

TT 358, TT 320 AND KV 39. THREE EARLY EIGHTEENTH DYNASTY QUEEN'S TOMBS IN THE VICINITY OF DEIR EL-BAHARI

David A. Aston

Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna

Abstract: This paper discusses the similarities between TT 358, TT 320 and, in its second stage, KV 39. In terms of both architecture and grave goods, it is suggested that these three tombs were all made for early Eighteenth Dynasty queens. That TT 358 was carved for Ahmose-Meryetamun is certain, whilst the suggestion that TT 320 was cut for Ahmose-Nofretari is defended. Although it is not certain for whom KV 39 may have been designed, the suggestion that it was Ahmose-Inhapi seems plausible.

Keywords: Ahmose-Meryetamun, Ahmose-Nofretari, Ahmose-Inhapi, Amenophis I

With the recent publication of two articles concerned with queen's tombs in the Valley of the Kings (Roehrig 2010; Preys 2011), an article on KV 42 (Eaton-Krauss 2012), and a book dealing with the re-clearance of TT 320 (Graefe and Belova 2010), interest in the queen's tombs of the early Eighteenth Dynasty is clearly on the rise. With this in mind I present here an article on the Eighteenth Dynasty Queen's tombs located in the area of Deir el-Bahari, with, for the purpose of this study, the topographical borders being KV 41 in the north and KV 39 in the south [*Fig. 1*]. At first glance it is perhaps strange to see TT 358, TT 320 and KV 39 linked together as belonging to three queens of the early Eighteenth Dynasty, the more so that

in excavation reports of TT 320, Erhart Graefe argues that it was first cut during the Twenty-first Dynasty (Graefe 2004: 55). This is in direct contrast to the views of, among others, Herbert Winlock (1931), Elizabeth Thomas (1966: 170–202; 1979: 90), John Romer (1976), Nicholas Reeves (2003: 69), and Dylan Bickerstaffe (2010: 31), who have all pointed out that both the architecture and location of TT 320 is remarkably similar to other '*bab*' tombs ascribed to the late Seventeenth and early Eighteenth Dynasty queens, and, as we shall see, they are remarkably similar in both plan and associated finds.

Perhaps, however, it is not so strange since all three have, at one point or another, been dated to the reign of Amenophis I,

with KV 39 and TT 320 being assigned to the king himself (Polz 1995; Dodson 2003b). Following the work of Nicholas Reeves and Catherine Roehrig, it would appear that, in addition to the tomb of Hatshepsut, KV 20, evidently carved once she had assumed pharaonic status, KV 21, KV 32, KV 42, KV 46, KV 49 and KV 56 [see *Fig. 2*] may all have been conceived as tombs for Eighteenth Dynasty consorts (Reeves 2003; Roehrig 2010) to which René Preys (2011: 318–320), following an idea mooted by Reeves (2003: 72), would add KV 38. Most recently Roehrig has proposed that the chronological order would be KV 42, KV 32, KV 49, KV 46, KV 21, with the unfinished KV 56, not considered by Roehrig, not being precisely dateable, with Reeves and Preys postulating that KV 38 would predate all of them.

Based on the foundation deposits found in front of KV 42, that tomb was probably intended for Hatshepsut-Merytre, wife of Tuthmosis III, though whether she was actually buried in it remains unclear. According to Roehrig (2006: 251; 2010: 182), KV 32 was also cut during the reign of Tuthmosis III, though her sole argument for such a belief seems to be its close proximity to both KV 42 and Tuthmosis III's own tomb, KV 34. Against this view is that of Preys (2011: 333), who has suggested that KV 32 was cut during the reign of Amenophis II. Recent work by the University of Basel, however, clearly indicates that KV 32 was used for the burial of Queen Tiaa, a minor wife of Amenophis II and mother of Tuthmosis IV, who appears to have died in or around Year 7 of her son (Bryan 1991: 108). It is thus




Fig. 1. Composite sketch plan of Western Thebes in the reign of Tuthmosis I (After Porter and Moss 1964: Pl. V and Reeves 1990: 14, Fig. 3 with additions and amendments)

possible that Amenophis II prepared it for Tiaa, although as she was only a minor wife, the tomb may actually have been created for his mother by Tuthmosis IV.

The initial cutting of KV 46, KV 49 and KV 21 cannot be dated archaeologically, although KV 21 certainly contained pottery which dates between the reigns of

Hatshepsut/Tuthmosis III and Tuthmosis IV (Aston, Aston, and Ryan 2000: 14–16), whilst KV 46 was utilised for the burials of Yuya and Thuya, the parents-in-law of Amenophis III (Davis 1907; Quibell 1908). Two female ‘royal’ mummies were found in KV 21 (Ryan 1991), and if, with Roehrig (2010: 182), KV 21 was




Fig. 2. Valley of the Kings
(After Reeves 1990: 14, Fig. 3)

cut during the reign of Tuthmosis IV — again on the reasoning that it is close to the king's own tomb — it is tempting to see in these wives of the latter, perhaps Iaret and Nefertiry. However, Preys (2011: 329–332) argues that, on architectural grounds, the tomb was cut during the reign of Amenophis III, and thus was made most likely for Mutemwia, another wife of Tuthmosis IV, and mother of Amenophis III, a view supported by Marc Gabolde (2013: 190–191), whilst Zahi Hawass (2013: 170) has recently suggested that the DNA of one of the mummies found in the tomb, KV 21A, indicates that she is the mother of the two foetuses found in the tomb of Tutankhamun. This would tend to imply that KV 21A ought to be Ankhesenamun; however, Gabolde (2013: 189–191, 203) makes a good case to show that the mummy KV21A is actually Mutemwia. If KV 46 predates KV 21, then it follows that KV 46 was cut most likely either by Amenophis II or Tuthmosis IV, presumably for the burial of one (or more) of their chief queens. Roehrig (2010: 184) has suggested that KV 49, being located near Amenophis II's own tomb, would be a better candidate for a queen of Amenophis II. However, this tomb does not have the single pillar in the burial

chamber, indicative of a mid-Eighteenth Dynasty queen's tomb, and Thomas (1966: 147, 165) has suggested that both KV 49 and KV 58 should be dated to the later Eighteenth Dynasty.

Reeves has shown that during the later Eighteenth Dynasty, starting with Amenophis III, separate but integral parts of the kings' tombs were intended for the burials of their wives (Reeves 2003: 70; see also Hayes 1935: 29 note 104; 1959: 241) whilst with the accession of Ramesses I, the chief queens were buried in the Valley of the Queens. Little work, however, has been done on the queens' tombs of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Dynasties prior to the reign of Tuthmosis III, with the last major contribution on this topic being that of John Romer in 1976 (Romer 1976). There is no doubt that the queens' tombs of the late Seventeenth–early Eighteenth Dynasty were '*bab*' tombs having an entrance shaft leading to one or more corridors. They are widely scattered throughout the Theban necropolis, from Dra Abu el-Naga in the north to Wadi el-Gharby (Wadi F) in the south. They have been little studied, since it is, with a few exceptions, generally impossible to assign any of these anepigraphic and robbed tombs to a particular person.¹

TT 358

TT 358 [Fig. 3 top], cleared by Herbert Winlock in 1929 (Winlock 1932), is entered via an entrance shaft, approximately 1.20 m², which, for argu-

ments' sake, we will call A. This shaft descended 2 m before ending in a crudely cut staircase which extended for 4 m, and descended for a further 3 m. At a point just

¹ The most comprehensive gathering of material on these tombs is still that of Elizabeth Thomas (1966: 170–202), the most salient points of which are summarised in Strudwick and Strudwick 1999: 124–128, but see now Litherland 2014. The tombs in Wadi Bariya are currently being excavated by a mission directed by Piers Litherland, and were clearly made for daughters of Amenophis III.




Fig. 3. TT 358 (top) and TT 320 (bottom) (not to scale)
 (After Winlock 1932: Pl. I; Graefe and Belova 2010: Plan 05)

above the last stair, a lamp niche had been cut 1 m above the floor. The staircase gave way to a descending corridor (B), which ran for 10 m from the last step. At this point Winlock believed it then collided with the foundations of Hatshepsut's temple, which thus forced the masons responsible for cutting the tomb to turn sharply northwards. However, recent archaeological research has indicated the opposite and the tomb must predate the temple, hence, contrary to Winlock's belief, it must have been the foundations of the temple that cut into the tomb (Wysocki 1984: 338–342)² and, when compared to the plan of TT 320, see below, it would seem that this northward change of direction was part of the original plan. This northward

corridor (C) ended in a well (D), at the top of which a short corridor (E), 2 m long, ended in a step down into a wide corridor (F, Winlock's antechamber), 8.20 m long, which itself led to the burial chamber (G, Winlock's crypt), barely 6 m long "with a back wall manifestly unfinished" (Winlock 1932: 7). Finally, at some point a corridor (H) was dug for a length of 5 m westwards from corridor C. Winlock had presumed that the original masons had cut corridor H as a continuation of corridor B, on a slightly different access once they had hit the foundations of Hatshepsut's temple, but had then abandoned it through fear of once more hitting the temple. However, as it now seems that the tomb predates the temple, this explanation is no longer valid.

TT 320

TT 320 [*Fig. 3* bottom] is a shaft tomb, hidden at the base of a rock chimney, located near the entrance to the first valley south of Deir el-Bahari, and was first 'officially' cleared in 1881. No proper plan was made of it until it was mapped by a German–Russian mission between 1998 and 2006 (Graefe and Belova 2010: Plan 05). This new plan reveals that the layout of TT 320 is uncannily similar to that of TT 358, but on a more massive scale. It encompasses an entrance shaft, A, which was approximately 2 m² and descended to a depth of 12.85 m. It opened westwards (or rather slightly north–west) into a sloping corridor B, which, as in TT 358, contained an irregular cut staircase,

this time of seven steps. This corridor descended 1.69 m before ending in a step which led down into a corridor, C, that extended in a roughly northwards (or rather slightly north–east) direction. At the end of corridor B, Brugsch reported a hollow niche, which had disappeared by 1998, located 1.20 m above the floor. This feature was probably a lamp niche similar to the one found by Winlock in TT 358. Corridor C continued for 23.60 m before ending in a staircase, D, which comprised eight to nine roughly cut steps. At this point a niche, E, was cut in a northwesterly direction, or approximately at a 90° angle from the corridor, extending for 3.30 m. Graefe believed that this was the

² W.C. Hayes (1959: 53–54) pointed out long ago that the objects found in the tomb should be earlier than the reign of Tuthmosis III, and reassigned the tomb to the reign of Amenophis I, as indeed had Elizabeth Thomas (1966: 176), but it was only with Wysocki's study (1984: 338–342) that good architectural grounds were brought forward to prove this hypothesis.

beginning of a corridor that was given up once the masons hit a stratum of poor, flaky rock. Work proceeded consequently on the staircase, D, which was then continued by another six, much steeper, stairs, leading down to a new corridor, F, which continued in roughly the same direction as corridor C. When compared with TT 358, it would appear that staircase D was equivalent to the well, D, in TT 358, whilst the TT 320 niche E was the equivalent of the short corridor, E, in

TT 358. If the TT 320 niche E had not hit a stratum of poor rock, it is probable that this niche would have opened into the corridor F. As it happened, the poor rock caused the staircase to be modified and corridor F carved from the bottom of the stairwell. As in TT 358, the last step into F was carved entirely within the corridor. Corridor F ran for 31.20 m before opening into the burial chamber, G. As in TT 358 this chamber appears to have been left unfinished.

KV 39

KV 39 (Rose 2000; Buckley, Buckley, and Cooke 2005) [*Fig. 4* left] is more problematic since it has never been properly planned, was clearly modified twice, and is, in effect, two, or three, tombs in one. Despite its nomenclature, KV 39 lies outside of the Valley of the Kings [see *Fig. 1*], being situated high up at the head of a small wadi above the tomb of Tuthmosis III, 120 cubits west of the 'Way Station' utilised by the necropolis workers on their way from Deir el-Medina to the Valley of the Kings. In the following interpretation, I would suggest that the tomb was originally entered via a shaft, A, which was later modified into a stairway.³ At the base it opened westwards into a corridor, B, 3.04 m long, which descends 6.70 m. At its end it opens into what is now a hall or vestibule, from which a chamber and two corridors now lead, but probably

corridor B originally ended in the so-called upper chamber, which we might term H. As such, its location and basic plan are very similar to tomb AN.A (= Carter Tomb 238), an "unnamed royal tomb of XVII–XVIII Dynasty" date, found at a short distance to the north at Dra Abu el-Naga (Carter 1917: 114). As far as I know, AN.A has never been scientifically excavated, although a sketch plan [*Fig. 4* top right], apparently drawn by Leslie Greener, was published by Elizabeth Thomas, who attributed the tomb to Queen Ahhotep I or a contemporary (Thomas 1966: 172), although there are no grounds for such a hypothesis.

During a second phase of construction within KV 39, a staircase was cut down from the end of corridor B that led at approximately right angles to a corridor C which proceeded southwards and is

³ For the purposes of this article I am using the sketch plans of John Rose, rather than the more accurate plan of A. Cooke (in Buckley, Buckley, and Cooke 2005: 76), since John Rose includes sectional sketches as well. In essence, Cooke's plan differs little from the original sketch plans of Rose, the more so that the newer plan incorporates parts of the original sketch plan, given that between 1994 and 2002 the entrance to the 'South Passage' had become blocked by a collapse of the roof and deposits of waterborne rock debris from the 1994 flood. The letters A–H are mine to show the relationship of these features to those of TT 358 and TT 320: for the nomenclature of the excavators see my *Fig. 5*.




Fig. 4. Plans of the tombs: left, KV 39, from top, first, second and final stages; top right, Tomb AN.A; center right, TT 320; bottom right, KV 32 (not to scale) (After Rose 2000: Fig. xxii; Thomas 1966: 159; Graefe and Belova 2010: Plan 5; Weeks 2003: 97)

currently known as the South Passage. This corridor descends steeply, undulates from side to side, and is probably about 24 m long. The friable nature of the rock, which has been severely eroded by water, meant that the corridor was never fully cleared (Rose 1992: 35; 2000: 38), and as John Rose points out the debris may cover signs of staircases. Nevertheless, it would appear, as is indicated on the sketch plan, that Corridor C ended in a staircase, D, which led into another corridor, E, continuing in the same direction, which itself gave way to a staircase, F, leading to the burial chamber, G, 3.25 x 7.50 m in area, which is sited at right angles to the staircase F. As with TT 358 and TT 320, this chamber seems to have been unfinished. The plan of this second stage is thus remarkably similar to both TT 358 and TT 320.

It should be pointed out that my reconstruction thus differs from that of Rose (2000: 150) who sees in the so-called South Passage a subsidiary construction for a cache, or an unfinished tomb, believing that the well carved, so-called East Passage would have been the original tomb. In my opinion, it would appear that at a later, and final, stage, the entrance shaft was turned into a staircase, the start of corridor B was enlarged and the eastern tomb complex, which looks somewhat similar to KV 32 [Fig. 4 bottom right], was cut (Buckley, Buckley, and Cooke 2005: 77–79). Considering the similarity of the 'East Passage' and KV 32, both were probably cut at the same time, that is, with Roehrig, during the reign of Tuthmosis III, or, with Preys and Gabolde, during the reign of Amenophis II.




Fig. 5. *Three stages of KV 39*
(Based on the plan in Buckley, Buckley, and Cooke 2005: Fig. 76)

FINDS

Architecturally, therefore, it can be seen that TT 358, TT 320, and, in my presumed second stage, KV 39 are very similar to one another. Since TT 358 must predate Hatshepsut's temple, it is likely that all three tombs can be dated to the early Eighteenth Dynasty. Of the three, TT 358 was clearly used for a queen Meryetamun, who is now usually identified with Ahmose-Meryetamun, the wife of Amenophis I,⁴ whose burial was restored in Year 19 of Pinedjem I, the tomb then being reused for the burial of Nauny sometime during the later Twenty-first Dynasty. With great prescience of mind, Winlock was able to differentiate items belonging to the original burial from those being brought in by Pinedjem's restorers, and from those belonging to the apparently intact burial of Nauny. Subsequent work on New Kingdom pottery and the burial assemblages of the Third Intermediate Period by the present author have confirmed that Winlock was right. Ascribed to the Eighteenth Dynasty were a collection of pottery vessels [Fig. 6] and a number of objects, comprising canopic jars, a wooden lattice, perhaps part of a bed, a wooden shrine, fragments of chairs, embalmed pieces of meat wrapped in linen, a duck-shaped box, rectangular wooden boxes, bread, basketry trays, a rope sling for transporting objects, an alabaster cup and a lid, baskets containing false hair, and seven other baskets, some of which had been sealed with cords (Winlock 1932: 24–36) [Fig. 7]. Meryetamun's burial can presumably be dated to the reign of

her husband, Amenophis I, or that of his successor, Tuthmosis I, which thus dates the objects associated with her burial to the early Eighteenth Dynasty.

The objects found in TT 320, however, are more difficult to date. When the tomb was illicitly discovered, probably around 1871, it contained the coffined remains of most of the late Seventeenth–early Eighteenth Dynasty pharaohs: Ahmose, Amenophis I, Sequenenre-Tao II, Tuthmosis II and Tuthmosis III, their wives Ahmose-Henetemmet, Ahmose-Inhapi, Ahmose-Meryetamun, Ahmose-Nofretari, Ahmose-Sitkamose, and their children, Ahmose-Hettimehu, Ahmose-Sipair, Siamun and Sitamun, alongside the burials of a number of Twenty-first Dynasty High Priests and their family members, namely Nodjmet, Tayuherit, Pinedjem I, Henettawy A, Maatkare A, Istemkheb D, Masaharta A, Neskons A, Pinedjem II, Nesitanebashru and Djedptahfankh A. The coffined bodies of Seti I, Ramesses II, Ramesses III, Ramesses IX, an early Eighteenth Dynasty nurse named Rai, buried in the reused coffin of Paheripadjet, and six anonymous people make up the total number of individuals found in the tomb. One of the three anonymous male mummies may be that of Ramesses I, since coffin fragments of his were found in the Cache. Graffiti at the bottom of the shaft clearly show that the burials of Neskons A and her husband, Pinedjem II, were interred in the tomb in day 21, 4 *šmw*, Year 5 and day 20, 4 *pṛt*, Year 10, respec-

⁴ Winlock had dated her burial to the reign of Tuthmosis III, but the style of Meryetamun's coffin bears closer similarities to that of Ahmose, Ahhotep I, Ahmose-Nofretari, and Sitamun, than to that of Tuthmosis III. J.H. Taylor (personal communication, 2015) would date it to the reigns of Amenophis I/Tuthmosis I. Such an early date negates Reeves' suggestion (Reeves 1990: 18–19) that the tomb was originally cut for Tuthmosis II.

tively, of a king who can only be Siamun;⁵ the dates when the other burials were placed here remain unknown, although that of Djedptahefankh A must have

been introduced no earlier than the reign of Sheshonq I, since braces found on his mummy mention the High Priest of Amun, Iuput A, who was in office during the ear-




Fig. 6. Pottery from TT 358
(After Winlock 1932: Figs 16 and 17)

⁵ These docketts simply refer to the date of burial, and name the members of the burial party. I fail to see where Belova gets the additional gloss that Neskhons was buried in Year 5 "in the house of eternity where Amenhotep I is too" (Belova 2003: 76-77).




Fig. 7. *Objects from TT 358*
(After Winlock 1932: Figs 9, 10, 14, Pls 28, 29, 33, 35, 37)

ly years of his father, Sheshonq I. In the latest definitive treatment of TT 320, Graefe comes to the conclusion that “the tomb had been cut in the Twenty-first Dynasty” (Graefe 2004: 55; see also Graefe 2003: 79; Graefe and Belova 2006: 211), although “whether TT 320 was an unfinished tomb reused for Neskhons [A] or whether it was cut for her remains an open question” (Graefe and Belova 2010: 48). This is also the armchair view of Niwiński (1984: 77), who presumed that the tomb was started in the Twenty-first Dynasty and subsequently enlarged for the burial of Neskhons.

The official reports of the 1881 clearance paid little attention to pottery,⁶ probably because most of the ceramics recovered by the German–Russian team had been buried beneath a rock fall which had come down from the ceiling of the burial chamber. During the clearance operations undertaken between 1998 and 2006, however, this material was retrieved, restored and some 77 pieces were fully published. Whilst all of this pottery was attributed to the Twenty-first Dynasty, in my opinion, only vessels C.001, C.002 and C.023 can but do not need to be of this date. C.065, C.069(?) and C.071 should be dated to around the 8th–7th century BC, whilst the remaining illustrated vessels are clearly Tuthmosid [for a selection of the different types, see *Fig. 8*]. It is at once apparent that the vessels C.008, C.017, C.019, C.029 and C.041 are very similar to pots found in TT 358 [see *Fig. 6*], but the overall assemblage finds its closest parallels in the tomb of the three foreign wives of

Tuthmosis III (Lilyquist 2003: 91–103). Indeed the TT 320 corpus fits very nicely with other Theban contexts [*Fig. 4*], dateable to the reigns of Hatshepsut–Tuthmosis III, in particular, Deir el-Bahari (Szafranski 1997; Rzeuska 2001), the Valley of the Three Pits (Loyrette 1997) and tombs K91.4, K91.5 and K91.7 in Dra Abu el-Naga (Seiler 1992; 1993). Graefe makes the interesting observation that a number of pottery vessels had clearly been broken whilst the contents were still liquid, thus implying that the ceiling collapsed very soon after the pottery had been placed in the tomb. The same liquid which had escaped from the pottery vessels had also covered mat fragments (Graefe and Belova 2010: 176–177, catalogue 243 and 246), which thus also dates these pieces to the early Eighteenth Dynasty.

With the redating of the pottery to the Tuthmosid period, the fragments of a chair (Graefe and Belova 2010: 104–123, catalogue 080), preserved under the same rock fall must also date to the Eighteenth Dynasty, and this is probably the case for numerous inlays (Graefe and Belova 2010: 129, catalogue 094),⁷ which find ready parallels in Eighteenth Dynasty furniture, whereas items of furniture are not objects buried with the dead during the Twenty-first Dynasty (Aston 2009: *passim*). With the acceptance of an Eighteenth Dynasty date for at least some of the items found in the burial chamber of TT 320, it is probably worth reexamining a number of the other finds in order to see if any of these could be of a similar date. In this respect many of the wooden fragments,

⁶ The only pottery vessels attributed to the royal cache known in museum collections appear to be the unpublished Cairo JE 26274, JE 46882 and JE 46883.

⁷ Graefe and Belova had already foreseen that inlay 094 might derive from the chair 080 (Graefe and Belova 2010: 77 note 219).




Fig. 8. Selected pottery from TT 320
(After Graefe and Belova 2010: Pls C01–C09)

and the triangular shaped piece (Graefe and Belova 2010: 137, Pl. 55, catalogue 108), in particular, are reminiscent of Eighteenth Dynasty boxes (see Killen 1994: 38–45) [Fig. 12], whilst several of the wooden 'knob-shaped handles', catalogue entries 127–140, probably come from such containers rather than ushebti boxes, and are very similar to the 'knob-shaped handles' found in TT 358 (see Graefe and Belova 2010: 142–144, Pls 58–60, with Winlock 1932: 28).

Whilst there can thus be no doubt that objects found in both TT 358 and

TT 320 are very similar to one another [see Fig. 13], it is not possible to compare these items with objects found in KV 39 since specialist studies of the objects and pottery found in the 'South Passage' of KV 39 still remain to be undertaken. However, among the objects recovered were a number of 'calcite-alabaster' fragments, sherds of decorated pottery, including rim and base sherds remarkably similar to vessel C.039 found in TT 320, gold flakes, textiles, and pieces of wood including parts of one, or more, coffins (Rose 2000: 39–58).




Fig. 9. Comparative pottery to that from TT 320 from the reign of Tutmosis III: top, from the Tomb of the Three Foreign Wives of Tutmosis III; bottom, from Deir el-Bahari (After Lilyquist 2003: 99–101, Figs 56–77; Rzeuska 2001: 306, 313, 315, Nos 11, 18, 20 with adjusted dates)




Fig. 10. Selected objects from TT 320; inset, Eighteenth Dynasty chest (After Graefe and Belova 2010: Pls 55, 60, 71, 80, 82, 84, 85, 86; inset, after Killen 1994: Pl. 40)




Fig. 11. Comparison of finds from TT 358 (left) and TT 320 (right) (not to scale)
 (For sources, see Figs 6, 7, 8 and 10)

ORIGINAL OWNERS

That TT 358 was used for Ahmose-Meryetamun, wife of Amenophis I, is no longer disputed, but the identification of the original owners of TT 320 and KV 39 is still a matter for discussion. In view of the close similarity in both plan and finds, it is now clear that TT 320 must be dated to the early Eighteenth Dynasty, and the candidates most often found in the literature are Inhapi and Amenophis I.

The presence of Inhapi in TT 320 has led to speculation that it should be equated with the *k3y* of Queen Inhapi mentioned on docket inscribed on the coffins of Ramesses I, Seti I and Ramesses II. These show that on day 17, 4 *prt*, Year 10 of Siamun, all three coffins were moved from the tomb of Seti I, KV 17, to the *k3y* of Queen Inhapi, in which Amenophis I lay. Winlock was the first to seize on the fact that, since all five individuals mentioned in these dockets were found in TT 320, it is logical to assume that TT 320 is, in fact, the *k3y* of Queen Inhapi (Winlock 1931; Černý 1946). Moreover, with the translation of *k3y* as a “high place”, TT 320 fitted the bill. Unfortunately Winlock utilised an incorrect date believing that the docket referred not to Year 10, but to Year 16, and was thus later in time than another set of dockets found on the coffins of Seti I and Ramesses II, which show that on day 20, 4 *prt*, Year 10 of Siamun — the exact same day that Pinedjem II was buried in TT 320 — these two coffins were removed to the ‘House of Eternity’ of Amenophis I. Thus, if TT 320 were indeed the tomb of Inhapi, then, with the correct dating of both dockets, the above theory can only stand, if the coffins of Seti I and Ramesses II were removed from TT 320

on the day that Pinedjem II was buried, and then reintroduced into the Cache at a subsequent date, as indeed argued by Jansen-Winkel (2000).

However, such a scenario would mean that at some point Inhapi was also removed from the tomb, placed in the coffin of Rai, and then returned to TT 320 sometime after the burial of Djedprahefankh A, since both she and Seti I were found near the entrance to the tomb. Nevertheless, the interpretation still found in most general books is that TT 320 is the tomb of Inhapi. On the other hand, that TT 320 was the tomb of Amenophis I has been suggested by Breasted (1906: 690) and Schmitz (1978: 218–219). This theory has been questioned by Daniel Polz (1995: 13), who asks “why would a 21st dynasty scribe call the king’s original tomb ‘the tomb of (Queen) Inhapi.... in which Amenophis rests?’ Recently I have suggested (Aston 2013) that TT 320 is none other than the original tomb of Ahmose-Nofretari, on the following grounds. Firstly, it is now clear that most of the pottery and several fragmentary objects found in the tomb date to the early- to mid-Eighteenth Dynasty. Secondly, of the Eighteenth Dynasty queens discovered in TT 320 only Ahmose-Nofretari, who died in Year 5/6 of Tuthmosis I (Bradbury 1985: 75), was found in her own coffin, and it is perhaps significant that it is also close in style to that of the Ahmose-Meryetamun found in TT 358. Thirdly, Ahmose-Nofretari’s canopic jars, Cairo JE 26255A–D, were certainly in the hands of the clandestine excavators of TT 320 in 1881, and, along with the Books of the Dead of Maatkare A, Istemkheb D and Neskhons A, were

shown to the then governor of Qena by Mohammed Abd el-Rassoul, as confirmation that the latter knew the location of the tomb (Maspero 1889: 516). It is thus highly likely that these canopic jars also derived from TT 320.

At this point it is worth considering the report of the 'official' discovery, written by Edward Wilson, who visited the tomb in company with Emil Brugsch in January 1882, a few months after the tomb had been cleared. Writing from memory, Wilson (1887: 7) recalls how Brugsch told him (Wilson) that he (Brugsch) saw, amid a great number of mummy cases of stupendous size and weight, "the coffin of the amiable Queen Nofretari" stored within Chamber G. If we are able to place any faith in this account, which was published five years after the visit, it certainly shows that Ahmose-Nofretari's coffin was found in the burial chamber. Whether this is because she was put there when TT 320 was turned into a royal cache, or whether this is her original burial place must remain a mystery. Circumstantially, however, the fact that Ahmose-Nofretari was found in her own coffin, in a room which also included mid-Eighteenth Dynasty pottery, in a tomb which also contained her canopic jars, is certainly suggestive. A date as early as Year 5/6 of Tuthmosis I, however, is perhaps a little early for the style of the pottery, which rather suggests a date in the reigns of Hatshepsut–Tuthmosis III. However, should the pottery corpora traditionally assigned to the reigns of Hatshepsut–Tuthmosis III have begun a generation earlier — the lack of well dated Theban burials which can be assigned to the reigns of Tuthmosis I and II implies that this is certainly possible — then

TT 320 could indeed have been made for Ahmose-Nofretari.

This identification is criticized by Graefe, whose principal objections are that the pottery is too late for the reign of Tuthmosis I (Graefe and Bickerstaffe 2013: 115 note 2), and that the coffin of Ahmose-Nofretari was not in the state one might expect if this were her original burial place, since the coffin had been stripped of its original decoration (Graefe and Bickerstaffe 2013: 116). However, this was probably done by the necropolis 'restorers' who were plundering the royal mummies on behalf of the state (Reeves 1990: 276–278; Jansen-Winkel 1995). The coffin, as found, is remarkably similar to that of Ahmose-Meryetamun in TT 358, which was also found bereft of its precious materials. In that case, however, it is known that Ahmose-Meryetamun's burial was 'restored' in Year 19 of Smendes (Winlock 1932: 51), when, presumably, the precious metals were stripped from the coffin. Her burial, however, remained in her tomb. A similar fate probably also befell Ahmose-Nofretari, whose coffin may thus have been stripped of its valuables at that time (reign of Smendes?), but her burial would still have remained *in situ*. However, if TT 320 were not the tomb of Ahmose-Nofretari, Graefe is unable to explain the presence of (early-) mid-Eighteenth Dynasty pottery in the tomb — with the dismissal of Ahmose-Nofretari, "eine andere Person dieser Zeit ist nicht in Sicht. Dann kann es immer noch sein, dass TT 320 während der 18. Dyn. für ein Begräbnis vorgesehen war und schon mit einem Teil der Grabausstattung bestückt wurde, aber dann wegen des vorzeitigen Felsabsturzes in dieser Zeit doch nicht für die Bestattung benutzt wurde" (Graefe and

Bickerstaffe 2013: 119). Graefe suggests that the pottery found in TT 320 cannot be as early as the reign of Tuthmosis I since this particular pottery style is not found this early at Tell el-Dab'a (Graefe and Bickerstaffe 2013: 115 note 2). Comparing Theban pottery of the early Eighteenth Dynasty with that from Tell el-Dab'a, however, overlooks the fact that during the early Eighteenth Dynasty, northern forms, particularly those in Tell el-Dab'a, are heavily Hyksos-influenced and it is only with the reign of Tuthmosis III that the Upper Egyptian style is found throughout the country (Aston 2003: 140–146). Consequently, it is not surprising that this southern style is not found at Tell el-Dab'a during the reign of Tuthmosis I. However, this does not mean that this southern, Theban style did not develop at Thebes before the reign of Tuthmosis III. Graefe seems unaware of the scholarly debate concerning the dating of early Eighteenth Dynasty Egyptian pottery, which basically hangs on the dating of Egyptian pottery with black rims, and when Cypriote Base Ring and White Slip wares were first imported into Egypt, but this is not the place to discuss this in detail.

One school of thought argues that all this pottery was already current within Egypt at the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty, whilst another believes it only appeared during, or shortly before, the reign of Tuthmosis III. The conventional Tell el-Dab'a dating follows the latter school of thought, a position which I once also endorsed (see Aston 2003; 2007), though for several reasons, none of which are provable, I now begin to waver towards the former view. In fact, if Bourriau (1981; 1991; Bourriau and Eriksson 1997) and Merrillees (1968; 2001) are right in their

dating of black-rimmed pottery, Base Ring ware, and early Eighteenth Dynasty pottery in general, then there is a large body of evidence to show that it had certainly developed before the reign of Tuthmosis I, and could very well have been provided for the burial of Ahmose-Nofretari, whether that was in TT 320 or another tomb. Moreover at Sesebi, the pottery style exhibited by the material found in TT 320 is found in pre-Tuthmosis III levels (P. Rose, personal communication, 2015).

The tomb usually ascribed to Ahmose-Nofretari is AN.B located in Dra Abu el-Naga [see *Fig. 1*] although there is no proof of this. AN.B is clearly a royal tomb of the early Eighteenth Dynasty, and fragments of stone vessels bearing the names of Apophis and his daughter Heret, Ahmose, Ahmose-Nofretari, and Amenophis I were all found within it, and, since the names of Ahmose-Nofretari and Amenophis I occurred most often, Carter (1916: 152) assumed that this was a joint tomb of Amenophis I and his mother. Stone fragments which joined the head of a king, bought on the art market, were also found in the tomb, and although Carter thus attributed this head to Amenophis I, it would seem to represent more likely a later king, possibly Tuthmosis III according to William Hayes (1959: 49, 123). The tomb had clearly been modified at some point, and Romer (1976: 205) suggests that the original early Eighteenth Dynasty 'queen's' tomb had been converted into a 'king's' tomb during the Tuthmosid period for the reburial of Amenophis I (see also Dodson 2013). Romer thus suggests that AN.B was originally the tomb of Ahmose-Nofretari, which was then modified during the Tuthmosid period for the reburial of her son.

However, as TT 320 is almost certainly the tomb of Ahmose-Nofretari, then, if Romer's theory is correct, AN.B is more likely to be the tomb of Inhapi, since documentary evidence indicates that Amenophis I was certainly reinterred within it. On the other hand, as Romer himself points out, the stone vessels had been so thoroughly smashed and distributed not only throughout the tomb, but also outside, that we do not know how many fragments have been lost, any of which could have borne the names of later kings, or other queens. That being the case the tomb could just as easily have been utilised for the burial of Queen Ahhotep I (Polz 2007: 171, 196), or either Tuthmosis I or II. In this respect, it is noteworthy that stone vessel fragments bearing the name of Ahmose-Nofretari were also found in the tomb of Hatshepsut, KV 20. These vessels could thus have been brought into Hatshepsut's tomb at the same time and from the same place as Tuthmosis I when she had him reinterred in her own tomb. However, if Hayes is right, and the Tuthmosid head does indeed represent Tuthmosis III, and not Tuthmosis I, then it may not be too far-fetched to suggest that the original queen's tomb could even have been modified by, or for, Tuthmosis III before he instigated a burial in the Valley of the Kings. After all the (probable) earliest tomb in the Valley of the Kings is that of Hatshepsut, KV 20, and it should not be forgotten that at the time KV 20 was carved, the "Valley" was just another wadi, like any other, in which Eighteenth Dynasty queens were buried. Whilst KV 20 is the earliest dateable tomb in the Valley of the Kings, it is possible that KV 38 predates KV 20, but KV 38, in its general characteristics, was evidently

designed as a queen's tomb (see Reeves 2003; Preys 2011: 319–320), and thus would not be out of place in this queen's wadi. That the queens' wadi, which we now know as the Valley of the Kings, was evidently chosen as a royal burial ground by Tuthmosis III can be seen in the fact that not only did he have a tomb, KV 34, cut there for himself, but that he also planned a tomb, KV 42, for his wife, prepared several tombs for private burials in the vicinity of his own (Thomas 1966: 157; Roehrig 2006: 248–251; Preys 2011: 322–324), and reused a tomb, KV 38, for the reburial of Tuthmosis I.

For whom KV 39 was intended is impossible to decide with any certainty. Before the tomb was properly cleared, the most usual candidate for the tomb owner was Amenophis I (Weigall 1911: 175–176; Thomas 1966: 73–75; Manley 1988; Dodson 1988: 116–117), although in its first two stages, it is reminiscent, in its ground plan, of an early Eighteenth Dynasty queen's tomb. John Rose (2000: 144–148), who cleared the tomb between 1989 and 1994, has made the suggestion that it was the tomb of Inhapi, later modified for the addition of the burial of Amenophis I, and, in essence, he might be right, although there is no definite proof. What is clear, however, is that the 'East Passage' is very similar to KV 32, which suggests that both were made at approximately the same time. Within, and at the entrance to KV 39 Rose found a number of model grinding stones inscribed in blue paint. As Dodson points out, such items are known from a series of temple foundation deposits, particularly those dating to the reign of Tuthmosis III, and it is very likely, therefore, that these derive from a disturbed foundation deposit. Rose

believed the blue-painted cartouches to be those of Tuthmosis I, Tuthmosis II, and Amenophis II, although Dodson (2003a: 188–189) plausibly argues that they probably all belong to the same king, Amenophis II, and indeed coffin fragments and pottery found in the tomb would indicate a mid-Eighteenth Dynasty use of the tomb. Should Preys (2011: 322–324) be right in his attribution of KV 32 to the reign of Amenophis II, then there would be no surprise that the KV 39 ‘East Passage’ and KV 32 are somewhat similar to one another. KV 32 was evidently used for Tiaa, a minor wife of Amenophis II, who died during the reign of Tuthmosis IV, so it is possible that both tombs could have been cut during the reign of Amenophis II, possibly for members of Amenophis II’s immediate family. On the other hand, however, if Rose (2000: 144–148) is right in his supposition that KV 39 was the tomb of Inhapi, the ‘East Passage’ could well have been made for a reburial of Amenophis I, which would certainly explain the docket inscribed on the coffins of Ramesses I, Seti I and Ramesses II, which relate that on day 17, 4 *prt*, Year 10 of Siamun, all three coffins were moved from the tomb of Seti I, KV 17, to the ‘*k3y* of Queen Inhapi, in which Amenophis I lay’, and such a hypothesis would clarify why the *k3y* of Inhapi was a well-known landmark. Moreover, as Weigall pointed out long ago, KV 39 lies 120 cubits west of the ‘Way Station’ situated on the path from Deir el-Medina to the Valley of the Kings, which is a very significant distance. The Abbot papyrus (London BM 10221, Peet

1930: 28–45, Pls i–iv) dated to Year 16 of Ramesses IX states that the tomb of Amenophis I lay 120 cubits below the ‘*h’y p3 ‘y k3 hr.tw r.f*’ which unfortunately cannot be accurately translated; Weigall (1911: 175) suggests that the ‘*h’y*’ should be seen as the Egyptian name for the ‘Way Station’ with the result that KV 39 thus ‘fits’ the topographical location of the tomb of Amenophis I. Since the coffin docket explicitly infer that Amenophis I had, at some time, been reburied within the tomb of Inhapi, then this coupled with Weigall’s interpretation of the location of the tomb could easily be reconciled with the view that KV 39 was indeed the tomb of Inhapi reused for that of Amenophis I, provided the latter had been reburied here before Year 16 of Ramesses IX.⁸

Despite the fact that I believe the original tomb of Ahmose-Nofretari to be TT 320, it is still possible that, with Polz (1995; 2007: 172–192), the tomb K93.11 in Dra Abu el-Naga was the original tomb of Amenophis I, although it is difficult to see for whom K93.12 was created. That K93.11–12 is a royal tomb of the late Seventeenth/early Eighteenth Dynasty seems certain, but, if it were the tomb of Amenophis I, he was either never buried here (although the discovery of early Eighteenth Dynasty pottery suggests that the tomb was used for someone), or presumably reburied elsewhere at some later date. If the latter, then current thinking would suggest AN.B during the Tuthmosid period, and/or KV 39 during the reign of Amenophis II, although the possibility that he was transferred to a different tomb

⁸ The only other tomb proposed for Inhapi is that of WN A or the Bab el-Maalag (Reeves 1990: 190). However, clearance operations here (see Bruyère 1934: 92–94; Gabolde et al. 1994) failed to find any late Seventeenth–early Eighteenth Dynasty pottery, although this may have been removed by later usurpers of the tomb.

altogether cannot be discounted. In any case, during the reign of Ramesses VI, K93.12 was modified by the High Priest Ramessesnakht who built a cult chapel here which was apparently destroyed not long after it was constructed (Polz 1998: 273; Rummel 1999: 351). The alternative that it was a rather elaborate tomb chapel seems excluded by the fact that no traces of Ramessesnakht's burial were found in K93.11–12, although remains of the burial of his son, Amenhotep G, were discovered (Rummel 2003: 331; 2009). Twentieth Dynasty pottery found in the court could have arrived here by way of cult activities, but whether for the cult of Amenophis I or the cult of Ramessesnakht and/or Amenhotep G is impossible to determine. However, from the published preliminary reports there appears to be a distinct lack of later Eighteenth or Nineteenth Dynasty pottery found, which one might expect if the cult of the deified Amenophis I had continued to be celebrated at this place throughout the New Kingdom, nor is there apparently any mention of Amenophis I on any of the sandstone blocks, although Polz (1998: 265–267; 2007: 185–187) suggests that fragmentary architectural remains and parts of stelae found in the courtyard may be relics of cult activities. This would rather tend to suggest, as Polz (1998: 291) previously argued, that Ramessesnakht's building was constructed as a "private" mortuary temple for Ramessesnakht himself, an unusual but not unprecedented phenomenon. In any

case it would appear that, at this time, if not earlier, K93.11–12 was thus no longer sacrosanct, and as the necropolis inspectors mentioned in the Abbot Papyrus found the tomb of Amenophis I intact in Year 16 of the reign of Ramesses IX, it would seem unlikely that during the reign of Ramesses IX, K93.11 was considered to be the tomb of Amenophis I.

Whilst TT 358, TT 320 and KV 39 were clearly finished, and evidently used, two other features in the vicinity may have also been intended as early Eighteenth Dynasty queen's tombs, but were abandoned before completion. The first of these is KV 41 (=Carter Tomb 237), which, like KV 39, does not lie in the Valley of the Kings proper, but high up on a spur behind Deir el-Bahari, and slightly to the north. It appears on Loret's annotated map of 1901, which implies that he discovered it (Reeves 1990: 168, Pl. xiii), but it was not excavated until 1991, when it was found to be unfinished, the tomb builders having given up once they had excavated the entrance shaft (Gabolde, Amer, and Ballet 1991). In the 1960s Elizabeth Thomas was able to see a striking similarity between what was then visible of KV 41 and TT 320, "the two deep pits sharing the unusual features of height and position directly against the cliffs" (Thomas 1966: 156). The second is the feature known as DB G, a shallow pit not far from TT 320. If it were designed as a tomb shaft, it was certainly abandoned before it had been dug very deep (Thomas 1966: 177).

CONCLUSIONS

From the above it would seem certain that TT 358, TT 320 and KV 39 were clearly designed as tombs for queens of the late

Seventeenth–early Eighteenth Dynasty, with TT 358 being utilised for the burial of Ahmose-Meryetamun, TT 320 for the

burial of Ahmose-Nofretari, and KV 39 possibly for Ahmose-Inhapi. All three had evidently been plundered at some time, and TT 358 and TT 320 were clearly reused during the Twenty-first Dynasty, TT 358 for the burial of Nauny, and TT 320 as the family tomb of Pinedjem II. Whether KV 39 was also used for Twenty-first Dynasty burials must await the final study of the objects found within it. However, if KV 39 were the tomb of Inhapi, then, like TT 320, it was clearly reused for the reburials of Ramesses I, Seti I and Ramesses II before their eventual removal to TT 320. Moreover,

pottery of the 8th–7th centuries BC was also found in TT 320, and these distinct phases of use — Eighteenth Dynasty, Twenty-first Dynasty, Late Third Intermediate Period — are mirrored in other early Eighteenth Dynasty ‘*bab*’ tombs, in particular those in the Valley of the Queens (Lecuyot 1996), Bab el-Maalag (Gabolde et al. 1994: 200–225), and the tombs in the Valley of the Three Pits (Wadi el-Rumi) (Loyrette 1997). Alas, what kind of activity is to be connected with the presence of this later pottery must remain unclear until more evidence comes to light.⁹

David A. Aston

Austrian Academy of Sciences, Institute for Oriental and European Archaeology
A-1010 Vienna, Austria, Postgasse 7/1/10
david.aston@oeaw.ac.at

REFERENCES

- Aston, D. A. (2003). New Kingdom pottery phases as revealed through well-dated tomb contexts. In M. Bietak & E. Czerny (Eds.), *The synchronisation of civilisations in the Eastern Mediterranean in the second millennium B.C.* II (pp. 135–162). Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Aston, D. A. (2007). Kom Rabi’a, Ezbet Helmi and Saqqara NK 3507: A study in cross dating. In M. Bietak & E. Czerny (Eds.), *The synchronisation of civilisations in the Eastern Mediterranean in the second millennium B.C.* III (pp. 207–248). Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Aston, D. A. (2009). *Burial assemblages of Dynasty 21–25: Chronology, typology, developments.* Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Aston, D. A. (2013). TT 320 and the *k3y* of Queen Inhapi: A reconsideration based on ceramic evidence. *GM*, 236, 7–20.
- Aston, D. A., Aston, B., & Ryan, D. P. (2000). Pottery from tombs in the Valley of the Kings KV 21, 27, 28, 44, 45 and 60. *CCE*, 6, 11–38.
- Belova, G. A. (2003). TT 320 and the history of the Royal Cache during the Twenty-first Dynasty. In Z. Hawass & L. P. Brock (Eds.), *Egyptology at the dawn of the twenty-first century:*

⁹ It is probably of interest that the same phenomenon is found in the Valley of the Kings, where a number of Eighteenth Dynasty tombs were reused during the late Twenty-first–early Twenty-second Dynasty and also contained pottery of the 8th–7th century BC.

- Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Egyptologists, Cairo, 2000*, I (pp. 73–80). Cairo: American University in Cairo Press.
- Bickerstaffe, D. (2010). History of the discovery of the Cache. In E. Graefe & G. Belova, *The Royal Cache TT 320: A re-examination* (pp. 13–36). Cairo: Supreme Council of Antiquities.
- Bourriau, J. (1981). Nubians in Egypt during the Second Intermediate period: An interpretation based on ceramic evidence. In D. Arnold (Ed.), *Studien zur altägyptischen Keramik* (pp. 25–41). Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- Bourriau, J. (1991). Relations between Egypt and Kerma during the Middle and the New Kingdoms. In W. V. Davies (Ed.), *Egypt and Africa: Nubia from prehistory to Islam* (pp. 129–144). London: British Museum Press.
- Bourriau, J., & Eriksson, K. O. (1997). A Late Minoan sherd from an Early 18th Dynasty context at Kom Rabi'a, Memphis. In J. Phillips (Ed.), *Ancient Egypt, the Aegean and the Near East: Studies in honour of Martha Rhoads Bell* (pp. 95–120). San Antonio, TX: Van Siclen Books.
- Bradbury, L. (1985). Nefer's inscription: On the death date of Queen Ahmose-Nefertary and the deed found pleasing to the King. *JARCE*, 22, 73–95.
- Breasted, J. H. (1906). *Ancient records of Egypt: Historical documents from the earliest times to the Persian conquest IV. The Twentieth to the Twenty-sixth Dynasties*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bruyère, B. (1934). *Rapport sur les fouilles de Deir el Médineh (1931–1932) I*. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.
- Bryan, B. M. (1991). *The reign of Thutmose IV*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Buckley, I. M., Buckley, P., & Cooke, A. (2005). Fieldwork in Theban Tomb KV 39: The 2002 season. *JEA*, 91, 71–82.
- Carter, H. (1916). Report on the Tomb of Zeser-Ka-Ra Amenhetep I, discovered by the Earl of Carnarvon in 1914. *JEA*, 3(2/3), 147–154.
- Carter, H. (1917). A tomb prepared for Queen Hatshepsut and other recent discoveries at Thebes. *JEA*, 4(2/3), 107–118.
- Černý, J. (1946). Studies in the chronology of the Twenty-first Dynasty. *JEA*, 32, 24–30.
- Davis, T. M. (1907). *The tomb of Louiya and Touiyou. The finding of the tomb*. London: A. Constable and Co.
- Dodson, A. (1988). The tombs of the Kings of the early Eighteenth Dynasty at Thebes. *ZÄS*, 115, 110–123.
- Dodson, A. (2003a). The burial of members of the Royal Family during the Eighteenth Dynasty. In Z. Hawass & L. P. Brock (Eds.), *Egyptology at the dawn of the Twenty-first century: Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Egyptologists, Cairo, 2000*, II (pp. 187–193). Cairo: American University in Cairo Press.
- Dodson, A. (2003b). The lost tomb of Amenhotep I. In B. Manley (Ed.), *The seventy great mysteries of ancient Egypt* (pp. 80–83). London: Thames & Hudson.
- Dodson, A. (2013). On the burials and reburials of Ahmose I and Amenhotep I. *GM*, 238, 19–24.
- Eaton-Krauss, M. (2012). Who commissioned KV 42 and for whom? *GM*, 234, 53–60.
- Gabolde, L., Amer, H. I., & Ballet, P. (1991). Une exploration de la "Vallée du Puits". La tombe inachevée no 41. *BIFAO*, 91, 173–189.

- Gabolde, L., Amer, H. I., Ballet, P., Chauveau, M., Laferrière, P., & Le Fur, D. (1994). Le "Tombeau Suspendu" de la "Vallée de l'Aigle.", *BIFAO*, 94, 173–259.
- Gabolde, M. (2013). L'ADN de la famille royale amarnienne et les sources égyptiennes. *Égypte Nilotique et Méditerranéenne*, 6, 177–203.
- Graefe, E. (2003). The Royal Cache and the tomb robberies. In N. Strudwick & J. H. Taylor (Eds.), *The Theban necropolis: Past, present, and future* (pp. 74–82). London: British Museum Press.
- Graefe, E. (2004). Final reclearance of DB320. *Kmt: A Modern Journal of Ancient Egypt*, 15(3), 48–63.
- Graefe, E., & Belova, G. (2006). The Royal Cache TT 320: New investigations 1998, 2003 and 2004. *ASAE*, 80, 207–220.
- Graefe, E., & Belova, G. (2010). *The Royal Cache TT 320: A re-examination*. Cairo: Supreme Council of Antiquities.
- Graefe, E., & Bickerstaffe, D. (2013). Die sogenannte königliche Cachette TT320 war keinesfalls das Grab der Ahmose-Nofretete! *GM*, 239, 115–119.
- Hawass, Z. (2013). *Discovering Tutankhamun: From Howard Carter to DNA*. Cairo: American University in Cairo Press.
- Hayes, W. C. (1935). *Royal sarcophagi of the XVIII Dynasty*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hayes, W. C. (1959). *The scepter of Egypt: A background for the study of the Egyptian antiquities in the Metropolitan Museum of Art II. The Hyksos period and the New Kingdom (1675–1080 B.C.)*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Jansen-Winkel, K. (1995). Die Plünderung der Königsgräber des Neuen Reiches. *ZÄS*, 122(1), 62–78.
- Jansen-Winkel, K. (2000). Zur Geschichte der "Cachette" von Deir el-Bahri. In R. J. Demarée & A. Egberts (Eds.), *Deir el-Medina in the third millennium AD: A tribute to Jac. J. Janssen [=Egyptologische uitgaven 14]* (pp. 163–170). Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- Killen, G. (1994). *Ancient egyptian furniture II. Boxes, chests and footstools*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Lecuyot, G. (1996). La céramique de la Vallée des Reines: Bilan préliminaire. *CCE*, 4, 145–169.
- Lilyquist, C. (2003). *The tomb of three foreign wives of Tuthmosis III*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Litherland, P. (2014). *The Western Wadis of the Theban necropolis*. London: New Kingdom Research Foundation.
- Loyrette, A.-M. (1997). Les tombes de la Vallée des Trois Puits, à Thèbes-Ouest. *Memnonia*, 8, 177–195.
- Manley, B. (1988). Tomb 39 and the Sacred Land. *Journal of the Ancient Chronology Forum*, 2, 41–57.
- Maspero, G. (1889). *Les momies royales de Déir el-Baharî [=MIFAO 1]*. Paris: E. Leroux.
- Merrillees, R. S. (1968). *The Cypriote Bronze Age pottery found in Egypt [=Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 18]*. Lund: P. Åström.

- Merrillees, R. S. (2001). The Cypriote Base-Ring I jug from a secondary burial in Saqqara Mastaba 3507. *KVHAA Konferenser*, 54, 23–30.
- Niwiński, A. (1984). The Bab el-Gusus Tomb and the Royal Cache in Deir el-Bahri. *JEA*, 70, 73–81.
- Peet, T. E. (1930). *The great tomb-robberies of the Twentieth Egyptian Dynasty*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Polz, D. (1995). The location of the tomb of Amenhotep I: A reconsideration. In R. H. Wilkinson (Ed.), *Valley of the Sun Kings: New explorations in the Tombs of the Pharaohs* (pp. 8–21). Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Egyptian Expedition.
- Polz, D. (1998). The Ramsesnakht Dynasty and the fall of the New Kingdom: A new monument in Thebes. *SAK*, 25, 257–293.
- Polz, D. (2007). *Der Beginn des Neuen Reiches: zur Vorgeschichte einer Zeitenwende* [=SDAIK 31]. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Porter, B., & Moss, R. L. B. (1964). *Topographical bibliography of ancient Egyptian hieroglyphic texts, reliefs, and paintings* I.2. *The Theban necropolis. Royal tombs and smaller cemeteries* (2nd ed., rev. and augm.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Preys, R. (2011). Les tombes non-royales de la Vallée des Rois. *SAK*, 40, 315–338.
- Quibell, J. E. (1908). *Tomb of Yuua and Thuiu*. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.
- Reeves, C. N. (1990). *Valley of the Kings: The decline of a royal necropolis*. London: Kegan Paul International.
- Reeves, N. (2003). On some queen's tombs of the Eighteenth Dynasty. In N. Strudwick & J. H. Taylor (Eds.), *The Theban necropolis: Past, present, and future* (pp. 69–73). London: British Museum Press.
- Reeves, C. N., & Wilkinson, R. H. (1996). *The complete Valley of the Kings: Tombs and treasures of Egypt's greatest pharaohs*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Roehrig, C. H. (2006). The building activities of Thutmose III in the Valley of the Kings. In E. H. Cline & D. O'Connor (Eds.), *Thutmose III: A new biography* (pp. 238–259). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Roehrig, C. H. (2010). Some thoughts on Queen's Tombs in the Valley of the Kings. In Z. Hawass & S. Ikram (Eds.), *Thebes and beyond: Studies in honour of Kent R. Weeks* [=ASAE Suppléments 41] (pp. 181–196). Cairo: Conseil Suprême des Antiquités de l'Égypte.
- Romer, J. (1976). Royal tombs of the Early Eighteenth Dynasty. *MDAIK*, 32, 191–206.
- Rose, J. (1992). An interim report on work in KV 39, September–October 1989. In C. N. Reeves (Ed.), *After Tutankhamun: Research and excavation in the Royal Necropolis at Thebes* (pp. 28–40). London: Kegan Paul International.
- Rose, J. (2000). *Tomb KV39 in the Valley of the Kings: A double archaeological enigma*. Bristol: Western Academic and Specialist Press.
- Rummel, U. (1999). Die ramessidischen Sandsteinfragmente aus K93.11. In D. Polz et al., Bericht über die 6., 7. und 8. Grabungskampagne in der Nekropole von Dra' Abu el-Naga/Theben-West. *MDAIK*, 55, 350–364.

- Rummel, U. (2003). Die Arbeiten im Ramsesnacht-Komplex, K93.11. In D. Polz et al., Bericht über die 9. bis 12. Grabungskampagne in der Nekropole von Dra' Abu el-Naga/Theben-West. *MDAIK*, 59, 319–334.
- Rummel, U. (2009). Grab oder Tempel? Die funeräre Anlage des Hohenpriesters des Amun Amenophis in Dra' Abu el-Naga (Theben-West). In D. Kessler (Ed.), *Texte, Theben, Tonfragmente: Festschrift für Günter Burkard* [=Ägypten und altes Testament 76] (pp. 348–360). Wiesbaden: Otto Harassowitz.
- Ryan, D. P. (1991). Return to Wadi Biban el Moluk: The second (1990) season of the Valley of the Kings Project. *Kmt: A Modern Journal of Ancient Egypt*, 2(1), 26–31.
- Rzeuska, T. I. (2001). Pottery from the Temple of Tuthmosis III at Deir el Bahari. *EtTrav*, 19, 299–328.
- Schmitz, F. -J. (1978). *Amenophis I: Versuch einer Darstellung der Regierungszeit eines ägyptischen Herrschers der frühen 18. Dynastie* [=HÄB 6]. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg.
- Seiler, A. (1992). Die Keramikbearbeitung. In D. Polz, Bericht über die erste Grabungskampagne in der Nekropole von Dra Abu el-Naga/Theben West. *MDAIK*, 48, 124–128.
- Seiler, A. (1993). *Grab und Kult, Zwei "ungestörte" Schachtgräber in der Nekropole von Dra' Abu el-Naga* (unpubl. MA thesis). Heidelberg University.
- Strudwick, N., & Strudwick, H. (1999). *Thebes in Egypt: A guide to the tombs and temples of ancient Luxor*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Szafranski, Z. E. (1997). Foundation pottery deposit found at the Djoser-Akhet Platform (part I). The Temple of Tuthmosis III at Deir el-Bahari. In *Essays in honour of Prof. Dr. Jadwiga Lipińska* [=Warsaw Egyptological Studies 1] (pp. 53–64). Warsaw: National Museum in Warsaw; Pro-Egypt.
- Thomas, E. (1966). *The royal necropoleis of Thebes*. Princeton, NJ.
- Thomas, E. (1979). The k3y of Queen Inhapy. *JARCE*, 16, 85–92.
- Weeks, K. R. (2003). *Atlas of the Valley of the Kings* [=Publications of the Theban Mapping Project 1]. Cairo: American University in Cairo Press.
- Weigall, A. E. P. B. (1911). Miscellaneous notes. *ASAE*, 11, 170–176.
- Wilson, E. L. (1887). Finding Pharaoh. *The Century Magazine*, 34(1), 3–10.
- Winlock, H. E. (1931). The Tomb of Queen Inhapi: An open letter to the Editor. *JEA*, 17(1/2), 107–110.
- Winlock, H. E. (1932). *The tomb of Queen Meryet-Amün at Thebes*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, Egyptian Expedition.
- Wysocki, Z. (1984). The results of research, architectonic studies and of protective work over the Northern Portico of the Middle Courtyard in the Hatshepsut Temple at Deir el-Bahari. *MDAIK*, 40, 329–349.