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Abstract

This study concerns the false doors of Hershefnakht, Nyankhanty and Senetites that are currently on display in the Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities in Stockholm. None of these doors has received much attention in the past, and certainly not their own dedicated study. Previously, these doors have only been roughly dated, and the status of their owners in society were practically unknown. This study seeks to narrow down the dating of these false doors and to more precisely make a judgement on their owners’ social standing within society. To more precisely date the false doors, relevant features are presented together with relevant information concerning the characteristic in question. As such, a more precise date is built from the various relevant elements of the door. The false doors are translated with appropriate commentary on the short texts. The most important parts of these texts are the titles and through comparisons to other holders of the same titles and discussion of what is known about these titles; a judgement of their social status is made. In the end, Hershefnakht’s and Senetites’ doors can be dated to, at earliest, the reign of Pepy II though their latest possible date is more difficult to establish with any certainty. Nyankhanty’s false door can be dated, at earliest to King Nyuserre Ini’s reign with the latest possible date being the end of the 5th dynasty. Due to only having a single title, Hershefnakht’s social standing is somewhat uncertain and it would be possible to both over- and underplay his status. On the other hand, Nyankhanty’s status can be established with more certainty and it seems he was a high-ranking priest and a commander of a force of men. Senetites can quite easily be placed in or close to the court, but the position therein is more difficult to define.
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Purpose & Question

In the Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities in Stockholm, there are currently three false doors on display. These doors have never received the attention of a dedicated study. Part of the purpose of this study is to give these false doors the attention they deserve, and to learn more of when their owners lived and what kind of position in society they had.

The two main aims of the study are to narrow down the dating of the doors and explore what the doors might say about the social standing of their owner. Furthermore, if the tombs of the owners could be identified, it could shed further light on the status of the owners or when they lived. In short, as many certain conclusions as possible are sought concerning these false doors and their owners, and in the process, collect all the past research of these doors in one place.

Method & Theory

This is a study about three objects from the Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities, and the methodology is based on the empirical evidence of their form in comparison to other such objects. The study is very limited by the objects to the period and cultural context, and serves to gain an understanding of the social positions of the owners of these objects and a more certain date using specific features of this kind of object. Thus, no specific overarching theory can be applied in this study for these three objects that would serve any purpose, seeing as it is so limited in time, context and the number of objects.

In this study, the form of the false door will be described and studied closely in relation to what is known about false doors from the time, to reach conclusions concerning the date and its owner. Through the translation of the text, the titles of each owner will be examined and compared to other holders of the same titles to gain an understanding of their social standing. Their tombs, when identified, may serve to gain further understanding of their standing in society.

Introduction

The false door was to all extents and purposes a form of magical door for the deceased in his tomb. The deceased could ‘appear’ through the door to take part in the offerings, both actual offerings and the invocation offerings; the formula of which is written out on the false door. All of it to sustain the deceased’s Ka.¹

The false door is one of the regularly surviving parts of tombs. Thus, as Strudwick points out, there is a possibility to use the false doors and its features to date both the door and its owner. Apart from the features of the false door, the position of the door within the tomb and the tomb itself would help a great deal in any such undertaking. Strudwick categorises false doors in two groups, those from Saqqara (and Dahsur), and those from Giza. The main reasons for this are that the chapel types were different between the two sites and that there is a difference in how often and when false doors with cornice and torus moulding appear. Specifically, at Giza, there is only the occasional door with such features before the 6th dynasty (unlike those at Saqqara).²

---

¹ Arnold 2003, 89–90; Roeten 2016, 30.
Fig 1: A false door and its features. Inspired by fig 1 in Strudwick 1985.

1. Cornice
2. Torus moulding
3. Architrave
4. Panel
5. Apertures
6. Outer pair of jambs
7. Lintel
8. Inner pair of jambs (If more specific: Middle pair)
9. Inner pair of jambs (If more specific: Innermost pair)
10. Central niche

The parts of the false door are better represented with a figure (Fig. 1), rather than words. Still, a few additional words might be required on terminology. The torus moulding is a roll around the outside edge of the door, that was a representation for the fibrous binding. The torus is always found together with the cornice. Furthermore, the terms for a one, two or three-jamb door relate to the number of pairs of jambs. For an example: a two-jamb door has two pairs of jambs, thus it has four jambs in total.3

3 Strudwick 1985, 10.
Another feature that is better explained by a figure is the quite distinctive T-shaped panel. It appears around the middle of the 6th dynasty and remained in use until the 12th dynasty. While Strudwick only briefly mentions the T-shaped panel, Brovarski points out that there are two types. The normal T-shaped panel has right angles where the vertical and horizontal lines of the T meet. This kind of panel is the earlier of the two and is used as early as the reign of Merenra. The second type is the flaring T-shaped panel whose sides have a gradual curve instead of right angles. This type was probably introduced in the middle of Pepy II’s reign, though possibly closer to the end of his reign.

Fig 2: Top: Normal T-Shaped panel. Bottom: Flaring T-Shaped panel.

---

4 Strudwick 1985, 18.
1.0 The False Door of Hershefnakht (MM 11407)

Fig 3: Photo from the Museum’s online collection/database.⁶

1.1 Background

The false door of Hershefnakht was first published by Firth & Gunn in 1926 in *Excavations at Saqqara: Teti Pyramid Cemeteries*. As such it is clearly from Saqqara, even though the tomb that door belonged to seems to be unknown. Firth & Gunn gives a short description of the door but gives no date. The door was acquired by the museum in 1935 when it was purchased from the Service des Antiquités, and it now has the inventory number MM 11407. In the museum’s database, it is listed as a 5th-6th dynasty door. One interesting note to make is the dimensions of the door: in the museum’s database, it is listed as H 85 cm x W 52 cm x D 14 cm. While Firth & Gunn lists the dimensions as H 83 cm x W 51.5 cm x D 10 cm. The differences are very small and are most likely explained by the points from which the door was measured, and of course that the door is not perfect in form (see Fig. 3).

1.2 Description

This door is a two-jamb door with cornice and torus moulding. The hieroglyphs are in sunk relief, except those in the panel. They are of a high quality and finely cut. The text is also of the same length and the figures on the bottom of each jamb are of the same size. The figure on the right outer jamb is standing with his hands up before him in prayer, he does not have a wig but he does wear a kilt. On the right inner jamb stands a naked figure of the deceased with a lotus bud in his left hand, hanging by his side and holding up a lotus flower to smell with his right hand (see Fig. 4). The figure on the left inner jamb wears a kilt, no wig and carries a staff in his left hand and sceptre in his right hand by his side. The last figure, on the left outer jamb, wears a wig and kilt and stands with both hands by his sides.

All the figures wear a collar around their necks. The panel is a flaring T-shaped panel with the deceased seated on a chair that has animal feet. He wears a kilt, wig and collar with his left arm folded across his chest and his right arm extended towards the offering table. On the offering table, there are twelve bread loves and on top of the bread lies a bird and the leg of an ox. On the right side of the offering table, there is a single jug on the floor. The craftsmanship of this door is excellent, and the preservation is also very good apart from the damaged corners. The colours that remain are limited to a few places; the cornice has a spot of red on one of the reeds, and another reed has a spot of blue. A few hieroglyphs have some traces of green left. The ‘background’ of the panel together with the torus have remnants of red as does the background behind the figures at the bottom of each jamb. Below them, the remnants of black are easy to see. The red of the figures’ skin and white of their garments can also be noted without major difficulty.

---

7 Firth & Gunn 1926, 184.
9 Firth & Gunn 1926, 184.
Fig. 4: Photo of the naked figure on the right inner jamb.
1.3 Translation

Fig 5: Architrave, lintel and jamb texts marked by a number.

Points of interest in the text will be marked by A, B etc. See below for commentary.

1. $htp \; dl \; nsw^A \; (n) \; wsir \; nb \; ddw \; prt-hrw$
   ‘An offering which the King gives (to) Osiris, Lord of Djedu, invocation offerings’

2. $-n=f\; nfr^B \; m \; iz=f\; n \; hrt-ntr \; hr \; \hat{s}=f\; nht$
   ‘For him perfectly in his tomb in the necropolis, Hershefnakht’

3. $smr \; w\; tw^C \; im\; lhw \; hr \; \hat{s}=f\; nht$
   ‘The sole companion, the Imakhu Hershefnakht’

4. $im\; lhw \; hr \; ntr \; \hat{r}^D \; nb \; pt$
   ‘The Imakhu before the great god, lord of the sky’

5. $im\; lhw \; hr \; \hat{s}=f\; nht \; l^D$
   ‘The Imakhu Hershefnakht’

6. $im\; lhw \; hr \; \hat{s}=f\; n\; ht$
   ‘The Imakhu Hershefnakht’

Panel: $h3 \; t3 \; hnk\; t \; h3 \; k3 \; h3 \; 3pd \; \hat{h}3 \; ss \; \hat{h}3 \; mnht^E \; n \; im\; lhw \; hr \; \hat{s}=f\; nht$
   ‘A thousand bread, beer, oxen, fowl, alabaster and linen to the Imakhu Hershefnakht’
1.4 Commentary

This (A) writing of the *htp di nsw* formula is very common throughout the Old Kingdom. However, point of interest B is interesting. It would be possible to interpret the determinative to *prt hrw* as a word in its own sense *snw -n=f nfr* – ‘Good food offerings to him’, or possibly, *snw nfr* – ‘Good food offerings’ if *nfr* is written strangely. However, a parallel could be made to the 12th dynasty false door of Khety-Ankh (from Heliopolis); […] *prt-hrw tś hnk t ksw ṣpdw -n=f nfr m is=f […]*. While Hershefnakht’s door does not have the piece ‘ksworth ṣpdw’ between *prt-hrw* and *-n=f*, it is otherwise the same which is a good pointer towards that being the same construction. The *tś* and *hnkt* signs are present, but I treated them as part of the *prt-hrw* in the transliteration and translation. Further supporting this is that *ksw* and ṣpdw were later additions during the 9th and 10th dynasties to this whereas the old version simply had the *tś* and *hnkt* signs. In the end, if one disregards *tś hnk t ksw ṣpdw* and simply treat them as part of the *prt-hrw* it is the exact same while there are no parallels to a construction along the lines of *snw -n=f nfr* or similar that I have been able to identify.

Since *smr waty* (C) is the only title present on the door, it is of some interest and will be discussed further below. In the short notes by Firth & Gunn, the title is also noted, as well as that the branch hieroglyph *ḥt* is always reversed. On the right inner jamb, the name has a final *i* which seems a bit strange, seeing as the other times the name is written, there is no *i*. Firth & Gunn think that it is a stative, which proves that the name is *hr š=f nh.t* and not *nh.t - hr š=f*. My original thought was that it was perhaps the first or second person *ki* and *ti* with the *k* and *t* omitted respectively. However, the only attested version of the name in Ranke’s list of names is *hr š=f nh.t (w) ‘Hershek is strong’*. Furthermore, seeing as *i* was an Old Egyptian form of the *w* stative ending, there is only one logical conclusion. The name is the commonly attested version with the 3rd person masculine singular ending visible on the right inner jamb. The reason why the final *i* only appears on this jamb is obscure, to say the least. As for the offerings written on the panel (E), they are the normal offerings that are found on panels. Thus, there is not much to point out about it, other than that it is the expected form.

---

10 Barta 1968, 12, 21.  
11 Simpson 2001, 9, 16.  
12 Barta 1968, 39.  
13 Firth & Gunn 1926, 184.  
14 Firth & Gunn 1926, 184.  
15 Ranke 1952, 253.  
16 Gardiner 1957, 235; Allen 2014, 228.  
17 Strudwick 1985, 21.
1.5 Analysis & Discussion

This is a two-jamb door with text of the same length on the outer pair and on the inner pair respectively. Below the termination of the text, there are four figures of the same size all facing inwards. The two-jamb door was one of the earliest developments of the false door and took place as early as the 3rd dynasty, and by the 4th dynasty, it had been fully adopted. However, the decoration of these doors was not yet standardised and that would only take place during the 5th dynasty where a more regular arrangement became the norm, though there was still variation in the decoration. Even so, a full standardisation did not take place until the 6th dynasty. This two-jamb door also has the cornice and torus moulding, which only appeared during the 5th dynasty, so it cannot possibly be earlier than that. Strudwick notes that the standardisation of text and figure size took place at the end of the 5th dynasty, where the doors of high officials had more regular text sizes that cut off the same distance from the figures. However, it is worthwhile to mention that the number of jambs was not standardised and both two- and three-jamb doors appear. It is possible that the number of jambs was tied to rank, where the larger three-jamb doors often belonged to the high officials who also had the cornice and torus. While lower ranked officials continued to use the earlier 5th dynasty norms. It would therefore be expected that a door with cornice and torus had three pairs of jambs if it was a 5th dynasty door, which is not the case with Hershefnakht’s false door.

Sunk relief became more popular during the 5th dynasty among high officials, and became the norm during the 6th dynasty. It can therefore be said that this door is most likely a 5th or 6th dynasty door, which is to be expected due to the other features such as the cornice and torus moulding. The existence or lack of the cornice and torus moulding is one of the most obvious and most noticeable differences between false doors. The first appearance of these features is during the early 5th dynasty in both royal and non-royal contexts. Their use was, at first, seemingly limited to high officials or those especially favoured by the King as the doors of lower ranked officials did not possess them. However, from the beginning of the 6th dynasty and onwards, the cornice and torus becomes the norm on all false doors and as such, it can no longer have the same implications of high rank or royal favour. It is however, worthwhile to mention that there was no instant switch for these features to become the norm, as with most things there was a transition.

Therefore, it can be said that the 5th dynasty cornice and torus is a sign of high station or royal favour. On the other hand, in the 6th dynasty the cornice and torus moulding was no longer a sign of high station or royal favour, as it was the norm for both high and low officials. Thus, all that can possibly be said about this false door from the cornice and torus depends on when Hershefnakht lived; if he lived during the 5th dynasty he was especially favoured and if he lived during the 6th dynasty these features tell us nothing of his status in society.

The early 6th dynasty norm was to have three pairs of jambs, with each jamb having similar text and decoration of the same size and length. That type remains until the reign of Pepy II where jambs became narrower with a single column of inscriptions on each. The fact that Hershefnakht’s door has narrow jambs with single columns of text does suggest that it is a door from Pepy II’s reign. Another piece of decoration that appears on Hershefnakht’s false door is that of the man holding up his arms in prayer on the outer right jamb. This prayer or adoration gesture is in this case directed as Osiris to receive food supplies. This feature is uncommon, but possibly a sign that the door is from the reign

---

18 Strudwick 1985, 15–16.
19 Strudwick 1985, 16.
21 Strudwick 1985, 15, 17.
22 Strudwick 1985, 15.
of Pepy II. Which again only reinforces the argument for a 6th dynasty door from the time around Pepy II.

The panel is a flaring T-shaped panel which was only introduced, at the earliest, during the middle of Pepy II’s reign but remained in use throughout the First Intermediate Period and only cease to be used during the 12th dynasty. The seated figure to the left of the offering table with the left arm across the chest and right arm extended towards the offering table is the common type of figure found on panels. However, there is a jug to the right of the offering table. This type of jug appears on the panels of Viziers during the 6th dynasty, often along with service tables and jar-racks. However, during the early part of Pepy II’s reign these scenes become less complex, and while jugs still appear there are fewer of them and instead of being placed on service tables, they are placed on the ground. During the second half of his reign, this becomes more extreme and the most ‘extreme’ versions of this simplicity have nothing beneath the table. While the simplicity of Hershefnakht’s single jug placed on the ground might be due to him not being a high official, it does otherwise fit with being the preferred simplicity of Pepy II’s reign. That fits very well with what the jambs already suggested in their form. Furthermore, the flaring T-shaped panel points towards the time of Pepy II at earliest, though it should be noted that it could be a later door.

The naked figure on the right inner jamb is strange, seeing as that is not especially common in that position and I have found no other examples of naked depictions on false doors. That is not because nudity in Egyptian art is unheard of, on the contrary nudity is present in Egyptian art from the very beginning in various forms. Considering that naked statues and depictions of naked figures are not unknown in funerary contexts, such statues may have been intended to allow the deceased to be reborn in the afterlife or as substitute bodies for the deceased Ka. It is not so strange that they thought to use naked statues and depictions seeing as they knew as well as we do today; everyone is born naked; thus, it makes sense that one would be reborn naked. While several naked statues have been found in tombs, they are rarer than clothed statues with a ratio of about 1 to 10. These statues are generally from between the reigns of Nyuserre and Pepy II. One could ascribe Hershefnakht’s depiction a similar date, seeing as the subject of both the statues and of the false door depiction is the same; a naked depiction of the tomb owner. The time where such statues appears does fit with the date of the door being from, earliest Pepy II. Furthermore, if the assumption that the two forms of showing the deceased naked are related, and thus possibly the time of appearance. Then it could be argued that, if the statues do not appear after Pepy II, then neither does the depiction on false doors, which would give a very specific date of Pepy II’s reign. However, that is based on assumptions and as such cannot be said with any certainty.

With the above in mind, it is not unreasonable to assume the naked figure of Hershefnakht is a symbol of rebirth. Another thought could however be added, concerning the lotus flower and lotus bud; as floral motifs became more popular during the 6th dynasty which could be a sign, once again, towards the 6th dynasty. Perhaps it is also possible to tie the lotus flower and bud into the idea of rebirth, considering the creation myth of Atum/Ra appearing from a lotus. Though again, further examples of this depiction are needed for any certain conclusions.

The workmanship is very fine, which could suggest either that he could afford a fine door to be made for him and thus be of a high station, or that he was favoured enough for a gift from the King. Though there is no real support for either of those options, other than that the door is well-made. In the

27 Strudwick 1985, 19.
28 Brovarski 2006, 71, 89, 93.
30 Harvey 2001, 27.
31 Harpur 1987, 135.
6th dynasty the honorific title ‘Sole Companion’ held some value, if less than during the 5th dynasty.\textsuperscript{32} It was seemingly ranked to the middle together with other titles during the reign of Pepy II.\textsuperscript{33} That would suggest that he at least had some moderate importance to gain the title, however, because he has no other titles listed, it is difficult to say anything with any real degree of certainty.

The matter can be compared to the false door of Henni (\textit{hnni}). Although it is from Giza (the mastaba of \textit{hnni}, S 311), it has the features of the cornice and torus moulding, an outer rim and a T-shaped panel and so follows the ‘new Saqqaran style’.\textsuperscript{34} Furthermore, Anubis is not written with the jackal, and as Junker points out, this dates the door to the late Old Kingdom. However, Junker moves on to the titles present on the door. Specifically, ‘King’s document scribe in the presence’, ‘Overseer of scribes of the judiciary’, ‘Administrator of the border district (of the southern settlement)’, ‘Royal Chamberlain’, ‘Companion’, ‘Sole Companion’, ‘Chief of the estate’, ‘Overseer of the approach to a building’, ‘Overseer of the approach to a door in the two houses’. Junker does however point out that it is not possible to tell if some of these titles were simultaneous or successive, though it is possible it is the steps of a career path. The title of ‘Sole Companion’ stands second on the outer rim jambs. Though the titles could be listed lowest to highest, Junker believes that they are listed highest to lowest.\textsuperscript{35} In either case, ‘Sole Companion’ does not become the least important. On the same note, the title of ‘Sole Companion’ is also present in the false mastaba of Khui-Ba (\textit{hw\textit{i-bi}) whose other titles are ‘Count’, ‘Lower Egyptian Treasurer’ and ‘Great Overlord’.\textsuperscript{36} The title of ‘Sole Companion’ is also listed as the lowest title of the many titles of Ip by Fischer.\textsuperscript{37} There is a previously unpublished false door of a similarly fine quality to that of Hershefnakht; the false door of Khaef Menu (\textit{h\textit{f}=f mn.w}) is from the time of Pepy II.\textsuperscript{38} This displays the expected features; cornice and torus moulding, the jug on the floor and two narrow pairs of jambs. The situation of titles is similar to earlier comparisons as Khaef does have the title of ‘Sole Companion’ but it is one of many titles, Khaef being a senior priest.\textsuperscript{39} However, the only thing that examples such as Henni, Khui-Ba, Ip and Khaef proves, is that high ranked officials could hold the honorific title of ‘Sole Companion’ but it is not actually placing Hershefnakht on any level of importance or status.

Whereas the importance of ‘Sole Companion’ might be unclear, the major difference is obvious between Hershefnakht and men such as Khui-Ba, Henni and Ip. Hershefnakht only possesses the ‘Sole Companion’ title unlike the many administrative titles of Henni and the others. In comparison, Hershefnakht seems underwhelming both in the number of titles and his importance thereof, though it is possible he held other titles that were not listed on his false door for some reason. Though this is impossible to prove, and thus impossible to work from. Then again, even if he held no administrative titles, one should probably not underplay the power or importance he could have held as an influential man at court. However, that is impossible to prove even if one can argue for it as he only possesses a single honorific title yet also a fine door. Furthermore, while the door is fine it is smaller than that of Khaef for example with a difference of 63 cm in height, 28 cm in width and 16 cm in depth (The size of Khaef’s door is as follows: H 148 cm x W 80 cm x D 30cm.\textsuperscript{40}). Of course, part of that is probably to allow for more titles to be written. Then the obvious argument to make is that, if Hershefnakht could afford a fine door, he surely would afford to make it big enough for the titles he had to fit. Yet the door remained small which suggests that no larger door was needed and thus that he held no further titles.

\textsuperscript{32} Strudwick 1985, 205.
\textsuperscript{33} Baer 1960, 235–39.
\textsuperscript{34} Junker 1953, 69–73; Strudwick 1985, 50.
\textsuperscript{35} Junker 1953, 69–73.
\textsuperscript{36} Fischer 1954, 30.
\textsuperscript{37} Fischer 1996, 21.
\textsuperscript{38} The false door was in the Saqqara Magazine, no 19573, as of the writing of El-Tonssy’s article.
\textsuperscript{39} El-Tonssy & Mohamed 2014, 439–48.
\textsuperscript{40} El-Tonssy & Mohamed 2014, 439–48.
1.6 Summary of Conclusions

Due to some features of the door, I believe it can be dated with some certainty to the 6th dynasty. The features I base this of being the flaring T-shaped panel and its decoration, plus the two pairs of jambs and their decoration. More specifically, the flaring T-shaped panel and the rather narrow jambs with single columns of text are both features that could suggest a date as early as Pepy II. Two of the other features on the door might support this conclusion; firstly, the figure at the bottom who holds up his hands in prayer. Secondly, the jug on the floor to the right of the offering table, which might be a sign of the preferred simplicity of the second half of Pepy II’s reign.

With those features in mind, the earliest possible date this door can have is the reign of Pepy II, possibly in the second half. However, it is worth to point out that the door could also date to a later date seeing as many of these features came to continue into the First Intermediate Period. For a more secure date, it would be required to have a feature that only exists during a certain more limited timespan or not possess a feature that is very common later. With this new, more certain date, it can be said with certainty that this false door is at least not a 5th dynasty door.

As for Hershefnakht’s social standing, it is difficult to say exactly what kind of position he held within the social hierarchy. Had he been a 5th dynasty man it would be easier to say, seeing as the cornice and torus would be a sign of high rank or royal favour. Yet that is not the case for Hershefnakht and thus we are left with a single honorific title that is of less worth than it once had been and a fine, well made false door that must have been finely painted. In comparison to the other examples, his lone title is underwhelming to say the least, but one should not assume unimportance simply because of that, nor should one assume the opposite. The fact of the matter is, other than the recognition of his title it is impossible to say what kind of position he held in the social hierarchy. As for what kind of position his sole title gave him, it is difficult if not impossible to say.
2.0 The False Door of Nyankhanty (MM 11406)

![Image](12133D_Bild)

*Fig. 6: Photo from the Museum’s online collection/database.*

2.1 Background

The false door of Nyankhanty was first published in 1943 by Junker in *Giza VI* (see bibliography for full title). Junker writes that this false door was found close to tomb S 1013 and that it was found in reuse. Junker also gives a short description and lists the titles.\(^{42}\) This door was later purchased from the Service des Antiquités as noted in the museum’s database, and now has the inventory number MM 11406.\(^{43}\) In Porter & Moss, Nyankhanty is listed as ‘Niankhnemti, called Ny’. The same titles are

---

\(^{41}\) The Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities Online Database. Item MM 11 406.

\(^{42}\) Junker 1943, 240.

\(^{43}\) The Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities Online Database. Item MM 11 406.
listed and the door is dated to the 6th dynasty.\textsuperscript{44} However, in the museum’s online database, it is listed as a 4th dynasty false door.\textsuperscript{45} The same version of the name as in Porter & Moss is used in GizaPyramids.org (The Giza Archives) where the tomb is listed as G 4742; a stone mastaba in the western cemetery though it is noted that the false door was found in reuse.\textsuperscript{46} The tomb itself has the southern side right against G 4741 and the eastern side against G 4740; the mastaba itself. The mastaba is however very damaged with few remaining details. The estimated size of the mastaba is 37.4 m\textsuperscript{2}. G 4742 has a single shaft (G 4742 A) that is 1.5 m x 1.5 m x 2.4 m in size cut into the rock. Furthermore, the chamber is ca. W 1.1 m x L 0.75 m x H 0.85 m. The passage has no jamb, and the tomb has been completely plundered with a few scattered remains of bones and stones from the blocking. The chapel is on the east side of the mastaba, and possibly also in the space opposite to the shaft. The chapel might have contained a stela and it had an open-air passage.\textsuperscript{47} The dimensions of the false door are H 85.2 cm x W 58.5 cm x D 17 cm.\textsuperscript{48}

2.2 Description

This false door has quite obviously been broken in half. Everything above and including the lintel is completely gone along with a small strip along the right side that is also gone, taking a column of text with it. Other than that, and some minor nicks and scratches it is very well preserved. It is a two-jamb door, with the outer jambs being wider than the inner jamb. The outer jambs have two columns of text separated by a small raised line. It has a central niche with writing and it is wider than the inner jambs. The hieroglyphs are raised relief, as are the figures and other details. The details are fine and well made. However, there are no remaining traces of colour on the door, probably because it was covered in plaster. Remains of the plaster can be seen on the lower right of the door. There is a total of four figures on the door, all facing inwards. The two figures on the inner jambs are of Nyankhanty’s son Imhotep. On the right inner jamb, he can be seen wearing a kilt and a wig while holding a staff in his right hand with a handkerchief in his left by his side. The figure on the left inner jamb is the same except for the wig which is not present on this figure, and of course, he faces the other way. On the left outer jamb, we can see a figure of what is most likely Nyankhanty himself. He wears a kilt and wig and holds a staff in his left hand in front of him, and a handkerchief in his right hand by his side. He has a collar around his neck. From his left shoulder, across his chest to under his right armpit he wears a wide shoulder sash. Junker mentions that Nyankhanty’s figure has a short beard,\textsuperscript{49} though I have been unable to see it. On the opposite side, his wife wears a tight dress. Her left arm hangs by her side and right hand is held by her chest. She has a band around each ankle and a band around her neck.

\textsuperscript{44} Porter & Moss 1974, 137.
\textsuperscript{45} The Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities Online Database. Item MM 11 406.
\textsuperscript{46} Gizapyramids.org. Site G 4742.
\textsuperscript{47} Reisner 1942, 023b.
\textsuperscript{48} The Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities Online Database. Item MM 11 406.
\textsuperscript{49} Junker 1943, 240.
2.3 Translation

Fig. 7: The central niche, drum and jamb’s text columns marked with numbers.

1. (i)m(y)-r mšrw n(y)-šny nty
   ‘The Overseer of the army (or expedition), Nyankhanty’

2. rl nsw ny
   ‘The Royal acquaintance Ny.’

3. šf smsw iwmr=f mry=shd dp t t htp
   ‘His eldest son, his heir whom he loves, inspector of boats Imhotep.’

4. hrp wfb nsw 3ht(y)[-hwfu]D
   ‘Chief of royal wab priests of the pyramid [of Khufu]’

5. …*[d-mr grg ]r mr nb=f ny
   ‘…[administrator of a settlement(or boundary official)] beloved of his Lord, Ny’

6. rl nsw hrp (i)m(y-w) rd(-mr) grg tr hrp (n) wfb(w) nsw t htp
   ‘Royal acquaintance, director of the members of a phyle, administrator of a settlement(or boundary official), Chief of royal wab priests Imhotep.’

7. … hmr.t-ntr [hw: t-hr nb.t] nh.t Mry-pth
   ‘… Priestess of Hathor, Mistress of the Sycamore Meri-pth’
2.4 Commentary

Junker notes that the name of Nyankhanty could be read ny-₅ⁿ⁻ˢ_km instead of ny⁻⁵ⁿ⁻ᵗ₅. However, on the bar above the central niche, the nickname ny can be seen with the title rḥ nsw. The nickname, according to Junker, makes it clear that the reading of the name is ny⁻⁵ⁿ⁻ᵗ₅ as it is, apparently, a nickname of that name. Junker also notes that the son, named imḥtp is written with the normal reed plume instead of the reed plume with feet.⁵⁰ All the titles are of some interest and in fact, everything written on (the surviving part of) the door is either a title, epithet or a name. Especially A, B, D, F & I are of greater interest. What the titles might tell us will be discussed further below. One of Imhotep’s titles is ‘Inspector of boats’. I have transliterated it as sḥḥ ḏḥḥ, though it could possibly be ṡḥḥ instead of ḏḥḥ. The cartouche (D) is not actually present, though Junker assumed there was a cartouche there and the title is otherwise known and listed in Jones’ Index as No. 2588.⁵¹ While not mentioned by Junker, there is a ‘feature’ that should be mentioned; if one looks closely above the ḥḥ bird, there are remains of the sign that used to be above it and it could possibly be the bottom of the cartouche. It would also be reasonable considering ḥḥt – ‘Horizon’ and the pyramid determinative. At E, only the t and determinative survive. However, I think that it can be reconstructed based on the title of the son (G). The assumption that the son had (some of) the father’s titles is based on the title of ‘Chief of Wab priests’ (D & H), but that will be further discussed below. Even so, simply considering that they have matching titles and the fact that the end signs of E & G match, it is a reasonable reconstruction of the title. Only the last pieces of Meri-Ptah’s title (I) remain, but it fits with ‘Priestess of Hathor, Mistress of Sycamore’ if compared to the Indexes of Murray and Jones.⁵²

2.5 Analysis & Discussion

It is of course important to consider the features of the door, yet the obvious problem in doing so is that half the door is missing. However, it is still possible to say a few things about the remaining parts. It is a two-jamb door which is a common enough set-up for false doors from very early on. It was also common to have jambs of varying width during the ₅ᵗʰ dynasty.⁵³ Therefore, the jambs could point towards a ₅ᵗʰ dynasty door. The relief is raised which was more common from the ₄ᵗʰ dynasty until the middle of the ₅ᵗʰ dynasty, though, none of that was really a rule, so this could simply be variations on a later door.⁵⁴ The central niche is also worth a comment since it is a feature that was usually left empty of text and decoration after the middle of the ₅ᵗʰ dynasty,⁵⁵ yet here we find it with a title and name, which could point to sometime before or during the middle of the ₅ᵗℎ dynasty. It is quite obviously an older type of door, as it does not have the cornice or torus. Seeing as the torus and cornice were only first introduced at Giza to any real extent during the ₆ᵗʰ dynasty,⁵⁶ it could be another pointer towards the ₅ᵗʰ dynasty as the old style of false door would remain prominent until the ₆ᵗʰ dynasty.⁵⁷

The context of the find is known though not its original context as it was apparently found in reuse. It is also the case that the tomb was at some point looted so that no other finds were made to add further context to the tomb and false door. As for the tomb and chapel, the tomb is 37.4 m² and the chapel is ca. 1 m² as judged by plans.⁵⁸

---

⁵⁰ Junker 1943, 240.
⁵¹ Junker 1943, 240; Jones 2000, 710.
⁵² Murray 1908, 29; Jones 2000, 545.
⁵³ Strudwick 1985, 16.
⁵⁶ Strudwick 1985, 52.
⁵⁷ Strudwick 1985, 16, 24-25 & 52.
⁵⁸ Reisner 1942, 023b; GizaArchives.org, Site G 4742.
If one follows Roeten numbers (see Fig. 8), this is too small for a rich tomb. It is in range of poorer tombs between the middle of the 5th dynasty and the 6th dynasty. For the middle 5th dynasty it is among the smaller tombs though for the late 5th dynasty it is slightly more average, though still on the small side. For the 6th dynasty however it is slightly larger than the smallest tombs. Though the chapel, if judged correctly, is very small for the 5th dynasty and only a bit smaller than the smallest in the 6th dynasty for the poorer tombs. Though, seeing as it was found in reuse in a tomb that points to a later date than the door does, it is not unreasonable to argue that they are unrelated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Richer Tombs</th>
<th>Poorer Tombs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb Surface</td>
<td>Chapel Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 4th Dyn.</td>
<td>715-1850 (565-715)</td>
<td>6-10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 4th Dyn.</td>
<td>595-751</td>
<td>3-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 5th Dyn.</td>
<td>225-440</td>
<td>3.2-5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid 5th Dyn.</td>
<td>300-480</td>
<td>5-11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 5th Dyn.</td>
<td>217-308</td>
<td>3-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Dyn.</td>
<td>147-250</td>
<td>6-11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 8: The various tomb sizes and chapel sizes through time.60 Inspired by fig. 65 in Roeten 2016.61

2.6 Titles

Nyankhanty’s titles are as follows: ‘Royal acquaintance’, ‘Overseer of the army/expedition’, ‘Chief of Royal Wab-priests at the pyramid (of Khufu)’. If my assumption is correct, he also possessed the reconstructed title (E in the commentary above) ‘Administrator of a settlement’ and possibly the titles (based on those held by his son), ‘Director of the members of a phyle’, ‘Chief of the Royal Wab-priests’ and ‘Inspector of boats’.

According to Junker, the titles of ‘Chief of Royal Wab priests’ and ‘Chief of the Royal Wab priests at the pyramid of Khufu’ is really the same title, which is not really that surprising, but it is worthwhile to mention and it further supports the idea of the son having the same titles has his father.62 Furthermore, it should be said that the title of ‘Royal Wab-Priest’ was often carried by lower ranked officials who also had the title of ‘Royal Acquaintance’.63 If so, it follows naturally then, that as ‘Chief of the royal Wab-priests’, Nyankhanty would be in charge of these lower officials which would lend him some influence.

‘The Director of members of a phyle’ is a title well attested at Giza, and its holder, quite obviously, directed the entire phyle and thus is a raised position.64 It is not possible to know the exact task of such titles. However, Kees does point out that this title appears first during the reign of

---

60 Roeten 2016, 39, 41–42, 46, 48, 51, 53.
61 Roeten 2016, 57.
62 Junker 1943, 15, 240
63 Strudwick 1985, 283.
64 Junker 1943, 20.
Nyuserre Ini and that almost all who held this title were also a ‘Royal acquaintance’. Both Kees and Roth notes that these titles were possibly inherited. Kees further points out that these Royal acquaintances could also be army leaders, though the only example he refers to happens to be Nyankhanty’s false door.

Khnunhotep (*hmnnwhtp*) is another man with the title of ‘Director of the members of a phyle’. His other titles are ‘Royal acquaintance’, ‘Overseer of the House/Estate’, ‘Overseer of Ka-priests’, ‘Director of Royal wab-priests’, ‘Priest of Khufu’, ‘Master of Secrets’, ‘Scribe of the Royal records’ & ‘…Scribe…’. Another interesting comparison is the man called Nisushankhu (*NiswSnwHw*) who also has the title of ‘Director of the members of a phyle’ yet alongside it, he has other titles such as ‘Royal acquaintance’, ‘Priest of Khufu’, ‘Master of Secrets’, ‘Inspector of Wab-priests’. Both, just as Nyankhanty has the title of ‘Royal Acquaintance’ which is to be expected, and each has other priestly titles. However, Nisushankhu does not have the secular titles that Nyankhanty and Khnumhotep carries, which could mean they were not necessary for these ‘Directors of the members of a phyle’ to possess.

Faulkner describes the title of ‘Overseer of the army’ as the only distinct regular officer title that is concerned with military operations, administration, supplies and all matters concerning the military. When the title is carried by royal princes it is something close to Commander-in-Chief (later *imy-r mš† wr*). These Overseers are known in various positions or tasks carried out by military units; be it commanding household troops, forces of new recruits, Nubian auxiliaries or commanding quarrying expeditions. Yet, the service of some of these Overseers remains unknown as to the nature of their post and the tasks they carried out. Three such Overseers are found at Giza, one of whom is Nyankhanty. Faulkner points out that the title was most likely a professional appointment, and not simply an addition to higher titles which does fit with Imhotep not possessing the title (to our knowledge). One of the others referenced by Faulkner is Meri-Ib (*mri-Ib*) and he has a total of 23 titles and epithets. Other than ‘Overseer of the army’, the titles include but are not limited to ‘King’s son of his body’, ‘Sole Companion’, ‘Lector priest’, ‘God’s seal bearer of the boat’ and ‘Royal acquaintance’. Suffice to say that he was of a high station and only share the titles of ‘Royal acquaintance’ and ‘Overseer of the army’ with Nyankhanty.

As for the importance of the title ‘Overseer of the army’, a few words should be said. While the importance of various individuals who had the same title could have varied, it is not unreasonable to present what might possibly be the maximum authority of someone bearing this title. The unnamed writer of a letter of protest against a Vizier’s orders carries the title of *imy-r mš†*. Gardiner argues that because this unnamed Overseer of the army remains unnamed, he was most likely too important for the need of specifying the name, the same reason the Vizier’s name is not written (at least to each other). Furthermore, he cannot be a subordinate officer as he speaks against an order of the Vizier. As such, his position must have been a powerful one or the order would never be questioned in such a way. However, it is not possible to say that Nyankhanty had such authority simply because he held the title of ‘Overseer of the army/expedition’. The unnamed writer’s authority could have stemmed from another title, position or situation which is nowadays unknown but would have been known to the Vizier. Still, it can be argued that it is the title of ‘Overseer of the army’ that gives the unnamed man authority and thus that Nyankhanty might have at least part of such authority and power. Though,
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65 Kees 1948, 81–84.
67 Kees 1948, 81–84.
69 Junker 1951, 177.
70 Faulkner 1953, 32–34.
71 Junker 1934, 132.
72 Gardiner 1927, 75–76.
73 Gardiner 1927, 75–76.
since Nyankhanty’s tasks are unknown, the comparison between the two leads to no certain conclusions concerning Nyankhanty’s influence and status.

It is of course obvious that Nyankhanty possibly held more titles that we do not know about due to the fact the door is broken. However, a point should be made concerning the shoulder sash he is wearing, which one can expect to be indicative of something; a rank, title or position. It is then an interesting note to make that the in the chapel of Qar (G 7101), this kind of sash appears 4 times in the funeral scene. Each time the title of hry-hb.t – ‘Lector Priest’ is present next to the figure with the sash. Similarly, in the funeral scene of Yeduw (G 7102), the wide cloth sash appears once on a man walking behind the coffin/shrine being dragged by people and oxen. The only text next to the man is the title of ‘Lector Priest’. In Wilson’s study of Old Kingdom funeral services, he also identifies the shoulder sash with lector priests and figures with said sash and titles appears frequently in the scenes discussed. Then consider Nyankhanty is shown with such a shoulder sash, it would not be unreasonable to assume that he held the title of ‘Lector Priest’ or he would, presumptively, not be wearing the sash in his false door depiction.

Nyankhanty’s wife, Meri-Ptah, has the title of ‘Priestess of Hathor, Mistress of the Sycamore’. Hathor can appear as a tree goddess, and then she manifests as a sycamore tree, this cult existed in the Memphite region, particularly Giza. The cult priest(esse)s held the title ‘Priest(ess) of Hathor, Mistress of the Sycamore’. However, while Bleeker makes Hathor and her appearance as a Sycamore and being the Mistress of the Sycamore seem rather straight forward, it is seemingly more complex. There is a total of 52 women who held this title (in Galvin’s study) and 49 of them are from the Old Kingdom. 6 of the 49 hold no other titles. Four of those six are from Giza, two of which listed as being from the 4th dynasty. One of those listed as being from the 4th dynasty (listed as person 201F) is Meri-Ptah. Of the total number of priestesses, twelve held the title of ‘Royal Acquaintance’ and fifteen had ‘Royal Acquaintance’ and some other title.

Considering that we are missing part of the door both above and to the right of that title, it is not unreasonable to expect further titles that have been lost. Another example of the title that survives is from Hetep-Heres (ḥtp-hrs) who does not only carry the title of ‘Priestess of Hathor, Mistress of the Sycamore’ but also the titles of ‘Royal acquaintance’, ‘Priestess of Neith, Opener of ways’ and ‘Daughter of the king’. Another example, that of Meru (Mrw) who is a man who held the title ‘Priest of Hathor, Mistress of the Sycamore’. He held several other titles, including but not limited to, ‘Royal Chancellor’, ‘Sole Companion’, ‘Chief Lector priest’, ‘Chief of the estate’, ‘Chief of the estate of Pepy’, ‘Royal acquaintance’ and ‘Overseer of the south’. Then there is the example of Inti who had the titles of ‘Priestess of Hathor, Mistress of the Sycamore’ and ‘Royal acquaintance’ on her false door, found at Giza and now in Boston (MFA 31.781). Though unlike the other examples, this door is seemingly prefabricated, though it remains unclear exactly which titles were prefabricated as it might be one or both titles. However, if it were both it would certainly suggest that the two titles were common together.

With those examples in mind, it might seem likely that Meri-Ptah held the title of ‘Royal Acquaintance’ and probably other titles too, yet it is impossible to say with any degree of certainty. After all, other examples such as Nebet (nb.t) and Memi (mmt) show that the title of ‘Royal
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74 Smith 1949, fig. 84a & 84b.
75 Wilson 1944, 203–18, pl. 12–15.
77 Galvin 1981, 53.
80 Junker 1938, 207.
81 Davies 1901, 24.
Acquaintance’ was not always present simply because they were a Priest or Priestesses of Hathor, Mistress of the Sycamore. In fact, Nebet’s only additional title was that of ‘Sole Royal Ornament’ and Memi had ‘Sole Royal Ornament’ and ‘Daily watcher of Min’.83

2.7 Summary of Conclusions

In terms of Nyankhanty, I believe the questions concerning the date of his false door and position in the social hierarchy can be answered with some certainty. While there are luckily several pointers to the date, as mentioned in the analysis, it should be said that a certain amount of difficulty is added to the ‘judgement’ of date and status, seeing as half of the door is missing.

The obvious lack of cornice and torus moulding suggests an old-style false door which fits with what is to be expected from the false doors at Giza during the 5th dynasty. The lack of both features is confirmed by the fact that they are always found together, and that the torus moulding cannot be seen on the left side of Nyankhanty’s false door which seems to be its actual edge. Furthermore, the door has two pairs of jambs, that are of different width, figures of different size which is again features of the old-style of false door. Further pointers towards the 5th dynasty is the raised relief and decorated central niche, both of which become less common after the middle of the 5th dynasty. However, one of the best pointers towards the earliest possible date is probably his title ‘Director of members of a phyle’. If that title does not appear before Nyuserre Ini’s reign,84 then it can be said with some certainty that the door is no older than Nyuserre’s reign. At the same time, the lack of cornice and torus moulding, which was adopted at Giza during the 6th dynasty, would be an indication that it is not a 6th dynasty door. That would place a date somewhere between the reign of Nyuserre and the beginning of the 6th dynasty. However, there is a point to be made about the decorated central niche and raised relief which decreased in popularity and use after the middle of the 5th dynasty. That could be an argument for the false door to be rather close to Nyuserre’s reign. Though, one should not forget that no switch, adoption or abandonment of features will ever be instant. As such, it could be a later 5th dynasty door with slightly earlier middle 5th – early 5th dynasty features. Thus, the only thing that can be said with any certainty, is that the false door is probably from the time somewhere between the reign of Nyuserre and the end of the 5th dynasty.

Nyankhanty’s social standing is somewhat easier to make judgement on than that of Hershefnakht as he possesses more titles. The most obvious is that Nyankhanty and his son were both priests at Khufu’s mortuary cult as the title was directly related to such cults.85 Seemingly they were priests with some authority and influence as the titles of ‘Chief of Royal Wab-Priests’ and ‘Director of the members of a phyle’ would suggest. While the tasks of such positions might be unclear, it is obvious that being the chief of lower officials serving as Wab-priests or directing a phyle would lend you some influence. However, further adding to his influence is the title of ‘Overseer of the army/expedition’. While the nature of his tasks might be unclear, it is clear enough that he likely commanded a force of men in some manner, be it soldiers or leading an expedition. While it should be said, that this might not have lent him the greatest influence, it is reasonable to think that it came with some perks, seeing it appears to be a professional appointment. The matter of the title being a professional appointment is further supported by his son lacking the title, even though he has all other titles held by Nyankhanty that we see. Lastly, there is the possibility of Nyankhanty having the title of ‘Lector Priest’ due to the shoulder sash he wears, which his son does not, probably meaning the title was not inherited or held by the son. However, if Nyankhanty held the title of ‘Lector Priest’ it would only add further to his status.

84 Kees 1948, 82.
85 Kees 1948, 82.
Nyankhanty’s wife only has a single surviving title, but due to the broken parts of the door, it seems likely that other titles might have been present. While it might be difficult to judge her exact standing in the social hierarchy, it should at least be said that she was a Priestess of Hathor in the Hathor cult in the Memphite or Giza area.
3.0 The False Door of Senetites (MM 11434)

Fig. 9: Photo of the False door from the Museum’s online database.\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{56} The Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities Online Database. Item MM 11 434.
3.1 Background

The false door of Senetites is first mentioned by Wångstedt in the Museum Bulletin from 1961. He mentions that the door is, apparently, from Saqqara though there are no notes of the excavation. Thus, no location can properly be established.\(^87\) The time and method of acquisition is however unknown and my inquiry of this led to no answers. Whatever the case may be as to the time and method of its acquisition, the false door of Senetites, with the inventory number MM 11434, is listed on the museum’s online database as a 6\(^{th}\) dynasty to First Intermediate Period false door. It is noted that it is most likely from Saqqara with the dimensions of H 105 cm x W 61 cm x D 13 cm.\(^88\) In the end, according to Wångstedt, all that can be said is the attested titles were often bestowed to distinguished women, though towards the end of the 6\(^{th}\) dynasty the social position of the owner can no longer be established. Though the first title does suggest a higher position in the social strata during later times. \(hk\textit{r.t-nsw.t}\ w\textit{f.t h\textit{m.t-nw h\textit{hfr}}\) is a common title combination during the late 6\(^{th}\) dynasty (Pepy II onwards) and the First Intermediate Period.\(^89\)

3.2 Description

This false door is a two-jamb door with cornice and torus moulding and an outer rim that adds an additional pair of jambs and an architrave. Each jamb, both on the inside and outside of the torus contain a single column of text. The hieroglyphs are not especially well made, but they are readable. The jambs on the inside of the torus each have a figure at the bottom. All the figures wear a collar and a tight-fitting dress. The two figures on the outer jambs both smell a lotus flower, holding the flower with one hand and keeping the other by their side. Furthermore, both wear wigs, as does the figure on the inner right jamb, though she has both hands by her sides. On the left inner jamb, the figure smells a lotus flower, but she does not wear a wig. The panel is a flaring T-shaped panel, and upon it, the figure of the deceased is sitting on a chair which has animal feet. She has a lotus flower in her left hand to smell, and extends her right hand to the offering table. She wears a wig, tight fitting dress, collar and arm rings. The offering table has bread and the leg of an ox on it and to the right of the table on the floor stands a jug. The reliefs themselves are sunk, except for the decoration on the panel and cornice. There is a fair amount of colour remaining on the door. The cornice has a combination of blue, yellow and red plumes that are easily visible. Some of the hieroglyphs can still be seen to be red. Furthermore, the central niche is coloured red, as are the cuts of the T-shaped panel. Below the figures, there is a black area, and the figures have red skin. On the panel, the figure has red skin and a black wig. The red colour is also used on the chair, table, ox’s leg, bread and the jug. The torus moulding has a black painted zigzag pattern. The false door is generally well preserved, though it has some nicks and other superficial damage. Though it is to be noted that some of the hieroglyphs have been partly damaged, though they are still readable.

\(^{87}\) Wångstedt 1961, 44-47.
\(^{88}\) The Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities Online Database. Item MM 11 434.
\(^{89}\) Wångstedt 1961, 44-47.
3.3 Translation

Fig. 10: Text on the jambs, lintel, architraves numbered.

1. \( htp\ di\ nsw^A\ (n)\ inpw\ tp\ dw=f\ imy\ wt\ nb\ t^3-dsr\ prt-hrw \)
   ‘An offering which the King gives (to) Anubis upon his mountain, who is in the place of embalming, Lord of the sacred land, invocation offerings’

2. \( n=s\ m\ iz=s\ n\ hr.t-ntr\ m\ s(my).t\ imnt.t\ im\hw.t\ hkr.t\ nsw\ w^s.t\ hm.t-ntr^n0\ htr-hr\ im\hw.t\ hr\ ntr\ ^s\ nb\ pt\ sn.t\ (i)t=s \)
   ‘For her in her tomb in the necropolis in the western desert. The Imakhut, the King’s sole ornament, priestess of Hathor. The Imakhut before the great god, lord of the sky, Senetites.’

3. \( htp\ di\ nsw^C\ (n)\ inpw\ nb\ t^3-dsr\ krts.t(w)=s\ nfr\ m\ iz=s\ n\ hrt-ntr\ im\hw.t\ sn.t\ (i)t=s \)
   ‘An offering which the King gives (to) Anubis, Lord of the sacred land. May she be buried well in her tomb of the necropolis, the Imakhut Senetites.’

4. \( htp\ di\ nsw^D\ (n)\ wsir\ nb\ dw\ prt-hrw \)
   ‘An offering which the King gives (to) Osiris, Lord of Djedu, invocation offerings.’

5. \( n\ hkr.t\ nsw.t\ w^c.t\ im\hw.t\ hr\ ntr\ ^s\ nb\ pt\ sn.t\ (i)t=s \)
   ‘For the King’s sole ornament the Imakhut before the great god, lord of the sky Senetites’.

6. \( im\hw.t\ hr\ hw.t=s^E\ sn.t\ (i)t=s \)
   ‘The Imakhut before her mistress, Senetites’

7. \( im\hw.t\ hr\ inp(w)^F\ sn.t\ (i)t=s \)
   ‘The Imakhut before Anubis, Senetites’
8. *hkr.t nsw.t sn.t (i)t=s*
   ‘King’s ornament Senetites’

9. *im3hw.t sn.t (i)t=s*
   ‘The Imakhut Senetites’

   Panel: *h3 t3 h3 hnk.t h3 k3 h3 3pd h3 s3 h3 mnh.t n im3hw.t sn.t (i)t=s*
   ‘A thousand bread, beer, oxen, fowl, alabaster and linen to the Imakhut Senetites’

3.4 Commentary

The writing of *htp di nsw* on the two architraves (A & D) is the very common form, found throughout the Old Kingdom. While its writing on the right jamb of the outer rim (C) is written in a form found during the 5th and 6th dynasties and the First Intermediate Period. The titles (B) and their combination is of some interest and will be discussed in more detail below. One interesting note is that the element ‘Sole’ is dropped from the title on the inner left jamb (G), though one reason for this could be a lack of space. On the lintel, Anubis is written without the determinative (F), which is a feature that will be discussed further below. Lastly, the title/epithet on the right outer jamb (E) is interesting seeing as the bird determinative is a bit strange. It is slightly unclear, due to the cut of the false door, but it seems to be the falcon perched upon a standard. The title, without the falcon determinative, is listed in Jones’ Index (No. 167), where the title is translated as ‘Revered with her spouse’. However, Fischer offers a slight correction in his review as *hnw.t* does not mean spouse, but rather, mistress. Fischer further notes that it can appear with the falcon perched upon a standard determinative, and it then refers to a divinity, particularly Hathor. One example of this would be on the north wall of the shrine in the tomb of Aba, where Aba’s wife Rahenem is *im3hw.t hr hnw.t=s* with the falcon determinative, translated by Davies as ‘Deserving before her mistress’. Lastly, a mention of the name should probably be made. *sn.t (i)t=s* ‘Her father’s sister’ is attested in Ranke’s list of names. Versions showing the *i* are also attested, as are versions with the *i* but no viper determinative.

3.5 Analysis & Discussion

Since no tomb is known, we can only discuss that which appears on the false door. Luckily, the door has several features that will be useful in the analysis and discussion.

The door has a cornice and torus moulding which means that the door could be at earliest an early 5th dynasty door; at which point it was a sign of those especially favoured by the King or of sufficiently high rank. Later however, it came to be a normal feature on all false doors during the 6th dynasty and as such no longer had the same implications of high rank or royal favour. That leads to a very broad 5th-6th dynasty timeframe, which can be made more specific with other features.

---
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The jambs of doors during the reign of Pepy II were narrow with single columns of text, often with figures of the same size. However, this door also possesses an outer rim (called supplementary frame by Brovarski) which adds an additional pair of jambs outside the torus moulding and an architrave on top of the cornice. This feature only appears during the late 6th dynasty, at earliest near the end of the first half of Pepy II’s reign. The outer rim and narrow jambs then indicate a later 6th dynasty door, at earliest around the middle of Pepy II’s reign.

The panel is a flaring T-shaped panel, that appeared during the second half of Pepy II’s reign. This door possesses the jug on the ground on the right side of the offering table, which could be the simple decoration preferred during Pepy II’s reign. Both the flaring T-shaped panel and the simple jug on the floor can serve as pointers towards, as the earliest possible time, Pepy II’s reign. It also fits very well together with the design of the jambs and the existence of the outer rim.

Furthermore, the reliefs are all sunk apart from the panel, which is to be expected of a 6th dynasty door and so, not that surprising. However, on the lintel Anubis is written without the jackal determinative which is interesting, seeing as it is a very late Old Kingdom feature. It would then, possibly point towards a door at the very end of the Old Kingdom instead of the earliest possible time of Pepy II.

The door of Wedja-Djeri (wDe-rDi) is a late Old Kingdom door (that at the time the writing of Metawi’s article was in the basement of the Cairo Museum, without any number in the register) with the expected features; cornice, torus, single columns of text, a T-shaped panel and in this case also an outer rim like that of Senetites’ door. Even though Wedja has more titles, such as ‘Regulator of Phyles’, ‘Overseer of Commissions’ and ‘Superintendent of hntyw-š officials of the palace’; the cut is similar in quality though the door is larger with a difference of 58 cm in height, 41 cm in width and 5.5 cm in depth. I would however, suggest that this difference in size is most likely because of having more titles, and not because of social standing. Though one could argue more titles could mean higher status, and that might go with the size of the door. Yet there is a point to be made about someone who has more titles and a larger door having a door of similar quality to that of Senetites.

3.6 Titles

The titles listed on Senetites’ door is ‘Priestess of Hathor’ and ‘Sole Royal Ornament’. Junker notes that hkr.t nsrw.t is most likely not a title of a concubine, but the title is one of honour. Also, the Priestess of Hathor is one of the most common for women during the Old Kingdom.

That the positions of ‘ornament’ was one of honour becomes even more obvious once it becomes known where these ‘ornaments’ were drawn from. Troy describes the ip.t as the ‘so-called harem’. It was the administrative body of royal wives, royal daughters, royal sisters and children of both sexes. It was in simple terms, the royal ladies of the court and their attendants and officials that were tied to the ip.t. Drawn from the ip.t are the hnr whose members are known as hkr.t. They were involved in the musical worship of the gods and thus served a ritual role. Still, their high status excluded any role as concubines. They were associated with Hathor and as the title came to degrade, the element ‘Sole’ was
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added to make it more prominent.\textsuperscript{103} That would mean that Senetites is a court lady to some extent, though probably one of the attendant ladies rather than one of the royal ones.

The combination of ‘Priestess of Hathor’ and ‘Sole Royal Ornament’ becomes more popular as ‘Royal Acquaintance’ starts to decrease in use. The peak of the combination was during the First Intermediate Period though it was also used during the 5\textsuperscript{th} and 6\textsuperscript{th} dynasties. Though it is then to be said that Galvin notes that the combination is not found at either Giza or Saqqara during the First Intermediate Period though seven examples have been found from the Old Kingdom in those areas. All of these are from the 6\textsuperscript{th} dynasty and six from the reign of Pepy II. As for the title of ‘Royal Ornament’ in combination with ‘Priestess of Hathor’; it was a popular combination during the 6\textsuperscript{th} dynasty and seemingly a transitional phase between the period of using ‘Royal Acquaintance’ + ‘Priestess of Hathor’, and the period using ‘Sole Royal Ornament’ + ‘Priestess of Hathor’\textsuperscript{104}. However, none of the people listed in Galvin’s study is Senetites and thus it seems that Senetites was unknown to Galvin.

A similar title combination to that of Senetites can be seen in the tomb and on the false door of Henet as recorded by Davies. The titles ‘Priestess of Hathor’ and ‘Sole Royal ornament’ are present and the only difference in titles is that of ‘Royal Lady’ for Henet. It does appear that she and her husband Meru are from the 6\textsuperscript{th} dynasty and were of the upper strata seeing as Meru’s titles were ‘Chief of the estate’, ‘Royal Sealbearer’ and ‘Sole Companion’.\textsuperscript{105} While some of his titles might be honorific rather than administrative, there are still some high titles. This would mean that both are at least on a distinguished level in the social strata. Also, as on Senetites’ door, Henet’s door has the ‘Imakhut before her mistress, Henet’, though without the determinative of the falcon perched on the standard.\textsuperscript{106} Another inscription from Giza in G 2094 has a similar if shorter set up of ‘Ornament’ and ‘Priestess of Hathor’ which does indeed seem like a common enough combination to find.\textsuperscript{107}

The 6\textsuperscript{th} dynasty door of Irti (currently in the Museum of Antiquities (Saskatoon), no number) has the same titles, plus that of ‘Royal Acquaintance’. This door is of moderate quality.\textsuperscript{108} While the titles are of at least moderately fine status, both the door of Senetites and that of Irti are not really that finely cut which raises questions as to why, though to reach any conclusions concerning the quality of the doors in relation to titles would require many more examples.
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3.7 Summary of Conclusions

Senetites’ false door can be dated well enough, and a judgement on her social station can be made based on her titles.

To begin with, the features of the false door suggest the 6th dynasty. The narrow jambs contain single columns of text which could suggest a date as early as the reign of Pepy II. The panel is of the flaring T-shaped type, which is another pointer towards Pepy II’s reign, as is the jug on the floor to the right of the offering table. The outer rim is another such feature which at earliest appears during the reign of Pepy II. However, it should be mentioned that features such as the outer rim continued into the First Intermediate Period, making the date less certain. On the lintel, Anubis is written without the determinative, which points towards the end of the Old Kingdom.

However, there is another point to be raised concerning the date of the false door. The title combination of ‘Priestess of Hathor’ and ‘Sole Royal Ornament’ peaked during the First Intermediate Period yet it is important to remember that the combination was used as early as the 5th dynasty. Senetites’ false door is most likely from Saqqara, but if the door is dated to the First Intermediate Period, she would be the only one buried at either Giza or Saqqara with that combination of titles. The fact of the matter seems to be, that the only time the combination is found at either Giza or Saqqara, it is during the Old Kingdom and most from Pepy II’s reign.

That does point towards Senetites being from the time of Pepy II or at least the 6th dynasty. If she was not, she would be the only one from Saqqara with that combination during the whole of the First Intermediate Period. It would in simple terms be breaking the norm of where the combination is found during the First Intermediate Period. However, it is worthwhile to point out that simply because it would break the norm, it does not rule out the possibility of it being a First Intermediate Period door. I would not disregard the possibility even if I would consider it less likely than it being a 6th dynasty door.

Due to her title of ‘Priestess of Hathor’ it can, obviously, be said that she was a priestess, though not one of a high rank as this was a common title for women. However, the title of ‘Sole Royal Ornament’ is more interesting, as this would place her in society. If all ḫkr.t, who were involved in the musical worship of the gods, were drawn from the ip.t that is where she would be placed. That would mean that she was part of an administrative body related to the royal family and thus the court. She could possibly have been a court lady of some sort, though perhaps simply an attendant of a court lady as they were also tied to the ip.t. Either way, it would be a respectable position in the higher parts of society, or certainly, closer to it. Though that raises questions about why the door is of such a poor quality if she was a part of the court to some extent. It could be argued that it is a sign of her being of a lower position, yet the fact remains that the titles are rather fine. As such, if she was of a low standing, she would probably not have the titles in the first place. Therefore, it is a bit strange that she has fine titles, but a low-quality door. Perhaps, a court lady of lesser importance, even with fine titles, could not afford the finest of doors. Whatever the case may be for Senetites, which is unclear, it is obviously not the only case as the other examples show that even those with more titles possess doors of a similar cut. It could be suggested that doors were overall of lesser quality than they once had been, though that would require a larger study of many more doors from this time.
4.0 Results

As for the results of the study, it can be said that the questions asked in this study have been answered to some extent for all three doors. Hershefnakht’s and Senetites’ false doors show them to be at earliest from the reign of Pepy II. Senetites’ has some features that suggest a possibly later door than Hershefnakht’s. However, both doors could be much later than the reign of Pepy II. There are simply no identified features that limit the latest possible time until after the First Intermediate Period. However, Senetites’ title combination did not appear outside of Giza or Saqqara during the First Intermediate Period.109 Thus, it can be said with some certainty that the false door is probably not a First Intermediate door. As for their social standing, both seem at least respectable based on their titles, even if Senetites’ door is not as fine as that of Hershefnakht. Senetites seemingly was a part of the ip.t and thus one of the ladies of the court.110 Though due to the low-quality door, one could argue that she was probably one of the ‘lesser noble ladies’ of the court. Hershefnakht’s status is not as easy to define, as he only bears a single title that happens to be an honorific title. It is possible to argue for both greater and lesser importance but there is no real proof of either. Nyankhanty’s false door, or rather, half a false door is very fine. His titles place him as an important priest who directed a phyle of priests and controlled the Wab-priests, but also as a commander of a force of men even though the exact nature of that command remains unknown. His door and titles also give a more exact date than the doors of Hershefnakht and Senetites. Nyankhanty’s false door is most likely from somewhere between the reign of King Nyuserre Ini and the end of the 5th dynasty.

As such, the Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities has a small, but fine collection of false doors that can show the development of the false doors. From the older type, still used at Giza during the 5th dynasty in the form of Nyankhanty’s false door. To the ‘new Saqqaran style’ of false door that would come to be adopted in Giza in the 6th dynasty, but was already in use at Saqqara during the 5th dynasty, in the form of Hershefnakht’s and Senetites’ doors. These two doors show late Old Kingdom developments in false doors, such as the flaring T-shaped panels, cornice and torus moulding and in the case of Senetites’ door; the outer rim. Nyankhanty’s false door in comparison shows the earlier features such as jambs of different sizes, with figures of different sizes and the decorated central niche and a door covered in fine raised hieroglyphs instead of the later sunk hieroglyphs found on the two later doors.
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