

Copyright Statement

PUBLISHER PERMISSION

This material has been reproduced after obtaining permission from the publisher or rights holder. The electronic form of this material is Copyright Macquarie University, Sydney.

THE TOMB OF THE CHIEF STEWARD OF THE KING, AMENEMHET, CALLED SURER (NO. 48)

THE tomb, which lies on the east side of the hill in the Khokha district,¹ was excavated and partly copied by Mr. Davies for the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, in the season 1914-15. A report of this work was published in the *Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum*,² and as no more detailed report was left by Davies,³ it is reprinted here with the alterations he had entered in his own copy of the *Bulletin*:

The first (transverse) hall of Surer, supported on twenty columns of the fluted 'Proto-Doric' type, had been partially excavated two years previously by Mr. A. P. Weigall, then Inspector-General for Upper Egypt of the Service des Antiquités, on a sum given by the King of Saxony when on a visit to Thebes. This undertaking had laid bare two very fine bas-reliefs showing Amenhotep III enthroned, on each side of the inner doorway. One, brilliantly coloured as well as beautifully sculptured, has suffered greatly [Pl. XXXI]; the other is nearly perfect [Pl. XXX]. The still unexcavated portions of the tomb comprised a courtyard buried not only under its natural accumulation of rubbish but under the out-throw from Mr. Weigall's work, and the inner halls, the first of which—seventy-four feet long and filled with *débris* halfway to the roof—showed at the back three doorways of singular architectural merit.

Twenty-three men and fifty boys under Hamid Mohammed, our head-foreman, attacked the mounds on December 29th [1914]. Our light railway was brought up to the face of the tomb and as it ran in almost at ceiling-level a causeway was built across Mr. Weigall's excavations so that the lads could carry in their baskets the many hundred tons of broken stone which filled the inner halls. By January 15th [1915] the second (longitudinal) hall was emptied and presented an imposing aspect, though the collapse of the roof in early times by doubling the designed height had given it completely false proportions. Originally it had formed a nave and two aisles with slightly vaulted ceilings carried on twenty papyrus-bud columns. Our disinterested undertaking was rewarded by a not unimportant gift in the shape of one large leaf of a papyrus manuscript, as well as a mass of written fragments in various hands. The former proves to be the relic of a legal document in which a citizeness of Thebes defends before the court against another woman her claim to a slave-girl. . . . The price of the girl is set forth and as all the objects of which the deal consists have their values stated in kedets of silver, the document is one of considerable interest. The work of piecing together the rest of the waste paper will be protracted and the probable result can scarcely be forecast at this moment.⁴

Beyond the second hall lay a third and rougher one, having also three aisles and four rows of rock columns with those inverted papyrus-head capitals which, happily for art, have hitherto been found only at Karnak.⁵ The roof of this hall was so shattered that work here had an element of considerable danger and it was with relief that I saw it finished. Beyond this again was a pillared hall, but only hewn out for half its projected height.

¹ See Gardiner and Weigall, *Topographical Catalogue of the Private Tombs of Thebes*, p. 21, pls. vii, viii.

² Vol. x, no. 11, pp. 230-4.

³ Miss Nora Scott has been kind enough to look through the records of the Metropolitan Museum in order to verify if there were any more reports, but unfortunately with negative result. In the correspondence concerning the Egyptian Expedition of the Museum, 4 Dec. 1914 to 11 Nov. 1915, there are several references to the work in tomb No. 48, but they chiefly concern financial problems and the division of the finds. Some of the finds were sent from Egypt on S.S. *Arabic* and the whole shipment was lost. There is a list of the objects sent by this ship, but it

includes also finds from other tombs, and it is not possible to make out which came from No. 48. The same is also the case with the baksheesh lists of Davies, where most of the finds of the season are mentioned.

⁴ [See Gardiner, 'A Lawsuit Arising from the Purchase of Two Slaves' (*J.E.A.* 21, pp. 140-6). S.-S.]

⁵ [See Pl. LXIII. According to Borchardt, *Allerhand Kleinigkeiten*, p. 24, this room was an imitation of a royal jubilee hall, of which that of Tuthmosis III at Karnak would be the only still existing instance. The columns are in Borchardt's opinion the architectural expression for tent-poles; cf. Vandier, *Manuel d'Archéologie*, ii, pp. 890 ff., 900 f. S.-S.]

The work which had meanwhile been done in the court proved disappointing, as the façade of the tomb had been faced with sandstone slabs and these had mostly disappeared. Nine or ten rough caves for burial had been dug in the court. The coffins from these we had already come upon, flung out in two separate batches by early plunderers. They were of late date and badly injured; for the treatment they had received was too much for the shoddy materials of which they were made. [On Pl. LXVI the ushebtis, &c., from these burials are reproduced here.] One interment, apparently of the Nineteenth Dynasty, was still undisturbed. It consisted of the coffin of a goldsmith Nebi,¹ another of an unnamed man on the top of whose mummy the body of a woman had been squeezed in, and a child's rough coffin. A fine royal head in black granite, battered but still dignified, had been thrown into a pit with the rubbish [Pl. LXIV c, d]. I attribute it provisionally to Thothmes IV.² These excavations left us also with thousands of fragments of inscribed stone.³ Not a few belong to the coloured figure of the king referred to above, and will in due course be refitted in their places and give back to the group something of its old appearance. It is only with the royal figure, however, that anything can be done. Surer fell into disgrace owing to his adhesion to the side of Amon in the struggle between that god and his unfilial son Akhnaton [cf. below, p. 36]. Hence, every figure of Surer, every mention of his name, every one of his numerous texts that covered the walls and assured him of eternal salvation, has been erased with punctilious malice. In a waste of chisel marks there stand out only the cartouches of Amenhotep (with loss of the 'Amon') and the few hieroglyphs in which the sun disk has a place. Fragments of costly statues and burial furniture of Surer were found, some of which, but for this enmity, might have adorned the show-cases of our Museum.

The statues comprised at least two of red granite and one of grey granite. One of the red granite statues shows a double scene on the front with Amenophis III before two divinities (Pl. LXVIII). Among the burial gifts was a blue glaze armlet, possibly with the name of Amenophis IV.⁴

Davies had the intention of publishing the tomb and copied part of it during the season 1914-15. He was, however, absorbed by other work, and the records he left behind, after having tried to finish the plates in the thirties, consisted of a few drawings and paintings which were more or less ready, some of which had been made by Mrs. Davies. These now partially exist only in the form of large photographs, the originals having been lost, but the majority were in the form of pencil drawings and rough handcopies of texts. All these unfinished copies had to be redrawn by me in ink, and, despite my efforts, they certainly lack some of that elegance which is so characteristic of Davies's own drawings. The records were then collated in the tomb by Dr. Janssen, Mr. Mekhitarian, and Mr. James in the winter of 1952-3 and some texts in the third hall by Mr. Labib Habachi in 1955.

The work, both of the others and of myself, has taken an unduly long time, and Davies was only too right when he expressed the fear that the tomb of Surer would 'give the maximum of trouble with the minimum of result'. But since so much painstaking work had already been accomplished by Davies, it would have been unjust to leave his records unpublished, and they do undoubtedly contain much of interest.

THE OWNER



Amenemhet, called Surer, is known from several other monuments than his once magnificent tomb in the Theban necropolis. One statue of him was found in the Karnak cachette and

¹ [Properly 'Overseer of goldworkers' *Nb-i-nfr*; Cairo Mus. temp. No. 2. 5. 15. 1; Pl. LXV A.]

² [Cairo Mus. ent. 45330.]

³ [Among these is the well-known VIth Dynasty fragment showing the 'Governor of the South and Controller of the State granaries, Unasonkh' (Pl. LXIV A; cf. Davies, *Bull. M.M.A.*, Eg. Exp. 1916-17, Mar. 1918, p. 23; Winlock, *The Rise and Fall of the Middle Kingdom*, p. 3). Another piece (Pl. LXIV B) is possibly a picture of Queen Tiy. For other loose finds see Pl. LXVII and Porter-Moss, *Topographical Bibliography*, i (2nd ed.).]

⁴ According to a letter from Davies to Lythgoe, 24 Sept. 1915. Perhaps the king was rather Amenophis III, as the list of the objects sent on S.S. *Arabic* mentions 'Fragments of blue

glaze open work bracelet (?) with  and 

in open work hieroglyphs', and this item is presumably the same as that mentioned in the letter. It is a great pity that this question cannot be answered with certainty. If the armlet really had the name of Amenophis IV, it would be the only indication that Surer had lived on into his reign.

published by Legrain.¹ It shows Surer kneeling, holding a 'coil of cord' Amūn in front of him. Another, stelophore statue also comes from the excavations in Karnak.² This latter is the counterpart of one of his three statues in the Louvre (A 50) which may therefore also come from Karnak.³ The British Museum possesses a third, rather similar stelophore statue of Surer,⁴ as well as the lower portion of a seated figure of him,⁵ which resembles two other statues in the Louvre, of which also only the lower parts remain.⁶ The upper part of a stela in Aix-en-Provence shows Surer, his brother Setau, and the *wꜥb*-priest of Neith Amenemope adoring Osiris.⁷ Finally, Daessy has published his funerary cones.⁸

From these texts and those in his tomb it is clear that Surer lived under Amenophis III, the only king mentioned in his records, and nothing supports the theory that he lived on under the reign of Amenophis IV.⁹ His father was 'Overseer of the cattle of Amūn', called Iṭet-towi (Pl. LX).¹⁰ It is interesting to notice that in all the preserved texts of Surer his father is mentioned only once (in the third hall of the tomb), whereas his mother Mut-tuy, who was a Royal Concubine (*ḥkrt nswt*), is especially honoured. Not only does her name and title occur rather often in the texts, she is also depicted together with Surer both in the traditional scene near the entrance of the tomb, where Surer is offering to the sun god (Pl. L A), and in the first entrance door, where both are represented adoring the rising sun (Pl. LI). This latter circumstance, his mother occurring where we should expect his wife to appear, can be explained by the fact that Surer seems to have been a bachelor—at least no wife is ever mentioned—and in such cases it was not uncommon to represent the mother in place of the wife where, according to tradition, the wife should have been depicted. But there is nevertheless a marked contrast between the honour paid to his mother and the humble role played by his father, and since Surer became above all a king's man, it is probable that he owed his social position to his mother's intimate connexion with the court rather than to his father's by no means unimportant post in the service of Amūn, and that he wanted to stress this, the more so at a period when an ever-growing antagonism between the king and his political rival Amūn prevailed.

Surer's brother Setau was Second Prophet of Neith (Aix-en-Provence 8); on the monument where he is represented behind Surer offering to Osiris 'The Great God in Thinis', Surer himself has only the title 'Chief Scribe' (*sš ḥry-tp*), which is also the case in the Molqatta texts from the 30th regnal year of Amenophis III (*JNES* 10, p. 100, fig. 21). Surer seems to have been rather an administrative than a military official in his younger days in contrast to some of the other Chief Stewards of the King (as, for example, the owner of tomb No. 73)¹¹—at least nothing indicates that he had had a military career. As is the case with his earlier colleagues in the office of Chief Steward of the King his titles connect him both with the king and with Amūn. Like his father Iṭet-towi he was 'Overseer of the cattle of Amūn', a title which the Chief Stewards Senmut, the unknown owner of tomb No. 73, Ḳenamūn, and Thenuna had also held.¹² And he shares the title 'Overseer of the

¹ *Statues et statuettes de rois et de particuliers* (Cairo Cat. gén.), No. 42128; here Pl. LXX D.

² To the east of the temple; Chevrier, *Ann. Serv.* 50 (1950), p. 438, pl. xii; Sauneron, *ibid.* 52 (1952), pp. 145-9. See Pl. LXX B here.

³ Published by Pierret, *Études égyptologiques*, ii, pp. 1 f. For the two others (A 51, A 52) cf. *ibid.* viii, pp. 38 f. Here Pl. LXX A, texts drawn from photographs and my own handcopies.

⁴ No. [123]; *Hieroglyphic Texts*, vii, pl. 42. Here Pl. LXIX B with some corrections according to a collation of the text for which I am indebted to Mr. I. E. S. Edwards.

⁵ *A Guide to the Egyptian Galleries (Sculpture)*, p. 118, no. 421 [503]; Pl. LXXI c, from photographs sent to me by Mr. Edwards.

⁶ Pl. LXXI A and B; cf. n. 3.

⁷ Devéria, *Mémoires et fragments*, i, pp. 230 f.; Pierret, *op. cit.* viii, p. 38. Aix-en-Provence no. 8 is published here on Pl. LXIX A from a photograph and a handcopy kindly put at my disposal by Mr. J. J. Clère.

⁸ *Mém. Miss.* 8, no. 199. See Pl. LXX c.

⁹ Cf. Borchardt, *Allerhand Kleinigkeiten*, pp. 23 ff., correctly denied by Helck, *Einfluß der Militärführer*, p. 49, n. 2, and *id.*, *Mitt. Inst. Or. Forsch.* ii, 2, p. 198.

¹⁰ Helck, *Einfluß der Militärführer*, p. 46, n. 5, wrongly calls him Surer's son.

¹¹ Cf. Helck, *op. cit.*, pp. 43 ff., esp. p. 50, who assumes that Surer had perhaps once been a *Rekrutenschreiber* or *suchlike*.

¹² Helck, *loc. cit.*

cows of Amūn' with Senmut, K̄enamūn, and Thenuna. In common with Senmut he has the title 'Overseer of the fields of Amūn', and other titles connecting him with Amūn are 'Overseer of the teachers of Amūn' (*imy-r sbꜣw n Imn*) and 'Divine Treasurer of Amūn' (*sdꜣwty-ntr n Imn*). He was also a 'Prophet of the entire Ennead' (*hm-ntr psdt tm[t]*) and 'in command of the secrets of the Divine Words' (*hry-sštꜣ mdw-ntr*).

This latter title or epithet may already belong to those connecting him with the king. Practically all his epithets refer to his royal service,¹ and so do his most common and important titles. These are 'Chief Steward of the King', 'Royal Scribe', 'He who is at the head of the King' (*hry tp nswt*), and 'Fanbearer on the King's right'.² Several times Surer is called 'Chief of the House of the Morning' (*hry-tp m* or *n pr-dwꜣyt*), that is 'in charge of the King's morning toilet',³ and once, on a loose block in the tomb, he is 'Chief of the embalming-house (?)'.⁴ Finally, he has the titles 'Great Chief in the King's house' (*hry-tp ꜣ m pr-nswt*; Louvre A 51 and third hall; Pl. LX), 'in command of the secrets of the King's house' (*hry-sštꜣ n pr-nswt*; loose block), and 'Overseer of horns, hoofs, and feathers' (column text; Pl. LX).

As pointed out by Helck (loc. cit.) the Chief Steward of a king practically always served under one king only, and most of them sooner or later fell into disgrace, which resulted in persecution of their memory in their tombs. Both in tomb No. 73 and here the destruction of the tombs or at least of the names of the deceased is natural, because in both cases the king whom they served was succeeded by one who followed a different policy from that of his predecessor. However, Helck is certainly right when he stresses the fact that Surer's tomb was destroyed twice, once when Surer fell into disgrace (probably before the end of the reign of Amenophis III) and was replaced by Amenhotep, who had been 'Steward' in Memphis, and once in connexion with the persecution of Amūn under Akhenaten. But in comparison with many other tombs the latter persecution was not very thoroughly done in the tomb of Surer, which had never been completed and had already been badly treated before. Thus the agents of Akhenaten presumably took less interest in a tomb already so spoilt.⁵ The attempts after Akhenaten to repair the damage, which we can observe in many other tombs, was in this hopeless case restricted to a restoration of a figure of Amon-Rē on one of the outer jambs.

THE DECORATION OF THE TOMB

THE HALL


BACK WALL (Pls. XXX–XL)

As in many other tombs of the XVIIIth Dynasty⁶ the walls on both sides of the entrance to the passage are decorated with representations of the reigning king on his throne (Pls. XXX,

¹ *ih-ib n nswt* (Louvre A 51), *iry-rdwy n nb-trwy* (Louvre A 50, A 52, B.M. 123), *wr hswt hr nb-trwy* (3rd hall; Pl. LX), *ꜣky n nswt, mty n bity* (B.M. 123), *wꜣ-n n-f Hr ib-f* (3rd hall), *mn hswt hr nb-trwy* (Louvre A 52), *mꜣ-ib mnꜣ n ity* (column text; Pl. LX), *rh štrw nb n ꜣh* (3rd hall), *hꜣy mry nb-trwy* (column text), *smrꜣ n nb-trwy* (Louvre A 52), *šꜣnt-n nb-trwy kꜣ-f* (Brit. Mus. 421 [503]), *šꜣp-n nswt hnt tꜣ pn* (Louvre A 52), &c., and his common epithet *tkn m nb-f*.

² According to Reisner, *J.E.A.* 6, p. 81, at this time a title reserved for the household officials of the court, and the Viceroy of Kush.

³ Cf. Blackman, *J.E.A.*, 5, pp. 148 ff.

⁴ ; hardly referring to the estate *Prw-nfr*, and the *nfr*-sign is perhaps not quite certain.

⁵ We find the same procedure, for example, in the contemporary tomb of the 'Steward of the great royal wife Tiy', Kheruef; see *Ann. Serv.* 42 (1942), p. 457; cf. also Davies, *The Tomb of Ramose*, p. 4, where the circumstances are

somewhat different, as Ramose was vizier under both Amenophis III and Akhenaten, whereas Surer was in office only under Amenophis III and perhaps died before Akhenaten became king (cf., however, above, p. 34, and Davies, *Bull. M.M.A.*, Eg. Exp. 1922–3, Dec. 1923, p. 45). Borchardt, *Allerhand Kleinigkeiten*, pp. 23 ff., may be right in dating the tomb to the very last years of Amenophis III (cf. the Molqatta texts), but his arguments are not convincing. Even if we assume that the 3rd hall of the tomb is inspired by the royal jubilee hall, and that the painted picture of the enthroned king (Pl. XXXI) should also be connected with the jubilee, which is more doubtful, Borchardt's reason for dating the tomb later than the 30th regnal year, because otherwise Surer should have been able to finish more of his tomb, is open to justifiable doubts.

⁶ Cf. Wegner, *Die Stilentwicklung* (M.D.I.K. iv), pp. 55 ff.

XXXI). We also found this type of decoration in tomb No. 73 (cf. above, p. 2), but the corresponding scenes in the tomb of Surer are of a higher quality and no doubt belong to the best of its kind in the necropolis. Close parallels occur in the contemporary tombs Nos. 226,¹ 57,² 120,³ 192,⁴ and in the slightly later tomb No. 55.⁵ This 'Place of Audience' has been extensively analysed by Davies in his publications of some of these tombs and in a special article.⁶

In the right scene, which is uncoloured, we can admire the same refined, elegant, but somewhat cool relief style typical of this reign as in, for example, the tombs Nos. 55, 57, 107,⁷ and 192, and it is one of the classical instances which has been published several times before, though only the central part of it.⁸ On Plate XXX the actual remains are reproduced and on Plate XXXVI an attempt has been made to reconstruct the façade of the pavilion or rather pavilions, as several different ones are erected one inside the other. Just as in tomb No. 226, we find no less than four rows of cobras and four differently decorated supports. The innermost are lotus columns, the next have compound capitals of 'lily' and lotus with ducks (better preserved in the left representation, Pl. XXXI), the third are corner posts. One would then expect the fourth type of supports with lotus capitals to support not the third row of cobras, as reconstructed on Pl. XXXVI, but the fourth, as in tomb No. 226, and also the same type of cube inserted between the lotus capital and the architrave. However, on two different drawings by Davies, which I have used for the reconstruction (combined with a third drawing for the lower part), traces of the lower part of the capital of the right column of this pair, which supported the extended part forming a kind of portico, are marked opposite the base of the second row of cobras. If these traces are correctly observed, a reconstruction in accordance with the picture in tomb No. 226 is impossible, or at least improbable, because the capitals of these outer columns would be disproportionately high, even if we add the common cube. And if we do add it and let the column support the third row of cobras, as drawn on Plate XXXVI, the capitals will be rather too small. This latter detail is, however, doubtful, but there are parallels where the cube is left out.⁹ The counterpart to the left of the entrance to the passage (Pl. XXXI) gives no help here, as it has only three rows of cobras, but it shows that the pendants should perhaps be added also between the outer columns in the portico.

The king's throne is again of the same type as in tombs Nos. 226 and 120, decorated with the sign of 'Union' only, and omitting the bound captives, which we find in tombs Nos. 57 and 192 (on the throne of Queen Tiy), but its arm-support shows the more elaborate type of these latter tombs and of No. 120.¹⁰ 'The Good God, Lord of the Two Lands, Lord of the scimitar, who seizes all countries, Neb-ma'et-Rē, given life' is shown in the form of a sphinx, trampling down two Nubians and an Asiatic. Behind him is the goddess Ma'et protecting him with her wings, whereas in the parallels in the other tombs we find the snake goddess there.

The podium is more elaborate than in the other tombs. As in tomb No. 226 there is first a row of cobras, but the six panels, depicting the victorious king,¹¹ are not found elsewhere in the contemporary private tombs. The king is in human form with different crowns, alternating with royal sphinxes. In the first, second, fourth, and sixth panels his victims are a Nubian and an

¹ Davies, *The Tombs of Menkheperasonb, Amenmose, and Another* (Theban Tombs Series V), pp. 38 f., pls. xli, xliii.

² *L.D.* iii. 77 c, and Wreszinski, *Atlas*, i. 203.

³ Davies, *Bull. M.M.A.*, Eg. Exp. 1928-9, Nov. 1929, pp. 36 ff., figs. 1-3.

⁴ Tomb of Kheruef; Fakhry, *Ann. Serv.* 42, pls. xxxix, xli-xliv.

⁵ Davies, *The Tomb of the Vizier Ramose*, pl. xxix.

⁶ *Z.Ä.S.* 60, pp. 50 ff.

⁷ Wegner, *Die Stilentwicklung* (M.D.I.K. iv), pl. xx.

⁸ Davies, *Bull. M.M.A.* x (1915), p. 233, fig. 4; Stein-

dorff and Wolf, *Die thebanische Gräberwelt*, pl. 11; Wegner, *Die Stilentwicklung* (M.D.I.K. iv), pl. xix; see also Meyer, *Darstellungen der Fremdvölker*, pp. 794-8. All these publications show more or less the same photograph of the central part and I have therefore preferred to reproduce here a drawing by Davies of the ensemble, finished by me (Davies had left out certain parts and only inked in part of it).

⁹ e.g. Davies, *Tomb of Ramose*, pl. xxix; tomb of Kheruef (No. 192; *Ann. Serv.* 42, pls. xxxix, xl, xliii).

¹⁰ See Pl. XXXV A, from a photograph by Mr. Mekhitarian.

¹¹ Pl. XXXII, from photographs by Mr. Mekhitarian.

Asiatic, in the third a Nubian, and in the fifth an Asiatic. The relief is extremely finely cut, and the foreigners well characterized. On the base is the common list of the Nine Bows in its conventional form.¹

The king in the kiosk depicted to the left of the entrance to the passage is badly damaged, but is remarkable in so far as the brilliant colours are still intact. The painstaking efforts by Mr. Davies have resulted in a successful restoration and reconstruction of this marvellous scene.² The *kheker*-frieze is painted in blue and yellow on a red background, the sky is blue with yellow stars, the cobras blue, yellow, and green on red background, and the pendants blue. The outer lotus columns are blue, its capitals red, yellow, and green, and its floating bands green and red. The corner post is yellow with blue and red hieroglyphs. The next column is banded in yellow, green, red, and blue, the 'lily' capital being blue, and the lotus light green and yellow with white and yellowish ducks. The inmost lotus column is yellow, banded in the lower part with blue bands and thin red lines, and in the upper part two fragments show scale and chequer ornaments. The background to the king is golden yellow with multicoloured hieroglyphs. In front of the king we read his name and 'the appearance of the King on the great throne like his father Rē every day'. The king is dressed in the *atef*-crown, and has the ram-horn of Amūn to mark his divinity.³ He wears a peculiar garment covering his body down to his knees. It seems to be a mantle, and it is covered with blue squares with a red square in each blue one. Its fringe, seen at his right wrist and along his thigh, is yellow with a pattern in darker yellow and black. A sporran (?) protrudes from the lap of the king, marked and coloured like the tail of a bird.⁴ The throne has the form of a cube, decorated with a façade (*srh*) with light blue, green, and red bands and squares, alternating, and with a yellow door.⁵ Behind the king on the throne is a hawk⁶ protecting the king with his enfolding wings, painted in blue and yellow.

The decoration of the podium is about the same as on the right counterpart (Pls. XXXIII, XXXIV A), with six panels depicting the victorious king alternately in human form and as a sphinx, and below these again the list of the Nine Bows.

On the right, 'northern'⁷ part of the back wall is a large scene corresponding to the main scene of tomb No. 73, whose owner, like Surer, was a Chief Steward of the King. Such a display of 'New Year's gifts' is a common motive, especially in the tombs of the Chief Stewards,⁸ and represented the yearly inspection by the king of the administration of his confidential high official. In the portico before the king a man is standing, waving his fan towards the king (Pl. XXXVI). He may well be Surer himself, in his capacity of 'fanbearer on the King's right', and this interpretation is supported by the fact that the figure has been practically completely erased. The text

¹ Pl. XXXIV B from photographs by Mr. Mekhitarian. Cf., for example, my *Ägypten und Nubien*, p. 169, n. 2 with references (add now also tomb of Kheruef, No. 192). Three name-rings of Asiatics have been published by Pillet, *Thèbes. Palais et nécropoles*, fig. 102, and the Libyan by Wreszinski, *Atlas*, ii, pl. 50 a, Beibild 10.

² Pl. XXXI, from a painting now in the Griffith Institute, Oxford. As Mr. Davies points out in a note, 'it appears that the head of the king should have been placed more to the right and his shoulders made broader, the line on the fragment with the hieroglyphs *sr nh* being that of his arm, this being shifted a little to the left'.

³ Cf., for example, Davies, *The Tomb of Ken-Amūn*, ii, pl. xi A; Calverley, *The Temple of King Sethos I at Abydos*, iii, pls. 35, 36, 40.

⁴ This is the explanation given by Davies, *Tomb of Rekh-mi-rē*, p. 16, n. 8, commenting on other multicoloured dresses of the king.

⁵ Borchardt is of the opinion (*Allerhand Kleinigkeiten*,

p. 24) that this type of throne is of especial importance, indicating that Surer had here depicted an audience of a more extraordinary character, probably in connexion with the royal jubilee, and adds 'zumal da über der Schurzspitze des sitzenden Königs das Ende irgend eines ungewöhnlichen, federartig verzierten Kleidungsstücks herausieht, der König also hier als Falke auf dem *Śrh* dargestellt war'. Borchardt may be right in this assumption; in any case the throne has not the normal form depicted in the other private Theban tombs. I know of no parallel to this kind of picture (but we must not forget that in many tombs the lower part of the enthroned king has been destroyed).

⁶ It could perhaps be a vulture, as in Davies, *The Tomb of Ramose*, pl. xxix.

⁷ In the description the usual fiction that the main axis of the tomb is east-west has been upheld, though in reality it is rather north-south.

⁸ Cf. above, p. 2, n. 1.

above him is also hopelessly destroyed.¹ In his left hand he has a *hkt*-crook and perhaps a towel.² Mounting the steps of the podium, which is here adorned with a royal sphinx, was another figure of Surer, of which only part of his feet and his right thumb are still left. He brings a staff, ending with an animal's head (?), and a pectoral decorated with two snake-goddesses protecting the royal name (Pl. XXXVI, inset).³ At the base of the stairs is another statue, a sitting lion on a podium. The text here above Surer is also destroyed but the few remaining signs make it probable that we should read the beginning: '... bringing [monuments and putting (them)] into the presence for inspection by the [good] god'.⁴

The 'gifts' were arranged in five registers. Of the first register only the left and right ends are still preserved, though badly damaged. To the left are the remains of several statues on bases. The first is a king with *khrep*-sceptre and staff. Behind him is something which cannot be identified, under a sky. Next follows a royal statue with an altar in front of it, and behind it are two statues of queens of a type better preserved in the fourth register, the difference being that the first one is standing on a prostrate foreigner. Similar statues were depicted in the second register immediately below those of the first register. The right end of the first register (Pl. XXXVIII, inset) shows different types of furniture—stools, beds, biers, and boxes, all very much destroyed. Below them in the second register are a few traces which can perhaps be interpreted as further remains of statues. Of the third register only the lower parts of two stools (Pl. XXXVIII, top) are still discernible.

The fourth and fifth registers are in a better state of conservation (Pls. XXXVII, XXXVIII). Here we see a procession of statues dragged along by groups of men. It is led by an official, who may have been Surer himself, or was at least thought to be so by the agents of Akhenaten. He is repeated again after the first group of statues in front of another squad of dragging men, and the fact that these latter have also been erased as well as their leader makes it somewhat doubtful if we may use the erasure of a person as an indication that the person in question was Surer. Many parallels show that we should not expect too great a capacity for correct interpretations from those who were in charge of the erasures, and they certainly acted on the principle that too much was better than too little. Both times there is a group of elaborate vases behind the official leading the two parts of the procession. At the top is a type of vessel known also from other tombs,⁵ and below are dishes of a simple but rarer type stacked in heaps on mats or tables.⁶ Dishes of the same type are also depicted between the sitting statues and in front of the man on the extreme right of the wall. The first statue represents the king, Amenophis III without doubt, and behind him are two statues of his queen. The last statue in this first part of the procession depicts the king standing on a prostrate Nubian. His dress with a small leopard's skin hung over the apron is said to be the same as that in which Amenophis III is depicted in the tomb of Kheruef.⁷ According to Borchardt⁸ this figure is a later insertion, but even if this were correct,

¹ The *////* may be part of the word *m33* 'inspect', and lower down perhaps [*kt*] *nbt* 'all the [works]'.
² Cf. tomb No. 226; Davies, *The Tombs of Menkheperasonb*, pl. xlii.

³ The same gift is brought in the tomb of Kheruef (*Ann. Serv.* 42, pl. xlv); cf. also No. 226.

⁴ Cf. tomb No. 47 (*Wb. Bel.* iii. 327¹²) and Sethe's copy (kindly put at my disposal by Prof. Grapow):



st]  &c. .

⁵ See, for example, Davies, *The Tomb of Puyemré*, pl. xxxviii; id., *The Tomb of Ken-Amün*, pl. xx; tomb No. 76 (Wreszinski, *Atlas*, i. 46 A; see Pl. LXXII).

⁶ Borchardt, *op. cit.*, p. 25, interpreted them as metal bars, which is hardly correct; at least they do not resemble the ordinary form of ingots and we do not find them in the scenes depicting metal-workers.

⁷ Davies, *J.E.A.* 9, p. 135, n. 1, and Borchardt, *op. cit.*, p. 25; cf. Petrie, *Six Temples*, pl. 10, and Helck, *Einfluß der Militärführer*, p. 49, n. 2.

⁸ *loc. cit.*

that would be no indication that it should depict not Amenophis III but Amenophis IV. I find it not at all improbable that still another statue of Amenophis III of a special type, made presumably under the supervision of Surer for a special occasion, should have been added as an afterthought.¹ But as far as I can judge both from Davies's drawing (Pl. XXXVII) and from Mr. Burton's excellent photographs,² the facts are not quite in accordance with Borchardt's description. It is true that its podium is not placed on the base line of the other statues, and that its right foot and the podium are cut over the podium of the preceding statue. Thus this lower part was certainly made after the lower part of the statue of the queen was ready. But it seems very doubtful if its right hand is really cut over and subsequent to the back of the throne of the queen, and Borchardt is certainly wrong when he asserts that this statue is also cut over the large erased figure following it. Its hand and arm do not at all interfere with this latter figure. Thus the correct interpretation seems to be that the statue is an afterthought, but that it had been already cut before the preceding statue of the queen had been quite finished. However this may be, we have no reason to interpret it as an indication of the much-disputed coregency of Amenophis III and Amenophis IV, as it has certainly no bearing whatsoever on that problem.

The second part of the procession consists of three seated statues of the king, and behind them three identical standing statues of the queen Tiy. They have the high feathers, double uraei, and the vulture head-dress, and carry a fly-whisk.³

The left part of the fifth and lowermost register is occupied by four cubicles with flat tops and lotus columns and a bed below. To the right of these are two statues of the hippopotamus goddess, two of Bes,⁴ and two of lions (Pl. XXXV B), and they are certainly to be connected with the bed cubicles, as these divinities were regarded as protectors of sleepers and childbearing women.⁵

At the right end of the whole scene there is a large erased figure, presumably of Surer himself, presenting a royal sphinx.⁶

Over the upper part of the whole scene a large stela (207 cm. high and 184 cm. broad) has been cut later. It is crowned with a cornice, and was interpreted by Borchardt⁷ as one of the typical stelae of Akhenaten, whether correctly is hard to say, as there are no traces whatsoever of any text or representation. Of course it is not impossible that such a monument was made in the tomb in connexion with the persecution of Amūn, but I know of no parallels to such a procedure and, as stressed above, Surer's tomb was probably so destroyed when he fell into disgrace, presumably already under Amenophis III, that the Atenists did not pay even the normal attention

¹ As stressed, in my opinion correctly, by Helck, *Mitt. Inst. Or. Forsch.* ii. 2, p. 198, if we accept Borchardt's idea that the statue is at all a later insertion.

² Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, photographs T 2141 (here Pl. XXXIX; cf. Borchardt, Abb. 4), T 413.

³ Cf. the pictures of Tiy, for example, in the tomb of Kheruef (*J.E.A.* 9, pl. xxii; *Ann. Serv.* 42, pl. xxxix). The mother of Tuthmosis IV is similarly depicted, also as a statue, in the tomb of the Chief Steward Thenuna (No. 76; Champollion, *Notices descriptives*, i, p. 481; now destroyed but traced by Hay [B.M. Add. MS. 29852 B, 179]. The whole scene has been reconstructed and redrawn by Mrs. Davies here on Pl. LXXII).

⁴ One of them has been published by Bruyère, *Rapport sur les fouilles de Deir el Medineh* (1934-5), 3rd part, p. 107, fig. 38.

⁵ Cf. Bruyère, loc. cit. We find very similar figures of Bes and the hippopotamus goddess under the bed on which Hatshepsut is born (Naville, *The Temple of Deir el Bahari*, ii, pl. li) and in the corresponding scene concerning Amen-

ophis III in the temple of Luxor (Gayet, *Mém. Miss.* 15: 1, pl. lxxv, fig. 199). For the hippopotamus goddess, see Säve-Söderbergh, *Horae Soederblomianae*, III, pp. 45 ff., and for the lion cf. the decoration of the head-rest of Baki in Deir el Medineh (*F.I.F.A.O.* xvi, fig. 118). Cf. also Quibell, *Tomb of Yuua and Thuiu*, pls. xxix, xxxi, xli, xlii, and de Wit, *Le Rôle et le sens du lion*, pp. 162 f.

⁶ The exact position of his right foot is somewhat uncertain as are, of course, also the details of the reconstruction which I have added merely in order to connect the foot with the arms and the traces of the necklace.

⁷ Borchardt, op. cit., p. 23. His conclusions are: 'er (Surer) sei bei dem jungen Herrn (Akhenaten) in Ungnade gefallen, und alle die Änderungen in seinem Grabe, Ausmeißelungen alt-religiöser Inschriften (at the entrance door), des Bildes des Amon (on the outer right door-jamb; cf. below, p. 45), seiner eigenen Abbilder und endlich die rücksichtslose Einsetzung des großen Aton-Denksteines seien nur Strafmaßnahmen gegen den Gestürzten gewesen.'

when erasing the hated name of Amūn but carelessly left it untouched in many places. It is hard to believe that they would have cared to cut a memorial to their king and his god in such a wrecked and disgraced place.

The subject depicted on the left, south back wall (Pl. XL) is the same as on the corresponding wall in tomb No. 55,¹ and we also find it in tomb No. 188,² but there it is on the right back wall. The right part of the scene is slightly different in our tomb, and corresponds exactly to the scene next to the king to the right of the entrance to the passage. Just as there, a fanbearer in the portico of the kiosk is waving his fan towards the king (Pl. XXXI), and Surer is mounting the steps presenting a pectoral. In the other tombs these figures are left out; in the tomb of Ramose two fans are held by an *ankh*- and a *waz*-sign, and in No. 188 there is instead a bouquet in front of the king. This latter arrangement is quite logical, as the subject in front of the kiosk is a presentation of different bouquets and staffs to the king by the tomb-owner. He is depicted, one figure behind the other, as many times as he has bouquets or staffs to offer, that is, 'he was to appear before the king, and not once only, but, for each function of his or for each blessing which he mediates, there was to be a figure carrying an appropriate symbol' (Davies, loc. cit.). The texts are quite destroyed in the tomb of Surer, but enough traces remain to show that there is no doubt about it that it is Surer who is depicted several times, dressed in much the same way as a *sem*-priest, with a skin over one of his shoulders. The formula repeated for each figure in the other tombs was the same as that used also when a tomb-owner himself received bouquets: 'For thy *ka*, a bouquet of . . . May he favour thee, love thee, and prolong thy life, &c.,'³ and presumably that was also the general trend of the texts in the tomb of Surer, though no traces remain of these words. It is not possible to identify any of the staffs or bouquets because of the fragmentary state of the scene both in our tomb and in the others.

The upper register, of which practically nothing now remains, may have contained a continuation of the same subject.

THE END WALLS (Pls. XLI-XLIII)

The subject filling the space of the left, south end wall of the hall is a harvest festival and in the lower part are figures of Surer adoring and offering on both sides of three doors, which are decorated with the flying sun disk and the royal name (Pls. XLI, XLII).⁴ The texts accompanying these offering-scenes are so badly destroyed that it is difficult to make out even to which gods he is paying homage. At the left door it is probably Amūn, to judge from the small horizontal text under the offering-list (*mꜣꜣw [n] Imn*). To the left of the central door it is probably Sakhmet who benefits from his censuring, but the other texts are not clear.

The harvest festival in the upper register has been analysed by Davies in a study of this scene

¹ Davies, *The Tomb of Ramose*, pp. 28 f., pls. xxx, xxxi.

² Davies, *J.E.A.*, 9, p. 140.

³ Cf. Schott, *Das schöne Fest vom Wüstentale*, pp. 825 ff.; above, p. 23 and Pl. XXVIII, 4.

⁴ These two plates had prepared by Davies, who had had them photographed, and only one enlargement including both plates (and in a rather bad state) was available to me. The original drawings from which it was made have apparently been lost. The enlargement was of the size in which it is reproduced here, and it was impossible to make any additions or corrections on an original of this small scale. However, it was unfortunately necessary to add some signs in the texts to the left of the central door and of the left door, which, according both to Davies's own notebook and the collation by Mr. Mekhitarian, had been overlooked by Davies when preparing the plate. (The exact space—accord-

ing to Davies 6½ squares—between the upper and the lower part of the text to the left of the central door is somewhat uncertain, as the lower signs are from the rough handcopy in Davies's notebook.) So the original enlargement had to be re-photographed and enlarged still more, in order to be corrected. I took this opportunity to include also the reconstruction of the upper left corner from Davies's published drawing of it in *Bull. M.M.A.*, Eg. Exp. 1928-9, Nov. 1929, part ii, p. 48, fig. 10, and Sethe's copy of the upper part of the text to the right of the king in the centre which had been destroyed in Davies's time (this addition was made with dots, the obvious emendation of the second line being added in full line but in square brackets). I am indebted to Prof. Grapow for putting Sethe's copies from different Theban tombs at my disposal.

and its parallels in tombs Nos. 120, 96 A, and 253,¹ and I can do no better than to quote his interpretation:

In the centre are two figures of Amen-hotpe III back to back, with the texts 'The king being Amen-hotpe who appears as king of South and North like his father Rē^c every day'; and 'The king being Neb-ma^cet-Rē^c who appears on the throne of Horus of the living like his father Rē^c every day'. The figure facing the right has also the text: '... on the 27th day of the third month of the second season, this day . . . [to Amūn], that he may make a gift of life like Rē^c for ever and ever.'² The king in this case is making offerings, including sheaves of corn, to thirteen specimens of the coil of cord used for measuring the harvest field; they are surmounted, as usual, by the ram's head of Amen-Rē^c and are labelled with various epithets referring to his creative beneficence. Beyond this and within a shrine with a Hat-Hor column are two snake-goddesses: one, 'Ernenūtet, lady of the granary', human-bodied, and nursing the young king on her lap; the other, a crowned snake on the (𐎃) sign within the (𐎃) arms, with a figure of the grown-up king standing under her chin, as if in her care. Presumably this is only a second figure of the same goddess in a similar rôle. This picture of Ernenūtet with the child in her arms we know from tomb 57 to represent the birth of Nepy, the corn-god, which was celebrated on the first of the ninth month, four days later.³ Here the child bears the name of the reigning king, so that an identification of the king with the corn-god seems to result, while the association of the figure with the harvest implements sacred to Amen-Rē^c implies that he is the father of the king in this aspect also.

The explanatory text appended to the figure of the king facing left is destroyed. In front of him a granary is shown, preceded by a gated forecourt. Both spaces are filled with piles of grain, seen one behind the other, like steep-sided cupolas; two trees are among the heaps in the court.⁴ The king has ascended as high as possible and offers incense to the god. The blank shrine in which the deity was conceived to be present takes the curious form of a framed window or door, the framing salient, the interior sunk two inches or so. It occurs at the top of three piles, but three more appear above it. Behind the king, but still some distance up, is a fanbearer, no doubt Surer, the owner of the tomb, and on the ground level perhaps another official, now erased.

Although the goddess was the recipient at the popular thanksgiving, the occasion of harvest touched the nation's welfare and the royal functions too closely for any but a cosmogonic god to suffice. In [tomb No. 96 A] the text may mention the name of Amen-Rē^c. In [tombs Nos. 120 and 253] the erasure makes it likely that his figure was shown on the stela, or was thought to be. But the substitution of a stela⁵ for an image and the celebration of the rite under the open sky seem to point to a sun-god as the object of worship, so that if Amūn is there it is as Amen-Rē^c. In [tomb No. 48] even this definition seems to be avoided. It looks as if a window, whose function it is to admit light, might serve, even when blind, as a symbol of the god of diffused light, as the open doorway of the tomb replaces an object of worship for the inhabitants. The rite enacted by the king here seems quite simple, as if we had to do with a plain return of thanks to the Creator, or a mere presentation to Amūn of his share of the harvest as revealed by the tithe measurements on the twenty-seventh day of the eighth month. But there may have been other celebrations on the next three days, culminating on the fourth, the first of the ninth month, if that was regarded as the agricultural birthday of the king, son of the sun in heaven and nursling of the chthonian goddess, Ernenūtet. No doubt this would not be regarded as merely a matter of divine descent, but as practically affecting the nation. As son of Rē^c and as corn-god, the king would be the mysterious mediator of the gifts of sun and earth to the people of Egypt, for even Akhen-Aten, after hymning the natural

¹ Op cit., pp. 46 ff.

² I have assumed that 'third month' is an error for 'fourth', since this is the date of the measuring of corn in tomb No. 38, and is succeeded, four days later, by the birthday of Nepy (tomb No. 57). [From Sethe's earlier copy it is clear that the text should be read: 'Slaughtering a big offering to Amūn [epithet] on the 27th day of the third month of winter, on this day of the measuring of the flour to [Amon-Rē^c], King [of the gods], that he may make a gift of life like Rē^c for ever and ever.' In tomb No. 38 (Kuentz, *B.I.F.A.O.* 21, p. 124; Schott, *Oriental Institute Communications*, 18, p. 88, fig. 44; Davies, *Tomb of Nakht*, p. 64, n. 3), where the tomb-owner makes a burnt offering to Amūn (erased) and to

Renenutet, the text where the same feast is alluded to clearly shows that Davies was right in his assumption that 'third month' is a mistake for 'fourth month': 'Offering everything good and pure [to Amūn] in all his places by the scribe of the corn [of Amūn] Joserkare, on this day of the measuring of the flour of the 27th day of the fourth month of winter.' Š.-Š.]

³ Davies, *Tomb of Nakht*, pp. 64 and 65. [Cf. Wreszinski, *Atlas*, i. 198. S.-S.]

⁴ [Cf. also *J.E.A.* 9, pl. xxv; 25, pl. xix. S.-S.]

⁵ For stelae as places of worship see Davies, *El Amarna*, vol. i, pl. xi; vol. ii, pl. xix; vol. iii, pl. xxx; vol. vi, pl. xx.

and daily beneficence of Aten, ends with a long epilogue on the text, 'None knoweth thee other than thy son; thou hast caused him to be skilled in thy ways and power.' What legends of sun-myth or Osiris-myth and what consequent dramatic episodes enlivened the festival we do not yet know; there was surely much more than happened in the grain store of Amūn and interested its overseer.

The decoration of the opposite, north end wall of the hall seems to have resembled its southern counterpart, to judge from the fact that the only remaining piece of the original relief in the centre of the wall is practically identical with the middle part of the south end wall. Below the part reproduced here on Pl. XLIII A, showing the *ka* of the king and the only figure of the king left, is a blind doorway like those on the opposite wall.¹

A group of fragments, depicting a ram, called Amon-Rē, in a shrine, with the first lines of a hymn to it spoken by Surer (Pl. XLIII B) may belong to this wall. The subject recalls the 'coil of cord' gods on the south wall, and in front of the ram are the same kind of bouquets as there, and presumably some feast at which Amūn played a leading role was depicted here, too. As it is probable that the god should be turned towards the centre of the scene, it seems plausible to locate the fragments to the left part of the wall.

THE FRONT WALL, SOUTH PART (Pls. XLIV–XLIX)

The wall is divided into an upper and a lower register. Only the southern part of the wall is now conserved and the upper register is interrupted by windows between which a series of adoration scenes have been inserted. The best-preserved scenes are those next to the south wall (Pl. XLIV). Here we see Isis, the Divine Mother, seated on a throne on a high podium. Because of the window there was no room in front of her for the figure of the adoring Surer, who was replaced by a text under the window. The next divinity is Osiris, and before him Surer is 'giving [praise] to Osiris, and kissing the earth to Wenenofre: "Praise to thee, king and ruler of eternity, son of [Geb . . .], ruler of the dead . . ."' Behind Surer is the second window with a completely destroyed text under it, and to the left of this again traces of a podium for a god. Immediately in front of this is the third window, leaving room only for a text under it, of which the last two lines contained the titles and name of Surer (*rpr-hsty-c, šš nswt [Im]n-[m-hst] dd n.f Swrr mꜣ-hrw*). There follows another podium of a divinity on a throne (Pl. XLV) with Surer adoring before it with the words: 'Praise to thee (fem.), who hast borne the gods, uplifting the sun disk (*itn*) in the morning.' These epithets show that the divinity was Nut, and it is therefore only logical that on the other side of the fourth window (which is immediately behind Surer) we should find Geb (Pl. XLVI). Surer is once more depicted, 'giving praise to Geb, the Prince of the gods. He says: "Praise to thee, father of the gods (?) . . . on the throne of Rē. Mayst thou grant that I am blessed in heaven, that I go out . . ."' Here begins a break which continues to the entrance door.

In the lower register we see the rites performed on the statue of Surer (Pls. XLVII–XLIX). It is a subject that normally occurs in the passage, and not as here in the hall. When it was intact, it was probably one of the most elaborate representations of this theme.² Next to the south wall (Pl. XLVII) the register is divided into four rows, with scenes which are rare in the private tombs but to which there are parallels in the daily cult of the temple of the gods.³ As is more or less the rule, the series starts at the bottom, where the shrine of the statue is still closed in the two lower scenes. Two priests are standing in front of the shrine, presumably performing the rites of breaking the seal (*sfh dbct; sd sin*) and drawing the bolt (*stꜣ s*). Then the doors of the shrine are opened

¹ Cf. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, photograph T 412.

² As a full treatment of the subject can be expected from

Prof. Otto, I refrain here, as in the case of tomb No. 17, from a detailed analysis.

³ Cf. Moret, *Le Rituel du culte divin journalier*.

and some rites performed, before the statue is taken out of it. In the top row two priests are lifting the statue,¹ attended by a third priest.

To the left of this is a large statue of Surer standing on the usual heap of sand, and before him the large offering-list with priests performing the rites normally connected with this list.² The introductory formula, repeated in each line of the offering-list, is that found, for example, in the tomb of Khaemhet:³ 'O Osiris, Royal Scribe Surer, take to thyself the eye of Horus, &c.'⁴

The next scene (Pl. XLVIII) contains the rites of the opening of the mouth of the large statue of the 'Seigneur, who is near to his lord . . ., in command of the secrets of the Divine Words, Prophet of the entire Ennead, the royal scribe, his truly beloved, who is at the head of the King, Amenemhet, called Surer, true of voice'. In the four rows in front of him there is a slaughtering scene at the top, and below the pieces of meat are being brought. In the middle a *sem*-priest is opening the mouth with the implements *dwꜣ-wr* (?) and *dwn-ꜥn*,⁵ and behind him another priest brings the *nms* band.⁶ In the lowest row more bands are offered to the statue.

The large statue of Surer to the left of this scene is destroyed except for a few remains of the legs, and practically nothing is left of the rites in front of it. But the fact that the last priest to the left is turned with his back towards the statue makes it probable that the *int rd* ceremony was performed here (unless the figure in fact belongs to the next scene). There follows a break, but as its length corresponds exactly to that occupied by each of the scenes depicting the large statue and the rites performed in front of it, there is little doubt that another such scene filled this lacuna. If so, the fragmentary figure of a large statue of Surer (Pl. XLIX) immediately below the adoration of Geb in the upper register (on Pl. XLVI) would be the fifth from the south wall. In the upper row in front of him are traces of a small female figure, perhaps the 'great kite' (*[ḏr]t wr[t]*), and in the next row was a *hry-ḥbt*. The figure behind the statue probably belongs to the scene on the right.

Several loose fragments can be ascribed to this wall. One group (Pl. LVII, lower left) shows parts of the framings of the windows in the upper register, another with small figures and small incised hieroglyphs certainly belongs to the lower register (Pl. XLIX, lower). One piece shows part of a *sem*-priest, and some texts mention the opening of the mouth and implements used in that ritual (*wr-ḥkꜣw*, *biꜣ-sh-ntr*).

THE FRONT WALL, NORTH PART (Pl. L A)

At the south end of this part of the wall we find the subject normally depicted next to the entrance door in the hall, the offering to the god of day (Pl. L A).⁷ Surer is pouring out incense on the altar, on which the burnt offerings are heaped up. The accompanying text is practically entirely lost, but enough remains to make clear that Re-Harakhte was one of the gods mentioned. Surer is accompanied by his mother the Royal Concubine Mut-tuy, who here takes the place ordinarily occupied by the wife of the deceased in other tombs.⁸ Behind her, servants or members of the family are bringing flowers and fowl. The scene is badly damaged, but with the aid of the parallels in the contemporary tombs of Khaemhet⁹ and Ramose¹⁰ we can visualize its original beauty.

¹ Cf. Davies, *The Tomb of Rekh-mi-rē*, pl. c; Wreszinski, *Atlas*, i. 166.

² Cf., for example, Davies, *op. cit.*, pls. xci, cviii; *id.*, *Tomb of Ramose*, pl. xx.

³ Wreszinski, *Atlas*, i. 212, next to the statues in the chapel.

⁴ By chance the *m* (Gardiner, *Grammar*, sign T 1; cf. § 336) has disappeared in all the lines, and I do not think it has been overlooked by Davies or by Mr. Harry James, who collated his copies of this wall.

⁵ Cf. Schiaparelli, *Libro dei Funerali*, i, pp. 103 ff.; Budge, *The Book of the Opening of the Mouth*, i, p. 90.

⁶ Cf., for example, Budge, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

⁷ See Schott, *Das schöne Fest vom Wüstentale*, chap. i, with references.

⁸ Cf. above, p. 35; there can be no doubt about the reading despite the fragmentary state of the text.

⁹ Wreszinski, *Atlas*, i. 190, 196, 197.

¹⁰ Davies, *Tomb of Ramose*, pls. xiv, xv.

The rest of the wall is in such a bad state of preservation that it is hardly worth reproducing. Behind the offering-bearers is a kneeling figure (on the same scale as they) and below him a fragmentary text, containing some common epithets and titles of Surer. To the left of this is the back arm of a large figure (of Surer?) behind which a fragmentary text with the phrase *phr hꜣ* [*sp*] 4 (?) *m n*///. There is a break, a scrap of two lines of text, and then a long gap of 51½ inches. On the rest of the wall only the feet of the figures still remain. Next to the gap is a small figure turned to the right dragging something behind him, and then there are a number of kneeling men facing left towards a table (?) behind which a large figure was standing (facing right). It is possible that the subject was the consecration of the meal, ending with the *int-rd* ceremony.¹ Next to the north end of the wall were two large figures facing one another with vases (?) between them.

THE DECORATION OF THE ENTRANCES

THE ENTRANCE TO THE FIRST HALL (Pls. L B, LI, LIV, LV C)

The façade towards the open court is now entirely destroyed. Only part of the outer right sandstone jamb of the first doorway still remains, though now no longer *in situ* (Pl. LIV B). In the uppermost panel King Amenophis III, dressed in an elaborate *atef*-crown, offers with *nut*-pots to Amon-Rē, Lord of Karnak. As is shown, for example, by the fact that the sceptre of the god is cut over the right hand of the king, the figure of Amon-Rē was restored after it had been destroyed by the agents of Akhenaten.² Below this the king, now in the blue crown, offers flowers to the ithyphallic Amon-Rē, King of the Gods, Lord of Heaven, and Ruler of the Divine Ennead. A loose fragment shows that there was at least one more similar representation. Other loose blocks make it clear that the left jamb was more or less exactly similar to the right one, and it can therefore be reconstructed with some degree of certainty (Pl. LIV A).³

On the left southern thickness Surer (?) was adoring the rising sun, facing outwards (Pl. LI). Only his finger-tips and part of his head now remain. Above him are the cartouche of Amenophis III and the words 'said by' (*dd mdw in*).⁴ Behind his head is again a fragmentary text: '... eternity to the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Neb-ma'et-Rē . . . that he may give life, duration, and stability to [the Son of Re] [Amen]ophis, [the Ruler] of Thebes'. There follows a hymn, which has been badly erased, only the signs of the sun being left untouched. But thanks to the fact that it has not been so deeply chiselled out, the text on the remaining part of the wall can be read, though with some difficulty:⁵ 'Adoring Rē-Harakhti (?), Amūn, the Lord of Karnak, going forth . . . the Royal Chancellor, only (?) companion, the noble at the head of the people (?) . . . [extolling] the beauty of his lord Amūn (?) at the Eastern horizon . . . horizon of heaven. Praise to thee in . . .'⁶ The last part of this text stands above another figure, presumably that of Surer's mother, who is followed by a girl.⁷ Between these two last figures is a fragmentary text, probably to be restored with a loose fragment 'His mother (?), the Royal Concubine (*hkr̄t nswt*) [Mut]-tuy'.⁸

¹ Cf., for example, Davies, *The Tomb of Ramose*, pl. xx.

² Cf. Borchardt, *Allerhand Kleinigkeiten*, p. 23, with n. 1; he calls it 'Südseite der östlichen Türeinfassung', that is the left jamb, which is hardly correct.

³ The lower blocks, which at first sight seem to belong to the first and second scenes, probably come from the third panel, as they do not fit very well in the upper ones.

⁴ The part of Surer's name in the first line is on a loose stone, tentatively put here on the plate.

⁵ Cf. the photograph published by Davies in *Bull. M.M.A.*, Eg. Exp. 1922-3, Dec. 1923, p. 45, fig. 9.

⁶ *dwꜣ Rꜣ-[Hr]-šh[ty], Imn, nb Ipt-swt, pr . . .*
sqꜣswty-bity, smr wꜣty (?), sr m hꜣt rhyt (?)
[swꜣš, wꜣs or sim.] nfrw nbꜣf Imn m šht šꜣbt[ꜣ] . . .
šht nt pt; šꜣw nꜣk m . . .

. . . //wy tw

⁷ It is not impossible that these two last figures represented Surer and his mother Mut-tuy. The first figure might then perhaps be the king, if the fragment with part of Surer's name belongs rather to the north thickness (Pl. L B).

⁸ Some other loose fragments attributed to this scene are placed over it on Pl. LI.

On the opposite, north thickness of the entrance the pair are facing inwards, adoring the setting sun (Pl. L B). This type of decoration of the reveals, once with the deceased facing outwards, adoring the rising sun, and on the opposite side facing inwards, entering the tomb or adoring the setting sun, is rather common in the necropolis.¹ The northern thickness has also been much damaged, and little more remains than what is necessary to determine the subject. The text started: '[Adoring Rē^c, when he sets] with life . . . great of magic . . . [by] . . . Surer, true of voice. He says: "Praise to thee, &c."' ²

Of the inside jambs only the northern one is well enough preserved to be worth reproducing (Pl. LV c). Two panels remain, showing the deceased adoring Isis in the upper, and Nephthys in the lower one. Between the seated goddess and Surer is an altar with offerings. The text of the lower scene contains the praise of the goddess and her answer.³

Of the other jamb only some traces of Surer in front of a seated divinity are now left, which shows, however, that the subject was the same here as on the northern jamb.

THE ENTRANCE TO THE SECOND HALL (Pls. LII, LIII, LV A, B)

Still less remains of the decoration of the entrance to the second hall with its three doorways. The outer jambs were similar to the inner ones of the first entrance, to judge from the only one preserved, that to the north of the northern doorway (Pl. LV B). There were six (?) panels showing Surer in adoration before different divinities. The topmost panel is entirely lost, and of the second one only the legs of Surer and the seated divinity as well as the offering-table now remain. To judge from two loose blocks, presumably belonging to the southern counterpart of this jamb (Pl. LV A), a fragment with the phrase 'Giving praise to Anubis, *imy wt*' should be assigned to the second, or possibly to the first panel. In the third scene Surer adores the goddess Neith, the Lady of Sais (*nbt Sꜣw*). The text above Surer reads: 'Giving praise to Neith by the Overseer of the fields of Amūn, the Royal Scribe Amenemhet, called Surer.'⁴ The fourth panel depicts an adoration of Selket, the Lady of Pe (?), and over Surer is the text: 'Giving praise to Selket by the Overseer of the cattle (?)⁵ of Amūn, the Royal Scribe Amen[emhet], called Surer.' Of the fifth and sixth panels⁶ only traces of Surer now remain, but the subject was apparently similar to that of the upper panels.

The two fragments mentioned above are what now remains of the corresponding southern jamb, and they belong to a panel where the Royal Scribe Surer is adoring Anubis, 'foremost in the divine booth' (Pl. LV A).

The southern thickness of the northern doorway to the second hall is rather well preserved (Pl. LII). Surer is here adoring the sun, and again we find one of the many variants of the more or less traditional hymns:

[Adoring Rē^c . . . by . . .⁸ Amenemhet], called Surer, true of voice. He says: 'Praise to [thee]⁹ . . . heaven. He

¹ To quote just a few published instances: Nos. 31 (Davies, *Seven Private Tombs*, pl. x), 49 (Davies, *The Tomb of Neferhotep*, pls. xxxvi, xxxvii), 55 (Davies, *The Tomb of Ramose*, pls. iv, v).

² [*dwꜣ Rꜣ ḥtpꜣf*] *m ꜥnh* . . . *wꜣ ḥkꜣw* . . . *Swꜣꜣ, mꜣꜣ-ḥꜣꜣw ḏꜣꜣꜣ: inḏ ḥꜣꜣꜣ ḥꜣꜣꜣꜣ-[ḥꜣꜣ] (?) nḥḥ* . . . *ḥm (?)ꜣ k imꜣḥ (?)* . . . *///mn///* . . . *stꜣ (?) tw [bꜣꜣw imntꜣꜣꜣ r] wꜣꜣt (?) im(t) tꜣ[-ḏꜣꜣꜣ]* (cf. *Ann. Serv.* 42, p. 462, l. 5) . . . [*šꜣꜣꜣꜣ i ḥꜣꜣꜣꜣ nt (?)*] *sktt* (cf. *ibid.*, l. 14), or [*ḥtpꜣ bꜣꜣꜣ i m (?)*] *sktt* (cf. Davies, *Ramose*, pl. vi).

³ The right part is now broken off after the initial phrase *rdꜣꜣꜣ tꜣꜣꜣ n Nbt-ḥꜣꜣ*, and the continuation *sn tꜣꜣ n*, &c., has therefore not been collated. In the left part several signs are doubtful (the last group of the first line, and the last two groups of the second line, especially the *wn*-sign).

⁴ It may be worth noticing that 'Amūn' here and in the

next panel has been left untouched by the agents of Akhenaten, despite the fact that it was just opposite the first entrance, and thus one of the first things one would notice in the tomb.

⁵ The ox-sign is now destroyed, and Davies's copy leaves some doubt.

⁶ Left out on Pl. LV as too little remains to be worth publishing.

⁷ A loose fragment which probably belongs here somewhere shows that Amon-Rē^c was also mentioned.

⁸ The words 'who is near his lord, [fan]bearer' (*[tkn] m nbꜣꜣꜣ, tꜣꜣꜣꜣ-ḥꜣꜣꜣ*) is on a loose piece, which cannot be exactly located.

⁹ The fragment tentatively added here by Davies gives no place for the expected preposition *ḥꜣꜣ*.

has extolled . . .¹ extolling his beauty, shining foremost (?) . . . one knows not who begat him. He traverses heaven, his heart being glad. The "sea of the knives" is at peace; those who are in thy bark jubilate, seeing Ma'et in thy train. Thou attainest thy heaven in triumph daily.' The Royal Scribe, his truly beloved, who is at the head of the King, Amenemhet, called Surer, he says: 'Praise [to thee], Amon-Rē, Great God, sweet of love. Grant divine offering of thy giving every day.'²

A similar scene decorated the southern thickness of the southern doorway of the second entrance (Pl. LIII). But of the solar hymn only enough is still preserved to make the subject clear.³

THE LINTELS (Pls. LVI, LVII, LVIII)

The lintels of these two outer entrances are no longer *in situ*, and can only to a certain extent be reconstructed with the aid of loose fragments. The allocation is of course doubtful, but it seems plausible to assume that those of sandstone belong to the outside of the first entrance, as the jambs there are made of that material. One sandstone lintel-block with the lower part of the banner name of Amenophis III, and another with the North plants tied to a *sma*-sign, can thus with a certain amount of probability be assigned to the outside of the first entrance, and the subject was probably the deceased adoring the royal name. (Some other sandstone blocks with *hotep-di-nesu* formulae come rather from the second hall; Pl. LIX, upper three rows.)

A group of coloured limestone blocks⁴ show the name of Amenophis III under a sun disk with pendant uraei, and on both sides two columns of texts; to the left we read: 'Giving praise to the victorious [King] (*[nswt] nht*),⁵ and kissing the earth to the son of Amūn, [by] the Seigneur, in command of the secrets of the King's house, Chief of the House of the Morning, the Royal Scribe, his truly beloved, who is at the head of the King . . .' and to the right: 'Giving praise to the Lord of the Two Lands, and kissing the earth to the Ruler of Thebes, by [the Seigneur], remaining in favour (*mn ḥswt*), great of love, whose excellence created his position. . . .' The surface has been erased on both sides of these texts, but there is little doubt that there were pictures of the deceased adoring.

A rather similar, brightly coloured block with the Horus name, the prenomen and the nomen, the two latter crowned with feathers (Pl. LVII, under the left Anubis), belongs to another lintel, and that the subject was the same here, is clear from several fragments of a third lintel which is the exact counterpart of the second, with the difference only that both Horus names are preserved, flanking the other names, with the prenomen to the left and the nomen to the right. To the right of the royal names are remains of the lower parts of a kneeling man.

Finally, there is a fourth group of blocks, from which a similar composition can be restored (Pl. LVIII; from a painting by Mrs. Davies in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York), and this lintel is remarkable in so far as the hieroglyphs are covered with gold against a blue background, which is something quite rare in a private tomb.

Thus, with the exception of the sandstone lintel, which probably belonged to the outer façade, we have remains of four different lintels, and as there are four doorways in the outer hall, it is tempting to locate them all in the hall, where their subject would well suit the themes depicted on the walls. If we should venture to go still farther in the attempt to locate them, it seems plausible to me that the fourth, golden lintel decorated the central door to the second hall, flanked by

¹ If the fragment can be added here, which is very doubtful, the object of the verb could have been Ma'et.

² Cf., for example, Davies, *The Tomb of Nakht*, p. 38 with parallels quoted there.

³ The first word of the text, *dw*, and the phrase 'the

adoration of the jubilating (baboons)' (*snsw n imyw htt*); cf. for example Naville, *Todtenbuch*, chap. 15 A (At).

⁴ Pl. LVII (under the right Anubis), drawn from a photograph kindly sent to me by Chief Inspector Labib Habachi.

⁵ Or [*ntr nfr*] *nht*; cf. Mariette, *Monuments divers*, pl. 70, 21.

the two counterparts, the second and the third lintel being over the north and the south door to the second hall. The first lintel, on which the text still remains, and which seems to be somewhat simpler in its execution, would then be the inner lintel of the first entrance, being flanked by the offering and adoration scenes on the front wall of the hall.¹

From other loose blocks another type of antithetically composed lintel can be reconstructed (Pl. LVII, top). In the centre are two Anubis-animals, back to back, with offering-tables in front of them. Surer is kneeling on both sides uttering wishes for his shadow, corpse, and *ba*-soul, that he may have freedom of movement, that his limbs may be assembled, &c. The right, adjoining jamb was decorated with an adoration of Amsety, to whom the Royal Scribe, called Surer, is paying homage, and Amsety promises him that he shall be provided with *ma'et* and that his soul shall be united with the 'akhu' by the favour of the Good God. A thin block with a very much destroyed text of at least six columns, each ending with a title and the name Surer, may belong to the soffit of this lintel, which is probably to be located on the inside of the entrance from the first to the second hall. In any case its subject, the adoration of Anubis, as a rule occurs on inside rather than on outside lintels.

The entrance from the second to the third hall consists of three doorways (Pl. LVI). The decoration over the doors represents, as has been shown by Hermann,² windows of an ordinary house, with an elaborate lattice of *djed*-pillars and papyrus buds. In the upper corners are cats, seated in the biggest openings of the windows, which the pet animals could use, if the doors were shut. If Hermann is right, this decoration is a purely domestic theme with no symbolical significance, and such a decoration is not out of place in Surer's 'house of eternity'. As this motive and its old traditions and parallels have been fully studied by Hermann, it is unnecessary to repeat his results here.

The jambs are destroyed, with the exception of the lowest part of the middle ones, where we read the names of the deceased.

TEXTS AND FRAGMENTS (Pls. LVII-LXI)

As a result of the thorough destruction of the tomb it is now full of an overwhelming number of loose fragments, of which only a selection can be published here.³

A number of fragments which possibly come from the hall have been assembled on Pl. LVII. Those in the lower left corner probably belong to the south part of the front wall, and the group to the right of the fragments with the royal name and the title and name of Surer may come from the thicknesses of an entrance, but I am unable to locate the others with any degree of certainty.

The 'protodoric' columns of the first hall had long texts on the north, east, south, and west middle grooves, containing varying *hotep-di-nesu* formulas ending with the titles and names of Surer. Most of them are now lost, and only four are worth publishing (Pl. LX), though rather for the titles and epithets than for the interest of the rest of the texts. The first is on the north side of the first right column on entering the hall, and its general trend is that '... after years to come,

¹ There are parallels to these lintels in the tombs Nos. 55 (Davies, *The Tomb of Ramose*, pl. xxviii, 1) and 365 (unpublished; Metropolitan Museum photograph T 2807); for the subject cf. above, tomb of Antef (pp. 18f. with references), and tomb No. 188 (*J.E.A.* 9, pl. xxiii); see also Säve-Söderbergh, *Einige ägyptische Denkmäler*, pp. 28 ff.

² 'Die Katze im Fenster über der Tür'; *Z.Ä.S.* 73, pp. 68 ff. One of the cats was depicted in *Descr. de l'Égypte*, *Ant.* ii, pl. 45 [14].

³ Davies seems to have copied most of them in his notebook and traced many of them. Most of those which were

traced are reproduced here, and it has been possible to attribute not a few of them to the extant scenes. I have studied all the copies carefully, and practically none of those left unpublished here contains, in my opinion, anything of interest. The majority are parts of the architraves with remains of the ordinary funerary formulas, and I have the feeling that it would be a waste of time to try and put together more than has been done here by Davies and myself. However, the copies are available in the Griffith Institute for those who are interested.

the *ka*-priest shall offer food as a gift of the king without interruption to eternity' to Surer. The other three texts are on the second right column near by, and contain mostly epithets and titles, which have been made use of above (pp. 34 ff.), when characterizing the social and political position of the tomb-owner.

The capitals of these columns had the *imakhy-kher* formula, to judge from the fragment on Pl. LIX (lower right corner). On this plate is a selection of fragments of different architraves, the upper ones being of sandstone, painted and unpainted (three upper rows), and at the bottom some more coloured fragments. The best of these were painted by Mrs. Davies for the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, and are reproduced here on Pl. LVIII. They are all of interest chiefly because of the stylistic beauty of the hieroglyphs, but no coherent text can be reconstructed.

Since the roofs of the two outer halls (probably the only ones which were sufficiently finished for the decoration to be begun) have both fallen in, it is not possible to locate the different ceiling patterns to be found on several fragments (Pl. LXI; from paintings by Mr. C. K. Wilkinson in the Metropolitan Museum). They do not show any extraordinary new designs, but are technically very well executed.

The last records of the tomb come from the third hall, the so-called 'jubilee hall', where we find some texts of a certain interest on the architraves and on the crown of the vault (Pl. LX).¹

The text of the crown of the vault starts with a *hotep-di-nesu* formula to Amūn, Rē-Harakhte, and Osiris, where, according to Sethe's copy, the first two signs (*nswt* and *di*) have been left out. The list of feasts which follows after the epithets, titles, and names of Surer is the same as that on the Bologna statue of Hapusonb.² The other texts contain the more or less commonplace formulas, epithets, and titles,³ but in one of them we learn the title and name of the father of Surer, the 'Overseer of the cattle of Amūn, Iṭet-towi', who, in comparison with his wife, the Royal Concubine Muttuy, plays such an unimportant role both on the other monuments of Surer and in his magnificent tomb in the Theban necropolis.

¹ Handcopies from Davies's notebook, kindly collated for me by Mr. Labib Habachi, and supplemented with earlier copies by Sethe, generously put at my disposal by Prof. Grapow. The parts marked with a dotted line were lost when Davies copied the texts, and as Sethe had the habit of changing the original order of the signs, it is uncertain whether my rearrangement of them in squares is absolutely exact.

² Sethe, *Urk.* iv. 482 f.

³ I know of no parallels to the expression in the north vault text *hb ṣhty (?) m pr.f* 'whom the horizontal one (?) sends out from his house', and *wṗ-n n.f Ḥr ib.f* 'to whom Horus has opened his heart' (where the *wṗ* sign is somewhat uncertain) is not very common either.