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Four decades of Czech archaeological excavations at Abusir have substantially enlarged and deepened our knowledge of this important Old Kingdom necropolis whose exploration was for a long time supposed to have been concluded by the German expedition directed by Ludwig Borchardt. Besides several pyramid complexes left unexplored by Borchardt, the work of the Czech archaeological team at Abusir has led to the discovery of new and large cemeteries dating from the Old Kingdom and the Saite-Persian Period. This field extends from the Abusir pyramids as far as the northern edge of the Saqqara necropolis. One of these cemeteries lies south-east of the mortuary temple and south of the causeway of Niuserre (pl. I, fig. P21).

Following a thorough survey of the area sloping south of Niuserre’s causeway, and the identification of the approximate extension of the cemetery covering this area, a decision was taken to begin in the autumn of 1976 the excavation from the presupposed western limit of the cemetery in an eastern direction, towards the edge of the Nile valley. Fortunately, the first days of the excavation not only confirmed the western edge of the cemetery but they also led to the discovery of the surprisingly well preserved mastaba of Princess Khekeretneby. In the same season of 1976, two monuments adjacent from the east and south-east to Khekeretneby’s mastaba were partly unearthed: Neserkauhor’s tomb and the complex of structures for the funerary cult. However, due to more urgent work in the pyramid complexes of Khentkaus (II) and Neferefre, the work in this site was delayed and its exploration halted by a decade.

In the season of 1987, the renewed excavation in the area around Khekeretneby’s mastaba resulted in the discovery and unearthing of further mastabas namely, those of Hedjetnebu, Mernefu, Lady L and Idu. As already mentioned above, the surface survey indicates that there are still other groups of tombs in this part of the Abusir necropolis, which extends as far as Niuserre’s causeway in the north and the edge of the Nile valley in the east. Therefore, it is not entirely certain that still some other, as yet unexamined tombs may have belonged to Djedkare’s family cemetery (no matter how improbable seems to be such an assumption judging by the surface survey of the site; see also the text below concerning the type and dating of Mernefu’s mastaba).

In this monograph, the results of the excavation in Djedkare’s family cemetery are published in chapters arranged according to individual tombs. This publication, however, does not involve secondary burials found in Djedkare’s family cemetery (which date from the Late to the Graeco-Roman Periods). These burials will be published later, together with other similar finds made by the Czech archaeological team in the larger area of Abusir, including, besides Djedkare’s family cemetery, the pyramids of Neferefre, Khentkaus (II), Lepsius no. XXIV and Lepsius no. XXV. Of course, the remnants of the original burials found in the tombs of Djedkare’s family cemetery are included in this monograph: they are published in a special chapter by Eugen Strouhal (“Anthropological Evaluation of Human Skeletal Remains from the Mastabas of Djedkare’s Family Cemetery at Abusir”). Eventually, the discovery of a group of tombs belonging to female members of a 5th Dynasty royal family offered us an opportunity to make a deeper investigation into the social position of these women in the Old Kingdom. The results of the investigation are appended to this monograph in Excursus I (“The Princesses and their Burial Companions”) and Excursus II (“Observations on the Position of Royal Daughters in the Old Kingdom”).

Finally, the authors would like to express their gratitude to those who made important contributions
to the publication of this monograph namely, Milan Zemina and Kamil Voděra, the photographers of the Czech archaeological expedition in Abusir, Jolana Malátková, the artist who made the drawings and the lay-out of the book, Luděk Wellner who drew the plans, and Hana Vymazalová who scanned the photos. Thanks, too, to Hana Navrátilová, who proofed the text. Above all, we need to thank our Egyptian colleagues and friends who assisted us in the excavation of Djedkare’s Family Cemetery: Inspectors Dr Sabbah Fatah, Mohamed el-Asher and the chief of workers reis Abdu el-Qereti and reis Mitaal el-Qereti.

21st May, 2002
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Opening the entrance to Khekereteby’s burial chamber by Mr. Sabbakh Fatah, inspector of antiquities, reis Abdu el-Qereti and reis Mitaal el-Qereti
1 The Mastaba of Khekeretneby (B)

The mastaba of Khekeretneby (see fig. G1.B) had originally been intended for the princess Khekeretneby alone but, at some later stage, another offering room was added to the superstructure and the mastaba’s substructure was altered. In a new offering room, a false door to Tisethor was erected. The mummy of Tisethor was interred in a newly added burial chamber.

Fig. G1 Plan of Djedkare’s family cemetery, showing the position of the mastaba of Khekeretneby

THE OWNER OF THE MASTABA

Khekeretneby

imḥbt ḥr Tssi “revered with Isesi”
imḥbt ḥr nswt “revered with the king”
imḥbt ḥr ntr ṣ “revered with the Great god”
mrťt (nt) Tssi “beloved of Isesi”
mrťt rʾ nb “his beloved every day”

sīt nswt “king’s daughter”

sīt nswt ḥt.f “king’s daughter of his body”

sīt nswt ḥt.f mrť.f “king’s beloved daughter of his body”

Tisethor

nbḥ imḥlt ḫr ntr ʾ3 ṣ nb nswt “possessor of reverence with the Great god and with the king”

1 For nbḥy in the titles and names of Old Kingdom queens, see H. G. Fischer, in: JEA 60, 94–99. In Khekeretneby’s name Nbḥy refers to the king, see ibid., 98 n. 18.
2 The English translation of the titles and epithets in the following text was adapted in accordance with Jones, Index. The original meaning of the title was linked to the dead one’s privilege to share in the offerings coming from the royal funerary estates, see Helck, Wirtschaftsgeschichte 92 (“der/die Versorgte von ḫy/dem König”).
3 The sign ḫr was probably omitted by mistake. The preposition r is not attested with the meaning “with”, see Edel, Grammatik II, 390 f., § 760.
4 Concerning the evidence of the title nbḥ imḥlt ḫr ntr ʾ3 in Old Kingdom texts, see Jones, Index I, 481. The variant nbḥ imḥlt ḫr ntr ʾ3 nb nswt, emphasizing Tisethor’s revered status with both the Great God and the King, does not seem to be attested prior to this time in the Old Kingdom.
Over the western half of the mastaba, a homogenous layer of sand, extending in a northerly direction, cut deeply into a massive deposit of pottery. The latter consisted of complete vessels and

![Diagram]

**Fig. B1** Profile above the southern part of Khekeretneby’s mastaba
1 yellow sand
2 limestone fragments, sherds
3 limestone fragments, sherds
4 clay
5 yellow sand, limestone fragments
6 false shaft
7 limestone fragments, sherds, yellow sand
8 pottery (beer jugs, stands, miniature vessels), sherds, yellow sand
9 serdab
10 broken mudbricks, limestone fragments, sherds

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORT**

The surface layer being very thin (not more than 20 cm) in this place (see fig. B1), it could be ascertained already in the first hours of the excavation that the monument was a relatively well preserved mastaba. In some places, even the rough limestone roofing slabs were found still *in situ*. The entrance to the mastaba, situated approximately in the middle of the eastern façade, fortunately, with a part of its limestone lintel still *in situ*, was discovered early in the excavation. The remains of a hieroglyphic inscription in sunk relief on both the lintel and the drum helped at the very beginning of the excavation to identify the owner of the tomb as Princess Khekeretneby, the daughter of the King Isesi.$^7$

Besides the eroded pieces of limestone, the surface layer of dark grey sand covering the extant superstructure of the mastaba contained a great number of potsherds dating from the late 5th Dynasty. In several places secondary burials dating from the Late Period were found under this uppermost layer, for example in the crown of the western outer wall near the north-west corner of the mastaba.

---

$^7$ For the bibliography concerning different interpretations of the meaning of the title, see Jones, *Index*, 794f. For discussion on the title itself, see D. Nord, in: *Serapis* 2, 1970, 1–16. Originally, it was taken to mean a concubine of the king, but the huge number of women with this title caused this equivalent to be called into doubt. Nord’s interpretation is now the generally accepted version of the title. The title dates from the 4th Dynasty onwards (see Murray, *Index*), as Nord (p. 4) has observed. Kaplon (IAF I, 372) thought that the title might have been current during the Archaic period, but his argument for an earlier version of this title cannot be supported by the evidence. In a well-documented argument, Nord (p. 7) demonstrates that the word *bk ret* within a title is associated with the adornment of the king (or else is used passively to indicate one adorned by the king). The male title also stems from the 4th Dynasty and is found only in compound titles referring to ornaments – which includes ointments as well as precious materials. Clearly, then, the title carried by Tisethor is indicative of her duties in caring for the personal adornment of members of the royal family.

$^6$ This double phrase, too, could be one of the earliest occasions on which it is used. From this same period, Queen Nebneby has a triple phrase: *immlt fr nswt, Wsr, fr nf* 5 “revered with the king and Osiris and with the Great God”, see Mariette, *Les Mastabas*, p. 225f. Concerning the occurrence of Wsr in the title, see Begelsbacher-Fischer, *Götterwelt des Alten Reiches*, 121–125.

$^7$ Concerning the preliminary report on the excavation in Khekeretneby’s mastaba, see M. Verme, in: *ZAS* 105, 1978, 157–159; see also *Unearthing*, 32 and pl. 25 upper right.
sherd and filled the whole central portion of the mastaba. The pottery had been used secondarily as building material to fill the large space above the burial chamber. It included a variety of late 5th Dynasty pottery types – for example: beer jugs, bread forms, cylindrical stands, conical stands, spouted jugs, ball-shaped vessels, small symbolic vases and dishes, bowls with rounded bottom and recurved rim, plates, footed trays, etc. The pottery very probably came from the waste dumps near the neighbouring mortuary temples and tombs in Abusir. Once used in the funerary cult and then thrown away, it was collected during the construction of Khekeretnebty’s mastaba to serve as a cheap and, at the same time, very appropriate building material. As a matter of fact, this layer of strong and relatively light pottery substantially decreased the pressure on the ceiling of the burial chamber below it.

The mastaba has a rectangular, north-south orientated plan (fig. B2). At present, the monument is 18.70 m long, 10.42 m wide and 2.78 m high, which may correspond to an originally planned length of 36 cubits, width of 20 cubits and height of 6 cubits. The outer faces of the monument were tilted at an angle of cca 80°. The somewhat atypical ratio between the length and the width is due to the additional enlargement of the mastaba by 3.21 m (cca 6 cubits) to the north. This enlargement was made at a later date for the burial apartments of Tisethor.

The masonry of the mastaba consists of two basic building materials: grey limestone of inferior quality and mudbrick. As a rule, the core of the walls was built of mudbrick, whereas their casing was of limestone. Concerning the limestone blocks, the dimensions fluctuated from less than 1 cubit long ashlar up to cca 3.5 m long ceiling slabs in the burial chamber of Khekeretnebty. Generally speaking, the merely roughly dressed limestone ashlar were arranged in horizontal rows. The mudbrick was made of grey-black Nile mud with a slight admixture of either chopped straw or crushed limestone. The average size of a single brick was 30 x 15 x 10 cm. The eastern half of the superstructure of the mastaba contained, besides the serdab in the south-east corner of the monument, three rooms: a vestibule, flanked on both the south and north sides with a chapel. The substructure of the mastaba consisted of two burial chambers, each of them accessible by means of a vertical shaft. One burial chamber was situated approximately under the centre of the mastaba, the other in the northern, additionally enlarged portion of the monument. Besides the above mentioned rooms, there was still a vertical shaft in the south-west corner of the mastaba.

The superstructure of the mastaba

The entrance

The entrance (fig. B2.1) was placed in a shallow niche in the eastern façade of the mastaba, closer to the north-east corner. Only a fragment from the limestone lintel above the entrance survived to date, bearing a hieroglyphic inscription in sunk relief with the remains of the funerary formula and Princess Khekeretnebty’s name, titles and representation. The inscription explicitly mentioned that Khekeretnebty was “Iseši’s daughter of his own body”. The 60 cm wide doorway was surmounted by a limestone drum, now badly weathered, bearing a roughly cut hieroglyphic inscription in sunk relief with the tomb’s owner name and principal title: Sjt nswt Hkrt- nbty (fig. B3).
Fig. B2  Plan of the Mastaba of Khekeretneby. 1 – entrance; 2 – vestibule; 3 – offering room; 4 – magazine; 5 – serdab; 6 – burial shaft of Khekeretneby; 7 – burial chamber of Khekeretneby; 8 – burial shaft of Tisethor; 9 – burial chamber of Tisethor; 10 – false shaft.
Around the entrance, on the eastern façade of the mastaba, the remnants of red painted stucco (imitating red granite?) were observed. The doorway bore traces of stucco, painted white, and it was decorated on both the northern and the southern side by two green painted horizontal bands (one broad, the other one narrower). Originally, the entrance was provided with a one-leaf wooden door.

The vestibule

The vestibule (fig. B2.2), following immediately behind the entrance, had a rectangular (2.14 x 1.52 m), east-west orientated plan. As indicated by three ceiling slabs found still in situ (though slightly shifted aside), the room was 2.52 m high (figs. B2 and B4). Its walls were covered with a very thin layer of stucco and whitewashed. Only the western wall originally bore an unfinished painting: Khekeretneby seated at a table and watching the bringing of offerings.

The whole room, up to the ceiling, was filled with grey sand mixed with fragments of limestone masonry from the tomb. Among the debris in the south-east corner of the vestibule lay a piece of candle left here probably by tomb robbers during their recent visit to the tomb. In the debris, several blocks bearing the remains of unfinished wall paintings were scattered. The blocks came from the badly damaged western wall through which the tomb robbers forced their way — and it was certainly the shortest way — to the vertical shaft. That lay behind this wall and gave access to the burial chamber, (pl. II, Bf2). Luckily, all the blocks extracted by the robbers were found and the wall bearing the painting could be reconstructed.

The floor of the vestibule was paved with roughly cut pieces of limestone of an irregular shape — as were the floors in other rooms to the south and north of the vestibule. To the robbers can be ascribed a hole (cca 1 x 1 m, and 0.5 m deep) excavated in the floor of the vestibule, immediately behind the entrance to the tomb.

Taking into account another piece of the candle found in the hole, the latter piece (as well as the other candle end mentioned above) may represent one of several attempts (dating from the same time as the recent burial – see below – in the serdab?) to penetrate this way into the underground of the tomb. Drops of wax and traces of soot from the burning candle were also disclosed on the ceiling of a short passage connecting the vestibule with Khekeretneby’s offering room.

Khekeretneby’s offering room

The debris which filled the offering room (fig. B2.3) contained, apart from the grey sand and broken mudbrick and limestone chips, pieces of a limestone false door of Khekeretneby and a fragment of a decayed, wooden standing female statue (front half of the right foot, painted yellow, white nails).

Fig. B4 Cross-section of Khekeretneby’s tomb
The room had a rectangular (3.50 × 1.56 m), north-south orientated plan. In contrast to the vestibule and Tisethor’s chapel, no ceiling slabs (either in position or collapsed) were found in this room. The remains of its original arrangement leave no doubt about its meaning: the room served as a cult chapel for Khekeretnebty. In the 162 cm wide and 55 cm deep niche in the western wall of the chapel, a limestone false door of Khekeretnebty had originally been embedded. The latter had been later extracted by the robbers and partly destroyed. Only several parts of the false door – the cross bar, a fragment of the right door jamb and the tablet with the funerary repast scene – were discovered (fig. B16) in the debris in the chapel. Another fragment, coming from the left door jamb is now in the Brooklyn Museum of Fine Arts in New York. Judging by the imprint found in the niche, the false door was surmounted by a concave cornice. In the niche, originally behind the false door, a red painted cursive graffito sêt nswt ḫrṭ-nbt y (fig. B5) was disclosed. On the ground, at the foot of the false door lay an offering table made of a piece of limestone roughly cut in the form of the hieroglyphic sign hetep.

The other fragment, bearing a part of the offering table scene in low relief, probably came from one of the neighbouring and as-yet unearthed mastabas.

The structure of the debris filling Tisethor’s offering room did not basically differ from that in Khekeretnebty’s offering room. It consisted of grey sand, limestone chips and fragments of mud bricks. In addition to that, it contained potsherds, miniature symbolic vessels, sporadic fragments of mummy wrappings, faience beads and several pieces of a reed rope.

This rectangular (2.78 × 1.59 m), north-south orientated room to the north of the vestibule served originally as a magazine. However, during the reconstruction of the mastaba, the magazine was converted into a chapel for the king’s courtier, Tisethor. Leaning against the western wall of the room, and resting on a low pedestal, was a monolithic limestone false door of the royal courtier, Tisethor. With some hieroglyphic signs being carved in sunk relief and some others only outlined in black paint, the false door was obviously left unfinished. The pedestal of the false door was built of mudbrick and plastered and whitewashed. On the ground, at the foot of the false door a small offering table was built of mudbrick, plastered and whitewashed.

The walls of Tisethor’s chapel were plain, only whitewashed. Like the offering room of Khekeretnebty, the chapel was also illuminated by means of a narrow opening in the eastern wall, just under the ceiling.

The serdab

The serdab (fig. B2.5), a narrow rectangular (3.25 × 1.10 m) and east-west orientated room, occupied the south-east corner of the mastaba. Its walls, built of small, roughly cut limestone ashlars, were not plastered. The ceiling of the serdab, formed by roughly cut limestone slabs of irregular shape, was uncovered in position; the room was 2.24 m high (figs. B8.A–A). A small opening in the north wall linked the serdab with the chapel of Khekeretnebty. The eastern wall and the easternmost ceiling slab of the serdab were damaged by tomb robbers who here cut a hole in order to open their way into the serdab. In the debris under the robbers’ hole, a tiny clay sealing bearing the Horus name of Niuserre, Št-ib-twy (1/B/78), was found.

On the ceiling of the serdab a large deposit of late 5th Dynasty pottery – beer jugs, bread forms, stands and miniature symbolical vessels – was uncovered just under the surface layer. The pottery, arranged in rows on the rough and irregular roofing slabs of the small serdab, was obviously designed to protect the serdab from above.

The debris (grey sand mixed with fragments of limestone and mudbrick) filled the serdab and sloped
underground apartments. The shaft, 5 m deep and almost square-shaped (1.90 × 1.87 m) in section, was originally built of small limestone ashlar of irregular size. Its south-east corner was partly destroyed by the robbers. However, its northern wall bore clear traces of a major reconstruction which had been made during the above-mentioned enlargement of the mastaba. Most of the original wall had been removed (obviously, to facilitate the construction of Tisethor's burial chamber) and was later rebuilt, but this time of small and irregular pieces of limestone (fig. B6).

The upper portion of the shaft was filled with yellow sand sporadically mixed with fragments of pottery and limestone. At a depth of cca 2–3 m under the mouth of the shaft, large pieces of the limestone lintel of Prince Neserkauhor were found. Besides the funerary formula, the lintel bore the titles, name and a striding figure of the prince. The assumption that the lintel came from a damaged tomb in the vicinity of Khekeretnebty's mastaba was soon to be confirmed in the successive season. Obviously, the robbers used large and relatively thin and flat pieces of the lintel extracted from the entrance to Neserkauhor's mastaba to build, in the SE corner of the shaft, a separation to block the filling of the shaft and facilitate their descent to the burial chamber.

At the bottom of the shaft, at a depth of cca 5 m, an offering of a gazelle foreleg on a dish of red burnt clay covered with a similar dish still lay in situ, pl. II, Bf3. Both dishes had been crushed under the pressure of the shaft's filling. This interesting find undoubtedly attests that part of funerary rites which pertained, following the burial, to the sealing of the entrance to Khekeretnebty's sarcophagus chamber.8

The 1.35 m wide and 1.05 m high entrance to the burial chamber, opening in the south wall at the bottom of the shaft, was built of big blocks of fine white limestone. The wall which blocked the entrance was almost intact, except for a small opening (cca 1.0 × 0.5 m) in the upper left corner of the wall cut by the robbers. The opening was just

---

westwards. Near the western wall of the serdab, in the debris, remnants of two decayed wooden standing statues (191/B/76 and 192/B/76) of the tomb owner were found. On the layer of the debris, just under the ceiling, lay a recent burial of a man. Undoubtedly, the dead body was inserted into the serdab through the above-mentioned hole. The anthropological examination showed that this middle aged man died about thirty or forty years before our excavation (i.e. approximately in the early 1940s).

The substructure of the mastaba

The burial chamber of Khekeretnebty

As already mentioned above, the robbers forced their way to the burial chamber of Khekeretnebty through the western wall of the vestibule to the vertical shaft (fig. B2.6) giving access to the mastaba’s

---

8 The offering of a gazelle, in the funeral offerings of Khekeretnebty, may have been thought ritually appropriate for the burial of a princess, for this animal has been linked with royal women in both Middle and New Kingdom period remains – see Troy, Queenship, 129f. Links between females and gazelles appear in the Old Kingdom too, for gazelle wands were carried by female dancers in the 6th Dynasty, (Petry, Deshasheh, pl.12) where Troy (op. cit., 130) interprets them as fetish symbols. Although Troy links these wands with the royal harim and with Isis, it seems more appropriate in the light of the hkr nswt's association with Hathor, to be a fetish of that goddess, having no necessary connection with the ‘harim’ at all. For discussion on the nature of the harim, see V. G. Callender, in: BACE 5, 1994, 7–25. It would be particularly appropriate to have a gazelle offering in a burial context (as here, with Khekeretnebty’s tomb) because of Hathor's connection with the Afterlife.
large enough to enable a boy or a slim man to draw himself through to the chamber. The side walls of the 1.3 m long passage linking the shaft with the burial chamber bore cursive inscriptions of s3t nswt Hkrt-ntby in red paint (fig. B7).

The floor of the burial chamber (fig. B2.7) was cca 2.50 m below the ground level of the mastaba. The chamber has a rectangular (3.88 × 1.83 m), north-south orientated plan. The ceiling of the 2.25 m high chamber was built of inferior quality limestone slabs (on average about 25 cm thick). The architect who built the tomb was very well aware of the low quality of the ceiling slabs. In order to reduce the pressure from above and to prevent the collapse of the ceiling, he built upon the slabs and above the whole chamber a mudbrick vault (fig. B8.B-B). The large empty space (5.47 × 3.49 × cca 3 m) above the burial chamber was then filled with two very different but, at the same time for the stability of the chamber, very suitable materials (figs. B2 and B8. B-B). The lower portion of the space, up to the top of the mudbrick vault, was filled by pure sand. The upper portion, up to the roof terrace of the mastaba, was formed by the thick layer of pottery already mentioned above.

However, the situation in the chamber must have certainly surprised the robbers. Even before their violation of the tomb, probably not a long time after the burial of Khekeretneby, one of the limestone ceiling slabs broke and collapsed onto the lid of the large limestone sarcophagus below, and partly damaged the mudbrick vault. (This had originally
been built in order to reduce the pressure of the massive layer of refuse pottery filling the central part of the superstructure.) Through the holes in both the mudbrick vault and the flat limestone ceiling, an avalanche of the aforesaid filling fell down and buried the whole northern portion of the chamber — including the sarcophagus.

The roughly cut sarcophagus filled almost the entire burial chamber. The bottom part of the sarcophagus, made of one huge block of limestone, was 2.90 m long, 1.20 m wide and 1.15 m high. The burial cavity in the block had the dimensions 2.30 × 0.65 × 0.60 m. The 0.4 m thick lid had the same length and width as the chest.

The robbers must have immediately realized how dangerous any movement in the chamber would be. They cautiously made their way through a narrow space left between the heap of debris and the ceiling, past the western wall of the chamber and the lid of the sarcophagus, towards the southern part of the chamber, which was not buried under the debris. The robbers were very prudent and did not touch that part of the burial equipment which had been laid on the ground around the north-east and north-west corner of the sarcophagus during the funeral ceremony. The more thoroughly, therefore, they plundered the southern half of the chamber. They cut a hole in the upper part of the southern wall of the sarcophagus and the lid, through which the mummy of Khékeret-neby was pulled out and torn to pieces. The jewels on the mummy — as well as the most precious pieces of the burial equipment left during the funeral rituals within the sarcophagus — were stolen. How successful the robbers were can be only indirectly guessed by the small portion of Khékeret-neby’s burial equipment found by our team in the chamber in situ (see below 31 ff.).

The remains of Khékeret-neby’s mummy were found in two places, outside the southern portion of the sarcophagus and near the entrance to the chamber. In the debris around the southern end of the sarcophagus, about 10–60 cm above the ground, the skull, mandible, some vertebrae and hand bones were disclosed. Some long bones were thrown onto the lid of the sarcophagus. In the debris cca 1 – 1.5 m above the floor of the shaft and close to the entrance to the burial chamber, the other remains of Khékeret-neby’s skeleton were found. Scattered near the entrance were also fragments of mummy wrappings, some of them bearing cursive, “semi-hieratic” texts.

Under the debris, but still in position on the ground near the north-west corner of the sarcophagus, lay an alabaster head-rest, crushed to pieces by the robbers, fragments of a wooden box, an alabaster tablet inscribed with the names of seven offering oils and some other objects.

Near the north-east corner of the sarcophagus, on the ground, still in their original positions, particularly miniature symbolic vases (some of them inscribed with hieratic inscriptions) and dishes of alabaster, miniature symbolic copper vessels and instruments of different types were discovered. In the south-west corner of the chamber, in the pile of limestone chips left here by the robbers as they cut their way towards the sarcophagus, two objects used originally in the rite of the Opening of the Mouth were found — evidently thrown away by the robbers. These were two small symbolic vessels, an almost translucent calcite vase with a slim, long neck (157/B/76) and a conical bowl of basalt (158/B/76).10

Among other objects found in different parts of the burial chamber were four canopic jars, including their flat circular lids, made of limestone (see below pp. 31–32). They were empty and only their surfaces bore the dark traces of resin. One canopic jar was found in the sarcophagus, one on the pile of limestone chips in the south-west corner of the chamber, one beside the western wall and one in the north-west corner of the chamber.

The list of objects found in the debris in the chamber contains cattle bones, a wooden model of a boat, a small flint knife, fragments of a rope made from palm tree fibres, fragments of pottery (it was very difficult to distinguish the pottery of the burial equipment and the filling above the burial chamber from each other), charcoal, etc.

The burial chamber of Tisethor

In comparison with the burial chamber of Khékeret-neby, that of Tisethor (fig. B.2.9) was built on a relatively high level, its floor being only 62 cm under the ground level of the mastaba. The burial chamber of Tisethor had a rectangular (4.01 × 1.89 m), north-south orientated plan. Its walls were built of small ashlars of inferior quality limestone. Contrary to the chamber of Khékeret-neby, the ceiling of Tisethor’s chamber (the room was 1.90 m high), built also of relatively thin slabs of inferior quality limestone, was not surmounted and protected by a mudbrick vault (fig. B.9.D-D). It seems that the chamber never contained a stone sarcophagus.

The access to Tisethor’s burial chamber was given by means of a vertical, square-shaped (the side was 1.32 m long) shaft (fig. B.2.8). The shaft was built of

9 Concerning the preliminary anthropological examination of the remnants of Khékeret-neby’s mummy, see E. Strouhal, in: ZAS 111, 1974, 41–44. For the final conclusions see id. in this monograph, pp. 120–131.
10 For the initial publication of these pieces in colour, see Verner, Forgotten Pharaohs, second fig. from above on p. 85.
a) North-south section of the tomb

b) East-west section through Tisethor's apartments
coarse limestone chips. In contrast to Khekeretneby’s shaft, that of Tisethor was built to the east of the burial chamber (undoubtedly with regard to the vicinity of the northern wall of the mastaba). It was damaged – it would perhaps be more appropriate to say “devastated” – by the robbers much more than that of Khekeretneby. Opened from above by the robbers, the flat ceiling of the chamber, built of roughly cut limestone slabs, was totally demolished. At the bottom of the shaft the skeletal remains of Tisethor were revealed.  

At the bottom of the crater left in the masonry only the ruins of the burial chamber and the vertical shaft were found. The upper layer of the filling of the crater was formed by a clean, blown sand deposit, whereas the lower layer consisted of dark grey sand mixed with big fragments of ceiling slabs, pottery (beer jugs, bread forms and stands), and fragments of animal bones, mummy wrappings of linen and two complete canopic jars of limestone. In the destroyed burial chamber neither the remains of a stone sarcophagus nor a wooden coffin were found.

The shaft in the SW corner of the mastaba

A vertical shaft (figs. B2.10 and B8.A-A) with a partly damaged mouth in the south-west corner was filled to the depth of cca 1 m by wind-blown sand. Deeper down the shaft, the clean drift sand was replaced by grey sand mixed with fragments of limestone, mudbricks, potsherds, an undecorated Late Period wooden anthropoid coffin and mummy wrappings. Apparently, the original filling of the shaft must have been removed sometime between the end of the 5th and the beginning of the 26th Dynasty.

The Wall paintings

The vestibule

The western wall of the vestibule, facing the entrance of the tomb, was the only decorated wall in the room. The wall bears a very roughly made – it would probably be more appropriate to say an unfinished – painting representing Khekeretneby watching the bringing of offerings (pl. III, Bf4 and fig. B10). The scene, painted on a thin layer of stucco, had been damaged by robbers in antiquity (see the text above). Fortunately, most of the painted fragments of the wall were found in the debris in the vestibule and the scene could be almost completely reconstructed. Khekeretneby, seated in her chair, is represented at the northern edge of the wall. The princess wears a long wig decorated with a head-band. She has

11 Some other fragments of Tisethor’s mummy were found in the debris filling the rooms in the superstructure of the mastaba. Concerning the preliminary report on the discovery of the remnants of Khekeretneby’s mummy, see E. Strouhal, in: ZÄS 111, 1974, 41–44. For final conclusions of the anthropological examination see id. below pp. 131 f.
a broad necklace and a long, tightly fitting robe. With her right hand she holds to her nose a lotus flower, her left arm rests on her lap. Above the seated figure of Khekeretnebythere are four vertical and one horizontal lines of hieroglyphic inscription:

1. St nswt nt htf
2. mrt.f, mrt.f, h(r^2)
3. TSSI, im3h(t) hr
4. ntr '3, ... im3h(t)...
5. Hkr-t-ntby.

1. "King’s daughter of his body,
2. his beloved one, one beloved by^{12}
3. Iesi, one revered with
4. the Great God, one revered ...,
5. Khekeretneby."

The remaining part of the wall in front of the princess bears four registers with scenes of bringing the offerings. In the largely damaged uppermost register, there is a partly preserved scene with two striding offering bearers. The first of them leads a male antelope (?), the second one carries on his shoulders two rectangular baskets hanging from a pole.

The scene in the second register from above does not basically differ from the previous one. It depicts a man leading an oryx and a man bringing two baskets hanging from a pole. The inscription painted above the oryx reads mihd “oryx”. Behind the man with the baskets, a single sign h'b is carved.

In the third register from above there is a priest showing to Khekeretneby an unfolded and uninscribed papyrus roll (perhaps representing a symbolic list of offerings). The reading of a roughly carved and partly damaged hieroglyphic inscription in front of the priest is not quite certain. H3m (? ) nswt Ny3-n3-m-R^5: sti^{13}. The priest is followed by a man bringing an ox. An inscription in front of the man reads Ini (?), that above the ox rn iw^3.\(^14\)

The lowest register contains an almost identical scene to the preceding register. A slightly bowing priest is showing to Khekeretneby an unfolded papyrus roll (a symbolic list of offerings). In front of the priest, there are faint remnants of a vertical line of an inscription just sketched in black paint, which perhaps reads Stš “Arranging (of the feast)” (or stš n ... “Arranging of the feast by ...”?). The priest is followed by a man bringing an ox.

The outlines of the figures, objects, register lines and stylized hieroglyphs were sketched in red paint against the whitish background of the stuccoed wall. Khekeretneby’s body was painted yellow. The figures of male offering bearers were either painted red (in the two lower registers) or only outlined in red (in the two upper registers). Here, the remains indicate that the artists had applied the decoration in a direction going from the bottom upwards. The bodies of animals, the baskets, the kilts of the offering bearers,

\(^{12}\) Once again, this is an unusual, reiterated formula, emphasising that the princess was a most loved daughter of the king.

\(^{13}\) The first part of the inscription looks like a title rather than a personal name. The remnants of a horizontal line belonging to the sign (an arm ?) following m perhaps justifies the reading of the preceding word as h3m. The meaning of the inscription, however, remains equivocal: "The adoration of the king’s daughter by Niankhre - Junior" or "Member of the king’s crew Niankhre - Junior" (?). Neither clear-cut is the reading Ny3-n3-m-R^5: sti (RPN 1, 171/17), too; though not attested in RPN, the reading of the name as Ny3-n3-m-nht perhaps cannot be excluded.

\(^{14}\) Is Ini a personal name, or is it to be understand as a part of the inscription Ini rn iw^3 “Bringing an ox”?
the princess' robe and ornaments, the chair and some hieroglyphic signs were in white paint.

Obviously, the whole scene representing Khekeretnebty seated in the chair and watching the bringing of offerings was left unfinished. As shown by the comparison with the scenes painted on the eastern wall of the neighbouring offering room, a more careful and detailed execution of the aforesaid scene was originally planned. The inscription in the third register from above, in front of the priest reading from the roll of the papyrus, seems to have been carved only additionally, possibly by a priest who was in charge of the mortuary cult of the tomb owner.

Khekeretnebty's offering room

On the eastern wall, opposite the niche in which originally Khekeretnebty's false door was embedded, there are the remains of a partly washed off wall painting which had originally been left in different stages of completion.

At the southern edge of the wall, close to the serdab, part of the scene of Khekeretnebty seated in the chair at the funerary table survived (fig. B11). The scene was damaged by tomb robbers who broke into the room from the outside just this way. The upper portion of Khekeretnebty's figure, from the knees upwards, is now missing. The preserved remains of the figure shows that the princess wore a long, white tightly fitting robe and green (faience?) anklets.

The offering table, loaded with stylized slices of bread, was surrounded with offerings. Under the table offerings were piled – including various kinds of fruit and vegetables. An inscription accompanying the scene reads: (h3 m) t5, h3 (m) lnkt, h3 (m) pšt, h3 (m) kšw, h3 (m) ṣpdw, h3 (m) šš, h3 (m) mnh.t “(a thousand of) bread, a thousand (jugs) of beer, a thousand of cakes, a thousand of oxen, a thousand of fowl, a thousand of alabaster vessels (with perfumes), a thousand (pieces) of clothing”.

Above the offering table there are remains of two narrow registers with other offerings. In the lower of the two registers, a row of vessels in stands, a table with an ever, figs, lettuce, etc., can be seen. From the offerings in the upper register only fragments of vessels, ribs, etc. have survived to date.

On the left side of the offering table, on the level of the row of stylized slices of bread, a priest fumigating the offerings is represented. The priest holds in his left hand the censer from which he lifts the lid with his right hand. The short inscription in front of the priest reads šnř “censing”. Both the figure of the priest and the inscription were only
sketched in white colour against the pale grey background of the plastered wall.

The wall painting in the central portion of the eastern wall is now missing. It has been completely washed away by rain water leaking through a narrow window at the top of the wall, just under the ceiling. The water destroyed the painting, including the plaster, and denuded a broad strip of about 80 cm from the stone masonry of the wall.

Another portion of the original decoration, divided in four registers, survived in the northern half of the eastern wall of Khekeretneby’s offering room. The two uppermost registers represent the continuation of the display of offerings (pl. III, B5).

In the uppermost register only the remnants of broad bowls on stands, ribs etc. can be identified (fig. B.12). In the second register from above a row of jars in stands, two offering tables (one loaded with fruit and vegetables, the other with meat), etc. survived in a much better state of preservation than the paintings in the preceding register. Though polychrome, the scenes in both upper registers were executed very summarily, or carelessly, and no details in the represented objects were marked.

The third register (fig. B.13) from above contains the remains of the scene with dancers and musicians. The scene was only sketched in white colour against the greyish background. In the left side of the register there are two female dancers with raised left arms and left legs. A short semi-cursive inscription, *lb3 “dancing”, in front of them briefly describes their activity. Furthermore, the register also contains a pair of seated men facing each other. One of them plays the flute, his activity being identified by a brief semi-cursive inscription above him as *s3b m3t “playing the flute”. The man facing the flautist seems to beat time by his raised right arm. The semi-cursive inscription (repetition) probably refers to the next musician whose figure was, unfortunately, washed away by the rain. Nevertheless, the inscription reading *hs bnt “to play the harp” (if the identification of the roughly sketched sign following *hs as bnt “the harp” is correct) indicates that a harpist was originally depicted in the damaged place.

In the lowest register, the butchering scene (fig. B.14) is represented. Two butchers standing above a fallen bull are cutting away the animal’s foreleg. A brief semi-cursive inscription near the head of one of the butchers reads *it rk “Pull, then!”, that near the other butcher reads *iry, “doing it”.

To the right of the butchering scene, with his back turned to the butchers, an offering bearer is represented. The man, holding birds in his hands, strides towards the right, i.e. towards the figure of the tomb owner seated in the chair at the opposite end of the wall. As was the case with the preceding scene of dancers and musicians, the scene with the butchers and the offering bearer was only sketched in a thin white line against the greyish smooth plaster.

It seems unquestionable that the paintings found in Khekeretneby’s mastaba were made hastily, probably because of restrictions due to time and material which followed the building of the tomb immediately after its owner’s death. This assumption is corroborated by the false door, whose decoration was also left in different stages of execution and completion. On the other hand, these observations stand in contrast to the archaeological evidence for a lengthy observance of mortuary practices in the local cemetery cult of Khekeretneby (see below p. 77 f.).

The haste with which the tomb decoration was made can perhaps help to explain why it is that in the antechamber only the western wall and, in the offering room, only the eastern wall, bear paintings.

15 Concerning the scene with dancers and musicians, see e.g. Capart, Les scènes, 357ff.; see also Harpur, Decoration, 75 and 80. 16 For similarly sketched outlines of scenes, however in black ink, on greyish plaster, see e.g. Saad, Saqqara and Helwan, 62 and pls. 32–33: tomb of Seshmennefer, Dynasty 5, NW of Unas pyr. 17 For the repertoire of butchering scenes in the Old Kingdom reliefs, see e.g. Eggebrecht, Schlachtungsbräuche, passim; Harpur, Decoration, 75 and 82.
Strikingly, even these few paintings were left largely unfinished. Other walls, especially the southern wall in the offering room, were left undecorated. The decoration program was reduced to several scenes only:

- the bringing of offerings (vestibule)
- the funerary repast (offering room)
- the display of offerings
- the butchers
- the musicians and the dancers.

Surprisingly, some important themes were not included in the decoration program, for example, the list of offerings.

With regard to the inferior quality of limestone from which the mastaba was built, paintings were the only possible way to decorate the inner walls of the monument with some standard funerary scenes. The unfinished stage in which the paintings were left enables us to reconstruct the different steps of their execution. At first sight, two different methods seem to have been used to execute the paintings.

In the vestibule a very thin layer of white stucco served as the basis for the paintings on the western wall. Against this background, the figures, objects and hieroglyphs were outlined in a thin red line. In the successive stage only some larger areas of just a few of the depicted figures and objects were painted, e.g. the body of the princess with yellowish colour, the bodies of some of the male figures with red colour, and some hieroglyphic signs with white colour. Apparently, the work was planned to be continued. In the next stage the more elaborate details were undoubtedly to be painted.

Contrary to Khekeretneby’s vestibule, in the offering room the eastern wall was first, before the execution of the paintings, covered with a relatively thick layer of greyish plaster, the surface of which was smoothed. The painting was obviously started from the southern end of the wall with the figure of the princess seated at the offering table. At first, the southern half of the wall had been whitewashed and then the outlines of the scene were sketched in red painted lines. The same method was applied in the vestibule, in the scene of bringing the offerings, too. Eventually, also this portion of the painting in the offering room was left unfinished in the same stage as in the vestibule.

In the northern part of the wall (approximately in the middle of the wall, both parts are separated by a broad strip in which the paintings, including the plaster, were washed away by rain water – see above p. 26), in only two narrow upper registers, there are summarily executed paintings as in the southern part of the wall, whereas the two lower registers bear just outlines of two scenes, the musicians with dancers and the butchers. The artist here used white paint to sketch the scenes on greyish plaster. It seems that this very simple method was applied in order to complete, hastily and very economically, the unfinished decoration so as to avoid leaving the wall empty.

**Items from the tomb**

Unless indicated otherwise, these objects are now stored in the Egyptian Museum Cairo.

Lintel, false doors, reliefs

1/B/76 Fragment of the lintel (pl. IV, Bf6 and fig. B15). Originally, the lintel above the entrance to the mastaba consisted of four pieces of approximately the same dimensions. This fragment represents the left end piece. At the left edge of the fragment there is the badly weathered standing figure of the tomb owner, in sunk relief, wearing a long wig, a necklace and a long, tightly fitting robe. Her left hand is laid on her breast, her right arm hangs alongside her body and her hand grasps an ankh-sign.¹⁹

From one vertical and three horizontal lines of a summarily cut hieroglyphic inscription in sunk relief, which originally covered the surface of the lintel in front of the figure, the uppermost horizontal line did not survive.

The vertical line, just in front of the figure, contains the tomb owner’s name and title:

\[ \text{S\text{"i}t n\text{"o}w Hkrt-\text{nbty}.} \]

“King’s daughter, Khekeretneby.”

The two horizontal lines of the inscription contain the remains of the funerary formula, including the cartouche of Iseesi:

1. ...? ...
2. \( im\text{"h}t \text{(t)} hr ntr \text{f} \)
3. \( \text{Is\text{"e}si, r}\text{f} \text{nb} \)

1. ...?
2. “…honoured by the Great God,
3. “…(honoured by) Iseesi every day.”

L: 65 cm; H: 48 cm; Th: cca 20 cm
Limestone
54 – 32 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

78/B/76 Fragment of the false door (offering scene tablet) of Khekeretneby (pl. IV, Bf7 and fig. B16).²⁰

The slab comes from the upper portion of the false

---

¹⁸ Though found in situ, the badly weathered fragment had to be moved to the field magazine of the Czech expedition in Abusir for security reasons.

¹⁹ This is, to our knowledge, the first occasion on which a princess holds such a sign, normally the prerogative of a king. Queen Khentkaus I is the first queen known to have used this insignia, which appears on her red granite door pillar at Giza, see Hassan, *Giza IV*, pl. V B.
door and bears a very roughly cut scene of Khekeretneby's funerary repast, including relevant inscriptions, in sunk relief. The king's daughter, seated on the chair at the offering table, raises her right arm towards the offerings on the table, her left hand being laid on her breast. 21 She is clad in a tightly fitted long robe and wears a long wig and a broad necklace. The table, loaded with pieces of bread, is surrounded with other offerings including various types of bread, fruits and vegetables, beer jugs in stands, a low toilet table with spouted vessels and bowls, etc. In addition to that, a short hieroglyphic inscription under the offering table reads:

\[ H\dot{3} (n) t\dot{3}, h\dot{3} (n) d\dot{3}, h\dot{3} (n) k\dot{3} 3pd. \]

"Thousands of bread loaves, thousands of beer jugs, thousands of oxen and birds."

A hieroglyphic inscription above Khekeretneby seated at the offering table contains the false door owner's name and title:

\[ S\dot{3}t nswt nt htf Hkr-nt-bty. \]

"King's daughter of his body, Khekeretneby."

79/B/76-a,b Two fragments of the false door (crossbar) of Khekeretneby (pl. IV, B18 and fig. B17).

The crossbar, broken in two pieces, bears two partly damaged horizontal lines of a roughly cut hieroglyphic inscription in sunk relief. The inscription, containing the funerary formula and the titulary and the name of Khekeretneby, reads:

1. \[ H\dot{3}p di nswt, h\dot{3}p di Tnpw, h\dot{3}nty sh-ntr, kr\dot{s}.t\dot{w}.t s m, h\dot{r}t-ntr, sm\dot{w}t\dot{y} nfr, im\dot{s}ht (h)r ntr f, \]

2. \[ (s\dot{3}t) nswt (nt htf), m\dot{r}t (n) t\dot{3}t, t\dot{3}t, mm\dot{r}t nswt, im\dot{s}ht (h)r (ntr) f, Hkr-nt-bty. \]

1. "An offering that the king gives and an offering that Anubis who is in front of the divine booth gives for her in order that she may be buried in the necropolis when she has beautifully grown old, one revered with the Great God,

20 For the first publication of Khekeretneby's false door, see M. Verner, in: ZAS 109, 1982, 72–75.

21 This was one of the traditional poses in which women – not only princesses – were depicted seated at the offering table, see e.g. Junker, Giza II, 120, fig. 10, for the titular princess, Nysedjerka, in the same position. In a variant pose, with one hand on her knee, the other reaching for the bread loaves on her offering table, see Princess Hemetre in Hassan, Mastabas, Pl. II, facing page 5. Junker, Giza I, 252 fig. 63 shows the Princess Wenshet in a different pose again, this time with both arms casually extended towards her offering table.
2. the King’s (daughter of his body), one beloved of (her) father Iseesi, one beloved of the king, the revered one with the Great God, Khekeretnebyt.”
Limestone
L: 152 cm; H: 27 cm; Th: 19 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

BM-64.148.2 Fragment from the left door jamb of Khekeretnebyt’s false door (Brooklyn Museum Acc. no. 64.148.2) (fig. B18).²²
Limestone
H: 52 cm; W: 42.4 cm
There can hardly be any doubt that the fragment, now in the Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn, New York, comes from false door of Khekeretnebyt and fits with the above-mentioned fragments no. 78/B/76 and 79/B/76-a.b. The fragment belongs to the upper left portion of the false door and bears the remains of the representation of Khekeretnebyt and the hieroglyphic inscriptions with the princess’s name and titles. From the originally standing figure of Khekeretnebyt, facing right and wearing a long wig, only the upper part of her body survived on the fragment (including her left hand laid on her breast). Khekeretnebyt’s figure was executed in what can be called a combination of the incised and low relief. The inscription in sunk relief, in three vertical and one horizontal lines in front and above the figure, reads:

²² The fragment from the Brooklyn Museum was published by James, Corpus, 20 and pl. XXII (no. 52). The photograph of the fragment was republished by the excavator of Khekeretnebyt’s tomb in ZAS 109, 1982, 74 Fig. 3, by courtesy of The Brooklyn Museum, New York.
1. S[t(t)] nšwt m ḫt.f, mrt.f...
2. .... imḥ(t) r(sic) nṯr,
3. mrt Tšš, nṯr
4. Ḥkrτ-nḥty.
1. “King’s daughter of his body, his beloved...
2. ....honoured by the god,
3. one beloved of Isesi,
4. Khekeretnebty.”

Around the inscription traces of the signs originally outlined in black can be seen. Exceptionally, one sign (ḥ in ḫr) was left uncarved, it was only outlined in black paint.

193/B/76 False door of Tisethor (pl. V, B19 and fig. B19).
The monolithic false door bears representations of Tisethor and the hieroglyphic inscriptions containing the funerary formula and Tisethor’s name and titles. The inscriptions are in sunk relief and only a small part of them, on the door jambs, was left uncarved; they were only outlined in black paint. Regardless of its unfinished state, the decoration of Tisethor’s false door was more carefully executed than that of Khekeretnebty.

On the tablet in the upper portion of the false door, Tisethor is represented seated on the chair at the offering table. She wears a short hairdo, a tightly fitting long robe and a broad necklace. Her right arm is raised towards the offerings on the table, her left arm being laid on her breast. Around the offering table, loaded with pieces of bread, other offerings are represented: a low table with bread, a low toilet table with spouted vessels and bowls, beer jugs in stands, etc. Moreover, a short inscription under the offering table reads:

ḥ3 (n) t3 ṣpd, ḫnkt p3t.
“Thousands of loaves and birds, thousands of beer jugs and cakes.”

Above the scene of Tisethor seated at the offering table there is a single horizontal line of a hieroglyphic inscription which reads:

ḥkrt nšwt mrt.f, Tḥṭ-hr.
“King’s ornament, his beloved one, Tisethor.”

The crossbar of the false door bears two horizontal lines of an inscription which read:

1. Ḥṭp di nšwt ḥṭp di ṭnḥw krṣʾtw.s ḫrt-nṯr,
2. Ḥkrτ nšwt, mrt.f, imḥt.f, Tḥṭ-hr.
3. “An offering that the king gives and an offering that Anubis gives for her burial in the necropolis,
2. King’s ornament, his beloved one, his honoured one, Tisethor.”

Both the left and right door jambs of the false door bear three columns of a hieroglyphic inscription framed by means of lines in black paint. The inscription reads:

1. Ḥṭp di ṭwrs, ṣḥt-hw nš, (m) t3 ḫnkt, p3t m ḫb nb,
2. ṣḥt imḥw ḫr nṯr ḫr nšwt,
3. Ḥkrτ nšwt Tḥṭ-hr.
1. “An offering that Osiris gives that there may be (made) invocation-offerings for her of bread and beer at every festival,
2. the lady honoured by the Great God and by the King,
3. King’s ornament Tisethor.”

The third column is inscribed in front of the standing figure of Tisethor with her right arm hanging alongside her body and her left hand laid on her breast. Tisethor wears a short hairdo, a tight shift and a broad necklace.

---

The inscription and Tisethor’s figure on the right door jamb are just a mirror copy of the left door jamb. The drum between both door jambs is inscribed with the name of Tisethor in black paint.
Limestone.
H: 151 cm; W: 66 cm; Th: 28 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

Canopic jars

125/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5565) A lid of a canopic jar (fig. B21b). This limestone lid was found about 1.25 m below the top of Khekeretnebty’s sarcophagus lid, in the NW corner of the burial chamber. It was resting in a layer of limestone chips, potsherds and sand. The lid has been smoothed, is flat and round in shape.
H: 3 cm; diameter: 15.5 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

126/B/76 A fragment of a limestone lid from a canopic jar. This fragment was found about 1.25 m below the top of the lid of Khekeretnebty’s sarcophagus, in the NW corner of the burial chamber. It was resting in a layer of limestone chips, potsherds and sand. The lid – a great part of which is missing – has been smoothed, is flat and round in shape.
10 × 7 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

148/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5562 a,b) A lid from a canopic jar (fig. B20). Found near the NW corner of Khekeretnebty’s sarcophagus, cca 1.5 m under the top of the lid, in a layer of sand, potsherds and limestone chips. The lid is smoothed, and is flat and circular in shape.
H: 3.4 cm; diameter: 14.3 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

149/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5564) A lid from a canopic jar. Found near the NW corner of the sarcophagus, cca 1.5 m under the top of the lid, in a layer of sand, potsherds and limestone chips. The lid is made of limestone. It is smoothed, flat and circular in shape.
H: 3 cm; diameter: 16.5 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

150/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5563 a,b) Two fragments of a lid from a canopic jar made of limestone. Found near the NW corner of Khekeretnebty’s sarcophagus, cca 1.5 m under the top of the lid, in a layer of sand, potsherds and limestone chips. The lid is smoothed, flat and circular in shape.
H: 3.4 cm; diameter: 14.3 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

153/B/76 A limestone canopic jar. This limestone jar was found in the debris between the S wall of Khekeretnebty’s sarcophagus and the S wall of the burial chamber, close to the SE corner of the room. The jar has been smoothed, but there are dark brown spots on the surface (both outside and inside).
H: 29.5 cm.; diameter of the mouth: 16 cm; diameter of the base: 11.5 cm.
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

255/B/76 Three fragments of a canopic jar made of limestone that once had a diameter of 15 cm. It was found in the largely damaged burial chamber of Tisethor, in the SE corner, just above the floor, in sand mixed with animal bones, limestone chips and fragments of mummy wrappings. These fragments reveal a straight-sided internal cavity, but the outer face of the vessel displays an reverted rim and a swelling along the upper body of the vessel.
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare
271/B/76 A fragment of a limestone canopic jar. It was found in Tisethor’s burial chamber, in sand mixed with animal bones, limestone chips and fragments of mummy wrappings.

13 × 11.6 cm; Th: 3.7 × 4 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

27a,b/B/76 Two rim sherds of a limestone canopic jar. These pieces were found in the debris filling the damaged shaft giving access to the burial chamber of Tisethor, about 0.5 m under the mouth of the shaft. The fragments have a smoothed surface and two small red spots are marked on them.

19 × 12 cm and 19.5 × 9 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

283/B/76 A fragment of a canopic jar made of limestone. It was found in the SW corner of Tisethor’s burial chamber, in sand mixed with animal bones, limestone chips and fragments of mummy wrappings. Nearly half of the jar is lost. On the outer face of the vessel there are dark spots.

H: 23 cm; bottom diameter: 10.5 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

71/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5562) A limestone canopic jar. The jar was found in Khekeretnebty’s burial chamber, in the debris, near the NE corner of the lid of the sarcophagus. The vessel is polished, but was empty when found. On the surface of the jar are traces of red paint (fig. B20).

H: 30 cm; mouth opening diameter: 15 cm; bottom diameter: 11 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

72/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5563) A limestone canopic jar. The vase was found inside Khekeretnebty’s sarcophagus, in its SW corner (pl. IV, Bf10). Like the previous entry, the jar was polished but found empty. Traces of red paint were on the vessel’s surface. Part of the mouth rim had been broken off.

H: 30 cm; mouth opening diameter: 15.5 cm; bottom diameter: 11.5 cm.
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

73/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5565) A limestone canopic jar (fig. B21). This vessel was found close to the SW corner of Khekeretnebty’s sarcophagus. It lay on a pile of limestone chips cut from the sarcophagus by the robbers. This vessel was polished but, like the others, was found empty. Traces of red paint on the surface remained, and part of its rim had been broken off.

H: of 27 cm; mouth opening diameter 15.5 cm; bottom diameter: 11 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

“Opening of mouth” set

157/B/76 A miniature h3tš-jar made of translucent calcite (pl. IV, Bf11 and fig. B22). It was found near the SW corner of Khekeretnebty’s sarcophagus, cca 20 cm above the floor, in a pile of limestone chips. The jar has an ovoid body with a long, flaring neck and a flat base. The surface of the jar is polished.

H: 6.8 cm; diameter of the mouth opening: 3 cm; base diameter: 1 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

158/B/76 A miniature hnt-basin of basalt (pl. VI, Bf12 and fig. B23). The basin was found near the SW corner of Khekeretnebty’s sarcophagus, cca 20 cm above the floor, in a pile of limestone chips. The basin has a simple conical shape and has been

smoothed. It has a flat bottom. The surface of the basin is polished.

H: 2.5 cm; mouth opening diameter: 3.4 cm; bottom diameter: 2 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

From the set of symbolic instruments and vessels of the Opening of Mouth ritual that used to belong to the burial equipment in Khekeretnebty’s tomb only two

---

24 For a detailed examination of Khekeretnebty’s canopic jars in the broader historical context of the royal canopic equipment in the Old Kingdom, see P. Vlčková, in: ArOr 70, 2002, 147–163.

25 For the previous publication of the vessel, see Verner, Forgotten Pharaohs, 85 (upper right). On the names, the elements forming an “Opening of mouth” set, and on the role of these artifacts in the ceremony, see A. M. Roth, in: JEA 78, 1992, 113–148 and id. in: JEA 79, 1993, 57–79.

26 Concerning the occurrence and use of this mineral in ancient Egypt, see Nicholson, Shaw, Minerals and Technology, 52.

27 In Reisner and Smith’s classification the type OK XV c (1), see Giza II, 97 and fig. 143.
vessels — a model hitš-jar and a model hnt-basin — were found. Judging by the place in which both pieces were uncovered, the set had originally been placed on the floor of the burial chamber, next to the sarcophagus (probably on the western side of the sarcophagus, later to be thrown by robbers to the SW corner of the room). Apparently missing from the original set are at least the knife peseshkaf, two netjerite instruments, several other symbolic vessels, etc., and also the stone or wooden box in which the whole set was kept.

However, the names and the exact meaning of vessels of the Opening of Mouth ritual, the models of which made part of the above-mentioned set, have not yet been identified. In the list of objects used in the ritual, different types of vessels have been named, for instance a nemsæt-vase, deshret-vase, mensæ-jug, hatjes-jug, etc. The exact replicas of the two vessels from Khekeretneby’s tomb can be seen, for instance, in a scene from the tomb of Samut representing the purification of statues during the Opening of Mouth ritual.

Seven sacred oils tablet

82/B/76 A tablet with inscriptions denoting the Seven Sacred Oils (fig. B24). The sacred oils tablet was found in the debris near the NW corner of Khekeretneby’s sarcophagus, cca 1.0 m under the top of the lid. Like the majority of these tablets, this specimen from Abusir is made of “Egyptian alabaster”. The tablet has a polished surface and has seven shallow basins for the oil. The inscriptions, carefully carved in columns from the right, read (from right to left):

1. sty ḫḥ “festival fragrance”: like many of the oils below, ḫm flowers and frankincense were two of the ingredients of this perfumed oil, but the precise recipe for the fragrance during the Old Kingdom is not known. Most of our knowledge about the oils comes from the Edfu List, recorded in that Ptolemaic temple.
2. ḥkw “hekenu oil”: hekenu oil was the most important of the oils. It took one year to prepare. It used antiu resin, dry bark from one of the Boswellia variety of trees, and possibly contained oil from the carob seed. The oil is mentioned in the Abusir papyri.
3. ssj “cedar oil”, had as its main ingrediant the resin from this tree.
4. ny-hnmt “ny-khnum unguent”
5. twswr “tuaut unguent”
6. ḥṣḥt nw 5 “the best (oil) of the pine/cedar” (i.e. the

Concerning the meaning of the knife, see, besides the previously quoted articles by A. M. Roth in JEA 78 and 79, also E. Graefe, in: JEA 57, 1971, 203; R. van Walsum, in: OMRO 49/50, 1978/1979 and Baud, Famille royale, 131.
29 A. M. Roth, in: JEA 79, 1993, 57–79
30 See e.g. the number of vessels in the set from the Zawiyet el-Aryan tomb of Metju dating from the 6th Dynasty (Desroches-Noblecourt et al., Un siècle, 98f. no 103) and the Harra Dom tomb of Idu Seneni from the 6th Dynasty (Sève-Söderbergh, Harra Dom, 1994, 70f. and pl. 74) or from Petizaews-Museum in Hildesheim (no. 4826 a-f, see Martin-Pardoe, CAA. Hildesheim, 113f. Included into this brief list should also be a nice set found in Menkaue’s pyramid complex, see, Thomas, The American Discovery, 122.
31 See T. J. Baly, in: JEA 16, 1930, 184ff. and Otto, Mundöffungsritual, passim; concerning the mensæ-vessel, see also W. Helck, in: MDAIK 22, 1967, 41.
32 See Otto, Mundöffungsritual II fig. 4.
34 See S. Tawfik, in: GM 30, 1978, 77–84, who points out that these palettes are indications of a very wealthy burial (because of the cost of the oils involved), therefore there are not an overwhelming number of them, and many of them come from the burials of queens or members of the royal family. Concerning the addenda to Tawfik’s list of Old Kingdom tablets, see J. Mälek, in: GM 33, 1979, 35–40, A. G. Bolshakov, in: GM 131, 1992, 21–23 and M. Bára, KMT 13, No. 1 (2002), 28. See also Koura, 7–Heiligen Öle, 40–44.
35 Manniche, Sacred Luxuries, 49. According to Koura (o. c. 175f.), ḥkw is to be identified with Menthophipeta L.
36 See Koura, o. c. 177–180.
37 Usually represented in vessels resembling the khnum-vase. In Balcz’s opinion (ibid. 94), the oil itself gave rise to the name for this vass. See also Koura, o. c. 171–173.
38 It also appears in the Abusir papyri (Posener-Kriéger, Les archives II, 151, fig. 17; 170 and 185), but we know nothing else about it. See also Koura, o. c. 181–183.
best resin being used for this oil). On the identity of the "3 tree, there is considerable debate.40

7. hmtt n Tnhw “the best (oil) of Tjehenu/Libya”41

The canonical list of oils on this palette – written in vertical registers, as usual – is followed below by a horizontal line of an inscription reading:

Nt (sic!) s\text{\textasciitilde}t nswt n hrf, im\text{\textasciitilde}t hr ntr 3, Hkrt-nby. “The King’s Daughter of his body, one honoured by the Great God, Khekeretnby.”

Inscriptions identifying the owner of the palette are very rare – this is, for example, the first one found at Abusir with the name of the owner.43 The last register consists of seven tiny shallow basins for token offerings of the oils themselves.

Numerous oils were used in rites for the dead from the 2nd Dynasty onwards. From the earlier part of the 4th Dynasty, Queen Hetepheres I, the mother of Khufu, had a wooden chest containing a set of calcite jars among her grave goods. These jars were inscribed with the name of the contents, and sty hb, hkmw, sf, h3tt n ’3, and h3tt n Tnhw (mentioned on Khekeretnby’s palette) were included in this collection.44 The numerous oil variants were reduced to only seven oils45 by the 5th Dynasty.46 These Seven Sacred Oils were used in rituals, each in its own vessel – as depicted by a shallow basin here on the tablet. Unfortunately, we do not know a great deal about the contents of these vessels – especially in this early period.

For a study on the specific vessels for these oils, see H. Balcz.47 It should be noted, however, that whereas Balcz supplies different variations in the shapes for each of the vessels holding the seven oils, this tablet of Khekeretnby supplies only the one, elegant lidded form for all seven. A similar offering tablet of calcified stone with traces of burning, featuring seven vessels of identical shape to those of Khekeretnby is JE 11271, in the Cairo Museum. However, none of the vessels depicted on this tablet is given a lid. The items from the display case (on the upper floor) are only minimally labelled as being from “one shaft burial of the Old Kingdom”.

While the offering palettes only had room for a tiny amount of oil, the Egyptians considered the oils themselves essential for the successful passage towards becoming an rfr\textsuperscript{48} (PT 1511). The ancient term for these seven oils was mrhr\textsuperscript{49}, and the term, mrht (meaning “oil”) appears in the Abusir papyri.\textsuperscript{50} They form part of the canonical offering list of the Old Kingdom. The precise nature of the oils, however, is a mystery. Pine, cedar and fir resins were frequently mixed with fats and oils to produce perfume from at least the 2nd Dynasty,\textsuperscript{51} but the proportions and items mixed in with these bases are not known. As later accounts show, the various ingredients of the unguents and perfumes of ancient Egypt varied with the passing generations, so that even well-established “brands” could be made up of different ingredients. In the Ptolemaic and Roman periods identification of perfumes and oils is more substantial, but not for this early period. A scene of preparations for the making of mrhr oil is found in the 5th Dynasty tomb of Iymry at Giza (G 6020).\textsuperscript{52} Here the jars labelled Seven Sacred Oils are shown beside the steeping and pressing scene.

L: 17 cm; W: 7.8 cm; Th: 0.5 cm\textsuperscript{53}

5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

Model stone bowls

13/B/76 A fragment of a miniature limestone bowl. It was found in the shaft in the SW corner of the mastaba in a layer of wind-blown sand, about 0.8 m under the preserved top of the walls of the shaft. The vessel has a cylindrical form with a flat base and smoothed surface. Exactly one half of the bowl is broken away.

39 There are variations in the way this word is written; see the illustrations (fig. 3) in the article by Vachala, mentioned above. Sometimes the h sign is accompanied by two t signs, sometimes by one and sometimes by none. See Vachala, o. c. 63, n. 21.
41 See Koua, o. c. 193–195.
42 Could the nt be a short-hand way of saying: “(The palette of 7 sacred oils belonging to) the King’s Daughter etc.”?
43 During the autumn 2001 season at South Abusir, in the cemetery of the vizier and r Nḥn n sfb Khr, another calcite seven oils palette was found in the burial chamber of his son, Senedjemib, which contained the name of the tomb owner. This inscription ends with a figure of a woman seated on a chair. It was very common for female names to be supplemented by such determinatives as this, whereas it is rare for men have their name accompanied by such signs. (See H. G. Fischer, in: Ancient Egypt in the Metropolitan Museum Journal, vols. I–II (1968–1976) 1977, 73).
44 Manniche, Egyptian Luxuries, 109
45 Seven being a “lucky” number in most societies—Tawfik, o. c. 78.
46 Posener-Krieger, Les archives I, 170 n. 2. In the tomb of Niannkhnum and Khnumhotep (Moussa, Altenmüller, Niannchnum und Chnumhotep,106 ff.) the older array of oils is found, so that the period in which this reduction took place must postdate their time (Niuserre).
47 MDAIK 5, 1934, 82ff.
48 Tawfik, o. c. 81
49 The term is used both as a word for scented oils and as a general word for oil – see M. Serpico, Resins, amber and bitumen, in: Nicholson, Shaw, Materials and Technology, 462.
50 Posener-Krieger, Les Archives I, 15ff., 26 and passim. Posener-Krieger, o. c. 26 suggests that it was used for the rapid anointing of statues, a drop at a time, to symbolise the ritual of the toilette carried out by the dead king. In Khekeretnby’s case, one imagines that the statues that she had in her tomb would have been used. (Concerning the anointing of statues and oils used in the Opening of Mouth ritual, see Otto, Mundöffnungsr¡tuál, 120ff.)
51 Ibid. 463
52 Ld II, 49; there are representations of later date from the Middle Kingdom, Saite and Ptolemaic periods as well.
53 As Tawfik, o. c. 78 points out, these palettes fall into a narrow range of sizes: from 6–23 cm in length and 7.5–21 cm in breadth.

Miniature bowls made of calcite, or “Egyptian alabaster”. These vessels (pl. VI, Bf13 – bottom half) were found close to the NE corner of Khekeretnebty’s sarcophagus, cca 1.25 m under the top of the lid. They were in a layer of sand and limestone chips. The vessels are polished and are rounded at the bottom.

The height of the bowls ranges from 0.6 to 2.3 cm, their diameter from 4.3 to 6 cm

5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

110/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5588) Two fragments of a miniature bowl made of “Egyptian alabaster”. It was found near the NE corner of Khekeretnebty’s sarcophagus, cca 1.27 m under the top of the lid, in a layer of sand and limestone chips. The bowl had been given a rounded bottom. Its surface is polished.

H: 2 cm; diameter: 5.2 cm

5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

111/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5589) Three fragments of a polished, miniature bowl made of “Egyptian alabaster”. The vessel had a rounded bottom. The pieces were found near the NE corner of Khekeretnebty’s sarcophagus, cca 1.25 m under the top of the lid, in a layer of sand and limestone chips.

H: 2 cm; diameter: 6 cm

5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

252/B/76 A miniature bowl made of “Egyptian alabaster”. This bowl was found in the SW corner of Tisethor’s burial chamber, in a layer of dark sand that contained limestone blocks and animal bones. The surface of the bowl is smoothed and the vessel has a flat base. It cannot be excluded that this vessel is an intrusive object placed originally in Khekeretnebty’s burial chamber and later removed by tomb robbers.

H: 1.5 cm; diameter of the rim: 5.5 cm

5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

258/B/76 A miniature limestone bowl. This vessel, too, was found in the filling of the mastaba core, above Khekeretnebty’s burial chamber. It is a better cut object than the previous entry, but is also thick-walled and shallow. The surface of the bowl is smoothed.

H: 4 cm; diameter: 2.1 cm

Late 5th Dynasty

259/B/76 A fragment of a small limestone bowl. The vessel was found in the filling of the mastaba core, above Khekeretnebty’s burial chamber. It has a thick base but, as it rises towards the rim it becomes thinner. The surface of the vessel is smoothed.

H: 3 cm; diameter: 6.7 cm

Late 5th Dynasty

As can be seen from the previous description, all model dishes from Khekeretnebty’s burial chamber were of the same type (pl. VI, Bf11 – lower half of the picture). They represented low, shallow bowls with rounded bottoms. The surface of the models, from outside and inside, was smoothed but not polished. On the other hand, the model bowls which survived from Tisethor’s burial equipment show some typological variability but they are only few and do not allow any clear-cut conclusions to be made.

Judging by the archaeological context, the model bowls of alabaster made part of Khekeretnebty’s burial equipment, whereas those of limestone (somewhat unclear is the origin of no. 252/B/76) can be ascribed to Tisethor.54 The few limestone bowls found in the tomb certainly represent only scanty remnants of the original set of model dishes deposited during the funeral in Tisethor’s burial chamber. Thirty-five pieces of alabaster model bowls revealed in the burial chamber of Khekeretnebty also hardly correspond with the original amount of these vessels placed next to the princess’ sarcophagus. As a matter of fact, the number of models of vessels – amounting usually up to seventy, quite exceptionally up to six hundred pieces of different types55 – indicates that they probably not only substituted the items included in the contemporaneous lists of offerings written on the wall of the tomb’s offering room but were probably used in the performance of the rite itself.56

Nearly all the model vessels found in Khekeretnebty’s burial chamber were in situ on the floor near the NE corner of the sarcophagus, which in principle corresponds with the usual location of these vessels in Old Kingdom tombs.57 As already emphasized above, these vessels survived in position thanks to the

54 Different material used for the production of the models reflects the higher social position of Khekeretnebty in comparison with Tisethor. The same observation concerning the choice of the material used for the models vessels – showing that it depended upon the social position of the tomb owner – was also observed at the Giza cemetery, see Reisner, Smith, Giza II, 102.

55 From the tomb of Seshemnefer IV in Giza, see Junker, Giza IX, 1953, 116f.

56 Concerning the meaning of the miniature models of vessels, see e.g. Junker, Giza I, 108f.; Hassan, Giza, 22; Do. Arnold, in: L’art égyptien, 379f.

57 See e.g. Junker, Giza I, 1929, 102; III
debris which fell down after the collapse of a ceiling slab that buried the northern part of the sarcophagus. Obviously, the model vessels – and some other items of the burial equipment, too – which had not been protected by this debris were taken away by tomb robbers.

Model stone vases

112/B/76 A miniature vase made of “Egyptian alabaster”. Like the miniature dishes mentioned previously, it was discovered near the NE corner of Khekeretneby’s sarcophagus, cca 1.25 m under the top of the lid, in a layer of sand and limestone chips. The body of the vase is elliptical in form with an everted rim and a flat base with no foot. The vase has no handles and it is polished. On its body an inscription in black paint reads:

'\textit{prt}\
\textit{"prt-vessel}’ ^{58}

H: 7.8 cm; diameter across the mouth: 3.5 cm; diameter across the base: 2.7 cm
5\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty, \textit{temp.} Djedkare

113/B/76 A miniature vase made of “Egyptian alabaster” (fig. B25). The vase was discovered near the NE corner of Khekeretneby’s sarcophagus, cca 1.25 m under the top of the lid, in a layer of sand and limestone chips. The body of the vase is elliptical in form with an everted rim and a flat base with no foot. It is polished. On its body an inscription in black paint reads:

'\textit{hs}\
\textit{"hs-jar}’

H: 8.5 cm; diameter across the mouth: 2.7 cm; diameter across the base: 1.9 cm
5\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty, \textit{temp.} Djedkare

114a/B/76 A miniature, polished vase made of “Egyptian alabaster” (fig. B26). The vase was discovered near the NE corner of Khekeretneby’s sarcophagus, cca 1.25 m under the top of the lid, in a layer of sand and limestone chips. This footed vessel is narrowest at the bottom and flares outward at the top. Its rim is everted. Though the inscription painted in black on the vase is identical to 112/B/76, the shape of both vessels differs in principle.

H: 7.5 cm; diameter across the mouth of the vessel: 3.3 cm; diameter across the base: 2.4 cm
5\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty, \textit{temp.} Djedkare

114b/2/B/76 A miniature vase made of “Egyptian alabaster” (fig. B27). It was discovered near the NE corner of Khekeretneby’s sarcophagus, cca 1.25 m under the top of the lid, in a layer of sand and limestone chips. The body of the vase is elliptical in form with an everted rim and a flat base with no foot. The body bears an inscription in black ink that reads:

'\textit{prt}\
\textit{"prt-vase}’

The vase has no handles and it is polished.
H: 7.7 cm; diameter across the mouth: 3.5 cm; diameter across the base: 2.7 cm
5\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty, \textit{temp.} Djedkare

115/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P.5567) A miniature jar made of “Egyptian alabaster” (fig. B28). It was discovered in a layer of sand and limestone chips, some 1.25 m under the top of Khekeretneby’s sarcophagus lid. The jar has an everted rim with an additional ring collar below it. The upper body is elliptical, but the lower body tapers slightly towards a flat base with no foot. The vessel is polished and has

^{58} For the publication of the vessel, see M. Verner, \textit{Forgotten Pharaohs}, 85 (upper right).

^{59} For the publication of the vessel, see \textit{ibidem}.
on its body a black hieratic inscription which reads: 
\[ \text{\textit{d\textit{\textit{3\textit{w}}} \textit{nfr}} “beautiful d\textit{\textit{3\textit{w}}}-jar”} \]
H: 8.5 cm; diameter across the mouth: 3 cm; diameter across the base: 2.4 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

119/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5570) A miniature jar made of “Egyptian alabaster”. This vessel, which is practically identical to the previous entry, was also discovered in a layer of sand and limestone chips, some 1.25 m under the top of Khekeretnebyt’s sarcophagus lid. The vase has an everted rim with an additional ring collar below it. The upper body is elliptical, but the lower body tapers slightly towards a flat base with no foot. The vessel is polished and has on its body a black hieratic inscription:
\[ \text{\textit{d\textit{\textit{3\textit{w}}} \textit{nfr}} “beautiful d\textit{\textit{3\textit{w}}}-jar”} \]
H: 6.7 cm; diameter across the mouth: 3.9 cm; diameter across the base: 2.8 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

47/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5570) A fragment of a miniature vase made of “Egyptian alabaster”. The fragment was found in the shaft giving access to Khekeretnebyt’s burial chamber, at a depth of 4.7 m from the mouth of the shaft, in a layer of dark sand mixed with potsherds and fragments of stones.
H: 2 cm; diameter: 3.2 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

As indicated by the archaeological context, all “Egyptian alabaster” vessels found in Khekeretnebyt’s tomb originally belonged to the princess’ burial equipment (pl. VI, Bf13 – upper half of the picture). On the other hand, it is difficult to say whether or not the ten model vases found in the tomb represented the complete set of this category of vessels originally deposited next to the princess’ sarcophagus. Apparently, in the Old Kingdom tombs both the number and the variety of types of these vessels fluctuated, very probably in relation to the social status of the deceased.60 Ti sethor’s burial equipment may have originally contained model vases (probably made of the same material, (i.e. limestone), as the model bowls), too, though none of them were found in her plundered sarcophagus chamber.

Typologically, the set of Khekeretnebyt’s vessels involves models of four different vessels. Moreover, three of these types are explicitly identified61 by short cursive inscriptions in black ink:
\[ \text{\textit{\textit{3\textit{h}}} -jar} – A barrel-shaped jar with flat bottom; the central part of the body is strengthened with a central cord wound round its body like a belt. Originally, such jars were made of fired clay and the cord helped not only to carry such vessels but also to protect their most vulnerable part, by providing a sort of cushion between the vessel and outside objects. It served as a wine jar. Though not very frequent, and also not

60 For instance, in Giza tomb G 7111 from the early 5th Dynasty, the ratio between model jars and model bowls found in one burial chamber C was 17 : 62, whereas that in the neighbouring burial chamber D was 6 : 65, see Simpson, \textit{Kuwaib}, 28f. and fig. 55.
61 It is unique evidence for the name of the type being written directly on the vessel.
62 For instance, from the tomb of Hetepheres I, (Reisner, Smith,
inscribed, this type of model vessel is attested from some Old Kingdom tombs.62

\textit{dhwj} - A collar jar, flat-bottomed. The cursive inscription \textit{dhw nfr} identifies not only the type of the vessel but emphasizes that it is a “beautiful” piece of this type.63

\textit{prj} - A shouldered jar with a band rim around its mouth, it is flat-bottomed. This type could serve as a storage jar for liquids, dried fruits, etc.64

The last of the four types represents an almost cylindrical jar, slightly narrowing downwards, with a band rim around the mouth and a splayed base. The jars of this type found in Khekeretnety’s tomb bore no identification inscription. Possibly, their meaning as ointment/cosmetic jars was so obvious that any explicit identification would have been considered redundant. Models of cosmetic jars frequently occur among Old Kingdom burial equipment.65

**Pottery**

Considering some specific aspects of the archaeological situation revealed in the tomb of Khekeretnety, it is quite difficult to reconstruct both the detailed stratigraphy and the precise chronology of the pottery found in this site.

Evidently, disused pottery, coming from earlier funerary cult ceremonies in both royal and private tombs in the necropolis and thrown away in the close vicinity of these monuments, was collected and used as a sort of building material in the construction of the superstructure of the Khekeretnety’s mastaba. It had especially been used to fill large vacant rooms above the burial chambers of Khekeretnety and Tisethor (fig. B8,B-B and fig. B9,C-C). Moreover, a thick layer of pottery had also been used to cover the whole western half of the mastaba (pl. VI, Bf14) while the three rooms in the eastern half were roofed with thick limestone slabs.66

From the archaeological point of view, the additional decision to expand the mastaba, together with the serious damage caused to the mastaba by later tomb robbers, resulted in a very complex stratigraphic situation. The earliest of these interferences, dating to the time shortly after the construction of Khekeretnety’s tomb, led at first to the removal of the northern wall of the mastaba and the northern half of the shaft giving access to the princesses’ burial chamber. Subsequently, a new burial chamber, with its own descending shaft for Tisethor, were now located where the northern wall of the mastaba had been removed.

The first robbers’ intrusions into the underground of the monument can probably be dated to the 1st Intermediate Period. During these intrusions, the pottery and potsherds from the above-mentioned filling of the mastaba’s core and the fragments of the destroyed limestone masonry have, to an extensive degree, fallen down and were mixed with the original inventory of the two burial chambers. Further visits of robbers followed, the last one – to the serdab and the other rooms in the tomb’s superstructure – in the 1940s.

Owing to the above said archaeological context, it is today extremely difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish the slightly earlier refuse pottery used as the building material, from that belonging to the original burial equipment of the two tomb-owners. With regard to this situation, it was decided to leave a major portion of the pottery (especially that filling the large room within the superstructure of the mastaba, above Khekeretnety’s burial chamber) in position and available for any more detailed examination in the future. The items presented below represent, therefore, just a sample selected in order to demonstrate the variety of pottery found in the debris which filled the mastaba’s substructure at the time of excavation. They largely correspond with a sample of 74 pottery vessels from the tomb of Khekeretnety examined (elemental analysis) by Strouhal et al.67

The analysis e.g. indicated that the pottery used as funeral offerings was produced at one or two kilns using two slightly different kinds of clay or production technology, whereas the pottery from the filling of the mastaba’s superstructure was of heterogenous origin, using different clays and/or technology and made in different kilns.68

**Stands**

2e/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5626) A chalice-shaped stand with flat bottom (pl. VII, Bf15 and fig. B29). This was found in the surface layer, above the

---

62 Concerning other examples of this type of vessel, which served both as wine and beer jars, see e.g. Simpson, Kawab, 288 and fig. 55; Junker, Giza X, 172 and pl. 22c; Hassan, Giza VI. Pt. 2, 30 (7); Reiser, Smith, Giza II, 97f. and fig. 144; etc.

63 The type OK V e of Reiser, see Giza II, 95 and fig. 140; see also Hassan, Giza VI. Pt. 2, 30 (6).

64 See e.g. Hassan, Giza IV, 145f. and 123f.; id. Giza VI. Pt. 2, 30 (1, 2); Junker, Giza III, 150 and pl. 9; id. Giza VI, 224 and pl. 21; id. Giza VII, 56 and fig. 21 on p. 55; Reiser, Giza I, 445 and fig. 267 on p. 442; etc.

65 The volume of pottery used in the mastaba’s construction can be estimated at about 100 cubic metres - literally thousands and thousands of pieces. To examine and work up all this mass of pottery, undoubtedly representing an invaluable variety of 5th Dynasty types, was beyond both the time and financial limits of the then Czechoslovak team. Be that as it may, most of the pottery has remained in position and can be examined under more convenient circumstances at any time in the future.


67 o.c. 427
serdab, close to the southern wall of mastaba. The stand had been shaped on a potter’s wheel. On the outside there are parallel smoothing marks made by the potter’s fingers. Medium firing. Part of the bottom had broken off.
Marl clay with a tiny amount of inclusion (chaff, grains of crushed limestone).
H: 25 cm; diameter across the mouth: 14.5 cm; base diameter: 15 cm; Th: 0.8 cm
Late 5th Dynasty

2d/B/76 A ring stand with roll rims. This was found in a surface layer, above the serdab, close to the southern wall of mastaba. The ring had been shaped on a potter’s wheel and had been hard fired.
H: 14 cm; diameter across the mouth: 16 cm; base diameter: 16 cm; Th: 0.8 cm
Marl clay with a little amount of organic inclusion (chaff).
Late 5th Dynasty

205a/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5627–29) Wheel-made ring stand of the low, broad biconical type, with roll rims. It was found beneath the vault made of sun-dried bricks, above the ceiling of the serdab. Medium firing.
Marl clay with inclusions (chaff, grains of crushed limestone).
H: 13.5 cm
Late 5th Dynasty

206c/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5631) Stand of slender type (fig. B30). This was found between the mud brick vault and the flat limestone ceiling of the serdab. The red-coated stand, slightly malformed at both the upper and lower end, was shaped on a turning device. On the outside of the body parallel marks of the potter’s fingers can be seen. Medium firing.
Marl clay with small amounts of inclusions (chaff, grains of crushed limestone).
H: (a) 23.7 cm; (b) 24.8 cm; (c) 23.9 cm
Late 5th Dynasty

Beer jugs
7/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5610) An ovoid beer jug (fig. B31) found in a layer of pottery and potsherds above the western wall of the mastaba, cca 0.3 m under the surface of the desert. This vessel was roughly shaped by pinching and hollowing on the outside of the body there are rough oblique smoothing marks left by the potter’s fingers. Medium firing.
Marl clay with a little amount of organic (chaff) inclusion.
H: 28.8 cm; diameter across the mouth: 9.5 cm; width: 14.7 cm
Late 5th Dynasty

74/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5633) An ovoid, red-coated and polished beer jug with pointed bottom. It was found in the filling above Khekeretnebty’s sarcophagus chamber. The jug (pl. VII, Bf16 and fig. B32) had probably been shaped over a core and only its low neck was finished on a turning device. On the outside of the vessel there are cutting marks running

---

69 Concerning the roughly made 5th Dynasty beer jars found so far in Abusir, see e.g. W. Kaiser, *Die Tongefäße*, in: Ricke, *Userkaf*, II, 54ff. (type VIII); Charvát, *The Pottery*, 159 and pls. 10–15; for some stimulating considerations about the meaning of this type of vessel, based on the examination of Old Kingdom beer jugs found in Abusir, see also M. Báta, in: *CCE* 4, 1996, 127–131.
70 For this shaping method, see Arnold, Bourriau, *Egyptian Pottery*, 15ff.
71 Kaiser, *o. c*. 52ff. (type V and VI) speaks about jugs made from Ballas or Qena clay respectively.
from the shoulders down to the pointed base. The neck is broken off. On the body, just under the neck area, there is a black-painted cursive inscription:

nw i®

"jar for washing water" (pl. VII, Bf17 and fig. B33). Marl clay with a tiny amount of inclusion (chaff, grains of crushed limestone).
H: 25.5 cm; W: 14 cm; diameter across the mouth could not be measured because it had been broken off. Late 5th Dynasty

Fig. B33

75/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5634) An ovoid, red coated beer jug with pointed bottom (pl. VII, Bf18 and fig. B34). This beer jug, found in the filling above Khekeretnebty’s sarcophagus chamber, was probably shaped over a core and only its low, flaring neck with a plain rim was finished on a turning device. On the smooth surface of the body there are cut marks running from the shoulders down to the base.
Marl clay with a tiny amount of inclusion (chaff, grains of crushed limestone).
H: 27 cm; W: 13.5 cm; diameter across the mouth: 6 cm
Late 5th Dynasty

164a,b/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5635) An ovoid beer jug with a small flat bottom (fig. B35). The red coated jug whose neck has been broken, was shaped over a core. The vessel comes from a selection of pottery found within the serdab.
Marl clay with a tiny amount of inclusion (chaff, grains of crushed limestone).
H: 15 cm; W: 11.7 cm; diameter of the base: 3 cm
Late 5th Dynasty

204d/B/76 A flat-bottomed beer jug with a short cylindrical base (pl. VII, Bf19 and fig. B36), found above the serdab, in the filling between the ceiling of flat limestone slabs and the mudbrick vault. The vessel was shaped over a core and only its low, slightly flaring neck was finished on a turning device. On the outside of the jug bearing the remnants of a white coating, oblique marks of potter’s fingers are visible. Most of the rim had broken off. Medium firing.

Marl clay with a little amount of inclusions (chaff, grains of crushed limestone).
H: 26 cm; W: 15 cm
Late 5th Dynasty

Fig. B34 75/B/76
Red-coated beer jug

Fig. B35 164/B/76

Spouted vases

41/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5638) A spouted vase (pl. VIII, Bf20 and fig. B37) found in the filling of the mastaba core above Khekeretnebty’s burial chamber. The red coated vessel has a biconical body, flat bottom and high flaring neck with roll rim. The body was shaped over a core, the neck was finished on a turning device. Medium firing.
Marl clay. (Illustration next page)
H: 17.4 cm; diameter across the rim: 7.3 cm; body diameter: 13.5 cm; length of the spout: 9 cm
Late 5th Dynasty

76/B/76 A biconical spouted vase with flat bottom and high flaring neck with a roll rim. The vessel was found in the potsherd filling above Khekeretnebty’s

Fig. B36
Flat bottomed beer jug
sarcophagus chamber. The body of the vase was shaped on a core and only the neck was finished on a turning device. On the surface of the red-coated vase, outside and inside, there are remnants of an additional white coating of paint. A small part of the neck has been broken.

Marl clay with a tiny amount of inclusion (chaff, grains of crushed limestone).

H: 18 cm, max. W: 14.5 cm; diameter across the mouth: 7.7 cm
Late 5th Dynasty

287/B/76 A ball-shaped, red-coated spouted vase with a high cylindrical neck and a small flat bottom (pl. VIII, Bf21 and fig. B38). The body of the vase was shaped on a core and only the neck was finished on a turning device. A part of both the neck and the spout have been broken.

Medium firing. Marl clay.
H: 17.2 cm; max. W: 12.4 cm; diameter across the neck: 3.8 cm; diameter across the bottom: 6 cm
Late 5th Dynasty

Bowls
45/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5642) Large, red-coated and polished bowl [72] with flat bottom, straight flaring sides and recurved rim. The vessel was shaped on a turning device. Medium firing.

The bowl was found in the shaft giving access to Khekeretneby’s burial chamber, just at its western wall, at a depth of 4.7 m from the mouth of the shaft, and 80 cm to the north from the SW corner. It had been crushed by a layer of stones that had been added when sealing the shaft after the burial. On the crushed bowl, the remnants of a gazelle’s haunch were laid-obviously, an offering brought and placed here after the entrance to princess’ burial chamber had been walled up.

Marl clay.
Diameter: 34 cm; Th: 0.5 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

155/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5643) A round-bottomed bowl with recurved rim. [73] The thin-walled, red-coated and polished bowl (pl. VIII, Bf22 and fig. B39) was shaped on a turning device and slightly malformed before the firing. It was found inside the sarcophagus and very probably may have belonged to the original burial equipment of the princess. Good firing.

Marl clay.
H: 1.7 cm; diameter: 9.7 – 10.1 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

156/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5644) A small, flat-bottomed bowl with conical body and molding under the roll rim (pl. VIII, Bf23 and fig. B40). The walls of the red-coated and polished bowl are very thin. Medium firing. The bowl, broken in pieces, was found near the SW corner of Khekeretneby’s sarcophagus, cca 20 cm above the floor, in a pile of limestone chips. The vessel may have belonged to the original burial equipment of the princess.

Marl clay.
H: 6.6 cm; diameter of the mouth: 11.7 cm; diameter of the bottom: 5.4 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

187/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5645) A large, round-bottomed bowl with a recurved rim. The red-coated

---

[72] Very close to Kaiser’s type XVIII:117, see W. Kaiser, o. c. 60; see e.g. also P. Ballet, in: CCÉ I, 1987, 15 fig. 10 B.
[73] See Kaiser, o. c. 58 (type XV). Both the shape and the date of the bowl found in Khekeretneby’s sarcophagus perfectly fit into Kaiser’s typological row of this type of vessels, see ibidem 81, fig. 10.
and polished vessel with thin walls was shaped on a turning device. The bowl, broken in pieces, was found in the debris in the shaft leading to Khereretneby’s burial chamber, just in front of the entrance to the chamber. Originally, it may have contained the offerings placed at the bottom of the shaft after the funeral (see p. 19).
Marl clay.
H: 7.8 cm; diameter of the mouth: 33.4–33.7 cm
Late 5th Dynasty

Bread moulds
179a-b/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5624) A thick-walled, flat-bottomed bread mould with slightly flaring sides and obliquely cut rim at the mouth.74 This bread form was found in Khereretneby’s burial chamber, near the entrance, in the debris fallen down through the broken ceiling slab. It is hand-made, slightly baked ceramic of the usual type.
Marl clay with a little amount of organic inclusion (chaff).
H: 16.2 cm; diameter across the rim: 20.1 cm
Late 5th Dynasty

Miniature vessels
168a-i/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5672) Miniature vases of different types, made of burnt red clay.75 These particular vessels were found in the filling of the mastaba core above Khereretneby’s sarcophagus chamber.
H: (a) 7 cm; (b) 6.6 cm; (c) 6.1 cm; (d) 7.9 cm; (e) 5.4 cm; (f) 6 cm; (g) 5.4 cm; (h) 5.5 cm; (i) 4.5 cm
5th Dynasty

203a-h/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5674-76) Miniature wheel-made vases of different types (pl. VIII, Bf24 and figs. B41). These were found in the dark sand between the remnants of the mudbrick vault and the flat ceiling of limestone slabs above the serdab. Medium firing.

Marl clay.
H: (a) 7.5 cm, (b) 6.8 cm, (c) 5.7 cm, (d) 6.7 cm, (e) 7 cm, (f) 5 cm, (g) 4.7 cm, (h) 5.2 cm
Late 5th Dynasty

218a-c/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5687-89) Miniature bowls of different types (pl. IX, Bf25 and fig. B42). These come from the filling above Khereretneby’s burial chamber. (Illustration below)
Marl clay.
H: (a) 3.3 cm; (b) 3 cm; (c) 2.8 cm
5th Dynasty

219a-i/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5677-85) Miniature vases of different types (pl. IX, Bf26 and fig. B43). These come from the filling above Khereretneby’s burial chamber. The vessels were shaped on a turning device; a spiral on the underside indicates that the vessels were cut off the wheel with a string. Medium firing.
H: (a) 7.9 cm; (b) 7.2 cm; (c) 7.4 cm (d) 7 cm; (e) 6.1 cm; (f) 6 cm; (g) 5.2 cm; (h) 5.2 cm; (i) 4.2 cm
5th Dynasty

Metal vessels
127/B/76 A miniature pot in copper (pl. IX, Bf27 – upper right, and fig. B44). Found near the NE corner of the sarcophagus, cca 1.25 m under the top of the lid, in a layer of sand and limestone chips. The pot has a conical shape, swelling out towards the rounded, convex base. The pot has a green patina.

74 Kaiser, o. c. 77f. (type LIV: 257; see also H. Jacquet-Gordon, in: Arnold, Studien zur altägyptischen Keramik, 11ff. and Fig. 3 (no. 5).
75 Undoubtedly, miniature (or model) vessels rank among the most frequent types of pottery found in Old Kingdom cemeteries and, moreover, it is thought that the 5th Dynasty is the period of their floruit (Junker, Giza I, 113). Large deposits of these model vessels were found e.g. in a pit near the entrance to the mortuary temple of Neferefre in Abusir (so far unpublished materials). A similar deposit was found near the entrance to the eastern enclosures of Djedefre’s pyramid at Abu Rawash (M. Baud, in: BIFAO 96, 1996, 255–288). Their shapes are mostly derived from different types of real pottery of everyday use. Only a few types seem to be an ad hoc production of a potter. According to Junker (Giza IX, 191f.), in the Giza necropolis, each burial was equipped with about 90 miniature vessels.
H: 3.8 cm; diameter of the mouth 2.5 cm; diameter of the base 4.6 cm.
5th Dynasty

128/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5594) A miniature of a pot in copper, similar to the entry 127/B/76. It is of a conical shape, swelling out towards the rounded, convex base. This model was found in the same place as the previous entry. It also has a green patina.
H: 3.6 cm; diameter across the mouth: 2.7 cm; diameter of the base: 4.2 cm
5th Dynasty

130/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5595) A miniature bag-shaped pot in copper (pl. IX, Bf 27 – bottom right). The model was discovered in the same place as the previous vessels. Its shape is similar to nos. 127 and 128.
H: 3.8 cm; mouth diameter: 2.7 cm; base diameter: 3.8 cm
5th Dynasty

132/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5596) A miniature pot in copper. Found in the same place as the previous entries. The vessel is of a conical shape, but is wider at the bottom than the top, like nos. 127, 128, 130. Like them, it has a green patina. The base of this vessel is partly destroyed.
H: 3.5 cm; mouth diameter: 2.6 cm; base diameter: 4.2 cm
5th Dynasty

133/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5597) A miniature bag-shaped pot in copper, similar to the previous entries 127, 128, 130 and 132. Its find position was the same at the others. The vase has a green patina.
H: 3.8 cm; diameter of the mouth: 2.6 cm; diameter of the base: 4.3 cm
5th Dynasty

134/B/76 A miniature bag-shaped pot in copper, similar to the previous entry. Archaeological context as before. Like nos 127, 128, 130, 132, this vessel has a base that is larger than its opening and is convex. Green patina covers the vessel.
H: 3.5 cm; diameter of the mouth: 2.5 cm; diameter of the base 4.6 cm
5th Dynasty

135/B/76 (Náprstek Museum 5598) A miniature bag-shaped pot in copper, identical to the previous entry. Found with the other vases, in a layer of sand and limestone chips. Covered with a green patina.
H: 3.4 cm; rim diameter 2.6 cm; base diameter: 4.6 cm
5th Dynasty

136/B/76 A miniature neckless shouldered jar in copper. (pl. IX Bf27 – left, and fig. B44 – bottom right) It was found near the NE corner of Khekeretneby’s sarcophagus, cca 1.25 m under the top of the lid, in a layer of sand and limestone chips. It has a flat base and a green patina.
H: 4.5 cm; W: 3 cm; base diameter: 2 cm
5th Dynasty

137/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5599) A miniature neckless shouldered jar in copper, similar to the previous entry, archaeological context as before. This jar has a flat base and is covered with a green patina.
H: 4.6 cm; W: 3 cm; base diameter: 1.8 cm
5th Dynasty

138/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5600) A miniature neckless shouldered jar in copper; find place as before. It has a flat base and a green patina and is identical in shape to the previous entries.
H: 4.7 cm; W: 2.8 cm; base diameter: 2 cm
5th Dynasty
139/B/76 A miniature neckless shouldered jar in copper, similar to the entries 136, 137 and 138. Find place as before. This jar also has a flat base and green patina.
H: 4.6 cm; W: 2.7 cm; base diameter: 2 cm
5th Dynasty

140/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5601) Another neckless shouldered jar in copper, identical in shape to the others. Its archaeological context was the same as the others. It is covered with a green patina.
H: 4.4 cm; W: 2.7 cm; base diameter: 1.8 cm
5th Dynasty

141/B/76 A miniature neckless shouldered jar in copper. It was found in the same place as the entries before. It has a flat base and a green patina and is identical in shape to the other jars.
H: 4.3 cm; W: 2.6 cm; base diameter: 1.9 cm
5th Dynasty

142/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5602) A miniature neckless shouldered jar in copper. Find place as before. It has a green patina, but the base of this piece has broken off.
H: 4.6 cm; W: 2.7 cm; base diameter: 1.8 cm
5th Dynasty

143/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5603) A miniature neckless shouldered jar in copper (fig. B44 – bottom right). Find place as before. It has a flat base and a green patina and is identical in shape to the previous entries.
H: 4.7 cm; W: 2.6 cm; base diameter: 1.8 cm
5th Dynasty

129/B/76 A miniature copper basinootnote{For the publication of the vessel, see M. Verner, Forgotten Pharaohs, 85 (centre).} found in the same place as the previous vases. The basin (fig. B44 centre left) has a broadly conical shape, flaring out at the rim. Its base is flat and it has a green patina. Originally, the basin together with an ewer no. 144/B/76, formed a washing set.
H: 2.5 cm; mouth diameter 5 cm; bottom diameter 2.7 cm
5th Dynasty

131/B/76 A miniature shallow, open bowl in copper (pl. IX, Bf27 – centre and fig. B44 – bottom right). It was found with the previous entries. The bowl has a rounded bottom and a recurved rim. The vessel has a green patina.
H: 1.7 cm; diameter: 6.2 cm
5th Dynasty

144/B/76 A miniature copper bowl with a spout (ewer) (pl. IX, Bf28 and fig. B44 – upper right). Find place as before. The vessel is biconical in shape. It has a green patina. The base of this vase has broken away. Originally, the ewer, together with the basin no. 129/B/76, formed a washing set.
H: 3.4 cm; W (incl. the spout): 6.7 cm
5th Dynasty
The set of model vessels in copper found in Khekeretnebty’s burial chamber contained not numerous but typologically very interesting examples. Some of these types occur infrequently among comparable material from the Old Kingdom.

As usual in that time, Khekeretnebty’s set of model vessels in copper contained a washing set (l‘), consisting of a ewer and a basin.

In Khekeretnebty’s set of model vessels in copper are of two types that are each represented by a single example, a shallow bowl with a rounded bottom and a bowl with a rounded bottom and a recurved rim. Both types imitate original pottery vessels which have their stone replicas, too. The former type occurs frequently among Old Kingdom model vessels of copper. Less frequently attested among the Old Kingdom model vessels in copper is the latter type. Radwan published from the Giza materials similar bowls with a rounded bottom and a recurved rim.

Better represented in Khekeretnebty’s set of model vessels in copper are two types namely, a pot with conical body, swelling towards the rounded bottom; the other vessel is a neckless shouldered jar with a flat bottom. The former type, only rarely attested among the model vessels, imitates a vessel originally made in pottery (dSrt) and used as a storage jar. The latter type, better attested in the Old Kingdom finds of model vessels in copper, also imitated an original pottery jar (nnmt).

Metal instruments

80/B/76 A copper needle. This was found in the potsherd filling above Khekeretnebty’s sarcophagus chamber, cca 2 m under the preserved top of the mastaba walls. It has a green patina.

L: 5.8 cm
5th Dynasty

147/B/76 Miniature copper chisels of different types. The chisels were discovered near the NE corner of the sarcophagus chamber, with the other items mentioned above. There was a bundle of them, stuck together because of the patina.
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

254/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5605) A collection of different types of symbolic tools made of copper. The instruments were badly corroded (pl. IX, Bf29). The following types were represented in this set:

a) a leaf-shaped knife (the tip of whose blade was broken off) or a chisel with a narrow blade; 7.8 cm long and 1.1 cm wide
b) a leaf-shaped knife the tip of whose blade was broken off; 7.5 cm long and 0.7 cm wide
c) an adze; 7.5 cm long and 1.6 cm wide

d) an adze; 5 cm long and 1.1 cm wide at its edge
e) a long thin chisel; 8 cm long and 3 mm wide at its maximum and 3 mm wide across its tip
f) a rectangular razor; 4.5 × 3.2 cm

These were found in the NE corner of Tis’ehor’s burial chamber no. 2, just above the floor, in sand mixed with limestone blocks and chips. The tools are damaged by patina.

5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

Faience materials

18/B/76 Blue, green and brown faience beads of a cylindrical shape. They were found scattered on the surface of the desert, above the NE corner of the mastaba.

The length of the beads varied between 0.7 – 2.9 cm. The width across the circular ends was 0.2 – 0.5 cm

5th Dynasty (?)

---

77 The models of vessels in copper were found in situ on the floor near the northern side of Khekeretnebty’s sarcophagus. Most of analogical objects from other Old Kingdom mastabas were found on the outer sides of sarcophagi and only rarely were they laid within the sarcophagus, see e.g. Hassan, Giza III, 240f. (shaft no. 559).
79 A washing set was part of the burial equipment not only in the Memphite tombs but in provincial ones, too, see e.g. a fine washing set from the 6th Dynasty tomb of Isi in Edfu (Desroches-Noblecourt, *Edfou III*, 191 no. 216 and pl. 21/10).
80 Nos. 133G and 138 published by Radwan, o.c. 53 and pl.25 represent a nice parallel to our bowl – see also Hassan, *Giza VI/2*, 41 (5).
81 o.c. 52 (nos. 132 B, D and 130 C) and pl. 24.
82 See also some other bowls of this type published e.g. by Hassan, *Giza III*, 241 fig. 217 and id. *Giza VII*, 41 (no. 9).
83 It occurs e.g. in the set of miniature copper vessels from the burial equipment of Iput I, see Radwan, o.c. 60 (no. 149 D) and pl. 26.
84 Hassan, *Giza VII*, 40 (no. 3); Radwan, o.c. 51 (no. 128 A) and pl. 24.
85 The small dimensions of copper needles, their liability vis à vis corrosion and consequently their easier disintegration might be one of the reasons why these objects occur in the burial equipment less frequently than e.g. the model vessels or instruments of copper. The needles so far revealed come from both male (see e.g. Junker, *Giza VII*, 228 and fig. 93; id. *Giza X*, 111) and female tombs (see e.g. Vallogia, *Ima-Pepy*, pl. 107) burials.
86 The models of chisels, kept at present in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo, have not yet been completely restored and their precise measurements are therefore not available.
87 The tool (the shape of which rather resembles a spear) is considered by Hassan, *Giza VII*, 42 (14) to be a wide-bladed knife with a tang for attaching to a wooden (?) handle whereas Reisner, Smith, *Giza II*, 35 (1058 no. 6) and fig. 37 take it for a chisel.
88 Analogical types of adzes were found e.g. in the 6th Dynasty tomb of Semdenti, see e.g. Lloyd, Spencer, Khoul, *Saqqara Mastabas II*, 23 (10) and pl. 24.
89 See Hassan, *Giza VI/2*, 43 (24).
90 Concerning this type of a razor, see Reisner, Smith, *Giza II*, 45 and fig. 45 (nos. 751, 1112, 1113, 1152); see also Hassan, *Giza VII*, 43 (19).
51/B/76 A fragment, which seems to be part of a faience ornament (the rear part of a head-band coming originally from a statue ?). The ornament (pl. XII, Bf44 and fig. B45) is both painted and glazed. The decoration on one side features vertical banding in black, blue, red and white colour, while on the opposite side the stripes of the same colours run the opposite way. The fragment was found among the potsherds filling above Khekeretnebty’s sarcophagus chamber, cca 1.5 m under the top of the W wall of the vestibule. H: 4.1 cm; W: 3.6 cm; Th: 0.5 cm
5th Dynasty

55a-c/B/76 Bluish-green glazed faience beads of a simple tubular shape. The beads were discovered in the lower third section of the sand layer in Tisethor’s offering room.
L: 35, 23 and 18 mm
5th Dynasty (?)

286/B/76 Faience fragments of cylindrical and disc-shaped beads, their maximum length being 2.5 cm, the diameter across their ends varying from 0.5 – 0.25 cm. These fragments were found scattered above the surface of the filling of Tisethor’s offering room.
5th Dynasty (?)

Flint finds

56/B/76 A flint blade. This was found in the lower third of the sand layer in Tisethor’s offering room. It had a long oblong shape with its ends missing. There was no secondary retouching carried out.
L: 4.3 cm; W: 0.9 cm
5th Dynasty

154/B/76 A flint knife (pl. IX, Bf30 and fig. B46). The knife, which is carrot-shaped, being pointed at one end and wide at the other, was found between the S wall of the sarcophagus and the wall of the sarcophagus chamber, cca 20 cm above the floor.
L: 9 cm; W: 3.3 cm; Th: 0.5 cm
5th Dynasty

177/B/76 A flint pebble. It was found in the SW corner of Khekeretnebty’s burial chamber. It was on the top of the detritus thrown out by the robbers. This semi-round instrument has three pressure flake marks at its lower end, adjacent to the main percussion break. These marks were probably due to the pebble being used for striking other objects (by the robbers for making the hole in the sarcophagus ?).
L: 9.2 cm; W: 7.2 cm; the pebble is 6 cm thick
5th Dynasty

Textiles

20/B/76 Small fragments of mummy bandages made of fine, plain woven linen. These were discovered in a layer of dark sand mixed with limestone chips in the shaft in the SW corner of the mastaba, cca 1 – 1.5 m under the mouth of the shaft.
5th Dynasty

146/B/76 A piece of mummy bandage made of fine, plain woven linen. It was found near the NE corner of the sarcophagus, cca 1.3 m under the top of the lid, among miniature vessels in a layer of sand and limestone chips.
5th Dynasty

151/B/76 A roll of mummy wrappings made of linen. The fabric was found at the entrance into the sarcophagus chamber, under the lowermost layer of stone masonry blocking the entrance.
W: cca 8 cm
5th Dynasty

169/B/76 Pieces of Khekeretnebty’s mummy wrappings made of fine, plain woven linen. These were mostly found in the debris around the sarcophagus in Khekeretnebty’s burial chamber. Some of the pieces were also found dispersed along the two ways by means of which the robbers penetrated from above
into the mastaba’s underground: in the shaft, in front of the entrance into the burial chamber, and in the vestibule behind the entrance to the mastaba. The wrappings consist mostly of linen of very fine texture, somewhat ochre coloured. Some of these textiles are folded into pads of different shapes, others consist of large sheets and cca 8–9 cm wide bandages. Five fragments (a–e, see the text below) bore the remnants of semihieratic inscriptions in black ink.91

169a/B/76 A fragment of mummy wrapping made of fine, plain woven linen.92 The fragment was found in the debris filling Khekeretnebty’s burial chamber, near the northern wall of the sarcophagus. This piece bears a vertical line of an inscription (pl. X, Bf31 and fig. B47):

91 A sample of Khekeretnebty’s linen wrapping was examined by means of C14 method and can be dated to 2869–2403 BC, see E. Strouhal et al., Fs L. Vyhniček, in press). (Similar inscribed mummy wrappings (0.5–5 m long) were found e.g. in the tomb of Khentkaus, north-west of the pyramid of Unas, see Saad, Saqqara and Helwan, 65 and pl. 31B: date + title + name + aA (?) 1.

92 For the publication of the fragment, see M. Verner, Forgotten Pharaohs, 84, upper right.
Abusir VI. Djedkare’s Family Cemetery

Hry-tp nswt Khf: hry-^r imy-r3 pr-in^wth/hts(w) Hnmm. (Width) 1 nswt (str nswt (?)); 3 (rolls) (?).
“King’s subordinate Kehef: (his) assistant: the overseer of weavers Kenemu. Royal (linen, width) 1.3 (rolls).”
W: 7–8 cm.; L of the inscription: 18.7 cm
5th Dynasty

169/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5609) A fragment of an inscribed mummy wrapping made of fine, plain woven linen. This piece, found outside Khekeretneby’s sarcophagus, was also made of very fine linen and it carried a vertical line of a semi-hieratic inscription (pl. X, Bf32 – right and fig. B48) in black ink:

imy-r3 ^kw, hry-tp nswt, mr.f nb.f, stb, ^d-mr str (?), hry-^r (?); pr-^nkh, imy-r3 h3yt (?); ... (width) 3 nswt.
“The overseer of provisions, King’s subordinate, one who loves his Lord, judge, district administrator Seru (?) – (his) assistant: (…) of the House of life, the overseer of the Hall (?), … (?). Royal (linen, width) 3.3 (rolls).”
W: cca 12 cm
5th Dynasty

169e/B/76 A fragment of an inscribed mummy wrapping made of fine, plain woven linen. It was found in Khekeretneby’s sarcophagus chamber, near the entrance. This example was also made of very fine linen and it carried a vertical line of hieratic inscription (pl. X, Bf 33 and fig. B49) in black ink:

hry-tp nswt 3ht-htp, hry-^r Khf
“King’s subordinate Akhethop, – (his) assistant: Kehef.”
The inscription is cca 7 cm long.
5th Dynasty

169d/B/76 A fragment of a mummy wrapping made of fine, plain woven linen. This piece was found in Khekeretneby’s sarcophagus chamber, close to the entrance. The fragment contains a vertical line of inscription (pl. X, Bf32 – bottom left and fig. B50) in black ink:

… (l)m(y–r3 ?) … Pth–sp3s …
“… the overseer …Ptahshepses …”
Max. L of the inscription: cca 5 cm
5th Dynasty

169e/B/76 A fragment of a mummy wrapping made of linen. The fragment was found in Khekeretneby’s sarcophagus chamber, near the entrance. The linen contains a single vertical line with the inscription (fig. B51):

…in’t (? (Width) 1 nswt.
“…weaver (?). Royal (linen, width) 1.”
L of the inscription: 6 cm
5th Dynasty

277/B/76 Fragments of mummy wrappings made of fine, plain woven linen. The pieces were found in the area of the destroyed burial chamber of Tisethor.
5th Dynasty

---

93 Concerning the name Strw, see RPN I, 31714. Was after hry-^r “(his) assistant” omitted in the title referring to the pr-^nkh?
280 and 281/B/76 Remains of fine, plain woven linen wrappings and mummy tissue. These linen pieces, found in the shaft giving access to Tisethor’s burial chamber, have no inscription.

281/B/76 Mummy wrappings of fine, plain woven linen. These were found in the area of the destroyed burial chamber of Tisethor. The pieces had been thrown out from the chamber, together with some skeletal remains (190/B/76). There were no inscriptions on the wrappings.
5th Dynasty

284/B/76 Linen mummy wrappings. The pieces were found scattered in the debris filling Tisethor’s offering room. They were uninscribed.
5th Dynasty

285/B/76 Mummy wrappings of fine, plain woven linen. The pieces were found scattered in the debris filling Tisethor’s burial chamber. They were uninscribed.
5th Dynasty

Wooden remains
46/B/76 A wooden section from a piece of furniture (a chair ?), having a length of 50 cm. The profile of the piece is square (4 x 4 cm), and there are 2.7 and 2.9 cm long pegs on both sides. This section was found in the secondary filling in the NE corner of the shaft giving access to Khekeretneby’s burial chamber, at a depth of 4.7 m from the surface. The piece may have come from the burial equipment originally placed in the princess’ sarcophagus chamber.
5th Dynasty

62/B/76 Charcoal pieces. These were found in the sarcophagus chamber, in a conical bowl (63/B/76) that had been set down in front of the lid of the sarcophagus – perhaps left here by robbers.
1st Intermediate Period (?)

70/B/76 A piece of wood, probably from a tray in the shape of the sign hetep (pl. X, Bf34 and fig. B52).

The object was found in front of the NW corner of the lid of the sarcophagus. It has four rounded moulds – perhaps for model vessels (?). There is a squarish cavity in the handle or upper part of the tray, too.
25 x 19.5 cm, with a thickness of 2.3 cm
5th Dynasty

163/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5606) A fragment of a painted statue in wood found in the southern offering room, in a mud brick annex adjoining the S wall, under the slot of the serdab. The fragment consists of the front half of the right foot (with toes) of a woman (pl. XI, Bf35). The flesh is painted in yellow, the toenails are painted white.
L: 13 cm; W: 5.5 cm
5th Dynasty

172/B/76 Fragments of a wooden box found in Khekeretneby’s burial chamber, between the southern end of the sarcophagus and the wall of the burial chamber. There were 22 pieces of thin, flat wood, some with original smoothed surface and notches for wedges. Some pieces were exceptional in having the remains of a whitish or an ochre coat of paint on them. Two pieces had small, circular holes.
Largest fragment – L: 10.5 cm; W: 2.1 cm; Th: 0.8 cm
5th Dynasty

175/B/76 A model of a wooden boat (fig. B53). This crudely cut boat had a smooth underside and sides. The prow was intact, but the other end and upper section were damaged. Only one other burial for a royal woman was found to contain boat models: this was the tomb of Queen Neith, from Dynasty 6. Neith had a small flotilla of boats of different types.95 These are thought to have had relevance for different types of transport in the Afterlife.96
L: 12 cm; W: 3.4 cm above and 2.8 cm below; Th: 1.7 cm
5th Dynasty

95 Jéquier, Neit et Apout, 33–40 and figs. 17–21
96 On these and other boats associated with Old Kingdom burials, see H. Altenmüller, in: ArOr 70/3 (in press).
**191/B/76** (Náprstek Museum P 5607) A large fragment of a decayed female statue with her left leg advanced\(^97\) (pl. XI, Bf36). The statue is made of dark, red-brown wood (*Ficus sycomorus*) with some remaining stucco and paint. It was found in the serdab, on the floor and cca 90 cm from the W wall, under a pile of mud bricks. The statue was laid with its head to the N, close to another statue (192/B/76). This fragmentary piece is missing its head, its hands and the legs from the knees downwards. The irregularities of the original surface of the statue were filled in with mud that had been mixed with sand. The surface of the statue had then been covered with pink stucco that was then painted. There are remains of light and dark green paint around the neckline, and light and dark green lines running down a strap of some sort (a bodice ?) that goes across the body.\(^98\)

Max. H: 94 cm
5\(^{th}\) Dynasty

**192/B/76** (Náprstek Museum P 5608) A fragment of a female statue, wearing a sheath dress (unfortunately, the fragment is so decayed that any more accurate identification of the dress is impossible), with left leg advanced, made from light brownish yellow wood (pl. XI, Bf37). This fragment was found in the serdab of Mastaba B, where it lay on the floor, about 90 cm from the W wall, under a pile of mud bricks. The statue was laid with its head to the south, close to 191/B/76. It was badly damaged, and both hands and feet are missing. Irregularities on the original surface had been filled with mud inlays. The surface had then been covered with white stucco, then it had been painted. On the head (pl. XI, Bf38), there are the remnants of a black painted short, close-fitting natural coiffure.\(^99\) Traces of paint survive, including details of a blue and yellow collar necklace. There are fragmentary remains of an anklet on the left leg.

Max. H: 49 cm
5\(^{th}\) Dynasty

**Miscellaneous objects from the mastaba**

**1/B/78** Sealing (pl. XII, Bf39 and fig. B54).

Dark grey clay, 3.4 x 2.6 cm

Found in the debris filling the serdab. The sealing bears the remnants of the following text:

A
1. *Hr S\(\text{t}-\text{t}b-t\text{w}\)*
2. *(hry)-$\text{stt}$*, ...$\text{s}$...(?), wd$\text{t}$

\(^97\) Harvey, *Wooden Statues*, 56 (Sf. 3 or 3a)

\(^98\) However, the remnants of painted stucco on the thigh indicate that on the statue no sheath dress was depicted. This decorative element may be the only type yet attested in wooden statuary. As Harvey has remarked, we have lost many nuances of clothing decoration for both males and females from wooden statues due to the deterioration of the wood and the fading of painted details in the clothing depicted on the statues. (J. Harvey, in: Ziegler, *L'Art de l'Ancien Empire*, 361.)

\(^99\) Harvey, *Wooden Statues*, 20 (Wf.5).
3. (Hr) St-ib-t3wy
4. ... (seated figure of the king holding bd-mace)
5. (Hr) St-(ib)-t3wy
6. Nchn-r

1. “Horus Setibtawy
2. (privy) to the secret, ...(?)..., order
3. Horus Setibtawy
5. (Horus) Setibtawy
6. Nekhenre”

B
1. hm-ntr (R n) Nchn-r
2. (Hr St-ib)-t3wy
3. hm-ntr (R n) Nchn-(r)
4. (Hr) St-ib-t3wy

1. “priest (of Re) of (the sun temple of) Nekhenre
2. (Horus Setib)awy
3. priest (Re of the sun temple of) Nekhenre
4. (Horus) Setbtawy”

C
1. Nfr-f-r
2. šb3, hry-ššt3 ... šš, (r) wdt hm
1. “Neferefre
2. instructor, privy to the secret ...(?)..., who makes what has been ordered by (His) Majesty”

Obviously, the sealing is intrusive and probably got into the serdab during a later violations of the tomb by robbers. For other sealings see p. 94.

38/B/76 Fragment of a relief (pl. XII, Bf40 and fig. B55).
Limestone
37 × 19.5 cm

Fragment of the upper portion of the wall with remains of hieroglyphic inscriptions, in three columns, in low relief and the upper frieze in black paint. The remnants of the inscription read:
1. ... mw (?), w’b ...
2. smr ...
3. ...?...
67/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5566) A fragment of a full-size headrest of alabaster. This fragment was found in front of the lid of Khekeretnebty’s sarcophagus, close to the NW corner. The fragment is from the headrest support column, between the foot and the curved top. It is highly polished and almost square in shape. It joins with 68a,b/B/76 and 152/B/76.
6.8 x 6 x 1.3 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

68a,b/B/76 + 152/B/76 (Náprstek Museum P 5566)
Two fragments of the alabaster headrest mentioned above (fig. B57). These pieces were found in front of the lid of the sarcophagus, close to its NW corner. The fragments come from the curved part of the headrest and have a polished surface. These pieces join with 67/B/76.
The dimensions of the curved part of the headrest – L: 19.2 cm; H: 7.6 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

69/B/76 Fragment of relief (pl. XII, Bf42 and fig. B58).
Limestone
29 x 30 cm
The fragment bears the remains of two columns of a roughly cut hieroglyphic inscription reading:
1. ... hb nb...?...
2. ... imšḫt ḫr ...?...

The anthropological and animal remains (for more details see chap. 10)

10/B/76 Bone fragments, consisting of the facial section of a juvenile male. These were found in a layer of sand above the mastaba, just under the surface of the desert.

32/B/76 Assorted bones of uncertain date, found dispersed in the central and northern chapel area, together with some bones of the individual 190/B/76. The collection from this area includes the left temporal bone of an adult woman (?) and the post-cranial bones of an adult man.

43/B/76 Human bones of the Late Period (?), found inside the coffin. See 43 a/B/76 in the section on Wooden Remains.
170/B/76 Assorted human bones from the 5th Dynasty. These consisted of a the skull, mandible, cervical and thoracic vertebrae, and bones of the hand that were found to the south of the sarcophagus, 6–10 cm in the debris above the floor. The long bones of the extremities lay on the lid of the sarcophagus, above its foot end. Some cervical and lumbar vertebrae, fragments of scapulae, the right talus and calcaneus and the lower end of the right fibula were found in the central shaft, in front of the entrance into the burial chamber.

The bones belonged to an adult woman of cca 25–35 years. She had a gracile body build and exhibited weak muscular relief.

171/B/76 Assorted animal bones from the 5th Dynasty. These were found in Khekeretnebty’s burial chamber, dispersed around the foot end of the sarcophagus, on its lid and in the SW corner of the burial chamber. Two left femora (F1 and F2) and one right scapula (Sc 1) were found 10 cm above the floor, between the eastern wall of the chamber and the sarcophagus, close to the NE corner of the sarcophagus.

The bones contained at least two fragments of cattle, one adult, one immature type, and remains of some other small species.

189/B/76 Gazelle bones from the 5th Dynasty. These were found in the central shaft, in front of the entrance into Khekeretnebty’s burial chamber. The bones consisted of the four extremities and were found in association with four bags.

190/B/76 Human bones from the 5th Dynasty. These were found adjoining the northern shaft, 1.2 m under the present surface of the ground. Some of the bones of this individual were found previously in the debris and sand of the central and northern chapels, together with a few bones of two other adults (see no.32/B/76 – Anthropological Remains).

The bones belonged to a juvenile female of 15–16 years of age. Her body build and muscular relief were in accordance with the age of the skeleton.

201/B/76 Human bones of uncertain date: these lay on the top of the mudbrick west wall of the mastaba, south from the NW corner. The body lay in an extended position, on its left side, head to the north and feet to the south. No traces of coffin or shroud might be found. The skeleton appears to be that of an adult male.

202/B/76 The bones of an adult male of uncertain date, found on top of the mudbrick west wall of the mastaba. The body lay to the south of the burial of 201/B/76. No trace of a coffin or shroud was found.

279/B/76 The bones of a child aged 8 or 9 years, possibly from the Ptolemaic period. These lay on the surface of the wall at the NW corner of the northern chapel, 30 cm below the preserved upper edge of the wall. The body lay in an extended position, head to the east, feet to the west. The lower part of the body had been disturbed by tomb robbers.
THE OWNER OF THE MASTABA

imḥw ḫr nṯr i3 “revered with the Great God”
ḥry-pn “hereditary prince”
wṯ dḥw (m) pr ḫwty1 “greatest of 5 in the temple
Thoth”
hḥy ṣḥṭḥ (n) mdw nṯr “one who is privy to the secret of
the god’s words”

office. All of these titles listed for Prince Neserkauhor belong to the class of so-called “honorary
titles”, with the implication that these indicated a re-
sident of the royal court who had no other profession.

In two recent studies on titles found on the inner
blocks from the pyramid of Pepy I, however, Vassil
Dobrev2 has demonstrated that the holders of these
honorable titles during the early part of the

---

Fig. G1 Plan of Djedkare’s family cemetery showing the position of Neserkauhor’s tomb

bḥy-hbt bḥy tp “chief lector priest”
sḏ nḥwt “king’s son”
sḏ nḥwt bḥy nṯm ḫt f mṛḥ (f’?) “eldest beloved king’s
son of his body”
ḥmr ḫt “sole companion”
ḥḥḥ nḏḥtnṯr “scribe of the god’s book”

The collection of titles given here are indicative of an
actual prince. As Bettina Schmitz3 was able to show
in her work, one of the indicators of a titular prince
was his “working” titles; after the early 5th Dynasty,
hereditary princes do not appear to have held public

6th Dynasty, at least, did indeed exercise one hitherto
unknown set of duties, being involved in the building

---

1 For the unclear meaning of the title “Greatest of the Five in the
temple of Thoth”, see Begelsbacher-Fischer, Götterwelt, 190f.
According to Begelsbacher-Fischer, the title disappeared at the
beginning of the 5th Dynasty. The discovery of this title for this
prince extends the date of usage for this post to the later
5th Dynasty. Neserkauhor thus could have been one of the last
attested Old Kingdom holders of the title known so far.

2 Schmitz, Königssohn

3 V. Dobrev, in: BIFAO 96, 1996, 103–142. and id., in: BIFAO 98,
works of the king’s pyramid. It is also evident that the viziers and king’s sons played an important role in the construction – that role being, perhaps, of a supervisory nature. Of particular interest for our purpose, is the presence of the king’s son, Teti-ankh\(^4\) as a supervisor of much of the area surrounding Pepy’s pyramid. This surely could indicate the sort of work being carried out by the king’s sons in earlier periods, such as might have been the case with Neserkauhor.

**THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORT**

The mastaba of Neserkauhor (fig. G1.C) is located just to the south of the complex of mudbrick structures and courtyards which were additionally built in front of the mastaba of Khekeretnebty.\(^5\) The extant height of the ruined monument does not exceed 1.5 m above ground level.

The remains of the mastaba were buried under a massive layer of debris ranging from 20 cm up to approximately 2 m. The uppermost, surface stratum consisted of dark sand mixed with small fragments of limestone and potsherds – mostly beer jugs, miniature symbolic vessels and bread forms and, more rarely, red-slipped bowls with recurved rim, or broadly opened bowls with incised horizontal lines under the rim – dating from the late 5\(^{th}\) Dynasty (fig. C1).

In the eastern portion of the mastaba, the debris under the surface stratum was formed by a homogeneous mass of dark sand mixed with fragments of mud bricks, limestone and, sporadically, late 5\(^{th}\) Dynasty pottery (mostly beer jugs and miniature symbolic vessels) (fig. C2).

The structure of the debris under the surface stratum in the western portion of the mastaba sharply contrasted with that in the eastern portion. The whole area, including the burial chamber and the vertical shaft giving access to the former, was filled with yellowish drift sand.

**The superstructure**

The mastaba (fig. C3) had a rectangular, north-south oriented plan which, in principle, did not differ from that of the mastabas of Khekeretnebty, Hedjetnebu or Lady L. The monument had originally been 12.30 m long and 9.10 m wide; its height could have been about 4 m. The stratigraphical examination of the masonry clearly showed, that Neserkauhor’s mastaba was obviously built later than the two buildings to

\(^4\)There is a prince of the same name, who is a son of Teti. He may be identical with the prince attested at South Saqqara. For the recent publication of the discovery of the tomb of Teti-ankh, by Z. Hawass (see Z. Hawass, in: Bárá, Krajčí, *Abusir and Saqqara*, 419–422). The bones within that tomb, thought to be the remains of Teti-ankh, were those of a man of 25 years, according to the author. This would mean that Teti-ankh must have worked on Pepy’s pyramid in the very early part of his reign, if the prince died around the age of 25 years.

\(^5\) For the preliminary report on the discovery and excavation of Neserkauhor’s mastaba, see M. Verner, in: *ZÁS* 107, 1980, 164f.
which it is adjacent: the mastaba of Idu and Khenit in the west and the complex of mudbrick structures for Khekeretneby’s mortuary cult in the north.

Most of the mastaba's superstructure was built of mudbrick. Only the lower part of the northern outer wall of the mastaba was built of small, roughly dressed irregular pieces of inferior quality limestone. Except for the position of the niche for the false door, the plan of the eastern part of the superstructure did not differ from the mastabas of Khekeretneby, Hedjetnebu and Lady L. It included a vestibule flanked in the north by a magazine and in the south by an offering room. In the SW corner of the mastaba the very ruined state of the monument, however, the exact angle of the inclined façade could not be established.

The entrance

The entrance (fig. C3.1) in the eastern façade of the mastaba was situated near the northeast corner, precisely at one third of the length of the façade. Above the entrance, placed in a shallow recess in the façade, was originally embedded a limestone lintel bearing, besides the funerary formula, the titles and the name of the tomb owner (see below, "The lintel").

The lintel, broken in several pieces, was found in

![Fig. C2 Profile between the western wall of the mastaba and the serdab](image)

1 eroded limestone fragments
2 limestone fragments, greyish sand
3 dark grey sand, limestone fragments, sherd
4 mudbrick wall
5 limestone masonry
6 mudbrick wall of the serdab
7 crown of the mudbrick wall

there was a small serdab. The remaining vacant space between these rooms and the western outer wall of the mastaba was filled with sand.

The faces of the outer walls of the mastaba were slightly tilted, plastered and whitewashed. Owing to Khekeretneby’s mastaba where it had obviously been used to facilitate the tomb robbers’ penetration of the burial chamber of the princess (see above).

6 The standard dimensions of each mudbrick were 7 x 14 x 28 cm.
The vestibule

The vestibule (fig. C3.2), following just after the entrance, was a small rectangular room, north-south oriented on the ground plan. It is not possible to deduce from the extant remains of the room any conclusions about the actual decoration of the plastered and whitewashed walls.

The offering room

The offering room (fig. C3.3) to the south of the vestibule had an L-shaped plan. Its walls were faced with roughly-cut limestone and whitewashed. Originally, in the western wall of a deep niche at the southern end of the room, a false door had probably been embedded. However, no remains of the false door were found either in situ or in the debris in the room. Whether the walls of the offering room were decorated or not remains unclear and so is the question of a little slot which may have linked (via the southern wall) this room with the serdab.

The magazine

The storeroom, situated to the north of the antechamber, differs little from the latter except for being a shade larger.

The serdab

A thick wall of cca 1 cubit separated the offering room from the serdab (fig. C3.5). The serdab was a very small closed room of a rectangular, east-west orientation. Its ceiling was originally formed by a barrel vault from which only a tiny fragment survived in position. In the debris – consisting of dark sand and fragments of mudbrick from the collapsed vault – fragments of several decayed wooden statues (pl. XIII, C11) of the tomb owner were found.

---

7 The plan of this room may have been derived from the earlier Giza mastabas with the interior L-shaped chapel, see Reisner, Giza, 203–210.
8 For the publication of the statues in the process of unearthing, see Verner, Forgotten Pharaohs, 86.
The Substructure

Unlike the other mastabas, there was no subsidiary shaft in the SW corner of Neserkauhor’s tomb. The mastaba’s substructure consisted of a burial chamber, which was accessible by means of a vertical shaft.

The burial shaft

The mouth of a vertical shaft (fig. C3.6) giving access to the burial chamber opened in the northern part of the mastaba, to the west of the magazine. The shaft is at present cca 3 m deep. It was built of mudbrick, and so was the burial chamber situated to the south of the shaft. The burial crypt was accessible from the bottom of the shaft by means of a short passage, the ceiling of which was formed by limestone slabs. In the entrance to the chamber there was a low wall made of fragments of limestone – obviously built by robbers – (see below no. 14/C/78). The present crown of the northern wing of the shaft is damaged by a deep and broad cut, undoubtedly showing the way through which the robbers in antiquity penetrated the substructure of the tomb.

The burial chamber

The burial chamber (fig. C3.7) had a rectangular, north-south oriented plan. It was built of mudbrick except for the flat, cca 20 cm thick ceiling made of roughly cut slabs of inferior quality limestone. The ceiling slabs were laid approximately at about ground level of the mastaba. As in other neighbouring mastabas in this cemetery, above the flat limestone ceiling a mudbrick barrel vault was constructed in order to reduce the pressure from the sand that filled the superstructure above the burial chamber. In the southern portion of both the vault and the flat ceiling, the robbers cut a hole through which they penetrated the burial chamber. Apparently, the robbers broke into the chamber in two ways – through the ceiling and through the descending shaft. These intrusions were undoubtedly made in different times in antiquity, but the precise period when that occurred is unknown.

Except for the drift sand mixed with fragments of mudbrick and limestone, no traces of a stone sarcophagus or wooden coffin were found in the burial chamber. Surprisingly, no other finds – like pottery, fragments of bones or mummy wrappings, etc. – were made in the chamber, either. This would suggest that the robbers must have very thoroughly plundered Neserkauhor’s funerary apartment.

Both the burial chamber and the shaft were filled with yellowish drift sand. Obviously, the original filling of the shaft must have been completely removed by the robbers and after the robbery, left open to the elements, and in this state it remained until our excavation.

Items from the tomb

The lintel

31a,b; 35, 36, 37 and 39/B/76 Parts of a limestone lintel of Neserkauhor (pl. XIII, C2/a-c and fig. C4). Originally, it consisted of four slabs. All fragments of the lintel were found beyond Neserkauhor’s mastaba, in a matrix of yellow sand mixed with limestone chips and potsherds, at a depth of 2–3 m below the mouth of the shaft, giving access to Khekeretnebty’s burial chamber.

The lintel features three horizontal lines of a hieroglyphic inscription: the traditional offering formula – in sunk relief – and one vertical line on the left hand side, in front of the striding figure of Neserkauhor with a long staff in his left hand and a handkerchief in his right. He wears a short kilt and wig. The figure faces the inscription and, at the same time, the entrance to his tomb. The inscription reads:

1. Hpt di nswt htp (di) Ini pw hnty sh nfr, imy-wt, tip dwj, hnty šp, nb T3-dsr, krš.tw.f nfr m hrt-nfr m smyt (n) Immt, smsww nfr wr ħty nfr 3.
2. Hpt w Wšir, nb Dwh, pr n.f ħrw n t, p3t m wpwy9, m Dwtt, tipy rnt, wj, ḫb Skr, ḫb wr, ḫk, prt Mnw, (ššd), (tpy) bsd nb, (tpy) smdt nb, ḫb nb rª nb.
3. Try-p³t, sš nswt šmsw n ḥt.f nry.(f?) ḫry-hbt ḫry-tp, šmr w³y, ss ṯṣḥ nfr, ḫy šštš mdw nfr, wr Dw (m) pr-Dwty, imšwy ḫr nfr 3;
4. sš-nswt Nsr-kšt-hr.

1. “A boon which the king gives, and a boon (which is given by) Anubis, who is in front of the divine booth, imy-wt, who is upon his mountain, who is in front of the district, lord of the Sacred Land (namely), that he may be decently buried in the necropolis in the western desert, that he may very happily grow old accompanying the Great God.

2. A boon which Osiris, lord of Busiris gives, that he may give invocation-offerings consisting of bread and cakes for him on the first day (of a month)10, on the festival of Thoth, the first day of the year, the wig-festival11, the festival of Sokar12, the Great Festival, (the festival of) Burning, the procession of Min13.

9 For the reading of the name of the feast, see Edel, Grammatik I, 183 § 420; see also J. Cerný, in: ASAE 51, 1951, 444.
10 This appears in Neserkauhor’s list, instead of wp rnt “New Year’s feast”, with which the series of feasts commonly opens (see e.g. Barta, Opferformel, 10). In Neserkauhor’s offering formula, wpwy “the first day of (month)”, stands at the beginning of the series of feasts.
11 Winter, Wag-Fest.
13 Gauthier, Les fête
Statues of Neserkauhor

6a/C/78 (Náprstek Museum P 5696) A fragment of a male statue (pl. XIV, Cf3a,b). Found in a layer of sand mixed with fragments of mud bricks, in a row of statues standing next to the S wall of the serdab facing north. This wooden statue of a naked striding male, his left leg advanced, is missing its left arm and both feet. His arm, hanging along his body, is in one piece and is attached to the body by a tenon. The head is without a wig. From the original surface covered by white stucco painted dark red only tiny remnants survived. The wood has rotted.

Wood
H: 93 cm; shoulder width (minus arms): 21 cm; tenons: 5.5 × 1 cm
End 5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

6c/C/78 (Náprstek Museum P 5696) A base belonging to the statue 6a,b/C/78. The base was found, in the same place as the previous two entries, next to the S wall of the serdab, on the floor. The base is a prism with a preserved fragment of the right foot, but no traces of polychromy. The surface has decayed.

Wood
L: 44.5 cm; W: 21 cm; H: 6 cm
End 5th Dynasty

Several parts of the statue 6a-c/C/78 were found not in position:
- the right eye made of crystal (lens) and bone and set in a copper frame (L: 3.5 cm; H: 1.7 cm; pupil diameter: 1 cm)
- the penis made of stucco with traces of dark red polychromy (L: 4.7 cm; diameter: 2 cm)
- one testicle made of stucco (L: 3.7 cm)
- the right ear made of stucco with traces of dark red polychromy (H: 4.5 cm; W: 3.1 cm)
- the beard made of wood (H: 3.9 cm; W: 1.9 cm).

7/C/78 (Náprstek Museum P 5697) Torso of a wooden statue (pl. XIII, Cf4). Archaeological position as before. The torso features the upper part of the trunk (without arms) and head. On the head, in low relief, are featured eyes, nose and a short echelon-curl wig covering the ears. On the shoulder are vertical slots for tenons, by which the arms were connected to the trunk (dimensions of the hole: 5.2 × 2 cm). The fragments were unfortunately badly rotten. No traces of polychromy.

Wood
Trunk height: 46.8 cm; shoulder width: 19.5 cm; head width: 17 cm
End 5th – early 6th Dynasty

8a/C/78 (Náprstek Museum P 5698) Remains of a statue (the trunk and part of the right leg). The fragments of the statue were found in a row of statues as above. They lay in filling almost horizontally, in front of the statue no. 7/C/78. No traces of polychromy were detected and all the fragments were badly rotten.

Wood
L: 37 cm; W: 16 cm
End 5th Dynasty

14 Except for the first feast (wyw instead of wp rapt), Neserkauhor’s formula contains the complete standard list of twelve feasts. Concerning this list, the chronological ordering and the various arrangements of feasts in the Old Kingdom, see A. Spalinger, Revolutions in Time, 50ff. and id. Feast Lists, 111ff.
15 Concerning this most common stance of male statues of the Old Kingdom, see J. Harvey, Wooden statues, 52f. (S. 1 – S. 2).
16 Very probably, it had a short, close-fitting natural coiffure (see Harvey, o. c. 12 (W.3)).
17 Only the most elaborate wooden statues of the Old Kingdom had details such as inlaid eyes, see Harvey, in: Ch. Ziegler, L’art de l’Ancien Empire, 360.
18 The wig, whose sides are not rounded but perpendicular, does not appear to occur in Harvey’s catalogue. The nearest type seems to be her W.6b – see Wooden statues, 15 and figs. 1a and 1b.
8b/C/78 (Náprstek Museum P 5698) The head of a male figure (pl. XIII, Cf5). On the head, belonging to the remains of the statue 8a/C/78, are indicated eyes, nose and a short echelon-curl wig. 19 The statue fragment was found in the same place as the preceding entry. It is badly decayed.
Wood
H: 17 cm; W: 14.5 cm
End 5th Dynasty

9a/C/78 (Náprstek Museum P 5699) A statue of a striding man (pl. XV, Cf6a,b). The statue was found in the same place as the previous entries. This figure of a striding man wears a projecting-panel kilt, mid-calf length. His left leg is advanced. 20 On the surface of the statue there are preserved traces of plaster painted pink. The kilt is covered with a layer of white plaster. The surface is badly weathered.
Wood
H: 85 cm; shoulder width: 14 cm; the lower edge of the kilt he wears is 20 cm in width
End 5th Dynasty

9b/C/78 (Náprstek Museum P 5699) Wooden statue base (pl. XIV, Cf7), belonging to the preceding statue 9a/C/78. 21
The base has been loosened by weathering. It still bears traces of a layer of white stucco, painted black, which originally covered its surface. On the upper sides are the remnants of two columns of hieroglyphic text in low relief:
1. sỉ nšwt n ḥt.f šmšw, mry(f)
2. Nsr-k3w-hr
1. “The king’s eldest beloved son of his body,
2. Neserkauhor.”
Wood
L: 42 cm; W: 21 cm; H: 7 cm
End 5th Dynasty

Although wooden statues and statuettes – particularly when there was a group of them within a tomb, as was the case for Neserkauhor – might have a wide range of postures, the above listed remnants from Neserkauhor’s serdab belong to the most common category of the striding male figure. Neserkauhor’s collection included at least one naked male statue in addition to those with the tomb owner wearing a kilt.

Miscellaneous objects

10/C/78 Lid of a canopic jar. Found in the layer of debris, cca 40 cm under the surface, near the southern wall of the mastaba. The lower side of the roughly made lid is flat, the upper side slightly convex with a small depression in the middle.
Limestone
Diameter: 9 cm; H: 2.5 cm
End 5th – early 6th Dynasty

14/C/78 Fragment of a relief (pl. XIV, Cf8 and fig. C5) found in the low wall built by robbers in the entrance to the burial chamber. On the fragment, there are, in two registers, the remains of scenes in low reliefs with traces of colours. In the upper register, two partly preserved male figures (the kilts are painted white, the bodies red) are seated on their heels with their backs turned to each other. In the lower register there are the remnants of a scene (of feeding or catching or the birds) with a flying bird (painted yellow and green) flanked on both sides by inscriptions: w... on the right and šh ... on the left.
The fragment probably comes from one of hitherto unidentified and unexplored tombs neighbouring that of Neserkauhor’s mastaba.
Limestone
Late 5th Dynasty

Fig. C5

---

19 Harvey, Wooden statues, 11 (W.1); as id. in: Ch. Ziegler, L’art de l’Ancien Empire, 357f. has remarked, the short curled wig appeared on wooden statues well in advance of stone statues.
20 Harvey, Wooden statues, 26 and fig. 3 (D.3a)
21 For the preliminary publication of the inscribed base shortly after its discovery, see M. Verner, ZAS 107, 1980, 165 and Fig. 8.
3 The Mastaba of Faaf, good name Idu, and Khenit (D)

THE OWNER OF THE MASTABA

Idu

\textit{lm\textsuperscript{3}hw \textit{hr} W\textit{sr} “revered with Osiris”}

\textit{w\textit{b} (n) B\textit{3}-K\textit{3}-k\textit{3}.1 “w\textit{b}-priest (of the pyramid)
‘Kakai-is-the-soul’”}

\textit{w\textit{b} (n) N\textit{try}-b\textit{3}-w-Nfr.f-r\textit{f} “w\textit{b}-priest (of the pyramid) ‘Divine-is-the-power-of-Neferefre’”}

\textit{hk\textit{3} hwt-\textit{f}t “chief of a great estate”}\footnote{Concerning the discussion about the meaning of the title see e.g. P. Piacentini, in: Allam, \textit{Gra\textit{3}und und Boden}, 235ff. hwt\textit{f} “private or semi-private estates (given as a grant or in usufruct ?)”; Alex 79.2069 “responsable du domaine fun\textit{?}raire”; Spencer, \textit{Temple}, 21ff.; Fischer, \textit{Egyptian Titles}, 65; Martin-Pardey, \textit{Provinzialverwaltung}, 23ff., 55ff.}

inscriptions on the sarcophagus only the tomb owner’s good name, Idu, occurs.

THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORT

The mastaba of Idu (pl. XV, D11 and fig. G1.D) lies on the southern outskirts of the small cemetery that has been unearthed around the tomb of Khekeretnebyt.\footnote{For the preliminary report on the discovery and excavation of Idu’s mastaba, see M. Verner, \textit{ZAS} 107, 1980, 165ff.} The tomb is adjacent in the NE part of its façade to the SW corner of the tomb of Neserkauhor. Like other tombs in this area, it was covered with a 20 – 30 cm thick layer of dark grey sand mixed with potsherds and limestone rubble.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{s\textit{b} s “juridical scribe”}
\item \textit{s\textit{h} m\textit{w} n\textit{swt “scribe of the king’s children”}
\item \textit{sh\textit{d} h\textit{mnw nfr (nyw) m\textit{wt n\textit{swt btty n\textit{swt btty (n\textit{swt btty m\textit{wt n\textit{swt btty ?) H\textit{nt-k\textit{w} “inspector of funerary priests of the mother of two kings of Upper and Lower Egypt (or: the mother of the king of Upper and Lower Egypt (acting as) the king of Upper and Lower Egypt) Khenkau”}

Although Idu’s titles were very fragmentary from his false door, most of the above were recovered from the erased inscription on his sarcophagus lid. In the

Fig. G1 Plan of Djedkare’s family cemetery showing the position of Idu’s tomb

The superstructure

The mastaba of Idu has an irregular, slightly trapezoid plan (fig. D1). To the western and northern wall of the tomb a mudbrick wall about 1 m thick was additionally built. This wall, running also along the western walls of the tombs of Khekeretnebyt and Hedjetnebu, represented the western enclosure wall of the cemetery.

From the superstructure of this relatively small mastaba of Idu, only the remains survive (fig. D2, A-A). The southern part of the superstructure – especially in the SW, where it was even more eroded – was no more than about 60 cm in height above the mastaba foundations. The extant masonry of the northern part of the superstructure does not exceed 125 cm in height (in the NW corner). It consists of only very roughly dressed limestone ashlars and irregular lumps of inferior quality limestone, cemented together with hard, pink mortar. As was evident in the other tombs here, the core of the walls was built of mud brick.

Nevertheless, there are enough remains left to reconstruct both the original plan of the superstructure and its later alteration connected with the decision to bury in the mastaba Idu’s wife Khenit, in addition to her husband. Originally, there were only two rooms within the superstructure, both of them being in the eastern half of the tomb. These consisted of a narrow, L-shaped corridor chapel and a serdab. In the western half of the superstructure, two shafts were found, one in the SW and one in the NW corner of the tomb. The NW shaft provided access to Idu’s burial chamber, while the other shaft, in the SW corner, led down to Khenit’s burial chamber.

The chapel

Close to the SE corner of the eastern façade of the mastaba, there is an entrance passage, cca 20 cm wide, leading into the chapel (fig. D1.1 and D1.2, A–A). It seems that the walls of the chapel were never plastered – at least, no traces of whitewash were found in this room.

Opposite the entrance, but somewhat further to the S, there is a niche in the W wall of the chapel. Originally, the false door of Khenit had been embedded here. From the false door itself, however, at the time of discovery only a fragment survived in position at the bottom of the niche.
At the northern end of the chapel, there is a deep recess in the W wall, giving an L-shaped plan to the room. In the W wall of this niche, the remnants of the lower part of the false door of Faaf were found in situ.\(^3\)

The serdab

Originally, this room in the SW part of the superstructure might have served as a serdab. It was a narrow, approximately NW-SE orientated room built of small limestone ashlar (including the floor). Most of the room had been dismantled and rebuilt during the reconstruction of the tomb when an additional funerary apartment, for Idu’s wife Khenit, was being prepared.

An irregular room (fig. D1.4) built of mudbrick, in the NE corner of the mastaba, just next to the niche with Idu’s false door, might have taken over the function of a new serdab. Originally, this room might have been left empty by the builders of the tomb, in order to save using mudbrick, or else, it may have been filled in with sand in order to preserve the mudbrick masonry.

Both the chapel and the serdab were filled with yellow sand that rested on a relatively thin layer of dark sand mixed with limestone rubble and decayed mud brick. This situation is indicative of a relatively extensive devastation of the monument due to its location on the very outskirts of the cemetery, where it lay close to a shallow wadi leading to the Nile valley. The tomb was thus the first in this cemetery to become a victim of stone robbers.\(^4\) No other architectural finds were made, either in the chapel or the serdab.

The substructure

As already mentioned above, the original plan of the substructure was additionally altered. Originally, the substructure consisted of Idu’s burial chamber D1.6 which was accessible from the north by means of a vertical shaft (D1.5). In addition to that, there was a smaller subsidiary shaft in the SW corner of the mastaba (D1.7). During the reconstruction, the

\(^3\) Faaf was the tomb owner’s great name, while his \textit{rn nfr} name was Idu. The latter seems to have been more favoured, see below, regarding the inscription on the sarcophagus.

\(^4\) In the same position, just on the northern outskirts of the cemetery, was the mastaba of Lady L which was also later largely devastated by stone robbers.
subsidary shaft became a burial shaft giving access to Khenit’s burial chamber (D1.8), which was built under the SW section of the superstructure, to the south of Idu’s burial chamber.

Idu’s burial shaft

The burial shaft of Idu (fig. D1.5) is extant in the NW corner of the tomb. It is cca 3.80 m deep and rectangular in horizontal section (1.70 x 1.50 m). The upper part of the shaft, built of mudbrick, was filled with yellow sand, down as far as the lintel that lies over the entrance to the burial chamber. The lower section of the shaft and the entrance area were filled with dark grey sand, mud brick refuse and potsherds.

The burial chamber of Idu

The burial chamber (fig. D1.6) lies south of the burial shaft and is accessible via a 1.70 m long and 1.20 m high passage. Both the passage and the burial chamber were built of roughly-dressed ashlars which were at maximum 1.50 m long. The ceiling of the chamber was constructed in the same way as in the other mastabas in this area: there was a double ceiling, the lower one made of six, flat limestone slabs, while the upper ceiling was a mud brick vault (fig. D2.B–B). Three ceiling slabs were still discovered in situ (fig. D2.C–C). The remaining three, which lay in the northern half of the chamber, were destroyed when the robbers broke into this room from above – even as the mud brick ceiling (mentioned above) had been destroyed for the same purpose.

The floor of the burial chamber was made of a layer of clean yellow and grey sand and the sarcophagus rested on this. Almost the whole burial chamber was filled by this roughly-dressed, white limestone sarcophagus (pl. XVI, D2). The chest of the sarcophagus was 265 cm long, 110 cm wide and 100 cm high. The slightly convex lid of the sarcophagus was 35 cm high, its length and width being the same as those of the chest. The lid had been pushed aside (its SW corner was broken off), and both the sarcophagus and the chamber had been plundered by robbers.

Though empty and of very poor workmanship, the sarcophagus is of immense historical importance. As a matter of great interest, there is on the front side of the chest a cursive inscription in red paint that had been applied upside down. The inscription consists of five lines containing a date and the name and titles of Idu. Both of these are of supreme significance for the chronology of the whole cemetery under discussion and for some aspects of the history of the 5th Dynasty – for instance the status of the royal mother, Khentkaus II (see below pp. 68).

Evidently, the robbers broke into the burial chamber from above, as they had done in the other tombs within this cemetery, close to the N wall of the chamber. The filling of potsherds and limestone rubble that had lain sandwiched between the ceiling of the burial chamber and the roof terrace of the mastaba, later fell down through the robbers’ hole and filled to the top the northern half of the burial chamber.

Khenit’s funerary apartments

The original flooring of the room was built here (D1.8). The original flooring of flat pieces of limestone was removed, and the builders excavated a new floor cca 50 cm below the original level of the serdab. Next to this renovated area, the shaft gave access to the new burial chamber. The new floor of the burial chamber was made of beaten clay and sand, no longer of stone paving. As a result of this reorganisation, the crown of the vault of the new burial chamber lay on a level parallel to the ground level of the mastaba.

For the construction of the new burial chamber (fig. D1.8), the original subsidiary shaft in the SW corner of the mastaba was used (fig. D1.7). At the bottom of the shaft, a little N-S oriented room was built. This was probably a small storeroom for Khenit’s burial equipment. The plan of this cca 1.20 m high chamber was slightly irregular (cca 2.30 x 1.00 m). To make this room, the builders had had to completely remove the south wall of the shaft and push the rest of the room further to the south. After this reconstruction, the new burial chamber lay immediately behind the burial chamber of Idu, while the storeroom lay to the west of the burial chamber. Like the little storeroom, the ceiling of the burial chamber was vaulted and made of mud brick, and its floor was made of beaten clay and sand.

The storeroom was entered in a rather bizarre way (see fig. D2. D-D on p. 67). There was a little vaulted opening (cca. 1.20 m wide and 1.20 m high) in the E wall of the shaft (figs. D1.8 and D3), which led from the shaft through to the burial chamber. From the burial chamber, another tiny opening (1 x 1 cubit), just above floor level, enabled one to enter the little storeroom below. Now seen from the burial chamber, the entrance was placed just under the chamber’s vaulted ceiling. It lay in a relatively high position above the floor.

No trace of a coffin or burial was found in the chamber. The existence of a limestone sarcophagus can be excluded because of the very restricted dimensions

---

5 For the view of Idu’s burial chamber, see Verner, Unearthing, pl. 27 (bottom).
The northern half of the burial chamber was destroyed by robbers who must have looted the tomb relatively early. The room was full of clean yellow sand, which had blown in from the destroyed vault above and had been deposited on the floor.

False doors of Idu and Khenit

From the false door of Idu (pl. XVI, Df3 and fig. D4) only a small fragment survived in situ. The fragment, made of inferior quality limestone, represented the lower left part of the door with the inner and outer door jamb.

The inner door jamb featured a striding figure of Idu wearing a short wig, a short beard, a broad collar and a short kilt. In his left hand he held a long stick, in his right hand a scarf. Above the figure, there are the remnants of a column of hieroglyphic inscription in sunk relief:

\[(s\delta)\ ms\nu-(m\swt)\ F^1\f\ "scribe of the King’s children Faaf"

H: cca 115 cm; W: cca 85 cm

The outer door jamb features again a striding figure of Idu wearing a short wig, a broad collar and a short kilt. In his left hand he holds a long stick, in

---

\(^6\) Unfortunately, the fragment of Idu’s false door was destroyed within a few hours after it had been discovered. Owing to its very bad state of preservation, a decision was taken to restore it instantly, still in position. In the night, the gaffir attempted to extract the fragment, packed in cotton soaked with chemicals, from the wall. During this robber’s attempt the fragment fell apart and turned in a pile of limestone chips.
his right hand a sekhem-sceptre. The remnants of a column of a hieroglyphic inscription in sunken relief above his head read:

\textit{im$\text{	extdegree}$y (sic) $\text{	extdegree}$r W$\text{	extdegree}$\text{sr}, $\text{nfr} Tdw} \text{ "revered with Osiris, good name Idu".}^7

From the simple false door of Khenit a small fragment survived, too (pl. XVI, Df4 and fig. D5). In this case only the lower part of the left and right door jams remained \textit{in situ} in the wall. On both door jams, there is a standing figure of Khenit wearing a long wig and a long robe. On the left door jamb, her left hand is laid on her breast, whereas on the right door jamb, her right hand rests on her breast, the other hand is hanging loosely alongside her body. Khenit’s figure is surmounted with the remnants of a column of a hieroglyphic inscription in sunk relief:

\ldots \text{hb nb Hnt} \text{ “...every festival, Khenit.”}^8

H: cca 65 cm; W: cca 47 cm

The Inscription on Idu’s Sarcothagus

The cursive inscription (pl. XVII, Df5 and fig. D6) in red paint originally consisted of five, possibly up to six horizontal lines and covered the whole front (northern) side of the chest of Idu’s limestone sarcophagus.\textsuperscript{9} The inscription was found upside down.\textsuperscript{10} It might have originated in the quarry and represented a sort of an address for the person who ordered the block (or, for whom it was ordered).\textsuperscript{11}

At the same time, it might have been a sort of a control, too, judging by the date with which the inscription commenced. When in position in the burial chamber, the inscription was intentionally destroyed by a series of oblique cuts made by means of a chisel.\textsuperscript{12} At present, only four of five or six lines of the original text survive:

1. \textit{Rnp$\text{	extdegree}$ (m-)$\text{	extdegree}$h sp 17, ibd 1 $\text{smw}$ (?), $\text{sw} 23$, $\text{tnw}$ (n) $\text{hm-nfr}$ (n) $\text{St-ib-r}^\text{	extdegree}$,
2. $\text{w$\text{	extdegree}$b}$ (n) $\text{Br-}$K3-k3.1, $\text{ss}$ $\text{msw-nswt Tdw}$.
3. \textit{Shd} $\text{hmw-k3}$ (nyw) $\text{mwt nswt bity}$ (n$\text{swt bity}$, m$\text{wt nswt bity}$) $\text{Hnt-k3w}$.$\text{sw}$, $\text{Tdw}$.

4. $\text{Shb}$ $\text{ss}$ $\text{hk3}$ $\text{hwt}$-\textit{q3t}, $\text{w$\text{	extdegree}$b}$ (?), (n) $\text{Nptr}$-B3-w-Nfr.$\text{fr}$-$\text{r}^\text{	extdegree}$ $\text{Tdw}$.
5. \ldots\ldots
6. \ldots\ldots

1. “Year after the 17\textsuperscript{th} occasion (of the cattle count), 1\textsuperscript{st} month of summer (inundation ?), 23\textsuperscript{rd} day.\textsuperscript{13} Gift (lit.: what has been brought) (for) the priest of (Neferirkare’s sun temple) $\text{St-ib-r}^\text{	extdegree}$,
2. $\text{w$\text{	extdegree}$b}$-priest of (the pyramid complex) ‘Kakai-is-the-soul’, scribe of King’s children Idu.
3. Inspector of funerary priests of the mother of two kings of Upper and Lower Egypt (or: the mother of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt (acting as) the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Khentkaus) Idu.
4. Juridical scribe, estate manager, $\text{w$\text{	extdegree}$b}$-priest of (the pyramid complex) ‘Divine-is-the-power-of-Neferefre’ Idu.”
5. \ldots\ldots
6. \ldots\ldots

5\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty, temp. late Djedkare

\textsuperscript{7} RPN I, 54/10; Concerning the discussion on the writing and meaning of the personal name Idu, see Schmitz, Idu II, 32ff.
\textsuperscript{8} RPN I, 270/1
\textsuperscript{9} For the publication of the inscription, see Vernier, in: SAK, 8, 1980, 243-268; see also id. Forgotten Pharaohs, 87.
\textsuperscript{10} Does this fact indicate that the block was lowered into its position by mistake, with the inscription upside down? Consequently, was the cavity cut as late as the time when the block had been placed in the yet unfinished burial chamber in its position?
\textsuperscript{11} Nevertheless, it is somewhat surprising that Idu’s “full address” was recorded, with all his titles. For an identification of the addressee one or two main titles would have been sufficient. It cannot be excluded therefore, that the inscription was the painted draft of an inscription intended to be carved on the lid (or, on the sides) of the sarcophagus.
\textsuperscript{12} Was the inscription removed because of the fact that it was upside down and this was considered to be disturbing? Or, was it because it had already fulfilled its purpose?
\textsuperscript{13} A renewed examination of the badly damaged inscription, however, has shown that the date should be read as given above, rather than the reading, nupt sp 14, ibd 3 $\text{smw}$ (prq ?), $\text{sw}$ 5 (6 ?) as suggested in the earlier publications mentioned.
Miscellaneous finds

2/D/78 A wooden model of the cult idol of Nekhen in the shape of a crouching falcon (pl. XVI, Df6). This was found outside the southern wall of the mastaba of Idu, in the filling consisting of sand, clay and chips of stone. The wood is covered with a thin layer of clay, the idol is painted red, with only its eyes and beak painted black. From the lower part, there is a slot where a tenon would have fixed the model to the base.

The only item worthy of specific mention in the tomb was the above described wooden cult model discovered near the southern wall of Idu’s tomb, but there were a number of the usual beer jars and bread forms sherds found in the area of Idu’s tomb. The robbers had either been more thorough with this tomb, or else it had never had a large quantity of funerary goods. In any case, its badly eroded state would have encouraged the dispersal of any items of value long ago.

L: 5.2 cm; W: 3 cm; H: 5.5 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare (?)
4 The Mastaba of Mernefu (E)

THE OWNER OF THE MASTABA

imḥw ḫr nb.f “revered with his Lord”
‘d-mr “administrator”

from Khekeretnebty’s façade (fig. G1.F). The extant
masonry of the mastaba retains a height of about 3.5
metres. This masonry is similar to that of the
neighbouring tombs already discussed: it is again

Fig. G1 Plan of Djedkare’s family cemetery, showing the position of Mernefu’s tomb

hry ṣḏ b m ḫwt-‘nh “he who is in charge of reversions
(of offerings) in the House of Life”
hry ṣḏ b ẖ pr-dwṯt “privy to the secret of the House of
Morning”
hry ṣḏ b n nṯ ḫ “privy to the secret of his God”
hbr ḫ “director of the ḫ-palace”
šḥ(w) Ḥr-ḥnty-pt “director (?) of (the district)
Horus-Who-Presides-over-Heaven”
šmr wṯty “sole companion”
šmr wṯty n ṣḥw “sole companion, possessor of love”

THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORT

To the E of the mastabas of Khekeretnebty and
Hedjetnebu lies the small tomb of Mernefu. The
western façade of this tomb is about 4 metres west

1 For the reading and meaning of the title, see J. C. Moreno-
2 For the meaning of the title, see e.g. Moreno-García,
Administration, 140ff. and Addendum “les hry ṣḏ b ṣḥw recrutaient
des travailleurs sur place pour les corvées du pr-nṯ ṣḥw relatives à la
mise en culture des champs”; Baud, Famille royale, 266
“répartiteur des surplus agricoles dans l’enclos-de-vie”; H.
Goedicke, in: Allam, Grund und Boden, 234 “one in charge of the
(sustenance) deed”.
3 See M. Báráta, in: ArOr 67, 1999, 1ff., “inspector of the Palace”
4 Jones, Index, 883f. There is not an unequivocal opinion
concerning the meaning of the title. Fischer (Egyptian Titles, 33
sub 1283b) translates the title as ”pupil of Horus Who Presides
over Heaven”. In his opinion, Ḥr-ḥnty-pt “is well known from the
early Old Kingdom as the name of a domain (within an
enclosure), and evidently has the same meaning in a recurrent Old
Kingdom title”. A similar interpretation of the title can also be
found in PM III, Pt. 2, Fasc. 3, 918 s.v. “Boundary official of (the
Fig. E1 The plan of the tomb of Mernefu; 1 – The niche; 2 – The serdab; 3 – The burial shaft; 4 – The burial chamber.
a combination of inferior quality limestone ashlarss and mudbrick, the former being used for the outer casing, the latter for the core of the walls. The limestone ashlarss, in this case, are fixed by tafla mortar and only the outer section of the gaps between the stones had gypsum mortar in them.

On some ashlarss from the masonry, there are mason’s marks. Some have the form of the sign mr which seems to have been an abbreviation of Mernef’s name (a sort of address to which the blocks were destined to go from the quarry ?), the others might have been a quarry mark – such as the circle enclosing a cross sign – a sign found at other sites in the Abusir cemetery.

The superstructure of the mastaba has an oblong, N–S oriented plan (fig. E1). In the eastern facade, closer to the south-east corner, there is a deep niche. The south-east corner of the superstructure includes a serdab. In the northern section of the superstructure, slightly to the east of the north-south axis of the tomb, there is a shaft giving access to the burial chamber.

The superstructure

The niche

The niche (fig. E1.1), built of limestone ashlarss, is cca 1 m broad and it might have originally been cca 1.5 m (3 cubits ?) deep. Once there had been a false door in the western wall. However, no trace of the false door was found, either in or around the tomb. After the removal of the false door, most of the niche was filled with limestone rubble, potsherds, broken mudbrick masonry and dark grey sand.

In the niche adjacent to the lower part of the now-missing false door, there is a low bench formed by a limestone slab, on the upper side of which there is a rounded off limestone table.

The Serdab

To the south of the niche, in the south-east corner of the mastaba, there is a narrow, east-west oriented room which served as a serdab (fig. E1.2). The room was built of mudbrick and, originally, it was vaulted. The filling of the serdab contained – up to the height of 0.6 m over its floor – decayed mudbrick from the collapsed vault, 5th Dynasty ceramic sherds and chips of limestone. The higher level was sand. In the lower layer of the filling, there were found the remains of wooden statues of Mernef, of which only the pedestals and lower leg portions survived (pl. XVIII, Ef1). The pedestals bear hieroglyphic inscriptions, featuring Mernef’s name and titles (see the text below).

The substructure

The burial shaft

The vertical shaft (fig. E1.3), which is square-shaped in section and at present about 5 m deep, was built of mudbrick. It once opened onto the roof terrace of the mastaba. From the bottom of the shaft, through the S wall, there was access through to the burial chamber. Most of the southern wall of the shaft was destroyed by robbers when, from above, they opened their way to the burial chamber.

The burial chamber

The burial chamber (fig. E1.4), separated from the vertical shaft by a short entrance passage, has an oblong, north-south oriented plan. In the south-east corner of the chamber, there was a little recess for the canopic jars.

The chamber was built of limestone ashlarss of poor quality, and only summarily dressed. The roofing of the burial chamber probably did not differ from that of the neighbouring tombs in this cemetery: It might have been a combination of a flat ceiling built of limestone slabs surmounted with a mudbrick vault. As mentioned above, the robbers unfortunately opened their way to the burial chamber from above in such a way that they formed a large crater, in which roofing of the chamber – including the S wall of the burial shaft – completely disappeared (fig. E2.A-A). The entire burial chamber and shaft were filled with limestone rubble and broken mudbricks, mixed with grey sand and potsherds – a conglomeration which

---

district "Star of Horus Foremost of Heaven" “ As the name of a domain (a vineyard ?), “Horus-Foremost-of-Heaven" is attested e.g. on a sealing found in Beit Khalil. It dates from the time of Djoser, see Garstang, Mahasna and Bet Khalil, 21 and pl. IX, 4; Kaplony, 166 and pl. 80/304. Jones (o.c. 883f) translates sbar as either “instructor" or “pupil". The latter translation ("Zöglings") was also favoured by H. Junker, see Giza IV, 59ff. On the other hand, E. Brøvardski, in: Dunham Studies, 18f., takes the whole phrase for an independent title in the Middle Kingdom and translates it as “Star-of-Horus-who-presides-over-heaven".

N. Strudwick, in: JEA 86, 2000, 190 n. 1 prefers the reading 'd-mer dwl Hr ḫnty-pjt to 'd-mer Hr ḫtw ḫnty-pjt. Taking into consideration an original meaning of sbar as "to steer", "to direct", "to lead", etc. (see S. J. Seidlmayer, M. Ziermann, in: MDAIK 48, 1992, 168ff.), and the fact that “Horus-Foremost-of-Heaven" is the name of a domain (or a district), it seems to be more logical to translate this title, combined with 'd-mer, of Mernef as “director of (the domain/district) Horus-Foremost-of-Heaven". Moreover, the title seems to complement another of Mernef’s functions reflected by his title of “one who is in charge of reversions (of offerings) in the House of Life". Interestingly in this context, Mernef held almost the same titles as Niuty, an official of the late 5th or early 6th Dynasty, buried in Giza (see LD II, 89; PM III, Pt. 1, 133.

5 For the preliminary report on the excavation of Mernef’s mastaba, see M. Verner, in: ZAS 107, 1980, 166f.
had originally formed the filling of the space above the burial chamber itself.

In the debris, the remnants of Merneufu’s burial and his burial equipment were found. Rags from mummy wrappings were also discovered, as well as a crumpled linen cartonnage mask bearing traces of the polychrome portrait of the male face of Merneufu. A most unusual find was the model(?) of wrapped male genitalia (the penis with the scrotum).

**Items from the Tomb**

**2/E/78** Fragment of a wooden statue with a base (pl. XVII, Ef2). This fragment was found in a row of statues standing near the southern wall of the serdab, on the floor made from the tamped clay, facing north. From the wooden statue of the striding man, only the base survived with a small part of the legs. The left leg, advanced well in front of the right foot⁶, is preserved to the height of the ankles. The legs were joined to the base by wooden tenons. On the legs tiny remains of stucco, painted pink, still remained. On the upper face of the base there is a hieroglyphic inscription in sunk relief (fig. E3). The base is painted black, the signs having originally been filled with the pink paste. The inscription, in two horizontal lines and three columns, reads:

1. Smr w²ty n mr(wt),
2. hry ššši n pr-dwšt, 
3. ʿd-mr, ʾbš(w) Hr-ḥnty-pt, hry wdb m ḫwt-śḫ, 
4. hry ššši n nṯr-f, imiḥy ḫr nb.f, 
5. Smr w²ty n mr(wt) Mr.n.f-wl.

1. “Sole companion, possessor of love, 
2. one privy to the House of the Morning, 
3. director (?) of (the district) Horus-Who-Presides-over-Heaven, he who is in charge of reversions (of offerings) in the House of Life, 
4. one privy to the secret of his God, revered with his Lord, 
5. sole companion, possessor of love, Merneufu.”

Base with fragment of a statue – H: 16.6 cm
Base – L: 79 cm; W: 32 cm; H: 9.6 cm
Mid 5th Dynasty

**3/E/78** Fragment of a wooden statue with a base (pl. XVII, Ef3). Found in the same place as the previous entry. From the wooden statue of the striding man, only the base with parts of the legs survived. The left leg, advanced to the heel of the right foot⁷, is preserved to the height of the knee, the right leg up to the ankle. The legs were connected to the base by wooden tenons. On the upper face of the base there is a hieroglyphic inscription in sunk relief (fig. E4). The base is painted black, the signs having originally been filled with the pink paste. The inscription, in two horizontal lines and three columns, reads:

6 Harvey, *Wooden Statues*, 53 (S.3)
7 The inscription contains - as do also other inscribed statues of Merneufu - only the name and titles of the tomb owner which seems to be typical for Old Kingdom statues, unlike the Middle Kingdom statues which contain also a ḥtp-di-nšw formula followed by n kš n. According to Harvey, *Wooden Statues* and id. in: Ziegler, *L’art de l’Ancien Empire*, 359, the statues from the Old Kingdom should be considered, therefore, as bšt rather than kš-statues.
8 Harvey, *Wooden Statues*, 52 (S.1)
filled with pink paste. The inscription, in four columns and one horizontal line, reads:

1. $\text{Smr w ty}, \text{hry t h},$
2. $\text{hry sibly (n pr-dw3t)},$
3. $^{d}-\text{mr, sb(t) Hr-lnty-pt (wdb m hwt-t)} q\text{(nh)}$,  
4. $\text{hry sibly n nr} t f, \text{imshw hry nb} f,$
5. $\text{Smr w ty} n \text{mr(wt) (Mr nr f)-wl}.$

1. “Sole companion, director of the palace,  
2. one privy to (the House of Morning),  
3. director (?) of (the district) Horus-Who-Presides-over-Heaven (the name is followed by a determinative of a falcon), he who is in charge of (reversions of offerings) in the House of Life,  
4. one privy to the secret of his God, revered with his Lord,  
5. sole companion, possessor of love (Mernef)u.”

Base and fragmentary statue – H: 48 cm  
Base – W: 69 cm; H: 27 cm; L: 76 cm  
Mid 5th Dynasty

4/E/78 (Náprstek Museum P 5703) Fragment of a wooden statue with a base (pl. XVIII, Eif4). Found in the same place as nos. 2 and 3/E/78. From the wooden statue of the striding man only the base with parts of legs has survived. The left leg, advanced to the end of the right foot$^9$ is preserved to the height of the ankle, the right leg up to the knee. The legs were connected with the base by wooden tenons. On the upper face of the base there is a hieroglyphic inscription in sunk relief (fig. E5). The base is painted black, and signs were originally filled with pink paste. The inscription, in five columns and one horizontal line, reads:

1. $\text{Smr w ty}, \text{hry t h},$
2. $(hry sibly)$
3. $(n) \text{pr-dw3t},$
4. $^{d}-\text{mr, sb(t) Hr-lnty-pt, (hry) wdb m hwt-t} q\text{(nh)},$
5. $\text{hry sibly n nr} t f, \text{imshw (h)} r \text{nb} f,$
6. $\text{Smr w ty} n \text{(mrwt Mr nr f)-wl}.$

1. “Sole companion, director of the palace,  
2. one privy to  
3. the House of the Morning,  
4. director (?) of (the district) Horus-Who-Presides-over-Heaven, he who is in charge of reversions (of offerings) in the House of Life,  
5. one privy to the secret of his God, revered with his Lord,  
6. sole companion, possessor of love Mernef.”

Base and fragmentary statue – H: 38 cm  
Base – L: 62 cm; W: 26 cm; H: 6.8 cm  
Mid 5th Dynasty

5a/E/78 Fragment of a wooden statue with a base (pl. XVIII, Eif5). Found in the same place as the previous statues. From the wooden statue of the striding man only the base with parts of the legs survived. The left leg, advanced to the end of the right foot$^{10}$, is preserved to a height below the knee, the right leg only up to the ankle. The legs were connected with the base by wooden tenons. On the upper face of the base there is a hieroglyphic inscription in sunk relief (fig. E6). The base is painted black, and signs were originally filled with pink paste. The inscription, in two horizontal lines and one column, reads:

1. $\text{Smr w ty}, \text{hry t h},$

$^9$ ibid.
$^{10}$ ibid.
2. hry wdb m hwt-5nh,
3. Mr.n.f-wd.

1. “Sole companion, director of the palace,
2. he who is in charge of reversions (of offerings) in
the House of Life,
3. Mernefū.”

Base and fragmentary statue - H: 44 cm
Base – L: 61 cm; W: 28 cm; H: 8 cm
Mid 5th Dynasty

5b/E/78 A šhm-sceptre made of wood.\(^\text{11}\) This sceptre was found in the same place as statue no. 5a. Originally, it made part of the statue. No traces of stucco or paint.
L: 27 cm; max. W: 3.5 cm
Mid 5th Dynasty

6/E/78 Fragment of a small statue with a base (pl. XVIII, Ef6). Found in the same place as nos. 2–5a,b. From the statue only the lower portion, from the waist downwards, survived. Originally, the statue represented a kneeling man who held an object (a stela ?; an offering table ?) in front of him. The knees were aligned, the tips of toes leaned on the upper rear edge of the base. The statue was connected with the base by wooden tenons. The front part of the base was broken off. On the base, at the left side of the statue, there is a column with the remnants of a hieroglyphic inscription\(^\text{12}\) in sunk relief:

šmr w’ty Mr.n.f(-wi).

“The sole companion Mernefu.”

Base with fragmentary statue – H: 12 cm
Base – L: 31 cm; W: 13 cm; H: 3.2 cm
Mid 5th Dynasty

11/E/78 A coin (pl. XIX, Ef7) – AE manghir – struck in the mint of Mısır al-Mahrūsa.\(^\text{13}\) On the recto of the coin there is an incomplete twisted pattern in a circle whereas the verso bears, also in a circle, an inscription (duriba) Mısır al-Mahrūsa (sanat) 974 “(struck in the mint of) The Blessed Land of Egypt (in the year of) 974”\(^\text{14}\).

The coin is covered with a thick layer of green patina.
Copper
Diameter: 2 cm; Th: 0.35 cm
Date: 974 AH, temp. Selim II (974–982 AH/AD 1566–1574)

13/4/78 A long stick, broken in three pieces. The upper end of the stick was convex. On the surface of the stick the remains of white stucco, linen and thin gold leaf survived. Judging by the place where the stick was found (in the shaft leading to the burial chamber), it had obviously been part of Mernefū’s burial equipment.\(^\text{15}\) Found in the same place as no. 12.

Wood
Pieces of the stick – L: 67, 43 and 32 cm
Mid 5th Dynasty

15/E/78 Model(?) of a penis (pl. XIX, Ef8).\(^\text{16}\) It was found above the floor of the burial chamber, in the layer of limestone chips and potsherds. The penis was connected to a band of linen (which served, undoubtedly, to fix the penis to the body) covered with a thin layer of white stucco.
L: 6 cm
Mid 5th Dynasty

16/E/78 The remains of a face mask (pl. XIX, Ef9). Found in the same place as no. 15. The plastic mask was made of several layers of linen glued with stucco. On the mask, traces of polychromy survived: black paint on the short cut hairdo and eyebrows, white on the face and pink on the eyes.\(^\text{17}\)
Cca 25 × 20 cm
Mid 5th Dynasty

18/E/78 Miniature chisel. Found in the same place as the nos. 15 and 16.
Copper, covered with patina.
L: 5.9 cm; W: 3 cm; Th: 1 mm
Mid 5th Dynasty

\(^{11}\) For the picture of the sceptre, see Verner, Forgotten Pharaohs, 86 (upper left).

\(^{12}\) The inscription clearly identifies the statue with the tomb owner. It can, therefore, hardly be ranked among the category of Old Kingdom kneeling statues of priests who were attached to the cult of a tomb owner. Concerning the aforementioned category of kneeling statues, see e.g. D. Wildung, in: MJBK, 17–38.

\(^{13}\) The authors would like to express their gratitude to Dr. V. Nováč from Náprstek Museum in Prague for his kind identification and dating of the coin.

\(^{14}\) See C. Olser, The Ornamental Copper Coinage of the Ottoman Empire, Istanbul 1975, p. 178, no. 11A.

\(^{15}\) Concerning different types of sticks and staffs which made up part of the burial equipment in the Old Kingdom, see e.g. Hassan, Stécke und Stübe, 55–67.

\(^{16}\) For the publication of the photograph of the object, see M. Verner, in: ZAS 107, 1980, 166 and Fig. 9; see also id. Forgotten Pharaohs, 86 (upper left).

\(^{17}\) Not far from Mernefū’s tomb, in the mastaba of Userkafankh a fragment of a similar face mask was found by Borchardt, see Ne-\(\text{user-ra}, 114 \text{ and fig. 92.}\)
5 Complex of funerary cult structures (F)

THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORT

In a large courtyard in front of the mastaba of Khekeretnebtty, and between the mastabas of Mernefu and Neserkauhor, a complex of offering tables, libation basins and associated magazines came to be built (fig. G1.F). It was a unique and, in some ways, bizarre complex of mudbrick structures which seems to have served the expanded mortuary cult of Khekeretnebtty (fig. F1). The complex consisted of two groups of small magazines. The "South storerooms" were located in front of the south-east corner of the mastaba, and the "North storerooms" were in front of the north-east corner of the mastaba. These two groups formed between them a small and narrow courtyard. It ran along the central part of the eastern façade of the mastaba and was bordered by a large courtyard situated to the east of the small court.

The stratigraphy of the filling (figs. F2 and F3) in the South storerooms (see fig. F1.1 and 2) shows that these structures never served any purpose, other than acting as temporary storage for the offerings used in the mortuary cult. On the floor of both rooms absolutely no objects were found, just a massive deposit of sand. Obviously, those rooms must have served their purpose for a relatively short period of time before they fell into disuse. Though constructed of very solid mudbrick masonry, surprisingly, the empty magazines were not used later for a dwelling. The sand started accumulating inside the rooms, having been blown in through the destroyed door openings. When the sand reached approximately to the height of one half of the door entrance, the mudbrick vaults in both rooms collapsed. Clean sand above this layer of decayed mudbrick shows that there was absolutely no activity in the area of the
Fig. F1 Funerary cult structures

1. South storeroom 1
2. South storeroom 2
3. Small courtyard
4. North storeroom (4)
5. North storeroom (5)
6. Large courtyard
a Group of offering tables
b Vaulted chamber
c Mudbrick structure
South storerooms after this event, and sand could fly in and accumulate until it reached the extant crowns of the walls.

The filling of the “Small courtyard” (fig. F1.3), immediately in front of the eastern façade of Khekeretnebty’s mastaba, shows a stratigraphy (fig. F4) which does not differ essentially from that in the South storerooms. It is characterised by massive deposits of clean yellow sand, through which run several thin layers of dark clay from mudbrick masonry that had been splashed with rain. Two features, however, are different: firstly, the absence of any mudbrick or organic layer, which proves that this area had always been an open court and had never been covered by either a mudbrick vault or a wooden (or a matting) roof. Secondly, an approximately 20–30 cm thick layer consisting of dark grey sand mixed with pieces of charcoal, ash, fragments of animal bones and late 5th – early 6th Dynasty potsherds on the floor of the courtyard, which indicates that Khekeretnebty’s mortuary cult thrived in the aforesaid period and that most of the activities connected with it took place just in front of the mastaba’s façade.
In the area of the North storerooms (fig. F1.4 and 5), the stratigraphy (fig. F5) differed from the southern group of magazines, indicating a difference in the function of the two structures. In storeroom no. 5, the lowest layer, approximately up to the height of the little basin adjacent to the N wall of the room, consisted of dark grey sand mixed with pieces of charcoal, ash and potsherds related to the period of the thriving mortuary cult. The next two layers, reaching to about half the height of the store-rooms no. 4 and no. 5, consist of detritus from the gradual decay of the two rooms (as clearly shown by dark sand mixed with decayed mudbrick masonry from the vaulted ceiling). Above this, the upper part of the room was filled with clean, wind blown sand.

The South storerooms

The South storerooms (fig. F1.1 and 2) make a pair of narrow north-south oriented rooms, built mostly of mudbricks and only occasionally of lumps of limestone in a mud matrix. Still today, parts of mudbrick walls in both rooms are preserved up to the height of about 2.25 m.

Both storerooms were accessible through the only entrance placed in the middle of the north wall of storeroom no. 1, close to the façade of Kheterneby's mastaba. Above the door, with its simple lintel made of a piece of limestone, there are four vertical slots, 7 cm broad, which served to ventilate and illuminate the room. The yellow-painted walls of the rooms are plastered with a yellowish-grey clay plaster, mixed with chopped straw and then whitewashed.1

The edges of the walls were decorated with a plastic torus, bearing a black-painted, zig-zag line. Below the torus, there is a narrow, 8 cm broad strip of whitewashed wall. Below this white stripe, the remaining part of the wall is painted yellow. The white stripe is separated from the rest of the wall by a black line (see pl. XIX, F11). The whole wall is yellow, except for the frieze of this torus with its zig-zag line and white and black stripes. On the yellow wall, there are numerous hand imprints made in grey clay. The meaning of the handprints is not quite clear. It was certainly not a deliberate decorative design (therefore, were the imprints made by people who later used the room as a storage facility?).

Immediately above the torus starts the roof, built in such a way that, from below, it resembles ribs that arch from one side of the room to the other.2 It has been plastered and painted red.3 There are only a few other examples of this decoration in the repertoire of Old Kingdom architecture. The central part of the vault – which is about 60 cm high – had been destroyed throughout its length, and only the sides of the vault remained, but this was enough to show that

---

1 This type of plaster and decoration frequently occurred in the chapels and mudbrick offering rooms e.g. in the tomb of Sabef in Giza (G 3033), see Fischer, The Minor Cemetery, 117.
2 This type of vault, called a "ribbed vault" or "reed barrel vault", often occurs in tombs built of mudbrick, see e.g. Fischer, o. c., 65 fig. 52, 106 fig. 96, 116ff. figs 107 and 108 and pl. 18; Abu Bakr, Gizaw, 129ff. Concerning other evidence for this type of vault, its origin and evolution, see el-Nagar, Les voûtes, 165ff.; id. in: Études dédiées à Jean-Philippe Lauer, 329 and 336, fig. 5.
3 The red colour indicates that the mudbrick vault imitated a structure which had originally been made of bent wooden poles covered with matting as, for instance, the Palace of the North in Djosé’s pyramid complex in Saqqara, see Lauer, L’histoire. Another type of vault represented in the early architecture was that where the roofs were built of bunches of reed – the so-called serif-style buildings, see K. P. Kuhlmann, in: Bietak, Haus und Palast, 120ff. In the latter case, however, green paint rather than red would have been used for the mudbrick imitation of a vault built originally from bunches of reed.
there had been a stretch of 29 corrugations or “ribs” between the end walls.

The entrance to the second storeroom, no. 2, is in the eastern wall of storeroom no. 1, near its northern end. Storeroom no. 2 is a little narrower (by 46 cm) than the preceding storeroom. The eastern wall of this room is directly attached to the western façade of Neserkauhor’s mastaba. Apart from this, room no. 2 is similar to room no. 1 in having an oblong plan, a north-south orientation and the same type of vaulted ceiling. In the upper part of the N wall, just under the vault, there are two ventilation and illumination slots. The slots were 10 cm wide.

The walls of room no. 2 were plastered with a dark grey clay mixed with chopped straw and then whitewashed. In this room, no torus decoration was included. The floors of both rooms, no. 1 and no. 2, were made of beaten clay. As already mentioned above, the rooms were barren of finds.

Judging by the archaeological context, the original function of the building (called the South storerooms) is somewhat nebulous. Clean drift sand filling both rooms, and the absolute absence of any archaeological objects in the filling only underline the ambiguous meaning of this mudbrick structure. Typologically, the building undoubtedly represented a sort of exterior chapel. A very close parallel to the South storerooms is, for instance, an exterior mudbrick chapel (consisting also of two vaulted rooms, one bigger and one smaller, illuminated by means of narrow vertical slots placed in the façade under the vault) built in front of Giza mastaba G 1203, in the West Field. The mastaba belonged to “the overseer of commissions Kanefer” and dated probably from the time of Khufu. It was built in front of the SE corner of the mastaba, the place where there used to be a niche with a slab stela. The same place for the exterior chapel was also chosen in front of the SE corner of Khekeretnety’s mastaba, though there is no niche in the eastern façade of the monument. Concerning the function of this mudbrick structure, in the case of Khekeretnety’s mastaba the mudbrick room probably served from the very beginning of its existence as a sort of magazine.

---

Fig. F4 Small courtyard (3)
1 greyish sand, limestone fragments, sherd
2 yellow sand, limestone fragments
3 yellow sand
4 dark grey sand, fragments of mudbrick, ash, charcoal, fragments of animal bones, sherds
5 clay, charcoal
6 beaten clay with limestone fragments
7 broken mudbrick
8 thin layers of mud

Fig. F5 North storerooms, near the north wall
1 light greyish sand, limestone fragments, broken mudbrick
2 yellow sand
3 dark grey sand, broken mudbrick
4 sherds, dark gray sand
5 greyish sand, charcoal, ash, sherds
6 basin
7 dtr 5

---

4 Type 1a according to Reisner’s typology of exterior chapels in Giza, see Reisner, Giza I, 187.
5 Reisner, o.c. 39 fig. 1; see also PM III, Pt. 1, 57.
Fig. F6 North of the south wall of the large courtyard (6)
1 yellow sand
2 yellow greyish sand with limestone fragments
3 greyish sand, limestone fragments, sherds, rare fragments of mudbrick, red granite and basalt

The North storerooms

In contrast to the southern pair of storerooms, the northern pair was arranged next to each other in a north-south direction, rather than an east-west one. As a matter of fact, both rooms were only additionally built in a narrow lane between the mastaba of Khekeretnebty and that of Mernefū.

Both rooms were built of mudbrick, except for one part of the eastern wall of room no. 4 in which, beside the mudbrick, lumps of limestone were used. Both rooms were originally vaulted. Unfortunately, these vaults (except for a small fragment in the SW corner of room no. 5), including the upper parts of the walls, have disappeared.

Room no. 4 (the front room situated closer to the entrance to Khekeretnebty’s mastaba) had an oblong, N–S oriented plan. The room originally had three entrances: one from the S, the second from the E and the third in the N wall, giving access to storeroom no. 5. The entrance in the E wall had later been walled up.

The walls of rooms no. 4 and no. 5 were originally plastered and whitewashed. In the NW corner of room no. 4, a fragment of the original decoration from the walls had survived, showing that in this room, the upper edge of the wall, just under the vault,

4 yellow sand, limestone fragments (fine)
5 broken mudbrick
6 dark grey sand, fragments of mudbrick, sherds
7 dark grey sand, clay, ash, charcoal, fragments of animal bones
8 floor of beaten clay, whitewashed (ten layers)

had been decorated with a plastic torus that was some 1.85 m above the floor. About 8 cm below the torus ran a horizontal, 1.5 cm wide black line. The floor of the room had been made of beaten clay.

In the SE corner of room no. 4, in front of the walled up entrance to the east (to the large courtyard), there is a low, mudbrick bench (10 × 20 × 52 cm). Two large bread forms were embedded in the bench.

Obviously, room no. 5 must have fallen into disuse before room no. 4: this is indicated by the secondarily walled up entrance to room no. 5. Today, the north wall of room no. 5 is largely missing. Beside the remnants of the north wall of room no. 5, however, on the floor, a low basin (85 × 54 cm, 20 cm high) was set. It had been made of mudbrick, then plastered and whitewashed. In the upper surface, there are two, roughly rectangular but shallow depressions. Nowhere in this room have traces of the original decoration survived, but we can assume that its appearance did not differ significantly from the decoration in room no. 4.

It seems that in the North storerooms the liquids were stored and possibly also prepared for offering in the open courtyard. It cannot be excluded that they were also used on the spot for some cultic purposes the meaning (see e.g. the position of the basin in the room no. 5) of which, however, remains unclear so far.
The large and small courtyards

Judging by the stratigraphy (fig. F6), this large courtyard (pl. XIX, Ff2) represents the most recent, third building stage of the mudbrick structures in the entire area F. It had been built following the erection of the South (first building stage) and North (second building stage) pairs of storerooms. The elaborateness of this complex attests to the importance of the cult.

Originally, there were four entrances to the courtyard: the main one from the east (close to the SE corner of Mernefu’s mastaba), the second (close to the exit from the South storerooms) and the third entrance (just in front of the entrance to Khekeretneby’s mastaba) from the small courtyard and the fourth one from the northern storeroom no. 4. The second and fourth entrances, giving direct access to the large courtyard from the South and North storerooms, were subsequently walled up.

The eastern wing of the court was formed by a 2-cubit thick mudbrick wall in the N part of which there was the main entrance to the whole complex of mudbrick structures and Khekeretneby’s mastaba itself. The original height of the wall cannot be established, but it would possibly correspond with the heights of the neighbouring mastabas of Mernefu and Neserkauhor (i.e. about 3–3.5 m). The main entrance appears to have been originally provided with a small door. Just behind the door, on the southern façade of Mernefu’s mastaba, there is a tiny, low platform made of clay. Possibly, clay used for the sealing of the door was kept on the platform or, maybe, lamps were kept here for an evening service.

The floor of the large court was made of beaten clay. The walls, however, had been plastered and whitewashed repeatedly, providing testimony for the lengthy duration of the cult. In different parts of the courtyard, there are structures or objects which apparently serviced the offering rituals that were performed in this area.

Approximately in the middle of the large courtyard, there is a group of six rounded and one rectangular offering tables (fig. F1.6a). The rounded offering tables were packed close to each other and only the rectangular table was situated a little to the N of this group, closer to the main entrance. Only the L-shaped base of this table has survived. It was built of mudbrick and plaster, and had been whitewashed. The base must have once supported a flat stone or a wooden slab as its plate.

The circular tables were built of mudbrick, except for the inner parts, which were made of limestone rubble, potsherds and fragments of mudbrick. The tables were of different sizes, except for the innermost pair that was bridged over with a little limestone block (fig. F7) with two, shallow rectangular basins. All the offering tables were plastered and whitewashed.

In the SW corner of the large courtyard, next to the entrance from the small courtyard, there was added a little vaulted chamber of which only a few remnants survived (fig. F1.6b). This room probably served as a sort of storeroom in which offerings used
on the tables were kept. It must have fallen into disuse relatively soon, as indirectly indicated by the fact that the aforesaid entrance from the small courtyard was later walled up. Obviously, both events reflected the decreased need and frequency of the offerings housed in the South storerooms.

Approximately on the E–W axis of the courtyard, adjacent to the face of the wall separating the large courtyard from the small one, there is a small, rather enigmatic mudbrick structure (pl. XX, Ff3 and fig. F1.6c). Originally, it seems to have been a barrel-shaped structure, on the eastern face of which there is a small, arched opening. The interior of this building was hollow. Both the opening and the barrel-shaped structure were plastered and whitewashed from both the outside and the inside.

At the foot of this structure and in front of the opening, there is a little rectangular basin. The exact purpose and meaning of this entire construction is rather uncertain. Judging by the basin, it is possible that cold water might have been stored inside the barrel-shaped building in order to be available for use in the cult. If this were so, perhaps h.bar-vases were filled above the basin.

Finally, close to the passage between the large courtyard and the small one, a pair of roughly-dressed stones was embedded in the floor. The stones, flanking the passage, were uninscribed and had pointed tops. They may have been early obelisks. If so, they must be one of the earliest attestations of this later popular practice.

In the NW corner of the small courtyard, next to the entrance to the northern storeroom no. 4, there is on the floor a low bench in which three bread-forms were embedded (pl. XX, Ff4). The bench was made of clay and whitewashed. The bench probably fell into disuse when the entrance to the North storerooms had been walled up.

In the axis of the passage linking the large and the small courtyard, and approximately in front of the obelisks, there is a small, low square-shaped structure made of limestone chips. A shallow circular depression within the structure indicates that a large vessel with a rounded bottom was probably placed here. Another imprint in the floor next to this structure might have belonged to a rounded offering table, or some sort of rounded vessel.

This group of offering tables also deserves special attention. Placed approximately in the middle of the large open courtyard, the tables differ from each other by their dimensions, height and shape: five are rounded, the largest one is provided with a spout, two tables form a unit and, finally, one table was formed by a rectangular slab (of wood or stone) resting on an I-shaped base of mudbrick. No doubt, the tables attest not only to the quantity but, also to the variety of offerings brought to the princess and, possibly, to other people buried in the neighbouring tombs.

The cultic practice in this place appears to have been quite involved. It seems, that in the North storerooms different offering liquids were kept but that some libation operations took place just here, too. On the other hand, in the South storerooms probably other kinds of offerings were placed. The room in the SW corner of the large open courtyard might have served as a place where the offerings were e.g. either cut, or arranged on plates, etc. The sealing of the entrance to this preparatory room from the Southern storerooms as well as the sealing of the entrance to the northern room in the North storerooms attest to the gradual extinguishing, in the early of the 6th Dynasty, of the function of the whole complex of structures in front of Khekeretneby’s mastaba. No doubt, this decline only reflected the gradually diminishing funerary cult of Khekeretneby.

In conclusion, it remains to be emphasized that both the stratigraphy of the site and the analysis of the miscellaneous collection of buildings and courtyards in front of the mastaba of Khekeretneby indicate that the princess became some sort of patron of this early part of the cemetery founded at Abusir for the members of Djedkare’s family.
6 The Mastaba of Hedjetnebu (K)

THE OWNER OF THE MASTABA

P. Posener-Kriéger rejected the excavator’s original reading of the princess’ name as Wadjjetnebu and imposed by a layer of decomposed mudbrick obviously coming from the core of the eastern wall of the mastaba. On the decomposed mudbrick layer rested a massive deposit of clean yellow sand.

with regard to the cursive versions (see e.g. fig. K11) of the name, suggested its reading as Hedjetnebu. s3t nšwt nṯt.f “King’s daughter of his body”\(^1\)

THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORT

Before the excavation, no traces of the mastaba of Hedjetnebu (fig. G1.K) were visible in the desert.\(^2\) The extant monument was covered by about 30 cm of a thick surface layer, consisting of dark grey sand mixed with weathered limestone pieces and late 5th Dynasty potsherds – mostly beer jugs and bread moulds (fig. K1).

Along the entire eastern façade of the tomb, there was on the ground a layer of dark grey sand super-

In the layer of decomposed mudbrick, several late New Kingdom and Late Period burials in primitive wooden coffins were found. Apparently, the mudbrick layer was at that time chosen as a convenient form of natural protection for these poor simple burials. This archaeological situation reveals that a long period – during which the gradual deterioration of the monument took place – was followed by a relatively brief phase, during which the badly weathered upper

\(^1\) For a study on this title in the Old Kingdom, see Schmitz, Königssohn. Also consult below Excursus I, “Observations on the Position of Royal Daughters in the Old Kingdom”.

\(^2\) For the preliminary report on the excavation of Hedjetnebu’s mastaba, see M. Verner, in: ZÄS 115, 1988, 163-166; see also id., Unearthing, 33 and pls. 27–29.
parts of the walls collapsed and formed the massive layer of mudbrick that then surrounded the monument. The final phase of this collapse must have happened some time before the late New Kingdom. The terminal phase of any activity in this area definitely seems to have been the Late Period.

The entrance in the eastern façade of the tomb enabled direct access to a small vestibule from which two other rooms were accessible: an offering room to the south and a small magazine to the north. This series of rooms, concentrated in the eastern half of the superstructure, was complemented by a small serdab in the south-east corner of the tomb.

**The superstructure**

Both the plan (fig. K2) of the superstructure and the materials used in its construction do not differ substantially from the mastaba of Khekeretnebty. The superstructure of Hedjetnebu’s tomb was built of mudbrick and limestone ashlars of inferior quality. These ashlars were only summarily dressed and fixed by means of a fine and firm gypsum mortar. Some of the remnants of this can still be seen. Mudbrick was also used for the inner core of the walls, with limestone ashlars for the casing.

The extant remnants of the monument are about 2 m high (originally, the superstructure reached a height of about 3 m) (fig. K3.A–A). The upper parts of the walls of the mastaba gradually collapsed and fell down both outside and inside the mastaba. Of the original roofing blocks, none survived.

The rectangular plan ($15.40 \times 10.35$ m, *i.e.* cca $30 \times 20$ cubits) of the superstructure is oriented in a N–S direction, but the eastern façade of Hedjetnebu’s tomb is not in alignment with Khekeretnebty’s mastaba; it is about 1.5 m to the west of hers. A mudbrick pillar (not on the plan) built additionally against the western façade (approximately in the middle) was obviously intended to support the deteriorating stability of this part of the mastaba.

The entrance to the mastaba is from the east, but it is closer to the NE corner of the monument (approximately one third across the length of the eastern façade). The eastern half of the mastaba contains four rooms: a very small vestibule, an offering room, a magazine and a serdab.

In the central sector of the superstructure, close to the N wall of the mastaba, there is a vertical shaft, giving access to the burial chamber. Another vertical shaft lies in the SW corner of the superstructure.

**The vestibule**

The entrance (fig. K2.1) to the mastaba lies closer to the NE corner of the monument. It is formed by a narrow passage that was originally provided with a wooden door of which no remains survived. In the
narrow passage giving access from the east, no traces of the customary lintel or drum from the doorway were found. The side walls of the passage were never decorated – except for a thin layer of whitewashed plaster. In the debris filling the entrance passage, a Late Period burial in a simple wooden coffin and two fragments of a clay sealing bearing the Horus names of Niuserre and Menkauhor (see below 26a,b/K/87) were found. The remains of the walls of the passage had thus provided a strong and convenient protection for the Late Period burial.

The coffin rested on a layer of potsherds, fragments of mudbricks and sand which had obviously been thrown into the vestibule (fig. K2.2) during the destruction of the central part of the superstructure, when the robbers opened up access to the burial chamber from above. They then threw their refuse into the already-destroyed region of the vestibule. This refuse formed the layer on which the Late Period burial had been deposited.

On the vestibule floor (made of beaten clay), a small, low offering table in the shape of the htp sign was found in the NW corner of the vestibule. The table was made of mudbrick and clay and had been whitewashed.

In the opposite SW corner of the vestibule, a low libation basin made of mudbrick, clay and whitewash was discovered. The basin contained two shallow depressions.

The offering room

Another narrow passage gave access from the vestibule to the offering room (fig. K2.3), situated in the south of the mastaba. The walls of the passage and the offering room were cased with inferior quality limestone. Originally, the walls were left undecorated, probably only whitewashed.

The upper part of the offering room was filled with yellow sand resting on a layer, approximately 20–30 cm thick, of dark grey sand, potsherds and fragments of limestone (see fig. K1). The origin of the latter layer is the same as that in the vestibule and magazine – a robber’s layer. The lowest part of the room contained clean yellow sand, indicating that, unlike the magazine, this room had never been occupied. In the W wall of the offering room is a compound niche for a simple false door. Originally, a false door, made of several limestone slabs, had occupied the niche, but now, unfortunately, only tiny, uninscribed fragments of this door were found on the floor of the room. Only four, black vertical lines on the composite niche indicated precisely the original position of the false door. On the ground in front of the niche, there is a low bench of mudbrick which has been plastered and whitewashed. Next to the bench, in the SW corner of the room, there was a small libation basin and a little offering table made of clay that was also plastered and whitewashed.

The magazine

In the N wall of the vestibule, a doorway opened into a small room (fig. K2.4) which filled the NE corner of the superstructure. Undoubtedly, it served as a magazine.

The magazine was built in a slightly different way from the vestibule and offering room. Only the lower part of the walls of the magazine were now cased
Fig. K2 Plan of the mastaba of Hedjedef
with limestone ashlers. The casing had obviously been added at a later stage to the original building. At first, the room had just been built of mudbrick – probably because of the shortage of limestone and also because it was considered to be a less important room. The walls of the magazine, both of limestone and mudbrick, were whitewashed. Above the limestone casing, in the E wall of the magazine, there runs a deep breach that had been made by tomb robbers – probably at the time when the plundering of the burial chamber took place.

The upper part of the magazine was filled with yellow sand, below which was a layer of potsherds, fragments of mudbrick and dark grey sand. The origin of this layer was the same as that of a similar layer in the vestibule (see fig. K1).

The layer of potsherds rested on the crown of the limestone inner casing for the wall. Below the level of the remaining walls, the lowest part of the room held a substantial layer of grey sand containing numerous remnants of reeds, but also potsherds and traces of ash. A small fragment of a clay sealing (see below no. 20/K/87) bearing the Horus name of Niuserre was found here, too. It seems that this room had been used – at least temporarily – after the tomb had fallen into disuse. It had been inhabited by someone who had used it as a dwelling.

Also in the magazine, another burial was found in a simple wooden coffin. The body lay with the head pointing to the west. The head rested on the limestone casing of the western wall of the room.

The serdab

To the south of the offering room, in the SE corner of the superstructure, was a little serdab (fig. K2.5) built of mudbrick. Originally, the serdab may have been linked to the offering room by means of a narrow slot. Unfortunately, the existence of such a slot cannot be confirmed archaeologically because the wall between the offering room and the serdab was largely damaged. If such a slot had ever existed, it must have been relatively deep, because the wall between the two rooms is rather thick (1.15 m).

The serdab was roofed with a mudbrick vault, traces of which survived along the eastern and western walls of the room. The vault consisted of two layers of mudbrick: the lower layer of brick was slanting upright, the upper one was laid crosswise over the tops of the lower layer. The upper surface of the vault was plastered. It seems that, inside, the walls of the serdab itself remained unplastered – a strange, but logical set of circumstances since the serdab was an enclosed room, whereas the outer layer of the plastered vault provided a protective coating, which still in part remains today.

The upper part of the serdab was filled with an approximately 60 cm thick deposit of clean sand resting on a 20 cm thick layer of potsherds, bovine and other animal bones, and pieces of charcoal mixed with the remnants of the walls. In the underlying layer, consisting of dark grey sand, a wooden statue of the tomb owner, Hedjetnebu, was discovered (see below no. 18/K/87). It was standing in the NW corner of the serdab, leaning with its left shoulder against the western wall and with its face against the north wall of the serdab (pl. XX, Kf1).

The substructure

The burial shaft

The actual burial shaft (fig. K2.6) lies close to the N wall, to the W of the magazine. It measures 1.00 × 1.80 m in horizontal section and is at present cca 5 m deep. The shaft is built of mudbrick (fig. K3. C–C).

The stratigraphy of the shaft’s filling (fig. K5) clearly reflects the events which followed the burial of the tomb owner. The shaft had originally been filled with sand and potsherds. During the plundering of the burial chamber, the original filling of the shaft was largely, but not completely, removed. Approximately at a depth of 0.8–1.00 m below the extant top surface of the shaft, remnants of the mummy and fragments of wood from a secondary, Late Period burial were found. At a depth of 1.2–2.5 m, there was clean yellow sand. Under this layer, from 2.5–3.3 m, was a layer of dark sand mixed with numerous potsherds and complete pieces of pottery, consisting of offering stands of different types, beer jugs, plates, jar stoppers of unbaked clay and models of small conical bowls with flat bottoms (pl. XXI, Kf2). In the same layer there were also fragments of mummy wrappings, pieces of wood with traces of stucco (the remnants of a tray ?), fragments of a reed mat and fragments of cattle bones, etc. Most of the contents of this layer probably come from the princess’ equipment placed originally in the burial chamber. When the robbers opened the shaft and penetrated to the burial chamber, the previously mentioned items were thrown out from the chamber to the shaft. On the sides of the shaft, in the W and E wall, shallow cuts had been made by the robbers. These nicks in the wall had helped the robbers make their descent down the shaft.

The entrance to the burial chamber is 0.9 m broad and 1.1 m tall and it is placed in the centre of the shaft’s wall. From the original wall sealing the entrance, about one third – some 40 cm – had been removed by the robbers (pl. XX, Kf3 and fig. K6). Near the south wall of the shaft, above the entrance to
the burial chamber and at a depth of 2.8 m, there lies the upper edge of a limestone lintel, cca 55 cm thick. Next to the lintel, the skull of Hedjetnebu was found.

The shaft contained under the threshold of the entrance to a depth of 3.8 m under the extant crown of the shaft. In the lowest part of the shaft, below the threshold to the burial chamber, there were many large fragments of limestone ashlars that had come from the wall that had originally sealed the entrance to the burial chamber. In the same layer as the broken ashlars, were further fragments of Hedjetnebu’s mummy wrappings (in some instances, fragments of hair were still adhering to the wrappings) and bones.

The shaft also contained fragments of wood and a reed mat, beer jugs, stands, clay models of bag-shaped vessels (see fig. K7), a dish with traces of gypsum on it and fragments of an antelope skeleton — including the skull. There were big lumps of clay, too, into which fragments of pottery had been pressed.

The burial chamber

The entrance passage to the burial chamber was 1.00 m long and only its front section from the shaft had been walled up. The burial chamber (fig. K2.7) was a relatively small room, 4.25 m long, 1.55 m broad and 2.05 m high. The chamber (pl. XX, Kf3) was built of inferior quality limestone ashlars, fixed by means of a pink gypsum mortar. The roof of the chamber was made of roughly dressed slabs of inferior quality limestone laid flat. Above this ceiling, there was another one provided by a mudbrick vault (fig. K4.B–B). The ancient architect’s intention was both clear and logical: this second ceiling was designed to reduce the pressure of the filling above the burial chamber.

The walls of the burial chamber were only summarily dressed and never whitewashed. With the exception of the ceiling blocks, on every aslhar, originally there was a red inscription with the title

3 The presence of antelope remains has a later echo in the time of Thutmose III, when the burial of three foreign-born princesses included an elaborate circlot (MMA 26.8.99) with the head of two antelopes (see Winlock, *Treasure*). The gazelle is a type of antelope, and Egyptian jewellery for the royal women alternated over the centuries between stags, antelopes and gazelles. There appears to have been some symbolic link between these animals and female lesser royalty. The antelope is one of the animals associated with Hathor and, as the wives of Egyptian kings were felt to have been the earthly counterparts of this goddess, the presence of the remains of this animal in Hedjetnebu’s grave shaft may have been a deliberate reference to this goddess. From the New Kingdom Deir el Bahari votive objects, G. Pinch (Votive Offerings, 286) mentions only one gazelle scaraboid, which she says was thought to be a symbol of rebirth. Princess Satamun from 18th Dynasty also wears the gazelle circlot on her head in the depiction of the princess on the back of her chair (now in Cairo Museum). See also L. Troy, *Queenship*, 129 on the symbolism of the gazelle. C. Aldred (Jewels of the Pharaohs, pl. 48 and notes on p.119) publishes an electrum circlot of a royal woman found at a late Middle Kingdom site in Saifiya in the Delta. It combines both gazelle heads and a stag head (MMA 68.136).
and name of Hedjetnebu, such as: sût nswt ḫḏt-nbw, providing sympathetic magic with the use of the tomb owner’s name (pls. XXI, XXII, Kf4 and 5, and figs. 8, 9, 10, 11). Most of the chamber was filled by a huge sarcophagus made of two monoliths of white limestone.

The sarcophagus is 2.26 m long and 70 cm broad. The chest of the sarcophagus is 95 cm high, while the lid is 35 cm high. The lid was slightly shorter by some 5 cm on each side to its corresponding bottom half. The sarcophagus had been opened by the ancient tomb robbers, who had plundered the room, then pushed the lid aside. The chamber (including the plundered sarcophagus) was covered with a layer of debris, left by the tomb robbers and consisting of fine fragments of limestone, dark grey sand and potsherds.

Around the sarcophagus and under the debris, several pieces of pottery from the original burial equipment, besides those found at the bottom of the shaft, were revealed (see pl. XX, Kf3). A large, roughly made, rounded dish with a raised rim, large beer jugs, stands, miniature symbolic offering vessels and a jar stopper of grey clay bearing the sealing with the Horus name of Djedkare (see below no. 27/K/87) were the major items found.

In the floor, in the SW corner of the chamber, there was an imprint of a small rectangular object, possibly a chest (for canopic jars ?).

The subsidiary shaft

In the SW corner of the superstructure, there is a vertical shaft (fig. K2.8), ca. 3 metres deep, that had been built of mudbrick. In the shaft, five layers of filling were found: the three upper layers seem to have been disturbed by later tomb robbers, for they contained grey sand mixed with fragments of limestone and potsherds, together with mudbrick and miniature pottery vessels etc. The remaining two bottom layers seem to have been intact. The lowest layer at the very bottom of the shaft consisted of small limestone chips, ash and potsherds. Interesting items were revealed in the second lowest layer: ash mixed with fragments of charcoal, small pieces of linen, two flint blades, symbolic miniature vessels and the remnants of some organic material (cheese or meat, according to our reis) neatly tied up by means of a narrow strip of fine linen (see below 17/K/87). The layer also contained small fragments of animal bones and two clay sealings bearing the Horus names of Neferefre, Niuserre and Menkaure (see below 3a-c/K/87). The bottom layer was formed of clean yellow sand. The shaft built in the SW corner of the mastaba can hardly be considered as an element having a purely technical interpretation. Obviously, this shaft ranks among the so-called false shafts found frequently in Old

4 Giza IV, 1943, 95ff.
Fig. K5 Shaft in the SW corner of the tomb
1 mudbrick wall
2 dark sand, limestone fragments
3 dark sand, limestone chips, potsherds, fragments of mudbrick
4 dark grey sand, ash
5 ash, flint blades, miniature vessels, wrappings of linen, bone, sealings, potsherds
6 clean sand

Fig. K6 Burial shaft
1 yellow sand
2 dark grey sand, broken mudbrick, pottery (stands), clay stoppers, fragments of linen wrappings, sealings, gazelle bones
3 fragments of limestone ashlars, fragments of linen wrappings, fragments of matting, fragments of wood, pottery (beer jugs, plates)

Kingdom tombs. For instance, S. Hassan reported that each of 250 false shafts found at Giza were “absolutely empty, except for its filling, which on examination proved to be original, and had not been touched since ancient times”. He suggested that “the false shaft then, should be a place of refuge for the šdjw, or spiritual body, and the false pyramid should be a further development of this idea, as applied to royalty.”

There are some doubts about Hassan’s statement that all false shafts he unearthed were “absolutely empty”. Certainly, they did not contain a burial or burial equipment. However, the question is how carefully did Hassan examine the filling, including the stratigraphy, of these shafts? In the Abusir cemetery under discussion in this book, in all tombs, except for that of Hedjetnebu, the false shafts were plundered by robbers down to the very bottom. This makes the false shaft in this tomb of special

Fig. K7 Clay models of vessels
significance, since so few of them have been found intact have been deemed worthy of archaeological description by the excavators. The objects found in the two lowest intact layers in Hedjetnebu’s false shaft seem to indicate that the latter might have been used for the remnants of the funerary service, when the leftovers would have been ritually buried.

Graffiti from Hedjetnebu’s tomb

Fig. K8

Fig. K10

Fig. K9

Items from the tomb

18/K/87 (Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JdE no. 98438) Standing statue of Hedjetnebu. The statue\(^5\) was found standing in the NW corner of the serdab (pl. XXIII, Kf6; see also the text above). The statue, bearing the remnants of its original polychromy, is fixed onto a prismatic pedestal. It represents the tomb owner as a young woman, standing with her arms (attached separately) hanging loosely alongside her body.\(^6\) The

---

\(^5\) For the previous publication of Hedjetnebu’s statue, see M. Verner, in: ZAS 115, 1988, 165 and Fig. 3 on p. 166; id., Unearthing, pl. 28; id. Forgotten Pharaohs, 83.

\(^6\) One of the typical attitudes of the Old Kingdom female statues, see e.g. Eaton-Krauss, The Representation of Statuery, 24.

\(^7\) Harvey, Wooden Statues, 20 (Wf.5)
princess’ body is painted yellow, her short cut hairdo\(^7\) is painted black.\(^8\) She wears a long sheath dress with a V-shaped bodice, covering the breasts. Only the bodice is decorated from her breast upwards with red, white (bordered by black zig-zag lines) and green horizontal stripes.\(^9\)

As Harvey\(^10\) has remarked, Old Kingdom wooden female statues are not only fewer than male statues, but their characteristic pose and dress were seldom varied, except for the wig worn by the statue. One might also add that there may have been variation within the patterns given on the simple shift worn by all statues of female tomb owners – such as we see in this statue of Hedjetnebu – but such patterns have usually faded from the statues before their discovery in modern times. Apart from the dubious possibility of such painted distinctions appearing within the textile renditions, the wooden statues discovered in the tombs of Khekeretnebty and Hedjetnebu, damaged as they are, show quite clearly that there was no differentiation given to the statues of princesses from those of other upper class women. This lack of distinction is repeated for tomb representations of royal women (both queens and princesses) and in their stone statuary as well. Until the introduction of the vulture cap for the queen mother in the later 4\(^{th}\) Dynasty, Old Kingdom royal women were not singled out for any iconographical difference from the depictions of other wealthy women.

On the upper surface of the pedestal, in front of the princess’ feet, the remnants of two (of originally three) columns of a roughly incised hieroglyphic inscription survived:
1. \((\text{\textit{Imi\textregistered}} \ h \text{rt} \ ntr \ \textit{3})\)
2. \((s\text{\textit{\textregistered}} \text{\textit{nswt} nt \ htf})\)
3. \(\text{\textit{Hdt-\textit{nbw}}}\)

1. “One revered with the Great God
2. (King’s daughter of) his (body)
3. Hedjetnebu.”

Wood, stucco, polychromy
H (including the pedestal): 81.5 cm; pedestal:
22.5 \(\times\) 13 \(\times\) 5 cm
5\(^{th}\) Dynasty, temp. late Djedkare

Sealings

\textit{3a/K/87} Fragment of a sealing. (pl. XXIV, Kf7a and fig. K12) found in the shaft in the SW corner of the mastaba (see the text above). The fragmentary text survived on three sides (A – C) of the slightly convex sealing:

\textbf{A}
1. \((\text{\textit{mr}}) r \ n \ \textit{nhf})
2. \((\text{\textit{Hr}} ... \textit{hfw})\)
3. \(\textit{hr} \ \textit{st3}\)

\textbf{B}
1. \(\textit{... rt}\)
2. \(\textit{Hr \ Nfr-(hfw)}\)
3. \(\textit{shd} \ \textit{irw-\textit{snw} pr-c3, ... nswt}\)
4. \(\textit{Hr \ Nfr-(hfw)}\)
5. \(\textit{...r..., mrr}\)

1. \(\textit{...?...}\)
2. Horus Nefer(khau),
3. inspector of hairdressers\(^11\) of the royal palace, king’s ....,
4. Horus Nefer(khau),
5. ... ? ..., beloved ...

Dark grey clay
cca 4 \(\times\) 4 cm
Late 5\(^{th}\) Dynasty

---

\(^8\) The colours conform to the Old Kingdom palette used in the decoration of wooden statues, see J. C. Harvey, in: Ziegler (ed.), \textit{L’art de l’Ancien Empire}, 360.
\(^10\) Harvey, \textit{o. c.}, 365
\(^11\) On the careers and significance of the royal hairdressers during the Old Kingdom, see Speidel, \textit{Die Friseure}.
This sealing, bearing the Horus name of Neferefre (and some other sealings quoted below bearing the Horus name of Menkaure, Niuserre and Djedkare), found in Hedjetnebu’s mastaba, open up an interesting question which has not yet been satisfactorily answered. Though bearing Horus names of kings that, with the exception of Djedkare’s sealing, are all anterior to the time at which Hedjetnebu’s tomb was built, the sealing belonged very probably to vessels which made part of the original burial equipment of the princess.

To date, an opinion prevails that a sealing as a sort of official document should date to the time of the king whose Horus name it bore.\textsuperscript{12} Theoretically, the occurrence of the sealings with the Horus names of earlier kings can be explained in two ways: either, the sealed objects came from earlier reserves or, earlier cylinder seals remained, under certain circumstances, in use after the accession of a new king (for instance, if the monument founded by a certain king contained his name, that seal might still be used at a later time, after the death of that king). The latter variant seems to be plausible, otherwise it would have been impossible to explain e.g. the frequent occurrence of sometimes much earlier sealings in later pyramid temples.\textsuperscript{13} Of special note, in the text on one of the sealings (27/K/87, see the text below) found in Hedjetnebu’s tomb, an “inspector of funerary priests in the funerary temple of Niuserre” is explicitly mentioned, confirming the above opinion that the seals of earlier kings were still in use in later royal cemeteries after the death of such kings.

\begin{itemize}
    \item \textit{Menkauhor. ... Re ... Min ...}
    \item \textit{Horus Men(khaur ...)}
\end{itemize}

Dark grey clay

\begin{itemize}
    \item \textit{3c/K/87} Fragment of a sealing found in the same place as the two previous entries. From the text that survived on the fragment only the sign \textit{mr} and a part of a serekh with the name \textit{St-ib-t\textsuperscript{3}wy} (Pl. XXIV, middle fragment).
    \item \textit{Dark grey clay}
    \item \textit{cca 2.5 × 2 cm}
    \item \textit{Late 5\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty}
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
    \item \textit{20/K/87} Fragment of a sealing (pl. XXIII, Ki7c and fig. K14). Found in the magazine (see above the text). On the sealing, the remnants of two imprints of the text survived:
    \begin{itemize}
        \item \textit{A}
        \begin{itemize}
            \item \textit{1. (Hr \textit{St-ib})-t\textsuperscript{3}wy}
            \item \textit{2.} \textit{r\textsuperscript{5} nb, ntr nfr}
        \end{itemize}
        \item \textit{1. “(Horus Setib)tawy, ...}
        \item \textit{2. every day, the Good God ..?..”}
    \end{itemize}
    \begin{itemize}
        \item \textit{B}
        \begin{itemize}
            \item \textit{1. (Hr \textit{St-ib-t})-t\textsuperscript{3}wy}
            \item \textit{2. mry (n) \textit{Shmwy}}
            \item \textit{3. ...(lower part of a serekh)}
            \item \textit{4. hnty(-$)}...
        \end{itemize}
        \item \textit{1. “(Horus Setibta)wy}
        \item \textit{2. ...one beloved by the Two Powers,}
        \item \textit{3. ... (Setibtawy)}
        \item \textit{4. the tenant ...”}
    \end{itemize}
    \item \textit{Dark grey clay}
    \item \textit{2.2 × 2.3 cm.}
    \item \textit{5\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty}
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
    \item \textit{26a/K/87} Fragment of a sealing (fig. K15), found in the entrance to the mastaba (see the text above). The sealing bears the remnants of a text which reads:
    \begin{itemize}
        \item \textit{1. Bik-nbw Ntry}
        \item \textit{2. Hr St(-ib-t\textsuperscript{3}wy}
        \item \textit{3. Hr St-ib-(t\textsuperscript{3}wy}
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}


\textsuperscript{13} For instance, in the pyramid complex of Khentkaus II, founded by Neferirkare and finished by Niuserre, sealings bearing the Horus name of Userkaf and Sahure were revealed, see Verner, \textit{Khentkaus}, 131.
1. “A falcon of gold Netjery,
2. Horus Setibtawy
3. Horus Setibtawy”

Besides the names of Niuserre on the sealing, there are also depictions of two striding male figures, each holding a long stick, together with fragments of several serekhs and parts of signs  $\$,  $\&$,  $\$,  $\$,  and  $\$. Dark grey clay
4 × 3.5 cm
5th Dynasty

26b/K/87 Fragment of a sealing (fig. K16). Found in the same place as the previous entry. The remnants of the text which survived on the sealing read:

1. … pr-$5$,  $\text{hm ntr}$,  $\text{hmty}$
2. $\text{Hr Mn-hf(w)}$

1. “… royal palace, priest, seal-bearer,
2. Horus Menkhau”

Dark grey clay
3 × 2.2 cm
5th Dynasty

27/K/87 Fragment of a sealing (fig. K17), found in the burial chamber (see the text above). Judging by the flat lower side, the small rounded, and relatively well preserved sealing probably comes from a chest. The remnants of the text imprinted on the sealing read:

A
1. … $k3$
2. $\text{Dd-(k3)}$-$r^e$
3. $\text{Hr}$ …

1. “…?…
2. Djedkare
3. Horus …”

B
1. $\text{...}$-$\text{s}$,  $\text{hm ntr}$,
2. $\text{hm-ntr Snfrw}$
3. a serekh containing the throne name $\text{Dd-k3}$-$r^e$
4. $\text{shd pr-}5$,  $s$m

1. “…?…, priest,
2. priest of Sneferu,
3. Horus Djedkhaou - Djedkare - Horus Djedkhau,
4. inspector of the employees of the royal palace”

C
1. $\text{...}$-$k3$
2. $\text{hm-ntr}$ ($R^c$)
3. lower part of a serekh with the $\text{sm3-bwy}$ symbol flanked by kneeling figures bringing offerings
4. $\text{...}$-$\text{wdty}$-$s$t.  $\text{shd hmw-ntr}$,  $\text{...Hwt-(nt)}$-$\text{Ny-wsr}$-$r^e$

1. “…?…
2. priest of Re,
3. Lower part of a serekh
4. ...?... Inspector of funerary priests, ... mortuary temple of Niuserre ...

Judging by the explicitly mentioned mortuary temple of Niuserre, some items of Hedjetnebu’s funerary equipment might have been stored in the magazines of this temple. Apart from this, we cannot explain why Niuserre’s priest was at work here. At this stage, we know little about the mortuary cults of royal children in the Old Kingdom and do not know whether or not they were incorporated into the cultic activities of the king’s temple.

Dark grey clay with the remnants of a piece of string cca 5 × 5 cm
5th Dynasty

Pottery

2/K/87 Beer jug of a slender type. Found in the filling of the superstructure, above the burial chamber. The jug has an almost pointed bottom, a high and slightly flaring neck and a mouth opening outwards. The exterior surface of the jug is coated with red slip. The neck of the jug was shaped on a turning device. Medium firing.

Marl clay
H: 33 cm, W (across the body): 13 cm, mouth diameter: 10.5 cm
Late 5th Dynasty

6a-c/K/87 Three models of bowls (fig. K7). Found in the burial shaft (see the above text). The bowls, partly imitating a desheret type of vessel, have relatively massive rounded bases and very thin sides of a conical, upwards tapering body. Judging by the archaeological context in which they were found, the vessels may have made part of Hedjetnebu’s burial equipment.

Dark grey alluvial, unbaked clay
H: a = 6 cm, b = 8 cm, c = 9 cm; bottom diameter: a = 12 cm, b = 11 cm, c = 12 cm; mouth diameter: a = 8 cm, b = 8 cm, c = 9 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

9/K/87 One complete plate and one half of another plate of the same type (pl. XXIII, Kf8 and fig. K18). Found in the burial shaft (see the text above, p. 89). Rounded, slightly convex plate with a roll rim. Shaped on a turning device. Medium firing.

Marl clay with a light amount of inclusion (chaff).
H: 2 cm, diameter: 27 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

10a-d/K/87 Different types of stands (see pl. XXIV, Kf9 and fig. K19) found in the burial shaft (see the text above).

a) Broad, low biconical ring stand with roll rims. H: 13 cm; diameter: 15.5 cm
b) Broad, low biconical ring stand without roll rims. H: 14 cm; diameter: 13–15 cm (mouth) and 16 cm (bottom)
c) Broad, low stand with flaring sides and upper roll rim. H: 11 cm; diameter: 13.2 cm (mouth) and 9.5 cm (bottom)
d) Slender, chalice type of stand with rolled rim on the bottom, H: 26.5 cm; diameter: 13 cm (mouth) and 15 cm (bottom)

Marl clay with a little amount of organic (chaff) inclusion.
5th Dynasty, temp. Djedkare

17/K/87 Deposit from the shaft in the SW corner of the mastaba.
– five miniature footed cups of burnt red clay, H: cca 6 cm
– two miniature dishes of burnt red clay, H: 1.5 cm, diameter 4.5 cm
– one miniature beer jug of burnt clay, H: 11 cm
– two flint blades (L: 9.5 and 7 cm, W: 2.5 and 1.5 cm)
– a piece of organic material tied up by means of a narrow strip of linen.

30/K/87 Cup.¹⁴ Found in Hedjetnebu’s offering room, in front of the niche for the false door. Inside the wheel-made, shallow cup with rounded bottom, 3 cm under the rim, runs an incised line. On the inside surface of the cup, there are several irregular white stains. Medium firing.
Marl clay with inclusion (chaff)
H: 4 cm, mouth diameter: 15 cm
5th Dynasty, temp. late Djedkare

¹⁴ For a very close parallel to this cup, see Kaiser, in: Ricke, *Userkaf II*, 61, type XX: 127.
The mastaba of “Lady L”\(^1\) lies north-east of the mastaba of Hedjetnebu and north of the mastaba of Mernef (see fig. G1.L). This monument was given that enigmatic name (derived from the archaeological denomination of our site plan) because there is not a single clue within the mastaba to tell us who this person might have been (but see Chapter 10, p. 124). This mastaba is, so far, the most northerly tomb yet unearthed in this part of the cemetery at Abusir. It lies on a slope SE of the mortuary temple of Neferirkare, quite close to the shallow depression running along Niuserre’s causeway; this depression might have originally been one of the access roads from the Nile Valley to the tombs lying around Neferirkare’s mortuary temple.

As in the case of the previous monument in the cemetery around the remains of the mastaba of Khekeretnebty, the tomb of Lady L was covered by a layer (20–50 cm) of dark grey sand mixed with late 5\(^{th}\) Dynasty potsherds, loose ashlars of inferior quality limestone coming obviously from the masonry of the mastaba, and weathered fragments of limestone.

---

**Fig. G1** Plan of Djedkare’s family cemetery showing the position of Mastaba L

---

**THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORT**

**The masonry**

Like the previous mastabas, the tomb of Lady L was made from large, inferior quality ashlars of limestone, these being cemented together with clay mortar, covered over from the outside with a pink gypsum plaster. The core of the walls was built of mudbrick. Mudbrick was also used for the burial shaft and the shorter, subsidiary shaft in the SW.

---

\(^1\) For the preliminary report on the excavation of the mastaba “L”, see Verner, in: *ZAS* 115, 1988, 166f.; see also id., *Unearthing*, 1990, 33.
Fig. L1 Plan of the Mastaba L

1. Entrance
2. Vestibule
3. Offering room
4. Magazine
5. Serdab
6. Burial Shaft
7. Burial Chamber
8. SW shaft
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corner. The extant masonry of the mastaba’s superstructure reaches to a height of cca 1.5 metres. As in the mastabas of Khekeretnebt and Hedjjetnebu, the space above the burial chamber was filled with pottery, both complete vessels and sherds (beer jugs, stands, and bread moulds, miniature vases and dishes, etc.).

The superstructure

Though more or less the same as that of Hedjjetnebu or Khekeretnebt (before its enlargement for Tisethor’s burial), the plan of the mastaba (fig. L.1) is somewhat irregular: the eastern side is 15.5 m long whereas the western one only 14.8 m; both the northern and the southern sides of the tomb have the same length of 10.5 m. The entrance to the tomb lies on the eastern façade of the mastaba, a little to the N of the EW axis of the tomb. There is the usual entrance, vestibule, magazine, offering room and serdab.

The entrance

The entrance (fig. L.1.1) is formed by a recess in the façade in which there is a relatively narrow (60 cm) passage giving access to the interior of the mastaba. In the entrance, several loose ashlars (obviously belonging to the original masonry of the tomb) bearing the remnants of masons’ marks and inscriptions were found. One of the inscriptions contained the date rnp’t sp 3 which plays an important role in the reconstruction of the chronology of Djedkare family’s cemetery in Abusir (see below, mason’s inscription no. 1). The severely damaged masonry of the monument whose northern wall does not exceed a height of 90 cm, and the loose ashlars scattered around the wall seem to indicate that the stone robbers must have contributed a great deal to the current lamentable state of the mastaba’s masonry.

All the rooms of the superstructure are concentrated in the eastern half of the mastaba. There is a vestibule, a magazine to the N of the vestibule, an offering room to the S of the vestibule while in the SE corner of the mastaba there is a serdab. The mastaba has two shafts, which open in its western part: the burial shaft lies close to the N wall, whereas the subsidiary shaft lies in the SW corner of the tomb.

The vestibule

Both the entrance passage and the upper half of the vestibule (fig. L.1.2) were filled with a thick layer of clean yellow sand, on which rested the dark grey sand of the surface layer. The lower half of the vestibule was filled with pieces of limestone ashlars, mudbrick and potsherds left here probably by robbers when they opened their way to the mastaba’s substructure.

Near the northern wall of the vestibule, on the debris layer, there was revealed a secondary burial (3/L/87) dating from the Late Period (fig. L.2.8).

Neither the passage nor the vestibule carry any trace of original decoration. We can only assume that the walls could once have been whitewashed. The floor of the room was made of flattish lumps of stone, covered with a thin layer of beaten clay.

The offering room

Another passage, this time in the S wall of the vestibule provides access to the offering room (fig. L.1.3). It is a long, rather narrow room, lined with limestone ashlars. On the western side of the room there is a niche in which originally a false door might have been embedded.

However, judging by the simple plan of the tomb, the nature of the burial equipment and the total lack of any decoration, it is quite possible that any false door placed here might have been merely painted.

The floor of this room was completely destroyed by the robbers. In the NW corner of this room is an opening from the robbers’ shaft giving access to the burial chamber. Unlike the magazine and the vestibule, the offering room was completely filled with clean yellow sand. Large limestone ashlars were deposited in the entrance passage to this room during the plundering, undoubtedly to protect the tomb robbers against the possible fall of the sand and debris from the vestibule.

The magazine

A passage opening in the N wall of the vestibule gives access to the magazine (fig. L.1.4). This room was filled up to the crown of its remaining walls with limestone rubble and fragments of mud brick. Very probably, this debris was thrown here by the tomb robbers when they opened up their access into the burial shaft and sarcophagus chamber. It is also likely that during these same activities, the entire NW corner of this room, including the ceiling, was seriously damaged.

The serdab

The serdab (fig. L.1.5) was situated, as in the other mastabas in this cemetery, in the NE corner of the tomb, to the south of the offering room. Unlike the mastaba of Hedjetnebu and Neserkauhor, though, this serdab was built of limestone ashlars and had an oblong, E–W oriented ground plan. Except for a secondary filling of yellow sand, nothing was found within the serdab. Between the serdab and the offering room, no trace of a connecting slot linking both rooms was found.
Fig. 1.2 Section of the mastaba's superstructure
1 yellow sand, limestone fragments, sherds
2 yellow sand
3 dark grey sand, limestone fragments
4 dark grey sand
5 limestone fragments (coarse)
6 broken up pavement

7 yellow sand, limestone fragments, sherds, pieces of limestone ashlars
8 burial 3/L/87
9 beaten clay with limestone fragments
10 dark grey sand, limestone fragments (coarse), broken mudbrick
11 mudbrick wall

The substructure

The burial shaft

From the vertical shaft (fig. L1.6), situated to the west of the magazine and giving access to the burial chamber, only the lower portion survived (the extant depth of the shaft is about 3.2 m). The shaft, square-shaped in horizontal section (the side was 1.85 m long), was built of mudbrick. At the bottom of the shaft, in the southern wall, the entrance opened into the burial chamber. The lintel and the side walls of the entrance were built of inferior quality limestone. Following the funeral, the entrance was sealed with a mudbrick wall, the upper part of which (cca 50 cm) was later removed by robbers.

The upper part of the shaft, down to the lintel of the entrance to the burial chamber, was filled with wind-blown yellow sand (fig. L3). The lower part of the shaft was filled with dark grey sand mixed with pieces of limestone ashlars and late 5th Dynasty potsherds. Obviously, this layer dates from the time when the robbers in antiquity penetrated this way to the burial chamber.

The burial chamber

The burial chamber was accessible through the shaft opening behind the western wall of the magazine.

The chamber (fig. L1.7) – 4.25 m long and 1.6 m wide – was built of limestone ashlars of inferior quality, and the same material was used for the roughly dressed slabs of the flat ceiling. Judging by the different size and colour of the ashlars in the
western wall, the chamber was built in two phases. Undoubtedly, the bottom part of the sarcophagus was lowered this way, from the W and by means of a ramp, to the chamber. As in other tombs in this cemetery, above the ceiling there was a vault built of mud brick. In some places on the walls of the burial chamber, traces of mason’s marks and inscriptions were found, including nivellation lines.

Besides using the vertical shaft, the tomb robbers penetrated to the burial chamber from two other sides as well, in both cases from above: from the west via the roof terrace of the mastaba and from the east via the NW corner of the offering room.

The whole burial chamber, except for its N part, was filled with blown, yellow sand. This clean sand permeated the burial chamber through a large hole cut by tomb robbers in the western part of the ceiling. There is an opening for this hole in the offering room.

Almost the whole of the chamber was filled with a relatively well-cut sarcophagus chest (2.4 m long and 1.1 m wide) made of a limestone monolith. The cavity within the sarcophagus was empty. Moreover, no trace of the lid was found. Did it ever exist within this tomb?

Around the sarcophagus itself, the skeletal remnants, together with pieces of mummy wrappings, were revealed. Among the few finds made in the chamber were the remnants of a fish skeleton (which might have been left here by the robbers) and several beer jugs, that were found in the sand filling the room. The vessels probably made up part of the original burial equipment arranged around the sarcophagus.

The subsidiary shaft

The whole subsidiary shaft (fig. L1.8), built of mudbrick and about 2 m deep, was filled with dark grey sand, sherds of beer jugs and several bone fragments belonging to small animals – mice, birds, etc. Obviously, the shaft was examined by tomb robbers in antiquity.

MASON’S INSCRIPTION NO. 1

The graffito was one of two mason’s inscriptions (one larger and earlier, the other smaller and later) which were found on a loose ashlar in the entrance to the mastaba. Judging by its shape and type of material, the ashlar certainly comes from the largely decayed masonry of the mastaba’s façade. The remnants of the larger graffito are illisible; the later, smaller graffito (pl. XXIV, L1 and fig. L4) reads:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{rnpt-sp} & \text{ 3 iḥd 4 3ḥt, šw 11,} \\
\text{The year of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} occasion (of the cattle count),} \\
\text{4\textsuperscript{th} month of the inundation season, 11\textsuperscript{th} day.}
\end{align*}
\]

The date is of great historical importance. Judging by the stratigraphy of the cemetery, and the fact that mastaba L was built clearly later than the tombs of both Mernefep and Hedjetnebu, the date cannot relate to Djedkare. Therefore, it very probably refers to the third cattle count which took place in the reign of Unas (for more details, see chapter 8 “The Chronology of Djedkare’s Family Cemetery”).
8. The Chronology of Djedkare’s Family Cemetery at Abusir

The archaeological materials and observations discussed in the previous chapters indicate that the earliest monument erected in Djedkare’s family cemetery in Abusir was the tomb of Princess Khekeretnebty. This was followed a little later by the mastaba of Princess Hedjetnebu. After a few years, the tomb of Idu was built, and subsequently altered to accommodate his wife, Khenit. It is from this man’s burial chamber that we have the all important date of rnrnpt m-hbt sp 17, giving a fixed chronological horizon for the relative dating of all the tombs. Prince Neserkauhor’s tomb then followed those of the two princesses and Idu. Much later, the tomb of Lady L was added to the cemetery and it, too, held a date. However, the latter date of rnrnpt sp 3 must belong to Djedkare’s successor, Unas. Only one tomb unearthen within this cemetery does not seem to relate to Djedkare’s family namely, that of Mernebu: his mastaba appears to have been built in this part of the Abusir necropolis prior to all the previously mentioned tombs, probably as early as in the time of Niuserre. (Besides the text below, see also the following chapter on the typology of the tombs discussed in this volume.) The discovery of Djedkare’s family cemetery in Abusir raises, some questions however which pertain not only to the chronology of this site, but also to the history of the late 5th Dynasty.

Neither Menkauhor nor Djedkare were buried at Abusir. The reasons why Niuserre’s successor Menkauhor, and following him also Djedkare, left Abusir, the necropolis of their royal predecessors, can only be guessed. Djedkare’s pyramid lies in South Saqqara. Menkauhor’s pyramid has not yet been identified but it certainly was not built in Abusir. According to J. Berlandini, Menkauhor’s pyramid is to be identified with the “Headless Pyramid” (Lepsius no. XXIX) in North Saqqara whereas R. Stadelmann suggested that it should be identified with the ruin of a pyramid (Lepsius L) in Dahshur. Regardless of the site of Menkauhor’s tomb, the reasons for each choice made by these two pharaohs may have been driven by different motivations.

One of the reasons might have been the lack of a convenient place large enough to enable the construction of a pyramid complex at Abusir. As a matter of fact, the pyramids of the first three pharaohs buried at Abusir – Sahure, Neferirkare and Neferefre – were arranged in such a way that the tangential line common to the NW corners of these pyramids was directed towards Heliopolis. It is needless to emphasize that the close links between the pyramids in Giza and Abusir with Heliopolis, the centre of the sun cult, imply serious religious connotations. Moreover, in Abusir the line – a sort of axis made within the Abusir pyramid field – apparently represented the southernmost limit of an area from which a visual connection with the Heliopolis obelisk was still possible. The intention to respect the Abusir pyramid necropolis axis would lead any king following Neferefre far into the desert (almost one kilometre away from the edge of the Nile valley); such a distance would enormously increase any building costs such a pyramid would demand. In order to choose a place for the construction of his pyramid, Niuserre, quite exceptionally and because of practical, but also political reasons, built his pyramid complex next to the unfinished monument of his father Neferirkare.

1 In: REd 31, 1979, 3ff.
2 In: MDAIK 38, 1982, 75ff.
3 Presumably, this line was aimed at the gilded top of the obelisk in the sun temple of Heliopolis. A similar arrangement of pyramids can be observed also in Giza where, however, the tangential line is common to the SE corners of the pyramids. (See H. Goedicke, in: BACE 6, 1995, 33ff.)
5 M. Verner, o.c. 597
Interestingly, the successors of Niuserre did not choose for the construction of their pyramids a large plateau extending south-east of Neferefre’s unfinished pyramid, between the Abusir pyramid field and North Saqqara. This plateau is large enough to take up two or three pyramids. Were they reluctant to use this plateau because it lay off the previously mentioned axis of the Abusir royal necropolis? Was the reason for their reluctance the presence of the surmised natural water basin, the so-called Lake of Abusir extending at the foot of this plateau? Or, were there some important buildings (e.g. the residences of the 5th Dynasty kings?) which might have been built at the edge of the lake?

Of course, there might also have been some other reasons, political or religious, for leaving the Abusir necropolis. For instance, there is so far not available any clear-cut evidence about the direct relationship of Menkauhor and Djedkare and Niuserre. As already mentioned above, Menkauhor’s tomb has not yet been safely identified, and the previous work in both Niuserre’s and Djedkare’s pyramid complex brought no evidence concerning the relationship of these two kings either. Though incomplete and inconclusive, the only evidence pertaining to Niuserre’s family comes from the pyramid complex of Khentkaus II in Abusir, where several fragments of reliefs from a scene of the king’s family were discovered. One of the king’s sons represented in this scene is called Khentykaus. Is it this prince who later became Niuserre’s successor and changed his name to Menkauhor? Finally, some religio-political reasons cannot be excluded, either, considering such events as Djedkare’s decision not to build a sun temple or, the rise of the cult of Osiris at exactly that time.

Nevertheless, the mortuary cults of the kings buried at Abusir do not seem to have been negatively influenced by Menkauhor’s and Djedkare’s decision not to build their pyramids in this cemetery. A mere statistical examination of hundreds of clay sealings found in the mortuary temple of Neferefre and bearing the names of Menkauhor and, especially, Djedkare’s name, indirectly attest the intensity of Neferefre’s cult during the reign of these two kings. The same trend can be seen in the papyri which survived from Neferefre’s mortuary temple archive: papyri, including decrees dating from Djedkare’s time, are more profuse in this period.

The extent of Djedkare’s attention to the mortuary cult of his predecessors in Abusir raises questions as to why it should be this king especially, and why there was such a deep interest in the Abusir cult during his reign. Did the abandonment of the Abusir necropolis lead Djedkare to a profound reorganization of the mortuary cults of his predecessors buried here? Or, did Djedkare need to reinforce his (otherwise weak?) dynastic position by emphasizing his blood links with the kings buried in Abusir?

Some doubts have been expressed about the legitimacy of Djedkare’s claim to the throne. For instance, V. Maragiglio and C. Rinaldi concluded from the magnitude of the pyramid complex in South Saqqara attributed to Djedkare’s anonymous wife, that the king may have owed the throne to his consort. According to A. Fakhry, the excavator of this particular pyramid complex in South Saqqara, some reliefs with the representation of the queen were altered, the texts above the queen’s head had been erased and replaced with vultures and other royal insignia. More recently, P. Jánosi reexamined the plan of the pyramid complex of Djedkare’s consort and came to the conclusion that some of its features – the entrance hall pr wrw, the open courtyard wšt and “antichambre carée”, in particular – are features of a king’s rather than a queen’s mortuary temple. Besides these features, the mere position of the queen’s pyramid, with regard to the king’s pyramid, indicates that the monument was not part of the original project of the king’s funerary complex. The additional changes in the relief decoration, upgrading the social status of the queen, too, point to a posterior rather than a prior date for these changes. The queen might have played an important role under hitherto unclear circumstances following Djedkare’s demise.

6 A lake called by the local people Birket Mokhtar Pasha had existed close to the mouth of Wadi Abusir, separating the cemeteries of South Abusir and North Saqqara, as late as the construction of the Aswan dams. Unfortunately, the precise location of this ancient lake has not yet been identified. The drill cores carried out by British archaeologists within the EES Memphis Project, however, seem to suggest that near the valley temple of Unas in Saqqara and near the Abusir valley temples of Sahure and Niuserre there were in the Early Dynastic/Old Kingdom periods two large lakes separated from each other by a high dry shelf. (See e.g. D. G. Jeffreys et al., in: JEA 83, 1997, 5f.)

7 Verner, Khentkaus, 65f.

8 It seems that in that time the names composed with – kIV-HR were not exceptional in the royal family as shown by the name of Prince Neserkauhor, perhaps a son of Djedkare, buried in the king’s family cemetery in Abusir – see above the chapter on the tomb of Neserkauhor in this volume, pp. 55f.

9 Griffith, Osiris, 41

10 See the preliminary dating of these papyri by P. Posener-Krieger, in: Melanges Mokhtar, 195; id., Dauer und Wandel, 35. Neferefre’s papyrus archive is currently being prepared for press. In Neferirkare’s mortuary temple archive, too, the papyri dating from the time of Djedkare are more prolific than in other reigns, see Posener-Krieger, Les archives, 483-491.

11 L’architettura, 98


13 Fakhry’s personal communication as quoted by Baer, Rank and Title, 298f.

14 MDAIK 45, 1989, 187-202

15 P. Jánosi, Die Pyramidenanlagen 189.
Or, was the move from Abusir an indication that Djedkare wanted to enhance the political position of the monarchy *vis à vis* the priesthood of Re?\(^\text{16}\)

However, the situation could have been quite different from the above considerations after Nisuerre’s death. Menkauhor’s decision – whatever his reasons might have been – to abandon the necropolis in Abusir and build his pyramid complex elsewhere could have had some negative consequences for the economy and operation of the funerary monuments of his predecessors. Though independent as far as the cult was concerned, the pyramid complexes of Neferirkare, Khentkaus II and Neferefre formed in many respects an operational unit with Nisuerre’s pyramid complex. As a matter of fact, the only access to the previously mentioned pyramid complexes from the Nile valley led through Nisuerre’s valley temple. Djedkare’s increased attention to the reorganization of the cults of his probable ancestors buried at Abusir could thus have been the king’s reaction to some practical operational difficulties which might have resulted from Menkauhor’s decision to build his funerary monument elsewhere.

Besides a number of papyri found in Neferirkare’s and Neferefre’s mortuary temples which date from Djedkare’s time, there is yet further evidence of the king’s close link to the Abusir necropolis namely, a cemetery with tombs of less important members of his family. Interestingly, the cemetery – fully published in this monograph – was founded in the plain sloping south-east of Nisuerre’s mortuary temple. It seems that the plain was not quite empty and that some tombs had already been built here prior to Djedkare’s reign. A surface survey indicates that besides the above quoted tomb of Mernefet there are to the north-east and north-west of this tomb, *i.e.* closer to Nisuerre’s causeway, several other as yet unexplored mastabas which were built in limestone and which are larger than the tombs of the members of Djedkare’s family. Some of these so far unexcavated mastabas have, however, been in the meantime covered with massive mounds of debris from Borchart’s earlier excavations in the pyramid complexes of Neferirkare and Nisuerre. On the other hand, some other, and – for the construction of a group of tombs – more convenient parts of the Abusir necropolis (*e.g.* the hillocks in south Abusir) were not chosen as royal burial sites. Therefore, we should admit a hypothesis that the members of Djedkare’s family who built their tombs near Nisuerre’s pyramid temple had a strong personal reason to be buried not only in Abusir but in just this place.\(^\text{17}\)

The fact that a possible tutor of the royal children was buried with the members of Djedkare’s family seems to indicate that a whole, well defined group centred around one part of Djedkare’s family\(^\text{18}\) took the decision to be buried at Abusir. Were they, for example, offspring of a wife of Djedkare’s who came from Nisuerre’s family? Did these children lose their position at the royal court? Or, did they want to distinguish themselves from the queen buried next to Djedkare’s pyramid and therefore they decided not to be buried near the king’s pyramid complex in south Saqqara? Unfortunately, as with so many interesting burials, the archaeological materials revealed so far in Abusir do not answer these questions, nor do they reveal the motivation behind the establishment of this cemetery. This is further reason for our regret that the exploration of Djedkare’s pyramid complex has not yet been completed (the causeway and the valley temple of the king, and the pyramid of the queen were never excavated). Furthermore, the archaeological materials from the earlier excavation of the monument still remain largely unpublished. Until these omissions are rectified, the answers to the many questions we have raised here will never be known.

Importantly in the context of the above unanswered questions, Djedkare’s family cemetery was founded in Abusir relatively late in the king’s reign, judging by the date discovered in the tomb of Idu and discussed in the text above (see p. 68). The date – *rupt (m–)hj sp 17, 3bd 3 hjt, sw 5 “the year after the 17th occasion (of the cattle count), the third month of the inundation season, the 5th day”* – refers to the reign of Djedkare. As a matter of fact, the stratigraphy clearly indicates that Idu’s tomb was built in the cemetery shortly after Khekeretnebty’s and prior to Neserkauhor’s tomb. Moreover, in the latest of the tombs unearthed in the cemetery, that of

\(16\) Djedkare’s decision not to build a sun temple must have had serious consequences pertaining to the royal mortuary cult. According to Ricke (*Baukunst II*, 83f.), from the time of Djedkare onwards there can be seen in the plans of the late 5th and 6th Dynasties mortuary temples a tendency to reintroduce some earlier elements that had been temporarily suppressed in the royal mortuary cult in favour of the emphasis given to sun worship. In the opinion of Baer, (c. 3000 BC), Djedkare also attempted to restore the central position of the king (*see e.g.* Kanawati, *Governmental Reforms*, 15f. and Strudwick, *The Administration*, 340).

\(17\) It is instructive, we think, that the position of Khekeretnebty’s tomb lies approximately in the axis of the pyramid complex of Queen Khentkaus II. Was this famous and revered woman an ancestor of Djedkare’s children?

\(18\) Djedkare had other family members whose burials were not at Abusir. For example, Queen Meresankh IV is thought to be a wife of this king. She is buried in Saqqara (*Mariette, Les mastabas*, 182f.). Furthermore, Prince Raemkuy, who was also buried at Saqqara, close to the tomb of Meresankh, also appears to have been another eldest son of Djedkare (*Hayes, Scepter*, 94–101). A hint of *dammate* is suggested in this burial by the erasure of the original tomb-owner’s name and some titles (*ibid.*, 94)
Lady L, another date was found. The latter date – *rnp* *sp* 3, *ibd* 4 *jhr*, *sw* 11 “the 3rd occasion (of the cattle count), the 4th month of the inundation season, the 11th day” – thus very probably refers to the reign of Unas (see p. 103). Obviously, Djedkare’s family cemetery at Abusir was founded towards the later half

of the king’s reign.19 The tombs in this cemetery must then have been built during a period of between ten and fifteen years, between some time prior to “the year after the 17th cattle count” under Djedkare and some time around the 3rd cattle count of Unas.

19 The available written evidence seems to indicate a long reign for Djedkare. According to the Royal Canon of Turin, the king reigned 28 years; Manetho attributed him a reign of 44 years (see e.g. Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, 435). The recent estimations of Egyptologists concerning the length of Djedkare’s reign range from 29 (W. Barta, *ZAS* 108, 1981, 23) to 38 years (Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 155). The highest contemporaneous chronological evidence for the length of Djedkare’s reign – *rnp* *sp* 21 (22 7), *ibd* 4 *jhr*, *sw* 12-is attested in the papyrus archive of Neferirkare’s mortuary temple (Posener-Krieger, de Cenival, *The Abu Sir Papyri*, pls. 41, 41 A; see also Posener-Krieger, *Les archives, 490). These chronological conclusions are corroborated by the results from the anthropological examination of Djedkare’s skeletal remains, discovered in the king’s pyramid in the mid 1940s by Abdel Salam Hussein and A. Varille. Recently, these remains have been reexamined by E. Strouhal et al. (see *Fs L. Vyhnanek*, in press). The anthropological analysis confirmed the results of an earlier study by A. Batrawi (*ASAE* 47, 1947, 98) concerning the determination of the king’s age: Djedkare died at the age of 50–60 years. The results of this analysis are in harmony with the available dated documents referring to the king’s reign, see M. Verner, in: *ArOr* 69, 2001, 405–410.
9. The Typology of Tombs in Djedkare’s Family Cemetery

One of the questions which remains partly unanswered in connection with this family cemetery of Djedkare within the Abusir necropolis, concerns the extension of the cemetery and the types of tombs discovered in it. To date, there were unearthed and examined six tombs in the cemetery namely, the mastabas of the princess Khekeretnebty and her daughter Tisethor (B), the princess Hedjetnebu (K), the anonymous royal lady (L), the prince, Neserkauhor (C), the scribe of the royal children Idu and his wife Khenit (D) and, finally, the director of the royal palace Mernefu (E). Trial diggings indicated that the tombs of Neserkauhor and Idu formed the southern whereas the tombs of Khekeretnebty and Hedjetnebu formed the western border of the cemetery. Unfortunately, it was not possible to establish such a clear cut border concerning the northern and eastern borders of the cemetery. In the northern direction, the cemetery extends as far as Niuserre’s causeway. To the east, the cemetery extends as far as the edge of the Nile valley. However, judging by the surface survey, the tombs in the two previously mentioned areas do not seem to represent a typologically and chronologically homogenous group. Near Niuserre’s causeway, some tombs, especially those built of limestone, seem to antedate the reign of Djedkare. On the other hand, in the large area between Djedkare’s family cemetery and the edge of the Nile valley small mudbrick tombs, postdating Djedkare’s reign, seem to prevail.

In Djedkare’s family cemetery three types of tombs can be distinguished. The first type is represented by four tombs belonging to members of the royal family - Princess Khekeretnebty, Princess Hedjetnebu, the anonymous royal lady “L” and the prince named Neserkauhor. The second type is represented by the tomb of Mernefu and the third type by the tomb of Idu.

**TYPE I**

Type I, among which all the royal tombs in Djedkare’s family cemetery rank, is a relatively small mastaba whose plan is more or less the same: it is rectangular, orientated in an east-west direction, the proportion between its length and width being cca 3 : 2 (figs. 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4). Moreover, in all the tombs of this type the number and disposition of the rooms in the super- and substructure are the same. Originally, the mastabas were about 3 metres high. The core of the walls is of mudbrick, whereas the casing is built of inferior quality limestone ashlar. The space within the mastaba, among the rooms and the outer walls, was mostly filled with pottery and potsherds.

In the eastern half of the superstructure of these tombs, there are four rooms: a vestibule, a storeroom in the north of the mastaba and an offering room to the south of the vestibule. In the south-east corner of the superstructure, lying south of the offering room, is a serdab.

The substructure consists of a single room, a north-south oriented burial chamber, entered from the north through a vertical shaft. The shaft opens just behind (i.e. to the west of) the storeroom. The burial chamber, connected with the bottom of the shaft by means of a short horizontal passage, thus lies very close to the offering room (almost under the false door embedded in the western wall of the room). A vertical “false shaft” placed in the south-west corner also belongs to the substructure of these tombs.

**The Entrance**

The entrance to the mastaba under discussion lies in the eastern façade of the superstructure, closer to the NE corner (approximately one third of the façade’s...
Fig. 9.1 The tomb of Khekeretnebty
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Fig. 9.6 The tomb of Mernefu
The Vestibule

The vestibule in all these mastabas is a relatively small room of rectangular plan. Unlike the rooms flanking it on the north and the south, the vestibule has an east–west orientation. The exception is Neserkauhor’s mastaba, in which the vestibule has a rectangular plan oriented in a north – south direction.¹ Surprisingly, the axis of the entrance to any of these tombs never coincides with that of the vestibule: it lies either slightly to the south (as in the mastaba of unknown lady “L”) or to the north of the latter (see the mastabas of Khekeretneby, Hedjetnebti and Neserkauhor). The reason for this little anomaly is difficult to explain (see below). Be that as it may, this alignment enabled the artist decorating the tomb to place the figure of the seated Khekeretneby (in the previously mentioned wall painting, or the theoretical place for the unpainted figures of the other tomb owners) in the axis of the entrance, just facing any visitor who entered the vestibule.

The finds made in Khekeretneby’s and Hedjetnebti’s vestibule seem to shed more light on the meaning of this room. A rather sloppily executed painting on the western wall of Khekeretneby’s vestibule represents the scenes with the bringing of offerings to the princess. In the vestibule of Hedjetnebti, on the other hand, there was found a small libation basin in the south-west and a small offering table in the north-west corner of the room. Though different in form, the finds from the two mastabas seem to express one and the same idea, namely, the bringing of offerings to the tomb owner immediately after entering the tomb.

Recently, P. Jánosi² suggested that in the mastabas under discussion, a statue of the tomb owner might have been placed at the western wall of the vestibule. Although it really seems that an offering was brought to the tomb owner just after entering the tomb (see the text above), the concrete architectural and archaeological context, however, does not indicate that a statue stood in the vestibule. In Hedjetnebti’s vestibule, for instance, such a statue could only have been positioned in a restricted place between the libation basin and the offering table (both built of mud). Between these two objects, however, there is in the floor covered with thin layers of mud no trace of any imprint of a pedestal of a statue. Moreover, there would be some problems with the stability of such a statue since the floor in this place is quite irregular – indeed, almost concave. There is still one aspect of the problem which raises a doubt, namely, the aforesaid disharmony between the axis of the entrance with that of the vestibule. As a matter of fact, one would expect the emplacement of the statue to lie in the axis of the entrance. In Khekeretneby’s mastaba, there is in the axis of the entrance the seated figure of the princess painted on the western wall of the vestibule.³ In the latter mastaba, there is no archaeological evidence of any previous presence of a statue of the tomb owner in the vestibule. In addition to that, such a statue standing in front of (and mostly below) the painted seated figure of Khekeretneby would present a rather strange conflict: which of the two would be the primary focus of the visitor’s attention?

The Offering Room

The chamber to the south of the vestibule represented in all examined mastabas the most important place in the superstructure, since it was here that the mortuary cult of the tomb owner took place. The preference for the southern part of the superstructure was historically determined: it was closely linked with the original position of the burial chamber and the main cult place which had traditionally been near the south-east corner of all previous tombs.

Approximately in the middle of the western wall of each of these offering rooms, except for Neserkauhor’s tomb (the false door was in this case set in the western wall of a deep niche in the south-west corner of the room – see above Chap. 2, p. 58 C3.3), there was a niche in which a false door was embedded. Only in Khekeretneby’s mastaba, however, were the remnants of a false door found. The false doors from the remaining mastabas were robbed and disappeared without any trace. Some of them might have been removed relatively early and reused for building purposes, some could have been

---

¹ Was the orientation influenced by the fact that Neserkauhor’s mastaba was the latest of the tombs under discussion and that its plan did not follow as strictly the model of Khekeretneby’s mastaba (see the different plan of the offering room and the absence of the “false” shaft)?
² “Im Schatten der Pyramiden – die Mastabas in Abusir. Einige Beobachtungen zum Grabbau der 5. Dynastie”, in: Bárta, Krejčí, Abusir und Saqqara, 454
³ Was the seated figure of the princess planned from the beginning to lie in the axis of the entrance? If so, it cannot be theoretically excluded that the plan of Khekeretneby’s mastaba might have also influenced those of the tombs of other members of Djedkare’s family built later in this cemetery.
robbed recently for commercial purposes.\textsuperscript{4} Whereas the offering room in the mastabas of Khekeretnebty, Hedjetnebu and the anonymous Lady “L” had a rectangular, north-south oriented plan, Neserkauhor’s offering room had an L-shaped plan.\textsuperscript{5}

Judging by the archaeological finds in Khekeretnebty’s offering room, it seems that the cult was not focused at least in this mastaba – on the false door only. Besides an offering table at the foot of the false door there was at the southern wall of the room, below the slot opening from the adjacent serdab, a low bench. Apparently, on the bench the offerings had once been placed for Khekeretnebty’s statues standing in the serdab.

The offering room of Tiset hor, additionally established in Khekeretnebty’s store-room, is a special case (see above p. 18).

It seems from the above set of information, therefore, that this cemetery of royal relatives and attendants provided several areas within their funerary monument for the sustenance of the \textit{k3} in the Afterlife. The first point of reference was the vestibule, the second the false door, and the third was the serdab emplacement - in Khekeretnebty’s case, very clearly defined. This repeated set of circumstances may reflect the gradually changing emphasis being placed on the funerary cult at this time, with the emergence and strengthening of the Osiris cult.

The Magazine

To the north of the vestibule, more or less in symmetry with the offering room in all examined mastabas of Type I lies a room whose meaning is not obvious at first sight. At least, the archaeological context does not indicate this meaning very clearly.\textsuperscript{6} Regardless of the concrete evidence, however, it seems to be logical to take the room for a magazine in which probably the offerings were kept, before their presentation to the \textit{k3} of the tomb owner in the offering room.

The Serdab

For the serdab, a room in the south-west corner of the superstructure was reserved. Two types of serdab are attested: a relatively narrow room of rectangular plan, oriented in an east-west direction (Khekeretnebty, anonymous Lady “L”) and a small square-shaped room (Hedjetnebu, Neserkauhor). Judging by the archaeological finds made in the serdab in the mastabas of Khekeretnebty, Hedjetnebu and Neserkauhor, it cannot be excluded that the capacity of the room might have been determined in advance by the number and size of the statues to be placed here.

It is very probable that in all the mastabas, the serdab was connected with the offering room by means of a narrow slot, placed high up on the southern wall of the latter room. Owing to the large-scale destruction of the masonry of the mastabas, the existence of such a slot was verified only in Khekeretnebty’s mastaba.

The Burial Shaft

The shaft giving access to the burial chamber is vertical in all four examined mastabas. A short passage leading to the burial chamber opens at the bottom of the shaft, in the southern wall. After the funeral ceremonies, the entrance to the passage was sealed by means of a stone wall. The sealing of the entrance to the burial chamber was obviously accompanied by some sort of ceremony, as indicated by the find of the remnants of an offering of a gazelle foreleg made in Khekeretnebty’s shaft (see p. 19). The shaft’s location immediately to the west of the store-room was determined by the position of the burial chamber and clearly, the intention of the builders was to have the latter as close as possible to the main cult place (false door) in the superstructure.

The Burial Chamber

Though built in the western half of the tomb, the burial chambers lie very close to the centre – in the mastaba of Lady “L” almost exactly under the centre of the superstructure’s base. As mentioned above, this position of the burial chamber clearly reflects the wish of the deceased to rest as close as possible to the place where offerings would be brought.

The burial chambers have a rectangular, north-south oriented plan. Their walls, built of only roughly dressed limestone ashlars, bore in two cases – in the mastabas of Khekeretnebty and Hedjetnebu – the

\textsuperscript{4} Since the tombs were looted repeatedly, and the robbers mostly left no chronologically clearly defined traces, it is difficult to determine accurately the time when the false doors were removed. For instance, the false door of Khekeretnebty seems to have been dismantled in two stages: at an earlier stage, the central part of the door was removed and recently, in about the 1940s, other parts were taken (see p. 18).

\textsuperscript{5} The difference might have been caused by Neserkauhor’s decision to build his tomb in a relatively restricted area in order to make use (obviously, for economic reasons) of the eastern wall of Idu’s tomb and the southern wall of the complex of funerary cult structures in front of Khekeretnebty’s mastaba. The L-shaped plan of Neserkauhor’s offering room may have been inspired by some earlier mastabas either in Giza (see Reisner, \textit{Giza I}, 185) or directly in Abusir (e.g. Kaaper’s tomb in South Abusir has an L-shaped chapel, see Barta, \textit{Abusir South}).

\textsuperscript{6} The origin of the sealings found in this room and in the vestibule of Hedjetnebu’s mastaba is questionable. The sealings might have strayed into these rooms during the robber’s plundering of the burial chamber.
name and title of the tomb owner written in cursive script. In Hedjnetnebu’s burial chamber almost every stone was inscribed with the princess’ name. In Khekeretnebty’s tomb, the name and title of the princess occur on the walls of both the entrance and the burial chamber. Clearly, the ashars were inscribed in situ, during or after the construction of the burial chamber. The tomb owner’s names were in this case no mason’s inscriptions enabling the workers to identify in the quarry or in the building site the addressee of the stone. Rather, the meaning of these inscriptions is to be sought in the field of religion and magic. Inscribed on the walls of the burial chamber, the name – an immortal element of its bearer’s identity – was supposed to enhance the eternal life of the deceased. An emphasis on the name of the deceased was a vital element in the revival of the dead, but in Hedjnetnebu’s case, presents an extreme insistence on this element. Perhaps there was some anxiety felt about the security within this recently abandoned royal cemetery, now that the king had moved elsewhere?

In each example of the Type I mastaba, most of the space within the burial chambers is occupied by a large limestone sarcophagus. Only in Nesperkauhor’s tomb might the deceased have been buried either in a wooden sarcophagus or just wrapped in linen bandages (see above p. 59). The sarcophagi, which were only roughly dressed, were not decorated. They did not contain any inner coffin, either, just the mummy, covered with linen wrappings, was laid in the chest of the sarcophagus. Obviously, the sarcophagi were lowered in position from above during the construction of the mastaba, at the time when the substructure was still open from above. Only in the mastaba of Lady “L” might the sarcophagus have been lowered to its position from the west by means of a ramp.

The burial equipment was placed around and also inside the sarcophagus. As has already been explained (see p. 21), the mere coincidence of lucky circumstances prevented the tomb robbers from taking away all the burial equipment from Khekeretnebty’s sarcophagus chamber. The rest left in situ gives us an idea about the lavishness of the equipment prepared for the princess’s afterlife. Moreover, it also corroborated the theory that individual items of the burial equipment used to be arranged at that time around the sarcophagus according to a certain scheme (for instance, model vessels of alabaster or copper around the northern end of the sarcophagus, etc.).

The Subsidiary Shaft

In three of the mastabas under discussion – those of Khekeretnebty, Hedjnetnebu and Lady “L” – there was in the SW corner of the superstructure a small vertical shaft, the bottom of which lay under the base of the mastaba. Apparently, the shafts were not built just to “relieve” the masonry of the SW corner of the mastabas but, at the same time, to enhance the stability of this part of the monument. Interestingly in this context, in the Anonymous mastaba in front of Niuserre’s mortuary temple, there is a twin shaft in the SW corner of the monument.7 Does this twin shaft reflect the fact that in that tomb there are two burial chambers?

The meaning of the so-called false shafts, however, is not quite clear – probably due to the lack of attention paid by earlier archaeologists to these shafts in other sites. As an example of the aforesaid approach to the problem, we might refer to S. Hassan5 statement, that each of the 250 false shafts he found at Giza was “absolutely empty, except for its filling, which on examination proved to be original, and had not been touched since ancient times”. Nevertheless, Hassan took the false shaft to be a place of refuge for the aah and a counterpart in private tombs of the cult pyramids in royal tombs.

Unfortunately, except for the tomb of Hedjnetnebu all these shafts in the Abusir mastabas under discussion were disturbed by robbers and, therefore, no definite conclusions are possible. However, the finds made in Hedjnetnebu’s mastaba may suggest that in these shafts some remnants left either after mumification or funerary ceremonies (some of which could have taken place on the roof terrace of the mastaba6) could have been buried (see p. 93).

Regarding these false shafts at Abusir, however, two items are worthy of mention. The first is that each of these shafts lies in alignment with the tomb’s serdab, in a manner that imitates the position of the burial shaft in relation to the burial chamber. Can we, therefore, assume that it might, in this case, be a duplicate burial provision, with the cult figure (the so-called k3 – statue) representing the tomb owner in the same way that the mumified body did within the burial chamber? The second item worthy of mention is that within Princess Hedjnetnebu’s false shaft, as well as that of Lady “L” (see the main reports for the details of food and vessels), bones of

---

7 Borchardt, Ne-user-re, 116ff. and pl. 21
8 Excavations at Giza. 1932–1933, IV, 1943, 95ff.
9 As indicated, for instance, by the remnants of a ramp leading to the roof terrace of the Dahshur mastaba of Prince Netjeraperef, see N. Alexanian, Dachschur II, mastaba no. 1, p. 36ff.
animals, beer jugs, miniature pottery vessels and other offering items were discovered. This might suggest that either some sort of funerary meal might have been left in the burial chamber itself, or, that it might have been a testament to the practice of leaving a final offering partway down the burial shaft.\textsuperscript{10}

Generally speaking, the above-mentioned Type I does not seem to be very common either in the Memphis necropolis or elsewhere. In the Abusir cemetery, a parallel of sorts can be seen in the mastaba of Djadjamankh dating from the late 5\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty.\textsuperscript{11} The superstructure of the latter tomb also involves a centrally placed vestibule flanked on each side by a room - one was an offering room for the tomb owner, the other one served as an offering room for the tomb owner's wife. The tomb has also two serdabs and two burial chambers. Moreover, the vestibule and the two offering rooms are oriented in an E/W direction, as are the tombs in Djedkare's family cemetery. Another parallel can be seen in the Anonymous mastaba excavated in Tell Edfu and dating from either the late 5\textsuperscript{th} or early 6\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty.\textsuperscript{12}

In this tomb, the vestibule, with an uninscribed stela set in the western wall, is flanked on each side by a room without any entrance (serdabs (?); as a matter of fact, there are two burial chambers in the tomb's underground).

The mastabas of Type I in Djedkare's family cemetery in Abusir thus seem to have been built according to an original plan designed specifically for the less important members of the king's family who were to be buried at Abusir. It cannot be excluded that their plan might have been inspired by that of the old cruciform chapel (sometimes with a serdab south of the chapel) of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 4\textsuperscript{th} Dynasties in Saqqara and Giza.\textsuperscript{13}

**TYPE II**

Type II in Djedkare's family cemetery in Abusir is represented by only one mastaba namely, that of Idu and his wife Khenit (fig. 9.5). Although slightly posterior to the tombs of Khékeretnebty and Hedjetnebwy and a little anterior to those of Nesperkahuor and Lady "L", the mastaba of Idu and Khenit belongs practically to the same chronological horizon as all these mastabas. Its masonry type does not differ essentially from the previously mentioned tombs. What differs, however, is the plan of Idu's mastaba, which may reflect the non-royal status of the tomb owner compared with that of the members of Djedkare's family.

The mastaba of Idu and Khenit also has a rectangular, N/S oriented plan. Its superstructure comprises a plain, N/S oriented interior corridor chapel. The chapel, entered from the east at the southern end and extending along the major portion of the eastern façade of the tomb, has two false doors embedded in its western wall. Originally, it was planned to have only one burial chamber (Idu's) and one relevant false door.\textsuperscript{14}

**TYPE III**

Type III is, like Type II, represented in Djedkare's family cemetery in Abusir by only one example: the mastaba of Mernef\textsuperscript{u} (fig. 9.6.) The mastaba's superstructure, in fact, contains no chapel. Instead, it only has a deep niche in its eastern façade, near the SE corner. A rectangular stone slab, with a rounded offering table rising from its upper surface, only emphasizes the meaning of the niche as the main cult place in the tomb. Behind the niche, there is a serdab. The tomb has only one burial chamber and there is no "false shaft" in its SW corner. It cannot be excluded that around the niche a small exterior chapel of mudbrick could additionally have been built. Unfortunately, the area east of the niche could not be excavated because of technical reasons.

Typologically, the mastaba ranks among relatively numerous monuments which have only one or, more frequently, two niches in their eastern façade.\textsuperscript{15} However, the absence of the false door, once set in the western wall of the niche and later removed by stone robbers, makes the exact dating of the tomb more difficult. Both stratigraphically and typologically, Mernef\textsuperscript{u}'s tomb appears to be earlier than

---

\textsuperscript{10} See, for example, the burial shaft of Queen Hetepheres I in G 7000x (Reisner, Smith, Giza II, 13), or the recently discovered shafts in the Qar complex at South Abusir (see M. Bártta, KMT 13/1 (Spring 2002), 27).

\textsuperscript{11} Borchardt, Ne-user-re, 117ff. and pl. 23

\textsuperscript{12} Alliot, Tell Edfou, 28-41 and pl. 39

\textsuperscript{13} See e.g. the chapels of Khabausokar (Mariette, Mastabas, no. A 2; FS 3073) or Mefjen (LD Text I, 142) in Saqqara. This type of chapel is also attested from the 4\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty e.g. in Giza (Reisner, Giza I, 247ff.), Meidum (Petrie, Meidum, pl. VII) or Abusir (Bártta, Abusir South I, 5f. and fig. 1.2).

\textsuperscript{14} In principle, the plan of the chapel corresponds with Type 5a identified by G. A. Reisner in the tombs in the Giza necropolis. (Reisner, Giza I, 1942, 185). In order to accommodate the burial of Idu's wife Khenit, the southern part of the mastaba has additionally been profoundly rebuilt. After the reconstruction, the mastaba substructure was provided in the substructure with another descending shaft and burial chamber and in the superstructure, at the southern end of the corridor, Khenit's false door was added. Eventually, the reconstruction thus resulted in a completely atypical plan for this mastaba.

\textsuperscript{15} See e.g. Reisner, o. c. passim. In the Abusir necropolis, such a type is represented e.g. by the previously mentioned "Anonymous mastaba", dating from the early 5\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty, excavated by L. Borchardt (Ne-user-re, 116ff. and pl. 21) in front of Niuserre's mortuary temple.
CONCLUSIONS

Summing up these features noticed so far, we may remark that although the Type I mastaba designed for members of Djedkare’s family is the most common design in this small cemetery, it is not frequently encountered, either in the Memphite necropolis or elsewhere. In the Abusir cemetery itself – a place where we would expect to find several parallels at least – only the 5th Dynasty mastaba of Djedjaemankh can be found – and that seems to have been an earlier model for the semi-royal tombs here. Elsewhere, only the late 5th or 6th Dynasty “Anonymous mastaba” excavated in Tell Edfu (see above n. 12) stands as an example of this rare type of tomb, and that monument was designed for a double burial, which the royal tombs were not. Moreover, it is possible that the plan evolved here might not have been totally original, but may have been inspired by the old cruciform chapel of the 3rd and 4th Dynasty originating in the other Memphite cemeteries.

Each of the other types of tomb (Types II and III) in Djedkare’s family cemetery in Abusir is represented by only one mastaba. While its masonry is similar to those royal tombs, however, its plan is strikingly different. This fact might have been an indicator that the people buried there were of non-royal status. In this respect, the tombs of this cemetery are noticeably different from the cemetery groups that are found in Khufu’s Western Cemetery, for in that place, non-royal persons occupied tombs of identical structure to those of the princes and princesses also buried there. Does this contradictory state imply that the social ranking of royal children was seen to be more elevated in the 5th Dynasty than it was in the 4th Dynasty? Or, does it suggest that, when Khufu’s architects laid out the basic forms for tombs in which his descendants were to be buried, the king envisaged a cemetery of his descendants extending into many more generations than they may have actually achieved?

In regard to Mernefū’s mastaba, we remark again on the absence of a chapel proper, and its closer affinity to the type of tomb which has only one or, more frequently, two niches in its eastern façade. Once again, there is a single prototype for the 5th Dynasty at Abusir, the “Anonymous” mastaba discovered by Borchartd in front of Niuserre’s mortuary temple, though we note that the exact date for this tomb remains problematic.

Unlike the tombs in Giza’s Western Cemetery, therefore, there is some dissimilarity within the cemetery of Djedkare’s children at Abusir. Very clearly, this was due to the inclusion of two middle-ranking officials of the palace having been buried in that place. Given that Mernefū’s burial was the first tomb to be erected there, we cannot just suppose that this was a group of persons who had an intimate acquaintance with the royal children and desired to be buried with their royal patrons, though it is likely that this was the case.

There yet remains an alternative reason for the additional burials of these royal children here at Abusir: that this was perhaps the last vacant area adjacent to the family of Niuserre that remained in the cemetery. Djedkare’s choice of this particular burial ground may have been because of links to Niuserre’s family – maybe to one of the queens whose pyramids lie so close to this little cemetery. Perhaps either he or his earlier wife could have been related to those royal ancestors. If that were the case, we might suspect that Mernefū (at least) could have had a similar reason for erecting his tomb on the outskirts of that royal necropolis, particularly if he had once provided services to that royal family, as well as the family of Djedkare. We might note in passing, that in Idu’s case, the service to that royal family was evident in the erased inscription still present on his sarcophagus, for he was a mortuary priest for both Neferikare and the grand matriarch of that branch of the royal family, Khenktaus II.

---

16 M. Mostafa, _Opfergaben_, 98ff.
17 However, many tombs in the Abusir pyramid field yet remain unexcavated, for instance those lying east and south-east of Neferikare’s mortuary temple and south of Neferefre’s mortuary temple.
18 The cores of the mastabas were evidently provided by the king, and it was up to the tomb owner (or the bureaucracy?) to complete the structure. It may be this factor which resulted in the tomb types being identical for royal and non-royal individuals in the Western Cemetery.
10 Anthropological Evaluation of the Human Skeletal Remains from the Mastabas of Djedkare Isesi’s Family Cemetery at Abusir

EUGEN STROUHAL
(with contributions by Přemysl Klír and Alena Němečková)

INTRODUCTION
It would be ideal if each of the above-mentioned investigated mastabas contained physical remains of its proprietor(s). Contemporary physical anthropology together with palaeopathology is able to identify skeletal remains of historical persons found in excavated graves as e.g. Queen Mutnodjmet (Strouhal 1982, Strouhal and Callender 1993), extremely fragmentary remains of Maya and his family members (Strouhal 1992b, Strouhal 2001) or a mere handful of bones of Neferefre found in his pyramid (Strouhal 2000, Strouhal et al. 2001). Moreover, such studies can add valuable details to their life stories concerning lifespan, physical status, particular kind of activity or state of health. In some examples such data may explain even recorded behaviour or historical deeds of these persons.

In the instance of mastabas from Djedkare Isesi’s cemetery at Abusir this was, unfortunately, not the case, due to destruction caused by tomb robbers. Only in four of the six mastabas human skeletal remains survived. According to a check of their bone inventories they could be attributed to five individuals.

Four of them were already described in anthropological papers containing all necessary technical details (Strouhal 1984, 1992a, Strouhal and Gaballah 1993). The main facts on them will be, therefore, only summarized in the following chapters together with the data on the fifth person, Idu, which were not yet published. The aim of this chapter is to prove or disprove their mutual blood relationship and thus to support the concept of a family cemetery, one of the most ancient revealed up to date. Regretably, no bones of Prince Neserkauhor and the official Mernefu remained in their mastabas.

INITIAL SITUATION AND STATE OF PRESERVATION OF SKELETAL REMAINS

Khekeretneby
In Mastaba B human remains of an adult person were found in the main burial chamber and at the bottom of adjoining shaft no. 1. These could be the skeletal remains of the proprietor of the mastaba attested epigraphically, Princess Khekeretneby. Originally her mummy was laid into the sarcophagus in whose southern end the robbers chiselled out a round hole, pulled out the mummy, and having torn it to pieces while robbing it, they threw her skeletal parts aside. The skull, mandible, five cervical and two thoracic vertebrae and some small bones of the hands were found on the floor of the burial chamber near the hole in the sarcophagus. The long bones of both arms were displaced on the southern end of the sarcophagus lid. Fragments of scapulae, two lumbar vertebrae, the upper anterior part of the left acetabulum and bones of the right leg were drawn to the bottom of the shaft, near the entrance of the corridor leading to the burial chamber. No bones of a left leg or other parts of the pelvis were found, being presumably completely destroyed by the robbers.

Some of the bones still retained tiny remnants of soft tissues, but no resinous coating was applied to them which might explain the reason why the mummy decayed into a skeletonized state.

Many strips of fine linen wrappings were scattered around the sarcophagus and at the bottom of the shaft. On one piece, a short semi-hieratic inscription
recalled the name and title of the man responsible for the production of the wrappings, but not the name of the princess.

**Tisethor**

Skeletal remains of another juvenile person were found still more widely dispersed by robbers. Parts of legs, the distal third of the right radius and the proximal epiphysis of the left humerus were buried in the sand deposits of the offering chapels no. 1 and 3. Fragments of a skull and most of the remaining parts of the postcraniul skeleton, together with the remains of wrappings, were accumulated at the bottom of shaft no. 2, to where they had been pulled out by robbers from the adjoining burial chamber no. 2, itself completely devoid of human remains.

All the bones are ochre coloured, smooth and without any traces of soft tissues. They revealed the same stage of onatogenetic development and no bone occurred twice, representing one and the same individual. Their accumulation in shaft no. 2 indicated that they belonged to a second occupant of the tomb attested epigraphically, Tisethor, for whom the mastaba was enlarged.

**Hedjetnebu**

In Mastaba K a skull, slightly damaged mandible, all cervical and 7 thoracic vertebrae, 15 fragments of ribs, the right clavicle, both scapulae, both humeri, the right ilium, both femora and both tibiae and right fibula were lying at the bottom of the main shaft of the mastaba in front of the entrance into the burial chamber, where they were pulled out from the chamber itself. Their state of preservation was mostly defective, partly fragmentary.

**Lady L**

Mastaba L remains nameless. The skeleton of the person buried there in the burial chamber was thrown out by the robbers from the sarcophagus under its northern end, where it was later covered by accumulated sand. A well preserved skull with its mandible and most of the postcraniul bones, partly defective, survived. They are ochre, almost yellowish in colour, devoid of soft tissues or remains of wrappings.

**Idu**

In the burial chamber of Mastaba D, a heap of disarticulated bones were found in a layer of yellowish sand under the southern end of the sarcophagus, from which the body had been disinterred by robbers. There was a complete skull with mandible, two ribs, most of the vertebræ, the body of the fifth sacral segment, the manubrium sterni, the lateral quarter of the right clavicle, lateral thirds of both scapulae, complete arms except the left ulna, and complete legs.

**Secondary burials**

Besides the described original 5th Dynasty burials, also nine secondary burials of the Late to Ptolemaic Periods were found in different stratigraphic positions in the mastabas. These were the skeletal remains of two males (30–40 and 35–45 year old) and two children (5.5–6.5 and 7–8 year old), besides a not yet investigated mummy in Mastaba K (of Hedjetnebu). Two 30–40 year old males and a 6–7 year old child were unearthed in Mastaba L (anonymous) and another 30–40 year old male in Mastaba D (of Idu). They will be dealt with as part of the publication of the secondary cemetery at the South Field of Abusir (in preparation).

**DEMOGRAPHIC DATA**

**Khékeretneby (Pl. XXV)**

**Age.** All the bones are of an adult individual. Its cranial sutures are externally open except the starting fusion in the lateral thirds of the coronal suture. Third molars are erupted and show the start of abrasion of dentine (the upper left one was lost post-mortem and the lower left one ante-mortem). First molars and lower second molars (upper ones lost post-mortem) show deep abrasion of dentine with remnants of enamel. Both upper second premolars were lost ante-mortem and their sockets closed. The left upper first incisor has a moderate abrasion of dentine. Other teeth are missing post-mortem. The cause of the ante-mortem loss of teeth was most probably caries, as abrasion did not reach the status of pulp exposure in any of the preserved teeth, nor are there signs of paradontopathy. There is only a slight retraction of the alveolar processes.

An incipient diffuse osteoporosis can be detected on the radiograms of the postcranial bones. No degenerative arthritis had started in any joint. The skeleton belonged to a 30–35 year old individual.

**Sex.** The skull and mandible are gracile and have accentuated feminine features. The whole skeleton, especially the arm bones, are extremely gracile, with only slightly developed muscular relief, and the circumferential and diameter measurements show very low values. Her stature, reconstructed according to tables of Trotter and Gleser (1952) for black females (whose proportions suit better to the Ancient Egyptian ones than proportions of white females according to Robins 1983 or Strouhal and Jungwirth 1984), was 155.8 cm, situated near the average for Ancient Egyptian females–155 cm. In spite of the lack of the pelvis, her female sex appears unequivocal.

**Tisethor (Pl. XXVI)**

**Age.** The development of the skeletal and dental systems was unfinished. The synchondrosis spheno-
occipitalis is widely open. In the erupted permanent dentition, second molars reach occlusal level, but their roots are still open, not attaining their final length. The developing third molars are deeply embedded inside the alveolar processes except for the right lower one showing just an incipient stage of eruption. Their roots are widely open and only 3 mm long. Tooth abrasion concerns only on the enamel.

Epiphyses and apophyses of the postcranial bones are not yet fused with their respective diaphyses, except for lateral and medial epicondyl of the humeri (the latter ones still retaining fissures after fusion) and distal humeral as well as proximal epiphyses of antebrachial bones. The hip bones show their components already fused in the acetabulum, but the preserved sacral segments S3–S5 are still free. For a female the age corresponds to 15–16 years.

Sex. The small and gracile skull shows feminine secondary sexual features. The postcranial skeleton is very gracile with low circumferences and diameters, and the muscular relief only incipient. The pelvic apophyses are feeble, the incisura ischiadica major forms a medium-large vaulted arch, the sulcus praearicularis had not yet developed. Stature assessed by diaphyseal length of the left femur using the table by Stewart (Olivier 1960: 259) was determined as 151.3 cm, a value below the female average, in harmony with her still unfinished growth. In spite of the juvenile age the sex appears most probably female.

Hedjetnebu (Pl. XXVII)

Age. The synchondrosis sphen-occipitalis is closed, with traces of a recent fusion. All cranial sutures are externally open. The completely preserved and fully erupted permanent dentition shows only slight abrasion of the enamel, except for the exposure of small spots of dentine on the first molars. All third molars are hypodontic (germs genetically missing) as confirmed by X-rays. No dental pathology intervened and retraction of the alveolar margin only started (stage 1 of Brothwell 1972).

Most of the epiphyses and apophyses of the postcranial bones are fused except for the epiphyses of the clavicles. Traces of recent union can be observed on the apophyseal plates of the cervical vertebrae, on the heads of the humeri and femora and on the distal epiphysis of the right fibula. No traces of spinal osteophytosis or degenerative arthritis can be detected. For a female, the age can be estimated as 18–19 years.

Sex. The skull is gracile and small with clearly feminine secondary sexual features. The postcranial skeleton, especially the bones of the lower extremities, are very gracile with low values of circumferences and diameters. The muscular relief is developed only slightly. The incisura ischiadica major is large. There is no sulcus praearicularis (indicating that the person did not bear a child). The reconstructed stature was 152 cm, being below the Egyptian female average. The sex of the individual was most probably female.

Lady L (Pl. XXVIII)

Age. The synchondrosis sphen-occipitalis is closed. Viewed externally, the coronal, sagittal and most of the left half of the lambdoid suture are fused, while the fusion just started in the right half of the latter. Of the fully erupted dentition the upper right and all lower second and third molars as well as the right lower first molar were lost intra-vitam, several other teeth post-mortem. Abrasion of the remaining teeth is very progressed, reaching deep into dentine, with the maximum on both upper first premolars and the left upper M1 (up to their necks). Retraction of the alveolar process is of stage 3 of Brothwell (1972) and partial atrophy of both jaws can be observed in the areas of M2-3. A medium degree of dental calculus (stage 2 of Brothwell 1972) is present on the preserved lower teeth. The posterior surface of the left mandibular condyle bears degenerative arthritic changes.

The epiphyses and apophyses of the postcranial bones are fused. The symphysis pubica is flat, with irregular edges and partly eroded (stage 10 of Todd 1920). Osteophytosis of the spine is progressed (osteophytes 3 mm and more long, but not overbridging). It is most massive on the right anterolateral edges of T10-11, as well as on the left upper lateral edge of L2. The cranial terminal plate of L2 is 5 mm depressed as a result of a compressive fracture. Eight intervertebral joints are affected with spondylarthris. Age at death points to 50–60 years.

Sex. The skull is medium robust and slightly bigger than the previous ones, but its secondary sexual features are clearly feminine. The postcranial skeleton is moderately robust with medium values of circumferences and diameters. Muscular relief is medium to well developed. The pelvis has medium developed apophyses, a large incisura ischiadica major, a deep and large sulcus praearicularis (suggesting several child-births), a small triangular foramen obturatum and a large subpubic angle. The reconstructed stature was 156.5 cm, slightly above the Egyptian female average. The female sex is unequivocal.

Idu (Pl. XXIX)

Age. The synchondrosis sphen-occipitalis is closed. The cranial sutures are externally open. The dentition is complete, except for the hypodontic third molars. Some of the upper frontal teeth are missing post-
mortem. The preserved teeth are affected with progressive abrasion of dentine, some with remnants of enamel, other without it. Both upper M_1 show attrition to the crown-neck border which caused an opening of the pulpar cavity and development of periapical abscesses opening on the buccal sides. Around the apex of the root of lower I_1 whose abrasion reached to half of the crown, a large cyst (diam. 8–10 mm) developed, open labially (Plate XXX:C). No caries could be detected. Alveolar retraction is relatively small (grade 1–2 of Brothwell) and no calculus accumulated.

The facies symphysialis resembles stage 7 in Todd (1920). The proximal ends of humeri and femora show no ageing changes described by Hansen (1953/54). The vertebrae have osteophytes around 3 mm in length. Spondylarthritis had developed in one cervical joint, on the cervico-thoracic transition and in 6 thoracic joints. Of the big joints, degenerative gonarthritis is apparent on the femoral condyles of both sides (Pl.XXX:D) as broad lipping (8–12 mm), erosion and formation of a patch of newly formed bone (A–P 17 mm, transv. 7 mm, thickness 2 mm). It is present also on the patellae (lipping 2–5 mm), which are of the patella bipartita type (congenital anomaly, Pl.XXX:D). Age at death was in the interval of 35–45 years.

**Sex.** The skull is robust and large. All secondary sexual features point to the male side, as the very prominent glabella, oblique forehead, extremely thick and broad mastoid processes, or the medium developed nuchal muscular relief indicate. The postcraniar skeleton is robust, the development of muscular relief medium to strong. The reconstructed stature was 170.6 cm, well above the Ancient Egyptian male average (165 cm). The male sex appears to be unequivocal.

**MUMMIFICATION**

The mumification of all five individuals consisted only in desiccation of the bodies and their wrapping in copious strips of bandages which were found near them. In any case, no resin was used. The bones were of ochre colour, in Lady L ochre-whitish. According to the untouched state of the nasal cavities and ethmoid bones in all individuals, no brain removal was performed. This was corroborated by the finding of remnants of dessicated brain tissue in cranial cavities of Khekeretnebyt (Němečková 1984) and Hedjetnebu (Němečková 1992) (see further p. 130).

**CRANIMETRIC COMPARISON BETWEEN THE FEMALES**

**Cerebral skull** (Tabs. 1–2)

The cerebral part of the skull in Khekeretnebyt (further KH) and Hedjetnebu (HE) is 5 mm shorter than that of Tisethor (TI) and Lady L (LL). LL shows the broadest skull, TI and HE a medium broad one and KH a narrower one. Expressed as cranial indices, KH and TI were mesocranic, HE slightly and LL more brachyocranic.

At the same time, KH shows a higher braincase while HE and LL lower ones (TI’s basion-bregma

---

**Table 1 Measurements of the skull**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>KH</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Max. length of the skull</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>177?</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Length of the cranial base</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Length of the foramen magnum</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Max. breadth of the skull</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Minim. frontal breadth</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91?</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Maximum frontal breadth</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Breadth of the foramen magnum</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Basion-bregma height</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Horizontal circumference</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Transverse curve</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>295?</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sagittal curve</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Length of the face</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Bi orbital breadth</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Bizygomatic breadth</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>f17?</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Height of the face</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>102?</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Height of the upper face</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
height reconstructed according to her porion-bregma height (104 mm) was probably identical to HE’s value. Height indices are hypsocranic and metriocranic in KH, while on the border of chamaericanic and orthocranic categories as well as tapeinocranic in HE, LL and probably also TI.

The minimum frontal breadth is similar in all females (only slightly higher in HE). The frontoparietal index is metriometopic in KH and HE, while stenometopic in the other two (slightly in TI, more in LL).

The horizontal circumference is small in all of them (in ascending order from HE through KH to LL, TI’s measurement lacking). The transverse curves in all females are almost identically small and sagittal curves are also small (in ascending order from HE and KH to LL, TI’s value lacking).

The cranial modulus shows low values in ascending order from HE through KH and TI to LL.

Strikingly identical is also the length of the skull base (TI’s measurement lacking).

**Facial skull** (Tabs. 1–2)

The facial measurements of KH, TI and HE show great similarity, with the exception of heights, which are still lower in TI because of her adolescent age. By contrast, the face of LL is definitely longer and narrower, higher in its upper part. The height of her whole face appears identical as in KH because of the greater teeth abrasion of LL. LL’s orbital and nasal openings are larger and her maxilla longer and narrower than identical measurements of the others. The facial modulus is low and similar with an ascending order of HE, LL and KH (TI’s value is lacking).

This is reflected in the values of pertaining indices, leptoprosope and lepten in KH and HE, mesoprosope and mesen in TI, but hyperleptoprosope...
and hyperlept in LL. The orbital index is hypsiconchic in all four, ascending from KH through TI and HE to LL. While KH and HE are leptorrhinous, TI and LL are slightly mesorrhinous. Most variable is the maxilloalveolar index due to the summation of individual and age differences – still strongly brachyuranic in TI, less so in HE, mesuranic in KH and dolichuranic in LL. In gnathic index, HE and KH are orthognathous, LL slightly prognathous.

**Mandible** (Tab. 3)

Of the measurements, length is similar in all females. The bicondylar breadth of KH is larger than that of HE and LL, while still lower in TI. The bigonial breadth is almost identical in the females except for the strikingly lower value of HE. All heights are very similar in them except for the smaller values of the adolescent TI. The thickness of the body is also similar except for a smaller value in HE. The breadth of the ramus is also similar in them except for a slightly larger value in TI. The mandibular angle is close in all the females in ascending order from HE through TI and KH to LL.

These differences are reflected in the indices. The breadth-length index is similar in HE and LL, being lower in KH, but slightly higher in TI. The index of thickness of the mandibular body is but variable, high in the juvenile TI, followed by LL, low in gracile KH and HE. The ascending ramus index is high in TI and similarly lower in the three adult females.

**Distance between the females**

The analysis of craniometrics showed the striking similarity of the three adult females with slight deviations for TI, due mostly to her adolescent age with incomplete growth and teeth eruption. In order to establish the mutual relations between the mentioned persons, a set of 39 craniometric dimensions recordable in all four skulls (excluding the mandibular angle) was analysed by a simple procedure using mean distance (MD), based on the differences between these measurements in pairs of skulls (d_{i,j}) which were squared, their sum divided by n (39) and the root extracted.

The least mean distance was found between KH and HE (3.5 mm). Only a slightly greater distance resulted between KH and TI (3.6 mm). On the other hand, the distance of TI was bigger from HE (4.5 mm). Most distant proved to be LL, either from HE (4.1 mm), or KH (4.4 mm), or TI (4.8 mm).

On the basis of cranionmetry, the two adult females, KH and HE, buried in adjoining mastabas, as well as the adult KH and the juvenile TI, buried in the same mastaba, proved to be mutually the closest. Their blood relationship is the appropriate explanation. They belonged most probably to one and the same nuclear family.

On the other hand, LL, buried in another row of mastabas, east-north of mastaba of HE, appears more distant, belonging most probably to a different lineage of the same extended family.

**OSTEOMETRIC COMPARISON BETWEEN THE FEMALES**

**Spine** (Tab. 4)

Only a few vertebrae were preserved in more than two or more of the compared females. Thus ventral vertical diameters are similar in vertebrae C2,A,6 and T6. The differentiation of the smaller (more gracile) vertebrae of the juvenile TI and the bigger, more robust ones of the adults HE and LL is apparent in T2. Moreover, L1,3 are bigger in LL than in KH.

**Upper extremities** (Tab. 5)

The clavicle is longest in HE, followed by LL, shorter in KH and shortest in TI, in which epiphysis was not yet fused. Its circumference is slightly bigger in LL and HE than in KH and TI. The length-thickness index proves the greater robusticity of LL compared with the other females with mutually close values (in TI the value would be smaller after fusion).
The humerus is longer in LL than HE (values for KH and TI missing). The minimum circumference of the diaphysis forms an ascending row from KH and TI to HE and LL. The same appears for the circumference of the caput (value for KH missing). The length-thickness index lies near in HE and LL (values for KH and LL missing).

The radius (missing in HE) is only slightly longer in LL than KH (value for TI lacking). There is but a significant distinction between the high minimum circumference of the diaphysis of LL and similarly low values of KH and TI, well reflected in the length-thickness index.

The ulna (missing in HE and TI) is longer in LL than KH, the difference between them in minimum circumference and length-thickness index being still more accentuated.

**Lower extremities** (Tab. 6)

The femoral length is similar in KH and LL, being shorter in HE and TI (diaphysial length). The sagittal diameter in the middle of the diaphysis and upper transversal diameter are also similar in KH and LL, being smaller in TI and HE. The transversal diameter in the middle of the diaphysis and the upper sagittal diameter of the diaphysis are similar or identical with the three adult persons, being smaller in TI. The circumference of the caput is similar in KH and LL and only slightly smaller in HE (missing in TI). The index of the middle diaphyseal section is variable in the ascending order of LL, HE, KH and TI. On the other hand, the index of the upper diaphyseal section shows a descending order from HE, LL (platymery) to KH and TI (hyperplatymery). The robusticity index of the caput is mutually more similar, yielding the same descending order HE, LL and KH (missing in TI).

The tibial length and its length-breadth index survived only in HE and as diaphyseal values in TI and cannot be, therefore, compared. At the foramen nutricium, the maximum diameter is greater in KH and LL than the similar values of TI and HE, while the transversal diameter forms a descending row from LL through TI and HE to KH. The resulting cnemic index is highest in TI and LL on the left side, lower in HE and LL on the right side and extremely low (hyperplatymery) in KH (right side). The minimum circumference of the diaphysis is larger in KH and LL than in HE and TI.

Measurements of the coxal bone and fibula are too few and cannot be compared. They were omitted also in the table.

Thus, in the postcranial measurements KH shows together with LL higher values than HE and TI. This reflects most probably their age differences (35–40 and 50–60 years in the former versus 18–19 and 15–16 years in the latter).

**CRANIOMETRY AND OSTEOMETRY OF IDU**

The measurements and indices of Idu, the only male whose skeleton was excavated in Djedkare’s family cemetery, can be compared with the values of the four above-mentioned females (Tabs. 1–4).

As expected with a male, almost all measurements are bigger than those of the females with only a few exceptions (length of foramen magnum, length of the face, thickness of the mandibular body same as with LL while the maximum breadth of the neurocranium
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Measurement / Index</th>
<th>KH</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Femur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maximum length</td>
<td>-422</td>
<td></td>
<td>-406</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>840/479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>L in natural posit.</td>
<td>-417</td>
<td></td>
<td>-404</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>748/477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sag. dm. of dia.</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Transv. dm. of dia.</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Upper trans. dm. dia.</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26/25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Upper sag. dm. dia.</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cf. of the caput</td>
<td>-126</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>143/142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robusticity i.1</td>
<td>-11.0</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. mid-diaph. sect.2</td>
<td>-109.1</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>93.5/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. upper diaph. sect.3</td>
<td>-72.4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80.8/84</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73.5/70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robust. i. of caput(^4)</td>
<td>-29.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>-30.4</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>29.9/29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Whole length</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(275)</td>
<td>(274)</td>
<td>-/350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>Max. diam. at f.nutr.</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>25/26</td>
<td>25/26</td>
<td>29/30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>Transv. diam. ibidem</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>17/18</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>20/19</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b</td>
<td>Minim. cf. of diaph.</td>
<td>-63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length-thickn. i. (10b:1)</td>
<td>(20.1)</td>
<td>(19.6)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-17.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cnemic i. (9a:8a)</td>
<td>-51.6</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>64/65.4</td>
<td>69/63.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Measurements and indices of lower extremity bones.

Explanations for tables 5 and 6:
Value left/value right, one value = identical on both sides
L = length, thick. = thickness, sag. = sagittal, transv. = transversal, dm. = diameter, diaph. or dia. = diaphysis, sect. = section, robust. = robusticity, max. = maximum, minim. = minimum.

1 nos. 6 plus 7 multiplied by 100, divided by no.2
2 no.6 multiplied by 100, divided by no.7
3 no.10 multiplied by 100, divided by no.9
4 no.20 multiplied by 100, divided by no.2
\(^1\) diaphyseal values are in brackets

even slightly smaller than with LL). On the other hand, also as expected, the mandibular angle is smaller than in the females and the length of the pubis is smaller than in LL.

In both cranial and facial moduli the much more voluminous size of the skull than that of the females is most obviously evident.

In cranial indices, some morphological aberrations of Idu compared with the females are apparent. His braincase is dolichocranic, chamaericanic and metriocranic, forehead metriometopic, face hyperleptoprosopic, hyperlepten and orthognathous, orbits hypsiconchic, nose hyperleptorrhin, upper jaw mesurancic, mandible relatively broader than longer.

In postcranial indices (tab. 5–6), the length-thickness indices of the humeri and robusticity indices of the femora are bigger than in the females; other indices range among the values of the females.

We may conclude that metrically, Idu does not reveal similarity to any of the four females.

**COMPARISON OF EPIDEMIC FEATURES**

For comparison of epigenetic features of the analyzed individuals, 18 features from those described by Berry and Berry (1967) were used (nos. 2–14, 18, 23, 24, 26 and 27). They were complemented by 3 additional cranial features (os japonicum, os inca, the remnant of the glabellar suture), one dental feature (hypodontic third molar) and six postcranial features (bifidity of cervical vertebrae, accessory opening at foramen transversale of second, fourth and sixth cervical vertebra, humeral perforation and squatting facets of tibiae). The epigenetic features of the four females were already published previously (Strouhal 1992 a). Those of Idu are summarized in Tab. 7.

Comparison of these 28 features between pairs of the females shows the highest proportion of identical features between KH and TI (84.0 %), less between TI and HE as well as between HE and LL (76.9 % respectively). This is followed by those between TI and LL (70.8 %) as well as KH and HE (70.4 %). The lowest proportion of identical features appears between KH and LL (60.0 %). Features of ID resemble mostly those of HE (76.9 %), less to those of LL (72.0 %), followed by TI (68.0 %), and least to those of KH (63.0 %).

The epigenetic features thus point, similarly to the metric ones, to the closest relation between KH and TI, followed by that of TI and HE, less close between KH and HE. The metrically most distant LL, and curiously enough, also ID, appear in these features most similar to HE and most distant from KH.
Features by Berry and Berry (1967):
Nos. 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 18, 23, 24, 26, 27 absent
Nos. 4, 6, 10, 14 present
No. 8 absent left, present right
Additional features:
Os japonicum absent, os incae absent, metopic suture present, hypodontic third molar present, bifidity of cervical vertebrae present on C5, accessory openings at foramen transversarium on C2 and C4 absent, while on C6 present, humeral perforation absent, squatting facettes of tibiae not preserved.

Table 7 Epigenetic features of Idu

CRANIOSCOPY

General descriptive categories commonly quoted in the literature (defined by Strouhal and Jungwirth 1984) were used (Tab. 8, Plates XXV–XXIX).

Similarly as in metric features, the skulls of three of the four females are rather close each to the others. Most of the identical categories appear between KH and HE (71.4 %) as well as KH and TI (70.0 %). TI is less similar to HE (63.3 %).

The fourth woman, LL, appears also in this comparison more distant from the previous ones, sharing with HE 51.5 %, TI 50.0 % and KH 42.4 % features. She differs from the others mostly by her expressive parietal bosses causing a rhomboid outline of the braincase in vertical view and a wedge form in occipital view.

Idu, possessing male secondary sexual features, proved to be most distant from all the females, sharing with TI 37.9 %, HE 35.3 %, LL 31.3 and KH 30.3 %.

OSTEOCOSPY

In the females, the range of agreement was found to be very wide. KH and TI share most features (88.9 %), followed by HE and TI (71.4 %), while KH and HE shared only 50.0 % of these features (Tab. 9).

On the other hand, LL appears distant from the others, less from HE (38.9 % of identical features), more from TI (22.2 %) and KH (18.2 %).

As expected, the skeleton of ID with its robust build and strong muscular relief, proved to be most distant from all the females, least from LL (26.3 % of identical features), more from KH (21.6 %) and HE (20.0 %) and most from the juvenile TI (16.7 %).

RADIOGRAPHY

Four of the skulls (except TI) were X-rayed and compared (Plates XXXI–XXXII). The shape of the orbits and of the piriform aperture appear generally similar. The frontal sinus is medium high and very broad, bordered almost horizontally on the upper edge (slightly higher right than left) and slightly ramified in HE. It is medium-sized, bouquet-like and less developed left than right in KH. On the other hand, it is quite absent on the left side and only small and not ramified on the right side in LL. Idu’s frontal sinus is the greatest, fan–like and well ramified. The maxillary sinuses are greatest in ID followed by KH, less developed in HE and least so in LL. While KH and LL share an outstanding alveolar prognathy, ID has a lesser one and HE is orthognathous.

COMPARISON WITH THE REMAINS OF KING DJEDKARE ISESI

The affiliation of two of the above-mentioned females, KH and HE to the penultimate king of the 5th Dynasty Djedkare Isei (further DI), was expressed in their respective mastabas by the attribute “King’s daughter of his own body”. For testing the hypothesis that this statement was not a mere honorific title but expressed the blood relationship between these persons, we decided to compare their data (Strouhal and Gaballah 1993).

Remains of King DI were found by the archaeological team led by the architect Abd el Salam Mohammad Hussein and the Egyptologist Andre Varille in the “Haram esh-Shawaf” (“Pyramid of the Sentinel”) on the plateau overlooking the village of Saqqara during the season of 1945–46. The excavations proved that the pyramid was built for King DI and that its original name was “Nefer” (“Beautiful”).

An archaeological report was never published (Moursi 1987). Only basic data are mentioned in the anatomical report (Batrawi 1947), while the human skeletal remains found in the pyramid became part of Batrawi’s osteological collection in the Department of Anatomy, Kasr el Aini Medical Faculty of Cairo University. Their authenticity was tested by a set of 6 radiocarbon dates (4 for DI, one for KH and HE), of which 5 yielded a dendrochronologically calibrated age range 2886–2507 years BC (W. Woelfli in Strouhal and Gaballah 1993: table 1).

King DI’s remains consist of 13 determinable skeletal parts, among which were parts of the calva (Plate XXXA), parts of the facial skeleton, mandible (Plate XXXB) upper half of the spine and lateral half
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>KH</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Robusticity of skull</td>
<td>gracile</td>
<td>gracile</td>
<td>gracile</td>
<td>gracile</td>
<td>robust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frontal bosses</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>exp.</td>
<td>sl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Orbital shape</td>
<td>rectangular</td>
<td>rectangular</td>
<td>square</td>
<td>square</td>
<td>square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Orbital axis</td>
<td>very oblique</td>
<td>very oblique</td>
<td>very oblique</td>
<td>very oblique</td>
<td>very oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Upper orbital edge</td>
<td>thin</td>
<td>thin</td>
<td>thin</td>
<td>thin</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and sharp</td>
<td>and sharp</td>
<td>and sharp</td>
<td>and sharp</td>
<td>thick and round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nasal bones shape (M-S 1959)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lower margin of piriform aperture (M-S 1957)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fossa canina</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to medium</td>
<td>to deep</td>
<td>to deep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Marginal process</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nasal spine (M-S 1957)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nasal back profile</td>
<td>slight con.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>slight con.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>slight con.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nasofrontal transition</td>
<td>obtuse angle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>obtuse angle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>obtuse angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Prominence of zygomatic bones</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Supraclavicular arches (Eickstedt 1944)</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Glabella (M-S 1957)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Alveolar prognathy</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Profile of forehead</td>
<td>sl. oblique</td>
<td>sl. oblique</td>
<td>sl. oblique</td>
<td>vertical</td>
<td>oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Profile of vault</td>
<td>drawn up</td>
<td>drawn up</td>
<td>drawn</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and back</td>
<td>and back</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>arched</td>
<td>arched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lambdoic flatness</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Occipital bulge</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ext. occip. protuberance (M-S 1959)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Temporal lines</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>very slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Supramastoid crest</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Vertical outline (Sergi in M-S 1959)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Parietal bosses</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>expres.</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Occipital outline</td>
<td>bomb</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>low bomb</td>
<td>wedge</td>
<td>low bomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Eickstedt 1944)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Nuchal muscular relief</td>
<td>very slight</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>very slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Shape of upper dental arch</td>
<td>ellipsoid</td>
<td>ellipsoid</td>
<td>ellipsoid</td>
<td>ellipsoid</td>
<td>ellipsoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Palate depth</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Robusticity of mandible</td>
<td>gracile</td>
<td>gracile</td>
<td>gracile</td>
<td>gracile</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Muscular relief of mandible</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mandibular angle</td>
<td>evert. &amp; inv.</td>
<td>slight evert. &amp; inv.</td>
<td>invert.</td>
<td>slight evert.</td>
<td>slight evert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Shape of lower dental arch</td>
<td>paraboid</td>
<td>paraboid</td>
<td>paraboid</td>
<td>paraboid</td>
<td>ellipsoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Chin shape (De Villiers 1968)</td>
<td>round (A)</td>
<td>round (A')</td>
<td>round (A)</td>
<td>round (A)</td>
<td>square (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Chin prominence</td>
<td>expressive</td>
<td>expressive</td>
<td>expressive</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>expressive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Cranioscopic features
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Bone/Feature</th>
<th>KH</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Costoclavicular pit</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trapezoid line</td>
<td>expres.</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>expres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Robusticity</td>
<td>very gracile</td>
<td>very gracile</td>
<td>very gracile</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Crista tuberculi maioris</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Crista tuberculi minoris</td>
<td>slight &amp; smooth</td>
<td>slight &amp; smooth</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight &amp; smooth</td>
<td>slight &amp; smooth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tuberositas deltoidea</td>
<td>very slight</td>
<td>very slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Robusticity</td>
<td>very gracile</td>
<td>very gracile</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Muscular relief</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Robusticity</td>
<td>very gracile</td>
<td>very gracile</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Muscular relief</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Robusticity</td>
<td>gracile</td>
<td>gracile</td>
<td>gracile</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tuberositas glutea</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Trochanter tertius</td>
<td>not developed</td>
<td>not developed</td>
<td>not developed</td>
<td>not developed</td>
<td>not developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fossa hypotroch.</td>
<td>not developed</td>
<td>not developed</td>
<td>not developed</td>
<td>not developed</td>
<td>slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tuberculum adduct.</td>
<td>not developed</td>
<td>not developed</td>
<td>not developed</td>
<td>not developed</td>
<td>not developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pilaster (M-S 1959)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Robusticity</td>
<td>gracile</td>
<td>gracile</td>
<td>gracile</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Linea musculi solei</td>
<td>slight &amp; rough</td>
<td>slight &amp; rough</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Robusticity</td>
<td>gracile</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>grazile</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Grooving</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Curvature</td>
<td>great</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Shape of the section</td>
<td>very flat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 Osteoscopic features

Explanations for tabs. 8-9: M-S 1959 = Martin and Saller 1959
expres. = expressive
of the left foot. Further, there were several fragments of cortex from the long bones of the extremities, several fragments of soft tissue with skin covered by linen, loose linen wrappings and textile pads and bags (Strouhal and Gaballah 1993).

Concerning demographic data, the majority of diagnostically significant features were those of a male. Ageing criteria yielded a 50–60 year range with a histomorphometric determination 52.8 ± 8.5 years (Sh. Saunders in Strouhal and Gaballah 1993). This proved the original determination of "about 50 years" by Batrawi (1947).

A set of 9 commonly used craniometric features (nos. 9, 10, 16, 60, 69.1, 69.3, 70, 71, 79 by Martin and Saller 1957), which could be measured on the remains of DI, was complemented by another 7 non-standard measurements (length and thickness of the mastoid process, cranial thickness at left and right tuber frontale, cranial thickness at left parietale, height of the mandibular body between M₂ and M₃, and thickness of the mandibular body between M₂ and M₃). In comparison with the four females (KH, TI, HE, LL, Tabs. 1–3), values of King DI are, as expected in a male, greater in minimum frontal breadth (95 mm), maximum frontal breadth (114 mm), height (65 mm) and breadth of the ascending ramus (33 mm) and height of the body between M₂ and M₁ (27 mm).

In another 11 measurements, his values lie within the range or 1 mm above the range of the females. This appears in features like breadth of the foramen magnum, length and breadth of the mastoid process, height and thickness of the mandibular body or thickness of the cranial vault. It expresses the delicate and gracile build of DI’s skull. One of the few observable osteoscopic features, DI’s postembryonic depression, recalls the same feature expressed in HE (Pl. XXVII).

Measurements of the four preserved molars of DI also show mostly similar values to the homologous molars of the four females (Strouhal and Gaballah 1993).

Of the 28 postcranial measurements, 17 were, as expected, greater in DI than in the females, while in the remaining 11, DI’s values were within or 1 mm higher than the female range. This proved to be the case in vertebrae C₃,₄,₇, T₁,₂,₃, while T₄ was even smaller than the same measurement in HE, perhaps as the result of a traumatic compression. Also the thickness in the middle of 1st rib, minimum diameter of the acetabulum, as well as length and breadth of the trochanter minor fall into the female range.

These comparisons illustrate the gracility of DI’s body build which was, at the same time, one of the most outstanding features of the compared females (least expressed with LL). The preserved fragments of DI’s skeleton show also the same tendency to low stature as revealed in the above-mentioned females. Blood-relationship between King DI and the four females appears thus very probable.

**BLOOD TYPING (P. Klír)**

Two methods were used, the absorption-inhibition method with anti-B and anti-A sera (titre 1:64) and the absorption-elution method with anti-A and anti-B of a higher titre (1:256). Tests were repeated, especially in cases of less expressive results.

Samples of KH were taken from the brain and bone tissues, and from wrappings which were in close contact with her body. In TI, two bone samples, a cranial and a postcranial one, were used. In LL, samples from a metacarpal and cuboideum were tested. In HE, hair, brain tissue and fragments of ribs were analysed. From ID, remains of tissue at the back of the skull and samples from both cuboidea were taken. From the remains of King DI, fragments of soft tissue from the left side of the face and of the scaphoideum were used.

The examined samples of Princesses KH and HE, female LL and the girl TI, as well as of King DI, showed consistently blood type A on repeated analyses. On the other hand, ID yielded blood type O. These results support well the conclusions of the morphological analysis.

**HISTOLOGY (A. Němečková)**

Of the two samples of dry, brittle and dark brown tissue samples of KH, one showed the structure characteristic of brain tissue. It preserved remnants of blood vessel walls with possible fragments of blood elements. The other sample proved to be muscular tissue also with relics of blood vessel walls.

In HE also dry, brittle and brown coloured brain tissue, in thin sections disintegrating into irregular strips and lacking cellular structures, was identified. One hair showed a damaged surface with the presence of dark pigment in places.

In a sample from the scalp of King DI, besides other details, evidence for degenerative atherosclerotic changes in some minute blood vessels and the increase in a number of fatty cells were revealed (Němečková 1993).

**DISCUSSION**

Anthropological material from the group of mastabas around its nucleus, the firstly built mastaba of Princess Khekeretneby, substantiates well the conception of a family cemetery, attributed, according to inscriptions and archaeological data, to
King Djedkare Isesi. Also, the common range of radiocarbon dating proved well the contemporaneity of the mastabas with finds from the burial chamber of King Djedkare Isesi’s pyramid.

Anthropological analysis of human remains from the original burials of five individuals (which fortunately survived and could thus be identified in four mastabas) enabled, moreover, to establish any blood relationship between them that might have existed.

Morphological analysis, corroborated by serology (blood typing), revealed close proximity between KH and the adolescent girl TI. It could have been solely of genetic origin. KH, for which the mastaba was built, died aged 30-35 years, TI, for which the mastaba was enlarged some time later, lived only to her 15-16 years. Their 14-20 year difference in age at death, plus the undetermined time lapse between burials of both, suggest more probably the possibility that TI was a daughter of KH than that they were sisters, cousins or persons of other kind of kinship.

Our anthropological conclusion, however, has not been supported by their titles. While KH was related directly to the king as a “daughter of his own body”, TI was called “King’s ornament, his beloved one” which is never a relationship title in any period of Egyptian history. Its part “King’s ornament” is interpreted as the title of women who were entitled to be present at the court. Also her epithet on her left false door jamb is common among female courtiers of that period (Callender 2002).

TI’s additional epithet “his beloved one”, related to the king, is, however, uncommon among the other females bearing the title “King’s ornament” so far known from the Old Kingdom. In the same time, TI lacks in her chapel as well in the chapel of KH’s, her supposed mother, one of the two titles of female descendants of known princesses from the Old Kingdom, “daughter of king” (s3t nisut) or “known to the king” (rḥt nisut) (Callender 2002).

Any trial to solve this discrepancy has to take into account the devastation of KH’s mastaba by robbers. By this, too much of important evidence was destroyed. Concerning KH, her pelvis which could had yield information whether she bore a child or not, perished. In TI’s burial, no traces of coffin and only sherds of canopic jars survived. Therefore, we cannot exclude the possibility that also one of the missing titles of female descendants of a princess disappeared.

Alternatively, we may suggest a compromising hypothesis on the situation in the KH’s mastaba. Some time after the burial of its proprietor, it was hastily enlarged (according to its unfinished decoration) accommodate an additional burial of a 15-16 year old girl who died unexpectedly. Architectural setting, decoration and burial equipment of the added part were similar and on the same level as that of both attested Princesses. Therefore, TI does not look like one of the common women “entitled to be present at the court”, even possessing an official status of a female courtier. She must have been not only physically, but also spiritually closely related to KH.

Her special relation to the king was, according to our opinion, expressed by her unique additional epithet “his (the King’s) beloved one”, not known hitherto from the Old Kingdom (Callender 2002). If she really were not endowed by a usual title for king’s granddaughters, it could had been perhaps caused by some special circumstances, e.g. by her illegitimate origin.

The mastaba of Hedjetnebu, built closely to the north, and attributed by inscription to another “King’s daughter of his own body”, reveals that there was a habit to build a separate tomb for each of the dead king’s daughters as could be expected due to their status.

HE was morphologically and serologically also closely related to KH, which clearly proves them as blood-related sisters and corroborates their titles as a real message and not as honorary titles reflecting the king’s favour.

This is also supported by the slightly bigger mean distance between TI and her possible aunt HE (4.5 mm) than between TI and her possible mother KH (3.6 mm).

Another, unfortunately anonymous lady, was buried separately in mastaba L, built in the same architectural style, disposition and orientation as the mastabas of KH and HE, in another but adjacent row of mastabas. She (labelled LL) showed slightly bigger mean distances from the others – HE (4.1 mm), KH (4.4 mm) and TI (4.8 mm) and a more robust body build. At the same time, she shared with them the same blood type and majority of the epigenetic features. Therefore, it is possible that she, too, could have been a member of the extended family of King Djedkare Isesi.

We should bear in mind that our comparisons were facilitated by the identical female sex of the compared persons. On the other hand, they were complicated by their differences in the age at death (from 15–16 years in TI and 18–20 years in HE, through 30–35 years in KH, to 50–60 years in LL) which influenced their morphologies and body build.

On the other hand, the educator/tutor of the princesses Idu was found morphologically as well as serologically dissimilar when compared with them and, therefore, most probably, he did not belong to the same extended family.

Notwithstanding the very fragmented state of his remains, the indicated father of the Princesses
Khekeretnebty and Hedjetnebu, King Djedkare Isesi, can be accepted as their real father on morphological grounds, sharing with them gracile skeletal built, less developed muscular relief and tendency to short stature, and the same blood type A.

Several questions concerning his family remain. Who was the mother of the princesses buried at Abusir? It was surely not his main royal consort, because if so, we might well expect that the princesses would be buried near their mother’s pyramid, within the precinct of the King’s pyramid at Saaqara-South. The mother of the princesses, buried perhaps also somewhere at Abusir, was obviously one of the hypothetical King’s secondary wives. Could it perhaps be the anonymous Lady LL?

In the case of Princess Khekeretnebty, other questions arise: who was her husband (or the man who begot Tisethor?) and why she was not buried in his tomb?

LITERATURE

Excursus I. The Princesses and their Burial Companions

The two princesses – without doubt, sisters – who were buried within Djedkare Isesi’s minor cemetery at Abusir offer us some interesting material for observation regarding their social standing, their marital state and their family connections. Relatively unremarkable as their remains might seem, their circumstances have provided us with a small window into the very closed world of the kings’ daughters in the Old Kingdom. From the records available within their complexes, neither princess appears to have been married, but certain medium-ranking officials chose – or were selected – to be buried within their small royal cemetery and this rather surprising feature has given us a glimpse of an unique social circle within the royal court. Other items of interest are noticeable within the titles of the princesses which, quite unusually, unequivocally identify these women with their royal father, Djedkare Isesi. Forensic examinations of the remains from their burial chambers have been compared with the remains from Djedkare’s pyramid and found to be so closely matched that the father of the princesses is for all intents and purposes beyond doubt (see Chapter 10). This circumstance is unique for genealogical links within Old Kingdom royal families. Such indications, together with other, perhaps less important issues, are worth discussing in finer detail.

THE CEMETERY AND ITS SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE

The burials of the princesses and their companions form a discreet group within the Abusir royal cemetery as a whole, a factor which is evident within the Area F courtyard, where a communal approach to the mortuary cult of these people is attested. What is striking about these burials is the closeness of the members of this group: the tombs form themselves into an enclosed space whose focus (symbolized by the open court of Area F) draws these people together – a circumstance that may have reflected the social configuration of the time when the persons concerned were alive. It is clear from the exclusive nature of this cemetery that these members of Djedkare’s court intended to continue after death an association that had evidently been appreciated during the lifetime of the princesses. Because of the inward-looking focus of this little cemetery, there was no opportunity for other later tombs to be added. Perhaps this exclusiveness in part explains the intrusive burial of Tisethor within the mastaba core of Khekeretnebty’s tomb, although Tisethor may have explicitly wished to be buried in Khekeretnebty’s tomb. Alternatively, she may have had no means to build her own tomb and thus obtained permission to be interred in this grave. As the Czechoslovak team at that time did not examine the area east of E, F and C, there may be even more tombs belonging to members of Djedkare’s family within this unexcavated area.

Such social circumstances as these are not evident within the burials of princesses in other cemeteries: apart from the regimented lines of tombs in Khufu’s eastern cemetery at Giza, princesses were not otherwise buried with other children of the king, though they could on occasions be buried near the tombs of either their parents or children.¹ And, with the exception of the proximity of the usual mortuary priest, no other cemeteries in which princesses were buried have disclosed any noticeable social links with persons other than close relatives who may have been buried in nearby tombs. This is one of several anomalies within this Abusir minor cemetery.

¹ There is, for example, a strong possibility that Queen Khamerenbety I and her daughter may have originally intended to have a joint burial – as is the possibility that Queen Hetepheres II and her daughter, Queen Meresankh III intended a similar joint burial. On the Galarza Tomb of the Khamerenbety women, see V. Callender, P. Jánosi, in: MDAIK, 1997, 53, pp.1–25. On the mortuary arrangements of Queen Hetepheres II and her daughter, see P. Jánosi, in ZAS 123, 1995, 46-62.
THE ROLE OF THE OFFICIAL MERNEFU

The fact that Mernefu was ḫr pj or “Director of the palace”, provides us with a readily understandable link to his relationship with the royal children buried in this special cemetery belonging to Djedkare’s family. The duties of such officials were to see to the daily functioning of the palace, in particular, with making sure that the provisions were there for the feeding of the king.² His titles of hry stš3 n pr-dw3t “privy to the secret of the House of the Morning” and hry stš3 n ntr.f “privy to the secret of his God” meant that he must have been a frequent visitor to the palace, where he would have been in daily attendance on the king, preparing him for his temple duties in the morning. He was a man who claimed to be im3hwn hr nb.f “revered with his Lord”, an epithet that has not been analysed. However, it is seldom used among the titles of officials, so must have been a sign of a special relationship at the court. As a smr wťy, or “sole companion”, Mernefu belonged to the more select group of court officials, but his rare, augmented title, smr wťy n mrw “sole companion, possessor of love” singled him out even above other companions of the king. He must for some reason have been specially favoured – as the title suggests.

Mernefu also had connections with the king’s mortuary cult, as his title hry wdb m hwt-š nb “he who is in charge of reversions (of offerings) in the House of Life” attest. Perhaps there is a link here, too, in that during the distribution of the offerings from the kings’ offering tables to those of royal dependents, Mernefu may have had special charge of the offerings for the princesses’ tombs. It is also pertinent in regard to this particular title to mention that Mernefu would also have been instrumental in arranging the banquets of the king.³

Mernefu’s title of director of the ḫr-palace did not place him among the elite of the 5th Dynasty courtiers – although it had been a distinguished title during the 4th Dynasty, when many of these title-holders had held the rank of King’s son or vizier, for example.⁴ By contrast, the 5th Dynasty inspectors of the Palace held lower-ranking titles, several of which Mernefu has (e.g. d mr šbw Hr-hnty-pt “director (?) of (the district) Horus-foremost-of-heaven” – an office which was responsible for the provisioning of the palace with wine supplies, and smr wťy, hry stš3 n pr-dw3t and hry wdb m hwt-š nb.

THE SCRIBE OF THE ROYAL CHILDREN

Idu was of more humble status. His main duties appear to have been priestly ones, but he was only a wṯ priest for royal monuments until promoted to inspector of funerary priests of Queen Khentkaus II.

One other title gives us a hint of his connection to the royal family, for he was a šš nsw nswt (“Scribe of the king’s children”). In this capacity, he probably acted as an instructor, as well as secretary on behalf of the royal children.

That a close bond may have been formed between this possible tutor and the royal family is very likely, but such a bond is a rarely attested phenomenon prior to the New Kingdom, when tutors on occasion displayed themselves with their royal charges seated on their knees⁵ or, as in the case of Princess Neferure and her tutor, Senenmut, wrapped within their arms. Queen Hatshepsut’s deep attachment to her female nurse is a similar phenomenon,⁶ but such expressions of affection are unknown before the New Kingdom. Given the age of Khekeretnebty and her sister Hedjetnebu, the friendship formed between the princesses, possibly their brother, Neserkauhor and their putative tutor could have been forged already in the years before Djedkare Isesi ascended the throne. Permission to be buried in a royal cemetery was jealously guarded: in theory, only the king had the right to permit burials in this place. This fact, together with the architecture of the tombs of these two officials (which are similar to the architecture and materials used for the tombs of the princesses), implies that the tombs – or parts of them at least – all came from the royal workshop. Evidently, the king approved of this unusual funerary situation.

THE EDUCATION OF ROYAL CHILDREN

Very little is known about the education of children in the Old Kingdom. Grdseloff⁷ suggested that women were in charge of the education of the royal young several decades ago, but there is no factual support for this claim. Indeed, the reverse is more likely to have been the case, for we have no evidence that women were taught to read and write during this period. And, although there is plentiful evidence that there were female seal-bearers – presuming some

² M. Báta, in: AR Or 67, 1999, 16. His title of hry wdb m hwt-š nb also meant that he performed similar services in both the king’s mortuary cult and in the palace (ibid., 14).
³ ibid., 14.
⁴ See Báta, o.c., 12f.
⁵ See, for example, the tomb of Paheri at el Kab, where the princes Wadjmose and Amenmose are shown with their tutor, or Hekeneheh, the tutor of the sons of Thutmose IV, who is depicted with Amenhotep III on his knee.
⁶ Besides being depicted seated on the knees of her nurse in a now-shattered statue (JE 56264), Hatshepsut had the tomb of her nurse Sitre (also known as Inet) excavated next to her own, in the Valley of the Kings (KV 60). The ostrakon relating to Sitre was found there and is now in Vienna’s Kunsthistorisches Museum.
⁷ B. Grdseloff, ASAE 42, 1942, 120.
basic literacy — there is not a single example of a female scribe known as yet for the Old Kingdom. Without such scribal training, it is difficult to envisage how female tutors could have taught the young boys in the royal kꜣp.

Evidence for schooling practices in this remote period in time is negligible. In his account of the education of boys and girls in the Old Kingdom, Hellmut Brunner was forced to rely for evidence on the written texts alone — namely, those of Ptahhotep and Kagemni. While it is true that both of those texts betray evidence of having been written in the Middle Kingdom period, it is generally agreed that they probably had their origins in the Old Kingdom, so that the accounts of education referred to there are not to be rejected. Nonetheless, neither text can be called contemporary evidence for schooling.

From these sources, Brunner adduced that there were three possible avenues for the education of male children:

a) A wise official might take on an apprentice (usually referred to as a “Staff of Old Age”) and educate him via personal tutoring.

b) Secondly, education could have been carried out in the home of the teacher — a rather nebulous claim as it cannot be substantiated.

c) Thirdly, though he says that there is no evidence for a school, Brunner mentions what must have been a de facto school within the royal grounds, cited in occasional texts as the kꜣp. Under this name, this institution continued into the New Kingdom and is referred to by officials when they mention that they were educated with the royal princes. Whatever physical form it may have had, the kꜣp was located somewhere within the inner palace and was what we recognize as a school where boys at least were educated. Weni of Abydos is a prime example of an Old Kingdom official who mentions his education in the palace (Urk. I.100); Ptahshepses of Saqqara (Urk. I.304) is another. Brunner points to the royal teacher in this place as being entitled Overseer of the King’s Children, although the simple word for “teacher” is unknown for the Old Kingdom. Nevertheless, given the large numbers of officials evident from the various cemeteries, there must have been people to teach them, even though the role of the teacher is not immediately discernible in their titles. Perhaps, the teacher only held the title of a sš “scribe”.

In considering the education of females at the court, Brunner has suggested that the women who were entitled ḫkt nswt may have been companions who were educated with the princesses. Whilst this might be a possibility, we do not have as yet any evidence in support of this claim. Rather, there is more convincing evidence for the ḫkt nswt as having been connected with the cult of Hathor, their titles suggesting that their function may rather have been to serve as courtiers who either assisted the royal family to adorn themselves, or who were women given adornments by the king. Whatever their function, they formed two classes of courtiers: those who were simply entitled ḫkt nswt, and those who were entitled ḫkt nswt wʾrtr, but their link with education is unattested in any period of ancient Egyptian history at present. It is interesting that, despite her physical links to the princesses, Tisethor belongs to the junior rank of female courtiers, for she was only entitled ḫkt nswt.

Brunner also suggested that the princesses in the Old Kingdom, while unlikely to have been taught writing, were probably educated in singing, dancing and the playing of selected instruments. Although the evidence in support of this statement does come at the earliest from Middle Kingdom tombs of non-royal nature, it is a very plausible hypothesis, for we know that later queens, at least, were involved in singing for the gods, and their sweetness of voice was at times the subject of remarks. One is also reminded that one of the most common titles of the queen for the Old Kingdom was wʾrtr hst (Great of praise). Troy considers that this term involves the queen in giving praise or recitation, but she thinks that it could also be the word for singing. Certainly, the playing of instruments was an accomplishment depicted in some of the non-royal tombs for upper class women in the Old Kingdom, although only

8 E.g. see the female seal-bearers in the unpublished funerary apartments of Wasetkheboth in the mastaba complex of Vizier Mereruka at Saqqara. There are other female seal-bearers in the tomb of Uhemka, for example (see Kayser, Uhemka, 69, 70), as well as in other tombs of the 6th Dynasty.
9 Brunner, Alteägyptische Erziehung, 10ff.
10 Lichtheim, Ancient Egyptian Literature I, 6.
11 Brunner, Alägyptische Erziehung, 11.
12 ibid., 12.
13 ibid., 11.
15 Brunner, Erziehung., 47.
16 Nord (o. c. 12.) has suggested that “the meaning of wʾrt qualifying the title could be understood, as some scholars have pointed out (in parallelism with sḫr wʾrt), as originally meaning “of the first rank”.
17 Brunner, Alägyptische Erziehung, 48
18 E.g. Nefertiti (“the one who pacifies the Aton with a sweet voice and whose hands carry the sister”, De Garis Davies, The Rock Tombs, pls 3, 5); in the case of Queen Nefertari it is that “one lives at hearing her voice”; she also pacifies Amen (Kitchen, Inscriptions II, 849).
19 Troy, Queenship, 88, citing Hickmann on the term ḫš as implying music-making in general.
20 E.g. The four wives of Mernebef playing harps for their husband (Dynasty 6, west Saqqara): see Myśliwiec, Eros nad Nilem, colour pl. 4.
two princesses have been recorded with any instrument (other than the sistrum) in their hands as far as we are aware. Instead, where any pictures remain, the princesses are entertained by others who play for them – as the third register on the north wall attests in Khekeretneby’s offering room.

It would certainly be likely that the princesses and upper class women were taught to dance – whether formally or informally – for dancing was a part of funerary and religious rituals and Old Kingdom princesses have been represented as we noted earlier (see p. 135) as taking part in religious ceremonies. And for those princesses who were priestesses of the king, some singing and dancing might well be expected of them during the performance of their duties. Unfortunately, though, this is all that might be gleaned about the education of the royal children buried in Abusir.

THE TITLES OF THE PRINCESSES

Exceptionally, Princess Khekeretneby was depicted in one of her reliefs with the ‘nh sign held in her hand: this sign not only gave her superior ranking among the royal relations at the royal court, but gave her unique status among the ranks of princesses within the Old Kingdom. No other princess appears with that sign – which was normally restricted to the king and the gods at that time. The presence of this symbol may well have been an indication of cult, for Queen Khentkaus I and Khentkaus II, both of whom are depicted with the ‘nh, have well attested cults – in their cases, maintained by hm ntr priests.

The princesses are also distinguished by their titles and epithets. Khekeretneby, for instance, has the title of st3 nswt nt htf mrrt nt Iissi and st3 nswnt nt htf mrrt.f r’h nb. Although the st3 nswt nt htf title is common for the Old Kingdom, both additional epithets, mrrt.f r’h nb and mrrt nt Iissi are unique for the Old Kingdom. This seems to echo the iconographic distinction of the ‘nh sign, mentioned above.

What might be the reason for this special distinction regarding the name of the king? Was Iissi’s name used primarily because this princess was buried so far from the tomb of her father and she wished to make the family connection known to passersby? Or, was it a question of recognition for later mortuary priests that the princess held a title that specified her father? Perhaps it was necessary to identify the cult from which the reversion of offerings for the princess were to come (see above, remarks made about Mernefu). On the other hand, she may have held these titles to give distinction to a princess who might have been deemed to have been of lesser rank for some reason or other. Unfortunately, our knowledge at this stage is still hypothetical rather than factual and any or none of these alternative suggestions might be right.

Other princesses buried some distance from their father’s tombs, such as Iabetet (G 4650 in Khufu’s western cemetery) make no such mention of their fathers, though it is clear in Iabetet’s case that the father of this woman could not have been Khufu, in whose cemetery she lies. Iabetet provides a fitting comparison therefore with the Abusir princesses. Unlike those sisters, we do not know who furnished Iabetet’s cult after her death. She names no son or husband who might have maintained provisions for her ka. That the cults of princesses were not always supported by their fathers is evident from the reliefs in the tomb of Meryinh, who clearly took on responsibility for the cult of his mother, Princess Sedit, as the decoration of his tomb attests. The same circumstance seems to apply to Princess Khentu, the mother of Kai. Khekeretneby and Hedjetnebu were provided for by Djedkare Iesi, as these special titles indicate, and this must be the reason why mention of the king’s name appears in the titulary of the princesses.

THE TITLES AND POSITION OF TISEOTH

Tisethor had her offering room in a small rectangular room that had once been the original magazine of

---

21 Queen Khentkaus II – this woman, surely a relation of the royal family of Djedkare Iesi – was also depicted holding the ankh sign (see Verner, Khentkaus, 80).

22 Tomb D in the family cemetery was the tomb of Idu, who was the inspector of hm kṣ priests for Queen Khentkaus II, for example.

23 Menkaouhor, who succeeded Niuserre, deserted Abusir’s cemetery (see Chapter 8, n. 2). Menkaouhor’s successor, Iesi, was not buried near his predecessor either, although there would have been room at that time for another pyramid complex near Lepsius no. XXIX at the North Saqqara site; instead, Iesi chose yet another site, at South Saqqara. Iesi’s origins are not known and no links with other members of the 5th Dynasty royal families have yet become apparent. His burial complex at South Saqqara does suggest that the king had some reason for removing himself far from the Abusir cemetery, although this may have been due purely to material considerations, such as the lack of space or dissatisfaction with the poorer quality limestone at Abusir. In fact, though scholars have frequently put forward shrewd suggestions, we seldom know why some kings chose new sites, but see p. 105. The fact that two of Iesi’s daughters and his eldest son were buried at this site, so distant from their father’s monument, could be suggestive of some disharmony within the family.

24 On the dating of Princesses Wenshet and Iabetet, see W. Helck, in: Berger, Hommages à Jean Leclant, 221-230, especially pp. 228f.

25 Sedit, however, was likely to have been the daughter of Khafu and her son the grandson of that king. Her actual burial place is unknown.
Khekeretneby’s mastaba. Her unfinished, monolithic limestone false door rested upon a pedestal against the western wall of the room. A small, mudbrick offering table that had been plastered and whitewashed lay at the foot of the door. The hieroglyphs on the false door comprised the only decoration in this plain, whitewashed room. Her burial was clearly intrusive.

Adjacent to the chapel and in the southeast corner of the mastaba was her serdab, in which the remains of two wooden statues were found. Her burial chamber, which lay to the west of the little chapel, at a rather shallow depth below the surface, had never held a limestone sarcophagus and no fragments indicative of a wooden coffin were discovered. Despite this lack of burial equipment, the presence of the shattered remains from four canopic jars from the shaft of Tisethor (and evidently hers, since Khekeretneby’s canopic set was more or less complete) indicates that Tisethor had been mummified (as fragments from her burial chamber endorse) although it is unlikely that a stone sarcophagus had been provided for the burial of this woman.

The only titles pertaining to Tisethor are those of nḥt imḥt and ḫkrt nṣwt mrtʾf. It is likely, therefore, that Tisethor belonged to the less-distinguished category of female courtiers. At one time considered to be a title of a king’s concubine, the title of ḫkrt nṣwt is now understood to be the title of women who were entitled to be present at the court. The fact that many women with this title were actually resident in the nomes, far from Memphis, underlines the impression that the title was a ranking title, rather than an indicator of one who attended the king and his family. In Tisethor’s case, she carries the additional epithet, mrtʾf, in relation to the king. Such an addition is uncommon among the titles of ḫkrt nṣwt that are so far known from the Old Kingdom. She also has the imḥt br ntr ‘3, ḫr nṣwt epithets on her left door jamb. Both phrases are common among the titles of female courtiers during the Old Kingdom.

It has been suggested by the anthropological evidence that Tisethor is likely to have been a close relative of Khekeretneby and indeed may have been a daughter. Certainly, the comparisons of the tissue samples and bones and the structure of the skull could be interpreted in this way (see Chapter 10, p. 131). There are two important hesitations against accepting this identity too readily, however: the fact that the all-important pelvis of Khekeretneby was missing (with its indication of whether or not the princess had ever given birth) and the nature of Tisethor’s title of ḫkrt nṣwt. There is little that can be said about the missing pelvis, for that would have clinched the argument in one way or another, so only the title of this young woman can be of use in determining the relationship.

Among the female descendants of known princesses from the Old Kingdom, all of those who are known are at least entitled rḥt nṣwt.20 Frequently, this title is recorded in the tomb of one or other of the woman’s parents. In many instances, they are also given the title of sḥt nṣwt – usually in the tomb that they own themselves or else on stelae.27 Tisethor lacks both titles and would thus be the only granddaughter of a king not distinguished in this way. This is very puzzling: why was she not given the expected ranking? One might therefore suggest that the evidence might be read to suggest that Tisethor was indeed the daughter of Khekeretneby, but that because this princess had not been “born to the purple”, her alleged daughter was not given the usual titles that the granddaughters of kings received. This explanation seems to fit less easily with the evidence – particularly when we know that not only were all the daughters recorded on Princess Wenenshet’s false door28 entitled rḥt nṣwt, but that two daughters, Wemen nefret and Tjnetet – who were granddaughters of the king – were later on entitled sḥt nṣwt when buried in their own tombs. One would therefore expect Tisethor to have one or other of those titles, but she does not.

Although the physical evidence suggests otherwise, the fact that Tisethor was interred within the mastaba of Khekeretneby need not necessarily have been due to her being Khekeretneby’s daughter. By the time this young woman came to be buried, Khekeretneby had achieved considerable status among the denizens of the family cemetery of Djedkare Isesi. Since there may have been no room to erect a tomb for this young woman within the closed-off circle made by the other tombs, it may have been this fact, or a question of wealth available for the funeral of the girl, together with the bloodline relationship which made the tomb of this princess the obvious choice for Tisethor’s resting place.

**THE TOMBS OF THE ROYAL RELATIONS**

The elderly woman who was buried in mastaba L had been provided with a tomb of her own; so had Prince Neserkauhor, although the tomb may never have been

---

20 E.g. the three daughters of Princess Hemetre (Hassan, Giza VI, coloured plate, fig. 41, from the eastern face of the second pillar); and the four daughters of Princess Wenenshet (Junker, Giza I, 25).

27 See, for instance, the two daughters, Wemen nefret and Tjnetet, who carry the title of sḥt nṣwt (W. S. Smith, AJA 46 (1942), 531) or Nesedjerkai, daughter of Prince Meryib, who also has this title, etc.

28 See Junker, Giza I, 249. The same elevation of title is noticeable for Meretites C, daughter of Khamerebneby of Abusir. Compare Verner, Ptahshepses I, 133 with L. Borchardt, Ne-user-Re, 126.
used by him. Like so many other princesses before them, Khekeretnebty and Hedjetnebu each occupied a tomb also dedicated to a single burial.\textsuperscript{29} We might assume from this situation that neither princess had been married; however, we know that (apart from princesses who were married to kings), a handful of Old Kingdom princesses were known to have married either princes or highly-ranked officials whose origins were non-royal.\textsuperscript{30} While some of these princesses were buried in single tombs, not all of these women acknowledged their husbands (e.g. Sedit, Wenshet, Hemetre A, etc.). We assume marriage because these women name their children in their reliefs, or else the presence of the princess’ name and relationship is recorded within the tombs of their children. This omission of the husband’s name makes it difficult to determine much detail about the marital policy regarding Old Kingdom princesses. Regarding Khekeretnebty, for example, the presence of Tisethor, buried within the mastaba of this princess, raises an interesting question concerning the marital state of this daughter of Iesi (see supra).

Above all, what is especially remarkable about the burial of these four known members of Iesi’s family is the fact that they were buried in Abusir. By the time of their burials, the children of Djedkare seem to have had no ostensible reason for being buried in this cemetery. Menkauhor had reigned and died, having moved his court somewhere closer to Saqqara, and Djedkare’s court was presumably located in the vicinity of South Saqqara. Why, when the centre of government was elsewhere, were these members of Djedkare’s family buried so far from the hub of courtly and family activity?

The immediate suspicion that springs to mind is the thought that there was some division within the family of the king – perhaps due to the presence of more than one wife. It is therefore possible that the king had taken another wife (he would certainly need a wife for ritual purposes if nothing else), making it feasible that some ill-feeling existed between the two branches of Iesi’s family.

Alternatively, we might suggest that these three siblings could have been the children of a woman who had fallen from favour. Such family friction during the Old Kingdom is evident not only among the tombs of commoners,\textsuperscript{31} but also among the monuments of relatives of the kings.\textsuperscript{32} As we now see with the burial of Teti’s queens, such divisions might lead to actual discrimination in favour of one side of the royal family at the expense of the other.\textsuperscript{33} While this likelihood is not to be excluded in Djedkare Iesi’s case, there are, however, other possible interpretations for the situation that existed.

Although Menkauhor and Djedkare had moved away from the Abusir cemetery, they had not abandoned the cults of the kings buried there. As the numerous remains of the papyri and sealings testify, both kings were assiduous in attending to the royal mortuary cults of their predecessors at Abusir. It may have been this very fact which influenced Djedkare to bury his children here, for neither of the mortuary complexes of himself nor of Menkauhor were situated close to the sun sanctuaries of the Abusir mortuary cults and no other long-established cults where the reversion of offerings might have been turned to the advantage of the royal children are known for the area at either Central or South Saqqara at that time. As we know from the Abusir papyri (particularly the fragments from Neferirkare’s and Neferere’s mortuary temples), those daily offerings from the sun temples – which were extremely generous – were afterwards transferred to the royal cults at Abusir, and from those royal cults to the cults of royal dependents. At Abusir, therefore, Djedkare’s children would have been assured of receiving steady offerings provided by their father via the sun cults. It might even have been the case that the frequency of Djedkare’s activities at Abusir were in part prompted by the fact that three of his children were buried there.

Djedkare Iesi’s complex and its surroundings at South Saqqara have not been thoroughly investigated – particularly intriguing is the smaller pyramid complex which lies adjacent to the royal monument.\textsuperscript{34} Apart from the dubious identity of a prince named Raemka, buried near the tomb of Queen Meresankh IV at central Saqqara, no other children of Iesi are known at present. It is quite possible that further family members might be found near the king’s complex at South Saqqara in future times, but it is also possible that the king buried all of his children at Abusir, where the mechanics of the reversion of offerings from the sun temples would ensure their well-being in the afterlife.

There is another indication of royal concern for these three offspring, too: although the tombs were

\textsuperscript{29} For a list of single occupants within the tombs of princesses see Table I for the daughters of the kings.

\textsuperscript{30} See, for example, Hetepheres A, the wife of Ankhkaf, Princess Sedit, mother of Meryib, Meretites A, wife of Akhhihetep, Khamaat, wife of Pahshepese of Saqqara, Khentkaus A, wife of Senedjemib-Mehi, etc., and others in Table I.

\textsuperscript{31} E.g. K. Myśliwiec, in: Bátra, Krężli, Abusir and Saqqara, 503, and in the tomb of Pahshepese of Abusir (see Verner, Preliminary Report, 71).


\textsuperscript{33} Z. Hawass, in: Bátra, Krężli, Abusir and Saqqara, 413–444.

\textsuperscript{34} On which, see P. Jánosi, MDAIK 45, 1989, 187-202, and note 9 in Chapter 8 of this volume.
by and large not made from the best materials, a great
deal of care had gone into the architectural design of
the structures (see Chapter 9). Moreover, even
though the burial provisions had been robbed in
antiquity, items such as the fine pottery, the generous
supply of miniature metal bowls and utensils, the
large number of calcite vessels and the presence of
the calcite tablet for the seven sacred oils demonstrate that
the provisions themselves indicate a wealthy burial
for each of the children. Lamentably, because of the
work of the thieves, it is only Khekeretnebty’s tomb
that gives us a good indication of the mortuary
donations made for each of the children at the time of
burial and therefore we are forced to concentrate on
her tomb more than the others.

Concerning the pottery, we have a major problem
in sorting the pottery refuse of the vaulted space from
the pottery deposited within the burial chamber of the
princesses, for both collections involved funerary
vessels (see p. 38). Nonetheless, the wide variety and
often good quality of the vessels included within the
burial chamber – there is a plentiful supply of
Meidum ware, for example – testify to the
generosity of the original funerary offering made. As
has already been mentioned (Chapter 1, p. 35), the
remaining miniature calcite vessels discovered in
the burial chamber were only a proportion of the
anticipated number of funerary vessels for this burial.
What did remain indicates that the princess was well-
provided for with numerous different vessels.

Another indication of generosity on the king’s part
is evident in the number of model metal vessels and
utensils buried with the best-attested burial. Not only
did these include the usual basin and ewer set but, as
has been mentioned previously (p. 44, 45), the
collection also included e.g. the bag-shaped pot
(pl. 44), which is quite rare for the Old Kingdom. (For
a selected list of the items, see p. 42f. of the text.)

Of particular note within the burial equipment
provided for Khekeretnebty is the calcite offering
tablet for the Seven Sacred Oils (see fig. B24). There
is only a small corpus of offering tablets like this
throughout the entire Old Kingdom period, for the
oils took a very long time to make and were very
costly so most people could not afford them.37 The
tablets were designed to hold drops of the oil – or they
may even have had purely symbolic use alone. In any
case, there have only been 23 of these utensils found so
far – including the recently discovered superb
example from the tomb of Senedjemib at South
Abusir – which fact again underlines the care taken
with the princess’s burial equipment.

We also note (pp. 46–48) that the few fragments
of linen found were of very fine material in
Khekeretnebty’s burial. Not only that, but, in one
recorded instance, there were 3 rolls of the material
from the king’s own storehouse. Elsewhere, the fact
that royal linen was used is mentioned in hieratic
writing on the linen itself. These records, together
with the names of royal officials written on the linen
attest to this burial having been made by the king’s
officials. This further demonstrates Djedkare-Iseisi’s
attention to the burial of his children, even if their
royal titles may have been given to them only after
the accession of the king.

While there were sufficient remains to indicate that
the burial chambers of the royal children were
provided with furniture, it is more significant that all
three offspring of Iseisi were provided with several k3
statues made from different types of wood and
beautifully painted. (Only one of these is now in any
reasonable state of repair: Hedjetnebu’s statue is
today on display in Cairo Museum, JE 98438.)39
Wooden statues of tomb owners were much less
common than stone statues and the fact offers another
example of the care and generosity of the person who
provided the burial equipment.

Finally, it should be stressed that the children of
Djedkare predeceased their father, for the dated
inscription from Idu’s tomb (see p.68) testifies that
this man was buried some time after the 17th
cattle count of Djedkare. As Idu’s tomb was built after
the princesses had been buried, Iseisi must have been
responsible for the building of their tombs. Analysis
of her remains suggests that Khekeretnebty died
when she was between 30–35 years of age; her sister
died at the age of 18 or 19. This being so, and with
regard to the irregularity of the cattle counts in that
time40 it cannot be excluded that both Khekeretnebty
and Hedjetnebu had been born to the king prior to his
succession to the throne.

Rather than family discrimination of an undesirable
nature, therefore, it is more likely that Iseisi

35 With the single exception of an uninscribed mastaba from Tell
Edfu of Dyn. 5 date, these tombs at Abusir have unique
architecture. On the Tell Edfu tomb, see M. Aïllet, ASAE 33,
1933, 2f. For other remarks on the Abusir tombs, see also
P. Jánosi, in: Bárta, Kreyčí, Abusir and Saqqara, 445–466.
36 Contrast this with the poorer supply of pottery and the fewness
of the stone vessels present in Tisethor’s burial chamber.
Moreover, Tisethor’s miniature vessels were made of limestone,
whereas most of Khekeretnebty’s model dishes were made of
calcite (see Chapter 1, p. 35).
37 On the Seven Sacred Oils, see above pp. 33–35.
38 The tablet in question is one of few found to date with blue
coloured hieroglyphs intact, although some other tablets featuring
black coloured inscriptions may be that colour due merely to the
oxidization process of the Egyptian blue that was used. For the
report (with photograph) on this new discovery, see M. Bárta,
KMT vol.13, No.1 (Spring 2002), 28.
39 For the original publication of the statue, see M. Verner, ZAS,
115, 1988, 165 and fig. 3.
ensured that his offspring were well-provided for in the tombs that he had built for them. If particular attention to the elder princess among this group of royal children has been given here at the expense of the other two, the reader needs just to remember that this is the result of the robbery and damage that had been done to the remains. Because of the accident of a collapsed roof, Khekeretnebty’s tomb provisions were better preserved than the remainder of tombs in the cemetery and they thus provide more material for analysis.

Given Khekeretnebty’s age, she may indeed have approved of the choice of burial with people she had associated with during her earlier years in the region of Abusir and it is possible that she sought a boon from the king to enable her commoner companions to be buried close to her tomb. That she had been esteemed during her lifetime is quite evident from the substantial mortuary cult that was maintained for her decades after her burial. The fact, however, sheds just a little more light on the position of the king’s daughter during the Old Kingdom.
Excursus II. Observations on the Position of Royal Daughters in the Old Kingdom

The position of the king’s female children is one that is not well understood in the Old Kingdom social milieu. Perhaps it is the dearth of evidence for such women that discourages enquiry, or perhaps the very nebulous presence of the princesses themselves meant that they had not drawn the attention of the scholar. Generally, their tombs are also limited in the types of relief and historical information offered and they may not have seemed as attractive to some archaeologists. As a result, there are only a limited number of works which touch on the topic, so it seems appropriate to give here some consideration to the position of these women. Hopefully, that may allow us a better appraisal of the social position of the princesses whose tombs figure largely in the current work.

THE TITLE OF sỉt nswt

The earliest examination of the title of a princess was Junker’s essay in the second of his volumes on Giza. He it was who demonstrated that some of the men bearing the title of sỉt nswt “King’s son” were not in fact the physical offspring of kings. The same proved to be true of the female offspring in two of the instances that Junker came across. The most celebrated of those women was Queen Meresankh III, a pivotal royal woman of the 4th Dynasty. In her case and in other cases too, the title of sỉt nswt “King’s daughter” is sometimes found to have been conferred on the king’s granddaughter.

There is a further consideration that needs to be examined in regard to these royal granddaughters: does the marriage of a king’s son and a king’s daughter entitle the offspring to be considered as full members of the blood royal? Unfortunately, at this stage at least, our knowledge of the prosopography even of members of the royal family during the Old Kingdom is very restricted; coupled with this fact is the practice of royal women who are separately buried omitting the names of their husbands in their tombs. Because Meresankh III names both parents, and both are the children of Khufu, we know that she

1 E.g. Desroches-Noblecourt in her study, *La femme*, barely mentions any princesses prior to the later New Kingdom, despite the fact that she covers all other classes of women from ancient Egypt. More surprisingly, Fischer, in his well-known pioneering study, *Egyptian Women*, confined his observations on princesses merely to remarks about the erasure of the title of sỉt nswt nt h.t.f in the tomb of a couple buried at Hemamiya (15, 47f). This omission was undoubtedly due to his aim being the overview of the various roles of the non-royal woman in the Old Kingdom — a much-needed study in its own right.

2 For example, Fischer has observed that “The tombs of non-royal women are not, in general, of great interest...” (*Egyptian Women*, 41).

3 Junker, *Giza II*, 37f.

4 Meresankh’s position is complicated by the fact that her mother later married a king (probably Djedefre), who appears to have adopted the child as his own daughter. As we are unsure of the religious or divinity status of the queen in the Old Kingdom, we cannot be sure whether the queen herself was entitled to elevate her daughter’s status to that of a sỉt nswt when the child had not been born as one. We do not know when the child was born, either, and this may have affected the assumed adoption. While the father of Meresankh III was later acknowledged as Kawab, the child may have been conceived late in Kawab’s life and born at an early stage in the marriage of Hetepheres and her new husband. Technically, such a posthumous birth would permit Meresankh to claim the title of a born princess: sỉt nswt nt h.t.f, because as a child of the new queen, she was indeed a princess. These theoretical possibilities make it risky to use Meresankh as an exception to what might seem to be a rule viz: that women entitled sỉt nswt nt h.t.f were real princesses.

5 In the case of Nesedjerkai, if her identity is identical with the daughter of Meryib, an official who is buried in the mastaba next to hers (on her circumstances see Junker, *Giza II*, 97ff), she is the great-granddaughter of a king. Her grandmother was Sedit (the mother of Meryib), and Sedit appears to have been a princess, not a queen. Sedit is only known from the mastaba of her son, Meryib, where her titles are sỉt nswt nt h.t.f and ḫntr nfr Ni. Schmitz (*Königstöchter*, 71) thinks she is not a queen because queens are usually named as such in the tombs of their children. This is correct, and the exceptional preservation of Meryib’s tomb precludes any accidental damage having occurred to Sedit’s titles.
at least had no commoner blood in her veins. Perhaps this is why her title of s3t nswt nt h.t.f jis is reiterated so much in her tomb. From the royal Egyptian point of view, she may have indeed been considered to be a bona fide princess.

**TITULAR PRINCESSES**

In addition to the s3t nswt who was a granddaughter of the king, there is a small handful of women who show no such close affiliation to the king. These two classes of princesses are referred to as “titular princesses” (see Table II). A titular princess is one who holds the title of princess without showing evidence for her being a close member of the royal family. Some of these women, as Schmitz demonstrated, have other courtly titles (such as hkr.t nswt – “royal ornament”) which a royal princess does not carry. Other princesses, such as Nesedjerkai, can be shown on genealogical grounds to have belonged to commoner families.

Of all the instances of titular princesses in the Old Kingdom, the clearest example of how such a princess was awarded the title is demonstrated by the case of Nebet of Koptos. She was not a born princess, but evidently wished to have the title. Her husband, Shemai, the governor of the nome, wrote to King Neferkauhor (8th Dynasty) to ask for permission for his wife to be elevated to the rank of princess. We do not have a copy of Shemai’s request, but the decree issued by the king was found at Koptos and subsequently transferred to the Metropolitan Museum in New York. In this decree, the king commanded that Nebet should henceforth be known as “the chief daughter of the king and royal ornament”. On her false door, Nebet is also entitled rfr.t (hereditary princess), a title only once before given to a commoner, the female vizier, Nebet, thought to belong to 6th Dynasty. Apart from that woman, the title had previously been reserved for the wives of kings.

**THE “HEIRESS THEORY” AND THE ROYAL PRINCESS**

Barbara Mertz was another rather early scholar who entered this difficult field of the s3t nswt “King’s daughter”. Her focus was on the role of the s3t nswt in the bestowal of legitimate kingship; the theory at that time was that royal daughters could confer that legitimacy via the female line. Although this theory has now been abandoned – see below and note 21 – Mertz offered some shrewd observations on the titles of the princess. In particular, she cautioned against making an assumption that regulations applying to one title (such as s3t nswt) could immediately be applied to a similar title (such as s3t nswt). The circumstances governing those titles might turn out to be quite different, she said. There is no doubt that Mertz is correct here, for the comparison between males with princely titles and females with the title of princess, shows that these seemingly equivalent titles must have operated under different rules.

Our research indicates that her carrying the title of a priestess for Neith would also disqualify her as a queen. Of all of the queens known to us, only Meresankh III and Banefer are priestesses of a goddess (queens held priesthoods for the male gods Thoth, Baal and Tsaqetep). Thus, the possession of the title of priestess of a goddess reassures us that Sedit was almost certainly a princess, not a queen.

6 In the interesting instance of Princess Wenshet, this royal woman had two daughters (Wehem-nefret and ‘Ijenetep) who carried the title of s3t nswt, and three other daughters who bore the lesser title of rht nswt. Neither of her sons had either equivalent title. See Junker, Giza I, 249f. There is no explanation for this curious outcome. It might be possible, though, that the daughters bearing the title of princess may have been born under one king who granted the title (perhaps because they were his own granddaughters), while the other girls may have been born during the reign of another king who did not have this close relationship with the family. Alternatively, it is possible that while correct status was recorded in the parent’s tomb, the child might be permitted to adopt the title of the parent for mortuary purposes only. For further comment, see the text below dealing with Princess Nebet of the 8th Dynasty.

7 Schmitz, Königssohn, 123. This title is held at Abusir by Tisnor, buried in the grave of Khekeretneby.

8 Goedicke, Königliche Dokumente, 1976. What is significant, but has been overlooked by Schmitz, Troy and others is that Nebet is not given the title of “King’s eldest daughter” (s3t nswt nms.t), but s3t nswt wrr.t, or “Chief daughter of the king”.


10 Mertz, Certain Titles, 14–20. The writer is most grateful to Dr Mertz for the very generous donation of a copy of her manuscript and would like to point out that the author pioneered many significant investigations into the study of royal women from the Old Kingdom to the end of the New Kingdom.

11 Mertz, Certain Titles, 17.

12 Junker (Giza II, 121f.), for example, uses the case of Meryib to assume that the princely title may have been passed from father to son, when it has now been shown that the title was also given to men who were not relatives of the royal family. E. g. the vizier, Phahespes of Abusir, who received the title relatively late in his career (Verner, Forgotten Pharaohs, 189), did not use the title in the earlier stages of the building of his mastaba and clearly did not inherit the title from his father. In spite of his prestigious position, and the fact that his wife was a true princess, none of Phahespes’ sons held the title of s3t nswt. It would also seem that Schmitz, who tends to view these titles of s3t nswt and s3t nswt as being similar, has sometimes missed nuances of difference, particularly in regard to the women who are simply entitled s3t nswt. She does not appear inclined to take on board the observation by Junker (Giza II, 37) that the title could be passed on to grandchildren. While Schmitz was able to demonstrate that in many cases Junker’s theory was imperfect, she was also wary of such titles, suspecting that it indicated a titular princesses. In several cases this was so, but it is very apparent that princesses with the extended title, s3t nswt nt h.t.f also used the s3t nswt title on occasion. Equally, some women with this title (e.g. Princess Wenshet’s two daughters – at least) do appear to have been granddaughters of the king, thus giving support to Junker’s hypothesis.
EXTENSIONS TO THE TITLE OF sšt nswt

At this point, we should mention that the title in question can have a number of extensions – excluding the usual epithets, such as mrt.f, “his beloved”.

Of these extended titles, sšt nswt nt htf “King’s daughter of his body” is the most common and it was certainly used by the daughters of kings to assert their legitimacy as physical daughters of a ruler. The two princesses buried in Djedkare Isesi’s family cemetery both carry that title and E. Strohals’s analysis of their remains, together with comparisons with the remains of the burial in Djedkare Isesi’s pyramid have revealed that those three persons were closely related, thus substantiating the title of sšt nswt nt htf.

Princess Redjet of the 3rd Dynasty was the first to use the extended title of sšt nswt nt htf, and while the extension may have indicated a need to distinguish the true princess from the titular princess, it should be noted that no titular princess has yet been recognised prior to the period between Dynasties 4 and 5. Rather, it should be suspected that Redjet’s use of the extension was merely typical of the Egyptian tendency to aggrandize their titles with additions to make them sound more impressive and to add to the list of titles that each individual had.

The next extension referred to the position of the princess within the family of the king; there were two variations: sšt nswt šmsr “king’s eldest daughter” and sšt nswt nt htf šmsr “King’s eldest daughter of his body”. They denoted the eldest female child from a particular queen – i.e., the king may have had 3 wives and therefore 3 eldest daughters. Princess Nefretkau A of the 4th Dynasty was the first known female to display this title.

An uncommon extension was sšt nswt bity “Daughter of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt”; this title was held by two princesses: Hetepheres II (4th Dynasty) and Iput I (6th Dynasty). A third princess, Nefretkau A (4th Dynasty) carried a variation of the title, being recorded in her grandson’s tomb in this way: nswt bity Snfrw sšt.f ŋ htf.15 This variant form is due to the inscription being a reference to Sneferu, rather than the usual title that accompanied the name of a princess. It is perfectly possible that this form was attached to Nefretkau’s name to give her further distinction. A fourth princess, Rekhetre (who later became a queen), was also referred to in an identical way in the tomb of Irenakhet, being entitled there: nswt bity ḫḥf-r’t ṣḥ.t.f.16 Yet another queen who may have used this title is Queen Khamererneby I, where the way in which the inscription mwt nswt bity sšt nrg is written contains the embedded nswt bity sšt of this extension title.17

A rare extension for the title of princess was sšt nswt wrt “chief daughter of the king” which, in the Old Kingdom was used only by the titular princess Nebeti, the wife of the governor of the Koptite nome in Dynasty 8.18 It was later used on two other occasions, in the 17th and early 18th Dynasties.

ASPECTS OF THE POSITION OF THE sšt nswt

The classic study for the sšt nswt is contained within the covers of Bettina Schmitz’s seminal work on the kings’ sons.19 Indeed, it was her research that made it common knowledge that some of the sšt nswt were what has come to be known as “titular princesses”20: princesses who were not direct children of the king, but raised to that status – presumably by the king himself.21 Considering that her study was primarily directed towards the male offspring of the king, Schmitz gave generous attention in her work to the position of the royal daughter, especially in regard to the marriages of such women.

Not surprisingly, those princesses who were married outside the royal family during all periods of Egyptian history were married to high officials. Nonetheless, even Schmitz’s careful research led to the conclusion that not a lot of insight could be gleaned about the other activities or the position of such women within their society. This situation is due to the very real lack of information from the society itself: women in ancient Egypt held very few titles indicating the sorts of things that filled their lives and they left no “biographies” as significant officials did. As in many societies past and present, women were seen primarily as wives and mothers and other activities they did (e.g. as midwives, nurses and village wise women) usually went unrecorded. It is therefore only from the titles and from archaeological

---

13 The statue of Redjet probably was made early in Dynasty 3, judging by its close resemblance to the statue of the Royal Builder, Ankhau. Redjet’s statue is now in Turin Museum; Smith (The Art and Architecture, 38) considers that the princess must have been able to command a fine sculptor for her statue. It is more likely to have been a gift from her royal father.
14 Nefretkau’s record is in the tomb of her grandson, Khaf-Sneferu (LD II, 16), where she is nswt bity (Snfrw) sšt.f ŋ htf śmsr Nfrt-kbw.
15 LD, I,16
17 See G. Daressy, in: ASEA 10, 1910, 46.
18 On the false door in Qift—see L. Habachi, in: SAK 10, 1983, 211. The wrt is translated as “eldest” by both Habachi (210) and Troy, Queenship, 195, which clashes with the usual translation of śmsr; therefore “chief” is to be preferred.
19 Schmitz, Königsson.
20 Schmitz claims (Königsson, 118) that all titular princesses are simply entitled sšt nswt, without extensions and the evidence seems to support this. Moreover, titular princesses frequently display their non-royal origins by having rḥt nswt and ḫrt nswt included in their titulary.
21 See comments on p. 2 above.
remains that we can gather anything about women in ancient Egyptian society.

THE MYTHIC PROTOTYPE

Another important study that considered the royal daughter – this time from a religious point of view – was L. Troy’s study on queenship in ancient Egypt.22 In her examination of the role of the queen, Troy included significant evidence for the way in which the royal daughter fitted into the religious concept of what she called “the mythic prototype”. For our purposes, however, her study is less useful for the Old Kingdom, since most of her significant material comes from the New Kingdom period and later. Incontestably, it is very clear to us that both conditions and concepts from the New Kingdom cannot always be established as having relevance for the Old Kingdom society.

In the early 1990s, G. Robins looked briefly at the position of kings’ daughters in regard to their importance and the roles that they played in the New Kingdom – in particular, focussing on the ‘royal heiress’ theory, which sought for the legitimation of a king’s accession to the throne via birth from a royal daughter.23 Results of her study showed conclusively that there was no “royal heiress” concept operating among the Egyptians of that time or at any other.

ROYAL DAUGHTERS AND THE QUESTION OF INCEST

Robins has also probed the touchy issue of royal incest, both brother-sister marriages24 and father-daughter marriages25 within the Egyptian royal family. By now, the material regarding brother-sister marriages has been well aired in both scholarly and general literature: the marriages in question sometimes being a marriage between half-brothers and sisters, although it is not always possible to ascertain this distinction.

Whilst father-daughter marriages also have a direct bearing on the role of the princess, once again, this practice has no application to the royal family in the Old Kingdom because there is no known case of such a union. However, the recent revelation that a queen from the 6th Dynasty had taken her nephew as husband does have application to the issue of royal incest. Queen Ankhnesemeryre II (also known as Ankhnesepy II) is now known to have been the wife not only of King Pepy I, but of his son, King Merenre I. This astonishing discovery has only recently been found and was not available to Robins at the time of her writing.26 Regarding princesses and incest, though, it has no bearing on the case, since Ankhnesemeryre II was not a princess, but a commoner. Nonetheless, it is interesting to speculate on the origins of Ankhnesenpepy III, who is the only known child of King Merenre. Was she the daughter of Ankhnesemeryre II (a relationship that today’s public would consider incestuous)? Her tomb complex, being in such close proximity to the newly-discovered complex of Queen Ankhnesenepy II, would surely suggest that this was so.27 It is also strongly suspected that one Old Kingdom case of uncle-niece incest is to be found in the probable marriage of Queen Meresankh III with her putative uncle, Khafrē.28

What are regarded by us as incidents of incest were not considered by the ancient Egyptians as unhealthy or socially unacceptable practices; rather, they viewed royal brother-sister marriages as conduct imitating the practices of the gods. As the kings (and possibly the queens, too) were regarded as semi-divine, such marriages would have been considered laudatory, rather than incestuous. It was for this reason that the Macedonian royal family during the Ptolemaic period embraced the Egyptian practice and virtually restricted itself to brother-sister marriages throughout its lengthy dynasty.

On a more pragmatic level, we suspect that such marriages might also have had the aim of restricting the royal divinity to as few persons as possible. (A wish to limit potential contenders to the throne might also explain why such a considerable number of princesses appear to have remained unmarried.) A policy like that would certainly have assisted in limiting the opportunities for ambitious commoners to mount a challenge to the throne through marriage to a princess. This seems to have been the purpose in the unusual marriage of King Khafrē and Queen Meresankh III, if Khafrē was (as we suspect) the

22 Troy, Queenship, passim.
23 Robins, Women in Ancient Egypt, 26. Her detailed article on this topic was “A critical examination of the theory of the right to the throne of ancient Egypt passed through the female line in the 18th dynasty”, GM 62, 1983, 67–77.
24 Robins, Women in Ancient Egypt, 27
25 ibid., 15, 296.
27 As Ankhnesenepy III was married to Pepy II, her burial should have been with those of his other wives, in that king’s complex, but in fact, it was close to the south-west corner of the pyramid complex of her grandfather, Pepy I. There must have been some strong reason to prompt this departure from the normal royal burial custom.
28 We do not know the physical relationships existing among Khufu’s children, but it is likely that Khafrē was a half-brother of Meresankh’s father, Kawab. However, there is no actual evidence either way. We are not told of the identity of Meresankh’s husband, either, although the fact that her son, Nebemakhet, vizier to Khafrē, implies in his own tomb that his father is Khafrē, makes this marriage almost certain.
brother or half-brother, not the son of his predecessor. Such a situation is perhaps rare to find because it surely raised the spectre of the contest between Horus and Seth. By tying his niece to his own family, Khafre would have prevented the possibility of a potent pretender to the throne.

THE PRESENCE OF THE PRINCESS IN ART

In the secondary literature, a few contributions to discussion on the royal women have appeared in catalogues stemming from museum exhibitions – the richly illustrated volumes entitled Nofret, die Schöné are prime examples of this, but no discussion on the role of Old Kingdom princesses feature in those pages. B. Bryan contributed a pithy essay on royal women in a catalogue for an exhibition organised by the Cincinnati Art Museum in Ohio, in 1996. Old Kingdom princesses are given some consideration in this piece, but there is no extended discussion on their role, other than a brief mention of their marital links with officials. However, the book accompanying the exhibition, “Queen Nefertiti and the Royal Women: Images of Beauty from Ancient Egypt” held at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York around about the same time, contains a chapter on the royal female image by Do. Arnold that breaks new ground in its analysis of the role of the queen and her royal daughters as they symbolise royal rejuvenation and rebirth. It is just unfortunate for us that the special religious characteristics of the Amarna period places it well beyond the Old Kingdom range that is the subject of this present chapter.

We can, however, compare the presence of the princesses in New Kingdom religious art with the very rare instances of princesses in art as revealed in the Old Kingdom. The damaged reliefs from the mortuary temple of Sahure and the sun temple of Niuserre preserve fragmentary glimpses of royal children serving what seems to be a similar religious function in the Old Kingdom. Although their iconographic significance in the decoration program of these temples is unknown, they reveal that princesses were involved in religious scenes on royal monuments. In the New Kingdom, the Amarna reliefs known as the talatat from both Luxor and Hermopolis reveal that princesses were included in the procession of celebrants involved in offering scenes, but they also appear in Akhenaten’s heb sed celebrations, where they take part in a procession in their carrying chairs. Thus a direct comparison can be made between Akhenaten’s reliefs and those reliefs from Niuserre’s sun sanctuary, where the msw nswt (children of the king) are depicted as participating in some ritual involving the carrying chair. We are also aware of the presence of the msw nswt within the heb sed festivities of King Amenhotep III, as well. Troy has explained their presence as serving some religious function in asserting the generational progression of the royal family.

From fragments found in the temple of Khentkaus II in Abusir (Dynasty 5), another small piece of relief featuring a Princess Reputub (though not in a carrying chair) may come from a scene in which a procession of members of the royal family is shown, perhaps paying tribute to Queen Khentkaus II. (It needs to be emphasised that, like a king, Khentkaus possessed a hwt ntr, or royal temple.) Thus, despite the fragmentary nature of the testimony, it is certainly significant that, whatever other roles they played, it was considered important – on some occasions at least – to give the king’s daughter a place in the decoration program of the royal temples.

Occasionally, individual princesses may be depicted with some unusual attribute - such as the panther skin worn over the normal shift, but we can point to select commoners who also wear this garment. Meresankh III is once depicted in such a skin, but she is also shown in a boating scene with her mother, this time wearing a flower diadem and a net garment. Although this combination is not worn by commoners, both items of apparel are worn separately by noble women of the commoner class. Princess Khekernebyt is distinguished in another significant way. On a fragment of a badly weathered lintel from above the entrance to her tomb (1/B/76), to the left, there is featured the traditional standing figure of the female tomb owner. Her left hand is laid on her breast in the usual female pose of deference, but her right hand holds an ankh-sign. This is, to our knowledge, the first occasion on which a princess holds such a sign, normally the prerogative of a king. Such a sign is not only unusual, but significant, indicating that Khekernebyt had especial religious esteem during her lifetime. It is perhaps this esteem which made her tomb the central focus of the Cemetery of Djedkare’s family and led to the establishment of a large, cult offering place within

29 Nofret – die Schöné I and Nofret – die Schöné II.
32 Smith, Redford, The Akhenaten Temple, pl. 41.
34 Troy, Queenship, 109ff.
35 Verner, Khentkaus, 65 and fig.186/A/78 on p. 83.
36 For the original publication of this region of Khekernebyt’s tomb, see M. Verner, in: ZAS 117, 1990, 72–78.
the open courtyard (Area F) outside the entrance of her tomb. This place consisted of offering tables, libation basins and associated magazines. From this miscellaneous collection of buildings and courtyards, it appears that Khekeretnebty became some sort of patron for this early part of the cemetery. The thick layer containing pieces of charcoal, ash, fragments of animal bones and potsherds on the floor of the courtyard, indicates that Khekeretnebty's mortuary cult was operating from the 5th to the 6th Dynasty, and the thickness of the ash layer, as well as the elaborateness of this complex attests to the importance of the cult.

We have another echo of unusual veneration being given to a princess in the Inventory Stela found in the vicinity of pyramid G 1c, at Giza. This Saite inscription celebrates offerings being brought for the "King's daughter, Henutsen" – presumably the owner of the pyramid, although this identification is hypothetical. In later times, the pyramid temple on the eastern side became expanded and, eventually, became a temple dedicated to Isis-Mistress-of-the-Pyramid. The stela makes it clear, however, that the person of the princess was incorporated into this cultic tribute to Isis. While the veneration of queens is well-attested, such honouring of a princess is most unusual and might suggest that princesses may indeed have had a religious role to fill which, due to the loss of material remains, will probably forever remain elusive to us. However, it is suspected that Henutsen was not only a king's daughter, but also a queen, and it may be in her status as queen (a status not mentioned on the stela) which was the origin of the veneration.

OTHER ASPECTS OF THE POSITION OF THE PRINCESS

While both the tomb reliefs and the titles of princes can sometimes inform us about the duties carried out by the sons of kings, the records for princesses are confined solely to a slender collection of titles and standard tomb decorations where the princess is depicted in a static position, feet placed together, one hand on her breast, sometimes smelling a lotus held in her hand. Occasionally – as with representations of the kings' officials – the princess may be taken somewhere in her carrying chair (Princess Watetkethor), or she may view the activities in the field or on the river (Queen Meresankh III), she may be shown taking a ride in a boat (Princess Iufi, Queen Meresankh II). Occasionally, she may even play the harp for her husband (Princess Watetkethor, wife of Mereruka), as other non-royal women did. Indeed, there is little difference between the activities of the princess and those of upper class, non-royal women. Exceptionally, Queen Meresankh and her mother are shown engaged in the religious activity of pulling papyrus for Hathor, but usually there is little movement or other activity indicated in the iconography of either the queen or the princess.

In her dress and adornments, the princess is indistinguishable from other wealthy women depicted in the tombs of important officials. One single item that may set them apart is the occasional depiction of the panther skin that can be found in women bearing the title of sšt nšwt, whether they have the extended title or not (e.g. Queen Meresankh III, Princess Nefertabet). The significance of that form of garment is not known, other than our awareness that it is a religious indication and men also are shown wearing it. As with most of the women living at that time, it is extremely difficult to reconstruct the elements of the life of a typical princess, nor can we fully understand their social or religious significance for the era in which they lived.

The social dimension

One of the unusual aspects of princesses during the course of the Old Kingdom is that there are so few of them in the current records that we have. There are far more royal sons than royal daughters. Given that some kings had several wives, this sexual imbalance is rather surprising. Schmitz has recorded most of these and Table I contains a list of those princesses who are known to us at present. Table II lists most of the titular princesses that are known.

Some of these princesses do not appear to have married. Princess Khekeretnebty and Princess Hedjetnebu, for example, do not appear to have had husbands. Those who seem to have been unmarried princesses occupy mastabas containing no other burial e.g. Meretites B Giza Western Cemetery (G 4140) is surely one of those, as is Princess Neferhetepes B (G 4714). Other royal daughters married high-ranking officials and some, of course, married kings.
Regarding the marriage policy of the Old Kingdom rulers, it becomes clear that, by the end of 4th Dynasty, princesses were occasionally used to cement loyalties with men of the class of high officials. This practice is notably substantiated by King Shepseskaf of 4th Dynasty, who married his daughter Khamata to the High Priest of Heliopolis, Ptahshepses (buried at Saqqara). This situation might hint at some insecurity felt by the king — there are other indications of unusual character noticeable in the monuments of Shepseskaf which have prompted other scholars to suggest a reign that may not have been either steady or secure. Several generations after Khamata’s time, Princess Khamerernebty, the daughter of Niuserre, was married to her father’s vizier, Ptahshepses (buried at Abusir). At the beginning of the 6th Dynasty, two of the daughters of King Teti, Watetkhethor and Nubkhetnebt, were married to their father’s viziers: Mereruka and Kagemni. It is possible that all these marriages were a reflection of politically unsettled times and that the king sought to make alliances with important and powerful families who could strengthen his control over the ever-expanding bureaucracy. This can be substantiated by a closer look at each of the above cases.

The Saqqara Ptahshepses was, unusually for those times, an official whose titles were wholly sacerdotal. He was connected with the cult of Ptah and the sun cult of Re at Heliopolis. On the other hand, the king whose daughter he wed seems to have been a man who may not have been the son of the previous king, Menkaure. (It has also been suspected by some scholars that Shepseskaf was the husband of Queen Khentkaus I.) It is certainly significant that Shepseskaf chose an unusual tomb for his royal burial, and it is surely significant that he chose to erect it in a place as far south from Heliopolis as he did. Was he making a religious statement, as Selim Hassan suspected?

The Abusir Ptahshepses was another prominent personality, this time, during the reign of Niuserre and probably also his brother and predecessor, Neferere. The reign of Shepseskare between these two brothers is also thought to have been not only brief, but of dubious legitimacy. There are very few records testifying to his reign. When the vizier married Niuserre’s daughter, he already had a family with at least three sons of his own, but he went on to raise another family with Princess Khamerernebty A. There is little doubt that the political situation at this time was unstable, due to the rapid turnover of the kings. It is very likely that the king sought support via a marriage link from a noble who was both prominent and capable at this time.

At the turn of the 6th Dynasty, King Teti seems to have had an extraordinary marriage policy. He had at least two wives, both of whom seem to have been princesses, Iput I and Khuit II. We know nothing about the earlier history of either of these women, but presumably, they were the daughters of Unis. Two of his own daughters, Watetkhethor and Nubkhetnebt, however, were given in marriage to men who became viziers, Mereruka and Kagemni. Two other daughters, Idut and Inti, seem to have been unmarried, for each woman has her own individual tomb. Idut’s tomb had been taken from vizier, in what may have been a difficult period. The political tenor of that era is indicated by Manetho’s claim that Teti was murdered by his bodyguard, and by the virtual damnatio experienced for the brief reign of King Userkare.

These, then, are the most prominent cases of the marital policy concerning princesses. Perhaps if other instances of marriage involving a princess and a commoner (e.g., Princess Nubibnebti, who married the courtier, Sankhuiptah — probably in the time of King Djedkare Isesi) are investigated, further interesting slants on the history of the Old Kingdom might be made.

RELIGIOUS TITLES OF PRINCESSES

As with other women from the upper echelons of society during the Old Kingdom, many princesses were priestesses of goddesses, most commonly, Hathor and Neith. Neither Princess Khekeretnebt nor Princess Hedjetnebu were title-holders of any

64 E.g. Princess Hetepheres A married Ankhhaf, a King’s son, a vizier and an overseer of the treasury and of all the works of the king. Princess Khamata, daughter of Shepseskaf, married the distinguished priest, Ptahshepses (buried at Saqqara), st i nswt n 5ht/b/Khetkawes was the wife of Kha/khufu II (who held the titles of st i nswt, imy-r mrt, imy-r smstw lmmtyt, imy-r kh n nswt, wr md 5m’tw, hry stti n nbf etc.). See Simpson, Kawab, 23. Princess Khamernebty A married Ptahshepses of Abusir.

65 E.g. Queen Hetepheres II, daughter of Khufu, wife of Kawab, later married an as yet unknown king (possibly Djedefre); Khamerernebty II, daughter of an unknown king (possibly Khafre), married an unnamed king — probably Menkaure; Rekhette, daughter of Khafre, married an unknown king (possibly Menkaure).

66 Whilst Bryan mentions no Old Kingdom examples, she is correct in her observation that “Royal women were important in securing the power of the royal family well beyond their ceremonial ties to the reigning king”.

69 Hassan, Gica IV, 34ff.

50 For an in depth discussion, see M. Verner, in: Bára, Krajčí, Abusir and Saqqara, 581–602, especially, 587ff.

51 There is an enigmatic king’s mother named Khent-t… She may have been the mother of the nebulous King Userkare. See J-P. Lauer, in: BSFE 52, 1968, 27. Seipel (Koniginnen, pp. 245f.) was the first to make the suggestion that this queen might have been Userkare’s mother. Further commentary can be found in Jánosi, Die Pyramidenanlagen, 43ff.
priesthood, however. See Table II for other princesses who record no priesthood.

The princess as priestess of a king

A handful of born princesses were priestesses of cults that honoured a king – usually, a grandfather. However, Queen Bunefre (Dynasty 4) appears to have held some cults in respect of her father, King Shepseska (perhaps because no female grandchild survived him?). Bunefre is also unique in carrying three separate priestess titles for the cults of King Shepseska, one as Horus, Hr Špsš-\(^{3}\), one for the king’s personal name, Špsš-kf, and one for his Nebty name, Nḥty Špsš-ṃrt.f. Another princess, Hemet B,\(^{52}\) this time for the late 5\(^{th}\)/early 6\(^{th}\) Dynasty, was a priestess for the mrt of Unas, and also of King Teti. It is suspected, but not verifiable, that Hemet may have been an unmarried daughter of Unas. She is the only royal woman to hold such titles.

The princess as priestess of a goddess

A number of the princesses also carried the title of priestess – usually for the goddess Hathor, but sometimes for Neith and sometimes for both of those goddesses.\(^{53}\) To date, no princess is known to have been a priestess for a male god in the Old Kingdom, although some of the queens did carry priestly titles in association with the ancestor gods, Thoth, Tjaatuf and Bapef. Some of the king’s granddaughters were priestesses for the cult of their grandfather – probably as part of ancestor worship. It is also noteworthy that, to date, only the 4\(^{th}\) Dynasty kings were associated with these ruler cults.

The most common priestly title held by women in the Old Kingdom was hmt ntr Hwt-hr “priestess of Hathor”. It was a title held by upper class women and princesses, not members of the lower class.\(^{54}\) Only two queens are known to have held the title during the Old Kingdom: Meresankh III and Bunefre. Again, this is likely to be due to their origins as a granddaughter of a king. Conversely, in the Middle Kingdom, a number of queens held this title, but only one princess (sīt nswt Iah\(^{55}\)) is recorded as having it at that time.

Three or four priestess titles involving Hathor are found among the princesses of the Old Kingdom: the first is the simple form, hmt ntr Hwt-hr; the second is hmt ntr Hwt-Hr nbt nhk: Hathor, Mistress of the Sycamore; its variant is, Hathor, Mistress of the Sycamore in all the places (hmt ntr Hwt-Hr nbt nhk m st nbwt); and the last title is: Hathor, Mistress of Denderah. Queen Meresankh III and Bunefre are the only ones to have the title, hmt ntr Hwt-Hr nbt Twnt, “Priestess of Hathor, Mistress of Heliopolis”. This may have been an indication that the sun cult was growing in strength at that time. It is surely significant that Khamaat, the daughter of Shepseska, became the wife of the High Priest of Heliopolis. Neith’s cult was detailed as hmt ntr Nt nbt inšt “Neith honoured Lady”, and hmt ntr Nt mḥt inb “Neith north of the wall”.

THE TOMBS OF PRINCESSES

In the ratio between men and women, few female individuals owned a tomb,\(^{56}\) but a large number of female tomb owners were princesses. Prior to the 2\(^{nd}\) Dynasty, however, there is no evidence regarding the burial of a princess, neither do we have any citation for a princess in the 1\(^{st}\) Dynasty, though no doubt the female children of kings existed. More surprisingly, we do not have any evidence for such persons even on the numerous cylinder seals which were prime grave goods for the 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) Dynasties.

One suggestion for the presence of princesses in the Predynastic era is provided by the fragmentary Hierakonpolis Macehead. This features the images of three females, each seated in a carrying chair, but the females are not labelled. Their iconography, however, appears in later heb sed evidence, where such a scene is labelled nsw nswt “the children of the king”. We should, perhaps, conclude from this that although there were royal children in every era of ancient Egypt, the title of sīt nswt had its origins only during the course of the 2\(^{nd}\) Dynasty.

---

53 For information on Princess Hemet B, see Hassan, Mastabas, 1–10. Princess Hemet is entitled rḥt nswt on her sarcophagus in the burial chamber, but on her false door she is entitled sīt nswt nḥf. She is the only woman with these conflicting titles, and some doubt her identification as a princess because of this. However, her title of sīt nswt nḥf Wnqs nfr swt is a pyramid title that otherwise only appears with royal women. In addition to this, Hemet is hmt ntr Mrt Tji, a unique royal title that was evidently a forerunner of the pyramid titles of the 6\(^{th}\) Dynasty. As it was meant to provision a female dependant from the king’s own largesse, it is unlikely to have been given to a commoner.

54 It is thought by Schott that these two goddesses may have shared a sanctuary during the Old Kingdom (in: Ricke, Userekaf II, 127 f.). This reflects the much greater importance of the goddess Neith in the Early Dynasty and Old Kingdom periods and would explain why so many upper class women held both priesthoods.

55 Begelsbach-Fischer, Götterwelt, 75 ff., shows that 109 women were Hathor’s priests, far outstripping the priesthoods held for other gods. Bunefre’s title may belong to her daughter.

56 On a block found at Deir el Bahari (BM 1819).

57 In the G 1200 cemetery, west of Khufu’s pyramid, for example, there are eleven tombs containing thirteen burials (some of the burial shafts were simply unfinished and unused – see P. Jánosi, in: ArOr 70/3, 2002 (in press). There were three known female tomb owners (Princess Nefertiabet, Princess Sety-hekenet and rḥt nswt Nofret), and there is a female burial within a male tomb (G 1235 name of tomb owner unknown). There were seven male tomb owners and two unknown tomb owners.
The earliest known tombs for princesses date to the Second Dynasty and are located at Helwan. From this site, so-called Ceiling Stelae were retrieved and documented by Zaki Saad. From this place comes the burial of Hetyep-neit, Khnumptah57 (no. 1) and Satkhum (no. 13)58. From Saqqara, Firth found the stelae of Shepshepet59 and Sihefener60, all of them labelled as princesses.

Although we have the statue of Princess Redjet61 and the hundred or so boundary stelae from Djoser’s complex with the names and titles (specifically, stt nswt) of his wife, Hetephernebtawy and daughter, Intkaes for the 3rd Dynasty,62 we do not have the tombs of either of these princesses. It seems very likely, though, that with Djoser’s family members, their burials were intended to be within the galleries of the Step Pyramid, since two women and a boy from this period were found here. At Dahshur, although tombs of the sons of a king were found (e.g. Rahotep, Nefermaat), no princesses’ tombs have yet been located. The tombs of the other 4th Dynasty princesses lying at Giza are the next batch that are known.

In Giza, princesses had graves in Khufu’s Eastern, Southern and Western Cemeteries. The Eastern Cemetery had a number of mastabas, each of them single tombs at first, but those on the northern row were later joined to mastabas to the immediate south of them. The result of this linking was to create a set of huge mastabas, with separate burial shafts and chambers within them. It is not impossible that these double mastabas were intended for male and female children of the king who were married to each other, as Kawab and Hetepheres II,63 Meresankh II and Hor(ba) were. The tombs in the southern rows do not appear to have been owned by any princesses, although only the wife of Khafkhufu I is known by name. She was not a princess. In the Southern Cemetery of Khufu’s pyramid field, Princess Nefert-kau was probably buried. Her son and her grandson occupied the two tombs in the same part of the cemetery. She may have been a sister of Khufu, but her origins are really only suggested by the title recording her as a daughter of Sneferu.

In Khufu’s Western Cemetery, a number of core tombs were put down during Khufu’s reign. Some of these core tombs were occupied by princesses. In this cemetery also, several tombs belonging to what Schmitz has called titular princesses can be found. The actual dates of the burials, however, are uncertain. Some of them appear to have been 5th Dynasty burials. The titulary princesses definitely belong to this group. Princess Meretites B (G 4140) may be a 4th Dynasty burial in this cemetery, but Princess Weneshet and lababet have been reclassified by Helck as being late 5th/early 6th Dynasty burials.64 From Abu Roash, no tombs for princesses have as yet been identified. This situation may change as a result of renewed excavation by a Swiss-French team, under the direction of Michel Vallogia, but no information is yet at hand.

From Khafre’s valley cemetery, the two princesses who were also queens named Khamerernebtawy are cited in the rock-cut Galarza Tomb. In the same cemetery, the tombs of Persenetet (evidently a wife of Khafre), Rekhtet (also a queen) and Hemetre A (both probably Khafre’s daughters) are known, as are one or two burials in later tombs built in Khufu’s Eastern Cemetery. Other 4/5th Dynasty princesses have tombs that can be found in Khufu’s Western Cemetery.

For the 5th Dynasty, the Mastaba of the Princesses65 excavated by Borchardt and the tombs of the Abusir princesses that form the core of Djedkare’s family cemetery are the only tombs of princesses yet discovered at Abusir.66 However, the mastabas en échelon to the south of Prince Nakhte’s tomb that begins a line of tombs that is south of Neferefre’s mortuary temple, may yield some more royal children. These mastabas have not yet been excavated.

In Saqqara, the King’s Daughter, Queen Khuit I was buried in a tomb which appears to be hers, although this is not verifiable as the tomb was inadequately excavated by Mariette and then covered over. Her circumstances appear to be similar to those of Queen Nymaathap II and Queen Meresankh IV (who were not princesses), in that they were not buried near their husbands.67

For the 6th Dynasty, Princess Inti was buried in a single tomb not far from the pyramid of King Teti, her assumed father.68 Hemetre B69 was also buried at Saqqara in a single tomb. Princess Idut was buried at

57 Helwan 175 HB; Saad, Ceiling Stelae, 5ff, pl. 2.
58 Saad, Ceiling Stelae, 41, pl. 24
59 Saqqara 3477; PM III: 2, 444.
60 Saqqara 2146E; Kaplony, IAF 1, 489, Abb. 568.
61 Turin 3065.
62 Cairo JE 52508-9.
64 see W. Helck, in: Berger, Hommages à Jean Leclant I, 221–230, especially pp. 228f.
65 Ironically, no princess was buried here. Khamerernebtawy was evidently interred with her husband in his mastaba, whilst Meretites, the other princess named there, was the granddaughter of the king, therefore, not a true princess.
66 Though no direct epigraphic evidence is available, it cannot be excluded – judging by some archaeological finds and observations, that Nebtyemneferes, buried in a mastaba east of the pyramid Lepsius no. XXIV, was a princess, too. For the mastaba, see M. Verne, in: ZAS, 115, 1988, 167–169.
67 For the pyramid tombs of Old Kingdom princesses who became queens, see Jánosi, Die Pyramidenanlagen, 5–50.
Saqqara in an usurped tomb, but on her own. Her sister, Watetkhethor, was buried within her vizier – husband’s tomb, but the burial of their sister Nubkhethetby, is uncertain. As von Bissing (Gem - ni - kai, 3) has observed, the funerary apartments of Kagemni’s tomb are unknown. No other 6th Dynasty princess who was not a queen has yet been discovered; all of the queens who were daughters of kings had pyramid complexes, most of which were close to the pyramid of their husbands.

In looking over the evidence for the burial of princesses – including the queens, who had their own separate tomb complexes – the striking thing is that most of them were buried alone within their own tombs. Khekeretnebty and her sister are two who are of particular interest to us, of course, but the letter S on Table I indicates those princesses who had single burials. (The letter U indicates that the tomb of that princess is not known; the letter H indicates burial within a husband’s tomb; the titular princesses in Table II have been treated in a similar way.) Of significant note is the fact that some of those single burials were those of married women who had children, yet they appear to have been buried apart from their husbands. This means that we really cannot confidently assume from a single burial with no mention of a husband or child that the princess interred there had never married.

While some of those tombs in which a princess appears to join her spouse, a re-examination of the shafts and burial provisions has shown that they are not proper funerary apartments at all. This also has thrown doubt upon our previous perceptions of princesses in the Old Kingdom.

Some princesses who had married prestigious officials were buried within the tomb of their husbands (e.g. Khamerernebty A, Khentkaus – wife of Senedjemib Mehi) but other married princesses have tombs that are unknown (e.g. Nefertkau A, Hetepheres A). A large number of princesses, however, cannot be associated with any tomb at all. Their references derive from tombs of their husbands, sons or grandsons (e.g. Hetephernebty, Intkaes, Redjet, Sedit, Khenuet etc.). This may be due to so much damage having been inflicted upon tombs that they are now anepigraphic.

CONCLUSIONS

The remarks in the above paragraph provide us with some clues to the very skimpy knowledge that we have about the burial of princesses during the Old Kingdom. As can be seen from the sketchiness of this outline, however, the topic is still an incompletely tilled archaeological field. This is also true for the social and religious aspects of princesses as well. Nonetheless, during their lifetimes, the princesses held an elevated status within the Old Kingdom, as the size and the decoration of their tombs attest – among the handful of examples we can call upon. Whilst their importance is assured, however, princesses form one of the lesser-known groups of society during the Old Kingdom.

69 Schmitz, Königsohn, 111f. does not consider her to have been an hereditary princess for two reasons: she carries the title of rht nswt and she holds a hmt ntr Mrt-Tet title, yet she is not the daughter of this king. In regard to the latter title, perhaps what we have here is another exceptional case, where Teti honoured a princess who belonged to the previous dynasty, probably to announce his good relationship with that dynasty. (It is certainly true that he emphasised this dynastic harmony by employing many of Unis’ officials, such as Kagemni). The issue of the rht nswt title is impossible for me to explain at this stage, unless it might be a reference to some relationship the princess had in regard to King Teti.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dyn.</th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Addenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hetyphiremety</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>sỉt nswt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother of Djoser</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inkaes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>sỉt nswt</td>
<td>Djoser</td>
<td>daughter of Djoser (?)</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redjet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>sỉt nswt nt ħt.f</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fakhry, Seneferu at Dahshur II/II (1961), pls XLIVf.</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wemtetka</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sỉt nswt nt</td>
<td>D. of Seneferu</td>
<td>Mother of vizier Nefermaat II G 7060</td>
<td>Possibly wife of Khufu, since her stela was found in situ in G 1c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nefretkau A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>nswt bity (Snfrw)</td>
<td>Seneferu</td>
<td></td>
<td>G 7050 First time for extended titles mrt.f, śmnšt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sỉt.f(nt) ħt.f śmnšt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Said to be D. of Seneferu but her priesthood suggests she was GD</td>
<td>Wife of Ankhkaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hethepheres A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sỉt nswt nt ħt.f mrt.f śmnšt hmt nṯr (Snfrw)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U - G. Reisner Giza II (1955), 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henutsen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sỉt nswt.f</td>
<td>D. of Seneferu?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possibly wife of Khufu, since her stela was found in situ in G 1c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hethepheres II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sỉt nswt nt sỉt nswt bity (Ḥwfw)</td>
<td>D. of Khufu</td>
<td>Wife of Ankhkaf, Mother of Queen Meresankh III</td>
<td>G 7110, but burial site unknown. G 7350 is unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khamerernebty I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sỉt nswt nt</td>
<td>D. of Khufu (?)</td>
<td>Wife of a king Khafre (?)</td>
<td>U - Galarza Tomb? Her titles preserved here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meresankh II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sỉt nswt nt</td>
<td>D. of Khufu</td>
<td>Wife of an unknown King</td>
<td>G 7410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sỉt nswt nt hmt nṯr Ni</td>
<td>D. of Khufu (?)</td>
<td>Mother of Meryib, husband unknown.</td>
<td>U - recorded in son’s tomb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neferhpetepes A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sỉt nswt nt</td>
<td>D. of Djedefre</td>
<td></td>
<td>U - recorded in son’s tomb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hethepheres B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sỉt nswt nt</td>
<td>D. of Djedefre</td>
<td>Sister of Neferhpetepes A</td>
<td>U - few records Abu Roash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebtytep-it.s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[sỉt nswt ?] Reported in Reisner</td>
<td>D. of Q. Meresankh II and unknown king</td>
<td></td>
<td>U - few records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per[sonet]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sỉt nswt nt</td>
<td>D. of Khufu (?)</td>
<td>Wife of an unknown King - Khafre(?).</td>
<td>G 88 - buried next to her son’s tomb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meresankh III</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sỉt nswt nt hmt nṯr Ḥwty-hr</td>
<td>D. of Kawab and Hethepheres Adopted by King?</td>
<td>Probably wife of Khafre (Khenwetep)</td>
<td>G 7530 - Although she claims princess status, she is king’s GD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khen[ut]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sỉt nswt</td>
<td>D. of Khafre ?</td>
<td>Mother of Kai Their titles are incomplete.</td>
<td>U - recorded by son.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopsetka</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[sỉt nswt?]</td>
<td>D. of Queen Meresankh</td>
<td></td>
<td>U - in mother’s tomb as sỉt.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meretites A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sỉt nswt nt hmt nṯr Ḥwty-hr hmt nṯr Ni hmt nṯr (Ḥwfw)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wife of Akhihetep</td>
<td>G 7650 3-shaft tomb; Smith, History, pl.41a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rekhetre</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sỉt nswt nt</td>
<td>D. of Khafre</td>
<td>Wife of an unknown King - Shespeskau ?</td>
<td>S - rock-cut tomb Hassan, Giza VI/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I King’s daughters, Dynasty 3–6
D –daughter; GD – granddaughter; S– single burial; H – in husband’s tomb; U – unknown burial
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dyn.</th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Addenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khamererneby II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>s3t nswt nt</td>
<td>D. of Queen</td>
<td>Wife of a king</td>
<td>Galarza Tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemetre A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>s3t nswt nt</td>
<td>D. of Khafre</td>
<td>husband unknown</td>
<td>S - rock-cut tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s3t nswt šmšt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hassan, Giza VI/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hmt ntr Hwt-hr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunefer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>s3t nswt nt</td>
<td>D. of Shepseskaf</td>
<td>Wife of a king –</td>
<td>S - rock-cut tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?hmt ntr Hwt-hr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?hmt ntr etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khamaat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>s3t nswt nt</td>
<td>D. of Shepseskaf</td>
<td>Wife of Ptaḥshepses</td>
<td>U - probably in husband’s tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s3t nswt šmšt</td>
<td></td>
<td>the High Priest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meretites B</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>s3t nswt nt</td>
<td>D. of Sahure and</td>
<td></td>
<td>S - G 4140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>s3t nswt</td>
<td>Nefertanethy</td>
<td></td>
<td>U - no evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputneby</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>... nswt</td>
<td>D. of Neferirkare?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Verner, Khentkaus, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khamererneby A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>s3t nswt nt</td>
<td>D. of Niuserre + Reputnub?</td>
<td>Married Ptaḥshepses</td>
<td>H - in Abusir mastaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khenkhaus A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>s3t nswt nt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wife of Senedjemib - Mebi (chief architect)</td>
<td>H - G 2376 LD II, 73, 74c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neferhetepes B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>s3t nswt nt</td>
<td>D. of Isesi</td>
<td></td>
<td>S - G 4714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khekeretneby</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>s3t nswt nt</td>
<td>D. of Isesi</td>
<td></td>
<td>S - Abusir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedjetnebu</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>s3t nswt nt</td>
<td>D. of Isesi</td>
<td>Her husband was Sankhwiptah,</td>
<td>S - Abusir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nubinbety</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>s3t nswt nt</td>
<td>Her husband was</td>
<td></td>
<td>U - Her title is on 2 statues of her husband (CG 37, 196)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khuit I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>s3t nswt nt</td>
<td>A queen, husband</td>
<td></td>
<td>S - MM D 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemetre B</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>s3t nswt nt</td>
<td>D. of Unas?</td>
<td></td>
<td>S - Saqqara. Schmitz classes her as Tit.P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s3t nswt...šmšt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>because she is rḥt nswt on her sarcophag.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rḥt nswt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weneshet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>s3t nswt nt</td>
<td>D. of Unas?</td>
<td>No husband known. All daughters</td>
<td>S - G 4840 (Junker, Giza I, 249-255)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hmt ntr Hwt-hr</td>
<td></td>
<td>are rḥt nswt, 2 s3t nswt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hmt ntr Nṯt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See W. Helck, Hommage à Jean Leclant I, 221-230 on dating.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iabetet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>s3t nswt nt</td>
<td>(See W. Helck, Hommage à Jean Leclant I, 221-230 on dating)</td>
<td></td>
<td>S - G 4650 (Junker, Giza I, 219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idut</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>s3t nswt nt</td>
<td>D. of Unas?</td>
<td></td>
<td>S - Buried near Unis’s pyramid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Usurped tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Dyn.</td>
<td>Titles</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Addenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iput I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>sšt nšwt nt</td>
<td>D. of Unas</td>
<td>Wife of Teti</td>
<td>S - Saqqara Hawass, op.cit.,414-419.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother of Pepy I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watetkhethor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>sšt nšwt nt</td>
<td>D. of Teti</td>
<td>Wife of Mereruka (vizier)</td>
<td>H - only wife with own burial apts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nubkhetnebi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>sšt nšwt nt</td>
<td>D. of Teti</td>
<td>Wife of Kagemni (vizier)</td>
<td>U - no burial shaft is known for her in her husband’s tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inti</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>sšt nšwt nt&lt;br&gt;sšt nšwt śmšt</td>
<td>D. of Teti</td>
<td>Pepy’s sister ?&lt;br&gt;</td>
<td>S - Buried near Teti’s pyramid, Saqqara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Callender, <em>JNES</em> 61 No. 3 (2002),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>sšt nšwt nt&lt;br&gt;sšt nšwt śmšt</td>
<td>D. of Pepy I</td>
<td>Wife of Pepy II&lt;br&gt;</td>
<td>S - pyramid, S. Saqqara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iput II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>sšt nšwt nt&lt;br&gt;sšt nšwt śmšt</td>
<td>D. of Pepy I</td>
<td>Wife of Pepy II&lt;br&gt;</td>
<td>S - S. Saqqara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Dyn.</td>
<td>Titles</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Addenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nefretiabet</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>s/j nswt</td>
<td>father was Mery-ib</td>
<td>husband unknown; GGD of king</td>
<td>S – G 1225 (Reisner, Giza I, 398f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasedjerkai</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>s/j nswt</td>
<td>mother was Princess Weneshet</td>
<td>3 sons + 4 daughters; husband unknown</td>
<td>S – G 2101 (Junker, Giza II, 97ff.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wehemnefret</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>s/j nswt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S – in G 4840 (Junker, Giza I, 249ff.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tjenetet</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>s/j nswt</td>
<td></td>
<td>sister of above</td>
<td>U - Both sisters have s/j nswt only in their own tombs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes-sat</td>
<td>Early 5</td>
<td>s/j nswt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Probably a sister of Tit. P. and vizier</td>
<td>U - (Junker, Giza II, 103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>....ka</td>
<td>Early 5</td>
<td>s/j nswt</td>
<td>D. of Khafkhufu I, a King’s Son</td>
<td></td>
<td>U – (Simpson, Kowaib, Khufu I &amp; II (1974)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meretites C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>s/j nswt</td>
<td>D. of Princess Khamerernebty + Ptahepses</td>
<td></td>
<td>S - Abusir, Mastaba of the Princesses (Verner, Ptahepses, 133; Borchart, Ne user-Re, 126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetepheres C</td>
<td>Late 5</td>
<td>s/j nswt</td>
<td>Wife of Seshenmefer III (vizier Tit. Prince)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H - husband’s tomb G 5170(?) (Junker, Giza III, pl.I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iufi</td>
<td>Late 5</td>
<td>s/j nswt nt</td>
<td>wife of Khament (Hemamiya)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H? Buried Hemamiya? (E. Mackay et al., Bahrein &amp; Hemamiya, 1929, pl.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Late 5</td>
<td>s/j nswt nt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neferirtenef was her husband</td>
<td>U - Mentioned in his tomb at Saqara (B. van der Walle, La chapelle funéraire de Neferirtenef, 1978, 80.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nefretnesut</td>
<td>Late 5</td>
<td>s/j nswt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Husband unknown. Her titles are in the Tomb of her son.</td>
<td>U – see Barsanti, ASAE 3 (1902), 202f. Probably buried at Dahshur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunefer A</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>s/j nswt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wife of Sekhemankh-Ptah (vizier)</td>
<td>H – in tomb of Sekhemankh-Ptah G 7152 (unpub)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Titular Princesses between Dynasties 4-8
All titular princesses had the simple title of s/j nswt, without the nt h.t.f addition.¹
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dyn.</th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Addenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nebeti</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>sỉt nšwt wr t  ēk rīt nšwt wōt ḫnt nfr Hwt-ḥr ḫnt nfr Ṣw Ṣnwr</td>
<td>Contra Schmitz, 177, her parents are unknown</td>
<td>Wife of Shemai, mother of Iđi both it nfr</td>
<td>H - buried at Koptos (Habachi, ASAE 55, 1958, 170ff.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Schmitz, Königsohn, 118. The same rule does not apply to males with the title of “King’s son of his body”, for that was a ranking title, as Schmitz has shown. With regard to the princesses, frequently it can be shown that the women were simply entitled as rḥt nšwt prior to their elevation to titular princess status.

2 This title was erased throughout the tomb. See Fischer, Egyptian Women (2000 edn), 15, 47f. (figs p.16).
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<tr>
<td>rnpt (m-) ḫt sp ....</td>
<td>68, 105, 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rḥt nšwt</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫtt nt ṣ</td>
<td>33, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫtt nt ṭḥnw</td>
<td>34, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥwt-(nt)-Ny-wsr-r</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥb</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫm nṯr Sṇfrw</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫry ṣḏb m ḥwt-Šnḥ</td>
<td>71, 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫry ẖṣḥ n pr-dḥtt</td>
<td>71, 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫry ẖṣḥ (n) mdw nṯr</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫry ẖṣḥ n nṯr.f</td>
<td>71, 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥk3 ḥwt-Št</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫknw</td>
<td>33, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫm</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫnty-š</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫrp ẖḥ</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫryan</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫryan ḫbt ḫry ṭp</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫryan ẖṣḥ</td>
<td>50, 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫryan ṭp nšwt</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫṯnty</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫkrt nšwt</td>
<td>14, 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫkrt nšwt mṯr.f</td>
<td>14, 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫkrt nšwt mṯr.f Šmḥṭ</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sḏ bš</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš nšwt</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš nšwt Šmšw nt ḥt.f</td>
<td>55, Excursus II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sḏ bš ḫk3 ḥwt-Št</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sšt nšwt</td>
<td>13, 141 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sšt nšwt nt ḥt.f</td>
<td>13, 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sšt nšwt nt ḥt.f mṯr.f</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sšt nšwt ḫḏt-nbw</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sḏš(w) ḫr-ḥnty-ḥt</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sḏt</td>
<td>33, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣmr wšty</td>
<td>55, 71, 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sṇfrw</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣḏḏ ḫrw-Šn r pr ṣḏ ..nšwt</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣḏḏ ḫmww nṯr (nwy) mḏw nšwt bity nšwt bity ḫnt-kšw.š</td>
<td>63, 68f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš mḏw nšwt</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sš mdḥt-nṯr</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣšt-hšwy</td>
<td>18, 51,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stḥ ḫḥ</td>
<td>33, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twšw</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫwv</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫḏd-kšr</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫḏd-ḥšw</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these words which are discussed in some way in the text, the usual funerary formulae (including collections of offerings) can be found on the following pages: 25, 27, 28, 30, 59f., fig. C4, 67, (Idu’s sarcophagus) 68, Seven Sacred Oils tablet 34
Sealings 50, 51, 94-97. Mason’s inscription 103.
Linen inscriptions 47f.
Index for Djedkare’s Family Cemetery

Main entries are in bold

Abusir necropolis 11, 92, 105,
Anonymous mastaba (Abusir) – see Mastaba of Lady L. 117
Anonymous mastaba (Abusir; Borchardt) 115, 116 note 15, 117
Anonymous mastaba (Tell Edfu) 106
Anonymous queen’s pyramid complex 90 and note 3
Anthropological analysis of cemetery inhabitants 119-122
comparisons between skeletal material 122-131
Arab coin 76
Balcz, H. 34
Berlandini, Jocelyn 105
Boat 49
Bones, human & animal 52f., [see also Chapter 10.]
Borchardt, Ludwig 11, 107
Brooklyn Museum of Fine Arts 18, 29
Burial chambers 114, Kh’s 19-23, T’s 21-23, N’s 59, F’s 66, K’s 66, M’s 73, L’s 102f.
Burial shafts 114, 19, 21, 22 ult.f., fig. B6, 59, 66f., 73, 89 102 and fig. L.3;
Butchering scene 26, fig. B13
Canopic jars 31f., 18, 21, 23, (lbd) 61
Censing motif 25
Cult - see Funerary Cult.
Cult idol of Nekhen 69
Cup 98
Dancers and musicians 26, 27
Date 66, 68, 101, 103, 105, 107,
Edfu list 33
Face mask 74, 76
Faience 45f.
Fakhry, Ahmed 106
False doors
Kh’s 26, 27-30, T’s 30f., F’s 67f., 96, and fig. D4, K’s 68 and fig. D5, 114
False shaft - see Subsidiary shafts.
Flint 46, 91, 98,
Funerary cult 77, 83, 84, 87, 113, 115f.
Funerary cult structures Chapter 5, plan fig. F1 (p.78), 113
Gazelle 19 and note 6, 41
Graffiti 93 and figs K8, K9, K10, K11.
Harvey, Julia 94
Hassan, Selim 91f., 115
Heliopolis 105
Jánosi, Peter 106, 113
Lake of Abusir 106 and note 6
Late Period burials 14, 87
Linen - see Textiles.
Lintels 27, 59f.
Magazines 114
Magic 91
Maragioglio, V. & Rinaldi, C. 106
Mastaba of Faaf/Idu & Khenit 64-67, 116
Mastaba of Hedjetnebu 85-93, 113
Mastaba of Khekeretnebty 14-23, 113
Mastaba of Lady L 99-103, 113
Mastaba of Mernefu 71-73, 116, 117
Mastaba of Neserkauhor 55-59, 113,
Mastabas in Djedkare cemetery - chronology of 105-108
Mastabas - typology of 109-117
Metal instruments 45
Metal vessels 42ff., 21, 45
Miniature pottery vessels 42 and note 75. Figs B41, B42, B43.
Model male sexual organs 76
Model pottery bowls 97
Model stone bowls 34f.
Model stone vases 36-38
Needle 45 and note 85.
Niche [Mernefu’s offering n.] 73, [canopic niche?] 73
Offerings and offering tables 24-30, 73, Chapter 5
Opening of Mouth set 32ff.
Paintings - see Wall Paintings.
Perfumes 34
Plate 97
Posener-Krieger, Paule 85
Pottery 38-42, 89, 90, 97f. and figs. K7, K18, K19
Robbers 17, 18, 19, 21, 25, 38, 57, 65, 66, 67, 73, 87, 89, 91, 92,
Sarcophagus 21, 23, 66, 91, 102, 103,
Scribe of the Royal Children 134f., 63f., 69
Sealings 91, 94-97
Serdabs 114, Kh’s 18f., N’s 58f., F’s 65, M’s 73, H’s 89, L’s 101
Seven Sacred Oils and tablet 33f.
Statues 17, 50, 60f., 73, 74-76, 89, 93f., 113
Stadelmann, Rainer 105
Subsidiary/False shafts 23, 91f., 115, 66, 91f., 103
Sun temples 107
Textiles 46-49, 74, 76, 91
Tomb typology Chapter 9, passim
Wall Paintings 23-27, 18
Wooden remains (see also statues) 49
Vodera, Kamil 12
Zemina, Milan 12
Index of Personal Egyptian Names

Akhethotep - 5th Dynasty official, royal subordinate, 48
Djadjaemankh - 5th Dynasty official, Abusir tomb, 116, 117.
Djedkare-Isesi - 5th Dynasty king, 4, 91, 95, 105, 106, 107, 127, 129f.
Faaf (good name Idu) - husband of Khenit, royal scribe, 63, 66ff.
Hedjetnebu - 5th Dynasty princess, 85, 89, typology of tomb 109, 113–116,
magical inscriptions 115, anthrop. data 120, 121, 124f.
Hetepheres I - 4th Dynasty queen-mother, 34
Idu - also see Faaf, 66f., 67 and fig. D4, 68, 105, 107,
typology of tomb 116, anthrop. data 120, 121f., 125f.
Iymery - 5th Dynasty official, 34
Kaaper - 5th Dynasty official, 114 note 5
Kehef - 5th Dynasty official, 48
Khekeretnebty - 5th Dynasty princess, 13–53, 13, 14, plan of mastaba 16, typology of her tomb 109–116
Khenemu - 5th Dynasty overseer of weavers, 48
Khenit - wife of Faaf/Idu, 64, 66, 68.
Khentkaus II - 5th Dynasty queen-mother, 66, 68, 106, 107,
Khentykauhor - 5th Dynasty prince, 106
data 120, comparisons with other tomb-owners 124–128,
Mernefu - director of the palace, 71, 74–76, 105, 107, typology of tomb 116f.,
Menkauhor - 5th Dynasty king, 87, 91, 105, 106, 107,
Neferefr - 5th Dynasty king, 91, 95, 105, 107,
Neferirkare - 5th Dynasty king, 105, 107,
Nekhenre - 5th Dynasty priest, 51
Neserkauhor - prince, 18, 19, 55f. [See also Chapter 2.]
Niankhre - priest in wall painting, 24
Niuserre - 5th Dynasty king, 87, 91, 95, mortuary temple of 97, 105, 106, 107,
Osiris - god, 106,
Ptahshepseps, 5th Dynasty overseer, 48
Qar - 6th Dynasty vizier, 34 note 43
Sahure - 5th Dynasty king, 105
Samut - official purifying statues
Senedjemib - 6th Dynasty official, son of Qar, 34
Seru - 5th Dynasty official, district administrator, 48
Teti-ankh - 6th Dynasty prince, 56 and note 4.
Tisethor - 5th Dynasty hkr nswt, 13f., 15, 18, 114
Unas - last king of Dynasty 5, 103, 108
Index of Titles and Epithets

im3ht hr Tssi 13
im3hw hr Wsir 63
im3ht hr nb.f 71
im3ht hr nswt 13
im3ht hr nswt, Wsir, hr nfr *3 14 note 6
im3ht hr nfr *4 13
imy-r3 *kw 48

ln*t 48
iry-p3t 55

*d-mr 71
*d-mr sb3(w) Hr-hnty-pt 71 [and note 4, cont. p.73.]

w*b (n) B3-K3-k3.i 63
w*b (n) Ntry-b3w-Nfr.f-r* 63
wr diw (m) pr Dhwyty 55
wrt hst 135
mwt nswt 143
nht im3hw hr nfr *3 13
r* nb nfr nfr 95

hm nfr Snfrw 96
hry wdb m hwt-*nhj 71
hry s3t3 n pr-dw*it 71
hry s3t3 (n) mdw nfr 55
hry s3t3 n nfr.f 71
hk3 hwt-*3t 63

hnty-$ 95
hry *h 71
hry-*$ 48
hry-hbt hry tp 55
hry-$s*$ 50, 94
hry-tp nswt 48
htmy 96
hkrt nswt 14
hkrt nswt mrt.f 14
hkrt nswt mrt.f im3ht 14
\[ \textit{sib} \text{ s̄} \quad 63 \\
\textit{̲s̄} \text{ nšwt} \quad 55 \\
\textit{̲s̄} \text{ nšwat} \text{ šmšw} \text{ n q̲t} \text{ t} \quad 55 \\
\textit{sib} \text{ s̄} \text{ h̲k̲3} \text{ hwt} \cdot \text{3t} \quad 68 \\
\textit{s̄t} \text{ nšwt} \quad 13, \text{ Excursus I, II} \\
\textit{s̄t} \text{ nšwat} \text{ n q̲t} \quad 13, \text{ Excursus II} \\
\textit{s̄t} \text{ nšwat} \text{ n q̲t} \text{ m̲r̲t.f} \quad 13 \\
\textit{s̄t} \text{ nšwat} \text{ H̲d̲t-nbw} \quad 91 \\
\textit{šbī(w)} \text{ H̲r}-\text{hnty-p̲t} \quad 71 \\
\textit{šmr} \text{ w̲t̲y} \quad 55, 71 \\
\textit{šh̲d} \text{ irw-šīr} \text{ pr} \text{ 3̲n̲ ś̲w̲t} \quad 94 \\
\textit{šh̲d} \text{ h̲m̲w} \text{ ntr} \text{ (nyw)} \text{ mw̲t} \text{ n̲ś̲w̲t} \text{ bity} \text{ n̲ś̲w̲t} \text{ bity} \text{ H̲nt-k̲w̲t.s̲} \quad 63, 68f. \\
\textit{s̄} \text{ m̲ś̲w̲t} \text{ n̲ś̲w̲t} \quad 63 \\
\textit{s̄} \text{ m̲d̲t-n̲tr} \quad 55 \]
Pf1 (above) View of Djedkare’s cemetery from pyramid of Neferirkare

Bf1 (below) Pottery deposit on Khekeretnebty’s serdab
Bf2 (above) Original state of Khekeretnebty's offering scene, damaged by robbers

Bf3 (below) Remains of the offering in Khekeretnebty's burial shaft
**Bf4** (above) The offering scene as restored (see Bf2)

**Bf5** (below) Sketches of offerings and musicians
**BF6** (left)
Fragment of a lintel 1/B/76

**BF10** (right)
Canopic jar 72/B/76

**BF7** (left)
Offering scene tablet 78/B/76

**BF11** (right)
Hatjes jar 157/B/76

**BF8** (below)
Crossbar of the false door 79/B/76a-b
Bf9 The false door of Tisethor 193/B/76
**PLATE VI**

_Bf13_ (left) Some of Khekeretnebty's alabaster model vessels

_Bf12_ (right) *Hatjes* jar and *henet* basin 157 and 158/B/76

_Bf14_ Pottery deposit above Khekeretnebty's burial chamber
Bf15 (left) Pottery stand 2c/B/76

Bf16 (right) Polished beer jug 74/B/76

Bf17 (below) Close up of the inscription on 74/B/76

Bf18 Beer jug 75/B/76

Bf19 Flat-bottomed beer jug 204d/B/76
**PLATE VIII**

**Bf21** (left) Ball-shaped spouted vessel 287/B/76

**Bf20** (right) Biconical spouted vessel 76/B/76

**Bf22** (above left) Polished bowl 155/B/76

**Bf23** (above right) Flat-bottomed bowl 156/B/76

**Bf24** (left) Selection of some of the miniature vessels 168 a-i/B-76
BF25 (above left) Selection of miniature bowls

BF30 (above right) Flint knife 154/B/76

BF28 (left) Miniature copper ewer 144/B76

BF27 (above left) Selection of copper vessels

BF29 (above right) Selection of miniature copper tools 254/B/76

BF26 (right) Selection of miniature vases
Bf31 (above left) Inscribed mummy wrapping
169a/B/76

Bf32 (above right) Inscribed linen fragment
169b/B/76

Bf33 (below right) Fragment of inscribed linen
169c/B/76

Bf34 (below left) Fragment of a tray 70/B/76
BF35 (above left)  
Fragment of a wooden foot  
163/B/76

BF38 (above right) Side view of 192/B/76

BF37 (left) Fragmentary wooden statue of a female  
192/B/76

BF36 (below right)  
Fragment of a torso and thighs of a wooden statue 191/B/76
Bf39 (left) Sealing I/B/78

Bf40 (right) Fragment of a limestone relief 38/B/76

Bf41 (above left) Fragment 39/B/76
Bf42 (above right) Fragment of relief 69/B/76
Bf43 (below left) Fragment of inscribed relief 212/B/76
Bf44 (below right) Fragment of a faience ornament 51/B/76
**Plates XIII**

**Cf1** Fragments of statues in Neserkauhor's serdab, as found

**Cf2** (above) Neserkauhor's lintel 31a-b; 36, 37 and 39/B/76

**Cf4** (left) Fragment of a wooden torso 7/C/78

**Cf5** (below right) Fragment of a head in wood 8b/C/78
**Plate XIV**

**Cf7** (above left) Fragment of a wooden statue base 9b/C/78

**Cf3** (above right) Frontal and side views of 6a/C/78

**Cf8** (below) Fragment of a relief 14/C/78
Cf6 (left) Remains of a statue with projecting panel kilt 9a/C/78

Df1 (below) General view of the mastaba of Idu and Khenit from the south
DF2 (above left) Idu’s burial chamber
DF3 (above right) Fragment of Idu’s false door
DF4 (below left) Fragment of Khenit’s false door
DF6 (below right) Nekhen cult idol
Df5 (above) The inscription on Idu’s sarcophagus
Ef2 (below left) Statue base from Memefu’s tomb 2/E/78
Ef3 (below right) Statue base 3/E/78
E f1 (above left) Fragments of Menefer's statues, as found
E f4 (below left) Statue base 5a/E/78
E f5 (above right) Statue base 4/E/78
E f6 (below right) Kneeling statue 6/E/78
**Ef7** (above left) Ottoman coin

**Ef8** Model (?) of male genitalia 15/E/78

**Ef9** Menefu's face mask

**Ff1** Fragment of the ribbed vault in South Storeroom 1

**Ff2** (bottom) General view of Area F cult structures
FF3 (above left) Domed structure in the large courtyard
FF4 (above right) Offering basin in the small courtyard
KF1 (below left) Hedjetnebu’s statue, as found in the serdab
KF3 (below right) Partly sealed entrance to Hedjetnebu’s burial chamber
Kf2 (left) Pottery from Hedjetnebu's burial shaft

Kf4 (below) Hedjetnebu's burial chamber
Kf5 Two walls from Hedjetnebu's burial chamber, showing the tomb owner's name and titles
Kf6  Hedjetnebu's statue 18/K/87

Kf8  (below) Pottery plate and remnant 9/K/87
Kf7 Sealings 3a, 3b, 3c

Kf9 Pottery from Hedjetnebu's burial shaft

Lf1 Mason's inscription no.1 from Anonymous mastaba L
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