who lived at court and were buried in the Memphite cemeteries.4

In contrast to this earlier situation two governors of the Thinite
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nome, Tjamerery and Hagy, are known at the end of the Old Kingdom, probably in the Seventh or the Eighth Dynasty, who were buried in the old Thinite Cemetery at Naga ed-Deir. This cemetery had been in use since predynastic times and a rich set of gold jewellery was found in a tomb of the First Dynasty there. Other officials of the end of the Old Kingdom, who are known from the paintings and inscriptions in their rock-cut tombs at Naga ed-Deir and the characteristic rectangular stelae set up in simpler chapels, were priests of Onuris whose cult had been established from early times in his temple at This. It has been observed that the titles of several of these men, including the two nomarchs, show them to have been loyal supporters of the crown, although rather vaguely connected with affairs at court. This is a situation that would be understandable in the Seventh and Eighth Dynasties with the king at Memphis, whereas the whole relationship of Naga ed-Deir with Abydos would seem impossible if we postulated a local dynasty ruling at This. In this connexion the interesting speculation has been put forward that it may well have been the cemetery of This at Naga ed-Deir and not that at Abydos which was pillaged during the struggles between Heracleopolis and Thebes that occurred soon afterwards.

The Thinite nome, its cemetery at Abydos long revered for its association with the kings of the First Dynasty and now at the end of the Old Kingdom a place of pilgrimage to the shrine of Osiris who had been assimilated with the ancient local god of the dead Khentiamenti, was undoubtedly of more importance politically than some of the other sites in Upper Egypt where cemeteries of the local notables are known from the First Intermediate Period. This is true even of Dendera where, as at Naga ed-Deir, enough material has been excavated to suggest a sequence of known persons extending from the Sixth Dynasty through the difficult period of the collapse of central authority at Memphis and the setting up of petty local government in the different provinces. Thebes, which was soon to assume such importance, was still a backward village in the later Old Kingdom. The few monuments of its important men may be briefly noted. The earliest is a fragment of relief from the tomb of a Governor of Upper Egypt named Unasankh. A small painted rock-cut chapel of Ihi and his wife is now known to adjoin a somewhat
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larger tomb belonging to an official named Khenti. Ihi and Khenti were both Overlords of Thebes but do not mention the name of the province in their inscriptions. A tomb nearby (no. 185) had an inscribed pillar with the figure of a ‘Chancellor of the God’ or expedition leader called Seniiker.

More interesting information can be derived from three tombs in the region between Thebes and Aswān. The only one of these which seems to belong properly to this period is that of Setka discovered in recent years at Aswān in a fine position high up in the western promontory overlooking the island of Elephantine where the important people of the Sixth Dynasty had hewn their rock tombs. Setka was a priest of the Pyramid of Phios II and must at least have begun his career in the Eighth Dynasty. Another of these tombs was made for Iti at Gebelein south of Thebes and Armant on the west bank of the Nile, while the third belonged to Ankhtify at El-Mī’alla, across the river and a little further south. The paintings in these three chapels bear remarkably close stylistic similarities to one another. This has suggested that no great length of time separated Setka from the other two men. However, with Iti and Ankhtify we have reached a time at the end of the Ninth Dynasty just before the rise of Thebes under the Inyotef family when the royal house of Heracleopolis was established in the north. Setka is our last connexion in the south with the old Memphite Royal House. It is fitting that the paintings in his tomb should anticipate a new style to be developed in the Ninth Dynasty while at the same time forming a link with the end of the Old Kingdom.

VI. LITERATURE AND ART

The collapse of the Old Kingdom is mirrored in a pessimistic literature which would have been foreign to the spirit and thought of the times that had gone before. Nothing could be further from the earlier idea of material success gained by the shrewd employment of a man’s abilities in a well-ordered society than the lamentations and prophecies of Ipuwer. This work seems to be nearer to the troubled times which it describes than similar compositions which belong more properly to the literature of the Middle Kingdom. Ipuwer bewails the break-down of law and order and represents a people who were the prey of violence, even the dead in their tombs being subject to vicious pillage. High-born ladies
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are clothed in rags, the official is insulted and the peasant tills his field with a shield to defend himself from the marauder. Foreigners have strayed into the Delta. Servant girls and slaves flaunt the possession of valuables of which they cannot comprehend the use. Ships no longer sail to Byblos and, in the absence of foreign trade, one is delighted even to see people from the Oases with paltry things to barter.

The precepts of the society which we see here in ruins are embodied in two compositions which, although in their present form of a later date, seem to have their origin in the Old Kingdom. These are the ‘Admonitions to the Vizier Kagemni’ which were ascribed to the time of King Huni at the end of the Third Dynasty, and the ‘Instruction of Ptahhotpe’ who is called a vizier of King Isesi of the Fifth Dynasty. Both consist of practical advice on how to get on in the world, and particularly on how to behave in the presence of equals or those who are superiors or inferiors. They lay emphasis upon good manners and upon truth and justice. The ‘Instruction of Ptahhotpe’ points out the advantage that the gift of eloquence can bring to a man. Nowhere is there a suspicion of doubt as to the permanence of the stable world in which these precepts are to be applied.

Literary documents which are actually contemporaneous with the Old Kingdom are limited in number and are restricted almost entirely to brief biographical inscriptions, and the great body of religious literature known as the Pyramid Texts. Of actual writing upon papyrus there is little more than the accounts of the temple of Neferirkare which were probably largely prepared in the reign of Isesi, and some fragmentary papyri which consist of family archives of the Sixth Dynasty nomarchs of Elephantine. One of the letters from these Elephantine archives has been translated. There is also a letter, probably of the reign of Phiops II, which was written by an indignant officer in charge of gangs of workmen in the Tura quarries objecting to the waste of time involved in bringing his men to Memphis for an issue of new clothing. In the preceding pages have been mentioned several letters from a king which the owner of a tomb has proudly caused to be copied on the stone wall of his chapel. Similarly, certain royal decrees have survived which were inscribed on stelae set up in temples. These inscriptions have also been listed under the reigns to which they belong.

The great series of utterances which were inscribed for the
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first time on the walls of the burial apartments of Unas, the last king of the Fifth Dynasty, continued to be so used throughout the rest of the Old Kingdom\(^1\) and formed the basis for the Coffin Texts of the Middle Kingdom and the later Book of the Dead. They incorporate elements of ancient kingly ritual as well as the early religious beliefs from both Upper Egypt and the Delta which had been assembled to form the doctrine of the Heliopolitan priesthood of the creator sun-god Atum-Re. Juxtaposed with these are the beliefs which eventually were to promise even the ordinary man resurrection through Osiris. This god, as one of the forces of nature, personified the growth of plant life through the stimulus of the life-giving water of the Nile. He was also identified with Andjeti the local royal hero of Busiris in the Delta and therefore embodied kingship. Finally he was assimilated with the protecting deity of the necropolis of Abydos, Khentiamentiu, who in his jackal form was related to the old god of the dead, Anubis.

The chief purpose of the magical spells of the Pyramid Texts was to make it possible for the dead king to take his place among the gods and to become one with Re, their leader. Primarily this was imagined as coming to pass in the sky but glimpses may also be caught of a different view of the afterlife due to that aspect of Osiris which was to make him the ruler of a gloomy underworld in which the dead must dwell. To this would be transferred the pleasant fields and thickets of reeds which at first were thought of as being in the heavens. Although the texts are difficult to understand one cannot fail to be stirred by the breadth and sweep of the early conception of a bright celestial afterworld in which the dead become the indestructible stars. The spells exhaust every possible means by which can be assured the king’s ascent to the sky. Through an earlier imagery this was formed by the outstretched wings and bright plumed body of the falcon Horus whose eyes were the sun and the moon. Various winged forms of ascent are evoked as well as steps and ramps. To this conception, one would think, is related the daring creation of soaring structures in pyramidal form for the royal tombs of the Old Kingdom. The king’s reception by the gods is pictured, as well as the moment when he takes his place in the sun-barque of Re. Nothing must be allowed to stand in his way and the savage ruthlessness of purpose reaches its ultimate conclusion in a famous cannibalistic text in which the king is portrayed as devouring the gods that he may become possessed of their most potent powers.

The literary form of this extraordinary assemblage of material betrays the Egyptian’s partiality for expressing himself by repetitive and balanced statement. The reiteration may have been thought to add potency to the spell and need not always have been a literary device. This parallelism receives varied treatment but presents most frequently a second line repeating the same idea with slightly altered wording. A form in which the same phrase is repeated in every alternate line is frequently found and is used in the hymn of victory which appears in the Sixth Dynasty biography of Uni. The Pyramid Texts exhibit another dominant Egyptian trait, the tendency to assemble an accumulated mass of material without synthesis. Contradictions are not resolved but presented side by side. A deeply ingrained sense of tradition prevented the Egyptian from discarding material which to us may appear discordant. Old beliefs that went back to the earliest religious impulses of the country were incorporated into the Heliopolitan solar doctrine and these again were overlaid with the newer Osirian beliefs. The language employed is archaic. Sethe placed the compilation of the texts in prehistoric times, but present opinion supports Kees who argues in favour of a time between the Third and Fifth Dynasties. The private tombs about the middle of the Fifth Dynasty begin to reflect the popular effect of the Osirian beliefs, while the Heliopolitan doctrine of Re reached its ascendancy as a state cult somewhat earlier. Thus both were in evidence before the first known copies of the Pyramid Texts begin to appear.

The compilation of religious lore in the Pyramid Texts is a characteristic Egyptian expression of what was perhaps the greatest achievement of the Old Kingdom. This was the establishment of a system of very detailed and enduring records which, as a result of the close relationship between writing and representation, are as much pictorial as they are literary. The beautifully drawn and attractively conceived hieroglyphs, which represent the sound values of the speech of the time and determine the sense of the words, are minor masterpieces in themselves. We tend to overlook this in our interest in the ideas expressed and in our frequent irritation at the laconic nature of such expression which is in some part due to our ignorance of the subtleties of meaning as well as to the fragmentary nature of the material as it has come down to us. It is fairly easy to grasp the significance of the huge architectural monuments and the remarkable portrayal of the people of the period in sculptural representation, or to be charmed
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by the glimpses of daily life that appear in the multitude of wall-reliefs in the funerary chapels. We have been slower in sensing the ingenuity of the development which lies behind the great cycles of scenes which covered the walls of the funerary temples of Userkaf and Sahure, largely owing to the lamentable state of preservation of these first surviving examples. But we must realize that the same mental vigour and sense of organization as the ancient Egyptians applied to the construction of the Great Pyramid entered into this presentation of the vital aspects of the king’s worldly life and his association with the gods.

In discussing the reign of Neferirkare attention was called to the apparent increase in the production of detailed records in the Fifth Dynasty. The royal annals, the account books of the Temple of Neferirkare and the more specific nature of the information supplied by biographical texts were cited, together with the elaborate picturing of the renewal of kingship in the Heb Sed scenes and the activities of the seasons of the year in the sun temple of Nyuserre. The three seasons of the year were portrayed in the so-called ‘Weltkammer’, a long narrow room which formed the last section of the corridor which bounded the court of this sun-temple and led to the ramp inside the base of the obelisk, the focal point of the monument. The recent publication\(^1\) of several key pieces of this fragmentary composition, which has intrigued scholars for half a century, makes it possible to suggest something more specific concerning its general arrangement. Evidently the whole scheme was repeated in more or less exact duplicate on the long east and west walls. It consisted of large figures in human form personifying the three periods into which the year was divided, Akhet, Peret and Shemu, each preceded by registers of figures representing the provinces of Upper and Lower Egypt.\(^2\) At the top of the wall, above the nomes of Upper Egypt, and again at the bottom, below the Lower Egyptian provinces, appeared processions of similar personifications of such entities as the Nile, the Sea, Grain and Nourishment. All brought their offerings to Re. Behind each figure of the season, a larger space, divided into horizontal sections of varying height by strips of water, was devoted to portraying the activities of the appropriate time of year. Akhet and Peret were shown as women, corresponding with the feminine ending of their names. Shemu was a male figure bearing on his head a sheaf of the ripened grain of his harvest time. Akhet is distinguished by a pool of lotus signifying the inundation, while plants seem to grow from the

\(^1\) §III, 4, 319; 21, 33. \(^2\) §III, 15, 129.
head of Peret as would be suitable for a time when things spring forth from the ground after the Nile flood. The three seasons, without their attributes, are shown as seated figures on a board which Mereruka is painting on a kind of easel in a relief in his chapel at Saqqara.

In the sections devoted to the activities of the seasons much space is allotted to animals, occasionally interspersed with small figures of huntsmen, in a habitat which is treated naturalistically like the fishing and other swamp pursuits. Such representations and the peculiar, formally arranged, groups of birds and plants with their names attached are of too general a nature to assign to a particular time of year. The capture of song birds in an orchard appeared again in the court of the temple of Userkaf, in the temple of Sahure, in several private tomb chapels, and in the picturing of the Seasons in the causeway of Unas and in the Valley Temple of Nyuserre. This subject could probably be attributed to a specific time of year, as could the propagation of animals, nesting birds, bee-keeping and agricultural activities. However, connecting these various fragmentary parts with others which actually join with a portion of one of the personifications of a season may prove a puzzle that defies satisfactory solution, in view of the duplication of so many of the elements. Nevertheless it is clear, as it has been since these reliefs were first discovered, that we have here one of man's most interesting early attempts to put into orderly sequence the various elements of his environment. In its peculiar combination of the specific and the general, the naturalistic and the formal, this production is characteristic of Egyptian method in the Old Kingdom. Like the Giza writing board with its lists of kings, gods, place-names (more correctly, estates) and hieroglyphs of birds and fish, the 'seasons' are in a sense related to the Onomastica of the later Egyptian scribes.

Frequent mention has been made in the preceding pages of the architecture, sculpture, painting and minor arts of the Old Kingdom because the relation which art bore to the funerary beliefs of the ancient Egyptian makes his tomb-monuments the basis of much of our historical evidence. Although the Third Dynasty
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was still a period of experimentation it is clear from the architecture, reliefs and statue-fragments of Djoser and the carved wooden panels and wall paintings of Hesyre, that a great measure of technical proficiency had been attained.\(^1\) The sculptor in the Fourth Dynasty reached the goal towards which he was striving. The statues of Redjedef, Chephren and Mycerinus present an ideal of kingly majesty which still retains human individuality. Everything superficial has been eliminated. The modelling is superb but simplified. The sculptor is completely master of his material. The same simplification of natural forms is consummately expressed in the Cairo statues of Rehotpe and Nefert, the Boston Ankhaf bust, the Hildesheim seated statue of Hemiunu and the portrait heads of white limestone from the Giza burial chambers.\(^2\)

We need expect no more from the painter’s skill than is to be found in the Maidûm wall-paintings of the reign of Sneferu.\(^3\) Although the fragility of the medium makes it difficult to follow out a series of examples from the few traces that remain, the same excellence was maintained in the best work as late as the painted reliefs of Phiops II. The large-scale simplicity of the Maidûm paintings is reflected in the bold stone reliefs of the reign of Sneferu,\(^4\) a style which, with some modifications, continues into the Fourth Dynasty and recurs again in the Sixth Dynasty as best exemplified by the reliefs of the chapel of Mereruka and the temple of Phiops II.\(^5\) A delicate low relief of superlative quality, which seems to have its origin in the time of Djoser, is found side by side with the higher relief style in a few Giza chapels of the reign of Cheops and Chephren and in the royal reliefs of the Fourth Dynasty and early Fifth Dynasty.\(^6\)

After the early part of the Fifth Dynasty, the large scale of the preceding period diminished, both in the making of statues and in architecture. On the other hand, every branch of the crafts felt the effects of the large body of skilled workmen trained in the great projects of the Fourth Dynasty pyramid builders. Just as high administrative posts were then opened to a wider group of persons than the members of the king’s immediate family, so a vastly increased number of people were able to command the services of a good craftsman to construct a well-built tomb and to provide it with statues and reliefs.

Accidents of preservation have undoubtedly blurred the picture. The large copper statue-group of Phiops I\(^7\) and his son from
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Hierakonpolis warns us, as do the limestone calves recently found in the temple of Djedkare Isesi, the fragments of a basalt ram with the name of Cheops in Berlin, the small sphinx with yellow painted skin from Redjedef’s temple at Abu Rawāš, and the squatting naked alabaster statuette of Phiops II, that there was a wider range of form and material than we are accustomed to think. The gold hawk’s head from Hierakonpolis reminds us of the figures of precious metals which were undoubtedly placed in temple shrines, such as the statue of Ihi, the son of the goddess Hathor, which the Palermo Stone tells us Neferirkare ordered for a sanctuary of Sneferu. Attention has been called to the appearance of polygonal limestone columns at Giza and the possibility that there were round granite columns in Redjedef’s pyramid temple at Abu Rawāš. We should therefore be careful not to draw too sharp a contrast between the light forms of the Third Dynasty temple of Djoser, the plant forms of the granite columns at Abusir and Saqqara in the Fifth Dynasty and the severe forms of the Fourth Dynasty as exemplified in the Valley Temple of Chephren.
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### Third Dynasty: c. 2686–2613 B.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horus Name</th>
<th>Personal Name</th>
<th>Years of Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanakhte</td>
<td>Nebka</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netjerykhet</td>
<td>Djoser</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sekhemkhet</td>
<td>Djoser Teti</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaba</td>
<td>('lacuna' in lists)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>Huni (Nysuteh?)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fourth Dynasty: c. 2613–2494 B.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years of Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sneferu</td>
<td>24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheops</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redjedef</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chephren</td>
<td>25(?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fifth Dynasty: c. 2494–2345 B.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years of Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Userkaf</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahure</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neferirkare Kakai</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepseskare Isi</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sixth Dynasty: c. 2345–2181 B.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years of Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teti</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Userkare</td>
<td>1(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meryre Phio(p)s I</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merenre Antyemsaf I (9)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Seventh Dynasty: c. 2181–2173 B.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years of Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neferkare, ‘the Younger’</td>
<td>Neferkamin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neferkare Neby</td>
<td>Nykare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djedkare Shemay</td>
<td>Neferkare Tereru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neferkare Khendu</td>
<td>Neferkahor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meryenhor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Eighth Dynasty: 2173–2160 B.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wadjkare Pepylonbe (Horus Kha-[bau?])</td>
<td>4 + x years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neferkamin Anu</td>
<td>2 years 1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakare Ibi</td>
<td>4 years 2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neferkare</td>
<td>2 years 1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neferkauhor Kapuibi (Horus Netjeryb)</td>
<td>1 year $\frac{1}{2}$ month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neferirkare (Horus Demedjibtowy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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