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THREE MONUMENTS OF OLD KINGDOM
TREASURY OFFICIALS

By N. STRUDWICK

The treasury in the Old Kingdom was an institution of considerable importance, no doubt controlling the revenues of the state as its principal function. Precise details of its responsibilities are very few, mainly because its activities are not part of the normal repertoire of Old Kingdom tomb decoration, whence often comes the information to flesh out clues given by other sources, such as juxtaposed titles. Activities shown on tomb walls seem largely to have taken place on private estates, and it is, therefore, probable that there was no formal private treasury administration thereon, but rather officials from the state treasury would carry out the necessary reckoning. This remains true for individuals who were officials of that institution.

Three unpublished monuments of officials who held the senior office of overseer of the treasury or two treasuries in the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties are presented here.1 These are accompanied by a discussion of the palaeography of the group pr-hd, ‘treasury’, mainly with reference to the Old Kingdom but with notes on other periods. Particular attention is paid to its value in the Old Kingdom as a criterion for dating.

I.

1. Drum of Nfr (see pl. III, 1)

Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 21.3080.² Provenance: excavations of Harvard–Boston Expedition to Giza, found in debris of tomb G1461. Material: limestone. Dimensions: overall length 0.85 m; diameter 0.204 m. Inscribed area: length 0.25 m; width 0.08 m. Bibliography: none, but see Porter and Moss, Topographical Bibliography, III², 64.

The drum, presumably from the entrance to a tomb, shows in the centre a panel containing a text carved in good-quality raised relief and of excellent preservation. There are no traces of colour.

Text: imy-r š, hry-sšt; 3ḥt-Hwfw, nb imš, imy-r pr-hd Nfr, “The overseer of

¹ Since it has not been possible to examine the original monuments and the photographs are sufficiently clear, line drawings are not included.
² I should like to thank Professor W. K. Simpson for his permission to publish this piece and the photograph. I am also grateful to Dr E. Brovarski and Mr P. Lacovara for other information on this object.
N. STRUDWICK

scribes and keeper of the secret matters of the pyramid 3ht-Hwfw ('The Horizon of Khufu'), the one who is provided for,³ the overseer of the treasury, Nfr.

It is clear from the excavation records that this piece did not form part of the tomb in which it was found. The only Nfr at Giza who is also imy-r pr-hd is the well-known owner of tomb G2110; however, this piece is not palaeographically similar, and any connection between the two has been denied by Smith.⁴ No further Nfr with comparable titles is known to have been buried at Giza, and thus the drum must have originated in an otherwise unknown tomb. About the only evidence available for dating comes from the palaeography of the signs, particularly that of the group pr-hd. From the discussion in Part II of this paper it emerges that this form of the sign with the mace completely enclosed by the house belongs at the latest to the early Sixth Dynasty. Titles, admittedly mainly priesthoods, incorporating the names of royal pyramids do not, in general, antedate the middle of the Fifth Dynasty.⁵ Holders of titles associated with the pyramid of Khufu date to the later Fifth and Sixth Dynasties, with the exception of two imy-r ntwt 3ht-Hwfw, who appear in the early to middle Fifth.⁶ On these very approximate criteria, Nfr was probably active in the later part of the Fifth Dynasty.⁷

2. Block of Śdy-pth Śdw (see pl. III, 2)

Rosicrucian Museum, San Jose, CA 1737.⁸ Provenance: originally from the excavations of Firth and Gunn in the Teti Pyramid Cemetery, Saqqara. Material: limestone. Dimensions: length c. 0.56 m; width c. 0.255 m. Bibliography: none, but cf. Porter and Moss, op. cit. 545, where a false door of the same man, present location unknown, is also mentioned (Firth-Gunn, Teti Pyramid Cemeteries, 1, 196 (27)).

This block presumably formed the left-hand end of an architrave or lintel. It depicts three standing figures of the deceased which face to the right. The figures on the right and in the centre are represented in identical poses, the left hand grasping the top of a staff and the right holding a hṛp sceptre. Both wear long wigs, broad collars, and triangular kilts. The only difference between the two figures is that the central one lacks a diagonal stripe on the kilt. The figure on the left holds a staff in the middle with his left hand, while his right hangs down beside/behind his kilt. No collar is depicted, and, owing to damage to the rear of the head, the wig type is uncertain. Before each figure is a vertical text containing titles, epithets, and names: those at the right and in the centre are of one column only, while that at the left

³ A more meaningful translation than the traditional 'possessor of reverence', or the like. For examples with the same sense see Helck, Wirtschaftsgeschichte, chapters 7–8.
⁴ A History of Sculpture and Painting in the Old Kingdom, 163 n. 1. The drum of G2110 is, contrary to Smith's assertion (loc. cit.), almost certainly that found by Fisher in tomb G3015A (The Minor Cemetery at Giza, pl. 50 (5)), as noted originally by Capart (Documents, 11, 23).
⁵ Baer, Rank and Title in the Old Kingdom, 264.
⁷ The tomb of the only other published holder of one of Nfr's titles, imy-r zš 3ht-Hwfw, exhibits both alternative forms of the pr-hd group, and thus possibly dates to the beginning of the Sixth Dynasty (3ht-hẓw), Hassan, Excavations at Giza, 1, figs. 137, 133). This would make him a little later than Nfr, and suggests that the title imy-r zš 3ht-Hwfw only appeared around the end of the Fifth Dynasty.
⁸ My thanks are due to Miss Lesley Bone for information about and permission to publish this piece and its photograph.
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comprises two vertical columns of titles, with the great name of the deceased written horizontally before the hand of the figure, and the good name vertically inscribed.

The whole block is cut in sunk relief. It is broken into two pieces, with damage to the decoration at the edges. The figures at the left and in the centre have traces of red colour on the bodies, and the left has some black on the wig. Otherwise, all indications of colour have disappeared.

Texts: (right), šhd dbjt, mty n z; Šdy-pth, ‘The inspector of the palace (?), regular one of the body of priests, Šdy-pth’.
(centre), šhd pr- rj, imhw Šdw, ‘The inspector of the great house, the one who has been provided for, Šdw’.
(left), (a) wrb 200, imy-r wpt Mn- nh-Nfr-kr-rc, (b) imy-r prwy-hd, imy-r izwy hkr nzwt, (c) Šdy-pth, rmf nfr Šdw, ‘The wrb-priest of the two hundred and overseer of commissions of the pyramid Mn- nh-Nfr-kr-rc (“May Neferkareš be established and live”), the overseer of the two treasuries, the overseer of the two chambers of the royal ornament, Šdy-pth, whose good name is Šdw’.

Since the titles of Šdy-pth mention the pyramid of Pepy II, the block cannot antedate the later Sixth Dynasty. It would seem that most Old Kingdom monuments from the area of the Teti pyramid cemetery date either from the beginning of the Sixth Dynasty through to some time in the middle of the dynasty (including all the large mastabas), or from the end of the Old Kingdom and beginning of the First Intermediate Period, monuments of the intervening period at Saqqâra coming principally from the area around the pyramids of Merenrēš and Pepy II. Mention of the pyramid of Pepy II on monuments from the Teti pyramid cemetery is very rare, and it is preferable to date this block to the end of the Old Kingdom or the early First Intermediate Period.

The false door belonging to Šdy-pth exhibits only the titles šhd pr-nzwt, šhd dbjt, šhd pr- rj. It is possible to interpret each monument as representing a different stage in this man’s career. After the false door was produced, he was probably promoted to the high office of imy-r prwy-hd, which brought with it the title of imy-r izwy hkr nzwt and the pyramid titles. Almost all holders of imy-r izwy hkr nzwt were overseers of the treasury, and in the Sixth Dynasty most of the highest officials held titles associated with royal pyramids; presumably their high civil rank qualified them for the material benefits to be gained by association with a royal temple.

3. Blocks of an unknown Official (see pl. IV)

New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 04.2.4-6. Provenance: uncertain. Material: limestone. Dimensions: 04.2.4, length 0.505 m; width 0.253 m; 04.2.5, length 0.32 m;

One example is the offering table of Mn-nh-Ppy Mni, Cairo Museum J. d’E. 38427, Cat. Gen. 57014, see Moret, Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire : Denkmäler des Alten Reiches, III, fasc. 1, 20 with pl. and fig.

One would expect him to have inscribed on the false door the highest titles held at the time of its manufacture, unless he simply valued those found on it more highly than the others.

My grateful thanks are due to Dr Christine Lilyquist for information about these blocks, the photographs, and permission to publish them.
width 0.2 m; 04.2.6, length 0.857 m; width 0.257 m. Bibliography: New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, *Egyptian Catalog 1898*, nos. 872-4: cf. Porter and Moss, op. cit. 760. The existence of these blocks is noted by Kaplony, *Studien zum Grab des Methethi*, 88.

04.2.4 is a block bearing part of four vertical columns of inscription. The wide border at the left indicates that it probably belonged to the corner of a tomb chapel. The right-hand end is damaged.

04.2.5 displays part of two vertical columns of inscription. Like 04.2.4, it probably came from the corner of a tomb chapel.

04.2.6 bears, at the left, part of two vertical columns of inscription. The remainder consists of three standing male figures, each preceded by vertical column(s) of text. Two such columns accompany the figure furthest to the left who wears a short, detailed wig and a short kilt. His right arm is held clenched to the chest while the left bears a *hrp* sceptre. The two remaining figures are each accompanied by a single column of text, wear short kilts, and hold the right arm clenched to the chest with the left beside/behind them. The only difference between them is that the figure furthest to the right does not wear the heavy, detailed wig of his companion. All three men wear small collars, although that on the left is not detailed. The left edge of the block is slightly damaged; the surface is worn in places.

All three blocks are cut in raised relief of a standard which, while perfectly competent, is not of the highest Old Kingdom quality; this may be seen particularly in the rendering of the facial features.

*Texts* (the translation of the major columns of inscription will be discussed below along with the arrangement of the blocks):

04.2.4 (1) *n [S]nfrw*, (2) *imi-ru iz*, (3) *Hwfw*, (4) *imi-ru pr-hd n*.

04.2.5 (1) *imi-ru pr-hd*, (2) *Dd-f-r*.

04.2.6 (at left) (1) *imi-ru pr-hd*, (2) *zŠ r nzwt*;
(before left-hand figure) (1) *zš f dt*, (2) *zš Tnti*, ‘His son, for whom (he) has provided,* a the judge and scribe *Tnti*’;
(before central figure) *zš N-ksmmk (?)*,b ‘The scribe, *N-ksmmk*’;
(before right-hand figure) *zš Pth-ḥtp(w)*, ‘The scribe *Pth-ḥtp(w)*’.

(a) Meaning one who benefits from his funerary establishment (cf. Helck, *Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 57–60).

(b) The reading of this name (not in Ranke, *Personennamen*) is extremely doubtful. The central element may be the verb *ksm*, ‘defy’, ‘obstruct’ (*Wb*. v, 141), appearing in the passive form with reduplicated third consonant (Edel, *Altägyptische Grammatik*, §§ 556–8). This gives the translation ‘You will / May you never be obstructed’, taking the verb in a future-optative sense (ibid., §562). There are two important obstacles to this interpretation. The verb *ksm* does not seem to be attested elsewhere before the Middle Kingdom, while the reduplicated passive in the Old Kingdom is an archaizing form not found outside the Pyramid and Coffin Texts. While one can explain away these problems, particularly the first, on the grounds of early forms and exceptions, it is clear that this interpretation is only tentative.
The arrangement and provenance of the blocks are the principal problems to be considered. On the basis of the main text, Winlock, according to the Metropolitan Museum, arranged them thus:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>04.2.5</th>
<th>04.2.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04.2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

giving the text

This produces the following transliteration and translation: (1) \( \text{imy-r \ pr-hd n Snfrw} \), (2) \( \text{zsr nzwit \ imy-r iz} \), (3) \( \text{imy-r \ pr-hd n Hwfw} \), (4) \( \text{imy-r \ pr-hd n Dd-f-r} \), 'The overseer of the treasury of Snofru . . . the scribe of the king's documents, the overseer of the chamber . . . the overseer of the treasury of Khufu . . . the overseer of the treasury of Djedefrēc.'

This reconstruction does not inspire confidence: first, the positioning of the cartouches is unusual. In general, Old Kingdom texts place the royal name either before or after the other title elements, but not both. If the cartouche of Djedefrēc was placed at what may be the top of a column of text for effect, then it would be expected that those of Snofru and Khufu would have received similar prominence; secondly, this reconstruction makes insufficient allowance for the discrepancies in the sizes of the blocks. There is no less than 5.7 cm difference in height between blocks 04.2.5 and 6, and so, if they are to be placed together, there is either room for another sign or signs between 04.2.5 and 4 or else the tops of the blocks were not level; in the latter case, the cartouche of Djedefrēc would not be the first group in its column.

Given that the blocks all emanate from the same wall (which would seem likely on the grounds of palaeography), an unknown number of blocks is lost, thus rendering
an alternative reconstruction difficult. The titles referring to the treasury of a deceased king found on these blocks when so reconstructed are unique in the Old Kingdom, and for this reason alone one’s suspicions as to the validity of this arrangement are aroused.\footnote{Some later parallels are found: a First Intermediate Period title refers to the treasury of Meryka\texttextcompwordmark{e} (on the false door of \textit{Htpi}, Cairo J. d’E. 39102, Quibell, \textit{Excavations at Saqqara} (1906–7), 72 pl. vi (2)), and in the time of Ramesses II an \textit{imy-r pr-hd m hwt Wsr-m\texttextcompwordmark{s}t-r\texttextcompwordmark{s} stp-n-r\texttextcompwordmark{s} n Imn} is found (see Helck, \textit{Verwaltung}, 516).}12 There is no evidence for treasuries apart from those of the state at this time, although it is not impossible that some such institution existed within a royal funerary complex. The Old Kingdom abounds in unique titles, and it is not impossible that each title was created especially for this one individual to enable him, like the holders of so many ‘priestly’ offices compounded with the name of a king, to benefit from the revenues of the institutions founded by that ruler.13

No indication is given as to the provenance of the blocks, although they are tentatively placed by Porter and Moss in the Saqqâra volume. A search for parallel examples has as yet failed to uncover anything similar; it is impossible to arrive at any conclusions based on the possible proximity of this tomb to a pyramid mentioned in the titles as the three institutions are widely separated (Dahshur, Gîza, Abu Roash).

As with the drum of \textit{Nfr} above, the best dating criterion (which only gives an approximate result) is the form of the \textit{pr-hd} group. This belongs with the examples dating not later than the end of the Fifth Dynasty (or the beginning of the Sixth if from Gîza: see Part II of this paper). A Fifth Dynasty date may be supported by some of the stylistic features, which, although not of the finest quality, lack the elongation and unshyly often found in Sixth Dynasty monuments.

\section*{II}

The sign-group translated ‘treasury’ (\textit{pr-hd}, \textit{Wb}. 1, 518) is written throughout Egyptian history by a combination of the mace and house signs. Phonetic spellings of the group are never found. The term is well attested in the First, Second, and Third Dynasties,\footnote{Gardiner, \textit{Sign List}, T.4. Only one example seems to show the mace completely enclosed by the house, in manner of Old Kingdom form B (below): Emery, \textit{Great Tombs of the First Dynasty}, 111, pl. 100 (7) (Saqqâra tomb 3507, time of Den).} where the form is normally written \[\text{\textit{pr-hd}}\] and occasionally \[\text{\textit{pr-wy-hd}}\], the latter showing a strap used to pass round the hand.\footnote{The only noticeable deviation appears with the dual \textit{prwy-hd}: this is normally formed by a straightforward doubling of the singular group, but in the Sixth Dynasty two examples appear with one \textit{pr-hd} group accompanied by a pair of house determinatives to indicate the dual. These come from the tombs of \textit{Mrrw-kii Mri} (Duell, \textit{The Mastaba of Mereruka}, 11, pl. 218a) and \textit{\textit{nh-mry-r}} (Lauer, \textit{Saqqara}, xviii, pl. 133). Some examples classed as form A show the mace protruding very slightly below the house (such as \textit{Djerm}, Petrie-Murray, \textit{Seven Memphite Tomb Chapels}, pl. xiv).}

Figure 1 gives a selection of well-dated Old Kingdom examples of the group \textit{pr-hd}. From this material it will be evident that within the one form there are two variants, \[\text{\textit{pr-hd}}\] and \[\text{\textit{pr-wy-hd}}\]. These will be termed form A and form B respectively.\footnote{\textit{Dqbt}, Petrie-Murray, \textit{Seven Memphite Tomb Chapels}, pl. xiv.} Both
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Middle to later Fourth Dynasty

Later Fourth and early Fifth Dynasty

Middle Fifth Dynasty

Reign of Djedkarēt

Reign of Wenis
9. Ḥḥt-hṭp(w), Saqqara, Davies, *Ptaḥ-hotep and Akhethotep*, ii, pl. ix, xx

Reign of Teti/Early Sixth Dynasty
11. Ḥḥḥ-hḥf Qr, Giza, Hassan, *Giza*, iii, fig. 115, 114.

Reign of Pepy I
12. Mḥv Ṭsqqārā, Saad, *ASAE* 40 (1940), pl. lxxxi.

Mid-Sixth Dynasty/Early reign of Pepy II

Reign of Djedkarēt
17. ḫw, Deir el-Gebrawi, Davies, *Deir el Gebrawi*, 11, pl. ix.

First Intermediate Period
18. Ṭḥw, Saqqara, Firth-Gunn, op. cit. ii, pl. 61.

Fig. 1. Old Kingdom examples of the group pr-hḥ which may be dated with a degree of confidence. These examples are not necessarily drawn to scale.

are found in the Fourth Dynasty (nos. 1 and 2), form A at Giza, form B at Saqqara.\(^\text{17}\) Form A is the only one evident in the early Fifth Dynasty at either site, showing that, although a localized writing existed previously, when Saqqara became the principal necropolis of the major state officials, the form prevalent at the previous main burial site continued to be used (nos. 4 and 5; a parallel example from Giza is no. 3).

The next well-dated certain example of form B comes from the tomb of Snḏm-ḥb Ṭṇτ at Giza, dated to the very end of the reign of Djedkarēt (no. 8). From that time onwards, this form clearly became the norm, providing no further significant indications for the purposes of dating. There are no obvious differences between the forms in use in the provinces (no. 17) and those in the Memphite region (rest of nos. 10–19).

Examination of later examples shows that form B remained the principal writing for the rest of Egyptian history,\(^\text{18}\) and there are no immediately obvious dating

\(^{17}\) No. 1 is in fact the only example of pr-hḥ from the Fourth Dynasty at Giza; another Saqqara example of the same date is Ṭṭz, Mogensen, *La Glyptothèque Ny Carlsberg : La Collection égyptienne*, pl. xcii (AEIN 896a). The earliest Fourth Dynasty example of this sign is unfortunately published only in typeface (Ph-r-nfr, Maspero, *Études égyptiennes*, 11, 248).

\(^{18}\) Middle Kingdom stela of Ṭpt, Cairo Cat. Gen. 20053 (Lange-Schäfer, *Catalogue des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire : Grab und Denksteine des Mittleren Reiches III*, Taf. V); reign of Thutmose III, Davies, *The
criteria to be drawn, unlike in the Old Kingdom. The principal variation was the separation of the two signs, often with the addition of a house determinative (\(\text{\textsuperscript{18}}\)). When the dual was written, the house signs were often joined together (\(\text{\textsuperscript{19}}\)).

More precise dating of the reintroduction of form B in the Old Kingdom is less simple. A scene from the tomb of \(\text{\textsuperscript{20}}\) at Saqqâra, probably to be dated to the reign of Niuserre, includes a man with the title of \(\text{\textsuperscript{21}}\), written using form B. The same is true for a \(\text{\textsuperscript{22}}\) in the tomb of \(\text{\textsuperscript{23}}\) at Gîza. If the accuracy of Mariette’s copy may be trusted, the writings in the tomb of the vizier \(\text{\textsuperscript{24}}\) complement the previous examples, suggesting the middle of the dynasty for the reappearance of this writing. Both forms are found in the tombs of \(\text{\textsuperscript{25}}\) and \(\text{\textsuperscript{26}}\) (no. 6), and \(\text{\textsuperscript{27}}\) (no. 9), indicating that neither form was necessarily standard at Saqqâra in the reigns of Djedkarê and Wenis.

The latest occurrence of form A which may be dated with some degree of certainty also comes from a monument containing examples of form B. This is the tomb of \(\text{\textsuperscript{28}}\) at Gîza (no. 11), perhaps of the early Sixth Dynasty. It is very likely that the older form persisted longer at Gîza than at Saqqâra, since the former site was far less important at that time and therefore not likely to reflect new practices from elsewhere except in the tombs of the most favoured officials (such as \(\text{\textsuperscript{29}}\) above). It is likely that it had ceased to be used at Gîza by the middle of the Sixth Dynasty.

Such palaeographical considerations enable the \(\text{\textsuperscript{30}}\) group to be used as a dating criterion to a limited extent in the Old Kingdom. A monument belonging to an important official (such as \(\text{\textsuperscript{31}}\)) bearing form A is most likely to have been made before the reigns of Djedkarê or Wenis, while one exhibiting form B is probably later than this date, or is Fourth Dynasty and comes from Saqqâra. If the example comes from Gîza, then the lower limit of form A may be extended into the early part of the Sixth Dynasty.

This criterion is applied in part I of this paper to help derive dates for \(\text{\textsuperscript{32}}\) and the official whose name is lost. Other examples where it may be of use concern the

---

\(\text{Tomb of Rekhmirê} \), pl. xlvi; Amarna period, id., \(\text{The Rock Tombs of El Amarna} \), i, pl. xxx; in the Ramesseum, Chapollion, \(\text{Notices descriptives} \), i, 889; reign of Osorkon I, Quibell, \(\text{Ramesseum} \), pl. xxii (1), xxiii (4).

\(\text{\textsuperscript{18}}\) Middle Kingdom stela of \(\text{\textsuperscript{19}}\), Cairo Cat. Gen. 20539, Lange-Schäfer, op. cit., pl. xli; early Eighteenth Dynasty tomb of \(\text{\textsuperscript{20}}\), LD iii, 122g; Piankhi stela, \(\text{\textsuperscript{21}}\), 30, 2.

\(\text{\textsuperscript{19}}\) See first two examples in n. 17.

\(\text{\textsuperscript{20}}\) LD 11, 56a bis.  

\(\text{\textsuperscript{21}}\) Epron-Wild, \(\text{Le Tombeau de Ti} \), i, pl. liii.  

\(\text{\textsuperscript{22}}\) Mariette, \(\text{Les Mastabas de l’ancien Empire} \), 228–9.

\(\text{\textsuperscript{23}}\) In the tomb of the father of \(\text{\textsuperscript{24}}\) (Pth-htp(w) I (no. 7)), only form A is found, showing a change in the practice of one family at this time.

\(\text{\textsuperscript{24}}\) All the tombs of probable Sixth Dynasty date exhibiting both of these forms together come from Gîza. There are at least two further examples: tomb of \(\text{\textsuperscript{25}}\), Junker, \(\text{Giza} \), iv—form A, Abb. 9, 11; form B, Abb. 5–8, 10, and that of \(\text{\textsuperscript{26}}\), Hassan, \(\text{Excavations at Giza} \), i—form A, fig. 137; form B, figs. 133, 135–6, 142. In all these instances, examples of the older form A are in the minority, showing it to have been falling out of use.

\(\text{\textsuperscript{25}}\) It should be noted that in the tomb of \(\text{\textsuperscript{26}}\)’s son, \(\text{\textsuperscript{27}}\), only examples of form B are found (no. 14).
officials Kši\textsuperscript{27} and Ny-sw-wsrt,\textsuperscript{28} both of whose monuments exhibit form A. The former's comes from Saqqâra, and is thus no later than the later Fifth Dynasty; that of the latter, coming from Gîza, has a lower date limit of the early Sixth Dynasty. This criterion can be seen to be particularly useful for Ny-sw-wsrt, whose monument is otherwise almost totally bereft of indications of a date.

\textsuperscript{27} Offering stand, Cairo Cat. Gen. 57048, Abu-Ghazi, \textit{Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire: Denkmäler des Alten Reiches}, III, fasc. 2, 41 with pl. and fig. The seemingly different form of the \textit{pr-hd} group used in the tomb of the vizier Kši (see above) suggests that the monuments are of different men.

\textsuperscript{28} Inscribed block, Hassan, op. cit. III, fig. 186, pl. lx (5), otherwise datable only by its proximity to the tomb of Nfr, probably of Fifth Dynasty date.
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