Arrangement of Murals as a Principle of Old Kingdom Tomb Decoration[1]

ANDREY O. BOLSHAKOV

Every Egyptian tomb is unique as concerns its architecture and decoration, and unique is its decoration as regards the selection of represented topics, their treatment and their arrangement. It is obvious that no description of a tomb is possible without some analysis of its architectural features at the initial stage, and, as a result, we have more or less extensive typologies of tombs and their components.[2] The selection of topics and the treatment of scenes and their details are the problems of vital importance for the chronology of tombs and for the art history, and they constantly attract attention of scholars studying tombs. The arrangement of representations is by no means less important, but it is still considered a marginal problem and it generates little interest.

The first scholar who detected the regulations of the arrangement of Old Kingdom tomb murals was Hermann JUNKER notable for his ability to think in general categories and to be very attentive to minor details at the same time – a rare combination of talents that made him one of the most universal scholars in the history of Egyptology. In twelve volumes devoted to publication and discussion of the materials of his excavations at Giza that turned Old Kingdom studies into an independent and all-sufficient part of Egyptology[3] he paid much attention to the rules of the arrangement of specific topics within the space of cult chambers and to the modifications of these rules in the course of time. These observations may seem insignificant, but actually they were a great achievement, even for a scholar of JUNKER's level, since for the first time in Egyptology he introduced some elements of a system approach to the monuments.[4] Although the application of these elements was incomplete and inconsistent, it made this part of Junker´s heritage more than important – it remains inspiring even in the rapidly changing world of the modern Egyptology.

JUNKER tried to combine publication and study of the monuments in the same work, which is a very contradictory and complicated task, and although he did as much as possible and much more than a single usual man can do, his brilliant observations spread among extensive descriptions of concrete materials were partly unnoticed and, in any case, they produced less impression then they would do if concentrated in a special book as its main contents. Egyptologists did not make as much use of JUNKER's system approach as they could, and this was one of the reasons of a serious stagnation in Old Kingdom studies after JUNKER's death, in the 60s – 70s.

---

1 The following abbreviations are used in this paper for the names of necropolises: DG – Deir el-Gebrawi, DhENPS – Dahshur, East of the Northern Pyramid of Snefru, EH – el-Hawawish, GCF – Giza, Central Field, GMPC – Giza, Mycerinos Pyramid Cemetery, GWF – Giza, West Field, QA – Quseir el-Amarna, Sha – Sharuna, ShS – Sheikh Saïd, SqESP – Saqqara, East of the Step Pyramid, SqNSP – Saqqara, north of the Step Pyramid, SqTPC – Saqqara, Teti Pyramid Cemetery, SqUPC – Saqqara, Unis Pyramid Cemetery, SqWSP – Saqqara, West of the Step Pyramid, ZM – Zawyet el-Mayitin. These abbreviations, numbers of tombs and museum numbers are placed in square brackets [ ]. Ciphers in braces { } refer to the numbers of registers of murals, starting from the bottom. Orientation of the figures of the tomb owners is designated by the arrows ◀ or ▶ , that of other personages by the arrows ⇐ or ⇒ . In the quotations of texts … is for the omitted passages, --- is for lacunae.

2 E.g., Reisner G.A., *The Development of the Egyptian Tomb down to the Accession of Cheops*. (Cambridge, Mass., 1936); idem., *A History of the Giza Necropolis* I (Cambridge, Mass., 1942); Lehmann K., *Der Serdab in den Privargräbern des Alten Reiches* (Heidelberg, 2000, http://www.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/archiv/2863). Now also Jánosi P., *Giza in der 4. Dynastie. Die Baugeschichte und Belegung einer Nekropole des Alten Reiches* I. *Die Mastabas der Kernfriedhöfe und die Felsgräber* (Wien, 2005), although the significance of the book is far beyond the scope of pure typology.

3 JUNKER H. *Gîza* I–XII (Wien [und Leipzig], 1929–1955).

4 On the role of Junker in the development of the system approach see Большаков А.О., "Герман Юнкер и его '*Гиза*'. Проблемы методики." *ВДИ* 174 (1985, № 3), 170–175 [BOLSHAKOV A.O. "Hermann Junker and his *Gîza*. Problems of the Method." VDI 174 (1985, No.3), 170–175]; BOLSHAKOV A.O., *Man and his Double in Egyptian Ideology of the Old Kingdom* (Wiesbaden, 1997, ÄAT 37), 41–42.

The scale of excavations of Old Kingdom monuments increased in the 80ˢ and caused the appearance of works devoted to interpretation of numerous problems at a qualitatively new level. Unfortunately, only two books continuing and developing JUNKER's system approach as a general method of research can be mentioned.

The first is *Decoration in Egyptian Tombs of the Old Kingdom. Studies in Orientation and Scene Content* by Yvonne HARPUR.[5] In a brief exposition of the purpose and principles of her study made in the Introduction, HARPUR never mentioned the name of Junker, nor did she offer a formal description of her method, but every aspect of her work demonstrates that methodologically she is one of the most consequential followers of JUNKER, and *Decoration* is justly one of the main sources of references as concerns both decoration of Old Kingdom tombs and their chronology. HARPUR's main interest was in minor details for which she has an excellent eye and manifestations of general regulations in concrete monuments. The regulations themselves were only traced and not explained, since that task would require a special study of the ideology of Old Kingdom tombs that was not an intention of HARPUR.

The study undertaken by the present author in *Man and his Double in Egyptian Ideology of the Old Kingdom*,[6] is an antithesis to that by HARPUR. I made stress on the most general rules of the arrangement of the tomb murals, which was predetermined by the function of the chapters devoted to them – to be a basis of the following study of the concept of the *k3*-Double in the Old Kingdom. As a result, the functioning of a tomb as a living organism was revealed for the first time, but details fell a pray to ideology and particular monuments gave place to the tendencies of development.

Both approaches are far from ideal. HARPUR deepened in details, whatever important each of them might be, and I had to deliberately avoid them in order to make generalizations more sweeping. However, if taken together, the two books form a

good introduction to the problem. Unfortunately, this their aspect remains practically unnoticed. In the book by HARPUR one searches for very concrete observations, while *Man and his Double* is taken mainly as a work devoted only to the *k3*. A promising line of investigation still remains undeveloped and the only thing to do is a long, slow and painstaking scrutiny of separate tombs with regard both to general rules and their concrete manifestations.[7]

---

5 London – New York, 1987 (KPI Studies in Egyptology).

6 BOLSHAKOV, *Man and his Double*, 50–122. The essence of that part of the study was set out more briefly in an earlier paper published only in Russian and, thus, practically unknown, Большаков А.О., "Системный анализ староегипетских гробничных комплексов", *ВДИ* 177 (1986, № 2), 98–137 [BOLSHAKOV A.O., "System Analysis of Tomb Complexes in Old Kingdom Egypt", VDI 177 (1986, No. 2), 98–137].

7 Such a book, although based on Middle Kingdom materials, appeared recently: KAMRIN J., *The Cosmos of Khnumhotep II at Beni Hassan* (London – New York, 1999). From the purely technical point of view this book is not a bad example of how the material must be presented. On the other hand, in spite of favourable reviews (e.g., by D. LEPROHON, *JEA* 90 (2004), *Reviews Supplement*, 22–26), it cannot be considered satisfactory as regards interpretations. KAMRIN is led not by the material as it must be, but by a biased and extremely dubious idea. She believes that the tomb decoration depicts reality not only at the level of the owner's household ("personal cosmos" in her terminology) but also at the levels of the "royal cosmos" (where the owner acts as a king's delegate), and of the "Egyptian cosmos" (Egypt as a whole, with the celestial and subterranean worlds), and violently squeezes material into that artificial framework. For instance, according to her, in the scene of *Hnm(w)-htp(.w)* II receiving a group of nomads, he is a king's representative (KAMRIN, *Khnumhotep* II, 93–96). However, the scene is purely domestic: the son of the tomb owner who served in the capital (see FRANKE D., "The Career of Khnumhotep III of Beni Hasan and the so-called 'Decline of the Nomarchs' ", in: S. QUIRKE (ed.), *Middle Kingdom Studies* (New Malden, 1991), 56–65) visits his father on the way back from an expedition; moreover, this scene most probably shows a concrete, real and dated event (BOLSHAKOV A.O., "Representation and Text: Two Languages of Ancient Egyptian *Totenglauben*", *AoF* 30 (2003), 127-139). As for the ceiling of the tomb decorated with textile patterns being an argument for the existence of the solar world in the tomb since it presupposes the presence of the sun above (KAMRIN, *Khnumhotep* II, 143), it is but laughable – in exactly the same way one can say that any mural scene serves as such an argument in the same measure, for people, cattle or vegetation represented cannot exist without the sun. Only depictions of the sun, stars or sky may be regarded as referring to the celestial realm in the ideological sense, but they are absent in private tombs. The only case when stars appear on the ceiling of a private Old Kingdom structure – in the burial chamber of *Hnt(j)-k3(.j)* at Balat (CASTEL G., PANTALACCI L., CHERPION N. *Balat V. Le mastaba de Khentika. Tombeau d'un gouverneur de l'Oasis à la fin de l'Ancien Empire* I (Le Caire, 2001, *FIFAO* 40/1), 131 – not reproduced, but clearly seen *in situ*) – is an exception proving the rule. It is an obvious loan from the royal tradition that was possible only in a desolate province not much controlled by the centre and in the tomb with its decoration being a contradictory mixture of

The idea of the editors of the present volume to discuss a limited number of tombs from as many independent viewpoints as possible gives a good opportunity to illustrate the efficacy of this combined approach, and I am grateful to them for offering an incentive to do it.

I. The chapels of *Ḥtp-sšȝ.t*[8] and *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)*

These two monuments of the early Dyn.V belong to the series of tombs with standardly decorated north–south L-shaped chapels. As demonstrated already by Junker,[9] the chapels are more than similar: the latter is a copy of the former, one of the exactest Old Kingdom copies.

The chapel of *Ḥtp-sšȝ.t* [G 5150 = LG 36]

Entrance thicknesses (SH.Abb.3+4).[10] The northern thickness bears a table scene (the tomb owner sitting → and his daughter standing behind him →) with two priests engaged in the *sȝḥ.t* rituals ←. On the southern thickness the owner and his wife are depicted as sitting ←, with their naked small son in front of them ←. Behind this group there are three registers of offering bringers →.

West wall (SH.Abb.7).[11] The space between two false doors is divided into four registers consolidated by a large figure of the tomb owner standing to the left of the northern false door ←. The subjects of the registers are devoted to the delivery of offerings: driving cattle →, a man with a *ḥz*-vessel and a *ḫȝw.t*-table in his hands ←, a man carrying a hyena ← {1}, a scribe writing down a list of offerings brought → and driving cattle → {2}, a son of the owner writing down a list of offerings and esta-

tes personified as interchanging male and female figures ← → {3}. The greater part of register {4} is destroyed; only the lower half of a figure of a standing scribe analogous to those in {2} and {3} is preserved →.

East wall (SH.Abb.5).[12] As contrary to the traditional arrangement of the entrance to the L-shaped Giza chapels in the northern end of the east wall, in *Ḥtp-sšȝ.t* it is placed almost in the centre of the wall, thus splitting its decoration into two independent parts. The northern half is occupied by the representation of the tomb owner and his wife sitting ←, with their daughter squatting under their chair ←. In front of them there are three short registers: four daughters of the tomb owner → ← {2} and → → {3}. Register {4} is completely lost. Register {1} spreads under the figures of the owner and his wife and is occupied by bringing in cattle ←. In the right part of the southern portion of the wall there are standing figures of the tomb owner and his wife ← accompanied by their little son ←. In front of them there are four registers: butchery and a man with a foreleg and a heart of an ungulate → {1}, bringing cattle and fowl → {2}, bringing various goods → {3} (upper part lost). Register {4} is almost completely lost, only the lower part of a figure of a man with a bag → is preserved. Above the entrance there is a representation of a rowing boat →.

North wall (SH.Abb.6).[13] The main topic of the wall is the tomb owner with his wife and their little son → receiving the list of offerings from a scribe ← in {3}; more household officials ← are present in {2} and {3}. Food offerings are depicted in registers {4}–{6} of a half height; the upper part of the murals is lost. Register {1} under the main scene is devoted to the procession of offering bringers ←.

South wall (SH.Abb.8).[14] The tomb owner is represented as sitting at a table ← with three priests in front of him → performing rituals {2}. The upper part of the wall is occupied by the list of offerings with the serdab slit in the centre of it. In the bottom register {1} there are two scenes of butchery and two men carrying forelegs of animals →.

---

various traditions; the latter fact calls the deliberate and sensible usage of the stars in question: for *Ḫnt(j)-kȝ(.j)* they were rather a sign of a high status, nothing more.

8 On the reading of the name see Bolshakov, *Man and his Double*, 12 (I do not think that Junker's arguments for the traditional reading *ȝ.t-ḥtp.t(j)* (Junker H., *Gîza* II (Wien – Leipzig, 1934), 188) are decisive.

9 Junker H., *Gîza* III (Wien – Leipzig, 1938), 71, 76.

10 Northern thickness: Junker, *Gîza* II, Abb.25; Kanawati N., *Tombs at Giza* II (Warminster, 2002, ACER 18), pl.43-a; southern thickness: Junker, *Gîza* II, Abb.26, 27; Kanawati, *Gîza* II, pl.43-b.

11 Junker, *Gîza* II, Abb.28; Kanawati, *Gîza* II, pl.45.

12 Junker, *Gîza* II, Abb.30–32; Kanawati, *Gîza* II, pl.44.

13 Junker, *Gîza* II, Abb.29; Kanawati, *Gîza* II, pl.47.

14 Junker, *Gîza* II, Abb.33; *Gîza* III, Abb.9-a; Kanawati, *Gîza* II, pl.46.

The chapel of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* **[G 4970]**

Entrance thicknesses[15]. Although the decoration of the entrance thicknesses of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* is only partly traced and not finished, it is possible that it was inspired by that of *Ḥtp-sš3.t*. On the northern thickness there is an incomplete outline of the figure of the owner in front of a table ➤ that corresponds to the respective table scene in *Ḥtp-sš3.t*. On the right part of the southern thickness we can see representations of the "sacred oils" that are absent in *Ḥtp-sš3.t*; however, they no doubt refer to the cultic aspect of the planned decoration on the thickness to the left and of the entrance in general.

West, north and south wall.[16] These walls of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* reproduce the program of those of *Ḥtp-sš3.t*. However, details may be rather different, and we shall turn to the distinctions later.

East wall.[17] The program of the east wall of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* is independent from *Ḥtp-sš3.t*. There are two reasons for it. First, the entrance to the chapel is traditionally placed at the northern end of the east wall, which predetermines another structure of decoration consisting of a single block of representations. Second (and more important), the content of the murals of the east wall is much influenced by the personal affairs of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)*. He had at least seventeen children – more than any known Old Kingdom official – and this fact had to be of great importance for him. At least he decided to immortalise the whole of his family in the murals of his chapel and chose its east wall for it. The space in front of the large figures of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* and his wife ◀ is divided into four registers, of which {3} and {4} are occupied by representations of seven sons ➤ (all wearing a panther skin and, thus, acting as priests in their father's cult) and nine daughters ➤ shown in a pose of respect and adoration, with a hand to the breast; the eighth, youngest son is depicted as a naked child clinging with his hand to his father's staff and offering him a bird ➤ . Registers {1} and {2} are devoted to the processions of offering bringers ➤, the most neutral topic of tomb decoration. Above the entrance there are representations of two rowing boats, either preceded by a skiff ➤ . It is difficult to speculate on the dependance of the scene on the prototype of *Ḥtp-sš3.t* due to the degree of destruction of the latter. However, it seems that the lower boat of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* is close to the analogous in *Ḥtp-sš3.t*, although the number of the rowers is different, and, thus, it may be a copy, but a free one due to the presence of a skiff.

Conclusion

What we see in the chapel of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* may be regarded as a successful attempt to reproduce the decoration of the cult chamber as a whole. Since the chapel of *Ḥtp-sš3.t* is one of the most characteristic of the period, that of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* also does not differ very much from the standard. As for the east wall, it is unique due to the figures of the owner's children being the central element of its program, but, interestingly enough, although its main topic is unique, the composition is not unusual in more general terms. Indeed, the figure of the standing owner is present on the east wall in most Giza chapels, and offering bringers are one of the commonest topics during the first half of Dyn.V.[18] The children of the owner, even though without offerings, look almost like a procession of the bringers and, thus, the east wall of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* seems typical and even banal.[19]

However, as soon as we start considering smaller details, the picture changes radically. It is impossible to discuss all the modifications, thus only the most important of them will be examined.

(1) The false doors of both *Ḥtp-sš3.t* and *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* belong to the type characteristic of the Dyn.IV – early Dyn.V Giza. They have only one pair of jambs and the upper lintel is much wider than the lower part of the false door. However, the artist of *Ḥtp-sš3.t* placed numerous figures of servants and relatives of the owner under the protruding parts of the upper

---

15 Northern thickness: KANAWATI, *Giza* II, pl.51-b; southern thickness: JUNKER, *Gîza* III, 166, Abb.31-c; KANAWATI, *Giza* II, pl.55-a.

16 West wall: JUNKER, *Gîza* III, Abb.27; KANAWATI, *Giza* II, pl.53; north wall: JUNKER, *Gîza* III, Abb.30; KANAWATI, *Giza* II, pl.57; south wall: JUNKER, *Gîza* III, Abb.9-b; KANAWATI, *Giza* II, pl.56.

17 JUNKER, *Gîza* III, Abb.28, 29; KANAWATI, *Giza* II, pl.52, 54.

18 See BOLSHAKOV, *Man and his Double*, Tbl.1.

19 This is a very interesting feature of Egyptian art that still awaits serious consideration: objectively different images (both flat representations and statues) may look similar, while analogous images may produce very different impressions. Thanks to this peculiarity Egyptian art successfully resists objective research.

lintels, thus transforming these portions of the wall into something that may be apprehended as pairs of the outer "pseudo-jambs" not separated spatially from the main plane of the wall. This witty arrangement seems to go back to the northern false door of *Mrjj-jb(.j)* [G 2100 = LG 24][20] where the figures to the right of it are facing it and those to the left of it are oriented towards the figure of the owner leftwards. The artist of *Ḥtp-sš3.t* made a full use of the idea and decorated either false door in the same manner. However, the artist of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* did not follow him and placed the figures of the servants only to the right of the northern and to the left of the southern false door.[21]

(2) The figures of the offering bringers and of the personified estates on the west wall of *Ḥtp-sš3.t* move both to the right and to the left, towards either false door. At the north end of the procession there is a vertical inscription "Bringing *pr.t-ḫrw* by his estates of the North at every festival, every day for *Ḥtp-sš3.t*"; at the south end there is a lower part of an analogous inscription "--- of the South at every festival, every day for *Ḥtp-sš3.t*". These inscriptions may be regarded as unusual abbreviated versions of the "seeing formulae"[22] and the fact that they appeared also in *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* is another manifestation of the dependence of his artist on that of *Ḥtp-sš3.t*. However, as for the processions, he oriented them to the right in all of the registers (no doubt, towards a large figure of the tomb owner); this made the presence of two inscriptions senseless, but he nonetheless reproduced them, although their arrangement is reversed. The latter may be caused by the fact that all the bringers move northwards, i.e., from the south, and, thus, the southern estates must be mentioned first. This may be regarded as a successful attempt to conciliate the modified orientation of the figures and the unaltered contents of the inscriptions; as for the details of the text, the copyist was

inattentive. In *Ḥtp-sš3.t* ḥb nb is spelled as [hieroglyph]; basing on a common spelling of ḥb as [hieroglyph], the copyist misinterpreted [hieroglyph] as [hieroglyph], which engendered strange [hieroglyph], "at festival, every day" instead of "at every festival, every day".[23]

(3) The false doors of *Ḥtp-sš3.t* bear his representations on the left jambs and in the niches, and that of his wife on the right jambs. The artist of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* placed a figure of the tomb owner leaning on his staff on either left jamb, which is quite uncharacteristic of the false doors and reveals his interest to complicated postures (see below, **4**, **5**, **8**).

(4) The same is true as concerns several more figures on the west wall. Three scribes making records – a man with a leg of an offering animal, a censing man and a libating man (the three latter on the southern false door) – are shown in *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* as widely striding and bent forward, while the postures of the respective figures in *Ḥtp-sš3.t* are traditionally motionless.

(5) The first, libating, man in the lowest register on the north wall of *Ḥtp-sš3.t* is shown with his back bent, the posture looking rather clumsy. The artist of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* uses his favourite striding and bent posture here, and it must be admitted that it looks much livelier. It is used also for the figures of the owner's son with the list of offerings in {3} (an analogous scribe in *Ḥtp-sš3.t* stands straight) and of a libating man in {2} (absent in *Ḥtp-sš3.t*).

(6) It seems that the composition of the first register on the north wall is intentionally modified in *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)*. In *Ḥtp-sš3.t* the distances between eight figures of the offering bringers are more or less similar, which creates a traditional steady rhythm of the procession. In *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* the space between the fourth and the fifth men is enlarged due to a *ḫ3w.t* table in a hand of the latter, and, thus, the procession is divided into two groups of the same size; this partition corresponds to the partition between the sitting figures of the owner and his wife and two registers of men in front of them in the central part of the

---

20 *LD* II, 19; Priese K.-H., *Die Opferkammer des Merib* (Berlin, 1984), Umschlag.

21 The "pseudo-jambs" of *Ḥtp-sš3.t* did not impress other artists and were never repeated, although the figures of the servants below the projecting upper lintel going back to *Mrjj-jb(.j)* sometimes appear in the north–south Giza chapels with two false doors (*Sšm(.j)-nfr(.w) I* [LG 45 = G 4940] (*LD* II, Bl.27); *K3(.j)-swḏ3* [LG 37 = G 5340] (*LD* II, Bl.85-*b*; Junker, *Gîza* VII (Wien – Leipzig, 1944), Abb.69); *Sšm(.j)-nfr(w) II* [G 5080] (Kanawati, *Giza* II, pl.63).

22 On them see Bolshakov, *Man and his Double*, 143.

23 Unnoticed both by Junker and Kanawati.

wall and that between the list of titles and the representation of a food-store in the upper part.

(7) A wrong arrangement of the offering list entries on the south wall of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* as compared to *Ḥtp-sš₃.t* has been discussed by Junker in detail[24] and must not be touched upon again. It should only be noticed that the artist of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* showed the same carelessness here as when reproducing inscriptions on the west wall (2).

(8) In the scenes of butchery in the lowest register of the south wall of *Ḥtp-sš₃.t* men firmly step on the carcasses of the animals with a whole foot, while in *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* they only touch them with their toes. In *Ḥtp-sš₃.t* the left man in the left group steps on the upper part of a foreleg of a bull being a good support for him; in *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* his foot rests on three bound shins of the animal. This would be very inconvenient in reality, but the artist was interested first of all in a complicated pattern of lines created; this man is also strongly bent forward in a manner so much favoured by the artist. The left butcher in the right group of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* is shown in a very unusual posture: he slightly leans backwards and pulls the foreleg of an oryx using all his weight, while in *Ḥtp-sš₃.t* he bends forward in a quieter manner. Interestingly, the expressionism of the artist of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* manifests itself even in the representations of the slaughtered animals: their bound legs are violently bent and their tails are curved in a much more agonizing manner than in *Ḥtp-sš₃.t*.

Thus, the comparison of the source of *Ḥtp-sš₃.t* and the copy of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* demonstrates the following.

(a) The decorative programs of the two chapels are similar both due to the copying and to the application of the same rules, which in its turn is in accord with the spatial and chronological similarities of the tombs – Giza, first half of Dyn.V.

(b) The main deviation of the copy from the original – the independent decoration of the east wall – reflects the specific personal circumstances of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)*. However, the degree of freedom is not very high at the level of the whole decoration of the chapel, and the author of the program of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* acts within the framework of the general rules. First, he places the unusual composition on the wall normally bearing the delivery scenes[25] and the latter are partly forced out of it. However, due to their neutral nature, the processions of bringers could be placed at any wall of the chapel, and in *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* they are present on the west and north walls, which compensates for their partial removal from the east. Second, the processions of the owner's children structurally do not differ much from the processions of the offering bearers and, thus, although the composition on the east wall of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* is unique, it looks standard. Thus, the rule is violated but in a manner making the violation as unnoticeable as possible.

(c) There is more freedom at the level of decoration of a single wall. It is reflected in the manner of copying in the same measure as in the decoration of independent synchronous tombs. This is no doubt a result of an obvious fact that the variations of a composition on a wall, whatever serious they may be, are beyond the sphere of the most general regulations if they do not change the nature of the scenes and do not affect their intelligibility. The author of the program of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* tries to avoid contradictions caused by the new orientation of figures by means of transposing inscriptions **(2)**, and although this modification results in a new inconsistency, it is caused by the need to be consistent.

(d) The artist is even freer at the level of a single scene and can modify a number of figures, their attributes, arrangement and orientation, not to mention smaller details. A single scene is a place where artistic individuality manifests itself most easily. It allows us to trace the personal manner of the artist of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)*. His main characteristic is an interest to complicated postures, sometimes resulting in manneristically complicated images **(4, 5, 8)** and non-standard choice of figures **(3)**; he also has a good feeling of composition **(6)**. On the other hand, he is either inattentive when reading inscriptions or his knowledge of hieroglyphs desires for the better **(2, 7)**. The artist of *Ḥtp-sš₃.t* is more traditional, not inclined to experiments, the more so that the figures in complicated postures may present some difficulties to him **(5)**. Thus, we obviously deal with two different men and two different creative personalities[26]

---

24 Junker, *Gîza* III, 71, 76.

25 The rule that existed at Giza till the mid to late Dyn.V (Bolshakov, *Man and his Double*, 64–65, tbl.1).

26 It is wrong, therefore, "to think that the two tombs were decorated by the same artists" as Kanawati does (*Gîza* II, 36).

and the case of *Ḥtp-sš3.t – N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* can be defined as a slight modification of the program without conceptual changes but with numerous variations of artistic nature.

II. The chapel of *K3(.j)-m-nfr.t* [SqNSP D 23, MFA 04.1761 + 07.1005]

When turning to the chapel of *K3(.j)-m-nfr.t*, we find ourselves in quite a different world. Although the chapel is of approximately the same size as the already discussed cult chambers at Giza, both the number and the diversity of representations in it are incomparably larger. This is explained by the greater height of the chapel, but the height itself is in its turn a result of squeezing in as many subjects as possible. This difference is in accord with the general difference between the decorations of the chapels of Giza and Saqqara: in the former it is standardised and laconic, while in the latter it is versatile and eloquent. This is a consequence of the different history of Giza and Saqqara during Dyn.IV, the formative period of the decorative system. At Giza internal chapels appeared as a result of reconstruction of the original mastabas and, hewn in their monolithic cores, they could not be large, which predetermined a strict selection of topics. Saqqara chapels continued the tradition of richly decorated cult chambers that had started in the Meidum tombs of the reign of Snefru.

The chapel of *K3(.j)-m-nfr.t* (reigns of Isesi – Unis) belongs to the latter type going back to the very beginning of interior cult places in Egyptian tombs. The deepening of the false door into the body of the mastaba engendered true cruciform chapels where the development of murals started. In the mid Dyn.V the flattening of the false door niche and of the false door itself led to the appearance of modified cruciform chapels characterised by the arrangement of the entrance in the centre of the east wall, opposite the false door.

It is well known that there is a number of factors making the decorative programs of the modified cruciform chapels particularly inconsistent.[27] The chapel of *K3(.j)-m-nfr.t* is one of the most unusual within that typological group and even at Saqqara in general as concerns the arrangement of the topics.[28] This

27 HARPUR, *Decoration*, 99–100.
28 Cf. the data in BOLSHAKOV, *Man and his Double*, Tbl.2.

makes its analysis more intricate but also especially interesting and requires its comparison with more characteristic monuments. This comparison can partly play the role of the above comparison of an original and a copy.[29]

Entrance to the chapel. The thicknesses of the entrance to the chapel are not decorated. However, MARIETTE mentioned representations of boats traced in red paint on the walls of a long north–south corridor leading to the chapel[30] (lost). Perhaps sailing to Sais was depicted.[31]

West wall (KMN.Abb.6).[32] The central part of the wall is occupied by a monumental false door. To the right of it there is an offering list and to the left offering bringers → {1} and numerous food articles {2}–{12}.[33] Along the left side of the wall the titles and the name of the tomb owner are written in two vertical columns of hieroglyphs.

East wall (KMN.Abb.2-4).[34] The wall bears numerous representations of daily life in eleven registers. On the right half of the wall there is a representation of the tomb owner (at the level of the sixth register) looking at driving cattle → {1}–{2}, men bringing tables of offerings → {3}, household officials at work, bringing a miscreant, filling granaries{4}, threshing, winnowing {5}, transporting grain on donkeys ← → {6}–{7}, reaping barley {8}, tying up bundles of flax {9}, pulling flax {10}, and sowing {11}. To the left of the entrance there are also eleven registers: driving cattle ← {1}, butchery {2}, fowl ← {3}, netting fish {4}, bringing fowl → {5}, catching fowl with a clapnet {6}, tending cattle {7}, boatmen fighting {8}–{9}, transporting oxen in boats → {10}, and driving oxen → {11}.

North wall (KMN.Abb.5).[35] The central place is occupied by the scene of the tomb owner fowling.

29 In this paper I shall ignore the fact that only the upper parts of the murals of *K3(.j)-m-nfr.t* are completed in relief, while the lower ones are only traced in paint – interesting as it is for the reconstruction of the techniques of decoration, it does not contribute much to our understanding of its program.
30 MARIETTE A., *Les mastabas de l'Ancien Empire* (Paris, 1889), 243.
31 SIMPSON W.K., *The Offering Chapel of Kayemnofret in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston* (Boston, 1992), 4.
32 SIMPSON, *Kayemnofret*, fig.B, C, D.
33 Later the procession of offering bringers was replaced by two registers of beer vessels (SIMPSON, *Kayemnofret*, 11, 12).
34 SIMPSON, *Kayemnofret*, fig.F, G.
35 SIMPSON, *Kayemnofret*, fig.A.

The original small scene → was replaced by a larger, more expressive and developed one ← (both only traced in paint). Below there are three registers: driving cattle ← {1} and offering bringers ← {2}–{3}. To the right of the fowling and papyrus thicket there are five short registers: originally netting fish, later eliminated and replaced by two figures of men ← accompanying the tomb owner in the new fowling scene {4}, originally binding a papyrus skiff, later eliminated and replaced by the titles of the tomb owner in the new fowling scene {5}, rope making {6}, bringing papyrus bundles → {7}, bringing fish and fowl → {8}.

South wall (KMN.Abb.7).[36] The standing tomb owner ◄ (at the level of the sixth register) looks at the delivery of offerings: offering bringers → {2}, driving cattle → {6}–{10}, scribes at work → {11}, and household officials → {12}. Register {1} is devoted to butchery, register {5} bears a palanquin scene ◄. Registers {3}–{4} are completely lost.

If there really were representations of sailing being a part of the funeral procession on the walls of the entrance corridor, they find parallels in the mastabas of $Htp-hr-3h.t(j)$ [SqWSP D 60, Leiden F.1904/3.1][37] and $K3(.j)-r^c(w)-pw$ [SqNSP D 39, Philadelphia E 15729][38] where they are placed on the entrance thicknesses. Sailing to Sais is represented also in the entrance portico in $N(j)-^cnh-hnm(w)$ and $Hnm(w)-htp(.w)$ [SUPC, Neuserra – Menkauhor].[39] This arrangement is the most radical manifestation of the association of the burial scenes with the outer parts of the tomb.[40]

The decoration of the west wall of $K3(.j)-m-nfr.t$ is very laconic; more compact it can be only in the tombs where there is nothing on the wall apart from the false door(s) (e.g., $Nn-hft(j)-k3(.j)$ [SqESP D 47],[41] $3h.t(j)-htp(.w)$ [SqUPC, Louvre E.10958],[42] $Hnm(w)-htp(.w)$ [SqESP, D 49][43]). The offering list is present on the west wall of a modified cruciform chapel also in $K3(.j)-m-sn(w)$ [SqTPC],[44] but there it is combined with a representation of the tomb owner and his wife. In the chapels of other types the offering list is possible on the west wall as well, but usually in association with the table scene, e.g., $K3(.j)-r^c(w)-pw$ [SqNSP D 39, Philadelphia E 15729],[45] $Pth-htp(.w)$ II-Tfj [SqWSP D 64],[46] $Mrw-Ttj-snb(.w)$ [SqTPC].[47] Representations of food and offering bringers are among the commonest topics of the west wall at Saqqara.[48] Although the laconicism of the west wall of $K3(.j)-m-nfr.t$ is unusual, in general its decoration is very characteristic of the Saqqara tombs where it rarely bears the table scene and is devoted mainly to the provision of the owner with food.

As contrary to the west wall, the east one bears one of the most extensive sets of murals in the modified cruciform chapels; in richness it can be compared only with $3h.t(j)-htp(.w)$ [SqUPC, Louvre E.10958].[49] The selection of topics is very consequential: they all belong to the group of agricultural works supplemented with offering bringers and butchery.

The table scene with related topics so common on the north wall of Saqqara chapels is absent there in $K3(.j)-m-nfr.t$; their place is occupied by marsh scenes, the owner fowling and spearing included. The latter are very rare on the north walls at Saqqara[50] and are never used in the modified cruciform chapels except $K3(.j)-m-nfr.t$, although other outdoor scenes (driving cattle, offering bringers, gathering grapes and fruits, catching birds) are present on it in $Nfr-jr.t-n.f$ [SqESP, D55][51].[52] Perhaps the reason of the transfer of the marsh scenes from the east wall, their most common place, was the extensity of decoration borne by the latter. Anyway, the north wall was correctly named 'all-purpose' by Harpur.[53]

36 SIMPSON, *Kayemnofret*, fig.E.

37 HOLWERDA A. E., BOESER P., HOLWERDA J. H. *Beschreibung der aegyptischen Sammlung des niederländischen Reichsmuseum der Altertümer in Leiden I. Die Denkmaeler des Alten Reiches* (Leiden, 1905), Taf.20.

38 *PM* III², 455.

39 MOUSSA, ALTENMÜLLER, *Nianchchnum*, Taf.6–15.

40 BOLSHAKOV, *Man and His Double*, 101–102.

41 *PM* III², 581.

42 ZIEGLER CH., *Le mastaba d'Akhethetep* (Paris, 1993), 30, 64–65.

43 *PM* III², 578.

44 *TPC* II, pl.62.

45 *PM* III², 456.

46 PAGET R. F. E., PIRIE A. A. *The Tomb of Ptah-Hetep* (London, 1898, *ERA* 1896), pl.38,41; DAVIES NORMAN, *The Mastaba of Ptahhetep and Akhethetep at Saqqareh* I (London, 1900, *ASE* 8), pl. 29, 30 [upper].

47 LLOYD A. B., SPENCER A. J., EL-KHOULI A. *Saqqara Tombs II. The Mastabas of Meru, Semdenti, Khui, and Others* (London, 1990, *ASE* 37), pl.9.

48 BOLSHAKOV, *Man and his Double*, Tbl.2.

49 *PM* III², 635–636; ZIEGLER CH., *Le mastaba d'Akhethetep*, 126–143.

50 BOLSHAKOV, *Man and his Double*, Tbl.2.

51 WALLE, *Neferirtenef*, pl.9–10.

52 Perhaps, also in $Hnm(w)-htp(.w)$ [SqESP D 49] – the reliefs are destroyed but some fragments with the scenes of daily life (*PM* III2, 579) could come from it.

53 HARPUR, *Decoration*, 91.

The main topic of the south wall at Saqqara is the table scene, but it is absent in *Kз(.j)-m-nfr.t*. Accordingly absent are the related topics of the cultic character; instead, the owner is represented as standing, and the registers before him are devoted to butchery, delivery of goods and the administration of his estate. The palanquin scene is small and, as contrary to most cases of its use, it does not dominate on the wall. However, being devoted to the owner visiting his tomb in the process of construction,[54] it is not out of place there.

The absence of the table scene on the walls of the chapel of *Kз(.j)-m-nfr.t* (it is shown only on the false door panel) is a rare feature; however, it is not unique and occurs in a number of chapels dating to the second half of Dyn.V: *R⁽(w)-m-kз(.j)* [SqNSP D 3 = S 903, MMA 08.201.1];[55] *Ḫnm(w)-ḥtp(.w)* [SqESP D 49];[56] *зḫ.t(j)-ḥtp(.w)* [SqUPC, Louvre E.10958];[57] *pd-ḥtp(.w)* [SqNSP D 15] [58] [59] [60]. In most of these chapels a small-scale table scene is located on the panel(s) of the false door(s), but since in the Louvre *зḫ.t(j)-ḥtp(.w)* the latter are replaced by palace facades, it is absent there completely.

This phenomenon remains practically unnoticed, perhaps because we pay attention mainly to the presence of something strange and not to the absence of a commonplace. Harpur mentioned it in an off-hand manner and supposed that in *зḫ.t(j)-ḥtp(.w)* the absence of the table scene could be compensated by a banquet on the north wall.[61] This is no doubt correct, but cannot exhaust the problem: the main scene of the tomb decoration is eliminated in a number of the richest tombs of the period when the quality and quantity of murals reached its summit. I can only suppose that this deviation from the main line of tomb development is explained by a contradictory nature of these chapels. On the one hand, their decoration is very rich and extensive; on the other hand, the space for it is limited by the walls of a single chamber. Some scenes had to be cancelled, and, since the increase of decoration was due to the introduction of numerous everyday scenes, the more traditional (although more important as well) ritual scenes fell a victim. Perhaps this was possible thanks to the presence of the table scene on the false door. In less richly decorated chapels and in multiple roomed tombs the problem of the lack of space never emerged and the table scene did not disappear from their walls.

III. The rock tombs of *Kз(.j)-ḥp-Ṯtj-jḳr(.w)* and *Špsj-pw-mn(w)-Ḫnj*

The rules of the arrangement of representations in the mastaba chapels are logical and strict (more at Giza, less at Saqqara), although sometimes their concrete manifestations may be hidden behind more or less serious deviations caused by various circumstances. Rock-cut tombs produce quite a different impression – that of an absence of definite rules. However, the rules do exist, and they are even close enough to those so obvious in mastabas, but they function in a different situation and are adapted to it.

The main feature of rock tombs differing them from mastabas is their variable orientation. Mastabas being free standing structures are usually exactly oriented to cardinal points,[62] while the orientati-

---

54 ROTH A.M., "The Practical Economics of Tomb-Building in the Old Kingdom. A Visit to the Necropolis in a Carrying Chair", in: *For his Ka. Essays Offered in Memory of Klaus Baer* (Chicago, 1994, *SAOC* 55), 227–240.

55 *PM* III², 487–488.

56 *PM* III², 578–579.

57 *PM* III², 634–637; now also ZIEGLER, *Akhethetep*.

58 *PM* III², 481–482.

59 Perhaps also *N(j)-kз.w-ḥr(w)* [SqNSP S 915, reign of Unis] – although the upper part of the north wall in his chapel is lost, the topics in the preserved lower registers (QUIBELL, *Excavations at Saqqara (1907 – 1908)*, pl.66-2) could hardly be placed by the table scene. Numerous chapels with much damaged walls are not considered here.

60 Cf. at Giza: *šm(.j)-nfr(.w) I* [G 4940] (*PM* III², 142–143; now also KANAWATI N., *Tombs at Giza* I (Warminster, 2001, *ACER* 16), pl.40–51) (however it could have been placed on the south thickness of the entrance – now lost); anonymous [G 6037] (*PM* III², 174–175); *Kз(.j)-m-nfr.t* [LG 63] (*PM* III², 208–209).

61 HARPUR, *Decoration*, 101.

62 This happens first of all in the Memphite region, while in other places orientation may be less exact; cf., e.g., PETRIE W.M.F., *Denhereh 1898* (London, 1900, *EEF* 17) pl.27; REISNER G.A., *A Provincial Cemetery of the Pyramid Age: Naga-ed-Dêr* III (Berkeley – Los Angeles, 1932), Sheet 1–2; perhaps also PETRIE W.M.F., *Deshasheh* (London, 1898, *EEF* 15), pl.2. Egyptians usually oriented their tombs not astronomically but along the Nile, deviations from the true north corresponding to the local deviations of the river from the meridional direction. It seems that an exact astronomical orientation in the Memphite region was due to the fact that the "Nile north" practically coincides with the true north there, which could cause special interest to the astronomical orientation.

on of the rock tombs is predetermined by the position and the outline of the cliff where they are hewn. Sometimes an orientation along the east – west axis was possible, but these cases were exceptional. Moreover, a number of provincial necropolises are placed on the east bank of the Nile, which predetermined a reversed orientation of the tombs, which, in its turn, if combined with deviations of the direction of the river, could result in most unusual variants of orientation.

It must be taken into account that when we talk about west and east, north and south, these are abstractions of *weltanschaulich* and religious nature. The west wall was of special importance in the Memphite chapels because it was associated with the West as the world of the dead, and the east wall usually bore representations of daily life because it was spatially close to the world of the living. When the orientation was abnormal, the innermost tomb wall was apprehended as western, whatever it might actually be. Such a spatial organisation of the decorative program may be designated as functional.

When the deviation reached 45°, two walls acquired equal right to be functionally regarded as the west one, and the choice of one of them could be based on some extra circumstances. So, e.g., the main chamber ("Room A") of the rock tomb of *N(j)-ꜥnḫ-pjpj-km* at Meir [A.1] is oriented along the axis southeast – northwest and has an entrance in the southeast wall;[63] thus, either the left or the innermost wall could be considered western. The latter option may seem preferable since it would allow to oppose the false door to the entrance, but it was probably more important to place the inner chambers of the tomb ("Rooms B–D") behind it, and the left wall was chosen to be functionally western as a result. This made the decorative program less logical, but logic was offered to constructive needs in this case. *Pjpj-ꜥnḫ(.w)-Ḥnj-km*, a son of *N(j)-ꜥnḫ-pjpj-km*, whose tomb [Meir A.2] forms a complex with the father's,[64] followed his example and placed a false door on the left, southwest wall of the "Room C"; an extra reason for it could be the arrangement of a burial chamber ("Room D") behind this very wall. However, in the "Room F" two false doors are hewn in the northeast wall. This must be explained by the arrangement of

the entrance to the chamber in the southwest wall and, thus, the decorative scheme conforms to the principle of opposition here. This example also demonstrates that in different chambers of the same tomb different walls could be functionally western.[65]

The developers of the programs of the tombs located at the east bank of the Nile faced another problem: what to do if the entrance to the tomb was at the west. The easiest solution could be paying no attention to orientation and placing the false door at the east, thus keeping the traditional opposition of the entrance and the cult place (e.g., *Mn(w)-wn.w* (?), [EH G79] [66]). However, although possible, such a mirroring of the tomb perhaps seemed too radical and other variants were preferred. The most interesting of them was keeping the false door(s) in the west wall even if the entrance was also in it, e.g., *Ttj-ꜥnḫ(.w)-Jj-m-ḥtp* [ShS 15] [67]; *Mrw-Bbj* [ShS 20] [68]; *Wjw-Jjjw* [ShS 19] [69]; *Mrw* and *Ḥnn.t* [ShS 18][70]; ShS 6[71]; *Mꜣj* [ZM 3], *Jbw* [ZM 10], *Ḥttj* [ZM 12], *Ḥ(w).t-ḥr(w)-m-ḥꜣ.t* [ZM 16], *Mꜣj* [ZM 11], *N(j)-ꜥnḫ-pjpj* [ZM 14][72]; *Pjpj-ꜥnḫ(.w)* [QA 1][73]; *Ḥw(j)-n-wḫ* [QA 2][74]; *Mn(w)-ꜥnḫ(.w)* [EH G84][75]; *Mrrw---* [EH F12][76], *Mtn.tj* [Sha Q10][77], *Jwḥj* [Sha R10][78], ano-

---

63 BLACKMAN A.M., APTED M.R., *The Rock Tombs of Meir V* (London, 1953, *ASE* 28), pl.1.

64 *Ibid.*

65 I do not want to discuss here the cases where there are several false doors in different walls of the same chamber, e.g., in all four in *Ḥnkw-J---f* [DG 3] (DAVIES Norman, *The Rock Tombs of Deir el-Gebrawi* II (London, 1902; *ASE* 12), p.22) – only one of the walls had to serve as the main cult place.

66 KANAWATI N., *The Rock Tombs of El-Hawawish* III (Sydney, 1982), fig.22, 26.

67 DAVIES NORMAN, *The Rock Tombs of Sheikh Saïd*, (London, 1901, *ASE* 10), pl.27.

68 *Ibid.*, pl.18.

69 *Ibid.*, pl.22.

70 *Ibid.*, pl.22.

71 BRUNNER H., *Die Anlagen der ägyptischen Felsgräber bis zum Mittleren Reich* (Glückstadt – Hamburg – New York, 1936, *ÄF* 3), Abb.12.

72 All *LD* I, Bl.57 = BRUNNER, *Felsgräber,* Abb.16; the latter also VARILLE A., *La tombe de Ni-Ankh-Pepi à Zâouyet el-Mayetîn* (Le Caire, 1938, *MIFAO* 70), pl.3.

73 BRUNNER, *Felsgräber,* Abb.26, EL-KHOULI A., KANAWATI N., *Quseir el-Amarna* (Sydney, 1989, *ACER* 1), fig.24.

74 QUIBELL J.E., "Rapport sur une nécropole de la VIe dynastie à Koçeir el-Amarna", *ASAE* 3 (1902), fig.1, EL-KHOULI, KANAWATI, *Quseir el-Amarna*, fig.29.

75 KANAWATI N., *The Rock Tombs of El-Hawawish* I (Sydney, 1980), fig.2.

76 KANAWATI, *The Rock Tombs of El-Hawawish* IX (Sydney, 1989), fig.4, 2-b (the wall actually is southwest, KANAWATI calls it south, but it seems that the Egyptians themselves appreciated it as the west one).

nymous [Sha T13][79]. In the tombs of Sheikh Saïd the abnormal position of the false door(s) was softened by the arrangement of engaged statues at the east – they could be hewn either in the innermost (second or third) chamber or in the east wall of the chapel. Thus, a second cult place was created, located at the main axis of the tomb, and it is impossible to judge which of the two was of more importance.

An extra answer to the problems caused by the location of tombs at the east bank were the so-called rock-cut mastabas constructed at Tehna ("Fraser Tombs")[80] and el-Hammamiya.[81] They are "formed by cutting an E shaped trench in the solid rock, the long side running parallel to the cliffs; by this arrangement a mass of rock is left standing free, surrounded on its north, south and eastern sides by passages, the western face of the mass being cut at an angle, the slope being much the same as in built Mastaba tombs. … the false doors, etc., are sculptured in its eastern side in the long passage…".[82] Especially remarkable is the rock-cut mastaba of $N(j)$-$k3(.j)$-$\varsigma n\underline{h}$ [Tehna 13] where a chapel is hewn in a massif surrounded by the trenches, with two false doors in its west wall.[83] In the rock-cut mastabas, as contrary to the rock tombs with both the entrance and the false door(s) at the west, false doors were separated from the valley, the world of life, not by a thin wall, but by a solid body of the "mastaba"; moreover, the apprehension of space by a person who reached the cult place by narrow, deep and turning trenches (roofed and dark in el-Hammamiya) had to be quite different. Thus, the rock-cut mastabas allowed their owners to keep the traditional orientation to the west and at the same time created an illusion of the false door facing the mountain.

It must be admitted, however, that all the above variants of organisation of the space of the tomb are contradictory, although in a different measure, and the Egyptians no doubt had the same feeling – otherwise they would not experiment with various orientations. Thus, another method was developed that could be used with almost every orientation of the tomb. If the false door could not be arranged without contradictions in the chapel, then it had to be placed in another, independent space. A deep niche was hewn in one of the walls of the chapel and the false door was carved in or painted on its west wall; at this, the mural decoration of the walls of this shrine was as close to the classical one as possible and, if necessary, not related with that of the wall in which the niche was deepened. Such plan is characteristic, e.g., of the large tombs at Deir el-Gebrawi[84] and el-Hawawish.[85] In spite of all its attractiveness, this method did not become universal either, perhaps because it required extra work of stonecutters and made the decorative program of the tomb more complicated.

Now we can turn to the tombs of the nomarchs of Akhmim $K3(.j)$-$\underline{h}p$-$\underline{T}tj$-$j\underline{k}r(.w)$ and $\check{S}psj$-pw-$mn(w)$ at el-Hawawish (reign of Pepy II).[86]

The tomb of $K3(.j)$-$\underline{h}p$-$\underline{T}tj$-$j\underline{k}r(.w)$ [EH H26]

The chapel of $K3(.j)$-$\underline{h}p$-$\underline{T}tj$-$j\underline{k}r(.w)$ is trapezoidal, with an entrance in its south-west wall;[87] after KANAWATI we shall call it "south" wall. In the right third of the opposite northeast ("east") wall there is a deep shrine with a false door in its northwest ("west") wall.

"South" wall (KH.Abb.3).[88] The wall is divided in two parts by the entrance to the chapel. On the right half the tomb owner stands ◄ observing the driving of cattle → {1}, metal works {2}, and carpenters making furniture {3} in front of him. The upper part of the wall is occupied by the representation of two sailing boats towing a boat with a canopy over a sarcophagus and a mourner at the stern ← (the other mourner is lost). The half of the wall to the left

77 SCHENKEL W, GOMAÀ F. *Sharuna* I (Mainz, 2004), Taf.82, Beilage 10.

78 *Ibid.*, Taf.89, 91–93.

79 *Ibid.*, Taf.120–121.

80 FRASER G.W., "The early tombs at Tehneh", *ASAE* 3 (1902), 69–73, 122–130.

81 WRESZINSKI W., *Bericht über die photographische Expedition von Kairo bis Wadi Halfa* (Halle, 1927), Abb.2–4; BRUNNER, *Felsgräber*, Abb.4–5; EL-KHOULI A., KANAWATI N., *The Old Kingdom Tombs of El-Hammamiya* (Sydney, 1990, *ACER* 2), pl.25, 31, 52.

82 FRASER, *ASAE* 3, 68.

83 FRASER, *ASAE* 3, pl.1; BRUNNER, *Felsgräber*, Abb.2.

84 *Jbj* [DG 8] (DAVIES, *Deir el-Gebrawi* I, pl.2); $\underline{D}\varsigma w$-$\check{S}m3j$ [DG 12] DAVIES, *Deir el-Gebrawi* II, pl.11);

85 $K3(.j)$-$\underline{h}p$-$\underline{T}tj$-$j\underline{k}r(.w)$ [EH H26] (KANAWATI, *El-Hawawish* I, fig.5); $\check{S}psj$-pw-$mn(w)$-$\underline{H}nj$ [EH H24] (KANAWATI, *El-Hawawish* II, fig.1); $Sf\underline{h}w$ [EH L21] (KANAWATI, *El-Hawawish* VI, fig.10);

86 In order to keep the size of the paper within reasonable reasons, I shall not discuss the orientation of the figures of the tomb owner on the pillars and pilasters, although they play a certain role in the organization of the space.

87 Plan: KANAWATI, *El-Hawawish* I, fig.5.

88 KANAWATI, *El-Hawawish* I, fig.8, 9.

of the entrance bears a representation of the owner spearing fish ➤.

"North" wall (KH.Abb.5).[89] In the centre of the wall there is a large palanquin scene ◀. Although the main function of the palanquin scene was to show the owner visiting his tomb,[90] it is always combined with various open-air household scenes because he could see them on the way to the cemetery. In our case these are driving cattle across water ➔ {1}, netting fish {2}, and fowling with a clap-net {4}, all from the repertoire of the marsh scenes; music and dances are added to them in {2}. To the right of the palanquin scene, by the opening of the shrine, there are figures of the standing owner and his wife ➤ accompanied by their two sons ➔.

"West" wall (KH.Abb.6).[91] The wall is divided in two parts by a pilaster bearing a representation of the tomb owner standing ◀. On the right half the owner is depicted as "seeing every good field work"[92] including a fight of boatmen {1}, {3},[93] making papyrus skiffs {2},[94] and ploughing and sowing {4}. On the left half of the wall there is a figure of the standing tomb owner leaning on his staff ◀ and "seeing a bull fight"[95] in four registers in front of him.

"East" wall (KH.Abb.4).[96] The wall is divided in two parts by a pilaster bearing a representation of the tomb owner leaning on his staff ➤. On the left half of the wall there are representations of driving cattle {1}, {2}, and of butchery {3}, {4}. On the right

half of the wall there are scenes of baking and brewing {1}, {2}, goats with shepherds {3}, reaping, tying and transporting sheaves on an ass {4}, men bringing offerings in baskets {5}.

Shrine, "west" wall (KH.Abb.10).[97] At the right there is a false door; to the left of it the tomb owner is depicted at a table ◀, with an offering list and priestly service ➔ over it.

Shrine, "north" wall (KH.Abb.11).[98] The wall is occupied by another table scene ➤, an offering list, a scene of the priestly service ◀, and a large figure of a man facing the owner ◀.

Shrine, "east" wall (KH.Abb.12).[99] The tomb owner is depicted as standing ➤, wearing a panther skin; in front of him there are four registers of offering bringers ◀ (only two upper registers are completely preserved, while the first is completely lost and only a small fragment remains of the second).

The decorative program of the tomb is clear enough, although it requires some comments.

The "south" wall is devoted to the outdoor scenes, including the owner spearing, driving cattle, handicraftsmen at work, and the ships of the burial procession. All these topics are characteristic of the east walls of the chapels with the traditional orientation, both at Giza and Saqqara. Thus, the "south" wall of *K3(.j)-ḥp* functions as the east one, which is only natural since it is the outermost wall of the chapel with the entrance in it.

The "north" wall, however, does not imitate the west one – a false door is absent and the palanquin scene is not at all usual on the west walls of the "normal" chapels. Since it is one of the open-air scenes, in multiple roomed tombs it is placed in one of the outer chambers, including porticos and open courts.[100] When in chapels, it is located mainly on the east wall,[101] sometimes on the north[102] or south wall,[103] but never on the west one. The only exception are several large false doors bearing the palan-

89 Kanawati, *El-Hawawish* I, fig.12, 13;

90 Roth, in: *For his Ka*, 227–240.

91 Kanawati, *El-Hawawish* I, fig.10, 11;

92 As described in the seeing formula in front of him.

93 The scene is defined as a part of field and, accordingly marsh *works* in the seeing formula, since it shows a fight occurring when the crew of each boats tries to surpass others and to be first in bringing offerings that are products of fields and marshes (Bolshakov A.O., "The Scene of the Boatmen Jousting in Old Kingdom Tomb Representations", *BSEG* 17 (1993), 29–39).

94 Kanawati (*El-Hawawish* I, 22) describes the scene as repairing the skiffs damaged in a fight, but I can hardly imagine that much damage could be caused to them in such a brief episode as a fight during bringing offerings.

95 For the scene as depicting an entertainment (as contrary to Seidlmayer S.J., "Kämpfende Stiere. Autorität und Rivalität unter pharaonischen Eliten", in: *Gegenworte. Zeitschrift für den Disput über Wissen* 4 (1999), 73–75) see Bolshakov, *Representation and Text: Two Languages of Ancient Egyptian Totenglauben*". *AoF* 30 (2003), 127-139.

96 Kanawati, *El-Hawawish* I, fig.14, 15.

97 Kanawati, *El-Hawawish* I, fig.17.

98 Kanawati, *El-Hawawish* I, fig.18.

99 Kanawati, *El-Hawawish* I, fig.22.

100 *PM* III², 85 (3), 90 (2), 171 (5), 185 (8), 227, 341 (1), 470 (6–7), 497 (2), 520 (3), 523 (22), 527 (14), 535 (94), 536 (115), 536 (116–117), 643 (18), 642 (11), now also Kanawati N., *The Teti Cemetery at Saqqara* (Warminster, 1999, *ACER* 13), pl.55.

101 *PM* III², 94 (2), 206 (6), 252 (2), 238 (2), 255 (5).

102 *PM* III², 460 (3), 535 (108), now also Roth A.M., *Giza Mastabas* VI (Boston, 1995), pl.191.

103 *PM* III², 186 (5).

quin scene,[104] but these are a very specific attempt to concentrate as many representations as possible by the main cult place (especially the false door of *nb*).[105] Marsh scenes that are attached to the palanquin scene, are also uncharacteristic of the traditional program of the west wall. Thus, the murals of the "north" wall of *K3(.j)-ḥp* continue the themes of the south (functionally east) wall.

It is even more unusual that the lateral, west and east walls bear the topics belonging to the same group of scenes of daily life. At this, two scenes at the west wall – boatmen jousting and bulls fighting – are entertaining, although the former is related with the delivery of offerings. It may be tempting to explain this by the fact that in the "normal" Memphite chapels the south wall (i.e., also the left one) is the most usual place for festive (= entertaining) topics – music, dances, etc., and to suppose that the decoration of the "west" wall of *K3(.j)-ḥp* is a very dim reflection of the functions of the south wall of the traditional chapel – but, most probably, it would be too far fetched.

Thus, the decoration of the chapel of *K3(.j)-ḥp* has no ritual motifs[106] and is entirely devoted to daily life. It is even wrong to call it chapel for it is not a real cult room. This was possible because all the ritual scenes were concentrated in a shrine. The false door is normatively carved in its "west" wall, while the

table scenes, offering lists and scenes of priestly service flanking it both on the "west" and the "north" walls create a chapel in miniature. The tomb owner receiving offerings on the "east" wall of the shrine is also one of the commonest topics of the east wall of the traditional chapels.

Luckily, we know the name of the man who was responsible for the decoration of the tomb of *K3(.j)-ḥp* and was brave and consistent enough to create an unusual program of the main chamber. This is the Scribe of images (*zš ḳd.wt*)[107] *Snj* who placed his representation and a short inscription on the "south" wall, by the figure of *K3(.j)-ḥp* spearing. In the inscription he says: "… (2) It was I who decorated the tomb of the 'count' *Ḥnj*, (3) as well as it was I who decorated this tomb, being alone". The situation is especially interesting because we know the other tomb decorated by *Snj* – that of *Špsj-pw-mn(w)-Ḥnj* hewn not far from *K3(.j)-ḥp* – and *Snj* is represented there as well! *Špsj-pw-mn(w)* left an inscription on the façade of *K3(.j)-ḥp* mentioning some of his activities in his father's tomb,[108] and KANAWATI with good reasons believes that *K3(.j)-ḥp* was a father of *Špsj-pw-mn(w)*;[109] we shall follow him in regarding the tomb of the *Špsj-pw-mn(w)* as a later work of *Snj* and its program as secondary in comparison with that of *K3(.j)-ḥp*.[110]

The tomb of *Špsj-pw-mn(w)-Ḥnj* [EH H24]

The plan of the tomb of *Špsj-pw-mn(w)*[111] is very similar to that of *K3(.j)-ḥp* if considering that its part to the right of the shrine is an unfinished extension of the original structure. The orientation of the tomb is also similar, which makes the comparison of the decorative programs much easier and more productive.

"South" wall.[112] The wall is divided in two parts by the entrance to the chapel. On the smaller right half the tomb owner sits ◀ observing the hunt in a desert {1}, metal works, making sculpture, squeezing grapes {2}, and carpenters making furniture and staffs {3} in front of him. The upper part of the wall

---

104 *nb* [GWF] (JUNKER H., *Giza* V (Wien – Leipzig, 1941), Abb.20); *Ptḥ-ḥtp(.w) II-Tfj* [SqWSP D 64] (PAGET R.F.E., PIRIE A.A., *The Tomb of Ptah-hetep*, (London, 1898, ERA 2), pl.29); *šm(.j)-nfr(.w)* [DhENPS] (DE MORGAN J. *Fouilles à Dahchour* II (Vienna, 1903), fig.3).

105 Palanquin scene is present also on the north wall of chamber A 13 of *Mrr-w(j)-k3(.j)* (DUELL, *The Mastaba of Mereruka* (Chicago, 1938), pl.157–158) that is functionally equal to the west wall due to the arrangement of a cult statue in a niche in it, but the orientation of the murals in this room is a controversial result of moving the entrance to the tomb from east to south (ibid., 9). BADAWY (*The Tomb of Nyhetep-Ptah at Giza and the Tomb of Ankhmahor at Saqqara* (Berkeley – Los Angeles – London, 1978), 3, fig.5) reconstructed a palanquin scene on the west wall of *N(j)-ḥtp-ptḥ* [G 2430 = LG 25], but his conjecture is at least questionable – a standing and not a sitting man is represented and, moreover, there is not enough space for a palanquin on the wall (cf. HARPUR, *Decoration*, 102).

106 Except for the pictures of the tomb owner wearing a sash of the lector priest on the east pilaster and on the east face of the west pillar, but this is rather a manifestation of a usual interchanging of figures with various attributes than something else.

107 I.e., the draughtsman who outlined representations for carving and/or painting and, thus, was responsible for the composition in general.

108 KANAWATI, *El-Hawawish* I, fig.19-a. Unfortunately, the passage saying what concretely was done is lost.

109 *El-Hawawaish* II, 14–15.

110 The results of our analysis will confirm this theory.

111 KANAWATI, *El-Hawawish* II, fig.1.

112 KANAWATI, *El-Hawawish* II, fig.17–19.

is occupied by a representation of two sailing boats towing a boat with a sarcophagus under a canopy and two mourners ←. Directly to the left of the entrance the owner is represented as spearing fish →. The rest of the wall is covered by murals made after the extension of the tomb. The owner stands leaning on his staff ← and "seeing every good field work":[113] boatmen jousting, granaries, a scribe receiving accounts in a chest {1}, reaping, tying and transporting sheaves on an ass, heaps of grain, measuring grain {2}, ploughing, sowing, measuring grain {3}.

"North" wall.[114] The wall is divided in two parts by the entrance to the shrine. In the centre of the left half there is a large palanquin scene ←. To the left of it are cattle wading a channel → {1}, music and dances {2}, netting fish {3} and fowling with a clapnet {4}. To the right of the palanquin scene, by the shrine, there is a figure of the tomb owner standing → wearing a sash of a lector priest, an artificial beard and sandals. The right half of the wall was decorated after the extension of the tomb. To the right of the shrine is a figure of the standing owner ← in a panther skin. The centre of this part of the wall is occupied by the false door of the owner's wife (?) Ḥtp, and to the right of it this woman is represented as sitting at a table →, with an offering list above her.

"West" wall.[115] The wall is divided in two parts by a pilaster bearing a representation of the standing tomb owner ← wearing a panther skin, an artificial beard and sandals. To the right of the pilaster there is a false door of a woman Ḥnjj, who is depicted at a table →, with an offering list above her, to the right of the false door. On the left half of the wall there is a figure of the tomb owner leaning on his staff ← and "seeing a bull fight".[116] However, the fight occupies only two uppermost of five registers in front of him, while in the lower ones there are driving goats →{1} and cows →, milking a cow {2}, tending cattle, and a bull covering a cow {3}.

"East" wall.[117] Only the left half of the wall is decorated. Three registers are devoted to production of bread and beer.

Shrine, "west" wall.[118] At the right there is a false door; to the left of it the tomb owner sits at a table ←, with a man (his son (?)) offering to him → and an offering list and priestly service → above. At the left there are five short registers with male offering bringers in them →.

Shrine, "north" wall.[119] An analogous table scene is arranged on the left part of the wall → ; above it there are an offering list and a scene of the priestly service ← . In front of the tomb owner are his wife sitting at her own table, his son with a foreleg of an offering animal, and two daughters smelling lotuses ←. On the right side of the wall are four registers with female offering bringers ← in them.

Shrine, "east" wall.[120] The standing tomb owner wearing a panther skin → observes driving cattle ← {1}–{2} and butchery {3}–{4}; in the right part of each register there are male offering bringers ←.

Although many representations are placed like in K3(.j)-ḥp and the treatment of the scenes reveals the same hand, the concept of the tomb decoration is quite different. The difference is caused by the need to introduce two cult places for the women of Špsj-pw-mn(w) into the chapel. K3(.j)-ḥp did not face this problem because his tomb was constructed late in his life (see below) and his wife could have died long before him and could have been buried elsewhere.[121]

The false door of Ḥnjj is arranged most logically – on the "west" wall, deep in the tomb. The orientation of her table scene (→) seems strange, for the main figures on the lateral walls usually face outwards, but, perhaps, it is turned towards the shrine

---

113 According to the seeing formula.

114 Kanawati, *El-Hawawish* II, fig.21–23.

115 Kanawati, *El-Hawawish* II, fig.4, 20.

116 According to the seeing formula.

117 Kanawati, *El-Hawawish* II, fig.5.

---

118 Kanawati, *El-Hawawish* II, fig.24.

119 Kanawati, *El-Hawawish* II, fig.25.

120 Kanawati, *El-Hawawish* II, fig.26.

121 This seems to be confirmed by the presence of only one burial chamber in his tomb except those with their shafts opening in the forecourt; as for the shaft beginning in the shrine, it may be intrusive – at least, it is hewn in unstable rock, which would hardly be done were it a part of the original plan of the tomb (cf. Kanawati, *El-Hawawish* I, 17). Kanawati ("The Living and the Dead in Old Kingdom Tomb Scenes", *SAK* 9 (1981), 213–225) made a demonstrative list of monuments to prove that Egyptians tried not to represent the dead except their parents in their tombs, which seems to contradict the above explanation, but this rule is not without exceptions (Swinton J., "The Depictions of Wives of Tomb Owners in the Later Old Kingdom", *BASE* 14 (2003), 109, n.18).

of *Špsj-pw-mn(w)*.[122] The false door of *Ḥtp* is placed also as properly as it is possible in a rock-cut tomb with an abnormal orientation – on the "north" wall that, being opposed to the entrance, functions as the west one. Her table scene is in the most unsatisfactory manner oriented to the deepest unfinished corner of the chapel (➤) and not to the shrine, as contrary to *Ḥnjj*. It may be explained by the fact that the most prestigious place on the right half of the "north" wall was occupied by the figure of *Špsj-pw-mn(w)* symmetrical to that to the left of the shrine and, together with the latter, forming an analogy to the decoration of the façade of the tomb. The table scene must be oriented from the false door, and, thus, placing it next to the figure of *Špsj-pw-mn(w)* would mean moving the false door in the corner where neither floor nor the walls were properly hewn; as a result, orientation was offered to the more important convenience of the cult.

The introduction of these two false doors and two table scenes completely destroyed the programs of the "north" and the "west" wall as compared to *K3(.j)-ḥp*, which, in its turn, forced *Snj* to modify the decoration the other walls as well.

The right half of the "south" wall was not much changed conceptually, although it was modified at the level of separate scenes: the driving of cattle in {1} is replaced by the hunt, while the squeezing of grapes is added by the representations of handicraftsmen in {2}. The first change is not surprising: it seems that *Snj* wanted to experiment with another topic rich of movements and arranged it on its most natural place; as for the second, I cannot find any reason for such a clumsy interpolation.

The left half of the "north" wall is also without serious changes, although details are different. The same cannot be said about the "west" wall. In *K3(.j)-ḥp* it is devoted to the scenes that entertain the owner and have an open-air character. The introduction of the false door destroyed the thematic unity, and even the composition on the left half of the wall was changed – the fight of the boatmen was replaced by driving and tending cattle, which was partly caused by removing cattle from the "south" wall. However, there was another reason for it: the extension of the chapel gave *Snj* a possibility to increase the number

of topics on the "south" wall, and the boatmen were moved to its left half.

Although the size of the "south" wall was almost doubled as compared to *K3(.j)-ḥp* and numerous extra scenes appeared on it, this did not much extend the decorative program of the chapel as a whole – the right half of the "east" wall remained unfinished and its topics had to be moved to the "south".

Baking and brewing were moved from the right half of the "east" wall to the left half of the "east" wall, but not other topics since the wall in *Špsj-pw-mn(w)* was lower due to the unfinished state of this part of the chapel and could not bear more representations. Ploughing, sowing, tying and transporting sheaves were moved from the "east" wall to the left half of the "south" wall. Thus, the only new scenes that could be placed at the "south" are granaries and measuring corn.

The decoration of the shrine is very close to that in *K3(.j)-ḥp*; only offering bringers are added on each wall as well as driving and slaughtering cattle on the "east" wall.

Thus, the arrangement of decoration in the tomb of *Špsj-pw-mn(w)* is much more banal than in *K3(.j)-ḥp*. Instead of an unusual room reproducing the earthly world with the cult scenes removed to the shrine, we see a common chapel with the ritual and daily scenes separated in a traditional manner – the former in the deeper part of the tomb, the latter mainly on the "south" wall, which makes it functionally even more similar to the east wall of a "normal" chapel.

Conclusion

The tombs of *K3(.j)-ḥp* and *Špsj-pw-mn(w)* give us a unique opportunity to compare two works of the same man and to consider his abilities both as an author of the concepts of the tombs and as an artist. As for the first aspect of *Snj*'s activities, we could already make certain that he could easily modify the program to adapt it to the requirements of a concrete situation; it may be of interest to discuss also some manifestations of his artistic abilities now.

(1) In *Špsj-pw-mn(w) Snj* almost literary reproduces the composition of the spearing scene of *K3(.j)-ḥp*. However, the birds above the papyrus thicket are rendered in a different manner. In the original they are only four and the space between them is filled with

---

122 As contrary to his father, *Špsj-pw-mn(w)* always depicted his women small, which may reflect their less respected position; then such an orientation would be only natural.

lotus blossoms and leaves; in the copy they are eight on a somewhat larger surface, but the space between them is blank and it makes a new impression.

(2) On the "west" wall of *Špsj-pw-mn(w) Snj* exactly reproduced the seeing formula used in *Kȝ(.j)-ḥp*: "Seeing a fight of bulls by… /titles follow/ *Ḫnj*". However, the fight of bulls is complemented here by cattle-breeding scenes, and the formula conflicts with the set of topics.

(3) *Snj* is skilful and inventive when depicting movements of animals, but he is rather helpless in the scene of fighting boatmen that seems to have been favoured by the Egyptians not only because of its meaning but also because it offered a possibility to show a variety of expressive postures. His boatmen do not fight but only clumsily imitate the postures of fighters. At this, in *Špsj-pw-mn(w)* the figures are less squat and the movements are lighter than in *Kȝ(.j)-ḥp*, which is a manifestation of a progress made by the artist with time.

(4) The same is true as concerns the figures and the movements of the men in the scenes of netting fish and catching birds on the "north" wall of either tomb.

(5) *Snj* often uses such a motif as upraised and much curving tails of animals: the butchery scene on the "east" wall of *Kȝ(.j)-ḥp*, the fighting and copulating bulls, and the calving cow on the "west" wall of *Špsj-pw-mn(w)*, the butchery on the "east" wall of the shrine of *Špsj-pw-mn(w)*.

(6) Another favourite motif of *Snj* is an animal cowering back. He uses it in different scenes in *Špsj-pw-mn(w)*: the calving cow on the "west" wall, the hound tearing a gazelle, the gazelle itself, and an oryx attacked by a lion on the "south" wall. It is absent in *Kȝ(.j)-ḥp*, which may mean that it was a later *Snj*'s invention.

Thus, in the case of *Kȝ(.j)-ḥp* and *Špsj-pw-mn(w)* we are dealing with a reproduction of an earlier monument by its creator. This allows us to trace the development of his skill and makes us sure that the modifications of the program were caused not by misunderstanding but by need. As in the case of the copy of *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* at Giza, they were necessary due to the personal affairs of the tomb owner, but were much more radical. This must be explained by the fact that in *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* the alteration concerned only the unimportant east wall, while in *Špsj-pw-mn(w)* the cult places were involved into the process of modification.

KANAWATI believes "that the decoration of *Kȝ-ḥp*'s tomb started before that of *Ḫnj*,[123] but was not necessarily completed before it".[124] Our comparison of the two tombs entirely confirms this idea. The following relative chronology may be possible. *Kȝ(.j)-ḥp* started his tomb late in his life and its decoration was not completed before his death.[125] The tomb of *Špsj-pw-mn(w)* was hewn in its original shape and its decoration was started immediately after his appointment, which interrupted *Snj*'s work in the tomb of the late nomarch. Then the tomb of *Špsj-pw-mn(w)* was extended for some reason, and it could be the time when *nj* returned to the chapel of *Kȝ(.j)-ḥp* and finished its murals. Later the paintings in the extension of the tomb of *Špsj-pw-mn(w)* were made. The development of *Snj*'s workmanship **(3, 4)** and the appearance of a new motif **(6)** may reflect the time span between the two tombs.

KANAWATI supposes that the brother of *Snj*, *Jzzj*, who was depicted by him in either tomb, was also an artist who participated in the decoration of the chapel of *Špsj-pw-mn(w)*.[126] It is possible that he could be a kind of *Snj*'s assistant, but it is impossible to prove that he was an artist[127] and his concrete role cannot be reconstructed. If he really helped *Snj*, his most probable role could be replacing him in the tomb of *Špsj-pw-mn(w)* when he returned to *Kȝ(.j)-ḥp* (this would explain *Snj*'s statement that he decorated the tomb of *Kȝ(.j)-ḥp* alone) – but these are only speculations. In any case the program of the tomb of *Špsj-pw-mn(w)* belongs to *nj*.

KANAWATI[128] also tries to identify *Snj* and *Jzzj* of el-Hawawish with the sculptor *Snj* and the Servant of the *kȝ Jzzj* represented in the tomb of *Jbj* at Deir el-Gebrawi[129] and with the Overseer of linen *Snj* and the Juridical book keeper[130] *Jzzj* depicted in the tombs of *Pjpj-ꜥnḫ(.w)-Ḥnjj-km* and of *Pjpj-ꜥnḫ(.w)* the Middle at

123 He prefers to use a shorter "young name" of *Špsj-pw-mn(w)*.
124 KANAWATI, *El-Hawawish* II, 15.
125 This means either that he became a nomarch in his declining years or died untimely. The first option appears preferable since his wife most probably died prior to him.
126 Ibid.
127 His only title was Scribe of the house of god's books of the palace.
128 KANAWATI, *El-Hawawish* II, 13.
129 DAVIES Norman, *The Rock Tombs of Deir el Gebrâwi* I (London, 1902), pl.14, 23.
130 So *zȝb (j)r(j) mdȝ.t*, JONES, *Index*, 805:2944 and by no means "Judge and mouth of the book" as KANAWATI reads.

Meir.[131] Although he does not conjecture that they worked in these tombs and supposes that they "could have been employed for some time in this province, but not in their capacity as artists", he lists a number of stylistic features that relate the tombs of el-Hawawish, Deir el-Gebrawi, Meir and Deshasha, which most probably presupposes some their responsibility for the similarities. However, this is impossible as a more accurate comparison of the scenes demonstrates. For instance, according to KANAWATI, "the family participation in the spear-fishing scene [of *Špsj-pw-mn(w)* (A.B.)]… has some similarity with that at Deir el-Gebrawi". Yes, but only *some*, and it is much more demonstrative that the equipment of the skiff shown in either tomb at el-Hawawish as well as the "Wasserberg" treated as a rectangle are absent in *Jbj*.[132] KANAWATI: "The funerary ceremony shown on the west and north walls of the shrine [of *Špsj-pw-mn(w)* (A.B.)] appears again in the tomb of *Jbj*". Yes, but it is present in most of tombs, – and details are very different (e.g., in el-Hawawish the *ḥz*-vessel in the hands of a libating priest is enormous and it seems that he beats the previous priest with it as if it were a club, while in *Jbj* [133] the proportions are normal. True, some other similarities considered by KANAWATI are real, but more differences can be adduced as well: e.g., the fighting boatmen are much livelier in *Jbj* than even in *Špsj-pw-mn(w)*, not to say about *K3(.j)-ḥp*, and the netting of fish is treated with much more fantasy.[134] There is no need to reconsider the examples from Meir and Deshasha – the results will be the same. Thus, we are dealing not with the works of the same men, but with a common local artistic tradition, which is not surprising – the distance between el-Hawawish and Deir el-Gebrawi is about 120 km and their nomes, Ninth and Twelfth, belonged to the same administrative group of provinces of Upper Egypt.

IV. The chapel of *N(j)-m3ꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* and its copies

Four of the five tombs chosen by the editors give us a rare possibility to compare an original with its copy. It may be of use to consider also the Giza chapel of *N(j)-m3ꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* and its partial and complete copies. Although this problem has already been discussed by the present author elsewhere,[135] thematically it is more than appropriate here.

The chapel of *N(j)-m3ꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* [G 2097]

The chapel (middle – late reign of Unis)[136] belongs to Reisner's type 5d: a north – south corridor with a deep recess at the north end of the west wall.[137]

West wall of the recess.[138] The wall is completely occupied by a palace façade and is opposed to the entrance to the chapel.

South wall of the recess.[139] The owner ◄ sits in a pavilion on an armchair with a dog lying under it and listens to music and singing ➔ {2} while playing *sn.t*-game with a man in the third register; other topics are scribes at work ➔ {4}, making bed {6} and offering-bringers both approaching to the owner ➔ {5} and heading eastwards ◄ {1}.

North wall of the recess.[140] The greater part of the wall is occupied by the tomb owner spearing and marsh scenes in front of him (only the lower half of badly weathered decoration is preserved).

West wall of the corridor. The decoration of this wall was removed a century ago, but it is almost completely preserved in two museums:[141] the false door from its left half is in Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek,

131 BLACKMAN A.M., APTED M.R. *The Rock Tombs of Meir* V (London, 1953), pl.27, 28; BLACKMAN A.M. *The Rock Tombs of Meir* (London, 1924), pl.15.

132 DAVIES, *Deir el-Gebrawi* I, pl.3.

133 DAVIES, *Deir el-Gebrawi* I, pl.17.

134 DAVIES, *Deir el-Gebrawi* I, pl.4.

135 BOLSHAKOV A.O., *Studies on Old Kingdom Reliefs and Sculpture in the Hermitage* (Wiesbaden, 2005, ÄA 67), 90–104.

136 BOLSHAKOV, *Studies*, 104–105.

137 REISNER G.A., *A History of the Giza Necropolis* I (Cambridge, Mass., 1942), 260.

138 ROTH, *Giza Mastabas* VI, pl.90, 91, 186.

139 KENDALL T., *Passing through the Netherworld. The Meaning and Play of Senet, an Ancient Egyptian Funerary Game* (Boston, 1978), 12–13; PUSCH E.B., *Das Senet-Brettspiel im alten Ägypten* I. *Das inschriftliche und archäologische Material* (München–Berlin, 1979, *MÄS* 38), Taf. 8–9; ROTH, *Giza Mastabas* VI, pl.92, 93-a, 187.

140 ROTH, *Giza Mastabas* VI, pl.87, 88-ab, 89, 185.

141 Identified in BOLSHAKOV, *Studies*, 62–67.

Copenhagen,[142] while the relief blocks from the right half are in the Hermitage Museum, St.Petersburg.[143] The Hermitage relief bears a set of ritual scenes: the tomb owner at a table ➤ (at the level of the third register), butchery {1}, offering bringers ⬅ {2}, {4}–{6}, and priestly service ⬅ {3}.

South wall of the corridor.[144] The tomb owner sits at a table ⬅ with an offering-list above and listens to singers ⬅ and watches dances ➤ {2}; below {1} is a procession of offering bringers ⬅.

East wall.[145] At the right the tomb owner is represented as standing ⬅, observing outdoor scenes (six registers are preserved): the life of the desert {1}–{2}, hunting {3}, bringing in cattle and fowl ➤ {4}, agricultural and marsh works and fighting boatmen {5}–{6}. The most striking feature of this wall is a great amount of representations of copulating animals, the motif that dominates its decoration and cannot be found elsewhere on such a scale.

The program of the chapel is logical, although it has some unusual features. The kernel of the decoration on the south wall of the recess is festive, which is traditional for the arrangement of these scenes at Giza.[146] The unusual orientation of the offering bringers in the first register (⬅) can be explained by the fact that the procession is continued in the second register on the west wall of the corridor and moves towards the figure of the owner by the false door and towards the false door itself.[147] The west wall of the corridor with a false door and ritual scenes proves to be the main cult place of the tomb, which is to be expected since the west wall of the recess with a pala-

ce façade bears no murals. The south wall of the corridor continues the festive topics of the south wall of the recess; thus, the two walls form a whole, its decoration being much richer than it is characteristic of the narrow south walls of the traditional north–south Giza chapels; at the same time, the table scene on the south wall of the corridor mirrors the same scene on its west wall, thus making the false door an axis of the cult space in spite of its arrangement close to the corner. It is strange, however, that a group of offering bearers {1} moves not to the false door but to the left, towards an insignificant corner; although they may be supposed to approach the figure of $N(j)$-$m^3{}^c.t$-$r^c(w)$ on the east wall from behind, this is the most illogical feature of the pictorial decoration of the chapel. The east wall traditionally bears the scenes of daily life. Quite the contrary, the arrangement of the picture of the tomb owner spearing and other marsh scenes except for fowling on the north wall of the recess is unusual. ROTH supposes[148] that this may be a counterpart to the scene of fowling (but not spearing) on the east wall of the tomb of the assumed father of $N(j)$-$m^3{}^c.t$-$r^c(w)$ $Z^3(.j)$-$jb(.j)$ [G 2092+2093] forming a complex with that of the son.[149] Her argumentation is convincing, but, on the other hand, such an apprehension of the space of the two tombs as a whole seems problematic due to the complexity of their structure, which makes desirable an easier interpretation: the east wall would be the most appropriate location for spearing, but it was reserved for an extensive suite of animal life and fertility and the north wall remained the only free place for the scene in question. This understanding is confirmed by the presence of the scene of the boatmen jousting on the north part of the east wall. The arrangement of spearing on the north wall, although rare, is nonetheless possible at Giza: $K^3(.j)$-dw^3 [GCF],[150] $K^3(.j)$-m-$^c nh$ [G 4561],[151] and, probably, $J^c zn$ [G 2196].[152] Either interpretation has its merits and demerits and it is difficult to give preference to one of them at the moment.

---

142 Inv.nos. Æ.I.N.1445, 1437; MOGENSEN M., *La Glyptothèque Ny Carlsberg. La collection égyptienne* (Copenhague, 1930), Cat.no.A 659; KOEFOED-PETERSEN O., *Recueil des inscriptions hiéroglyphiques de la Glyptothèque Ny Carlsberg* (Bruxelles, 1936, BÆ 6), 34; idem., *Catalogue des bas-reliefs et peintures égyptiens* (Copenhague, 1956), Cat.no.15, pl.22 (with a wrong Inv.no.), Cat.no.19; BOLSHAKOV, *Studies*, fig.5.3, 5.4, pl.20-21

143 Inv.no. 18123; БОЛЬШАКОВ А.О., "Египетский рельеф Старого царства из собрания Государственного Эрмитажа (№ 18123)". *Эпиграфика Востока* 23 (Ленинград, 1985), 3–11; BOLSHAKOV, *Studies*, fig.5.1, 5.4, pl.16–18.

144 ROTH, *Giza Mastabas* VI, pl.93-b, 94-ab, 188.

145 ROTH, *Giza Mastabas* VI, pl.95–97, 189.

146 BOLSHAKOV, *Man and his Double*, 64–66, Tbl.1.

147 It would be even more consistent to place the offering bringers in the lower register on the west wall, but it is occupied by the scenes of butchery that usually tended to be arranged at the bottom of the decorated surface.

148 ROTH, *Giza Mastabas* VI, 46.

149 ROTH, *Giza Mastabas* VI, pl.73-ab, 74-a, 181.

150 HASSAN S., *Excavations at Giza* VI/3 (1934–1935) (Cairo, 1950), pl.41, fig.80.

151 JUNKER H., *Gîza* IV (Wien – Leipzig, 1940), Abb.8; KANWATI N., *Tombs at Giza* I. *Kaiemankh (G 4561) and Seshemnefer I (G 4940)* (Warminster, 2001, ACER 16), pl.31.

152 SIMPSON W.K., *Giza Mastabas* IV. *Mastabas of the Western Cemetery* I (Boston, 1980), pl.44-a, fig.30.

In spite of some unusual details and untraditional arrangement of some murals, the chapel would remain one of Old Kingdom monuments of relatively high quality but not of much interest were it not unique as concerns copying. As noticed by ROTH,[153] several rare motifs in it are inspired by the prototypes in the Saqqara tomb of *Ptḥ-ḥtp(.w) II-Tfj* [SqWSP D 64].[154] On the Hermitage relief we can see one more loaned detail – the right group in the scene of butchery. An ox lies with its both hind legs and a foreleg tied together; a man tightens the rope, his front foot treading on the bound legs of the animal. The other foreleg, the one to be cut off, is free, and the ox tries to push off the ground with it, but a man to the left treads upon its head, holds its horns and tries to turn it over on its back. Among hundreds of scenes of butchery there is only one exact analogy to this episode. In *Snḏm-jb(.j)-Mḥj* [G 2378, reign of Unis] three men are represented in the same postures, an ox also lies on its belly with its three legs bound and one free.[155] Since the two tombs are practically synchronous within the margins of error, it is impossible to decide which of the two representations was a source for the other if basing only on chronology. However, it is logical enough to suppose that a vizier and king's architect *Snḏm-jb(.j)-Mḥj* who had all necessary resources in his hands would not borrow from a tomb of an insignificant official, and, thus, we may assume that the scene in *Snḏm-jb(.j)-Mḥj* influenced *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)*; this supposition may be supported to a certain extent by the fact that the cues of the butchers that are present in *Snḏm-jb(.j)-Mḥj* are omitted in *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)*.

However, the loans from the decoration of the tomb of *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* are of much more interest.

The copy of *Nfr-msḏr-ḫw(j).f-w(j)* [G 2240]

Scenes on the west wall of the corridor of *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* (the Hermitage relief) were almost completely and very accurately reproduced in the neighbouring and approximately synchronous mastaba of *Nfr-msḏr-ḫw(j).f-w(j)*;[156] moreover, this is one of the exactest Old Kingdom copies we know. The dependence of the artist of *Nfr-msḏr-ḫw(j).f-w(j)* on that of *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* is obvious; however, we can hardly suppose that the same artist decorated both chapels, for stylistic differences are also indubitable (e.g., some figures in *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* are treated livelier but more schematically).

Both the structure and the details of the representations on the west wall of *Nfr-msḏr-ḫw(j).f-w(j)* follow the prototype of *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)*, only the procession of offering bringers being omitted. Three scenes of butchery {1} are very close to *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)*, including the right group depicting the turning over of an ox with a free foreleg. As in *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)*, three men work on the ox, their postures being very close to the original, although the figure of the man holding the horns is less expressive; as in the original, the ox pushes off the ground with its free leg that is also stretched forward and not bent, as contrary to the image in *Snḏm-jb(.j)-Mḥj*.[157] Another scene deserving special attention, is the priestly service. The totality of the actions represented in *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* has no analogies apart from the copies from them,[158] and in *Nfr-msḏr-ḫw(j).f-w(j)* it is almost literally repli-

---

153 ROTH, *Giza Mastabas* VI, 46.

154 This is a remarkable fact: *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* was an official of a middle level (see the list of titles in BOLSHAKOV, *Studies*, 78, Commentary v), while *Ptḥ-ḥtp(.w) II-Tfj* belonged to a high-ranking family (his father and grandfather were viziers and, probably, he also rose to the same position by the end of his life (HASSAN S., *Excavations at Saqqara, 1937–1938* II. *Mastabas of Ny-'ankh-Pepy and Others* (Cairo, 1975), 67); thus, the fact that an artist of *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* could acquaint himself with the chapel of *Ptḥ-ḥtp(.w) II-Tfj* who could be still alive at that time, may testify for an existence of some contacts between these people from different strata of the officialdom. Unfortunately, all the above scenes are damaged too badly in *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* to judge the degree of dependence of his artist on that of *Ptḥ-ḥtp(.w) II-Tfj*.

155 *LD* II, Bl.73; BROVARSKI, *Giza Mastabas* VII. *The Senedjemib Complex* I (Boston, 2001), pl.114-b, fig.112–113.

156 ROTH, *Giza Mastabas* VI, pl.127-a, b, 207.

157 ROTH (*Giza Mastabas* VI, 165) saw there "the foreleg of an earlier victim lying in the foreground"; her conjecture was possible due to a poor preservation of the relief, but it must be renounced now in the light of the evidence of *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)*.

158 Representations in *Ḥnw* [GCF, Dyn.VI] (HASSAN S., *Excavations at Giza* II *(1930–1931)* (Cairo, 1936), fig.196), *Dwꜣw-wꜣš(.w)* [GCF, Dyn.V] (HASSAN S., *Excavations at Giza* IX *(1936-37-38)* (Cairo, 1960), fig.23), *Jj-nfr.t* [GMPC (?), Dyn.V, reigns of Neuserra – Isesi] (WIEDEMANN A., PÖRTNER B, *Aegyptische Grabreliefs aus der Grossherzoglichen Altertümer-Sammlung zu Karlsruhe* (Straßburg, 1906), Taf.3; SCHÜRMANN W., *Die Reliefs aus dem Grab des Pyramidenvorstehers Ii-nefret, Karlsruhe* (Karlsruhe, 1983), Abb.20), and *Kꜣ(.j)-dwꜣ* [GCF, second half of Dyn.VI] (HASSAN, *Giza* VI/3, fig.81) differ from *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* by the arrangement of the censing priest before the libating ones, in the three latter tombs there is also a figure of an invocating man in the end of the composition.

cated. The main difference is the absence of the unique figure of a kneeling priest holding a rounded object (?) in his hand that is placed fifth in *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)*, which may signify that its meaning was obscure for the copyist.

The copy of *Rꜥ(w)-wr(.w) II* [G 5470 = LG 32]

The scenes of the butchery and the priestly service were copied for the second time for *Rꜥ(w)-wr(.w) II* [159] who could be a younger contemporary of *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* or lived soon after him. The degree of coincidence is smaller in *Rꜥ(w)-wr(.w) II* than in *Nfr-msḏr-ḫw(j).f-w(j)*, but the rare scene of overturning an ox with a free foreleg is present also in his chapel and differs mainly by another position of the leg of the animal and by the absence of the man sharpening a knife.

The artist of *Rꜥ(w)-wr(.w) II* had not enough space for an exact reproduction of the scenes of the priestly service and he divided them among two registers. However, the selection and the order of actions are the same, and the fifth priest is absent like in *Nfr-msḏr-ḫw(j).f-w(j)*. The artist of *Rꜥ(w)-wr(.w) II* was evidently inspired by the murals of *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* and not by those of *Nfr-msḏr-ḫw(j).f-w(j)*, which can be proven by the legends close to the former and not to the latter.

The copy of *Kꜣ(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ* [G 4561]

As contrary to the tombs of *Nfr-msḏr-ḫw(j).f-w(j)* and *Rꜥ(w)-wr(.w) II* decorated soon after *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)*, the tomb of *Kꜣ(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ* is much later and most probably must be dated to the reign of Pepy II.[160] Its chapel also belongs to Reisner's type 5d, which makes its comparison with that of *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* especially demonstrative.

West wall of the recess.[161] Entirely occupied by a large false door.

South wall of the recess.[162] The tomb owner sits at a table ◀ with an offering list above. In front of him are butchery {1}, offering bringers → {2}, celebrating priests → {3}, a lector priest → and a man with a bag ◀ {4}.

North wall of the recess.[163] A large representation of the owner spearing fish → occupies the whole wall. It is accompanied by cattle crossing water → and several men holding fish and belongings of their master →.

West wall of the corridor.[164] In the centre of the wall there is a false door. On the right half of the wall is a picture of the owner sitting with his wife in a pavilion on an armchair ◀ ; he plays *sn.t* with a man in the second register in front of him. Other representations in four registers are: female singers ◀ and dancers → {1}, two men playing *mḥn* → ◀ {2}; harpers →, flutists → and male singers ◀ {3}, sitting scribes → . The left half of the wall is not decorated.

South wall of the corridor. Not decorated.

East wall. Not decorated.

Kꜣ(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ reproduced the priestly service of *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* for the third time. Since it is placed not on the west but on the south wall in *Kꜣ(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ*, an artist had to mirror it in compliance with the rules of orientation of the murals; except for this, the reproduction is even more exact than that in *Rꜥ(w)-wr(.w) II*, although small distinctions are more numerous. The fifth priest of *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* is present, but his posture is different: he is depicted with his hands touching the ground, which had to represent the display of offerings unloaded from a box.[165] As contrary to *Nfr-msḏr-ḫw(j).f-w(j)* and *Rꜥ(w)-wr(.w) II*, *Kꜣ(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ* did not reproduce the scenes of butchery, but the priestly service is not the only topic copied by him from *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)*. The compositions on the south wall of the recess in *N(j)-mꜣꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* and on the west wall of a corridor in *Kꜣ(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ*[166] are so similar, that the dependence of the latter on the former is indubitable both as concerns the set of topics and most of their details.[167] At this, the artist of *Kꜣ(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ* did not

159 *LD* II, Bl.84; Junker H., *Gîza* III (Wien – Leipzig, 1938), Abb.46.
160 Kanawati's attempt to date it to the reign of Isesi (Kanawati N., *The Tomb and its Significance in Ancient Egypt* (Giza, 1987), 137; idem., *The Tomb and Beyond. Burial Customs of Egyptian Officials* (Warminster, 2001, 112–114); idem., *Gîza* I, 15–18) is impossibile, Bolshakov, *Studies*, 105–110, cf. Baer K., *Rank and Title in the Old Kingdom. The Structure of the Egyptian Administration in the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties* [Chicago, 1960], 141:520; Harpur, *Decoration*, 270:255; Lapp G., *Typologie der Särge und Sargkammern von der 6. bis 13. Dynastie* (Heidelberg, 1993, SAGA 7), 30.
161 Junker H., *Gîza* IV (Wien – Leipzig, 1940), Abb.6.

162 Junker, *Gîza* IV, Abb.7; Kanawati, *Giza* I, pl.29.
163 Junker, *Gîza* IV, Abb.8; Kanawati, *Giza* I, pl.31.
164 Junker, *Gîza* IV, Abb.9–11; Kanawati, *Giza* I, pl.32.
165 Scene 8 of the priestly service after Junker, *Gîza* III, 109, Abb.10.
166 Junker, *Gîza* IV, Abb.9; Kanawati, *Giza* I, pl.32.
167 Their similarity was noticed by Pusch (*Senet-Brettspiel*, 29–31), but he did not infer that one of them has been copied from the other.

reproduce the model slavishly – quite the contrary, he was rather inventive, especially as concerns the legends and the words of the represented people.

The figures of the tomb owner playing *sn.t* are practically identical in *N(j)-m3ᶜ.t-rᶜ(w)* and *K3(.j)-m-ᶜnḫ* as concerns their proportions and garments and attributes

(starched short trapezoidal kilt, no wig, broad collar, bracelet on the wrist of the back arm, brachiomorphic "flail"). The only serious difference is the presence of a dog in the original and of the owner's wife in the copy.

Besides the central scene, a number of topics are also similar on these walls.

N(j)-m3ᶜ.t-rᶜ(w)	*K3(.j)-m-ᶜnḫ*[168]
{1} (under the figure of the tomb owner). Procession of offering-bringers moving leftwards.	
{2} Harpist with a legend "Singing /and/ playing"; singer with a legend "Singing"; flutist (destroyed) with a partly destroyed legend "Playing [flute]".	*Representations of the concert are placed in {3}. Two groups of a harpist and a singer and a group of a singer, a flutist and a clarinettist. The figure of the first harpist is very similar to that in* N(j)-m3ᶜ.t-rᶜ(w), *including the type of the harp. Legend to the first group: "Be in time! Grant (my) wish, o (my) dear, don't hurry, /don't/ complain. Do it!";* legend to the second group: "Singing, playing harp"; legend to the third group: "*Singing*, playing flute, playing clarinet".[169]
	{1} *Female dancers and daughters of the tomb owner clapping hands.*
{3} Tomb owner's partner at the *sn.t* game-board; 11 (?) playing pieces shaped as ⌂ on the game-board. Legend over the figure of the man: "Playing *sn.t* ".[170] Two men playing *mḥn* (the left man and the game-board are lost, but there is enough space for them in a lacuna) with a legend "[Pl]aying[171] [*mḥn*]".	*Representations of playing games are placed in* {2}. Tomb owner's partner at the *sn.t* game-board; *14 playing pieces* shaped as ⌂ on the game-board; *the form of the table is slightly different.* Legend over the figure of the man: "Playing *sn.t*".[172] Two men playing *mḥn* with legends "Playing (?)[173] *mḥn*" and "Hurry up! Do play!".
{4} Two scribes at work with legends "Scribe of the steward" and "Scribe". The rest of the register lost.	{4} Two scribes at work with legends "*His oldest son, Scribe of the treasury Ḫw(j)-w(j)-wr*" *and* "Scribe of the treasury". Three sitting men with a legend "Collegium of the own house".
{5} Procession of offering-bringers.	
{6} (on a loose block, but no doubt from here). Man making bed standing under a canopy; another man holds a headrest and an oval object; legend: "---approaching".	*Representations of home servants are placed in {5}. Two men with an armchair; legend: "Straining /the seat of/ a chair".* Man making bed standing under a canopy; another man holds a headrest; *the third man touches the back of the bed; general legend "Making bed".* Two men bringing a kerchief, a "flail", a vessel and a stand.

168 Details absent in *N(j)-m3ᶜ.t-rᶜ(w)* are italicised; details that could be present on the lost parts of the relief of *N(j)-m3ᶜ.t-rᶜ(w)* are underlined.

169 For reading see Junker, *Gîza* IV, 38–39; on the instruments see Manniche L., *Ancient Egyptian Musical Instruments* (München – Berlin, 1975, MÄS 34), 12–16, 18–20; idem., *Music and Musicians in Ancient Egypt* (London, 1991), 28–29.

170 For reading see Pusch, *Senet-Brettspiel*, 31–32.

171 [Ḥ]ᶜb.

172 ⌷ . It seems that the misspelling of the word *sn.t* in *K3(.j)-m-ᶜnḫ* is an abortive attempt to correct a misspelling in *N(j)-m3ᶜ.t-rᶜ(w)*, ⌷ . If so, this is another argument for understanding the composition in *K3(.j)-m-ᶜnḫ* as a copy of that in *N(j)-m3ᶜ.t-rᶜ(w)*.

173 *Jtj.t*. The meaning is not registered in dictionaries, but see Junker, *Gîza* IV, 37.

Some details are very close also in the scene of spearing on the north walls of *N(j)-mȝꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* (unfortunately, with its upper half lost) and *Kȝ(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ*.[174] The son of *N(j)-mȝꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* is represented as a standing naked child holding a bird in his back hand and clinging with his front hand to what looks like his father's staff. The son of *Kȝ(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ* is also a naked child with a bird positioned differently and holding vertically a harpoon of his own. The latter difference deserves some discussion. *N(j)-mȝꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* was no doubt shown in the process of spearing, already holding fishes on the points of his harpoon, since a *Wasserberg* is depicted in front of him, and, thus, the presence of a staff is a very strange detail that has already astonished Roth.[175] However, most probably this is not a staff at all. In several scenes of spearing, the tomb owner clutches a stem of papyrus with the front hand while brandishing a forked fishing harpoon with the other,[176] and it seems that this may be also the case in *N(j)-mȝꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)*, the "staff" actually being a slightly bent stem. All of the just listed scenes differ from that in *N(j)-mȝꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* in two respects: first, they show the very beginning of spearing when the harpoon is only being raised and, accordingly, the *Wasserberg* is always absent in them; second, the figure of the tomb owner is placed at the background of papyrus thicket, while in *N(j)-mȝꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* the thicket is depicted only in front of the skiff. It seems that the artist of *N(j)-mȝꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* made an attempt to combine the features of the both types of the scenes of spearing, which, if it was actually the case, was an interesting innovation. However, it was not accepted by *Kȝ(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ* – probably because a single stem of papyrus behind the skiff looked too artificial.

The hydrophytes that are traditionally represented under the stern of the skiff are inhabited by two frogs and a butterfly in *Kȝ(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ* and by the similarly arranged frog and butterfly in *N(j)-mȝꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)*;

since the place occupied by the second frog in *Kȝ(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ* is destroyed in *N(j)-mȝꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)*, it is very possible that an analogous frog is lost there. Although representations of marsh plants with frogs are not rare, especially in the late Dyn.V – early Dyn.VI,[177] the combination of a frog and a butterfly (however, with a different arrangement) appears only in the mastaba of *Kȝ(.j)-gm(.w)-n(.j)-Mmj* [SqTPC],[178] which makes us interpret the picture in *Kȝ(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ* as inspired by *N(j)-mȝꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)*.

Even more important is the fact that both the architecture and the decorative program of the chapel of *Kȝ(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ* were greatly influenced by *N(j)-mȝꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* in general. This is not obvious *prima facie*, for the arrangement of the murals is different, but as soon as one considers the circumstances that forced *Kȝ(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ* to modify the prototype, the picture becomes quite logical.

Both chapels belong to a highly infrequent type 5d (other chapels of this type are G 1208N[179] and G 1103[180]). In the light of an apparent interest of *Kȝ(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ* in G 2097, this cannot be a mere coincidence. The recess in the chapel of *Kȝ(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ* is somewhat smaller than in *N(j)-mȝꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)*, but the corridor is twice longer; at this, the southern part of its west wall and the whole south and east walls are not decorated. Most probably this implies that the initial plans of *Kȝ(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ* were more ambitious than his means would allow to realize and that he had to retrench the decorative program, thus diverging from the model of *N(j)-mȝꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)*.

(1) The scene of spearing fish is arranged in *Kȝ(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ* at the same place as in *N(j)-mȝꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* – on the north wall. Since such an arrangement is rather unusual, this may be considered a loan from *N(j)-mȝꜥ.t-*

---

174 Junker, *Gîza* IV, Abb.8; Kanawati, *Giza* I, pl.31.

175 Roth, *Giza Mastabas* VI, 130.

176 *Nb(w.j)-m-ȝḫ.t(j)* [GCF LG 86] (*LD* II, Bl.12-b; Hassan S., *Excavations at Giza* IV (1932–1933) (Cairo, 1943), fig.77); *Ḥꜥ(j).f-ḥw(j).f-w(j) II* [G 7150] (Simpson W.K., *Giza Mastabas* III (Boston, 1978), fig.47); *Jt(w)-sn* [Giza CF] (Hassan S., *Excavations at Giza* V (1933–1934) (Cairo, 1944), fig.123); *Ḥw(j)-w(j)-wr* [GCF LG 95] (*LD* II, Bl.43-a; Hassan, *Giza* V, fig.104); *Dwȝ(.j)-kȝ(.j)* [Giza CF] (Hassan, *Giza* VI/3, fig.80); *Jȝzn* [G 2196] (Simpson, *Giza Mastabas* IV, fig.30; on the specific shape of the spear see *ibid.*, 20).

177 *N(j)-ꜥnḫ-ḫnm(w)* and *Ḫnm(w)-ḥtp(.w)* [SqUPC] (Moussa A., Altenmüller H., *Das Grab des Nianchchnum und Chnumhotep* (Mainz, 1977, AV 21), Taf.74); *Špss-rꜥ(w)* [SqNSP LS 16 = S 902] (*LD* II, Bl.60); *Nfr-jr.t-n.f* [SqESP D 55] (Walle, B. van de, *Le chapelle funéraire de Neferirtenef* (Bruxelles, 1978), fig.1); *Jj-nfr.t-Šȝ-n.f* [SqUPC] (Kanawati N., Abder-Raziq M., *The Unis Cemetery at Saqqara* II (Waminster, 2003, *ACER* 19), pl.37); *Mrrj* [SqTPC] (Davies W.V. et al., *Saqqâra Tombs* I. *The Mastabas of Mereri and Wernu* (London, 1984, *ASE* 36), pl.5); *Wr-nw* [SqTPC] (ibid., pl.25-a).

178 Firth C.M., Gunn B., *Teti Pyramid Cemeteries* II (Le Caire, 1926), pl.53; Wreszinski W., *Atlas zur altägyptische Kulturgeschichte* III (Leipzig, 1936), Taf.92-a.

179 Reisner, *A History of the Giza Necropolis* I, fig.159.

180 www.gizapyramids.org/full/EG000502.jpg .

$r^{c}(w)$, the more so as the east wall that is much more appropriate for the outdoor scenes remained undecorated.

(2) A table scene in conjunction with an offering-list is placed in $N(j)$-$m3^{c}.t$-$r^{c}(w)$ on the south wall of the corridor. Since this wall remained undecorated in $K3(.j)$-m-^{c}nh, this main topic of any chapel had to be moved to the most prestigious place on the south wall of the recess, close to the main false door. This transfer was especially natural because in $N(j)$-$m3^{c}.t$-$r^{c}(w)$ the south walls of the corridor and of the recess conceptually form a whole.

(3) Festive scenes arranged in $N(j)$-$m3^{c}.t$-$r^{c}(w)$ on the south wall of the recess could not be located at the same place in $K3(.j)$-m-^{c}nh since it was allotted for the table scene and ritual scenes. As a result, they had to be moved to the northern part of the west wall of the corridor.

(4) Another table scene of $N(j)$-$m3^{c}.t$-$r^{c}(w)$ was on the west wall of the corridor together with priestly service, butchery and offering-bringers (the Hermitage relief). In $K3(.j)$-m-^{c}nh this location was occupied by festive scenes and, thus, the second table scene was cancelled and other topics were transferred to the south wall of the recess.

Conclusion

Thus, the reversed disposition of the ritual and festive scenes in $K3(.j)$-m-^{c}nh in comparison with $N(j)$-$m3^{c}.t$-$r^{c}(w)$ can be easily explained as a result of an attempt to borrow all of the important scenes and at the same time to arrange them on a smaller surface. It may be asserted that although the two chapels seem different, the intention of $K3(.j)$-m-^{c}nh was to copy the whole prototype, from architecture to murals, which is a good illustration of the principles of Egyptian "copying".[181] The copy made for $K3(.j)$-m-^{c}nh may be characterised as conceptually reworked.

---

181 The author cannot resist the temptation of surmising that the decoration of the burial chamber of $K3(.j)$-m-^{c}nh including numerous scenes characteristic of chapels is a result of the same process: $K3(.j)$-m-^{c}nh could not decorate his chapel at the scale that had been contemplated at the moment of its construction, and the arrangement of representations in the substructure could be an attempt to compensate for the insufficiency of reliefs in the substructure by means of much cheaper paintings. Of course, this assumption cannot be proven and, in any case, the instance

The threefold copying of the reliefs of $N(j)$-$m3^{c}.t$-$r^{c}(w)$ is unique, but it is in accord with the general tendencies of development of Giza tombs and the peculiarity of work of their artists. At Saqqara, with tombs scattered over a great territory, the influence of older patterns was not strongly pronounced, while in the compact Giza necropolis where later mastabas used to cluster by the great structures of the ancestry, an artist could much more easily take their decoration as a model for his own work. This engendered not only reproductions of separate scenes, but also the well-known phenomenon of general archaization of murals, epigraphy and of tombs on the whole.

V. Post scriptum

The genre of this paper where both general regulations of the tomb decoration and their particular manifestations in concrete monuments are discussed makes writing a general conclusion a complicated task: the former are formulated in the text and there is no need to repeat them, the latter are too numerous and sensible only in definite contexts. So I prefer to choose the easiest (for the author) solution – not to write a resumptive conclusion at all. Instead of it I would like to outline a problem that must be obvious for an attentive student of Egyptian monuments in general, that is manifest in the discussed monuments, and that seems to have never been seriously considered.

We know very little about historic events in ancient Egypt and even less, almost nothing (usually nothing) about personal affairs of the people whose monuments are used as indirect sources for writing the history of Egypt. Our history of Egypt is not a history of events but a history of tendencies, and the history of Egyptian monuments is a history of tendencies even to a greater extent. We understand why standard monuments look as they do because we more or less know their historical, ideological, religious, artistic, etc. backgrounds, but we can do very little to clarify the uniqueness of unique

---

is much more complicated, including a serious ideological background; however the way for such a radical turn had already been paved by the previous development of decorated burial chambers, and the financial affairs of $K3(.j)$-m-^{c}nh could well be an incentive to the innovation.

monuments for they were engendered by the circumstances unique and, thus, usually hidden from us.

The architecture of Egyptian tombs, the selection, arrangement and treatment of the topics of their decoration are standardised, but there are no absolutely similar monuments and we have almost no hope to explain the dispersion of their features. Ancient copies of older monuments give us a unique opportunity to fathom out some circumstances of their construction and decoration – just because they double information available. The discussed pairs of tombs are very edifying in this respect.

Although they are very different, they have a common characteristic: the most important modifications of the copies in comparison with their originals were caused by the personal affairs of their owners, while the smaller changes were mainly consequences of the radical ones. *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* did not copy the east wall of *Ḥtp-sš3.t* because he reserved it for the pictures of his numerous sons and daughters. This fact proves that the multiplicity of descendants that was of importance for every Egyptian on account of both economic and ideological nature was a matter of special pride for *N(j)-sw.t-nfr(.w)* – just because he had them more than anybody around, and it is very human to take pride in having something that others do not have. The decoration of the main chamber of *K3(.j)-ḥp* is unique because his wife died before the construction of the tomb and was buried elsewhere, while the more traditional character of the tomb of his son is explained by the presence of the false doors of two women in it. It is difficult to say why the murals of *N(j)-m3ꜥ.t-rꜥ(w)* was worthy of triple copying, but it is clear that the complicated pattern of their modifications in *K3(.j)-m-ꜥnḫ* was caused by the financial situation of the latter.

Thus, the strict general rules of the tomb decoration could be flexible enough within certain limits when necessary. The main problem is the wideness of these limits, but it seems that in the capital region they were narrower than in the province – it is difficult to imagine such an unusual tomb as that of *K3(.j)-ḥp* at Giza or Saqqara.