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The central area of the hill known as Dra Abu el-Naga, at the northern end of the
Theban necropolis, was first excavated in January 1899 by the Marquis of Northampton, Spiegelberg and Newberry. According to Spiegelberg’s Excavation Journal, they
worked here for almost a month, and cleared the entrance to the inner part of the
funerary monument of Djehuty (TT 11), Overseer of works and Overseer of the Treasury
under Hatshepsut–Thutmose III, to a distance of six meters away from the façade.
Approximately ten years later, the Antiquities Service roofed this area and closed it
with a stone wall and an iron door, in order to protect from the robbers the inscriptions
and scenes carved on the façade. The area further away from Djehuty’s façade was
never excavated or cleared.

Later re-uses of the courtyard

This circumstance explains how, in front of the entrance to the tomb of Djehuty and only
about nine meters away from the façade, a complete, untouched and well preserved
coffin was unearthed in 2003 by the Spanish-Egyptian mission working in the area.


2 Kept at the archive of the Griffith Institute, Oxford.

3 A.E.P. WEIGALL, A Guide to the Antiquities of Upper Egypt (London, 1909), 182; A.H. GARDINER, A.E.P. WEIGALL, A Topographical Catalogue of the Private Tombs of Thebes (London, 1913), 16f.; R. ENGELBACH, A Supplement to the Topographical Catalogue of the Private Tombs of Thebes (Nos. 253 to 334) with some Notes on the Necropolis from 1913 to 1924 (Cairo, 1924), 12. Before the entrance to Djehuty’s tomb got roofed, a set of photographs was taken, and they are now kept at the Griffith Institute: Griffith Institute photo 1684; 1731; 1685 = AHG/ 28 652 = Davies MSS 1.2.2; AHG/ 28 651.

4 During Northampton’s excavations another Third Intermediate Period coffin was unearthed near the façade, this one inscribed and belonging to a woman called Mut-ankh-khonsu, according to W. SPIEGELBERG, Excavation Journal, 84.
The coffin was apparently left lying on the ground, previously levelled with mid-size stone blocks, its base resting 0.30 m above the court’s floor. Then, it was completely covered with a heap of rubble. The coffin measures $1.83 \times 0.45 \times 0.45$ m, it is un-inscribed, with the outer face coated with a creamy whitewash, and having only the eyes and eyebrows painted in black. The lid represents the body of a woman, wearing a wig and round plug-earrings. The breasts are small and rounded, protruding below the straight ends of the two lappets of the wig, and the arms lay crossed over the chest, with the hands opened. The thickness of the wood of both lid and case, i.e. the edges where they joined, were painted in red-brown\(^5\). The coffin probably dates to the end of the Ramesside Period or very early Third Intermediate Period. The mummy found

inside belongs to a mid-aged woman, with a linen shroud covering her body and tied at the feet, neck and head.

A group of four individuals were also buried one next to each other in front of the entrance to Djehuty’s tomb, some 24 m away from the façade (figures 1, 2). Two of them, males aged in their mid-twenties and late thirties at death, have very badly preserved painted anthropomorphic coffins following the Twenty-First Dynasty style. Another individual, a male in his forties, was wrapped in a shroud, and was left on the ground without coffin. The fourth one is an infant, about five years old, placed inside a modest, rectangular wooden box. They were lying close together, 0.30 m above the

---

6 The mummy was x-rayed and studied by Salima Ikram. The human remains found during the excavation are being analyzed by Roxie Walker.

7 The technique and quality of the mummification procedures seem to indicate a slightly later date for the bodies and their burial. Thus, to be on the safe side, the group should better be dated broadly to the Third Intermediate Period.
court’s floor, covered by a tumulus of stones, mud bricks, wooden planks from old coffins, parts of canopic jars and wall fragments. Luckily, these later interments were quite modest and did not affect the structure of the court. Several mumification deposits were also found on Djehuty’s courtyard, most of them consisting of a couple of big jars characteristic of the Saite Period, linen bandages and natron linen bags\(^8\).

During the sixth archaeological season, in January-February 2007, a small pit was found in the middle of the court, at a distance of 22 m away from the façade. It opened practically at the ground floor level, measuring 1.10 × 1.30 and 0.70 m deep. It primarily contained pottery vases and flower bouquets. All the vases but one were broken into pieces. Some were thrown inside the pit already broken, while others seem to have been smashed against some mid-size stones that were also thrown inside. Everything seems to indicate that the vessels were intentionally broken. We were able to put together seven tall containers, and thirty-five closed jars of medium size of one and a half litre capacity. All of them are Nile silt daily use ware of the Twentieth Dynasty\(^9\).

Mixed with the fragmented pottery, there were at least forty-four flower bouquets (figures 3, 7). Most of them were made of persea branches, seven consist of Assyrian plum branches (\textit{Cordia myxa} \textit{L.}), two bouquets combine these two plants, and finally three of them combine olive branches (\textit{Olea europea} \textit{L.}) and apple (\textit{Malus sylvestris}). The bouquets are tied up in different ways, all using date-palm leaflet strips\(^{10}\).

This deposit is certainly not a “foundation deposit”, despite the fact that bundles of persea and sycamore branches were part of one of the five foundation deposits at the entrance of Senenmut’s lower tomb (TT 353)\(^{11}\). There are other possible explanations for the ensemble, which may actually be just pictorial variants of the same idea and funerary custom. The pit’s content might be the consequence of the removal and hide away of what the relatives and friends were carrying with them during the funerary procession and was placed near the burial ground. An illustration of this custom might be found in the tomb of Ramose (TT 55), where a group of men are depicted carrying flowers in baskets and vases hanging inside nets while approaching the tomb at the funerary precession\(^{12}\). Indeed, flower stands were set up at the entrance of the tomb at

---


\(^9\) A study of the pottery can be found in the article by M.-J. LÓPEZ and E. DE GREGORIO, included in this volume.

\(^{10}\) A thorough study of the plant remains was conducted at the site by the archaeobotanist Ahmed Fahmy: A. FAHMY, J.M. GALÁN and R. HAMDY, ‘A Deposit of Floral and Vegetative Bouquets at Dra Abu el-Naga (TT 11)’, \textit{Bulletin de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale} 110 (2010), 73-89.


the time of the funeral, as depicted in tomb scenes of the Eighteenth Dynasty and in
funerary papyri\textsuperscript{13}. The deposit might also be related to a ritual described in the tomb of
the general Horemheb at Saqqara and other contemporary monuments, where mourners
are shown breaking vases next to flower stands\textsuperscript{14}. The deposit is probably the largest
group of flower bouquets ever found. It constitutes the archaeological evidence of a

\textsuperscript{13} See the vignette in the Book of the Dead papyrus of Nebqed, now at the Louvre Museum; E. Naville,
\textit{Das aegyptische Totenbuch der XVIII. bis XX. Dynastie} (Berlin, 1886), vol. I, pl. 4.

\textsuperscript{14} G.T. Martin, \textit{The Memphite tomb of Horemheb commander-in-chief of Tutankhamun, I: The reliefs,
inscriptions, and commentary} (London, 1989), 100-2, pl. 118-24. See also the relief from the tomb of
und Papyrussammlung} (Mainz am Rhein, 1991), 136-8 (no. 82). See recently on this topic V. Müller,
‘Bestand und Deutung der Opferdepots bei Tempeln, in Wohnhausbereichen und Gräbern der Zweiten
Old and Middle Kingdoms}, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 103 (Leuven, 2001), 175-204. M. Raven
showed similar scenes and archaeological material related to this ritual in his congress’ communication
ettitled ‘The tomb of Akhenaten’s royal butler Ptahemwia at Saqqara’.

Fig. 3. Some of the forty flower bouquets found inside a pit dug into the court’s floor
during the Twentieth Dynasty.
practice well documented in iconography. Its relevance increases by the presence of olive branches among the plants used to form the bouquets.

The courtyard of Djehuty’s tomb

Djehuty’s courtyard laid under more than five meters of rubble, due to its foothill location. It took five seasons of fieldwork to bring to light the court’s floor (figure 4). The court measures 34 m long. It is, to the present day, the largest courtyard preserved of the time of Hatshepsut–Thutmosis III. On the other hand, the court’s width has the average size, measuring 7.60 m wide. Djehuty’s courtyard is, thus, extraordinarily elongated.

The sidewalls were carved on the rock, following the descending hill slope. When they reached the floor level, at about 12 m away from the façade, they were artificially enlarged. The north-eastern rock wall was prolonged by means of a masonry wall surmounted by layers of mud bricks. The south-western rock wall was extended by means of a mud brick wall that is three meters high at a distance of 16 m from the façade. Since the façade is also 3 m high, it seems that the sidewalls maintained this height at least for sixteen meters. Their tops seem to have been flat, and they are both 1 m. thick. The outer face of the walls lies on the rubble accumulated at both sides, and thus they do not go all the way down to reach the court’s level. The inner face of the walls reach the court’s floor, and was entirely covered with a layer of carbonated mud mortar coated with a fine layer of stucco. The mud brick walls have a previous layer of coarse mud mortar (not detected on the masonry wall).

The court’s entrance was defined by a mud brick wall, or “pylon”, with an open space in the middle 2.70 m wide. What remains of the entrance wall reaches 0.68 m high (figure 5). Although we are not sure about its original height, it was probably not much higher, since next to it only a few mud bricks were found fallen on the court’s floor. We cannot know either if its top was flat or rounded. Its inner face was coated with carbonated mud mortar and stucco. The area just outside the “pylon” was slightly lower than the court’s floor, what implies that one had to climb a step to get inside. Steps, either going up or down (as in the case of the sunken courtyards), were meant to separate two areas of a different nature.

17. Rekhmira and Puiemra courtyards, as they are known today, measure about 19 m long.
Fig. 4. Courtyard of the tomb of Djehuty (TT 11),
high official under Hatshepsut-Thutmose III.

Fig. 5. Entrance wall to the courtyard.
At approximately the middle of Djehuty’s courtyard, the sidewalls show a significant deviation to the north-east, particularly the south-western wall, breaking the monument’s central axis. This alteration in the court’s layout is probably due to the presence of an earlier structure in the area south-west of the court’s entrance. It must have been relevant enough to deserve being respected and to cause the adaptation of Djehuty’s monument to it.

The floor of the court near the façade was carefully cut on the bedrock. However, as the hill slope maintained its inclination, the rock sinks below the court’s floor level at a distance of 12 m away from the façade. Thus, in order to reach the court’s entrance, the remaining area was filled and levelled with limestone chips and rubble, and then covered with sand. The latter was pressed hard to make an artificial floor ("dakka"), and was then covered with the same carbonated mud mortar that was used for the inner face of the walls (figure 6). The courtyard must have had, indeed, a very whitish and shiny appearance.

The detailed study of Djehuty’s courtyard is particularly relevant when one realises that the courts of outstanding funerary monuments belonging to important officials of the Eighteenth Dynasty remain to a great extent unknown. This is even more so concerning the entrance to the courts, since very few have been excavated and documented.

18 N. de G. Davies, *Five Theban Tombs* (London, 1913), 2, informed about his work at the funerary monument of Montuherkhepeshef (TT 20), fan-bearer of Thutmose III, concluding: “A wider clearance in the vicinity would probably increase the number (of wall fragments), and as even a few consecutive hieroglyphs might be most enlightening as to the purport of the scenes, it is to be hoped that this may some day be undertaken.” However, the monument was restored without conducting any excavation at the courtyard. The same author, in his publication of the monument of Puienra (TT 39), second prophet of Amun under Hatshepsut–Thutmose III, suggested the possible reasons why the courtyards were ignored by most Egyptologists: “Too little attention has been paid to the exterior of Theban sepulchres, partly because the researches necessary involve considerable expense for little reward, partly because great pains and wide knowledge are necessary to recover any details at all of the original features from amidst the tangle of later interments;” N. de G. Davies, *The Tomb of Puyemré at Thebes* (New York, 1922), vol. II, 51. Indeed, at that time, most Egyptologists were interested either in excavating burial chambers, or in copying wall inscriptions. Davies belonged to the second kind, and for that reason, he avoided the excavation of the court of the royal butler and royal herald under Hatshepsut–Thutmose III, Djehuty (TT 110): “(The courtyard) is deeply buried at present and, as the thicknesses of the entrance do not appear to be decorated, little or nothing is likely to be gained by its complete clearance,” N. de G. Davies, “Tehuti: Owner of Tomb 110 at Thebes’, *Studies presented to F. Ll. Griffith* (London, 1932), 279. Until now, the courtyard of Uset (TT 21), steward of Thutmose I-II, has never been properly excavated: see Davies, *Five Theban Tombs*. The monument of Ineni (TT 81), who lived under Amenhotep I down to the reign of Thutmose III, and held the office of overseer of the granary of Amun, is yet another surprising case where the court was left unexcavated: E. Dziobek, *Das Grab des Ineni. Theben nr. 81* (Mainz am Rhein, 1992). The courtyard of one of the monuments of Menkheperrasen (TT 86), first prophet of Amun under Thutmose III, was cleared by Robert Mond in 1903, but it was never really excavated and documented; see N. de G. Davies, *The Tombs of Menkheperrasenb, Amenmose, and another* (London, 1933). These are just a few examples.

19 The courtyard of the extraordinary monument of Thutmose III’s vizier Rekhmira (TT 100) was first cleared by Newberry in 1900, and Davies laid bare the court in 1935 to a distance of eleven meters from
Previous interments below the court’s floor

A trench was opened into the artificial floor of Djehuty’s courtyard during the sixth season of field work, and an early Eleventh Dynasty coffin was found close to the northeast sidewall, 22 m away from the façade, one meter below the court’s floor, and lying on the bedrock (figure 7). It is rectangular (1.87 × 0.40 × 0.47 m), made of thick wooden boards (5 cm; the interior is thus 30 cm wide), and with a protruding handle at the shorter sides of the lid. It is un-inscribed, and has no trace of decoration. It belonged to a woman over fifty years old. She was laid in the coffin extended on her right side, facing the sunrise. She was very superficially mummified (only traces the façade. In his publication, despite the lack of available data, he pointed out: “The court is heavily encumbered with rubbish on the outer edge, so that its limits are not ascertainable; but tombs of the period rarely show any demarcation of the court by an outer wall or pylon….” N. de G. Davies, The Tomb of Rekh-mi-Re at Thebes (New York, 1943), vol. I, 6, n. 14. An enlightening overview can be found in F. KAMP, Die thebanische Nekropole, Theben 13 (Mainz am Rhein, 1996).
of textile), and was just adorned with a simple faience necklace made of small beads. A *hes*- and a *nw*-vase were found 20 cm. above the lid. When the coffin was removed from its place, seven balanos (*balanites aegyptiaca*) fruits/nuts were found underneath.

Inside the coffin there was a great quantity of mud, which was brought inside by running water due to heavy rains. Actually, at the trench were the coffin was found, the section that goes down from Djheuty’s floor down to the Eleventh Dynasty floor, approximately 1 m high, shows clear evidence that there had been four mayor floods during the five hundred years lap that separate the two levels.

The following season, close to the south-western wall of Djehuty’s courtyard, and again 22 m away from the façade, another intact burial was found one meter below Djehuty’s floor level (figure 8). This time the coffin was pushed sidewise inside a small rock recess of $1.80 \times 2.60 \times 1.00$ m. The entrance, at the south-eastern side of the niche, was then blocked with big stones. The coffin was placed so that the deceased would be facing outwards, towards the sunrise. Outside the entrance, but near the

---

**Fig. 7.** Trench opened in Djehuty’s courtyard. To the right is an Eleventh-Dynasty coffin *in situ*; to the left is the pit where the flower bouquets were found.
deceased’s head, an oval offering tray made of clay was left on the ground\textsuperscript{20}. Inside, a group of five arrows were left next to the coffin’s head-end. The arrows seem to have been intentionally broken in two. They measured around 82 cm, are made of hollow reeds (diameter: 1 cm), and three of them still have feathers attached to the rear end. The tips are made of ebony and have a plain end (diameter: 0.5 cm). No pointed attachment made of flint or copper was found\textsuperscript{21}. Aside of the arrows, the only other  


\textsuperscript{21} See H.E. Winlock, \textit{Excavations at Deir el Bahari 1911-1931} (New York, 1942), pl. 20; \textit{idem}, \textit{The Slain Soldiers of Neb-hepet-Re Mentu-hotpe} (New York, 1945); W.C. Hayes, \textit{The Scepter of Egypt. A Background for the Study of the Egyptian antiquities in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Part I: from the Earliest Times to the End of the Middle Kingdom} (New York, 1953), 279-81 (fig. 182). Broken bows and arrows with feathers can be found in J. Garstang, \textit{The Burial Customs of Ancient Egypt as Illustrated}
object found next to the coffin was a very fine marl clay C globular jar, similar in shape to some of the early Eleventh Dynasty vessels found at el-Tarif.22

Near the foot-end of the coffin a thin linen band was still hanging vertically, as if it was meant to keep the lid attached to the box. However, since there were no linen remains at the other side of the coffin, nor at the central area or close to the head-end, it is not clear what was the real purpose of the piece of cloth.

The coffin is rectangular, measuring 1.95 × 0.44 × 0.54 m. The upper face of the lid has two holes at each end to pass through them a string to be used as handle. The boards employed, including the lid, are quite thick (7 cm), leaving a narrow space inside (just 30 cm wide), but enough to squeeze in the body sidewise. The fact that the body seems to have been wrapped with little linen might have helped also, as in the case of the woman mentioned above. The exterior of the coffin was first painted in white. Secondly, a band of hieroglyphic text was written running along the four sides and the lid. Finally, the coffin was painted in red, imitating a better quality wood, such as cedar, leaving in white only the background of the text band. The eastern side had a pair of udjat-eyes painted below the inscription, and also having a white background. Unfortunately, the eastern side near the head-end has suffered much from water and termites.

The hieroglyphic signs are polychrome and they have been traced in a naïf style characteristic of the First Intermediate Period. The head-end has one of the earlier references to Hathor in the Theban necropolis.23 It is worth pointing out the peculiar semantic determinative with which the name of Anubis lord of Sepa is written on the lid: a seated human figure completely painted in red, wearing a conical tall crown and holding a flagellum. The choice of such a determinative could be taken as a scribal error, since a similar figure – although not painted in red – is commonly associated with Osiris lord of Busiris and Khentiamentyu lord of Abydos, the other deities mentioned as guarantors of the deceased’s wellbeing.24 However, since these two have a


23 S. Allam, Beiträge zum Hathorkult (bis zum Ende des Mittleren Reiches), Münchner ägyptologische Studien 4 (Berlin, 1963), 58. Note that Hathor is not mentioned (leaving aside titles) in the few known coffins of the First Intermediate Period.

24 Note that in most cases the figure is not holding the flagellum, despite of the fact that he has both hands stretched forward, ready to hold it. In the Eleventh Dynasty coffin of Henuy from Gebelein, Berlin Museum no. 13772, both divine figures are holding the flagellum; see G. Steindorff, Grabfunde des Mittleren Reichs in den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin, II: Der Sarg des Sekb-O. Ein Grabfund aus Gebelên (Berlin, 1901), pl. 10, 18; G. Lapp, Typologie der Särge und Sargkammern von der 6. bis 13. Dynastie, Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte Altiägyptens 7 (Heidelberg, 1993), pl. 9 (G 7). See also n. 25, 27.
common and very specific determinative, which is the same one used for Anubis on the eastern side of the coffin (different from that used on the lid), it seems that the distinctive figure of Anubis lord of Sepa is intentional.

The inscription has two significant features. Firstly, the horned-viper-sign for the letter \( f \) has its neck always cut off. Secondly, when the same sign is written two or three times consecutively (the yod, the water-sign for the letter \( n \), and the seat-sign for the word \( st \) “place”), they alternate colours to avoid repetition. The closer parallel to Iqer’s coffin is said to come from Farshut (north of Thebes), and is now kept at the Fine Arts Museum, Boston (no. 03.1631 a, b).

The name of the owner, Iqer, is written only once, at the foot-end, without a semantic determinative and just preceded by the epithet “the venerated one”. Inside the coffin, the body lay on the left side. It had a cartonnage mummy mask, with a usekh-collar painted on the chest. The shroud wrapping the body is tied up at the feet, the laces also holding attached to the body two long self-bows and three curved staves. The bows are made of a single piece of wood, circular in section, and measure 1.60 m. Actually, they seem to be 10 cm taller than their owner, as his height is estimated to be 1.50 m. They still have the twisted gut cord tied to both tips. The staves measure 1.09 m, and are slightly curved near the top-end. The interior of the coffin has suffered greatly from running water and termites, and it is in an extremely fragile condition.

Iqer has no titles, but the fact that he was buried with five arrows, two bows and three curved staves seems to indicate that he may have been somehow related to a military contingent at some point in his life. Indeed, it is true that bows were also used for hunting game in the desert edge, that they were used as a sign of social status, and for that reason they were frequently included in the funerary equipments of that period. Nevertheless, since armed conflicts seemed to have been quite common at the beginning of the Eleventh Dynasty, it seems likely that Iqer would have been at some point a mid-class soldier under one of the Theban leaders or kings.

The finds below Djehuty’s court floor document an earlier use this area of the necropolis, and how previous and more modest burials ended up being covered by and hidden under sumptuous funerary monuments of roughly five hundred years later.

---

Conclusion

The excavation of the courtyard of Djehuty’s funerary monument (TT 11), during the first seven archaeological campaigns that the Spanish-Egyptian mission has conducted at Dra Abu el-Naga, has proven to be quite fruitful. Firstly, an exceptionally long court of the time of Hatshepsut–Thutmosis III (c. 1480 BC) was brought to light, enlarged with mud brick walls. Secondly, later re-uses of the area for humble burials (namely coffins under tumuli of debris) during the Third Intermediate Period (c. 1000 BC) were documented less than half a meter above the floor level. Thirdly, part of the Eleventh Dynasty necropolis (c. 2000 BC) was found one meter below Djehuty’s artificial court floor. Thus, in a relatively small area, we have been able to document a sequence of more than one thousand years of funerary activity in the Dra Abu el-Naga necropolis.
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