



The Asyut Project 17

Harrassowitz Verlag

Mahmoud El-Khadragy

Tomb N13.1 of the Nomarch Iti-ibi(-iqer) at Asyut

with collaboration of Ulrike Dubiel and Eva Gervers



The Asyut Project

Edited by
Jochem Kahl, Ursula Verhoeven,
Mahmoud El-Khadragy and Andrea Kilian

Volume 17



2022

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Mahmoud El-Khadragy

Tomb N13.1 of the Nomarch Iti-ibi(-iqer)
at Asyut

with collaboration of
Ulrike Dubiel and Eva Gervers

2022

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Cover: Tomb N13.1, northern wall, the nomarch Iti-ibi(-iqer) and his wife Senebti(-iqeret) below his kilt; photo: Fritz Barthel 2014, © The Asyut Project

Gefördert durch die Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <https://dnb.de/> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the internet at <https://dnb.de/>.

For further information about our publishing program consult our website <https://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de/>

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2022
This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.
Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

Printed on permanent/durable paper.
Printing and binding: Memminger MedienCentrum AG
Printed in Germany

ISSN 1865-6250
ISBN 978-3-447-11778-4

eISSN 2701-5610
eISBN 978-3-447-39255-6

Content

Preface and acknowledgments	1
1. Introduction	3
1.1 Conducted fieldwork	3
1.2 Epigraphic conventions	4
1.3 Method of description	5
2. The tomb owner in his social and historical setting	7
2.1 The tomb owner as the head of an extended household	7
2.1.1 Possible subsidiary burials in the forecourt	7
2.1.2 Individuals named in the tomb – subordinates and family	7
2.2 The tomb owner in his historical setting	10
2.2.1 Sequence of local nomarchs	10
2.2.2 Approximation to a chronological placement of the tomb	11
3. Architectural features	15
4. Coloring and execution of the decoration	17
4.1 Colors of hieroglyphs	17
4.2 Anomalies in the orientation of signs	28
4.3 Colors of the representations	29
5. Representations and inscriptions	31
5.1 The entrance	31
5.2 The northern wall	31
NI.1 – The tomb owner, family members and possibly a biographical inscription	32
NII.1 – Inspecting cattle and military scenes	36
NIII.1 – Senebti(-iqeret) offers the <i>mn.t</i> -necklace and sistrum to Iti-ibi(-iqer)	42
NI.2 – Grain storage and river-faring ships	45
5.3 The western wall	50
Inscription line framing top of WIX, ledge of niche and WIII	50
WI–WIII – Tomb owner sitting below canopy watching butchers, offering bearers, musicians and cranes being fed	52
WIV – Offering scenes and offering list (northern part)	65
WV–WVII – False door and offering scenes	75
WV.1–4 – Offerings, offering table scene, slaughter of an ox, offering bearers (northern part)?	76
WVI.1 – False door	78
WVII.1–4 – Offerings, offering table scene, slaughter of an ox, offering bearers (southern part)	80
WVIII – Offering scenes and offering list (southern part)	82
WIX – Watching fighting bulls and woodworking?	90

5.4 The southern wall	95
SI.1 – Commemorating Khety II	95
SII.1 – Fowling in the marshes with the goddess Sekhet	98
SIII.1 – Fishing scene	102
SIII.2 – The desert hunt	106
SI.2 – Tilling, sowing and tree felling	108
SI.3 – (Force-)feeding of cattle and fording scenes	111
SI.4 – Bread and beer production	116
5.5 The eastern wall	118
EI.1 – Soldiers	118
EI.2 – Harvest of flax and grain	122
EI.3 – Offering bearers and threshing	122
EII.1–7 – Offering bearers and fishing	123
5.6 The pillars	125
Pillar A	125
Pillar B	132
6. History of later usage of the tomb	141
Bibliography	143
List of figures	155
List of plates	155
Figures 1–48	157
Plates 1–156	203

Preface and acknowledgments

This book is one important outcome of the long-term Egyptian-German co-operation in archaeological fieldwork at the necropolis of Asyut. My own participation in *The Asyut Project* extended for eleven seasons of fieldwork between 2003 and 2014. In the first year and with a restricted plan for our project, Jochem Kahl (*Freie Universität Berlin*) and I surveyed the First Intermediate Period tombs of Khety I, Iti-ibi and Khety II, with the aim of preparing future epigraphic and architectural studies therein.

2004, Ursula Verhoeven (*Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz*), joined our project, and the financial support of both *Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz* and *Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster* motivated us towards expanding our original plan so as to include more tombs; i. e., those of the so-called “Northern Soldiers-Tomb” and Djefai-Hapi I, and to survey the necropolis for mapping during season 2004.

Our increasing ambition for more fieldwork activities, which became possible due to the financial support of the German Research Foundation from season 2005 onwards, led us to expand the activities of surveying the necropolis on a larger scale for the purpose of mapping, and resulted in discovering Tomb N13.1 which belongs to the Nomarch Iti-ibi(-iqer). During the next season 2006, the surface of the inner hall and parts of the forecourt of Tomb N13.1 were cleaned, and its decoration was fully documented. In the next season 2007, the shafts of the inner hall of Tomb N13.1 were examined and the tomb’s forecourt was cleaned.

This discovery is the only available source of information introducing the then unknown Siutian nomarch Iti-ibi(-iqer), who probably witnessed the final stages of the civil war between Heracleopolis and their Theban rivals. It also provides us with a possible evidence connecting the well-known Siutian family of nomarchs, who ruled Asyut during the later part of the First Intermediate Period, i. e., Khety I, Iti-ibi and Khety II, on the one hand, and the celebrated nomarch Mesehti, owner of the two sets of model-soldiers representing Egyptian spearmen provided with shields (Cairo CG 258) and Nubian archers (Cairo CG 257), in addition to the two coffins (Cairo CG 28118, 28119), on the other. Moreover, the tomb’s decoration is one of the best preserved late First Intermediate Period/early Eleventh Dynasty tombs known to us up to date. Its iconographic details present one of the earliest known examples of a fabulous creature in a hunting scene in a private tomb and the earliest known example of goddess Sekhet dominating a fowling scene in a non-royal context. Some of its epigraphic features are distinctive, including an apparent tendency towards replacing some of the standardized sitting man determinative/ideogram by a standing one.

The plan of publishing Tomb N13.1 was laid out by Ursula Verhoeven, Jochem Kahl and myself at the beginning of season 2006, according to which the study of the tomb’s visitors’ graffiti (*dipinti*) was

entrusted to Ursula Verhoeven,¹ the study of the original tomb decoration was assigned to me, leaving the finds to other experts of our joint mission; e. g., the stoppers of the vessels were assigned to Michael van Elsbergen,² studying the pottery was the task of Andrea Kilian,³ while the wooden models were committed to Monika Zöller-Engelhardt.⁴

During the course of our work, we received generous financial support from various institutions without which this project could never have been accomplished. Our most sincere appreciation is extended to *Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz* (season 2004), *Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster* (season 2004), the German Research Foundation (short term project at *Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz*, seasons 2005–2007; long term project at *Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz*, seasons 2008–2009; long term project at both *Freie Universität Berlin* and *Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz*, season 2010–2019); Ursula Verhoeven's Fellowship of the *Gutenberg Forschungskolleg* (for Eva Gervers in 2013–2015); Egyptological Seminar of *Freie Universität Berlin* (for Max Bader in 2018).

The continued and valuable support of the staff of the Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities is gratefully acknowledged. In this respect special thanks are extended to Professor Zahi Hawass, former Chairman of the SCA, and Dr. Sabri Abel-Aziz, former Head of the Archaeology Sector. Our sincere thanks are also extended to Mr. Magdy El-Ghandour, former Head of the Foreign and Egyptian Missions Affairs and Permanent Committee, Mr. Samir Anis Salib, former Director General of Antiquities of Middle Egypt, Mr. Ahmed El-Khatib, former Director General of Asyut, Mrs. Nadia Naguib, former Director of the magazine at Shubt, and the two successive accompanying inspectors Mr. Magdy Shaker and Mr. Mohamed Mustafa Al-Shafey, who greatly facilitated our fieldwork.

I would like to express my deep appreciation to all those who were involved in the preparation of this book. Eva Gervers (*Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz*) collated the whole decoration, typed the computer version of the hieroglyphic inscriptions, contributed much to the documentation and studied the color conventions. The resulting manuscript was thoroughly revised by Ulrike Dubiel (*Freie Universität Berlin*). Max Bader (*Freie Universität Berlin*) took care of the transliteration. The epigraphic work and the final line drawings of the scenes and inscriptions were executed by Sameh Shafiq (EGOTH Higher Institute for Tourism and Hotel Management, Luxor). The architectural drawings are the work of Ulrike Fauerbach (The German Archaeological Institute, Cairo). The photographs were provided by Fritz Barthel. Finally, the manuscript was edited by Ursula Verhoeven and produced for printing by Andrea Kilian.

Sohag, June 2021

Mahmoud El-Khadragy

1 Cf. VERHOEVEN (ed.), 2020.

2 Cf. ELSBERGEN, 2019.

3 Cf. KILIAN, 2019.

4 ZÖLLER-ENGELHARDT, in press.

1. Introduction

1.1 Conducted fieldwork

The tomb of the nomarch Iti-ibi(-iqer) with the number N13.1¹ (figs. 1–2) occupies a rather conspicuous position high up on geological step 7² of the Gebel Asyut al-gharbi on the southern side of the necropolis (pl. 1). The tomb had been unknown to scholars until its discovery by the joint Egyptian-German mission of “The Asyut Project” at the end of the 2005 season.³ No references to its existence had ever been made by previous archaeological missions or visitors of any kind to the mountain.⁴

With the season of 2005 coming to a close, time allowed only for a short examination of the tomb,⁵ but in the following year thorough investigations were conducted: During the season of 2006, a part of the area in front of N13.1 and the inside of the tomb were cleared from the accumulated debris (cf. pls. 2b–4a for pictures of the tomb before cleaning).⁶ Subsequently, the mission’s restorers tended to the walls to clean the decoration and inscriptions, while also stabilizing the plaster in order to prevent loosened fragments from flaking off. In a next step Egyptologists carried out epigraphic work on the tomb’s walls: the images and texts were copied⁷ at a 1:1 scale on transparencies which were then processed for inking.⁸ Examination of the inked graffiti (dipinti)⁹ started at the same time with the production of facsimiles and photographs.¹⁰ In addition, first measurements of the tomb’s architecture were taken to generate the ground plans.¹¹

Excavating the three shafts inside the tomb was accomplished during the season of 2007,¹² whereas the first phase of a comprehensive photographic documentation¹³ starting with overviews of whole wall sections leading over to smaller details was carried out. At the same time the architectural survey and

1 The tomb’s number results from a grid laid over the necropolis’ map with letters along the west-east axis and numbers along the north-south axis (cf. FAUERBACH, 2006, 245–246).

2 For the geological division of the mountain by D. Klemm and R. Klemm cf. KAHL, 2007, 59–61, fig. 33 and KLEMM/KLEMM, 2008, 112–115, fig. 165.

3 Cf. KAHL et al., 2006, 241f.; KAHL/VERHOEVEN, 2008.

4 Cf. VERHOEVEN, 2009, 87; cf. also KAHL, 2013b.

5 Cf. KAHL et al., 2006, 242.

6 Cf. KAHL et al., 2007, 84f.

7 The facsimiles of the decoration and inscriptions were prepared by Sameh Shafik and Ilona Regulski.

8 Sameh Shafik created the ink drawings.

9 Later added inscriptions and art works were executed in two different techniques: they were either incised into the wall plaster as the term “graffito” resp. plural “graffiti” originally implied or painted on the walls with pigment, for which the term “dipinto” resp. plural “dipinti” is preferred here.

10 This work was conducted by Ursula Verhoeven. For the *modus operandi* employed, cf. VERHOEVEN, 2012a, 48–49; VERHOEVEN, 2020, 5–6.

11 This work was provided by Ulrike Fauerbach.

12 KAHL et al., 2008, 200.

13 Those photographs were made by Fritz Barthel, cf. KAHL et al., 2008, 201.

the mapping continued.¹⁴ In the following campaigns, work in Tomb N13.1 mainly focused on studying the pictorial and inscriptive decoration as well as the palaeography of the hieroglyphs. Simultaneously, the documentation and comprehensive analysis of the New Kingdom dipinti took place.¹⁵ During the fieldwork season of 2014,¹⁶ the facsimiles were thoroughly collated, revising the original ink drawings with corrections and additions.¹⁷ Moreover, the photographic documentation of the tomb's scenes and inscriptions could be completed.¹⁸

Starting in 2006 the annual preliminary reports of the Asyut Project appeared, informing about the work progress in Tomb N13.1. A condensed overview of the decoration and inscriptions as well as a first assessment of the chronological evidence and deduced date for the tomb were published in 2007.¹⁹ In addition, members of the project have authored a number of contributions dealing with various aspects of the decoration.²⁰

At this point in time, the study of Tomb N13.1 is almost fully completed except for the burial chambers, with detailed studies of different object groups either published or in print.²¹ Accordingly, some remarks on the history of later phases of use are in order.²²

1.2 Epigraphic conventions²³

In order to create facsimiles huge transparencies were hung up on the walls, onto which the epigraphers copied the depictions and hieroglyphs (except the small captions) with permanent markers. In a second step, the drawings were scanned, scaled down and printed on paper thus delivering the templates for the calking done by hand and in ink on large pieces of tracing paper.²⁴ After another scanning process those ink-drawings were digitized and could be enhanced and given final touches using image-editing software.

As the decoration of Tomb N13.1 is riddled with holes and scratches in almost every scene, adding these “lacunae” – be it as additional lines or dotted areas – would have rendered the monochrome facsimiles quite unreadable. Accordingly, they were left out. However, rough outlines of the destroyed areas

14 Architects in charge were Manja Maschke and Cornelia Goerlich.

15 The text dipinti, mostly written in hieratic, a few in hieroglyphics, were studied by Ursula Verhoeven with the cooperation of Svenja A. Glden, the figural dipinti by Eva Gervers. Cf. the final publication of both parts in VERHOEVEN, ed., 2020. Some more details are given below in chapter 6.

16 Due to the political situation in Egypt, the project did not conduct any fieldwork campaigns in the years 2013 and 2015.

17 The collating was done by Eva Gervers, the copying by Sameh Shafik and Eva Gervers and the inking by Sameh Shafik.

18 The photographs were taken by Fritz Barthel, the layout of the details planned by Eva Gervers.

19 Cf. EL-KHADRAGY, 2007b. For another tentative approach to dating the tomb (which was based on the evidence then available but has since been turned obsolete) and the order of the nomarchs of Asyut, see also EL-KHADRAGY, 2012.

20 In the preliminary reports of the Asyut Project: KAHL et al., 2006, 241f.; KAHL et al., 2007, 81, 84–87; KAHL et al., 2008, 199, 200–205, 206f. Further articles by members of the project include EL-KHADRAGY, 2008, 227–229; KAHL, 2006; KAHL, 2008a, 182; KAHL, 2012, *passim*; KAHL, 2013; KAHL/VERHOEVEN, 2008; VERHOEVEN, 2013; VERHOEVEN, 2015a; VERHOEVEN, 2015b, VERHOEVEN, 2016; KILIAN, 2018; cf. also VERHOEVEN, 2020; GERVERS, 2020.

21 The pottery was being studied by Andrea Kilian (KILIAN, 2019), the stoppers by Michael van Elsbergen (ELSBERGEN, 2019); the wooden models by Monika Zller-Engelhardt (ZLLER-ENGELHARDT, in press.)

22 Cf. chapter 6.

23 For the epigraphic methods utilized in Asyut, see also SHAFIK, 2012, esp. 60f.

24 This work was conducted by Sameh Shafik.

are given in the architectural maps; cf. figs. 9–12. The main focus was on revealing the decoration itself, ameliorating its visibility with the aid of the drawings, whereas the photographs serve as a complementary tool for studying the decoration program, showing the intentional destruction, the fading original color and the red paint from Islamic times²⁵ thus also documenting the state of preservation. It was also decided not to add graphical reconstructions for sections lost to the facsimiles. Furthermore, the facsimiles only include painted shapes with distinguishable outlines; amorphous patches of color can still yield information about elements once depicted, however they were left out of the drawings and can only be seen in the photographs. So ultimately, the facsimiles and the photographic documentation need to be studied together to achieve a full understanding of figural and textual decor.

It took until the end of the 2012 resp. 2014 seasons to complete the epigraphic work on the inscriptions resp. depictions, which were collated in detail by studying photos as well as by counter-checking on site. By the end of the 2014 season the recording of the representational depictions was concluded likewise.

1.3 Method of description

The description of the decoration including representations and texts starts with the northern wall (N) and is carried out from the outside (east) to the inside (west). It continues with the western wall (W) from north to south. The southern wall (S) is again described from the outside (east) to the inside (west) of the room. Finally, the eastern wall (E) is discussed, beginning with the southern part and finishing with the northern part. Thus, the order of the description of the walls is roughly counterclockwise. Pillars A and B conclude the recount.

For the identification and differentiation of single sections and scenes, a system was established that gives a combination of numbers depending on the section's position.²⁶ However not just the position on the respective walls but also the contents of the scenes were taken into account for the attribution of an identification number. The large main sections were given a capital letter and a Roman number e. g. SI–SIII on the southern wall, with single elements or sub-themes further differentiated, e. g. SIII.2.1. The principal (and large-sized) scenes SI.1–SIII.1 are discussed first. In addition, the southern wall shows smaller registers of varying lengths below the larger scenes. These registers are named after the large scene under which their starting point is, e. g. SI.2, regardless of the actual length – in the case at hand SI.2 keeps running below section SII – and regardless where the ending point is as in the case of SI.3. Those registers are presented after the larger scenes. Generally, the description goes from top to bottom unless the context demands otherwise. Schematic plans showing the numbering system used for the walls give a quick overview of the decoration layout and facilitate the identification of the scenes (figs. 21–31). The two pillars are not especially mentioned in the schematic overviews as the positions of scenes or elements can be easily determined by referring to their sides (e. g. pillar A, northern side).

²⁵ Cf. chapter 6.

²⁶ This system was developed by Eva Gervers.

2. The tomb owner in his social and historical setting

2.1 The tomb owner as the head of an extended household

2.1.1 Possible subsidiary burials in the forecourt

Iti-ibi(-iqer)'s tomb is not an isolated monument – cleaning work done in the forecourt exposed numerous shaft tombs respectively remains of such structures.¹ All in all 98 different loci were excavated, some of which reduced to mere traces of pits in the gebel surface, others still with intact architecture.² Shafts are ranging in depth between 1 m and 1.2 m, with a diameter of about 70 x 70 cm. At times a western extension at the base of the shaft served as a burial chamber. Not all of these shafts were finished; two of them were even found undisturbed, the sealings made of rocks and mud still intact. Inside each finished shaft was a single burial: the bodies, lying on their left side in a contracted position with their faces towards the east, i. e. the river resp. the city. The sexing determined that shafts F3 (N12.10), F5 (N13.4), F8 (N13.7), F10 (N12.13)³ were the final resting places of men, F4 (N12.11), F14 (N12.17) those of women whereas F7 (N13.6) contained the body of a child of about 6 years of age. Textile impressions preserved on lumps of mud indicate that the dead had been either enswathed in fabric or dressed in clothes prior to the burial. Furthermore, it appears that some of the bodies were laid on wooden frames; in the case of shaft F1 (N12.8), a reed box was employed as a coffin. The men buried in F5 (N13.4) and F8 (N13.7) were arranged like sleepers on their head rests. Grave goods were extremely rare: e. g. the deceased person in F14 (N12.17) was buried with only one pottery vessel.

Kilian delivers an overview of the grave goods of further shaft tombs in the area⁴ and an analysis of the ceramic material. Her thorough examination of the pottery indicates dates for those shaft tombs ranging from the late Old Kingdom to the Middle Kingdom. In summary, it seems plausible that some of the shaft tombs on step 7 are contemporary with the tomb-owner and can maybe be allotted to members of Iti-ibi(-iqer)'s extended household, so that in death as in life the clientel-patron relationship would persevere.

2.1.2 Individuals named in the tomb – subordinates and family

The information about the social networks Iti-ibi(-iqer) participated in is rather limited as he – at least to this day – is not known from other sources but his own tomb. In the inscriptions of his chapel, only a few individuals are mentioned by name.

1 A full publication of these complexes is in preparation by Meike Becker (working title: Shaft burials from step 7).

2 The following refers to KAHL, 2007b, 85, and KAHL/EL-KHADRAGY, 2009, 116 with fig. 2.

3 During excavation, the shafts were given temporary identifier 'F+x' and were re-named later on according to the grid system used by the Asyut Project, cf. the following concordance: F3 (N12.10), F5 (N13.4), F8 (N13.7), F10 (N12.13), F4 (N12.11), F14 (N12.17), F7 (N13.6), F1 (N12.8).

4 KILIAN, 2019, 39–51. Those being N13.11, N13.17, N13.18, N13.22, N13.28, N12.20, N13.44, N13.45.

Amongst those is one man called Wepwawet-nakht. He appears on the northern wall (NII.1.2, fig. 33, pl. 19) in a scene of cattle presentation. There, he is depicted in the uppermost register as he leads the parade of oxen and their handlers, being labelled as:

(1) *(i)m(.i)-r3 iḥ.wt Wp(i)-w3(i).wt-n[ḥ]t* (2) *ḥtm.t(i)-bit smr w^c(i).t(i) (i)m(.i)-r3 rw.t Wp(i)-w3(i).wt-nḥt.0*
 “(1) The overseer of fields, Wepwawet-na[kh]t, (2) the sealer of the biti-king⁵, the sole companion, the overseer of the gateway, Wepwawet-nakht.”

The last man in the same register is an “overseer of cattle” called Sedekh, *(i)m(.i)-[r3] iḥ.w Sdḥ* (cf. pl. 20).

Said Wepwawet-nakht re-appears on the western wall in the context of scenes with fighting bulls (WIX.1.3, fig. 40, pl. 85), where he is apparently depicted trying to restrain one of the vivacious animals. Another overseer referred to as *(i)m(.i)-r3 [...] [i] [...] Wp(i)-w3(i).wt-[m]-ḥ3.t [...] (cf. NI.2, fig. 32, pl. 29)* is rendered addressing men who deliver grain to a storage unit. It seems that the very same individual is mentioned in a scene with river-faring ships on the western side of NI.2 (below NII and NIII, cf. fig. 22, pl. 34). Above one of the ships, parts of a short inscription might read: *[(i)m(.i)-r3] [sn^c.w] [...] [N5/O49] [...] Wp(i)-w3(i).wt-[m]-ḥ3.t] “[The overseer of the store]house? [... of the] city? [...] Wepwawet-[em-hat] ...”⁶*

On the northern part of the western wall, male and female musical performers are pictured (WI.1–2). It seems likely that all those performers were mentioned by name, but only a few signs are preserved in case of the female musicians, whereas some names of their male counterparts can still be read, those being Iup, Senbi, Sa-Sobek and again Wepwawet-em-hat (fig. 35, pl. 37).

Equally, not much can be deduced from the family members featured in the tomb decoration. On the northern wall, Iti-ibi(-iqer)’s spouse is depicted with her name *Snb.ti-ikr.t*⁷ – “Senebti-iqeret” (NIII.1), preceded by the designation *ḥm.t=f* – “his wife” (NIII.1, NII.1.1; fig. 33, pls. 21, 24). On pillar A (eastern side), her title as priestess of Hathor, lady of Medjed,⁸ is preserved (cf. fig. 46, pl. 139). Another female relative, a lady named Iti-ibi(-iqeret) is pictured in an offering table scene on the western wall (WVII.2), designated with the epithet “beloved of Hathor”, albeit without the addition of “lady of Medjed” (cf. fig. 38, pl. 72). Her kinship relations to the tomb owner are not explicated, but taken into consideration that she is not labelled *ḥm.t=f*, like Senebti(-iqeret), Iti-ibi(-iqeret) might have been the nomarch’s mother. As it happens a similarly named individual occurs in the decoration of N12.1, the tomb of Khety II. This woman is identified as *ḥkr.t nsw w^c.tt ḥm(.t)-ntr Ḥw.t-Ḥr im3w.t=s n.t r^c nb im3ḥ.yt It(i=i)-ib(=i)* – “The sole ornamented one of the king, the priestess of Hathor, her well-disposed one of every day, the

5 For a discussion of the royal titulary commonly translated as “king of Lower Egypt” and new interpretation cf. KAHL, 2008b.

6 On the western wall (WIII.1.4) few traces of another inscription are preserved that read “...-m-hat”. The inscription is set above a scene with offering bearers and a person who carries a bowl functioning as an incense burner. Could that person be Wepwawet-em-hat?

7 The following *mz(i)[.t n?] K3.w=f* is not to be understood as “born of Kauef” but refers to the act that Senebti(-iqeret) is performing - she is extending a *mni.t*-necklace to her husband, thus the epithet is translated here as “who is offering (the merit) [for?] his Ka”. Cf. chapter 5.2, section NIII.1.

8 Cf. KAHL, 2018, 51.

honored one, Iti-ibi”.⁹ Even though Iti-ibi-(i)qer/(i)qeret) was obviously a popular name amongst the local elite, it is plausible to consider that Khety II, whose image was integrated prominently in the decoration of N13.1, visually spelling out its owner’s position as a legitimate heir in a longer line of predecessors respectively ancestors, could have been Iti-ibi-(i)qer’s father and that the lady Iti-ibi-(i)qeret) was thus depicted in both tomb chapels in her roles as wife respectively mother.

On the southern wall, the tomb owner is shown while spearing fish accompanied by two ladies: one is called “the sister, whom he loves, whom he favors every day” and seems to have the name “Sat-Hathor, [born by] Iti-ibi-iqeret”, but see the discussion on the phrase in chapter 5.4 (SIII.1, line 7); the other one might be a daughter whose name is lost.

While three or possibly four female relatives are mentioned resp. depicted in the tomb, only one male relative appears: The inscription on the northern wall (NIII.1; pls. 24, 25) states clearly that the tomb was prepared for Iti-ibi-(i)qer) by his eldest son and heir, the “hereditary prince”, “count”, “overseer of the priests of Wepwawet, lord of Asyut”, “overseer of the priests of Anubis, lord of Ra-qereret”, Mesehti-(i)qer). As Mesehti is a rare name amongst Siutian nomarchs,¹⁰ it is not overstretching the evidence to suggest that the son and the namesake local officeholder, known for his coffin ensemble and model soldiers,¹¹ might be the same person. The inscription in section NIII states:

“(1) That what he did as his monument, namely a tomb for his father, the count, the overseer of priests, Iti-ibi. It is his eldest son, his beloved, his heir, the possessor of all his possessions, the count, the overseer of priests

(2) of Wepwawet, lord of Asyut, and Anubis, lord of Ra-qereret, the hearer of that which one alone hears in the [palace], the true [overseer] of priests of Wepwawet, Mesehti-iqer.”

As a matter of fact, Mesehti features prominently in the representations and the inscriptions. On the north wall his image is placed right behind his father’s. Though his figure is shown at a smaller scale, he is shown holding the same regalia as Iti-ibi-(i)qer) – staff and scepter (NI.1, pl. 15, fig. 32). Arguably the most eye-catching inscription stretching over the top of the western wall is composed as Mesehti’s statement, starting with his titles and ending in his direct speech (figs. 40 and 34):

1) (i)r(i)-p^c(w.t) ḥ3.t(i)-c.w ḥtm(.ti)-bit s[mr] w^c(i).t(i) (i)m(.i)-r3 ḥm(w) ntr n(i.w) Wp(i)-[w3](i).wt nb Z3.w.t(i) im(.i)-r3 ḥm(w) ntr n(i.w) (In)pw nb R3-ḳrr.t ḥr(i)-s:št3 n(i) s:ḏw.ti-ntr ḥ3.t(i)-c.w [...] ḥm(w) [ntr] Mzh.ti dd ...

“(1) The hereditary prince, the count, the sealer of the biti-king, the sole companion, the overseer of the priests of Wepwawet, lord of Asyut, the overseer of the priests of Anubis, lord of Raqereret, privy to the secret of the god’s treasure,¹² the count ... the priest Mesehti, says: ... (unclear text)”

⁹ EL-KHADRAGY, 2008, fig. 2; GRIFFITH, 1889, pl. 13, 38–40, inscription in tomb Siût IV [38–40]. As Fischer already observed, personal names can at times be augmented by the epithet at (FISCHER, 1961b, 59). Both FISCHER, 1968, 130–131, n. 576, and BROVARSKI, 1985, 134, discuss the possibility that an additional *ikr* after personal names acted as a posthumous distinction during the Heracleopolitan Period and the Eleventh Dynasty, see here footnote 13.

¹⁰ However, the name does appear for other individuals who were not holders of said office, cf. ZITMAN, 2010b, 180–182.

¹¹ CG 257/JE 30969 and CG 258/JE 30986.

¹² Cf. JONES, 2000a, 638–639 [2340].

Also on the western wall, above the register WI.1, a double line of inscription names not the tomb owner but Mesehti with his titles (fig. 35). Even the line superscribing the back wall of the niche is all about him (WV-WVII, fig. 38). In the scene of catching birds in a clap net in the company of the goddess Sekhet on the southern wall (SII, fig. 42), albeit just showing the likeness of Iti-ibi(-iqer), Mesehti is present in writing.

2.2 The tomb owner in his historical setting

2.2.1 Sequence of local nomarchs

Finding Tomb N13.1 also meant the discovery of a hitherto unknown Siutian nomarch, *ʿIt(=i)-ib(=i)-(i)kr*, Iti-ibi(-iqer),¹³ and the necessity to integrate this individual into the historical framework already established for ancient Asyut.

The titles he bore according to the inscriptions present him as an *(i)r(i)-p^c(w.t) ḥ3.t(i)-^cw*, “overseer of the priests of Wepwawet, Lord of Asyut”, “overseer of the priests of Anubis, Lord of Ra-qereret”, “overseer of the army of the whole 13th Upper Egyptian nome”.

As mentioned above, the tomb decoration puts Iti-ibi(-iqer) in connection with the nomarch Khety(-iqer), depicted on the southern wall, with the former facing the latter in veneration (fig. 28, fig. 41, pls. 94–95). It stands to reason that Khety(-iqer) was the predecessor in office of Iti-ibi(-iqer). As stated elsewhere before, of the two individuals named Khety, known as local nomarchs in the First Intermediate Period, Khety II (Tomb IV; N12.2) is the more likely candidate to have been pictured in N13.1.¹⁴ While Khety I (Tomb V; M11.1) seemingly had a peaceful governorship,¹⁵ the biographical text of Khety II describes him as an ally to the Heracleopolitan king Merikare, fighting a military campaign against Theban forces.¹⁶ In his tomb chapel, the southern wall features a scene of marching soldiers, and obviously the topic of military conflict was already visualized in the tomb of Khety II’s own predecessor, It-ibi (Tomb III; N12.1).¹⁷

As opposed to his apparent antecedent, Iti-ibi(-iqer) neither held the title *ḥr.i-tp 3 n šm^cw* “great overlord of Upper Egypt” nor *ḥr.i-tp 3 n Ndf.t* “great overlord of 13th Upper Egyptian Nome”,¹⁸ however he bore the military title of *(i)m(i)-r3 mš^c n(i) Ndf.t ḥnt.t mī-ḳd=š* – “the overseer of the troops of

13 The ‘iqer’ element is put in brackets as it is difficult to decide, if it is an integral part of a personal name or an epithet. Alexander Ilin-Tomich was so kind to point out the chronological implications of the element according to several studies: SCHENKEL, 1962, 76 gives evidence for the epithet *iḳr mš^c-ḥrw*, favoring a date for the documents he has analyzed in the First Intermediate Period resp. the Eleventh Dynasty. FREED, 1996, however, assumes a date for a stela with said epithet in the early Twelfth Dynasty. Cf. also POLOTSKY, 1964, 63–64 who studied the expression. Further examples of this epithet on stelae have been gathered by ROSATI, 2016; just like her, BROVARSKI, 1989, 239–241, note 275, prefers a chronological assignment for the objects in question in the early Middle Kingdom.

14 EL-KHADRAGY, 2012, 31–46; EL-KHADRAGY, 2007b, 114.

15 GRIFFITH, 1889, pl. 15 (line 1ff.); SCHENKEL, 1965, 71–74 [§57]. For Khety I’s efforts in developing the irrigation methods in Asyut, see: SCHENKEL, 1978, 29–35.

16 GRIFFITH, 1889, pl. 15, col. 9–19. For a detailed discussion of the biographical inscription of Khety II, see: EL-KHADRAGY, 2008.

17 EL-KHADRAGY, 2008, 226–229; fig. 4–5; pls. 3–4.

18 Cf. EL-KHADRAGY, 2008, 231.

the entire 13th Nome of Upper Egypt”, which obviously highlights the role he played in the war effort. And also the motif of marching troops ready for battle is still relevant for the tomb decoration, taking up most of the space of the southern part of the chapel’s eastern wall, with four registers of marching soldiers (EL.1.1–EL.1.5, fig. 30, pls. 118–124) and two registers on the northern wall (NII.1.4–5, fig. 22, pls. 21–22).

As for the tomb chapel of his presumed successor, Mesehti, it seems to have remained undecorated,¹⁹ however the military subject is realized three-dimensionally in the famous models of Egyptian spearmen and Nubian archers.²⁰

2.2.2 Approximation to a chronological placement of the tomb

Putting a precise date on Tomb N13.1 is not without challenge. At this point it seems to be prudent to review the facts at hand, keeping in mind that building and decorating Iti-ibi(-iqer)’s final resting place was an endeavor spanning a certain period of time.

The topographical setting as well as the architectural traits of the tomb suggest at least a somewhat limited time frame for its chronological placement. The tomb is situated high up in the seventh geological step of the gebel; in comparison, the tombs of several nomarchs, those being M11.1 (Tomb V) of Khety I, N12.1, also known as Tomb III of Iti-ibi, as well as N12.2 (Tomb IV) of Khety II, all from the First Intermediate Period, were hewn into a lower layer (geological step 6), about half way up the desert mountain, so there is no immediate spatial proximity. N13.1’s architectural characteristics – that is to say it being a single-room chapel supported by pillars with a vertical shaft leading to the burial chamber – can be found amongst local tombs dating before respectively no later than the early Twelfth Dynasty, two obvious examples being the aforementioned N12.1/Tomb III of Iti-ibi and N12.2/Tomb IV of his presumed successor Khety II, both being considerably larger than N13.1.²¹

A first chronological assessment mainly based on the tomb’s decoration was presented by the author in his article in 2007.²² At the heart of the then proposed line of argument was the commemoration scene visualizing the connection between Iti-ibi(-iqer) and the First Intermediate Period Siutian nomarch Khety II with the latter being the former’s predecessor and possibly father.²³ It was deemed highly unlikely that a Siutian nomarch serving under Mentuhotep II Nebhepetre in a reunited Egypt would have a veneration scene in his tomb featuring the previous office holder and ally to the Heracleopolitan king Merikare.

19 The tomb could be re-identified in the year 2017 by the Asyut Project and has been given the designation K11.3, cf. KAHL, 2019, 29–32.

20 Cairo CG 258 and 257.

21 Cf. N12.1/Tomb III of Iti-ibi: KAHL et al., 2006, 243–244, fig. 2; EL-KHADRAGY, 2006, 83, fig. 2 for N12.2/Tomb IV of Khety II.

22 EL-KHADRAGY, 2007b, 116–119.

23 EL-KHADRAGY, 2007b, 117.

Other elements of the decoration have chronological implications, e. g. the zigzag-frieze that tops the wall scenes is pointing towards a relatively early date as it was commonly replaced by a combination of kheker-frieze and banded frieze in provincial tomb-chapels during the Middle Kingdom.²⁴

The long-stemmed water lily flower that Iti-ibi(-i-*qer*)'s wife raises to her nose on the northern wall, has parallels from the Eleventh Dynasty.²⁵ In the same image, she is holding an *ꜥnh*-emblem in the right hand which is not attested for non-royal individuals before the late First Intermediate Period and again in the late Eleventh Dynasty resp. the later Middle Kingdom.²⁶

In the meantime, new observations have been made during recent fieldwork, leading to a better understanding of the chronological placement of the tomb itself: While in the above mentioned article from 2007, evidence is stressed that dates Iti-ibi(-i-*qer*) into the First Intermediate Period prior to the Theban conquest,²⁷ the find of Theban pottery and the canon of proportions used in his tomb indicate that the nomarch might have still lived during the transition from the First Intermediate Period to the Middle Kingdom;²⁸ to be precise: it is the changes in the canon of proportions compared to earlier tombs and especially the discovery of pottery made of Theban marl clay²⁹ that plausibly point towards a scenario in which Iti-ibi(-i-*qer*)'s burial took place during the time when the Theban party already governed Asyut.³⁰ If by then Mentuhotep II was already king of Egypt or still fighting against Heracleopolis cannot be determined. Therefore, Tomb N13.1 can be dated to a time span starting immediately before the unification of the empire, that means before the 13th regnal year of King Mentuhotep II and ending at the very beginning of his rule over all of Egypt.³¹ If we take Mesehti's statement that it was him who prepared the tomb for his father Iti-ibi(-i-*qer*)³² at face value, we might have an explanation for the modest size of the monument as well as why the decoration was executed not in time consuming relief but in painting. The fact that Theban pottery and a different canon of proportions can be observed as an interesting facette to the discussion if and how historical respectively political events cause or better are reflected by change in material culture. The case at hand points towards an almost immediate flow of commodities and specialized knowledge from the Theban side with the Siutian receiving and adapting both.

The discovery of Tomb N13.1 in particular and the work of the Asyut Project in general contributed to plausibly establish the relative sequence of Siutian nomarchs³³ (tab. 1) extended now by Iti-ibi(-i-*qer*), while the question of his and Mesehti's correlation with greater historical events like the defeat and conquest of Asyut by Theban forces under Mentuhotep II and the reunification of Egypt under the

24 Cf. BLACKMAN, 1915a, pl. 10; BLACKMAN/APTED, 1953b, pls. 13, 15–17, 19; DAVIES/GARDINER, 1920, pls. 4, 15, 31–33; NEWBERRY, 1893a, pls. 11–20, 29–30, 32, 34–37; NEWBERRY, 1893b, pls. 4–5, 7, 11–17; GRIFFITH/NEWBERRY, 1895, pl. 11. For a First Intermediate Period example associating the kheker-frieze with the banded frieze at Asyut in the chapel of Khety II see: EL-KHADRAGY, 2008, 221, 226, figs. 1–5.

25 BROVARSKI, 1989, 236–237.

26 FISCHER, 1973, 23–24, nn. 31, 33.

27 EL-KHADRAGY, 2007b, 117–119.

28 KAHL, 2013, 141–146.

29 KAHL, 2016, 35.

30 Cf. also KAHL, 2019, 27.

31 GESTERMANN, 2008, 1–15.

32 Cf. the inscription in section NIII.

33 Cf. EL-KHADRAGY, 2012, *passim*, KAHL, 2012, 170, fig. 5; KAHL, 2019, 33–34.

same king remains.³⁴ Another interesting question is that of the succession of the influential office of the nomarch after Mesehti and whether the owner of the Northern Soldiers-Tomb (H11.1), and Anu (the location of whose tomb is unknown) represent a new line of office-holders or descended from the same family.³⁵

Table 1: Sequence of Siutian Nomarchs in the First Intermediate Period (adapted from KAHL, 2019, fig. 12)

Tomb	Localization	Tomb owner	Most important titles	Dating
Tomb V (M11.1)	Step 6	Khety I	Count, overseer of priests of Wepwawet, overseer of priests of Anubis, overseer of priests of Osiris	First Intermediate Period
Tomb III (N12.1)	Step 6	Iti-ibi	Count, overseer of priests of Wepwawet, overseer of priests of Anubis	First Intermediate Period
Tomb IV (N12.2)	Step 6	Khety II	Great Overlord of the 13 th Nome of Upper Egypt, count, overseer of priests of Wepwawet, overseer of priests of Anubis	Merikare/First Intermediate Period
Tomb N13.1	Step 7	Iti-ibi(-iqer)	Overseer of troops of the whole 13 th Nome of Upper Egypt, overseer of priests	Time of the conquest of Asyut by Mentuhotep II Nebhepetre (11 th Dyn.)
Tomb K11.3 (Hogarth Tomb 3)	Step 8	Mesehti	Count, overseer of priests of Wepwawet, overseer of priests of Anubis	Mentuhotep II Nebhepetre (11 th Dyn.)
Tomb M10.1	Step 6	?		First Intermediate Period – early 12 th Dyn. (a more precise date is not possible at this point)
Tomb H11.1 (Northern Soldiers-Tomb)	Step 6	?		11 th Dyn.
Tomb I10.1	Step 6	?		End of 11 th Dyn./beginning of 12 th Dyn.
Tomb of Anu	Localization unclear (possibly Tomb I10.1 or H11.1)	Anu	Count, overseer of priests of Wepwawet	Beginning of 12 th Dyn.

³⁴ Cf. KAHL, 2019, 36–37 for an overview of nomarchs and historical events.

³⁵ Concerning Anu cf. ROCCATI, 1974, 43; furthermore cf. EL-KHADRAGY, 2012, 31–46; ABDELRAHIEM, 2020, 46–47.

3. Architectural features

The facade of Tomb N13.1 is partly smoothed, the area around the door is set back slightly. It seems the front was not finished as a lot of the natural rock surface seems untouched, however the floor of the dromos leading to the doorway is hewn out well (pl. 2a) and it is conceivable that it once was part of a causeway. In later times, quarrying activities encroached upon the tomb destroying pharaonic structures and changing the gebel's surface to such an extent that the original approach can be reconstructed but in a rather general manner.¹

Nowadays secured by a modern metal door, an entrance passage of 1.40 m length provides access to the tomb. At its end, a number of different features chiseled into the stone indicate that a large wooden door was once used to close the entry way (pl. 4b). The upper hinge of the door had to be put into a pivot hole in the ceiling first; the lower hinge was then set into the ground, being led through a rectangular hollow in the floor, into another, larger pivot hole. After the door was inserted, these structures in the ground could be covered to make them traversable. With the door stop inside the tomb, the open door would swing inward and instead of using a raised threshold and a lowered top jamb the stone masons had sunk shallow square recesses into the room's ceiling as well as the floor thus providing the edges against which the door would close as well as the necessary space within which the door leaf could be moved (cf. fig. 3).²

The tomb chapel of N13.1 consists of one trapezoidal hall with a niche in the middle of the back i. e. western wall. The width of the floor increases from 7.60 m at the eastern i. e. entrance side to 9.25 m at the back of the room in the west, right in front of the niche (figs. 4, 6). The length of the hall is 8.40 m from the entrance to the niche, which itself is max. 2.25 m deep and raises the total extent of the tomb chapel to 10.65 m. The room is architecturally divided into three sections (pls. 5, 7): The first section right behind the entryway is approximately 3 m in height and ends with a three-stepped ledge, which lowers the ceiling of the section following. Very shallow vertical ledges on the northern and southern walls each emphasize the partition (pls. 15, 11). Two pillars are positioned right beneath the three-stepped ceiling ledge. The second section continues to the western wall, where the niche, with its further lowered ceiling, constitutes the third section. Besides the aforementioned shallow protrusions on the northern and southern walls, a larger vertical ledge can be found at the northern part of the western wall (pl. 10, 47) that is not repeated in the southern part.

From the floor of the tomb chapel three shafts cut into the rock lead to burial chambers: shaft 1 and 3 belonging to the original layout, shaft 2 which is actually rather a short slanting passage ending in a small chamber, being a later addition (figs. 7–12, pls. 8, 9).³

The ceiling is smoothed but undecorated (fig. 5). The floor is very irregular today, due to later modifications like holes and carvings and possibly also burial pits (figs. 4, 12; cf. pl. 9).

1 Cf. KAHL et al., 2008, 204.

2 Cf. KÖNIGSBERGER, 1936, and FISCHER, 1996.

3 Cf. chapter 6.

The bedrock is interspersed with nodules of siliceous limestone, which in places are jutting out of the decorated walls or pillars as they were supposedly too big for removal (cf. pls. 6, 9, 113). Elsewhere, spots where the plaster coating flaked off reveal that smaller nodules were indeed extracted, leaving roughly hewn holes in the walls that were subsequently filled with plaster to smooth the surfaces (cf. pl. 107). A large crevice pervades the front section of the tomb, including the ceiling, the northern and southern wall, as well as the floor and the walls of shaft 3 (pls. 12b, 93). It is filled with soft, red-brown *tafl* which has crumbled in large parts, causing the decorated plaster that once covered it to chip off (figs. 3, 5, 9–12).⁴

⁴ Cf. also the architectural descriptions by KILIAN, 2019, 17–19, and VERHOEVEN, 2020, 3–4.

4. Coloring and execution of the decoration

The walls and the sides of the two pillars are coated with a thin layer of gypsum-plaster, on which all the inscriptions and representations were applied with paint. Although most scenes are quite severely damaged with the surface scratched, pecked out or covered with paint in Islamic times, plenty remains to identify the themes of decoration and the associated inscriptions. There is no evidence that the long lines were made with the help of a long line doused in pigment and then snapped against the wall. Instead of this kind of chalk line an instrument like a ruler must have been used.















It should be pointed out that when colors are described in the publication at hand, it is based on their appearance in the 21st century CE after having undergone multiple processes of aging over the millennia. While some colors seem basically unchanged in spite of having been exposed to pollution, water damage etc., others were obviously impacted by environmental factors. It is often difficult to determine if the hues that can be observed today are the result of darkening or fading. The creamy beige color of the gypsum plaster was probably a shining white when Iti-ibi(-iqer)'s funeral took place, and it is highly doubtful that a number of men were originally depicted with blond hair.

4.1 Colors of hieroglyphs














Red-brown, blue and yellow are used for the polychrome hieroglyphic inscriptions with outlines drawn in black (cf. e. g. pl. 149).
















The hieroglyphs listed in the extensive table below follow the sequence of the Gardiner Sign-list. Their coloring is described and their location on the wall given (e. g. SII = southern wall, section SII; BE = pillar B, eastern wall). Included are all signs in the polychrome inscriptions, excluded are the ones of small scene captions and of the offering lists, as they are unexceptionally executed in blue color with black outlines. On the northern wall, section NII, there are a few inscriptions with characters somewhat smaller than the ones of the large texts heading the registers, but still bigger than the hieroglyphs of the blue and black captions. Their coloring often varies from that of the large signs. In the given table they are marked for easy identification and possible distinction of different coloring conventions. "NII (b)" thus means hieroglyphs from the big inscriptions, "NII (m)" the middle-sized polychrome signs.

"W line" denotes the signs of the long inscription line on the west wall, reaching from WIX over the niche until WIII.














Gardiner Sign-list	Sign	Color	Location
(A12) A211 (<i>JSešb</i>) ^a		blue hair, red body, colorless kilt, black weapons ? gray/black hair, red skin, colorless kilt, black weapon, yellow object	NII, WIX SII
A19		red body, blue hair, colorless kilt	NIII
(A21) A147 (<i>VisualGlyph</i>)		red body, blue hair, colorless kilt red skin, colorless kilt, hair not preserved red skin, colorless kilt + hair	NII (m) BS BE
A25		skin + stick red, colorless kilt, hair not preserved	SII
A40		yellow, blue hair and beard yellow, blue hair, black beard yellow, blue hair, colorless face, black beard	NII (b) NII (m) BS
A50		red, blue hair, black beard, yellow chair yellow, blue hair?	NIII NII (b)
A84		red body, colorless kilt, hair not preserved	BS
B1		yellow yellow, blue hair	BE BS
D1		red skin, hair not preserved red skin, blue hair, no beard yellow skin, blue hair	SI SII BN, BE
D2		red, blue hair yellow, blue hair	SII W line, WI
D3		blue	AS
D4		blue yellow, black pupil	NIII, W line, WI, WIX NII (b)
D21		blue red	NII (m) NII (b, m), NIII, W line, WI, WIII, WIX, SI, SIL, SIII, AN, AS, AE, AW, BN, BS, BE, BW
D28		red yellow	NIII, WIX, SIII NII (b), WIII, AE, BS

^a The soldier ideogram/determinative in our three examples NII, WIX and SII is shown standing and holding an ax supported over one of his shoulders, while the soldier's other hand of SII holds a shield, the object held in the other hands of NII and WIX is not clear. Such palaeographic feature of the standing soldier ideogram/determinative is consistent with the other provincial inscriptions dated to the First Intermediate Period at Asyut, Dendera, Naga ed-Dêr and Deir el-Bersheh (cf. GRIFFITH, 1889, pls. 11: 7, 10, 16, 34 (Tomb III), 14: 48 (Tomb IV), 15: 17 (Tomb V); FISCHER, 1968, 138; BROVARSKI, 1989, 268–70, fig.20; GRIFFITH/NEWBERRY, 1895, pl. 13: 15, respectively).

















Gardiner Sign-list	Sign	Color	Location
D36		red yellow	NII (b), NIII, W line, WI, WIII, WIX, SI, SII, SIII, AN, AS, AE, AW, BN, BS, BE, BW W line, BE
D40		red	BS
(D45) D140 (<i>VisualGlyph</i>)		red	NII
D46		red	NII (b, m), NIII, W line, WI, AS, AE, BN
D52		red yellow	W line WIX
D54		yellow	AS
D58		red yellow	NII (b, m), NIII, W line, WI, SII, AS, AE, BN, BS, BE SII
E1		yellow	NII (b), WIX
E9		yellow	NIII, W line
E16		blue blue jackal, yellow shrine blue jackal, red shrine	NII (b), SI, SIII NII (b), NIII, W line, WIII, AN, AS W line, WIX
E23		yellow, blue face	NII (m)
E153 (<i>VisualGlyph</i>)		blue jackal + uraeus, red standard + base blue jackal + uraeus, red standard base, black standard blue jackal + uraeus, red standard base, blue standard blue jackal + uraeus, red standard, colorless horizontal element blue jackal + uraeus, colorless standard, base at the front, standard destroyed blue, standard colorless blue, red standard base	NII (b), SIII NII (b), NIII, WI, SII WIX W line NII (b) AN AS
F1		red yellow	WIII NII (b)














Gardiner Sign-list	Sign	Color	Location
F4		red legs, blue head and mane yellow legs, blue head and mane	NII (b), AE NII (b), NIII, W line, WI, WIII, WIX, SI, SII, SIII, AN, AS, AW, BN, BS
F13		blue yellow	NII (m), AS NII (b, m), NIII, W line, WIII, WIX, SI, SII, SIII, AN, BS
F21		yellow	NIII, WI
F32		yellow	SI
F34		red yellow	NII (b), AE NIII, WIII, SI, SII, SIII, AN, AS, BN, BS, BE, BW
F35		yellow	WI, WIX, SII
F39		blue red yellow	AS SIII, BE NII (b), W line, WIX, SIII, AN, AE, BS
F44		yellow	NIII, W line
G1		blue yellow	NII (m) NII (b, m), W line, WI, WIX, SII, BS, BE
G4		yellow	NII (b)?
G5		yellow, blue wing and head	NI
G7		yellow, blue wings, head not preserved	AS
G17		blue yellow, colorless front yellow, blue wing	NII (m) NII (b, m), NIII, W line, WI, WIII, WIX, SI, SII, SIII, AN, AS, AE, AW, BN, BS, BE, BW SII
G25 ^b		yellow	WI
G29		yellow	NII (m)



















^b Cf. POLOTSKY, 1929, 10.

Gardiner Sign-list	Sign	Color	Location
G38		yellow	SII
G39		yellow yellow, blue wing yellow, blue wing + tail feathers yellow, blue wing + head yellow, colorless detail wing	NII (b), SII, SIII, AN, AS NII (b), NIII, W line, WI, WIII, SII, SIII NIII SIII BS
G40		yellow	BN
G43		yellow, blue legs yellow	NIII NII (b), NIII, W line, WIII, SII, SIII, AN, AS, AE, BN, BS, BE
H1		yellow	NII (b), WIII
I9		yellow yellow, colorless details	NII (b, m), NIII, W line, WIII, SI, SII, SIII, AN, AS, AE, BN, BE, BW AN
I10		yellow	W line, WI, BS, BE
K4		yellow	BS
K5		yellow red tailfin, head destroyed	SII SIII
L2		red body + head, yellow wings + legs yellow yellow, red zigzag on body yellow, red head, red zigzag on body yellow, blue legs	NII (b) WIII, SI, SII, SIII, AN, AS, AW, BS NII (m), W line, WIX SIII BN
M1		blue yellow	BE NII (b), BS
M1, I9, X1		yellow	NII (b)
M3		blue yellow	NII (m) NII (m), SII
















Gardiner Sign-list	Sign	Color	Location
M12		yellow	WIII
M13		yellow	BS
M17		blue blue with yellow stem yellow with blue stem	NII (b), SI, SII, SIII, AN, AS, BN, BE NII (b), NIII, W line, WI, WIII, WIX, SII, SIII, AS, AE, BS, BE AS
M21		yellow, blue inflorescence yellow, inflorescence +details below base blue	WIX, SII SII
M23		blue yellow	NII (b), W line, SIII AN, BN
M26		blue yellow	BS AN
M40		yellow yellow scroll, colorless rope, red ribbon	NIII, W line AS
M42		yellow	W line, SIII
N5		yellow red circle, yellow dot	NII (m), NIII, SII, SIII, AN AE
N16		yellow	NII (b), SI, AS, BE
N21		blue yellow	NII (m) NII (b), BN
N24		yellow	AS
N25		yellow	AS
N26		yellow	NII (b, m)
N29		red yellow	WI NII (b), NIII, W line, WIII, WIX, SI, SII, SIII, AS, AE, BN, BS
N31		blue yellow yellow, colorless lower shrub	NII (m), AS NII (b, m), NIII, W line, WI, WIII, SI, SII, SIII, AE, BS WIX, AN

Gardiner Sign-list	Sign	Color	Location
N35		black blue gray colorless	SI, SII NII (b, m), NIII, W line, WI, WIII, WIX, SII, SIII, AS, BN AN AS, AE, BS, BE
N37		blue	WI
N38		blue inside, yellow outside	NIII, W line, SII
(N42)		yellow	NII (m), NIII
O1		red yellow	NII (b) NIII, W line, WI, SIII, AS
O2		yellow	BN
O4		yellow	AN
O6 + I10		yellow	SII
O10		blue frame, yellow bird, blue wing yellow frame (?), yellow bird, blue wing yellow frame, yellow bird, blue wing + tail yellow frame, yellow bird, blue head + wing	AE NIII, SIII SIII BE
O29		yellow	BE
O34		red	NII (b, m), NIII, W line, WI, WIII, SI, SII, SIII, AN, AS, AE, BS, BE
O49		red yellow	W line NII (b), NIII, W line, WI, WIII, SI, SII, SIII, AS, AE
O51		yellow	BN
O70 (<i>VisualGlyph</i>)		yellow	NII (b)
P8		red yellow	SIII SI
Q1		yellow	NII (b), AS, AW

Gardiner Sign-list	Sign	Color	Location
Q3		blue blue, frame + inner line yellow yellow yellow, frame + inner line colorless yellow, frame + inner line blue	NII (b), WI, SI, SIII, AN, AS, BE AN NII (b), NIII, W line, WI, WIII, WIX, SII, SIII, AE, AW, BN, BS, BE AN AS
R4		yellow	NII (b)
R8		blue	NII (b), NIII, W line, WI, WIII, WIX, SI, SIII, AN, AS, BN, BS, BE
R11		red	NII (b)
S19		blue yellow	BN NII (b, m), W line, WI, WIII, WIX, SI, SII, SIII, AN, AS, AW, BS
S21		red yellow yellow, filled with yellow	WIX NII (b), W line, WIII, SIII, AS AN
S29		red (mostly inversed)	NII (b, m), NIII, W line, WI, WIII, WIX, SI, SII, SIII, AN, AS, AE, AW, BN, BS, BE, BW
(S29+V6) V105 (<i>VisualGlyph</i>)		yellow	BS (used for S28 )
S34		yellow	BS
T14, mirrored		yellow	W line
T18		blue	AS
T21		red yellow yellow, red barb yellow, blue barb	BN NII (m), NIII, W line, WI, WIII, WIX, SI, SIII, AN, AS, AW, BS NII (b) BW



Gardiner Sign-list	Sign	Color	Location
T22		blue	SIII
(T26) U145 var. (<i>VisualGlyph</i>)		yellow	SII
T28		yellow	SIII, AN, AE, BS
U1		red yellow	NII (b) NII (b), NIII, W line, WI, WIX, SI, SIII, AN, AS, AE, BN, BS, BE
U6		red yellow	NII (b) NII (m), NIII, W line, SI, SII, SIII, AS, AE, BN, BS, BE
U13		yellow	BS
U15		yellow	W line (inversed)
U17		pick red, ground grey/black	W line
U23		red red handle, yellow blade yellow	WI, WIII, WIX, SI, SII, SIII, AN, AS, AW, BN, BS, BW NII (b) NII (m)
U24 ^c	 var.	yellow	W line
U30		yellow	W line, WI
U33		red	BS
U36		blue	NII (b), NIII, W line, WIII, WIX, SI, SII, SIII, AN, AS, BS, BE
V4		blue yellow	AE SI, BN, BS
V5 var. (?)	 for:  (?)	blue outlines, yellow inside	BS
V13		yellow	W line, SII, BE
V22		yellow	NII (b), SII


^c Although deviated slightly from its normal shape, the stone-worker's drill ideogram (Gardiner Sign-list U24) still shows here all its main components; namely the upper handle, the two weighted stones at top, but too slenderized instead of being oval as usual, the crank drill and the drive rod driven into a stone vessel (cf. DRENKHAHN, 1976, 74, figs. 19, 23).








Gardiner Sign-list	Sign	Color	Location
V28		blue yellow	NII (m) NII (b, m), NIII, W line, WI, SI, SII (four loops), SIII, AN, AS, AE, BN, BS, BE
V29		yellow	BE
V30		blue yellow	NII (b, m), NIII, W line, WI, WIII, WIX, SI, SII, SIII, AN, AS, AE, AW, BS, BE SI, AS
V31		red	SII, BS
(W11)		yellow	W line
W14		blue blue top, yellow body yellow	AN NIII, AS, AE SIII
W16		yellow	BN
W18		yellow yellow bottles with blue top and stand yellow bottles with blue top, stand unclear	BN NII (b) AE
W19		red yellow + black, layered upper part yellow, lower part red	NII (b) AS AE
(W22)	 var.	red yellow	WIII NII (b)
W24		yellow	NIII, BN
W25		yellow	SII
X1		blue red yellow	NII (m), WIX, SI, SII, AN, AE, AW, BN, BS, BE, BW NII (b) NII (b, m), NIII, W line, WI, WIII, WIX, SI, SII, SIII, AS, AE, BN, BE
X2		yellow	WIII
X8		yellow	NII (b), BE

Gardiner Sign-list	Sign	Color	Location
Y2		yellow	NIII, W line, AS, BS, BE
Y3		yellow	W line, AS
Y5		yellow	NIII, WIII, AS
Z1		blue red yellow	NII, SI, AS NII (b), AN, AE NII (b, m), NIII, W line, WI, WIII, WIX, SI, SII, SIII, AN, AS, AW, BN, BS, BE, BW
Z2		blue red yellow	NII (m) NII (b), AE NII (b, m), NIII, W line, WI, WIII, WIX, SI, SII, SIII, AN, AS, BS
Z3	⋮	red yellow	NII (b) NII (b, m)
Z11	⊕	red yellow	NII (b) BN
Aa1	⊙	blue yellow	NII (m) NII (m), W line, WI, WIII, WIX, SII, SIII, AE, BN, BS, BE
Aa11	<i>m3^c</i>	red	NIII
Aa12	<i>m3^c</i>	red yellow	NII (b), SI, SIII, AS NII (b), W line
Aa20	var.	yellow	SII
Aa23	var.	yellow	AE, BE
Aa28	var.	red yellow	NII (b) AS

Hieroglyphs showing persons or human body parts, like (A25), (D58) or (D36), are normally painted in red-brown following the skin coloring conventions. As could be expected, in N13.1 they mostly appear in a context with a male person. In very few cases, the sign, or rather, the skin is colored yellow when the text is mentioning a woman (only: A40 in NII (m), D28 in AE, D36 in BE, D58 in SII, W25 in SII), but this does not seem to be an unbreakable principle:

e. g. in the columns mentioning Iti-ibi(-iqer)'s wife Senebti on AE, D28  is yellow but D58  is red-brown, showing the inconsistencies.





Another example is sign D52  which appears in red-brown (W line) as well as in yellow (WIX.1.1) demonstrating that – at least in this tomb – the choice of color for signs of body part shape does not depend on the gender of the named person or the content of the text.

There seems to be some interchangeability between blue and black – blue is often used instead of black, e. g. the jackals of E16  and E153  are blue, hair  (D3) and hair of anthropomorphic signs (e. g. D1 ) is mostly blue as well. The water line (N35 ) in fact can be painted black instead of blue (cf. e. g. SII). Blue also is used for elements that one would expect to be colored green, as e. g. M1  or M17 , a phenomenon that can also be seen in the rest of the decoration of N13.1, with only a few exemptions¹.

In quite a number of cases, the fungibility of yellow and blue occurs, (keeping in mind that in some examples blue might have been regarded as equal to green). Also, red-brown and yellow were regularly exchanged.²















4.2 Anomalies in the orientation of signs

A number of hieroglyphic signs are written retrogradely, some with an obvious regularity, others only sporadically. The following list shows the signs, their actual orientation as well as the reading direction of the text. Their position in the inscriptions of the tombs is listed, as well as the number of the respective signs in the column/line which are actually retrograde.

Gardiner	Depiction	Instead of	Position	Reading direction text	Frequency
S29			NIII, line 2	←	2 of 2
			WI, lines 1+2	←	5 of 5
			WIII.1.1	←	1 of 1
WIX.1.1, dogs			→	2 of 2	
SII, line 1			→	1 of 2	
SII, line 3			→	1 of 1	
SII, line 5			→	1 of 1	
			AN, column 2	→	1 of 1

¹ Cf. chapter 4.3.

² This matches the conclusion of Schenkel, who has described these colors to be interchangeable: Green and blue can be exchanged, as well as yellow and red, as they were generally seen as cold and warm colors respectively, cf. SCHENKEL, 2015, 20. Exchanging yellow and blue (or green) as occurring in the hieroglyphs of N13.1 regularly, is not mentioned as constancy by Schenkel.

Gardiner	Depiction	Instead of	Position	Reading direction text	Frequency
M3			WIX.1.2, column	→	1 of 1
M26			BS, column 2	←	1 of 1
U6			NIII, line Senebti	→	1 of 1
			WIX.1.1, lower dog	→	1 of 1
			NIII, line 1	←	1 of 1
U15			W line	→	1 of 1
V4			SI, column Iti-ibi(-iqer)	→	1 of 1

The thought arises, that more than one artist wrote the inscriptions onto the tomb's walls and that possibly one of them can be linked to the occurrence of the retrograde signs. SIII, NIII and the small captions in WIX all show several cases of retrograde signs, conceivably, those areas were drawn by the same person. However other retrograde signs are distributed irregularly throughout the tomb's texts, prompting the question what caused this peculiarity – a flawed text template that was copied, a conscious choice or honest mistake by the executing artisan.

Fischer, discussing the reversal of individual hieroglyphs, describes an “occasional tendency to retain the prevalent rightward orientation for inscriptions that face left”.³ This might be an explanation for several of the signs in N13.1 appearing in texts written from left to right. However, this does not explain the retrograde hieroglyphs in text written from right to left. All in all, the number of examples for this phenomenon is rather small in N13.1, too small to elucidate possible underlying patterns.


The area WV–WVII features several lines and columns of hieroglyphs executed quite differently, being drawn with black outlines and details only, whereas the interior was not colored in but shows the beige background hue. Around the signs red-brown pigment was applied demarcating the margins of the inscription line (pl. 70). Smaller hieroglyphs used in the offering lists or as captions near several scenes, are held in blue with black outlines (cf. e. g. pl. 56). Lines framing the inscriptions are painted blue or black.

4.3 Colors of the representations

Red-brown paint is used for the skin of men and yellow for women's. Noteworthy is the blue painted skin of a fabulous creature in the hunting scene (SIII.2.2, pl. 106) and a similarly colored figure associated with the goddess Sekhet in the fowling scene (SII.2, left side, pl. 101).

The tree in the tree felling scene (SI.2, pl. 110), the stems of lotus flowers (e. g. SI.1, pl. 95) and of reed plants (on top of the offering tables, cf. e. g. pl. 62, as well as in most hieroglyphs) and also the small papyrus skiffs (e. g. SI.3, pl. 112) are painted blue instead of green. In these cases, it might be assumed that

³ FISCHER, 1977b, 112.

blue was regarded as an alternative to green paint.⁴ The color green itself is used in this tomb though, but only rarely. In SII.1 the inside of the net in the fowling scene is painted green (pl. 101). In the same scene, for the hieroglyphic sign  for “field”, *sh.t*, on top of the goddess Sekhet’s head, green is used for the spikelets (however the panicles are done in blue). A streamer hanging down from Sekhet’s fillet is colored green (pl. 98) in a technique that can also be observed on the western wall: WV.1 shows a vessel partly painted blue covered by yellow, which results in a green tone (pl. 68). In both cases, green seems to have been produced by layering blue and yellow on top of each other on the wall itself. Finally, parts of the plumage of the cranes in WI.3 (pls. 43, 44) appear slightly greenish in addition to the basic blue coloring, suggesting that a shade of green was somehow mixed in or overlaid.

The basic color palette used in Iti-ibi(-iqer)’s tomb – red-brown, blue, yellow and black – was completed in some scenes by different shades of coloring, apparently prepared by mixing the pigments at hand, and applied, for example to depictions of animals for a broader range of fur-colors and coat patterns (e. g. SIII.2.5, pl. 108) or images of boats and ships rendering the wooden hulls in a variety of hues (e. g. SI.3, pl. 111). There are a number of examples of a vermillion red, e. g. on the western wall (WIII.1.5, pl. 51), where it was used for the depiction of a clay jar, or for the column and line borders of the offering lists (pl. 53). The question arises if this intense orange was created with the same red pigment like the dark red-brown usually utilized in the tomb albeit in a lesser saturation resulting in a brighter hue.

The color black is well preserved in some places but has largely vanished in others.⁵ While in some scenes gray and not solid black was used on purpose, other scenes must have faded, turning the original dark paint a shade of gray or rose.

The walls are bordered at the top by a black line pattern of triangles and vertical strokes composing a zigzag-frieze, which in many parts, due to aging, has paled to different tinges of black or gray, being in some spots scarcely recognizable nowadays (cf. pl. 56). Underneath the zigzag-frieze, the walls are framed at the top as well as at the outermost sides by a banded frieze with oblong blocks of red-brown, blue and yellow paint. Between the colored blocks are narrow rectangles that were left blank and thus only show the tone of the wall plaster; all elements are outlined in black or, possibly intentionally, in gray⁶ (cf. pl. 44). On each wall the area of decoration is separated from the plain dado below by two painted horizontal bands, the upper one being red-brown, the lower one yellow, both have narrow black outlines. The socle area below these bands is plastered but undecorated (cf. pl. 28).

4 This phenomenon seems to be a local particularity as it can be observed in other tombs on the Gebel Asyut al-gharbi. For the exchangeability of colors, cf. SCHENKEL, 1963; especially for the substitutability of green and blue cf. SCHENKEL, 1963, 132; SCHENKEL, 2015, 23.

5 Cf. DAVIES, N. M., 1936, text, xlvi, where black is described as the color most likely to disappear on plaster. JAROŠ-DECKERT, 1984, 19, mentions the same problem for the black color in the tomb of Jnj-jtj.f in the Asasif.

6 Only the lower line framing the continuous horizontal inscription, running on top of WIX, going on above the niche and finishing atop WIII, is not black but blue in color, as are the borders of the vertical band on the northern side of WI.