

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MEMPHITE NECROPOLIS IN THE POST-AMARNA PERIOD

Jacobus van DIJK

The aim of the present contribution is to try to find an answer for the following basic question: Why is it that after the Amarna Period, under the reigns of Tutankhamen, Ay and Horemheb and under the earlier Ramessides, a number of the highest officials of the realm chose the necropolis of Memphis as their burial-ground? At first sight this may seem to be no problem at all, for it is often taken for granted that this suddenly increasing importance of the Memphite necropolis was caused by the transference of the royal residence to Memphis after the fall of Amarna. The *communis opinio* was neatly formulated in Jaromír Málek's recent article on the Saqqâra tomb of Heqama'atrê-neheh: "The decisive impetus for the large-scale building of free-standing relief-decorated tomb-chapels was provided by Tutankhamen's abandonment of Akhetaten in favour of Memphis early in his reign, around his regnal year 3"¹. This statement contains at least two presuppositions. In the first place it assumes that Tutankhamen did indeed move the court to Memphis, rather than to Thebes, and secondly it implies that it is the fact that a given city became the capital or residence of Egypt that accounts for the presence of tombs of persons belonging to the highest echelons of the administration in the necropolis of that city. Let us examine these two presuppositions more carefully.

The first concerns the location of the royal residence. That it was indeed Memphis that was given this honour after the abandonment of Amarna is not so evident as it may seem to be². The main argument in favour of Memphis is a passage in the Restoration Decree of Tutankhamen on a stela from Karnak and therefore depicting the king offering to the Theban gods Amun and Mut. According to this text the decree was issued from the Domain of 'Aakheperkarê³ which is almost certainly the foundation of Tuthmosis I in Memphis known from other sources. It seems certain, therefore, that Tutankhamen was staying at Memphis at the time the decree was proclaimed, but this does not necessarily imply that he was residing there permanently. Another argument adduced in favour of Memphis is precisely the

1. J. Málek, "The Tomb-chapel of Hekamaetre-neheh at Northern Saqqara", in *SAK* 12, 1985, 44.

2. See for the following remarks J. van Dijk-M. Eaton-Krauss, "Tutankhamun at Memphis", in *MDAIK* 42, 1986, 35-41.

3. *Urk.* IV, 2028, 7; 2031, 15.

presence of an extensive New Kingdom necropolis at Saqqâra, but since we are investigating the very reasons for this phenomenon here we will pass over this argument in silence. Those who choose the Theban option mainly refer to the numerous monuments of Tutankhamen at Thebes and the renewed prominence of its chief god Amun during his reign which is not in the last place evident from the name change from Tutankhaten to Tutankhamen. Also, there is some evidence to suggest Tutankhamen's presence in the former palace of Amenhotep III at Malqata⁴. Of course the large-scale building activities of Tutankhamen and Horemheb at Thebes can hardly be taken as a serious argument, for the extent of preservation of the great temples of Karnak is incomparably better than that of the temples of Memphis and a proper investigation of the vast Memphite temple complex has only just begun⁵. At present hardly any archaeological evidence can be produced to decide the question of the location of the residence in favour of Memphis. On the other hand, there is one important document which does not seem to have been taken into account by those who claim the residential status for Thebes. In the great Decree of Horemheb inscribed on a huge stela set up against the inner face of the Tenth Pylon at Karnak the king says that he travelled upstream (and downstream on the return journey) to Thebes to celebrate the annual Opet Feast⁶, thus implying that he resided elsewhere, which can have been hardly anywhere else than in Memphis. Moreover Horemheb expressly states that this custom of an annual journey to Thebes to celebrate the Opet Feast had existed since the reign of Tuthmosis III: "The travelling to and fro is that which exists since the time when Menkheperre' travelled [upstream and downstream] every year [...] on his journey to the City (i.e. Thebes)"⁷. From this text it would seem to be indisputable that the more or less permanent residence under the kings of the post-Amarna period was indeed Memphis, which city the king left for Thebes only on important religious occasions such as the celebration of the Opet Feast, and that this situation had already existed in the period before the Amarna interlude, during the reigns of Tuthmosis III, Amenhotep II, Tuthmosis IV and Amenhotep III. In other words, both the view that Tutankhamen returned to Thebes after the abandonment of Amarna and the view that he moved the residence from Thebes to Memphis are incorrect: in actual fact Tutankhamen *returned* to Memphis, thereby restoring it to the position it had already occupied before the Amarna Period. This is further corroborated by the well-known fact that it is from the reign of Tuthmosis III onwards that the office of the vizier is divided and given to two separate viziers, a northern vizier residing in Memphis and a southern one in Thebes⁸. This situation persisted under the successors of Tuthmosis III and under the Ramessides and is usually explained as a result of the transference of the royal residence and of a large part of the administration of the country to Memphis under Tuthmosis III⁹.

This brings us to the second presupposition we have detected earlier in this paper: for, if it is true that the residential status of a city implies that its necropolis is the place where the high-ranking officials of the civil and military administration were buried, one may well ask why there does not seem to be at Saqqâra a necropolis of high officials dating from the reigns of

4. Cf. van Dijk - Eaton-Krauss, *l.c.*, 35, n. 8.

5. D. G. Jeffreys, *The Survey of Memphis, Part I: The Archaeological Report*, London 1985, with a survey of earlier work done on the site on p. 11-16.

6. *Urk.* IV, 2150, 4ff. Cf. W. Helck, *Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reiches, Probleme der Ägyptologie* 3, Leiden-Köln 1958, p. 5; G. A. Gaballa - K. A. Kitchen, "The Festival of Sokar", in *Or.* 38, 1969, 28; J.-M. Kruchten, *Le Décret d'Horemheb*, Bruxelles 1981, p. 109-110.

7. *Urk.* IV, 2150, 7-9.

8. Helck, *o.c.*, p. 21-28.

9. E. Martin-Pardey, "Wesir, Wesirat", in *LdÄ* VI, 1228 with n. 22.

Tuthmosis III to Amenhotep III. Again, I believe that the said presupposition is incorrect, and that there is no *direct* connection between the residential status of a city and the prominence of its necropolis. It should be remembered that there exist at Saqqâra many tombs dating from the reign of Ramesses II (and not just from the earlier years of this king), who moved the residence and administrative centre to Pi-Ramesse. Particularly interesting in this respect is a group of tombs at Saqqâra belonging to a number of high officials of the Theban mortuary foundation of Ramesses II, the Ramesseum. These include Tia¹⁰, (another) Horemheb¹¹, Iurokhy¹², Yupa¹³, Ramessesnakht¹⁴, Amenemone¹⁵, and Nedjem¹⁶; all of them were *imy-r pr*, *imy-r pr wr* or *imy-r pr-ḥd* of the Temple of Userma'atrê-setepenrê in the Domain of Amun, i.e. the Theban Ramesseum. Unless one wants to assume that these officials had their offices in Memphis where they spent their lives signing documents and cutting through "red tape" while leaving the actual administration to their Theban subordinates, the presence of their tombs at Saqqâra is difficult to explain if a connection between the residence and the burial-ground of the high officials working in that residence is retained.

It would seem, therefore, that the situation is slightly more complicated. To begin with, a connection between the residence and the administrative centre is well established. In the words of Helck: "Wie im ältesten Zeit die ersten Beamten im Palast des Königs saßen und von da aus den königlichen Besitz verwalteten, so ist auch noch im Neuen Reich die königliche Residenz der Mittelpunkt der Verwaltung; wechselt ein König die Residenz, so gehen die hohen Verwaltungsgämter mit"¹⁷. It does not necessarily follow, however, that there is a similar connection between the residence and administrative centre on the one hand and the necropolis on the other. Such a connection exists only in appearance, because the king's own tomb and mortuary foundation were usually located near the royal residence. In the Old Kingdom the pyramid complex of the king was surrounded by the mastabas of the members of his family and of the officials of his administration, and the same situation continued to exist in later periods. When at the beginning of the 12th Dynasty Amenemhat I transferred the residence to Itj-Tawy he also built his pyramid there and the officials of his government built their mastabas around it, not so much because they lived and worked in Itj-Tawy, but first and foremost because their king was buried there. This may be the explanation for the absence of a major pre-Amarna necropolis at Saqqâra, for although the administrative centre was transferred with the residence to Memphis, the king still had his tomb and his main mortuary foundation on the Theban West bank, and consequently the officials of that period had their

10. G.T. Martin, "The Tomb of Tia and Tia: Preliminary Report on the Saqqâra Excavations, 1982", in *JEA* 69, 1983, 25-29; id., "The Tomb of Tia and Tia ... 1983", in *JEA* 70, 1984, 5-12.

11. Re-used blocks in the Monastery of Apa Jeremias, see PM III², 667-668.

12. PM III², 661.

13. Son of Iurokhy, see J. Ruffle-K.A. Kitchen, "The Family of Urhiya and Yupa, High Stewards of the Ramesseum", in *Glimpses of Ancient Egypt. Studies in Honour of H.W. Fairman*, Warminster 1979, p. 55-74; the presence of Yupa's tomb at Saqqâra is certain since a double seated statue and a few blocks from his tomb were discovered in the area to the north of the tomb of Tia (see a forthcoming note by the present writer).

14. There can be little doubt that a relief-block of this man in Brussels (E. 5183) comes from Saqqâra, see Kitchen, *RI* III, 198; J. Berlandini, "Varia Memphitica III", in *BIFAO* 79, 1979, 249-253, pl. 51. Fragments of an alabaster canopic jar of a Ramessesnakht (possibly the same man) were found in the surface debris above the tomb of Maya by the EES-Leiden Expedition in 1987.

15. Tomb found by an expedition of Cairo University immediately west of the Monastery of Apa Jeremias; cf. J. Leclant, "Fouilles et travaux en Égypte et au Soudan, 1976-1977", in *Or.* 47, 1978, 278.

16. See Kitchen, *RI* III, 199-202, for the monuments of this man; his canopic jars are from Saqqâra, see PM III², 771.

17. Helck, *o.c.*, p. 1.

tombs prepared on Theban soil too. The few funerary monuments of officials dating from the time of Amenhotep III which were found at Saqqâra may be exceptional; they seem to belong to persons working in the local rather than the national administration, or to the clergy of Ptah or the other Memphite divinities. In this connection it is interesting to note that even Menkheper, Mayor of Memphis under Amenhotep III appears to have had a (still undetected) tomb on the Theban West bank, for a massive doorjamb from his tomb was found reused as a doorsill in a Saite tomb in the 'Asâsîf and a statue of his was found at Deir el-Bahri¹⁸.

We may now return to our initial problem. We have seen that after the fall of Amarna, Tutankhamen restored Memphis to its position of royal residence and administrative centre of the land. But since Memphis had a similar status before the Amarna Period, this fact alone is insufficient to explain the sudden rise to glory of the Memphite necropolis. We have also seen that the connection between the location of the residence and the prominence of its necropolis should be replaced by a connection of the latter with the location of the royal tomb and mortuary temple. Thus we may re-formulate our initial question as follows: Why did the great officials of the administration in the post-Amarna period suddenly choose the Memphite necropolis for their interment, despite the fact that their king was buried in Thebes? This question contains in itself two components: firstly, why is it that for the first time in Egyptian history the tombs of the great officials of the realm were disassociated from the royal tomb, and secondly, why was the necropolis of Memphis chosen as the site of these private tombs?

The answer to the first question may be sought in the Amarna Period itself. The dissociation of royal and private tombs is a reaction to certain aspects of Akhenaten's doctrine. To be sure, the connection still existed at Amarna: royal tomb and private tombs were both located in the necropolis of the residence. The Amarna Period was only a short interlude and Akhenaten's attempt to impose his new religion on his subjects eventually failed. But for most Egyptians it had been a truly traumatic experience which did not fail to leave its marks on the period which followed. In a recent book on Egyptian religion Jan Assmann writes: "Ihre Folgen (...) kann man sich gar nicht tiefgreifend und umfassend genug vorstellen. Sie treten auf allen möglichen Gebieten zutage, so dass im ganzen gesehen der Übergang von der 18. zur 19. Dyn., der Ramessidenzeit, eine Epochenschwelle, vielleicht die tiefgreifendste der ägyptischen Geschichte überhaupt, darstellt"¹⁹. The religion of Ramesside Egypt, he writes, is a "new" religion too, it is the old religion «which under the enormous pressure of the Amarna Period has changed its structure. In this respect the Amarna Period is the prehistory of Ramesside religion. It has created the specific climate out of which the old religion could only emerge transformed into a new one". Of course we cannot deal with this transformation in detail here, but two aspects are of great importance for the problem we are discussing. In the first place the attitude of the Egyptians towards the king had changed. Before the Amarna Period the long history of Egyptian religion had seen a gradual development towards a more personal relationship between the gods and their individual worshippers. Akhenaten had tried to call this development to a halt and had proclaimed a god who could only be worshipped by his son, the king himself, whereas all individual, personal devotion had to be directed not to the god but exclusively to the king. "With this over-estimation of its religious function, kingship had lost its credibility", Assmann writes in the book we have already quoted; "Akhenaten had usurped the personal devotion of his subjects

18. W.C. Hayes, *The Scepter of Egypt*, II, New York 1959, p. 272.

19. J. Assmann, *Ägypten: Theologie und Frömmigkeit einer frühen Hochkultur*, Stuttgart 1984, p. 258.

by demanding a royal cult exclusively for himself, but in reaction to this the conception of god now incorporated many traditional aspects of kingship. 'God is king': the emphatic proclamation of god's kingship becomes a central theme in the hymns of the post-Amarna period²⁰. Akhenaten's doctrine had shown through even in the decoration of the private tombs of his subordinates, which is dominated by scenes of the royal family, and the sun-hymns traditionally found in New Kingdom tombs are replaced by hymns to the king, whereas the hymns to the Aten are not addressed to him by the tomb-owner but by the king. The reaction provoked by this over-emphasis on the king is illustrated in the Theban private tombs. The decoration of pre-Amarna tombs had often included a scene showing the tomb-owner offering flowers or other gifts to the king who is shown seated under a baldaquin²¹. After Akhenaten, however, even this traditional scene of the king receiving offerings has become "suspect", and is therefore replaced by a similar scene showing Osiris enthroned, a scene which now occupies the same location in the tomb that had originally been reserved for the king under the baldaquin²². I am convinced that the idea underlying this rejection of the importance of the living king for the deceased was also the decisive factor behind the dissociation of royal and private necropolis in the post-Amarna period.

That the necropolis of Memphis was chosen as the location of these independent, self-contained tombs is connected with another aspect of the religious innovation of the Amarna aftermath, viz. the much increased importance of the god Osiris. Again in reaction to Akhenaten's religion, which viewed life after death only in terms of a continued existence upon earth under the beneficial rays of the Aten in the presence of the king²³, and which did not provide a real alternative for the traditional belief in a hereafter, the role of Osiris becomes much more important in the period following Amarna. The solar interpretation of the mythology of Osiris now becomes a common theme in hymnical literature. Osiris is seen as the nocturnal manifestation of the Sun-god. Rē and Osiris are two mutually dependent aspects of the great universal god of the "new" post-Amarna religion and both gods assume a role of equal importance in the private tomb decoration²⁴. This new role of Osiris is linked up with another development which had become apparent in the royal mortuary cult in Thebes during the 18th Dynasty, viz. the growing importance of the cult of Ptah-Sokar-Osiris. The transference of the royal residence from Thebes to Memphis under Tuthmosis III coincides with the appearance of the Festival of Sokar in the Theban temples²⁵. In the Akh-menu built by Tuthmosis III in the eastern part of the temple of Karnak and dedicated to the ritual renewal of kingship, one of the two cult-"zones" is entirely dedicated to Sokar-Osiris, and in these rooms the funerary rites for the "dying" and "resurrected" king took place. Under Amenhotep III the cult of Ptah-Sokar-Osiris is, as far as we know, linked for the first time with the royal mortuary cult on the West bank. This king built an important "house for Ptah-Sokar-Osiris and his Ennead", either as a part of his vast funerary temple or as an adjunct to

20. Assmann, *o.c.*, p. 265.

21. M. Abdul-Qader Muhammed, *The Development of the Funerary Beliefs and Practices Displayed in the Private Tombs of the New Kingdom at Thebes*, Cairo 1966, p. 61-62; A. Radwan, *Die Darstellungen des regierenden Königs und seiner Familienangehörigen in den Privatgräbern der 18. Dynastie*, MÄS 21, Berlin 1969, p. 3-17; the last example of the king under the baldaquin is in Theban Tomb 40 (Huy), temp. Tutankhamen.

22. J. Assmann, *Das Grab des Basa (Nr. 389) in der thebanischen Nekropole*, AVDAIK 6, Mainz 1973, p. 31.

23. J. Assmann, "Totenkult, Totenglauben", in *LdÄ* VI, 670.

24. J. Assmann, *Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete*, Zürich-München 1975, p. 64-77; J. van Dijk, "The Symbolism of the Memphite Djed-Pillar", in *OMRO* 66, 1986, 7-20, and "An Early Hymn to Osiris as Nocturnal Manifestation of Re", in G.T. Martin, *The Memphite Tomb of Horemheb*, I, London 1988 (in the press).

25. Gaballa-Kitchen, *l.c.*, 26-32.

it²⁶, and this temple continued to be the centre of the cult of Sokar on the Theban West bank well into the Ramesside period. As Kitchen and Gaballa have noted in their study of the Festival of Sokar "the appearance of this phenomenon under Amenophis III coincides with other facets of this reign, for he is known to have favoured both Memphis and its cults; one of his sons, the prince Thutmose, was even High Priest of Ptah in Memphis for a time. Therefore, a further importation of Memphite cultic usage into the Thebaid is certainly in character with this reign (...)"²⁷. Among this cultic usage is also the Ritual of Erecting Djed-Shepsy. The rite may have originated in Busiris in the Delta, but already in the Old Kingdom Djed-Shepsy is well-known as a Memphite deity connected with both Ptah and Sokar. The first attestation of the Ritual of Erecting Djed-Shepsy on Theban soil is precisely under Amenhotep III, in the tomb of Kheruef²⁸; the djed is identified as the Djed-Shepsy of Ptah-Sokar-Osiris and the rite, which is given a solar interpretation, is carried out in the presence of the Sem-priest and the High Priest of Ptah, thus further stressing its Memphite character. Another rite which may have been imported from Memphite cultic practices is the Breaking of the Red Pots, also attested for the first time in a temple ritual under Amenhotep III²⁹. Under the Ramessides Sokar and Sokarian rites continued to be of central importance in the Theban mortuary temples, being well attested in those of Seti I at Qurna, Ramesses II — the Ramesseum — and Ramesses III at Medinet Habu, as well as in the great temples of Seti I and Ramesses II at Abydos. In short, from the second half of the 18th Dynasty onwards the Memphite form of Osiris, Ptah-Sokar-Osiris, is one of the most important aspects of the god, besides his more traditional "classical" Busirite and Abydene forms. Therefore, the principal reason for the great self-confident officials of the post-Amarna period to choose the Memphite necropolis as the location of their tombs may have been that this was the ancient sacred abode of Ptah-Sokar-Osiris, who, in their day was such a dominant figure in the mortuary cult. Of course it stands to reason that this choice would not have been possible had not Memphis become the great residence of Egypt, but the principal motivation of the choice of Memphis was undoubtedly a religious one.

Finally, we may now turn our attention to the actual tombs at Saqqâra. These are free-standing buildings usually consisting of an open court with or without columns, containing a shaft of varying depth which leads to the subterranean burial-chambers; the courtyard gives access to three chapels, the central one of which contains the cult stela where the offerings for the deceased tomb-owners were deposited by their surviving relatives. This groundplan could be extended considerably in the larger tombs by adding a second courtyard and more rooms, but the basic division of the cult-area into three units would always be retained. In very small tomb-chapels on the other hand there could be only one or two rooms and no real courtyard. As far as we can see now, the earlier examples (from the late 18th Dynasty to the earlier part of the reign of Ramesses II) were built of mud brick with a relief-decorated limestone revetment in the central cult-chapel (in the smaller tombs³⁰) or all around (in the

26. H. Ricke, "Der Totentempel Amenophis' III. Baureste und Ergänzung", in G. Haeny (ed.), *Untersuchungen im Totentempel Amenophis' III.*, BÄA 11, Wiesbaden 1981, p. 31-37.

27. Gaballa-Kitchen, *l.c.*, 29.

28. *Epigraphic Survey. The Tomb of Kheruef, Theban Tomb 192, OIP 102*, Chicago 1980, p. 59-61, pls. 56-57.

29. J. van Dijk, "Zerbrechen der roten Töpfe", in *LdÄ VI*, 1391 with n. 27.

30. E.g. those of Apuia (J. E. Quibell - A. G. K. Hayter, *Teli Pyramid, North side*, Le Caire 1927, pl. 8), Ramose (found by the EES-Leiden Expedition in 1986) and Paser (G. T. Martin, *The Tomb-chapels of Paser and Ra'ia at Saqqâra, EES Excavation Memoirs 52*, London 1985). The chapel of Paatenemheb in Leiden doubtless belonged to the same type (cf. PM III²/2, 709-711).

large ones³¹). In the later part of the reign of Ramesses II mud brick walls were no longer used but replaced by walls built entirely of limestone, usually in the form of hollow skin walls filled with rubble³². The development of freestanding tombs at Saqqâra is often connected with local geological circumstances. The quality of the rock is said to be too poor to be suitable for the cutting of large rock-tombs and for decoration in relief. It should be borne in mind, however, that the only rock-cut tombs known so far at Saqqâra have at least partly been decorated in relief³³. Furthermore, the quality of the rock in the Theban mountains was often not very good either, hence the frequent use of a painted decoration on a layer of gypsum. There is no reason why such a method could not have been used at Saqqâra. Neither did the quality of the rock prevent the Memphite stone-masons from cutting into it a whole network of subterranean chambers at various levels. The only practical reason that rock-cut tombs were given up at a certain moment may have been a general lack of space. The few Memphite tombs of the time of Amenhotep III are known to us only through pyramidia and stelae and through various objects from the burial-chambers such as canopic chests, shabti boxes, cubit-rods, model palettes, etc., whereas not a single loose block from these monuments has come down to us. This strongly suggests that the tombs of this period were all rock-cut tombs³⁴.

In the light of our previous discussion of the motivation behind the choice of Memphis as the necropolis of the high-ranking officials of the post-Amarna period I would propose to seek the real reason for the origin of free-standing tombs in the nature of these buildings themselves. Their general lay-out as well as a number of special features clearly mark them as temples. In agreement with the dissociation of the private tombs from the royal tomb and mortuary temple and with the location of these tombs in the sacred necropolis of Ptah-Sokar-Osiris, the Saqqâra tomb-chapels have to be considered as private mortuary temples in which the cult of the deceased was integrated into the cult of Osiris. The general plan of these tombs, most conspicuously of the large ones, is similar to that of the royal mortuary temples, and especially with those parts of these temples which were dedicated to the cult of Osiris. Elsewhere I have suggested that it was in these Osiris rooms that the Memphite Ritual of Erecting Djed-Shepsy took place³⁵, and that the groundplan of the Ramesseum Osiris complex is strikingly similar to that of a small mortuary temple of Ramesses II at Mit Rahina.

That the tombs at Saqqâra have to be considered as temples appears also from a number of other features. In the first place, there is an inscription in the tomb of Tia saying that it was built under the supervision of Tia's brother-in-law, Ramesses II himself, who "made it as a monument for his father Osiris"³⁶. Then the tombs at Saqqâra contain free-standing statues of divinities. In the Ramesside period statues of gods appear in the Theban tombs as well, first at Deir el-Medina, but here statues represent only Osiris flanked by Isis and Horus, or the

31. Those of Horemheb and Maya.

32. E.g. those of Tia, Ra'ia, Iurufef, Kha'y, Pabes (all EES-Leiden Expedition), Neferrenpet, Amenemone and several others (Cairo University Expedition).

33. Located in the escarpment above the Bubasteion ('Aperel, Resj, Meryrê, Merysekhmet, Nehsy, see A.-P. Zivie, "Une tombe d'époque amarnienne à Saqqarah", in *BSFE* 84, 1979, 21-32; id., "Trois saisons à Saqqarah: les tombeaux du Bubasteion", in *BSFE* 98, 1983, 40-56; id., "Tombeaux rupestres de la falaise du Bubasteion à Saqqarah - II^e et III^e campagnes (1982-1983)", in *ASAE* 70, 1985, 219-232).

34. I am inclined to date the reliefs of Merymery in Leiden (PM III², 705-706) temp. Tutankhamen; cf. Málek, *l.c.*, 44, n. 2.

35. J. van Dijk, "The Symbolism of the Memphite Djed-Pillar", in *OMRO* 66, 1986, 7-20.

36. Cf. G. T. Martin, "The Tomb of Tia and Tia...", in *JEA* 70, 1984, 7.

Hathor cow protecting a small figure of the king³⁷. At Saqqâra examples of statues of divinities include Osiris (single)³⁸, Hathor Lady of the Southern Sycamore protecting not the king but the tomb-owner and his wife³⁹, an unidentified triad (standing, not seated as in Thebes)⁴⁰, the Apis bull⁴¹, and a crocodile identified as Sobek⁴². Another statue shows Osiris seated with Ma'at and Isis depicted on the sides of the throne and with representations of the deified king Teti on the pedestal, being worshipped by the deceased couple⁴³. Closely related to these statues are the naophorous statues, the New Kingdom temple statues *par excellence*, which are a fairly common feature of Saqqâra tombs; in the reliefs from the tomb of Maya naophorous statues are shown being transported to the tomb as part of the funeral outfit and at least thirteen examples have Saqqâra as their known or very probable provenance⁴⁴. Another characteristic element of the Memphite tombs, or at least of those from the Ramesside period, are the square djed-pillars showing the deceased supporting the djed-symbol upon his hands or shoulders⁴⁵, a special version of the Ritual of Erecting Djed-Shepsy related to the vignette of Book of the Dead 15-16, a ritual which was part of the Osirian rites in the royal mortuary temples of the New Kingdom. Perhaps the most striking element in the tombs at Saqqâra is the presence of king-lists. King-lists are found in the royal mortuary temples of Seti I and Ramesses II at Abydos, where they are connected with the cult of the royal ancestors. Although complete lists have not been found in the Theban mortuary temples⁴⁶, the existence of a cult of the royal ancestors in these temples as well as in the Akhmenu of Tuthmosis III at Karnak⁴⁷ is well attested. At Saqqâra several monuments from private tombs testify to the cult of the royal ancestors in these tombs, varying from loose blocks with a few Old Kingdom pharaohs (buried nearby) to the celebrated King-list in the tomb of Tjuneroy⁴⁸. Depictions of the royal ancestors occur in Theban tombs as well, often in connection with the king(s) under whose reign the tomb-owner had served, or with the cult of the deified Amenhotep I and his family, but these depictions rarely show more than a few kings, and nothing comparable to the great Saqqâra King-list of Tjuneroy has been found in a Theban tomb⁴⁹. As Dimitri Meeks has rightly pointed out⁵⁰, Tjuneroy's list is used as an

37. J. Assmann, *Das Grab des Basa*, p. 30-31.

38. Tomb of Mose: G. A. Gaballa, *The Memphite Tomb-Chapel of Mose*, Warminster 1977, pls. 2 and 18.

39. Statue from the tomb of Pabes, now in Leiden (P. A. A. Boeser, *Beschreibung der ägyptischen Sammlung des niederländischen Reichsmuseums der Altertümer in Leiden. Die Denkmäler des Neuen Reiches*, II, Leiden 1913, pl. 13; cf. PM III², 305, as from Giza).

40. Tomb of Tia: cf. Martin, in *JEA* 69, 1983, pl. 5/2. The deities are hard to identify because the statue is unfinished but they are almost certainly not Osiris, Isis and Horus; a graffito on top of the statue depicts the god Ptah but it is uncertain whether this has anything to do with the divinities represented in the statue itself.

41. Tomb of Tia; cf. Martin, in *JEA* 69, 1983, 28.

42. From a tomb north of the pyramid of Teti: Quibell-Hayter, *o.c.*, p. 11.

43. Doubtless from the Teti pyramid area; now in Marseille; cf. PM III², 729; M. Nelson, *Catalogue des Antiquités Égyptiennes, Musée Borély*, Marseille 1978, p. 33-34.

44. J. van Dijk, "A Ramesside Naophorous Statue from the Teti Pyramid Cemetery", in *OMRO* 64, 1983, 49-60.

45. M. C. Betro, "Il pilastro del Museo Civico di Bologna 1892 ed il suo contesto storico-religioso", in *EVO* 3, 1980, 37-54; van Dijk, in *OMRO* 66, 7-20; also the contribution of Jocelyne Berlandini-Keller in the present volume.

46. But see PM II², 434 and 500, for scenes in the Ramesseum and in Medinet Habu.

47. PM II², 111-112.

48. PM III², 666.

49. See now D. B. Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists, Annals and Day-Books. A Contribution to the Study of the Egyptian Sense of History*, SSEA Publication 4, Mississauga 1986, p. 1-64, for a complete survey of all known king-lists and related material; Tjuneroy's list is discussed on pp. 21-24.

50. D. Meeks, "Une fondation memphite de Taharqa (Stèle du Caire JE 36861), in *Hommages à la mémoire de Serge Sauneron*, I, *Égypte pharaonique*, BdE 81, Le Caire 1979, p. 245-246.

appendix to Chapters 141-142 of the Book of the Dead, "to be recited by a man for his fathers and mothers" and concerned with "the names of Osiris in his every seat where he may desire to be", thus incorporating the cult of the royal ancestors into the private mortuary cult of the deceased.

To sum up: After the abandonment of Amarna the young Tutankhamen restored the situation that had existed before Amarna, since the reign of Tuthmosis III. Memphis regained its position of chief residential city and administrative centre of the land. As a reaction to certain aspects of the Amarna religion, notably its over-estimation of the role of the king in religious matters, the high officials working under Tutankhamen and his successors dissociated their tombs from the royal tomb. In accordance with the increased importance of the cult of Osiris and especially of the Memphite form of this god, Ptah-Sokar-Osiris, the necropolis of Memphis was chosen as the location of these tombs. The tombs themselves took the form of freestanding temple-like buildings which are to be interpreted as small-scale private mortuary temples. It is interesting to observe that, viewed in this way, the occurrence of this type of tomb provides yet another illustration of the well-known tendency in the history of Egyptian culture towards the usurpation of royal privileges by non-royal persons, such as the use of the Old Kingdom Pyramid Texts by private individuals of the Middle Kingdom and of the New Kingdom royal funerary texts like the Amduat or the Book of Gates on private sarcophagi and papyri of the Late Period, or the usurpation by commoners of certain types of royal monuments like pyramidia⁵¹ or standard-bearing statues⁵² in the New Kingdom. The appearance of the Memphite "temple-tomb" may perhaps also have been influenced by the existence of the then unique private mortuary temple of Amenhotep son of Hapu⁵³, which, although on a much grander scale, displays a plan not dissimilar to that of the Saqqâra tombs. This private mortuary temple of a famous man was undoubtedly widely known and it is quite possible that the idea of such a building greatly impressed men like Horemheb and Maya⁵⁴.

The funerary monuments in the Memphite necropolis provide by their very presence in that necropolis as well as by their architecture and decoration revealing illustrations of one of the most fascinating periods in the history of Egyptian culture.

51. A. Rammant-Peeters, *Les pyramidions égyptiens du Nouvel Empire*, OLA 11, Leuven 1983, p. 184-186.

52. H. Satzinger, "Der heilige Stab als Kraftquelle des Königs. Versuch einer Funktionsbestimmung der ägyptischen Stabträger-Statuen", in *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien, Sonderheft* Nr. 263, 1982, 9-11.

53. C. Robichon-A. Varille, *Le temple du scribe royal Amenhotep fils de Hapou*, FIFAO 11, Le Caire 1936. It would be most interesting to compare the Saqqâra tombs dating to the reign of Ramesses II with the much smaller private mortuary temple of Nebwenenef near the Qurna temple of Seti I (PM II², 421) but unfortunately this has been completely destroyed and Petrie's plan of the scanty remains of its foundations is not very helpful (W. M. F. Petrie, *Qurneh*, London 1909, p. 14-15, pl. 47).

54. It may be mentioned here that the subterranean parts of tombs of Horemheb and Maya have much in common with the royal tombs in the Valley of the Kings in their architectural design as well as in their dimensions.

Le développement de la nécropole memphite à l'Époque Post-Amarnienne

Pourquoi les grands personnages officiels de l'Époque Post-Amarnienne se sont-ils fait enterrer à Memphis alors que les rois continuaient à être inhumés à Thèbes ? Ce ne peut être seulement parce que Memphis était la résidence royale principale et le centre administratif le plus important, puisque cela était déjà le cas de Thoutmosis III à Aménophis III. La raison est plutôt d'ordre religieux. En réaction à certains aspects de la religion amarnienne, en particulier sa surestimation du rôle du roi dans les questions religieuses, les grands notables dissocièrent leur tombe de la tombe royale. Conformément à l'importance accrue du culte d'Osiris sous sa forme memphite de Ptah-Sokar-Osiris, la nécropole de Memphis fut choisie comme lieu de sépulture. Les tombes se mirent à ressembler à des temples funéraires privés, imitant en cela une pratique royale et s'inspirant peut-être du temple funéraire d'Amenhotep fils de Hapou à Thèbes.